

**The Intervention Strategies of Resource Persons Monitoring Home Education:
A Typology and a Questionnaire**

Brabant, C. (2021). The Intervention Strategies of Resource Persons Monitoring Home Education in Quebec: A Typology and a Questionnaire. *Journal of School Choice*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15582159.2021.2015552>

Author : Christine Brabant, Ph. D., Associate Professor

Corresponding author: Christine Brabant, Ph. D., Associate Professor; 2900 Bd Edouard-Montpetit, Montréal, Québec, Canada, H3T 1J4; christine.brabant@umontreal.ca

Affiliation: Department of Educational Administration and Foundations, Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Montréal

Email: christine.brabant@umontreal.ca

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/christinebrabantchercheuse/>

LinkedIn: https://www.linkedin.com/in/christine-brabant-b7815915/?lipi=urn%3Ali%3Apage%3Ad_flagship3_feed%3BIV3NBmmPQWazRye84JeG9w%3D%3D

Abstract

In Quebec (Canada), a new normative framework and the COVID-19 pandemic have precipitated the hiring, by the ministry of education, of at least a hundred new resource persons to monitor home education. According to international writings, these professionals are at the crossroads of normative, political, and educational conflicts. Our literature review reveals that these resource persons might solve such conflicts by adopting some of ten typical intervention strategies: mutual understanding, tolerance of disagreement, search for the child's interest, creativity, competency development, negligence, abuse of power, protection of their professionalism, incontestability, and distrust. A questionnaire was constructed on the basis of this typology, aimed at supporting the study of their interactions with families.

Keywords: homeschooling, home education, regulation, monitoring, supervisors.

Wordcount: 6688 words (article only)

This article focuses on the challenges, for education governance, that home education oversight and support represent. In this study, this educational option is defined as *the education of school-aged children under their parents' general monitoring, and it replaces full-time attendance at a campus school* (Lines, 1999, p. 1). The role and training of the resource persons tasked with supervising these families are at the heart of this contribution, whose problem was initially situated in Quebec (Canada), but which more broadly concerns any state or educational system that mandates persons or organizations to ensure some monitoring of home education.

Aimed at creating knowledge about home education regulation practices, this contribution is based on a pragmatic paradigm, derived from Habermas, Ferry and Maesschalck, where “it is not a matter of agreeing on a position of principle, nor of determining what the most equitable option would be, but of determining the action one is planning to respond to a shared life problem” (Maesschalck, 2007, p. 19). The pragmatic turn in social sciences attempts to determine in what conditions decision-making processes can be appropriated by the different communities concerned by them. In particular, a pragmatic critique of the legal system’s social authority emphasizes that the demand for good governance implies a requirement of social experimentation impossible to limit to a single group of officials (Maesschalck, 2010). In this sense, the orientation is suggestive of experimentalist democracy, an “overall system of public problem solving that combines federal learning with the protection of the interests of the federated jurisdictions and the rights of individuals” (Dorf and Sabel, 1998, p. 288), and which is “no more inclined to presume that the circle of participation in decision making is fixed than to treat any body of expertise as self validation” (Sabel, 2005, p. 12). From this perspective, the study presented here will give home educating parents, education ministry resource persons, the various stakeholders involved and researchers a research tool to better describe home education monitoring, discuss it and potentially

participate, democratically and scientifically, in its evolution.

Home education in Quebec

The various estimates of the home education movement in Canada calculate it as comprising between 27,000 and 50,000 children from 2014 to 2019, some 0.5 to 1% of school-aged children (before the COVID-19 pandemic) (Brabant and Dumond, 2017; International Center for Home Education Research, 2021). These gaps between the estimated numbers can be explained by the fact that the children are not always registered or known to school authorities, on the one hand, and by the variability of methods of counting these children, on the other. Furthermore, the multiple forms of distance learning from public or private sources, part-time school attendance, and other hybrid forms blur the distinction between school attendance and home education. Statistics Canada has therefore suspended compiling national data on this form of education until new definitions are established.

In Quebec, the Canadian province where the issue presented in this article is situated, according to ministerial data, the number of children officially registered as homeschooled rose from 388 to 1180 between the school years of 2002-2003 and 2013-2014 and has only continued to grow. Before its COVID-19-related surge, the number of children enrolled in home education was 5964 in 2019-2020 (see Footnote 1), some 0.55% of the school-aged population (Ministère de l'Éducation et de l'Enseignement supérieur, 2020). Since the pandemic, this number has soared, reaching nearly 15,000 children in spring of 2021 (see Footnote 2).

Quebec parents have founded regional support groups and community centres to organize activities for their children, share resources, and discuss their practices, and formed associations (the main ones at the provincial level being the Québec Association for Home Based Education, the Association of Christian Parent-Educators of Quebec, and the Jewish Association for

Homeschooling) to hold events, defend their interests, and sometimes contribute to interactions with the school authorities and to the development of policies that concern them (Brabant, 2004, 2010, 2013; Brabant and Arsenault, 2014; Brabant and Bourdon, 2012; Brabant, Bourdon and Jutras, 2003).

A new legal framework

Concerning the legislative aspect, it should first be pointed out that education in Canada has been of exclusively provincial jurisdiction since the 1867 Constitution Act. There is no federal jurisdiction in education. Consequently, as the country is divided into ten provinces and three territories, there are thirteen different legislations governing homeschooling from coast to coast.

In Quebec, the Education Act has permitted the practice since 1943 (Marshall, 1998) by providing for the possibility of exemption from the obligation of school attendance (Government of Quebec, 2020a, chap. I-13.3, sec. 15, para. 4). By referring to the six typical approaches to governance that reflect the interplay of parental, school, and other decision-making powers in monitoring and evaluating the practice (Figure 1), namely, 1) the absence of an obligation of interaction, 2) support, 3) intervision, 4) control, 5) the obligation of school attendance, and 6) the participation of other powers (Brabant, 2013; Brabant and Dumond, 2021), the Quebec normative framework currently uses a combination of regulatory tools associated with two of these typical approaches: intervision and control, with some elements of the support and third-party actors approaches.

*[Figure 1. The six typical approaches to home education governance
and their regulatory measures (Brabant & Dumond, 2021)]*

In 2017, the government created a new normative framework entirely based on the typical

approach of “intervision” by setting “appropriate education” conditions for home education, such as extensive areas to be addressed in the parents’ learning plan for their children, and by mandating an evaluation of the child’s progress without demanding that they attain set school levels. In addition, the regional school authorities had to provide the registered children with access, free of charge, to a range of learning resources, such as school textbooks, career counselling, psychological and special education services, libraries, science and computer laboratories, auditoriums, art rooms, sports facilities, and their material and equipment. If they wanted, the children were also allowed to sit for any examination and its preparatory activities in view of obtaining a diploma (Government of Quebec, 2018). The government also created a provincial advisory panel on homeschooling, where education authorities and professionals, associations of homeschooling parents and academic research are represented (Government of Quebec, 2021). Implemented in 2017 and 2018, this legal framework generally fostered a collaborative approach between the parents and the ministry of education’s “resource persons”, mandated to accompany them in their home education project (Government of Quebec, 2020b). The year after its implementation, a subsequent minister of education added new regulations and administrative practices typical of the “control” type, above. It now requires that the parents’ learning plan follow the provincial curriculum and imposes end-of-year provincial exams, as well as a yearly meeting between the resource person and the child, creating a shift and an ambiguity in the sharing of decision-making power between the parents and the state (Government of Quebec, 2018).

A new profession: home education monitor

Following the implementation of this new normative framework in July 2019, the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, which provoked a dramatic rise in the number of home-educated students,

precipitated the hiring by the ministry of education of at least one hundred new resource persons mandated to monitor home education. As is the case in other states in which the legal framework requires educational authorities to monitor home education (e.g., France, Poland, Switzerland, United Kingdom, some of the United States), these resource persons are occupying a relatively new function, of which very little is known. Yet, already, voices have been raised to draw attention to this challenging mission. From a dual perspective of protecting the rights of children and those of their parents, an investigation report by the Protecteur du citoyen (2015) in Quebec, and the Badman report (2009) in the United Kingdom had highlighted the risk of the injustice and prejudices that might be experienced by parent educators and their children because of the variability of monitoring practices.

In this context, it appears relevant and even necessary to study and ensure a certain supervision of this new professional practice by examining the role of the resource persons mandated to carry it out. Among the national and international studies on educational policies covering home education (the site of the International Center for Home Education Research lists over 320 scientific journal articles in English that have appeared on the subject since 1980), only a few of the most recent have brought up the complex role of the resource persons mandated to carry out this monitoring.

With this in mind, this study is aimed at better understanding the way that resource persons, in Quebec and elsewhere in the world, assume this role in relation to the institution that has assigned it to them. A preliminary examination of the problem through the scientific writings finds first that these resource persons are placed at the centre of normative conflicts; then, that the school authorities give them a discretionary power that is fairly broad, but contested by the parents; and, finally, that their role raises issues of governance and training.

The role of the resource persons at the centre of normative conflicts

First, the legal analyses explain that these actors are placed at the centre of a complex legal space where the rights and interests of the child, of the parents, and of society—as well as the responsibilities of the governments in this regard—intersect (among others, in Canada, see Blokhuis, 2009, 2010 and Lagos, 2011, 2012).

The articles of law permitting this educational option are often thin and use imprecise formulations. For example, in Europe, depending on the country, the education received in the family must be *minimal* (Ireland), *sufficient* (Sweden), *equivalent* (Belgium, Norway), or *appropriate* (Denmark); *[follow] the national curriculum* (Estonia); or be that *to which [the children] are entitled* (France) (Harding and Farrel, 2003).

Monk's political analysis (2009) explains this fuzziness by the presence of *broader political agendas* (p. 155): 1) these somewhat vague formulations that are centred on educational means, rather than results, avoid a situation in which parents of children attending school might direct criticism at the school over its own effectiveness; 2) defining the child's right to education, because it is generally centred on individual development, limits evaluation of the aspects of socialization and civic education of learning at home, but also avoids having to apply the same evaluation to all schools supervised by the government; 3) opting out of the school system and opting in for home education serves as a democratic safety valve for the expression of certain differences of opinion, which then legitimizes state control over school content (for example, sex education); 4) when a schooled child is suffering or failing, the absence of a better alternative justifies recourse to, and often supports measures for, home education, even when it is deemed unsatisfactory, rather than forced reschooling.

Furthermore, certain school authorities can use the option of home schooling as an offload solution. For example, in the United States, resource persons in Indiana were suspected of encouraging parents to remove their children in difficulty from school to educate them at home (Francisco, 2011), while resource persons in Texas themselves classified students who had left school in the same category (Radcliffe, 2010), reducing the state's dropout statistics. In Quebec, to solve the problem of schools operated by religious groups and considered illegal because they did not comply with ministerial requirements, formal agreements have been established with these groups to have their children enrolled in home education. This was the case, among others, of 144 children from the group La Mission de l'Esprit-Saint in Lanaudière (ICI Radio-Canada, 2006) and of 230 children from the Satmar Hasidic Jewish community in Outremont (Robillard, 2015).

In the examples cited above, the option of home education constitutes an advantage for the school system by freeing it, in a sense, from embarrassing cases, but perhaps not an advantage for the young people whose parents have not voluntarily opted for the lifestyle that home education represents. Furthermore, these administrative or governmental decisions place the resource persons, in charge of subsequently monitoring these young people's education, on an ambiguous standing.

A discretionary and contested power

At the centre of this contentious legal and political context, broad discretionary power is left to the resource persons to evaluate the educational situation of these children and make decisions over whether educational standards, clearly established or not, are being satisfied. The legal and institutional standards already differ; the norms and social constructs held by the resource persons (Farges and Tenret, 2018; Terrillon, 2002) and by the parents (Dumond, 2017) only exacerbate

these differences. Certain resource persons from Quebec school boards studied by Brabant (2016) even confide that the collaboration and support they are asked to establish with the parent educators put them in a conflict of interests and of values, both with their mission of supporting the public school, and with their own educational convictions. These normative conflicts are fertile ground for divergences in interpretation, judgment, and practices in the resource persons, as researchers have found in France (Terrillon, 2002; Farges and Tenret, 2018, 2020), the United Kingdom (Badman, 2009; Monk, 2009), Poland (Paciorkowski, 2014), Quebec (Brabant, 2004, 2010, 2013, 2016; Protecteur du citoyen, 2015), and the fourteen countries studied by Blok and Karsten (2011).

Albeit difficult to assume, the power and judgment of these resource persons may prove decisive for the families who choose home education. Their decisions, made with or without the support of a solid normative framework, must still be justified. Indeed, they are sometimes contested by the parents, often even before the courts (Brabant, 2010; Monk, 2009; Paciorkowski, 2014; Rothermel, 2010; Stafford, 2012).

However, resource persons are asked to avoid coercive relationships with parents, by establishing relationships of voluntary cooperation, openness, and trust instead. For example, in Quebec, the *Homeschooling Support Guide* (Government of Quebec, 2020b) insists on fostering a close collaboration with the parents to reach a shared understanding of the family's educational situation. Similarly, British ministerial orientations recommend designating the resource person mandated to monitor families as an adviser, home-educating consultant, or facilitator, rather than as an inspector, examiner, or assessor, to contribute to the development of positive relationships (Department for Children, Schools and Families Guidance, 2005, cited in Monk, 2009). In Romandy (Switzerland), the controls provided by law are implemented by resource persons whom the Canton of Vaud's general directorate of mandatory education calls "educational collaborators."

They must assist parents in their task of education and aim for a climate that is “serene, of dialogue, and of trust” (Canton of Vaud, 2018, p. 2, our translation).

Issues of governance and training of resource persons

It is clear that educational resource persons have a significant role to play in successful home education monitoring and consequently in the successful governance of this educational phenomenon. Their complex and problematic position calls for a resolution, preferably one informed by scientific knowledge. At this point in the research on home education governance, authors are proposing various solutions to the problem of the role of the educational resource person: reflection by society, a review of procedures, consultation with or support for the resource persons themselves, and even a change of resource persons.

First, Monk (2009) maintains that local school authorities and their resource persons must be supported in fulfilling their crucial role. In his opinion, this requires an in-depth reflection on the definition of education that a society wants to set for itself. Defining a child’s healthy development is not based on a scientific or objective concept alone, but on a set of cultural, philosophical, and political standards. The same goes for home schooling governance. Monk suggests that at the end of this reflection, resource persons might be reassured of the legitimacy of their actions by being provided with clear benchmarks.

Next, Blok and Karsten (2011) recommend a review of homeschooling-related evaluation and decision-making procedures, according to criteria of transparency, consistency, and efficiency, in order to reduce the gap between the normative frameworks and their application. They suggest evaluating the services dispensed to families, the decisions made by the resource persons, and their justification.

After that, in its report, Quebec's Protecteur du citoyen (2015) recommends that the Ministère de l'Éducation, du Loisir et du Sport:

R-2 establish and support dialogue and cooperation among education players so that they can share their best practices (...)

R-3 identify the training needs of the education players responsible for supervising and monitoring home education projects and support the school boards in meeting those needs (p. 18, our translation).

However, a doubt is raised by Rothermel (2010), a psychologist and education researcher, who acts as an expert witness in the British courts in disputes over home education. Among education professionals, she, too, notes a lack of training, preparation, and even understanding of government intentions, on the one hand, and of the practice of home education, on the other. She considers that remedying these shortcomings should be a priority. However, she questions the relevance of assigning to this monitoring, professionals who firmly believe that learning at home is a poor educational choice. She even casts doubt on the effectiveness of attempting to train them for this responsibility, the risks of failure and harm being too high.

Similarly, in France, according to Quatrevaux (2011), actors other than school education inspectors would be more open to and better judges of a less formal education, such as education specialists, psychologists, sociologists, occupational training specialists, and representatives of parents' associations—all actors who have an interest in the education of the child and of the greatest number, but who are not *guardians of educational orthodoxy* (p. 42, our translation).

For all of these suggestions for advancing the problem of home education monitoring, there is little empirical support for steering action in one direction or another. No study has documented whether the resource persons mandated for this monitoring in the different countries involved

currently receive training to do so. Only one study (Brabant, 2016) has explored some of the questions involved in this training, specifically, whether certain types of actors are better able to take on the role than others, whether their initial representations can be modified, or whether consultation between them yields benefits. These findings were made in the course of a training offer conducted by the researcher, who asked the participating resource persons if she could accompany them in a reflective practice on their actions. The study describes the practices of the resource persons, the training dispensed, and the learning process experienced by the actors.

However, in view of increasing knowledge and enriching the training's development, it is first necessary to better understand the practices of the resource persons at work, and their training needs, particularly in regard to the normative conflict they are at the centre of. This observation raises the question: How is normative conflict resolved in practice? In order to answer this question, this contribution pursues the following research objectives:

- To identify the intervention strategies adopted by the resource persons in their role with the families, and
- To construct, in a questionnaire, a tool to study these interactions.

Method

Based upon a literature review, in English and in French, on the practices of resource persons mandated to monitor and support home educating families in the world, we found and compiled nine description-rich qualitative studies, supplemented with a few additional writings. A content analysis of these selected writings revealed a range of methods with which these professionals interacted with the families, which we categorized according to the disposition of their practices and attitudes, in the form of a typology composed of ten intervention strategies. We then put

together a list of typical statements describing the practices associated with each of the strategies. These statements, reformulated in the form of descriptive, concrete, and personalized items, are the basis of a questionnaire constructed with a view to enable parents, on the one hand, to describe the practices and attitudes of their resource persons; and to enable resource persons – or their managers, on the other, to summarize and evaluate their monitoring practices and attitudes.

The version of the questionnaire addressed to parents was validated for content and then tested for feasibility in April 2021. Four parent educators and four heads of local and national home education associations completed the questionnaire and shared their remarks and suggestions, which improved the wording of certain questions and statements. They confirmed that the questionnaire was consistent with their knowledge of monitoring practices and expressed interest in the data it would generate. Over the period from May to September, 2021, the questionnaire was used for the first time in an investigation aimed at painting a portrait of home education in Quebec. Some 434 parents completed it online.

Results

According to the studies consulted, the resource persons mandated to monitor the children adopt a range of intervention strategies to reconcile the normative conflicts encountered with their contested discretionary power. According to our analysis, these strategies are: negligence, abuse of power, protection of their professionalism, incontestability of their judgment, mutual understanding, tolerance of disagreement, search for the child's interest, distrust, creativity, and competency development. We present first these strategies, then the descriptive statements of the practices we drew from them, and finally the exploratory questionnaire constructed from these statements.

Typical monitoring strategies

Negligence. Certain resource persons adopt a form of negligence, a strategy Monk calls the *ostrich approach* (2009, p. 183). It involves rejecting their responsibility of evaluation, and a voluntary ignorance of problematic cases in order to avoid conflict. Others also neglect their mission of educational support and of searching for the child's interest to entrench themselves instead in an opposition in principle to the parent educators and even in legal actions that disrupt the family equilibrium when the educational situation does not call for it (Rothermel, 2010).

In Brabant's study (2016) (see Footnote 3), the resource persons from one of four school boards studied go so far as to affirm their opposition to the legality of home education and reject the responsibility of monitoring. Consequently, they only provide an initial communication in writing to the families and then no further monitoring, and do not respond to requests. The frequent changeover in persons responsible for the dossier also contributes to inhibiting the continuity of the monitoring and the development of expertise. In a second school board, the resource persons were advised not to foster an overly inviting collaboration or support with the families, so as not to create a precedent. In a third, rural, school board, the resource persons knew the families concerned and gave them their *de facto* trust, with no requirement for formal registration or monitoring.

In France, a number of city halls also neglect their responsibility in this regard, because only half of the dossiers of home-educated children contain a report from the "city hall supervision" (*contrôle de la mairie*) aimed at verifying the parents' motivations for home schooling, the family's living conditions, and the child's health condition (MEN, 2018, in Farges and Tenret, 2020).

Abuse of power. Other resource persons adopt an approach that Terrillon (2002) qualifies as *abuse*

of power (p. 103), in that they base their evaluations of home education on the social standards they know and in which they are trained and on school standards and school programs, rather than on legal standards. Her study of thirty-eight administrative reports demonstrates that the resource persons were searching more, in the work of the children, for formal schooling than the broader aims of education enshrined in law. They also subjected these children to a obligation of results not required by law.

At the end of semi-directed interviews with thirty-one inspectors in charge of supervising instruction in families practising home education in France, Farges and Tenret (2018) found similar practices in a sub-group that they called the *republican* supervisors (p. 57). They often make reference to school programs and levels and use exercises taken from school textbooks to verify the children's knowledge, rather than interact on the basis of the evidence of learning presented by the parents or the child. Supervisors of this type also express frustration over the difficulty of evaluating, in a non-school context, cross-curricular competencies, or competencies in the scientific and social domains, for example.

In Brabant's study (2016), the resource persons from one school board maintained that they were in favour of prohibiting home education and of threatening the parents with a term of imprisonment to convince them to re-enrol their children in school. In practice, they submitted their monitoring requirements to parents in such a formal and dissuasive way—hinting at personal, educational, and social integration difficulties in adulthood—that they succeeded in eroding the parent educators' territory—although it is not known whether the parents sent their children back to school, slipped into clandestinity, or moved away to pursue their projects on less hostile ground.

Protection of their professionalism. Quatrevaux's study (2011) reveals that certain resource

persons adopt an attitude of protection of their professionalism. He analyzed eighty home education supervision reports by the national education inspectors in France, and compared them with the inspection reports of teachers for whom the inspectors were also responsible. Like Terrillon (2002), he notes first that the former concerned the outcome of the parents' instruction (what the children learned), while the latter evaluated the educational action of the teachers themselves. He then highlights two other asymmetries: first, the individuality of evaluating a home-schooled child, compared to the collectivity of evaluating education that takes place in a school; and then the asymmetry of the authoritarian relationship established by the inspectors with the parents, who are often discredited from the start, which is not the case with the teachers. He finds, too, that the national program and its typical or average progress, useful for collective teaching, but ill-adapted to the individual kind, are still the targets expected for each child.

Quatrevaux hypothesizes that the inspectors, who come from the teaching *elite*, are profoundly resistant to the possibility that the parents, these *amateurs*, can succeed as well as or better than the professionals (p. 41). It may be that the inspectors find it difficult to imagine a learning that borrows from other forms, other paces, and other places, without professional intervention. As such, Quatrevaux adds an actor in the overlap between the interests of the child, the parents, and society: the interests of the school actors themselves. He denounces their designation as judges of *situations that they have no interest, at least no professional interest, in seeing prosper* (p. 42, our translation).

Farges and Tenret (2018) find similar characteristics in the *republican* inspectors. These inspectors tend to defend the expertise of the teachers and to discredit parents who have not been trained in teaching. They even consider that their role is to bring the children back to school. Some of the inspectors they followed on their rounds (2020) appeared particularly annoyed by parents

who were themselves teachers and who, from the point of view of the inspectors, had in some way betrayed the institution and the profession by choosing home education for their children.

Resource persons questioned by Brabant (2016) admitted that they assumed a defensive position toward the parents from the outset based on a presumption that the parents were rejecting the school framework and their profession, for fear of being confronted or that their work in the school environment would be criticized.

Incontestability. Quatrevaux also observes that the resource person alone was in charge of collecting the data that had to shore up their evaluation, of analyzing them, and of formulating their judgment and arguments based on these same data, which made inspection reports difficult to contest. This strategy of incontestability and the absence of an appeal procedure forced dissatisfied parents to seek counsel from one another to take collective action or file complaints in court. Furthermore, while the teachers' inspection reports belonged to the administrative genre (predictable, graded, and formative), the evaluation reports of home education, more subjective and not standardized, adopted, in his opinion, a quasi-legal form: they issued a binary *judgment* (satisfactory/insufficient), without the possibility of recognizing potential excellence, then determined the *penalty* arising from it (redoing the exam, returning to school, or passing), often with a pass threshold that was more demanding than it was for children in school (p. 36). Having attended thirty-three supervisions conducted by inspectors with the families, Farges and Tenret (2020) raise the variability and the subjectivity of their criteria for assessing situations of instruction, matched with a "dominant" stance (p. 142), elements that might contribute to an incontestability of their judgment.

Mutual understanding. Eddis (2007) observes a more open stance adopted by certain resource

persons in Florida and in the United Kingdom. Studying their attitudes and those of parent educators on various aspects of home education, she notes their ability, like that of the parent-educators, to see the other party's point of view. If certain interactions ended up being quite constructive, it was because the people involved had developed a mutual understanding.

In Farges and Tenret (2018), inspectors of the *inclusive* type also demonstrated an openness toward the parents, built on a consideration of them as citizens. As such, the parents were seen more often than not as sharing an objective of socially integrating the child. Once they were reassured that these values were present in the parents and actualized in the method of instruction, the supervisors respected their educational project and their expertise and gave them latitude over teaching methods.

In Brabant's study (2016), a training activity by the researcher informed the resource persons on the phenomenon of home education, the motivations of the families, and the needs of the children, satisfying a need for knowledge on the population. The training also clarified their understanding of their work's normative framework, offering them better support in their demands from parents. According to the resource persons, the training fostered greater mutual understanding between them and the families, and a better climate in their interactions.

Tolerance of disagreement. Eddis (2007) highlights another attitude of certain resource persons. They tolerated a certain disagreement between the parents and them (*agreeing to disagree*, p. 278). Despite their divergences, they gave priority to maintaining collaboration and to the zones of convergence that fostered it.

Certain inspectors studied by Farges and Tenret (2018, 2020) also demonstrated such tolerance by approving situations of instruction that were not consistent with their personal values

and by agreeing to compromise over educational targets when they saw a need to, whether it was because of the child's abilities or of temporary constraints on the parents, such as the birth of a new child.

In Brabant's study (2016), when faced with less than satisfactory educational situations, resource persons reduced the extent of the monitoring, concentrating on the core subjects, to preserve a connection with the family that would be weakened by more stringent requirements. Others said that, once their misgivings and conflicting values were elucidated in the training activity, they were better able to adopt a professional and more objective position with the families they were monitoring.

Search for the child's interest. In certain resource persons studied by Eddis (2007), standing at a remove from the school standards enabled them to observe that seemingly different educational visions might coincide by focusing on the shared interest that was the good of the child. This higher interest became the point of reference for the dialogue with the parents. A personalization of the learning path then became acceptable, one that went beyond the benchmarks represented by programs and grade levels.

Resource persons of the *puerocentric* type, as Farges and Tenret (2018) identify them, also adopted this more individualistic than systemic outlook. For them, the fundamental knowledge that had to be evaluated could be adapted by the parents according to their child's profile. These resource persons then placed themselves in the position of advisors to the parents, collaborating with them to support the child's development.

In Brabant's study (2016), one resource person bypassed her school board's instructions to not recommend parents' associations because she considered that this networking and sharing of

resources between parents benefitted the child.

Competency development. According to Eddis (2007), certain resource persons had so transformed their role and their competencies in regard to this method of education that they could be considered as part of the home education community.

The so-called *puerocentric* educators encountered by Farges and Tenret (2018) considered this role as enriching their duties as teacher or inspector because it made them question their own practices and discover new ways of working.

In Brabant (2016), too, by working with children with specific difficulties in this population, resource persons saw that the experience of educational differentiation with homeschooled children enabled them to develop services and competencies that could enhance their work with these families, but also with school-educated children and, more broadly, could help to improve the school system as a whole.

Creativity. To this is added a strategy of creativity in the interaction between certain resource persons and certain parents, identified by Badman (2009) in an investigation report on home education in the United Kingdom. Placed before administrative obstacles or educational challenges, they innovated outside of established frameworks by creating, for example, group meeting and activity days between families and resource persons, to get to know each other and talk; information documents on home education; and a discussion forum between school actors and home education leaders, to reflect on difficult cases.

This strategy mirrors the creativity noted by Brabant (2010, 2013) in Quebec, based on testimonies reporting resource persons experimenting with new forms of evaluation, adapting

procedures for evaluation and moving on to higher education, and lending material and premises. In one of the four school boards studied (2016), adapted educational material was designed, support and monitoring activities were introduced, and evaluations specific to the home-educated population were developed, testifying to an investment in the mandate and a commitment of the innovative kind that exceeded legal requirements.

Distrust. A final strategy raised in the literature is a deep distrust, particularly in regard to issues of youth protection. For example, certain school actors had difficulty shaking off traumatic experiences, such as discovering families where the pretense of practising home education actually masked situations of abuse or negligence. The practices of these resource person could remain tainted by these experiences for a long time (Eddis, 2007).

Similarly, the so-called *puerocentric* supervisors encountered by Farges and Tenret (2018) were more likely, as a consequence of this orientation, to be sensitive to situations that appeared to threaten the child's safety or development. A doubt over the parents' motivations could create a tension, which the supervisors resolved by either not investigating the family domicile as closely, potentially approaching a strategy of negligence, or by transferring this concern to their supervisors or to social services. In addition, *inclusive* supervisors could display irritation when the socialization offered by the parents was situated in a religious framework or a home education group that ran counter to their vision of social cohesion. Here, a risk of discrimination in their practices could begin to be apparent. In another study by the same researchers (2020), they report a *suspicion in principle* (p. 146) that the supervisors adopted in their relationships with the families, by using various techniques to ferret out false or injurious situations.

These ten strategies and the practices described for each are summarized in Table 1.

[Table 1. Typology of intervention strategies of home education monitors]

Preferable or counterproductive strategies

In short, the studies mentioned above describe a variety of intervention strategies that are to a greater or lesser extent compatible, depending on the case, with the mission assigned to home education monitoring agents. In a context where the ministerial aim is to maintain collaboration and dialogue with the parents and to ensure the children’s education is monitored to protect their right to education—more specifically to a non-school education permitted by law—it would seem that the strategies of mutual understanding, agreeing to disagree, searching for the child’s interest, creativity, and competency development adopted by certain resource persons are preferable to those of negligence, abuse of power, protection of professionalism, incontestability, and distrust, which risk provoking the opposite of government intent.

These ten typical intervention strategies of home education monitoring agents can also be discussed in relation to the six typical approaches to home education governance (Brabant and Dumond, 2021) cited above (Figure 1). The five preferable strategies, in the left column of Table 1, all correspond to home education governance approaches that to some extent combine state decision-making power with parental decision-making power, namely, the approaches of support, intervention, and control. In each of these approaches, the five preferable strategies are applied to lesser or greater degrees.

The other five intervention strategies, in the right column of Table 1, appear as counterproductive to the monitoring mandate. Indeed, on the part of the resource person, they are based either on an expectation of “no interaction” (negligence) from the start or on an implicit wish for a “prohibition” framework, as revealed by the resource persons’ exaggerated insistence

on state decision-making power or on their own decision-making power as professionals. As shown in the literature, these strategies tend to result in a “no interaction” situation because communication with the parents becomes skewed or is broken off altogether. Consequently, the resource person jeopardizes their capacity – and the state’s – to exercise oversight of the child’s education and surrenders all decision-making power to the parents. The governance approach of “control” – because it is already in a borderline position for its unequal distribution of decision-making power in favour of the state and because its typical regulatory measures presuppose the superiority of school education over home education – is probably the most likely to foster counterproductive strategies in monitoring agents. As reported in Brabant (2016), training that clarified the state’s expectations and modelled appropriate practices might alleviate this tendency.

The Home Education Monitoring Strategies Questionnaire

To provide a tool to better study resource persons’ interactions with families, we constructed a questionnaire based on our typology of intervention strategies. This questionnaire repeats, for each of the strategies, the behaviours and attitudes described in our summary of the literature, formulated as statements in random order, in a list of items to which the respondents assign a level of agreement in the form of a Likert scale. Two different versions of the same questionnaire are proposed: one addressed to parents and the other to the resource persons themselves. In the former (see Appendix A), the title of the questionnaire is “Interactions with your home education monitor.” Every item starts with “My monitor,” followed by a verb in the third person, where the parent or the family is in the first person, for example, “1- makes the effort to understand my viewpoint” and “18- offers documents or tools adapted to home education and to our family.” In the second version of the questionnaire (see Appendix B), the title of the questionnaire is

“Interactions with the families.” Every item starts with “In my role as a home education monitor, I,” followed by a verb in the first person, where the parent or the family is in the third person, for example, “1- make the effort to understand the parents’ viewpoint” and “18- offer documents or tools adapted to home education and to the family.”

Conclusion

To better understand the practices of resource persons monitoring home schooling and their training needs, particularly in regard to the normative conflict they are at the centre of, we devised a typology of the intervention strategies cited in the literature and then developed an exploratory and descriptive questionnaire drawn from this typology. This typology and this questionnaire may support future research on the practices of these professionals and enable school authorities to better evaluate how well practices reflect government intentions. Finally, this questionnaire and its results can support potential training of these resource persons, who are pioneers of a new profession that is destined to expand, proportionately to the growth of the home education movement around the world, insofar as its states adopt normative frameworks providing for the monitoring and support of these children.

Footnotes

1. Information obtained by a request to the government, through the Commission d'accès à l'information du Québec, 2020.
2. Personal conversation with Caroline Kelly, director of the Quebec ministry of education's homeschooling directorate (April 16, 2021).
3. This study was conducted before the 2017-2018 revision of the legal framework, when 72 school boards were responsible for evaluating, on their territory, whether the education a child received at home was equivalent to education in schools, and there was no provincial coordination of the school boards' actions in that matter.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Jacquie Charlton for translation and linguistic revision.

Declaration of interest statement

The author reports there are no competing interests to declare.

References

- Badman, G. (2009). *Report to the Secretary of State on the Review of Elective Home Education in England*. London, United Kingdom: The Stationery Office.
- Blokhuis, J. C. (2009). *Parens patriae: A comparative legal study of sovereign authority and public education policy in the province of Ontario and the state of New York* (unpublished doctoral thesis). Rochester, New York: University of Rochester.
- Blokhuis, J. C. (2010). Whose custody is it, anyway? 'Homeschooling' from a *parens patriae* perspective. *Theory and Research in Education*, 8(2), 199-222.
- Blok, H. and Karsten, S. (2011). Inspection of Home Education in European Countries. *European Journal of Education*, 46(1), 138-152.
- Brabant, C. (2004). *L'éducation à domicile au Québec: les raisons du choix des parents et les principales caractéristiques sociodémographiques des familles*. (Master Thesis, Université de Sherbrooke). https://udemontreal-my.sharepoint.com/:b:/g/personal/christine_brabant_umontreal_ca/EboP2KVaEuRPvcm8yrHFx8IBZrPGgyj1wtTXjB-KqbPJmw?e=FUc34W
- Brabant, C. (2010). *Pour une gouvernance réflexive de l'«apprentissage en famille». Étude des processus d'apprentissage de trois groupes de parents-éducateurs au Québec*. (Doctoral Thesis, Université de Sherbrooke). https://udemontreal-my.sharepoint.com/:b:/g/personal/christine_brabant_umontreal_ca/EUhVM7ZapstHvJdVuhzUmrYBUR9KzMSmssWCvgamQCf5VQ?e=WK7cUu
- Brabant, C. (2013). *L'école à la maison au Québec : un projet familial, social et démocratique*. Québec, Québec : Presses de l'Université du Québec. <http://www.puq.ca/catalogue/livres/ecole-maison-quebec-2583.html>
- Brabant, C. and Arsenaault, S. (2014). L'école à la maison au Québec / La création d'une nouvelle forme de communauté éducative. *Education Canada*, 54 (4). <https://www.edcan.ca/articles/lecole-a-la-maison-au-quebec/?lang=fr>
- Brabant, C. and Bourdon, S. (2012). Le changement en éducation et la gouvernance réflexive. Expérimentation d'un modèle d'appropriation du changement par des groupes de parents-éducateurs au Québec. *Éducation et francophonie*, 40(1), 32-55. https://revue.acef.ca/pdf/EF-40-1-032_BRABANT.pdf
- Brabant, C., Bourdon, S. and Jutras, F. (2003). Home Education in Quebec: Family First. *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 17(2-3), 112-131. <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~db=all~content=a907086388>
- Brabant, C. and Dumond, M. (2017). Home Education in Canada. In M. Gaither (dir.), *The Wiley Handbook of Home Education* (p. 271-302). Wiley. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/book/10.1002/9781118926895>
- Brabant, C. and Dumond, M. (2021). La gouvernance de l'apprentissage en famille : outils de régulation et approches types. *Éducation et Sociétés*, 1(45), 143-160. <https://www.cairn.info/revue-education-et-societes-2021-1-page-143.htm>
- Canton of Vaud. (2018). *Modalités et cadre légal de la scolarisation à domicile*. Direction

- générale de l'enseignement obligatoire.
https://www.vd.ch/fileadmin/user_upload/organisation/dfj/dgeo/fichiers_pdf/DP_scolarisation_domicile.pdf
- Dorf, M. C. and Sabel, C. F. (1998). A Constitution of Democratic Experimentalism. *Columbia Review*, 98, 267-473.
- Dumond, M. (2017). *Les groupes de soutien d'apprentissage en famille (« école à la maison ») : production de normes sociales dans une perspective de gouvernance réflexive de l'éducation* (master's thesis, Université de Montréal).
<https://papyrus.bib.umontreal.ca/xmlui/handle/1866/19468>
- 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* (unpublished doctoral thesis). Guilford, United Kingdom: University of Surrey, Department of Political, International and Policy Studies.
- Farges, G. and Tenret, E. (2018). Les inspecteurs et les « fondamentaux » de l'éducation à l'épreuve des contrôles de l'instruction dans la famille. *Revue française de pédagogie*, 4(205), 51-64.
- Farges, G. and Tenret, E. (2020). Évaluer l'instruction en dehors de l'école. Une enquête sur la fabrication du jugement des inspecteurs dans les contrôles de l'instruction dans la famille. *Sociologie*, 2(11), 131-148.
- Francisco, K. (January 11, 2011). Homeschool regulations ahead? *The Journal Gazette*.
<http://www.journalgazette.net/article/20110111/BLOGS13/110119904/1002/LOCAL>
- Government of Quebec. (2018). *Homeschooling Regulation*.
<http://legisquebec.gouv.qc.ca/en/ShowDoc/cr/I-13.3,%20r.%206.01>
- Government of Quebec. (2020a). *Education Act*. Laws and Regulations of Quebec. Quebec City, Quebec: Québec Official Publisher. <http://www.legisquebec.gouv.qc.ca/fr/showdoc/cs/I-13.3>
- Government of Quebec. (2020b). *Homeschooling: Support Guide*. Ministère de l'Éducation et de l'Enseignement supérieur.
http://www.education.gouv.qc.ca/fileadmin/site_web/documents/education/Guide-enseignement-maison-EN.pdf
- Government of Quebec. (2021). *Provincial Advisory Panel on Homeschooling*.
<http://www.education.gouv.qc.ca/en/school-boards/support-and-assistance/homeschooling/provincial-advisory-panel-on-homeschooling/>
- Harding, T. and Farrell, A. (2003). Alternate models of schooling: legal and ethical considerations. *The Journal of the Australia and New Zealand Education Law Association*, 8(1), 125-133.
- ICI Radio-Canada. (2006). *Des résultats scolaires désastreux*. Montreal, Quebec: ICI.Radio-Canada.ca. <https://ici.radio-canada.ca/nouvelle/323594/mission-saint-esprit>
- International Center for Home Education Research. (2021). Frequently Asked Questions about Home Education. <http://icher.org/regulations.php?location=canada&entity=world>
- Lagos, J. A. (2011). *Parental education rights in the United States and Canada*:

- Homeschooling and its legal protection* (unpublished doctoral thesis). Pontifical University of the Holy Cross, Rome, Italy.
- Lagos, J. A. (2012). Parental education rights in Canada: canon and civil law approaches to homeschooling. *Studia canonica*, 46(2), 401-469.
- Lines, P. M. (1999). *Homeschoolers: Estimating Numbers and Growth*. National Institute on Student Achievement, Curriculum, and Assessment, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Washington, District of Columbia: U. S. Department of Education.
- Maeschalck, M. (2007). *Les désillusions de la gouvernance démocratique. Sortir du modèle délibératif et après?* Unpublished manuscript, Université catholique de Louvain, Centre de philosophie du droit, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgique.
- Maeschalck, M. (2010). *Transformations de l'éthique: de la phénoménologie radicale au pragmatisme social*. Brussels : P.I.E. Peter Lang.
- Marshall, D. (1998). *Aux origines de l'État-providence : familles québécoises, obligation scolaire et allocations familiales, 1940-1955*. Montreal, Quebec: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal.
- Ministère de l'Éducation et de l'Enseignement supérieur. (2020). *Effectif scolaire de la formation générale des jeunes, selon diverses variables, années scolaires 2005-2006 à 2019-2020^o, Québec*. Direction des indicateurs et des statistiques. Information Portal, Charlemagne System. Data as of January 30, 2020.
https://bdso.gouv.qc.ca/pls/ken/ken213_afich_tabl.page_tabl?p_iden_tran=REPERB7P33J17-1532021908312~L8&p_lang=1&p_m_o=MEES&p_id_ss_domn=825&p_id_raprt=3413#tri_de_trtr=0&tri_com_scol=0&tri_ordr_ensgn=1&tri_niv_scol=1&tri_lang=1
- Monk, D. (2009). Regulating Home Education: Negotiating Standards, Anomalies and Rights. *Child & Family Law Quarterly*, 21(2), 155-184.
- Paciorkowski, S. (2014). Homeschooling in Poland? Legal Status and Arguments Used in Polish Debate Over Home Education. *Social Transformations in Contemporary Society*, 2, 153-167.
- Protecteur du citoyen. (2015). *La scolarisation à la maison : pour le respect du droit à l'éducation des enfants* (investigation report). Quebec City, Quebec: National Assembly.
- Quatrevaux, A. (2011). Le système scolaire face à l'instruction dans la famille : Analyse de rapports de contrôle. *Cahiers de la recherche sur l'éducation et les savoirs*, 10, 29-43.
<https://journals.openedition.org/cres/179>
- Radcliffe, J. (2010). Experts: Home-schooling doesn't add up across Texas. *Houston Chronicle*.
<http://www.chron.com/life/mom-houston/article/Experts-Home-schooling-doesn-t-add-up-across-1717652.php>
- Robillard, J.- P. (2015). *L'école à la maison, une solution aux écoles juives illégales?* Montreal, Quebec: ICI Radio-Canada. <http://ici.radio-canada.ca/nouvelles/societe/2015/11/12/003-ecole-juive-illegale-scolarisation-maison-outremont.shtml>
- Rothermel, P. J. (2010). Home education: practising without prejudice? *Every Child Journal*, 1(5), 48-53.
- Sabel, C. (2005). Globalization, New Public Services, Local Democracy: What's the

Connection? In OCDE, *Local Governance and the Drivers of Growth, Local Economic and Employment Development* (p. 111-131). OCDE.

Stafford, B. (2012). Bad evidence: the curious case of the government-commissioned review of elective home education in England and how parents exposed its weaknesses. *Evidence & Policy*, 8 (3), 361–381.

Terrillon, N. (2002). *L'instruction dans la famille comme alternative à l'école. Sa place entre norme juridique et norme sociale* (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Université Lyon II).

APPENDIX A: The Home Education Monitoring Strategies Questionnaire – For parents

INTERACTIONS WITH YOUR RESOURCE PERSON

The following statements concern INTERACTIONS WITH YOUR RESOURCE PERSON from the ministry of Education or school board.

Please indicate to what extent the following statements correspond to your monitor's interactions with your family, by circling the corresponding number.

MY RESOURCE PERSON:

| | Totally disagree | Disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree | Totally agree | Not applicable |
|---|------------------|----------|----------------------------|-------|---------------|----------------|
| 1- makes the effort to understand my viewpoint. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 2- accepts some disagreements over some issues in discussion with me. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 3- does less monitoring less than prescribed by the Homeschooling Regulation. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 4- bases their intervention on social and academic expectations rather than on the legal obligations for homeschooling. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 5- recognizes that different educational approaches can promote child development. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 6- established an authoritarian relationship with me by discrediting me from the start. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 7- innovates outside of established frameworks when there is an administrative obstacle or educational challenge, adjusting procedures if necessary. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 8- acts and decides entirely on their own. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 9- seeks to learn and evolve in their role as a resource person. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 10- is quick to suspect families of abuse, neglect, and violence. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 11- promotes an "ideal" educational path (e.g., of aiming to become a university student or an employee), showing no open-mindedness toward other paths. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 12- recognizes and values my parenting skills. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 13- has a broad perspective of education, beyond pedagogical and administrative details. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 14- offers the support outlined in the Regulation (e.g., preparing documents, helping in case of difficulty). | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 15- rigidly applies administrative and school standards. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 16- focuses on the child's development. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 17- seems to me to be more demanding with us, in terms of the program, the teaching, and the child's school results, than what is expected in schools. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 18- offers documents or tools adapted to home education and to our family. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 19- informs us that there is a remediation process in case of a disagreement (e.g., review, consultation, mediation). | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 20- develops knowledge and skills related to home education. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 21- implies that choosing home education stems from the parents' lack of judgment or their malicious intent. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 22- shows openness to various educational paths (e.g., vocational school, virtual school, self-directed learning, entrepreneurship, apprenticeship, artistic path). | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |

MY RESOURCE PERSON:

| | Totally disagree | Disagree | Don't agree, nor disagree | Agree | Totally agree | Non applicable |
|---|------------------|----------|---------------------------|-------|---------------|----------------|
| 23- is open to dialogue. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 24- yields to our divergent viewpoints in order to preserve a spirit of collaboration. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 25- intentionally ignores problems and challenges in order to make things easier for them. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 26- for any child, aims for the "standard" framework of the ministerial program and its Progression of Learning. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 27- emphasizes that we share a common goal: the child's well-being. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 28- is able to imagine meaningful learning outside of school, in other forms and places and at other paces, without professional intervention. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 29- seeks solutions to my family's challenges, with us. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 30- makes subjective judgments that are not based on clear criteria. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 31- values parent-educators' feedback on their work as resource person. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 32- performs personal checks that go beyond what is expected in the Regulation (e.g. on our private life, our honesty). | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 33- demonstrates resistance or prejudice in relation to our family, our culture, our way of life, or our religion. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 34- adapts their language and translates ministerial expectations for home education and my family. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 35- opposes unjustified refusals or recourses to an outside authority (e.g., youth protection services, transfer or closure of a file). | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 36- is attentive to the child's particular needs and to the specifics of their situation (e.g. family or cultural). | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 37- tries to convince us to (re)integrate the child into a school. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 38- proposes new means of collaboration between us. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 39- makes minimal and binary judgments (e.g. satisfactory / insufficient) which leave no room for emphasizing our strengths. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 40- demonstrates motivation and enthusiasm for their work. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 41- is interested in my child's independence, relationships, and social activities. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 42- makes the effort to understand our written material and accomplishments in terms of learning activities, and values them in line with the ministerial expectations. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 43- complains about working as a resource person and seems uninterested in home education. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 44- insists on their decision-making power and on the possible consequences of our weak points or our disagreements with them. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 45- works collaboratively with their colleagues. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 46- creates a positive relationship between our family, themselves, and the institution they represent. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 47- considers that my child will be able to succeed and integrate socially after being educated at home. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |

| MY RESOURCE PERSON: | Totally disagree | Disagree | Don't agree, nor disagree | Agree | Totally agree | Non applicable |
|---|------------------|----------|---------------------------|-------|---------------|----------------|
| 48- is interested in the child's personal and professional projects. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 49- criticizes the parent, their teaching approach, or the educational project in the child's presence. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 50- contributes to my child's success through their interaction with us. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 51- collaborates with me in attaining the goals I set for my child. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |

**APPENDIX B: The Home Education Monitoring Strategies Questionnaire –
For Home education monitors**

YOUR INTERACTIONS WITH HOME EDUCATING FAMILIES

The following statements concern YOUR INTERACTIONS with home educating families.

Please indicate to what extent the following statements correspond to your interactions with families, by circling the corresponding number.

| | Totally disagree | Disagree | Don't agree, nor disagree | Agree | Totally agree | Non applicable |
|---|------------------|----------|---------------------------|-------|---------------|----------------|
| IN MY ROLE AS A HOME EDUCATION MONITOR, I: | | | | | | |
| 1- make the effort to understand parents' viewpoint. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 2- accept some disagreements on some issues while discussing with parents; | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 3- do less monitoring than prescribed by the Homeschooling Regulation. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 4- base my intervention on social and academic expectations, rather than on the legal obligations related to homeschooling. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 5- recognize that different educational approaches can promote child development. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 6- establish an authoritarian relationship with parents by discrediting them from the start. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 7- innovate outside of established frameworks in the face of administrative obstacles or educational challenges, adjusting procedures if necessary. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 8- act and decide entirely on my own. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 9- seek to learn and evolve in my role as a resource-person. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 10- demonstrate suspicion towards families with regards to issues of abuse, neglect, violence. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 11- promote an "ideal" educational path (e.g.: aiming for university or employee status), without showing open-mindedness about other paths. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 12- recognize and value parents' parenting competences. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 13- hold a broad educational perspective, beyond pedagogical or administrative details. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 14- offer the support provided for by the regulations (e.g.: preparation of documents, help in the event of difficulty). | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 15- apply administrative and school standards with some rigidity. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 16- focus on the development of the child. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 17- tend to be more demanding, in terms of program, teaching, and school results of the child, than what is expected in schools. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 18- offer parents documents or tools adapted to home education and their family. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 19- refer to the existence of a remediation process for parents in the event of a disagreement (e.g. review, consultation, mediation). | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 20- develop knowledge and skills related to home education. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 21- think that choosing home education stems from a lack of judgment or malicious intentions on the part of the parents. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |

IN MY ROLE AS A HOME EDUCATION MONITOR, I:

| | Totally disagree | Disagree | Don't agree, nor disagree | Agree | Totally agree | Non applicable |
|---|------------------|----------|---------------------------|-------|---------------|----------------|
| 22- show openness to various educational paths (e.g.: metier, virtual school, self-directed learning, entrepreneurship, apprenticeship, artistic path). | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 23- am open to dialogue. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 24- let go on certain diverging viewpoints in order to preserve collaboration. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 25- intentionally ignore problems and challenges in order to make things easier for me. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 26- target, for any child, the "standard" progression corresponding to the ministerial program and its Progression of Learning. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 27- emphasize that we share a common goal: the child's well-being. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 28- am able to imagine meaningful learning outside of school, in other forms, rhythms and places, without professional intervention. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 29- seek solutions to each family's challenges, with them. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 30- make subjective judgments, not based on clear criteria. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 31- value parent-educators' feedback on my work as resource person. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 32- perform personal checks that go beyond what is expected in the regulations (e.g. on families' private life, parents' honesty). | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 33- demonstrate reluctance or prejudice in relation to some families, their culture, their way of life or their religion. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 34- adapt my language and translates ministerial expectations in accordance with home education and families. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 35- oppose unjustified refusals or premature external appeals (e.g. Child Protection Services, transfer or closure of a file); | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 36- am attentive to the child's particular needs and to the specifics of his/her situation (e.g. family or cultural). | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 37- try to convince the parents towards reintegration in school. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 38- propose new collaboration means. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 39- make minimal and binary judgments (e.g. satisfactory / insufficient) which leave no room for emphasizing a family's strengths. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 40- demonstrate motivation and enthusiasm for my work. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 41- am interested in a child's independence, relationships and social activities. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 42- make the effort to understand a family's writings and their accomplishments, then values them according to ministerial expectations. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 43- complain about working as a resource person and am not very interested in home education. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 44- insist on my decision-making power and on the possible consequences of a family's weak points or on our disagreements. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 45- work collaboratively with my colleagues. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 46- create a positive relationship between a family, myself, and the institution I represent. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |

IN MY ROLE AS A HOME EDUCATION MONITOR, I:

| | Totally disagree | Disagree | Don't agree, nor disagree | Agree | Totally agree | Non applicable |
|--|------------------|----------|---------------------------|-------|---------------|----------------|
| 47- consider that each child will be able to succeed and integrate socially from home education. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 48- am interested in the child's personal and professional projects. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 49- criticize the parent, their teaching approach, or educational project in front of the child. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 50- contribute to a child's success through my interaction with the family. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 51- collaborate with me parents the goals they set for their child. | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |

Table 1. Typology of intervention strategies of home education monitors

| Strategies of home education monitors | |
|---|---|
| Preferable strategies | Counterproductive strategies |
| <p><i>Mutual understanding</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ability to see the other party's point of view - recognition of parental competencies and motivations - openness to dialogue - ability to interpret ministerial language and expectations according to the family - ability to interpret the family's language and achievements according to ministerial expectations | <p><i>Negligence</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - absence of monitoring - rejection of their responsibility to evaluate - voluntary ignorance of problematic cases - avoidance of conflict - opposition in principle to home education and parent educators - unjustified legal proceedings |
| <p><i>Tolerance of disagreement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - approach of collaboration with the parents through the acceptance of differences of opinion over certain points - more global vision of education that goes beyond pedagogical or administrative details - compromise over educational expectations for the sake of preserving the connection | <p><i>Abuse of power</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - evaluation based on social standards and school programs, rather than on legal standards - a search, in the work of the children, for formal schooling rather than the broader aims of education enshrined in law - use of means of dissuasion and intimidation |
| <p><i>Search for the child's interest</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recognition that a number of educational visions can coincide when they aim for the good of the child - focus on the child's development - a search for shared interests - attention to the particularities of the child (needs, pace, interests, development) and their situation (e.g., family, cultural, or social) | <p><i>Protection of their professionalism</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - authoritarian relationship with the parents, who are often discredited from the start - ministerial programming and its typical or average progress evoked as the expected targets for each child - difficulty imagining an education that borrows from other forms, other paces, and other places, without professional intervention |
| <p><i>Creativity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in the face of administrative obstacles or educational challenges, innovation outside of established frameworks - offer of adapted documents or tools | <p><i>Incontestability</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the resource person acts alone - absence of appeal - subjective judgments that are not criterion referenced |

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - adjustment of procedures if necessary - demonstrated flexibility - seeking of solutions to the family's challenges - proposal of new activities for the families | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - binary judgment (satisfactory/insufficient) with no possibility of recognizing potential excellence - insistence on their decision-making power (redoing a level, returning to school, acceptance, success) |
| <p><i>Development of competencies</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a desire to learn and evolve in their role - development of knowledge and competencies specific to home education - value placed on parent's feedback on their work - collaborative work with parents and colleagues to develop relevant resources and practices | <p><i>Distrust</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - deep suspicion toward home education and parents, particularly in regard to youth protection issues - presumption of malice or lack of judgment in the parents - a penchant for ferreting out situations of abuse or negligence with questions or checks that exceed guidelines and standards |

Figure 1. The six typical approaches to home education governance and their regulatory measures (Brabant & Colleague D, 2021)

