DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 411 883 JC 970 467

AUTHOR	Ho, Ching-jung
TITLE	Lifelong Learning and Basic Literacy: Adult Literacy Education in Chinese Taipei.
PUB DATE	1997-00-00
NOTE	15p.; In: Lifelong Learning: Policies, Practices, and Programs; see JC 970 458.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; *Adult Literacy; Educational Objectives; Educational Policy; Foreign Countries; *Lifelong Learning; National Programs; Program Improvement; *Role of Education
IDENTIFIERS	Taiwan (Taipei)

ABSTRACT

Although Chinese Taipei has adopted lifelong learning as an educational goal, adult literacy education programs have not been based on their tenets. Lifelong learning is a deliberate process that emphasizes the autonomy of learners and a breadth of learning throughout the life span. The two adult literacy programs in Chinese Taipei, Supplementary Education Program (SEP) and Adult Basic Education Program (ABEP), focus on listening, speaking, reading, writing, and numeracy abilities and are offered by elementary teachers in elementary schools. Rather than incorporate elements of lifelong learning, however, these programs are static, conservative, narrowly applied, and isolated. They tend to focus on basic speaking, reading, and writing skills and only superficially address practical issues related to functional literacy. In addition, the notion of literacy for empowerment is completely absent, with practitioners still counting the number of words that students should learn as the criteria for literacy education. To realize the potential for adult literacy training and provide a supportive platform for lifelong learning opportunities, Chinese Taipei should expand the role of ABEP, improve the flexibility of SEP, encourage other institutions to provide literacy training, and improve teacher training programs. Contains 32 references. (BCY)

Lifelong Learning and Basic Literacy: Adult Literacy Education in Chinese Taipei

Ching-jung Ho

In: Lifelong Learning: Policies, Practices, and Programs

Lifelong Learning and Basic Literacy: Adult Literacy Education in Chinese Taipei

by Ching-jung Ho

Lifelong learning is a deliberate process; it must emphasize learners' autonomy and life-wide learning as well as learning throughout the lifespan. This paper argues that a paradigm for understanding and evaluating adult literacy comes directly from within the lifelong learning context. In essence, adult literacy education, as a primary subset of lifelong learning, should emulate the best and strongest characteristics associated with lifelong learning. In Chinese Taipei, with respect to adult literacy programs, this is not the case. Even though the accomplishments of adult literacy programming have been documented, in fact, adult literacy programs are static, conservative, narrowly applied and isolated. The solution is to adopt, through specific strategies, an integrated, flexible, broad-based approach to the development and delivery of adult literacy programming; to, in effect, make it part and parcel, the first plank if you will, of lifelong learning.

INTRODUCTION

Recently, lifelong learning has become an agreeable, almost seductive, goal in Chinese Taipei, advocated, encouraged and endorsed by a host of ministries, government departments, councils and agencies. The Ministry of Education has just proposed a policy titled the "Middle Term Plan for the Development of Adult Education towards Lifelong Learning" (Ministry of Education, 1996), and the Council for Culture Planning and Development, Executive Yuan, has connected lifelong learning with community reform, as an essential means for developing and transforming Chinese Taipei society (Chen, 1996). Even the President, Teng-hui Lee, has incorporated in many of his speeches, directly and indirectly, the importance of building a "learning society".

Rhetoric aside, do our educational policies and practices at all levels reflect the active, dynamic, integrated and seamless principles that are typically associated with the best aspects of lifelong learning? Or are there unfulfilled promises and limitations associated with the actual implementation of lifelong learning in our educational policies and practices? In order to move beyond the slogans and take a serious, reflective and measured view of lifelong learning in Chinese Taipei, this paper addresses the following: (a) How should the concepts associated with lifelong learning be used as the basis for adult literacy education policies and practices in

Taipei, and (b) what recommendations can be made for the actualization, rather than simple promotion, of a lifelong learning culture within the adult basic education and literacy context.[1]

During the past few years, adult literacy education has been a central concern within the adult education community. In response, the Government developed and implemented a new program titled "Adult Basic Education Program" (ABEP), and at the same time made great efforts to improve the older literacy related program titled "Supplementary Education Program for the Stages of Fundamental Schooling (Grade 1 through Grade 9)" (SEP). Since 1991, enrolment in ABEP has increased dramatically. In 1991 there were 63 ABEP sections offered in 41 schools; however, by the first session of the 1994 school year this had increased to 493 ABEP sections offered in 352 schools (Ministry of Education, 1991a, 1994a). Annually, there are approximately 10,000 ABEP graduates (Ministry of Education, 1993, 1994a). With regard to SEP, growth has also been very fast. In the 1990 school year, 138 elementary schools offered SEP, with a total enrolment of 19,415 students (Ministry of Education, 1991b). By 1993, 292 schools offered SEP, enroling 24,975 students (Ministry of Education, 1994b). Thus, from 1990 to 1993 the number of elementary schools offering SEP grew by 154 or 112%, and an additional 5,560 students enroled, representing an increase of 29%. However, in spite of the additional facilities and the growth in the participation rate, ABEP and SEP drop-out rates continue to be very high and many think the learning materials are too difficult and complicated for all but above average students (Ho, Ho, Tsai & Hsieh, 1995).

To develop an understanding of the key issues and forces at work in this paradigm, and to offer recommendations, requires a broad examination of the adult literacy education polices and practices in Chinese Taipei. This examination demonstrates broadly how the operational definition of adult literacy education may be understood as a critical basis for lifelong learning policies and practice, or the lack thereof, and specifically how certain changed practices would be beneficially important to the illiterate portion of the population.

LIFELONG LEARNING AND ADULT LITERACY

Learning is a natural lifelong process. However, lifelong learning is more than a simple experiential activity; it comprises deliberate learning and the associated processes that give rise to certain meanings, interpretations and purposes. As Jarvis (1992, pp. 11-12) pointed out, learning is:

> *of the essence of everyday living and of conscious experience; it is the process of transforming that experience into knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, and beliefs. It is about the continuing process of making sense of everyday experience... . Learning is, therefore, a process of giving meaning to, or seeking to understand, life experiences ... [however] ... unless provision is made for learning, the experience of everyday living may be restrictive, and learning may be limited to the primary experiences of life.*

[1] Definitions of adult basic education and adult literacy education are not the same; however, they are used interchangeably in Chinese Taipei. In this article, the term "adult literacy education" encompasses "adult basic education".

More specifically, "deliberate" learning (see Tough, 1971) is a significant component of lifelong learning and, as Knapper & Cropley (1985, p. 20) noted, has a multiplicity of characteristics. For example, deliberate learning is intentional, and learners are aware that they are learning. It has definite and specific goals, and is not directed at vague generalizations such as developing the mind. The goals provide the rationale that motivates the learner, as compared with other factors such as "boredom". Further, the learner intends to retain what has been learned for a significant period of time.

From a broader and more inclusive perspective, Cropley & Knapper (1983, p. 17), describe lifelong learning as lasting for the whole lifetime of the learner; leading to the orderly acquisition, renewal, upgrading or completion of knowledge, skills and attitudes; fostering and depending for its existence on people's increasing ability and motivation to engage in learning, much of the time without dependence upon traditional schools or school-like institutions; and depending on the contribution of all available educational influences including formal, non-formal and informal.

Effective lifelong learners need to be self-directed learners. Knapper and Cropley (1985) describe effective learners as being aware of the relationship between learning and real life, cognizant of the need for learning throughout the lifespan, motivated to learn throughout the lifespan, and in possession of a self-concept supportive of lifelong learning. Specific skills for lifelong learning include the ability to set personal objectives in a realistic way; the ability to apply knowledge already possessed; the ability to evaluate one's own learning; the ability to locate information; the ability to use different learning strategies and learn in different settings; the ability to use learning aids, such as libraries or the media; and the ability to use and interpret materials from different subject areas. Above all, lifelong learning must emphasize learners' autonomy and learning life-wide (a wide breadth of learning, not simply length of learning) as well as throughout the lifespan. These are basic principles for lifelong learning of all stripes, including adult literacy education. The question addressed in the following sections of this paper is to what degree these characteristics and skills are supported in the delivery of one component of the lifelong learning continuum, namely, adult literacy education.

ADULT LITERACY EDUCATION

A review of the literature supports the conclusion that literacy is an abstract term. It changes with time, and has no agreed upon common definition (see Campbell, Kirsch & Kolstad, 1992; Cervero, 1985; Fingeret, 1992; Hunter & Harman, 1979; Imel & Grieve, 1985; Jarvis, 1990; Levine, 1986). According to *An International Dictionary of Adult and Continuing Education*, literacy has at least three common definitions (see Jarvis, 1990, p. 204). For example, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) defines a functional literate person as one who has acquired the knowledge and skills in reading and writing which enable that person to engage effectively in all activities in which literacy is normally assumed to be required within that specific culture or group. Other definitions

include a reading age level of 9.5 years, or five years of completed schooling.

UNESCO's definition rests on a concept known as "functional literacy", a perspective which was widely adopted in the 1950s and broadly applied through the 1970s. According to this view, the meaning of literacy depends on and changes in accordance with the individual, as well as with the time and place. A synthesis by Hunter and Harman (1979, pp. 7-8) describes functional literacy in the following manner, with an emphasis on the individual perspective:

> *[It is] the possession of skills perceived as necessary by particular persons and groups to fulfil their own self-determined objectives as family and community members, citizens, consumers, job-holders, and members of social, religious, or other associations of their choosing. This includes the ability to obtain information they want and to use that information for their own and others' well-being; the ability to read and write adequately to satisfy the requirements they set for themselves as being important for their own lives; the ability to deal positively with demands made on them by society; and the ability to solve the problems they face in their daily lives.*

Based on the functional literacy noted earlier, obviously, basic literacy benchmarks are being elevated as technology becomes more pervasive and increasingly complex. To a greater and greater degree, literacy is a crucial prerequisite for obtaining information and using basic technology. Without basic literacy, it is increasingly difficult to fulfil goals that form the basis for a comfortable and fulfilling life in a developed economy. In this sense, learning for literacy is the most basic stepping stone in life-wide and lifelong learning.

Literacy is not simply a mechanism for adjustment in order to "fit" or "survive". As Scribner (1984) pointed out, literacy has at least two other principal functions: first, it furnishes power; and second, it contributes to a "state of grace". Literacy as power emphasizes the liberating nature of knowledge. As Freire (1970, p. 205) suggested, literacy "is truly an act of knowing, through which a person is able to look critically at the culture which has shaped him, and to move toward reflection and positive action upon his world." Literacy as a state of grace is perhaps best appreciated and understood as the tendency in many societies to endow literacy with exceptional virtues. Examples can be seen in Chinese sayings such as "beauties are in books", "gold is hidden in books" and "bookish traditions are superior to everything".

The power and grace functions of literacy are not contradictory and, as this researcher (Ho, 1995a, p. 63) has noted, "the kind of education which [Chinese Taipei] presently lacks is how to help individuals with life adjustment and then how to empower them to participate in cultural creation." In this context, learning for literacy becomes a broad lifelong learning endeavour, and particularly so within the functional literacy context where the needs of the individual are continually changing. (In concrete terms, it is interesting to consider how dramatically levels of computer literacy have changed in the past twenty years.)

The purpose of adult literacy education cannot be limited to helping people obtain conventional reading, writing, mathematical, and the somewhat newer addi-

tion, computing abilities. Literacy must be a mechanism for empowerment, unleashing creative and inquisitive energy. This means that structures and programming to support adult literacy in Chinese Taipei must be centred on a holistic view of lifelong learning and giving power to people (see Ho, 1995a, p. 63). In effect, the characteristics of effective lifelong learning need to be embedded within literacy education, and the target groups for literacy education need to be defined quite broadly.

ADULT LITERACY – PROGRAMS AND POLICIES

As mentioned earlier, there are two adult literacy programs in Chinese Taipei: SEP and ABEP. The former was established on the basis of the Supplementary Education Act of 1976, and can be traced to the idea of using supplementary education to compensate for the shortage of the provisions of formal education that existed since the late Ching Dynasty (Ke, 1993, p. 491). (The Supplementary Education Act was revised in 1982, yet the basic rationale for SEP has not been changed.) The goals of the Supplementary Education Act are as follows: "to complement citizens' life knowledge [and] raise educational levels; to teach practical skills [and] increase productive competence; [and] to cultivate healthy citizens [and] promote the development of the society" (Ministry of Education, 1976). According to the fourth item of the Act, SEP includes both elementary and junior high school levels, and was established for people who are beyond the fundamental school age of 15 (Ministry of Education, 1976). Elementary SEP is divided into two sub-levels: six months to one year at the Junior Level, and one and one half years to two years at the Senior Level. Graduates from elementary schools' SEP are seen to be equivalent to graduates from elementary schools (Grade 1 through Grade 6). At the junior high school level, the length of SEP is no less than three years, and graduates from this level are equivalent to graduates from junior high schools (Grade 7 through Grade 9) (Ministry of Education, 1976). Graduates from both the elementary school or junior high school level of SEP receive certificates following completion of their studies.

In 1990, statistics showed that there were about 1,340,000 illiterate people in Chinese Taipei (Ministry of Education, 1991c). At that same time, Western notions of "adult basic education" and "functional literacy" as well as adult education had been introduced into Chinese Taipei (Ho, 1996). As a result, the Government started to review policies pertaining to adult literacy education, and it was found that the elementary level SEP, the only adult literacy education program, contained many shortcomings (Ministry of Education, 1991c). For example, with its long history of being subordinate to fundamental education, SEP did not even have its own facilities, including desks and chairs for students. Also, SEP was not large enough to meet the demands for literacy education. As a result of this review, improvements were made to SEP, and as well ABEP was initiated through the Working Project of Adult Education Plan of 1990 and the Hsin-min (New People) Project: A Five-Year Plan of Adult Basic Education of 1991. Officially, ABEP is considered to be equivalent to the Junior Level of the supplementary program of elementary education and is connected to the Senior Level of SEP in elementary schools.

The purpose of adult literacy education in Chinese Taipei is to "cultivate the lis-

tening, speaking, reading, writing and numeracy abilities of those who have been unable to attend schools in order to complement their basic life knowledge and skills and raise their educational levels" (Ho, 1996, p. 19). Both SEP and ABEP are offered through elementary schools in the evening and are taught by elementary school teachers. However, SEP is a regular program based on law and funded through local governments, whereas ABEP is project-based, temporary by nature and funded through the Ministry of Education. Accordingly, SEP follows the national curriculum standards and uses the same textbooks which are based on the rationale of fundamental education (Ho, 1995a, p. 61). ABEP does not use these texts, and in fact, because of a lack of textbooks, ABEP teachers are encouraged to prepare some of their own teaching materials. As well, the Ministry of Education provides funds directly to the elementary schools and recruits experts to compose learning materials for ABEP literacy programs. As previously mentioned, concepts associated with functional literacy as well as adult education have been accepted in Chinese Taipei since 1990, and as a result practical aspects have been used as a basis for the development of ABEP learning materials (see Ho, 1996, pp. 19-20).

There are some policy issues associated with these programs. First, literacy education in this context is considered to be a reimbursement device or a form of social welfare directed solely at older adults who were deprived of educational opportunities because of the political and economic fluctuations that occurred in Chinese Taipei during the 1940s. From the explicit policy, one may not see this social welfare rationale. However, since the fundamental school entrance rate is very high, it is widely believed that, if illiterates do exist in this country, they are older adults. This is demonstrated, for example, by the design of a popular television program for illiterates titled "Every Day is Study Day". Its songs and lessons are clearly designed for older adults (Ho et al., 1995). When operationalized, this narrow view of the illiterate population automatically excludes certain segments and sets limits for the function and application of literacy education. Research has identified at least four target groups for basic literacy education, and the targeted group of older adults represents only about one third of this population (Ho, 1995a, 1995b). Other groups include: (a) people who are younger than 50 years of age and who may have participated in fundamental education at one time or another but dropped out before developing basic skills; (b) people who speak and understand partial Mandarin and who would benefit from learning the language to a functional level; and (c) foreign labourers who came to Chinese Taipei after the job market opened during the past few years and who have now temporarily settled here.

A second issue associated with these policies is the fact that basic literacy education is confused with supplementary education, and the result is that neither is able to fulfil its potential. ABEP, with funding from the Ministry of Education, is viewed quite simplistically as an impermanent device to promote adult literacy education under the given shortage of opportunities available through SEP. With no summer classes, the total length of ABEP training is nine months, and students are only allowed legally to enrol once since the program is considered to be the equivalent of the Junior Level of SEP elementary education, which in turn is connected to the Senior Level of SEP in elementary schools. In fact, a survey by Ho et al. (1995)

found that many students returned to the same ABEP classes in subsequent years, expressing a desire for expanded literacy programs of more than one year. They did not enrol in SEP to continue their literacy learning because they did not want the full SEP curriculum, just the Mandarin courses. This situation not only identifies a gap between the continuation of the Senior Level of SEP in elementary schools and ABEP, but also reveals that the older design of SEP does not address the need for basic literacy education.

Originally, SEP had as its main purpose the education of youths who did not complete elementary schooling. The goal was to help them learn basic reading and writing and numeracy skills. As the fundamental schools' entrance rates have increased with each passing year, adults, and more specifically older adults, have become the main target for SEP. SEP's curricula, standards, materials, and teaching approaches, however, were not designed for an older age group, nor do they even touch on fulfilling broader lifelong learning tasks such as preparation for retirement and leisure time activities. With its strong conventional and very formal educational features, SEP is not only unsuitable for adult learners, but may also be unsuitable for the underprepared youth groups. In effect, through SEP, adult literacy education has been implemented as traditional school-based education delivered at least partly in a form contextually designed for young people. This reflects a narrow view of literacy, a narrow pedagogical perspective, and dismissal of the best characteristics of lifelong learning.

Conventional and restrictive practices for adult literacy education are also seen at the level of provision. For example, even though the Ministry of Education has created a policy that encourages institutions in addition to the publicly funded schools to support adult literacy programming, these private institutions are required to cooperate with publicly funded schools in order to get subsidies (Ho et al., 1995). This continues to have a tremendously limiting effect on the provision of adult literacy education and is inconsistent with one of the most basic principles of lifelong learning - providing as many different opportunities for as many people in as many forms and venues as possible.

According to a survey by Ho et al. (1995), there are a number of other key issues associated with the delivery of adult literacy education in Chinese Taipei. For example, most of the teachers delivering adult literacy courses are elementary school teachers. These teachers have little or no training specific to the teaching of adults. For many of them, teaching in adult literacy classes is just an extra job. In addition, the curriculum is far too weighty. It emphasizes a foundation appropriate for learners who plan to spend many years in the formal system of education. The content of SEP avoids a practical approach, stressing instead abstract, enigmatic and even obscure cases. As a result, the attrition rate is as high as 43% (Ho et al., 1995).

As mentioned earlier, for older learners, attending SEP and ABEP is psychological compensation for earlier lost learning opportunities. These learners are very humble in their approach to learning, assuming and accepting the merits of education, learning, and schools with no questions or doubts. Though this view brings a respectful attitude and strong measure of support to the learning environment, it also tends to foster passive learning, a learning style that makes the acquisition of

language and mathematical skills difficult. Younger learners, on the other hand, differ in their attitudes and performance. More often, they come to SEP and ABEP for certificates in order to better their lot in life by achieving basic literacy levels and then moving on to other studies.

Even though the policies and programs used to support adult literacy education in Chinese Taipei have drawbacks, accomplishments have been documented. For example, Ho et al. (1995) identified the following as achievements of the current system: (a) it helps selected learners acquire basic Mandarin; (b) it broadens the learners' vision of society and improves attitudes and temperament; (c) it promotes and actually increases grandparent to child and parent to child communications; (d) it increases the quality of leisure time in the learners' lives; (e) it provides learners with a sense of self-satisfaction; and (f) it establishes a bridge between schools and communities. This study also found that some learners view literacy as a means to awaken their interest in self, life, and learning even though that was not the original intention of the policies.

LIMITATIONS OF ADULT LITERACY EDUCATION

The above mentioned programs and practices carry implicit but generally unstated views with regard to the meanings of literacy, learning, education, and lifelong learning as these pertain to the broader society. Inappropriately, literacy classes for the most part focus narrowly and directly on basic speaking, reading, writing, and numeracy skills. Even though the term "functional literacy" has been used in Chinese Taipei for many years, the implications described earlier in the paper are, from a policy and curriculum development perspective, only superficially in evidence if at all. For example, training that deals with some of the practical problems associated with day-to-day living, such as paying bills and completing application forms, are incorporated into literacy curriculum. However, as described by Heath (1986), higher level and, ultimately, more meaningful applications such as social-interaction activities, news-related contexts, memory-supportive frameworks, and substitutes for oral messages are not embedded in adult literacy education. The notion of literacy for empowerment is completely absent, and practitioners still count the number of words that students should learn as the criteria for literacy education. As a result, literacy is isolated from the socio-cultural context. This static view of literacy ensures that it remains apart and separate from the lifelong learning context.

Literacy education in Chinese Taipei is narrowly defined and operationalized as school education or formal education at a primary level. This is documented by the actual policies as well as the learners' needs, attitudes and levels. Although ABEP and SEP do attract learners, they only deal with the small subset who are willing to come to schools and study in a conservative and non-adaptive environment. Unjustifiably, illiterates who are unwilling or unable to survive in the formal school context have no options. This creates what Mezirow, Darkenwald and Knox (1975) referred to as the "creaming effect". The original intention may have been egalitarian, but the effect is quite different.

As previously mentioned, in Chinese Taipei it is common for learning to be associated with the development of a state of grace. Also, people generally link learning

most directly to formal education and schooling. These thoughts, in turn, further influence people's attitudes toward adult literacy education. It can also be concluded that adult literacy education is not a broad topical issue, in part because the elementary school entrance rate in Chinese Taipei exceeds 99%. This creates a general perception that there is no serious illiteracy problem and that illiteracy tends to be first and foremost an issue for the least developed economies. It is widely believed that, if illiterates do exist in Chinese Taipei, they are older adults who did not, and perhaps did not find it necessary to, complete their fundamental education in the elementary school system. In fact, as described in this paper, illiteracy in Chinese Taipei is not effectively addressed by the current programs and policies (see Ho, 1995b).

Responding to adult literacy needs through the formal school system mitigates against the development of learner-based lifelong learning tools as described by Knapper and Cropley (1985) and noted earlier in this paper. In Chinese Taipei, schools have a long history of being instruments for controlling knowledge. Examinations, for example, have been institutionalized to the degree that they overpower the educational system, becoming the end instead of the means. In this context, formal schooling stands as the symbol for the official, standardized approach for literacy training and rates. The way literacy is currently taught and institutionalized completely ignores the notion that it can be a tool for participation, power and for the development of fundamental skills - self direction as a key example - that provide the basic sustenance for full and active participation in the lifelong learning process.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to realize the potential for adult literacy training, and at the same time provide an accommodating and supportive platform for the transition to the full range of lifelong learning opportunities, there needs to be change in the definitions, goals, platforms and policies regarding literacy, learning and lifelong learning in Chinese Taipei.

Learning needs to be viewed as a process whereby meaning and purpose is constructed throughout one's lifetime. Through learning, the depth and breadth of life is enlarged and enhanced, making learning life-wide as well as lifelong. Literacy is the most fundamental tool for awakening individuals' interests in self, life, and learning. True learning for literacy should, as Mezirow (1991) stated, help learners transform their perspectives about life. Thus, literacy and learning should not be confined to basic writing, reading, and calculating skills. Instead, literacy needs to be a vehicle whereby empowerment is the legitimate end. At the same time, learners need to learn how to learn, and they need to become self-directed learners, something that doesn't happen within the current more formal and narrow setting. Also, learners also need to assume responsibility for their own learning.

With regard to policy, it is important to include avenues and opportunities for all groups in need of basic adult literacy programming, including drop-outs, foreign labourers, and older illiterates. Also, different levels, different contexts, and different providers need to be available and drawn into the mix. Adult literacy education

r) beyond schools and reach out to communities as well as families. This is particularly important in that it will draw people who have negative attitudes towards schools, and encourage them to attend. Also, it helps break stereotypes about schools, education and the student-teacher relationship, and in turn renews and broadens the public's view of learning. Community-based and family-directed literacy programs are essential, and there is much to learn from English as a Second Language Programming used in the United States and other countries (see Fingeret, 1984; Nickse, 1990). Most importantly, adult literacy students need to become active, self-directed, autonomous learners if they are to continue down the lifelong learning continuum.

In summary, the Ministry of Education needs to achieve a number of objectives. These include: redefining and expanding the role of ABEP; amplifying the SEP functions making the programming delivery and design more flexible; encouraging a host of institutions to provide adult literacy education; re-inventing and emphasizing teacher training programs; developing new approaches for teaching and skill training; revising learning materials, and encouraging studies and experiments to evaluate and enhance teaching methods and materials; and, most importantly, linking adult basic literacy to a wide range of lifelong learning activities and opportunities. This latter point is what will draw adult basic literacy programming out of its narrow and confining shell and into the broader learning context rightfully associated with responsible holistic participation in the society at large. Redefined, restructured and revamped adult basic literacy programming and practices will do much for groups that are currently excluded from the opportunities associated with full participation in a learning society, and in the end the entire community will benefit from increased cohesion and economic potential.

REFERENCES

Campbell, A., Kirsch., & Kolstad, A. (1992). *Assessing literacy: The framework for the National Adult Literacy Survey*. Educational Testing Service and Westat, Inc.

Chen, C. N. (1996). *Lifelong learning and community holistic construction.* [Translated]. Paper presented in Rooted in Communities for Lifelong Learning: Community Adult education Symposium. Kaohsiung: National Kaohsiung Normal University.

Cervero, R. M. (1985). Is a common definition of adult literacy possible? *Adult Education Quarterly*, *36*(1), 50-54.

Cropley, A. J. & Knapper, C. K. (1983). Higher education and the promotion of learning. *Studies in Higher Education*, *8*(1), 15-21.

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

Fingeret, H.A. (1992). *Adult literacy education: Current and future directions.* ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career and Vocational Education, Columbus, Ohio. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354 391)

Freire, P. (1970). The adult literacy process as cultural action for freedom. *Harvard Educational Review*, *40*(2), 205-225.

Heath, S. B. (1986). The functions and uses of literacy. In S. de Castell, A. Luke, & K. Egan (Eds.), *Literacy, society, and schooling: A reader* (pp. 15-26). Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ho, C. J. (1995a). An examination of adult literacy education in Taiwan based on an analysis of the meaning of literacy and literacy education related issues. *Kaohsiung Normal University Journal, 6*, 45-68.

Ho, C. J. (1995b). Myths and reflections in adult literacy in Taiwan. [Translated]. *Taiwan Education Review*, *535*, 23-28.

Ho, C. J. (1996). Reflections on limitations and moving forward: A study of essential issues in adult literacy education in Taiwan. [Translated]. *Taipei Adult Education Information Centre Quarterly*, *12*, 17-22.

Ho, C. J., Ho, J. T., Tsai, P. T., & Hsieh, D. C. (1995). *Planning of adult literacy education based on learners' characteristics*. [Translated]. Kaohsiung: National Kaohsiung Normal University.

Hunter, C. S. J., & Harman, D. (1979). *Adult illiteracy in the United States: A report to the Ford Foundation*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Imel, S., & Grieve, S. (1985). *Adult literacy education*. Overview. Columbus, Ohio: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 259 210)

Jarvis, P. (Ed.). (1990). *An international dictionary of adult education*. London: Routledge.

Jarvis, P. (1992). *Paradoxes of learning: On becoming an individual in society*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ke, J. F. (1993). The Supplementary Education Act. In Y. H. Chen (Ed.) *An analysis of main educational laws and regulations in the Republic of China*. (pp. 485-518) [Translated]. Taipei: Wu-nan.

Knapper, C., & Cropley, A. J. (1985). *Lifelong learning and higher education*. London: Croom Helm.

Levine, K. (1986). *The social context of literacy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mezirow, J., Darkenwald, G., & Knox, A. (1975). *Last gamble on education*. Washington, DC: AEA.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ministry of Education (1976). *Supplementary education act.* [Translated]. Taipei: Author.

Ministry of Education (1991a). *Handbook for the subsidized adult basic education programs in the first and second sessions of school year 1991.* [Translated]. Taipei: Author.

Ministry of Education (1991b). *Education statistics of the Republic of China*. Taipei: Author.

Ministry of Education (1991c). *Hsin-min Project: A five-year plan of adult basic education*. [Translated]. Taipei: Author.

Ministry of Education (1993). *The materials for applying the adult basic education program of 1994*. [Translated]. [Unpublished raw data]. Taipei: Author.

Ministry of Education (1994a). *The materials for applying the adult basic education program of 1995*. [Translated]. [Unpublished raw data]. Taipei: Author.

Ministry of Education (1994b). *Education statistics of the Republic of China*. Taipei: Author.

Ministry of Education (1996). *Middle term plan for the development of adult education towards lifelong learning*. [Translated]. Taipei: Author.

Nickse, R. S. (1990). *Family and intergenerational literacy programs. An update of the noises of literacy.* Columbus, Ohio: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 327 736)

Scribner, S. (1984). Literacy in three metaphors. *American Journal of Education, 93*, 6-21.

Tough, A. (1971). *The adult's learning projects*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

JC970467

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Lifelong Learning: Policies, ~~Processes~~ Practices and Programs

Author(s): Michael J. Hatton (Editor)

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: June 1997.

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 1** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 2** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.

Level 1

☐ Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Level 2

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at **Level 1**.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature: Michael J. Hatton

Printed Name/Position/Title:

Organization/Address: School of Media Studies, Humber College, 205 Humber College Blvd, Toronto CANADA M9W 5L7

Telephone: 416 675-6622 x4510

FAX: 416 675 9730

E-Mail Address: hatton@admin.humber.on.ca

Date: Sept 2/97