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Abstract

The field of lifelong learning is often placed in a continuum with adult education, and this is appropriate. However, there are major distinctions to be made between the two. The needs of the typical student enrolled in lifelong learning programs today are different from those of most adults in public school adult education and other settings, and the desired outcomes are different as well. This essay explores the literature of adult education, along with more general educational research and theory, in search of parallels and helpful lessons. It also examines education in a postmodern age with its demand for collaborative and democratic practices in the classroom, in this case, the content-driven classroom. The future of lifelong learning programs is examined in light of general education reform movements within host institutions and the perceived needs of new generations of students who will be enrolling.

Introduction

As lifelong learning institutes look toward the future, it is essential to abandon early assumptions regarding what students expect and to face and embrace new realities. One of these realities is that the traditionally educated student will be replaced gradually, and then rapidly, by students whose introduction to schooling has been more progressive. This first wave, famously known as “Boomers,” will have a dramatic impact on enrollment (Lightfoot, 2006, p. 2). Holding the interest of these new students and continuing to attract them is of critical importance to lifelong learning institutes if they are to survive and thrive.

With the Information Age well launched, the demand for content-driven courses will continue to build. Concurrent with this is the growing postmodern consciousness that positions the individual squarely in the midst of her social and cultural environments, with private, local, and national loyalties giving way to an identity that is borderless. This postmodern awareness has been prevalent for several decades in higher education and is reflected strongly in the new general education guidelines and principles that are being developed nationwide. At the University of Southern Maine (2004), for instance, the “Vision Statement of the
General Education Council” for the new General Education Guidelines and Criteria included the following statement: “General education at USM is a coherent, integrative, and rigorous liberal education that will enable our graduates to be world-minded, intentional, life-long learners.” Among the values to be instilled are: an understanding of the natural world and human cultures, the ability to think in complex terms, the ability to communicate effectively, an awareness of what it means to be active citizens, the development of an ethic regarding critical issues in local and global communities.

Lifelong learning institutes that are hosted by colleges and universities would be well advised to take note of these documents and to create or adjust their own mission statements accordingly. One possible adjustment, and the subject of this paper, is how classroom culture and methodology, specifically methodology in content-driven courses, ties in with the stated goals of general education reform statements. At this time, the predominant method for delivering content is the lecture, interspersed with or followed by discussion. Other more progressive and collaborative models, however, are promoted and practiced in the broader field of adult education and, indeed, throughout the entire spectrum of formal education. I will consider some of these practices, including collaborative learning, discussion (and its facilitation), small groups, and writing to learn or writing-across-the-curriculum. Most recently, discussions of the democratic classroom model are appearing. Behind this concept lies the impulse to reduce or eradicate all forms of power, clearly a tightrope walk in education, where the underlying purpose is to impart knowledge to initiates by a knowledge bearer, the expert teacher. Nevertheless, many see a moral imperative here. I will attempt to make the case that adoption of these teaching and learning practices in the classroom encourages the adoption of a new social consciousness into, within, and beyond our local communities, that it is the responsibility of lifelong learning institutes to engage pro-actively in this high-minded endeavor, and that, indeed, in light of the movement toward re-visioned general education principles within higher education in general, it may be critical for their survival.

For Donald Schon, author of The Reflective Practitioner, classrooms are “instruments of social control” (Schon, 1983, p. 288). To agree with this assertion is to take the position that the classroom, if it is to conform to democratic principles, must demonstrate them. In such a class one would observe the use of collaborative teaching and learning methods that respect every person regardless of gender, race, or any other marginalizing indicator. In these classrooms any and all attempts to display power or to control or dominate are quickly identified and subdued. The democratic or collaborative classroom serves as a working model for the world beyond it as students adapt behaviors and practices that can be applied to other life situations. Many disagree, believing that the classroom serves no such purpose and has no such responsibility, that it is a finite entity in which the instructor has no other mission than to deliver information, the student none other than to absorb it.

In the United States, collaborative teaching styles are used extensively in elementary, middle, and high schools by trained and certified teachers. A majority of faculty in higher education, on the other hand, despite the heroic efforts of centers for teaching, are unconcerned with classroom methodology (although younger fac-
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...ulty are beginning to experiment with new strategies). Instead, they perpetuate their own student experiences in which the power-focused performance model predominated. It is primarily from this well of educators (and expert professionals) that lifelong learning institutes draw their faculty for courses that are content-driven.

Adult Education and Lifelong Learning Compared

What became immediately apparent in searching the vast literature of adult education (Brookfield, 1995; Elias and Merriam, 2005; Houle, 1984; Jarvis, 2004; Knowles, 1970, 1990; Lindeman, 1987; Smith and Haverkamp, 1977) are the significant differences that exist between it and lifelong learning. The goals are simply very different. The intended outcomes of adult education are to equip those who have been educationally under-served or who, for a wide variety of very practical and often critical reasons, need to upgrade their skills. They are of all ages and classes, are culturally and ethnically diverse, and are often economically disadvantaged. They range from the poorest refugee who needs to learn English to the financially secure Harvard Law School graduate who needs to upgrade her skills for professional advancement. Students entering the lifelong learning classroom come with more existential goals: to enhance an already satisfying life, to satisfy curiosity, to fill leisure time, to engage socially. They are almost universally white and middle class, and their appetite for information and further education is whetted by their prior positive educational experiences. Demographics gathered at the Osher Lifelong Learning Institute at the University of Southern Maine showed a fairly even spread among age groups from 64 and under to 80 and older, with the youngest and eldest being nearly equal (Brady, Holt and Welt, 2003). (As I have noted above, “boomer” generation enrollments are expected to change these numbers significantly.)

The spectrum of adult education programs is wide ranging and includes a variety of models such as cooperative extension, general education degree programs, language learning, continuing education programs on the college and community college level, university-based professional schools, and programs in business, industry, and the military. In a literature search one encounters descriptors such as experiential learning, self-directed learning, collaborative learning, and cooperative education. The term “lifelong learning” is used to describe yet another experience on the adult education continuum and also appears in the literature of elementary and secondary education to define learning experiences throughout the life span, whereas, interestingly, the term “adult education” does not. Indeed, more than two decades ago Houle suggested that “the central conception of education in the future is likely to be that of lifelong learning” (Houle, 1984, p. 223).

Those who teach in adult education, with exceptions for business, the military, and other unique areas of expertise, are graduates of specifically designed degree programs which focus on program design, measurement, achievement, and methodology. As I have said earlier, by contrast, most faculty in lifelong learning programs, especially in content-dependent courses, are retired from the professions or from college and university teaching. They bring considerable gifts to the classroom, but, in general, have not had prior experience teaching adult or lifelong learning students (Vega and Taylor, 2005).
Theoretical Perspectives

As lifelong learning institutes look to improve the ways in which curriculum is delivered there is much to be mined from a study of the philosophical and theoretical groundings of the adult education movement as it has developed over time. It is an ancient and revered one; lifelong learning, once an experiment, is now firmly established. Institutions of higher education, notably Harvard and Brown, established lifelong learning divisions decades ago as a way to foster mutually beneficial relationships with the surrounding communities. There were earlier experiments in the United States since the time of Emerson and Thoreau, the Chautauqua Institution founded in 1874 being a famous example. In England and France, the University of the Third Age thrives.

Cyril Houle (1984) was one of the first in the US to explore the education of adults as something distinct and different. His delightful survey, *Patterns of Learning*, is crammed with pithy and entertaining quotations and maxims from the early Greeks to modern times and acclaims the inherent human impulse to pursue knowledge throughout the life span. Representing ever changing needs and desires, it has been, variously, a way of examining one’s life, a tool taken up to learn something specific, an accomplishment, a way of preserving the state, a pleasurable activity, part of a personal rule of discipline, a mandate, a way of avoiding responsibility, an emblem of elitism, a rung on the ladder of success, a personal discipline or rule of life (p. 173–186). In short, adult education reflects the visions and mores of each time as each succeeding stage of history “finds ways of using these ancient processes..., putting them together in new ways [while] adding refinements” (p. 191). For Houle, the apex of this continuum is achieved in what he calls “self-directed study” or “individualized self-teaching” (p. 191). He envisions this ideal under a number of guises, including student-initiated study or “mutual instruction” groups, peer tutoring, discussion circles, “master-teacher” relationships, “scholarly companionship,” and the formation of monastic-like study communities (p. 190–198). (It is tempting to draw parallels between this and today’s lifelong learning programs. Indeed, how pleasant it would be to explore ways in which Houle’s examples could be replicated in present time curriculum planning. I was reminded of this when I read a description of the course “Renaissance Lessons for Today” taught by Diane Dreher at Santa Clara University’s Osher Lifelong Learning Institute in Volume 1 of *The LLI Review*.)

Houle’s visions and ideas contrast dramatically with later theorists and practitioners in the field of adult education who have decidedly more pragmatic goals. In reality, there is a grittiness in the field that is driven by the needs of those who typically seek out education as adults. The vast majority are motivated by very practical previously unmet needs. Unlike the ideal man whom Houle follows in his scan of history, these real time adults are in no position to use education as escape or amusement or to retreat into study circles in remote idyllic locations. However, much of what he describes as the ideal student in the ideal educational setting does apply to the lifelong learning experience of middle class Americans.

As Smith and Haverkamp (1977) point out, the needs of adults in the typical adult education program are similar to those of the average freshman college student. These needs, first articulated to a broad audience by Malcolm Knowles (1970, 1990), include, among others, the ability to formulate questions, to toler-
ate ideas that vary with what has been previously assumed, to determine what learning is essential and what is not, to locate what is necessary, to choose appropriate sources, to organize acquired data, and to integrate this with prior learning. Students entering the lifelong learning classroom are already in command of these skills.

It was Malcolm Knowles (1970, 1990) who brought the term “andragogy” into adult educators’ lexicon, although Stephen Brookfield has attributed that unique honor to social philosopher Eduard Lindeman (Brookfield, 1987, p. 9). Andragogy, which is a methodology more than a theory, operates under the assumption that adults learn in unique ways and not as children do. Because adults bring life experience, self-direction, readiness, and a mature problem-solving approach to learning, changes need to be made in the ways in which information is delivered to them. Knowles (1970, 1990) promotes an interactive student-driven classroom in which content is embedded in activities designed to engage students cognitively, emotionally, and socially. The trained adult educator creates the learning materials and facilitates the process; she is also cognizant of her teaching style and of her students’ learning styles. She works under the assumption that the nature of their shared endeavor is collaborative.

In recent decades few if any adult educators have had more influence than the Brazilian educator Paulo Freire (1970, 1973, 1978), who lived from 1921-1997. Given the mandate to eradicate illiteracy among the rural peasant classes, he created a unique classroom methodology and culture. In his literacy classrooms, the student/teacher relationship was revolutionized; students were given the right to choose what it was they needed to learn, and the teacher’s role was redefined and redesigned to facilitate that learning. Such a radical shift in what and how one learned naturally transformed his students who were socially, culturally, and economically marginalized in the stratified Brazilian society of the time. Regardless of the unique situation in which he worked, Freire’s methods and theories, when he began to proclaim his gospel from his own margins after being exiled by a reactionary government, touched a universal chord. At Harvard and elsewhere around the globe he became the darling in progressive education circles.

Freire is rightfully characterized as a Marxist/Christian, and his theories and praxis belong in the radical school of educational thought. It is unquestionably political in nature and asserts implicitly and explicitly that the classroom is in full relationship with the social and cultural environment within which it operates. In time, his intuition about the behavior of all disadvantaged populations in alien educational settings, and their perception of education as a privilege of the dominant classes, was folded into feminist thought by such luminaries as Mary Belenky et al. (1997) and bell hooks (1994). After Freire, the link between what transpires in the classroom and the world that students enter when they leave had been made and would thereafter never be broken.

It is well to note that theory regarding learning in general and education in particular universally begins in studies of children, and none is better known in this country than John Dewey (1916, 1938), the father of progressive education. In his preferred method a problem is proposed to the student, who then examines it using resources provided by the teacher. It is the teacher’s role to set up the experience and facilitate the process, and it is the teacher, of course, who must be in command of
the material. As with other theorists in education, Dewey’s work has been applied mostly in lower and secondary education. In adult education, however, his influence has been deep and long lasting and has inspired the contributions of such stars in the field as Lindeman (1987) and Knowles (1970, 1990).

The influence of Lev Vygotsky (1962), a Russian psychologist, has also been enormous. Vygotsky died in 1934, leaving a vast amount of research, but it was only in the late 1970s, when his 1962 book *Thought and Language* was translated, that his theories became widely known. It is his premise that children advance to new levels of learning through play, the use of the imagination, and social interaction with peers and authority figures. Having integrated content in this way, they reach a level of comprehension in which they themselves are able to construct new meaning and knowledge. From his initial empirical studies came a new awareness of the importance of social factors in the learning process (Lee and Smagorinsky, 2000, p. 4; John-Steiner and Meehan, 2000, p. 42). Vygotsky’s work also inspired the intensive use of writing as a learning tool. Subsequently, the process writing, writing-to-learn, and writing-across-the-curriculum movements came into being. A fourth component, following play, social interaction, and the uses of language, concerns the interrelationship between students and the social and cultural environments in which they live. Vygotsky, prefiguring Freire, asserts that a mutuality between the classroom and the world outside exists in ways that are both subtle and overt.

Certain implications follow. The classroom is a community, and as such all members—teachers and students, students with other students—work together in joint activity. The best of these activities involve the whole person and engage the senses and the emotions as well as the intellect. Learning experiences should be creative and interesting. By demonstrating how knowledge is constructed, an individual can add to what is learned in any given lesson (Wells, 1999, p. 60–61). Therefore, outcomes and goals are not the end and “less” becomes “more.”

Of persistent interest in progressive educational practice is the concept of the democratic classroom. Hardly radical or new, it has roots in the philosophies of Emerson and Dewey among others. Eduard Lindeman (1987) tirelessly promoted it in the field of adult education, undoubtedly as a result of his early experience in “the school of hard knocks,” and he expounded on it in an impressive output of writing reviewed in Stephen Brookfield’s *Learning Democracy: Eduard Lindeman on Adult Education* (1987). In the laudatory preface Brookfield, himself renowned in the field, notes that among Lindeman’s major concerns is the “belief that adult education was a force for constructive social action” (Brookfield, 1987, p. 4). What is of particular interest here is his firm belief that the classroom should model democratic principles and practices. He criticized formal educational methods which merely recited from the teacher’s repository of knowledge, Freire’s “banking method.”

**Discussion**

From the previous, admittedly selective, literature review, I draw the following conclusions. While lifelong learning students share the same skills and can-do attitudes with the typical, more practical-minded students enrolled in formal adult education programs, in most content-driven lifelong learning classrooms the meth-
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ods and teaching/learning strategies developed and promoted by Knowles (1970, 1990) and his successors are not employed. Expert faculty, either disinterested in or unaware of the full range of methodologies available to educators, fail to recognize the adult student’s impulse to drive the material and to process it in a problem-solving way, and, instead, get in the way of authentic learning by lecturing on the subject and expecting their students to be passive learners.

What we have come to understand about teaching in general and teaching styles in particular is that they, first of all, reflect the underlying philosophies of the times. Today, we are in a time between times, when “modernist” theories that evolved from the Enlightenment are gradually (now rapidly) being replaced by those coming out of a postmodern sensibility, which I will discuss later. Rational thought demands measurement and specific outcomes, thus education’s historic fascination with tests and quizzes and grades and standards and textbooks, all of which reduce learning to a common denominator. It is no surprise that the apex of the teaching methodologies of the modern period is the ubiquitous PowerPoint presentation, “almost as if the technology has assumed a greater importance than the content or the teachers and learners” (Jarvis, 2004, p. 193).

But is not the well-designed (and sometimes audio-visual supported) lecture a prefiguration of the technologically driven PowerPoint presentation? And does not the expectation that the teacher be popular and a performer, as well as an endless well of information follow from that? (“All eyes focus here.”) The cult of the teacher still rides high in many post-secondary classrooms, including the lifelong learning classroom. Indeed, these qualities in a teacher are highly honored and desired. Results of a recent poll at the Osher Lifelong Learning Institute at the University of Southern Maine, for instance, showed that for a large majority of students this is their preferred classroom model (Collins, 2006, p. 8). This “best teacher” model is in direct conflict with Freirian thought, which claims that a teacher who dominates by force of personality speaks, even if unwittingly, for the power class. Many can remember the once domineering and sometimes harsh teacher, now replaced by the benign and entertaining one—eloquent, witty, amusing. The effect, however, is the same and renders the student’s learning a by-product of the main attraction, the articulate teacher/performer. (I call this the “John Barrymore Effect.”)

Consider instead a scenario in which teachers and learners interact equally in a relationship based on respect and mutuality. Both understand the nature of the engagement, in this case the intake of knowledge, and both recognize the responsibility of the other: the teacher to be in control of the material and to facilitate the process through which it is delivered, the student to cooperate in this effort. In this classroom setting, which builds on the work of Carl Rogers (Elias and Merriam, 2005), the teacher and student share responsibility for co-creating the learning experience. (I have observed a number of children come up through the grades, and nothing has impressed me more than seeing this contract-driven, project-oriented methodology at work, clearly promoting positive responsible attitudes.) Stephen Brookfield nudged this forward in what he calls “a transactional drama in which... participants and facilitators... interact continuously to influence the nature, direction, and form of the subsequent learnings.” (Brookfield, 1987, p. viii).

The teacher who would be reflective and responsive will “ground [his] practice in core democratic values such as justice, fairness, and compassion” (Lindeman,
Consider instead a scenario in which teachers and learners interact equally in a relationship based on respect and mutuality.

1999, p. 44). Such a learning environment allows for active participation, avoids textbook-dominated (and I would add lecture-dominated) instruction, encourages reflective thinking, gives students power to make decisions, and respects all students (Kubow, 2000, p. 9). Students are enabled to learn by way of shared activities based on readings, problem-solving groups, peer evaluation, and small group discussion (Thayer-Bacon, 1996; Vega and Taylor, 2005). In such an environment the focus shifts from being teacher-centered to learning-centered, a culture of collaboration is constructed, and students assume responsibility for their learning, the better to retain the material. (It is generally understood now that the one who learns best from a lecture is the lecturer herself). In effect, a real-life experience is designed, giving students the opportunity to develop the skills for cooperative problem-solving behaviors beyond the classroom.

Classroom culture and methodology have changed significantly as a result of the enormous acceptance of these theoretical perspectives. These include learning in groups, collaborative learning, process writing, writing to learn, and writing-across-the-curriculum, among others. Attention has also been drawn to the fact that not all students learn the same and that adjustments should be made to accommodate these differences. Thus, says Jarvis, “it is necessary to consider not only the aims, methods, and content of a particular teaching session, but also the teaching style and the morality of the approach in relation to the participants in the process” (Jarvis, 2004, p. 189).

The groundbreaking work of Howard Gardner (1983) upended traditional assumptions about how students learn and speaks to this “morality of approach.” His theory of “multiple intelligences” challenged the time-honored belief, widely accepted since the Greco-Roman era, that the only way to integrate new knowledge or information was through mental activity, with reading and writing highest on the list of intellectual skills. More millions than can be comprehended have suffered as a result of this discrimination. Now there is general agreement that, while many do learn best through reading and writing, others comprehend better in a variety of alternative ways, some by using mathematics, logic, or spatial relationships; some through images; others kinesthetically or through music and rhythm; and still others through social interactions or inner reflection. Each of us has a preferred way. Some individuals may be able to call on any or all of these ways as called for, while, for others, only one way may be available; it is for the experienced and sensitive teacher to know.


Simultaneously, empirical research on the relationship between writing and learning by James Britton (1975) in England and Janet Emig (1971) in the US
opened up an interest in how to use writing as a learning tool (Bruffee, 1985, 1989; Fulwiler, 1982; Maimon, 1981, 1989; Tchudi, 1986; Sheridan, 1992). Thus, the emergence of process writing, writing-to-learn, and writing-across-the-curriculum, all of which have been fully integrated into curricula throughout the spectrum (Sheridan, 1995). As time goes on, students entering lifelong learning programs will have had educational experiences incorporating many if not all of these methods.

**Conclusion**

If the medium is the message as Marshall McLuhan posited long ago, then classroom culture is also the message. The pedagogies (andragogies) briefly described above represent the effort on the part of enlightened educators to equalize power and thus to promote democracy both within and beyond the classroom. No one would argue against democracy; why then the continued resistance to classroom reform in terms of methodology? For Donald Schon a formidable reason for resistance among teachers and other experts is that it takes time to rethink and change what it is we do best, in other words, “reflection [seemingly] interferes with action” (Schon, 1983, p. 277). Action is a hedge against fear, fear that (with our instructors’ hats on) we may be paralyzed in the moment should we press the pause button and relinquish our power to the student. In that moment (without our notes) we may lose our grip on the master plan and be revealed as an emperor without clothes. Suddenly, a Pandora’s box of complicated “out-of-control” possibilities has been opened up, disrupting our game plan. Out of control, we risk paralysis and discovery, and so we retreat to the safety of traditional power-based forms, such as the lecture. To forestall this dilemma, we keep moving, “keeping on keeping on” and so retain control.

Administrators, if they are to be vigilant about maintaining the highest professional standards, need to step in to help. As is clearly stated in “Appendix 4” of the Guidelines and Criteria for General Education at USM, “General education requires administrative leadership” (University of Southern Maine, 2005, p. 21). One possible focus for leadership in lifelong learning institutes is to offer faculty development workshops designed to reduce resistance through non-invasive information sessions. Such sessions might include success stories from early resisters as well as opportunities to “experience” and try out some of these methods in safe, professionally run settings (Brookfield, 1995, p. 260–267; Vega and Taylor, 2005). Moving forward from administratively sponsored initiatives is the possibility of forming what Drennon and Cervero call “practitioner inquiry groups” in which faculty/ participants “act on power relationships in ways that either reproduce or transform them” (2002, p. 1). The ultimate goal is to help faculty re-vision themselves as facilitators who are co-participants with the students in the process of learning (Elias and Merriam, 2005, p. 127).

Administrators can also help by insisting on the provision of classroom features such as seminar room setups and round tables. Sitting at round tables or facing one another in a seminar configuration, students and faculty naturally enter into a dynamic in which it appears that all are sharing equally in the discovery of some new knowledge (Brookfield, 1995, p. 44; Nesbit, 1998, p. 7; Heimstra, 1991).
Colin and Heaney (2001), calling on the iconic Dewey, Lindeman, and Brookfield, seek to promote social and cultural diversity in adult education doctoral programs, an issue that is a growing concern in lifelong learning institutes. A review of a typical curriculum, however, makes it very clear that the Eurocentric focus remains dominant. In graduate and undergraduate education where students of many cultures have a voice, these imbalances are gradually fading, but in lifelong learning, where the vast majority of students are white, middle class, and older, this consciousness is presently dormant. It is impossible to force such a sensitive issue; here is a place where “affirmative action” would be ineffective as well as inappropriate. Again, administrators will need to find a way out of this dilemma. One first step might be to recruit faculty who are culturally and racially diverse.

“Deliberate ethical implications” follow from a close reading of new general education guidelines, stated Lee Knefflamp speaking at the University of Southern Maine’s Gloria S. Duclos Convocation, Liberal Education in the 21st Century Academy. (Knefflamp, 2005). One of the ideals expressed in the university’s liberal education vision statement is to “enable our graduates to be world-minded, intentional, life-long learners.” Our real-time lifelong learners are already influential members of their communities, narrow and broad, and serious about their roles as citizens, but they are no less open to formation. Lifelong learning institutes, recognizing the considerable potential of their students to be “change agents,” can help them realize that potential in overt and subtle ways.

Guidelines such as these reflect an emerging postmodern consciousness. So what is postmodernism? Despite its sometimes bad press—Would someone please explain Foucault to me? Who the heck was Jacques Derrida?—postmodernism is here to stay. And for good reason. Elias and Merriam describe modernism, to which postmodernism is a reaction, as “the many social, economic, and political systems that have developed in the West since the eighteenth century” (Elias and Merriam, p. 219). Some say it began with the European Renaissance, some say the Protestant Reformation, some say the Enlightenment. Whatever the origin, its central and continuing belief is rationalism, from which have emerged industrialization, capitalism, the cult of the institution, persistent Colonialism, and through which are perpetuated repressive power structures. Postmodernists, especially those identified by Elias and Merriam as “constructive postmodernists,” seek to replace these realities, and the resulting attitudes, with a liberating sensibility that diminishes or transforms them (2005, p. 224). This is an impossibly oversimplified definition; for a sophisticated and illuminating treatment, see Elias and Merriam (2005).

As this consciousness rises, a new type of individual is emerging, one who has a global rather than local identity, yet who views truth as relative to each unique set of circumstances; who is emotionally open, relaxed, and flexible; who is receptive to revisionist interpretations of history. This is the lifelong learning student of the future, and she will be a challenge. It’s time to get ready.
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