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What a Trip: Working and Studying with Dr. Douglas H. Smith

In the 1990s I (Tonette Rocco) was a graduate student at The Ohio State University. I had become interested in a former faculty member by the name of John Ohliger. Dr. David Boggs had introduced Ohliger through his writings in various classes. And Dr. Dowling had entertained students with stories about Ohliger that were quite funny. In my quest to find out more about John Ohliger, David Boggs said there was a faculty member in Florida who had studied with Ohliger and Dowling in the 1970s.

His name was Doug Smith.

In 1997, the year I graduated from Ohio State, the Adult Education Research Conference was held at Oklahoma State University. I had been told to look for Dr. Smith who would be there. And as fate would have it running past me up the stairs hurrying to his session was Doug Smith. I tried to speak to him, but he gasped “I’m late; I can’t talk now.” A refrain I would come to know well. His session was on TQM. Years later I would share this story with Karen Watkins who assured me Doug was famous for being in a hurry. Doug is also well known in adult education and human resource development circles for his work, and many famous scholars consider him a friend.

In 2000 I met Doug again, and again he was in a hurry, but this time he sat with me to talk. And later during the conference, we talked to Jo Gallagher too because I had applied for the assistant professor position at Florida International University. And so I joined the faculty at FIU under Doug as program leader. He made my husband, Maurice, and I feel welcome, inviting us to his home on several occasions during our first few years here. Reaching out to junior faculty is something Doug just did naturally, and many new faculty are grateful in the college. Maybe he could make us feel welcome because over the years, he has been Dean, Associate Dean, Associate Professor, and Professor but somehow was able to skip being an Assistant Professor.

Over the years, Doug has accomplished much:

- Guiding 36 students to finish writing their dissertations to become doctors of education
- Serving on numerous student dissertation committees and publishing articles with many of these students
- Serving the college in many leadership positions
- With almost 50 publications focused on TQM, management issues, and distance education, his work has been cited by hundreds of scholars winning awards such as the Cutting Edge Award from the Academy of Human Resource Development

Serving the field:

- as a founding member of the Academy of Human Resource Development and first historian for the organization

http://education.fiu.edu/newhorizons
Karen Wollard met Dr. Smith about 20 years ago. She observes that Dr. Smith grew with the fields of adult education and human resource development and reflected the cutting edge of its practice. For years, he coordinated the job opportunities listings for the Miami Chapter of American Society for Training & Development, facilitating dozens of internships and jobs all over the county and across the country. He knew so many of the HR professionals in Miami that going to a meeting with him was often like following a politician as he worked the room. When there was a training position to be filled, everyone knew that Dr. Smith was the one to contact because he knew the likely candidates. This kept him informed about the realities in hiring, changing skill demands, and increasing technological challenges, while his research and writing kept him abreast of the trends and issues.

In the classroom, Dr. Smith applied what he taught. In the 1980s he was involved in continuing education, and those lessons transferred to the classroom. He experimented with retreat-style courses, offered a special topics seminar on “The Study of the Future,” ran simulations, discussed TQM, proffered learning contracts, showed a documentary film he made of Malcolm Knowles, and brought in experts in Neuro-linguistic programming and brain research. He did his best to create classes that gave students the skills and knowledge they needed to serve the field well.

Dr. Smith loved technology and understood early its power to help train and develop human resources. He taught a computer-based training course when that term meant drill-and-practice almost exclusively. He chose not to retire sooner because he was offered the opportunity to coordinate the College of Education’s technology programs. He tried distance learning courses, authoring software, web-based training, and courses on CD-ROM, often long before they were embraced by other educators.

Doug Smith helped define the place of adult education and human resource development within the realm of lifelong learning and continuous education. He realized that the field is a work in progress and that changes in economics, biology, politics, and technology could all change the future course. As he now takes on a three-year commitment to lead the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education, he continues to shape the future.

As Doug observed in his interview (in this issue), “All I can say of the journey over the last 25 at FIU, and 40 years overall? What a trip.”

Tonette S. Rocco and Karen Kelly Wollard
THE TYRANNY OF TECHNOLOGY:
A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE SOCIAL ARENA OF ONLINE LEARNING

Jamie L. Callahan
Associate Professor
Human Resource Development
Texas A&M University

Jennifer A. Sandlin
Assistant Professor
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
Arizona State University

Abstract

Educators and learners in adult education have been sentenced to online learning before we have truly explored the verdict of whether online learning is all it is touted to be. The vast majority of online learning dialogue has extolled the virtues of cybereducation as not only the future but the salvation of education (Brabazon, 2002; Menchik, 2004). Davison (2004), however, suggests we have not mindfully considered how technology transcends mere use and intertwines with our sense of self and the world. In this article we critically question this dominant view of technology, using Bourdieu’s (e.g., 1977) theory of practice to inform our challenge of dominant discourses around online education. We present a brief review of Bourdieu’s theory of practice, followed by an overview of the dominant discourses associated with cybereducation and our Bourdieusian interpretation of cybereducation. We conclude with implications for the future of online learning for the field of adult education.

“Sentence first, verdict afterwards.”
(The Queen of Hearts, Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland, Carroll, 1865/1961, p. 157)

Educators and learners in adult education in many contexts, ranging from adult basic education to adult higher education, have been sentenced to online learning before truly exploring the verdict of whether online learning is all it is touted to be. While there have been studies cautioning adult educators about the uncritical embracing of distance technologies as a panacea for issues of access and success for adults in higher education and more informal learning contexts (Boshier, Wilson, & Qayyum, 1999; Gibson, 2000; Gray, 1999; McKie, 2000; Miller, 2001; Miller, Leung, & Kennedy, 1997), the vast majority of dialogue and popular discourse about online learning in more formal adult education contexts, including adult literacy education and especially adult higher education, has extolled the virtues of cybereducation as not only the future but perhaps even the salvation of education (Bates & Poole, 2003; Brabazon, 2002; Cahoon, 1998; Conceição, 2002; Day, 2004; Hanna, Glowacki-Dudka, & Conceição-Runlee, 2000; Huang, 2002; Huber & Lowry, 2003; Menchik, 2004; Negroponte, 1995; Russell, 1999; Schrum, 1998; Wang, 2005). Miller (2001) argues that this “utopian” vision of technology...
in adult and higher education embraces technology with “evangelical enthusiasm” (p. 191), seeing technology as “having the power to transform education, providing learners with greater choice, flexibility, and control in relation to what, where, and when they study” (p. 187).

Proponents of distance education, online learning, and computer-based tools for learning have dominated much of the dialogue around these modes of education and learning in adult education journals, for example, suggesting means to foster cultural inclusivity (Chang, 2004; Ziegahn, 2005), reducing barriers to technology integration amongst adult basic educators (Kotrlik & Redmann, 2005), or incorporating distance education as a means to appeal to non-traditional female students (Carney-Crompton & Tan, 2002). While some scholars recognize the inherent problems of using online learning technologies, there is nevertheless an implicit assumption that such technology is a given and it is the instructors’ responsibility to improve their practice to meet demands (Hodge, Tucker, & Williams, 2004). Davison (2004) suggests, and we agree, that educators have not fully and mindfully considered how technology transcends mere use to intertwine with our sense of self and the world. Indeed, from within the discipline of adult education, the most salient challenges to, or critiques of, these dominant perspectives of technology as a pedagogical tool have appeared in scholarly journals primarily as book review essays (e.g., Fenwick, 2004; Walter, 2001), as book chapters (Miller, 2001), or conference proceedings (Boshier & Wilson, 1998; Miller et al., 1997). More comprehensive reflections and research on the implications of technological pedagogy are still lacking in the adult education literature.

Thus, we contend that online entrepreneurs have presented adult educators and learners with a rabbit hole into cybereducation and that adult educators, learners, and administrators have fallen into it. The purpose of this article, then, is to present a critique of the mass acceptance of cybereducation in the practice of adult education. In this article, we use Pierre Bourdieu’s (e.g., 1977) “theory of practice to frame our challenge of the dominant discourse around online learning and teaching. We focus largely on the context of higher education, which continues to see an increase in adult learner enrollment (Sissel, Hansman, & Kasworm, 2001) and is one of the main arenas where adult educators are practicing, researching, and promoting online learning (Miller, 2001). Higher education is one of the arenas of adult learning (along with business and industry, the military, government, and health fields) hosting the majority of all educational programs offered at a distance (Gibson, 2000). Higher education continues to see an increase in the numbers of universities offering online learning courses and adult learners enrolling in online courses (Gibson, 2000; Waits, Lewis, & Greene, 2003; Yoon, 2003).

Before embarking on our challenge of cybereducation, it is important that we position ourselves within the very arena of online and distance learning. Both authors of this article are experienced users of online learning technologies. Indeed, this article emerged from our observations of online learning during the administration of a grant to convert traditional courses to an online format. Both authors also have experience with a variety of different online learning software platforms, including Centra, Blackboard, FirstClass, WebCT-SE, and WebCT Vista, having used them in both web-supplemented (hybrid) and fully online graduate courses. The first author also used blogs and wikis as a central component of her teaching when these tools were not yet incorporated into the online learning software platform for the university. Thus, our observations of, and subsequent challenges to, cybereducation are not borne of a lack of
familiarity or competence in applying the technologies. They have emerged from our reflections in and on our practice as adult educators.

In what follows, we first present a brief review of the key elements of Bourdieu’s theory of practice. We then offer our Bourdieusian interpretation of the dominant discourse associated with cybereducation in adult higher education. We conclude with implications for the future of online learning and the fields of adult education.

**Through the Looking Glass of Bourdieu**

Bourdieu sought to build a theory that synthesized both subjective and objective paradigmatic perspectives (Grenfell & James, 1998). His structuralist conflict approach (Morrow & Torres, 1995; Turner, 1991) incorporated subjective schemes of self-embodiment within context, identified as *habitus*, and objective orientations of positions within a common network, identified as *fields*. Individuals’ positions within any given field are, in part, determined by their *habitus*, and the interactions between positions result in unequal distributions of power, or *capital*. In turn, the use of capital to maintain dominant positions within a given field results in *symbolic violence* toward those in less powerful positions.

Habitus represents a dialectic of how the body inhabits or exists within the social world, while, at the same time, the social world inhabits the body (Reay, 2004). Habitus is not simply the representation of belief systems, but includes the whole range of ways of thinking, feeling, and acting. Lingard and Christie (2003), following Bourdieu, describe habitus as a system of “socially-constituted dispositions” (p. 320). Topper (2001) further describes these dispositions as “the embodied product of an individual’s history, experience (especially early childhood experience) and social location, becoming over time an ethos, a set of flexible but enduring ‘mental structures’ and ‘bodily schemas’ that organize, orient, and direct comportment in private and public space” (p. 38). These dispositions are durable over time and are deeply embedded, becoming our “common sense” or seemingly “natural” responses and personalities. They are also transposable in that these dispositions can be adapted to guide behavior, thoughts, and feelings in fields outside of the one where they were originally developed (Topper, 2001). Habitus influences how we walk and talk, how we make decisions, what entertainment we pursue, when and how we display anger or joy or sorrow, and all of the other elements of “being” within a network of interconnected relationships.

Fields are those interconnected relationships (Grenfell & James, 1998; Menchik, 2004). Bourdieu (1998) describes a field as

A structured social space, a field of forces, a force field. It contains people who dominate and people who are dominated. Constant, permanent relationships of inequality operate inside this space, which at the same time becomes a space in which the various actors struggle for the transformation or preservation of the field. All the individuals in this universe bring to the competition all the (relative) power at their disposal. It is this power that defines their position in the field and, as a result, their strategies. (p. 40)

A field is thus “a structured system of social relations” (Grenfell & James, 1998, p. 16), which is also “a structure of power relations” (Topper, 2001, p. 39). Fields are comprised of
differential positions that compete for capital. This competition leads to the concept of fields of conflict: Various positions within fields are held by individuals or institutions, or actors, and the relationships and interactions (or conflicts) between different positions shape how the field is structured (Topper, 2001). Actors occupy positions within these fields based on their habitus, which is learned through familial socialization and previous education exposure. In turn, the thoughts, feelings, and actions that form habitus serve to either reinforce or reshape the structure of fields. Fields are relatively autonomous; however, multiple fields exist within any given society and new fields can emerge (Menchik, 2004). In the context of education, Morrow and Torres (1995) explain Bourdieu’s concept of fields as being “close to what are often academic disciplines, that is, contexts of cultural discourse and activity that are organized as markets of symbolic goods” (p. 182).

As actors interact within their field positions, they enact capital (Grenfell & James, 1998). There are three essential types of capital—economic, cultural, and social—which are interpreted as symbolic products of habitus in action (Grenfell & James, 2004). The root of all capital is economic in nature; however, the economic underpinnings and implications of cultural and social capital are often obscured. All positions within a field have capital; however, the nature and influence of that capital is different and unequal and results in a hierarchical field structure (Naidoo, 2004). In other words, different positions within a field are determined by the extent to which individuals or institutions possess certain forms of capital that are considered valuable in any particular field (Topper, 2001).

Bourdieu (1977) argued habitus and capital are reproduced, in part, through the field of education, which serves as an important purveyor of social and cultural values. The obscuring of economic capital through social and cultural values legitimizes unequal power relationships (Grenfell & James, 2004; Wolfreys, 2000). As a result, those who are dominated come to accept their positions as normal and natural. This application of capital to control the field of conflict is referred to as symbolic violence; those with more capital within a field are able to control symbolic meanings and to “impose them as legitimate by concealing the power relations which are the basis of its forces” (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 4). Symbolic violence refers to a kind of violence, oppression, or coercion that is not physical; rather, symbolic violence is “a gentle, invisible violence, unrecognized as such” (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 127).

Bourdieu and Cybereducation

We argue that the field of adult education has patterns of action (habitus) associated with cybereducation that have come to be accepted as normal and natural. This habitus is enacted as adult education, as a field in conflict with other fields, tries to achieve legitimacy, status, and credibility in its larger social context. The economic roots of habitus are obscured by the superficial purpose of education as the purveyor of cultural and social capital. This hegemonic process of making cybereducation seem normal and natural is consistent with Bourdieu’s (e.g., 1990) conception of symbolic violence.

While online distance education, or cybereducation, is not yet a field in its own right (Menchik, 2004), it can be explored as part of the broader fields (in the Bourdieusian sense) of adult and higher education. Within those fields, technology can be considered “little crystallized
parts of habitus” (Sterne, 2003, p. 376). Technology plays a fundamental role in shaping our lives, and members of society often fail to appreciate this phenomenon (Madaus & Horn, 2000). Such a failure is referred to as misrecognition by Bourdieu (Grenfell & James, 1998, 2004)—a failure to see how economic capital masquerades as cultural or social capital. In this way, technology itself serves as symbolic violence that maintains unequal distributions between people who occupy various positions in society.

**Challenging the Dominant Discourse**

The dominant discourse within adult education associated with information technology, internet education, online learning, and similar refrains of the digital age centers on accepting the inevitable reality that the nature of adult education—and specifically the nature of adult education within higher education settings—will fundamentally change as a result of distance technology (Miller, 2001). Even though universities have been cornerstones of society for hundreds of years, some have contended that universities simply will not survive the technological revolution and others have supported that notion by comparing universities to the now practically non-existent family farm (Duderstadt, Atkins, & Houweling, 2002). The discourse framed by proponents of cybereducation typically follows three streams: availability of and access to learning, learner engagement and involvement in learning, and revenue generation.

**Availability and Access to Learning**

Perhaps the loudest argument made by proponents of adopting cybereducation is the claim that technology renders higher education open to anyone (Duderstadt et al., 2002) because it transcends the boundaries of time and space (Schrum, 1998). As such, proponents claim that cybereducation helps increase the diversity of the student body (Conceição, 2002; Sanders, 2001). The implication is that because underrepresented adults now have access to higher education, cybereducation increases equality among diverse groups in society.

Education is widely viewed within a capitalist society as a means to achieve upward mobility (Baptiste, 2001; Delbanco, 2005). Two profound moments in higher education policy in the United States, for instance, were crafted specifically to meet the needs of adult learners: the Morrill Act which created land grant universities in 1862, and the GI Bill, which was implemented in 1944 to help returning soldiers afford higher education (Sissel et al., 2001). Furthermore, in the Cold War Era fight against communism, the exclusive doors of higher education were cracked to many adults who otherwise could never have gained access. Those doors, however, are currently being pulled shut because tuition is increasing, financial aid is waning, faculty salary is stagnating, and public support is decreasing. As a result, the gap between elites and non-elites is widening. Dominant discourses proclaim cybereducation to be the answer to increasing access and gaining funding (Katz & Associates, 1999). However, we join oppositional voices (e.g., Gibson, 2000) who suggest cybereducation may actually increase this gap.

Technology creates a gap between adults who have access to a common language of technology and those who do not. Proponents of online education hail the equalizing properties of distance education and the technological improvements that have made online education more
personal (for example, Katz & Associates, 1999). However, these “bells and whistles” require more sophisticated computer equipment and high speed internet access that make it more difficult for less advantaged adults to access the distance learning services of higher education (Gibson, 2000). University administrators argue online technology increases outreach for geographically marginalized learners; however, studies have shown that this perception is not accurate (David, 2003). Benson and Wright (1999) found technology actually hindered learning for over 20% of their students. And in Canada and England, for example, adults with lower socio-economic and educational statuses are significantly less likely to own a computer (Miller, 2001; Nakhaie & Pike, 1998).

In other words, education is increasingly associated with wealth, which is, in turn, associated with increased access to technology. Thus, as cybereducation becomes more popular, education is made virtually inaccessible to those who do not have the wealth to afford state of the art computers and high speed internet access. This constriction of access contributes to a vicious cycle that feeds the human capital theory perspective that low socio-economic status individuals remain in poverty because they choose to limit their personal investment in education (Baptiste, 2001). This cycle of manufactured inequalities lends support to our contention that both technology and education produce elites. In this way, cybereducation serves as a mechanism of symbolic violence because it provides the false perception (or creates misrecognition) of increasing access and, in turn, equality while instead maintaining inequalities.

Engagement and Involvement

Another argument in the discourse supporting cybereducation is that cybereducation enables learners to become active consumers of educational services (Conceição, 2002; Duderstadt et al., 2002). Proponents argue that participants are more engaged in the learning process because technology allows them to have a greater voice in their education. Opponents argue that the dominant discourse has co-opted the language of critical and feminist pedagogy by claiming learners have more “power” in the online classroom. As Miller’s (2001) study shows, however, technology is not value neutral and cybereducation does not always allow for the “empowerment” of all students. Rather, technologies are socially shaped, with “assumptions built into their production and consumption that are class, gender, and culture specific” (Miller, 2001, p. 203). Miller (2001) found, in her study of poor black women who participated in an introduction to technology course, that while these women were given access to computer hardware, they encountered racism when interacting with computer support technicians, as well as other aspects of institutional racism that negatively impacted their cybereducation experiences. Viewed within the context of Bourdieu, these learners navigated the field of cybereducation while possessing less-valued cultural capital and were thus relegated to a less powerful position within the field. Miller (2001) concludes that power relations—particularly inequalities with regards to gender, ethnicity, and class—are always implicit in the practice of cybereducation.

Furthermore, viewing learners as consumers, as some proponents of cybereducation do, has resulted in higher education becoming what Noble (2001) refers to as digital diploma mills. Within these digital diploma mills, learners and the market are determining the content of learning instead of faculty exercising their expertise through academic freedom. Similarly, Jarvis
(2000) speaks of “corporate universities” that are seeking to compete in the “global learning market” (p. 49) through offering market-driven, vocationally-oriented courses, increasingly through distance technologies.

In this case, both learners and educators are affected by the symbolic violence enacted by implementing cybereducation. As disadvantaged learners attempt to engage with cybereducation, their access does not ensure full engagement. Indeed, barriers of gender, ethnicity, and socio-economic status continue to shape the inequalities found within the field while those who support cybereducation simultaneously make claims to the contrary. Thus, those who would seek to use education as a means to increasing their position within the field discover that inequalities continue to be reproduced. Further, adult educators are also victims of symbolic violence in the application of cybereducation. Instead of maintaining a relative position within a field based on their earned expertise, educators are pressured into basing the content of their courses largely on the whims of the market.

Revenue Generation

Revenue generation is one of the key reasons higher education administrators are leaping to implement online learning systems (Brabazon, 2002; Duderstadt et al., 2002). With decreasing government support (Delbanco, 2005), universities are searching for innovative ways to generate funding streams. Online learning is seen as the answer because higher fees can be charged for the convenience of earning a diploma from home, a larger pool of potential learners can be reached, and overhead for facilities is minimized; this further exacerbates the positioning of adult learners in higher education as “cash cow boons” (Sissel et al., 2001, p. 18), which many adult educators have decried (Sissel et al., 2001). Not accounted for in this equation is the increase of time and effort by faculty to support this online initiative.

One of the ways technology creates elites within the university setting is by diminishing the purpose of higher education and fostering a higher-level technical college that serves corporate interests (Brabazon, 2002; Jarvis, 2000). While the most elite universities are still able to regulate themselves, newer and public universities try to earn their “keep” by serving corporate capital interests. By becoming handmaids to corporate interests, higher educational institutions are unable to foster equality among different positions within society (Grenfell & James, 1998, 2004); and, exactly as Bourdieu (e.g., 1977, 1990) argued, symbolic violence will then occur because differential positions are part of any field (Wolfreys, 2000).

Furthermore, the symbolic violence of online education results in the exploitation of educators. Educators are encouraged, even brow-beaten, into using online technology to deliver their courses (Bates & Poole, 2003; Brabazon, 2002). Mirroring our own experiences, we consistently hear complaints from colleagues at conferences, in hallways, and other informal spaces about the overwhelming burden of using online technology with little or insufficient technological support and even less time and energy to devote to delivering quality courses online. The online media of delivery is substantially more time consuming than traditional modes of delivery: higher course development time, greater learner expectations of immediate response, increased time in course delivery, and greater expectations for technological expertise (Fein &
Logan, 2003). And these increased expectations and workloads are not typically remunerated.

Thus, in this final stream of the dominant discourse, symbolic violence is primarily directed at those within the field of education—the educators and the administrators. Educators are victims of symbolic violence because they are tasked to do more with less and for less based on the false premise of providing greater access and equity to the less powerful. Administrators are victims of symbolic violence because they have accepted the market-driven premise that cybereducation will solve their financial woes and enable them to achieve a respected and credible position within the field of education.

Conclusion

University of Michigan President Emeritus, James J. Duderstadt, argued that the advent of virtual universities, or educational institutions with only online education, could be compared to the Nike Corporation. Sadly, we agree, although we employ the analogy quite differently. Duderstadt (1999) suggests Nike, a major supplier of athletic shoes in the United States and worldwide, does not manufacture the shoes it markets. It has decided that its strength is in marketing and that it should outsource its manufacturing to those who can do it better and cheaper. In a sense, the virtual university similarly unbundles marketing and delivery. It works with the marketplace to understand needs, and then it outsources courses, curricula, and other educational services from established colleges and universities…and delivers them through the use of sophisticated information technology. (p. 13)

We suggest the analogy rests in the fact that Nike exploits oppressed workers in order to profit from their labor and to provide mass produced goods at a high price to consumers desperate to create a sense of belonging through brand image. Our contention is that educators are exploited when pushed to use online technologies to teach without remuneration for the extra work required, or be “demeaned as neo-luddites, reactionaries, or has-beens” (Brabazon, 2002, p. xii). Online classes are often cookie-cutter copies created by web-specialists and lack depth of spontaneous interactive reflection. Furthermore, learners recognize they need credentialing in order to be successful and, therefore, seek what they perceive to be the easiest path to achieve that goal.

The push for online platforms of learning represents an implicit incursion of corporate capital into the field of adult education that results in the exploitation of educators, the corporatization of education, and the expansion of the gap between privileged and disadvantaged learners. David Noble (2001) sounds a chilling warning about the automation of higher education, “…all too often in the past people had only belatedly realized the dimensions of the calamity that had befallen them, too late to act effectively in their own interest” (p. ix). Let adult educators take a lesson from Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland (Carroll, 1865/1961) and be aware of both the reality and fantasy of cybereducation. We call for the field of adult education to not simply enact a “blind embrace of technology” (Davison, 2004, p. 86) but, rather, to act mindfully instead of mindlessly, so we can perhaps avoid falling deeper into the rabbit hole of online education.
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Abstract

This study aimed to study the andragogical and pedagogical orientations of adults learning English as a foreign language. The Turkish version of the Educational Orientation Questionnaire (Christian, 1983) was used. Sixty adults at evening classes in Turkey were included in the study. The results of the study revealed that the subjects were more andragogically oriented. However, the wide range of scores suggested that they were not rigid in their orientations and tended to hold pedagogical tendency towards learning too.

Since Malcolm Knowles (1973, 1980) popularized the term andragogy in 1970s, which he defined as “the art and science of helping adults learn” (Knowles, 1980, p. 38), there has been a spate of discussion over the term itself and the word pedagogy, which is defined as “the art and science of educating children” (Knowles, 1980, p. 38).

Knowles (1980) says that the term pedagogy derived from the Greek stem paid- (meaning “child”) and agogos (meaning “leading”). As the derivation suggests, pedagogy can refer only to children and teaching or leading them. On the other hand, the term andragogy stems from the Greek word aner with the stem andra meaning “man, not boy” or adult, and agogus meaning “leader of.” These stems make it clear that the two terms refer to totally different things.

It was not Malcolm Knowles who used the term andragogy for the first time. It was first coined by Alexander Kapp, a German teacher to describe the educational theory of Plato in 1833 (Davenport & Davenport, 1985). However, another German, Johan Frederick Herbart, opposed the use of andragogy for this purpose, and the term was forgotten for a long time. It was taken up again in the first half of 20th century in Europe and gained popularity in the second half of the century in France, Holland, and Yugoslavia. Martha Anderson and Eduard Lindeman introduced the term to the United States in 1927, but they did not develop the concept. On one of his trips to Europe, Malcolm Knowles was introduced to the term, and was carried away with the meaning of it, which, he believed, compromised the elements of his theory, which he was developing at the time.

According to Knowles (1980), andragogy is a set of assumptions about adults as learners and a series of recommendations for the planning, management, and evaluation of adult learning. This explanation of the concept has two important presuppositions. First, self-directedness is a core of adulthood. Second, andragogical practice involves collaboration with the learners in their quest for learning.

Knowles (1980) states that the four assumptions that underline adult learning differ from those underlining the pedagogic teaching:
… as a person matures, (1) his self-concept moves from one of being a dependent personality toward one of being a self-directing human being; (2) he accumulates a growing reservoir of experience that becomes an increasing resource for learning; (3) his readiness to learn becomes oriented increasingly to the developmental tasks of his social role; and (4) his time perspective changes from one of postponed application of knowledge to immediacy of application, and accordingly his orientation toward learning shifts from one of subject-centeredness to one of problem-centeredness. (p. 39)

These assumptions underlying the theory of andragogy imply some issues that need to be considered in adult education: Learners (a) have the right to know why something is important to learn, (b) need guidance about how to direct themselves through information, (c) need to be able to relate the topic to their experiences, (d) can learn when they are ready and motivated to learn, and (e) might need help to overcome inhibitions, behaviors, and beliefs about learning.

The andragogical model differentiates the roles of the teacher (or rather the facilitator) from those in the pedagogical model. The andragogical model is a process model, and in this model the facilitator prepares in advance a set of procedures for involving the learners (and other relevant parties) in a process involving these elements: “(1) establishing a climate conducive to learning; (2) creating a mechanism for mutual planning; (3) diagnosing the needs for learning; (4) formulating program objectives . . . that will satisfy these needs; (5) designing a pattern of learning experiences; (6) conducting these learning experiences with suitable techniques and materials; and (7) evaluating the learning outcomes and rediagnosing learning needs” (Knowles, 1973, p. 54).

Jarvis (1985) compares the assumptions of pedagogy and andragogy. In the pedagogical approach the learner is expected to be dependent and the teacher is the one who dictates the content to be learned while androgogical approach gives the learner independence, meaning that the learner is supposed to be self-directed. The learner’s experience, according to the pedagogical approach, has little relevance. In androgogical approach, however, the learner’s experience is valuable for learning, and, therefore, among the methods to be used are discussion and problem solving. While pedagogy supposes that society dictates the learner what to learn, androgogical approach acknowledges what people want to learn, which necessitates learning programmes to be organized around life applications.

Davenport and Davenport (1985) also point out some of the androgogical and pedagogical differences in application. In pedagogical philosophy, the instructor is the one who diagnoses the needs of the learners, prepares objectives and evaluates the process. The instructor is the knowledge transmitter; therefore, the learner has a passive role. In contrast, an instructor with andragogical philosophy aims to create an informal, collaborative and respectful climate. He involves the learner in the process of designing and evaluation of the learning activities which are based on the learner’s problem areas. The techniques include group discussion, role-playing, action project, case studies etc.

Knowles (1980) argued that learners in a pedagogical learning experience are more teacher-directed. The learning content is generally prescriptive with the emphasis on transmittal of knowledge and both acquire knowledge and skills, and demonstrate their competence to their teacher. These learners also expect the teacher to firmly direct their
learning, motivate them, and be responsible for assessing all the learning. Common practices that support a pedagogical orientation include lectures transmitting factual information, assigned readings, drills, tests, and rote learning. Teachers operate on the assumption that learners are ready to learn whatever is prescribed to them in the form of standardized curriculum. Although pedagogical practices are more appropriate for children, Knowles defended the use of such practices with some adult learners, particularly in circumstances where any other approach is unsuccessful.

In contrast, the practice of andragogy is more learner-centered and the role of the teacher is primarily that of a facilitator. Characteristics of adult learners learning in an andragogical experience include self-direction, autonomy, responsibility for decisions, resource of experience, performance of social roles, and immediacy of application or action. Knowles (1980) recommends this orientation to accomplish more meaningful outcomes because it encourages learners to stress and display their freedom of choice for learning goals, content, and processes. Learners with an andragogical orientation expect the teacher to provide an environment that enhances learning, have at least some control over the process of learning, and encourage higher levels of self-direction.

Despite the differences between andragogical and pedagogical orientations to teaching, such as the roles of the teacher and the learners and the learning climate and environment, many adult education institutions require a diploma or certificate in pedagogy. Therefore, inevitably adult educators in various fields seem to hold their pedagogical beliefs about education. However, to have the desired level of learning, the characteristics of adult learners should be considered. Only in this way can appropriate learning environments be provided for our learners. However, the assumption that all adult learners know and endorse the andragogical model cannot be made. One of the pillars of the andragogical model is to start from where our learners are and to make use of their previous learning experiences. Therefore, the fact that learners may hold strong pedagogical beliefs and expectations cannot be overlooked. If it is overlooked, the andragogical assumption would be imposed onto the learners, resulting in possibly a negative effect on their learning. Therefore, it seems reasonable to suggest that in every adult education program the learners’ beliefs about learning need to be known, which requires teachers to learn the learners’ andragogical-pedagogical orientations.

Previous Studies on Andragogical-Pedagogical Orientations of Adult Learners

A number of studies have been conducted on the on andragogical-pedagogical orientations of adult learners in other fields. The following is a summary of eight representative studies.

Hadley (1975) pioneered the studies on andragogical and pedagogical orientations. However, Hadley’s study was on adult educators’ orientation. The method of his study was taken up by other adult educators who adapted his Educational Orientation Questionnaire (EOQ; Hadley, 1975) in order to investigate the andragogical and pedagogical orientations of adult learners. Van Allen (1982) was the first person to use Hadley’s questionnaire to measure student attitudes in eight North Carolina Community Colleges and discovered that full-time younger female and married students had higher andragogical orientations than other students.
Christian (1983) adapted Hadley’s (1975) EOQ, for civilian-military students attending classes at Tinker Air Force Base. The results of his study revealed differences related to whether classes were mandatory or voluntary. He did not examine possible relationships between educational orientation and age and sex.

Davenport & Davenport (1986) replicated Christian’s (1983) study and included the relationship between age, sex, academic achievement, and educational orientation among students at the University of Wyoming. Their study revealed that female students had a higher andragogical orientation. However, they could not find statistically significant relationship between age and educational orientation and academic achievement and educational orientation.

Grubbs (1981) conducted a study with 332 students in 20 mid-western schools of theology and found that females and younger students were more andragogical than others. Delahaye, Limerick, and Hearn (1994) studied the andragogical and pedagogical orientations of university students studying business management. Using Christian’s (1983) Students’ Orientation Questionnaire (SOQ) they found that the relationship between an andragogical orientation and a pedagogical orientation is not based on a continuum, but is orthogonal. Such a relationship implies that an individual can be located within a two dimensional space that is bounded on one side by andragogy and on the adjoining side by pedagogy. Therefore, a learner could have a higher score on pedagogy and andragogy or lower score on pedagogy and andragogy.

Choy and Delahaye (2002) investigated the learning approaches, study orientation, and readiness for self-directed learning of 266 youth aged 17-24 years old and enrolled in four Technical and Further Education Institutes. Three instruments were used, the Study Process Questionnaire (Biggs, 1988), SOQ (Christian, 1983), and the Learning Preference Assessment (Gugulielmino & Guglielmino, 1991). The data showed that most youth have a predominant surface approach to learning, a preference for an andragogical orientation, and a low level of readiness for self-directed learning. There was no statistically significant difference in the pedagogy scores by gender.

Chen (1994) conducted a study to identify and compare the learning orientation of 683 adults and 699 traditional students in vocational programs of six junior colleges in Taiwan. He used the SOQ (Christian, 1983) to determine the students’ andragogical or pedagogical orientation. The data suggested adult students tended to prefer andragogical orientation more than the pedagogical one. There were significant differences among adult and traditional students in the dimensions of “self-directed learning” and “instructor's direction” and in the learning orientation of students grouped by gender, age, type of programs, and grade.

Finally, Richardson (1994) aimed to determine if there was a difference in program satisfaction between students who graduated from high school and began their nursing education and those students who waited before beginning their nursing education relative to their preference for andragogical or pedagogical teaching methodology. The study included 481 sophomore, junior, and senior baccalaureate nursing students. The survey instruments obtained data on preference for andragogical or pedagogical teaching methodology, program satisfaction, and demographic characteristics. Analysis of variance was used to determine if there were significant differences in Hadley's (1975) EOQ and a program satisfaction scale scores based on student age, gender, marital status, and year in college. An analysis of
variance was used to determine if differences existed for students who started their pre-nursing program after high school and those who waited. In general, students preferred the andragogical teaching methodology over the pedagogical teaching methodology. There was a significant difference between the EOQ mean score and age ($p = .01$) with the 22-24 year olds having the highest preference for the andragogical teaching method. There was a significant difference in EOQ score and year in college ($p = .00$), with sophomore and senior students preferring more andragogical teaching methods than junior students. It was also found that there was satisfaction with the program, though junior students were more satisfied with the program than sophomore or senior students. Analysis of variance determined there were no differences in program satisfaction or preference for andragogical or pedagogical teaching methods between students who started their education after high school and those who waited.

**The Purpose of This Study**

Even though the literature has some examples of studies conducted on adult learners’ andragogical and pedagogical orientation to learning in other areas and academic subjects, as cited above, the field of English as a foreign language (EFL) is devoid of such studies. The notion of andragogy is not known, or even given priority. The curriculum of programs preparing English teachers seems to focus more on the pedagogical orientation of education, which tend not to focus on adult learners. The informal talks and conversations with many EFL practitioners, who were either teaching children or adults, lead to the conclusion that the term andragogy does not exist in their lexicon.

Such an orientation to teaching will have negative effects on adults’ learning English because some adults do feel more anxious about learning a foreign language, believing that language learning can best take place in earlier stages of life. Therefore, they may feel at a great disadvantage to learn English. If the language education programs do not take these adult learners’ characteristics into consideration and language teachers lack the capability to adopt pedagogical orientations to teaching adults learning English, the result might be much more detrimental.

Because of this pedagogical emphasis, some practitioners who may implement andragogical practices in their teaching are likely not aware of their doing so. They call themselves “English language teachers” and do not make a distinction between those teaching adults and those teaching children, which might point to the lack of interest to andragogical language teaching. Therefore, an assessment of the pedagogical and andragogical orientation of adult learners learning English can provide material and curriculum designers, as well as the practitioners in the field of EFL, with new insights and open an andragogical door to English language teaching. The aim of this study was to reveal the andragogical and pedagogical orientations of Turkish adult EFL learners.

**Method**

This section describes the respondents, data collection and analysis procedures, and the limitations of the study.
The Respondents

In this study, 60 Turkish adult learners enrolled in community evening EFL classes were included. They had been studying English for about six years on and off. However, for the three months prior to the study, they had been attending their classes regularly. Their ages varied between 17 and 44. The mean age was 26. This was a convenience sample because I had access only to students who I was teaching.

Data Collection and Analysis

In this study, a Turkish version of Christian’s (1983) EOQ has been adopted as the main instrument to gather data (see Appendix). Christian’s questionnaire was similar to that of Hadley (1975), but contained 25 andragogical and 25 pedagogical items. Ten items were omitted due to validity problems. A reliability coefficient of .77 was found for the EOQ using the Kuder Richardson Formula. Content validity was tested by the jury method of validation, with two groups reviewing the instrument. Thirteen prominent adult educators, including Malcolm Knowles, had reviewed the EOQ and found it acceptable. The Turkish version of the instrument was reviewed by the teaching staff at the Department of Adult Education, Ankara University.

The questionnaire followed Hadley’s (1975) six dimensional design that measures: (a) the purpose of education, (b) the nature of the learner, (c) the characteristics of the learning experience, (d) management of the learning experience, (e) evaluation, and (f) the relationship among learners and between learners and educators.

The 50 EOQ statements were randomly numbered, with statements 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 32, 33, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45, 47 and 49 the andragogical items, and statements 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 37, 38, 43, 44, 46, 48 and 50 the pedagogical items (see Appendix). Andragogical statements were scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 5 (almost always) to 1 (almost never), and pedagogical statements were reversed, with 1 (almost always) to 5 for (almost never). Hence, a high score represents an andragogical orientation, and a low score represents a pedagogical orientation. Since there are 50 items on the questionnaire, 250 was the highest possible score and 50 the lowest possible score. A score of 150 was the median point and was considered neutral. Scores over 150 would be considered andragogical, whereas scores under 150 would be considered pedagogical. A z-test was conducted to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference between the scores that show an andragogical orientation and those that show a pedagogical orientation.

The Limitations of the Study

Three limitations impacted this study. First, this study included only 60 learners in the context of the Turkish culture. Therefore, the results of the study cannot be generalized to all adult learners in the field of EFL. The second limitation lies in the sampling procedure. The subjects were not selected randomly. The researcher was limited with the choice of the schools from which the respondents were chosen, as he only went to the schools where he worked previously. However, the results still could be generalized to similar populations of learners at private evening language courses. Third, the socioeconomic level and the educational background of the respondents were not taken into consideration and can also affect the result of the study.
Results

The data gathered in the study revealed three learner groups:

1. Those who tended to be andragogically oriented ($n=51$, 83.3%). The andragogical scores varied between 151 and 196.

2. Those who tended to be pedagogically oriented ($n=7$, 11.7%). The pedagogical scores varied between 135 and 148.

3. Neutral. Two of the respondents had the score of 150. Because this means a neutral orientation, they were not taken into consideration in the analysis of the data. The standard deviations for the instrument are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$X$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>4.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andragogy</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>13.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $z=7.698$, $z > 1.96$

The mean for the pedagogy ($M=143$; $SD=4.358$) was larger than the mean for the andragogy ($M=166$; $SD=13.33$). When the pedagogical and andragogical scores were compared, a statistical significance of 0.05 was found ($z=7.698$, $z > 1.96$). Andragogical scores were found to be statistically more significant than the pedagogical scores, which suggest the majority of the respondents (83.3 %) were andragogically oriented. However, it is important to note that those who were andragogically oriented were not so rigid in their orientation to learning, since their scores ranged from 151 to 196 ($SD=13.13$). Therefore, the andragogical group tended to be more heterogenous. Also, although they were small in number, those who were found to be pedagogically oriented tended to be a more homogenous group compared to the andragogically oriented group ($SD=4.36$).

Conclusions

The adults who were learning English as a foreign language tended to be more andragogically oriented in their learning. However, the wide range of scores also indicates a tendency towards pedagogical orientations. Therefore, it would be wrong to assume that the learners would only go for the andragogical and/or pedagogical items.

When the number of the learners found to be andragogically oriented is considered, the purpose and the needs of the learners on a course should be taken into account. Therefore, before starting certain courses, educators need to find out the needs, interests, and purposes of their target groups. For example, if the learners of English wanted to learn the language to use
it in social groups, the educational program should help them to develop their communicational skills.

Educators should not assume that all their adult learners will be andragogically oriented. In organizing the educational settings and the materials, pedagogical factors need to be taken into consideration. It is also important to be aware of those who could be totally andragogical or pedagogical in a group. Only in this way can educators provide educationally appropriate opportunities for all individual learners, enabling them to reach more learners. Learners who are pedagogically oriented should be approached in pedagogical ways first. Then, step-by-step they could be helped to have and appreciate the andragogical experiences.

Educators need to be informed about the concept of learning orientation. Educators who appreciate the importance of this concept and know how to use it would choose to find out the learning orientation of their learner from the very beginning. Educators should also learn their own orientation, which would allow them to make a comparison between their own and their learners’ orientation, giving them the opportunity to build realistic expectations and arrange the learning environment accordingly.
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ÖĞRENME TUTUMU ANKETİ

Yaşınız : ..........
Cinsiyetiniz : ..........
Eğitim Durumunuz : ..........
Medeni Haliniz : ..........

Bu anket öğrenmeye yönelik tutumları belirlemek üzere düzenlenmiştir. Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadeleri, öğrenmeye yönelik görüşlerinize uygun olarak cevaplandırınız.

Her bir ifade için, sizin için uygun olan kutucuğa “X” işaret koyunuz.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Örnek: Öğretmen, diğer öğrencilerle iyi bir ilişki kurabileceğim bir ortam sağlamalıdır.</th>
<th>Hemen Hemen</th>
<th>Her Zaman</th>
<th>Genellikle</th>
<th>Rarez</th>
<th>Nadiren</th>
<th>Hemen Hemen</th>
<th>Her Bir Zaman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hemen Hemen</td>
<td>Her Zaman</td>
<td>Genellikle</td>
<td>Rarez</td>
<td>Nadiren</td>
<td>Hemen Hemen</td>
<td>Her Bir Zaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen tüm bilgileri kesin gerçekler olarak sunmalıdır.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen, hislerimi, tutumlarını ve davranışlarını sorgulamam için beni teşvik etmelidir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmenin öğrenmeyi yönetmelidir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen bana öğrenme yeteneğim olduğunu hissettirecek şekilde davranmalıdır.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen neyin nasıl öğrenileceğine karar verme sürecine aktif olarak katılmama izin vermelidir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen düzenli şekilde sınav yapmalıdır.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen öğrenme aktivitelerinin içeriği ve sırasını düzenleme konusunda bana yardım etmelidir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen benim başarımı değerlendirirmeli ve bana not vermelidir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hemen Hemen</td>
<td>Her Zaman</td>
<td>Genelikle</td>
<td>Razen</td>
<td>Nadiren</td>
<td>Hemen Hemen</td>
<td>Her Zaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen kendi öğretimini geliştirme konusunda benden fikir almalıdır.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen, öğrenciler arasında yarışı teşvik etmelidir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen deneyim ve becerilerine saygı duyduğunu, onlara değer verdiği hissettirmelidir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen toplumun değerlerini kabul etmem konusunda yardımcı olmalıdır.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmenin ana metodu, ya kursüden konuyu kendisi anlatmak, ya okuma ödevleri vermek, veya her ikisi birden olmalıdır.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen akademik anlamda öğrenciler arasında bireysel farklılıklar olmasına izin vermemelidir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen, benden öğrenmemi istediği konular için beni motive etmek konusunda sorumlu davranmalıdır.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen, öğrenme konusunda kendi yöntemini geliştirmem için bana yardımcı olmalıdır.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neyin ne zaman, nerede öğrenileceği konusunda tüm kararları öğretmenin kendisi vermesi gerekir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen nadiren, orta düzeydeki öğrencileri farklı bireyler olarak değerlendirilmelidir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen geçerli sebepleri olmadığı müddetçe önceden belirtmiş olduğu kararları değiştirmemelidir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen sınıfta samimi ve işbirlikçi bir ortam sağlamalıdır.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen kendi başarısını değerlendirmeme izin vermelidir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen, öğrenciler arası yarışmaları engellemelidir.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öğretmen kendi öğrenme güçlüklerini benimle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Öğretmen istedikim davranış değişikliklerini tanımlamama ve bu değişiklikleri gerçekleştirmeme yardımcı olmalıdır.

Öğretmen kendi öğrenme projelerimi seçip bunları yerine getirmem konusunda yeterli olduğuma inanmalı ve bana bu şekilde davranmalıdır.

Öğretmen gelişmeme engel olan düşünce kalıplarından ve kalıplasmaşmış alışkanlıklarından kurtulmam için yardımcı olmalıdır.

Öğretmen kendi öğrenme aktivitelerimi ve materyallerimi yaratma konusunda beni teşvik etmelidir.

Öğretmen ödev vermeli ve bunlara not vermelidir.

Öğretmen konulara dayalı bir kurs planı takip etmelidir.

Öğretmen değerlendirmeleri tamamen kurs hedeflerine dayalı yapmalıdır.

Öğretmen çalışkanlık, azim ve cesareti geliştirmek için öğrenciler arasında yarışmayı desteklemelidir.

Öğretmen, öğrencilerin kendisi ile sıcak ilişki kurabileceği bir ortam sağlamalıdır.

Öğretmen toplumu eleştirisel olarak değerlendirme mem ve yeni davranışlar denemem için beni desteklemelidir.

Öğretmen, öğrencileri için neyin daha iyi olduğunu öğrencilerden daha iyi bilmelidir.

Öğretmen hata yaparsa öğrencilerin saygısını kaybeder.

Öğretmen olgunluğun, bilgideki artıştan çok bireyin kendisini anlamak konusundaki gelişmeye bağlı durumu inanır şekilde hareket etmelidir.

Öğretmen neyin nasıl öğrenileceğini bana söylemedir.
Öğretmen ilgisiz konularda zaman kaybetmeyi engellemek için öğrenme hedeflerini önceden belirlemelidir.

Öğretmen her şeyden önce öğrencilerin ihtiyaçlarını düşünmelidir.

Öğretmen, öğrencilerin sınav hazırlamasına izin vermelidir.

Öğretmen kendi hedeflerini belirlememe izin vermelidir.

Öğretmen kendi kişisel hedeflerimi elde etmeme faydali olacağını karar verdiğim şeyleri öğrenmemeye yardımcı olmamalıdır.

Öğretmen, öğrencilerinin kendisinden süsümler halinde faydalanmasını engellemek için çok dikkat etmelidir.

Öğretmen risk almamalıdır.

Öğretmen, öğrencilerin aralarında işbirliği yapmalarını, risk almalarını ve yeni şeyler denemelerini desteklemelidir.

Öğretmen sınıfta yapacaklarını dikkatlice planlamalıdır.

Öğretmen sınıfta yalnızca kendisi konuşmak yerine grup çalışmalara yer vermelidir.

Öğretmenin öğrencileri ile ilişkisi kişisel olmamalıdır.

Öğretmen yapılacak işleri öğrencileri ile birlikte planlamalıdır.

Öğretmen net bir plan yapması ve ona bağlı kalmalıdır.

Anketi cevaplandığınız için teşekkür ederiz.
PERSPECTIVES ON PRACTICE

“History, huh, yeah
What is it good for?
Absolutely nothing” … or is it?

John D. Truty
Doctoral Candidate
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Northern Illinois University

Abstract

Human resource development (HRD) professionals have an obligation to provide programs/products with the highest probability of success. The exclusion of workers’ perspectives, from their standpoint, would seem to produce suboptimal results. Therefore, consulting workers’ literature, labor and working class histories, management histories, and other sources that represent the workers’ lived experiences would, on the face of it, provide additional data that would help gain insights into the root cause failure of past programs and increase the probability of success. These data sources also raise awareness of topics not typically found in a managerial discourse. Suggested sources are included.

With apologies to Edwin Starr (1970), I have co-opted and modified the opening lines of this Viet Nam War protest song, the first by the production company Motown. The notion of management history as relevant information is lacking in much of the field of management. Smith (2007) concludes, “we are diminishing the importance of history in our instruction and research and choosing ignorance of our intellectual heritage rather than learning from it” (p. 531). Fischer (1970) provides some additional justification on the value of historical research: it (a) helps clarify the context in which modern-day problems are situated, (b) suggests a course of action for the future, and (c) helps define who we, management employees, are.

At this point I will provide the reader with a brief overview of the arguments being made here. My basic tenet questions the professionalism of HRD scholars and practitioners who have not informed themselves of labor and working class history, of the writings of labor activists, or of current events from the lived experience and writings found in a labor and working class point of view. Note that I am asking the HRD professional to inform him- or herself of the issues. I am not advocating an uncritical acceptance of these points of view. I will argue that when HRD professionals view current issues of importance to the organization from both the management/organization points of view as well as from a worker’s informed point of view, the project outcomes will have a higher probability of success. As an employee, the HRD professional is ethically bound, I would argue, to provide plans and programs that have the highest likelihood to improve the bottom-line. Second, I would argue that all histories or recounting of events is subject to bias and that if HRD professionals and scholars are only

http://education.fiu.edu/newhorizons
informed via a single discourse, typically a managerialist one, the products of their labor will have a higher probability of being flawed. Third, I suggest that the worker’s produced perspective has value. Often issues concerning the failure of management programs surface in workers’ writings. It is not uncommon that these writings would be critical (some might opine that they are overly critical), which may contribute to their exclusion from the mainstream of managerialist writings. But in any event, the contribution of a failure mode and effects analysis (FMEA) is provided from the perspective of those being acted upon and adds a dimension that is typically lacking and could help in diffusing groupthink. Fourth, I argue that workers have power by virtue of knowledge they possess of the labor process. The field of management has long contended worker-controlled knowledge. This contestation has been mutually harmful to all parties. Fifth, I hold that approaching the literature bases of the labor and working classes as a new weapon in the hand of management is not the intent of this perspective. Finally, I conclude with a list of resources for those unfamiliar with labor and working class history.

Management, Labor, and Working Class History

Herein, I would like to comment not only on management history but also on labor and working class history. Consider: if HRD has at its core the training, education, and development of the working people of an organization, then, I would suggest, it is reasonable that a diligent learning and contextual analysis would have to include the history (i.e., the experiences, of those working peoples). Lacking the perspective of those who actually do the work of organizations (working people) or informed by a perspective from those who assume they understand a working person’s point-of-view, the project entered into by the HRD professional has an increased probability of failing to accomplish its objective. Some level of proof is contained in the accounts of workers’ resistance that can be found in the justification of most new managerial programs. Also, with today’s highly competitive global market place, programs intended to improve the efficiency of the organization via its most valuable assets, its people, would seem to require planning and execution that would insure the highest degree of success. Anything less would appear to be management malfeasance, a contravening of the Freidmanian moral principle of maximizing shareholder value. While this may be an extreme view for some, for others it is the corporation’s raison d’etre and, therefore, closely held.

History as an Interpretive Discipline

History is a qualitative social science. Historians and their products are subject to the centrality of interpretation, the use of descriptive data, and the emphasis of context (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). Therefore, if history is an interpretive art, as Maxwell (2005) suggests, it not only must represent the meaning that actors place on the events in which they have participated, but it must also represent the interpretation of events and the assignment of meaning that others have participated in (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003). A logical extension of this line of thought is that those who write history influence the creation of history. The events that shape the world in which business operates and in which the HRD professional is employed are subject to the same influences of interpretation. Therefore, the manner in which a discourse is created is a function of the events the creator(s) have participated in and/or the points of view the creator(s) are exposed to. The place from where the HRD practitioner/scholar views the world, that is, one’s standpoint, influences how one socially constructs the world.
Current Perspectives in HRD

The discourse within HRD is predominantly shaped by business and management literatures. HRD is a management function that principally is concerned with the educative arm of the firm, with the expressed purpose of improving the productivity of the employee by training him or her to efficiently perform the current task, educating the employee for some future task, or preparing the employee through developmental processes for some unknown future state (Nadler, 1970). Productivity improvement is not the exclusive domain of the HRD professionals. It is shared with others whose field of practice could be organizational development (OD) or organizational behavior (OB), to name just two. What makes HRD unique within the organization is the responsibility for translating the strategies, philosophies, visions, and cultures directed at individual employees into actual concrete training products intended for changing employee behavior and, to a limited extent, the mental attitudes with which the employee interacts with the job and the organization. Therefore, one could construct the notion that the work of the HRD professional is deeply embedded in “manufacturing consent” (Burawoy, 1979), that is, providing an illusion of choice while actually constructing and highly restrictive work environment where the participation of workers creates consent and, therefore, minimizing conflict between management and labor. Given the nature of a capitalistic democracy grounded in the mantra of free enterprise, this function may not seem problematic. Indeed, it may even appear valorous.

Seeing Another Perspective

It is not beyond reason to expect that non-management workers may have a different perspective of the work world than management workers. In many organizational cultures where there are structure and positional authority, power is perceived as behaving in a zero-sum game so that power gained by A is at the expense of B. Much of management literature, as it pertains to the management of employee output, seems to position management as the endower of empowerment, the instigator of involvement, and the conveyor of commitment. The notion that these are management responsibilities and tasks insinuates that the power to release the commitment of employees, to allow workers a level of involvement, or to grant empowerment, rests in the class of employee known as management.

Authority and power have context also. At the work site, those who are performing the task, those who produce the actual product or service that is sold and from which all profit is generated, have power and authority (if you don’t think so, ask someone who has managed people in an environment where quantity, quality, cost, and timeliness of a good or service is closely measured). Management and business leaders, while not openly referring to this perspective in mutualistic terms, have recognized this phenomenon; and there has been a series of attempts to co-opt this power. The famous story of Schmidt frames the efficiency movement at the turn of the 20th century. “Are you a high priced man?” Taylor (1967) asks Schmidt, and from that followed the “principles of scientific management” (Taylor, 1967, p. 44). Mayo (1960) concludes that merely paying attention to the workers is sufficient to improve their output, and thus is born the human relations school of employee management. Jacoby (1997; 2004) tells of the use of welfare capitalism and bureaucratic systems that attempt to transfer power and authority from the workers to management. In the struggle between labor and management, the
rights of management have most often centered on the issue of who controls the knowledge of production (Harris, 1982). And while it is a humorous quip, “the manager’s brains are under the worker’s cap” (the origin of this anecdotal quip is unknown to me though I have run across it in cartoon form), there is ample evidence, as witnessed by the continuum of programs intended to engage, attach, empower, and involve the worker, that the struggle continues and the costs/causalities of failed programs are mounting.

What Might It Mean?

The lessons of history, especially labor and working class history, are available for the HRD professional if one is willing to look toward a history that has been given voice by workers. With a perspective seen through the eyes of the workers, the HRD professional can expect to gain higher probabilities of success while attempting to institute workable solutions to improve worker productivity. I can argue that managers know this to be intuitively true because of the parade of programs designed to involve the worker in the production process (e.g., engagement, empowerment, involvement…). It is important to realize that this vision cannot be granted to the HRD professional as a function of management interpretation, business or management literature, or the consultant. There might be those who would argue that the past experiences of a young manager during a summer internship could lend that perspective. It may be suggested that a non-management job during the college years or some other process of passing through the management hierarchy on one’s way to the executive suite could provide that vision. Or, being part of what McKenna (2006) titled his book The World’s Newest Profession: Management Consultants in the Twentieth Century (less reverently, Micklethwait (1996) refers to consultants as “witch doctors” in the title of his book) gives them an insight into the day-to-day of the working classes’ lived experiences. While those highly filtered experiences may contain a scintilla of insight, these interpretations are likely skewed and representative of a managerial view of labor. The difference in this view is how the environment is decoded and how the distribution of benefits is determined because just as the corporation is a profit-seeking, profit-maximizing self-interested “person,” it is often overlooked or dismissed as counter-productive that workers embrace these attributes, too. Why is the maximization of shareholder value unquestioningly considered a desirable goal while the maximization of wages for working peoples is often framed as requiring a defense or justification (framed as inflationary, framed in the language of anti-organized labor rhetoric)?

When reading from a labor perspective, there is a noticeable inclusion of how working women and men utilize their power and authority in the creation of profit (for both the corporation and themselves). The quality of work life (QWL) movement of the 1970s/1980s was, from many working people’s perspective, a new concept of labor-management cooperation. Quality-of-Work-Life-type programs were heralded in both the popular and academic press as the salvation of the American economy. Worker perspectives of QWL contain sufficient evidence (from the workers’ standpoint) that the benefit of cooperating with management did not protect/preserve their jobs (restructuring, downsizing, and off shoring of jobs) and that the financial benefits were disproportional to the knowledge contribution by the different parties (Parker, 1985; Parker & Slaughter, 1988; Rinehart, Huxley, & Robertson, 1997). In short, the labor perspective questions the distributive justice of the American business enterprise. Although mainstream writers might have ignored these questions of distributive justice, they were never-
the-less issues of continued resistance and were contained within the writings of workers’ literature.

Continuing on—when reading the work of labor historians, or labor writers, there is a theme (among many) that emerges. It is the struggle for workers to maintain a level of autonomy in their work, that is, a notion that their skills have value and that their perspectives on the process of production have a currency that is not easily transferred or replaced (Brody, 1993; Burawoy, 1979; Juravich, 1985; Montgomery, 1979; Parker, 1985, 1994; Parker & Slaughter, 1988).

There are specific areas that are cogent today and that may be informed by a reading of the past via a labor perspective. As an example, the entire area of labor-management cooperation has been intensely contested since the late 1960s. The decreasing levels of corporate profitability and an association between inflation, wages, and productivity were propagated within the press in this era. Worker productivity reportedly was declining; and given the inflationary times, attention was focused on workers, especially the youth (Rukeyser, 1969; Seligman, 1969; Swerdloff, 1969) and organized workers (Burck, 1969, 1970a, 1970b, 1971; Davenport, 1971). This attention stimulated government hearings (Improving National Productivity, 1972; United States. Congress. Senate. Committee on Banking Housing and Urban Affairs. Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization., 1973; Worker Alienation, 1972, 1972) and gave rise to what I referred to above as the QWL Movement. The origin of this program was the recognition of certain management practices that had created a mind- and body-numbing work experience. This was highlighted by the 1972 strike against the General Motors plant in Lordstown, Ohio (Aronowitz, 1973). The solution was a process of empowering workers to participate with management in the redefining of workers’ jobs, thereby improving the quality of the work life of employees. The QWL program was intended to reverse, via the improvement in workers’ productivity, the alarmingly increasing rate of foreign manufacturing incursion in automotive, steel, and electronics industries and the impact that would have on the American economy. The method drew on a philosophy similar to the general works councils of the Second World War where labor and management co-operated the enterprise in recognition that, as attributed to Benjamin Franklin when he signed the Declaration of Independence, “We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately” (“Hang Together”), thereby creating a sense of joint destiny.

There have been many contributions on the topic of QWL (and under that broad umbrella, employee empowerment, labor-management cooperation teams, team building, jointness, and employee involvement to mention the most notable) by both business consultants and academics. Additionally, a series of enlightening perspectives were written by labor activists of the era. These contributions provide an insight as to how workers are responding to that activity, from an insider’s point of view. It is a point of view that is rationalized without censorship from management, paid consultants, or business school academics. That is not to say that the labor position is correct in and of itself or represents all of labor. Nor is it to say that a labor position is monolithic. But it is a perspective that provides insight from the lived experiences of workers on how they are responding, how they interpret the activity, what they fear from the implementation, and how they may sabotage that effort. One also gets a worker’s
perspective on how to improve the situation. This is a key insight that is missed if the HRD professional does not avail him- or herself of the workers’ literatures.

Labor, especially organized labor has been portrayed in a negative light by the popular press (Martin, 2004). Organized labor is seen as an enemy of a productive free-market state. It is often framed as socialist and anti-American. In the post-war anti-communist era as well as the current political environment, this polarization has been useful to quiet dissent and discredit other actors. This portrayal, therefore, questions the value of labor/worker literature. When reading the works of Mike Parker (1985, 1994; Parker & Slaughter, 1988) or the journal of the Midwest Center for Labor Research (Labor Research Review), for example, there is a healthy dose of critique/criticism but also the rational notion that workers need to preserve their jobs and that the business should provide those jobs. These sources are actively involved in providing solutions that typically are not found in management journals or readily among the consultant bestseller list. A reasonably intelligent person would believe that not every solution is the best, or even practicable, regardless if that solution came from labor, management, academia, or consultancies. But ignoring a set of solutions out of hand would seem not to be in the best interest of the firm. Rather, it could be construed as being in the best interests of certain individuals within the firm. And if I were allowed a bit of hyperbole, knowingly ignoring the labor literature would seem to be management malfeasance.

Reflections on HRD

Please note that it is not my intention to value one set of perceptions over another. The focus of this discussion is in the relevance of reading workers’ history and perceptions of the workplace as their lived experiences. HRD interventions are intended for change. The change is intended to alter the current status quo and to move the organization, via its people, to a new set of behaviors and/or attitudes. These new behaviors and/or attitudes are intended to improve the performance of the organization, typically judged by improvements to the bottom line(s) -- the ultimate purpose of a business in a capitalistic society. An HRD professional, typically within the ranks of management, would need to suspend judgment as he or she attempts to understand the perceptions of workers. What is gained could be the difference between failed and successful programs. It is important, like any other failure analysis (which is precisely what is being performed at some level within the organization because the status quo is no longer acceptable to the senior levels of management, and thus the desire for change), that the data be collected from all sources and evaluated within a relatively objective framework. The exclusion of a labor or managerial perspective will only lead to partial solutions -- and sub-optimal ones at that. If the HRD professional is truly professional in her work and he does due diligence, there will be an honest effort to understand the subject at hand - the workers.

A Closing Note

HRD professionals are not typically sitting at the table of corporate power. Therefore, while the HRD professionals may not be the creators of policy, they tend to be the interpreters and implementers of policy. This is a powerful (and dangerous) position from which they can choose to be normative or transformative (within reasonable limits). If they are to create programs with the intention of improving the outcomes of labor, then understanding labor’s
locus of resistance is central. Understanding resistance is not meant to defeat resistance through a force of power (it is well known that the laws and courts in the United States have long ago established the rights of management and the concomitant legitimate control of the shop floor) but rather to reform the energy of resistance to a process of \textit{co-creation}. This notion of co-creation is a process where the lived experiences of the workers, as expressed by the workers, are included in the establishment of work processes.

It is in this area of HRD, wherein the true interests of management and labor can come together, that the strongest ties between adult education and HRD can exist. In the past century, the idea of industrial democracy has taken on several and different meanings. The view with which I closely associate was proposed by Irving Bluestone and his son Barry (1992). Industrial democracy was a two-track process. The first was a tactical track, and it dealt with conditions of work at the site of labor. Labor had a responsibility to improve their efficiency at work. This was done via cooperation with management and the sharing of workers’ insights and knowledge to convey that labor and management \textit{are} in it together. In many cases these are worthwhile activities and do improve the working lives of employees. The second track was a strategic track. It proposed that the benefits that are accrued to society via the efforts of the working classes be equitably shared. It also involved an “Enterprise Compact” (Bluestone & Bluestone, 1992, p. xiii) that broadened labor’s involvement in the inner working of corporate strategic decision-making in such areas as outsourcing, support of trade treaties, and restructuring. This second track is involved with institutional change, altering the balance of power. While there has been a broad acceptance by many for the first track, there has been a quiet resistance to the second.

Given the tension between labor and management, which has been with industrialized societies since their inception, it may be tempting to the HRD professional to delve deeply into the literature of labor and the working classes with an eye toward learning how to incorporate what has been learned for the overwhelming benefit of management. While this cannot be prevented, it was not my intention. With my own special brand of naiveté, it was my hope that this perspective would further a mutualistic outlook of the world of work. As Phyllis Cunningham, one of my professors, once said to me, “we make space where we are.” For the most part HRD professionals are situated in the business world, and in that world there is an expectation of ever increasing profits. For one class of workers (management) to disproportionately benefit from the labors of another (workers) would not seem to contribute to a socially just world. Therefore, while is may be entirely unrealistic to expect the HRD professionals, on their own, to alter the culture of business, it is clearly within the realm of possibilities that the HRD professionals can learn from the writings of the laboring and working classes. What has been learned can contribute to the designs of programs with an intent to produce a more equitable and socially just work world. An empathetic reading (recall that managers are workers, too) of these literature bases with an eye towards understanding the critique can lead to programs that are truly beneficial (within a frame of distributive justice). Incremental change, while not revolutionary, is certainly a way to “make space.”

\textbf{Where to Look for Material}

It is fairly certain that labor/working persons’ literature will not be found in the same arena as management literature. It will usually not be found in business schools or in their
journals. Typically the websites of the major unions are rich with information (e.g., http://www.aflcio.org or http://www.seiu.org). “Labor notes” (http://www.labornotes.org), a labor newsletter, has a worker’s perspective of many current issues. There are several labor journals, including: Labor Studies Journal (http://www.uale.org/lsj/lsj.shtml), Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas (http://www.dukeupress.edu/labor/), International Labor and Working-Class History (http://www.newschool.edu/gf/history/ilwch/), Labor History (http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/0023656X.html), Labour/Le Travail (http://www.cclh.ca/llt/), Mexican Labor News & Analysis (http://www.ueinternational.org/Mexico_info/mlna.php), and New Labor Forum (http://www.newlaborforum.org/). More prominent labor and working class authors include Stanley Aronowitz, Kevin Boyle, Kate Bronfenbrenner, David Brody, John R. Commons, Melvyn Dubofsky, John Dunlop, Leon Fink, Jack and Phillip Foner, James Green, Herbert Gutman, Eric Hobsbawn, Tom Juravich, Alice Kessler-Harris, Nelson Lichtenstein, Seymour Lipset, Staughton Lynd, Joseph McCartin, Ruth Milkman, C. Wilber Mills, David Montgomery, Bruce Nelson, Bruce Nissen, Selig Perlman, E. P. Thompson, Beatrice and Sidney Webb, and Robert Zieger… and this is not an exhaustive list. Within the academic management sphere, there is a group of critical management scholars. While these academics are not strictly from the ranks of labor, they support views critical of established management practices and the established social order. These academics are associated with the Academy of Management and have formed an interest group within the Academy\textsuperscript{xvi}.

In closing, I would like to reiterate that the forced preference of one view over the other is not my intent. It is one with the other that will bring a strong objectivity to the work of the HRD professional. My point is also that exposure to a labor and working class perspective of the work world will influence the thinking of the HRD/manager and in time create a perspectival shift, that is, a making of space where equity for the working classes is a natural phenomenon. It would not be the first time that I was branded as an idealist. I would comment, in my defense, that the pragmatics of the past century have not brought the labor-management accord/compact any lasting resolution. Perhaps it is time to be a bit idealistic; and let’s give learning through labor and working class history a chance….
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**Notes**

---

i Edwin Starr performed “War” in 1970 after being originally released by the Temptations. The song was written by Norman Whitfield and Barrett Strong in 1969 and is considered to be an obvious anti-Vietnam War song. After several requests, Whitfield recorded the song as a single with Starr so as not to alienate the more conservative Temptations fans ("War (Edwin Starr song).", Whitfield & Strong, 1969). For the complete lyrics to the song, see [http://www.oldie lyrics.com/lyrics/edwin_starr/war.html](http://www.oldie lyrics.com/lyrics/edwin_starr/war.html)

ii I would assert that the scholarly practice of HRD must include these points of view if only to prepare the HRD practitioner/scholar for his or her new/continuing role. And to be included would mean that an academician would need to be well versed in the topic. Otherwise he or she too would be less that professional in one’s career.

iii I would assert that the scholarly practice of HRD must include these points of view if only to prepare the HRD practitioner/scholar for his or her new/continuing role. And to be included would mean that an academician would need to be well versed in the topic. Otherwise he or she too would be less that professional in one’s career.

iv Not all HRD professionals are managers. I would argue that all HRD professionals are, in some more or less fashion, the handmaidens of management. That is, they are tied to a management perspective, and the output of their effort (work) is either tacitly or implicitly acceptable only if codified by the managing hierarchy. The emphasis here is on the HRD professionals whose responsibilities include the interpretation of the cultural/working environment, the creators of materials intended to support, enhance, or radically change the environment, and those who do the research and suggest changes to the environment. For the
most part, it would exclude those whose job responsibilities require them to *only* deliver the prepared texts.

---

*Productivity has many technical, economic, and political meanings. I am using the term in a broad manner (i.e., the amount of goods and services produced per unit of human effort).*

---


---

*This is not referring to CEOs and others who form the economic elite.*

---

*Over the decades since the inception of QWL this movement has adapted, adopted, and transformed into jointness programs, empowerment, and employee engagement programs to mention the most famous. In each of these programs, the intent is to gain the willful cooperation of workers, have them cease their resistance to management initiatives, and improve the cost structures of the business through the workers’ knowledge of the system under their control. A central aspect of these programs is the creation of an emotional connection between the worker and the organization so as create a sense that the plights of the worker and the organization are one and the same. Minimized in these programs is the recognition that while their plights *may* be intertwined, the outcomes are disproportionately distributed. Since the 1990s, the connection between the worker and the organization is being replaced with an emotional attachment among workers and workers and managers (i.e., with personal connections). This shift gained popularity when organizations changed their positions with regard to loyalty towards the employee.*

---

*There are many theories as to the origin of this profitability decrease. Most of these explanations rest on the economic policies of the Johnson administration in its determination to fund the war in Viet Nam and, at the same time, the domestic social programs of the Great Society. These policies exacerbated inflation and simultaneously spurred organized labor to demand increased wages. The wage increase was not being offset by the increase in workers’ productivity; therefore, the lack of productivity squeezed profits. This was occurring when the baby-boomer generation was coming of age at a time of great civil unrest, generational conflict, racial tensions, and a rise in feminism and anti-war protests. A counter theory is proposed by Robert Brenner (2006). He posits that it was the international capitalist competition that drove profits down and not the loss in worker productivity.*

---

*Also the National Committee on Productivity (NCOP) was created that was intended to further research in the field.*

---

*This strike was not about wages but about work conditions. The Lordstown plant was producing the Chevrolet Vega, a compact car that was intended to stem the tide of lost market share to foreign manufacturers. The plant was designed to produce 100 cars per hour, a rate 60% greater that the most modern domestic manufacturing plants. This meant that a typical assembly line worker’s job was 36 seconds in duration and repeated over 680 times in an eight-hour shift (30 minute lunch and two 20-minute breaks; Aronowitz, 1973).*

---

*Not knowing the exact origin of this quote, I did a Google search and found two slightly different quotes with two different attributions. One is, “If we do not hang together, we shall surely hang separately.”--attributed to Thomas Paine from the website [http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=US&vol=118&invol=394](http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=US&vol=118&invol=394).*

xiii An interesting theoretical construct has emerged within the discourse of Standpoint Theory. That construct is labeled “strong objectivity,” a mid ground between logical positivism and a rejection of grand unifying theory. Strong objectivity grants the existence of several standpoints and embraces similarity and/or apparent contradictions in the formation of a broader world view. For more on this topic, see Harding (2002, 2003, 2003). An online copy of Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology can be found at http://www.gendersee.org.mk/files/harding.Objectivity.pdf

xiv Yes, there are exceptions in the form of Chief Learning Officers (CLOs) and other powerful agents that have a direct interest in the work of HRD, but typically those that are directly responsible for executing programs are not the ones who have conceived of them or the ones who have ultimate approval power.

xv Prior to his death in 2007, Irving Bluestone was a United Auto Workers vice-president (GM Division), the personal assistant to Walter Reuther until the time of his death in 1970, and a major influence in the creation of Saturn Corporation. His son Barry is a political economist and author (Bluestone & Harrison, 1982; Harrison & Bluestone, 1988).

xvi For more information see http://group.aomonline.org/cms/ ("Critical Management Studies - Interest group"). There is a web portal rich with links and other information on critical management: http://www.criticalmanagement.org/index.htm ("Critical management").

I, John D. Truty, am now retired after close to thirty years (with twenty-two of those years in management) in the same large, family owned, non-union confectionary manufacturer. The vast majority of my career duties include Quality Engineering, Technical Training, and general HRD activities. Currently I am a doctoral candidate at Northern Illinois University in the area of Adult Education. The working title of my dissertation is “Ideas in disguise: Fortune magazine and the articulation of productivity 1969-1972.” My research interests are broadly defined in the Quality of Work Life area (AKA Jointism, Empowerment, Engagement ... among a host of other similar notions) with a strong influence of labor and working class history. I can be reached at john@truty.org
PERSPECTIVES ON PEOPLE

Down the Winding River with Gordon G. Darkenwald

Donald J. Yarosz
National Center for Children in Poverty
Columbia University, New York

Gordon G. Darkenwald (Gerry) Professor Emeritus of Adult Education at Rutgers University received his doctorate from Teachers College, Columbia University. Many of his students have gone on to leadership positions in the field. His impressive list of achievements includes holding editorships of *Adult Education Quarterly* and *The Jossey-Bass Series of Monographs in Adult and Continuing Education*. Gerry received numerous awards including the Houle Award (with co-author Sharan Merriam for Adult Education, Foundations of Practice) in 1982 and the Oakes Award for Last Gamble in Education. He was awarded a Fulbright Senior Research Scholarship to go to England to share his work on deterrents to participation in adult education and classroom social environments. He has chaired numerous dissertations and has published numerous articles. Dr. Yarosz has enjoyed a professional relationship with Gordon for over 15 years. Gordon served as Dr. Yarosz’ dissertation chair. Gordon also taught Don to Fly Fish.

DON: This is an interview with Gordon G. Darkenwald, Professor Emeritus at Rutgers University. Thanks for agreeing to spend some time with me today, Gerry. I’m going to start out with a softball question: How did you become interested in adult education?

GORDON: By working in an adult evening college when I was a student. I got interested in adult students who seemed to have a need for assistance in answering questions about the programs of study and more personal kinds of concerns that I often was required to help them resolve, for example, managing their time, especially at home and on the job. Many were having difficulty with mathematics. So that's how I got interested, and I worked after I graduated from college as a counselor at Hunter College. And then I went to Columbia University to study adult education and higher education.

I was a higher education major, but my interest shifted to adult education during my time as a student at Columbia University during the 1960s. And there I took courses with Alan Knox and Jack Mezirow. They had a very profound effect on my professional life. And when the Adult Education Act was passed, Jack got …an enormous grant from Washington to do the “Last Gamble” Study. He hired me as his assistant director. We had faculty members and graduate students working in several different cities across the country as part of this plan. And in New York, Hal Beder was the researcher in charge. So, that is how I met Hal. And we worked together on that project till 1974. And it was quite a good experience. First of all, working with Jack and Alan Knox was the equivalent of a tutorial in research methods and the epistemology of social science. You couldn't ask for people who had more knowledge, but also, very contrary opinions on how to do research. And I’d just listen for the most part.
I decided that both qualitative and quantitative research had their virtues and their place in most kinds of research that I would find interesting. So I did in fact do both types of research, although I focused a little more on the quantitative than the qualitative. I guess I’d have to say that I think I saw myself as a social psychologist. I was in a special Ph.D. program that was cross-disciplinary in the social sciences and education. So I took many of my courses in the social sciences, mostly social psychology, some psychology and sociology. So I got into this perspective on social relations in which groups played a tremendously important role. And just looking back now, just about everything I’ve published and all the research I’ve done could be characterized as social/psychological in orientation.

DON: It sounds as if your formative experiences came out of a counseling perspective and social psychology and that you carried them forward. (I came out of a similar counseling background). Anyway, Last Gamble was the first book you worked on. What was your perception of the significance of the book?

GORDON: Well, I'm biased, of course. I think the book is important. It still needs to be read if you want to focus on adult literacy education. As an overview of what was happening in adult basic education in the United States with various populations, various delivery systems, teacher training, curriculum development. Virtually every dimension of adult basic education we have something to say [about] in that book. It was also a book that combined quantitative with qualitative research. And I had most of the responsibility for the quantitative part, as well as some of the qualitative work. We found out some things that I think helped to contribute to practice in the field.

One of those things was to be in tune with the cultural background of the students you were teaching. And we found the more you address their immediate needs and their cultural situation, the more successful they were in the program [and] the more they were likely to continue to participate. The dropout rate was related to an insensitive or uninvolved stance by the teacher. Successful teachers stressed ethnic heritage and life coping skills, practical things like civil rights law, renting apartments, keeping a job and things like that. That dimension of the basic education curriculum began to be recognized as important. And I think that was due in part to that research, to what we found in that research.

DON: So, as they found that literacy was related to their life, their world, their families, and their jobs, they became more engaged in the process. And that a caring teacher was of paramount importance. You know, we found the same thing in Mexico. Moving forward, after the grant ended, what did you find when you came to Rutgers?

GORDON: Well, what I found principally at Rutgers was Hal Beder. I eventually decided to join him. He came to Rutgers a little earlier than I. And, so, we had a program that was just starting. We had about 50 students, as I recall, and the program was located in the Department of Educational Administration. With only two full-time professors we never felt that we had the resources to be a free-standing department. Unfortunately, this is generally the case in our field. So we were always aligned with another program. First, it was Educational Administration, and later, it was a Social and Philosophical Foundations. And we managed to function within those parameters. Most programs today find themselves similarly situated. That is, part of some other
larger academic unit.
DON: Well, there you were. And one of your early publications was on Grounded Theory. Grounded theory was developed by Barney Glasser and Anselm Strauss (1967) in their book *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*, Chicago, Adeline.

GORDON: Their work on grounded theory influenced us very much. When we first began the “Last Gamble” research, they came in as consultants, and they gave us a week of training on grounded theory methods. That was our methodological bible. Hal and I continued to develop lines of inquiry that had begun with grants from Washington, but this time with support from the State Education Department. And for many years we were heavily engaged in research, until frankly, I had had enough. It was too much Mickey Mouse, too much paperwork, and too much hassle.

DON: This was before Al Gore’s “Federal Paperwork Reduction” campaign of the 1990s, right? (grin). So, research was the fun and interesting part, but the administration of the federal grant was---?

GORDON: Very painful. Yes, it was *painful* and mostly a useless exercise to keep bureaucrats busy, though that's probably changed somewhat today. I would hope so, anyway, for younger scholars, such as yourself.

DON: O.K. Let’s back out a little bit. Let’s talk a little bit about some things that were going on concurrently. I know you were a respected editor and a good writer. Can you talk a little bit about some of the editorial positions you held?

GORDON: In 1974 I was named editor of *Adult Education Quarterly* and held that position until 1979, or 1980. Subsequently, I was named Editor of *New Directions in Adult and Continuing Education*. And that is a job I held for about four years. I saw this as a very significant position. First of all, it led to an understanding of what research was happening in the field in adult education across the country. And even in Europe.

DON: Because people were sending you manuscripts? And you didn't have any Internet where you can download or read papers online instantaneously. So you're in a position where you were able to get cutting edge paper manuscripts, which, back then, was unusual.

GORDON: And of course I had an editorial board.

DON: Well, that must have been an eye opener!

GORDON: Of course. It was a real education for me. So, sure, let’s back out. In addition to having Knox and Mezirow as advisers, I then become the Editor of *Adult Education Quarterly*. And later on, *The New Directions Series*. And those were two *influential* periodicals. But editing them was not easy.

There was so little good research being done in the 1970s that in the early 80s, I had to scramble mightily to put out each issue of the journal. Some of the work would not have been publishable
without heavy editing. By the mid-1980s, more research was being conducted and the quality of the journal improved. Not just due to my work, but to the other editors as well and to the one or two editors who followed.

There was a little bit of historical research that came along. But the most of the qualitative research took the form of simple case studies and descriptive narratives. Then, in the 1990s, the sky fell in with the advent of critical theory.

If you weren't doing critical theory, you weren't doing anything really significant or interesting. At the Adult Education Research Conference, at the Commission of Professors meetings, and at the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education [AAACE] meetings, philosophical subjectivism reigned as official doctrine. Incoherent articles were published at the journal, and papers read at conferences had no relationship to the field of adult education as a field of study or practice at all.

DON: So that conflicted, that sort of conflicted with your coming to education as a counselor, primarily concerned with people's real world problems and personal realities?

GORDON: Well, yes, and as a social scientist. It also conflicted with a lot of my students' ideas of why they were in graduate school. I remember taking students to Adult Educational Research Conference at Penn State and quite a few papers were presented on critical theory. And the Adult Education Research Conference students were saying it just didn't make any sense to them. They didn’t see any point to do it. And my response to them was that I didn't see any point to it either. And that was that!

DON: Well, moving on, let's talk about some of the people you've worked with and some publications of yours for which you are still known. You wrote a book, Adult Education: Foundations of Practice with Sharan Merriam, who is prolific and is still writing books. Could you touch a little bit on that?

GORDON: The figures on participation and commentary about professional organizations, and so forth, are dated. So the book is outdated. But it was widely used as a “Foundations” textbook in programs for about 10 years. I wrote it for a couple of reasons. First, because I had to teach a course called Introduction to Adult Education. And I had to copy hundreds of pages of material from various sources for this course.

DON: So, your motivation was to get away from the library and copy machine? (grin)

GORDON: (laugh) Sure. That was the sole motivation! But, seriously, there was a book that is out of print now, and that was widely called the Black book, and it gave a disciplinary perspective on the field, but it didn't really serve the purpose of introducing adult education. And, by the 1980s, it was dated. The other factor was that I was fortunate enough to have Sharan Merriam as a doctoral student. She had a great talent for writing and writing accurately and fast. Well, I had written about the first couple of chapters, I guess, and I decided that it would be the end of the century by the time I finished it, so, I needed a co-author. And I had just the perfect person there. Sharan agreed to be the co-author. She got right into the psychology chapter, and
we started making faster progress. The book won the Houle Award for Adult Education Literature.

DON: Well, I’ve still got my copy, and, seriously, it is actually a very readable text.

GORDON: Well, we wanted it to be readable, and we wanted to say some things about the field itself that had not been said. And things like the rivalries between different groups of adult educators and a lack of cooperation and coordination. We had American Society for Training and Development [ASTD]. Many health professions have continuing education organizations, the Literacy people, and so on. So, there was a great deal of fragmentation. And I was always opposed, during that period, to fragmentation. For example, I wanted Adult Education Research Conference [AERC] to meet with the American Educational Research Association [AERA], so we could somehow tie in with the definitive or principal research organization in education.

DON: I’m surprised Adult Education is not a Division of AERA, actually. It would make things so much simpler, conceptually and logistically.

GORDON: Well, it would help to reduce our marginality.

DON: Well, maybe a joint meeting might be a starting point for something like that? Or, perhaps, bringing together some of the Special Interest Groups could all get together to talk about it? Anyway, before we wrap, I’d like to ask you about your Fulbright scholarship to England. Tell me a little bit how you got a Fulbright and what that was about.

GORDON: Hal Beder and I had established the Center for Adult Development. We had our own building. We did a lot of things other than research. We did staff development and prison education work, and then the Fulbright. Well, in 1985 I was awarded a Fulbright Senior Research Fellowship in the United Kingdom, for a subsequent year to work with the staff at the Open University. This was, really, the most exciting year in my professional life. The Fulbright grant gave me enormous latitude in what activities to engage in and how to use my time.

We wanted to establish a practical means whereby British and American educators could talk with one another. And perhaps serve as a channel for information and research via the Internet. However at the time, the Internet was simply not developed to the point where you could do this very well.

What I discovered, what I learned, was the type of provision for Adult Education in other countries not dissimilar in name, can be enormously different in function. And that there might not be a real counterpart in terms of educational institutions. We wanted to try to set up counterparts between the two systems of adult education in the United States and Britain. And back at that time, particularly, and here’s an example - there were no Community Colleges in Great Britain. It gave me, anyway, a sense that there are many ways to skin a cat. You know, the United States could potentially learn from British practices, but it would be particularly beneficial for the British to adopt the community college concept, which began to be done after I had left the UK.
We were also treated like royalty and taken to shows in London and to parties and went to castles, cathedrals, and ruins. It was the greatest vacation you could possibly ask for. But, you know, I did work there. I gave a couple of papers at the University of Leeds Bi-national conference. I also spent a month working in Paris.

DON: Well, after you returned was when I first met you and you seemed very excited. We got a chance to review a lot of the classroom climate literature and work on a revision of the Adult Classroom Climate Scale. That was a lot of fun and that more than a few students were able to conduct doctoral dissertations on that line of inquiry. Anyway, there are three areas that Hal Beder mentioned, such as Adult Literacy, Human Resource Development, and Distance Learning, that are “big and strong”. How do you respond?

GORDON: Well, Hal’s right. The thing is, none of these specializations is sufficiently encompassing to qualify as a field of study for university degrees. Well, possibly Training and Development. I don’t see Adult Literacy as having enough substance to qualify as a field for university study, well, maybe as a specialty of study within adult education. But, taken as a whole, adult education is a field of study with many areas of specialization. That has always been my position. And I don't think I have been or should be ostracized because I happen to take quantitative social science inquiry as the primary method enhancing knowledge and in theory building in a university setting. But there is a big mistake that people make. People think that adult education is a discipline. It is not a discipline. Education properly construed is not a discipline. The disciplines are the fundamental purveyors of knowledge and insight into physical, biological, and social worlds. We borrow from the disciplines and will always be a field of study. But we can get pretty convoluted in discussing what's a discipline or not so, I will forego it, because this is an interview, not a theoretical article.

DON: But it is an interesting point. And, I think, a good idea for a paper, actually, if it hasn’t been done yet. I’d have to poke around.

GORDON: There is a question in my mind as to whether adult education can be even a field of study, when it is so fragmented. God, being as splintered as we are, it's very difficult to do. And I think what happened is I joined adult education at its peak, which was the 1969 Galaxy Conference on Adult Education. There was the American Library Association the Association of Community Colleges, The American Association for Higher Education, The National University Extension Association and on and on and on. They were all meeting together as one united group with a common interest. A group that passed quasi-legislation on to Political Action Committees that were intended to bring together the groups and influence government policy.

DON: Yes, that seems like an interesting model. It seems like what we started to get at, at the think tank, this summer [2007] in Washington, with Alan Knox facilitating.

GORDON: Yes, well, there, in 1969, Alan Knox was also facilitating. We were all very excited about this new field of study, and it really was for all practical purposes, a new field of study. We had a limited literature, but we had something. And I would say that the field grew. There was a rigorous professoriate in the mid 1970s until the 1990s that consisted of able, dedicated people, who had various views on methodology and in subspecialties. We had a field that was growing
in quality and quantity. And then everything seemed to untangle. What we had hoped for was a new area of government policy and academic research. But what we got was an era of fragmentation, strife and a lack of togetherness. And could we have avoided it? I think the answer is possibly yes.

DON: Rather than fragmentation, you think that it would be desirable to try to get back to the point the First Galaxy Conference. It seems almost ironic because everything that had been predicted about people living longer, more adults in college, more women in education, distance education taking off, lifelong education being mandatory with rapidly changing technology, the growth in information, etc., that adult education would actually be stronger today than ever before.

GORDON: Yes, you would.

Dr. Donald J. Yarosz is currently an independent research consultant. While at the Center for Early Education Research (CEER) at Rutgers, he provided analyses useful for procuring the Pew Charitable Trusts grant that launched the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER). He served as a member of the research faculty at NIEER. He filled a variety of roles at the institute. Areas of expertise include life span development, school readiness, survey design, test construction, assessment, and the continuing education and training of teachers, among others. He consulted with the National Center for Education Statistics on the content of the School Readiness component of the National Household Education Survey. He has served as an International research consultant to the government of Malaysia. He studied with both Hal Beder and Gordon Darkenwald at Rutgers University. His dissertation topic focused on the adult learner in higher education, occupational attainment, and the occupational transitions of adult evening college graduates 5, 10, and 15 years after graduation.
Dr. Douglas Smith has been influential to the growth and direction of the fields of adult education and human resource development for four decades. As he retires from his faculty position, he is moving ahead to lead the American Association of Adult and Continuing Education (AAACE) at a time when new direction is needed. In this interview, Dr. Smith reflects on what he has learned and what he still has to offer to the scholars and practitioners in his chosen fields.

In the summer of 2007, Douglas H. Smith, Ph.D., retired from Florida International University (FIU) as a Professor of Adult Education and Human Resource Development (AE/HRD). Dr. Smith had served the university for 24 years as Dean of Continuing Education, Assistant Professor and Professor of AE/HRD, Program Director in AE/HRD, and Director of Educational Technology for the College of Education. Prior to joining FIU, Doug Smith had spent 16 years teaching and doing research at The Ohio State University, Indiana University, and Drake University. Dr. Smith has chaired 36 successful dissertation committees, been named Graduate Educator of the Year (2000), written extensively, and developed and implemented grants and programs around the world.

This past year he volunteered to take a leadership position as President-elect of AAACE, the American Association of Adult and Continuing Education, the “Premiere adult education association dedicated to being the leading source in the field of adult learning” (AAACE, 2008). Dr. Smith will serve as President-elect, then President, then Past-President, representing a three year commitment to continuing his dedication to the field.

Dr. Karen Wollard, the author of this Perspective, began her long association with Dr. Smith in the fall of 1985. The purpose of this piece was to ask Dr. Smith to reflect on the state of AE/HRD from his unique perspective, discussing the changes he has witnessed and lessons learned along the journey. The discussion touches on the challenges facing AAACE and those entering the field of adult education and human resource development.

KAREN: Dr. Smith, would you talk about the important changes you have seen in the field of AE/HRD in the past 25 years?

DR. SMITH: There are three changes I would touch upon. The first is the acceptance of AE/HRD as practice. Human resources have become equal to financial and material resources for many organizations. HRD personnel are increasingly recognized for their contribution to organizational success.


http://education.fiu.edu/newhorizons
The second change is the decline of AE/HRD programs. While the field is growing, demand for degrees in the field is not growing. The field has diversified and decentralized. It is now within a business model that includes knowledge management, learning organizations, learning for productivity, and efficiency. There has been a loss of attention to the individual. Individuals are now defined by performance within the organization. Business has become more competitive, and organizations are looking for ways to maximize their resources, so the HRD field has shifted to an emphasis on organizational performance to ensure support for their programs.

The third change is the increased role of research at the expense of practice. Because of the academy, students are focused on doing research, not actively developing programs for practitioners. There is no great interest in the universities in doing practitioner-oriented research. At the same time, businesses are not paying the universities to do research, and there are few grants available in this field. To survive in academia, you must do research, yet the research isn’t valued as practical in the field.

KAREN: What about the adult education field? What is their role?

DR. SMITH: Adult education is still viable in two areas: understanding adult development and its relationship to learning and as practitioners for basic skills, literacy, ESOL, and programs focused on developing the population of workers. Continuing education and lifelong learning are still pervasive and part of the practice of adult education as well.

KAREN: What are the most valuable lessons you have learned on your journey?

DR. SMITH: My most important lesson was to establish goals early, then pursue them but remain open. Lifelong goals helped me identify a plan and then incrementally achieve those goals. Having goals helps you create directions and take advantage of options. Those who succeed have goals early that are long range but viable. Having goals helps you make decisions about training, learning, and positioning. In my case, I never would have predicted where I would end up; I was open to possibilities and had support. Before my mid-20s, I had low expectations of myself, just to pursue my education and have fun.

KAREN: What are the most crucial challenges facing AAACE as you take the reins?

DR. SMITH: Image and branding are the challenges. Those outside the organization often have a better opinion of the organization than those inside. The organization had tried to be too broad and did not pay attention to building a meaningful brand. In the last 10 to 15 years, membership has gone from 6,000 to 500. This decline represents poor management, a lack of broad-based leadership, and a failure to focus on the mission. The good news is that there is growth from younger practitioners and students and the 2007 Conference in Norfolk, Virginia, attracted 400 people. My goal is to focus on the mission and supporting interest groups and commissions that support the key elements in adult education and learning. We had gotten to the point where there were 25 interest groups and seven commissions. There was no depth. We also need to enhance the position the military learning practitioners and researchers have always held. They have been key players in building adult education and training theory and practice.
KAREN: What recommendations would you make to a student just starting into our graduate programs?

DR. SMITH: First, I would counsel new students to seriously weigh the commitment of time and money. They need to be sure that this is the field they wish to pursue. Some students seem to choose this field because they think it will be easy. Second, I would tell them to be an active student. This means owning your program and doing the work well, making good choices. It’s okay to question what you are learning, but there is no need for whining. Getting a degree should take focused effort. Finally, I think every student should join their professional associations and go to the meetings and conferences. Wait until after graduation to take on the volunteering efforts. Being a student is enough responsibility. Go and meet people in the profession and learn all they can teach you while you build a network of contacts.

KAREN: My last question is about where you see the field heading, where the opportunities appear to be for individuals and organizations.

DR. SMITH: The field seems to be being accepted without a lot of academic support. We are seeing transitions and a reorientation in most graduate programs, some of which are doing well because of strong local leadership. Organizations are very much embracing the lessons of HRD and are looking for practitioners to improve practice. The other looming need is increasing the integration, not just the use, of technology. Technology has to be internalized and viewed within the context of how it complements understanding and is used to foster learning and performance. There are huge opportunities for academics, researchers, and practitioners who are open to diversity and who attend to the changes, the innovations, and the image of the field as a legitimate professional practice.

KAREN: Any final thoughts?

DR. SMITH: All I can say of the journey over the last 25 to 40 years? What a trip…

Karen K. Wollard, Ed. D., received her doctorate in Adult Education and Human Resource Development from Florida International University. Dr. Smith was an active member of her committee. Dr. Wollard is an HRD practitioner, scholar, and researcher whose areas of interest include organizational learning, performance and change; strategic HRD and planning; career development; employee engagement; customer service quality and self-directed learning. She has designed, developed, and implemented initiatives and interventions globally, nationally, and locally. She can be contacted at kkwollard@aol.com.

Transformative learning is a “dramatic, fundamental change in the way we see ourselves and the world in which we live” (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999, p. 318). In the second edition of Understanding and Promoting Transformative Learning: A Guide for Educators of Adults, Cranton lays an in depth foundation for the value and meaning of transformation within adult learning. Cranton describes transformative learning as a primary goal of adult education and encourages learners and educators to explore assumptions upon which “performance, achievement, and productivity are based” (Mezirow, 1985, p. 148). In the first part of the book she explains transformative learning theory from the learner’s perspective. In the second part she focuses on practical strategies for educators to promote transformative learning within adult education contexts. In contrast to the previous edition, Cranton here elaborates more deeply into the transformative learning process, individual differences, and practical strategies for learners and educators.

In chapter 1, Dimensions of Adult Learning, Cranton provides a brief overview of adult learning theory against Mezirow’s (2000) definition of transformative learning, “a process by which previous uncritically assimilated assumptions, beliefs, values and perspectives are questioned and thereby become more open, permeable, and better validated” (p. 2). She links “imagination, intuition, soul, and affect” (p. 2) and adults’ complexity, self-direction, experiences, collaboration, self-concepts, learning styles, and social conditions to the learning process. She describes Merriam and Brockett’s (1997) philosophical classification system surrounding growth, knowledge, behavioral change, personal development through relationships and social change as patterns or systems, which help us understand adult learning. Two dimensions that underlie adult learning are an individual-to-social continuum, in which practitioners focus on the individual or society, and kinds of knowledge, either technical, practical, or emancipatory, which provide “a set of interrelated understandings of the world and ourselves within that world” (p.10). Cranton says that although not all adult learning is transformational, clearly that which is can be empowering and revolutionary for the learner and the educator.

In chapter 2, Transformative Learning Theory, we see that adults make meaning out of their experiences that lead to transformative learning as they examine habitual expectations, revise them, and act upon them. “Transformative learning [in turn] leads to perspectives that are more inclusive, discriminating, and integrative of experience” (p. 19). Her explanations of frames of mind, habits of the mind, and critical reflection are discussed as essential to understanding the true nature, meaning, and application of transformational learning. Cranton’s use of Mezirow’s (1975) phases of personal perspective transformation, showing disorienting dilemmas, self examination, critical assessment, discontent, exploring our options, building competence and self confidence, planning, knowledge acquisition, new roles, and reintegrating into society, provides the foundation for transformative learning theory. Cranton recalls her own practice of asking reflective questions that enhance transformative learning and poses questions that help readers enhance their own understanding of the theory.
In chapter 3, *A Theory in Progress*, Cranton extends our understanding of transformative learning as an evolving theory in which connected knowing, contribution to social change, group or organizational transformation, ecological views and extrarational approaches can shape the transformational journey of adults. We see different paths to transformational learning, relational or self-other relationships and holistic or self-world relationships, both leading to the same place. Cranton situates the individual within various contexts related to social change or social transformation and introduces emotion, spirituality, authenticity, and personal identity as areas of special interest that can further develop transformational learning theory.

In chapter 4, *Transformation: The Learner’s Story*, the author analyzes what provokes an individual’s transformative learning through various phases and contexts. She uses well designed examples to show how engagement of our feelings and emotions are affected by power, disorientating events, assumptions and perspectives, discourse, dialogue, and support, and she discusses ways that these can lead to transformation. By examining and understanding how we become so deeply engaged, we can gain an extra-rational perspective of transformational learning that is not normally under our control (e.g., emotive episodes when we as learners suppress our emotions, or when we as educators are unaware of how to manage emotional tension). Through Cranton’s examples we see the temporal dimension of transformative learning as it develops, either “gradually over time (incremental)…[or through a] sudden and dramatic change in perspective (epochal)” becoming increasingly complex as we grow older (p. 71).

In chapter 5, *Individual Differences*, Cranton describes Jung’s psychological type theory as a lens to understanding human dynamics. Jung recognized introvert and extrovert attitudes, but did not believe they were sufficient to account for the differences among all people. Jung formulated 4 psychological constructs that yielded a total of 16 personality types. The four psychological constructs are: extraversion versus introversion, sensing versus intuitive, thinking versus feeling, and judging versus perceiving. Cranton contends that transformative learning varies among people depending on their personality types. The chapter is an excellent resource for understanding the relationship between psychological types and their impact on transformative learning and the adult learner.

In chapter 6, *Educator Roles*, the author empowers educators to become change agents, fostering transformative learning experiences in and outside the classroom. Educators’ roles in learners’ acquisition of technical, communicative, and emancipatory knowledge and the power of transformative leaning are discussed. Technical knowledge occurs through learning from a hands-on or experiential teaching methodology. Communicative knowledge describes how a learner’s perspective interacts with the social world to shape his/her experience. Emancipatory learning occurs through events or thoughts that challenge, stimulate, or provoke critical thinking. Emancipatory learning encourages us to question our understanding of power and to become conscious of its relationship within our daily practice.

Chapter 7, *Empowering Learners*, challenges the reader to think critically about the learner and the relational positionality the educator and learner develop and share. Empowering learners is about creating environments that allow differences to flourish (Tisdell, Hanley, & Taylor, 2000). Cranton asks readers to think about empowering learners through four connected ways: bringing about the awareness of power relations, exercising power responsibility,
empowering through discourse, and allowing learners to make course related decisions. Alternatively, the disempowered learner is described as “an individual who is insecure, lacking in confidence, anxious, or unsupported [who] may not be able to overcome the emotional barriers to questioning values and assumptions without first learning to exercise his or her power in relation to the teacher and other participants” (Cranton, 2006, p. 133). This chapter is a call to action for educators to see students as unique learners with different experiences, styles, and values and to respond in ways that will empower each learner.

In Chapter 8, *Fostering Critical Self-Reflection and Self-Knowledge*, the author explores how educators set the stage for transformative learning to occur. Examples of self-reflection and self-knowledge exercises, including reflective questioning, consciousness-raising experiences, journal keeping, experiential learning, reflecting on critical incidents, and art-based activities, are explored as techniques for connecting the experiences of adult learners. Adult learning experiences are not isolated but rather connected to previous opportunities for learning. Cranton shares that each learner’s response to stimulus influences reflection and self-knowledge. A cautionary word against imposing biased viewpoints while deploying these techniques is strongly suggested.

In Chapter 9, *Supporting Transformative Learning*, Cranton addresses moments of authentic reflection (i.e., the expression of the genuine self) and action, which can throw a learner’s life into chaos or can lead to the learner’s transformation. Educators who encourage transformative learning embrace the life experiences of students. The process of becoming an authentic educator is a transformative process for the educator as well. Transformative educators must build relationships with learners through respect, trust, and openness if transformation is to occur, even at minimal levels. The educator’s own transformational experiences make him an empowered catalyst to transformative learning in others.

In Chapter 10, *The Educator’s Transformative Journey*, Cranton discusses authenticity as a way to “increase self-awareness, explicate our assumptions and beliefs, engage in critical reflection and dialogue, and develop an informed theory of practice” (p. 182). Suggestions are provided for the educator to “try on, reject, or elaborate on in order to find his or her path” (p. 182). The reader is invited to examine and reflect on personal psychological perspectives of the self, needs, inhibitions, anxieties, and fears. These explorations, while potentially painful, help to reshape personal biases and assumptions. Strategies such as the use of journals, experimentation, and consultation are explored to further enhance transformational discoveries and the promotion of healthy development. As an educator develops, “conscious development replaces unconscious behavior [and the]…teacher as Self” advances (p. 197).

In some respects, Cranton could go further with her explanation and definition of transformative learning. Emotional issues usually manifest in an explicit manner and often reflect dynamics that are more subtle, implicit, and even beyond conscious awareness (Salzberger-Wittenberg, Henry, & Osborne, 1983). Cranton’s explanation of the processes and the complexities of transformative learning only touch on the “subjective resonances” by which learners apprehend reality (Taylor, 1989, p. 510). “When we take seriously the responsibility of developing a more conscious relationship with the unconscious dimensions of our being, we enter into a profoundly transformative, life-changing process” (Dirkx, 2006, p. 15). Hence,
transformative learning depends upon recognition of the many obstacles to subjective independence through a deeper understanding of the social and psychological processes of self-awareness. Cranton should, therefore, consider the emotional subjective experiences of an individual’s sense of self and personal agency in the next edition of this book.

In conclusion, we recommend this book to practicing adult educators, students and faculty in adult education programs, and those in the professional education field. This edition is intended to help readers better understand transformative learning and how it applies to their work and, therefore, is most applicable to practitioners and to adult education scholars. This book provides an exploratory guide into ways we may redefine or expand our perspectives and is best used through this lens. As a reader, one should become aware of limiting habits of the mind and discrepancies between expressed values. Freed from “personal constraints” (p. 18), or limitations, readers will be better able to connect what they learn to events that occur within their lives. Through transformative learning “previous uncritically assimilated assumptions, beliefs, values, and perspectives are questioned and thereby become more open, permeable, and better validated” (p. 2).
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