DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 272 CE 067 203

AUTHOR	Shanahan, Timothy; And Others
TITLE	The Professionalization of the Teacher in Adult Literacy Education.
INSTITUTION	National Center on Adult Literacy, Philadelphia, PA.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	NCAL-TR94-11
PUB DATE	Sep 94
CONTRACT	R117Q0003
NOTE	35p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Center on Adult Literacy, Publications, 3910 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-3111 (order no. TR94-11, $6; diskette order no. D-06, $7).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; Adult Basic Education; *Adult Educators; *Adult Literacy; *Educational Attitudes; *Literacy Education; Professional Development; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Professionalization of Teaching

ABSTRACT

A study examined issues of teacher professionalization within adult literacy education. Relevant research and theory on professionalization were reviewed, the historical experiences of other professional fields were examined, data on state certification requirements for adult basic education (ABE) teachers were analyzed, officials from states having such requirements were interviewed, and focus group discussions and interviews were conducted with adult literacy teachers and program administrators in the Chicago area. It was concluded that the debate on professionalization is likely being impeded by the existence of the following unstated beliefs or premises regarding the nature of ABE: (1) the right of adults to education; (2) state responsibility for the education of adults; (3) the role of teachers in achieving/improving educational quality; (4) the effectiveness of teacher training; and (5) the existence of a body of knowledge relevant to adult literacy education. It was further concluded that the quality of the ABE teaching force will be improved only through close collaboration of practitioners, researchers, and policymakers and on their finding common ground on the five issues identified. (The bibliography contains 46 references. Appended are three tables detailing state teacher preparation/certification requirements, states' teacher training expenditures, and the relationship between them.) (MN)

NCAL

NATIONAL CENTER ON ADULT LITERACY

THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF THE TEACHER IN ADULT LITERACY EDUCATION

Timothy Shanahan
Maureen Meehan
Stephen Mogge
University of Illinois at Chicago
Center for Literacy

NCAL TECHNICAL REPORT TR94-11
SEPTEMBER 1994

THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF THE TEACHER IN ADULT LITERACY EDUCATION

Timothy Shanahan
Maureen Meehan
Stephen Mogge
University of Illinois at Chicago
Center for Literacy

NCAL TECHNICAL REPORT TR94-11
SEPTEMBER 1994

This work was supported by funding from the National Center on Adult Literacy at the University of Pennsylvania, which is part of the Education Research and Development Center Program (Grant No. R117Q0003) as administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, in cooperation with the Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services. The findings and opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of the National Center on Adult Literacy, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or the U.S. Department of Education.

NATIONAL CENTER ON ADULT LITERACY, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, 3910 CHESTNUT STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-3111

NATIONAL CENTER ON ADULT LITERACY
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
3910 CHESTNUT STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-3111
PHONE (215) 898-2100 FAX (215) 898-9804

The National Center on Adult Literacy (NCAL) was established in 1990 by the U.S. Department of Education, with co-funding from the Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services. The mission of NCAL addresses three primary challenges: (a) to enhance the knowledge base about adult literacy; (b) to improve the quality of research and development in the field; and (c) to ensure a strong, two-way relationship between research and practice. Through applied research and development and dissemination of the results to researchers, policymakers, and practitioners, NCAL seeks to improve the quality of adult literacy programs and services on a nationwide basis. NCAL serves as a major operating unit of the Literacy Research Center at the University of Pennsylvania.

NCAL publications to date include:

May 1992 *Matching Literacy Testing With Social Policy: What are the Alternatives?*
Richard L. Venezky *(PB92-01, 7 pages)*

Oct 1992 *Life-Span and Life-Space Literacy: Research and Policy in National and International Perspectives*
Daniel A. Wagner *(OP92-01, 15 pages)*

Oct 1992 *Expanding Theories of Adult Literacy Participation*
Karen Reed Wikelund, Stephen Reder, & Sylvia Hart-Landsberg *(TR92-01, 30 pages)*

Oct 1992 *Invitations to Inquiry: Rethinking Staff Development in Adult Literacy Education*
Susan L. Lytle, Alisa Belzer, & Rebecca Reumann *(TR92-02, 44 pages)*

Dec 1992 *Developing the Professional Workforce for Adult Literacy Education*
Susan L. Lytle, Alisa Belzer, & Rebecca Reumann *(PB92-02, 11 pages)*

Jan 1993 *The Analysis of Adult Literacy: Problems in Factor Analysis Bib-Spiralled Item Administration*
David Kaplan *(OP93-01, 18 pages)*

Mar 1993 *The Impact of Workplace Literacy Programs: A New Model for Evaluation of Workplace Literacy Programs*
Larry Mikulecky & Paul Lloyd *(TR93-02, 180 pages)*

Mar 1993 *Literacy and Machines: An Overview of the Use of Technology in Adult Literacy Programs*
Terilyn C. Turner *(TR93-03, 86 pages)*

Jun 1993 *Myths and Misconceptions in Adult Literacy: A Research and Development Perspective*
Daniel A. Wagner *(PB93-01, 10 pages)*

Jun 1993 *Literacy and Development: Rationales, Assessment, and Innovation*
Daniel A. Wagner *(IP93-01, 50 pages)*

Jun 1993 *Early Childhood, Family, and Health Issues in Literacy: International Perspectives*
Laurel D. Puchner *(IP93-02, 45 pages)*

Sep 1993 *What Makes Worker Learn? The Role of Incentives in Workplace Education and Training*
Donald Hirsch & Daniel A. Wagner (Eds.) *(IP93-03, 243 pages)*

Sep 1993 *Prison Literacy: Implications for Program and Assessment Policy*
Anabel Newman, Warren Lewis, & Carolyn Beverstock *(TR93-01, 219 pages)*

Sep 1993 *Management Information Systems in Adult Education: Perspectives from the States and from Local Programs*
Mark A. Kutner, Lenore Webb, Rebecca Herman, & Pelavin Associates, Inc. *(TR93-04, 150 pages)*

Sep 1993 *What Can Employers Assume about the Literacy Skills of GED Graduates?*
David Kaplan & Richard L. Venezky *(TR93-05, 45 pages)*

Sep 1993 *Should Reading-Disabled Adults Be Distinguished From Other Adults Seeking Literacy Instruction? A Review of Theory and Research*
Anne E. Fowler & Hollis S. Scarborough *(TR93-07, 101 pages)*

Sep 1993 *When Less Is More: A Comparative Analysis for Placing Students in Adult Literacy Classes*
Richard L. Venezky, Page S. Bristow, & John P. Sabatini *(TR93-08, 46 pages)*

NCAL publications to date (continued)

Sep 1993 *Metacognitive Aspects of Adult Literacy*
Scott G. Paris & Andrea Parecki *(TR93-09, 44 pages)*

Nov 1993 *Teamwork and Literacy: Learning from a Skills-Poor Position*
Sylvia Hart-Landsberg & Steve Reder *(TR93-06, 63 pages)*

Nov 1993 *Motivations for Learning: Voices of Women Welfare Reform Participant*
Karen Wikelund *(TR93-10, 54 pages)*

Nov 1993 *Initiating Practitioner Inquiry: Adult Literacy Teachers, Tutors, and Administrators Research Their Practice*
Susan L. Lytle, Alisa Belzer, & Rebecca Reumann *(TR93-11, 69 pages)*

Nov 1993 *Coalition Building for Adult Literacy: Historical and Organizational Perspectives*
Anabel P. Newman & Bernadette Lehman *(TR93-13, 68 pages)*

Nov 1993 *Effective Service Delivery in Adult Literacy Programs: A Policy Review and Recommendations*
Judith Ann Koloski *(TR93-14, 46 pages)*

Dec 1993 *Issues and Challenges in Adult Numeracy*
Iddo Gal *(TR93-15, 62 pages)*

Dec 1993 *Adult Literacy Training and the Integration of Human Services*
Elizabeth R. Reisner *(TR93-16, 30 pages)*

Apr 1994 *Measuring Gain in Adult Literacy Programs*
Richard L. Venezky, Page S. Bristow, & John P. Sabatini *(TR93-12, 24 pages)*

Apr 1994 *Understanding Family Literacy: Conceptual Issues Facing the Field*
Vivian L. Gadsden *(TR94-02, 32 pages)*

Apr 1994 *Children, Parents, and Families: An Annotated Bibliography on Literacy Development In and Out of Program Settings*
Vivian L. Gadsden, Ludo C. P. Scheffer, & Joel Hardman *(TR94-04, 84 pages)*

Jun 1994 *Literacy Transfer: A Review of the Literature*
Larry Mikulecky, Peggy Albers, & Michele Peers *(TR94-05, 21 pages)*

Jun 1994 *Instruction and Assessment for Limited-English-Proficient Adult Learners*
Ronald W. Solórzano *(TR94-06, 33 pages)*

Jun 1994 *Early Warning Signs of Functional Illiteracy: Predictors in Childhood and Adolescence*
Nazli Baydar, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, & Frank F. Furstenberg *(OP94-01, 13 pages)*

Jul 1994 *Use It or Lose It? The Problem of Adult Literacy Skill Retention*
Daniel A. Wagner *(TR94-07, 27 pages)*

Jul 1994 *Technology: New Tools for Adult Literacy, Videoconference Participant Materials*
Joyce Harvey-Morgan, Chris Hopey, & Karl Rethemeyer (Eds.) *(VC94-01, 58 pages)*

Sep 1994 *Supply and Demand for Literacy Instruction in the United States*
Richard L. Venezky & Daniel A. Wagner *(TR94-10, 13 pages)*

Sep 1994 *The Professionalization of the Teacher in Adult Literacy Education*
Timothy Shanahan, Maureen Meehan, & Stephen Mogge *(TR94-11, 20 pages)*

Sep 1994 *Abilities and Competencies in Adulthood: Life-Span Perspectives on Workplace Skills*
Jacqui Smith & Michael Marsiske *(TR94-12, 36 pages)*

Sep 1994 *The Role of Literacy in the Wealth of Individuals and Nations*
Sue E. Berryman *(TR94-13, 15 pages)*

Information on ordering of NCAL publications may be addressed to Dissemination at NCAL.
Revised September 12, 1994

NCAL MANAGEMENT

Daniel A. Wagner, Director
Richard L. Venezky, Co-Director for Research and Development
Joyce Harvey-Morgan, Associate Director
Vivian L. Gadsden, Associate Director
Sandra K. Stewart, Manager of Dissemination
Mary O. Russell, Administrative Coordinator
Janet Smith, Editor
Karl Rethemeyer, Analyst/Technology

NCAL SENIOR PROJECT DIRECTORS

María Carlo, University of Pennsylvania
Vivian L. Gadsden, University of Pennsylvania
Iddo Gal, University of Pennsylvania
Joyce Harvey-Morgan, University of Pennsylvania
Susan L. Lytle, University of Pennsylvania
Larry Mikulecky, Indiana University
Scott G. Paris, University of Michigan
Laurel D. Puchner, University of Pennsylvania
Stephen Reder, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Karl Rethemeyer, University of Pennsylvania
Regie Stites, University of Pennsylvania
Richard L. Venezky, University of Delaware
Daniel A. Wagner, University of Pennsylvania

NCAL NATIONAL ADVISORY PANEL

Carl Kaysen, Chair, NCAL National Advisory Panel, and David W. Skinner Chair of Political Economy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Richard C. Anderson, Director, Center for the Study of Reading, University of Illinois
Joan D. Baraloto, Director, Education and Family Initiatives, USA Today
Jack Bowsher, Director of Education (ret.), IBM, Inc.
Jeanne Chall, Professor, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University
Lillian Escobar-Haskins, Executive Director, Governor's Advisory Commission on Latino Affairs, Pennsylvania
The Honorable William F. Goodling, U.S. Representative, Pennsylvania
Luis Laosa, Principal Research Scientist, Research Department, Educational Testing Service
Noreen Lopez, Director of Adult Education, Illinois Board of Education
Geraldine Novelo, Deputy Director (ret.), Instituto Nacional para la Educación de los Adultos, Mexico
Van D. Ooms, Senior Vice President and Director of Research, Committee for Economic Development
Bernard P. Reca, Vice President, Bell Atlantic
Anthony Sarmiento, Assistant Director, Human Resources Development Institute, AFL-CIO
Robert Schwartz, Program Director, Education, Pew Charitable Trusts
Ramsay Selden, Director, State Education Assessment Center, Council of Chief State School Officers
Senator Paul Simon, U.S. Senator, Illinois
Dorothy Strickland, Professor, Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University
Francis X. Sutton, Vice-President (ret.), Ford Foundation
Calvin Tyler, Senior Vice President for Human Resources, UPS, Inc.
Peter Waite, Executive Director, Laubach Literacy Action

NCAL EDITORIAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

Hal Beder, Rutgers University
Maria Carlo, University of Pennsylvania
Suzanne Cockley, Virginia Adult Education Research Network
Aydin Durgunoglu, University of Illinois, Urbana
Marcia Farr, University of Illinois
Beth Foley, Utah State University
Maggie Gaines, Baltimore City Literacy Corp.
Sheryl Gowen, Georgia State University
Keiko Koda, Ohio University
Susan Lytle, University of Pennsylvania
Peter B. Mosenthal, Syracuse University
Thomas Reeves, University of Georgia
Timothy Shanahan, University of Illinois at Chicago
Keith Stanovich, University of Toronto
Sondra Stein, National Institute for Literacy
Terrence G. Wiley, California State University Long Beach

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF THE TEACHER IN ADULT LITERACY EDUCATION[1]

Timothy Shanahan
Maureen Meehan
Stephen Mogge

University of Illinois at Chicago
Center for Literacy

Abstract

Professionalization refers to the process of using education and certification to enhance the quality of performance of those within an occupational field. This report analyzes issues of professionalization within adult literacy education. It includes a review of relevant research and theory on professionalization, and an examination of the historical experiences of other professional fields. Data on state certification requirements for adult basic education teachers were analyzed, and interviews were conducted with officials from states having such requirements. Interviews and focus group discussions were conducted with adult literacy teachers and program administrators in the Chicago area. Analysis of this information suggested that debate on professionalization is probably being impeded by the existence of unstated beliefs or premises. The report describes five, usually unstated, premises concerning the nature of adult basic education: (a) the right of adults to education, (b) state responsibility for the education of adults, (c) the role of teachers in educational quality, (d) the effectiveness of teacher training, and (e) the existence of a body of knowledge relevant to adult literacy education.

INTRODUCTION

How do we ensure the availability of a corps of high quality teachers in adult literacy education? Issues of teacher quality continue to be hotly debated topics within the adult literacy community, and rules and regulations for governing who can be a teacher are being rethought or revised in many states. Recent federal literacy legislation even calls on the states to encourage and facilitate the "training of full-time professional educators." Unfortunately, research in this area has been so limited that policymakers have had to make decisions without much in the way of empirical support. Since public discussions and publications on the issue usually appear to be atheoretical in nature or based upon a series of unstated premises, they often appear to confuse as much as inform.

The purpose of this paper is to make sense of the discussion about the professionalization of the adult literacy teacher, and to "unpack" some of these unstated premises on which previous arguments have often been based. We review the extant literature on the preparation, certification, and licensure of adult educators, and we also will draw on information from other fields about their professionalization process. Extensive interviews and focus group discussions were conducted with adult literacy educators from the Chicago area in order to gain access to teacher insights concerning these issues. Finally, interviews with appropriate state education officials were conducted. An examination of the basic beliefs held by those in the field provides a better foundation on which to develop theories, empirical research, and, eventually, policy on teacher development.

As we began interviewing teachers and officials, it became evident to us that words like *professionalization* and *certification* have multiple meanings and that some of these are controversial or negative within the field. Mention of such words conjured images of bureaucracy, lost employment, the adoption of requirements out of line with salaries, the disenfranchisement of volunteers, government intrusion, and the like. Some individuals saw *professionalization* and *unprofessional* as the intended contrasts. We noticed, also, that many publications on these issues did not use such terminology, but instead focused on *teacher preparation*, *staff development*, and *in-service training*.

To begin this discussion profitably let us define the term *professionalization* as we intend to use it. According to the *American Heritage Dictionary*, a *profession* is an "occupation or vocation requiring training in the liberal arts or the sciences and advanced study in a specified field," and a *professional* is "one who has an assured competence in a particular field or occupation." Thus, *professionalization* refers to the movement of any field towards some standards of educational preparation and competency. The term *professionalization* indicates a direct attempt to (a) use education or training to improve the quality of practice, (b) standardize professional responses, (c) better define a collection of persons as representing a field of endeavor, and (d) enhance communication within that field.

One reason that professionalization generates so much heat is that it is an issue of both education and access. Professionalization necessarily entails ideas such as certification and licensure, although it cannot be defined by them.

Certification is simply the requirement of some specific standard of knowledge, training, or education for entry into a field. Such requirements are not necessarily external to a profession. Although they could be imposed by a government agency through licensure, they could conceivably be established by the members of the profession themselves. Professionalization has to do with the preparation and ongoing learning of quality teachers, while certification is just a mechanism for imposing this training standard. Thus, when we talk about certification here we are not proposing a specific method for certifying adult literacy teachers (i.e., licensure, programs of study, apprenticeship, and examination systems), but rather suggesting that some control on access is appropriate.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS OF PROFESSIONALIZATION

Debates over professionalization have beset the field of adult literacy education for almost three decades, and they have persisted even longer in adult education (Darkenwald, 1992; Nadler, 1985). The continuing debate suggests a seemingly enduring concern about the quality of teaching available in adult literacy programs, as well as a lack of resolution on how to accomplish this. Although discussions of professionalization and teacher preparation reveal many important differences of opinion, they also demonstrate two major points of consensus.

First, discussions of professionalization generally show a widespread concern for the quality or effectiveness of the profession in addressing the problems of adult literacy (Cranney, 1983; Diekhoff, 1988; Fingeret, 1984; Foster, 1988; Kazemek, 1988; Sherman, Kutner, Webb, & Herman, 1991; Tibbetts, Kutner, Hemphill, & Jones, 1991). Although, undoubtedly, many variables influence the ultimate effectiveness of instruction, discussions have focused often on the qualifications and training of teachers in the field. Generally, researchers seem to agree that adult literacy teachers need to be better prepared (Cope, 1983; Fingeret, 1984; Foster, 1988; Gilley & Galbraith, 1988; Kazemek, 1988; Lytle, Belzer, & Reumann, 1992; Sherman et al., 1991; Tibbetts et al., 1991). In the more general realm of adult education, it was as early as 1951, that the *Educator's Washington Dispatch* called for the development of a cadre of highly skilled teachers, capable of teaching adults to participate in the democratic decision-making process (cited in Sheats, Jayne, & Spence, 1953). The early philosophy of "friends educating friends" promulgated by Jane Addams or Eduard Lindeman appears to have been replaced by calls for the professionalization of adult educators by the 1970s (Carlson, 1977). The friends educating friends concept persists in the field, however, as reflected in the increased participation of volunteer tutors, their numbers having doubled between 1985-1989 (Tibbetts et al., 1991).[2]

Following the passage of the Federal Economic Opportunity Act, both the American Education Association (Fironza, 1966) and the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE, 1965) published studies

emphasizing the need for adult basic education teacher training. The more comprehensive NCTE study discussed teacher training needs that had been identified by practicing teachers themselves, including (a) methods to determine the needs and goals of learners, (b) development, (c) selection and evaluation of materials, (d) program evaluation, and (e) assessment.

The concern for teacher quality has been a recurring theme in the literature, but discussions of barriers to accomplishing these goals through professionalization are equally apparent. Early on, program administrators (NCTE, 1965) indicated concerns about the expense of training in a field so reliant on part-time staffing and with such high staff turnover rates. Given that the number of full-time adult literacy teachers has declined by 48% since 1980 (Pugsley, 1990) and that budget constraints persist, it is not surprising that discussions of the barriers to adequate professional development have been a continuing theme (Cross, 1986; Foster, 1988; Galbraith & Gilley, 1985; Harman, 1985; Kazemek, 1988; Sherman et al., 1991). Additional concerns have been raised concerning the (a) lack of adequate regulation (Galbraith & Gilley, 1985), (b) limited knowledge base (Cross, 1986), (c) numbers of teachers already in the field (Griffith & Marcus, 1978), and (d) diversity of the teaching force (Galbraith & Gilley, 1985).

Unfortunately, discord has been more apparent than unity. There has been consensus for increased quality of instruction and widespread recognition of the problems associated with improving the teaching force, but otherwise there has been little agreement. Several researchers claim there is a core of knowledge essential to providing high quality adult literacy instruction (Fingeret, 1984; Foster, 1988; Sherman et al., 1991), but there is great disagreement about what constitutes this core (Fingeret, 1984; Kazemek, 1988), or how we can best ensure that teachers have this knowledge (some innovative staff development programs have been described; see, for instance, Lytle et al., 1992; Marlowe, 1991). Some experts have supported the establishment of formal teacher training programs at the graduate level (Smith, Palmer, & Evanson, 1979). But such plans have been opposed by those who believe that university-trained adult educators are likely to be ineffective because their loyalty to profession or subject matter precludes close community ties (Rippletoe & Maes, 1979). Other opponents of this approach argue that most formal teacher training emphasizes inappropriate methods (Foster, 1988). Similar disagreements are apparent around the issues of the amount of training needed (Kazemek, 1988; Ulmer, 1980), and the benefits of certification standards (Cope, 1983; Galbraith, 1987; Lopez, 1992).

Further complicating the discussion of knowledge base or entry standards for teachers—issues central to any discussion of professionalization—is the lack of agreement as to whether it actually matters. Critics frequently cite research suggesting that the relationship between training and teaching effectiveness has not been established (Hoffman, 1980). We were unable to identify any empirical research that correlated student achievement with teacher training in adult education, although such studies are evident in elementary and secondary education.

CURRENT STATUS OF PROFESSIONALIZATION EFFORTS

We then turned from the academic debates to those that take place among state policymakers. Since states are the principal funding source of adult education efforts, we wanted to determine what, if any, teacher preparation standards they support in their policy considerations. Specifically, we wanted to know what qualification standards for adult literacy teachers are currently in place and how states identify the minimal competency of the professional adult literacy teacher To answer these questions, we analyzed data reported by Kutner et al. (1991) that profiles the teaching requirements for ABE teachers in 49 states and the District of Columbia. (Information from Florida was not available.)

Analysis of this data indicates great discrepancies among the states. Twenty-six states have specific preservice standards for adult educators that govern entry into the field, while 24 do not. Of those with such standards, only 9 require any coursework in adult education. The other 17, with preservice requirements, accept an elementary or secondary teaching certificate as a sufficient entry requirement. Most states require separate certificates for elementary and secondary teaching—reflecting the different kinds of knowledge and experience believed to be relevant to the demands of these jobs—but such specialized knowledge seemingly is not required for adult educators.

In Mississippi, anyone with a baccalaureate degree is considered qualified, while in the other 23 states that have no specific training requirements, even that does not appear to be necessary (Kutner et al., 1991). We conducted interviews with several state education officials to determine the accuracy of the Kutner et al. data, as well as to provide explanations of the responses. Although most states have no rules against the employment of noncollege-trained teachers within the professional ranks of adult educators, state officials emphasized that this rarely occurs in practice. Kansas, for example, does not have a rule requiring a college education, but education officials indicated that 80% of their teachers do have such backgrounds. Low availability of college courses on adult education issues has prevented Kansas from implementing more specific training requirements. Similarly, Idaho has no state requirements, but their regional adult education centers require college-educated teachers. Idaho education officials indicated that mandatory credentials would be difficult to implement because of the part-time nature of the field, low salaries, and the lack of available coursework and degree programs in adult education. Employment practices in most states appear to be more rigorous than what is suggested by state regulations, and states are careful not to require too much, given the limited resources available to adult literacy education.

Alternatively, officials from states that have certification requirements, such as Arkansas, Alabama, and Connecticut, indicated that certification was an effective means of ensuring program quality. They were aware of the

difficulties and expense inherent in such an approach, but they expressed a clear belief that the benefits outweighed the liabilities.[3] In summary, it is clear that policymakers are as divided as those in the research community concerning how to guarantee high standards of teacher development in adult literacy education.

THE PROFESSIONALIZATION EXPERIENCES OF OTHER FIELDS

Of course, adult literacy education is not the only field to struggle with issues of practitioner quality. What choices have other professions made with regard to educational standards, certification, or licensure? To answer this question, we reviewed the literature on such issues and conducted interviews with Sherry Francis, Assistant to the Director of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teachers; Jayne Meyer, President of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification; and Jack Cassidy, former President of the International Reading Association.

Debates on professionalization, no matter what the field, have typically emphasized the relevance of such approaches to the quality of services provided (Boyd, 1973; Gilley, 1985; Miller, 1976). A 1985 survey of professional associations identified the primary reason for certification as to "increase and assure professional competence" (Gilley, 1985, p. 60). Other common goals of certification included the promotion of professionalism (usually some standard of status for members of the profession), the improvement of academic programs, greater workforce retention, and the avoidance of governmental regulation, among others.

The experiences of other fields suggest that the professionalization process can take years, decades, or even centuries. Consider the evolution of medicine as a profession in the United States. During colonial times, "physicians were badly wanted, and whoever was able and willing to help was therefore welcome" (Sigeirst, 1935, p. 1060). However, early on, medical practitioners were expected to serve an apprenticeship with a doctor. Initially, there was no set length of apprenticeship, nor were there any specific qualifications for the supervisor. The exigencies of the Revolutionary War highlighted the need for stricter controls and encouraged change. Medical schools, initially based in universities, developed set curricula and began the formal training of potential physicians. These schools, however, operated independently and had no shared standards of quality. Nevertheless, such a degree was considered an assurance of medical knowledge or minimal competence, and licenses were issued. As the American population expanded throughout the nineteenth century, medical schools sprang up everywhere and the need to control the quality of those entering medicine became increasingly evident. An incompetent doctor clearly can cause death. Government, therefore, assumed a regulatory role by the 1870s in order to protect citizens. State boards of medical examiners were established, and they are credited with influencing medical education reform and

gradually, yet consistently, raising standards. A system of credentials had the dual benefit of protecting the public and building public recognition and confidence in the profession.

The professionalization of elementary and secondary teachers has also evolved gradually and incrementally (Lieberman & Miller, 1992; Monroe, 1915; Sykes, 1992; Zimpher, 1985). Like physicians, teachers were initially unregulated. Until the mid-nineteenth century, the practice of hiring teachers was similar to that currently used to hire adult educators in most states: Qualifications were largely left to those doing the hiring. Nepotism was common, and there was great disparity in teacher quality. Unlike medicine, the schools received government support directly, and so their process of licensure was imposed by government rather than instigated by the profession itself. By the late nineteenth century, state inspectors or state-appointed county superintendents had begun to set standards, administer exams, and grant certificates. Gradually a system of schooling and academic credentials began to replace examinations as the method of assuring consistent quality. By 1873, completion of a two-year normal school (teacher preparation college) program was sufficient to permit licensure, but by 1930 all states required a four-year college program for secondary teachers and they were moving toward similar requirements for elementary teachers, too. The system of teacher licensure has not changed dramatically in ensuing years, but standards have gradually become more specific and rigorous.

Reliance on professional boards to identify and enforce specific requirements became the dominant means for occupation regulation and subsequent state licensure. By 1890, ten occupations pursued professionalization through licensure. Thirty years later, this number had doubled and included many occupations within medicine (i.e., dentistry, nursing, and optometry), as well as funeral directors, architects, surveyors, accountants, and real estate agents. After World War II, hundreds of additional occupations joined the licensure ranks. Currently, more than 1,100 occupations are regulated by one or more states, while 60 enjoy such status in all states (Paxton, and Associates, 1990, cited by Morrison, 1992).

From medicine and law to the newly professionalized field of aerobic dance teaching (Cinque, 1986), licensure or certification has been seen as a way to protect the public from injury, as well as to sustain public support and recognition for an occupation. Most professionalization efforts appear to emerge from within fields and then these efforts become codified through governmental partnership, although sometimes—especially when public expenditures are required or fundamental protection of the citizenry is seen as tantamount—standards might be imposed upon an occupation by a state. Often entry or preparation standards are entirely regulated by professional organizations with little or no governmental involvement, although these are usually aimed at achieving excellence within a profession rather than fostering minimally acceptable standards of proficiency (J. Cassidy, personal communication, April 20, 1993). In any event, professionalization or assurances of satisfactory standards of professional practice are rarely accomplished through a single action, but instead appear to be the result of an ongoing process of adopting and refining various mechanisms for governing entry to a field. Articles published around the time that the certification standards are established tend to be laudatory and supportive. Publications

that appear much later (sometimes decades later) tend to support the original mechanism with some suggestions or rationale for increasing the level of the standard.

PERCEPTIONS OF THOSE WITHIN ADULT LITERACY EDUCATION

Another essential source of information on issues of professionalization comes from those who work within the field. We conducted interviews with individuals who were administering or teaching adult literacy programs and with state education officials charged with responsibilities in the area of adult literacy. In addition, focus groups, comprising leading members of Chicago's adult literacy community, were convened to discuss the university role in adult literacy education and teacher preparation.

INTERVIEWS WITH STATE OFFICIALS

To gain some sense of state experiences with certification and licensure issues in adult education, interviews were conducted with officials from four states that have state-controlled systems of certification for adult literacy teachers. States were selected on the basis of their certification plans as described in Kutner et al. (1991). Arkansas has had standards in place since the passing of the Adult Education Act in 1966, and Wisconsin has had them in place since the early 1970s. Two other states, Alabama and Connecticut, were selected because they have adopted such standards recently. An effort was made to include states from different regions.

We contacted the department of education of each of these states to determine who could best provide the type of information required. Telephone interviews were requested with these individuals and all generously accepted our invitation. Interviews were scheduled at their convenience and conducted by one of the authors, who took field notes at the time of the interview. An open-ended, semistructured interview approach was used. It allowed for additional questions to be posed as appropriate, but it also assured that certain core information would be common to all interviews (Seidman, 1991). The field notes were then discussed by all three authors, and in cases where there was confusion or additional issues of interest raised, follow-up calls were made.

Garland Hankins, Deputy Director of Adult Education in Arkansas, informed us that the legislature and the education department had operated from the beginning on the belief that the level of professionalism in adult education should be as high as that in elementary or secondary education. For this reason, Arkansas made a commitment to develop a teaching force made up largely of full-time teachers, believing that this type of staffing would lead to "more commitment, dedication, ability and fewer moonlighters." While conceding that it costs more, full-time teachers comprise between 70-75% of the adult educators in Arkansas. In addition to completing the educational foundations

courses common to all teachers, adult educators are required to complete a program consisting of four university courses selected from a wide variety of options that are specific to issues of teaching adults.

In Wisconsin, too, certification requirements were established for adult educators by legislation. According to Mary Ann Jackson, ABE Consultant with the Wisconsin Department of Education, this occurred because adult education was given program status within the two-year college system. Since the 1970s, teachers in Wisconsin have had to be certified in elementary or secondary education. In 1989, these standards were revised for teachers at the Level III ABE (9th-12th grade equivalent). Jackson believes that Wisconsin's credential standards provide for a "more credible system of adult education." However, she does identify associated concerns, including the problem that teachers whose training emphasizes the education of children are not always open to altering their practices in accordance with theories and research on adult education. In addition, there may be problems with bureaucracy, unionization, and the state's ability to pay full-time teachers.

As a result of the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), in 1986 the Connecticut State Department of Education and the Connecticut state legislature reviewed standards in all levels of schooling. Among its reforms, the state adopted certification requirements for teachers in the state adult education system. Full- and part-time staff have identical requirements, which include adult education coursework and concept and content exams leading to certification. There was a one-year provisional period during which existing teachers could satisfy the requirements. State law, in Connecticut, requires every school district to provide adult education services; therefore thus, each district is reimbursed for the services that it provides. A conscious effort was made to connect issues of educational standards, teacher preparation, increased funding, and improved relationships with universities. Regarding teacher preparation, the belief is that "teachers have the responsibility to be professional and should be held to standards. . . . Teaching adults is no less significant than teaching anyone else. It is a disservice to suggest that anyone can teach" (interview with Roberta Pawloski, Director, Division of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education).

Alabama recently adopted certification standards for its adult education teachers as well. The Alabama State Department of Adult Education decided that its approach to meeting the increasing demands for adult education would be through more highly trained teachers. Although the existing workforce is still predominantly part-time, it was decided that full-time teachers would be required to obtain certification by 1998. At that time, all new full-time adult education teachers will be required to obtain certification prior to hiring. One current obstacle is that only one university in the state offers the required coursework. There are plans to expand the offerings to other universities, however (interview with Naomi Scales, Assistant to the State Administrator).

It is clear, as the experiences of Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, and Wisconsin suggest, that the adoption of teacher standards in adult literacy education requires that the state examine its comprehensive commitment to the system of adult education. In each of these cases, the state adopted its

requirements based upon the assumption that staffing and training requirements would yield better teaching and learning results. All of these requirements took the form of some system of college- or university-based classes, rather than any kind of formal apprenticeship or other kind of alternative preparation model. These assumptions raise empirical questions (at-this-time unanswerable) concerning the relationships between teacher preparation requirements and quality of teaching and learning.

However, it is possible to evaluate the generalizability of the information provided by these officials through an examination of Kutner et al.'s (1991) largely unanalyzed data concerning teacher utilization, training, and overall funding patterns. (Although some errors are evident in this data, and the data are now a little out of date, they represent the best available information on the various state prTR94-13 shows the relationship between preparation standards for adult literacy teachers and the nature of the teaching force in the various states. These data show that states with any kind of certification standards typically employ a larger proportion of paid staff than do those without any certification standards. However, the difference is not great (only about a 7% difference). Interestingly, states with specific adult education certification standards tend to employ a smaller percentage of paid teachers than do those that only require elementary or secondary teaching certification. Differences between full- and part-time paid staffing are negligible. A notable exception is Arkansas, which employs up to 75% full-time teachers based upon a strong belief in their greater effectiveness. Thus, the states that have demanded the highest training standards have tended to employ a slightly smaller proportion of full-time staff and paid staff; the differences are rather small, however.

Do states with the strictest standards expend more resources directly on teacher training? Again, we looked at the Kutner et al. (1991) data. The data relevant to this question concern the use of federal money through Section 353 of the Adult Education Act and "nonfederal 353 money." Section 353 funds have been the main means of funding training for adult education teachers. Table 2 (see Appendix) describes the source of training money, 353 and non-353, as a percentage of the total amount each state spends on teacher training. These data, taken alone, might be misleading as an indicator of state commitment to training, as they do not necessarily include any of the university-based, preservice training already discussed. However, from these data it appears that states that have training requirements for adult education teachers draw a larger proportion of their in-service training budgets from federal sources than do states with no such requirements. One can only speculate as to why these states rely more heavily on federal funding for training. Unfortunately, available data do not permit an analysis of whether states with teacher preparation requirements spend more on training relative to the number of teachers or students.

The Kutner et al. (1991) data do reveal greater consistency in the pattern of teacher certification standards and amount of state support for adult education. Table 3 (see Appendix)illustrates that states with teacher preparation requirements tend to contribute a much greater share of total adult basic education allocations than do states that have no such requirements. These data reflect the comments made by the state officials of Arkansas, Alabama, Connecticut, and Wisconsin—namely, that the establishment of teacher preparation requirements in adult education tends to be part of a more

comprehensive commitment by a state to the adult education system. The differences here are not ambiguous at all. States that have specific adult education teacher preparation standards demonstrate a more comprehensive commitment to their systems of adult education as evidenced by their support of a much larger proportion of the expenses associated with adult basic education.

Focus Groups

In the spring of 1993, the Center for Literacy at the University of Illinois at Chicago convened a meeting with 24 leading adult literacy educators in the city of Chicago. The assembled group consisted of representatives from several community-based organizations, libraries, community colleges, alternative high schools, and the Illinois State Board of Education. Random selection was not used. Participants were selected specifically on the basis of their positive reputations in the community. About a month before the meeting, six university faculty members met to suggest categories of programs from which teachers and administrators might be invited. At that time, recommendations were made concerning possible participants. In addition, several leading adult literacy educators were contacted by phone and asked to make additional recommendations. Participants included individuals who were either teachers or administrators (or both) in their organizations, and representatives from programs that emphasized English as a second language as well as adult basic education and adult literacy. Each participant was contacted by phone initially, and each received a follow-up letter with details about the meetings. Participants were provided a brief list of questions that might be discussed at the meetings in order to give them an opportunity to reflect on the issues. They were invited to share their views about adult literacy teacher preparation and to help the university to study issues of graduate education for adult educators.

Discussions took place simultaneously in four focus groups (participants were assigned randomly to these), each with a moderator from the Center for Literacy. Focus groups are small, face-to-face, guided discussions. They are a cost-efficient way to get clear, subtle, and useful information when one does not know fully the issues or perspectives of expert populations. The moderator in each group was a university faculty member whose task was to ask questions and to facilitate conversation among peers. These discussions emphasized teacher preparation, hiring procedures, student issues, and curriculum. The focus groups met together for about four hours. These sessions were transcribed by graduate students who acted as secretaries; sessions were tape recorded as well. Each group answered a set of common questions, but group responses often raised a variety of issues that were explored only by a single group. For the purposes of this paper, a summary of views related to individuals' experiences in the field, teacher preparation, and hiring issues will be presented.

None of the individuals interviewed had selected the field of adult literacy as a career goal early in their lives. Similarly, none had completed undergraduate education with the expectation that they would enter the field. Many members of the group had previous teaching experience in elementary or secondary settings and then moved into adult literacy, looking for new and varied ways of fulfilling their teaching careers. Others were active in their communities, were involved in social services, or were interested in making

a contribution to society. Once in the field, many of them sought graduate degrees in related areas such as reading education, adult education, or social work. All indicated that they attended workshops and seminars on specific adult education issues. The majority expressed deep career satisfaction and a strong commitment to their profession.

Many of those who participated were administrators who could describe the criteria used for hiring adult literacy teachers and staff. Predominantly, they indicated that they look for a caring person who is sensitive to the needs of the adult learner, and who might be effective in the classroom. Some participants indicated that they valued previous teaching experience in alternative settings. A few valued traditional elementary and secondary teaching experience, while others considered such experience a barrier to successful work with adult learners. Although many of the participants had graduate degrees of one kind or another, only a few suggested that such degrees were as important as other less tangible criteria such as personality, commitment, and sensitivity. Few described a well-established, consistent set of hiring criteria.

When asked specifically about teacher preparation, most of the initial responses consisted of anecdotal evidence reflecting the unique experiences of the individuals' entrance into the field. Only after they were asked to evaluate the content of any relevant coursework that they had completed, did many of the individuals indicate that educational experience was significant—perhaps even important—in selecting teachers. Similar probing about the participants' own educational experiences led to a general consensus that all adult literacy teachers should have, at least, a bachelor's degree to ensure adequate content knowledge and to establish the teacher as an appropriate role model. However, when asked to make general comments about the value of formal training for adult education, many respondents indicated that it was not very valuable. When asked about the importance or appropriateness of their own training, most typically saw it as essential to their own success—whether they had studied counseling, education, social work, or other fields. Overall, the majority of participants thought that a graduate degree in adult literacy education could be valuable if it emphasized appropriate knowledge and experiences and included some kind of internship within adult education programs. Many suggested that such graduate study should include emphasis on administration, proposal writing, and volunteer coordination, in addition to curriculum, instruction, and assessment. There was wide agreement that such preparation would only be valuable if it included a strong internship experience in which prospective teachers would actually work in the types of agencies that employ adult educators.

The context in which these administrators and practitioners work is critical to understanding their comments. Illinois is one of the 24 states that do not have even a minimum standard for adult education teachers. The community colleges hire mostly part-time teachers, yet, as separate entities, they can establish different employment criteria. The Chicago City Colleges require a baccalaureate degree only (field unspecified) and employ mainly part-time adult education staff. Some other Illinois community colleges require a master's degree and employ full-time adult educators. The state has historically restricted most funding of community-based organizations to the administration of volunteer tutor programs, although this has changed recently. One final note

regarding the focus groups is that many participants said that it was refreshing and rewarding to spend time reflecting on the development of their profession.

Individual Interviews With Current Adult Literacy Teachers

Because administrators predominated in the focus group sessions, it was important to conduct individual interviews with other practicing teachers of adult literacy. Ten additional teachers were interviewed (five from community colleges and five from various community-based organizations). This group was selected so as to represent a broad range of professional training and accomplishment in adult education. Five of the teachers had graduate degrees (two in adult education, two in education, one in reading), while five possessed only baccalaureate preparation. Four of the teachers had less than two years teaching experience in adult literacy, four had 5-8 years of experience, and two had been adult literacy teachers for more than 12 years. All of those interviewed were currently teaching ABE level students with less than eighth-grade achievement levels. The teachers were interviewed by telephone or in person with a specific set of questions. All of the teachers interviewed were willing participants, although the majority expressed surprise that anyone was researching issues related to their profession. Those interviewed were promised anonymity.

When teachers were asked to identify skills that adult literacy teachers need in order to do a good job, the majority identified awareness of adults' sensitivity about basic education, while others raised issues regarding the special nature of adult learning. Some responses emphasized the value of knowing how to teach reading, as well as other subjects. When asked how teachers should accomplish such learning, half of the respondents indicated graduate level study, while others suggested reading professional journals, attending workshops and seminars, and interactions with peers or mentors. Two teachers suggested that the necessary skills could not be taught.

The teachers were asked to evaluate their own understanding or accomplishments in several areas of adult literacy education including (a) teaching adults versus children, (b) theory of reading, (c) writing and math instruction, (d) curriculum theory, (e) psychology/counseling, (f) multicultural awareness, (g) assessment and evaluation processes, (h) learning disabilities, and (i) the selection and design or modification of instructional materials. With the exception of knowledge about learning disabilities, most respondents perceived themselves as qualified or skilled in the areas listed. Most indicated that experience was the primary mode through which they became qualified or skilled. Experience was followed by graduate coursework, workshops, and journal reading, in rank order. Six teachers indicated a need for more training in the area of learning disabilities, as well as math, counseling, reading and writing theory, ESL, and multicultural awareness.

All ten teachers responded that preservice training in the areas mentioned above would have a positive effect on program outcomes and student learning. When the teachers were asked if it was a problem that adult literacy teachers typically have less preservice training than elementary and secondary teachers, nine thought it was When asked what, if any, specific training

requirements should be adopted for adult literacy educators, all ten indicated that a bachelor's degree would be an appropriate minimum requirement. Four of the respondents suggested a master's degree, while two called for some type of specific certification in education or adult education.

All ten teachers indicated that specific training or degree requirements would be beneficial to adult educators and, in turn, to students. Because the teachers consider adult literacy education to be a specialization within the teaching field all ten consider it to be a profession. Seven reported, however, that they do not believe the profession is successfully meeting the needs of the student population. They attributed this failure to insufficient resources, and an overreliance on a part-time, underprepared teaching force.

Initially, only two teachers supported certification standards, but after answering questions and reflecting about the status and condition of their profession, seven then indicated that adult literacy teachers should be certified. They gave a number of reasons for this requirement, including the need to (a) establish a consistent, reliable profession; (b) weed out bad teachers; (c) elevate professional status; and (d) raise quality standards. Several noted that such an approach might lead to better pay or could help elicit more funding for the field. The three who did not favor certification were concerned that it might be too general to be helpful; they thought that the currently available graduate courses, workshops, and on-the-job experiences were sufficient training.

All ten teachers indicated that if the profession or state required that they become certified, then they would attempt to fulfill the requirements. Four of the teachers thought that their current backgrounds were probably sufficient for future certification requirements. However, one first-year teacher, who had been hired after tutoring for three months, stated, "I would feel better knowing that I had this job based upon a set of qualifications, instead of just being hired off the street." These teachers, like the state officials and the focus group participants, demonstrated a variety of views about teacher preparation. Most believed that some type of preservice education should be required as an entry standard, but wide disagreements were apparent concerning the reasons for such requirements, the effectiveness with which they might be administered, the appropriateness of various alternatives, and the expense. Teachers and administrators usually thought that they themselves were sufficiently skilled, but they were concerned about the professional competence of others and the low status and rewards for those in the field. Often, respondents made general remarks that seemed to reject the value of any kind of preservice training or certification requirements, but usually—when they reflected either on the quality of available instruction or on their own experiences in adult literacy education—their specific responses embraced the adoption of some kind of standards. The standards that they conceived of typically were reflective of their own experiences and expertise. In other words, most were concerned about the teacher preparation and certification of others—not themselves—underlining the difficulties of administering any such system. It should be noted, however, that the teachers said that they would seek certification if it was required, and program administrators said that they would use it in hiring.

PREMISES ON WHICH THE PROFESSIONALIZATION DEBATE FOUNDERS

Again and again, we have seen disagreements and disputes in discussions of professionalization in adult literacy education. Disagreements seemed central whether we were interviewing teachers, administrators, or state education officials, examining the professional literature, considering the experiences of other professional fields, or analyzing the ramifications of state policies. Many observers appear to value the specifics of teacher preparation, but claim that there should be no system of requirements. Teachers often believe that their training was essential to their success, but they seemed uncertain as to whether requiring such knowledge would be a good idea. Often, the debate turned not on the values of teacher preparation, but on related issues, such as flexibility and cost. Some observers supported a professionalization process because they thought it would raise teacher status and attract better funding, while others rejected this course because teacher status is so low and salaries so unattractive. State policies seem equally confused: They typically demand specific certification and training requirements for other aspects of education, but then suggest that such requirements are inappropriate, ineffective, unfair, or unmanageable with adult educators. Contradictions appear to dominate the discussions. This is most likely because many of these discussions have been based on a series of unstated premises or assumptions. Based on the various analyses reported here, we would like to describe five of these premises and suggest ways in which the contradictions might be resolved.

The professionalization of an occupation is not a dichotomous event (Darling-Hammond & Berry, 1988). Rather, the professionalization of the adult literacy teacher should be viewed as a process involving movement along a continuum of potential knowledge and skill-based standards that are necessary for teachers to acquire in order to meet students' needs. This suggests that there will be no final answer to establishing appropriate and effective teaching standards in adult literacy education. However, whether debate focuses on the establishment of initial standards or the revision of existing ones, it is imperative that there be fewer unstated, and therefore unexamined, premises dominating the arguments.

THE RIGHT TO BASIC EDUCATION

The first of these unstated premises has to do with the value and importance of adult basic education. Arguments about professionalization often seem to center on whether basic literacy education is seen as a fundamental right of adults or as "extra" education that society generously makes available to some of its citizens. If literacy education is a right, then it is critical that adults have effective teaching available as needed. If it is only a charitable gift, then quality is less of an issue and adult students should appreciate the teaching they receive. These days, few would dispute the need to support elementary and secondary schools, as it is obvious that children would have great difficulty participating in society without them. But what

about adults who have not yet developed the requisite basic skills to participate in the economic and civic activity of the society? There are many reasons why adults might lack such skills: the basic education that they received might have been of low quality; the literacy demands of society have increased, rendering earlier academic accomplishments insufficient; older Americans and immigrant populations often did not have opportunities to go to school or to learn to read and write in English; students might have suffered from some disability that limited their ability to gain sufficiently from schooling and so on. Does society's fundamental responsibility to provide basic education end at adulthood? If it does or if this right to education is uncertain, then there is little need for quality control in this area. A surprising number of state officials and individual teachers indicated that professionalization was expensive, but necessary. We increasingly came to believe that they took this position not out of insensitivity to the costs, but because of their assumption that adults needed this education and that they had a right to it.

THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROVIDE BASIC EDUCATION

A second premise, closely related to the first, has to do with who is responsible for providing basic education to adults. Historically, in American education, the state has been responsible for providing for the educational needs of children, but adults were expected to take care of their own educational needs. However, if basic literacy education is a fundamental right for all, then the state obviously must bear some responsibility for providing such education. Certainly, the role of government in education beyond the secondary level is not as clear as it is in elementary and secondary education. Since the passage of the Morrill Act in 1863, government has taken at least some role in postsecondary education. More relevant is government's involvement in adult literacy education—the Adult Education Act, the National Literacy Act, Education 2000, as well as many state and local laws and programs. But, while government has provided funding and programs in this area, it has rarely accepted any fundamental responsibility to do so. Arguments over professionalization have often focused on the premise of government responsibility.

We repeatedly heard arguments against professionalization based on fears of government intrusion into local programs or because of the added costs that government might have to bear. Even when respondents supported the idea of some kind of occupational entry requirements, they often appeared to argue with themselves over whether government could do this well or efficiently. The assumption of many seems to be that government is ultimately responsible for professionalization, and that such a process cannot proceed without government regulations. It should be remembered, however, that many fields have gone through professionalization without government action. The state usually becomes involved only if it appears that this is necessary to protect citizens from unscrupulous and unqualified practitioners, or if the service is perceived as a fundamental right. There is no reason why professional organizations cannot take the lead in establishing professional requirements in adult literacy education. In fact, the International Reading Association (IRA) has recently renewed its interest in establishing a set of standards to guide the professional development of adult literacy educators. Historically, state policymakers have turned to the IRA recommendations in developing standards for K-12 reading professionals. Even with professional guidance, however, because of the

widely held assumption that basic education is a fundamental right, it is not surprising that government action might be seen as the most appropriate safeguard of this right.

THE IMPORTANCE OF QUALIFIED TEACHERS

A third, often unstated, premise in arguments about professionalization concerns the importance of quality teachers. Those who believe that quality education is dependent on quality teaching, also often think that such quality should be required. When teaching quality is not viewed as central to program success, then certification is perceived as being less necessary. The idea that quality teaching is a necessary component in education is not new. As early as 1839, Horace Mann associated educational improvement with the better selection, training, and improved status of teachers. Each wave of educational reform since then has emphasized professionalization of teachers as a critical component of quality education. Unfortunately, the role of quality teaching in adult literacy education is less accepted.

The role of volunteers in adult literacy education often complicates this issue. Professionalization is seen as a rejection or marginalization of the efforts of weakly trained volunteers. Suggestions that teacher education training is needed to assure the highest quality of education appear to be criticisms of volunteer teachers, and, at some level, they certainly must be. However, those who call for greater professionalization do not necessarily reject volunteer involvement in literacy instruction, but believe that such participation should take place under the supervision of professional educators.

Another problem has been the assumption that adult progress is less dependent on teaching quality, because learning is so dependent upon motivation and the learners' own actions. "Since adults choose to enroll in basic education programs then they evidently have sufficient motivation to learn," the reasoning seems to go. However, it should be remembered that adults are increasingly required to seek basic education by employers, and that many have difficulty succeeding because of prior failures, learning problems, or the less-than-ideal educational circumstances in which they find themselves. The need for quality teaching, so obvious in the education of children, is likely to be just as necessary in the basic education of adults. If quality teaching is essential in adult education, then some governance of the profession—through governmental or professional action—might be needed to guarantee such quality.

THE POSSIBILITY OF IMPROVING TEACHING QUALITY

Even if we accept the central importance of quality teaching, is it possible to improve quality through increased requirements for education and teacher training? The professionalization debate often turns on the premise that teaching ability can be improved through the imposition of some kind of educational requirements or professional accomplishments. Critics of professionalization often cite the current crisis in elementary and secondary education as proof that certification and licensure are doomed to failure: "If it works so well, why are they having so much trouble?" Such arguments, though, are disingenuous at best. The benefits of professionalization in elementary and secondary education have been so fully realized in the system

that current concerns about the quality of education are largely irrelevant to any estimate of the value of professionalization. American schooling underwent almost constant improvement through the first half of this century (Stedman & Kaestle, 1987), and at least some of these gains are attributable to teacher improvement. Current complaints should not mislead anyone into thinking that the professionalization process failed, as today's schools—whatever their problems—are markedly better than their pre-professionalization forerunners. Educators whose focus is on improving K-12 education are not rejecting previous attempts at professionalization, but instead are adding to those requirements in order to assure even higher quality (Cassidy, 1993; NCTE, 1993).

Our interviews with teachers repeatedly highlighted their belief in the need for committed, caring teachers in adult literacy education. It seems obvious that training standards or new skill and knowledge requirements are unlikely to assure such personal attributes. Although some evidence supports the notion that more learning accrues with teachers who have received more training (Goodlad, 1990), we found no clear empirical support for this idea in adult literacy education. Those who call for greater professionalization often believe that new requirements will improve quality, and those who reject establishing more specific professional standards often do so because they do not believe improved quality to be a likely outcome.

Often the belief is that professional entry requirements are needed to provide specific knowledge or skills that could be directly used in teaching. However, the road to improved quality might be somewhat less direct than that. For instance, some teachers that we interviewed expressed the idea that better training and higher standards would result in better pay and improved status (an idea with which the state officials appeared to agree). It was often surmised that these improvements in teaching conditions would lead to improved dedication, stability, time availability, and communication among professionals, all of which might *eventually* have an impact on learning.

THE KNOWLDGE BASE FOR ADULT LITERACY EDUCATION

The fundamental idea of professionalization is that expertise and quality depend on knowledge. Those who believe that certification and licensure is a good idea in adult literacy education accept the notion that there is a body of professional knowledge worth pursuing. Often those who reject the idea of professionalization in this field seem to do so because they believe that such a collection of knowledge, understandings, skills, technologies, and ethics does not exist. Certainly, the information base of adult literacy is not as extensive as it should be. An examination of the Educational Resources Information Clearinghouse (ERIC) database shows that 1,210 research studies in adult literacy and 3,056 other documents on adult literacy have been generated since 1966. Although this might sound impressive, it only amounts to about 45 reported investigations per year, and, of course, not all of these are necessarily of the highest quality. For the sake of comparison, the more general field of reading education has generated 28,588 non-adult literacy studies in the same time period (and about 71,747 other documents, not including those on the reading of adults).

Our interviews showed that adult literacy educators depend on their knowledge of psychology, curriculum, instruction, and assessment specific to adult literacy learning. However, it was clear that they also considered information on more general issues of adult education (on this, ERIC has about 33,000 documents), second language learning, multiculturalism, and counseling to be relevant as well. Each of these areas represents rich sources of scholarship. There appears to be a core of information and skills that would benefit adult literacy educators, although there clearly is a need for the availability of even more research.

One additional point should be considered. Although many documents in ERIC or other databases emerge from teachers and administrators, or from independent agencies that conduct research, most are published by university professors and graduate students. One only has to look at the comparative number of college faculty devoted to elementary and adult education to understand the different rates of research and publication in the two fields. Again, considering the ERIC database, elementary education documents outnumber adult education ones by a margin of about 5:1. Is it that we have more professors of elementary education because there is so much more to know in that field, or is it that the availability of higher education resources devoted to elementary education has led to the development of a more sophisticated and ambitious knowledge base? Those who recommend that professionalization should wait until we have a greater knowledge base could be unintentionally limiting its development.

Even when discussions assume that an appropriate and adequate knowledge base exists, there can be serious disagreements over related issues of authority. Who determines which knowledge is relevant to adult literacy? The history of such disputes in other fields suggests that there is no simple answer. Usually such standards do not have a single source, but emerge from some combination of sources, including members of the profession through their professional organizations, individual scholars, and state regulators. Although it is common in those professions funded directly by tax dollars, that governmental regulation takes a primary role in standard setting, the history of such efforts suggests much wider participation—and even the adoption of extant professional standards.

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this paper was not to resolve the professionalization debate in adult literacy education, but to attempt to understand it. This understanding was sought through a review of the literature, consideration of the professionalization process of other fields, analysis of the state requirements for adult literacy teachers, and interviews and focus groups with teachers, administrators, and state education officials. What became most apparent to us was the great disparity of opinion and deep disagreement evident in the field around these issues. As we pursued the various lines of reasoning and argument, it became apparent to us that the disagreements

seemed so deep—and possibly unbridgeable—because they were often based on a series of unstated beliefs. We attempted, on the basis of our analysis, to identify the premises underlying these disagreements.

Sometimes the disagreements seemed to have their source in differing values or beliefs, such as those dealing with the educational rights of individuals and the responsibilities of the state. We have no illusions that such value-based disagreements will be resolved satisfactorily through empirical study. These are more likely to be resolved through open debate and discussion. However, we do not believe that these are static issues, either. As the economic and social demands for literacy continue to accelerate and the common good becomes increasingly reliant on the skills and abilities of all, individuals might change their views on these rights and responsibilities. We recommend that such debates, at least within the field's professional organizations, begin.

At other times, the points of dispute seemed to be more empirical in nature, although usually direct evidence on these issues was not yet available. For example, there were great disagreements about whether teacher training requirements would improve the quality of teaching. The role of training standards in educational outcomes is a complex problem, but one that can be evaluated through empirical research. The diversity of approaches taken by the various states creates an almost ideal laboratory for evaluating the effectiveness of various policies. We strongly recommend federal support for such research, and hope that this work will not initially assume too direct a connection between teacher training outcomes and student learning. It will probably be easier to link such policies with differences in instructional quality, the amount of time teachers devote to their students, or the stability of the workforce than to student learning. A clearer empirical determination of the benefits of at least one kind of state-administered certification program could resolve this disagreement.

Often the premises turned on a "chicken-and-egg" kind of reasoning. For instance, some argue for training standards because of the possibility that these might raise status and salaries (as has occurred in some other professions), while others oppose them because of the limited status and income of adult literacy teachers ("it wouldn't be fair"). The disagreements about the sufficiency of an appropriate body of knowledge and skill appear to founder in the same way; it seems doubtful that there will ever be such a body of knowledge unless it is created by those charged with the responsibility of educating practitioners in the field. These problems, much like the "chicken-and-egg" dispute, are unresolvable, and we do not believe that policymakers should be deterred by these particular discrepancies in opinion.

If these debates over professionalization are to be resolved in a satisfactory way, it is essential that adult literacy teachers themselves take a major role in it. However, even with their participation, debate seems likely to founder over these unstated issues. By focusing discussion more directly on each of the five premises identified in this paper, a more fruitful debate might be conducted. It would be presumptuous to assume that these are the only premises that will need to be confronted. However, it is clear to us that without a resolution to the arguments over these premises, progress is unlikely. Attention to these typically unstated premises could serve to unify the field through the promotion of a more common purpose, and it would allow more productive discussions to proceed concerning specific knowledge and skills requirements. Including all

stakeholders in such discussions is critical to ensuring their enfranchisement. Our interviews and focus group discussions revealed profound interest on the part of teachers and program directors in participating in such discussions regarding the future of their profession.

Finally, we were struck by the number of respondents who thanked us for giving them the opportunity to discuss these issues. Teachers and administrators uniformly appreciated the chance to reflect on the value of their own training and development and to speculate on what that training should be. State officials thanked us for our interest and expressed a desire for opportunities to share their experiences, insights, and strategies with the officials of other states in order to facilitate more effective professionalization policies. While researchers attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of various approaches to certification and licensure, as well as to increase the body of common knowledge, it would appear to be beneficial for the field to encourage and support these opportunities to share. Toward that end, we recommend the establishment of a series of policy forums that would involve state policymakers and government officials in continuing discussions around these issues.

The quality of the teaching force will be improved, ultimately, only through the close collaboration of practitioners, researchers, and policymakers. The success of such collaborations depends on finding common ground on issues concerning the rights of adults to education, state responsibility for that education, the role of teacher quality in providing it, the effectiveness of teacher training, and the existence of a body of knowledge about adult literacy education.

ENDNOTES

[1] This research was conducted with the support of the National Center on Adult Literacy.

[2] We do not intend to deal with the issue of volunteers here. Whether the quality of the professional teaching force is upgraded or not, volunteers are likely to continue to play an important role in adult literacy education.

[3] When discussing these issues, state officials always considered higher salaries for better prepared teachers to be part of this added cost. Although individual teachers might initially bear the cost of any system of preparation or certification, it is generally assumed by these policymakers that those costs would be recouped through direct reimbursement or eventually higher incomes.

REFERENCES

Boyd, R. G. (1973). The development of accreditation and its influence upon curriculum development in higher education. *Journal of Thought, 8*, 188-196.

Carlson, R. A. (1977). Professionalization of adult education: An historical-philosophical analysis. *Adult Education, 28*, 53-61.

Cinque, C. (1986). Aerobic instructor certification: Standards at last? *The Physician and Sports Medicine, 14*, 171-177.

Cope, J. L. (1983). *Feasibility of requiring and delivering certification for ABE teachers in Pennsylvania. Final report and recommendations.* Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania State Department of Education. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. 239 071)

Cranney, A. G. (1983). Two decades of adult reading programs: Growth, problems, and prospects. *Journal of Reading, 26*, 416-423.

Cross, K. P. (1986). *Adults as learners: Increasing participation and facilitating learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darkenwald, G. G. (1992). Adult education. In M. C. Alkin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational research* (Vol. 1, pp. 3[illegible]5). New York: Macmillan.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Berry, B. (1988). *The evolution of teacher policy.* Center for Policy Research in Education. US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERIG008690011).

Diekhoff, G. M. (1988). An appraisal of adult literacy programs: Reading between the lines. *Journal of Reading, 31*, 624-630.

Fingeret, A. (1984). *Adult literacy education: Current and future directions.* Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. 246 308)

Fironza, A. (1966). *Adult basic education study: Survey and directory of non-governmental agencies involved in adult basic education programs in the USA.* Washington, DC: Adult Education Association of the USA. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. 023 032)

Foster, S. E. (1988). *Professionalization of the adult literacy workforce.* Connecticut: Southport Institution for Policy Analysis. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. 302 680)

Galbraith, M. W. (1987). Certification would advance professional practice. *Lifelong Learning, 2*(2), 15-18.

Galbraith, M. W., & Gilley, J. W. (1985). An examination of professional certification. *Lifelong Learning, 9*(2), 12-15.

Gilley, J. W. (1985). *Professional certification: The procedures established, the issues addressed, and the qualification criteria adopted by professional associations and societies.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University.

Gilley, J. W., & Galbraith, M. W. (1988). Commonalities and characteristics of professional certification: Implications for adult education. *Lifelong Learning, 12*(1), 11-14.

Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Griffith, W. S., & Marcus, E. E. (1978). *Accreditation, certification, and licensing for adult education teachers—An examination of facts, opinions, and options.* Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. 194 704)

Harman, D. (1985). *Turning illiteracy around: An agenda for national action*. New York: Business Council for Effective Literacy. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. 308 342)

Hoffman, L. M. G. (1980). ABE reading instructions: Give them something to read. *Community College Review*, (Summer), 32-37.

Kazemek, F. E. (1988). Necessary changes: Professional involvement in adult literacy programs. *Harvard Educational Review, 58*, 464-497.

Kutner, M., Herman, R., Stephenson, E., Webb, L., Tibbetts, J., & Klein, M. (1991). *Study of ABE/ESL instructor training approaches: State profiles report*. Washington, DC: Pelavin Associates. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. 338 605)

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1992). Professional development of teachers. In M. C. Alkin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational research* (Vol. 3, pp. 1045-1051). New York: Macmillan.

Lopez, N. (1992). *A policy issue response*. Paper presented at the Literacy Policy Forum Conference, National Conference for Adult Literacy, Washington, DC.

Lytle, S. L., Belzer, A., & Reumann, R. (1993). *Developing the professional workforce for adult literacy education* (PB92-02). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, National Center on Adult Literacy.

Marlowe, M. (1991). *Adult basic skills instructor training project. Phase I and phase II*. Boone, NC: Appalachian State University. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. 328 708)

Miller, E. L. (1976). *Professionalism and its impact on accreditation-type programs*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor.

Monroe, P. (Ed.). (1915). Certification of teachers. *A cyclopedia of education* (pp. 560-563). New York: Macmillan.

Morrison, R., & Carter, E. A. (1992). Licensure, certification, and registration. In M. C. Alkin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational research* (Vol. 2, pp. 746-753). New York: Macmillan.

Nadler, L. (1985). Adult basic education. In T. Husen & N. T. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of education* (Vol. 1, pp. 105-207). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Council of Teachers of English (1965). *Language problems for the disadvantaged*. Champaign, IL: NCTE. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. 036 506)

National Council of Teachers of English. (1993). Language arts teachers first eligible for national certification. *The Council Chronicle*, (September), 1-8.

Paxton and Associates. (1990, August). CLEAR listing of who's licensed where shows diversity of regulated occupations in U.S. *Professional Licensing Report*, 1-3.

Pugsley, R. (1990). *Vital statistics: Who is served by the Adult Education Program?* Washington, DC: Division of Adult Education and Literacy, U.S. Department of Education.

Rippletoe, J., & Maes, S. (1979). *The role of community based education as an instrument for community mobilization. Coming Home: Community based education and development of communities*. Washington, DC: Clearinghouse for Community-Based Free Standing Educational Institutions.

Seidman, I. E. (1991). *Interviewing as qualitative research*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sheats, P. H., Jayne, C. D., & Spence, R. B. (1953). *Adult education: The community approach.* New York: Dryden Press.

Sherman, R. Z., Kutner, M., Webb, L., & Herman, R. (1991). *Key elements of adult education teacher and volunteer training programs.* Washington, DC: Pelavin Associates.

Sigeirst, H. E. (1935). The history of medical licensure. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 104,* 1057-1060.

Smith, E. H., Palmer, B. C., & Evanson, J. L. (1979). Training the ABE specialist: What is needed? *Adult Literacy and Basic Education, 3,* 100-104. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. 219 221)

Stedman, L. C., & Kaestle, C. F. (1987). Literacy and reading performance in the United States, from 1880 to the present. *Reading Research Quarterly, 12,* 8-46.

Sykes, G. (1992). Teacher licensure and certification. In M. C. Alkin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational research.* (Vol. 3, pp. 1352-1366). New York: Macmillan.

Tibbetts, J., Kutner, M., Hemphill, D., & Jones, E. (1991). *The delivery and content of training for adult education teachers and volunteer instructors.* Washington, DC: Office of Vocational and Adult Education.

Ulmer, C. (1980). Teaching in adult basic education. *New Directions for Continuing Education, 6,* 9-15. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. 235 963)

Zimpher, N. L. (1985). Certification and licensing of teachers. In T. Husen & N. T. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of education* (pp. 660-663). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

APPENDIX

Table 1

The Relationship Between State Teacher Preparation Requirements and the Deployment of the Teaching Force

	Percentage of Full-Time Paid Teachers	Percentage of Part-Time Paid Teachers	Percentage of Volunteer Teachers
States with no preparation requirements (n=24)	5%	45%	50%
States that require elementary/secondary teacher certification (n=17)	7%	51%	42%
States with specific adult education standards (n=9)	9%	45%	46%

Note. Data summarized from Kutner, Herman, Stephenson, Webb, Tibbetts, & Klein, 1991.

Table 2

Average Percentage of Teacher Training Expenditures by Source for States

	Percentage of Teacher Training Budget From Section 353 Funds	Percentage of Teacher Training Budget From Non-353 Funds
States with no preparation requirements (n=24)	57%	43%
States that require elementary/secondary teacher certification (n=17)	78%	22%
States with specific adult education standards (n=9)	86%	14%
Combined averages for states with any kind of standards (n=26)	74%	26%

Note. Data summarized from Kutner, Herman, Stephenson, Webb, Tibbetts, & Klein, 1991.

Table 3

Relationship of Teacher Certification Standards and Proportion of Funding Provided for Adult Basic Education

	Percentage of States Providing Greater Than 50% of Adult Basic Education Allocation	Percentage of States Providing Greater Than 70% of Adult Basic Education Allocation
States with no preparation requirements (n=24)	46%	21%
States that require elementary/secondary teacher certification (n=17)	59%	41%
States with specific adult education standards (n=9)	89%	78%
Combined averages for states with any kind of standards (n=26)	69%	54%

Note. Data summarized from Kutner, Herman, Stephenson, Webb, Tibbetts, & Klein, 1991.