CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Perspectives on Illiteracy

Illiteracy is a fact of life for a substantial minority of Canadian adults. In 1976, the most recent year for which relevant census data is presently available, the number of adults out of school and 15 years of age and over with fewer than 5 years of schooling was[1] 856,000, or 5.6% of the adult population. While caution must be exercised in using data on grade completion to indicate adult competency, various studies[2] indicate that a large proportion of adults with this level of educational attainment are illiterate in the conventional sense, i.e., lack even very basic skills in reading and writing. In the same year, those with 5 to 8 years of schooling numbered 3,520,595, or 22.9% of the adult population.[3] With the caveat about the nature of the data in mind, and referring to existing studies, we may suggest that although adults with this amount of schooling generally possess at least elementary literacy skills, a considerable percentage of them can be termed functionally illiterate in that they are unable to carry out more advanced reading and writing tasks that are called for in important daily activities. Taken together, the two categories of educational attainment incorporated 28.4% of the adult population of Canada in 1976.

For many of these adults, looking up a telephone number, filling out a form or reading a newspaper may be difficult or impossible. For example, an Ottawa man who spent most of his life unable to read and write, but who recently learned to do so with the help of a local literacy program, writes:

> I remember when I wanted to go to Heron road one day (from Preston St.). I walked all the way because I couldn't read the bus routes and I was too embarrassed to ask the driver for assistance .... Going shopping was a pain. I always got someone to go with me because I couldn't read the labels.... I thought I was the only one in the world who couldn't read. Now that I am more aware of the problem I feel sad for the million other Canadians who can't read .... Knowing how to read affects me in a number of ways. I now have confidence and a sense of independence because I don't have to rely as heavily on others around me.[4]

One of the most painful consequences of illiteracy is the sense of personal shame that often accompanies being unable to read and write in a society in which literacy is taken for granted. In a letter written in response to a 1978 television show on the subject of illiteracy in Canada, a woman stated:

> I am writing on behalf of my husband, who is not -able to read or write. He was born and raised in the backwoods and did not attend school. This fact bothered and embarrassed him all his life. Since he knows the bush so well, he has been able to make a living guiding and trapping. He is partially retired now, only traps and has time during the summer months. But I do think sometimes that when things go wrong he blames his troubles on the fact that he isn't able to read.[5]

It is clear that illiteracy can impose serious hardships and limitations on Canadian adults in various contexts of their daily lives. However, in spite of this, the resources which are committed to adult literacy and basic education opportunities in Canada are only a fraction of what would be required to adequately respond to the need. As a Canadian expert on illiteracy noted in 1979, "on any scale of national or provincial priorities, adult illiteracy does not even appear on the list". [6] In a sense, this neglect should not surprise us for, as the history of movements like those for women's liberation, gay liberation and civil rights for racial and ethnic minorities has shown, long-standing victimization, suffering and alienation on the part of a particular minority or category is seldom sufficient in itself to provoke public action on a serious social problem. The dimensions of consciousness and power are crucial, and in this regard, illiterate adults form a classically silent minority.

Illiteracy and Poverty

Even if the response to the problem of adult illiteracy has never been adequate, a number of public and private organizations and groups are working to meet the need. Indeed, such efforts extend as far back as 1899 in Canada.[7] However, where action has been taken, it has rarely been solely in response to the problem of illiteracy itself. Instead, the primary meaning and significance of illiteracy has been seen in terms of its empirical association with another problem that of poverty. That is, the stratification of literacy and illiteracy closely parallel social class stratification---with illiteracy heavily concentrated among those at the bottom of the class structure---and efforts to respond to illiteracy have generally emerged as a secondary consequence of strategies to deal with poverty and poverty-related problems like unemployment, the growth of welfare spending or social and political unrest.[8]

This generalization holds true for much of the history of literacy education in Canada, and it is particularly pertinent for the period from 1960 to the present, which forms a distinct era with regard to public action on illiteracy. While prior to 1960 the extent and severity of the problem was hardly recognized outside of the adult education profession,[9] by 1967, the most massive single program dealing with illiteracy to date had been

developed within the Canada Manpower Training Program, a federal government initiative primarily aimed at alleviating poverty and unemployment. Since, the inception of the program, many thousands of Canadian adults have received academic upgrading in preparation for job training or direct entry into the labor force. [10]

The theoretical perspective which informed and guided the incorporation of literacy and basic education in anti-poverty programs during what became Canada's own "war on poverty" has become so widespread and frequently repeated that it has acquired a commonsensical, "taken for granted" quality, even among laymen. It was first formulated and articulated by economists, sociologists, educators and others in the early 1960's.[11] In its simplest form, it hypothesizes that there is a direct causal link between lack of basic education and poverty, i.e. that lack of basic education is one of the most important obstacles preventing adults from achieving adequate employment and income, and that this explains much of the observed poverty and unemployment in Canada. Based on this reasoning, it is suggested that literacy and basic education constitute a particularly effective anti-poverty strategy.

This point of view can be called the liberal perspective on illiteracy, indicating its close relationship to liberal welfare state doctrine, which argues for the necessity and desirability of government action to compensate for the social consequences of "imperfections" in the capitalist economy. It has been influential not only in facilitating government involvement in literacy and basic education for adults, but also in shaping the programs in distinctive ways, particularly their emphasis on occupational preparation and their technocratic "skill acquisition" approach to methods and content.

Crisis

The liberal perspective has been extremely important in that it has provided the principal theoretical and practical basis for public action with regard to adult illiteracy for over two decades. However, with the onset of a severe and chronic economic crisis in Canada and other capitalist nations in 1974, the consensus around liberal welfare state policies has been seriously eroded.[12] Liberal fiscal and monetary policies have been unable to check the problem of "stagflation", and existing anti-poverty and anti-unemployment programs have proved incapable of containing its effects. The entire liberal 'educational solution' to poverty, including the liberal perspective on illiteracy, has come under attack by academics and political and economic elites.[13] This criticism, coupled with a fiscal crisis in government revenues, has resulted in serious cutbacks in the already inadequate funding of academic upgrading under the Canada Manpower program. For example, those with 4 or fewer years of schooling are no longer eligible for training.[14] As well, funding for many new and existing literacy and basic education programs is in jeopardy across Canada. [15]

The federal cutback has created a vacuum in provision for illiterate adults in Canada that cannot be easily or soon filled. In a way, the situation is in danger of reverting back to the pre-1960 period, when there was little attention to, or action on, the

problem. However, in another sense, the situation is even more problematic in 1982 than it was then. In what was a buoyant climate of a growing economy in the early 1960's, the proposals for government action on the part of architects and early adherents of the newly emerging liberal perspective went relatively unchallenged. However, today, after two decades of controversial experience with liberal anti-poverty programs and unemployment strategies, and in the midst of an economic recession, there is increasingly sophisticated and effective opposition to them. Given this situation, it is not certain that an effective basis for public action on illiteracy can be reestablished, or if it can, what form this might take.

Alternative Perspectives

In this atmosphere of crisis and contention, two alternative perspectives on illiteracy have emerged to challenge the still dominant, but faltering liberal perspective, both of which represent potential new bases for public policy regarding the problem. Both perspectives, the conservative and the critical, implicitly reject the principal theoretical assumption of the liberal perspective, i.e. that illiteracy or lack of basic education is one of the primary causes of poverty, and draw their own conclusions about the meaning and significance of illiteracy and the proper means of responding to it.

The more influential of the two is the conservative perspective, which embodies the themes of neo-conservative thought and possesses a strong affinity to laissez-faire doctrines of the 19th century.[16] Like those who subscribe to the liberal perspective, adherents of the conservative perspective are committed to stabilizing and preserving the institutions of capitalist society. As we have seen, liberals believe that this goal often requires governments to intervene to ameliorate the negative social consequences of what are seen as malfunctions in the economy, particularly poverty. However, conservatives reject any attempts by government to redistribute social and economic opportunity. In their view, the expenditure of government funds for such programs hinders the attainment of a goal that is more important than social equality--the maintenance of an optimum climate for private initiative and economic growth. As well, an influential current of conservative, thought even rejects the feasibility of increased social equality, arguing that a more fundamental cause of poverty than illiteracy is to be found in what are seen as irremediable deficiencies in ability, intelligence and motivation on the part of members of certain races, social classes, etc.[17] In general, while more moderate conservatives favor either scaling down or postponing government expenditures for programs like literacy education until the current economic crisis is resolved, more doctrinaire conservatives believe that they are best handled entirely through private means (e.g. through charity or volunteer efforts).[18] The conservative perspective underlies much of the current cutback mentality on the part of political elites in Canada.

The other challenger of the liberal perspective is the critical perspective, which approaches the question of adult illiteracy from socialist and Marxist assumptions. The term "critical" is used in recognition of the seminal contribution of Third World literacy educator Paulo Freire, and his concept of "critical consciousness".[19] As we have seen,

the liberal perspective attributes poverty in large part to deficiencies in basic education and other skills (i.e. "life" skills, job skills). In contrast, those Committed to the critical perspective view both poverty and illiteracy as products of a third factor--the dynamics of class inequality in a capitalist economic system.[20] Thus, while liberals see literacy education as a technical process of compensating for cognitive skill deficiencies among the poor (to permit them to better adjust to the needs of the economy), adherents of the critical perspective view such efforts both as ineffective-because they do not deal with the root cause of poverty--and as oppressive--because they better accommodate the poor to the structures which exploit them. [21] For their part, they would make adult basic and literacy education a vehicle for the awakening of critical social consciousness among members of subordinate social classes and a means of support for collective efforts to radically transform the class system. [22]

The two contending perspectives on illiteracy, the conservative and the critical, dissent from the hypothesis that underlies the liberal perspective, i.e. that illiteracy is one of the main causes of poverty. Each offers an alternative interpretation of the illiteracy-poverty link, the conservative perspective arguing that illiteracy is a distinctly secondary cause of poverty, and the critical perspective suggesting that both illiteracy and poverty are the products of the capitalist economic structure.

However, an even more striking difference among the three perspect.ives lies in the divergent political visions which underly them. Illiteracy is closely related to poverty and class inequality--the most explosive and divisive issues in political thought and practice--and each of the three perspectives on illiteracy is based on a different set of ideological assumptions regarding the origin of inequality and the question of what, if anything, can or should be done about it. These assumptions, as drawn from the political philosophies of liberalism, conservatism and critical (socialist and Marxist) thought, saturate each level of the three perspectives, from views on the meaning and significance of illiteracy to such seemingly purely technical matters as the definition of literacy, the objectives of literacy programs and the question of instructional methods and content.

The specifically political implications of literacy work have not been widely recognized in Canada, largely because the longdominant liberal perspective has represented literacy education as a neutral, technical matter of remedial "skill acquisition". However, adherents of the critical perspective charge that the very claim of being 'above politics' itself serves a significant political function: it obscures the manner in which literacy education, as based on the liberal perspective, secures the adjustment of the poor to the economic and political status quo. [23]

Statement of the Problem

It is clear that adult basic educators and others committed to preserving and extending educational opportunities for illiterate adults in Canada are confronted by serious challenges. The immediate task is a formidable one--that of rallying public

concern about the problem and exerting pressure for the development of new educational policies, and doing this at a climate of economic crisis and growing conservatism among political elites. However, as difficult and problematic as this challenge is, it is further complicated by a growing dilemma within the field of adult basic education itself. For two decades, the professional roles. of adult basic educators and literacy instructors have rested on what appeared to be a firm theoretical and practical foundation. However, that foundation of outlooks and approaches, as informed by the liberal perspective, is being widely questioned and rejected, particularly by those adhering to conservative and critical perspectives. Those in the profession are increasingly confronted by difficult theoretical questions regarding the place of illiteracy in the dynamics of class inequality, and hard choices concerning their own political stance.

To a large degree, the efforts undertaken by adult basic educators to meet this challenge within their profession will determine the prospects for the success of their actions to meet the larger, external, challenge, i.e. the task of building an effective movement to preserve and develop educational opportunities for illiterate adults in Canada. That is, in view of the increasingly. hostile political and economic climate, such a movement can ultimately succeed only if it presents a sound and credible basis for theory and practice in the field, one that embodies an accurate and dynamic analysis of the meaning and significance of illiteracy.

The present study will address this central problem: the political and economic assumptions which underly the theory and practice of adult literacy and basic education in Canada. The aim is to do so in a way that has immediate relevance for those involved in the movement to develop new opportunities for illiterate adults. The study is not impartial in the conflict among the three perspectives on illiteracy--the case is argued that the critical perspective offers a superior theoretical and practical guide for the reconstitution of adult literacy and basic education in Canada.

Objectives of the Study

1 .A principal objective of the study is to clarify the political and economic dimensions of the current period of contention concerning the future direction of adult literacy and basic education in Canada. To do so, the study wiII: (a) describe the course of events which has led up to the current conflictive situation and outline the main features of it, (b) present the political economic assumptions and arguments of the three perspectives on illiteracy--liberal, conservative and critical--influencing the present situation, and (c) analyze the role of members of the adult education profession, particularly,adult basic educators, in the present context, and determine the relative influence of each of the three perspectives on their efforts to respond to it.

2 .A second principal objective is to give special consideration to the analysis and further development of the political economic basis of the critical perspective on

illiteracy. In doing this, the study will: (a) probe the reasons for the present13ineffectiveness of this perspective In Canadian adult basic educators, (b) augment the perspective with assumptions drawn from Marxist political economy, and compare it with the liberal perspective in terms of its capacity to explain the dynamics of class inequality and poverty, and, (c) make use of its assumptions to develop a critical history of adult basic education in Canada---one which can serve as a source of guidance for adult basic educators in the present period of crisis and contention.

Assumptions of the Study

The major assumption of the present study is that reading and writing are complex social practices which touch on many levels of our social existence in a literate society like Canada, and cannot be understood in terms of their effect on any one level alone. For example, from one point of view, reading and writing together constitute a "technology of the mind", a highly sophisticated set of skills involving the manipulation of “visible language”, which can be considered through psychological concepts like cognition and intelligence, and physiological ones like perception.[24] From another point of view, since reading and writing make use of language-a system of symbols which serves as the medium of expression of meaning, indeed of human consciousness itself---they are closely bound up with cultural and ideological phenomena.[25] On a third level, reading and writing constitute part of the "means of production", i.e. they form "tools" in. the process of production, distribution and exchange of goods and services in a predominantly literate society like Canada, and so interweave with economic practices. [26] On a fourth level, the political, writing forms one part of the "network of power", in Poulantza's terms. For example, he points out that "in a certain sense, nothing exists for the capitalist State unless it is written down....27

Because of the complexity of the interweaving of literate communication with social processes at these four levels, we must adopt a 'holistic' framework in order to understand it. Similarly, we cannot reduce the meaning and significance of literacy to any single level; for example, we cannot see it solely in psychological and physiological terms as the possession of a cognitive skill (i.e. a purely technical matter). We must keep in mind that literacy possesses irreducible economic, political and ideological dimensions as well.

Limitations of the Study

Two major limits have been placed on the present study. First, the study primarily deals with the larger economic, political 'and ideological aspects of illiteracy, and touches very little on more specifically educational issues. For example, there is little discussion of what might be called the phenomenology of illiteracy--i.e. the psychological, emotional, and sociological aspects of it in everyday life. As well, there is little consideration of the questions of methods, materials, subject matter, etc. of the literacy or adult basic education class or project. However, even if I have largely

excluded these issues, this does not signify that I believe they are less important, or that they are not amenable to critical analysis. In fact, the present study can be seen as an attempt to clarify the framework of assumptions upon which the study of more specifically educational problems can proceed.

A second limitation of the study is that it primarily focuses on Canada. Although I have profited from examining materials and examples pertaining to illiteracy in the United States, I feel that there are sufficient differences in context between the two countries to make such a limitation advisable. By clearly establishing the unique features of the Canadian scene first, we are in a better position to undertake what could be an interesting comparative education study of illiteracy, and responses to it, in the two nations.

Method of Research

If we consider methods of research as referring to something more basic than just techniques of data gathering--that is, as the logic of inquiry and the philosophical assumptions which underly it--we may identify three principal methods in use in Canadian adult education research. These include the positivist (neo-positivist, critical rationalist, etc.), which is presently the dominant method; the phenomenological (heuristic, existential, qualitative, humanistic, etc.), a method which has recently grown in stature in the field; and the dialectical matdrialist (or more commonly, Marxist), which as yet, exercises a relatively minor influence as a method of research.[28] The present study is based on the Marxist method.

Like researchers in the positivist tradition, Marxists make use of scientific procedures--often formal ones like the formulation of empirically falsifiable hypotheses, the gathering of empirical data to test them, etc. [29] However, unlike positivists, they consider this empirical data (e.g. economic trends, population distributions, individual attitudes) as the surface effects ("appearances") of a more basic social reality. This deeper level consists of a totality of structures--including modes of production (capitalist, communist, feudal, etc.), classes (bourgeoisie, - or capitalist class, working class, etc.), the State, ideologies, etc.--in which economic phenomena are the main (but not only) determinant factors. [30]

Like phenomenologists, Marxists pay careful attention to subjective states, i.e. to consciousness. However, unlike phenomenologists, Marxists do not take consciousness as their starting point. [31] In their view, the political economic structures of society--particularly class--have causal primacy, limiting and shaping subjective states in ways that are open to scientific study. However, they believe that in turn, when particular subjective states influence large numbers of people, they (as ideologies) become a structural force in their own right, able to initiate, retard or accelerate change in other structures, including political economic ones.[32]

Marxists assert that this deeper structural level is absolutely essential for the explanation of the patterns and regularities of social life. For example, with specific reference to the study of education, Rachel Sharp asserts that:

> A sine qua non of an adequate problematic involves relinquishing the framework of bourgeois social thought concerning education and society. What needs to be developed is a holistic conceptual structure which may have little readily apparent relation to what bourgeois social theorists believe should be explained. Those who wish to understand education should ... concentrate their attention ... on more significant issues concerning the nature and dynamics of capitalist societies.[33]

There is no space here to adequately discuss Marx's account of the underlying structures of capitalist society, as based on his materialist conception of history (historical materialism), but the interested reader may consult one of a number of useful introductions to the subject.[34]

Marxists hold that when social research is rooted in the logic of Marxist categories, careful inferences from the results can illuminate aspects of this more basic level of social reality.[35] This not only helps us to better understand society, but also in turn helps us to change it in historically progressive ways--in particular, to work toward the elimination of classes and class exploitation.[36] In fact, from a Marxist standpoint, criteria establishing the objectivity and truthfulness of the findings of social research include both the extent to which they account for the observed facts of social life, as well as how adequately they guide practical efforts to transform it.[37] Thus, in contrast with positivists, Marxists believe that -research which embodies an explicit ideological commitment can also be scientifically valid. (However, Marxists believe that certain ideologies place limits or blinders on social science theory and research, i.e. the ones associated with classes having a vested interest in the preservation of class exploitation, e.g. those subsumed under the category of bourgeois ideology.) [38]

Significance of the Study

While the present analysis takes the form of an academic study, its original point of departure was a practical problem. As a participant in an organization which supports and promotes adult literacy opportunities, I found that I had conflicting views about a question that sometimes was a source of contention among the membership. That is, is it possible to work for the development of new literacy opportunities for adults while putting aside the question of the political orientation of the methods, content and objectives of the classes or projects? The obvious, most frequently encountered answer is that we can do this because, it is argued, the problems of illiterate adults (particularly low income and inadequate employment opportunities) are to a large degree the result of the simple fact that they cannot read and write. Therefore, all programs that effectively help them to become literate are equally valuable, regardless of their political orientation. However, Paulo Freire presents a

dissenting view in his writings, arguing that we are never justified in remaining silent or passive concerning the political dimension of literacy programs because the plight of the impoverished and dispossessed primarily stems from class oppression and not from the simple inability to read and write (or any other personal deficiencies).

Obviously, the present study has grown to be broader in scope than the question that initially sparked it. However, its purpose has remained the same--to provide a means for reflection on the political, economic and ideological implications of our efforts to preserve and extend adult literacy and basic education opportunities for adults in Canada--and I feel that this is where the principal significance of the study lies. In this regard, I wish to make it clear that when I criticize particular beliefs or approaches with regard to literacy, I am often engaging in self-criticism as well, because I myself have held many of the positions that I question. As I pointed out, it was contradictions in my own beliefs that served as my starting point.

One other significant aspect of the present study is that it demonstrates that the study of illiteracy presents an interesting approach to the analysis of larger social questions, particularly class inequality. Social historian and specialist on literacy Harvey J. Graff has written:

> The study of literacy, I urge, is important not only in and for itself; it also illuminates the dynamics of society and provides penetrating insights into how its processes functioned--for example, in stratification, in mobility, or in family adjustment. Literacy study therefore constitutes a valuable mode of analysis for students of society.[39]

Terminology Used in the Study

Throughout the study, reference is made to adult literacy and basic education. Adult literacy education is instruction in elementary skills of reading and writing (and frequently computing), usually through a level equivalent to grade 4 in elementary school. Adult basic education (often abbreviated ABE) is a more inclusive term, covering academic upgrading in a range of subjects, including reading and writing, above the grade 5 level and often extending into high school. At times, I use the terms "adult basic education" and "adult basic educator" to refer to classes and instructors at both the literacy and basic education levels. The context should make it clear where this is intended.

When the terms illiterate and illiteracy are used, they usually stand for both the condition of conventional illiteracy (i.e. lack of even elementary literacy skills) as well as the condition. of functional illiteracy (i.e. possession of elementary skills, but inability to handle reading and writing tasks above the grade 8 level).

Sometimes reference is made to language classes for immigrants to Canada. While these do not constitute literacy education in a strict sense, many who attend

them are illiterate in their native tongues as well as in English or French. In an important way, their language problems are also literacy problems, and so the language classes that accommodate their needs are included in the present study.

Let us now explore the events surrounding the emergence of the three perspectives on illiteracy and the basic assumptions and propositions of each, beginning with the dominant, liberal, perspective (Chapter 2) and moving on to the conservative (Chapter 3) and the critical (Chapters 4 and 5). Based on this information, we will then proceed to compare the perspectives In terms of their current influence among adult basic educators (Chapters 6 and 7) and to judge the relative adequacy of the liberal and critical perspectives as foundations for Canadian adult basic education thought and practice (Chapters 8 through 12).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1. Audrey Thomas, Canadian Adult Basic Literacy Resource Kit (Toronto: The movement for Canadian Literacy, 1979), p.22.

2. Audrey M. Thomas, Adult Basic Education and Literacy Activities in Canada, 1975-76 (Toronto: World Literacy of Canada, 1976); Norvell Northcutt, Final Report: The adult Performance Level Study (University of Texas at Austin, August 1977).

3. A. Thomas, ...Resource Kit, op.cit., p.22.

4. Ibid., p. 42.

5. Ibid., p. 31.

6. Gary Dickinson, quoted in R. J. Adams, Education and Working Canadians: Report of the Commission of Inquiry on Educational Leave and Productivity (Ottawa: Labour Canada, 1979), p. 122.

7. The Reading Camp Association, later renamed Frontier College, began providing reading materials and literacy instruction in Ontario in 1899. See Chapter 10, 11 and 12 for a critical history of literacy activities in Canada.

8. Coolie Verner, "Illiteracy and Poverty, B.T.D.S Review 11:2 (November 1973), p. 9.

9. J.R. Kidd, "From Remedial to Continuing Education," Food For Thought 21:3 (December 1960), p. 108.

10. For example, adults with fewer than 8 year of educational attainment (i.e. from no education through 7 years of schooling) made up 13% of full-time institutional trainees in the Manpower program in the 1974-1975 year, totaling over 23 thousand adults. See Canada Manpower and Immigration, Adult Training 1:3 (Winter 1976), p. 41.

11. Henry M. Levin, "A Decade of Policy Developments in Improving Education and Training for Low-Income Populations" in Robert H. Haveman (ed.) A Decade of Federal Antipoverty Programs (New York: Academic Press, 1977), p. 123-130.

12. Paul Gingrich, “Unemployment and Capitalist Crisis” in Fred Caloren et.al., Is the Canadian Economy Closing Down? (Montreal: Black Rose Books 1978), p. 96 - 97.

13. Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Schooling in Capitalisst America (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1976), chap 1.

14. Metropolitan Toronto Movement for Literacy, “Librarians Urged on to More Literacy Work,” Starting Out 1:2 (Nov. - Dec. 1980). Metropolitan Toronto Movement for Literacy, “Manpower Plans Cut to Basic Ed. Purchase, Starting Out 1:1 (Sept. - Oct. 1980).

15. Literacy, “Adult Learning and Public Policy Conference.” 4:4 (1979) , p. 21.

16. Cy Gonick, “The Economy: the New Supply Side Economics,” Canadian Dimension 15:4 (February 1981), p. 18.

17. Hyman Lumber, Poverty: Its Roots and Its Future (New York: International Publishers, 1965), p. 13-17.

18. Nathan Wright, “ The New Black Leaders,” N.Y. Times Magazine (October 4, 1981) p. 20.

19. Paulo Friere, Education fro Critical Consciousness (New York: The Seabury Press, 1973).

20. Serge Wagner, Literacy and Citizenship,” B.T.S.D. Review 3:2 (February 1975), p. 5-6.

21. Anthony R. Berezowecki, “Liberation or Domestication: Adult Basic Education in Canada,” Literacy Discussion 5:4 (1974).

22. Op.cit., Wagner, p. 6-7.

23. Paulo Friere, “Literacy and the Possible Dream,” Prospects 6:1 (1976).

24. John Oxenham, Literacy: Writing, Reading and Social Organisation (London: Routledge & Keegan Paul, 1980).

25. V.N. Volosinov, Marxism and the Philosophy of Language (London: Seminar Press, 1973), chap.1.
Rosalind Coward and John Ellis, Language and Materialism (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977), chap 5.

26. Raymond Williams, “Means of Communication as Means of Production” Problems in Materialism and Culture (London: Verso, 1980), p. 50-63.

27. Nicos Poulantzas, State, Power, Socialism (London: Verso, 1980), p. 59-60.

28. See Leland J. Davies, “Adult Learning: A lived Experience Approach to Understanding the Process,” Adult Education 31:4 (Summer 1981) for the distinction between positivist approached (which he calls analytical and behavioural science) and the phenomenological; see Nickolas Prychodko, “Socialist Construction and the Role of Education in the Republic of Cuba,” Masters Thesis, University of Toronto, 1979 for and example of the dialectical materialist method.

29. Ehud Sprinzak, “Marx’s Historical Conception of Ideology and Science,” Politics and Society 5 (1975).

30. Erik Olin Wright, Class, Crisis and the State (London: Verso 1979), chap. 1.

31. Alan Swingewood, Marx and Modern Social Theory (London: The MacMillan Press, 1975) p. 37.

32. Colin Sumner, Reading Ideologies (London: Academic Press, 1979) p. 21-22.

33. Rachel Sharp, Knowledge, Ideology and the Politics of Schooling (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980), p. 10.

34. Maurice Cornforth, Historical Materialism (New York: International Publishers, 1962; Frank Cunningham, Understanding Marxism (Toronto: Progres Books, 1978).

35. Wright, op.cit., chap. 1; Russel Keat and John Urry, Social Theory as Science, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975), chap. 5.

36. Zygmunt Bauman, Hermeneutics and Social Science, (London: Hutchinson of London, 1978), chap. 2.

37. Ibid., chap. 2; Adolfo Sanchez Vazquez, The Philosophy of Praxis, (New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1977), chap. 3.

38. Martin Shaw, “The Coming Crisis of Radical Sociology,” in Robin Blackburn (ed.) Ideology in Social Science (Glasgow: Fontana/Collins, 1972), p. 33-34.

39. Harvey J. Graff, The Literacy Myth (New York: Academic Press, 1979), p. 19.