The problem is accommodating these two sets of concerns—the need to acknowledge existing language, knowledge, practices and organizations in a society, and the need to develop highly literate, bureaucratic national institutions and the competence to fully participate in them. (Olson & Torrance, 2009, p. 12)

Consider the following from an adult literacy perspective: Exiled Afghan women NGOs use the Afghan Women Network to negotiate new gender roles, arguing that access to education and full economic participation will support Islam and reduce ethnic division (Rostami-Povey, 2007); prisoners in Ireland are given voting rights and responsibilities (Behan & O’Donnell, 2008); children of Sudanese refugees act as brokers to help parents understand the purpose of a school yearbook (Perry, 2009); the President’s Council of Economic Advisors identifies skills needed for emerging jobs in healthcare and green technologies (PCEA, 2009). These phenomena illustrate the social, economic and cultural flux that situates adult literacy practices. Conversely, as a cultural tool for reading the world and sharing understandings, literacy mediates this flux.

Like any field of study, adult literacy needs to be understood from multiple perspectives. In this chapter we draw an intentionally sharp line between two research stances: a reductive one that isolates variables from context to establish generalizable truths, and a holistic one that describes literacy practices in context to understand their complex social, psychological and cultural purposes (Bredo, 2009). We agree with literacy and mixed methods scholars who press to move beyond this duality. But the duality serves two purposes here. First, most of the studies cited in the chapter can be aligned with one or the other stance. Second, the duality helps highlight the strengths and limits of both approaches.

In this chapter we describe these two stances, which we refer to as epistemic and phronetic, based on the work of Bent Flyvbjerg, and summarize key characteristics of each. Then we report on three adult literacy sub-fields—related to the literacy-proficiency discourse, literacy and work, and English language learners—and observe the shifts between episteme and phronesis along the way. Our intent is to put both perspectives on even footing, while illustrating distinct advantages of each way of knowing about adult literacy.

From Flesch to Flyvbjerg

In 1955, Rudolf Flesch reignited the debate over the primacy of code-versus-meaning approaches to early reading instruction. Since then, “code-side” adult literacy scholars have studied the roles of reading components and cognitive processes such as phonological processing and short-term memory (Read, 1988), decoding and prior knowledge (Adams, 1990), vocabulary (Curtis, 2006), and processing speed (Sabatini, 2002). Contemporary scholars (e.g., Alamprese, 2009) attempted to apply these insights to adult literacy instruction.

Growing knowledge about component-level reading processes provides a practical framework for understanding diverse cognitive strengths and needs of adult learners (Kruidenier, 2002). However, researchers have struggled to demonstrate the effects of component approaches on learning. Their work is hampered by ethical and practical problems related to random assignment (see Reder & Bynner, 2009), weak interventions driven by persistence problems, and intervention fidelity (e.g., Hurry, Brazier, & Wilson, 2009). Experimental research is reductive in nature. To the extent it is possible to isolate variables, control for complexity, and generalize instructional rules across contexts, controlled experiments are the gold standard of adult literacy research.

Other researchers take interest in literacy events that are intuitive and holistic rather than rule-governed and context-free. The Danish urban planner Bent Flyvbjerg (2001) argued for a social science that makes sense of
context-dependent events. He cited Dreyfus and Dreyfus’ (1986) description of expert chess players shifting from rule-based to non-linear, intuitive ways of “reading” chessboards. They seemed to judge new situations in their entirety, based on cumulative past experiences, rather than adhere to a set of rules. Flyvbjerg argued that, like these chess players, adults become experts (or virtuosos) at routine tasks such as reading itemized bill statements and shopping for bargains at the grocery store. Rule-governed activity is important at beginning stages of learning. As learning proceeds to mastery, context-independent rules become less important, and judgment—about when, how, and why to use skills—becomes increasingly so. Through multiple, situated experiences learning transcends mystery and approaches virtuosity. In new situations virtuosity relies almost exclusively on intuitive, holistic judgment rather than rule-governed behavior. Situated literacy practices—whether at beginner or advanced levels (Barton, Ivanic, Appleby, Hodge, & Tusting, 2007)—often involve virtuosity in that they require holistic and multi-dimensional ways of knowing that might require understanding code, genre, and cultural values (Perry, 2009). Thus, literacy learners often act as virtuosos and beginners simultaneously.

Flyvbjerg (2001) argued that the situatedness of human behavior is difficult to study through experimentation because each context presents uncontrollable variance. Using Aristotelian categories, he viewed episteme—analytical scientific knowledge such as that gained from controlled experiments—as suited to natural science’s search for general rules. Although he acknowledged episteme’s capacity to address technical questions raised in social science, he saw another Aristotelian form of knowledge, phronesis, as necessary to study social (human) activity precisely because it resists reduction. Phronesis attends to contingencies of experiences to produce a practical, applied wisdom. Thus liberated from “physics envy” (Sennett, 1995, p. 43), the social sciences, in Flyvbjerg’s view, should no longer be held to an exclusively epistemic standard of truth. He posited an equally rigorous phronetic standard that concerns irreducible understandings of complex, power-infused practices. Flyvbjerg saw social science’s primary role as igniting debate and informing policy by bringing power relationships and social practices to light, the way, for example, ethnography sometimes reveals the virtuosity of non-dominant discourses despite their de-valuation in mainstream cultures.

The exclusivity of the epistemic gold standard for social science is rightly challenged. (This may sound like an old argument; nevertheless all six adult literacy studies approved by NICHD’s Adult Literacy Research Network from 2001–2007 employed experimental designs [NICHD, 2004]). We agree with Flyvbjerg that episteme has an important role in social science and adult literacy research. Epistemic knowledge is needed to inform instruction in rule-governed skills. Metalinguistic awareness, for example, requires language learners to step out of context, sometimes through comparison across language systems (Nagy & Anderson, 1999). When skills are taught progressively, episteme helps identify best practices and calibrate standards. But literacy classrooms are host to situated practices where literacy events are infused with meanings that impede and enhance instruction in idiosyncratic ways. Thus we advocate for a tempered and pragmatic use of episteme (Green, 2007).

There is an interplay between epistemic and phronetic ways of knowing. Epistemic study can help a society formulate general proficiency levels of literacy, while phronesis provides the means to set the bar at levels consistent with its values and aspirations (Chall, 1990). See, for example, Smith (2009), Sticht (2001, 2005), and Strucker, Yamamoto, and Kirsch (2007) for a lively debate around the criterion—an .80 response probability—used in the National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS), the Adult Literacy and Lifeskills (ALL) survey, and the International Adult Literacy Survey to gauge proficiency level.

Researchers study adult literacy within contexts (phronesis) and across them (episteme). Table 11.1 summarizes attributes of both approaches. In the remaining sections, we comment on studies in terms of the episteme-phronesis dichotomy, and the interplay between them or the lopsided way one approach dominates the discussion. We have not attempted an exhaustive review of both stances. Rather, our purpose is two-fold: (a) to provide an update in three sub-fields of adult literacy, and (b) to champion the unique contributions of phronetic and epistemic approaches to social science research.

### Literacy and Proficiency

Three notions about literacy have been shifting over the past 40 years (Wagner, Venezy & Street, 1999): (a) literacy is a singular system cultivated by an

---

**TABLE 11.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Episteme</th>
<th>Phronesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foci:</strong></td>
<td>component level</td>
<td>literacy-in-use; context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“variables”</td>
<td>generalizable skills</td>
<td>situated practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ways of</strong></td>
<td>analysis of parts</td>
<td>judgment based on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowing:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>holisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literacy as:</strong></td>
<td>rule-based skills</td>
<td>communication practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>component-level processes</td>
<td>that involve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>intention, power-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learners as:</strong></td>
<td>students at various</td>
<td>relationships, values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>proficiency levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction as:</strong></td>
<td>a-political, neutral</td>
<td>ideological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge as:</strong></td>
<td>received, instrumental</td>
<td>constructed,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>transformative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major</strong></td>
<td>measure behavior</td>
<td>examine complexity,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contributions:</strong></td>
<td>against standards</td>
<td>power, agency,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>determine best</td>
<td>identities, narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limitations:</strong></td>
<td>rigor needed for</td>
<td>difficult to generalize,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>controlled experiments</td>
<td>difficult to build theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>across studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
elite class; (b) it is a unidirectional cause of economic prosperity; and (c) people are either literate or not. The discussions of literacy proficiency that follow implicate these ideas.

**Illiteracy Myths.** Scribner and Cole’s (1981) study of the psychological effects of print literacy debunked the widely accepted belief that literacy per se improved cognition. The economic benefits of literacy are also contested. Illiteracy is often blamed for poor productivity, but others complain that the term is over applied (Mikulecky, 1978), blames the worker for complex institutional problems (Graff, 1979), privileges independence over interdependence (Fingeret & Drennon, 1997), and perpetrates a discourse of privilege (Street, 1984). Robinson-Pant (2004) critiqued the agendas of literacy campaigns in developing countries and identified unintended consequences such as: (a) valuing women’s roles as mothers but not as individuals; (b) blaming ‘illiterate’ women for economic underdevelopment and ignoring the motives of aid organizations; (c) devaluing the parenting role of men; (d) privileging autonomous social structures; (e) discounting women’s everyday literacy and orality; and (f) seeking technical solutions to deep political problems.

The term “illiteracy” became a discursive battleground of adult literacy, sometimes pitting champions of day-to-day virtuosity (and situated literacy) against proponents of conventional approaches. Deconstructing illiteracy’s ideologies constituted a phronetic corrective, yet episteme, too, provided correctives, as the following section illustrates.

**Proficiency Scales.** Policy discourses have shifted from a literacy/illiteracy dichotomy to degrees of proficiency (Wagner et al., 1999). Reflecting this shift, the 2003 ALL survey measured the proficiency levels of adults from six countries (Bermuda, Canada, Italy, Norway, Switzerland, and the United States). Kirsch, Braun, Yamamoto, and Sum (2007) found a “perfect storm” (p. 1) of disturbing findings: (a) the proficiency of U.S. adults declined from 1992 to 2003; (b) Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians were more likely than Whites to perform at lowest levels; and (c) of six countries with complete data, U.S. adults scored lower in literacy and numeracy than all but Italy. Higher proficiency was associated with higher employment and wages. For example, only 49% of level one (lowest proficiency level) performers were working or looking for work, compared to 91% of those at level five (highest proficiency level).

The picture is bleak, but not entirely. A comparison of the 1992 NALS with the 2003 National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NAAL; White & Dillow, 2005), revealed U.S. proficiency trends in three areas: prose, document, and quantitative. In 2003 only 13% performed at the proficient level on prose and document tasks, down from 15% in 1992, but fewer adults performed at below basic levels in document and quantitative literacy tasks—a drop from 14% to 12% in document, and from 26% to 22% in quantitative. Since 1992, more U.S. adults perform at basic and intermediate levels and fewer at below basic or proficient levels.

**Becoming Proficient.** The NAAL-NALS comparison provides snap shots of two points in time, but does not explain how adults acquire knowledge and skills over time. Reder (2009) filled some gaps by monitoring the literacy development of 658 adults from 1998 to 2005. During this span some participants attended literacy programs while others did not. Reder found that White, U.S. born males had the highest proficiency levels at entry. However, over time learners who were younger or born outside of the United States achieved proficiency at higher rates. Reder did not find that participation in programs increased proficiency, but did improve “engagement in literacy and numeracy practices” (p. 79). He also found a relationship between practice and literacy development.

Alamprese (2009) studied the progress of adults continuously enrolled in Adult Basic Education (ABE) programs over 2 years. She found younger adults made greater gains in comprehension, and non-U.S. born adults had greater gains in decoding and word recognition. But all participants made very small gains in vocabulary and comprehension in the first year. She criticized the National Reporting System (NRS) for not being sensitive to component-level gains: “…the use of general literacy measures may not be adequate to document gains… Rather, instruments that measure decoding as a discrete skill may need to be included in…NRS reporting” (p. 127). (We might suggest another NRS outcome measure—literacy practice—based on Reder’s findings above.)

Strucker (1997) argued that a single measure—such as a comprehension score—can mask important differences at the component level of reading. Alamprese (2009) demonstrated this by showing how a phonics program did not improve comprehension of learners with low decoding/low comprehension profiles, but did for low-decoders with medium-high comprehension.

These epistemic studies provide nuanced descriptions of populations. They suggest: (a) U.S. adults have more basic skills but less proficiency than in 1992; (b) proficiency correlates with economic growth; (c) gains in comprehension may take more than a year to demonstrate; and (d) instruction may need to be tailored to learner characteristics such as reading profiles.

**Work-Related Literacy** Adults integrate literacy practices into their lives in many ways—parenting, community life, etc. In this chapter we focus on one: work-related practices. Kirsch et al.’s (2007) perfect storm called for intense adult literacy resources, given the growing sophistication of the workplace. The studies that follow—largely using phronetic approaches—examine the nature of these on-the-job demands. We then present epistemic and phronetic approaches to integrating literacy and work skill instruction.

**Literacy on the Job.** Mikulecky (2009) enumerated the functional literacy practices of receptionists and paramedics—such as taking phone messages or reading Do Not Resuscitate orders—and noted the “pervasiveness
of literacy in daily work and how different these materials and tasks are from what most students experience in the classroom” (p. 148). The PCEA (2009) also identified non-academic literacy practices. In an analysis of emerging occupations—especially health care and green technology—PCEA concluded, “...while many...jobs in the past required only proficiency in well-defined tasks—e.g., operating a rotary drill—the...tasks that are uncertain and interactive” (p. 9). These practices were anticipated by the U.S. Secretary of Labor’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS) in 1991, with its emphasis on “…critical thinking, problem solving, decision making, knowing how to learn...working productively with others” (Rockman, 2004, p. 13).

Hull and Grubb (1999) found literacy practices “woven throughout the fabric” (p. 312) of a circuit-board manufacturing plant; but they questioned the extent to which rhetoric of higher-level skills was reflected on the factory floor:

...frontline workers...were...engaged in tasks [which] were quite constrained...limited to describing to management what was happening on the shop floor. In effect, the literacies that workers acquired served to put them even more securely under the thumb of management. (p. 312)

Conversely, Hart-Lansberg and Reder (1997) described production teams’ sophisticated social literacy practices such as collective agenda setting and problem solving. The extent to which higher-level literacy skills are actually embedded in the “good jobs,” defined as “those that pay high wages and provide a ticket to the middle class” (PCEA, 2009, p. 9), remains to be determined.

Integrated Instruction. Instructional approaches that integrate literacy and technology learning are gaining popularity. However, divisions remain about what should be integrated, and how. We review integrated instruction from two perspectives: (a) a functional-context perspective that fuses academic and vocational skill learning and seeks replicable instructional models; and (b) a situated practice critique of the unintended consequences of workplace literacy policies.

The PCEA (2009) identified problems with the adult education system, including: (a) low completion rates (only 53% of community college students earned or still pursued a degree within 6 years); (b) high rates of first year students in remedial courses (one-third); and (c) widespread use of drill and skill instruction. PCEA cited Washington State’s Integrated Basic Education and Skills Training (I-BEST) program as a model that “blends basic skills and occupational training to generate more contextualized learning, where traditionally these have been segregated into distinct programs” (p. 18). The Council reported that I-BEST students were more likely than others to “improve basic skills and earn college-level credits” (p. 18). Functional-context approaches like I-BEST and others (see Reder & Byunner, 2009), frame literacy as discrete skills that can be woven into the vocational curriculum (Grubb, 1997; Hull & Grubb, 1999).

These approaches draw on experiential learning to the extent they include realia (e.g., medical charts, job applications). But they have been criticized for not drawing on learners’ lived experiences and their layered ways of knowing. Note, for example, Hull’s (1995, p. 19) description of a lived workplace literacy event:

To be literate in the workplace means being a master of a complex set of rules and strategies which govern who uses texts, and how, and for what purposes...[to know] when to speak, when to be quiet, when to write, when to reveal what was written, and when...to respond to texts already written.

In this situated view of literacy, the learner must simultaneously apprehend purpose, culture, code, and one’s agency and make judgments about how to act. This integration goes beyond discrete skills—whether basic or advanced, functional or academic—and involves the actor as both a virtuoso with accumulated life experience and a learner. Belfiore, Defoe, Folinsbee, Hunter, and Jackson (2004) stated that integrated approaches work “only when skills are learned and used in a manner that is integrated with understanding and action” and suggested that teachers, “not...treat them as isolated...skills...but as integral parts of everyday cultural knowledge...” (p. 8).

The Grameen Bank study (Khan, 1994) illustrated the way economic development can precede literacy development, as impoverished Bangladeshi women (identified as illiterate) were given collateral-free loans to improve their families’ welfare or start micro-businesses. The women became members of a new economic community. Although literacy was not the goal of the project, Hull and Grubb (1999, p. 316) noted:

[the women] began to engage in...literacy practices...[which] transform[ed] their ways of thinking about themselves and their relationship with others...The women acquired rudimentary reading and writing practices in the face of tremendous odds because these activities were part...of their emerging identities as providers.

In situated approaches such as this, literacy learning is integrated with vocational training. But unlike functional-context models, literacy skills are learned on the job and are often by-products of participation in collective experience. The integrated approaches above reflect two perspectives—functional-context and situated practice. Functional-context approaches may have advantages over traditional literacy instruction, including increased motivation, content learning, social interaction, and modeling of real work tasks through simulations (Grubb, 1997). Functional-context curricula emphasize discrete skills that can be evaluated epistemically. On the other hand phronesis-oriented studies exposed hidden agendas and unintended side effects of some functional-content approaches and contributed important correctives, such as: viewing learners as virtuosos as well as students; illuminating genres and other overlooked dimensions of learning, raising awareness of power relationships,
supporting learner agency, and reflecting on literacy as a by-product. Still, others have complained that deconstructing existing practices is insufficient, and argue for concrete models that help practitioners move beyond academic workplace instruction.

**Phronesis and English Language Learners (ELLs)** ELLs represent the fastest growing sector of adult education in the United States (Strucker, 2007). This group’s great diversity is often poorly understood by adult literacy practitioners and oversimplified in policy, despite the fact that much research in this field reflects a situated perspective offering rich ethnographic data. We therefore emphasize studies that reveal the great diversity of adult ELLs, the nuances of literacy as it is practiced in day-to-day contexts, and the characteristics of programs that embrace complexity as a learning resource. Thus, the studies cited in this section are more likely to make phreric arguments than epistemic ones.

**ELLs—A Diverse Group.** ELLs are far from homogeneous—they represent a great range of backgrounds, including a wide variety of prior experiences with languages, literacy practices, and formal schooling. Some ELLs are international migrants, such as refugees, legal and illegal immigrants, while others represent groups that are native to the United States but grow up speaking languages other than English. While some may share characteristics with native English-speaking learners, they also have distinct characteristics. For example, one group of researchers in the U.K. found that

There is a marked difference between many ESOL students, particularly refugees and asylum seekers, and other literacy and numeracy students. This group has, on the whole, higher levels of confidence in educational settings… Compared with other learners, people in this group are often experiencing downward mobility. Many are well qualified or have high academic potential, yet even ‘fast tracking’ will not lead to jobs of the financial and social status they had or could expect in the countries they came from. (Barton et al., 2007, pp. 102–103)

However, the opposite can also be true of some ELLs from certain backgrounds. For example, participants in one inter-generational literacy program for low-English-literate adults represented a great range of educational experiences; nearly all at one of the two research sites were African refugees who were unschooled in their own countries and could neither speak English nor read or write in any language (Anderson, Purcell-Gates, Gagne, & Jang, 2009). Yet, even within a single cultural community, educational experiences may vary widely; Perry’s (2009) study of southern Sudanese refugee families included adults with educational experiences ranging from some elementary school to professional degrees.

As a result, educators must not assume that adult English language learners all require the same type of learning. Some learners, who may be well-educated and literate in their own languages, require only English language development. Others, particularly those who had limited (or no) opportunities to attend school or become literate, may require both English and literacy instruction. Still others may represent some sort of middle ground, such as those who already are literate in a different script but must still develop facility with the Roman alphabet. Despite this diversity, programs often treat learners as though all had the same learning needs—and that those needs are the same as those of English-speaking adult literacy learners (McKenna & Fitzpatrick, 2004).

**Issues Facing Adult ELL Instruction.** Adult and inter-generational literacy programs often encounter struggles not faced by educators in K–12 or higher education settings. Adult ELL educators often are volunteers or employed part-time and may have little (if any) professional training or experience. They may lack training in language acquisition theories, effective methods for teaching reading and writing, and/or pedagogical content knowledge related to ELLs (Anderson et al., 2009; McKenna & Fitzpatrick, 2004). As McKenna and Fitzpatrick (2004) note, “The volunteer ethos in most countries…has created a tradition of a teaching workforce with minimal professionalism…and a lack of clear training and career pathways” (p. 7).

Additional special challenges are associated with teaching ELLs who may be non-schooled, non- or low-literate. For example, many adult ELL programs must accommodate a range of English language and literacy levels within one class (Anderson et al., 2009; Mingkwan et al., 1995). Suda (2002) argued that the literacy needs of ELLs are highly specific and are generally not well-addressed in either English language or adult basic literacy courses. Although classes organized by ability, language, and culture are ideal, this organization rarely is possible.

Another challenge facing both learners and teachers is the perceived need for students to rapidly become a productive part of the workforce, often an explicit goal of some programs. However, English for employment purposes only is not sufficient (Mingkwan et al., 1995); it fails to account for the full range of students’ survival needs, educational aspirations, and life goals (Perry, 2008). While seeking employment may be some students’ primary goal (Barton et al., 2007), others hope to gain English language and literacy skills for purposes such as pursuing higher education, helping their children in school, or participating in the community life of their new contexts (Burgoyne & Hull, 2007; Perry, 2008). As a result, adult ELL instruction must be grounded in a “broader framework of wellbeing” (Suda, 2002) that also connects to practical real-world skill areas outside of work (Burgoyne & Hull, 2007).

Students’ diverse personal and community histories greatly matter in adult ELL instruction, and educators can be more successful when they get to know their learners well. For example, researchers found that teachers in one program for Sudanese refugees were not aware that their students came from a highly oral culture and that this
might have certain implications for the students’ learning of English literacy (Burgoine & Hull, 2007). Educators’ values also can be greatly at odds with those of their students, which may impact the quality and effectiveness of instruction (Anderson et al., 2009; Suda, 2002). Experts, therefore, advocate for dialogic models of instruction, such as those based on Freirean educational models, in which practitioners get to know their students’ histories and goals, and in which learners have a “say” in the process (Anderson et al., 2009; Barton et al., 2007; Suda, 2002).

Conclusions

The chapter provided an update on the field of adult literacy and illustrated two ways adult literacy researchers frame their work based on Flyvbjerg’s (and Aristotle’s) episteme/phronesis distinction. We recognize that our framework perpetuates what some would consider an unhelpful dichotomy, and we share Olson and Torrance’s (2009) desire to unify the field. Nevertheless, we believe the dichotomy does a reasonable job of juxtaposing major research traditions. Further, duality can call attention to double standards—such as the privileging of epistemic over phrenetic ways of doing research by powerful U.S. research institutes. Our argument for the second standard—phronesis—which tempers precise understandings of general instructional truths with the practical wisdom to judge when and how learning in context is optimized, is based on our desire to see both research stances privileged.

The complex issue of how to move past the duality remains. We do not believe there is necessarily one way for the adult literacy field to move forward, as illustrated by the different approaches of this two-person author team. Muth adopts a bicultural stance (Kidder & Fine, 1987) that attempts to make sense of pragmatic convergences and dialectical (and irreconcilable) differences across paradigms. Perry advocates for a more strongly phronetic stance, emphasizing that context matters a great deal, and anything—whether it be an individual learner, a cultural community, a learning process, or an educational program—must be understood from the perspective of the multiple layers of context that shapes it. However the field advances, we hope resolution of tensions between these world views is no longer achieved by privileging one over the other.
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