

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Sandra Tierney Stanley for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Education presented on November 8, 1989.

Title: Motivational Orientations as Perceived Deterrents to
Participation Among Low-Literate Adults Seeking Literacy
Referral Services.

Redacted for Privacy

Abstract approved: _____

Wayne W. Haverson

This investigation identified perceptions of deterrents to participation in adult literacy programs from among a low-literate non-participating adult population residing in the greater Portland, Oregon metropolitan area. While previous investigators have identified deterrents to participation among other subgroups of the population, such investigations have focused on those currently, or recently participating, in a variety of adult education programs.

The Oregon Literacy Line, a statewide literacy referral hotline, provided the database for this research. A total of 48 subjects were interviewed by telephone with a survey, Deterrents to Participation Scale - Form LL (DPS-LL), a 32 item questionnaire, developed by Hayes (1987) for administration to low-literate adults participating in adult basic education programs.

Descriptive statistics provided the basis for the analyses of the data. Of the 32 reasons for not participating in literacy programs listed in the survey, the six with the highest mean scores were; It was more important to get a job than to go to school, I didn't have time to go to classes, Starting classes would be difficult, with lots of questions to answer and forms to fill out, I didn't think that I could go to classes regularly, The classes were held at times when I couldn't go, and I was not given information about where I could attend classes.

The categories which underlie these discrete deterrents were identified and included; Personal Priority, Institutional Deterrents, Self Confidence, and Situational Deterrents.

The findings suggest that the deterrent construct is multidimensional, and the identified deterrents categories differ from those previously cited. Further, this research provides useful information about potential literacy program participants. Suggestions are made for differentiated recruitment strategies and program planning to increase rates of participation among the nation's "most in need" population.

MOTIVATIONAL ORIENTATIONS AS PERCEIVED DETERRENTS
TO PARTICIPATION AMONG LOW-LITERATE ADULTS
SEEKING LITERACY REFERRAL SERVICES

by

Sandra Tierney Stanley

A DOCTORAL THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Completed November 8, 1989

Commencement June 1990

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Wayne W. Haverson
Professor of Education in Charge of Major

Redacted for Privacy

Joe Hlebichuk
Department Chair, Postsecondary & Technological Education

Redacted for Privacy

Robert E. Barr
Dean, College of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean, Graduate School

Date thesis is presented November 8, 1989.

Typed by Sandra Tierney Stanley.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The completion of a dissertation represents much more than the research described in its pages, and is based on the cumulative efforts of many, including those previous researchers (Cross, Darkenwald, Hayes, Merriam and Valentine, in particular) upon whose work this investigation is founded.

I am also indebted to my committee members, Ken Ahrendt, Frank Dost, Bonnie Staebler and Ruth Stiehl for their guidance and support. I am particularly grateful to Wayne Haverson, who chaired my committee, mentored me throughout my studies and guided me through to completion. His ability to inspire confidence, create a positive learning environment, and share the joys of learning is most unique and greatly valued. To fellow graduate students, especially Paul Killpatrick and Gerri Graber-Wilson, my thanks for the special friendship we have shared these past three years. This work represents their efforts as well.

Above all, for giving so much, encouraging, and always being there for me, I am deeply grateful to my husband Ken and my daughters Karlyn and Mary. This work is the product of their sacrifice much more than mine.

Finally, I dedicate this work to the memory of my mother. She taught me persistence, to trust my intuition, and to reach in to other human beings. Without that, this would never have been.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One	
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Purpose of the Study.....	8
Limitations of the Study.....	10
Definitions of Terms.....	11
Chapter Two	
Review of the Literature.....	13
Becoming a Literate Nation.....	14
Summary.....	31
Motivational Orientations to Participation...	33
Summary.....	41
Participation Research.....	42
Identifying Deterrents to Participation.....	46
Summary.....	54
Chapter Three	
Design of the Study.....	57
Population.....	58
Instrumentation.....	60
Data Collection.....	62
Data Analyses.....	64
Chapter Four	
Analyses of the Data.....	69
Characteristics of the Population.....	69
Perceived Deterrents to Participation.....	72
Categories of Identified Deterrents.....	77
Chapter Five	
Summary and Discussion.....	85
Deterrents to Participation.....	85
Deterrent Categorical Structures.....	87
Implications for Research and Practice.....	92
Bibliography	99
Appendices	
A. Oregon Literacy Line Intake Form.....	113
B. Telephone Survey Script.....	115
C. DPS-LL.....	117

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Grouped Characteristics of Respondents.....	70
2.	Individual Characteristics of Respondents.....	71
3.	Rank Order of Deterrents.....	74
4.	Derived Deterrent Structures.....	79
5.	Inter-Item Correlations (Spearman Rho).....	81
6.	Frequency Table of Deterrents-Personal Priority...	83
7.	Frequency Table of Deterrents-Institutional.....	83
8.	Frequency Table of Deterrents-Self-Confidence.....	84
9.	Frequency Table of Deterrents-Situational.....	84

MOTIVATIONAL ORIENTATIONS AS PERCEIVED DETERRENTS
TO PARTICIPATION AMONG LOW LITERATE
ADULTS SEEKING LITERACY REFERRAL SERVICES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The Commission on Higher Education and the Adult Learner, established by the American Council on Education in 1981, recently published its first report, *Adult Learners, Key to the Nation's Future* (Commission on Higher Education and the Adult Learner, 1984). Within this report was stated the need for increased opportunity for adult learners. Based on a three year series of open forums, deliberations and examination of various studies and reports, the Commission concluded that national attention must be focused on adult learning as a major source in solving the nation's economic and social dilemmas. Two of the five major tasks assigned the Commission were 1) eliminating adult illiteracy, and 2) ensuring equal access to education for all adults. Listed as major impediments to meeting the nation's need for a more literate society were: institutional barriers, inadequate funding, and a lack of awareness.

In *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), a call was made for educational reform to focus on creating a learning society that is committed to

lifelong learning, to enable each individual to develop his, or her, abilities to the fullest .

The *Twentieth Century Task Force on Educational Policy* (Graham, 1983) has further issued a statement which suggested that levels of literacy required for effective living in today's complex society must include the acquisition of skills so that individuals, as well as society, may continue to grow and prosper.

The Fourth World Conference on Adult Education organized by the United Nations Education, Science and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and held in Paris in 1985, passed a declaration on the right to learn. Included within that declaration was a statement which emphasizes that without the right to learn there can never be any meaningful human development (Mutava, 1988).

While literacy issues have not received as much attention as some more controversial social issues, it becomes a critically important issue when we consider the role of the individual within the community social structure (Mutava, 1988). Literacy today exceeds the need to read, write and compute at a minimal level (Anderson, 1981; Clark, 1984; Cressy, 1983; Dauksza-Cook, 1977; Harman, 1987; Jones, 1981; Kozol, 1985). An ever growing, more globally oriented society, requires a higher level of interaction among its

citizens, and a greater need to process oral and written language from within the context of a variety of traditions in both the work and community setting (Cressy, 1983). Increasingly higher levels of literacy will be required for participation in the future. Levels of literacy required for full participation in today's society will probably be less than adequate by the year 2000 (Resnick and Resnick, 1977).

Becoming more literate requires participation. Participation in a democratic society implies that one has equal access, and an equal opportunity to take part in the decision-making processes (Harman, 1987). Various statistics (Chall, 1983; Commission on Higher Education and the Adult Learner, 1984; Hunter and Harman, 1979; Larrick, 1987; Northcutt et al., 1975) have indicated that a high percentage of this nation's population do not have the skills to adequately address personal or social needs, or to adequately participate in the decision-making processes which enable citizens to fulfill life goals. Equal opportunity and equal access may not be a perceived reality for many low-literate adults (Cross, 1981).

Currently, among the 159 members of the United Nations, the United States ranks 49th in its literacy level. And, an estimated additional 2.3 million low-literate adults are added to the illiterate class annually (Larrick, 1987).

While national figures describing the percentage of low-literate adults often vary from 27 to 72 million (Harman, 1985; Chall, 1987; Larrick, 1987; Northcutt et al., 1975), best estimates place a scant four percent of that lower figure in literacy programs (Chall, 1987; Harman, 1987; Northcutt et al., 1975). It has been estimated that more than half of those currently enrolling in adult basic education programs leave prior to completion of their goals (Chall, 1987). The low rate of participation among this nation's low-literate adult population continues (Larrick, 1987).

Low rates of participation among those most in need is not a recent phenomenon. Cross (1981) and Northcutt et al., (1975) reported that in 1975, the latest figures available from the United States Department of Education which reported the data in achievement or attainment levels, the United States had 53 million adults with less than a high school education. Following that report, the 1976 literacy campaign, further described by Cross as "the nation's largest antiilliteracy project", was undertaken at a budget of no less than \$252 million, and had attracted no more than four percent of the targeted population (p. 47). Because most adult learners are voluntary, participation is central to theory and practice in adult education.

National policymakers, program planners, and literacy service providers continue to struggle with the question of how to reach the unreached within our communities (Fingeret, 1984; Harman, 1987). The ability to respond to the needs of the low-literate adult population lies, in part, in a clearer understanding of who the low-literate adults are, and what perceptions deter them from participating in currently available literacy programs (Cervero, 1985; Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982; Darkenwald and Valentine, 1985; Fingeret, 1982; Quigley, 1987a; Valentine, 1986).

An examination of the many reasons given for non-participation provides further explanation of motivational orientations to assist literacy providers to more adequately address the identification, recruitment, and program planning needs of this population (Boshier, 1971, 1973, 1976; Chall, 1983, 1987; Clark, 1984; Hayes and Darkenwald, 1988).

Statement of the Problem

A problem in the study of deterrents to participation among low-literate adults lies in the identification of the population (Hayes, 1987). A major issue is that of arriving at a universally understood definition of literacy. As a result of the variation in assessing this target population,

descriptive information about low-literate adults may be distorted or inaccurate. Information is lacking about differences among the low-literate adult population.

Previously identified deterrents to participation have largely been derived intuitively, based on theorists' perceptions of deterrents, or from the perspective of the participating adult learner (Aslanian and Brickell, 1980; Cross, 1981; Boshier, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1976, 1977; Darkenwald and Valentine, 1985; Fingeret, 1984; Hayes and Darkenwald, 1988; Houle, 1961; Johnstone and Rivera, 1965; Morstein and Smart, 1974; Quigley, 1987a; Scanlan and Darkenwald, 1984).

These past studies, focusing on those currently, or very recently, participating in various adult education programs, have not identified deterrents to participation within the low-literate nonparticipating population. While these past studies have contributed significantly to an understanding of the characteristics of program participants, such studies have contributed little insight into the underlying factors relating to nonparticipation among those who remain outside of the literacy providers doors (Quigley, 1987b).

Information about potential learners' perceptions of deterrents is essential for efforts to reduce such obstacles and increase participation among this hard-to-reach group

(Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982; Hayes, 1987; Quigley, 1987). Prior researchers (Aslanian and Brickell, 1980; Cross, 1981; Fingeret, 1982; Scanlan and Darkenwald, 1984; Sheffield, 1974) have suggested that deterrents for the low-literate adult population differ in many respects from those facing the general population, and that potential learners' perceptions of deterrents are critical factors in determining participatory behavior.

Theory and research on participation forms a significant part of the body of knowledge in adult education. There have been a number of different conceptualizations of the construct of deterrents in general theories of participation (Cross, 1981; Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982). In the past, little research has attempted to validate or invalidate these models.

Three recent studies (Darkenwald and Valentine, 1985; Hayes, 1987; Scanlan and Darkenwald, 1984) have employed empirical methods to examine the structure of the deterrents construct among participants in a variety of adult education settings. The results of these studies indicated that the structure of the deterrents construct differs from the intuitive models. And, findings also suggested that the categories underlying the identified deterrents may be different for different subgroups of the adult population.

To contribute to this new line of research into the nature of the deterrents construct, this current investigation of nonparticipation among a group of nonparticipants in literacy services was undertaken. The previously stated low rates of participation among the low-literate adult population lend support to deterrents research for this target population. Nonparticipating low-literate adults have thus far eluded researchers in adult education.

Purpose of the Study

The overall purpose of this study was to extend the earlier investigations initiated by Scanlan and Darkenwald (1984), Darkenwald and Valentine (1985), and Hayes (1988), and explore the nature of the deterrents construct to participation in literacy programs from among a low-literate nonparticipating adult population, seeking literacy referral services within the Portland, Oregon greater metropolitan area.

This study identified *nonparticipants'* reasons for not participating, and provided voice for a number of low-literate adults to identify reasons for the decision not to participate in a literacy education program. This research contributes to the general theory of deterrents to

participation, and added to the research base, specific knowledge of deterrents from among a low-literate nonparticipating adult population, residing within the greater Portland, Oregon metropolitan area, who had sought literacy program referral. Through the application of an approach with demonstrated utility for the study of deterrents to a new subgroup of the adult population, general theory about the multidimensional nature of the deterrents construct is enhanced.

The overall goal of this study was to investigate the nature of the deterrents construct among a targeted low-literate nonparticipating adult population requesting literacy referral services. Specifically, this investigation addressed the following three research questions:

- 1) Who are the non-participating low-literate adults residing in the greater Portland, Oregon metropolitan area seeking literacy referral services through the Oregon Literacy Line?
- 2) What reasons do they state as deterrents to participation in available adult literacy programs?
- 3) Do the stated deterrents interrelate in such a way that certain categories of deterrents can be identified?

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited in the ability to generalize the research findings to a greater population of low-literate nonparticipating adults. The use of subjects who had initially contacted the Oregon Literacy Line by telephone, and had demonstrated awareness of literacy program referral services cannot be interpreted as representative of Oregon's general population of nonparticipating low-literate adults. All low-literate adults requiring literacy services, in the greater Portland metropolitan area, do not have telephones, or are aware of the literacy program referral service.

Lack of random selection of research subjects further restricts external validity. It could well be that deterrents identified by low-literate adults in the greater Portland, Oregon, metropolitan area may differ from those residing in Oregon's rural areas, or suburban areas with different sociodemographic compositions.

An additional limitation results from the size of the sample. Categories based on small numbers can change substantially due to small variations in response. Therefore, the categories identified in this study must be considered tentative until their validity can be established through replication.

Definitions of Terms

The following operational definitions are provided for terms frequently used throughout the study:

Adult - an individual 16 years old or older.

Adult Basic Education - traditional basic skills classes in reading, writing and computation for adults functioning between the 0 - 8 (grade) level.

Adult education - any formal, organized educational activity undertaken for the purpose of satisfying an identified personal or social need.

Deterrents - perceived obstacles which discourage full participation. (Previously described as 'barriers')

Functional literacy - a specified level of competency perceived as necessary by a particular person/group, which allows one to fulfill certain familial/societal expectations.

Literacy - the ability to apply language, reading, writing and computational skills competently within the context of daily wants/needs.

Low-literate adult - an adult whose basic literacy skills levels are perceived as inadequate to complete the necessary tasks of daily living, or to accomplish one's goals.

Motivation - wants or needs which direct an adult toward a specific goal.

Nonparticipation - not enrolling, joining, or becoming a part of (...an organized literacy education program).

Participation - engaging, becoming actively involved in (...an organized literacy program).

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The low rates of participation among the least educated most in need, though often reported in the adult education literature, have not led to a substantial body of research into the nature of deterrents that contribute to this phenomenon.

This chapter presents the low-literate adult from an historical perspective, tracing literacy campaigns throughout the United States as a form of response to a greater society's need to maintain a more literate population. Complex and varying definitions of literacy are discussed.

General theories of motivation have been used as the basis for a number of models of participation, which have served as a guide for current research on deterrents. These general theories will be presented, and theories relating to motivational orientations of participation will be compared.

The research on participation in adult education settings, and previously identified deterrents to participation will be described which provided the basis for this investigation of motivational orientations deterring participation among a low-literate adult population.

Becoming a Literate Nation

Literacy is best understood through an analysis of need. During the early colonization period, the Puritan way of life centered around Christianity, and the importance of reading and living the words of the Bible. Literacy efforts were focused to that end (Verner, 1987).

Fingeret (1982) wrote "illiteracy at that time, was not a problem as reading and writing were not often required for daily living, and generally, norms were oriented around other skills" (p. 45).

Still, the percentage of literate adults continued to grow during that time, and appeared to be more directly related to availability of reading materials and moral inclination, rather than attributed to educational reform (Harman, 1987).

Literacy was acquired by those whose opportunity coincided with interests requiring it, even if those interests may have been primarily fundamentally religious in motive. Literacy participation was a personal goal, rather than an imposed social need.

By the eighteenth century, literacy as a form of moral development, became replaced with literacy as a form of effort to secure social, cultural, economic and political

cohesion (Arnove and Graff, 1987). During that time period, immorality appeared to be equated with illiteracy. Verner (1987) stated: "Because people believed that the ability to read the Bible would strengthen the morals of the poor ... reducing crime and other associated ills, philanthropy took the form of adult schools" (p. 9).

The nineteenth century brought with it new demands for literacy. Rachal (1988) attributed the literacy rate climb at that time to socioeconomic factors. "It is clear that literacy was a response to environmental factors based on need and opportunity" (p. 132). As the number of literates increased, so did the taste for increased political participation and partisanship.

Literacy was clearly identified as a form of social status (gentry were literate, while laborers and servants were not); matter of geographical region (urbans more literate, rurals less); and a predictor of occupational access (scriveners and apothecaries were, thatchers and slaters were not). Two forms of social literacy interests were recognized at that time. One primarily mercantile, the other fundamentally religious (Grattan, 1955).

Where the religious motivation prevailed, literacy's broad function was cultural integration through social control. According to Grattan, adults in early schools "were

to be taught not only reading and possibly writing, but also serious deportment, cleanliness, temperance, honesty, and the habit of regularly attending church" (pp.75-76).

Where the mercantile motivation dominated, Grattan continued, the function of literacy was to develop a good memory and an understanding of business matters and the world. The complexities of society grew, and so too did the level of literacy. Literacy was acquired by those whose opportunity coincided with interest.

Literacy was considered a personal right available to all. The middle of the nineteenth century brought social change, and increased evidence of literacy as a form of social control. As reading materials became more readily available larger segments of the population began reading, including a large number of Southern slaves. Until the proliferation of abolitionist literature in 1834, an assumed undeniable right became outlawed. Southern slaves were denied opportunity (or access) to pursue literacy needs (Cressy, 1980).

In *The Literacy Myth*, Graff (1979) described how religion lost its dominance in the literacy movement the latter half of the nineteenth century. Literacy became the "one central instrument and vehicle in efforts to secure social, cultural, economic and political cohesion in an

economy of the expanding capitalistic order" (p. 25).

Maintaining societal norms, or societal expectations, became the motivating factors driving literacy campaigns during the eighteenth and nineteenth century, continued on into the twentieth century.

The "Americanization" of immigrants became the central focus of literacy efforts during the industrialization period. Classes aimed at learning how to spend wages more wisely, eat the right kinds of foods, wear the right kinds of clothes, and spend in America the money earned in America were prevalent (Graff, 1979).

Literacy became increasingly more important as a tool for cultural integration, and an instrument for social stratification. This may have been less true when illiteracy was more universal, but as the need and opportunity for literacy increased, it became firmly embedded in the socioeconomic structure (Cressy, 1983).

As the nation became increasingly more aware of its low-literate adults, so too did the stereotypes describing them. The language of personal deficiency (affliction, and the need for treatment or rehabilitation) runs throughout the literature. The tone was one of mission and concern for the less fortunate. Surprisingly, these same terms continue to exist in the literature of today.

Dauksza-Cook (1977) claimed that it was only during times of war that the government rediscovered illiteracy in dramatic ways:

It was not an uncommon thing during the late summer of 1917 for men to be arrested for their failure to register and brought before federal officers. It was then disclosed that they were illiterate and did not know of the registration or draft, and some did not even know that the country was at war (p. 11).

Statistics reported during World War I, indicated 700 thousand of the 10 million first registered for military service were totally illiterate (Dauksza-Cook, 1977). The Army initially refused to take illiterate citizens, but soon came to realize they were unable to continue to do so.

Approximately 407 thousand illiterates had enlisted for service prior to the outbreak of World War II. By May of 1941, 38 out of every thousand white enlisted, and 112 out of every thousand black were turned away because of the inability to read. In 1943 the Army set up its own literacy program; new recruits were given 13 weeks to attain fourth grade reading level, or they were discharged (Dauksza-Cook, 1977). Literacy training was deemed essential to the national security.

Following the Korean conflict a report by Ginzberg and Bray, *The Uneducated* (1953), was published. Their thesis: illiteracy was a threat to democracy because it created

vulnerable citizens and undependable soldiers. Thus, illiteracy, a national disgrace, became a social problem.

Despite the implementation of a variety of literacy education and training programs, the concern for the maintenance of a literate service corps has been critical at each point of recruitment and training to this day.

The first example of American government intervention linking literacy to employment occurred during the Depression in the early 1930s (Dauksza-Cook, 1977). According to her, the nation's high rate of unemployment was deemed to be directly attributed to lack of skill, calling for "New Deal" legislation to provide some federal support for adult literacy education. This legislation included some reading instruction for adults who were participating in the Civilian Conservation Corp (CCC), and the Works Progress Administration (WPA) programs.

The Works Progress Administration's response to providing literacy instruction for the unskilled population was to introduce instructional reading materials intended to produce "useful citizens" (Dauksza-Cook, 1977). Readers were identified which would "take subjects of normal adult interests, such as health, safety, occupation, family life and government, and present them in simplified assimilable form" (p.41).

The economic needs of the nation precipitated literacy efforts among the low-literate population. Fingeret's (1984) comment: "campaigns are often justified in terms of the presumed causal relationships between literacy and national economic development, although evidence of causality is not at all conclusive" (p.22).

In 1941 Ruth Kotinsky conducted a field study of programs serving illiterate adults in the south. At that time Kotinsky wrote:

To the literate man on the street, the illiterate is a "dope". To the educationally and socially sophisticated, he is a problem. To a decreasing but still substantial number of landowners, managers, overseers and farmers in the south he is not a dope, but a hand, and, as such, better ignorant and dumb...But, to none of these does the quality of the illiterate's life stand out... for he is merely in the position of the vast majority before the Gutenberg invention. He is illiterate in a world that postulates literacy as a universal characteristic of complete manhood. This means, in the first place, that he feels himself something less than a full man, something of a social deformity, because he cannot read and write (p. 11).

Kotinsky inferred that illiterate adults were handicapped in their personal lives, but even more importantly, they were handicapped in their understanding of the larger economic and political realities. She further continued, that while illiterate adults may not be stupid, they probably were the victims of inadequate schooling. Kotinsky did acknowledge that while many may have shown

themselves to be capable of learning the manual and social skills necessary to carry on their own daily lives, the illiterate could not be expected to make the right moral or ideological choices. Illiterate adults were not capable of intelligent participation in a larger social world. They were "socially, economically, as well as culturally, underprivileged", and "without outlook, vision, orientation, and methods of attack on their problems" (p. 36). The solution was to propose a change in the objectives of adult literacy programs and address the issues of "social responsibility" through education on cooking, child care, budgeting, and hygiene. As a result, a redefinition of literacy began to take place.

The concept of functional literacy was first introduced by William Gray in 1956.

A person is functionally literate when he has acquired the knowledge and skills in reading and writing which enable him to engage effectively in all those activities in which literacy is normally assumed in his culture or group. (Gray, 1956, p.24)

Functional literacy became the new catchword in literacy discussions, and national attention was focused upon addressing individual competency needs.

It was not until the 1960s that governmental, nationwide literacy programs really began. The 1962 Manpower Development and Training Act provided funds to public and

private agencies to design and carry out adult basic education programs for the undereducated.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 saw funding for literacy education available to individual States for the first time. The Adult Education Act of 1966 (U. S. Congress, 1966), an outgrowth of that earlier act, provided funds to the various states for the purpose of establishing adult basic education programs. The stated purpose of each act: employability; rehabilitation; and patriotism. Targeted were those adults, 16 years of age and older, who had not completed high school. Estimates based on the 1970 census data indicated that over 23 million persons still had less than an elementary school education and that over 55 million had less than a high school education (Northcutt et al., 1975). Mezirow (1981) described programs then as having held little promise, lamenting that social and political factions continued to have a tug-of-war over which set of objectives would be served by adult basic education programs.

Kozol (1985) commenting on public policy and adult education programs suggested:

Publicly proclaimed program goals and actual achievements are far apart. The "inability to get or retain employment" will not be eliminated for adult basic education participants. Illiteracy will not be "defeated in ten years".... Such goals are rhetoric designed to secure legislation and funding from a Congress that knows little about its educationally and economically marginal constituents (p. 57).

Defining the set of societal expectations for a changing society became a difficult matter. It is in the process of redefining those expectations that a number of different and sometimes contradictory definitions of literacy have been offered.

Many definitions of literacy related to basic levels of competency in reading, writing, and computation (Cervero, 1981; Jones, 1981; Northcutt et al., 1977). More recently, definitions have surfaced which relate to the functional uses of literacy as a tool for daily living (Anderson, 1981; Fingeret, 1984; Valentine, 1986), and as a form of personal empowerment enabling individuals, or groups, to influence decisions regarding the personal pursuit of wants and needs (Clark, 1984; Dauzat and Dauzat, 1984; Freire, 1970; Harman, 1987). Within these definitions differentiation is often made between the "literate" and the "illiterate" as though literacy were an all or none state. The majority of press today appears to focus on the notion of functional competence, a predetermined acceptable achievement level deemed necessary to function at a minimal level of competency in our society (Anderson, 1981; Clark, 1984; Harman, 1987; Jones, 1981).

To some, the basic levels of competency in reading, writing and basic mathematical calculations are still

considered to encompass the whole of literacy. As Jones (1981) pointed out:

On the surface, the concept of illiteracy seems understand. A person who is illiterate, as the term is generally defined, is a person who is unable to read and write. The key issue then becomes unable to read and write what, or to what extent? (p. 4).

Two more current, often reported, studies on the assessment of adult literacy levels were those completed by Louis Harris and Associates in 1970 and 1971, and the Adult Performance Level Project of 1971-1977.

The Harris survey was commissioned by the National Reading Council in 1970, and the National Reading Center in 1971, to assess the functional reading abilities of adults in the United States. The purpose of the survey was to determine the number of adults lacking the "functional", or practical, reading skills necessary to "survive" in the nation at that time. Subjects were instructed to read and fill out five different application forms requesting: Social Security number, personal bank loan, Public Assistance, Medicaid, and driver's license. Persons who were unable to respond meaningfully to 90% of the items on these forms were judged to have a literacy level described as "marginally" functional (Adult Performance Level Project, 1977).

The Adult Performance Level Project (APL) was begun in 1971 by the University of Texas and funded by the U. S.

Office of Education for the stated purpose of 1) identifying competencies which were deemed to be essential to economic and educational success, and 2) to develop an instrument for assessing those competencies within the adult population at that time.

The outcome of that project was a classification of competencies associated with different levels of adult success measured by income, job status, and education. Three levels were chosen and simply labeled: APL 1 = those who function with difficulty; APL 2 = "functional adults"; and APL 3 = "proficient adults". Using these levels to measure literacy status, approximately one-fifth of our population, or 23 million, were judged to have severe literacy deficiencies (Jones, 1981; Northcutt et al, 1975).

This notion of achievement or grade level of competence remained central to the concept of functional literacy. According to the APL research, approximately one-fifth of America's adults, over 23 million, are functionally incompetent. The least educated are "those adults whose lack of mastery of competency objectives is associated with: inadequate income, inadequate education, and low job status" (Northcutt et al, 1975). Interestingly, eight years of schooling or less is one parameter which continues to be used to describe the least competent.

The relationship between education and the number of grades completed has long been controversial (Cervero, 1977; Northcutt et al, 1975). Adult educators and public policymakers who prefer measuring functional literacy and competency view the APL data as a more significant look at undereducation and its results than the state reported adult basic education data (Cervero, 1977).

Currently federally sponsored programs, those programs supported by adult education funds, emphasize functional competency (Harman, 1987). Most states are implementing, or designing, programs which focus on functional competency listings similar to those identified in the original APL study. Materials are selected by program directors and instructors to specifically address the attainment of the identified APL competencies (Harman, 1987).

Other researchers (Anderson 1981; Clark, 1984; Dauzat and Dauzat, 1977; Fingeret, 1984; Gray, 1956; Harman, 1987; Jones, 1981; Richardson, 1981), viewed literacy from a functional competence perspective, and did not differentiate among levels, but merely defined the types of functional skills required as a basis for assessing levels of competency among the adult population. Such interpretations of competence are based upon individual need.

Realization that the low-literate population are not a homogeneous group, but rather a composite of individuals with differing needs is emerging. As Fingeret (1983) so well described:

Illiterate adults appear to embody a range of attributes, rather than presenting a homogeneous picture. Some are ambitious, others content; some approach life positively, while others are fatalistic and depressed. The same range of characteristics may be found in the population at large, or among literate, educated adults. As long as literacy programs continue to publicize a homogeneous image of inadequate, dependent illiterate adults, we will continue to attract only a small number of potential program participants. In addition, we will be participating in creating the problem we seek to address: feelings of powerlessness and disenfranchisement (p. 142).

It is this orientation which has created a more comprehensive view of ways to address the needs of the low-literate adult population. As described further, attempts have been made to define literacy from the learner's point of view, rather than from the identification of specific levels of competence, or a number of specific discrete objectives.

Recent thinking, prompted by changes in our social structure and an expanded worldview, has extended this definition.

Beverly Anderson (1981), writing from the functional competence perspective, distinguished three categories of literacy skills: generic literacy skills (reading, writing

and computation); everyday skills (writing letters, giving directions); and job related skills (reading an instruction manual).

Harman (1987) contended that most people view literacy from a simplistic definition of some predetermined levels of achievement in reading and writing ability and do not view literacy as dependent on content or the functions of reading or writing. Literacy can be viewed as an ever changing relationship between man and his environment and is "situational: it can only be defined in context and can only be tackled in context" (p.44). This definition allows for the most flexibility when assessing the literacy needs of the adult with the demands of their immediate environment.

Others have approached literacy from an educational, or learning, viewpoint such as Richardson (1981) who considered the definition of literacy in terms of its components; the nature of the language involved, the way the language is processed, the context in which the language is presented, and the functions of this use in education.

Among those who have struggled with providing a more generic, or comprehensive view of literacy, Dauzat and Dauzat (1977), after reviewing current definitions of literacy, concluded that the "abstract puzzle" of literacy has three components: 1) proficiency in the use of all

aspects of language as a means of communicating ideas and influencing environments; 2) functional levels of competency; and 3) freedom from social, economic and political oppression (p. 5).

Clark (1984), analyzing the definitions of literacy and the implications of definition as a basis for policy and practice, emphasized the error of many definitions that assume literacy is of one kind, and that an individual is either literate or not.

A division of opinion regarding literacy as a means to an end or as an end in itself is emerging. A number of groups, such as educators, politicians and program administrators, favor definitions of literacy which are based on quantifiable criteria (grade level achievement, number of years of school completion, test scores, etc.). Primarily, it would seem, because this is familiar terminology and would allow for the utilization of familiar existing methodologies in attempting to alleviate the problem (Harman, 1987; Kozol, 1985).

Literacy as an instrument of social access has begun to surface in more recent literature. Kozol (1985) cited the inaccuracy of census statistics and the imprecision of years of school completion and reading levels, and discusses at length the impact of the lack of ability to successfully

utilize social service agencies within a community, both upon the individual and upon society. Kozol suggested that illiterates are often seen as having brought the lack of literacy upon themselves and that they can "pull themselves up by the bootstraps" -- an attitude which does nothing to increase individual or collective literacy levels. Kozol continued on to say that illiteracy may become hereditary, as those of the next generation have minimal benefit of assistance from parents. Kozol also described literacy as a form of personal empowerment, giving access to social mobility and participation in occupations, community life, and political issues.

Literacy as a form of thinking, or critical analysis, is presented by Kirsch and Jungeblut (1986), who redefine America's literacy problem as one of impoverished critical thinking skills. Literacy is presented as encompassing more than the ability to read and write.

Literacy as a form of critical analysis, and (as a form of) personal empowerment can also be found in the writings of Paulo Freire. In the words of Freire (1970b), literacy invokes critical thinking, consciously engaging in analyses of one's own reality in relationship to that of the greater society. Reading the word is reading the world, and having an opportunity to interpret that world.

Stanage (1986), building upon the philosophy of Freire (1970b), contended that the self is a process which changes as it interacts with the world. Low-literate adults must then be taught not only how to read the words, but how to use those words (or ideas) to help them further meet the goals they have set for themselves.

Freire and Stanage have each suggested that a lack of literacy can lead to social alienation. Low-literate adults may have difficulty accessing a variety of community services which allow them to meet certain basic needs. The leverage of political negotiation often necessary to attain certain basic needs may be denied the individual who is unable to participate in a print society (Harman, 1987).

Summary

This review of the literature has suggested that historically, literacy has most often been identified as a form of social responsibility and responses to maintain a more literate society have been directed toward that end. Different perspectives on the definition of literacy have been presented. While early definitions primarily describe a minimal ability to read and write, recent authors have approached literacy from the perspective of personal need.

Some generalizations can be drawn from the more recent

literature describing literacy. Literacy is not a single skill, or specific group of skills. Literacy is evolutionary and developmental, an ongoing process of interpreting symbols and meanings, and attaching relevance to those meanings in one's own life. Literacy is a form of becoming, creating a sense of being within a greater social order. Literacy brings a sense of empowerment, the confidence that one is able to have a degree of control over one's life, and to affect one's own environment.

Literacy is both an end and a means. Literacy is situational. The level of literacy required on the job may be greater than, or less than, that required for personal or family needs. The level of literacy required for completion of certain tasks in one's life may also vary from day to day. Individuals determine the level of literacy necessary to live out their lives, weighing the factors for seeking additional literacy instruction against the personal or family needs at the moment.

Low-literate adults have been described as being poor, disadvantaged, unemployed, incompetent, and unable to fully participate in a democratic society. When low-literate adults are viewed from a deficit perspective they are deemed incapable of making rational decisions regarding individual personal needs and are thereby denied access, and participation in the decision-making processes.

Motivational Orientations to Participation

Motivation Theory

Theory on the psychology of human behavior has contributed to the study of participation in adult education. General theories of motivation have been used as the basis for a number of models of participation, which, in turn, have served as a guide for current research on deterrents.

Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs theory is based on the assumption that individuals are motivated to action through an attempt to satisfy certain universal needs. The number of needs is relatively small, and are arranged in a hierarchy. Maslow, identified five basic needs. While the first need addresses physiological satisfaction (hunger, thirst, etc.), the remainder of the needs relate to psychosocial interactions. In ascending order, they include the need for belongingness and love, the need for self esteem and recognition, and the need for self-actualization. According to Maslow, lower-order needs must be satisfied before one can strive to achieve higher-order needs.

Force-field analysis by Lewin (1951) recognized that people are driven by many motivations, and that sometimes these motivations are not consistent, or may, in fact, be in conflict with one another. Tendencies to approach or avoid

a goal are determined by the degree of influence each exerts. Once a decision is made, individuals seek ways to confirm that decision. The individual is often required to make a decision and choose a course of action in which some motives, but not others are satisfied.

Goal theory (Locke, 1968) is based on the premise that intentions to achieve a goal constitute the primary motivating forces behind the behavior. The goal-setting process begins with judging elements of the environment to determine which actions will contribute to the individual's well being. Value judgements, the basis for choosing among alternative courses of actions, are then experienced as emotions. Based on the alternative that is selected, the individual projects instrumentalities for the anticipated behavior and resulting satisfaction, and then takes action.

The cognitive dissonance theory of Festinger (1970) proposed that individuals are motivated to action by seeking to maintain cognitive consistency (consonance) and reducing cognitive inconsistency (dissonance). When dissonance is present, individuals will actively avoid situations and information which are perceived as likely to increase dissonance. Festinger referred to the term "cognitive" as any knowledge, opinion or belief about the environment, about oneself, or about one's behavior. Opinions and attitudes

tend to exist in clusters that are internally consistent, and activities are directed toward the maintenance of those opinions and attitudes. The importance of social support is central to this theory. While Festinger viewed the social group as a major source of cognitive dissonance for the individual, social networks also provide the major vehicle for the reduction of dissonance.

These theories of motivation describe the role of internal drives and perceptions as determinants of behavior. This description is continued in theories of participation in adult education. The models presented here provide a framework for recent investigations into the nature of deterrents, and indicate the number of variables that influence participatory behavior.

Participation Theory

Using Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs and Lewin's (1951) force field theory, Miller's (1967) force-field analysis sought to explain both why people participate in adult education and why differences exist between social classes in what individuals wish to attain from participation. Miller used Lewin's model of positive and negative forces operating within an individual's lifespaces to explain motivation to participate in educational

activities. Environmental factors combine with personal factors to influence a person's decision to participate in educational activities. According to Miller, participation is most likely when both needs and social forces drive an individual toward an objective that will be attained by educational activity. When needs create a drive that is not reinforced by complementary social forces, then participation is not likely. If social structures encourage participation, but individual needs do not exist, then educational activity is also unlikely, and if initiated, will tend to diminish. If needs and social structures are opposing (creating inner tension and conflict), then participation will also be discouraged. Previously reported data about individuals' educational interests clearly support this theory (Carp, Peterson and Roelfs, 1974; Johnstone and Rivera, 1965).

Miller used the theory to explain the low level of participation among the educationally and economically disadvantaged population. He pointed to a greater number of negative than positive forces in the social environment of the lower classes, which results in little motivation to participate. Miller's theory is global in its conception of the driving and restraining forces affecting participation. Research building on Miller's work is conspicuously lacking in the adult education literature.

Boshier's (1973) congruence theory, like Miller's model, is based on the idea that motivation for learning is a function of the interaction of both internal psychological factors and external environmental factors. According to Boshier, participation is primarily a function of the magnitude of the discrepancy between an individual's self-concept and aspects of his environment.

Boshier suggested that an important factor in educational participation is individual self-esteem. Those who evaluate themselves negatively are less likely to experience congruence. For low socioeconomic status adults, negative past educational experiences contribute to incongruence with the educational system. Nonparticipation is based on a generalized self-institutional incongruence.

While empirical testing of the relationship between discrepancy scores and dropout lends support to Boshier's paradigm, the interactive effect of external variables with congruence on dropout has not been studied. The model has not been applied to the study of nonparticipation. Boshier emphasized individual self-perceptions as determinants of participatory behavior, with environmental factors acting as mediating variables.

Cross's (1981) Chain-of-Response (COR) model is a synthesis of previous models of participation, using an

individual-environmental interaction paradigm. In this model, participation is the result of a chain of responses, based on an evaluation of the position of the individual in his or her environment. Although, in this model, the forces that affect participation are ordered from mainly internal psychological variables to social and environmental variables, Cross (1981) emphasized that the responses are bi-directional and cyclical.

The chain of responses begins with individual self-evaluation and attitudes toward education. These variables interact and influence the next element in the model, the importance of goals and the expectation that participation will meet these goals. The chain of response is also affected by life transitions. If the individual is motivated to participate, at this point in the continuum, he or she experiences opportunities and "barriers" (deterrents) to participation. Cross believes an individual's response to these variables depends both on the strength of motivation and information available for decision-making.

Of particular significance in Cross's work was her conceptualization of those "barriers" to participation. Based on the results of national surveys (Carp, et al., 1974; Johnstone and Rivera, 1965), Cross classified barriers into three categories. The first, "situational barriers", arise

from one's situation in life at a particular time. The second group, "institutional barriers", consist of deterrents related to the institution which discourage participation. The last category, "dispositional barriers", included the attitudes and self-perceptions of the learner.

While Cross acknowledged that her model is only a tentative framework for the understanding of the variables affecting participation, the COR paradigm is useful in its organization of existing knowledge and implications for research. Several factors are relevant to the present line of research on deterrents toward participatory behavior. Specifically, the emphasis on internal psychological variables as critical determinants of how the individual perceives and responds to the varied elements in his or her life space, and the multidimensional conceptualization of the deterrents construct.

Darkenwald and Merriam (1982) also described participation as a continuum of responses, but placed a different emphasis on the determinants of behavior. Their model emphasized social environmental forces, in particular socioeconomic status. However, they noted that individual traits are important, although less is known about their influence on participation.

The psychosocial interaction model proposed by Darkenwald and Merriam (1982) considers individual and family characteristics (intelligence, socioeconomic status) as strong influences, matched with the environmental influences on educational activities learned in pre-adulthood, and is based on the concept of "learning press". Learning press can best be described as "the extent to which one's total current environment requires or encourages further learning" (p 142). Total environments which tend to encourage certain attitudes toward the value and utility of education, produce adults who are more likely to participate. This model serves to explain the relationship between choice to participate and imposing environmental factors influencing that choice.

Darkenwald and Merriam's model, like Cross's (1981), has been useful as a synthesis of prior theory and a guide for the testing of more concrete aspects of theory. The model's proposed relationship between socioeconomic status, learning press, perceived value of education, and participation stimuli and barriers emphasizes the importance of individual perceptions as a basis for an understanding of participatory behavior. In particular, the relationship of socioeconomic status to perceptions of participation stimuli and perceived deterrents lends further support to the use of a perceptual approach in the study of deterrents to participation among

the least educated adult population. This conceptualization of deterrents, while not supported by empirical data, is suggestive of the potential complexity of the deterrent construct.

Summary

The motivation and participation theories presented suggest that at least two general kinds of variables, internal/psychological and external/environmental, affect participation. Psychological variables play the primary role in determining participation in most models. Due to the lack of specificity of the majority of these models, they have provided little guidelines for an empirical investigation of the relationship among the variables that affect participation.

These models do enable the development of a number of speculative assumptions about the nature of the deterrents construct. Described by Scanlan (1982) they include the following:

1. The deterrents construct is probably multi-dimensional.
2. The individual's perception and interpretation of deterrents to participation may have a greater influence on behavior than other actual deterrents.

3. Psychosocial and environmental variables may influence the perception and interpretation of the deterrents construct.
4. The deterrents construct may represent the absence of enabling factors as well as true barriers or obstacles to participation.
5. The individual is probably best able to identify the elements that constitute the dimensions of the deterrents construct. (pp.62-63).

These assumptions have served as a guide for the current line of inquiry into the nature of the deterrents construct.

Participation Research

A review of past research identifying motivational factors of participation have primarily examined the relationship of demographic and selected nondemographic variables to participation in adult education, rather than exploring the deterrents to participation.

The seminal work of Houle (1961), was the first major effort to identify the motivational orientations adults give for participating in adult education. Houle formulated a typology which included three distinct types of learners; goal oriented, activity oriented and learning oriented.

These three typologies appear to be closely related to the self-actualization theory of Maslow (1954) and goal theory of Locke (1968). It was the early Houle study which led to the later investigations centered around motivational orientations. Most of the subsequent research has attempted to test and refine Houle's (1961) basic concepts, and represents a shift toward an examination of the psychosocial determinants of participation in adult education settings.

Building upon Houle's typologies, Sheffield (1964) sought to identify reasons for participation among those attending a continuing education conference. A list of 58 reasons for participation was compiled; sixteen of those reasons were judged to be representative of each of Houle's three typologies. While not generalized to the total population of adults in educational settings, the findings did extend and build upon the Houle concept.

Two separate studies followed which analyzed participation from the perspective of social class. A frequently cited investigation by London (1970) on the influence of social class as a predictor of participation in adult education was based on the concept that social class differences relate to a social ranking system, the purpose of which is to stratify a population (on some scale of value). Differences in values, attitudes and life styles

are a result of this social stratification. London's investigation on participation in adult education concluded with:

Some evidence indicates that lack of past achievement and limited opportunities tend to create a system of values and beliefs which negate efforts to improve one's social and economic position. To the extent that the working class believes that achievement beyond his present accomplishment is impossible becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. This belief renders ambition, motivation, and the sense of achievement beyond the apparent grasp of the working class and out of his reach. (p. 147)

During this same time Douglass (1970) was completing an analysis of the current state of the research on participation, and suggested that the motivational aspect of participation be further explored. Referring to Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs, Douglass asserted that reasons for the low rates of participation among the adult population were more highly related to the emphasis placed on highly abstract needs such as "the democratic way of life", or "achievement motivation", while most adults were striving to satisfy basic survival and personal safety needs. Douglass further suggested that the individual could be more appropriately viewed as passing through a life cycle in which needs and social roles change. The identification of these various life cycles and an assessment of the particular growth level of specific groups of the population would allow

adult educators to plan more appropriate programs. The assumption being made by Douglass (1970) was that the developmental tasks serve as motivators, and careful attention to these tasks in educational activities would enhance adult participation in such activities.

Houle's (1961) typologies and those motivational factors identified by Sheffield (1974) were further analyzed by Boshier (1971), who developed a survey instrument, the *Education Participation Scale (E.P.S.)*, to measure and interrelate those factors previously described. His findings identified a total of fourteen deterrents, or motivational orientations, and were similar in order to the findings of Houle and Sheffield. Boshier emphasized that all participants in adult education are goal directed and the motivation that the goal is related to determines the extent to which the lower-order needs of Maslow (1954) are satisfied.

Studies utilizing the E.P.S. among different populations in The United States, New Zealand and Canada have yielded remarkably similar findings for different populations of adult learners.

While these investigations have focused mainly on identifying the general underlying structure of motivations toward participation in a variety of adult education

settings, little attempt had been made to correlate motivational orientations with participant and program characteristics, among different subgroups of the population, or among the nonparticipant population.

Identifying Deterrents to Participation

Some of the first descriptive information on deterrents to participation was collected by Johnstone and Rivera (1965), as part of a national study. Johnstone and Rivera intuitively divided deterrents into two categories; environmental/situational and internal/dispositional. Situational deterrents were mentioned more frequently than dispositional deterrents, particularly for those who expressed interest in participation. The relationship of deterrents to selected demographic variables were explored. Age, sex, race, and socioeconomic status were all found to be related to perceptions of deterrents. This study reflected the influence of socioeconomic status on participation in adult education. Johnstone and Rivera concluded:

Learning and education are perceived and evaluated in radically different ways by persons on different rungs of the social ladder. Lower-class adults not only value high educational attainment less, but they assess the worth of the education strictly in terms of the tangible advantages which can be gained

from having it. They see little value in obtaining knowledge for its own sake... Lower-class adults fully realize that education can lead to employment opportunities and job security, but education in no sense is defined as pleasurable. Indeed, for the typical lower-class adult, the concept of "learning" and "spare-time enjoyment" convey quite opposite meanings (p. 65).

The findings of Johnstone and Rivera were supported and extended ten years later by another national survey conducted by Carp, Peterson and Roelfs (1974). Situational factors were identified more often than dispositional factors for those responding. A number of findings from this 1974 study provided implications for a preliminary understanding of the deterrents construct among the low-literate adult population. Respondents with less than a high school diploma were three times as likely to identify a lack of confidence due to past poor academic performance. Twice as many nonwhites as whites also indicated a lack of confidence. Access to institutional facilities, difficulties with transportation, cost, and lack of childcare were disproportionately reported by nonwhites.

These two studies were limited however, in their reliance on intuitively generated lists of deterrents. The results of each of these studies do suggest potential dimensions of the deterrents construct.

The first empirically derived attempt to assess categories relating to nonparticipation was a study by

Boshier (1972), which explored the motivational determinants in job related knowledge need satisfaction. The *Dropout Prediction Scale (D.P.S.)* was constructed to measure the degree of congruence between the adult student's concept of self, and the two most important aspects of the adult education environment identified by Boshier (the instructor and other adult students).

Boshier sought to recognize motivational orientations to dropout as a function of the interaction between the adult student and the educational environment. Boshier's findings indicated that those who considered educational activities to be more worthy persisted, those for whom educational activities were viewed as less worthy had greater potential for dropout. Thus, those who valued education, or the educational activity, were more likely to persist in organized educational endeavors. Boshier's comments: persisters are those for whom the work-life success needs are greater because the basic lower needs have been satisfied. The typical program participant is motivated by primarily secondary drives (self esteem and self actualization).

The *Education Participation Scale* and the *Dropout Prediction Scale* developed by Boshier (1972, 1973, 1977) were designed to study what might be described as the typical adult learner in organized education.

Other researchers have identified psychosocial factors as primary deterrents to participation. Anderson and Niemi (1970) identified several social and psychological deterrents, including the fear of failure, school and change, that underlie interpersonal relationships among the low-literate adults and between their subculture and the greater society. They observed that a lack of self-confidence often results in the acquisition of behavior patterns which conceal personality deficiencies, and which may inhibit these individuals from pursuing educational goals in later years.

Kavale and Lindsey (1977) reported that the most inhibiting obstacle low-literate adults have when returning to school appeared to be psychological. Listed as contributing factors were previous school failure, and a fear of the academic symbols educational institutions project.

Further, Martin (1978) found a majority of students in adult basic education programs reporting negative psychosocial characteristics. He concluded that mistrust and lack of initiative were the psychosocial problems most needing the attention of adult education practitioners.

The evidence from these studies established support for the suggestion that low-literate adults experience negative self-concepts arising in large part from psychosocial problems. These investigators lend further support to the

premise that psychosocial problems among our low-literate population are evident in learning settings and contribute to the difficulties they experience in learning. Mezirow (1981) asserted that such failure oriented experiences lead to the self-fulfilling prophecy.

Psychosocial deterrents appear to be multiple, interrelated and complex, and related to a large degree to the values, attitudes, and experiences associated with differing levels of socioeconomic status (Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982). Social institutions influence to a great extent what may seem on the surface to be solely individual or psychological deterrents to participation in adult education activities (Cross, 1981). Social forces not only give rise to many of those deterrents, but also operate to maintain and reinforce them. The person, and groups, in one's social environment exert strong pressure to conform to prevailing values and norms (Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982). Thus, psychosocial factors deterring participation appear to be related to both the educational learning activity, and to the self as a learner or potential learner.

To test the Psychosocial Interaction Model of Participation in Organized Adult Education, and contribute to theory building in the area of participation in adult education, Scanlan and Darkenwald (1984) explored the

underlying structure of reasons adults gave for not participating in adult education activities. It was anticipated that an identification of deterrents to participation would provide useful information in predicting involvement in future educational activities for adults.

The *Deterrents to Participation* scale (DPS) was developed and administered to a sample population of allied health professionals. For the first time empirical research into participation included exploratory factor analysis to predict patterns of interrelationships, to determine how the reasons adults stated for lack of participation related to categorical groupings of deterrents. Six deterrent categories (categorical constraints) were identified as significantly deterring participation and appeared to support an underlying complex structure of deterrents to participation, specifically those related to earlier intuitively derived deterrents labeled as "situational" by Cross (1981). This investigation provided strong support for the inclusion of the deterrent construct as logical groupings of psychosocial and environmentally related deterrents to participation.

In their discussion of these deterrents as predictors to participation, Scanlan and Darkenwald (1984) were careful to suggest the need for additional research to replicate the

study with similar populations, and to develop and test new versions of the DPS for other populations. Underlying motives may typically be multiple, and often not obvious or rational.

The DPS consisted of a first step in the development of a new line of inquiry into nonparticipation. Darkenwald and Merriam (1982) wrote: "the motivational orientations of distinctive subgroups of adults, such as the disadvantaged or health professionals, might well differ from those of the general public" (p.136). Additional studies using the DPS to measure deterrents to participation in adult education settings have been completed by Darkenwald and Valentine (1985), Hayes (1987), Hayes and Darkenwald (1988) and Martindale and Drake (1989).

The 1985 study by Darkenwald and Valentine sought to identify reasons stated for deterring participation in organized adult education from among the general public. Building upon the research of Scanlan and Darkenwald (1984), a new *Deterrents to Participation* scale, the DPS-G was developed for application to a more general adult population. Categories of deterrents were identified and findings indicated those categories identified differed substantially from the earlier DPS study. As in the original DPS study, the six deterrent categories did provide support for the

multidimensionality of the deterrents construct, the underlying structure of which was found to differ from the earlier intuitive conceptualization proposed by Cross (1981).

Additional research utilizing the DPS-G was completed by Martindale and Drake (1985) to assess deterrents to participation among Air Force enlisted personnel. Eight deterrent categories were identified, and were determined to be consistent with the findings previously identified. The eight category structure further developed the six category structure listed in prior studies.

Hayes and Darkenwald (1988), then developed an instrument to measure deterrents to participation among the low level adult basic education population. The *Deterrents to Participation Scale - Form LL* (DPS-LL) was administered in groups, to a total of 160 low level adults participating in adult basic education classes. In summary, five categories of deterrents were identified, and differed substantially, as would be expected, from the deterrents previously identified for health professionals, enlisted Air Force personnel, and the general population. The DPS-LL deterrent categories also differed from the intuitive categories proposed by Cross (1981), and Darkenwald and Merriam (1982). However, a number of these deterrents had previously been identified as "dispositional" by Cross

(1981), and "psychosocial" by Darkenwald and Merriam (1982).

These findings did support the assertion of prior theorists (Anderson and Niemi, 1970; Kavale and Lindsey, 1977; Mezirow, 1981; and Martin, 1987) that the low-literate population experiences a variety of dispositional types of deterrents that may be related to a distinctive subculture, and are not the same for all members of the adult population.

Summary

Previous investigations into participation did confirm that the decision to participate in adult education activities is related to specific goals. Individuals' goals were in direct response to the fulfillment of primary (deficiency) or secondary (self-actualization) drive needs.

Participants have generally been described as white, more highly educated, and of middle or better socioeconomic status, than the general population. This has remained fairly consistent throughout the years. Past research has indicated that those choosing to participate have been motivated to do so primarily in response to the fulfillment of secondary (self-esteem, or self-actualization) drive needs. Individuals whose need to participate is primarily deficiency based tended not to participate.

Early investigations into participation cited those most commonly stated reasons for lack of participation as lack of time and lack of money. While these may have been accurate perceptions, those stated rationales can be viewed as overly simplistic, and contribute minimally to our greater understanding of factors which deter participation.

Beginning with Houle's (1961) seminal work, theoretically-oriented research on participation in adult education has strongly emphasized identification of learner types, motives, or motivational orientations. These studies have contributed to an understanding of participation phenomenon, but have not been successful in predicting antecedents to participatory behavior.

Deterrents to participation have only recently been discussed. Intuitively derived categories inhibiting participation have been identified as situational, institutional, informational or psychosocial. The more recent investigations into participation, or nonparticipation, have emphasized psychosocial factors as primary deterrents. These studies have provided meaningful ways to identify factors deterring participation, however the literature remains markedly void of information on non-participants' perceptions. Nonparticipants' perceptions of deterrents are essential to providing responsible programs

to meet the low-literate adults' needs.

The DPS, DPS-G, and DPS-LL have been presented as viable instruments for the identification of deterrents for different groups of our population. The factor analyses employed within each investigation have indicated motivational orientations do correspond to previously identified learner types. However, different populations have presented different categorical structures. There is a need to extend these earlier investigations, to construct meaningful theory relating to deterrents to participation in adult education programs, particularly among the low-literate adult population.

CHAPTER THREE

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This is a descriptive study, which represents a first attempt to examine the phenomenon of nonparticipation among a group of self-identified low-literate adults. Phenomenological investigations are described as those which are concerned with the themes of perception, intention, the origin of experiences and the relationship among experiences (Merriam and Simpson, 1984; Stanage, 1987).

The lack of prior research related to the targeted population supported the need to describe deterrents to participation as a basis for further empirical research.

Yin (1987) has stated descriptive research techniques are preferred when little is known of the targeted population, the research investigates a contemporary phenomenon, as boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident. Borg and Gall (1989) have stated that it is difficult to study complex relationships unless the basic descriptive information has first been offered. Merriam and Simpson (1984), Rosenthal and Rosnow (1984), and Stanage (1987), have indicated descriptive techniques as appropriate for those investigations which seek to describe or uncover certain facts, particularly those concerned with studying the

relationship among experiences. Merriam and Simpson (1984) further recommended descriptive techniques in the discipline of adult education, specifically because of the need to define and describe, particularly in the area of adult participation (p. 63).

Specific objectives have been stated which relate to an identification of the characteristics of this specific low-literate adult population, the identification of stated (perceived) deterrents, and the interrelationship of perceived deterrents as measurable categories (as derived from the DPS-LL), deterring participation in available literacy programs.

A description of the population, research instrument, method of data collection and data analyses employed to investigate this phenomenon are included herein.

Population

For the purposes of this research, population validity, as described by Borg and Gall (1989), was established by identifying a group of adults who had perceived a personal need for literacy instruction, contacted a literacy network for literacy program referral, and had not entered a literacy education program. Low-literate adults were self-identified when each initiated a call for literacy referral information.

The Oregon Literacy Line database provided access to a number of self-identified low-literate adults. The Oregon Literacy Line, a state-wide literacy hotline, provided literacy information and referral service to potential students and volunteers, literacy service providers, and other community agencies throughout the State of Oregon. Individuals seeking literacy referral information were provided basic information and were then later contacted by a number of community literacy programs and provided information regarding types of services offered, times and locations of classes, etc. (see Appendix A for a copy of the Oregon Literacy Line initial intake form).

All subjects met the adult education age criterion of 16 years or older. Callers requesting referral to English as a Second Language programs were excluded because of expected differences in individual motivations, life situations, instructional needs and past educational experiences. A total of 79 callers were selected as fulfilling the criteria for inclusion in this investigation.

Because of the small number remaining, it was not considered feasible to secure a random sample (Borg and Gall, 1989; Dillman, 1978). The 79 callers identified from the Oregon Literacy Line database comprised the total research population. Individuals were then contacted by telephone

during the months of January through August, 1989. A number of contacts were not possible (disconnected phone numbers, changes in stated place of residence, etc.). A total of 48 telephone surveys were completed. All of those contacted agreed to participate in the telephone survey.

Instrumentation

Because of the distinctive nature of the target population, the survey instrument selected for use was the *Deterrents to Participation Scale - Form LL (DPS-LL)* developed by Hayes (1987). The DPS-LL was selected for this study for several reasons, carefully adhering to criteria established by Dillman (1978). First, the DPS-LL was constructed for use with the low-literate adult basic education population, specifically to measure factors perceived as deterrents to participation in adult education (Darkenwald and Hayes, 1988; Hayes, 1987). Secondly, the instrument is clearly written, short and easily administered through telephone interviews. Thirdly, other forms of the DPS had previously identified deterrent structures for other subgroups within our population. This research could then be added to other investigations (Darkenwald and Hayes, 1988; Darkenwald and Valentine, 1984; Hayes, 1987; Martindale and Drake, 1989; Scanlan, 1982; Scanlan and Darkenwald, 1984),

providing further explanation and comparison for future theory building (Borg and Gall, 1989; Dillman, 1978; Merriam and Simpson, 1984).

Content validity of Hayes's DPS-LL can be inferred from the procedures employed in its design and construction (Hayes, 1987). Specifically, the use of interviews and literature review relating to previously identified deterrents to participation among other subgroups of the population helped ensure that the items constituting this form of the DPS were representative and adequately sampled those items perceived as deterrents to participation among low-literate adults. Hayes developed her preliminary version of the DPS-LL through a series of interviews with low-literate adult basic education students. Following the interviews, identified deterrents to participation were listed and matched with those obtained through previous use of the DPS-G and reported in the literature. A 35 item instrument was drafted.

Hayes's preliminary version of the DPS-LL was pretested for clarity and reliability through administration to 29 low level adults participating in adult basic education programs in a large urban center. Additional feedback on clarity of items was obtained from students and program administrators. As a result, three items were deleted, the wording on five

items was simplified, and standard item analyses were completed for the final version of the DPS-LL (Hayes, 1987).

Reliability for the preliminary version of Hayes's DPS-LL was reported to be high (alpha .88). The final, shorter, version of the DPS-LL reported an alpha reliability of .82.

Hayes's version of the DPS, the DPS-LL, was deemed to be an appropriate instrument to assess the perceptions of deterrents to participation among the nonparticipating low-literate adult population (see Appendix C for a copy of Hayes's final version of the DPS-LL).

Data Collection

Certain identifying data were initially obtained through the Oregon Literacy Line database and included caller name, address, phone number, reason for requesting literacy information, who the literacy referral was for, and whether or not that individual was currently, or had been recently, participating in a literacy education program.

Through a review of the literature on survey research, telephone interviews were determined to be appropriate as the primary means of data collection for an investigation into deterrents to participation among the nonparticipating adult population. In general, the literature reported telephone

interviewing to obtain as high a percentage of returns, and produce comparable information as personal interviews (Borg and Gall, 1989; Dillman, 1978). More specifically, Borg and Gall suggested there is some evidence to indicate that there may be an advantage to telephone interviewing particularly when dealing with sensitive topics, or questions may be viewed as very personal in nature or psychologically threatening.

An initial introductory script was constructed to identify the researcher, the purpose of the study, and an acknowledgement of intent to continue with the interview (a copy of this script is identified as Appendix B).

The DPS-LL, a questionnaire developed to identify deterrents to participation among low-literate adults, was administered through telephone interviews. Upon consent to continue, respondents were then read the set of directions for completing the DPS-LL questionnaire. Each respondent was asked if they understood what would be expected of them. Further clarification was provided, as needed. The researcher read each item to the respondent. The respondent was then asked to indicate the degree of importance each of the reasons stated on the questionnaire were in relation to their own personal decision not to participate in a literacy instruction program. A "True", "Somewhat True", or "Not

True" comment was required at the end of each statement.

After respondents were asked if they wished to provide any further insight into their decision not to enter a literacy program at this time additional sociodemographic data was collected. This included verification of age, race, and employment status.

Data Analyses

Analyses of the data were conducted in several stages, specifically addressing each of the stated research questions:

1. Who were the non-participating low-literate adults?
2. What reasons were perceived as deterrents to participation in adult literacy programs?
3. Did those perceived deterrents interrelate in such a way that certain DPS categories of the deterrents could be prioritized and analyzed?

To address the first research question, an identification of the characteristics of the respondents, data was tabulated and frequency counts were obtained for respondents by age, sex, employment status and race.

To address the second research question, the perceived deterrents to participation, scores were obtained for each

of the deterrent statements. To derive the importance of the deterrents items for the total population, each of the thirty-two items on the DPS-LL was determined to be representative of a discrete deterrent. The degree of influence each item was perceived to exert as a deterrent corresponded to values ranging from 1 to 3 (1 = not true; 2 = somewhat true; 3 = true) on the Likert-type scale.

Simple descriptive statistics as described by Borg and Gall (1989) and Tuckman (1988) were calculated for the total number of respondents. Item mean scores and standard deviations were computed for each item, and used to rank the deterrents according to their relative degree of influence.

The item mean scores for each were used as the basis for analyses addressing the remaining research question, the identification of categories of deterrents that inhibited the low-literate adults calling the Oregon Literacy Line from participating in literacy programs.

Since past research (Carp and Roelfs, 1975; Cross, 1981; Darkenwald and Valentine, 1985; Johnstone and Rivera, 1965; Scanlan and Darkenwald, 1984) had suggested that identified categories of deterrents may differ from those categories previously identified for other groups in the adult population, no assumptions about the possible categorical structure was proposed. Factor analyses measures, more

commonly utilized to abstract source factors statistically, could not be employed due to the limited number of respondents (Nunnally, 1967). However, Tuckman (1988) contended that complex factor analysis is not necessary when one already knows (1) which variables measure each factor (category) and (2) the variable's relative importance. Such categorization can be implied in the items statements, and has been validated empirically by prior researchers Hayes and Darkenwald, 1988; Darkenwald and Valentine, 1986; Hayes, 1987; and Scanlan and Darkenwald, 1985.

The confines of this study were consistent with those recommendations stated by Tuckman (1988). Categories of deterrents identified with Hayes's DPS-LL included: Attitude Toward Classes, Institutional Deterrents, Self Confidence, Situational Deterrents, Social Approval/Disapproval, and Personal Priority.

The Spearman rank correlation coefficient (ρ), used as a means of correlating variables when variables are available in rank form (Borg and Gall, 1989; Tuckman, 1988), was calculated to determine the degree of relationship among the stated deterrents, and measured the interitem degree of influence. The relative importance of the deterrent categories was determined through the use of the Spearman (ρ) correlation matrix. Levels of significance for the

interrelationship of the stated deterrents were then determined through the use of the *Spearman Rank Critical Values Table* (Tuckman, 1988).

If "True/Somewhat True" are both a measure of the validity of the statement for the individual respondent, in this case "True" or "Not True" could be examined from a nominal perspective. This process was employed to determine the statistical levels of significance between the stated deterrents within each of the categories.

Two-way frequency tables were constructed for each of the categorical structures. The formula employed for testing the independence of each of the categorical structures using the chi-square statistics was as follows:

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(\text{observed cell count} - \text{expected cell count})^2}{\text{expected cell count}}$$

$$\text{expected cell count} = \frac{\text{expected} \quad (\text{row total}) (\text{column total})}{\text{grand total}}$$

The observed cell count was the reported frequency count representing the number of respondents who stated "True/Somewhat True" or "Not True" to each of the deterrent statements. The expected cell count referred to the number which would have been expected in each cell when there is no significant relationship between the variables.

In conclusion, levels of significance for each category of deterrents were independently determined, utilizing the *Critical Values of Chi-Square Table* (Tuckman, 1988). Each deterrent category was represented by a different level of significance, ranging from $p < .001$ to $.10$.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This study investigated the perceived motivational orientations among a group of low-literate adults who had initiated a call to the Oregon Literacy Line, and had chosen not to participate in available literacy services. Four specific research questions were addressed relating to: 1) a description of the surveyed non-participating low-literate adult population, 2) an identification of perceived deterrents and (3) an analysis of the stated deterrents to identify categories which further describe those deterrents.

Characteristics of the Population

The characteristics of the surveyed population appear in Tables 1 and 2. Eighty-five percent of the population were white, fifteen percent black. An equal number of males and females participated in this study. The age in years ranged from 19 to 61, with fifty percent of the population falling within the 19-31 age group (19-21 = 25%, 26-31 = 25%). White females totaled ninety-five percent of the 19-31 age group, with over fifty-five percent currently employed. While these characteristics are similar to those described in the annual report on participants in Oregon's adult basic education

programs (State of Oregon, 1988), they were not consistent with those findings reported in the participation research of Mezirow, Darkenwald and Knox (1975), Darkenwald and Valentine (1984), Hayes (1987), and Scanlan and Darkenwald (1985).

Table 1

GROUP CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

Age		White		Black	
		Female	Male	Female	Male
19-25	Unemploy	3		2	1
	Employ		2		
26-31	Unemploy	7	1	1	
	Employ	3			
32-36	Unemploy		5		1
	Employ	3	2		1
38-48	Unemploy		3	1	
	Employ	2	3		1
53-61	Unemploy	2	1		
	Employ		3		
N=48		20	20	4	4

Table 2

INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

Age	Female	Male	White	Black	Employ	Unemploy
19	2		2		1	1
20	1		1			1
21		2		2		2
22	1			1		1
23	1		1		1	
24	1			1		1
25	1		1			1
25		1	1			1
26	3		3			3
27	2		2		2	
28	3		3		1	2
28	1			1		1
29	1		1			1
31	1	1	2			2
32		3	3			3
33		2	1	1	2	
34		1	1		1	
35	1		1		1	
36		2	2			2
38		1	1			1
39	1		1		1	
39		1	1			1
42		2	1	1	2	
45		1	1		1	
46	1			1		1
48	1		1		1	
48		2	2		1	1
53		1	1		1	
55	1		1			1
55		1	1		1	
58		1	1		1	
60	1	1	2			2
61		1	1			1
N	24	24	40	8	18	30
%	50	50	85	15	35	65

Perceived Deterrents to Participation

To address the research question relating to the identification of perceived deterrents, each of the 32 items on the DPS-LL survey represented a discrete deterrent to participation. The degree of influence that each item was perceived to exert as a deterrent corresponded to the values ranging from 1 to 3 (1 = not true, 2 = somewhat true, 3 = true) on the Likert-type scale.

Simple descriptive statistics were calculated for the total sample of respondents utilizing GB-STAT (Dynamic Microsystems, 1988), a statistical package for the personal computer. The item means were used to rank the deterrents according to their relative degree of influence. The items, item means, and item standard deviations are listed in rank order by item mean, and are included in Table 3. The mean item importance scores ranged from 1.27 to 2.31. The overall mean item importance score for the scale was 1.59.

The importance of scores assigned by the respondents to the individual deterrent statements correspond to some extent to the findings of past research. The overall ranking of those deterrents exerting the most influence (It was more important to get a job than to go to school, and I didn't have time to go to class) reflected a low priority for partaking in educational activities and a priority of

economic concerns over education earlier identified as Personal Priority. These findings are consistent with those reported by Fitzgerald (1984) and Kavale and Lindsey (1977).

Those items ranked next as most important (Starting classes would be difficult, with lots of questions and forms to fill out, and The classes were held at times when I couldn't go) are consistent with those identified as situational barriers identified by Johnstone and Rivera (1965) and Carp, Peterson and Roelfs (1974). These studies cited situational barriers more often than dispositional, particularly for those who expressed an interest in participation.

Of moderate importance were items relating to self-confidence or dispositional barriers (It would take a long time for me to learn to read better, I was afraid I was not smart enough to do the work), which further supports previous investigations.

Those of least importance included perceptions that education would be of little value (I didn't think book learning was important, I didn't think I needed to read better) and discouragement of educational endeavors by family and friends (I felt that my friends or family or people I work with wouldn't like it if I went to literacy classes).

Table 3
RANK ORDER OF DETERRENTS

Item	Mean	S.D.
1. It was more important to get a job than to go to classes.	2.312	1.01
2. I didn't have time to go to classes.	2.104	.88
3. Starting classes would be difficult, with lots of questions and forms to fill out.	2.062	.90
4. I didn't think that I could go to classes regularly.	2.020	.86
5. The classes were held at times when I couldn't go.	1.958	.82
6. I was not given information about where I could attend classes.	1.916	.96
7. It would take a long time for me to learn to read better.	1.833	.85
8. I thought that literacy classes would be like my past schooling.	1.791	.84
9. I had family problems.	1.791	.87
10. I didn't want to admit that I needed help with reading.	1.729	.93
11. I didn't know anyone who was going to literacy classes.	1.687	.92
12. I was afraid that I was not smart enough to do the work.	1.645	.83
13. I didn't think learning to read/write better would help me much.	1.645	.88
14. I had health problems.	1.625	.84
15. I didn't want to go to classes alone.	1.562	.76

Table 3 (continued)

Rank Item	Mean	S.D.
16. I didn't want to answer questions in class.	1.562	.79
17. I felt the teachers would not be friendly or understanding.	1.562	.82
18. I didn't think I would like being in classes with younger students.	1.541	.79
19. I didn't want to do schoolwork.	1.541	.84
20. I couldn't pay for childcare or transportation.	1.520	.77
21. I didn't want to take classes in a school building.	1.520	.82
22. I was not comfortable being with other students in a literacy class.	1.479	.77
23. I didn't want to attend classes in the area in which they were held.	1.479	.85
24. I didn't have transportation to the literacy classes.	1.458	.74
25. I felt my family would not like it if I went to literacy classes.	1.458	.79
26. I didn't think "book learning" was very important.	1.375	.73
27. I didn't think I needed to read better.	1.375	.76
28. I tried to start classes but they had no tutor/space for me.	1.375	.76
29. I felt I was too old to learn.	1.375	.78

Table 3 (continued)

Rank Item	Mean	S.D.
30. I felt that my friends or people I work with wouldn't like it if I went to literacy classes.	1.312	.58
31. I heard that literacy classes were not very good.	1.312	.65
32. I went to adult education classes somewhere else and didn't like it.	1.270	.64

Also ranked low were deterrents related to the educational program itself (I went to classes somewhere else and didn't like them, I tried to start classes but they had no space/tutor for me, I heard that literacy classes were not very good, I didn't want to do schoolwork, I didn't think book learning was very important).

Social disapproval toward participation among family and friends, and an unfavorable attitude toward literacy instruction (I felt that my friends or the people I work with wouldn't like it if I went to literacy classes, I felt my family would not like it if I went to literacy classes, etc.), were deterrents which had the least influence in the decision not to participate in a literacy class. Interestingly, these respondents valued literacy instruction, and their social systems tended not to discourage participation.

Categories of Identified Deterrents

The structure of the categories that underlie the deterrent statements and that were identified through this administration of the DPS-LL, addressed the final research question, and included an analyses of the item mean scores which provided the basis from which categories could be derived. The computed interitem (rho) correlations presented the final categorical structures. The item means for each deterrent are included in Table 4.

A number of items had relatively high means. The first category, labeled Personal Priority, presented an overall items means for this grouping of 2.02. These items related to situations in which educational activities are not viewed as having as much value as the need to be employed, or to partake in other types of activities (It was more important to get a job than to go to classes, I didn't have time to go to class, etc.). Personal Priority deterrents had not been cited as identifiable deterrents in any of the previously described investigations (Hayes and Darkenwald, 1988; Darkenwald and Valentine, 1986; Hayes, 1987; and Scanlan and Darkenwald, 1985).

The second category, labeled Institutional Deterrents (The classes were held at times when I couldn't attend, I was

not given information about where I could attend classes, etc.), represented an overall item mean of 1.80 for this group of deterrents. Institutional deterrents had previously been intuitively identified by Cross (1981) as a primary barrier to participation among adults, but, again, had not been identified in past empirical studies.

The third category, labeled Self-Confidence (It would take a long time for me to learn to read better, I didn't want to admit that I needed help with reading, etc.) yielded an overall item means score of 1.69. These items involve feelings of doubt about personal ability to succeed, and a fear of the tasks required in the process of education. Self-Confidence was previously reported by Hayes (1987) as the primary deterrent among participating low-level adult basic education students.

The fourth category consisted of statements that relate to deterrents of a situational nature (I had family problems, I had health problems, I couldn't pay for childcare and transportation, etc.), and were labeled Situational Deterrents. These items represented a total means score of 1.60.

The identification of situational deterrents is also supported by the intuitively derived deterrent described by Cross (1981) and the empirical research described by Hayes (1987).

Table 4
Derived Deterrent Structures

Category 1 - Personal Priority	
Item	Item Mean
1. It was more important to get a job than to go to classes.	2.312
2. I didn't have time to go to classes.	2.104
3. I didn't think that I could go to classes regularly.	2.020
4. I didn't think learning to read/write better would help me much.	1.645
Category 2 - Institutional Deterrents	
Item	Item Mean
1. Starting classes would be difficult, with lots of questions and forms to fill out.	2.062
2. The classes were held at times when I couldn't attend.	1.958
3. I was not given information about where I could attend classes.	1.916
4. I thought that literacy classes would be like my past schooling.	1.791
5. I felt the teachers would not be friendly or understanding.	1.562
6. I didn't want to take classes in a school building.	1.520

Table 4 (continued)

Category 3 - Self Confidence	
Item	Item Mean
1. It would take a long time for me to learn to read better.	1.833
2. I didn't want to admit that I needed help with reading.	1.729
3. I didn't know anyone who was going to the literacy class.	1.687
4. I was afraid that I was not smart enough to do the work.	1.645
5. I didn't want to go to classes alone.	1.562
Category 4 - Situational Deterrents	
Item	Item Mean
1. I had family problems.	1.791
2. I had health problems.	1.625
3. I couldn't pay for childcare or transportation.	1.520
4. I didn't have transportation to the literacy classes.	1.458

Table 5

INTERITEM CORRELATIONS (Spearman Rho)
Category 1 - Personal Priority

Item #	2	3	4
1.	.2724*	.0167	.0547
2.		.1930	.2660*
3.			.3991***

Category 2 - Institutional Deterrents

Item #	2	3	4	5	6
1.	-.0248	.0425	.4306***	.4073***	.0436
2.		.0759	.2608*	-.2471*	-.2997*
3.			.0043	-.0469	.0596
4.				.2930**	.1366
5.					.1655

Category 3 - Self Confidence

Item #	2	3	4	5
1.	.1538	.4681***	.2711*	.4821***
2.		.1207	.3351**	-.0764
3.			.3753***	.5030***
4.				.3368**

Category 4 - Situational Deterrents

Item #	2	3	4
1.	.0072	.2126	.0788
2.		.13417	.0713
3.			.0471

* $p < .10$ ** $p < .05$ *** $p < .01$

The computed chi-square statistics (Tuckman, 1988), measuring the relationship between obtained frequencies identified within each of the categories with those which would occur through chance, was reported in the two-way frequency tables included as Tables 6, 7, 8 and 9.

Those deterrent items identified as Personal Priority are included in Table 6. The chi-square value equals 10.737, (for a tabular value of 9.84, significant at the .02 level; Tuckman, 1988).

Deterrents categorized as Institutional, identified in Table 7, indicate a chi-square value of 17.45 (a tabular value of 15.09, significant at the .01 level; Tuckman, 1988).

Those items representing deterrents identified as Self-Confidence yielded the highest level of significance with a chi-square value of 18.75 (with a tabular value of 18.46, significant at the .001 level; Tuckman, 1988), and are included herein as Table 8.

Deterrent items categorized as Situational, included in Table 9, yielded a chi-square value of 4.848 (with a tabular value of 4.60 significant at the .10; Tuckman, 1988).

The categorical structures represented by this administration of the DPS-LL are deemed to be significant.

Table 6

TWO WAY FREQUENCY TABLE FOR STATED DETERRENTS

Personal Priority					
Item #	1	2	3	4	Row Total
True	35 (1.02)	32 (.21)	31 (.07)	20 (3.05)	118
Not True	13 (1.04)	16 (.33)	17 (.12)	28 (4.87)	74
Column Totals	48	48	48	48	192

$$\chi^2 (3, N = 48), = 10.37, p < .05$$

Table 7

TWO-WAY FREQUENCY TABLE FOR STATED DETERRENTS

Institutional Deterrents							
Item #	1	2	3	4	5	6	Row Total
True	30 (2.63)	31 (3.37)	24 (.07)	25 (2.41)	17 (1.28)	17 (1.28)	134
Not True	18 (2.29)	17 (2.92)	24 (.11)	23 (2.10)	31 (1.11)	31 (1.11)	154
Column Totals	48	48	48	48	48	48	288

$$\chi^2 (5, N = 48), = 20.65, p < .01$$

Table 8

TWO-WAY FREQUENCY TABLE FOR STATED DETERRENTS

Self Confidence Deterrents						
Item #	1	2	3	4	5	Row Total
True	10 (1.78)	18 (.52)	9 (2.53)	13 (.32)	26 (7.67)	76
Not True	38 (.82)	30 (.24)	39 (1.17)	35 (.15)	22 (3.56)	164
Column Totals	48	48	48	48	48	240

$$\chi^2 (4, N = 48), = 18.75, p < .001$$

Table 9

TWO-WAY FREQUENCY TABLE FOR STATED DETERRENTS

Situational Deterrents					
Item #	1	2	3	4	Row Total
True	24 (1.81)	19 (.04)	15 (.58)	15 (.58)	73
Not True	24 (1.11)	29 (.02)	33 (.35)	33 (.35)	119
Column Totals	48	48	48	48	192

$$\chi^2 (3, N = 48), = 4.848, p < .10$$

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This investigation, identifying the characteristics of nonparticipating low-literate adults calling the Oregon Literacy Line, and the reasons they stated as deterrents contributing to their decision not to participate in adult literacy programs, suggests that the deterrents construct does differ among various subgroups of the population (Darkenwald and Hayes, 1988; Darkenwald and Valentine, 1985; Hayes, 1987; Martindale and Drake, 1989; Scanlan and Darkenwald, 1984; Scanlan, 1982), and that those stated deterrents can be meaningfully applied to recruitment and program planning strategies.

Deterrents To Participation

All deterrent statements on the DPS-LL were perceived as being of at least some influence for some respondents. The importance of scores assigned by the respondents to the individual deterrent statements correspond to some extent to the findings of past research. However, the overall mean item importance score for the DPS-LL was low; low item means were also characteristic of the DPS (Scanlan and Darkenwald,

1984) and the DPS-G (Darkenwald and Valentine, 1985). As Scanlan (1982) suggested, an overall low item mean may have indicated that one or both of the following are true: 1) a perceived lack of social acceptability of the items created a response bias and/or 2) most of the individual deterrent statements were not actually perceived as very influential by the respondents in preventing their participation in adult literacy programs. The chance does exist that important deterrents were not represented by the DPS-LL. A third, and more convincing, explanation of such a pattern of low item means was offered by Darkenwald and Valentine (1985), who suggested that for most people, nonparticipation is the result of a combination of deterrents, rather than one or two that would hypothetically be more easily overcome.

The relative importance given to each deterrent statement must be interpreted cautiously. The significance of the difference between item means was not determined, therefore, conclusions based on these differences are tentative. In addition, the rank order of the deterrent statements, as well as the overall low item importance scores, may have been influenced by social response bias, with the more socially acceptable statements given higher scores than the less acceptable statements.

A number of statements had relatively high means, which suggests that those statements which referred to dispositional deterrents (I didn't think learning to read/write better would help me, etc.) were particularly relevant for this population. These statements reflected a personal orientation in which participation in educational activities is not perceived as important or helpful. This is of particular significance in light of the fact that all respondents had a perceived need for literacy education when they initially contacted the Oregon Literacy Line.

The high ranking of the statement identifying lack of information regarding literacy program services as an identified deterrent, and the low ranking of statements reflecting a negative attitude toward the value of school and education in general, lends support to such a conclusion.

The results also indicate that deterrent statements referring to social disapproval of educational efforts are not perceived to be important for those who choose not to participate.

Deterrent Categorical Structures

The identification of deterrent categories in this investigation, as did the analyses of Darkenwald and Valentine (1985), Hayes (1987), Martindale and Drake (1989),

and Scanlan and Darkenwald (1984), utilizing various others forms of the DPS, provides support for the multidimensional conceptualization of the deterrent construct.

The categories identified with this administration of the DPS differed from previous intuitive conceptualizations (Cross, 1981; Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982), and from those categories identified by prior administrations of the DPS within the general population (Darkenwald and Valentine, 1985; Johnstone and Rivera, 1965; Carp, Peterson, and Roelfs, 1975), and with other subgroups of the general population (Hayes, 1987; Martindale and Drake, 1989; Scanlan and Darkenwald, 1984).

Only two categories, Self-Confidence and Personal Priority, were identified with the DPS-G for the general population. It was noted by Darkenwald and Valentine (1985) that their sample consisted of primarily middle-class suburban adults.

The structure of the deterrent categories found with the use of the DPS for health professionals, professional continuing educators, or enlisted Air Force personnel was different from those identified for the low-literate nonparticipating adults who initiated literacy referral services through the Oregon Literacy Line. Given the differences in the characteristics of these groups, such

dissimilarities could be expected.

Those categories reported by adults participating in adult basic education programs (Hayes, 1987) suggests some commonality with this current research population, particularly those deterrents describing Self-Confidence (I thought starting classes would be difficult, with lots of questions and forms to fill out), Situational Deterrents (I couldn't pay for childcare or transportation), and Personal Priority (It was more important to get a job than to go to class).

A number of categories identified in this investigation (Self-Confidence and Social Disapproval) had previously been included in the single intuitively derived category described as dispositional by Cross (1981), and psychosocial (Institutional and Situational) by Darkenwald and Merriam (1982). Notably, in the research with the DPS and the DPS-G, dispositional types of deterrents were also represented by a single category (Situational). The present finding lends support to the assertion of prior theorists, such as Anderson and Niemi (1970), that low-literate adults experience a variety of dispositional deterrents related to a distinctive subculture that are not the same for other members of the general adult population. Additionally, the items comprising the Self-Confidence and Personal

Priority categories on the DPS-LL were given greater importance than those similar categories on the DPS-G. This finding was in accord with past research (Carp, Peterson and Roelfs, 1975; Johnstone and Rivera, 1965), indicating the significance of dispositional deterrents for the less-educated population.

A single category (Situational) was found to be roughly equivalent to the intuitively derived category of situational deterrents postulated by Cross (1981). In previous research with the general population (Darkenwald and Valentine, 1985) this type of deterrent was more complex, represented by several factors: time constraints, cost and personal problems. These categories of deterrents also were perceived as having high relative importance for adults in general while situational deterrents were perceived as moderately important by the low-literate adults. This difference reflected the generally lower level of social involvement and corresponding lack of conflicting commitments for the low-literate adult population. Cost may be less likely to be perceived as a deterrent to participation in literacy education because the classes are free.

The strongest deterrent category identified, Personal Priority, did not seem to correspond to any of Cross's (1981) intuitively derived categories. However, this category was

reported in Darkenwald and Valentine's (1985) research with the DPS-G. Deterrents which indicate a low personal priority for literacy instruction at this time, clearly demonstrates that low-literate adults are similar to the general adult population in that having a variety of roles and responsibilities may make educational activities of secondary importance.

The second category, Institutional Deterrents, did relate to those deterrents described by Cross (1981) and Darkenwald and Merriam (1982), particularly that which describes lack of information regarding the availability and location of adult literacy programs.

While Institutional Deterrents were also identified by previous studies also (Darkenwald and Valentine, 1984; Scanlan and Darkenwald, 1985), items were referenced to course relevance, cost, and quality.

The findings from the current research indicated that lack of information had significant importance as a deterrent to participation in literacy education programs for this targeted population. Informational deterrents were perceived as relatively unimportant in the research with the DPS and the DPS-G, and seems logical for those populations with more access to a variety of sources of information.

The overall pattern of interitem correlations of perceived deterrents provided additional information, and in accord with theory and previous research (Aslanian and Brickell, 1980; Boshier, 1971, 1973, 1976, 1977; Boyd and Martin, 1985; Cross, 1981; Darkenwald and Merriam, 1984; Quigley, 1987a) suggested that perceptions of deterrents differ according to the life circumstances and personal characteristics of individuals.

The structure of the categories as reported by this group of low-literate nonparticipating adults has indicated that individual differences in the perception of deterrents are more important than aggregate characteristics in determining deterrents to participation.

Implications for Research and Practice

Prior research had not empirically explored the nature of the deterrent construct among a low-literate nonparticipating adult population. This study extended the knowledge of the nature of the deterrents construct to participation in adult education by providing new information about deterrents for a new subgroup of the adult population. The results of this study suggested several directions for future research.

First, in order to determine the stability of the category structure of the deterrents identified with the DPS-LL, replication of this study with additional groups of nonparticipating low-literate adults is necessary. The surveyed population is small in number and geographically centered in the metropolitan center of a very sparsely populated state. Additional investigations among those in differing population centers are also needed.

Second, information is needed about how the low-literate adult population can be helped to overcome identified deterrents to participation. Identification of the life events that provide increased motivation, opportunities, and a need for learning, as well as, an exploration of the strategies that other individuals use to overcome deterrents to participation would provide a basis for targeting efforts to increase participation in adult literacy programs.

Reasons stated as primary deterrents to participation for this research population related primarily to those factors which are more externally, rather than internally controlled. Additional research into levels of self-efficacy and program participation would lend further insight into the rationale for stated deterrents.

Finally, the results of this research have implications for program planners and practitioners interested in

increasing enrollments of low-literate adults in adult literacy or adult basic education programs within the greater Portland metropolitan area. The relative importance of informational and dispositional deterrents for the low-literate adult population calling the Oregon Literacy Line for literacy program referral, reinforced the findings of past research, and indicated a need to address these deterrents in developing strategies to increase overall participation in literacy education programs.

While each respondent had perceived a need for additional literacy instruction, the high incidence of items relating to personal priority as primary deterrents for this group has suggested that low-literate adults contacting the Oregon Literacy Line were concerned about their ability to successfully participate in available literacy programs, and questioned the relevance of these programs to their immediate need. Few apparently perceived that the educational activity would, in fact, enrich their lives. As many of these low-literate adults reported a perceived lack of support from the teaching staff, more emphasis must be placed on making counselors available to perspective students, and training literacy education counselors and instructors in the area of adult education (adult development, motivation and learning theory).

It is to be recognized that adults have other responsibilities and obligations and unless the educational activity is viewed as being able to respond to individual personal or social needs, participation is unlikely.

Low-literate adults who have come forward and identified a personal need for literacy services must be positively recognized for taking that important first step. The importance of immediate follow-up procedures can not be overstated. The nonparticipating low-literate adult population requires initial follow-up and recruitment strategies which are differentiated, and tailored to reduce deterrents for this group.

Differentiated recruitment strategies require an increased emphasis on establishing community liaisons with a variety of ethnic community centers, churches, and social service agencies on an ongoing basis. Recruitment strategies which are targeted to the specific needs of each subgroup would more effectively reduce deterrents. An emphasis which is placed on promoting program awareness by word of mouth, and increasing motivation to participate by instilling higher levels of self-confidence is necessary. Previous campaigns which have been directed primarily by print could more effectively be combined with a unique blend of visual and oral techniques to overcome the distinctive combination of

deterrents experienced by this group.

Low-literate adults who had contacted the Oregon Literacy Line were concerned about their ability to profit from formal educational programs and to regularly attend scheduled classes, need assurance that program offerings are different from basic high school equivalency preparation programs. Culturally relevant community based programs providing individually paced instruction and individual tutoring services must be available.

Program offerings are to be consistent with the time needs of the community to be served. The stated perceptions that educational institutions erect obstacles relating to the availability of program offerings at times and in places which are inconsistent with the culture of the community, all contribute to feelings that the educational institutions are not receptive to meeting the unique needs of these low-literate adult learners. The availability of literacy services within distinct communities sends the message that the literacy provider is responsive to the unique instructional needs of the low-literate adult.

Alternative methods of curriculum planning and instructional delivery must be explored. Low-literate adult students must be included in program planning; determining goals, choosing instructional materials and assessing

personal progress. Instructional practices and curricular materials must address a broader need. Inclusion of basic life skills, as well as specific instruction relating to differentiated vocational training programs would assure this low-literate adult population that available programs can help fulfill personal goals.

This investigation has provided insights into perceptions as deterrents to participation from among a group of previously unidentified, low-literate nonparticipating adults contacting a literacy referral service in the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area. Avenues have been opened for continued investigations into the deterrent construct from among this population. Ongoing follow-up studies must continue.

State-wide, toll-free, literacy referral call lines have been initiated in many other states, as has welfare reform legislation mandating literacy education for a greater percentage of this nation's population. Each will provide additional population databases for future investigations. No longer need the nonparticipating low-literate adult who perceives the need for literacy education be represented by the perceptions of someone outside of this group.

Overall, a significant conclusion of the present research indicates that low-literate adults do not form a

homogeneous group. It is possible to identify differences in characteristics and perceptions of deterrents from within different groups of the population.

The deterrents identified and the derived categorical structures provide a way for practitioners and researchers to make order out of the chaos of individual differences while acknowledging the diversity of the low-literate population as a whole.

As Darkenwald and Valentine (1985) reported, the findings confirmed that for this research population the decision not to participate in available literacy programs is typically due to the combined (synergistic) effects of multiple deterrents, rather than just one or two in isolation.

This research allows those literacy service providers in the greater Portland metropolitan area to begin to view the nonparticipating low-literate adult from a more holistic perspective--one in which the adult measures the pressures of immediate need with the value of the expected outcomes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, B. L. (1981). *Guide to adult functional literacy assessment using existing tests*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Health.
- Anderson, C. & Darkenwald, G. (1979). *Participation and persistence in American adult education*. New York, N.Y.: College Entrance Board.
- Anderson, D. & Niemi, J. (1970). *Adult education and the disadvantaged adult*. Syracuse, N.Y.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult Education.
- Anderson, L. K. (1980). *Functional literacy, need for measurement and local efforts*. Occasional paper.
- Anderson, R.E. & Darkenwald, G.G. (1979). *Participation and persistence in American adult education*. New York, N.Y.: College Entrance Examination Board.
- Arnette, J. (1988). The importance of being literate. *Adult Education*, 60(4), 341-344.
- Arnove, R. & Graff, H. J. (1987). National literacy campaigns: Historical and comparative lessons. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 69(3), 202-206.
- Aslanian, C. B. & Brickell, H.M. (1980) *Americans in transition: Life changes as reasons for adult learning*. New York: Future Directions for a Learning Society, College Board.
- Bandura, A. (1981). Self-referent thought: A developmental analysis of self-efficacy. In H. Flavel & L. Ross (Eds.), *Social cognitive development* (pp. 200-239). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Belz, E. (1984). Educational therapy: A model for the treatment of functionally illiterate adults. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 35(2), 96-104.
- Blunt, A. (1983). Development of a Thurstone scale for measuring attitudes toward adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 34(1), 16-28.

- Boggs, D. (1974). Adult basic education in Ohio - A program impact evaluation. *Adult Education*, 29, 123-140.
- Borg, W. R. & Gall, M.D. (1989). *Educational Research* (5th ed.). New York: Longman
- Boshier, R. (1971). Motivational orientations of adult education participants: A factor analytic exploration of Houle's typology. *Adult Education Journal*, 21(2), 3-26.
- Boshier, R. (1972). The development and use of a dropout prediction scale. *Adult Education*, 22(2), 87-99.
- Boshier, R. (1973). Educational participation and dropout: A theoretical model. *Adult Education*, 23, 265-289.
- Boshier, R. (1976). Factor analysts at large: A critical review of the motivational orientation literature. *Adult Education*, 27, 24-47.
- Boshier, R. (1977). Motivational orientations revisited: Life-space motives and the education participation scale. *Adult Education*, 27, 89-115.
- Boshier, R., & Collins, J. B. (1985). The Houle typology after twenty-two years: A large scale empirical test. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 35, 113-130.
- Boyd, R. D. (1961). Basic motivation of adults in non-credit programs. *Journal of Adult Education*, 11, 91-96.
- Boyd, R. D. & Martin, L. G. (1984). A methodology for the analysis of the psychosocial profiles of low literate adults. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 34(2), 85-96.
- Brookfield, S. D. (1986). *Understanding and facilitating adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Brown, C. D. (1984). Reappraising the professionalism of adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 34(2), 97-100.
- Burgess, P. (1971). Reasons for adult participation in group educational activities. *Adult Education*, 22, 3-29.
- Carp, A., Peterson, R. & Roelfs, P. (1974). Adult learning interests and experiences. In K. P. Cross & J. Valley (Eds.), *Planning nontraditional programs*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cervero, R. (1981). Assessment in adult basic education: A comparison of the APL and GED tests. *Adult Education*, 31, 67-84.
- Cervero, R. (1985). Is a common definition of adult literacy possible? *Adult Education Quarterly*, 36(1), 50-54.
- Chall, J. S. (1983). Literacy: Trends and explanations. *Educational Researcher*, 12, 3-8.
- Chall, J. S., Heron, E. & Hilferty, A. (1987). Adult literacy: New and enduring problems. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 69(3), 190-196.
- Clark, E. H. (1979). *Adult education and participation: A study of the reasons why disadvantaged adults do not participate in adult basic education*. (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1978) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 40, 3049A.
- Clark, R. A. (1984). Definitions of literacy: Implications for policy and practice. *Adult Literacy and Basic Education*, 8(3): 133-146.
- Commission on Higher Education and the Adult Learner (1984). *Adult learners: Key to the nation's future*. Columbia, Maryland.
- Cookson, P. S. (1986) A framework for theory and research on adult education participation. *Adult Education Quarterly* 36 (3): 130-141.

- Courtney, S. (1986). Response: Focus on adult education research questions. On derivation of the research question. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 36(3), 160-165.
- Cressy, D. (1983). *Literacy and social order: Reading and writing in Tudor and Stuart England*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cross, K. P. (1981). *Adults as learners*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cunningham, P.M. (1973). *The effects of self-esteem and perceived program utility on persistence and cognitive achievement in an adult basic education program*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Darkenwald, G. G., & Merriam, S. B. (1982). *Adult education: Foundations of practice*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Darkenwald, G. G., & Valentine, T. (1984). *Outcomes and impact of adult basic education*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Center for Adult Development, Rutgers - The State University. Research Monograph no. 6.
- Darkenwald, G. G., & Valentine, T. (1985). Factor structure of deterrents to public participation in adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 35, 177-193.
- Dauksza-Cook, W. D. (1977). *Adult literacy education in the United States*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Dauzat, S. V. and Dauzat, J. (1977). Literacy: in quest of a definition. *Adult Literacy and Basic Education*, 1 (1): 1-5.
- de Vaus, D. A. (1986). *Surveys in social research*. Boston: George Allen & Unwin.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Douglass, M. (1970). Some perspectives on the phenomenon of participation. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 20(2), 88-98.
- Dynamic Microsystems (1988). G-B Stat, Version 1.0. Maryland: Silver Spring.
- Eberle, A. & Robinson, S. (1980). *The adult illiterate speaks out: Personal perspectives on learning to read and write*. Washington, D. C.: National Institute for Community Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 195 771)
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Fingeret, A. (1982). *The illiterate underclass: Demythologizing an American stigma*. Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University.
- Fingeret, A. (1983) Social network: A new perspective on independence and illiterate adults. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 33: 133-145.
- Fingeret, A. (1984). *Adult literacy education: Current and future directions*. Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Career and Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 246 308).
- Fitzgerald, G. (1984). Can the hard-to-reach adults become literate? *Lifelong Learning*, 7: 4-5, 27.
- Fowler, F. J. (1984). *Survey research methods*. New York: Sage Publications.
- Freire, P. (1970a). Cultural action for freedom. *Harvard Educational Review*, 40, 205-225.
- Freire, P. (1970b). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Fueyo, J. M. (1988). Technical literacy versus critical literacy in adult basic education. *Journal of Education*, 170(1), 107-118.

- Garrison, D. R. (1983). Prediction of adult learner dropout using a psychosocial system model. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1983). *Dissertation Abstract International*, 44 1293A.
- Garrison, D. R. (1988). A deductively derived and empirically confirmed structure of factors associated with dropout in adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 38(4): 199-210.
- Gee, J. P. (1988). Discourse systems and aspirin bottles: On literacy. *Journal of Education*, 170(1), 27-40.
- Ginzberg, E. & Bray, D. W. (1953). *The uneducated*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (1988). Schooling, popular culture, and a pedagogy of possibility. *Journal of Education* 170(1), 9-25.
- Grabowski, S. M. (1973). *Motivational factors of adult learners in a directed self-study bachelor's degree program*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University.
- Graff, H. (1979). *The literacy myth: Literacy and social structure in the 19th century city*. New York: Academic Press.
- Graham, R. (1983). *Twentieth Century Task Force on Educational Policy*. United States Department of Education. Washington, D.C.
- Grattan, C. (1955). *In quest of knowledge: A historical perspective on adult education*. New York: Association Press.
- Gray, W. S. (1956). *The teaching of reading and writing*. UNESCO Monographs on Fundamental Education. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization: New York
- Green, K.R., Reder, S., & Conklin, N.F. (1985). *Literacy outreach: The community link. A guide to working with literacy helpers*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

- Griffith, W. S., & Cervero, R. M. (1977). The adult performance level program: A serious and deliberate examination. *Adult Education*, 27, 209-224.
- Grotelueschen, A. D., & Caulley, D. N. (1977). A model for studying determinants of intention to participate in continuing professional education. *Adult Education*, 28, 22-37.
- Guthrie, J. T. & Kirsch, I.S. (1983). *What is literacy in the United States?* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Haddon, R. L. (1986). *A process for the evaluation of learner goals, reading comprehension, and program impact as elements of adult literacy programs.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Oregon State University (1987).
- Harman, D. (1987). *Illiteracy: a national dilemma.* New York:Cambridge.
- Havighurst, R. J. (1970). Changing status and roles during the adult life cycle: Significance for adult education. Burns, Norbert (Ed.). *Sociological backgrounds of adult education.* Syracuse, New York: Center For The Study of Liberal Education for Adults.
- Hayes, E. (1988). A typology of low-literate adults based on perceptions of deterrents to participation in adult basic education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 39(1), 1-10.
- Hayes, E. & Darkenwald, G. (1988). Participation in basic education: Deterrents for low-literate adults. *Studies in the Education of Adults* (U. K.), 20(1), 16-28.
- Heisel M. & Larson, G. (1984). Literacy and social milieu: Reading behavior of the black elderly. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 34(2), 63-70.
- Houle, C. O. (1961). *The inquiring mind.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

- Houle, C. O. (1972). *The design of education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hunt, D. E. (1975). Person-environment interaction: A challenge found waiting before it was tried. *Review of Educational Research*, 45, 209-230.
- Hunter, S. T., & Harman, D. (1979). *Adult illiteracy in the United States: A report to the Ford Foundation*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Johnstone, J. W. C., & Rivera, R. M. (1965). *Volunteers for learning: A study of the educational pursuits of American adults*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Jones, E. V. (1981). *Reading instruction for the adult illiterate*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Kavale, K. A. & Lindsey, J. D. (1977). Adult basic education: has it worked? *Journal of Reading*, 20, 368-376.
- Kazemek, F. E. (1988). The self as social process: the work of George Herbert Mead and its implications for adult literacy education. *Adult Literacy and Basic Education*, 12: 1-13.
- Kazemek, F. E. (1983). *Toward a theoretical framework of adult literacy*. Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University.
- Knowles, M. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy* (2nd ed.). Chicago: Follett.
- Knowles, M. (1984). *The adult learner: A neglected species*. (3rd ed.), Houston: Gulf Publishing Company.
- Knox, A. (1985). *Reducing barriers to participation in continuing education*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin. Occasional paper.

- Knox, A. B. (1977). *Adult development and learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Knox, A. B. (1980). Proficiency theory of adult learning. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 5, 378-404.
- Knox, A. B. (1986). *Helping adults learn*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kotinsky, R. (1941). *Elementary education of adults*. New York: American Association for Adult Education.
- Kozol, J. (1985). *Illiterate america*. New York: New American Library.
- Larrick, N. (1987). Illiteracy starts too soon. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 69(3), 184-189.
- Lefcourt, H. M. (1982). *Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers*. New York: Harper.
- Litchfield, A. (1965). *The nature and pattern of participation in adult education activities*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Locke, E. A. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 3, 157-189.
- London, J. (1970). The influence of social class behavior upon adult education participation. *Adult Education Journal*, 20(3), 140-153.
- Lowenthal, M. F., et. al. (1975). *Stages of life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Martin, L. (1978). *An exploratory descriptive study of the psychosocial characteristics of ABE/ASE students and the effects of education on four psychosocial variables*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison. 1978.

- Martin, L. (1987). Life style classification of adult high school noncompleters. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 38, 32-45.
- Martindale, C. J. & Drake, J. B. (1989). Factor structure of deterrents to participation in off-duty adult education programs. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 39(2), 63-75.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Merriam, S. B. (1978). Middle age: A review of the literature and it's implications for educational intervention. *Adult Education*, 29, 39-54.
- Merriam, S. B. (1982). *Adult education: Foundations of practice*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Merriam, S. B. (1987). Adult learning and theory building: A review. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 37(4), 187-198.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). Finding your way through the maze: A guide to the literature on adult learning. *Lifelong Learning*, 11(6), 4-7.
- Merriam, S. B. & Jones, E. V. (1983). The use of documentary sources in adult learning and development research. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 34(1), 54-59.
- Merriam, S. B. & Simpson, E. L. (1984). *A guide to research for educators and trainers of adult education*. Malabar, Florida: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Co.
- Mezirow, J. (1971). Toward a theory of practice. *Adult Education Journal*, 21(3), 135-147.
- Mezirow, J. (1981). A critical theory of adult learning and education. *Adult Education*, 32(1), 3-27.
- Mezirow, J., Darkenwald, G., & Knox, A. (1975). *Last gamble on education*. Washington D.C.: Adult Education Association of the United States.

- Miller, H. L. (1967). *Participation of adults in education: A force-field analysis*. Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED 011 996).
- Morstein, B. R. & Smart, J. C. (1974). Reasons for participation in adult education courses. *Adult Education*, 24, 83-98.
- Moshenberg, D. (1988). To anticipate tomorrow by dreaming today. *Journal of Education*, 170(1),
- Mutava, D. M. (1988). Forty years of struggle against illiteracy: The Zambian case. *Prospects*, 18(3), 335- 350.
- National Academy of Education. (1985). *Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the commission on reading*. Washington, D.C.: The National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education.
- Neugarten, B. L. (1968). The awareness of middle age. Neugarten, B. L. (Ed.). *Middle age & aging*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Nordhaug, O. (1987). Adult education and social science: A theoretical framework. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 38, 1-13.
- Norman, C., & Malicky, G. (1986). Literacy as a social phenomenon: Implications for instruction. *Lifelong Learning*, 9, 22-24.
- Northcutt, N., Selz, N., Shelton, E., Nyer, L., Hickok, D., & Humble, M. (1975). *Adult functional competence: A summary*. Austin: Division of Extension, University of Texas at Austin.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1967). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw Hill.

- Pratt, D. D. (1988). Androgogy as a relational construct. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 38(3), 160-172.
- Psacharopoulos, G. (1981). Returns to education: An updated international comparison. *Comparative Education*, 17, 321-341.
- Quigley, B. A. (1987a). *The resisters: An analysis of nonparticipation in adult basic education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University.
- Quigley, B. A. (1987b). Learning to work with them: Analyzing nonparticipation in adult basic education through resistance theory. *Adult Literacy and Basic Education*, 11(2), 63-71.
- Rachal, A. R. (1988). Gutenberg, literacy, and the ancient arts of memory. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 38 (3), 125-135.
- Resnick, D. P. & Resnick, L. B. (1977). The nature of literacy: An historical exploration. *Harvard Educational Review*, 47, 370-385.
- Richardson, J. S. (1988). Networking for adult literacy: A position statement. *Adult Literacy and Basic Education*, 12, 27-32.
- Richardson, R. C., et al. (1981). *Functional literacy in the college setting*. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education (AAHE-ERIC/Higher education research report; no. 3).
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L. (1984). *Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal vs. external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80, 1-28.
- Rubenson, K. (1982). Adult education research: In quest of a map of the territory. *Adult Education*, 32, 57-74.

- Scanlan, C. (1982). *Factors deterring allied health professionals from participating in continuing education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers: The State University.
- Scanlan, C. & Darkenwald, G. (1984). Identifying deterrents to participation in continuing education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 34, 155-166.
- Seaman, D. R. & Chroeder, W. L. (1970). The relationship between extent of educative behavior by adults and their attitudes toward continuing education. *Adult Education*, 20, 99-105.
- Sheffield, S. B. (1974). The orientations of adult continuous learners. In D. Solomon (Ed), *The continuous learner*, Chicago, IL: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.
- Shye, S. (1978). *Theory construction and data analysis in the behavioral sciences*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Sisco, B. (1983). The undereducated: Myth or reality? *Lifelong Learning*, 6, 14-15, 24, 26.
- Smith, D. H. (1980). Determinants of individuals' discretionary use of time. In D. H. Smith, J. Macaulay, & Associates (Eds.). *Participation in social and political activities* (pp 34-75). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, D. H. (1980). General activity model. In D. H. Smith, J. Macaulay, & Associates (Eds.). *Participation in social and political activities* (pp 461-530). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, F. (1989). Overselling literacy. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 70(5), 352-359.
- Stanage, S. M. (1986). "Unrestraining" liberty: Adult education and the empowerment of persons. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 36(3), 123-129.
- Stanage, S. M. (1987). *Adult education and phenomenological research: New directions for theory, practice and research*. Malabar, Florida: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Company.

- State of Oregon (1988). *Profile of adult education participants: 1987-88 (Annual Report)*. Salem, OR: Oregon Department of Education, Office of Community Colleges.
- Thistlewhite, L. L. (1986). The adult beginning reader: Assessment/discussion/instruction. *Lifelong Learning* 10, 4-7.
- Tuckman, B. W. (1988). *Conducting educational research (3rd ed.)*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch, Publishers.
- U. S. Congress. (1966). *The adult education act: PL 89-750*. Washington, D.C.: 89th Congress
- Valentine, T. (1986). Adult functional literacy as a goal of instruction. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 36, 108- 113.
- Verner, C. (Ed.). (1987). *Poole's history of adult schools*, Washington, D.C.: Adult Education Associates of the United States.
- Yin, Robert K. (1987). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - OREGON LITERACY LINE INTAKE FORM

LITERACY LINE _____ PORTLAND PHONE: 294-1808.
 2850 SE 82ND AVENUE STATEWIDE TOLL FREE PHONE:
 PORTLAND, OREGON 97266 1-800-322-8715.

DATE: _____ TIME: _____ TAKEN BY: _____

NAME OF CALLER _____	
SEEKING HELP FOR _____	
ADDRESS _____	
CITY _____	STATE _____
ZIPCODE _____	COUNTY _____
PHONE (HOME) _____	(WORK) _____
BEST TIME TO CALL _____	

<p>POTENTIAL STUDENT</p> <p>HAVE YOU HAD READING SKILLS CLASS/TUTOR BEFORE?</p> <p>___ YES. ___ NO.</p> <p>CAN YOU ATTEND A CC CLASS?</p> <p>___ YES. ___ NO.</p> <p>TIME PREFERRED?</p> <p>___ DAY. ___ EVENING.</p> <p>HOW DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE LITERACY LINE?</p> <p>___ TV/RADIO. ___ POSTER. ___ FRIEND/RELATIVE. ___ EMPLOYMENT DIVISION. ___ ADULT & FAMILY SERVICES. ___ OTHER _____.</p>	<p>POTENTIAL TUTOR</p> <p>ARE YOU INTERESTED IN:</p> <p>___ BEING A TUTOR. ___ OFFICE HELP. ___ RECRUITMENT/PUBLICITY. ___ OTHER _____.</p> <p>HAVE YOU WORKED AS A TUTOR BEFORE?</p> <p>___ YES _____. ___ NO.</p> <p>CAN YOU WORK IN AN ABE CLASS?</p> <p>___ YES. ___ NO.</p> <p>CAN YOU WORK ONE-TO-ONE?</p> <p>___ YES. ___ NO.</p> <p>TIME PREFERRED?</p> <p>___ DAY. ___ EVENING.</p>
--	---

FORM SENT TO: CC ABE/GED _____ OLI _____ OTHER _____

COMMENTS: _____

LITERACY LINE _____ PORTLAND PHONE: 294-1808.
 2850 SE 82ND AVENUE _____ STATEWIDE TOLL FREE PHONE:
 PORTLAND, OREGON 97266 _____ 1-800-322-8715.

DATE _____ AGENCY COMPLETING FORM _____

STUDENT	VOLUNTEER
WAS SUBJECT CONTACTED? 1) <input type="checkbox"/> YES. 2) <input type="checkbox"/> NO.	WAS SUBJECT CONTACTED? 1) <input type="checkbox"/> YES. 2) <input type="checkbox"/> NO.
HOW CONTACTED? 3) <input type="checkbox"/> PHONE. 4) <input type="checkbox"/> MAIL. 5) <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER	HOW CONTACTED? 3) <input type="checkbox"/> PHONE. 4) <input type="checkbox"/> MAIL. 5) <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER
WAS SUBJECT REGISTERED FOR A CLASS? 6) <input type="checkbox"/> YES. 7) <input type="checkbox"/> NO.	VOLUNTEER STATUS: 6) <input type="checkbox"/> SENT TUTOR INFORMATION 7) <input type="checkbox"/> MATCHED ONE-TO-ONE. 8) <input type="checkbox"/> PLACED IN A CLASSROOM. 9) <input type="checkbox"/> TRAINED.
WAS SUBJECT MATCHED WITH A TUTOR? 8) <input type="checkbox"/> YES. 9) <input type="checkbox"/> NO.	VOLUNTEER WILL WORK: 10) <input type="checkbox"/> AS A TUTOR. 11) <input type="checkbox"/> AS OFFICE HELP. 12) <input type="checkbox"/> WITH PUBLICITY. 13) <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER CAPACITY.
WAS SUBJECT REFERRED ELSEWHERE? 10) <input type="checkbox"/> YES. 11) <input type="checkbox"/> NO.	WAS SUBJECT REFERRED ELSEWHERE? 14) <input type="checkbox"/> YES. 15) <input type="checkbox"/> NO.
WHERE? _____	WHERE? _____
WHAT READING LEVEL? 12) <input type="checkbox"/> BEGINNING (0-4 GRADE). 13) <input type="checkbox"/> INTERMEDIATE (5-8). 14) <input type="checkbox"/> DEVELOPMENTAL (9+).	COMMENTS: _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
WHAT DID S. WANT HELP WITH? 15) <input type="checkbox"/> READING. 16) <input type="checkbox"/> WRITING. 17) <input type="checkbox"/> MATH. 18) <input type="checkbox"/> GED. 19) <input type="checkbox"/> ESL. 20) <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER	THANKS.
ARE SUBJECTS GOALS: 21) <input type="checkbox"/> PERSONAL. 22) <input type="checkbox"/> JOB RELATED.	

APPENDIX B - TELEPHONE SURVEY SCRIPT

A. "Hello, may I speak to _____?"

If LitLine caller available, go to B.

If not at home, ask when to call back
(._____).

B. "This is _____ calling from the Oregon
Literacy Line.

We are conducting a survey to determine whether those who called the LitLine received the help they requested, and secondly, if you would give us your ideas regarding literacy in our community. We are asking the same questions of other LitLine callers. Your thoughts and feelings are very important to us and will be kept confidential. All answers will be recorded without your name. Do you have three minutes now to help us?" "Thank You"

1. "First, we are interested in knowing how people found out about the Oregon Literacy Line."

_____ newspaper	_____ flyer
_____ friend	_____ church
_____ family	_____ social service agency

2. "Was the LitLine person helpful and able to answer your questions?" [Record any comments]

YES NO

3. "Did you receive information about literacy programs from other literacy program offices also?" [Record any comments]

YES NO

4. "Do you recall what programs contacted you?"

_____ community college _____ Oregon Literacy
_____ other: (list) _____,

5. "Did the programs offer what you had expected, or were they different?"

EXPECTED ___
 DIFFERENT ___
 UNCERTAIN ___

[If different]: "How was it different?"
 "What did you expect?"
 "What didn't you like?"

7. "Thinking back to your reasons/goals for requesting information, would the literacy class help you reach them?"

A LOT ___
 MAYBE ___
 NOT SURE ___
 NOT AT ALL ___

[If not/not sure]: "Why is that?"

8. "We are interested in knowing more about the people who call the LitLine. Would you tell me:"

___ Male Age: ___ Race: ___ White
 ___ Black
 ___ Female ___ Asian
 ___ Hispanic
 ___ Native
 ___ American
 Employed: YES NO ___ Other

10. "There is just one more part to our survey. I would like to read a list of reasons why adults sometimes find it hard to attend literacy classes. I will give you some reasons and ask you to tell me if these reasons were important to you also."

(Go to DPS-LL Questionnaire)

APPENDIX C - DPS-LL

Deterrents to Participation Scale - Form LL

DIRECTIONS: Sometimes adults find it hard to go to literacy classes even if they need help. Listen carefully to some of the reasons adults give for not going to literacy classes. Think back to when you called the LITLINE for literacy information, and decide how true each one was for you when you decided not to go to a literacy class at that time.

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Not True</u>	<u>Some/True</u>
1. I couldn't pay for childcare or transportation.....1	2	3
2. I didn't want to take classes in a school building.....1	2	3
3. I had health problems.....1	2	3
4. I didn't want to answer questions in class.....1	2	3
5. I didn't have time to go to classes.....1	2	3
6. It was more important to get a job than to go to classes.....1	2	3
7. I tried to start classes but they had no space/tutor for me.....1	2	3
8. I didn't want to admit that I needed help with reading.....1	2	3
9. The classes were held at times when I couldn't go.....1	2	3
10. I didn't know anyone who was going to the literacy class.....1	2	3
11. I felt I was too old to learn.....1	2	3
12. I felt my family wouldn't like it if I went to literacy classes.....1	2	3

DPS-LL continued...

13.	I didn't have transportation to classes.....1	2	3
14.	Starting classes would be difficult, with lots of questions & forms to fill out.....1	2	3
15.	It would take too long for me to learn to read better.....1	2	3
16.	I didn't want to do schoolwork.....1	2	3
17.	I didn't think I need to read better.....1	2	3
18.	I thought that literacy classes would be like my past schooling....1	2	3
19.	I heard that literacy classes were not very good.....1	2	3
20.	I felt that my friends or people I work with wouldn't like it if I went to classes.....1	2	3
21.	I didn't think I would like being in classes with younger students...1	2	3
22.	I didn't think "book learning" was important.....1	2	3
23.	I was afraid I was not smart enough to do the work.....1	2	3
24.	I didn't want to go to classes alone.....1	2	3
25.	I felt the teachers would not be friendly or understanding.....1	2	3
26.	I didn't think I could go to class regularly.....1	2	3
27.	I didn't want to attend classes in the area where they were held...1	2	3

DPS-LL continued...

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 28. I didn't think learning to read/
write better would help me much.....1 | 2 | 3 |
| 29. I was not comfortable being with
other students in literacy classes..1 | 2 | 3 |
| 30. I went to adult education classes
somewhere else and didn't like it...1 | 2 | 3 |
| 31. I was not given information about
where I can attend literacy
classes.....1 | 2 | 3 |
| 32. I had family problems1 | 2 | 3 |