INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA

UMI®
800-521-0600

BEHAVIOUR AND BELIEFS OF VOLUNTEER LITERACY TUTORS

by

Catherine Hambly

Department of Culture and Values in Education

McGill University, Montreal

April 1998

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

ABSTRACT

Volunteer literacy tutors are key actors in one-on-one adult learner-tutor relationships, although few studies have examined tutors' role in literacy provision. This study had two objectives: to describe and analyse how McGill Students for Literacy tutors understand literacy and how they behave toward their learners and toward their organization, and to understand why many tutors distance themselves and their match from the organization. 18 McGill Students for Literacy tutors participated in semi-structured interviews with the researcher in this organizational case study. The hypothesis states that tutors choose autonomy from the literacy organization because of certain beliefs related to their attitudes as volunteers and to the organization's focus on individualized learning. These beliefs are: one-on-one instruction succeeds where classroom-based instruction has not, individual attention compensates for lack of training, good-will is better than good training, and volunteer activities can be justified on the basis of perceived need rather than demonstrable progress.

RÉSUMÉ

Les tuteurs bénévoles en alphabétisation jouent un rôle clé dans les relations individuelles entre tuteur et apprenti, quoique peu d'études ont examiné leurs rôles dans la provision d'alphabétisation. Cette étude a deux objectifs: décrire et analyser comment les tuteurs du "McGill Students for Literacy" comprendre l'aphabétisation et comment ils agissent envers leurs apprentis et envers leur organisation et, deuxièmement, comprendre pourquoi tant de groupes tuteurs-apprentis se distancent de l'organisation. Il y a dix-huit tuteurs du "McGill Students for Literacy" qui ont participé à des entrevues semi-structurées avec le chercheur de cette étude. L'hypothèse de l'étude affirme que les tuteurs choisissent d'être autonomes vis à vis l'organisation à cause de certaines croyances reliées à leurs attitudes comme bénévoles et à l'insistance de l'organisation envers l'apprentissage individuel. Les croyances sont: l'instruction individuel réussit où celle pratiqué en classe ne réussit pas, l'attention individuelle compense pour un manque d'entrainement, une bonne volonté est mieux qu'une bonne formation et les activités bénévoles peuvent être justifiée selon le fondemont d'un besoin perçu plutôt que d'un progrès évident.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to recognize the effort of the many tutors and staff involved in the Students for Literacy movement who bring enthusiasm and dedication to the literacy community. I would particularly like to thank Jennie Peters and Heidi Chestnut of the McGill Students for Literacy Organizing Teams (1996-1997 & 1997-1998) who encouraged this research from the very beginning and whose interest in the outcome of the study helped me to think creatively and analytically about the subject of literacy volunteers.

I would also like to thank my supervisor, Prof. Ratna Ghosh, and the many professors at McGill in the department of Culture and Values in Education and in the department of Educational Studies who encouraged my research and allowed me to pursue my interests through their classes. I am also very grateful to Literacy Partners of Quebec and to The Centre for Literacy for their support, suggestions and interest in my research, and for their dedication to literacy organizations in Montreal.

Finally, I would like to thank my husband, George, whose commitment to research is an ongoing inspiration and whose ability to listen and question helped me to develop this thesis in ways I could not have done otherwise.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Volunteer literacy programs based on a one-on-one model of instruction often have a difficult time maintaining contact with their tutors. In contrast to paid instructors who have clearly defined roles and responsibilities, volunteers give their time and energy to meet with learners without receiving financial recompense. So, although they are affiliated with an organization from which they receive training and support, tutors can choose to what extent they use support services.

Although this phenomenon of tutors distancing themselves from their organization is not an unknown occurrence, volunteer programs may not want to put additional requirements on their tutors for fear of tutors leaving the program. There is a high rate of tutor turnover in many programs. Volunteer programs expend much time and energy recruiting, training, and supporting their volunteers as tutors come and go. A better understanding of what tutors believe and how they operate within their match and within their organization could help programs improve their training and support of volunteers which could in turn lead to greater retention of tutors and ultimately improved services for the adult learners.

Volunteer programs have few funds or time for conducting research. As a result, although we know much about adult learners from studies conducted by adult educators, we know very little about tutors who work in the volunteer sector. Tutors, as partners

with the learners and as the learners' access link to resources, are key players in one-on-one literacy relationships. Knowing more about tutors' behaviour and beliefs will help literacy organizations improve their training and support of their volunteers and in this way help reach their primary goal of offering quality literacy instruction for adult learners.

Objectives

This study has two objectives:

1. To provide a description of volunteer tutors' understandings of literacy: how and why they became tutors, how their definitions of literacy develop, how they tutor, and how they relate to their learners and to their volunteer organization

2. To use the description to suggest reasons why some tutors distance themselves and their match from the organization

As there are few studies of volunteer tutors, and no studies related to the chosen research population, the study was approached from a broad perspective of tutors' behaviour and beliefs within the McGill Students for Literacy organization. The focus on the phenomenon of tutors distancing themselves from the organization developed during the course of the study in response to the organization's need for a better understanding of this aspect of tutors' behaviour and in response to the researcher's interest in patterns suggested in the data.

Hypothesis

The following hypothesis is presented in this study:

> Tutors choose autonomy from the literacy organization because of their belief in the value and necessity of volunteer work and because of the organizations' focus on individual learning.

This hypothesis was explored through a qualitative study design which will be described in this chapter.

Research site

McGill Students for Literacy (MSL) is a club organized by undergraduate students at McGill University and funded through the Students' Society of McGill University and through club fund raising efforts throughout the school year. MSL provides several programs namely: one-on-one adult literacy tutoring, reading circles for children, and youth-at-risk tutoring. This study focuses exclusively on the tutors involved in the one-on-one program. Approximately forty tutors are involved each year in this free service to adult learners from the Montreal community. MSL trains these tutors in the Student Centered Individualized Learning (SCIL) method developed by Frontier College (Carpenter, 1986), and receives some support services from Frontier College. Although MSL was the model for the other Frontier College--Students For Literacy groups across Canada, MSL is autonomous.

MSL was chosen as the research site because of its active and well-established one-on-one tutoring program and because, more than other literacy organizations in

Montreal, its tutors are drawn from a relatively homogeneous population of university students. The homogeneity of this group of tutors allowed for comparison of their behaviour and beliefs. The researcher was known to the organization as a former tutor with MSL (1995-1996). In addition, the researcher was involved with Trent University's Frontier College–Students For Literacy program (1993-1994). The study was conducted with the support of the 1996-1997 MSL organizing team.

Significance

The undergraduate students who organize MSL have no time or resources to conduct research. This study, the first in the club's history, and likely the first study conducted in one of the approximately thirty Students For Literacy clubs on colleges and universities across Canada, will allow the organization to examine how its policies affect the tutors in the program. A grounded understanding of the tutors' behaviour and beliefs, interpreted in the context of the phenomenon of tutors' distancing themselves from the club, will allow the club to question its practices in a self-reflective manner. The process of self-reflection will ideally lead MSL to concrete ways they can offer better training and support to their tutors. Although the study findings will apply only to MSL, other Students for Literacy clubs and other volunteer literacy organizations can use the findings to reflect on their own tutors, and they may choose to conduct similar studies in their own contexts.

Conceptual framework and methodology

This study has the goal of generating substantive theory, which-- unlike grand or middle-range theories-- is restricted to particular contexts and real life situations (Ely, 1991). The goal in this study is not to generate a theory that will apply to all varieties of literacy programs using one-on-one university student volunteers, but rather to explore the behaviour of a specific population of literacy volunteers: more research done in other populations would determine if the theory from this study also applies to other literacy volunteers. The practical objective of this study-- helping MSL provide a quality program for both its tutors and its learners-- requires that the research be related to this one site, and thus substantive theory is appropriate since, as one qualitative researcher states, "Substantive theory is restricted to particular settings, groups, times, populations, or problems" (Merriam, 1990, p. 57). The methodology chosen for this study reflects a multi-stage process that allowed the researcher to develop and pursue questions as they emerged in the data, and to alter the focus of the research as it became necessary for issues of ethics and depth of the investigation.

The methodology involved both quantitative and qualitative analysis of two main data sources: inactive tutor and learner files from 1989 to 1995, and semi-structured interviews with 18 MSL tutors. In addition, the researcher attended a general club meeting, a "Spelling Bee" fund raiser, and the year-end learner awards night. These events provided the researcher with a current understanding of the study context and an ongoing, though relatively non-participant, presence within the club.

The data presented in Chapter 3 is based on qualitative case-study methodology. The case study method (Merriam, 1990) is useful in constructing theory when there is no existing theory "to provide an adequate or appropriate explanation" (Merriam, 1990, p. 59). To this end, it must be "heuristic" in its aim to find out (Eckstein, 1975, p. 104), and inductive in its mode of thinking about the problem and analyzing the data (Merriam, 1990). There is no theory in the literature on how beliefs linked to literacy volunteerism relate to tutors' behaviour, nor is there a theory as to why tutors distance themselves from their organizations. Using case study methodology, this study will describe the phenomenon within the holistic context of the tutors' behaviour and beliefs, and will then relate several themes in the data to the phenomenon.

Study-specific rationale for the chosen methodology

This study is a case study of an organization of individuals who share characteristics as North American university students and as volunteers in an adult literacy organization. As there is a frequent turnover in the organizing team, and no funding agency requirements for keeping statistics, no collated information was available on club demographics. A quantitative analysis of the tutor and learner files was necessary to give background information for the study. The results of this preliminary quantitative study are not presented in conjunction with the results of the qualitative study in Chapter 3 since the file information was not recorded by past tutors in a monitored or consistent way from 1989-1995, and also because the information in many files was not complete. Despite the validity issues outlined above which prevent the quantitative data from being

included in this thesis, the file analysis was useful in that it suggested directions for the research before the qualitative interviews began and provided some information about the general demographics of past tutors and the learners. The methodology for the file analysis is outlined in this chapter, and the findings are presented in Appendix A.

The use of interviews for this study developed through necessity and through the appropriateness of interviews for this kind of research. Although an ethnographic study of the tutor in action (i.e. with the learner during a tutoring session) could have been informative, the presence of an outside observer in a one-on-one session would have had consequences for the tutoring relationship, and would have presented ethical barriers (such as tutor-learner confidentiality). Instead, in-depth interviews with the tutors permitted the interviewer to explore themes, and to focus on the tutors' beliefs and behaviour (interview questions are listed in Appendix C).

Methodology for collecting quantitative data from past MSL files

Club organizers released all files on tutors and learners who are no longer active in the club to the researcher. There were 246 tutor files and 92 learner files. The learner files contained information entered on standardized forms by club coordinators during the learners' initial "placement" interviews. This information was often incomplete and there is no guarantee of its accuracy nor of how the tutors displayed their own bias in selecting what information from the interview was recorded on the sheets. Notes written on the back of these files indicated the learners' progress within the club: comments made by

tutors or the learner, tutor changes, and estimated dates of the end of the learners' involvement with MSL. The tutor files contained a questionnaire completed by each tutor upon entering the program. The tutor questionnaire provided profiles of the tutors and reasons why the tutors joined MSL. Notes on the back of the forms often indicated the progress and involvement of the tutor within the organization.

Codes were devised for all the information in the files (Rubin & Babbie, 1997) and the information was organized into tutor and learner databases. Although the learner database is of limited use due to vast amounts of missing information, the tutor database is quite complete. A report on the database with a summary of the tutor and learner demographics was written in March 1997, and this report was made available to MSL at that time.

Methodology for the qualitative interviews

Three series of qualitative interviews followed the quantitative analysis of the MSL files. Much thought was given to participant selection. Although Seidman (1991) recommends purposeful participant selection over random selection in interview-based qualitative research, the random method was preferred for several reasons. Random selection allows the participants' identities to remain anonymous and thus encourages honesty in the interviews. The pool of possible participants in this study was quite small: under forty tutors were involved in the one-on-one tutoring program in 1996-1997. In order to protect participant confidentiality, participants could not be selected through

purposeful sampling. Also, the coordinators could not help in the participant selection process in order to avoid bias from the organization towards tutors they knew or tutors they considered exemplary. The goal of the study was to gain a perspective on the range of tutor experiences within MSL: random selection of participants seemed the method best suited to selecting a varied pool of tutors.

The selection procedure was as follows. MSL provided a complete list of phone numbers for tutors and learner-tutor coordinators (LTCs) in the one-on-one tutoring program for 1996-1997. The names of the tutors were numbered and those tutors whose numbers were randomly chosen by a computerized random selection function were contacted by the researcher. Ten out of approximately thirty tutors were selected through a random sample, and when contacted, all consented to the interviews. All four LTCs were contacted and agreed to interviews. Four new pre-training tutors were subsequently randomly selected from the list of tutors to be trained and they gave consent to interviews.

The interview participants reflect the general demographics of the club as revealed through the quantitative file analysis (i.e. 4 men, 14 women; a majority of Arts students, no Bachelor of Education students; a significant number of tutors with interests in pursuing education careers; several tutors who are non-students, etc.). The sample (see Appendix B for a description of the participant tutors) is fairly representative of those within the organization if the demographic data from the quantitative file analysis (Appendix A) is used as a rough guide.

The interviews were conducted by the researcher in a semi-structured format (questions are listed in Appendix C). These "ethnographic interviews" (Ely, 1991) were the primary method of data collection. The interviews were planned in advance and were relatively consistent in format and content between the series of participants (new, experienced and leadership tutors). They were generally conducted in a neutral, quiet area on campus, so the interviewees could reflect on their experiences in depth and at their own pace. Interviews lasted between forty-five minutes and an hour and a half each, with the average length being approximately an hour long. All interviews, save two interviews with two prospective MSL tutors, were conducted on a one-on-one basis between the researcher and the tutor.

All the interviews were tape recorded and later transcribed. Data analysis followed Glaser and Strauss' (1967) 4-stage constant comparative method. Coding methods were influenced by Miles and Huberman's (1994) descriptive coding and Strauss and Corbin's (1990) method of open coding. Preliminary categories were established by the interview questions and more detailed categories emerged as patterns surfaced within the data.

Description of the series of interviews

Ten tutor interviews were conducted in a space of 11 days. All interviews were based on a set of questions which were introduced and expanded upon in a natural way as

each interview progressed. Tutors were encourage to talk freely, to go on tangents as they wanted to, and to question the researcher. The research questions were prefaced by an introduction to the study goals, and by an introduction to the researcher as a former tutor who is interested in the experiences of other tutors within MSL.

After the ten initial tutor interviews, there was a two-and-a-half week interval to review the research and prepare for the next series of interviews with the four learner-tutor coordinators, interviews which took place over four consecutive days. These interviews were generally over an hour long, and were based on the same set of questions used for the tutors with an additional set of questions related to the specific experiences of the learner-tutor coordinators.

The final set of interviews was conducted with four prospective MSL tutors. Three tutors were contacted and interviewed both before and after they attended the MSL May 1997 training session. One tutor was interviewed only after the training session.

All interviews were transcribed during the months of April and May and were analyzed between June and August 1997.

Thesis Outline

Chapter Two will introduce the historical and theoretical context of literacy volunteerism. The theoretical foundations for this study of literacy tutors will be explored, with an emphasis on the few studies conducted with university student tutors. Chapter Three will present the analysis of the interview data, with Part One describing the tutors' behaviour and beliefs, and Part Two relating these beliefs to the phenomenon of tutors distancing themselves from the organization.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Historical overview: the development of literacy volunteerism

Adult literacy education has a long history of association with volunteer movements. Early (17th–19th century) voluntary efforts focused on poor children, or the ongoing education of workers through, for example, the Y.M.C.A./Y.W.C.A. and the Mechanics' Institutes (Graff, 1982). Literacy education for adults emerged during the final decades of the nineteenth century. McKallip (1984) reports that in the post-Civil War U.S. South, 1,300 volunteers taught 90,000 students in 1,000 schools. Exemplary programs include South Carolina's night mill schools founded in 1893 (Berg, 1966), North Carolina's Moonlight schools (Ellis and Noyes, 1978) of the same era, and in Canada, the Reading Camp Movement (later Frontier College) which was founded in 1899 (Pierpoint, 1987; Robinson, 1960).

Canadian literacy activity in the early part of the century is best explored through the pioneering work of Alfred Fitzpatrick's Frontier College (Pearpoint, 1987; Robinson, 1960). The College dedicated itself to providing education wherever and whenever people who could not access regular educational institutions were able to study. Frontier College developed a labourer-teacher program (still in existence), English as a Second Language and citizenship manuals for new immigrants, and even offered correspondence courses and an "open university" until established institutions quashed those ventures. Although these were landmark initiatives, it is difficult to measure the Canadian general public's awareness of literacy in the first half of the century.

The onset of World War I marked the beginning of heightened American interest in adult literacy. Army training officers discovered that many recruits lacked basic literacy skills (Selman & Dampier, 1991; Sticht, 1997), and the government and the public took notice. The resultant surge in interest in adult literacy continued through and beyond World War II as missionary-literacy advocates such as Frank Laubach publicized literacy as "Enemy Number One" (Laubach, 1960) at home and abroad. Many citizens were encouraged to take part in the "fight against illiteracy", and the two major volunteer literacy organizations in the U.S. date from this period: Laubach Literacy was founded in 1955 and Literacy Volunteers of America in 1962.

Several factors converged in the 1970's to keep adult literacy in the public eye. Economic recession in North America brought attention to a much-debated decline in reading skills among students and a high illiteracy rate among adults (Limage, 1990). American media began to sound an "illiteracy alarm", a message which was undoubtedly also heard by Canadians. By the mid-1980's adult literacy in Canada was a well-documented issue and the 1986 Speech from the Throne galvanized the voluntary sector into action (Selman & Dampier, 1991). Several national adult literacy surveys and awareness campaigns in Canadian publications such as Macleans, the Globe and Mail, and the Southam Newspaper affiliates (Calamai, 1987) helped reinforce the role of the volunteer sector in adult literacy provision by encouraging citizens to volunteer as literacy tutors.

There was, and still is, a great deal of disagreement over the statistics presented in the 1987 literacy survey, as well as over the way to approach the issue of "illiteracy" in industrialized countries like Canada (Brand, 1987; Costa, 1988; Charnley & Jones, 1978). The most recent (1994) Canadian survey conducted as part of the multi-country International Adult Literacy Survey states that 22% of Canadians (those who could take the test in either official language) score at the lowest level (Level 1), and only 4% at the highest level (Level 5) (Reading the future, 1996). These findings were consistent with the Literacy Skills Used in Daily Activities survey (Schweitzer, 1992) and the report issued by the Southam Newspaper group in 1987 (Calamai, 1987). Although the "rate of illiteracy" seen in these surveys may seem high, Sticht (1997) responds to this report of 22% Level 1 readers by explaining how the levels are constructed: a Level 1 reader can read at least 80% of the Level 1 material correctly, but reads less accurately at higher levels-- this means that a Level 1 reader can often read up to 20% of the material at Level 5 correctly. The 80% correct benchmark, Sticht comments, is an arbitrary standard. A lower standard, such as has been used in other studies, could generate very different interpretations of Canada's literacy "crisis" (Sticht, 1997).

Many researchers claim that the statistics are misleading, or disagree with the way the reports are manipulated by the public and by literacy groups. Willinsky (1990) details how the Southam report "created" the literacy crisis in Canada. Pipho (1988) documents multiple, large discrepancies between state and federal estimates of the literacy rate in the United States. Carroll (1987) concludes his overview of the United States' National

Assessment of Educational Progress by stating: "The goal of 12th grade literacy for all adults must remain only a tantalizingly remote possibility...We must confront the possibility that somehow the nation will have to accommodate itself to pretty much to the levels of reading skill now attained by various segments of the population" (p. 430). This view complements Miller's (1988) assertion that there will always be a portion (approximately 5%) of any given population that will not be able to learn to read. Brand (1987) responds to Miller's notion of "residual illiteracy" by shifting the discussion away from statistics and into the arena of human rights. Brand states: "There is a [...] danger of considering a situation which is first and foremost a denial of justice as definitively normal" (p. 137). This emphasis on the equation of rights with the need for a literacy level that *must* be universally-attained (and note, not one that is universally *attainable*) is one which volunteer organizations use to attract tutors and to promote their cause. While the surveys provide some demographic data on literacy in Canada, the statistics are used by interest groups in conjunction with the media to promote a "literacy crisis" that argues for the necessity of creating more programs to "fight" illiteracy and to "save" people (Kangisser, 1985). Although media coverage of adult literacy issues dropped off after the International Literacy Year in 1990 (see Appendix D), adult literacy agencies dating from the late eighties are well-established and continue to operate in literacy tutoring and public awareness capacities. Meanwhile, many adult educators question the role of volunteer organizations, since the available data on adult literacy learning demonstrates that many programs have little success and that generally the most learning occurs within the initial stage of learning and levels off after the first months to a plateau where little or

no progress is achieved (Lewis, 1989; Kazemek, 1988; Sticht, 1994). Few literacy agencies systematically collect data, so studying learning or tracking trends in literacy programs is a difficult venture.

The surveys published in the last decade have contributed to a return to volunteerism that is influenced by the values of certain privileged groups, such as was seen in the early days of literacy activism. Whereas the earliest literacy volunteers were often encouraged by religious ideals, modern volunteers are motivated by their desire to help the unfortunate illiterate achieve a "better" (by their definition) quality of life and by their belief that illiteracy will impact nations' economies in a detrimental way. Stuckey (1991) presents a thorough analysis of the "middle-class value system" in literacy programming. She describes "the American practice of missionary literacy and the faith that there simply must be some good that comes from what we all know to be good." (p. 33). Stuckey's work complements Heath's (1983) seminal research into the sociolinguistic aspects of literacy. Stuckey and Heath both elaborate how the definition of "literacy" is controlled by those who set the standard based on their own ability to meet it, and by those who are worried that their culture is put at risk by "the illiterates". In this view, literacy volunteerism is a reaction of self-preservation and reproduction of the volunteers' own value systems. Lytle and Schultz (1990) echo this view when they state: "In individually-oriented programs, literacy [...] is the primary focus of instruction; the goal is essentially to "mainstream" the adults into the middle class" (p. 365). However, this imposition of values is not limited to volunteer programs: Stuckey, Heath and others

document how this imposition is part of formal education; since the majority view is generally that of the system, those who hold congruent views are successful in the system. The question of value imposition in volunteer literacy programs is one that has not yet been researched adequately in the volunteer sector, although the impact of values on how literacy is defined in theory has been well-documented in the literature. The question of values imposition influenced the researcher's approach and own way of looking at literacy; it, however, could not fall within the direct focus of this research.

Literacy in North America: Discussion of definitions

The boundaries of any discussions on the definition of literacy in the twentieth century are often unclear: narrow definitions of literacy, such as "the ability to read and write a simple sentence" or broad definitions including "specialized" literacies such as computer literacy or cultural literacy, are insufficient. Literacy is not a set of discrete skills: it takes place in a cultural context, involves social analysis, and embodies social values. Venezky, Wagner, and Ciliberti (1990) make the following introductory statement about literacy 'definitions': "Social concepts such as literacy and poverty are integrally tied to their labels. Like jelly and sand, they are without intrinsic shape, defined and redefined by the vessels that hold them. Who is literate depends upon how we define literacy" (p. ix).

Scribner (1984) outlines three metaphors which organize the many definitions of literacy present in the literature. First, Scribner describes literacy as "adaptation". This

metaphor acknowledges that literacy is about survival, the adaptation of individuals to the demands of their environment. Next, literacy is related to "power": literacy is linked to group advancement or social change according to many definitions. Lastly, literacy confers a "state of grace" on the literate individual when a social elite attributes special values (such as intelligence, culture, or religious status) through participation in the written word. Each of Scribner's metaphors is involved in our understanding of literacy-- and our literacy instruction-- at the end of the twentieth century.

The volunteer literacy movement has been directly involved in literacy provision through all stages of the evolution of our current debate on literacy. The following discussion of definitions is necessary in order to understand why and how tutors work as literacy volunteers.

Morality-based, functional and critical literacy

The earliest adult literacy advocates generally approached adult literacy education with the attitude of the post-Victorian reformers. Many, notably Alfred Fitzpatrick of Frontier College in Canada, were advocates for social change, but the methods and motivations for offering literacy instruction were based on preventing moral corruption (and later, communism) and on the "redemption" of the working man. Although literacy was defined as fundamental "reading and writing", the goals of literacy transmitted the values of the dominant cultural groups in society. This paternalistic understanding of

literacy reached its apex in 1949 when UNESCO declared the aim of literacy as "[helping] people develop what is best in their own culture" (UNESCO, 1949, p. 16). However, modernization and human capital theories proceeding from the United States replaced this definition of literacy with the economically-attractive and relativistic idea of "functional literacy" (Bhola, 1989).

Although the idea of "functional" literacy had its roots in the army literacy problems of World War One and World War Two, the term functional literacy first appeared in print in 1956 when W.S. Gray's UNESCO survey made the level of literacy relative to what an individual needed to engage in the normal literacy activities of the culture or group (Gray, 1956). This definition assumes that society can set the standard for individuals' literacy: although Gray did not equate economic development with literacy here, the idea of functional literacy assumed a nuance of "literacy for work-related purposes" with economic and productivity dimensions (Levine, 1982). Although Gray's definition of literacy was the foundation of policies on literacy projects in developing countries, the economic crisis of the early 1970s shifted Americans' attention to their own domestic education problems (Limage, 1990). Surveys and studies conducted around this time raised concerns that low literacy skills in the population would harm the national economy. This debate over the relationship between national literacy levels and the economy continues today (Boothby, 1993; Kozol, 1985; Miller, 1988; Thomas, 1989; Willinsky, 1990).

Public concern over inadequate work skills, media attention pointing to high illiteracy rates, and the commonsense appeal of the term have given the "functional" definition of literacy long staying power. Articles in popular magazines generally associate low literacy with inability to perform survival tasks and automatic relegation to dead-end jobs (Bowen, 1986; Brown, 1991; Campbell, 1991; Katz, 1990; Mickelson, 1988; Morey, 1992; Wolkomir, 1996). Programs incorporate workplace literacy into their mandate, or run literacy classes in conjunction with job training programs, with uneven results (Hull, 1993; Malicky & Norman, 1994). Only recently has the concept of "functional" literacy seriously been challenged in the literature as researchers demonstrate how the proposed economic outcomes of "functional" literacy are often illusory. More importantly perhaps, educators have become aware that the term "functional" is directly tied to the values of market-based capitalism, and that offering this type of literacy instructional could be an act of cultural domination (Mace, 1994; Mitchell & Weiler, 1991; Stuckey, 1991; Valentine, 1986). The functional definition of literacy is based on independence and competition in a capitalist model; it does not account for interdependence and cooperation.

The most recent and radical development in literacy was presented by Freire (1970), and influenced many Latin American Popular Education movements. This "emancipatory" or "critical" literacy has only in the last two decades entered Canadian literacy practice largely through community-based organizations. Beder (1991) describes Freire's approach to literacy as "one of the mechanisms through which adults come to

understand their world and, through the process of becoming literate, become empowered to act rather than being acted upon" (p. 3). Literacy is not seen as a set of mechanical or linguistic skills (Al-Khatany, 1996), but as a means through which adults critically comprehend and act on their world (Freire & Macedo, 1987).

Critical literacy works outside of education "systems"; it recognizes that education is an institution of a society and inculcates that society's values. This duality between the culture of formal education and the counter-culture of literacy activists is part of the volunteer vs. adult education discord. Some volunteer programs, because of their relatively autonomous status, have always aspired to deliver an alternative education to adults not served by existing structures. The existence of volunteer programs raises questions about the effectiveness of formal adult education, and the priority it is given in education budgets. The challenge, however, is for volunteer literacy programs and formal education programs to adopt a critical stance towards literacy.

Although adult education as a field has been professionalized in Canada, much of literacy delivery– the volunteer sector– remains outside of their sphere of influence (Selman & Dampier, 1991). Selman and Dampier state that this two-tiered system "raises the spectre of a deeply divided field of adult education, with an establishment-regulated and dominated system of adult education on the one hand and a counter or alternative system on the other" (p. 266). MSL works within this duality, ostensibly providing an

alternative service to learners whose needs are not met elsewhere, and this dynamic shapes the type of literacy service the club offers.

The effects of literacy definitions on literacy delivery

Chall, Heron and Hilferty (1987) outline three types of literacy programs: volunteer, community-based, and competency-based organizations. Competency-based programs are designed to prepare students for school equivalency exams and generally employ paid adult educators. Although competency-based programs in North America tend to have a traditional focus centered around formal schooling, instruction can encompass emancipatory elements if the organization encourages it: the National Adult Education Institute of Mexico (INEA) is competency-based, yet has used Freirian methodologies and ideologies and relies on volunteers (Instituto Nacional para la Educación de los Adultos, 1996). Community-based organizations, in contrast, focus on the learner in the social context of their community (Heath, 1983), and offer instruction in small groups. As Gaber-Katz and Watson (1991) note, not all community-based programs adopt a model of critical literacy, although many aspire to it. Lastly, Chall, Heron and Hilferty (1987) describe volunteer organizations which range from national organizations such as Laubach Literacy, Literacy Volunteers of America, and Frontier College, to local groups: these organizations generally work with adults at early stages of reading development. Although some take a very mechanistic or in other cases a functional approach to literacy, others have a goal of learner-centered instruction that can be based on functional definitions of literacy or include critical literacy.

Characteristics of Volunteer programs

Although volunteer programs and formal adult education programs have many differences, they share some characteristics that give a frame of reference to this discussion. First of all, all literacy programs together reach under 10% of the estimated learner populations. Moreover, of those learners who make initial contact with programs, up to 70% drop out before completion. Although these two aspects of non-participation have been documented since the early 1980s, they are notoriously difficult to research (Quigley, 1990; Quigley, 1992).

Volunteer literacy programs account for approximately 7% of adult learners served in the United States (Venezky & Wagner, 1996). However, in real terms this means that in the U.S. alone, the main two volunteer literacy programs, Laubach Literacy Action and Literacy Volunteers of America counted around 150,000 active volunteer tutors and administrators in 1990 (Tenebaum & Strang, 1992). While the numbers of people involved as volunteers each year remains fairly constant, there is a high turnover of volunteers. Volunteer tutors, like adult learners, have a high rate of recividism. Programs expend great effort and resources attracting tutors and training them, although many tutors stay no more than a year. Duprey (1992) outlines Literacy Volunteers of America's 50/50 management model, where half of the organization's resources are devoted to intake (recruiting, training) activities, and the other half go to support functions. This goal of no more than half of the resources going to intake activities outlines the reality of high tutor turnover in volunteer literacy programs. Abadzi, in her

review of literacy programs around the world, concludes that tutor training is one of the most significant needs for programs (1994). More research is obviously necessary into how to best train and retain tutors, but lack of funds and personnel inhibit volunteer groups from undertaking the task.

Specific concerns about volunteer literacy programs

Criticisms of volunteer programs center around several factors including: lack of training for volunteers, low rates of tutor retention, and a learner-centeredness in theory that is not always present in practice. The limited research available on each of these topics will be presented individually before proceeding to the research specific to university-student volunteer tutors.

Training for volunteer tutors

Programs often recruit tutors by asking for only two qualifications: a desire to help, and an ability to read. Many researchers and practitioners have raised concerns about this simplification of the requirements of a tutor given the types of learners these tutors serve. The large majority of learners in volunteer programs are at the entry level (basic literacy skills) and recently practitioners have acknowledged that many of these learners are learning disabled or dyslexic, and have had the same difficulties with literacy since their early years of elementary school. These are learners whose past bad experiences with schools prevent them from considering entering a classroom (Quigley, 1992) and they are often the "marginalized" learners volunteer programs aim to attract.

Volunteer programs state that these special needs learners require one-on-one instruction, rather than group instruction, to learn (Wolkomir, 1996). Their tutors have traditionally been given around ten hours of initial training accompanied by various amounts of in-service training (Chall, Heron & Hilferty, 1987). However, adult educators say that tutors receiving only ten hours of training are not equipped to help a learner with these problems. Chall, Heron and Hilferty comment: "Many of the dyslectics could not reach functional literacy even after several years' instruction" (p.192), and state that the learners require special instruction which is not available. Likewise, English as a Second Language (ESL) learners are frequently involved in volunteer literacy programs and present another training requirement which may not be met: many ESL learners improve their speaking– but not their reading– skills in literacy programs (Chall, Heron, & Hilferty, 1987). Also, recent research (Aaron, 1997) suggests that volunteers do not always want to work with ESL students and may drop out of the literacy program if assigned to such a learner. The use of volunteers has been called both a "panacea" and a "stop-gap measure" given the types of learners volunteers are expected to work with and the training they receive.

The impact of training on volunteers' tutoring styles has also been called into question. Ceprano (1995) found that tutors do not use modern effective strategies but rather they employ the traditional teaching methods they themselves were exposed to as learners. Although Ceprano states that this conclusion has not been causally linked to learner success or retention, she states that "Literacy tutors, regardless of good intentions,

utilize instructional strategies and practices that could ultimately lead to feelings of frustration and defeat for their clients" (p. 63). Likewise, a tutor trainer states "I'm becoming more and more convinced, particularly since I've just recently done a spate of tutor training, that to do the kind of eight weeks or one week-end [...] just isn't working" (Ontario Department of Education, 1991, p. 8). Criticism, then, focuses not only on the possible inadequacy of the training for dealing with special needs but also over concerns of the impact of the training on the tutors.

Tutor Recividism

There is a consistently high rate of tutor turnover in volunteer literacy programs which has been a concern for many years wherever volunteers are used as literacy tutors (Aaron, 1997; Calamai, 1987; Pothier & Vermette, 1982). The high turnover of tutors has several consequences. The delivery of literacy services is affected as more administrative resources are required to recruit and train new tutors (DuPrey, 1992; Sanders, Reine, Devins & Wiebe, 1996). Trabert (1986) notes that when tutors leave disgruntled "they can inhibit further recruiting efforts by word of mouth, regardless of whether complaints reflect real inadequacies on the part of the organization" (p. 1). Volunteer attrition also disrupts ongoing relationships with learners who then have to readjust to new tutors, and this could influence a learner to drop out (Aaron, 1997).

Several studies have suggested reasons for volunteer attrition. Rubin and Thorelli (1984) state that in a setting where the costs of volunteering were greater than the egoistic

benefits ("rewards"), volunteers who entered needing or expecting egoistic benefits had low volunteer longevity. This study applies to literacy tutors as they are unlikely to see rapid progress or "change someone's life" during the six to twelve months of a typical volunteer's commitment. Charnley and Jones (1979) report several stages in the development of the tutor-learner relationship, and highlight the "reactive period" during the first six weeks of tutoring where scheduling difficulties, lack of rapid progress, and time demands differ from the tutors' original expectations. This reactive period, where the relationship and idealistic expectations must adjust to the reality of the setting, is a critical period for the longevity of the relationship. Trabert (1986) identified a later stage where the tutors' evaluation of the "cost-effectiveness"of tutoring (time invested compared to return on that investment) determines tutor longevity: when conflict over the tutor's time arises, "the rewards from tutoring perceived by the tutor become critical in determining whether s/he would continue or terminate" (p.101). In summary, tutor longevity could relate to:

1. the tutor's egoistic expectations of rewards upon entry and the adjustment to the actual rewards
2. the relationship, demand, and rewards of tutoring in early stages
3. the "cost-effectiveness of tutoring" in competition with the tutor's other activities.

The economic costs of volunteering must not be overlooked. Volunteers are often asked to pay for training materials, and Aaron (1997) cites this as a reason why some

volunteers don't pursue their tutoring interests. A study conducted by the Department of the Secretary of State of Canada (Ross, 1990) concluded that based on a 1986/87 survey, the average volunteer spends approximately $158 dollars each year on non-refundable expenses. Although this survey encompassed all types of volunteer work with organizations, and not just literacy volunteerism, the findings likely apply to some degree. Tutors are required to give time, and also to give money in the form of transportation and other miscellaneous expenses. This could be a factor in tutor retention.

Learner-centeredness in theory and practice

Volunteer programs generally fall into two categories as far as their choice of learning materials. National programs such as Laubach Literacy have their own standardized curriculum and teaching methods. Other programs use materials prepared for specific literacy initiatives or material available on the market. Many literacy programs have chosen to forego any specific standardized teaching curriculum in favour of a learner-centered curriculum which could incorporate any appropriate curriculum materials, or not use prepared materials at all. Gaber-Katz and Watson (1991) define a learner-centered program as one where "learners set their own goals and measure their own progress" (p. 22). This approach allows the curriculum to be based on the learners' needs, interests and experiences, as a new plan of study is developed for each new learner. Whole language theory is often integral to this approach (Caplan, 1989; D'Annunzio, 1994).

MSL was originally affiliated with Laubach Literacy of Canada and used Laubach's standardized materials. In the 1991-1992 academic year, MSL adopted the Student-Centered Individualized Learning (SCIL) tutoring method of Frontier College out of concern for better meeting students' needs (Stokes & Simpson, 1994). SCIL is a flexible, learner-centered approach based on whole language theories (Carpenter, 1986). Each match (tutor-learner pair) determines their own "curriculum" and goals, as per learner-centeredness theory.

Learner-centeredness is subject to several practical criticisms. There is a duplication of time and effort in creating curriculum, and generally tutors have few opportunities to share ideas with each other (Gaber-Katz & Watson, 1991). Also, many learners define literacy according to their own experiences with traditional teaching and methods, and may not be able to envision something different (Malicky and Norman, 1995). Lastly, as the curriculum is negotiated between the tutor and learner, the tutor's own value system can impose itself within the curriculum, casting doubt on the true "learner-centeredness" of the materials and methods (Stuckey, 1991).

Curriculum questions, like a definition of literacy, center around whose needs are being met, or who is defining the needs (Cervero, 1985). Choice of materials, goals set, and methods employed carry messages of power relationships and of value systems. This is inherent in any model of education. Volunteer programs that choose a learner-centered approach do so in hopes that this model will best allow the learners' needs to determine

practice, and a good learner-centered program practices a critical literacy that acknowledges and is aware of the different value systems of the tutors and learners in the program.

Volunteer management

Volunteer management is an increasingly important topic in the field of adult literacy. Many different structures of administration and supervision have been developed and successful models are often adopted by other organizations. Several issues are central to the literacy volunteer management. These issues are the hierarchy and sharing of power within organizations and the training and support of volunteers.

Adult literacy programs have tried to eliminate the power roles suggested by a teacher-student relationship, on the basis that power and hierarchy are incompatible with adult learning. In recognition that adults enter a learning situation with a large repertoire of skills and knowledge gathered over a lifetime, progressive programs have tried to establish relationships built on respect for their adult learners. Williams (1990) writes: "The group does not focus only on the tutor as the source of knowledge but instead everyone is contributing and learning from each other" (p. 93). Gaber-Katz and Watson (1991) describe this balance of power as "the relationship of equals" (p. 15). This sharing of learning as well as of responsibility is central to many adult literacy programs (Freer, 1993).

In practice, power roles are difficult to eliminate. A participant at a literacy conference questioned: "How do we actually create an equal relationship between volunteers and learners?" (Williams, 1990, p. 94). The first barrier to equal relationships is often the different social classes of most volunteers and learners. D'Anglejan (1994) writes that the types of students most in need of literacy programs "are likely to be individuals for whom limited literacy may be but one of a cluster of disadvantages including low levels of income and formal schooling and an inadequate knowledge of the predominant societal language" (p. 289). Tutors and teachers, in contrast, often are those who had success in the education system, and furthermore who are part of the dominant culture of a society. Quigley (1990) suggests that many adults drop out of programs or never join programs because their non-participation is an act of resistance against the values of the dominant culture which are consciously/unconsciously embodied in literacy programs. Other studies suggest that those students who are successful in literacy programs are those most willing to adopt the values of their teachers (Davis, 1991).

Zieghan and Hinchman (1993) argue that university student literacy volunteers could play a unique role in literacy programs: they are themselves students but when they become tutors, they are in a position to challenge and reshape the role of "teacher". Zieghan and Hinchman state that according to the model of critical pedagogy, teachers can open a dialogue to address power differentials in society (p. 356). They believe that undergraduate students can become critical educators, rather than reproducers of dominant values, if their own teachers are able to model that role.

The training and support of volunteer tutors determines the extent to which tutors can be challenged to recognize cultural domination and power roles within tutoring matches. Models which situate their work within a particular community from which they draw their tutors and learners can work towards meeting community advancement projects and merge literacy and group activism (Gaber-Katz and Watson, 1991; Kozol, 1986). Community-based programs can educate tutors on issues of critical pedagogy: one program in London requires its volunteers tutors to read Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970), and other books dealing with language, dialect and power issues. However, exposing tutors to critical pedagogy does not mean they will adopt a critical stance. Zieghan and Hinchman (1993) found in their study that there was little evidence that tutors were assuming the role of critical educators and questioning social inequalities. The tutors in their study appeared to fall back onto the model of the traditional school teacher. Although critical pedagogy is an ideal many programs may aim for, in practical reality there may be little modeling or acceptance of it.

Research on university student volunteer tutors

Despite many public calls for university students to act as volunteer literacy tutors, many literacy campaigns in countries such as Cuba and Nicaragua which used students as tutors (Arnove & Graff, 1987; Cairns, 1989), the growth of the Students for Literacy movement in Canada, and the now-defunct (for lack of funding) Student Literacy Corps in the United States, there are only a few research studies focusing on undergraduate student tutors.

Four studies were available in the literature, and all of them focused on tutors' experiences as part of the United States' Student Literacy Corps. The Corps program was funded by the U.S. Department of Education to help meet local literacy needs and encourage student involvement in adult literacy. The program gave funds to institutions across the U.S. to design and implement undergraduate courses that provide students with a foundation in literacy theory alongside supervised placement as tutors in local literacy programs. The teachers implementing the Corps programs acknowledged the paucity of research on the effects of participation on the student tutors (Hayes, 1996).

D'Annunzio (1994) describes how undergraduate students in a Philadelphia Student Literacy Corps program used non-intrusive instructional procedures and non-directive counseling procedures to help the adult learners establish and attain literacy goals. This study emphasizes the positive effects undergraduate students had on the learners, especially the "dramatic increase" in learners' self-confidence in reading and writing and in their sense of personal self-esteem. The tutors noted the effectiveness of the language experience approach in creating high levels of learners' personal involvement. The tutors' training in non-directive counseling skills and empathetic listening also had a positive carryover effect into the tutors' relationships with people other than the learners. Tutor retention after completion of the credit course was very high. This study highlights the effectiveness of well-trained tutors on their learners' ability to set and achieve their goals, but reveals little about the tutors' actual experiences, behaviour and beliefs.

Newman (1991) reports on how the four objectives of the Student Literacy Corps were met in her college. Of interest to this study are objectives 2 and 3:

> 2. To include as part of the course the requirement that each student shall perform not less than six hours of voluntary, uncompensated service each week of the academic term in public community agencies as a tutor
>
> 3. To provide through the course a tutoring service that is supplementary to existing instructional services, offered in a structured classroom setting, and supervised by qualified personnel

In this program, the tutors met and often exceeded the requirement of six hours (later revised to four hours) per week of tutoring. This tutoring, as indicated in objective 3, was supplementary to the course instruction in instructional strategies. Newman notes that the training received by these Corps tutors "far exceeded" the training given in the literacy agencies where they worked. The tutors were also regularly supervised by the course or the agency directors. This combination of intensive, guided training in addition to extensive, supervised field experience is an excellent example of a model for literacy programs. Newman states that this program was possible because students received academic credit for their participation and because the course was developed using (now unavailable) federal funds.

Zieghan and Hinchman's (1993) study focuses on student tutors' abilities to redefine their roles from the traditional "teacher" role to one of a critical educator able to question the social inequalities built into our educational structures. Again, these Syracuse, New York students were supported by a training and support structure similar

to Newman's which is more extensive than that which one-on-one volunteer tutors normally receive. Tutors in this program were satisfied with learners' progress in reading, but were also equally satisfied with the improvement in learners' personal growth and self-confidence. Tutors experienced the gradual removal of the boundaries of "teacher" and "student" as they worked with the learners.

Other tutors experienced high levels of frustration with learners who didn't seem to progress or who weren't committed to the tutoring. Zieghan and Hinchman report that when tutors were frustrated, they fell back on the 'school teacher' model, 'diagnosing' the learners' problems. Overall, these tutors learnt to be sympathetic and concerned teachers. Zieghan and Hinchman wonder why these tutors did not question how their learners interacted with society, and the authors conclude that although the ideal model for teachers should be based on Giroux's critical pedagogy, tutors need to have this type of critical education modeled for them. The authors state:

> [Redefining] the power relationships between the various players in the literacy discourse will necessitate a major disruption of the status quo. Tutors will be become critical educators only if this role is sanctioned by their own teachers
>
> (p. 357)

Zieghan and Hinchman's emphasis on redefining the roles of tutors is one that the other Student Literacy Corps researchers also mention as a concern.

Hayes' (1996) article is the most relevant to this study. Hayes describes the experiences of a student tutor in her Student Literacy Corps class, drawing from a

database of interviews with the student, class assignments, and reflective journals. The tutor was placed as an assistant to a teacher in a community-center in a low-income housing development. She wrote frequently about the learners, emphasizing the role of motivation even as she learned about other factors which act as barriers to participation. Her original understanding of literacy as functional literacy changed into an awareness of literacy in societal contexts, although this did not lead her to question adult education practices or her own beliefs. Tutoring in a community center gave the tutor a broader awareness than other students in the Corps program received of the context of the adult learners' lives. Although the tutor stressed the importance of giving emotional support, she felt that it needed to be combined with structure to "keep learners on task" (p. 390). Hayes reports that although the tutor had less time with students than other tutors, she continued as a literacy volunteer after the end of the Corps course.

Differences between other volunteer literacy programs and MSL

The main difference between MSL and the other types of literacy programs reviewed here is that MSL's program is run completely by university student tutors without links of accountability to professionals, other literacy programs, or funding agencies. This gives the tutors a certain level of autonomy which is not possible in the other programs. This difference in autonomy as well as in its tutor population (most other programs have a more diverse group of tutors) means that the literature in the field cannot be generalized to this particular site, although some features may emerge as shared characteristics.

The Montreal anglophone literacy community and McGill Students for Literacy

The final section of this literature review will situate MSL within the Montreal anglophone literacy community and discuss MSL's position vis-à-vis other literacy organizations. The Montreal anglophone literacy community is rather distinct from other literacy communities in Quebec and in Canada, and this affects MSL's position in Montreal and the choices MSL makes.

The Montreal anglophone literacy community is used to operating alongside the larger francophone literacy community, but resists efforts to unite the two groups in order to protect anglophone needs from possible encroachment due to the Quebec government's priorities for French language education. This uneasy coexistance is evidenced clearly through the question of second language learners within literacy, as the Quebec givernment prefers to educate these non-native speakers through COFIs (Centres d'intégration et de formation des immigrants), programs for teaching French (D'Anglejan, 1994). Due to these policies, MSL is one of the only literacy groups in Montreal that can offer ESL tutoring without risk of losing funding (MSL is funded by McGill students through the fees paid to the Students' Society). However, MSL is aware that they have no firm policy on ESL learners, nor on whether or not they should accept francophones as learners, since they already have all the literacy and language skills required for life in Quebec.

MSL receives learners from the Montreal community through the same channels as other literacy groups: MSL coordinators make contact with social service agencies, halfway homes, and other groups to offer their services, and they also receive learners who are referred to MSL from the central referral system, the LEARN line. MSL appeals to many learners because of its flexibility and its learner-centeredness. MSL shares many of the same characteristics as other literacy groups, and enjoys a good standing in the anglophone literacy community.

A recent study (Aaron, 1997) commissioned by Literacy Partners of Quebec highlights several problems that exist within the Montreal literacy community, and the data collected for this thesis which was conducted independently and without prior knowledge of Aaron's study, corroborates some points Aaron raises in reference to learners and tutors who called the referral system, the LEARN line. First, ESL learners present a challenge for literacy programs. Aaron recommends that since tutors are not trained for ESL, and since tutors often do not want ESL learners, non-anglophone learners should be referred to other education centers. More importantly, Aaron draws attention to the insufficient support of volunteer tutors, and to the high rate of tutor dropout. She recommends that tutors go through a more rigorous screening process, and that programs provide more materials and support for their tutors. This second issue will be examined in Chapter 3 with an exploration of the beliefs of tutors coming to the program, and how their beliefs impact their behaviour as tutors.

The purpose of this chapter was to provide a framework of literature within which MSL tutors' experiences will be situated. Issues raised in the literature, such as tutor motivations, training, and understanding of literacy in theory and practice, formed the foundation for the questions explored in the tutor interviews. Chapter Three presents the data from these interviews in a structure that offers a general description of the behaviour and beliefs of the literacy tutors (Part One), and then relates these findings to the study question of why many tutors choose to keep their matches distant from the organization (Part Two).

CHAPTER THREE: DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

This chapter will address the two study objectives outlined in Chapter 1: to generate a description of the tutors involved in MSL, and then, using the description, to explore why many tutors in this one-on-one literacy program choose not to maintain closer relationships with MSL.

Part One: Concepts of literacy

Concepts of literacy refer to the tutors' understanding and expression of what literacy meant to them at various stages of their involvement with MSL, and what it meant at the time of the interview.

Entry to MSL and pre-MSL concepts of literacy

Most tutors interviewed selected MSL for their volunteer work during a university activities night where McGill student clubs recruit members through booth displays. As these tutors' choices are usually not pre-meditated (as they often are for tutors involved in non-university-based volunteer literacy programs), they do not always have an informed understanding of literacy. Whereas some tutors know people with reading problems, others join because they feel qualified or skilled enough in reading to help someone else. Another important motivating factor is the tutors' own love of reading: literacy, literature and reading for pleasure seem interrelated to many beginning tutors. Other tutors join because the type of volunteer work MSL provides is judged as worthwhile and good, and

because the one-on-one learning relationship is flexible. The tutors expect that the one-on-one tutoring will provide the satisfaction of helping one individual in a concrete way. A few tutors join because they are considering pursuing a degree in education after their initial Bachelor's degree, and they believe the tutoring experience will help them explore this possibility.

Tutors were asked for their retrospective comments on how they understood literacy before their MSL involvements. Most tutors stated that they saw literacy (previous to MSL) as "reading and writing" as opposed to a range of skills and literate behaviour, and some included the "appreciation of books" as part of literacy, although one tutor acknowledged that a love of reading for pleasure is part of a value system that is not necessarily shared by learners. Nevertheless, many tutors are drawn to literacy work for reasons reminiscent of the earliest literacy advocates: helping a person "discover" and enjoy books. This concept of "appreciation of books" is very different from critical literacy views, and brings value judgements on the purpose of literacy into the tutoring match. However, tutors only mentioned "love of books" as part of their motivations upon entry, and did not bring them into their current motivations. This could indicate an important shift from recognizing one's own values in literacy to recognizing that the learner's values may not include reading for pleasure.

In terms of the types of learners the tutors expected to encounter, most tutors made black-and-white distinctions such as "illiterate vs. literate" or "well-educated vs.

illiterate". The tutors indicated that they questioned how someone could get a job or survive in life without a functional degree of fluency in reading and writing. Tutors perceived learners as dependent, rather than inter-dependent on others. When asked how they initially had pictured a learner, the images centred around "older" people who hadn't had a chance to learn as children, and people who had fallen behind in school. Some tutors included immigrant English as a Second Language learners within literacy, others did not.

Literacy after training

All tutors must attend MSL's six to nine hour training (spread over two to three sessions) before they are matched with a learner. The sessions are based on a structure developed by McGill Students for Literacy, and the tutoring techniques demonstrated in the sessions are based on Frontier College's Student Centered Individualized Learning manual (Carpenter, 1986). The training is presented by the current leadership team members and generally incorporates the trainers' experiences into the training outline.

The most important change noted in the tutors' concepts of literacy is a realization of the range of abilities and levels of literacy learners. This awareness of "range" can be subdivided into 4 groups: those who question how much literacy is "enough", those who acknowledge the "subjectivity" of literacy for each learner, those who recognize that many learners are not "illiterate", and those who now see literacy in an extreme way as relativistic to each individuals' set of knowledge, so that no one can really be "illiterate".

Several comments from the tutors indicate a current inability to "define literacy". One tutor stated: "It's such a complex question... I don't really feel comfortable necessarily answering it. It's kind of a broad subject", while another said:

> I don't know if I could still define it adequately...the term as it is known probably embodies a bit of a mix, like literacy with I don't know. I think the program if anything made me realize that every definition that I've come up with is inadequate in some way

A different tutor said that it was difficult to put into words. The tutors' hesitation to voice an opinion could indicate that the organization is working without a clear boundary of what for them constitutes a "literacy" learner, and by extension the criteria delineating who can use the services of a "literacy" tutor. The hesitation could also indicate that tutors may want to move their understanding of literacy beyond the narrow confines of "functional literacy", yet they do not have the words to describe what they can sense is missing from their economically-defined concept of literacy.

In summary, the training provided the tutors with a perspective on the range of learners the tutors could encounter, but left ambiguities within the tutors' broadened concepts of what literacy means. This ambiguity reflects the organization's open stance towards accepting learners into matches. Within this study, there were ESL learners, a child and an adult with Down syndrome, several adult learners with suspected learning disabilities, and several teenagers (see Appendix B). This variety displays one consequence of the organization's relatively open mandate on accepting learners: the

variety of specific needs within the organization limits the depth of appropriate training and support MSL and their learner-tutor coordinators can offer, and makes literacy a very broad, unbounded– and hence undefined– concept.

Literacy after tutoring

The development of tutors' concepts of literacy after training is intimately linked to their experiences with their learner(s), since it is extremely rare that a tutor consults resources (books, articles, the Montreal literacy community) or other tutors for a deeper understanding of literacy and their practice as volunteers. Most tutors describe their current definition of literacy as "functional", although their understanding of that term differs.

The tutors' definitions of functional literacy in this study are associated with reading materials that are considered "everyday" such as bank slips or newspapers, but frequently the tutors also mention functional literacy as "access" and "interaction/engagement" with the world. This emphasis on access to information and upon interaction departs from the job-related or survival-related emphasis of functional literacy and could be seen to approach a more critical concept of literacy. However, the tutors, lacking exposure to the field of critical literacy, confine their actions within the scope of the functional, although in theory they want their learners to become more active agents. This evident lack of exposure to other perspectives on literacy surfaced again in

questions about the term "empowerment".

Tutors were asked what they thought of the term "empowerment" in literacy. Following from their confine of functional literacy, most tutors either steered away from the word "empowerment", a term associated with critical literacy, or endowed it with a job-related or quality of life meaning. Although at a different point in the interview many tutors expressed concerns about their learner being cheated or without full access to their rights, only one tutor questioned a job-orientation to literacy by mentioning her reaction to criticisms of certain functional literacy programs in India. Rather than relating learners' empowerment to learners' increased control or action over their lives, tutors related empowerment to "getting into the real world", "giving you an edge in any field", and "more open doors"— terms strongly associated with employment and competitiveness. A few tutors associated empowerment with self-esteem, and another was able to comment that a tutor cannot empower a learner. The overall emphasis was on "getting further in life" without questioning what and whose values "further" implied.

The organization does not have a clear policy on who a literacy learner is, and what kinds of literacy instruction MSL tutors can offer. Tutors are not aware of the values implicit in functional definitions of literacy, nor are they aware of theories of critical or emancipatory literacy. An awareness of other literacy theories and practices could encourage the tutors to reflect on their own values and practices, and encourage MSL to question and define its role in the learners' communities and in society.

Literacy in practice

Literacy tutoring in MSL's one-on-one program takes place within matched tutor-learner pairs who meet at their own convenient times and locations and for the duration of time that they deem necessary to meet the learners' goals. Learner-tutor coordinators (LTCs) evaluate information on the tutors and learners and try to make compatible matches. Once the "match" has been assigned, the tutor and learner are responsible for initiating and developing the relationship, while an LTC is responsible for monitoring the match and providing ongoing support. The tutor-learner match involves several key components: the relational aspects of the match, the tutoring content of the match, and the learner's progress in the match. After discussing the components of the match, the tutor's relationship to MSL will be explored, outlining the behaviour of the tutors within the context of the organization's structure and support system.

Tutor relationships with the learner

The one-on-one structure of the matches is characterized by two features: the amount of individualized attention a learner receives, and the quality of the relationship a learner and tutor establish. Most advocates of one-on-one tutoring emphasize these two features as the strengths of this type of volunteer tutoring. MSL tutors appreciate the one-on-one format because they believe it is not a rigid structure and thus less of a chore, it is more productive and confidential, and it allows the learner to receive individual attention.

Cooperative relationships within the sessions

Many tutoring matches develop into cooperative learning relationships, where both the tutor and the learner identify themselves as learners in the relationship: while the tutor offers academic skills, the learner offers the tutor, who is often much younger, awareness of a different life and their accumulated life-skills. Many tutors describe their relationships as "friendly", recognizing that there are situational limits to how much friendship can and should be built within tutoring sessions. A significant number of tutors describe their relationship as "friendships", and spend time in friendship-related activities during and outside of the tutoring sessions. Only one tutor stated that the relationship had moved to a "primarily friends" relationship where they were "not really tutor-learner". Generally however, it seems that although the social aspect of the tutoring becomes more pervasive-- and is indeed recognized as vital to the relationship-- the relationships operate within the structure of the learning sessions.

Trust and goal-setting within tutoring relationships

Two elements can weaken a tutor-learner relationship: the issues of trust and honesty and the challenge of setting goals. The two elements are often connected within the relationships. First, several tutors in "friendly" relationships stated that they didn't believe their learner fully trusted them or was completely honest with them. This lack of trust manifested itself in, for example, a learner who wouldn't accept a tutor's statement that Ottawa is the capital of Canada rather than the capital of Quebec, learners who wouldn't discuss their discontent with how sessions were run, and learners who switched

programs without discussing with the tutor how to alter the relationship to better suit their needs. It should be noted that the inverse situation also occurs: a tutor does not always trust the learner's decisions. For example, one tutor did not want to allow the learner to read the higher level adult-reading book he chose for their sessions; the learner insisted on the choice and the tutor eventually recognized his decision and appreciated his reasons and perspective. Some learners shift the weight of goal-setting or planning onto their tutors: the tutors mentioned wishing that the learners could be more decisive or stated that the learners' goals were as vague as "getting better". This is a potentially difficult area of the learner-tutor relationship which has received some notice in the literature: not all learners are ready to set their own goals, although this is the foundation of a learner-centered curriculum.

The issues of trust and honesty and the issue of goal-setting responsibilities might be related to the differences in perspectives and values between the tutors and the learners: a tutor might value reading comprehension (and choose a low-level book) while a learner values the type of book being read (adult vs. children's content), or a tutor might value writing as a tool of communication whereas an ESL learner would put greater value on speech. These value differences can surface and affect the relationship.

Relationships outside of the tutoring sessions

Tutors will occasionally engage in non-literacy related activities for which the learner requests help. One tutor reported that her learner expected her to get job

applications and to call potential employers. Another learner wanted the tutor to teach the family how to skate. The tutors' sense of discomfort in these situations is understandable: they recognize that there are limits to the support services they can offer. However, the issue of operating a literacy program without integrating it into other aspects of the learners' lives marks a radical difference between programs such as MSL and community-based programs. Whereas tutors in MSL often believe that the tutor should limit their involvement to the literacy aspects of a learners' life, community-based programs recognize that the "literacy" includes "process and content" and that literacy from the critical perspective "[encompasses] the notions of advocacy and community education" (Gaber-Katz & Watson, 1991, p. 31).

Content of the tutoring relationship

The materials used in a tutoring relationship depend on the learner: in about a quarter of the matches, learners are also involved in education outside of the tutoring match. In these cases, the learners' school materials are the basis for the match activities, although supplementary activities and materials are brought in. These match situations, where the tutor supplements instruction received in a classroom-based, teacher-directed format, seem to generate the most tutor satisfaction. However, the fact that these learners are involved in the formal education system indicates a commitment to a specific set of goals and indicates that they are learners who could likely benefit from any educational opportunity.

The case of learners for whom MSL is their primary program of education is much more difficult in terms of content. In these cases, the tutors must elicit goals, decide how to work towards those goals, and find materials to help achieve these ends. This planning task is complicated, as stated above, by a values clash or a lack of honesty, and is also complicated by the learners' perceived or real psychological or mental hindrances. In one case, a learner told the tutor: "I can't read. I'm dyslexic. You know. Just show me how to read". In another situation, a tutor learned that the learner with Down syndrome was most comfortable working within a routine of familiar exercises, and the tutor learned to vary exercises within a standard format. ESL learners present another challenge: depending on their goals and their English abilities, these learners may have a wide variety of needs that a tutor must accommodate. The outcome of the effectiveness of the content of the tutoring sessions can only be analyzed in this study through the tutors' statements about their perceptions of their learners' progress.

Learner progress

MSL has no system in place for evaluating a learners' progress: as part of their goal of offering student-centered individualized learning, they do not measure progress by tests but rather by a learner's own goals and sense of progress. In this study, the learners were not available to comment on their progress; instead, each tutor offered their analysis of their learner's progress at various points in the interviews. Obviously, this is no real measure of progress but rather the tutors' perceptions of progress. This, in itself, is valuable to our understanding of tutors, but it also provides a window into the role a

learners' progress plays in the tutoring relationship and into the tutors' perceptions of the importance of learning goals.

Most matches report only questionable progress. Only one tutor was completely positive about the learner's progress (and notably this learner is involved in formal education outside of MSL); all the other tutors gave a mixed report. Three tutors report little progress:

> We do beneficial things, but I don't see a big improvement
>
> It's difficult to make progress...it's not something that's a huge aspect of [the learner's] life
>
> It's difficult to advance with only two and a half hours a week

Seven other tutors report that they feel inadequate, lack feedback from their learner, do not have enough direction in the tutoring, or that the learner is not committed to the relationship or is not communicating their needs.

The tutors' attitudes towards progress could explain why they are content in relationships that have questionable progress. First, the tutors acknowledge that with more structure in the sessions, progress could be more noticeable, but they continue without making this change because "it's what the learner wants to do". The shared responsibility for the match can nurture a situation where neither the tutor nor the learner takes the initiative to push the match forward. A similar attitude emerged when a tutor

stated "I'm not sure if it's wholly what [the learner] wanted, but [the learner] keeps on coming". Matches can settle into patterns that go unchanged or unchallenged-- although they may not be effective learning patterns-- if the matches are socially-stable relationships.

Two tutors emphasize the social aspect of the relationship as being more important than the learning: one says "Maybe it's wrong, but it's for [the learner's] enjoyment. It gets [the learner] out of the house, and [the learner] loves it", while the other states "It's more a social thing, more friends who go for tea and sit around and write or talk". Another tutor indicated that mutual understanding is a result of familiarity, not necessarily learning progress: "[The learner] doesn't necessarily get better at reading and writing but they get the hang of what you're trying to say". Overall, it seems that established and comfortable relationships can undermine the original learning goals, particularly when the learning goals are not clearly defined or the responsibility for progress is not assumed by either the tutor or the learner.

The tutors' relationships with MSL

The tutors' lack of accountability to MSL seems to play a role in the tutors' acceptance of questionable progress in the match. The data on tutors' relationships with MSL support the common understanding among literacy programs that contact between supervisors and tutors is difficult to maintain. The data presented here will document this phenomenon, and present a preliminary analysis. A comprehensive analysis will follow.

Contact between tutors and the LTCs monitoring their matches is supposed to occur in three ways: monthly progress reports tutors are asked to submit, regular phone conversations between tutors and their LTCs, and general meetings and special events throughout the year. The tutors' responses to questions about the contact they need and want indicate a desire to operate the match with few ties to MSL.

Forms

Tutors rarely fill out the monthly progress reports, and the organization is unsure of how to address this issue. Why these forms are not used varies between matches. One tutor states: "It forces me to evaluate [the learner] and I don't want to". This tutor also comments that she has never filled out the form although she knows she is supposed to: "It's constraining and silly. If I fill out a monthly report who beside me will know what's going on?". Because the learning occurs in one-on-one sessions, tutors may feel that whatever happens within the match is private or that no one else will really be able to "know" what occurs. This could be an effect of the focus on the individual over the group that will be addressed in greater depth.

This rejection of "evaluation" indicates that tutors may not see their match as part of a larger organization that needs to keep records. More importantly, it may signal that tutors are uncomfortable with evaluating progress and reporting on the learning content of the match. For example, one tutor believes that unless goals are clearly defined, it doesn't matter if the learner isn't aware of progress:

> If the goals are clearly defined [...] I think the learner should see where they're going because they want to have the impression that they're going somewhere, but when the goals aren't defined, I think that as long as I'm seeing that we're making progress, we are making progress

This quote demonstrates how the monthly progress reports may be incompatible with many tutors' approaches to progress and goal-setting within the match. The tutors may see progress or the content of the match as a highly personal area that should not be reduced onto a standard form, or they do not see themselves as being accountable to the learner or to MSL.

The LTCs who receive the forms are also divided on the issue: one mentions that it is difficult to note progress every month and that since tutors are constantly changing during the match "whose progress is being evaluated?". Two LTCs stated that tutors need to know that their actions go beyond them, and that the forms assist the LTCs and future tutors. The other LTC noted that the forms only get done by those tutors who are dedicated to the organization, drawing an interesting distinction between tutors who are dedicated to their learners and those tutors who are dedicated to both their learner and the organization. These quotes demonstrate invisible barriers between the matches and the management of the organization, whereas progressive volunteer management requires the volunteers and administrators/coordinators to work in unison and to demonstrate accountability and professionalism.

Phone contact

The level of phone contact between LTCs and tutors continues the theme of tutors resisting evaluative or other contact and suggests reasons for this phenomenon. Tutors are asked to bring up problems and update the LTC on their match when the LTC calls. The LTCs report that although some tutors regularly discuss their matches, others only say "It's fine". The tutors' reticence about asking for help or sharing about their match can be linked to several beliefs. First of all, some tutors do not perceive that the LTCs can offer adequate assistance or stay aware of what is going on in their match. One tutor states: "I talked quite a bit with my coordinator, told [the LTC] the problems I'm having, but I didn't really get any constructive advice". Another tutor said that her LTC wasn't very aware of what was going on and had given her a wrong impression of the match before the tutor entered it. More tutors indicate that the lack of contact was a function of themselves and not the LTCs: the support network seemed accessible, but the tutor decided they didn't need it for their match. However, given that several tutors expressed a need for more resources and training for special needs, and given the questionable progress reported by these tutors, this lack of desire for communication is problematic.

General meetings and special events

Tutors are asked, but not required to attend the general meetings and special events. Many tutors go to only one event all year; many never make a meeting. Schedule conflicts are offered as the reason for missing meetings, but one tutor alludes to another issue: the meetings are used primarily for administrative purposes: planning fund-raisers

and special events, elections, etc. The meetings are not organized as forums for tutors to share experiences and develop peer support networks. The meetings are also not used for in-service training purposes. This could be a result of the nature of undergraduate schedules and because of the volunteer nature of the club: organizers are very hesitant to impose extra training or meeting time into their tutors' busy schedules. However, tutors trained in the May 1997 session articulated a strong desire to have regular meetings where tutors could share their experiences and get advice from their peers. Many tutors did not have lot of time in their schedules, and MSL did not want to demand more than these tutors could give. The volunteers, rather than the organization, determined the amount of time spent in tutoring and in training.

The next section will attempt to relate the themes described in this section to the tutors' perceptions of themselves as volunteers. By linking the need for more training, accountability, and questionable progress with the tutors' roles as literacy volunteers, an interpretive framework emerges that could help MSL better meet tutor and learner needs. The following section will describe the tutors' perceptions of their roles as volunteers.

The tutors' perceptions of their role as literacy volunteers

In order to elicit a better understanding of the tutors' beliefs about their roles as volunteers, the researcher asked the following "Devil's advocate" question (Strauss, Schatzman, Bucher & Sabshin, 1981):

> Many adult educators don't think volunteer tutors have enough training to be able to tutor adults effectively in literacy, and that volunteers should only be used as teacher's aides. How would you respond?

This is a question designed to elicit open response, and it received more attention from the tutors than did many other questions. The tutors' views reveal several interesting patterns of belief that should be noted in light of the descriptions above of tutors' conceptions of literacy, the tutoring relationship and their accountability to MSL.

The majority of the tutors believe that although their learners may not be getting much "good" or progress from the match, at least no harm is being done. These sentiments are expressed through the following statements:

> The work can be useless sometimes...but I don't think there can be a major screw-up, which is perhaps what these people are afraid of...I think from certain matches no one gets anything out of it and that happens, but I don't think there's too much damage that can be done

> It's not doing any harm but I'm sure a trained person would have much better progress

This sentiment was also echoed by two tutors before they were matched, suggesting that this sentiment is not one that develops only after exposure to literacy tutoring, but perhaps is present before training and tutoring:

> I think tutoring is like medicine. First of all, you should do no harm, and there's a lot of teachers out there doing harm...So I think if you have the right heart, and you at least do no harm, then it doesn't necessarily make you a good teacher but at least, like I said, you're doing no harm

This quote, while echoing the complacent sentiment of "at least do no harm" seen in the

earlier quote, offers a clue for intuiting why these tutors are comfortable adopting this position: the tutors perceive that since they believe many teachers to be inadequate or even harmful, volunteers cannot be any worse. This belief is expressed in the following quotes, where a tutor reasons away the differences between adult educators with several years' training in adult education and tutors with approximately ten hours of training:

> I can understand the point that if you just put an unprepared person who can read [with learners] and just say "Teach them" there are a lot of things that one has to deal with...and it could be more damaging to everyone to put this volunteer, untrained, in. ***But what is a professional teacher but someone who's just been trained and a volunteer doesn't necessarily have to be untrained*** (italics mine)

This same "logic" is used by another tutor, even while the tutor admits their own inadequacy in the match:

> Sometimes I feel a little inadequate with my learner who has a learning disability and I haven't necessarily been properly trained in that area. It makes me feel that the way I am helping her is quite inadequate. At the same time I think there are some volunteers out there who are highly trained and the fact is that they should not be ignored. They're highly trained and the whole reason behind that is because they're motivated to do good. They're volunteer-- they don't expect anything out of it in return. I don't think that should be overlooked as a lack of experience or a lack of ability. But I think that to a certain extent the level of training must be taken into account. But just because you're a volunteer doesn't mean that your level of training is inadequate

This tutor agrees with the criticism of literacy volunteers by referring to her own situation, but then jumps to a generalized (and ambiguous) statement about volunteers who are highly trained because they are volunteers. What being "highly trained" means in this tutor's opinion is never explained. Tutors' "good-will" in volunteering is offered as a substitute for experience and ability, leading the tutor to conclude that ***despite her***

experience to the contrary, being a volunteer doesn't mean that your training is inadequate. These important questions remain: are tutors are engaging in self-reflective practices to react in context to what they are doing, and why do they generalize their frame of reference to deflect criticism by extolling the virtues of volunteerism?

Part Two: Why do many MSL tutors not forge a closer relationship with MSL?

The rest of the chapter addresses the question: "Why do many MSL tutors not forge a closer relationship with MSL?". Using the analysis in the preceding part of this chapter and additional data, several reasons emerge in response to this question. These reasons, presented in the following statements, will be explored individually:

1. Tutors believe that a learner who does not succeed in a classroom learning format will be helped by one-on-one tutoring.

2. Tutors, while recognizing the wide variety of learner needs, rely on individual attention rather than specific training to function in the match.

3. Tutors value good will over good training.

4. Tutors defend their volunteer activities based on perceived needs rather than demonstrable progress and results.

These four statements revolve around the two main theoretical foundations of literacy within MSL, namely that is it based on theories of individualized literacy learning (1,2), and that it is a volunteer effort (3,4). The four statements demonstrate the value system through which these volunteer literacy tutors reconcile their actions and their experiences with possibly contradictory ideals and aspirations. The statements display foundational beliefs that reinforce tutors' choices to maintain only a loose relationship with MSL, even when their learners don't seem to make much progress in the match.

Tutors' concepts of individualized literacy learning

Statements 1 and 2 read:

> 1. Tutors believe that a learner who does not succeed in a classroom learning format will be helped by one-on-one tutoring.
>
> 2. Tutors, while recognizing the wide variety of learner needs, rely on individual attention rather than learner-specific training to function in the match.

These two points summarize tutors' understanding of why MSL operates within a one-on-one framework, and how the tutors use MSL support services. Each will be examined separately then a concluding paragraph will relate these statements to each other and to the study question.

Belief in success through one-on-one tutoring

Statement 1 is based on two different patterns in the data: a criticism of classroom learning, and a belief in the value of individual attention for better learning. Tutors in this study were quite critical of the "education system". Although some spoke directly about adult education, many spoke in general terms about the (perceived) state of education in Canada.

The criticism of the "system" reflects a public attitude towards education in this time of funding cutbacks. Interestingly, although the open-ended question used to elicit responses asked "If you wrote a letter to the minister of education about *adult learners* and literacy, what would you say?", most responses ignored the adult learner focus and

centered on criticism of the system in general. Very few of the tutors demonstrate an awareness of the systems of delivery of adult education in Quebec. Although their criticisms may be valid, they generalize their perceptions of the education system to include all its branches— including adult education. These tutors accept MSL's learning philosophy of one-on-one instruction as being the alternative since their criticism of the system primarily focuses on the flaws of classroom-based learning.

Central to the tutors' concerns are teachers who are insensitive to individual learners within groups or who are unable to cope with the wide spectrum of their students' needs. Likewise, criticism is aimed at the quality of Canadian education, given that problems aren't detected and solved early on. Tutors mentioned that many students "fall through the cracks" given the impossibility of giving individual attention to students in the "traditional" school system, and that students are "herded along" or streamed through "teacher-developed equations". Some comments raised about adult education specifically mention adults' vulnerability in group settings and question why adults would return to a school setting where they previously encountered problems. Adult education programs are criticized as not being effective, and for not paying their over-stressed teachers enough. The criticism focuses on a model of classroom-based education which the tutors call into question, specifically for adult learners.

In contrast, tutors are generally quite positive about the benefits of one-on-one instruction. Tutors believe that the one-on-one format is more productive and that the

learner can be more relaxed. Learners can benefit from the networking aspects of interaction and intervention, and can also concentrate on their weaknesses more. These characteristics of one-on-one instruction reflect the profile of one-on-one tutoring presented to the tutors during their training.

As evidenced by the quotes, tutors create a duality between classroom-based instruction and individual instruction without presenting any other alternatives. None of the tutors considered small group learning, or peer learning, etc. This classroom vs. individual duality could be a consequence of MSL's decision to concentrate on one-on-one tutoring (although some students in the past have tried to begin discussion groups), but given that few tutors were able to talk specifically of adult education, this duality could better be interpreted within the tutors' general lack of awareness of the field of adult literacy education. Tutors are introduced to one philosophy of education during their training and exposed to only one type of literacy education which itself developed as an alternative to the adult education system. They are not presented with any other methods to consider, nor are they presented with serious questions about the pros and cons of one-on-one instruction. The tutors' beliefs, as outlined in statement 1 above, reflect their limited exposure to other practices of literacy education, and as a result, an unquestioned reliance on the value of individual versus classroom instruction. This theme will be explored in the following section about statement 2.

Belief in individual attention rather than training to meet learner needs

As seen earlier, while tutors generally enter a program with a black-and-white illiterate/literate concept of literacy, they leave the training acknowledging that literacy learners have a range of needs, skills and experiences. This recognition of range is heightened through the match, when tutors are faced with a learner whose skills and needs were often not anticipated. Many tutors admitted that they didn't feel prepared for tutoring after the training, although several qualify that by stating that "each learner is different so you can't go in prepared for anyone". When faced with a learner with special needs, tutors can either deal with the demands on their own or they can consult their LTC or other tutors for advice and help. Response to the question about how much contact the tutors want with MSL was surprising: although many tutors stated that they did not feel prepared for their match, reported questionable progress, and expressed feelings of inadequacy, only one tutor reported going to their LTC for advice; all the other tutors chose to deal with the match on their own. The tutors who choose not to contact MSL for help give similar reasons for this: they didn't feel like they needed help, although at other stages in the interview they expressed doubt about progress and their adequacy in the match. Although some tutors state that they prefer to keep their matches independent of MSL to prevent the organization from "interfering with their style of tutoring", perhaps their over-reliance on their own abilities to tutor well are rooted in something deeper than dissatisfaction with an LTC. Since individualized learning is the only educational philosophy presented to the tutors in their training sessions, it could have an effect on tutors' behaviour toward organizational support.

Training materials, while they recognize the wide variety of learner needs, insist that these needs can be met using the tutors' common sense and through building a trusting relationship: A paragraph in the training book used by MSL states:

> Since every student is unique, an individual approach is needed for each one...learning must remain in the hands and minds of the learners. They have a lifetime of thoughts that can come pouring out if trust is developed. Reading can be made more complicated than it really is. Rather than relying on methods with which students have not been successful, it is more productive for tutors to think of common sense solutions to individual difficulties (Carpenter, 1986, p.33).

This reliance on individual attention to meet a variety of unique needs is transferred from the LTCs to the tutors through the training sessions, and emphasized when tutors are not given training in any reading methods.

The downplaying of training because of individualized learning is emphasized as tutors become aware that the LTCs receive little more training than that which tutors possess. One tutor stated: "I talked quite a bit with my coordinator [LTC], told [the LTC] the problems I'm having, but I didn't really get any constructive advice. They mean to support as much as they can, but the LTC has the same resources I would have". Since LTCs are elected (often by acclaim), and receive little training beyond the administrative aspects of their positions, it is possible that the LTCs are not perceived as resource people or as supervisors to whom tutors are accountable. The tutors then, have no model other than what is taught and demonstrated: their individual attention and their commitment to the learner are enough to help. While this philosophy legitimizes tutors who have no

experience or background in the teaching of reading or in education, it also creates tutors who believe that they can do it on their own. This message downplays the role of advanced training for literacy tutors and is reinforced when tutors are able to advance to supervisory/administrative positions without receiving additional literacy training.

Relationship of statements 1 and 2 to the hypothesis

MSL's philosophy of learning and organizational structure could contribute to tutors' reliance on individual attention, rather than specific training, within the matches. Tutors are introduced to a pedagogy that emphasizes relationships over specific training as the key to successful tutoring (Carpenter, 1986). Thus, tutors might not feel the need to contact their LTC whom they perceive as someone no different from themselves, and choose to continue to work things out on their own within the match. However, given a) the questionable rates of progress, b) the barriers between LTCs and tutors, and c) the division between learners who are committed to the organization and those who are not, the tutors could be over-reliant on the importance of individual attention.

Tutors' volunteer-related values

Statements 3 and 4 read:

> 3. Tutors value good will over good training.
>
> 4. Tutors defend their volunteer activities based on perceived needs rather than demonstrable progress and results.

These two points summarize the key values underlying the volunteer basis of the tutors' activities. As with the previous two statements, these values affect the quality of the

literacy provision and reflect a difference between the fields of professional adult education and literacy volunteerism. Each statement will be examined separately in this subsection, with a concluding paragraph relating these statements to each other and to the study question.

Belief in the value of good will over good training

Motivation and preparation are key factors in learning situations. As explored earlier in this chapter, volunteer tutors are highly critical of the education system and particularly of teachers they perceive as being insensitive to students' needs or without a true vocation. Tutors made the following comments about teachers:

> Programs need to be set up with good teachers who want to teach and are accessible
>
> I didn't have a good experience with elementary teachers-- they were inadequate
>
> Having a degree doesn't make you a good teacher; it's a personality type

These quotes demonstrate a variety of attitudes towards teachers which address issues of motivation for teaching and ability. The emphasis here is on motivation to teach as much or more than it is on preparation for the job. When these quotes are compared to responses elicited using the Devil's advocate question about limiting the role of tutors to teachers' aids because of tutors' lack of training, the emphasis on good-will and motivation emerged as being more important to the tutors than extensive preparation. Tutors state:

> They criticize volunteers just to save their jobs. Tutors are needed until unlimited all-motivated adult educators can take over
>
> Teachers come in because they're paid
>
> Volunteers come with a pretty good attitude; they'll try

Perhaps the most insightful quote comes from one tutor who believes:

> Some volunteers are highly trained because they're motivated to do good, they don't expect in return

The emphasis, then, is that motivation based on a tutor's good-will is the most important qualification, and only as a result, or in conjunction with good-will, can someone be prepared to be a good teacher/tutor. Again, the tutors' perceptions of their own role in literacy provision are based on the deficits in the adult education sector, namely that teachers do not care, are not committed to their students and teach because they are paid to do so. In contrast, the tutors see themselves as doing their best, and trying to help. Because of their sense of good-will, the tutors feel they have the most necessary characteristics to do the job.

Defense of volunteer activities based on need not results

Tutors recognize that although they do their best, the learners may not make large improvements, or the learners may learn at a slower rate than if a better-trained person was with them. One tutor says:

> Having someone taught more slowly or not focused on the perfect path is better than nothing at all

This statement reveals the underlying reason why tutors continue in matches even when they can't see much progress or when they feel inadequate: tutors believe that they are meeting needs that the education sector is not reaching, or does not have the resources to meet. This belief is the most pervasive of the four statements. Tutors state:

> You would lose everyone with that policy; [there are] not enough good-well-trained teachers
>
> That would reduce manpower
>
> It's needed, so why not provide it?
>
> There are no teachers volunteering-- the club wants to help and is doing it
>
> [The mother of the learner] said 'Beggars can't be choosers'
>
> People come to volunteer organizations because there's not enough out there
>
> You can't come down on everything that isn't done with years of experience or nothing will get done

These quotes clearly show how the tutors delineate their actions within an area of high demand and unmet needs. Their actions are necessary, they believe, because without the volunteer sector no one would be there to help.

This belief has two components: the reality of the belief and the effect of the belief on the tutoring matches. Both components will be examined in the context of MSL and the Montreal community.

Volunteer organizations are often at the vanguard of change and of recognizing new areas of service. Literacy volunteerism, as was seen with Frontier College in Canada, is no different: volunteer activities paved the way for the professional development of the field and for the establishment of state-funded institutions and outreach. The emphasis on the need for increased volunteer activities was heightened during the 1980's as media focus on the "adult literacy crisis" was used as a rallying call for more volunteers. More recent actions, such as the American summit on volunteerism in 1996, have highlighted the growing reliance of the government on volunteer activities to provide basic community services. Programs such as MSL try to go beyond the reach of state-funded education, offering flexible learning opportunities to people who have not had access to, or success in, the educational opportunities available through Quebec school boards. The tutors' belief in the need for their services is grounded in reality. The effect of this belief, however, can work against the desired outcomes.

The most visible effect of the tutors' belief that their help is necessary is manifested in their attitudes towards training and progress. As noted in section 3.4, many tutors defend their actions by saying that they are doing "no harm" although they admit that someone with better training could probably help the learner progress more. This belief stands alongside the tutors' acknowledgement of questionable progress in most matches. However, although the tutors may perceive no harm in a match where learning is slow, what can be said of the effects of slow progress on the adult learner? An adult learner may not be willing to invest time into an endeavour where visible results and

outcomes are unclear. When tutors feel that their help is 'better than nothing', the focus of the match is more easily lost.

Relationship of statements 3 and 4 to the hypothesis

An emphasis on good will over training, and a belief that one's actions are necessary whether or not they are effective, leads tutors to isolate themselves within their matches. Tutors are not held accountable for their actions when organizations need to retain them and do not want to place demands for accountability or contact on the tutors, as the section on attitudes towards forms, phone calls, and meeting attendance demonstrated. Likewise, when tutors are told that it is more important for them to be sensitive to the learner than to be prepared for the learner, the organization gives the tutors the impression that it is the tutors' choice if they want to keep the activities of their match-- as well as any problems or lack of progress-- out of the organization's reach. The central study question asks why tutors do not rely more on the services available to them through MSL. Statements 3 and 4 suggest that the tutors do not rely on MSL because they are told that their volunteering is necessary and that tutoring does not require extensive training. In this way, the volunteer nature of the activity undermines the effectiveness of the activity.

Conclusion

This chapter has given a description of the tutors' experiences and beliefs, and uses this description to explore the question of why many tutors do not establish a closer relationship with MSL. The analysis presented four main features of the tutors' belief system as it relates to individualized learning within MSL and to the nature of volunteer activities, and related these features to the central study phenomenon of why tutors do not rely more on the organization.

CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSION

This study of volunteer literacy tutors, as outlined in Chapter One, stated as its objectives:

> 1. To provide a description of volunteer tutors' understandings of literacy, how and why they became tutors, how their definitions of literacy develop, how they tutor, and how they relate to their learners and to their volunteer organization.
>
> 2. To use the description to suggest reasons why some tutors distance themselves and their match from the organization

The first of the two objectives was met in the first part of Chapter Three, where a detailed analysis describes tutors' behaviour and beliefs upon entry to MSL and through their tutoring experiences. The second objective was addressed in the second part of Chapter Three through four statements which summarized key tutor beliefs related to being volunteers and to using an individualized theory of learning. This concluding chapter will outline suggested future areas of research on adult literacy volunteers.

A summary of the key issues raised in the first part of Chapter Three will be presented in the next subheading. The four statements outlined in the second part of Chapter Three will be addressed by grouping the statements together into their two underlying themes, volunteerism and individualized learning, and summarizing the issues raised by these beliefs. The theoretical implications of this study and further areas of research will follow. A forecast of how this research will be used by MSL to improve training, volunteer support and better learning opportunities for adults will conclude this study.

Summary of the volunteer tutors' understanding and practice of literacy, and their relationship to their organization

The tutors involved in this study displayed changes in their understanding of literacy from their point of entry to the program, through the training, and through their experiences with learners. The tutors developed a more complex understanding of literacy, but they seemed unable to extend their understanding of literacy beyond a functional, work-oriented definition. Their beliefs reflect the organization's ambiguous stance on accepting learners. This lack of focus hinders MSL's ability to train tutors on specific issues, and perhaps contributes to tutors' lack of reliance on the organization's resources and support structure.

The tutors developed friendly relationships with their learners. In only a few cases did the friendship take priority in the sessions over learning goals. In most cases, the relationship was kept within the bounds of the tutoring relationship. Issues of lack of trust surfaced in several relationships.

The tutors took a complacent attitude towards progress: although most tutors reported questionable progress, many believed that their tutoring, while possibly not doing any good, at least was doing no harm. This sets up a contradiction in the tutoring relationship: the tutors acknowledge that learning is not taking place, but state that they are not doing any harm. No tutors considered the potentially negative impact of slow rates of learning on an adult learner.

Although tutors did not feel that their learners had made much progress, tutors were not likely to go to their Learner-tutor coordinators (LTCs) for help. The program has not stressed the tutors' accountability to the program, and LTCs are divided as to what kinds of contact should be required between tutors and MSL. Tutors may not see their LTC as a resource person because the LTC often has no more training in literacy than the tutors. The LTCs try to maintain contact at regular intervals with the tutors, but may feel like intruders when they call. A division was suggested by one LTC between tutors who are committed to the organization and tutors who are committed only to their learner. The effects of this division on training and support have not been considered by MSL.

The tutors' act of distancing themselves from MSL was traced to four salient beliefs about volunteer literacy tutoring. Tutors reject the school system because they perceive that too many students fall through the cracks in classrooms, and as a result they believe that a learner who does not succeed in a classroom learning format will be helped by one-on-one tutoring. Likewise, while tutors recognize the wide variety of learner needs, tutors rely on the individual attention they can give a learner rather than on wanting more training to function effectively in the matches. These are key attitudes which are perhaps related to the method of individualized learning that tutors were exposed to in training. Several beliefs related to volunteerism also emerged in the data. The tutors valued their good will in volunteering as a substitute for their lack of training. Likewise, the tutors defended their volunteer activities based on perceived needs for

literacy volunteers rather than on demonstrable learner progress in their matches.

Theoretical implications and further areas of research

This is the first study of its kind. In all other studies, either the agency of tutors in the match was ignored to focus exclusively on the learners, or the learner was ignored to focus exclusively on what the tutor gained from the literacy experience. This study, where the tutors' behaviour was connected to their beliefs, and where their beliefs were shown to affect their decision to distance themselves and their learners from MSL, demonstrates that tutor perspectives are necessary in order to understand the dynamic of how adults learn in one-on-one literacy models. The tutors, rather than being passive transmitters of knowledge according to the learners' needs, are active, decision-making partners in the learning process. Future studies should continue to examine the role of tutors in literacy provision.

Many directions in this research could be pursued. First of all, tutors in other programs may or may not share the beliefs of the group of mostly undergraduate tutors surveyed in this study. The responses from the few non-students in the study indicate that some, if not all four, of the main beliefs may be related to volunteerism and the pedagogy of an organization, and thus the beliefs could be present in other literacy volunteers working within the same theoretical framework. Studies should determine to what extent these attitudes are prevalent in other volunteer groups, and how programs should deal with the impact of these beliefs in their particular contexts.

Another productive area of research could examine how relationships between tutors and learners develop, taking into account the age, gender, class, and ethnicity factors that shape relationships. Studies should be done to establish whether or not these factors of gender, class and ethnicity affect the learners' or tutors' decisions to continue in a program. More specifically, programs that use university students as volunteers could investigate the impact of age differences between tutors and learners in combination with the factors mentioned above. One preliminary study has been conducted by this author in MSL that indicates that this is a productive area of research.

A concluding major area of research could examine how tutors work within the Student Centered Individualized Learning paradigm. Tutors are given strategies and directed to resources, but are told to negotiate a curriculum with their learners. To what extent do the lessons follow the learners' goals and desires in receiving tutoring? Are the tutors able to plan towards goals and work within such an intense format of learning? This would be a difficult issue to study, but undoubtedly it would be very important in assessing the impact of the tutoring.

Plans for MSL's response to issues raised in this study

The study objectives were based on the researcher's personal study interests and MSL's expressed, explicit needs for a better understanding of their tutors' experiences. As there are so few funds or time for study of volunteer programs, it was hoped that this research would lead to concrete ways to improve or evaluate MSL's literacy activities.

The results from this study are being released to MSL and to the Montreal literacy community. The researcher will meet with the MSL organizing team of the 1997-1998 academic year to discuss how the research will impact the literacy program. To date, the organizing team has been very receptive of all aspects of the research and is eager to address the issues raised in the study. The research has already had an impact on how the topics of literacy and the roles of volunteer tutors were presented in one of the two September 1997 tutor training seminars.

The study will be made available to literacy groups. It is the researcher's hope that these studies and others to follow will challenge literacy groups to reflect on their practices and to welcome investigation, accountability and change as part of progressive volunteer activity.

References Cited

Aaron, Mandie. (1997). Increasing awareness for successful outcomes: Referral systems in Quebec. Montreal, QC: Literacy Partners of Quebec.

Abadzi, Helen. (1994). What we know about the acquisition of adult literacy. Is there hope?. Washington DC: World Bank Discussion Papers No. 245.

Al-Kahtany, Abdallah Hady. (1996). Literacy from a linguistic and sociolinguistic perspective. International Review of Education, 42 (6), 547-562.

Arnove, Robert F. & Graff, Harvey J. (1987). National literacy campaigns: Historical and comparative lessons. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 202-206.

Beder, Hal. (1991). Adult literacy: Issues for policy and practice. Malabar, FL: Kreiger Publishing.

Berg, Paul Conrad. (1966). Illiteracy at the crossroads. In Frank W. Lanning & Wesley A. Many. Basic education for the disadvantaged adult: Theory and practice (pp. 47-55). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Berkowitz, Peggy. (1995). Fired up for learning: Students teach for social justice on a changing frontier. University Affairs, 36 (9), 6-7.

Bhola, Harbans S. (1989). Adult literacy: from concepts to implementation strategies. In Morsy Zaghloul (Ed.), The challenge of illiteracy: From reflection to action. (pp. 115-126). New York: Garland.

Boothby, Daniel. (1993). Schooling, literacy and the labour market: Towards a 'literacy shortage'?. Canadian Public Policy, 19 (1), 29-35.

Bossort, Patty. (Ed.). (1990). Literacy 2000: conference summary. Literacy 2000: Making the next ten years matter. Douglas College, New Westminster, B.C.

Bowen, Ezra. (1986, May 5). Losing the war of letters. Time, 127, 68.

Brand, Eugen. (1987). Functional illiteracy in industrialized countries. Prospects, 17 (2), 137-147.

Brown, Christiane N. (1991). Literacy programs that can use your help. Good Housekeeping, 213 (5), 240.

Cairns, John C. (1989). Lessons from past literacy campaigns: A critical assessment. In Morsy Zaghloul (Ed.), The challenge of illiteracy: From reflection to action. (pp. 105-114). New York: Garland Pub.

Calamai, Peter (1987). Broken words: Why five million Canadians are illiterate. Toronto, ON: Southam Newspaper Group.

Campbell, Melvyn. (1991). Read this page to someone who can't. Omni, 13, 33.

Caplan, Marilyn. (1989). Making it meaningful: A whole language guide for literacy tutors. Saint John, NB: Laubach Literacy of Canada.

Carpenter, Tracy. (1986). Tutor's handbook for the SCIL program. Toronto, ON: Frontier College.

Carroll, John B. (1987). The national assessments in reading: Are we misreading the findings? Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 424-430.

Ceprano, Maria A. (1995). Strategies and practices of individuals who tutor adult illiterates voluntarily. Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 39 (1), 56-64.

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

Chall, Jeanne S, Heron, Elizabeth, & Hilferty, Ann. (1987). Adult literacy: New and enduring problems. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 190-196.

Charnley, A.H. & Jones, H.A. (1978). Adult literacy: A study of its impact. London: National Institute of Adult Education.

Charnley, A.H. & Jones, H.A. (1979). The concept of success in adult literacy. Cambridge: Huntingdon Publishers.

Costa, Marie. (1988). Adult literacy/illiteracy in the United States. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-Clio, Inc.

D'Anglejan, Alison. (1994). Language and literacy in Quebec: Exploring the issues. In Bernardo M. Ferdman, Rose Marie Weber & Arnulfo G. Ramirez. (Eds.), Literacy across languages and cultures. (pp. 273-291). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

D'Annunzio, Anthony. (1994). College students as tutors for adults in a campus-based literacy program. Journal of Reading, 37 (6), 472-479.

Davis, D. (1991). Adult literacy programs: Toward equality or maintaining the status quo? Journal of Reading, 37, 34-37.

Eckstein, H. (1975). Case study and theory in political science. In F.I. Greenstein & N.W. Polsby (Eds.), Strategies of inquiry. (pp. 79-138). Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Ellis, Susan J. & Noyes, Katherine H. (1978). "By the people": A history of Americans as volunteers. Chicago, IL: The Swallows Press, Inc.

Ely, Margot. (1991). Doing qualitative research: Circles within circles. New York: Falmer Press.

Freer, Kevin J. (1993). ERIC Digest #132: Adult literacy volunteers. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 355 454)

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. (Myra Bergman Ramos, Trans.). New York: Herder and Herder.

Freire, P. & Macedo, D. (1987). Literacy: Reading the word and the world. London: Routledge, Kegan Paul.

Gaber-Katz, Elaine & Watson, Gladys M. (1991). The land we dream of: A participatory study of community-based literacy. Toronto, ON: Ontario Institute of Studies in Education Press.

Giroux, H. (1991). Schooling and the struggle for public life. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Graff, Harvey J. (1987). The legacies of literacy: Continuities and contradictions in Western society. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Gray, W.S. (1956). The teaching of reading and writing. Paris: UNESCO.

Hayes, Elisabeth. (1996). Learning about adult literacy: A case study of a college tutor. Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 39 (5), 386-395.

Heath, Shirley Bryce. (1983). Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hull, Glynda. (1993). Hearing other voices: A critical assessment of popular views on literacy and work. Harvard Educational Review, 63 (1), 20-49.

Instituto Nacional para la Educación de los Adultos. (1996). Educación de los adultos, XV años y más... . México, D.F.: Instituto Nacional para la Educación de los Adultos.

Index on adult literacy. (1996). Canadian Forum, 75, 48.

Kangisser, Diane. (1985). Pioneers and new frontiers. The role of volunteers in combating adult illiteracy. New York: Business Council for Effective Literacy.

Katz, Sidney. (1990). Escapes from the dungeon of illiteracy. Reader's Digest, 137 (824), 99-102.

Kazemek, Francis E. (1988). Necessary changes: Professional involvement in adult literacy programs. Harvard Educational Review, 58 (4), 464-487.

Kozol, Jonathon. (1985, May 24). A nation's wealth. Publisher's Weekly, 227, 28-30.

Kozol, Jonathon. (1986). Illiterate America. Scarborough, ON: Plume.

Labrie, Vivian. (1991). Québec sans lunettes. Relations, 572, 179-180.

Lanning, Frank W. & Many, Wesley A. (1966). Basic education for the disadvantaged adult: Theory and practice. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Laubach, Frank C. (1960). Forty years with the silent billion. Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Co.

Levine, Kenneth. (1982). Functional literacy: Fond illusions, false economies. Harvard Educational Review, 52 (3), 246-266.

Lewis, Anne C. (1989). Adult education: More than moonlighting?. Phi Delta Kappan, 70, 500-501.

Limage, Leslie (1990) The industrialized countries: questions and answers. Unesco Courier, 43, 16-17.

Lytle, Susan L. & Schultz, Katherine. (1990). Assessing literacy learning with adults: An ideological approach. In Richard Beach & Susan Hynds (Eds.), Developing discourse practices in adolescence and adulthood. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp.

Mace, Jane. (1994). Literacy interests or literacy needs? Contexts and concepts of adults reading and writing. Convergence, 27 (1), 58-67.

Malicky, Grace V. & Norman, Charles A. (1986). Literacy as a social phenomenon: Implications for instruction. Lifelong Learning, 9 (7), 12-15.

Malicky, Grace V. & Norman, Charles A. (1994). Participation in adult literacy programs and employment. Journal of Reading, 38 (2), 122-127.

Malicky, Grace V. & Norman, Charles A. (1995). Perceptions of literacy and adult literacy programs. Alberta Journal of Education, 41 (1), 63-83.

McKallip, Jonathon. (1984). Use volunteers successfully. In Virginia K. Lawson & Jonathon McKallip. (Eds.), Management handbook for volunteer programs. Syracuse, NY: Literacy Volunteers of America.

Merriam, Sharan B. (1988). Case study research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mickelson, Carolyn. (1988). Unreadable pain. Seventeen, 47, 97-98.

Miles, Matthew B & Huberman, A. Michael. (1984). Qualitative analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Miller, George A. (1988). The challenge of universal literacy. Science, 241, 1293-1299.

Mitchell, Candace & Weiler, Kathleen. (1991). Rewriting literacy: Culture and discourse of the other. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Press.

Morey, Janet Robbie. (1992). Touched by an angel. Reader's Digest, 140 (840), 24-28.

Newman, Anabel, P. et al. (1993) Student Literacy Corps, 1990-1991. Final report. Indiana University, Bloomington, School of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 350 588)

Ontario Department of Education. (1991). The role of volunteers in adult literacy, roundtable. Toronto, ON: Ontario Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 383 908).

Pearpoint, Jack. (1987). Frontier College: literacy education since 1899. In Morsy Zaghloul (Ed.), The challenge of illiteracy: From reflection to action. (pp. 233-242). New York: Garland.

Pipho, Chris. (1988). Sorting out the data on adult literacy. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 630-631.

Pothier, Nicole & Vermette, Monique. (1982). La pre-alphabétisation; les bénévoles. Direction générale de l'éducation des adultes, Gouvernement du Québec Ministère de l'Éducation.

Quigley, B. Allan. (1990). Hidden logic: Reproduction and resistance in adult literacy and Adult Basic Education. Adult Education Quarterly, 40 (2), 103-115.

Quigley, Allan. (1992). Looking back in anger: The influences of schooling on illiterate adults. Journal of Education (Boston), 174 (1), 104-121.

Reading the future: A portrait of literacy in Canada. (1996). Statistics Canada, Human Resources Development Canada and the National Literacy Secretariat.

Robinson, Eric Wifred. (1960). The history of Frontier College. Unpublished master's thesis, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada.

Ross, David P. (1990). Economic dimensions of volunteer work in Canada. Ottawa, ON: Department of the Secretary of State of Canada & Social and Economic Research.

Rubin, Allen & Babbie, Earl R. (1997). Research methods for social work. Pacific Grove, CA:Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.

Rubin, Allen & Thorelli, Irene M. (1984). Egoistic motivations and longevity of service of participation by social service volunteers. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 20 (3), 223-235.

Sanders, Maureen, Reine, Margaret, Devins, Susan, & Wiebe, Grace. (1996). Testing the balance: 50/50 management in a volunteer tutor program. Edmonton, AB: Prospects Literacy Association.

Schweitzer, Thomas T. (1992). Schooling and the Statistics Canada survey of literacy skills used in daily activities. Working paper no. 36. Economic Council of Canada.

Scribner, Sylvia. (1984). Literacy in three metaphors. American Journal of Education, 93, (1) 6-21.

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

Selman, Gordon R. & Dampier, Paul. (1991). The foundations of adult education in Canada. Toronto, ON: Thompson Educational Publishing.

Sticht, T. & Armstrong, W. (1994). Adult literacy in the United States: A compendium of quantitative data. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Literacy.

Sticht, Tom. (1997). Functional context literacy-- 1997. Manual from a workshop.

Stokes, Lynda & Simpson, Danielle. (1994). History of McGill Students for Literacy. Unpublished manuscript.

Strauss, Anselm & Corbin, Juliet. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Strauss, A., Schatzman, L., Bucher, R. & Sabshin, M. (1981). Psychiatric Ideologies and Institutions. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books.

Stuckey, J. Elspeth. (1991). The violence of literacy. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Tardif, Jean-Claude. (1992). Programmes et pratiques d'alphabétisation des adultes au Québec, une double logique de désertion et d'exclusion. L'Action Nationale, 82 (10), 1318-1326.

Tenebaum, E. & Strang, W. (1992). The major national adult literacy volunteer organizations: A descriptive review. (Final Report). Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc.

Thomas, Audrey. (1989). The social and economic costs of illiteracy. In Morsy Zaghloul (Ed.), The challenge of illiteracy: From reflection to action. (pp. 39-49). New York: Garland Pub.

Trabert, Judith Anne. (1986). Initial and continuing motivations of volunteer adult literacy tutors. (Doctoral dissertation , Syracuse University, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47 (8), 2878-A.

UNESCO. (1949). Fundamental education: A description and programme. Monographs on Fundamental Education No. 1, Paris: UNESCO

Valentine, Thomas. (1986). Adult functional literacy as a goal of instruction. Adult Education Quarterly, 36 (2), 108-113.

Venezky, Richard L. & Wagner, Daniel A. (1996). Supply and demand for adult literacy instruction in the United States. Adult Education Quarterly, 46 (4), 197-208.

Venezky, Richard L., Wagner, Daniel A. & Ciliberti, Barrie S. (Eds). (1990). Toward defining literacy. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Williams, Althea. (1990). A volunteer's trip through the system. Volunteers in Adult Basic Education in Hackney: the philosophy and practical implications for the selection and training of volunteer tutors. In Bossort, Patty. (Ed.), Literacy 2000: conference summary. (pp. 92-94). Literacy 2000: Making the next ten years matter. Douglas College, New Westminster, B.C.

Willinsky, John. (1990). The construction of a literacy crisis in Canada. Canadian Journal of Education, 15 (1), 1-15.

Wolkomir, Richard. (1996). Making up for lost time: The rewards of reading at last. Smithsonian, 27, 82-91.

Zieghan, Linda & Hinchman, Kathleen H. (1993). Tutor-learner relationship in literacy education: Redefinition or reproduction?. Adult Education Research Annual Conference Proceedings. University Park, Pennsylvania. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 368 967)

APPENDIX A

RESULTS OF THE QUANTITATIVE FILE ANALYSIS

This information is offered as a general description of the types of tutors and learners MSL has worked with since its inception in 1990. The information was gathered from files of tutors and learners who are no longer active in MSL. There is no way of guaranteeing the validity of the information in files, nor the manner in which it was obtained, and for this reason it is not included in the text of the thesis.

The tutor files are likely good sources of information since tutors filled in their own forms, and since the forms remained fairly standard across the years. Most information in them is complete.

The learner files are much more suspect. The tutor interviewing the learner was responsible for entering information, and thus the information is secondhand. The tutors' subjective opinions of the learners are very evident in the information they recorded. Also, the tutors did not always ask all the questions, which means that very few of the files contain all of the requested information.

There can be no estimate of tutors' and learners' length of stay in the program, since the comments on the files after the initial interviews are very scarce and vague.

The information is presented here since it represents the only data available on the types of tutors and learners served by MSL. It is not included in the text of this thesis because the information was not collected in a manner that can be validated.

TUTOR DATA

Faculty

Values were available for 228 of the 246 files.

Arts	143	
Science	29	
Education	14	
Commerce	6	
Graduate studies	6	
Other	30	(non-students)

Sex

Values were available for 241 of the 246 files (missing variables represent names which were ambiguous or were not known to the researcher as either male or female names)

Female	187
Male	53

Number of matches

Values were available for all 246 files.

Not matched	49
One match	151
Two	36
Three	9
Four	1

Preferred sex of learner

Values were available for 215 of the 246 files.

No preference for male or female learner	132
Female learner, not a male learner	76
Male learner, not a female learner	7

LEARNER DATA

Sex

Values were available for 91 of the 92 files.

Male	56
Female	35

Age

Values were available for 74 of the 92 files.

15 years and under	25
16-25 years old	12
26-35 years old	27
36-45 years old	16
46-55 years old	10
60-65 years old	6
66 years and above	1

English as a Second Language or Immigrant (country of origin indicated on file)

36 learners indicated that English was their Second Language or that they were born outside of Canada (they are included in this category because of possible dialect variation)

Stated Handicaps

11 learners had a stated mental or physical handicap on their file.

Parenthood

63 files had a response to the question asking if the learner has children.

has child(ren)	37
no child(ren)	26

History of Drug Abuse

12 learners stated that they have a history of drug abuse.

Help Sought Previously

Values were available for 60 of the 92 files.

33 learners have sought help previously for literacy
27 learners have never before sought help.

Past Effects of Literacy "Problem"

Values were available for 43 of the 92 files.

psychological or social effects	19
limited job or educational opportunities	9
dependence on others	7
no past effects acknowledged	6
anger or aggression	2

Experience of school

Values were available for 49 of the 92 files

financial or family responsibilities made learner leave	9
infrequent attendance, lack of interest	8
quit (unspecified reason)	7
conflict with a teacher, lack of help from a teacher	6
school's standards "too low"	5
school's standards "too high"	2
never went to school	2
other	10

Preferences for a male or a female tutor

Values were available for 61 of the 92 files.

No preference	33
Prefer a female tutor	26
Prefer a male tutor	2

APPENDIX B

TUTOR AND LEARNER DESCRIPTIONS

Tutors

1. Fourteen female tutors were interviewed.
   Four male tutors were interviewed.

2. All tutors but 4 were students under the age of 25. The four non-students were between the ages of 26 and 45.

3. Of the fourteen students interviewed, 9 were in Faculty of Arts programs and 5 were in the Faculty of Science.

4. Only two tutors were members of visible minority groups.

Learners

1. 8 of the 14 learners working with the tutors at the time of the interviews were ESL learners.

2. 3 learners were children or adolescents.

3. 2 learners had identified mental handicaps.

4. 2 learners were "traditional" (non-ESL, non-child) literacy learners

5. 8 of the tutors' learners were male, 8 were female (the four beginning tutors were not matched at the time of the interview; two LTCs had been matched twice).

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Age
2. Sex
3. Languages spoken
4. Program at McGill
5. Previous volunteer/teaching experience
6. Future goals
7. Amount of time in MSL

MATCH DATA

8. Distance travelled to meet with learner/tutor (how much did the tutor and learner travel to reach their sessions?)
9. Number of sessions/week
10. Length of sessions
11. Length of breaks over holidays, exam periods
12. Where were sessions held?

TUTOR BACKGROUND

13. How did you learn about MSL?
14. What made you want to join the program?
15. How did you view literacy before the training? What kinds of learners did you expect?

EXPERIENCES AS A TUTOR

16. How did the training affect the way you define literacy and what you expected in a learner?
17. When you meet with your learner, what are the sessions like? (relationship, methods, materials)
18. How would you describe the relationship you have with the learner?
19. Has the relationship changed over time?
20. How do you and the learner decide what to work on in a session? What goals were set?
21. How do you keep the motivation and momentum for the sessions going?

BELIEFS ABOUT LITERACY AND LITERACY VOLUNTEERISM

22. Given your experiences as a tutor, how would you now define literacy?

23. I'll read a quote, and I'd like you to comment on it. Do you agree, disagree? What stands out?

> "Five million adult Canadians are marching against their will in an army of illiterates. These illiterates are an army in numbers only. Darkness and hopelessness are usually their banners. The picture is not totally bleak. Many illiterates say they are satisfied with their lives" (from Willinsky quoting Calamai)

24. If you had to write a letter to the minister of education about adult learners and literacy, what would you say?

25. What characteristics are important in a tutor, in a learner?

26. Have you ever considered becoming a teacher? If yes, how have your experiences with Student Centered Individualized Learning and one-on-one tutoring influenced your choice or how you want to teach?

27. Many adult educators don't think volunteer tutors have enough training to be able to tutor adults effectively in literacy, and that volunteers should only be used as teacher's aides. How would you respond?

28. Many adult literacy learners have needs other than literacy, needs they might ask their tutor to help them with. How would you respond to the statement that at times literacy tutors play the role of a social worker?

QUESTIONS SPECIFIC TO LEARNER-TUTOR COORDINATORS

29. What made you decide to be an LTC?

30. How did you prepare yourself for the role (extra reading, training, etc.)?

31. How have your experiences as an LTC deepened your understanding of literacy and literacy learners?

32. How much contact should there be, in your opinion, between tutors and their LTCs?

33. How much feedback do you want from the tutors on how the matches go? How much feedback do you receive?

34. Do you think that the organizing team of MSL and the tutors share similar views and understandings of the role of the club and its mandate on literacy?

35. Do you plan to continue working with literacy groups after you leave MSL?

APPENDIX D

CANADIAN PRINT MEDIA COVERAGE OF ADULT LITERACY, 1982-1996

In order to obtain an overview of how literacy has been presented to the general public, I analyzed the entries under "literacy" of the Canadian Index for the years 1982-1996. The entries were divided into those that referred to adult literacy versus those that referred to literacy for children and adolescents. Of the articles pertaining to adult literacy, I organized them into two groups: the first group comprises those that use the term "illiteracy" in the title or use of a "negative" word or image (such as battle, fight, illiteracy, plague, etc.) in the title; the second group contains all other "OK" titles, such as those that have a positive message or that use negative, but non-violent words. Several examples (from parallel reports in various Canadian newspapers) demonstrate the categories, with the key word(s) in bold:

Negative	"OK"
1. Coalition demands action to **fight illiteracy**	Learning to read is a big step
2. **Illiterate** Newfoundlanders cracking the books	Second chance at reading, writing skills: Newfoundlanders netting long-forgotten literacy
3. Reading problems **plague** Canada	Reading difficult for 4 out of 10 Canadian adults

The categories serve as a general indicator of the tone of the headline. The rationale for using headlines, rather than analyzing the whole texts, is that while not everyone reads the texts, many read the headlines. The headline sets the mood for the articles, and thus shape how the article will be read.

The following chart demonstrates the number of articles on adult literacy, with the split between negative and other headlines outlined.

(Chart on next page)

Frequency of articles on Adult Literacy (AL) 1986-1997:

Year	total # on literacy	total # AL	# OK[1] AL	# obscure[2]	# negative AL	% negative AL
1982	2 [3]	2	0	0	2	100%
1983	12[3]	11	1	1	10	91
1984	12	11	3	1	8	73
1985	31	30	10	1	20	67
1986	42	32	11	5	21	66
1987	144	129	60[4]	4	69	53
1988	45	41	12	0	29	71
1989	43	31	11	3	20	64
1990	65	50	25	5	25	50
1991	37	24	12	5	12	50
1992	31	17	11	1	6	35
1993	86	52	34	3	18	35
1994	91	27	21	4	6	22
1995	97	42	34	9	8	19
1996	77	28	21	4	7	25

[1] "OK" refers to headlines which did not contain the word "illiteracy/illiterate", and did not use words which were unnecessarily negative (ex: "One million say reading difficult" and "Long road to literacy" would be "OK"). This is admittedly a subjective classification.

[2] "obscure" refers to headlines which give no idea of the article's content, and thus could not be excluded from nor included in the adult literacy count.

[3] The category "literacy" only replaced "illiteracy" as a grouping title in the 1984 volume.

[4] The 60 "OK" titles would be reduced by 14 if the repeat survey headlines "Literacy" (used 7 times) and "Literacy in Canada" (used 7 times) were not included, which they are in this count.