

NEW HORIZONS IN ADULT EDUCATION
ISSN. 1062-3183

Volume 14 Number 3 Fall 2000

EDITOR

Nancy Gadbow.....Nova Southeastern University

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Linda Howard.....Nova Southeastern University

EDITORIAL BOARD

H. K. (Morris) Baskett..... The University of Calgary
Dale Cook..... Kent State University
Karen Garver..... University of Nebraska
Jan Jackson..... California State University
Janice Johnson..... University of British Columbia
Kathleen King..... Fordham University
John Kingsbury..... Nova Southeastern University
Mary Klinger..... SUNY Empire State College
Patricia Lawler..... Widener University
Norma Long..... College of Notre Dame of Maryland
Robert Preziosi..... Nova Southeastern University
Mark Rossman..... Capella University
Burt Sisco..... University of Wyoming
Sue Slusarski..... Kansas State University

New Horizons in Adult Education, founded in 1987, is a refereed electronic journal published by Nova Southeastern University's Programs for Higher Education. The journal provides faculty, graduate students, researchers, and practitioners with a means for publishing their current thinking and research within adult education and related fields: research, thought pieces, book reviews, point-counter-point articles, conceptual analysis, case studies, interactive articles, and invitational columns. The authors retain copyright of individual articles. Any item that appears in New Horizons in Adult Education may be retrieved without permission. However, when this material is quoted or reproduced, the author, title of the item, and issues must be cited. The journal is transmitted electronically on the Adult Education Network (AEDNET) web page <http://www.nova.edu/~aed/newhorizons.html>

To correspond with New Horizons in Adult Education send email to horizons@nova.edu or send postal mail to the following:

New Horizons in Adult Education
Nova Southeastern University
Programs for Higher Education
1750 N.E. 167th Street
North Miami Beach, FL 33162-3017

NEW HORIZONS IN ADULT EDUCATION
Volume 14, Number 3, Fall 2000

CONTENTS

Editor's Preface.....3

ARTICLES

Evaluation of Adult Learners: Ethical Issues
by Jean L. Crowe.....4

Old Planet, New Millennium, Same Excuses? Taking Responsibility: The Need for
Adult Environmental Education
by Tarah Sharon Alexandra Wright.....11

A Film Review of "Women of Summer"
by Jodene Melinda Mills.....14

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

HOW TO RESPOND TO ARTICLES ON AEDNET.....22

How to Obtain Back Issues and the Cumulative Index to New
Horizons.....22

Call for
Manuscripts.....22

NEW HORIZONS IN ADULT EDUCATION
Volume 14, Number 3, Fall 2000

EDITOR'S PREFACE

The assessment of adult learning has been a recent topic of interest for many adult educators. Research has confirmed that there are many ways to learn and many ways to demonstrate learning. This change in recognizing the ways learning takes place and how it can be assessed challenges the traditional approaches to evaluation. Evaluation of Adult Learners: Ethical Issues by Jean L. Crowe discusses different types of evaluation in teacher-directed learning (TDL) and in self-directed learning (SDL). Several ethical issues are raised in regard to these approaches to evaluation. Crowe suggests that learner-centered programs combining SDL and TDL assessment techniques can resolve many of these ethical issues related to learner assessment.

Old Planet, New Millennium, Same Earth: Taking Responsibility: The Need for Adult Environmental Education by Tarah S. A. Wright challenges adult educators to reconsider their role in facilitating an understanding of the critical environmental issues that face our planet. Education is presented as an essential part of the movement to promote responsibility toward the environment.

Jodene M. Mills thoughtfully reviews the film, Women of Summer. This complex and revealing film documents the situation of women in the 1920s and 1930s who participated in Bryn Mawr's Summer School for Working Women. Their stories and their growth and development reveal a rich history of working women and the powerful impact of this remarkable and unique adult education program on their lives.

Readers are invited to make these articles “interactive” by responding on AEDNET and sharing their comments. (Directions to guide this discussion are given in this issue on page 22). Readers also are encouraged to submit an article for consideration by the editorial board of New Horizons on a related topic or other topic relevant to adult education philosophy, research, and practice. (See Call for Manuscripts on page 22 for details.)

EVALUATION OF ADULT LEARNERS: ETHICAL ISSUES

Jean L. Crowe
University College of the Fraser Valley
Abbotsford, B.C.

Abstract

In this article, the author presents an overview of the different types of evaluation, or assessment, typically used in college and university settings. Three ethical issues commonly identified when evaluating adult learners are discussed: learner readiness, evaluation credibility, and the power issue. Learner-centred or collaborative programs are suggested as the type of learning experience that could best resolve the ethical dilemmas when assessing adults.

As more and more adults are returning to the classroom, the question of how to provide meaningful evaluation is a challenge facing many educators. Increasing numbers of adult learners are demanding a high quality learning experience, including assessments that are appropriate to their needs. An examination of the various styles of evaluation available will provide insight into how facilitators can make such changes in their curricula.

In this article, I will describe the methods of evaluation typically used to assess adult learners in self-directed learning (SDL) and in teacher-directed learning (TDL) situations. Some advantages and disadvantages of each method will be stated, followed by a description of selected ethical issues associated with evaluation in each case.

I will also discuss the middle ground between SDL and TDL. In my opinion, this middle ground, often called learner-centred and collaborative learning, is becoming popular in institutional programs. I will examine the possibility that evaluation techniques in this middle zone may act to resolve some ethical dilemmas of assessing adults.

Teacher Directed Learning

Tests, examinations and graded reports or essays are typically used in the TDL approach. The teacher sets the objectives, curriculum, and evaluation processes, and grades the students according to the established standards. The intent is to test the knowledge and skills that have been passed on. In this model of education, evaluations determine the extent to which the predefined educational objectives are being realized (Hammond & Collins 1991). In terms of describing evaluation as either formative ("on-going") or summative ("backward looking"), TDL is purely summative.

Self-Directed Learning

An alternate philosophy of education governs practice around the notion of SDL. The purposes of evaluation in this approach are not merely to rate the learner's performance and to maintain academic standards, but are used instead to encourage independent learning and critical thinking. Accomplishing this starts with involving the learners in making decisions about their program (Boud 1990, Hammond & Collins 1991). According to Lowry (1989), SDL is "a process in which individuals take the initiative to diagnose their learning needs, formulate learning goals, identify resources, select and implement learning strategies and evaluate learning outcomes" (p.98).

Assessment tools vary according to each learner's needs. Reflection and self-reflection through observations and journal writing are commonly used in many SDL classrooms. Some learners may benefit from self and peer feedback through interviews and group discussions. On occasion, feedback from clients or from the community is presented as evidence of learning (Boud, 1990). In SDL, evaluation is both formative and summative (Hammond & Collins).

Comparison of Evaluation Methods

Assessment practices of TDL can be easy to administer and give the appearance of equality and fairness. However, such summative testing may be counter-productive to the achievement of a high quality of learning. Topics not tested are ignored by students and lower level cognitive skills like memory are often emphasized. Furthermore, examinations produce no useful information for the learner and the learners tend to focus their energy on grades only (Boud, 1990; Hammond & Collins, 1991).

As mentioned earlier, SDL assessment tools are learner-determined and focus on self-reflection that increases learning and promotes self-awareness (Boud, 1990; Callendar, 1992; Garrison, 1997; Hammond & Collins, 1991). Summative reflections bring together the threads of learning and give the student a sense of completion and accomplishment. For many adult learners, SDL offers a breath of fresh air into the stifling atmosphere of the enforced dependency of TDL that most suffered through as children and young adults.

Critics of SDL note that this style is difficult for some learners who are accustomed to TDL and the approach may cause such learners to become anxious and frustrated (Brockett & Hiemstra, 1991; Hammond & Collins, 1991; Lowry, 1989). The SDL style is also more demanding of educators, requiring openness, creativity, and time (Boyd, Rossing & Neuman, 1993, p.25). Others believe that SDL focuses on psychological growth and maturity rather than on the attainment of knowledge (Callendar, 1992).

Three Ethical Issues of Assessing Adult Learners

There are numerous ethical issues associated with the assessment of adult learners. The three issues most commonly raised when comparing TDL and SDL are learner readiness, the credibility of evaluation in an institutional setting, and the power issue.

Learner Readiness

When considering learner readiness, SDL requires "a great degree of initiative, perseverance, and self-discipline" (Brockett & Hiemstra, 1991, p. 200). Educators using SDL must be prepared to accept the consequences of the problems learners may have who are not willing or capable of achieving success in this format (Vernon, LoParco & Marsick, 1993). Is it detrimental to force SDL on learners who may not adjust to the transformations that critical self-reflection may induce? Many believe that it is detrimental to learners not to introduce SDL techniques since TDL assessment has such limited effectiveness (Brockett & Hiemstra, 1991; Callendar, 1992; Garrison, 1992).

Evaluation Credibility

As to the issue of credibility, is it possible to implement SDL assessment tools in an institution while adhering to academic policies and procedures? In true SDL situations, all evaluations are completed by the learner only, without being graded - a situation that is often judged not feasible at present in many institutional settings. Policy makers believe that their institutes have an obligation to their students and to the community to set standards for their graduates (Hammond & Collins, 1991), standards that are most frequently symbolized by grades. Self-assessments are rarely viewed as credible in an academic environment.

Instructors of TDL in institutions may also experience an ethical dilemma when their own educational values do not match their assessment practices. For instance, they may critically analyze and reflect on their own work but not expect the learners to do so (Boud, 1990), which raises the question of how credible TDL evaluation techniques can be if they are not valued by the instructor.

The Power Issue

When considering the issue of power as it relates to assessment, it may be helpful to consider the question, "Does assessment exist primarily to serve the needs of teaching or of learning?" (Boud, 1990, p.4). In TDL, the educators are often reluctant to share their most important power tool, that is, assessment (Hammond & Collins, 1991). Or they may believe that the educator is the best judge of the student's performance. Either way, the educators want to maintain control of assessment "to secure a favourable verdict regarding their contribution" to the teaching process (Boud, 1990, p.5). When students are graded, they too are focused on the verdict passed by the instructor, not necessarily on their learning. In pure SDL situations, the power of leading the learning process is in the

hands of the learner. The learner is presumed able to describe the types of learning that have occurred and their importance in her/his own life.

Learner-Centred Programs - the Middle Ground

Learner-centred programs, or collaborative learning, utilize a combination of SDL and TDL. The program may be learner-centred as in SDL, but often remains "other-directed" (Jarvis, 1992, p.142), a basic trait of TDL. From the outset, the setting is a collaborative one in learner-centred programs. Participants may be given a choice of evaluation techniques. Often a learning agreement or contract is used to structure this evaluation activity (Hammond & Collins, 1991; Jedrey 1985; Lowry, 1989; Vernon, LoParco, & Marsick, 1993). From an ethical standpoint, if not also from a good-practice standpoint in an institutional program, the agreement should clearly outline that SDL is fostered but not practiced in all aspects, since in an institution, the facilitator usually has the responsibility for the ultimate assessment.

When considering evaluation, learner-centred programs use what Hammond and Collins call a "triangulation" method of evaluation (1991, p.187), which they believe results in a more comprehensive assessment. Assessments are engaged in collaboratively by the learner, by peers, and thirdly, by the facilitator, who gives "the final stamp of approval," validating for external reasons (and for the benefit of outcome-focused learners) that learning has occurred.

Despite this final validation, most of the learning that occurs in learner-centred programs is learner driven. Group discussions enable the sharing of information and knowledge, formative self-reflections document unanticipated learning and the synthesis of ideas (Beatty, Benefield, & Linhart, 1991), and a summative self-evaluation reflects the intensity and effectiveness with which the participants engage in the learning agenda.

When evaluating written work, educators encourage growth by commenting on the degree of thought and learning shown in the work as well as commenting on the understanding of content, form and syntax (Jedrey, 1985). Grades, if given, should be clearly justified, as should be the final mark.

Resolving the Ethical Dilemmas

Readiness

Learner-centred programs have the potential to address the issue of readiness. Learners who feel uncomfortable in pure SDL situations will adapt easier to the more structured format of learner-centred programs (Garrison, 1992; 1997). Learning agreements, organized activities, guidance through projects, and triangulated evaluation all assist adults in making the leap from TDL to SDL. When the concept of SDL is introduced slowly amidst the more familiar TDL activities, the instructor can more easily identify those learners needing assistance in embracing the SDL concept. And with a learning contract, opportunities are always available for those wishing to increase their

level of independent learning. The learner-centred program is structured with this variety of evaluation techniques to enable the optimum number of learners to find the level of assessment appropriate to their need.

Credibility

Does this middle ground of collaborative learning also resolve the issue of the credibility of assessment techniques? Brockett and Hiemstra (1991) believe that this ethical dilemma can be resolved when the degree of the SDL experience is acknowledged openly and when the specifics of grading policies are discussed and justified. Learners are made fully aware of the institutional requirement for submitting grades but are also instructed on the details of the importance and relevance of the self-directed learning experience. In such situations, the instructor's philosophy of education must fit in with the "middle" approach of assessment for the learners to trust the evaluation process as it is presented (Hammond & Collins, 1991). It is a challenge for educators to accept this "middle approach" concept. Each instructor must find her/his own "middle ground" philosophy and communicate it clearly to the class to achieve the trust necessary for the learners to engage in the SDL process.

The difficulty in achieving this trust is compounded when the learners may not share the "middle approach" concept either. Frank discussions throughout the program will help to bring everyone's focus back to what is important, that is, meaningful learning. When the evidence of learning central to SDL criteria becomes the focus of achievement, a mature learner in this situation (with encouragement) should be able to view the assigned grade as incidental to the deeper learning that is occurring.

Power

Does triangulated assessment in learner-centred programs serve the needs of teaching or of learning? The aim of this style of assessment is definitely intended to improve the learning and not simply to pass judgment on an individual's attainment (Waldron & Moore, 1992). However, since the educator usually retains the authority of the "final stamp of approval," learners will continue to view themselves as having less power than the educator in the learning situation. The program may be learner-centred but learning remains "other-controlled" (Jarvis 1992, p.142).

Conclusion

In this article, I have analyzed selected ethical issues surrounding assessment practices in self-directed learning and teacher-directed learning and suggested a middle ground - learner-centred or collaborative approaches. I have suggested that the learner-centred program, which could combine both SDL and TDL assessment techniques, is able to resolve most successfully key ethical dilemmas that arise when evaluating adult learners.

It is necessary to consider that the two extreme styles do not exist independently of each other. Paradoxically, as Jarvis states, control in learning often has to be exercised to help people become more self-directed (1992). Collaborative learning can be utilized to wean students from dependence on others and ultimately to assist them in understanding the concept of SDL. As Boud (1992) has so nicely set out for us - in collaborative learning, both educator and learner have a role to play; both have responsibilities to fulfill in the achievement of a quality learning experience.

References

Beatty, P.T., Benefield, L.L. & Linhart, L.J. (1991). Evaluating the teaching and learning process. In M.W. Galbraith (Ed.), Facilitating adult learning. Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Boud, D. (1990). Assessment and the promotion of academic values. Studies in Higher Learning. 15(1) 101-112. (Retrieved from EBSCOhost WEB Full Display, Oct. 17, 1998).

Boud, D. (1992). The use of self-assessment schedules in negotiated learning. Studies in Higher Learning. 17(2) 185-201. (Retrieved from EBSCOhost WEB Full Display, Nov. 2, 1998).

Boyd, E., Rossing, R. & Neuman, T.P. (1993). A reflective practice of evaluation. How and why?. Adult Learning 5 (2) 25-26.

Brockett, R.G. & Hiemstra, R. (1991). Self-direction in adult learning. New York, NY: Routledge.

Callender, W.D. (1992). Adult education as self education. Adult Education Quarterly. 42(3) 149-163.

Garrison, D.R. (1992). Critical thinking and self-directed learning in adult education: An analysis of responsibility and control issues. Adult Education Quarterly 42 (3) 136-148.

Garrison, D.R. (1997). Self-directed learning: toward a comprehensive model. Adult Education Quarterly 48 (1) 18-33.

Hammond, M. & Collins, R. (1991). Self-directed learning: Critical practice. New York, NY: Nichols/GP Publishing.

Jarvis, P. (1992). Paradoxes of learning. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jedrey, C.M. (1985). Grading and evaluation. In M.M. Gullette (Ed.), The art and craft of teaching. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lowry, C.M. (1989). Supporting and facilitating self-directed learning. Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on adult, career and vocational education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED 312 457, ERIC Digest No 93).

Vernon, S., LoParco, L.B. & Marsick, V.J. (1993). Satisfying accountability needs with non-traditional methods. In P. Mulcrone (Ed.), Current perspectives on administration of adult education programs. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Waldron, M.W. & Moore, G.A.B. (1992). Helping adults learn : Course planning for adult learners. Toronto, ON: Thompson Educational Publishing.

NEW HORIZONS IN ADULT EDUCATION
Volume 14, Number 3, Fall 2000

OLD PLANET, NEW MILLENNIUM, SAME EXCUSES?
TAKING RESPONSIBILITY: THE NEED FOR ADULT ENVIRONMENTAL
EDUCATION

Tarah Sharon Alexandra Wright
Ph.D. Candidate - University of Alberta
Instructor, Grant MacEwan Community College
Instructor, Athabasca University

ABSTRACT

Education is recognized as an essential component to the advancement of humans living sustainably with the environment. While it is critical to instill an environmental ethic in school children, it is equally important for environmental education to be directed towards adults, as they make consumer, social and political decisions that affect our world. This brief paper explores adult environmental education and its importance within the environmental movement. The underlying argument is that the health of humanity and the planet can be improved through adult environmental education.

Introduction

I recently attended a workshop on how to teach about climate change. As an environmental educator, I was pleased to be a part of this event, but became disappointed by the attitudes of many participants. We discussed familiar environmental problems, yet there seemed to be many excuses as to why possible solutions have not had a significant impact. The keynote speaker claimed that his generation (the Baby Boomers) was incapable of changing their consumptive ways and it was the responsibility of the younger generations to make a difference to our ailing planet. Being one of the youngest educators there, I felt uneasy with this heavy reliance on "the next generation," by this proverbial "passing of the buck" and the apathy many participants demonstrated towards the ability of adults to create positive environmental change.

Education is recognized internationally as an essential component to the advancement of humans living sustainably with the environment (Clover, Follen & Hall, 1998; Kennedy, 1993; Palmer, 1997). While it is critical to instill an environmental ethic in school children, it is equally important for environmental education to be directed towards adults, as they make consumer, social, and political decisions daily that affect our world.

In 1977 the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) met in Tbilisi,

USSR at the Intergovernmental Conference on Environmental Education in order to establish the goals and objectives of international environmental education programs (UNESCO-UNEP, 1978). In the proceedings, it was recognized that environmental education should be considered a lifelong process and must therefore be directed towards the whole community.

In this way, environmental education will be able to provide the different actors in society with the scientific and technical knowledge and the moral qualities that will enable them to play an effective part in preparing and then managing a development process compatible with preservation of the productive potential and the aesthetic values of the environment. (UNESCO-UNEP, 1978)

North America has been successful in developing and implementing environmental curriculum in elementary and secondary schools, yet I believe, has not reached its full potential in terms of adult environmental education.

While adult environmental education initiatives are necessary worldwide, it is imperative that North American educators recognize the major role they must play in order to facilitate change. All human beings have an impact on the earth, but it is the well-educated people of the industrialized nations who use approximately three-quarters of the earth's natural resources and who contribute the most to the world's ecological problems (Orr, 1992).

Some may be convinced that the next generation will be the one to create change. I argue that we do not have the time to wait. The earth that supports all kinds of life is slowly becoming inhospitable for human beings. While we may not feel changes in global temperature, personally witness the disappearance of species, or understand how deforestation affects individual livelihoods, the degradation of the environment is real and must be addressed if we are to assure environmental health and human survival. I challenge all adult educators to contemplate how they can make a difference in their teaching. It is not an easy road to travel, but I believe that as adult educators and as human beings, it is our responsibility to help adults understand and act responsibly towards the environment. We can make a difference.

References

Clover, D., Follen, S & Hall, B. (1998). The nature of transformation: environmental, adult and popular education. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies In Education / University of Toronto Press.

Kennedy, P. (1993). Preparing for the twenty-first century. New York: Random House.

Orr, D. (1992). Ecological literacy: education and transition to a postmodern world. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Palmer, J.A. (1997). Beyond science: Global imperatives for environmental education in the 21st century. In P. Thompson (Ed.), Environmental education for the 21st century (pp. 3-12). New York: Peter Lang.

UNESCO-UNEP. (1978). Recommendations of the intergovernmental conference on environmental education TBILISI, USSR. Paris, France: UNESCO Press.

NEW HORIZONS IN ADULT EDUCATION
Volume 14, Number 3, Fall 2000

WOMEN OF SUMMER

A Film Review

Jodene Melinda Mills

Graduate Student, Master of Distance Education
Athabasca University

Abstract

"Women of Summer" is a film documenting the plight of women in the 1920s and 1930s at the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Working Women. The struggle of women is well documented throughout history, and included in that struggle is the right to an education. Enter the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Working Women. As one of the ex-faculty state, "It has taken radical ideas throughout history to change society – and Bryn Mawr was one of them." In 1884 five visionary women who called themselves "The Committee" created Bryn Mawr. "Then and now, Bryn Mawr remains committed to providing the educational preparation girls and young women need to lead lives of consequence" (Bryn Mawr, No date, p. 1). The film "Women of Summer" wonderfully portrays the heartache and bliss women shared in an unforgiving time in society.

Introduction

The struggle of women is well documented throughout history. Included in that struggle is the right to education. In the early twentieth century when women were confined to the home or to the factory, the seeds of dissent were brewing. They wanted education. They wanted intellectual stimulation. They wanted unions. They could not have any of these things if they were working eighteen-hour days in a factory, getting paid four dollars per week. Enter the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Working Women. The faculty was revolutionary, certainly ahead of their time. Women who received a scholarship to the college were taught English, economics, sociology, political science, history, law, astronomy and physical education. Above all else, they were taught that they could contribute something to their society. "It has taken radical ideas throughout history to change society – and Bryn Mawr was one of them".

History of Bryn Mawr

In 1884 five visionary women who called themselves "The Committee" created Bryn Mawr. The two who left the clearest mark on the character of the school were M. Carey Thomas, who was dean and later president, and philanthropist Elizabeth Garrett. Over the past century, faculty at Bryn Mawr has striven to continue Thomas and Garrett's pioneering vision. What began as a preparatory school for girls is philosophically the

same today. “Then and now, Bryn Mawr remains committed to providing the educational preparation girls and young women need to lead lives of consequence” (Bryn Mawr, No date, p. 1).

The institution was intended as a feeder school for Bryn Mawr College, and was one of the first solely college-preparatory schools for girls in the United States at the time. It left its mark in history in many ways, but perhaps one of the most memorable was the major role “The Committee” played in gaining admission for women to the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine. Philanthropist Elizabeth Garrett promised the school a gift of \$100,000 if women were guaranteed admission (Bryn Mawr, No date, p. 3).

In 1963 the administration of Bryn Mawr made the bold move of becoming one of the first independent schools to progress to racial integration. This decision “transform[ed] its identity and shap[ed] its future direction as a truly diverse community” (Bryn Mawr, No date, p. 4).

“It’s an education to be here”
A Summary of “Women of Summer”

Although the Bryn Mawr University was founded more than 100 years ago, the Summer School for Working Women was not born until 1921 and lasted only 17 years. Professors teaching the summer school women followed the same beliefs Bryn Mawr creators did, which was “girls and young women should have the same opportunity their brothers had to study the most demanding subjects and to prepare for college in a world in which they would be able to take a meaningful difference” (Fox, No date, p. 1).

The movie titled “Women of Summer” discusses the history of a school with revolutionary staff and students, viewed from the perspective of the alumnae at a fifty year reunion. Time had not dimmed the minds of these graduates, as they remember the 1920s and 1930s as a tumultuous era. There was great ignorance toward the working class in society. They were seen as uneducated and deviant. So when some mystery women began spouting “nonsense” such as equal education? Equal rights? This was quite out of the ordinary, and the summer school was branded as trouble.

The 100 women attending the Bryn Mawr Summer School were chosen based on scholarship approval. May Stokes, the College Fundraiser, said simply, “I don’t know how I picked out my...victims”. Upon arrival on campus, the women were divided into groups of twenty. Each group was “its own little world”. It was meant to show the women that all fields impact all others. You cannot think of yourself as belonging to, or specializing in, any one field.

On normal societal barriers for the time, student Marjorie Lynch Logan, one of the five first black women to attend Bryn Mawr Summer School for Working Women, said surprisingly there were no barriers at Bryn Mawr. There was no different treatment based on skin colour, accent, or experience. Students were made to believe they could

achieve anything, and that they were worth something. This was quite revolutionary thought for the time. “Working women in a privileged environment? No one had any idea where it would lead”. Up until this time, women had been raised in a society that had immense prejudice towards the working class. Student Carmen Lucia said she was the victim of intolerance all throughout her life – and she thought Bryn Mawr would be the place to “give some of that intolerance back”. Instead of intolerance she found long-lasting friendships with faculty and friends.

Although the women are discussing the heartache and troublesome times they grew up in throughout the film, there is an overwhelming feeling of peace and relaxation when they talk about their time at Bryn Mawr. As one of the students remarked, it was a kind of multicultural setting the women were not used to in their factory towns. They would sing at night – Irish jigs, and Italian dances. It was a time to learn to relax. “All we had to do was look up at the stars at night and we could forget the meanness of mankind” (Carmen Lucia). It was a very exciting time for women, and education. The Women of Summer “is a story of class and race uniting on the common goals of education and social justice. It is a living demonstration of the power of education to improve lives (Filmmaker’s Library, 1985, p. 1).

“They’re Sweating Blood!”
Conditions of Women's Lives at the Beginning of the Movie

The 1920s and 1930s were hard times for everyone in the working class. This was a time when prejudice ran high, and Communists were “everywhere”. It was a time when women had no real childhood, or womanhood. They started working at ten years of age in the factory and did not know what a vacation was. Freddy Paine, a student at the summer school, remembered: “We had no such thing as Tampax. Men would say we women were sweating blood. We literally did not have time to change”. One of the women had worked thirteen years at a silt mill. She remembers the acidic smell even today. “Boys always knew when they were on a date with a silt mill girl”. These were the women who wanted desperately to take part in a program such as the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Working Women. One student reminisced that Bryn Mawr was her rebellion – she wanted to be able to go to Bryn Mawr and quit her job.

However, there were some women who arrived with a “chip on their shoulders,” or those who plainly did not want to go. Sophie Rudolfo said she did not want to go, because the four dollars per week she earned would be lost. When she finally told her father, he said, “to think that a child of mine, whom I was not able to give the education that she deserved, at last has a chance.” He cried out of pure joy. Others such as Carmen Lucia mentioned students were immediately suspicious of each other as well as the program. This skepticism is what psychologists call the Imposter Syndrome. None of the women thought they belonged there. They believed the school was beyond their intelligence. After a short while, they were no longer afraid and the barriers came down. Because the summer school curriculum was not in any set format or routine, it was a completely different experience than other high schools had, which resulted in a much

more open student centered atmosphere. There was much discussion back and forth between teacher and student. Everyone had equal opportunity to be heard.

“Changes Don’t Come About Because of Propaganda – They Come About Because
There’s a Sore”
Women Learning Their Rights

One of the two most important courses taught at the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Working Women was economics, as it was noticed that women were drawn to labour economics at the time. This is most likely because of the vast rift between classes in society. However, as the women attending Bryn Mawr Summer School became more involved in the labour movement, support for the program began to wane. It began in 1926 when Hilda Smith decided the school should integrate. A contributor stated, “do not mix reforms, but drive straight to your goal – looking neither to your right nor to your left.”

Bryn Mawr was slowly changing from a school for “making girls into women” to a “Hotbed of Radicalism.” Regarding the ebbing support, one student proclaimed the societal view that: “we weren’t just nice girls anymore. We wanted to vigorously change society. Students were taught to believe that the process of democracy is so strong that it [could] withstand conflicting views.” However, the students and faculty were just too “radical” for the times, and funding was slowly pulled.

How was a learning community created?

The learning community in Bryn Mawr Summer School for Working Women was quite diverse. Students and faculty joined together with their experiential and cultural background, coupled with knowledge, to create an extremely diverse learning community. Every day, every tree had something going on underneath it, whether the discussions were on economics or history. Courses were well balanced, and taught by open-minded professors.

How did adult learning occur?

Adult learning occurred through liberal means. Classes were held in an informal setting, professors were knowledgeable yet approachable and students were willing. The most important ingredient was the fact that students were hungry for knowledge. The difficulty professors had was not the normal “how do we get them to learn?” but rather “how do we find them enough to learn?”

What problems were encountered?

As with the birth of any new institutions, problems were encountered and dealt with accordingly. Upon their arrival at Bryn Mawr, many of the women had a chip on their shoulders that had to be removed before any learning could take place. Once they

were receptive to being at Bryn Mawr, they soon opened up and became productive members of Bryn Mawr.

Another problem both staff and students encountered was that of societal disdain for workers, not to mention worker education. As the economics professor stated, many people thought the workers were dangerous. However, it must be noted that Bryn Mawr was not a Hotbed of Radicalism as the newspapers suggested. "People trying to affect change for the good, attract trouble. But society needs change to go forward. You cannot bring back the past."

Staff of Bryn Mawr encountered a completely new phenomenon - trying to feed the girls' knowledge when they were used to trying to fuel the knowledge. They asked questions, and debated with their teachers. It was a much more open environment than most high schools, an environment that later led to the way adult education is practiced.

In what ways were the problems resolved (if they were resolved at all)?

The first issue of behaviour was solved with patience. Once women got over the Imposter Syndrome and decided they could learn something from teachers and fellow students, they became more open to learning and began to enjoy themselves.

The problem of societal prejudice toward workers and worker education took decades to remedy, with educators and students still in the fight today for equal education. "The fight goes on, but there would not be a fight without struggle." The narrator stated, "we have to go back and do the kind of groundwork we did in the 1930s." Only then will society remember history, and set about changing the future.

Bryn Mawr and Its Links to Critical Theory

"Critical theory posits that the human being has the capacity to learn and, in particular, to be a reflective, critical learner; however, the social structures, the institutions, the conditions of people's lives often prevent them from developing individually and collectively" (Merriam, 1993, p. 108). A central criticism critical theorists make on the modern practice of adult education is that 'adult education is preoccupied with technical concerns at the expense of democratic social action' (Merriam, 1993, p. 11). Bryn Mawr faculty was not preoccupied with technical concerns. The only thing they were concerned about was if students were getting the proper education they required. Nothing was at the expense of democracy, as the students were taught the importance of living in a democratic nation.

The critical perspective "focuses on bringing about change in the present social, political, and economic order through the questioning of assumptions held by learners about the world in which they live and work" (Caffarella, 1993, p. 27). The summer school program at Bryn Mawr did just this. Faculty and students questioned society and societal beliefs. Lessons focussed on showing students they had the power to change present social, political, and economic order, through education.

The contribution of Feminist Pedagogy to Bryn Mawr

Bryn Mawr was, and still is today, operated on the premise of feminist pedagogy. Feminist pedagogy has many different strands to reflect on different educational models, but there are similarities throughout: (a) How to teach women more effectively so that they gain a sense of their ability to effect change in their own lives; (b) an emphasis on connection and relationship (rather than separation) with both the knowledge learned and the facilitator and other learners, and (c) the women's emerging sense of personal power" (Tisdell, 1993, p. 93). In practice, feminist pedagogy is emancipatory. It is concerned with women's personal empowerment as well as collective growth.

Faculty at the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Working Women most certainly follows the theory of feminist scholarship. This theory includes many different views, encompassing sociology, psychology, and critical dimension. "Some proponents emphasize the nature of power relations in society that result in women being in oppressed and marginalized groups. Others focus on the empowerment process for the individual woman" (Merriam, 1993, p. 12).

Bryn Mawr was ahead of its time. The feminist education practices faculty at Bryn Mawr followed were revolutionary for the time. Only now is feminist pedagogy literature "beginning to have an impact on adult education. As we come to better understand the ways in which women and minorities know and learn, practitioners who want to raise consciousness or challenge power relations in the adult learning environment are beginning to adopt teaching strategies intended to directly challenge structured power relations" (Tisdell, 1993, p. 101). The Bryn Mawr Summer School for Working Women followed these edicts in the 1920s.

Were the Adult Education Effort and Learning Outcomes Effective?

"Women of Summer" was an interesting documentary depicting conditions of women's lives as well as societal power struggle and relations, and successfully presented an introduction to the history of adult learning. It portrayed the successes of the adult education effort as well as effective learning outcomes.

The adult education effort succeeded in gaining a foothold in society with the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Working Women. It was an institution that started out as a college preparatory school for girls, and quickly grew into a champion of women's and workers rights to equality and education.

The learning outcomes brought about by Bryn Mawr faculty and students were quite effective. Many graduates became teachers themselves or pursued the labour movement. Others became writers, social workers, or community activists. Most women returned to the factory, but were much better educated upon their return than they would have been if they had never heard of Bryn Mawr. Three success stories are Sophie Schmidt, Carmen Lucia, and Freddy Paine.

Sophie Schmidt realized her dream of a college education. She met her husband there, and upon graduation they moved back to his hometown in the Philippines and opened a school there. Carmen Lucia tried to be a singer, but found out “the best singing [she] could do was on the picket line”. She was a co-founder of the Hatter’s Union and became their Vice President in 1946. Freddy Paine became a Union Organizer. She now lives in a women’s collective and has co-written a book.

Conclusion

The narrator of *Women of Summer* stated that “it didn’t start now. It started way, way back, and we have to know that.” The film wonderfully portrayed the heartache and bliss women shared in an unforgiving time in society. Messages in songs such as *Bread and Roses* ring true even today: “Small heart and love and beauty, their drudging spirits knew. Yes, it is bread we fight for, but we fight for roses too.” The simple fact that history does not happen, that it is up to us to change it, rings true through the film. Students at the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Working Women learned a lot from faculty and each other. “The program forever changed their lives and has left a legacy meriting public awareness” (Filmmaker’s Library, 1985, p. 1). “The work that was done by Jane Smith will never die. I’m sure she’s not far away – she’s listening to us.” We have something to pass on – and we should.

References

Bryn Mawr (No date). History of Bryn Mawr. Available: www.brynmawr.pvt.k12.md.us/Bmhist.html. 27 October, 1999.

Bauman, Suzanne and Rita Heller. (1985). *Women of Summer* [Film]. (Available at Filmmaker’s Library Inc., 124 East 40th Street, New York, NY. 10016).

Caffarella, Rosemary S. (1993). “Self-Directed Learning” in Sharan Merriam’s (Ed.) *An Update on Adult Learning Theory*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers. pp. 25-33.

Filmmaker’s Library, Inc (no date). *The Women of Summer: An Unknown Chapter of American Social History*. Available: www.filmakers.com/. 7 November, 1999.

Fox, Rebecca MacMillan (no date). About the School. Available: www.brynmawr.pvt.k12.md.us/AboutBM2.html. 27 October, 1999.

Merriam, Sharan (Ed.), 1993. “Taking Stock”. In *An Update on Adult Learning Theory*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers. pp. 105-110.

Merriam, Sharan (Ed.), 1993. “Adult Learning”: Where Have We Come from? Where Are we Headed?” In *An Update on Adult Learning Theory*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers. pp. 5-12.

Tisdell, Elizabeth J. (1993). "Feminism and Adult Learning: Power, Pedagogy, and Praxis" in Sharan Merriam's (Ed.) An Update on Adult Learning Theory. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers. pp. 91-102.

NEW HORIZONS IN ADULT EDUCATION
Volume 14, Number 3, Fall 2000

HOW TO RESPOND TO ARTICLES ON AEDNET

To respond to the article Evaluation of Adult Learners: Ethical Issues and Old Planet, New millennium, Same Excuses? Taking Responsibility: The Need for Adult Environmental Education, as well as the film review of Women of Summer, please send your comments to AEDNET identifying the subject as "Evaluation of Adult Learners," "Old Planet," and "Women of Summer."

HOW TO OBTAIN BACK ISSUES AND CUMULATIVE
INDEX OF NEW HORIZONS

It is now possible to search the AEDNET archives via a web browser. All the archived issues of New Horizons in Adult Education can be located at the following: <http://www.nova.edu/~aed/newhorizons.html>

CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

New Horizons in Adult Education, founded in 1987, is a refereed electronic journal that provides faculty, graduate students, researchers, and practitioners with a means for publishing their current thinking and research within adult education and related fields. The journal is published two or three times a year and is transmitted electronically on the Adult Education Network (AEDNET) web page <http://www.nova.edu/~aed/newhorizons.html>

New Horizons publishes research, thought pieces, book reviews, point-counterpoint articles, conceptual analysis, case studies, interactive articles, and invitational columns. The editorial staff welcomes articles for review submitted either electronically or in a variety of disk formats through regular mail. Guidelines for manuscript submission are available on the AEDNET and New Horizons in Adult Education web page at <http://www.nova.edu/~aed/newhorizons.html>

If you would like to submit an article, you may contact New Horizons in Adult Education by e-mail or mail.

E-mail address: horizons@nova.edu

Mailing address:

Nancy Gadbow, Editor, New Horizons in Adult Education
Nova Southeastern University
Programs for Higher Education/FCAE
1750 N.E. 167th Street
North Miami Beach, FL 33162-3017