limitations of an unexamined faith in the "educational ideology" will find the book useful. Despite some shortcomings, the book is a good example of a critical analysis that is complex and nuanced.

Kingdom of Children: Culture and Controversy in the Homeschooling Movement. By Mitchell L. Stevens. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001. Pp. ix+228. $24.95.

Ed Collom
University of Southern Maine

The number of American parents who choose to home school their children has recently increased dramatically. Even more impressive is the number of organizations that these parents have founded to support this endeavor in various ways. Mitchell L. Stevens's *Kingdom of Children* stands to fill an important void as home schoolers and their organizations have been slighted by both sociologists and social-movement scholars.

This book is extremely well written and thought provoking. The fieldwork spanned 10 years (beginning in 1989) and included 40 interviews with home-schooling parents, visitations to 10 "nationally active" home-schooling organizations, and participant observation in several events. Fundamentally, the book is an analysis of home schoolers' organizations.

Stevens begins by arguing that "home schooling is, in short, a social movement, with a rich history and an elaborate organizational apparatus" (p. 4). Stevens's organizational analysis and interviews support the idea that there are essentially two groups of home schoolers. Jane A. Van Galen (in *Home Schooling: Political, Historical, and Pedagogical Perspectives* [Ablex, 1991]) popularized this dichotomy by labeling home schoolers with religious motivations as "ideologues" and the antibureaucratic libertarian group as "pedagogues." Stevens refers to the former as "believers" or "heaven-based" and the latter as "inclusives" or "earth-based."

A substantial contribution of Stevens's research lies with its documentation of the differing forms that the organizations founded by these two groups take. Support organizations of the earth-based group strive to be democratic. Their meetings are loose and informal, and decisions are made by consensus. The organizations of the heaven-based group differ considerably. "Committed to an ideal of godliness, the believers have created a system that is built around leaders and that discourages dissent" (p. 115). With an array of marketed curricular materials and steep dues, the believers' organizations are also "big business." "The believers were after authority and control, while the inclusives wanted democracy. The believers were interested in making money and centralizing power, the inclusives in grassroots empowerment" (p. 146).

In the most analytical portion of the book, Stevens examines the two camps' response to threatening federal legislation. A prominent organi-

zation of the believers launched an intensive campaign that forced the inclusives to react and counter what they saw as a misrepresentation of the home-schooling community. Stevens quickly dismisses resource mobilization and network approaches to social movements, arguing that "we need a cultural explanation" (p. 166). Unfortunately, the analysis is very loose and atheoretical. He argues that the strength of the believers' campaign is attributable to the acceptance of their national leaders' authority and the reputation of their hierarchical organizations. The inclusives lacked a shared identity, and their last-minute coalition captured no media attention. Nonetheless, each group was successful, as the amendments offered by both camps ultimately passed.

The major weakness of this book is that social theory is not seriously engaged. Stevens never defines what he considers "social movements" to be. It is a nontrivial issue to argue that home schooling is a social movement. The legislation analysis tells a story that has to do more with "normal" politics and professional lobbying than contentious collective action. Concepts such as political opportunity, collective action frames, and biographical availability should have been engaged to strengthen the analysis.

The book also has some methodological weaknesses. No numerical data are ever presented. Stevens admits that home schooling changed dramatically over the period of his study. Yet we have little sense of the overall number of home schoolers and the relative size of the believers and the inclusives and their organizations over this decade. More specifics about the fieldwork are also needed, such as how rapport was built with a population that has often been skeptical of, if not hostile to, "research." Using existing organizations as a sampling frame limits this research too. What about those home schoolers who are not affiliated with any "nationally active" organizations?

The contemporary relevance of this book is compromised as Stevens perpetuates a false dichotomy by focusing on the extremes. Had the existing body of research examining why parents home school their children been cited, the diversity of this growing population would be evident. Home schoolers cannot be so neatly divided into earth-based and heaven-based groups. There are a host of "middle grounders" as parents have taken on this responsibility for a variety of reasons. To his credit, Stevens does note: "People who came in during the late 1990s joined a different movement. . . . Home schooling had become a fully institutionalized if still unconventional educational choice" (pp. 195–96).

Despite its limitations, Stevens's research is commendable, as it gives voice to differing types of home schoolers. This ethnography provides valuable firsthand experience and motivations. Stevens's work also dispels the "antisocial" myths surrounding home schooling by stressing that it has always been a *collective* enterprise. *Kingdom of Children* will no doubt play an important role in the much-needed sociological dialogue surrounding home schooling.