

FINAL REPORT

Contract no: SOE2-CT98-2043

Project no: PL980025

Title: Lifelong Learning: the implications for the universities in the EU

Prepared by
Prof. Nikos Kokosalakis
Prof. Maurice Kogan

Project co-ordinator: Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences.
Centre for Social Morphology and Social Policy
(KEKMOKOP), Athens, Greece

Partners: European Institute of Education and Social Policy (EIESP), France;
Institut für Hochschulforschung Wittenberg e.v., (HOF) Wittenberg,
Germany; Instituto Valenciano de Investigaciones Económicas (IVIE),
Spain; Norwegian Institute for Studies in Research & Higher Education
(NIFU), Norway; Göteborg University, Department of Education,
Sweden; Brunel University, Centre for the Evaluation of Public Policy
Policy and Practice (CEPPP), UK

Reference Period: from 1-11-1998 to 31-10-2000

Starting date: 1 November 1998 Duration 24 months

Date of issue of this report: 20 March 2001

Project funded by the European Community under the
Targeted Socio-economic Research (TSER) programme

Contents

ABSTRACT

Section 1: *Executive Summary*

The project set up
The multi-modality of Lifelong Learning
Summary of main findings
Conclusions and policy implications

Section 2: *Background and Objectives of the Project*

2.1 Rationale and General Objectives
2.2 Specific Research Objectives

Section 3: *Scientific Description of the Project Results and Methodology*

CHAPTER ONE

3.1 INTRODUCTION

3.1.1 Lifelong Learning: The meaning and definition of the concept

3.1.1.1 *The Conceptual Context*

3.1.1.2 *The Definition and operational problems*

3.1.2 Theoretical and Methodological Framework

3.1.2.1 *Theoretical approach*

3.1.2.2 *Methodology*

3.1.2.3 *The research design and timetable*

3.1.2.4 *Generalisability*

CHAPTER TWO

3.2. THE LEGAL AND REGULATIVE FRAMEWORK OF LLL IN THE UNIVERSITIES

3.2.1 General Considerations

3.2.2 France

3.2.3 Germany

3.2.4 Greece

3.2.5 Norway

3.2.6 Spain

3.2.7 Sweden

3.2.8 UK

3.2.9 The Comparative Perspective

CHAPTER THREE

3.3 THE INTERACTION OF INTERNATIONAL, NATIONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES

3.3.1 Introduction

3.3.2 The International Policy Discourse

3.3.3 The EU Guidelines for LLL Policy in Higher Education

3.3.4 The Main Objectives of International Policies

3.3.5 The National and Comparative Context

- 3.3.6 Promoting New Access Policies**
- 3.3.7 Personal Development or Personal Training?**
- 3.3.8 Flexibility, Diversification and Demand-driven Learning**
- 3.3.9 The Views of the Actor**
 - 3.3.9.1 International policies*
 - 3.3.9.2 National and institutional policies*
- 3.3.10 Conclusion**

CHAPTER FOUR

3.4 CURRICULA AND CHANGES IN KNOWLEDGE

- 3.4.1 Lifelong Learning and the Knowledge Society**
- 3.4.2 Forms of LLL Curricula**
- 3.4.3 A portrait of Implementation of LLL in Each Country**
 - 3.4.3.1 France*
 - 3.4.3.2 Germany*
 - 3.4.3.3 Greece*
 - 3.4.3.4 Norway*
 - 3.4.3.5 Spain*
 - 3.4.3.6 Sweden*
 - 3.4.3.7 UK*
- 3.4.4 The Shift from Teaching to Learning**
 - 3.4.4.1 The theory*
 - 3.4.4.2 The practice*
 - 3.4.4.3 From learning substance to learning process*
- 3.4.5 Access**
 - 3.4.5.1 LLL and open or extended access*
 - 3.4.5.2 Entry requirements*
- 3.4.6 Modes of delivery**
 - 3.4.6.1 Flexible and multifaceted modes of delivery*
 - 3.4.6.2 Distance learning*
- 3.4.7 Accreditation and Quality Assurance**
 - 3.4.7.1 Accreditation and certification*
 - 3.4.7.2 Quality assurance*
- 3.4.8 Concluding Remarks**

CHAPTER FIVE

3.5 ORGANISATION OF LLL IN THE UNIVERSITIES AND CHANGES IN POWER STRUCTURES

- 3.5.1 Introduction**
- 3.5.2 Organisational Patterns of LLL in the Universities**
 - 3.5.2.1 International policies and LLL organisation*
 - 3.5.2.2 National policies and LLL organisation*
- 3.5.3 LLL and Power Structures/relations in the Universities**

CHAPTER SIX

3.6 PARTNERSHIPS AND MARKET RELATIONS

3.6.1 Partnerships

3.6.2 Market Relations and Financial Issues

Section 4: *Conclusions and Policy Implications*

- I How the project advanced the state of the art**
- II The contribution of the European collaborative effort**
- III The key results from the project**
- IV Policy and practice implications**
- V The transnational applicability and relevance of the results**
- VI The need for further research**

Section 5: *Dissemination and/or Exploitation of Results*

Section 6: *Acknowledgements and references*

Section 7: *Annexes*

Annex 1: A List of the Institutions of the Sample

Annex 2: Interview Schedule

Annex 3: List of Reports Delivered

Annex 4: List of Publications from the Project

ABSTRACT

This project has examined how the universities in the EU respond to the concept of lifelong learning (LLL) and has analysed the structural and functional implications which the application of the concept entails for the universities in the 'information society'. The study also investigated and discussed policies and university practices of LLL and raises more general questions concerning strategy and the problems involved in LLL provision at university level.

The research took place between November 1988 and November 2000 in England, France, Germany, Greece, Norway, Spain and Sweden and was based on literature surveys and field studies in a sample of four universities from each country (28 in all). Each national study involved documentation and interviews with members of university administration and faculty. The studies were based on a common methodology entailing specific criteria of identification of LLL provision and yielded perceptions of lifelong learning from the perspectives of disciplines at different levels.

The study commenced with a review of literature and an analysis of the state of the art of relevant research in each country involved and examined the legal and regulative framework concerning LLL. It analysed the variety of the actual forms of LLL provision and examined policies and strategies of the institutions concerning LLL and compared them with corresponding national and international policies (EU, OECD, UNESCO). The study further examined the implications of LLL provision for traditional conceptions and forms of knowledge and for power structures and relations within the universities. In addition a link was made between LLL provision and the involvement of the universities with outside partnerships and market relations.

The basic findings of the research show that the forms and the volume of LLL provision vary from country to country but on the whole it is still at the margin of university activities. The results also show that there are many definitions of LLL and in some countries the term is hardly used, continuing or adult education being used instead. Indeed, the concept of LLL itself is loaded with ambiguity. There is, however, a common historical pattern of provision in most countries from adult education to continuing education to lifelong learning. On the whole universities seem open and well disposed to LLL but its application on a wide scale would entail a revolution in university education as we have known it. At present there seems to be a substantial gap between national and international policies for LLL and policies and strategies of the universities; the latter being frayed at the edges and unclear. The LLL policy (-ies) reflects the multifariousness of goals and tensions between divergent functions of contemporary higher education (i.e. social goals-economic goals; personal development – competence development: etc, etc).

The study has produced seven national reports, three thematic reports and a general report. Some preliminary data have been published in the *European Journal of Education* vol. 35 no. 3. Another issue of this Journal (Sept. 2001) will publish substantive results and discuss policy implications.

Section One: Executive Summary

The Project set-up

1. The project examined policies and university practices in Life Long Learning (LLL). It was undertaken between 1998 and 2000 in England, France, Germany, Greece, Norway, Spain and Sweden and thus involved studies from northern, central and southern Europe.
2. It is based on national literature surveys and field studies in a sample of four universities from each country (28 in all). Each study involved documentation and interviews with ten members of university administration and faculty. The studies yielded perceptions of LLL from the perspectives of subjects ranging from archaeology and social sciences to law, management, science and engineering, and from institutional managers and academics at different levels.
3. The project methods and scope were framed, and findings collated trans-nationally, at meetings held in Greece and Germany, together with smaller group meetings in England.

The multi-modality of Lifelong Learning

4. The aim was to investigate how universities in the EU respond to the concept of Life Long Learning (LLL) and to analyse its implications for universities in the 'information society'.
5. The take-up of LLL policies varies between countries, partly due to differing constitutional, policy-making and administrative traditions, and how far higher education has been incorporated into a legal framework. Not all countries have adopted the terminology of LLL. In France, Germany and Spain, 'permanent' or 'continuing education' are used instead. In some cases, LLL is seen primarily as entailing distinct forms of provision for distinct groups of people. In others, it is more integrated in the totality of higher education.
6. Changes attributable to LLL policies may have also been engendered by other drivers, such as the need to secure survival or autonomy in the context of reduced resources, student recruitment and performance measures. LLL provision can be implicit in conventional university education. In some countries it continues a previous tradition of continuing education.
7. Sweden was in the forefront internationally on lifelong learning. The idea of recurrent education was launched in the late 1960s by Olof Palme as Minister of Education who envisaged it primarily as a means to guarantee democracy, equality and individual freedom of choice. It emphasised institutions' "third obligation" to give service to their surroundings and their duty to relate to expected or expressed 'societal needs'. The current international concern for Lifelong Learning can be traced back to an OECD's ministerial meeting in January, 1996.
8. LLL addresses three fundamental objectives of education: personal development (the point of reference is the individual); social cohesion (the point of reference is society) and economic growth (the point of reference is economic market forces).

9. The earlier concern with widening access has partly given way to a concern with enhancing skills and knowledge for economic development. There remains tension between enabling students to acquire 'hard' knowledge and skills, and belief in learning relying to some extent on students' own knowledge. There is therefore not a single LLL concept or policy.

Summary of main findings

Key Characteristics of Life Long Learning

10. A main task was to establish the definitions accorded to Life Long Learning by those active in it. Our project design offered the following broad span definition: *Those novel forms of teaching and learning that equip students (learners, individuals) to encounter with competence and confidence the full range of working, learning and life experiences.*

11. LLL was generally found to comprise the following connected elements:

(i) educational philosophies centred on learning, rather than teaching, and linked to learning for both professional development and self-fulfillment. This emphasis implies that LLL will be demand- rather than supply-driven;

(ii) institutional policies for reducing exclusion and enlarging access in terms of social class, age, gender and ethnic groups. This entails flexible delivery and alternative modes of learning;

(iii) institutional policies to create the knowledge and skill base for a competitive economy in the age of the 'knowledge' or 'information' society and rapid change in technologies and labour markets; these include expanding continuous professional development (CPD), specialist education and education designed to facilitate career changes;

(iv) innovative procedures of evaluation and certification, adapted to new conceptions of curriculum and flexible modes of learning and leading to new degrees and diplomas.

12. The following paragraphs consider the range of defining aspects and how far they have been achieved as drawn from the literature, our country and thematic reports:

- Access
- Preparation for careers and participation in the economy
- Personal development
- Concepts of and approaches to learning
- Modes of study and delivery
- Distance learning and Open Universities
- Concepts of curriculum
- Conceptions and organisation of knowledge
- Power relations
- Partnerships and market
- Quality assurance and certification
- Financial aspects of LLL
- Staffing needs

13. The aspects of *access* thought to be implied by LLL included:

(1) Enabling individuals with insufficient educational qualifications to secure late entrance to, or second chances of, degree and other professional courses.

(2) Providing more flexible ways to pay for or subsidise courses.

(3) Universalism: including students from different backgrounds, experiences and abilities. Giving access to all from 'cradle to grave' at an appropriate level.

(4) Making universities a resource for a range of information, skills, opportunities, networking and contacts, available to more people than might now be admitted to higher education.

(5) Encouraging pursuit of a lifetime of learning. This might mean that developed values and cognitive capacities enable individuals to continue learning, or that they will be encouraged to seek learning opportunities to meet changing needs throughout their lives and careers.

14. Extending access has been strongly associated with LLL, specifically in the success of Open Universities, although other factors have contributed to wider recruitment. Wider social inclusion has proved difficult to achieve, even by institutions most committed to it and in areas where it is evidently relevant. Mature student numbers have increased everywhere, though with national variations. Because LLL is often not defined separately from other systems of access, it is not possible to ascertain its extent or its growth.

15. Universities in all seven countries offer a variety of continuing education for persons employed or seeking employment. Offers for senior citizens catering to their specific requirements were mentioned only in one report. However, in some countries they can enrol in regular study programmes either as regular students or as 'auditors' and guest students.

16. Adults of all ages can enroll for degrees as regular students in all countries, provided they meet admission criteria. Admissions tests usually provide a relatively high hurdle jumped by very few. In the UK and France the previous experience of mature students lacking entrance qualifications can be recognised.

17. In France, enrolment to longer programmes or as regular students requires an entrance or degree qualification, passing a scholastic aptitude test (SAT) or a subject-related entrance examination. Open universities, however, accredit work-based and experiential learning. Returning or second chance adults are treated as initial students, or have access to APEAL (accreditation of prior education, achievements and learning). But departments vary in their willingness to accept students through APEAL.

18. In most German states, although adults with job experience but without entry qualifications can follow first degree courses, few do so. Professionally oriented postgraduate courses represent most continuing education and whilst many for whom they cater may be 'second chance' they have combined objectives of career advancement with access to higher education. Yet universities are increasingly interested in meeting the LLL aspirations of younger alumni which may run counter to the recruitment of older and underprivileged groups.

19. In Greece, there are no clear rules for access, which is competitive although in theory open to all. Access to the OU because of high demand has an upper age limit of 44 and requires a high school certificate, a degree and possibly practical experience for entry into a postgraduate

course. It is thus closed to a significant proportion of the adult population. For 2000-2001, of 23,913 applicants for all courses only 4,080 were admitted.

20. In Norway, non-credit courses are generally open to all, but formal competence is required for courses in both initial and continuing education leading to examinations and generating credits. A system for recognition of practical competence has been discussed but not implemented. Initial studies in arts, social and natural sciences are widely used for adults older than 30 years, but are generally offered separately from initial courses for regular students.

21. Spanish universities allow adults over 25 years to enter without a secondary degree. Around three percent of students enter in this way. Perhaps more than 10 % of higher education students are adult LLL learners. But working experience or practical knowledge is not formally recognised in the regular programmes.

22. Admission for elder students in Sweden is facilitated by the '25-4 scheme' (for applicants lacking upper-secondary education or older than 25 years of age and with more than four years of work experience and competence in English and Swedish). About one-third of new entrants are older than 25.

23. In the UK each university decides its own entry requirements. There are thus variations in access patterns in the seven countries.

24. ***Preparation for careers and participation in the economy.*** Much LLL is directed at employment, career opportunities and continuing professional education for both the employed and unemployed. The aspects of LLL concerned with participation in the work-force were:

(1) Vocational objectives: up-dating or re-training, for continuing professional development, to extend or acquire knowledge and skills or qualifications for new roles.

(2) New employment patterns: people need to prepare for several careers in their lifetime.

(3) Enabling people to move in and out of educational institutions to fit changing career needs.

(4) Learning related to career objectives set externally. Support, advice or mentoring to enable students to reach their own goals, to come from either the university or the workplace.

(5) Professionally oriented courses. Theoretical training mixed with work-based learning or experience. Cognitive structures originate from demand-driven interests outside the university.

25. In the UK, the need is increasingly emphasised to prepare for employment at all levels of education, including Master's and PhD degrees. In most countries, universities respond to external demands for services. This may derive from social principle, the moral duty to provide expertise to society and economy, as is explicit in Swedish and Norwegian policy, or from the need to sell services in order to survive.

26. Examples of how universities may work with clients on LLL content are given in several country reports. Such relationships may affect research and teaching agendas. Contract research may lead to requests for courses and feedback from teaching may provide starting points for research. Universities often contract professionals as teachers while companies contract academic staff for in-house continuing education.

27. In some countries (eg Germany), employers and economic organisations are well represented on higher education's instruments of government. For the most part, the external groups are in market relationship with universities; resources and support are given in return for market-defined services. In many universities entities are created to support such connections.

28. *Personal development*, implicit in the moves towards student based curricula, was seen by some to be potentially in conflict with economic objectives. Its components were:

(1) Learning for personal satisfaction, inquisitiveness, fulfillment of personal wishes, not necessarily vocationally related skills.

(2) Improving education to develop one's talents and the ability to be self-evaluative.

(3) Doing away with notions of being 'done to' in the learning process.

29. These definitions presented common ground for those involved in LLL.

30. The perceived *concepts of and approaches to learning* were:

(1) 'Learning replaces teaching' so that the 'focal point is on the learner rather than the providers' or teachers. An emphasis on learning processes and new curricular concepts was most clearly identified in the British and Swedish universities.

(2) Yet, there was support for placing lifelong learning within a award-bearing, structured framework, especially in areas where interviewees believed that where the epistemic core was stable e.g. in mathematics and physics, training in analytical thinking and models would best contribute to competence and the capacity to handle change within working-life.

(3) An evolving process of learning which is natural or organic, experienced every day even if not formalised and linked with learning outside institutions and valuing previous experience.

(4) Teachers setting out a learning template: 'This is what you need, this is what we help you provide, there are these gaps and you owe it to yourself to look at how those are filled.'

(5) Teaching undergraduates how to be more responsible for their learning .

(6) Learning as problem-solving.

31. Shifting from teaching to learning and from supply- to demand-led provision was widely accepted, particularly in the UK and Sweden, but examples of programmes where this philosophy is translated into practice were less common. Academics mostly retained control of programmes and curricula.

32. The national reports discussed changes in the pedagogical and epistemological foundations which accompanied this shift. Although practice faced obstacles, not least academic scepticism, individual learners and their needs for knowledge and skills were in the foreground of Swedish LLL policy and practice, which is more integrated into higher education than in other countries. Both learning and teaching appeared to become more individualised.

33. Most of the country reports revealed attempts at forms of interaction between teachers and learners, particularly attempts to incorporate work experiences as part of a reflexive process or to try out new approaches for solving practical problems.

34. The extent to which students already participated in determining patterns of learning has been understated in some countries. It is not possible, in the present state of research, to say how far LLL has produced substantial changes in this area.

35. **Modes of study and delivery.** Innovation has primarily been in mode of delivery, particularly distance learning, rather than in learning objectives or outcomes. Modularisation is well established in many universities but not widely translated into movement of students freely between programmes. How far life long learning has led to innovations in courses is contestable. Many innovative or non-traditional patterns existed before LLL policies emerged.

36. In Germany, ways of teaching students how to learn and handle information have hardly been conceived within the framework of continuing education. However, the proportion of self-directed work is high. In France, as elsewhere, courses display flexible delivery, with alternative modes of learning, such as full- and part-time attendance, day or evening classes, block sessions, distance education, self learning, and apprenticeship, i.e. alternated university- and company-based learning. In Greece, the main forms of LLL offer a mixture of traditional classroom delivery, electronic technology, distance learning, the Internet, PCs, multimedia technology, audio-visuals etc. In Norway, advanced multi-media platforms are being tried out. Spanish interviewees urged the need for more use of IT and flexible modes of instruction.

37. **Distance learning and Open Universities.** More recent adoption of distance learning can be interpreted as a response to the globalisation of higher education and as an aid to survival. It is a well established and successful mechanism for LLL. Greece, Spain, France, Germany and the UK have open universities offering distance learning; it is also strong in UK standard universities. Most students are mature and employed; of the UK's OU students, 70 % are between 30 and 49. Distance learning requires large student groups for viability.

38. Its potential is constrained by the need to provide well-organized tutoring; there is awareness that not all students can cope with the amount of self-learning resulting from intensive use of distance education technology and in the Greek Open University audio-visual methods and the Internet are in limited use. Specially produced books and study guides remain the basic method of delivery whilst instructors and personal tutors assist the learner to learn in a self-paced mode. These methods aim to by-pass the impersonal mass classes of most universities. In Norway, too, distance learning based wholly on PC technology is regarded with some scepticism and distance learning is not individualised.

39. The UK Open University offers the prime example of distance learning although other universities also make substantial offerings in it. It has taught 2.5 million students since 1971 and over 230,000 clients in 1998. Over 70 per cent are in full-time employment. 230,000 adults have graduated, and 70,000 have graduated through other UK universities. Over 1 million adults have gained credits leading to certificates, diplomas and degrees.

40. **Concepts of curriculum** The rhetoric of LLL speaks of shifts from discipline to domain-based programmes, from teaching to learning processes, from directed to negotiated curricula and from knowledge to skills; the latter has emerged as a strong trend whilst other dimensions are more ambiguous. Undoubtedly, multi-disciplinary, inter-disciplinary and domain-based

provision has expanded, particularly in continuing professional development. Lifelong courses may be multi-disciplinary, offering 'integrated' parts of courses in initial education, although this must not be attributed wholly to LLL. Where they are organised in modular terms, lifelong learning courses innovate in terms of an 'integrative code' and are, with a few exceptions, less innovative with regard to disciplinary coding lines.

50.

41. However, there is no simple equation of LLL with a rejection of discipline-based knowledge and education. The relative importance of content and process varies between kinds of courses and learning objectives. New stakeholders in some areas, notably in CPD, are beginning to assert themselves in the setting of curriculum objectives and content, although they do not, on the whole, seek to challenge academic authority in this area.

42. If curricula are determined by students (or their employers), their needs become the organising principle. Modularised structures could allow students to construct their own curricula, although these ideas have been practiced in differing degrees.

43. Changes in the nature of knowledge in curricula are less dramatic than sometimes portrayed. The importance of theory, academic modes of inquiry, forms of argument and analysis for professional practice are strong themes, as well as wider modes of knowledge and learning.

44. Where LLL courses are separately identifiable, most are built around new conceptions of curriculum. In France, for example, they are characterized by (i) combinations of disciplines leading to competency clusters or generic occupations, (ii) a concern for career strategies, (iii) modular structure, with learning modules often modelled on disciplines, but aiming towards trans-disciplinary objectives; and (iv) a significant amount of work-based learning integrated with the curriculum. Outside partners are sometimes involved in the conception of a curriculum moving from traditional disciplinary lines. Most universities providing LLL would subscribe to these components, but explicit implementation would vary greatly.

45. Shifts towards domain-based curricula and transdisciplinarity were mostly found in technological subjects such as engineering, computer science, information and communication technologies, and in economics, law, management and organisation studies, mainly under the heading of continuing professional development. However, academics from the softer or less restricted areas of knowledge also appeared ready to give more responsibility to learners in constructing the curriculum. Opinions on these issues are affected by the views held of the nature of knowledge and the extent to which it is provisional and negotiable or determinate..

46. For the most part, it was assumed that content, as opposed to modes of transmission, would not differ greatly from that offered in standard full time education. There was emphasis on courses that would enhance professional and other working competencies, but this did not necessarily exclude LLL from providing access to traditional knowledge and skills.

47. Even when state controls of higher education were strong, as in Greece, curricula varied from traditional disciplinary content to inter-disciplinary and/or trans-disciplinary courses, from training programmes to those that combine education and training.

48. ***Changes in conceptions and organisation of knowledge.*** As yet, LLL policies have not produced major change in conceptions of knowledge and its organisation or significant 'drift of epistemic criteria' (Elzinga 1985). Indeed, traditional epistemological assumptions and

evaluative criteria have obstructed stronger implementation of LLL. However, our study indicates that significantly extending LLL can imply change in knowledge assumptions.

49. Arguments for lifelong learning challenge the idea that higher education objectives are centred on the advancement and transmission of knowledge. They reflect alternative value bases - the democratic or integrative, enhancing social inclusion and participation, and the economic, income generation, wealth creation and competitiveness.

50. **Alternatives to discipline-based organisation of knowledge.** If curricula are increasingly influenced by needs of learners, occupational groups and employers, they are likely to become domain rather than discipline-based and structured round externally defined problems rather than the concepts and epistemic criteria of disciplinary communities. They will be multi-disciplinary, interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary. They may be framed by new combinations of actors, as well as academics. They may be linked with research agendas pursued within Mode 2 knowledge development (Gibbons et al. 1994).

51. More flexible criteria for admission to courses give credence to the idea that advanced knowledge may be grounded in multiple sources of learning, including experiential knowledge. Learning becomes more individualised and less easily framed within concepts of progression determined by disciplinary communities in universities. Fragmented patterns of learning make it more difficult for providers to reinforce disciplinary values, cognitive or conceptual frameworks in student learning. Students and employers may have a stronger integrative role, determined by their own perceptions of need.

52. Arguments about the obsolescence of knowledge, technological change and the reconfiguration of the labour market may emphasise *shifts from knowledge to skills* in curricula. Curricula based on disciplines may focus more on transmitting analytical tools and methods than substantive material. Curricula may be framed predominantly within problem-based learning approaches. Problems may be defined by applications external to, or cutting across, academic frameworks. Learning as the object of learning becomes more important within concepts of the curriculum. Skills may be not only cognitive but social or personal.

53. If such changes are accepted, they alter what is required of faculty. The expertise would rest pedagogy as well as discipline-based knowledge, and on ability to convey transferability of knowledge to non-academic contexts.

54. **Alternative perspectives.** However, lifelong learning policies can facilitate access to traditional curricula and firm disciplinary frameworks. Respondents from some subjects insisted that core knowledge and specific cognitive rules were important for lifelong learning in these fields. Domain-based or transdisciplinary frameworks need not mean the abandonment of academic standards and criteria. Respondents from more than one country pointed out that problem-based learning was framed within the traditional research project design

55. **Changes in power relations** might emerge in teacher-student relationships, internal university organisation and university-state relationships. Encouragement of student reflection, developing flexible, independent and student-centred learning, might affect power relationships between students and teachers. The aims, outcomes and design of courses might become negotiable and student evaluations and feed-back looked at closely and welcomed. Recognising students' own ideas would mean that learners were the agents of their own learning and less dependent on teachers. They might recognise that teachers were a resource and not the arbiters

or the owners of the knowledge. Teachers would recognise that mature students have experience and knowledge which must be taken into account.

56. Modest infrastructural changes within institutions to meet the needs of LLL were evident. Mostly, however, LLL remained inexplicit in most universities' concerns. Institutions' inability to promote LLL within their main mission reflected characteristics of university organisation and management –inability to invoke departmental response to new policies and practices, or to withhold resources for specific developments were examples given.

57. In some systems universities were creating central entities to advance LLL practices. Reluctance to create vice-rector led units or committees, may have stemmed from the belief that LLL was already implicit in higher education practice or from academic reluctance to yield power or engage in new style activities. Larger-scale LLL provision could create shifts in power relations, some limited manifestations of which have already emerged.

58. At the national level, it seemed likely that existing power relationships and structures determined forms of LLL rather than the converse. Countries where power was devolved may take on more directive features if they wished universities to greatly expand their LLL activities, whilst the eclectic nature of LLL might cause relaxation of state control in some countries.

59. **Partnerships and markets.** Two aspects of higher education's connections with the outside world are partnerships and market. Partnerships may be with other higher education institutions; or with other public institutions, voluntary and non government organisations and with the private sector. All the institutions studied had formed such partnerships, if to a limited extent.

60. Partnerships could involve cooperation with employers or the region, perhaps based on labour market analyses leading to offers to meet actual demands. There might be cooperation through technology transfer units, or commissioned LLL courses as in Sweden. The French report gives examples of joint work on continuing professional development. In Spain, employers and external professionals were involved in curriculum design; in most of our seven countries university provision of LLL often contracted external professionals as teachers while academic staff were contracted by companies for in-house continuing education.

61. Partnerships of Greek universities with academic institutions at home and abroad already existed, but it was thought necessary to establish them more generally with public and private sector agencies. In Sweden, to enhance economic and regional growth, coalitions with industry and local municipalities had been developed. Recently formed universities have played a vital role in interpreting the 'third obligation' to contribute to society and the economy.

62. **Market.** A market orientation is present in virtually all LLL programmes. The centre of gravity may have changed from the public to the private spheres of society; there is an economic and administrative privileging of 'strategic' cognitive fields, especially within natural science and technology, and industrial collaboration-partnerships, directed especially towards small and medium-sized companies and of economic motives, modelled on assumptions about 'industrial' goals and efficiency, which are related to 'academic' goals and efficiency.

63. The growing role of market forces as implied from the joint development of curricula and their representation in the assessment of courses is noted as representing a shift in power relations and a reduction in academic power. For the most part, however, the relationships are

those of market and exchange; research and teaching objectives are negotiated and expertise is exchanged for resources and other forms of support.

64. The definitions of LLL and discussion of its present status above concern its theories, content and styles. The project, however, yielded thinking about its ways of becoming operational, including quality assurance, resourcing and staffing. We note these issues below.

65. ***Quality assurance and certification.*** Issues of accreditation and quality assurance in LLL are not prominent in the countries studied and different ways of dealing with them could be found in the national reports. LLL provision is seen as not possessing the depth, length, and rigour of regular university studies and therefore poses a threat to the status and quality of traditional programmes (Greece). Elsewhere, no systematic mechanisms are in place. The fact that LLL is offered by universities and taught by professors or other academic staff with appropriate expertise is deemed to be sufficient guarantee of quality (Germany, Greece, Spain).

66. Normal accreditation and quality assurance for undergraduate courses are applied to LLL (UK, Sweden, Norway, France); longer LLL courses, particularly those leading to degrees, are subject to requirements for undergraduate education. Shorter types of LLL may provide a certificate of attendance or successful completion.

67. In most of the seven countries, there are plans to improve the diversity in assessment and certification and lack of quality assurance mechanisms, but not much action. The exception is in open or distance universities. They have designed procedures for quality assurance, assessment of learners' progress and course evaluation related to more flexible modes of delivery and dependence on autonomous learning .

68. Computerised assessment and evaluation of learners' progress may lead to greater standardisation threatening the benefits of individual progress from flexible modes of delivery. Customised delivery could conflict with standardised assessment and certification.

69. Employment related LLL co-operating with industry requires flexibility towards short term demands and quality mechanisms. In England, national subject reviews and quality assurance are discipline based and seen by some as too restrictive for LLL provisions designed to be trans- or inter-disciplinary. In France, it is an accepted practice that experts and tutors from outside the university become more involved in learners' assessment when project work and outcomes of practical phases have to be evaluated.

Financial aspects

70. The project did not provide for cost analyses but indications emerged from the studies. National systems do not generally fund LLL specifically and, except for Open Universities, where the whole enterprise is a form of LLL, universities make little specific provision for it.

71. Costing was available from the UK's Open University. Originally it was assumed that its costs were between half and two-thirds of producing traditional degrees. But in 1998, OU costs reached slightly above the sector average per student.

72. More traditional universities offering LLL incur additional costs not always recovered from fees, although courses in some areas may produce revenue. Distance Learning can be economically viable, though courses must reach orders of size unthinkable to most universities,

in order to be pay for themselves. For example, an Open University foundation general science course costs at least £5 million to produce and must run for the best part of ten years. Part time Masters courses, for which universities charge what the market will bear, may also be viable.

73. Some of the costs of offering LLL in a traditional university might include: additional library costs for servicing part-time and DL students; administrative costs for multiple registrations and keeping track of students, more complex assessment procedures; advertising costs; refectory and caretaking costs of extended hours.

74. LLL students may need special classes or curricula written for them. Universities may not sanction extra payments for the extra work. A recurrent complaint, too, is that academics secure rewards for research rather than teaching. A different problem arises when 'commissioned' courses attract revenues and staff set up virtually private enterprises – a situation which some governments are seeking to regulate.. Some UK universities allow departments to establish entrepreneurial centres. Staff may be on fixed term contracts paid from their centre's earnings. Centres are expected to make a financial return to parent departments and faculties. In Germany, Norway and Sweden, the status of such centres is being considered.

75. Most countries make no explicit provision for LLL student support although relief may come from unemployment benefit, or fee remission, or loan schemes for part-time students. Some universities give concessions for short course fees. Some courses are sold at prices close to their costs but these prices can be high, especially in technology courses. Where returning adults can secure grants the procedures can be time-consuming. The emergence of fee-paying LLL may breach the sacrosanct principle of tuition-free higher education where that still exists.

76. In Sweden, a condition for allowances is that the study is state administered, supported or supervised and at least half time. People over the age of 45 can be awarded allowances only for special reasons. The right to allowances is linked to performance. About 19 per cent of all students have full time work. About one third of all students work part time.

Staffing needs of LLL

77. LLL needs faculty able to deliver a curriculum and relationship appropriate to students' needs. Two of the principal UK distance learning universities apply specific selection criteria

78. Statutory definitions of conditions of service, expressed in teaching hours, and the reliance on research achievements to govern career progression, may be obstacles to using professors' time. Employing outside professionals to teach LLL has mobilized up-to-date expertise, but also prevented LLL from becoming part of mainstream university activity.

Conclusions and policy implications

79. The concept of LLL is in itself loaded with ambiguity yet there is awareness almost everywhere of the importance of providing appropriate education beyond the years of formal higher education and for wider social, ethnic and age groups. But there are gaps between policy intention and delivery. In almost all countries, LLL has relatively low status. Institutional and academic survival depend on research outcomes and the capacity to attract school leavers to full time courses. Resources are rarely dedicated to it by national authorities. Yet it moves forward.

80. Our conclusions for policy are directed to national authorities; institutions and departments, individual academics, employers and the wider community. They are as follows:

81. *At the national level:*

(1) LLL policies are multi-dimensional and objectives, economic, social, political and individual, are not necessarily reconcilable. These multiplicities should be recognised so that priorities costs and benefits can be assessed by those active in it. The analysis might focus on: how far LLL can provide a value framework for the universities' policies; ways of reconciling the aspects likely to need strongest political and economic support; the connections between LLL and other policies, past and present.

(2) There is no single LLL package. Planning for it must therefore allow for flexibility and not be inhibited by existing regulations which countries should review and review whether their system provides adequate incentives and guidance enabling further advancement of LLL.

(3) Central authorities should clarify LLL policies and the funding to be allocated to them; establish minimum criteria and training needs for a commonly recognised accreditation system; establish criteria for admissions to LLL courses; identify trends and LLL interests in the socio-economic environment; establish regulations directed at guaranteeing quality; clarify legislation on the time dedicated to LLL teaching.

(4) Review of entry requirements and assessment procedures to fit the educational characteristics of different groups of students seems a necessity in some countries,

(5) Countries should define LLL functions of HE as against further education. There is uncertainty how far universities should be using specialist resources in providing for training

(6) Curriculum content remains the terrain of academics, but policy-makers should provide teachers with training facilities for new thinking about the curriculum. Discussion about its nature and modes of transmission should form a part of the work of Institutes of Learning and Teaching where they exist. The use of IT and distance learning is well acknowledged in all systems. Their costs and educational benefits need full evaluation in the LLL context.

82. *At the institutional level*, there is little evidence of change in the hierarchy of academic rewards that might advance LLL. Institutions should be encouraged to develop comprehensive strategies linking practical actions to a more holistic analysis of aims and policies. They should:

(1) define LLL policies within mission statements and University Plans. Set up policies or structures to identify needs and to anticipate the demands for LLL;

(2) create adequate university roles and structures (eg vice-rector and inter-faculty committees) to ensure that the university's LLL mission is actualised;

(3) identify faculty skills when making LLL appointments; review academic profiles. Analysis would feed into recruitment, pay, promotion, staff development and appraisal policies and the rewards systems.

(4) with top sliced money support LLL and distance learning; adapt the range of courses to suit the needs of external users of the university; win company-training contracts;

(5) establish control mechanisms and indicators for minimum standards of quality;

(6) utilise resources by interdepartmental collaboration; identify facilities required for LLL provision eg library loans, cafeteria and other opening times on campus;

(7) install technology to overcome barriers to distance learning.

83. ***At the departmental level:***

(1) departments and individual academics must remain the primary custodians of standards and academic values whilst promoting the updating of knowledge, a practical approach and the capacity for LLL, developing different concepts of curriculum, negotiated with or customised for different types of students;

(2) consider how far the materials or methods developed for LLL can contribute to conventional programmes, and how far aspects of main line courses can enhance LLL;

(3) work through patterns of relationships with types of students different from the traditional full-time school leaver or post-graduate students;

(4) adopt a more calculative approach to work burdens so that a balance is struck on the time allocated to standard teaching, research, general administration and LLL.

84. ***Faculty training*** for LLL should be concerned with:

(1) infusing traditional courses with attitudes and forms of learning that enhance self consciousness of learning capacities, self-dependency, working flexibility and 'transferable skills'. It would involve recognition and exploitation of experiential learning;

(2) encouraging students to identify learning needs, particularly in the context of career development, and linking learning with personal employment development..

85. ***Resources:*** LLL requires resources additional to those allowed institutions and their component units. Fee income is unlikely to solve funding problems. Specific proposals are:

(1) central government should clarify its expectations of institutional in LLL, and fund them accordingly. It should clarify who is to pay for LLL: the state, or employers or students. Current allocation systems do not give institutions incentives for offering part-time courses and IT-based distance-education;

(2) institutions should optimise their fee incomes from LLL, but so as not to disturb the balance between the different LLL objectives.

(3). Review of student funding arrangements is necessary. Many part-time students are unable to receive grants or loans. Where it is in force, the principle that studies should be free of charge and all students treated equally prevents institutions from offering different types of educational to different categories of students.

85. Several issues affecting *staffing arrangements and incentives* arise from LLL:

(1) remuneration for extra LLL duties should be worked out within comprehensive agreements about total duties;

(2) arrangements for rewarding work with external commissioning bodies should be regularised so that there are no losers, including the university and its regular students. Negotiations should be conducted with companies, so that they allocate funds to support training places through an approved university-business institution.

86. **Power structures:** Systems and their universities start from different points. The relationship between the state and universities differs widely. The extent of change is determined as much by existing political and administrative structures as by LLL itself. Many of the shifts recorded in the project are evidence of increased permeability and susceptibility to external influences rather than a shift in power.

87. Responsiveness to EU policies depends on how far national systems have a linear managerial relationship with universities. A system that rules by decree or legal requirements is more likely to empathise with, and to be responsive to, supranational nudges from the EU.

88. In some universities visible structures for LLL have been created in the form of central coordinating offices and vice-rector roles which may include LLL among their responsibilities. There is recognition of the need for more explicit organisational arrangements for LLL.

89. In some systems, there are shifts in teacher-student relationships, although that may be more in intention than in actual practice. The impacts on students of LLL is a key area for investigation which would have taken us well beyond our remit and resources.

90. LLL does not appear to have brought about large shifts in power although it may have led to some growth of internal structures. How far LLL will cause further power displacements is uncertain and may depend whether academics may be prepared to negotiate relationships with clients in which academic values may be sustained whilst meeting new needs.

91. **Relationships with economic institutions:** Almost all universities respond to external demands for services, either from social principle, or from the need to sell services in order to survive. Such relationships affect research and teaching agendas. In some countries economic organisations are strongly represented in national consultative bodies. The external groups do not dominate universities but resources and support are given in return for specialist services.

92. **Relevance to Europe as a whole:** The results of our research relevant across Europe are:

(1) LLL requires thought and action at several levels which can only be effected by working from the different starting points from which universities and countries move. Success in LLL policies is not clearly related to any one pattern of national policy implementation.

(2) There are some surprising changes evident in some unlikely places. A trans-national study such as this can encourage those attempting to cause change through transmission of examples of change taking place elsewhere.

Further research

93.. A continuing research effort on LLL is necessary. Areas for further work are:

- a. ***Definitions and characteristics:*** Characteristics of national systems that affect the ability to sponsor LLL; the legal and regulative frameworks of LLL; assessment of the extent to which particular definitions of LLL are dominant in practice.
- b. ***Institutional and departmental policies and academic responses to LLL.***
- c. ***The curriculum.*** Monitoring of LLL curriculum content and how far it involves experiential learning and is adaptive to previous experience, knowledge and needs of LLL students. How far changes in teaching and learning are affected by changes in the nature of knowledge.
- d. ***Shifts in teacher-student relationships*** and the impacts on students of LLL.
- e. ***patterns of participation*** in lifetime (post-23) learning and how these relate to careers.
- f. ***Access.*** Monitoring of changing patterns of recruitment and access to HE as a result of LLL.
- g. ***Academic criteria, quality procedures, accreditation and certification, quality assurance.*** How far quality criteria are affected by enhancements in LLL.
- h ***The relationships between LLL and employment: partnerships***
- i. ***Resources, budgets, costs, student support.*** A sophisticated analysis of costs and outcomes of LLL would be requisite.

Section Two: Background and objectives of the project.

2.1. Rationale and General Objective

In recent years, LLL has become a fundamental goal of education policies, both at a national and international level. It is often advocated as a panacea for socio-economic development and as a tool to promote the 'information' and 'knowledge' society. But going beyond policy statements is not easy, as the concept is somewhat elusive and resists stable operational definition. Certainly, the applied forms of LLL cannot be but multiple and multifaceted. So if LLL is not to remain a mere slogan submitted to the vagaries of political discourse, education policy analysts and academics face the challenge of making the concept 'operational', i.e. identifying its key dimensions and 'translating' it into concrete initiatives and reform proposals. This is particularly difficult and challenging for the universities which, must both retain their conventional status as knowledge producing institutions and provide and disseminate knowledge in and for contemporary society.

We did, thus, realise that although there is a great deal of interest and literature in the topic of lifelong learning there is hardly any detailed empirical research especially concerning the involvement of the universities in LLL provision. The question therefore arose: what are the implications of the increasing demand and expansion of lifelong learning for the universities? In this context, the general aim of this project is: to investigate how the universities in the EU respond to the concept of and the demand for LLL and to analyse the structural and functional implications which the application of the concept is bound to have for the universities in the «information society». The study also aims to examine strategies and policies of the universities relevant to LLL provision and in that context raise more general issues concerning higher education reform and the reformulation of higher education policies at a European level. As we put it in our research proposal, submitted to the European Commission for financial assistance for this project, «We need, thus, to know the degree and nature of the actual and potential involvement of the university in these areas at various levels and aspects of its teaching. We need to know how traditional continuing and adult education teaching and structures are being transformed within the universities. We also need to know the actual policies as well as the 'thinking' of the university regarding these areas. Furthermore we need to analyse the structures of the university in the context of its involvement in these areas.» (p.6)

These questions are examined within a framework applying conceptual and empirical methods and involve six EU countries (France, Germany, Greece, Spain, Sweden, UK) and

Norway. The basic empirical data are drawn from a sample of 28 universities, four from each country (appendix 1).

The project has been co-ordinated by the Centre for Social Morphology and Social Policy (KEKMOKOP) of the department of Social Policy and Social Anthropology of Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences in Athens.

2.2 Specific research objectives

The specific objectives of the project were formulated as follows:

- a) To provide a review of literature and assess the state of the art of LLL in the universities in the countries involved in the study.
- b) To examine in brief the historical evolution of LLL in the universities in the countries involved in the study.
- c) To examine the legal and regulative framework of LLL provision in the universities in the countries involved in the study.
- d) To identify, and analyse the extent and nature of the actual involvement in LLL provision of the universities included in the study, that means to look at programmes and structures that are offered beyond the undergraduate years as they relate to LLL and to traditional settings of continuing and adult education.
- e) To investigate and discuss actual policies and strategies of the universities concerning LLL, as they arise out of the research, and compare and analyse such policies with corresponding national and international ones. More specifically, such policies and missions are to be analysed in the context of policies and missions on LLL emanating from the EU and international organisations such as the OECD, UNESCO and the Council of Europe.
- f) To identify and examine changes in the domain of knowledge which concern the way in which LLL involves some movements and shifts from traditional discipline based knowledge to domains which start with problems to be solved but then recruit disciplines in order to tackle them. In this context we shall identify tendencies of LLL programmes to concentrate in one or other of the clusters of knowledge namely the natural sciences, engineering, the social sciences, the humanities
- g) To identify and examine curricula and forms of LLL which involve new concepts of learning, new modes of access, delivery, quality assessment and control as well as new procedures of certification and accreditation. The transition to LLL implies substantive changes in certification and is riddled with problems of recognition, accreditation and quality

assurance. Recognition and certification of acquired knowledge and experience are a major problem in adult learning and it is hypothesised to be even more complex in LLL which presupposes the assessment, recognition and certification of previously acquired knowledge and competencies. Up to now conventional certification methods have prevailed in higher education. The universities now, in order to participate, let alone lead in the field of LLL, need to devise radically different forms of assessment and certification from those applied in traditional disciplines. Even more complex is the problem of quality assurance. There are various types of standards of assessment and quality assurance applied to different forms of higher education. Such standards concern selection, content, performance and outcome in various programmes. How are standards guaranteed in LLL provision in the universities?

- h) To examine describe and discuss the implications which LLL practices and programmes are having, or are anticipated to have, on traditional power and organisational structures within the universities. If academic departments are expected to change their terms of reference and their range of tasks to participate in LLL provision, there will obviously be transfers of power from basic units to institutionally led groups dealing with such provision. There will also be some transfer of power from teachers to learners. With the introduction of LLL new institutional entities are being formed, sometimes under a pro-rector, and such entities may create tensions and shifts of power within traditional units. We shall examine actual and potential tensions in this area and explore their organisational significance within the universities. Within that framework we shall examine certain operational issues. An important one is whether it is academic departments, or especially created centres that will take the lead. If it is LLL centres (which many institutions already have) the definition of their tasks in relation to academic departments must be carefully undertaken. Whilst it can be assumed that they will work with departments in taking stock of how far existing teaching sequences and contents are usable in LLL, and what modifications are necessary, they will help academic departments to assess the leads of various client groups. They will work together to create the appropriate curriculum models and modes of outreach.
- i) To identify and discuss new partnerships between the universities and external agencies as a result of LLL provision and the way such partnerships may involve the universities in new market relations. The programmes which relate more immediately to LLL at university level are various taught M.A. courses, diplomas and certificates and other short educational and training courses, most of them connected with adult and continuing education. They are more vocationally oriented than most conventional undergraduate studies and thus relate in some immediate sense to the labour market. A basic characteristic of LLL programmes is

that they are demand-led and may be commissioned by employers of the private or the public sector but they may also be demand-led in the wider sense of the needs of recurrent and continuing education of the individual and the various professions. In any case such programmes involve the universities in a new framework of market relations compared to conventional programmes.

- j) To raise and discuss briefly the issue of funding of LLL programmes and the wider economic implications of LLL provision for the universities.

These have been the specific objectives formulated by the partners originally and set out in our work programme. We found no reason during the research to change or to modify those objectives seriously. The findings of the research, however, necessitated that certain objectives have been met and discussed more substantially than others. The results have been discussed and analysed in the seven **national reports**, the reports on **the national reviews of literature** and the three thematic reports namely: **Lifelong Learning: University Policies and international Policies; Lifelong Learning and Power Relations and Structures; The Implications of Lifelong Learning for Conceptions of Knowledge and its Organisation in the Universities**. In this report we summarise the project according to the guidelines set by the European Commission.

SECTION THREE

3. Scientific description of the project results and methodology.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

3.1.1. Lifelong learning: The meaning and definition of the concept

3.1.1.1 The conceptual context

Lifelong learning, the key concept of this research project, is riddled with ambiguity both in its conceptual and operational dimensions. The idea of learning throughout life can be traced back to Solon and to Greek classical philosophy but the concept of LLL, as it is used today, does not carry the philosophical weight which it did especially in the writings of Plato. It was a basic premise of Socrates that learning should be a continuous lifelong process and that inquisitiveness (aporia) constitutes the basis of knowledge and self development. However, a basic conceptual characteristic of the contemporary usage and meaning of the term is that it retains the classical element as a capacity of 'learning to learn'. Indeed, the essential feature of the concept of LLL is that it entails a shift from education to learning and it is for this reason that lifelong learning rather than lifelong education conveys the core meaning of the concept. So compared to the conventional meaning of education, LLL places emphasis on the learner rather than the teacher, demand rather than supply, and this has substantial implications for all forms of higher education provision and university education in particular.

LLL is an evolving, even evolutionary concept which is immediately linked to social change and education policy and to educational philosophy and practice. Aspects of its contemporary meaning can be traced back to Dewey and other pragmatist philosophers early in the 20th century (Jarvis, 1995) and must be distinguished from both traditional formal education and from conventional adult education in so far as such education corresponds to stages of life.

Conventionally, university education **has not been for everybody**. In principle, and to a large extent in practice, university education has been elitist. Certainly only persons with specific qualifications and certain intellectual ability, which in often meant persons of certain social class and status, needed apply for such education. Also university education in its traditional form has been strictly characterised by disciplines. LLL provision, by contrast, entails a radically different educational philosophy and practice. LLL within the «learning» and the «information» society is potentially **for everybody**. Indeed, the cohesion of the «knowledge» society demands that as large sectors of the population as possible are

knowledgeable by being involved in lifelong education. So the OECD Education Committee at Ministerial level met in Paris in January 1996 with the specific aim to discuss «broad strategies for making lifelong learning **a reality for all**» (OECD, 1996:13).

According to an International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first century, «LEARNING: THE TREASURE WITHIN» must encompass four pillars, namely: **learning to know; learning to do; learning to live together; learning to be** (UNESCO, 1996a: 85-110). This rich and complex meaning of LLL «is still open to selective interpretation» (OECD, 1996:89) but in general terms it stresses a process of conscious learning from childhood to active retirement with emphasis on creativity, responsiveness, initiative and ability to handle and synthesise knowledge on the part of the individual.

The extensive literature on the subject (Smith, 1994; Sutton 1994; Titmus, 1994; Tuijman, 1994; UNESCO, 1996; Tuijman & Schuller 1999; Jarvis, 1995; 1999) emphasises various strands in the meaning of the concept and according to Tuijman (1999) the ambiguity of meanings gives the term a touch of «anarchy». Others, (Wain, 1993; Watson and Taylor, 1998) point to the profound institutional problems which LLL poses for university education. Indeed, LLL now presents a serious challenge for the universities (Teichler, 1999).

According to OECD (1996:89), the characteristics of the concept could be summed up as follows: a) a strong emphasis on the intrinsic as opposed to instrumental value of education and learning; b) universal access to learning opportunities regardless of age, sex, or employment status; c) recognition of learning in diverse settings and not only in educational institutions; d) great diversity of methods of teaching and learning unlike conventional education; e) promotion in learners of personal characteristics useful and or required for subsequent learning including motivation to engage in self managed independent learning; g) LLL «as a critique of, and alternative to, conventional ‘front end’ educational philosophies.»

3.1.1.2 Definition and its operational problems

From the literature examined and from our research it transpired that there is and cannot be a single universally agreed definition of LLL which encompasses both its conceptual and operational dimensions. At the operational level the content and morphology of LLL vary according to the structure and the historical development of higher education systems in each country. Even within the same country the meaning and content of the term may have shifted overtime and different terms have been used for the operationalisation of almost the same kind of phenomena (e.g. continuing education, recurrent education, adult education, permanent education, lifelong learning).

It must be stressed also that LLL has been used as a master concept in order to explore the various theoretical and policy implications posed by non traditional education in the context of, what has been called variously, ‘the learning’, ‘the information’, or ‘the knowledge society’. Much of the literature in this sense has been exploring LLL as a *policy concept* (Cropley, 1980; Lawson, 1982; Knapper and Cropley, 1991; Longforth and Davis, 1996; Tight, 1998; Tuijman, 1999; Hasan, 1999). The problems of operationalising LLL, thus, are understood as problems of policy which, in our case, involve universities and governments. LLL thus involves key issues of change in educational policy in educational systems and institutional practice. The universities are called to provide education in new areas which involve new modes of teaching and learning and new principles for selecting and structuring knowledge (towards inter-disciplinary and problem -based learning). All that of course requires new institutional missions, strategies and policies.

Within this framework some authors have seen LLL as involving certain value orientations with significant ideological and political overtones. LLL at university level is not just a second chance for those who missed the opportunity for formal higher education; it is a process of learning involving individual development in various perspectives for ever widening circles of population. In this context, Knapper and Cropley (1991) discuss LLL as a reaction against and a rejection of traditional restrictive forms of education. Others, (Bagnall, 1990; Pasmazoglou, 1996; Barnett, 1998; Tight, 1998a) view LLL as an illiberal concept and analyse it in a broad sense as instrument of social control which serves the needs of the free market. Griffin (1999, 1999a), in particular argues that in policy terms a shift from education to learning involves a shift from a progressive social democrat approach to a neo-liberal welfare approach. This means that the state loses much of its traditional control of education and the universities as public institutions become increasingly involved in market-oriented operations.

3.1.2 Theoretical and methodological framework.

3.1.2.1 Theoretical approach

The study of LLL within the context of higher education and the university specifically poses profound theoretical and philosophical questions which have to do with the nature and function of education and the role of the university in contemporary society. Doubtless the traditional role of the university as producer, provider and disseminator of knowledge remains.

But a major problem arises in defining and dispensing its role in 'the knowledge society'. What is at stake is the degree of its involvement in new conceptions of education in a society in which learning involves potentially all its citizens. **Lifelong learning for all** is thus understood not as an option but as a basic social need. In this sense the core element in the study of LLL is **change**: change in educational policy, change in the educational system and change in educational practice in the context of wider socio-economic change

Recent research and academic literature on higher education reforms at an international European level (Kogan and Hanney, 2000; Kogan et al, 2000; Henkel, 2000; Bauer et al., 1999; Teichler, 1998; Etzioni-Halevy, 1985; Neave and van Vught, 1991; Jordan and Schubert, 1992) have applied successfully a blend of elite theories, organisational and policy community theories, in conjunction with theories of reflexive interaction between individual agents and structures (Archer, 1981; Becher and Kogan, 1992; Clark(ed.), 1993; Clark, 1983; Geertz, 1983). For our research, which is basically about higher education policy and social change, such blend of theories critically and selectively applied to our data seems especially appropriate. In addition our research was placed in the wider theoretical framework which arises from what is now massive literature on post industrial and knowledge society (Giddens, 1984; 1990; 1991; 1995; Kumar, 1995; Drucker, 1993; Oosterbeeek, 1995; Masuda, 1981; Bell, 1973).

Educational reform and educational policy change concern a tripartite structure involving: the state and its apparatuses, ministries of education in particular; providing institutions, in our case the universities; and users or clients, in our case students or learners or companies and other agencies. At a higher, non directly executive level, higher education reform also involves international actors (EU, OECD, UNSECO, etc.). There are various theoretical models concerning the interplay between the structures and the actors involved. Models differ according to the intensity of interaction.

In our project, in any case, we were not driven by any high theoretical ambitions. Instead, as stated in our objectives, we wish to understand the structural and functional implication of LLL provision for the universities. We focus therefore on the links between policies and the institutional providers in this case the universities. We could not possibly take on board, although we touch upon them, the wider and all important theoretical problems involved in the interaction between international organisations, states, institutional providers and users (learners) in the context of LLL provision. Theoretical advances in this area could be forthcoming from a large and long term research project examining the parameters of educational reform and educational policies in the context of the complex relationship of all the actors involved in the framework of the wider socio-economic change.

3.1.2.2 Methodology

Education reform in all countries takes place at two basic levels: that of the system and that of practice. This has been already well documented in studies concerning the Scandinavian countries and Britain (Lundgren, 1997; Bauer et al., 1999; Kogan et al., 2000; Kogan and Hanney, 2000). But this is also true for the rest of the countries in Europe (Teichler, 1998; Neave and van Vught, 1991). It is also true of the EU countries concerning this project as the preliminary results, published in the *European Journal of Education*, (vol. 35, no 3, Sept. 2000), make clear.

This being a qualitative rather than a quantitative study, in the sense that we did not aim to arrive at statistical co-relations through numerical data, our basic methodological problem was how to assess the interplay between policy and practice and their implications at the structural level concerning frameworks of knowledge and its delivery. In this sense our national case studies were designed and carried out as implementation studies. This meant that our first methodological problem was to determine our terms of reference and to define our master concept. Given the ambiguity in the meaning of the concept of LLL discussed earlier and its multifaceted operational morphology and the differences in the higher education systems in the countries involved in this study, the consortium, after long and intense discussion, adopted the following generic operational definition:

Those novel[did we not omit the word ‘novel’ ? They are not novel everywhere] forms of teaching and learning that equip students (learners, individuals) to encounter with competence and confidence the full range of working, learning and life experiences.

Another important methodological problem was to identify the actual policies which have prompted the implementation of LLL and explore their consequences for the universities in each country. This, above everything, meant to discover the origin of policies and their interplay. It was hypothesised that such policies could emanate from: international actors (EU, OECD, UNESCO, Council of Europe); from states and state apparatuses; and from providing institutions, in this case the universities. In the latter case policies could emanate from the institutional leadership in general (rectors, senates), from special units such as continuing education centres, or from basic academic units such as departments. Depending on the point of departure and their dominant effect such policies could be in harmony or in conflict. Thus, top down international policies could conflict and/or be in tension with national ones and both could conflict and be in tension with bottom up institutional policies. Methodologically,

therefore, the exploration of policies and their interplay at the levels just stated, formed a central objective of the research.

We hypothesised that to the extent that such policies would aim at higher education reform they would be linked at state level with particular legislation. At the level of implementation such legislation would imply a regulative framework for the institutions. Such regulative framework, however, would have substantive implications at various crucial operational levels. Methodologically it was important to discover the extent to which such legislation for the implementation of LLL provision in the universities was in accord with existing conditions in the institutions. It was important therefore, to find out the actual volume and the structure of LLL provision already in operation in the universities studied in our sample. Parallel to this our methodology would discover structural obstacles concerning implementation of missions of LLL as well as attitudes of the academic and administrative staff in implementing relevant legislation. There is also a comparative dimension involved. As LLL policies and provision and concomitant legislation have been introduced at different points in each European country and as policies concerning such provision have different origins and different educational context of operation it would be important to discover how far common LLL policies in an EU wide educational area would be possible. In addition it could be discovered how far the legal nexuses between the state and institutions constitutes obstacles for the implementation of common LLL policies across the EU countries.

We also hypothesised that missions and policies of implementation of LLL provision at university level, whatever their origin, would affect conventional conceptions of knowledge and the modes of its transmission. For the researcher, LLL presents special problems not just in defining it but also in finding it. The existing and potential operationalisation of LLL at university level implies a variable morphology which would be out of the reach of our project and difficult, in any case, to encompass within a single conceptual and empirical framework of a single project. Given that elements of LLL could exist within both traditional undergraduate programmes as well as within various new forms of higher education provision, we had to identify the types of curricula and their modes of transmission which we would explore within the institutions which we selected for the research. This could be discovered only by applying special criteria to specific actual curricula which corresponded to LLL as we defined it.

Following our definition of LLL we adopted four operational criteria which set the framework for the fieldwork, as well as the literature to be examined. These criteria are:

- new conceptions of curriculum content
- new modes of delivery
- new access policies and
- quality assurance procedures.

These operational criteria correspond to four conceptual parameters of our definition, which also served as a guide to empirical investigation, and which are:

- universalism - wider categories of students
- lifetime learning
- focal point, the individual learner-not the individual provider
- shift in balance from learning substance to learning process.

Not all criteria may apply to all forms of LLL provision but for our methodological purposes finding to what extent some or all of these criteria are operational is in itself a very significant finding.

To establish the degree of change at the level of knowledge as a result of LLL provision according to the above criteria necessitated analysis of conceptions of curricula, shifts of emphasis from teaching to learning, specific access policies, modes of delivery and quality assurance and accreditation/certification procedures. This was achieved by in depth interviewing of the respondents as well as by document and content analysis of the LLL programmes on offer.

A further methodological problem was to elicit enough information to establish how far LLL provision, actually or potentially, implied significant changes in power structures and power relations as well as changes in the organisation of university education at large. Such information was elicited again by in depth interviewing of key actors and also by the analysis of programmes and literature.

In all facets and levels of the research, of course, the methodology involved a comparative analysis. So LLL provision, according to our definition and criteria of its identification, involved comparison between such provision and conventional programmes. At the level of the national case studies the comparative structure was introduced automatically by the common methodological framework outlined above. At a European level the comparative perspective was worked out by synthesising and comparing the national findings in the thematic reports. Finally, the European comparative dimension is highlighted throughout this final report.

3.1.2.3 *The research design and its timetable*

A general outline of the design of our project and its timetable has been provided in our research proposal and the Work Programme for our contract. Here we present a concise picture showing how the research design has been structured and carried out.

The study was designed to be carried out in four phases involving seven work packages from first November 1998 to thirty-first October 2000. Phase A included the production of a review of literature and the collection of the various forms of empirical data at national level, phase B included the analysis of national data and the writing of national reports, phase C involved the synthesis of the findings of national reports into three thematic reports, and phase D involved the writing up of the final report synthesising the process and the findings of the research. Although started a little later than planned the consortium kept to this timetable and overall design. For various reasons, however, there was about two months delay in writing up of the national and the thematic reports and consequently a corresponding delay in the completion of the final report.

Table of phases and work packages of the project

Phase	WP	Content	Month
A	1	Collection of data for review of literature and writing up of report.	1-6
	2	Collection and classification and analysis of various types of data of national case studies.	1-12
B	3	Systematisation of data and writing of national reports.	12-18
C	4,5,6	Synthesis of national reports and the writing of the three thematic reports.	18-21
D	7	Synthesis of national and thematic reports and writing of final report.	21-24

The empirical material collected and/or used for each national case study included: government reports and documents; legislation and various pamphlets concerning education and LLL; documents profiling the universities and the departments investigated; data concerning specific LLL programmes in each department and each centre of continuing education; reports and other literature by the EU, OECD, UNESCO concerning developments in higher education and LLL specifically; academic literature in the form of books and articles; press reports; and data collected by in depth interviews on key actors.

As primary units of investigation we adopted institutions and within institutions academic faculties or departments and centres of continuing education. The choice of programmes was

guided by the methodological criteria mentioned above. All units were selected on the principle of balance between the social sciences, the natural sciences, engineering and the humanities. For the choice of institutions apart from the principle of balance between disciplines other factors including size and geographical area were also considered. The open university or its equivalent in each case study was chosen as a guide and as an institution which provides lifelong learning *par excellence*.

Applying the general principles just stated four universities were selected from each country included in the project making thus a sample of 28 universities. For a list of these institutions (see Annex 1). The rector or the leading administrative officer in each university was approached and permission was obtained for their institution to be included in the research. In all cases permission was granted.

Following the choice of institutions between 10-12 key actors were approached in each institution for an interview. The lists included: rectors or vice-rectors; key administrators, especially those responsible for continuing education and studies related to LLL; heads of departments and other academic teaching staff. Most persons accepted to be interviewed and those unable were replaced with others. Each interview lasted between 60-90 minutes. There were between 40-45 interviews for each case study amounting to around 300 interviews in total. For all the interviews a set semi-structured interview schedule was used (see Annex 2) which could be adapted slightly according to each case study.

The first work package in phase A involved the review of literature in each country. Seven national reports were produced which were bound together with a long introduction by the coordinator and were submitted to the European Commission, DG Research in June 1999. This report contained significant preliminary findings of the research which now have been published in an issue of the *European Journal of Education* vol.35, no 3, Sept. 2000.

The second work package involved the collection and classification of data which constitute the empirical basis for the overall objectives of the research. The collection of the data was completed by month 12, the end of phase A of the project and was classified according to the basic methodological categories and the specific objectives of the research. Work package three involved the analysis and systematisation of data and the production of national reports based on the case studies. Reports at this stage were produced in draft form. This work package constituted phase B of the project.

Phase C included three work packages. At the beginning of this phase partners exchanged the national reports each partner receiving all reports. On the basis of national reports the three thematic reports were written by teams of partners: one report presenting and discussing

international LLL policies and their implications for the universities, one report discussing changes in organisation and power structures and one report discussing changes in knowledge. Thematic reports in draft form were exchanged amongst all partners.

Phase D constituted the writing up of the final report which synthesises the data and the findings of the research presented in detail in the national and the thematic reports. The design of the final report was discussed by all partners at their last meeting and was written by the coordinator and one other partner.

The interaction between the partners took place with e-mail, fax, telephone and conventional post throughout the period of the research. What, however, proved invaluable were the four meetings/workshops which were strategically placed in month 1, 7, 13, and 23 of the project. During those meetings partners not only discussed in detail the methodology, the progress and the findings of the research but they also became aware of the deeper value of interdisciplinary co-operation and the comparative analysis of data and scientific concepts. An additional advantage was the establishment of a really international consortium for further research and the establishment of lifelong friendships.

3.1.2.4 Generalisability

Given the limited number of institutions selected from each country for study and the small number of actors interviewed from each institution the question of the scientific validity of the findings and the problem of generalisation of conclusions based on the data has been a serious concern of the consortium throughout the research.

We know that the question of arriving at conclusions from data and linking data to generalisability is an important [scientific] methodological problem in itself regardless of accepted rules and methods of establishing what is called statistical significance. At the quantitative level, therefore, all national and all thematic reports disclaim any statistical significance as the numbers used would not warrant it. For this reason there are very few statistical or numerical tables in the national and thematic reports and hardly any in this final synthesis report. In this sense all reports advise caution of generalisability and of drawing firm conclusions based on limited numbers.

However, we did take particular care to establish that the findings and the conclusions of our project carry as wide validity and significance as possible. We hope that this has been achieved by the conceptual and qualitative analysis of our data. The way we have conceptualised the issues, the procedures of the research and the parameters of the concept of LLL itself at an empirical operational level establish a degree of validity and relevance for all universities in the

countries included in the study and to a certain extent for the rest of the universities in the EU. Given that we could not work with a full population sample of institutions, we aimed for Yin's (1984) concept of 'analytic' generalisability which meant that we deferred to findings, themes and concepts that we knew, from the literature and other projects, to be applicable to the areas under study. In the first instance therefore we claim that generalisability is embedded in our methodology and the conceptual framework outlined above. Over and above this general framework there are certain specific dimensions of the research where generalisability is forthcoming.

- a) All national studies have discussed literature both in the form of books and articles as well as government reports, policy documents, pamphlets etc., concerning the state of the art in the respective countries. Literature concerning LLL at a more general international level has been discussed in the thematic reports and in this final report. Our data can thus be linked with knowledge derived from other projects.
- b) All national case studies have been carried out at the interplay of two levels: that of the national system which encompasses the higher education system in each country, and that of structures and practice of given institutions. What establishes generalisability in this context are the national policies, legislation etc., concerning LLL which encompass all universities. The analysis at the system level, therefore, was based on data concerning all universities in each country. On the institutional level although there is discrepancy between institutions, in most cases the issues and the problems faced are the same although the responses differ from one institution to the other. In the choice of institutions, in any case, great care was taken to represent regions geographically and balance between disciplines.
- c) Institutional policies, strategies and missions were analysed in all case studies in the context of international (EU, OECD, etc.), and national policies. Indeed, the report **on policies** as well as the reports on **changes in knowledge** and **power structures and organisation** analyse the topic of LLL in a European context.
- d) Another level which introduces general validity to the findings is that of **comparability**. Throughout the study and especially in the thematic reports and above all in this final report the comparative dimension is central to the analysis of data and the findings.
- e) Although LLL provision varies from institution to institution and from country to country what is common in all cases is that LLL represents a shift from teaching to learning. It is demand-led and arises out of wider socio-economic change in the information and knowledge society. There is a shift of emphasis from institutions to learners. What,

therefore, establishes generalisability from the institutions examined to all universities in each country and beyond is that the shift from teaching to learning constitutes a core dimension of the research and is treated as such. The central objective of the study has been to examine the implications of that shift for the universities and the pursuit of that objective underpins the analysis of all national reports and concerns all institutions and the system at large.

- f) At another level LLL is examined in conjunction with higher education reform in the context of socio-economic change at a national and European level. All reports relate LLL with changes in the system and higher education reform. It is shown by all case studies that the current usage of the concept of LLL is differentiated from erstwhile concepts of adult education, recurrent education etc., by the fact that its linked to the demands of the information and knowledge society. In this context, all reports link the concept and practice of LLL with what now has come to be called the ‘third obligation’ of higher education institutions namely to respond to and serve the needs of contemporary society.
- g) For the smaller countries Greece and Norway generalisability can be claimed even at a numerical level. In Norway there are four universities and all of them have been included in the study. In the case of Greece, four universities out of eighteen represent a significant proportion and the basic data on implementation of LLL as stipulated by state legislation concern all universities. Also, in addition to ten or so interviews from each of the four universities some additional interviews have been conducted from other universities.
- h) In conclusion although this is not a quantitative study in the statistical sense **generalisability** and **scientific validity** are established at the qualitative level and the level of conceptual, contextual and comparative analysis of the data. Our claim for certain validity of the findings for the universities in the EU at large rests, apart from the arguments just provided, also on the fact that our study includes two countries from the North of Europe (Sweden, Norway), three large countries from the centre (Germany, France, UK), and two countries from the South (Spain, Greece). Although our sample cannot claim to be completely comprehensive we are offering a wide repertoire of experiences and concepts from the seven countries.

CHAPTER TWO

3.2. THE LEGAL AND REGULATIVE FRAMEWORK OF LLL IN THE UNIVERSITIES.

3.2.1 General considerations

Providing a clear picture of the legal and regulative framework of LLL provision in each country has been important. Legislation can promote or can be an obstacle to such provision. A supportive, open and flexible legal framework can create the necessary conditions for the universities to implement and promote LLL to its full potential. Rigid and/or outdated legal structures on the other hand can be a serious obstacle in adopting or initiating new policies for the promotion of LLL. This has been recognised by OECD in stating that «The implementation of a framework of lifelong learning may call for a new balance in regulations concerning tertiary education, in which authorities will assume increased responsibilities for establishing means for assessment and quality assurance while relinquishing even more of their responsibilities for oversight of the structure, organisation and management of provision. In this regard there is a need to look closely at present legislation and proposed reforms» (OECD, 1996:179).

Also, giving an account of the legal landmarks related to LLL provision in each country provided at the same time a historical picture of its evolution and a link with wider higher education reform. A pattern thus emerged, which more or less applies to all countries, according to which there has been a development **from adult education to continuing or recurrent education to lifelong learning**. Each EU country, however, has pursued its higher education policies and reform at appropriate historical points related to its own socio-economic development. The legislation accompanying those reforms is now determining the forms of LLL provision in each country to a considerable extent. This became obvious to us early in the study and it has been very useful in steering our research accordingly.

The implementation of LLL entails new regulations in various areas. These concern: access; quality assurance; certification and recognition; and partnerships with outside bodies as in the case of commissioned courses, for instance. The structure and intensity of legal regulations differ in the countries included in the study and we present below a short summary for each country in alphabetical order.

3.2.2 France

In France adult education has a long history going back to the establishment of the CNAM (Conservatoire National des Arts et Metiers) by the Revolution in 1794 as a scientific and technological museum and a higher education institution for adults. At the end of the 19th century there were various rather unsuccessful experiments with the *universitaires populaires* providing evening classes for workers accompanied by certain legislation. From 1919 to 1971 the Ministry of Education provided a regulative framework for adult education especially concerned with worker's education (*education ouvriere*) with CNAM as the leading institution.

In 1971 a special law on continuing education became a landmark for its development. «The main effect of the 1971 law was to create a **huge demand for continuing training**. At the individual level, people were encouraged to seek further training through a right (under certain conditions) to educational leave. At the collective (company) level, a training plan was to be proposed and discussed every year with the workers' representatives in line with the human resources policy of each company. Both individuals and employers were to be financed through a new **tax/ exemption scheme** amounting initially to 0.8% of the payroll, subsequently increased to its present level of 1.5%. Companies that were able to prove that they had spent this amount for the training of their workers would be exempted from paying the tax» (Jallade, 2000:305). This law encapsulated ideals about *education permanente* which is close to what is now called lifelong learning. As a result of this law the universities soon realised that they could benefit financially from being supplying institutions of continuing education. The universities, however, became actively involved in continuing education and most of them established special departments (Department d'Education Permanente (DEP)) for its provision as a result of another law on higher education in 1984 «which stipulated that initial education, research and continuing education were all to contribute 'to upgrade the scientific and cultural level of the population'» (Jallade, 2000:306).

Legal regulations concerning access to higher education have also been set in place for non-traditional students. In 1994 the DAEU (Diplome d'access aux etudes universitaires) became a national diploma granting access to higher education without the bac. In 1985 a decree by the Ministry of Education authorised the accreditation of prior experience achievement and learning (APEAL) to obtain access to the various levels of university education without the specified diplomas of entry. In 1992 another law and decrees in 1993 complemented and amplified regulation concerning the exemption from modules of study and examinations of applicants on the basis of work experience (*validation des aquis professionnelles*, or VAP).

3.2.3 Germany

Unlike France, in Germany continuing education in the universities has been a relatively recent development. In 1976 the Framework Law for Higher Education (*Hochschulrahmengesetz* (HRG)) decreed that it was amongst the duties of the universities to provide such education. Paragraph 21 of this law specifically states: «Universities should develop and offer provisions of continuing education. Continuing education programmes are open for applicants with a university degree and also for applicants who have acquired the necessary aptitude for attendance at work or in other circumstances. The provisions should match existing curricula as far as possible and integrate work experience in order to enrich teaching. Provisions in continuing education should consist of self-contained segments and take into account the needs of participants.» Recent revision of this law (1998 HRG) gives continuing education the same status as research and teaching but the above paragraph has been omitted and it is now up to states to provide specific legislation for continuing education. But it should be stressed that the legal situation in the respective states concerning this area continues to differ. However, para 1 (1998 HGR) enables the universities to award international Bachelor and Master degrees and this could promote LLL.

Alesi & Kehm (2000:286) have found that « The inscription of continuing education in federal and state laws on higher education lacks regulations to put it into practice. After more than 25 years, universities are still faced with administrative and legal obstacles if they want to do justice to this task.»

3.2.4 Greece

Adult and continuing education at university level are recent phenomena in Greece. The basic law 1286/1982 (*nomos Plaisio*), currently in force for higher education institutions, meant revolutionary change for universities but did not provide specifically for continuing education so the universities did not offer such education until the 1990s. In 1997 legislation, aimed at wide-ranging educational reform and at the same time facing the problem of the very high demand for higher education by school leavers, provided also for lifelong learning. Law 2525/1997, article 6, para. 2 states: « Programmes of Elective Studies (PSE) are decreed in (upper) Higher Education Institutions (AEI) and in Technological Educational Institutions (TEI). The PSE widen the educational choices and in parallel introduce lifelong learning in higher education with emphasis on new courses and inter-departmental co-operation.» This legislation was met by substantial opposition from most university departments but further

legislation now under way aims to convert the PSE into lifelong learning institutes within the universities.

Apart from the PSE the universities can provide vocational training through centres of continuing education and/or centres of vocational education (KEK). There is a series of legal provision for such centres (law 2224/1994; law 2469/1997; and ministerial decrees 111232/12/12/1997; 111238/12/12/1997).

The Hellenic Open University (HOU) was created by Law 2083/1992 article 27. And further legislation (Law 2592/1997) spelt out in detail its organisation, administration, and functions. The HOU has been established on the model of the Open University of the UK and offers first degrees, post-graduate degrees and certificates by distance learning for adult candidates.

Continuing education at a post-graduate level, (Master and Doctorate), is provided in the framework of regulations drafted by the Ministry of Education in 1997.

3.2.5 Norway

In Norway, as in the rest of the Scandinavian countries, adult education has its roots in the 19th century and has been part of social and political reform and was promoted for sometime by voluntary organisations and popular movements. In 1964-65 official Government policy was expressed in a White Paper *On Adult Education* and in 1966 a Department of Adult Education was established in the Ministry of Education.

In 1976 the Adult Education Act was passed. It covered many aspects of adult education provision and included the right to obtain **formal recognition of professional knowledge and skills** but it did not provide regulations as to how this was to be done and did not include a legal right for educational leave for employers or workers. In 1989, as a follow up of the Adult Education Act, the Ministry of Education published a White Paper, *More Knowledge for More People* opening the way for the promotion of LLL at various levels including the universities. In 1995 the Act of Universities and Colleges states that ‘the institutions are responsible for offering or arranging refresher courses in their disciplines’ (para. 2.5). In 1998 another White Paper *The Competence Reform* formed the basis for a comprehensive policy for continuing education.

Access to higher education for non-traditional students had been opened up by a White Paper in 1975 which provided officially for **the evaluation of individual experience**. Since then candidates to higher education institutions over 23 years of age could gain access on the basis of five years full time work experience plus minimum secondary education. This ruling

has been included in the University and College Act of 1995. The White Paper also recommended that work experience, including child care and military service, should give **extra credits** for admission to all types of higher education.

Higher education institutions have criticised the government's excessive legalism and have argued that «they have been **handicapped by governmental regulations** in the market for continuing education» (Ellen Brandt, 2000:277).

3.2.6 Spain

There is very little legislation in Spain concerning LLL provision directly. Indirectly, however, LLL programmes are within the legal framework provided by the 1983 University Reform Act (*Ley de Reforma Universitaria* (LRU)). Until 1983 universities in Spain had been regulated by the central Ministry of Education according to the Napoleonic Model (Mora, 1997). With the 1983 University Reform Act the universities gained autonomy. Since then, the central government has been providing only general guidelines for the organisation of academic programmes. The financing of public universities and higher education policy is largely left to regional governments, except the National Distance University (UNED) which is under the responsibility of central government. The formation and provision of curricula are the responsibility of the universities and *the Council of Universities* is the co-ordinating and accrediting body of *national regulated programmes* which represent what are known as *traditional programmes*. According to the Reform Act, however, universities can offer *non regulated programmes* and most of such programmes would go under what is called lifelong learning. Yet, as Mora et al., (2000:319) state «Despite its remarkable development, LLL has never been the subject of a defined policy in Spain. Neither governments nor universities have made declarations on LLL, except for general statements about the need to develop it. There is no specific framework for LLL activities and this makes it difficult to clarify what universities are doing in this field.»

In 1991 the Council of Universities made an effort to bring LLL programmes and courses under some regulated framework by a voluntary agreement with universities specifying the conceptual definition of contents and duration of studies as well as requirements for access. The Open Universities use exclusively distance learning methods. The National Distance University (UNED) was established in 1972 and is accountable directly to the central government. The Open University of Catalonia was created in 1995 and bases its teaching on the concept of virtual campus and operates under the regional government of Catalonia.

3.2.7 Sweden

In Sweden «Adult education played a central role in the rise of the modern Swedish nation, its industrial and economic development and its political culture.» (Askling & Foss-Fridizius, 2000:258). The education system had until recently been centralised and education policy was steered through legislation and state regulations. In 1923 adult education was incorporated into law and received state allowances. In the late 1960s and 1970s the emphasis shifted from adult to recurrent education.

The 1977 higher education reform codified many of the ideas on recurrent education and embedded it in new organisational forms and structures which still frame the activities of the universities in this area. In fact with the 1977 reform higher education took on many characteristics of lifelong learning although it was not labelled as such. One of the most important aspects of the 1977 reform was that it blurred the dichotomy between traditional and non-traditional students. Entrance requirements were liberalised and work experience was introduced as selection criteria along with school grades. In addition, quota were introduced for applicants over 25 and with four years work experience.

In 1993 there was another extensive reform of higher education which decentralised the system and created «a radical shift from state governance through regulation and input control to governance through control of outcomes and through external (market) forces acting directly upon the universities and colleges»(Askling & Foss-Frdizius, 2000:263). A direct result of this reform has been the intensification of what has been called «the third obligation» of the universities i.e. their obligation to link their activities to their social environment. *Commissioned education*, namely courses commissioned by companies and authorities for their staff, has also been regulated since 1986.

3.2.8 UK

Adult and continuing education in the universities in the UK has a long tradition mainly through what have been called extra mural departments and above all through the Open University which is the most important of its kind in Europe. Legal regulations, however, concerning such education and its evolution have been hardly in existence. Kogan (2000:353) states that: «In the UK, there are no legal or regulative frameworks concerning LLL and the universities. Government policy has not been ‘hard’ in this area but has involved encouragement rather than clear policies.» In the UK the universities are largely free of state control concerning teaching and research and regulation is mediated indirectly through highly prescriptive quality assurance and through grants for policy led-purposes.

In 1996 the government issued a White Paper where it is stated: «Lifetime learning is not a Government Programme, or the property of one institution. It is a shared goal relating to the attitudes and behaviour of many employers, individuals and organisations. Government has a part to play but governments alone cannot achieve the cultural changes involved in making a reality of lifetime learning» (DfEE, 1996:4). A more specific framework for the promotion of LLL in the universities in the UK has been formed by various reports issued by national committees and advisory groups. The most important ones are: *The Fryer Report* (1997); *The Dearing Report* (1997); *The Kennedy Report* (1998). Responding to these reports the government has issued a White Paper turned into Green Paper (DfEE, 1998) (DfEE, 1998a).

There has been much discussion in Government and academic circles in the UK following these reports. Despite that, however, the legal and regulative framework for LLL provision in British universities remains unclear. One reason for this is that Universities in the UK never operated under direct government legislation. Another reason is that the boundary between university education proper and further education has become increasingly blurred.

3.2.9 The Comparative Perspective

Comparing the national legal frameworks for LLL just presented it is clear that although the differences between countries are substantial there are certain patterns in common. The need for legislation for adult education in most cases arose early but the 1970s was the decade for the institutionalisation of continuing and recurrent education and coincided with substantial reforms of the higher education systems.

There is thus a clear pattern in the legal and regulative framework **from adult education to continuing education to lifelong learning**. The need for regulation of LLL has appeared in all countries during the 1990s and since **1996 (the European year for LLL)** in particular. This means that there are common trends throughout Europe and that international and EU policies have a direct bearing on national legislation.

The intensity of regulation differs from one country to another. In Britain and Spain the regulation is vague whereas in Sweden, France and Greece, in particular, the regulation is specific and detailed. Both excessive legalism and lack of clear regulative frameworks can and do impede the implementation and promotion of LLL at university level. There is a clear need, therefore, for a close look at national legislation on LLL in the context of common European policies and directives.

CHAPTER THREE

3.3. THE INTERACTION OF INTERNATIONAL, NATIONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL *POLICIES* ON LLL IN THE UNIVERSITIES

3.3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to compare national policies on LLL and discuss them in the context of international policy discourse on the one hand and university policies on the other. The idea is to elucidate whether there have been reciprocal influences between them and to check if there is any congruence between international policies, and those of the EU in particular, and the actual policies and strategies of the universities in the field of LLL. This research has shown that in most countries involved in the study adult and continuing education has been practised for sometime. The universities had certain policies concerning adult and continuing education but such policies, have been intensified and changed over the last five years or so largely due to national policies and international policy discourse on the subject.

3.3.2 The international policy discourse

The concept of LLL surfaced almost simultaneously in three major international organisations (the Council of Europe, UNESCO AND OECD) in the late 1960s under such titles as «*recurrent education*», «*adult education*» or «*education permanente*». In all cases the central idea was the same: the development of coherent strategies for the provision of education and training opportunities for all individuals over their whole life span.

The Council of Europe proposed the comprehensive concept *education permanente* as the framework of a new education policies «capable of meeting the rapidly increasing and ever more diversified educational needs of every individual, young and adult in the new European Society.»

UNESCO in two major reports (UNESCO, 1972; 1996) set out a broad universal, humanistic vision of education policy for LLL which was intended to serve more as a source of inspiration rather than as a guide to practical action. This vision, which was portrayed as «necessary utopia», depicts the universities as crucial institutions in the learning society which, however, should be diversified and become the ‘cross-roads of learning’ throughout life. Various conferences organised by UNESCO have attempted to convert the vision into broad policy proposals. The Palermo conference (24-27 Sept.1997) recommended: «more institutional diversification, new policies of access to higher education, flexibility with regard to content, breadth, depth and duration of programmes, means of delivery, examination and validation.»

(UNESCO, 1997). All this represents a framework for change in higher education rather than concrete policies for LLL, but it has contributed significantly to the international discourse on the subject.

The OECD has given more focus and substance to this discourse. In 1973 it launched its *Recurrent Education Strategy* (Papadopoulos, 1994) aiming at 'the spreading of educational opportunities over the individual's lifetime'. This strategy shifted later into a more empirical analysis of concrete problems having to do with admissions procedures, modular curriculum structures, recognition of work experience etc. In 1996 a comprehensive strategy was proposed advocating *Lifelong Learning for all* (OECD, 1996), to take place in both formal and informal settings. For higher education institutions LLL provision in this context implies co-operation and partnerships with other actors. The strategy also emphasised a shift from teaching to learning and a focus on the needs of the individual learner, i.e. on individual rather than social demand. Converting, of course, the strategy into concrete policies is not easy. There is a conflict and even a contradiction between individual and social demand which is usually side-stepped or tacitly ignored by national and international policy makers. There are also substantive problems at the operational level which concern access, quality assurance, certification, etc., but international organisations can afford to set broad policy objectives.

3.3.3 The EU guidelines for LLL policy in higher education

In the context of international discourse on LLL EU education policies have a direct bearing on the policies of member states. Since 1995 strategies concerning education and training have been given particular emphasis. In this respect the document «*Teaching and Learning. Towards the Learning Society* (1995)» constitutes a landmark and a precursor to the adoption of the year 1996 by the Council and the European Parliament as the *European Year for Lifelong Learning*. The events on the theme during that year, conferences, workshops etc., formulated a series of guidelines amounting to wide ranging LLL policy adopted by the Council. The main guidelines state:

- Lifelong learning initiatives should strike an appropriate balance between personal, cultural, civic and social dimensions, and economic and employment concerns. In addition they should include democratic principles and human right values.
- Lifelong learning must be based on a wide range of learning opportunities, allowing all individuals to progress in their education according to their social, cultural and economic interest and needs.

- Lifelong learning should aim to promote individual abilities, enhance employability, make the best use of available human resources talent as well as contributing to the promotion of gender equality, the elimination of social exclusion and the promotion of active participation in a democratic society.

As overall policy objectives these are very laudable but very ambitious and when policy is translated into action there are certain conflicting dimensions within them. a) **Lifelong learning for all** in diverse settings is a far cry from what educational institutions do and can actually provide. This was the message by a recent Euridice (2000) survey. b) the socio-economic rationale to achieve economic competitiveness and the need to bridge the ‘skill gap’ is largely in conflict with the rationale of active citizenship, personal development and a sense of belonging to the community. This tension is also surfacing in documents about LLL provision in Europe issued by the Directorate-general for employment and the Directorate-general for education (European Commission, 1999, 2000).

These documents also argue for target setting for LLL in the member states as a means to «help focus policy objectives» and «mobilise key actors for the success of the strategy». But target setting in the complex and polymorphous area of LLL does not look very promising and it could be that collecting and evaluating programmes of good practice would yield more results for the formulation and implementation of policy objectives.

3.3.4 The main objectives of international policies

The policies of the international organisations outlined are characterised by certain common objectives concerning LLL. These objectives can be summarised as follows:

- Promoting equity and new access policies. Equity is understood in a double sense: a) giving a chance to adults who missed the opportunity for higher or further education; and b) making LLL accessible to adults from any socio-economic background. These objectives would, of course, require new access policies.
- Promoting social and individual development and professional training. This objective is common to the policy documents of the UNESCO, OECD and the EU and has a double aspect: a high civic and personal value and an economic and social aspect in promoting high skills and a ‘knowledgeable’ adult population.
- Meeting individual demand and promoting student-centred learning. This implies a shift to demand-led higher education and a shift of emphasis from teaching to

learning. It also means organising education to satisfy as much as possible the specific need of each individual.

- Diversification. A prerequisite of meeting individual learning needs would be a highly diversified system of LLL provision.
- Flexibility. LLL provision requires not just new highly flexible programmes and structures within educational institutions but also new innovative ways of delivering knowledge and the involvement of outside actors as well as finding ways of assessing diverse sources of knowledge and experience.

3.3.5 The national and comparative context

A main objective of our research has been to assess the interplay of these international policy objectives with national and institutional ones. We found that in one way or another such objectives were part of all national policies. These policies vary from one country to another not only because of historical educational reasons but also because of different economic policies. Thus, in Greece, the introduction of LLL at university level was part of the government's wider economic and development policy as well as a response to EU educational policy because much of the financing of LLL provision came from EU revenues. In Germany, LLL is largely understood as continuing academic education and constitutes a peripheral policy to most German universities. In Spain, continuing education is used instead of LLL. The policy focuses on specialisation and the upgrading of skills and methods of professionals and the improving of graduates' employment prospects. In France also continuing or permanent education is used instead of LLL. There is, however, an emphasis on providing a chance for those who, for whatever reason, could not have higher education.

In the Nordic countries LLL policies develop in parallel to policies connected to democracy. They have followed international trends on LLL and in some ways they have been pioneering such trends. Certainly, Sweden seems to have the strongest claim to have been in the forefront of policy thinking on LLL not only nationally but also influencing Europe. In Norway too continuing education became a formal policy for all higher education institutions and higher education generally contains many non-traditional characteristics.

In Britain although no specific policies concerning LLL for the universities are set by the government, LLL provision under different names (Liberal Education, Adult Education, Continuing Education, etc.) has existed for sometime. Also, new access policies and forms of institutionalisation seem to be developing rapidly.

3.3.6 Promoting new access policies

As we have seen, new access policies have been one of the defining characteristics of LLL provision in the universities. New access procedures and regulation constitutes part of all national and institutional policies. Thus, in most German states adults above 23 or 25 can enter higher education on the basis of job experience, apprenticeship and an admission test. Although such policies widen access to continuing academic education at the same time they open up the way towards lifelong learning. In Greece, new access policies have been central to higher education reform and in parallel introduced LLL in a significant way. The establishment of the Open University has been part of that policy. In Spain, the high cost of university LLL is a barrier for equity. There are, however, flexible access procedures to non-regular programmes for adults which open up the way to continuing education. In France, equity has been implicit in the access policies of CNAM for sometime and the policy of giving «a second chance» for learning in many universities, but of late there is an emphasis on continuing professional training.

In Norway and Sweden access to higher education for adults has been a comprehensive policy since the 1970s as part of the wider policy towards social equality. Over the years this policy has become sophisticated and wide ranging but of late, especially in Sweden, it has become more market and economically orientated. In Britain, access policies to higher education for adults have never been a centralised on a top-down direction by the government. Yet the establishment of the Open University in 1969 has been a pioneering institution for the promotion of LLL and opening higher education to non-traditional students has been a leading force for new access policies in the universities.

In summary, although access policies exclusively for LLL in the countries involved in this research is not a central concern either of the governments or the institutions, in all countries such policies are increasingly gaining momentum and they enlarge the framework of equity towards higher education.

3.3.7 Personal development or professional training?

Examining the national policies and their implementation it became clear that the element of personal development of LLL was less prominent than the element of training and the promotion of knowledge skills. In all cases, however, both elements are present and there is a good proportion of programmes from each of the major areas of knowledge.

Continuing education in German universities is divided into two main streams: general continuing education and professionally-oriented continuing education. Both missions of LLL are considered important. Yet, professionally oriented continuing education, is less prestigious and of lower status than traditional professional education.

In Greece, many programmes considered as LLL (because of the different modes of access) have the same goals as general education. As such they involve both personal development and professional training. The Open University has an expressed mission to cover both these elements. Some of the new postgraduate programmes on the other hand are vocationally orientated.

In France, the majority of LLL courses is oriented towards professional training and retraining. Of the wide range of distance education courses offered by CNED, many are aimed at «individual development», but even there statistics of enrolment show a heavy weighting towards preparatory courses for civil service *concours*, short, vocationally-oriented courses and foreign languages. French universities can charge fees for LLL courses and this may explain their strong market orientation. Adult students, however, enrol in traditional degree courses for personal development.

In Norway, despite public declarations on the general goals of LLL, professional training seems to be the prevalent objective of LLL provision in the universities. There are, however, many undergraduate courses with the credit giving system in the social sciences, the language, environmental issues etc., which are taken by adult students for personal development.

In Sweden, more than anywhere else, LLL is integrated in the regular system of higher education. LLL policy has been interwoven with social ideals. This has been a deliberate policy aiming both at personal development and as a response to social developments. Of late, the direct role and impact of state policy on education has decreased although the general ethos still remains. There has been, however, an emphasis on socio-economic concerns and the universities organise special courses focused on professional training.

In Britain initially adult education in universities was tailored to those who had been denied higher education and those who wanted additional education as leisure time pursuit. The employment aspect was much less of a concern. From the mid-1980s occupational motives became strong. The mission of LLL in the universities is underpinned by vocational objectives intended to update and expand skills for graduates, meet new employment needs, enhance work mobility, respond to technological developments etc.

In short, looking at the profile of national and institutional missions on LLL as a whole economic and employment concerns take precedence over issues of individual and social

development. This was expected. For despite the rhetoric by international organisations about the human and social development objectives of LLL, economic and employment concerns are clearly dominant.

3.3.8 Flexibility, diversification and demand-driven learning

Compared to traditional programmes LLL provision is carrying with it substantial diversification and flexibility in order to respond to the needs of learners. This is implicit or explicit in varying degrees in all national policies and programmes of LLL.

Some policies are more flexible than others. Thus, in Spain, because of the regional decentralised system and the distinction between regulated and non regulated courses the flexibility is extreme. In Greece by contrast where the system is centrally regulated flexibility cannot be introduced at the grass roots and has to be implemented according to national policy. Flexibility, however, is a central feature of all policies and in Sweden and Norway it seems to have been incorporated into the higher education system at large in order to cope with the needs of LLL. In France also significant efforts have been made by the universities to make the supply of LLL courses more flexible whether in terms of curriculum conceptions, modes of delivery or certification. But as in other countries individual organisers need a framework to introduce flexibility. There is thus a need for a university policy in order to harness and strengthen various fragile experiments. In other words the challenge is «**mainstreaming**». Such mainstreaming policy seems now to be a necessity in all universities in all countries.

The demand driven character of LLL has necessitated policies of diversification of programmes which is also a central feature of national and institutional policies but with variations from country to country. As a rule, the longer a country or an institution has been involved in adult and continuing education the more diversified missions and structures it has developed. Because of the open, increasing and fluid character of LLL, however, constant diversification is called for along with a pressing need to frame, structure, and regulate diversification.

3.3.9 The views of the actors.

3.3.9.1 International Policies

The responses of our interviewees presented a variable picture of knowledge and understanding of international policies. The majority were not aware of, or were not conversant with, the influence of such policies on the missions of their institutions and others saw only

tentative connections. In German universities the policies were known only to a limited extent mainly by directors and heads of units of continuing education but no one was able to refer to actual documents or recommendations of the EU. Spanish academics also assessed the influence of international policies on the development of LLL in Spanish universities as very low and most of those interviewed stated that they knew very little or nothing about such policies. In England, the impact of international policies and specifically those of the EU, was seen to be largely indirect and related to ends other than LLL.

In Greece, by contrast, respondents saw a clear connection of international and EU policies and LLL provision in the universities. They described a top-down process connecting international (mainly EU), national and institutional policies. In Norway and Sweden also it seemed that reports of international bodies on LLL were studied and taken into account in designing programmes and some maintained that European policies on LLL were influenced by developments in the Nordic countries.

3.3.9.2 National and institutional policies.

The effects of national policies on institutional policies differed in the seven countries on several dimensions. To a large extent the national role in advancing LLL practices depends on the nexus between higher education institutions and the state. In some countries LLL policies were enforced or encouraged by changes in legal requirements in universities. In Germany, Greece and Spain, there were specific enactments and policies, although LLL was not always defined as for example in Spain. In other countries, and the UK is the clearest example, LLL was more the subject of exhortation and some marginal and unsystematic funding of particular initiatives. In the latter cases, governments might regard LLL as adjacent to other socially derived policies such as the widening of access, the encouragement of new groups to enter higher education and making it more relevant to the needs of the economy. In all countries, existing arrangements were meeting some LLL objectives without being denominated as such.

In the UK the definition and policy for LLL was diffused in the governments' strategy to develop a «learning society» by promoting learning at home, the community, the workplace and in traditional institutions. The policy did not include any specific institutional arrangements for LLL in the universities. National policies were seen by the respondents as making little impact as funding for part time students was still marginal. Respondents, however, believed that there was a framework of policy for the universities to act and take initiatives. Universities should not be left behind.

French authorities promoted LLL along four different paths: a specialised institution for returning adults such as CNAM; a special department as in Nanterre; fostering LLL in all university departments with a comprehensive policy as in Lille; a distance education centre like CNDE. Within this framework, respondents felt that the universities were left to make their own missions in their own way.

In Germany universities are accorded some autonomy following the principle of «intellectual freedom in teaching and research». External influences, however were strong. Federal educational policy was long influenced by the recommendations of educational committees discussing issues of continuing education and of late LLL. Such committees expressed demands to reduce curriculum in undergraduate courses in a favour of a shift towards specialisation later within professional life.

In Greece, universities are self governed but their dependence on the Ministry of Education leaves little room for initiatives on LLL as all courses have to go through existing legislation. So in LLL as in all other matters universities have to act within government policy. This was so much taken for granted by the respondents that there was hardly any alternative visualised. Universities, however, were free to take or not the provision of Programmes of Elective Studies (PSE) and indeed most of them declined the offer. Respondents on the whole were critical of the LLL policies of the government. As a result the Government has been working on this policy which is again to come before parliament proposing now the establishment of institutes of LLL in the universities.

In Norway, the state policy has been to press for continuing education in all universities. In addition the Norwegian Higher Education Distance Network (SOFF) has been promoting distance learning since 1990. In the late 1990s the universities took initiatives to set up two networks: the Network University and the Enterprise University. These networks offer distance education and commissioned courses. Norwegian academics take it for granted that they will participate in LLL activities of some kind.

In Sweden, whilst institutional freedom grew in recent years, there remained some central controls which affected the ability of the universities to act in their own ways. National policy was embedded in a 'strategic' situation in which pressure on higher education to expand and review curricula increased and state funding decreased. This introduced an economic bias between state and university policies. Universities became dependent on external funding which led to some changes in the curricula to address, in a competitive way, the need for distance education, commissioned and vocational courses, etc. These, and non-regular part-time

programmes generally, are imbued with ideas of LLL but the universities are not given economic incentives to develop them sufficiently.

In Spain, despite its substantial expansion, LLL was never the subject of a defined policy. Governments and universities made only general statements about the need to develop this area. The lack of a specific framework made it difficult to clarify what universities were doing under this concept. According to interviewees, the influence of national LLL policies on university activity was almost non-existent. Some respondent believed that certain national employment policies had an adverse effect on the development of LLL at university level since they were not adapted to the needs of participants and their aim was to obtain funds for trade unions and business organisations.

3.3.10 Conclusion

In conclusion we can state that the effect of international and EU policies on member states is uneven. In any case such policies do not constitute a clearly defined set of ideas and practices. There is no systematic way by which such policies are disseminated down to the institutional level and as a result knowledge of these policies by the actors at the operational level is insufficient and/or fragmented and consequently not generating sufficient dialogue and action at grass root level.

National policies also are influenced variably by international ones. However, all national policies are embodying in varying degrees the main objectives and goals of international ones and of the EU especially for member states. The patterns of promotion and implementation of LLL by national policies depend on the relationship between higher education institutions and the state in each country. In some countries, notably Sweden and the UK, LLL policies are integrated in the higher education system. In other countries, France, Germany, Norway and Spain, LLL activities mean largely continuing education. In Greece, where the demand for higher education is very high, policies are mainly oriented to open access to new students. A general conclusion, which became emphatically clear in the UK report, is that there are multiple and variable definitions of LLL and there is certainly a need to link policies to definitions as well as a need for better definition.

CHAPTER FOUR

3. 4 CURRICULA AND CHANGES IN KNOWLEDGE

3.4.1 Lifelong Learning and the Knowledge Society

We have noted in the previous chapter that the underlying objective of all international and national policies on LLL is to respond to the pressing and rising educational and learning needs of the knowledge society. We have seen, however, that both the concept of LLL and that of knowledge society involve substantive shifts from the concept of traditional knowledge and this is clearly established in the literature examined, as well as in the findings of our study. The metaphor ‘knowledge society’ emphasises that ‘knowledge’ and ‘knowledge production’ play radically new and increasingly dominant roles in society.

Bell (1973) relates the knowledge society to post industrial society in the sense that knowledge is the source of innovation and the basic economic driver and consequently the weight of investment by societies is knowledge ‘as an intellectual property, which involves valid knowledge and its dissemination’. Bell, however, sees and discusses the role of the universities in knowledge society from a traditional and rather conservative angle.

Bohm and Stehr (1986) identify the distinguishing feature of knowledge society to be its own ‘immediate productive force’ (p.19). The knowledge produced enables us to elaborate, develop and intervene in our social world. They see the production of knowledge not so much as an appropriation of nature but as a process of transformation of society. In a similar vein, Gibbons et al (1994) argue that knowledge is generated in the context of application. It is transdisciplinary and it is problem oriented in the sense that it involves participants with different forms of knowledge collaborating in flexible and short lived structures to define problems and strategies for their solution. Such knowledge production is not haphazard if it follows the canons of experimental method and its conclusions are communicable to a wider community, repeatable and transparent (p.30). Castells (1996), also, sees revolutionary change with the emergence of the ‘information society’. The revolutionary character of knowledge society consists not in the centrality of knowledge itself but in ‘the application of knowledge and information to knowledge generation and information/processing/communication devices, in a cumulative feedback loop between innovation and the uses of innovation.’ (p.32). What should be stressed is that there is little in the literature to suggest that knowledge societies will necessarily or even probably be more inclusive or integrated than those in the past.

There is, however, a fair amount of agreement that in the knowledge society we have moved away from the idea that knowledge is a matter of discovering the truths of an inherently stable order. Instead, we have come to conceptualise knowledge and its acquisition in terms of regulated practices, collectively tested methodologies and the exercise of cognitive skills. This shift also implies cutting through traditional dichotomies between theory and practice, knowledge and skills and education and training.

Concerning the concept of LLL changes in the conception of knowledge entail a shift from education to learning. It is for this reason that lifelong learning rather than lifelong education render more accurately the core meaning of the concept. Compared, thus, to the conventional meaning of education LLL places an emphasis on the learner rather than the teacher, demand rather than supply, and this has substantive implications for all forms of education provision and the universities in particular. In so far as universities espouse LLL policies they are at the same time responding to the needs of the knowledge society. In practical terms this means that LLL provision should aim to: foster personal development; strengthen democratic values; promote equity and maintain social cohesion; serve innovation and economic and technological competitiveness (OECD, 1996:89). There are, however, critics who see LLL as promoting primarily economic values and serving uncritically the needs of the free market (Barnet, 1997; 1998; Griffin, 1999; 1999a).

The interaction of the demands of knowledge society and the logic of LLL imply certain epistemological shifts. Regular programmes have been constructed traditionally within established frameworks of knowledge and in most cases within defined disciplinary lines. In most countries there have been some epistemological shifts in degree studies from single disciplines to interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary domain based studies which have their origins in socio-economic forces. Lifelong learning policies may have contributed to this change. Action oriented and problem based interactive learning, tends to affect rigid lines of traditional disciplinary knowledge and dissolve its structures. In the Swedish report (p. 33) this is stated clearly: «Belief in the regulating powers of disciplines and collegiality [has been] replaced by beliefs in multidisciplinary forms of knowledge formation, capabilities and extended as well as intensified relations between academics and between academic and ‘non-academic’ actors.»

3.4.2 Forms of LLL curricula

We have noted that LLL is a complex and multifaceted concept and it involves many definitions. In terms of curricula we cannot separate completely LLL programmes from traditional degrees, undergraduate or post-graduate, in that many of the LLL characteristics, especially those advancing critical ability and personal development, are shared by what the universities claim to have been always doing. In fact in the UK many of the respondents emphasised that the role of the most prestigious universities and traditional courses was to inculcate on the students 'the ability to master a large amount of knowledge critically and creatively'. Also it became clear in our research that, in all countries, the relationship of LLL to traditional disciplines is a complex and as yet not clarified issue. However, as mentioned in our methodology chapter, we did establish specific criteria in order to identify new types of curricula specifically pertaining to LLL and being clearly different from conventional programmes. These criteria refer to: new forms of access procedures; universalism (addressed to all ages and categories of students beyond traditional undergraduates); new types and structures of the curricula not only in terms of content, away from disciplines and towards domains of knowledge, but also in terms of duration, place, and modes of delivery; new quality assurance and accreditation procedures.

Within this framework we have identified four types of curricula. a) Academic degrees, mainly for people who missed a chance or had no opportunity to enter higher education. b) Post graduate programmes. These involve a variety of Masters courses and even Ph. D. degrees. c) A great variety of programmes for Continuing Professional Development (C.P.D), many of them involving commissioned courses. d) Smaller training courses, some of them commissioned, and short courses for personal development.

All countries deliver all these categories but there are variations between them because of different legal and policy frameworks explained in chapters two and three. The types which predominate overall are c), and d). So in France, Spain, and Norway, LLL means mainly continuing professional education, but degrees are also provided in distance learning institutions as well as in certain universities. In Germany the weight is on continuing academic education, and in the UK, Sweden and Greece there is a mixture. Thus in Sweden, where the centrally regulated admissions system has favoured mature students, there are almost as many non-traditional as traditional students amongst the regular students. There are no statistics as to how many of these students participate in recurrent education or LLL courses but it is estimated that about 3% of the total number of students participate in commissioned education (Akling&Foss-

Fridizius, 2000:264). In the UK there is also a large proportion of mature students attending traditional degree courses and the Open University has been a very successful institution in providing degrees for mature students. In Greece LLL programmes through the Open University and the programmes of elective studies are predominantly degree courses.

All types of LLL curricula differ from conventional degree courses in that they are predominantly interdisciplinary, or transdisciplinary, and domain based and flexible, although much of LLL provision seems to be built from modules of traditional programmes on the basis of credits or certificates. Let us now describe briefly how these types of curricula have been implemented in each country of the study (Details are available in the national reports).

3.4.3 A portrait of implementation of LLL in each country.

3.4.3.1 France

In French universities, what is called *formation continue* or *education permanente* became official policy after 1984. So at present most universities have a department of continuing education (DEP) which offers a variety of courses mostly for mature students. Such departments vary significantly in size but the biggest provider by far is the CNAM with 30% of the total turn over and registered students. The overall number of students enrolled in such courses is around 370.000, with an average of 127 contact hours per course. Most of these students are in employment (80%), or seeking employment 10%, or returning to university after some years interruption. Universities charge fees for such courses and in 1996 there was a turn over of about 1.5 billion FF, of which 1.2 billion came from DEPs (Jallade, 2000:306).

Programmes for continuing education fall into three categories: a) Short courses not leading to official diplomas but providing *ad hoc* certification. Such curricula may be commissioned or negotiated with companies and DEPs even have to bid for such courses by tender. b) Longer courses leading to university diplomas. These are targeted mainly to professional development and to demand unmet by national degrees. c) Courses leading to national degrees. Curricula for this category are specially structured to respond to the needs of mature students active in the labour market.

Distance education involves another category of curricula promoted by the *Centre National d'Enseignement a Distance* (CNED), comprising about 25 distance education sites located in French Universities and the CNAM. As CNED is not a university its higher education courses are delivered in partnership with universities. In 1997 there were 200.000 learners registered

for such courses of which about 20.000 led to national degrees or university diplomas and the rest were mostly two year vocationally oriented courses and courses leading to teaching careers.

Apart from these categories there are the non-traditional students (over 27 years of age) attending traditional courses. In 1992 a survey found that 32% of the student population would fall into this category (Beduwe et Espinasse, 1995).

3.4.3.2 .Germany

There are different forms of LLL provision in German universities but only continuing academic education is really significant in volume and importance. Universities have a statutory duty to provide such education, which, on the whole, is accorded rather low status in comparison to traditional degrees. It is divided into *general* and *professional* continuing academic education. The first type is intended to meet general educational needs of the citizens. Courses for senior citizens or courses only for women can be examples. The second type aims at continuing professional development and constitutes the larger part of LLL provision in Germany and covers a large spectrum of domains and disciplines. The duration of such courses range from a few days up to two years. Short work-related courses are provided by 77% of the universities in the country and 30% offer courses by distance learning. Compared, however, to the total number of undergraduate and postgraduate traditional courses continuing education is low amounting only 5% of the total higher education provision.

3.4.3.3. Greece

As noted in chapter two the implementation of LLL in Greece followed specific legislation introduced during the late 1990s. Much of LLL provision is degree oriented and consists of the Open university, the Programmes of Elective studies (PSE), and special post-graduate courses. The Open University has at present registered over 5.000 students (between 23-50 years of age) and is expected to recruit up to 20.000 over the next 5 years. The PSE had many teething problems and a lukewarm or negative reception by the universities but have good prospects to develop as lifelong learning institutes opening thus the way for significant LLL provision in the country. At present they have enlisted 2051 students and run parallel to, conventional undergraduate programmes. The Centres for Continuing Education constitute only marginal structures in Greek universities and have not managed as yet to recruit significant numbers of learners.

3.4.3.4 Norway

In Norway continuing education is well integrated into the higher education system as a matter of policy. In 1995 it had 15.5% first time entrants to universities over 35 years of age (the highest percentage amongst OECD countries) and 31% over 25 years of age (approximately the same as in Sweden and Denmark). There is a substantial amount of flexible learning through part time courses. The number of students in continuing education in universities rose from 7,000 in 1983 to 19,000 in 1998 in short non-credit courses and from nearly 2000 in 1988 to 8000 in 1998 in long credit courses. Distance education also features highly in Norwegian universities. The typical distance education student is between 35-45 years of age with some initial higher education. In 1997, there were about 5,000 distance education students at universities and state colleges.

3.4.3.5 Spain

Most universities in Spain have been providing adult education since the mid 1980s in the form of non-regulated courses which have been branded as *continuing education*, *permanent education* or *non-regulated education*. Spanish universities have been offering over 2,500 courses of this type of between 20 and 500 hours class contact. The longer courses are designated as *Master* (39%), *Specialist* (35%), or *expert* (26%) and the smaller courses involve postgraduate teacher training, summer courses, Spanish for foreigners, and various workshops and seminars. For the year 1998/1999 the two open universities UNED, and UOC had enrolled 135,000 and 8,000 distance learner respectively. The spectacular growth of LLL provision is attributed to the slowness and rigidity of conventional regulated programmes to respond to needs of the labour market and the wider educational needs of Spanish society.

3.4.3.6 Sweden.

The implementation of LLL in Swedish universities has been part of higher education reform since the late 1970s. There has been thus a comprehensive embodiment of LLL provision in the higher education system not so much as a specifically designated LLL institutional policy but as a response to the needs of the information and knowledge society. Amongst other things, substantial flexibility was introduced to all higher education programmes not only in the form of modularization of courses but also in framing curricula in such way as to respond to individual needs of students. Admission to non-regular students has been a central feature of the system for sometime. From 1995 to 1999 the admitted number of students over the age of 30 had increased to more than 50%. The provision of distance education has also been emphasised

since 1995 when the *Distance Education Committee* (DUKOM) was created. In 1996-97 about 9% of all registered students were enrolled in some course of distance education and in 1998 there were 6,800 full time places.

3.4.3.7 UK

As in Sweden the implementation of LLL in the universities in the UK has been part of organic change of the higher education system over the last fifteen years or so but unlike Sweden there has not been a central government policy, otherwise than generalised encouragement, towards it. Widening access to university education has been very much part of LLL provision. A large proportion of the undergraduate and postgraduate populations in British universities now are what are called mature students. The open university has been a major institution for such provision for sometime but for some time most universities have been introducing postgraduate certificate and Master's courses aiming to respond to demand for CPD. There has been almost universal expansion in modularised programmes along with changes towards an interdisciplinary and domain based provision. In most curricula there is now strong evidence of a shift from «knowledge» to «skills» but universities, however, are not sensitised as yet towards providing a flexible framework of provision intended specifically to meet the needs of individual learners. [??? I think we would claim that it has always been pretty individual through personal tutoring and the rest]. Distance education remains primarily the province of the Open University although other universities are have substantial involvement.. Students in the Open University cover a large spectrum of age and background. Its oldest graduate was 94 and its youngest 20 but 70% of the students are aged between 30 and 49. Since 1971 it has taught 2,500,000 students and in 1998 it had 230,000 registered. During that period, over 1,000,000 have gained credits leading to certificates diplomas and degrees. 230.000 have graduated and a further 70.000 have proceeded to graduate in other British universities.

3.4.4 The Shift from Teaching to Learning.

3.4.4.1 The theory

The logic and rhetoric of LLL as presented in the literature in general and specific reports of international bodies in particular (OECD, 1996; UNESCO 1996), make explicit the need for a generic, paradigmatic shift from teaching to learning and from supply led to demand led higher education provision. This means that the logic of learning rather than that of teaching and the needs of the learner rather than the aspirations and the values of the teacher

should be the driving forces behind all higher education provision and should be the hall mark of curriculum content and delivery. One of the consequences of such shift would be that the learners and agencies outside the academia participate substantially in the organisation of learning. It means further that learning in different settings should be recognised, assessed and taken into account both in access and in curricula setting and delivery. In theory a substantive shift from teaching to learning would entail revolutionary change in higher education.

3.4.4.2 *The Practice*

From the fieldwork of the research it became clear that in the universities no substantial shift from teaching to learning has actually taken place as yet but there is an atmosphere and an anticipation of change. The attitude of academic staff towards LLL was on the whole positive and it was regarded by most as 'politically incorrect' to reject or to oppose new forms of provision. Most interviewees, however, were aware that their institutions lacked a clear definition and a comprehensive policy towards the implementation of large scale LLL provision. Typically, for most institutions included in the sample, LLL initiatives and activities were left to individuals and to specific, often isolated units for continuing education. Being involved or promoting LLL programmes does not also entail specific rewards and most academic staff seem to consider the traditional duties of pursuing research and traditional undergraduate and postgraduate teaching as the core of their duties. In many cases, however, as in Spain for instance, where engaging in LLL programmes entails additional personal income, members of staff show explicit motivation.

In this respect the shift from teaching to learning and the direct or indirect involvement of the learners in the formulation of curricula has not taken place as yet because teachers retain strong control of programmes and curricula. Having stated that, and emphasising that practice varies from country to country and from institution to institution, the needs of the learners, socio-economic demand, and a direction towards interdisciplinary domains feature curriculum development work in all institutions of our sample, maybe more in Sweden than in other countries. At the institutional level, most country reports refer to programmes involving new forms of interaction between teachers and learners with serious attempts, as in France, Sweden, Norway and the UK, to incorporate and use as a starting point the work experience of learners.

In practice the shift from teaching to learning involves two other important dimensions. a) independent learning and b) negotiated learning. Both these dimensions were implicit or explicit in varying degrees in the curricula of the institutions included in the study. As learners take more responsibility for their own education so their aptitudes in identifying, assessing,

prioritising and fulfilling their learning needs should be enhanced. Respondents were aware of the difficulties involved in this area and there was strong evidence that this dimension is seriously taken into account especially in the curricula and programmes of distance learning. Concerning negotiated learning the exercise take place at two levels: between the individual learners and the providing institution and between companies or other agencies and the institution. The former type featured very marginally in our findings and only in very few instances. The second type, however, was part of the curricula and the programmes in all countries again in varying degrees. Thus in France, Sweden, Norway and Spain commissioned courses between institutions and companies or agencies is common practice. In many cases teaching staff from the companies or the agencies is involved.

3.4.4.3 From learning substance to learning process.

Enhancing and cultivating the capacities of learners to learn features prominently in LLL literature. The possession of factual knowledge is considered less important than the capacity and the aptitude of ‘learning how to learn’ in the information and knowledge society. The rapid and massive amount of information, which is constantly produced, and the antiquation of knowledge, due to rapid technological and scientific change, place in the foreground learning skills and the capacity to select relevant knowledge for the solution of problems. In this context the traditional role of the teacher, especially in higher education, shifts from someone who possess and transmits knowledge to someone who assists and facilitates the process of learning. The objective for the teacher and the learner alike is that the latter acquires the skill of independent learning and become a ‘reflective practitioner’. Consequently the learning process takes precedence over learning substance. In the knowledge society it is the skill to retrieve the most relevant facts rather than the knowledge of facts themselves which is important and useful.

Most programmes and curricula in the institutions included in the study carried this as a background assumption. Certainly in Swedish and British universities but also in the other countries academics placed an emphasis on the learning process. They stressed the need to help learners to learn how to retrieve, systematise and synthesise information, use prior experience, present and summarise results and how to reach sound conclusions. Such teaching, however, would not only be very costly but would also require specific undertaking for staff development by higher education institutions. On the whole, LLL provision specifically designed to include the acquisition of skills in learning how to learn is still rather rare.

It should also be stressed that not everyone would accept the arguments for such shifts. Many respondents viewed developments in LLL provision with certain unease and branded such

provision as 'training'. Some insisted that 'maths is maths and engineering is engineering' arguing that the core knowledge in disciplines is more stable than often assumed. Others, whilst realising that shifts have taken and are taking place, insisted that the function of university teaching is to ground such shifts within the methods of traditional 'research project design' and train students in analytical thinking.

3.4.5 Access

3.4.5.1 Lifelong learning and open or extended access.

The demarcation between LLL and conventional higher education is most clearly exemplified in access procedures and targeted populations. National and international policies on LLL assume extended or universal access as part of wider socio-economic policies which have to do with competitiveness and social cohesion. The implications of such policies have not been thought out in detail but there is an implicit potential conflict between the pursuit of competitiveness and that of social cohesion which has been pointed out by many of our respondents. However, widening access to higher education has been a policy of all countries over the last 20 or 30 years and there has been a massive expansion of higher education everywhere benefiting categories of class and gender and various minorities. Higher education systems have managed to absorb that expansion with significant change in their structures and curricula. Yet the challenge presented to higher education institutions by universal access and lifetime learning is altogether of a different order and magnitude.

Broadening access to university education to include the whole life span would have revolutionary consequences for higher education systems. In practice such access is still limited. In Sweden, where access to universities is administered centrally and LLL has been imbedded significantly into regular higher education structures, a quota for access to various categories of students has been introduced. The so called 25 plus 4 scheme (over 25 years of age +4 years of work experience) resulted in the increase of non-regular students to about 50% of the total student population. Consequently a large number of part time courses were introduced. But admitting large number of mature students tended to be at the expense of admission of regular young students. So in 1993 the 25 plus 4 scheme was partially abolished. Even so in 1995, 50% of the new admissions were aged over 30 years. In Greece, LLL access policies were aiming at the same time to give a chance to the 2/3s or so of the school leavers who failed to enter higher education because of the *numerus clausus* system of admission. In the Open University, however, where in theory access is open to all over 23 years of age, in practice access has been granted only to those between 23 to 45. Even so admission has been very competitive. In 2000-

2001, of 23,913 applicants for all courses, only 4,080 were admitted. So, at least in Greece, lifelong learning is not **for all** after all. In Germany 50 universities offer special programmes for senior citizens and access has been enlarged to target various special categories of learners. In all countries of the study older students can have access to credited courses on the basis of specified entry requirements.

3.4.5.2 LLL and entry requirements

In all countries certain qualifications for access to most LLL courses are necessary. Indeed, totally free access to higher education would be impractical for two main reasons. a) The universities could not, under the present structure, be able to accommodate the masses of students that would result from a totally free entry, and b) free entry would be incompatible with the minimum standards and quality assurance required for higher education. So in all countries of the study and all institutions included in the sample access to the bulk of courses is obtained on the basis of certain entry requirements. Thus, in France, for entry to LLL programmes of long duration, a formal entrance or degree qualification or passing a scholastic aptitude test (SAT) or a subject related entrance examination is required. Returning or second chance adults to higher education may also be admitted through APEAL (accreditation of prior education, achievements and learning). In Germany, Universities in most states would admit adults for initial degrees on the basis of job experience but only about two per cent of all students are admitted in this way. Access to Master's or postgraduate certificate courses usually require a first degree or some equivalent academic qualification. In Norway, non credit courses are generally open to all, but for credited examinable courses of both continuing and initial education a SAT is required. In Spain, adults over 25 can enrol in university programmes without a secondary degree but for certain programmes a special exam is required. Around three per cent of students enter in this way and a much higher proportion in distance universities. Working experience is not formally recognised in regulated programmes. In the UK each university decides its own entry requirements but in most cases APEAL and interviews are applied.

Looking at the pattern of entry requirements for LLL courses in the universities, we can say that longer credited courses leading to a degree, diploma or certificate invariably apply certain entry requirements either in the form of a formal academic qualification or SAT or APEAL or the latter two together. Shorter courses on the other hand in the form of sets of seminars, summer schools etc., may lead to a certificate with or without examination but in most cases

access may be free. These patterns of entry requirements depart radically from traditional ones applied in regular programmes.

3.4.6 Modes of delivery

3.4.6.1 Flexible and multifaceted modes of learning

LLL can not be provided without a substantial departure from traditional higher education modes of delivery. Whilst much of LLL provision takes place in the classroom in the framework of lecture, seminar, tutorial, in all institutions included in the study new and variable modes of delivery are applied extensively. The majority of LLL programmes tend to be part-time rather than full-time, modular rather than comprehensive and to a large extent delivered from a distance. The style of delivery gives emphasis on self learning and thus there is substantial use of modern technologies. All national reports stress the point that delivery must be based on what the British Fryer Report has called «the need to put learners before structure». The life style of adult learners and the fact that they are mostly in full or part time employment necessitate new flexible modes of delivery. Thus, modular courses, summer schools, sets of seminars and lecture series, evening classes, and distance courses, and the use of multimedia are central features of LLL provision. These modes of delivery and especially modularization and credit accumulation and transfer have made learning very flexible and have enabled learners to move from one providing institution to another and to interact between work and learning. This, of course, places special responsibility for the learners to organise their own education and for the teachers the obligation to teach learners how to learn. All national reports have described a variety of modes of flexible learning and the French report identified several patterns of LLL courses alternating between the work place and the university and in many cases curricula were constructed jointly between academics and representatives of customer or employer organisations.

3.4.6.2 Distance learning

Most respondents emphasised the importance of distance learning in LLL provision and for some this is its most essential characteristic. Distance learning entails both a radically different organisation of learning and a novel mode of its delivery which frees the learner from being physically present in the providing institution. This is of crucial importance especially for those who cannot afford or do not want to interrupt their employment to devote time to continuing education. Unlike conventional courses distance learning common curricula can be designed to

reach large numbers of students potentially in any part of the globe. Such curricula can involve common sets of materials, specially designed textbooks and guides, special processes of exchanging material and information between teachers and learners through electronic means and common forms of assessment. Distance learning can often be interpreted as response to globalisation of higher education and many universities implement it as part of a strategy for survival.

Distance learning is generally well established and a dominant mode of LLL provision in many countries. As pointed out earlier (3.4.3), in the UK, Greece, Spain, France and Germany there are [very] successful Distance Universities which cater for [very]['very' is a useless word] large numbers of students. Many standard universities are also running distance learning programmes and there seems to be a dynamic towards rapid increase of this form of provision. The Norwegian and the Greek report pointed out that as distance learning tends to isolate students from live contact with the teacher and other learners emphasis has been placed in complementing the teaching with instructors and personal tutorial assistance. Distance learning by multimedia and electronic means alone is considered to lack the personal dimension which is essential in educational terms but when this dimension is added it is considered superior to conventional teaching in large courses with hardly any contact between students and teaches.

3.4.7 Accreditation and Quality Assurance

3.4.7.1 Accreditation and certification

In general terms, accreditation for the bulk of LLL courses at university level almost automatically follows the fact that universities are accredited institutions to offer higher education. Such accreditation may or may not be systematic and official. Certification on the other hand is in most cases systematic although variable from country to country. Longer courses, especially those leading to an academic degree, are accredited and certificated with the same procedures which apply to traditional undergraduate and post graduate degrees. This is certainly the procedure in Sweden, the UK, Norway, Germany and France but there are some variations in Spain and Greece. In Spain, LLL courses are not regulated by central government and are accredited and certificated in the regulative framework of individual states or individual universities which can provide their own degrees. Certificates and degrees of LLL courses thus do not carry an official academic status although they are recognised in the labour market. In Greece by contrast all LLL courses in the Universities are accredited on the basis of central legislation. Such legislation also distinguishes certification of degrees provided by regular

undergraduate courses and that provided by LLL courses. There is thus specific legislation applying to degrees forthcoming from Programmes of Elective Studies (PSE), and degrees forthcoming from the Open University. Such degrees are, however, fully equivalent to traditional undergraduate and postgraduate degrees and fully recognised by the public and the private sector. Shorter LLL courses, which in Greek universities are still few, and are produced by the Centres of Vocational Education (KEK) are also accredited by special legislation but their certification carries no official status although they are recognised in the labour market.

In short, accreditation and certification of LLL courses, including distance learning, fall under two major categories which apply to all countries. a) Degrees which are awarded, more or less, within the same regulative procedures applying to traditional undergraduate and post-graduate certification. b) Certificates. These concern the bulk of LLL courses, differ greatly between them, and are provided on the basis of the nature, content and length of the actual courses attended. More specifically such certificates concern: modules or credits which can be transferred and accumulated towards building a degree or can be used individually; certificates of vocational courses, commissioned courses, and courses of continuing education intended mainly for continuing professional development (CPD); shorter courses, series of seminars, summer schools etc., for personal or professional development. The weight of all these certificates depends on the length of study and the examinations involved or not. Accreditation to the various forms and types of certificates varies from country to country and from institution to institution. In a broad sense they are all accredited although they may not be officially and generally recognised.

3.4.7.2 Quality assurance

The problem of quality assurance of LLL provision does not seem to preoccupy seriously the universities which we investigated. There seem to be two reasons for this. Firstly, compared to traditional undergraduate and post-graduate curricula and writing and research activity, LLL provision as such occupies a marginal concern. Secondly, all universities apply certain formal or informal procedures to guarantee standards and quality in higher education. The fact that LLL provisions are offered by universities and taught by academics and other experts is considered a guarantee for quality. There have been, however, many interviewees, especially from Greece and the UK but also from other countries, who consider LLL short courses as ‘a soft option’ and not possessing the depth, length, rigour and systematic quality of regular university studies.

In countries where formal quality assurance mechanisms are in place for undergraduate studies (UK, France, Norway, Sweden) these mechanisms also cover aspects of LLL provision especially those involving degrees. In shorter certificated courses, however, such mechanisms are on the whole informal and vary from country to country. Often there are plans and recommendations from official bodies to improve this situation but no concerted action has taken place in any country as yet. There is also another issue, mentioned in the French report but seems to be general, and this concerns the of LLL learners by computerised, assessment processes. Such customised processes of assessment and quality assurance seems to contradict the emphasis placed by LLL on the individual learner and her/his needs.

Another, as yet unclarified, issue concerning quality assurance is the growing number of commissioned courses and courses involving outside partnerships generally. Universities need to act quickly and flexibly in accrediting them if they are to meet the timetables of the external partners. Teaching and assessment of quality in most of these cases involves experts from outside [the] academia. Here the standards and the epistemological assumptions between academics and outsiders as to what constitutes quality may differ greatly. Related to this problem is the qualitative assessment of LLL curricula which are multi-disciplinary, domain based and involve a shift from teaching to learning. Most national reports were in agreement that in all these areas the Universities find themselves in uncharted waters and sooner or later quality assurance mechanisms specific to the growing LLL provision will have to be developed.

An area which provides a lead towards this direction is that of distance learning. Open distance learning universities seem to have developed mechanisms of assessment of both their degrees and the shorter certificated units. In many open universities, including the Greek one, all course units are subject to assessment at various levels and are also assessed by the students. The Open University of the UK, with a massive provision, has maintained very high standards of degrees and certificates and its teaching methods materials and textbooks are regarded very highly and are being used widely by conventional undergraduate programmes.

3.4.8 Concluding remarks

Lifelong learning if implemented in the universities in a large scale would imply radical changes in curricula and the conception and dissemination of knowledge. It would amount to a revolution in higher education as we know it. LLL provision entails demand led rather supply led curricula, a shift from teaching to learning and a consequent shift in the roles of teachers and learners. Learners become reflective practitioners and teachers act as mediators and facilitators

in the learning process. Knowledge and experience from different settings (family, work, etc.) is taken into account and incorporated in the learning process which is likely to involve partners outside the academia. Within LLL provision, traditional discipline boundaries become blurred or disappear and flexible, trans/inter/multidisciplinary, action-oriented frameworks of knowledge become dominant. These frameworks are characterised by what Gibbons et al (1994) have termed as «knowledge production in mode 2».

The above constitutes an emerging normative theory for higher education. In practice, the universities are beginning to respond to the challenge but they are very far from entering into such kind of provisions in a large scale. With the exception of Sweden and to a lesser extent Norway, LLL policies are far from being embedded in the universities we have investigated. In most cases the implementation of such policies was left to departmental initiatives, to isolated units of continuing education, or to individuals. Even in the countries and institutions where such policies have taken hold substantial numbers of individuals held the view that that the values of independent learning and the capacity to transfer skills could be well served by traditional higher education. In Germany, for instance, there has been an emphasis on independent learning traditionally and most LLL provision takes place in the context of continuing academic education.

Academic staff on the whole, perhaps in anticipation of developments, consider it 'politically incorrect' to reject the idea of LLL but teaching and research within disciplines takes precedence in their interest and pre-occupations. In many cases, as in Spain for instance, the motives in espousing LLL curricula may be economic for departments or individuals. The relationship between disciplines and LLL is a very complex and still unclarified issue which needs much thought and discussion. The example of Sweden shows that the assumed dichotomy between LLL and traditional provision is not as sharp as often assumed. The transformation from disciplines to domains may after all be a relatively smooth evolutionary process in which disciplines and LLL interact and coexist.

Concerning subject areas some cautious statements could be made. Shifts towards trans-disciplinary and domain based curricula were frequent in technological subjects such as engineering, computer science, information and communication technologies, economics, law, management and organisation. Such domains were demand led in the context of CPD.

Finally, cases of good practice at an institutional level seem to be forthcoming from the Open Distance Universities. Such institutions are LLL providers *par excellence*. They were established for the purpose and are not hampered by the rigidities and the structures of ordinary universities. The content and the mode of their curricula seem well able to respond to the needs

of the knowledge society. The standards of their provision and their quality assurance and accreditation and certification mechanisms seem to dispel fears about lowering of standards etc. Their present function and standard of provision may augur well for LLL provision in the future. Standard universities may well employ substantially open distance learning provision in the years ahead.

CHAPTE FIVE

3.5 ORGANISATION OF LLL IN THE UNIVERSITIES AND CHANGES IN POWER STRUCTURES

3.5.1 Introduction

Higher education systems in Western Europe have undergone significant transformation as a result of national economic and educational policies over the last twenty years (Kogan et al, 2000; Kogan and Hanney, 2000; Henkel, 2000). Apart from curricula, such policies have also been affecting the organisation of higher education institutions and power structures and relations within them. In some universities, new organisational units to broker and encourage LLL, sometimes under the supervision of a senior academic, have appeared. These developments, where they occur, may have contributed to shifts of power from the *collegium* and from departmental and faculty boards and other units of the base to the rectors and vice-rectors and various special committees. Within departmental structures, there are examples of universities permitting the designation of entrepreneurial centres which can employ staff on specific contracts and build up their own reserves whilst contributing to the resources of the university. This makes it possible for them to fashion their working patterns to the needs of students who may be in work or in other countries.

International, national and institutional policies on LLL were bound to have a significant impact in the organisation and power structures and power relations in universities, proportionate to the degree of implementation of such policies. In this chapter we summarise our findings on these topics, which have been dealt more extensively in the national reports and in the thematic report: Lifelong Learning and Power Relations and Structures.

3.5.2 Organisational patterns of LLL in the Universities.

3.5.2.1 International policies and LLL organisation

Our data show that international policies on LLL have affected only slightly and on the whole indirectly the organisational patterns at the level of provision (see also 3.3.9.1). Thus, in England, Germany, Spain and France our respondents saw little or no direct effect of the policies of international organisations (UNESCO, OECD, EU) on the organisational patterns of LLL in their institutions. Many saw a connection between LLL programmes in their institutions and various EU programmes such as Leonardo, Lingua, Socrates etc. and they also saw a link in the financing of certain education and training programmes. In Norway and Sweden there was evidence that international policies were taken seriously by academics in the implementation of LLL and some saw an influence of the pioneering policies of the Nordic countries on the policies of the EU and the OECD. In Greece, more than any other country, there seemed to be some direct influence between LLL provision and EU policies. This was mainly due to the fact that various forms of LLL such as the Open University, the PSE and certain post-graduate programmes were largely funded by EU revenues.

3.5.2.2 National Policies and LLL organisation

National policies affected variously the formation of LLL structures in each country and such effect was in large part determined by the relationship of the state and higher education institutions. Thus, in the UK, apart from the Open University, which was established by government action in 1969, there has been very little government intervention in the forms of LLL organisation in the universities.

In France the influence of public authorities was more direct and LLL provision was channelled along various patterns including the CNAM for returning adults; specialised university departments; fostering provision in all departments; degree level provision in the distance learning centres (CNED). Institutions however were given substantive autonomy in the implementation of these patterns.

In Germany, federal legislation provided the framework within which the various states legislated for LLL implementation in the universities which exercised their 'freedom in teaching and research'. On the whole, universities have not welcomed, a wide variety of forms of LLL preferring to provide largely continuing academic education. Various education committees, however, have been pressing for a reduction of undergraduate curricula in favour of specialisation in later stages of life.

In Greece, there is a close connection between the state and the universities. Although, in theory, the latter are self-governed institutions, in practice, the constitutional and legal framework leave little room for innovation from within. As mentioned earlier, LLL provision in the universities was introduced largely after 1997 and its forms of organisation in the universities have been determined in great detail by state legislation (see 3.2.4). Apart from the implementation of LLL the legislation also was intended to widen access to ease the problem of the very high demand for degree based higher education. As a result most of LLL provision in Greek universities is degree oriented either at undergraduate or post-graduate level and the great majority of students are aged between 25 to 35. In this respect Greece differs from the other countries in the study in which the great part of provision is within continuing education and a large proportion of learners are over the age of 30.

In Norway, universities are state institutions and governments have emphasised the importance of continuing education as a social and political goal. As a result of state policy a variable organisation of LLL provision came into being. In 1990 the Norwegian Higher Education Distance Network (SOFF) was established to promote distance education in the universities. In the late 1990s the universities set up two networks: the Network University and the Enterprise University. These are specific forms of organisation of LLL. The former is a collaborative project which provides mainly modular credit giving courses in IT by computer based distance learning. The latter is also collaborative and offers commissioned and standard courses delivered in house to firms and public administration.

In Spain, state policy has not defined LLL and this made it difficult for universities to produce explicit forms of provision in this area. Demand, however, in this area has been high and provision developed in a somewhat anarchic way. A great variety of short and longer courses have been offered, including universities' own degrees, outside official regulated courses. The organisation of LLL in Spanish universities thus seems to follow the rules of the free market.

In Sweden, state policy and the central admissions system seem to be the main determining factors of LLL organisation. Large proportions of mature students were admitted to higher education in a variety of courses. Despite the fact that institutional autonomy was enhanced in recent years the universities were pressed to provide more study alternatives to more students in a situation of decreasing state funding.

In conclusion we can say that the evidence forthcoming from our findings is that the introduction of LLL in the universities has not affected in any significant way state university relationships. LLL organisation in the universities, in most countries, is still determined to a

large extent by the nature of the state and its relationships with universities, and by tradition and the history of education systems.

3.5.3 LLL and power structures/relations in the universities

3.5.3.1. The specific questions we had to answer in this section were: how far and in what ways does LLL provision affect basic units in the universities such as departments, faculties etc.? does LLL lead to new definable structural developments? Is there evidence of changes in the distribution of power as a result of LLL provision? The answers to these questions are closely connected to the volume of provision in each institution and we must distinguish between structures at the institutional level, rectors vice-rectors, special senate committees, and structures at departmental and faculty level.

We should also emphasise that Open distance Universities are *sui generis* in the sense that they have been established and structured to provide LLL. In this respect organisation and power structures/relations differ substantially in these institutions compared to standard universities. The above questions therefore do not arise for Open Universities which can serve as comparative structures for standard universities.

3.5.3.2 The findings on these questions, concerning the seven countries as a whole, confirm that the impact of LLL on power structures/relations is rather low and differs from country to country and from institution to institution according to the volume and forms of LLL provision. There is not as yet a critical mass of LLL provision in universities for the distribution of power to be seriously affected. Especially where LLL is provided mainly through departments as in England, Germany, and Sweden no significant shift in the distribution of power within institutions was observed.

One issue which affected variably the distribution of power between institutions and in most institutions examined is that of funding. In all countries, the majority of LLL courses attract funding from sources other than the revenues provided by the state. Such revenues tend to strengthen certain units such as entrepreneurial centres and Business Schools in British Universities for instance. The same was observed in Greece where LLL units were funded by EU revenues through the Department of Education. This connection between LLL provision, funding, and strengthening of units, whether departments or centres of continuing education, applied to all countries and is connected to the shift from internal state to external sources of funding.

3.5.3.3 A general pattern emerged between those countries and institutions where LLL was provided largely through traditional departments and those in which provision went through special units such as special LLL departments, continuing education centres and other parallel structures. In Britain, Germany and Sweden, LLL was offered mainly through structures within traditional departments. In Spain initiatives were taken mainly by individuals and there have been certain institutional structures in the process of formation. In France and Norway there was a mixture between special units and departmental provision and in Greece all LLL provision was provided by special units and structures established by special legislation.

The case of France is of special interest and points to significant directions for the potential developments in LLL provision because there is sufficient volume between the two modes of structures for comparisons to be made. In France, there has been great demand from people who missed a first chance for higher education and from returning adults for continuing professional development. This required not only new structures and new modes of delivery but also ways of assessing prior knowledge and experience. The oldest and most special institution for LLL provision CNAM, rigidified by tradition and professorial status, has not been flexible enough to respond adequately to the new and rising demand. In Nanterre university also, despite the dynamism and the dedication of the continuing education department, the emphasis placed on disciplines and their importance prevented an efficient implementation of the APEAL policy. In both institutions tensions were observed at the structural level of the introduction of LLL. In the scientific university of Lille, by contrast, LLL provision has become an institution-wide objective shared with active commitment by all departments with appropriate support services provided by a central unit staffed with professionals. As a result in 1996 alone the university of Lille had an income of 14 million Euros from continuing education activities and there were about 500 adults registered on the basis of paid professional leave. The point to stress is that in Lille with a comprehensive LLL policy shared actively by all departments tensions about power transformations are virtually absent whereas in most other institutions, where such comprehensive policies have not been developed, significant obstacles and tensions in LLL implementation have been observed.

In the Nordic countries also, and Sweden in particular, where comprehensive national policies coalesce with policies, practices and structures shared by faculties and departments, LLL provision is very advanced with minimum power tensions. In Greece, by contrast, the introduction of Programmes of Elective Studies (PSE) as structures parallel to departments, created internal conflicts both at institutional and departmental level and the great majority of departments opposed them. The lesson, therefore, forthcoming from these cases is that LLL can

be implemented better within an evolutionary framework using comprehensive policies and structures involving all departments along with new institution wide structures. In this manner actual and potential power conflicts are prevented or mitigated. Also, dichotomy between LLL and conventional discipline based provision becomes attenuated and the boundaries between them become eventually blurred.

3.5.3.4 The fact that LLL is basically demand-led entails also a certain shift of power from teachers to learners. Given that LLL provision involves as yet only a small proportion of the activities of the universities we did not attempt to measure or assess such a shift in current practices. We did attempt, however, to register the views of our respondents on this matter. In most cases LLL was assumed to involve mature students, postgraduates and returning adults for continuing professional development. Within this context, we were able to elicit from our interviewees two major categories of perceptions as to what a shift of power from teachers to learners would actually mean in practice. These categories corresponded to different philosophies of knowledge and what university education is about.

The first category, advocated by the majority, believed that LLL involves a shift of power from teachers to learners because such learning is clearly dialectical in the sense that it involves, 'flexible learning', 'independent learning' and 'student-centred learning'. This meant that learners should be involved even in designing curricula and students would have a direct role in evaluating content and modes of delivery. We can infer from this majority view, that LLL implementation on a large scale would alter the norms of power relations in the universities.

The other category believed that whilst LLL entailed shifts at various levels and consequently in teacher-student relationships, the fact remained that in university education the authority between them can never be equal. Although the knowledge which the teachers possess is not sacrosanct, that very possession places them in an advantageous position which by its very nature is a position of power.

3.5.3.5 In conclusion we can say that as things stand at present **the changes in power structures and power relations in the universities are more potential than actual**. The dynamics of LLL implementation, however clearly point to the direction of substantive changes at all levels and this involves relations and structures of power. Having said that we must stress that the extent of change in this as in other areas is determined as much by the fundamental nature of existing political and administrative structures as by the intrinsic characteristics of LLL itself.

CHAPTER 6

3.6 PARTNERSHIPS AND MARKET RELATIONS.

3.6.1 Partnerships

3.6.1.1 In many countries, universities, for sometime, had been thought of as ‘ivory towers’ concerned primarily with ‘the disinterested search for truth’. Our research showed that such an image no longer characterises the universities in the countries involved in the study. Evidence from the institutions investigated and from general data collected in each national study show that the universities are now well involved in what the Swedish report calls ‘the third task’ or ‘the third obligation’. Socio-economic objectives and motives underpin now a significant part of higher education provision and LLL is an important factor in the pursuit of such objectives be it employment for the students or income for the institution.

The universities have been involved in partnerships with outside agencies for sometime but in several countries, especially in the U.K and in Germany such partnerships have increased during the 1980s. On the whole, such partnerships concerned research and consultancy but, during the 1990s, they have been increasingly involving teaching and commissioned programmes.

Partnerships of universities with outside bodies have, in some cases, been initiated by governments determining that businessmen and managerial personnel would be involved in the allocation of funding but such personnel has not affected curriculum development directly in any significant sense. Indirectly, however, and to the degree that they have been advocating government policy they have influenced curricula substantially. This was certainly true in England during the Thatcher period, when the universities had to operate in the context of ‘the enterprise culture’, a motive that has persisted.

This gave rise to matters of principle as to how far universities should relinquish their commitment to the ‘disinterested pursuit of truth’. In this general context, some of our respondents argued that partnerships threatened the autonomy of the universities and the freedom of the academia to determine the content of curricula. Some questioned whether the primary role of the universities was to prepare the students for employment. The majority of respondents in all institutions, however, did not believe that external partnerships in themselves would threatened the universities’ ‘pursuit of truth’ or their role in the design and delivery of curricula. On the contrary, most of them seemed to welcome engaging in partnerships with

external actors as a challenge and as a necessity of the function of the universities in contemporary society. In most cases, the respondents pointed out, outside partners were in a negotiating position with the universities.

The partnerships, which relate directly to the introduction of LLL in the universities, and which have increased substantially especially since 1995, are of three major categories: a) partnerships with other academic institutions inside and outside each country; b) partnerships with the public sector and non government and voluntary bodies; c) partnerships with the private sector, namely corporations, companies, banks etc. The first category increased substantially everywhere. The inter/trans/multi-disciplinary character of LLL necessitates co-operation inside and outside institutions.

3.6.1.2 All institutions investigated were engaged in partnerships of the categories just mentioned but the mix and the volume differed between institutions and countries. Thus, in England and Germany the emphasis was on partnerships with the private sector whereas in Sweden the majority of commissioned courses were with state and municipal authorities and non government organisations. In Germany, agents from industry and the managerial world are actively involved in various education committees of the regional states and seem to influence the formation of partnerships between the universities and the private sector. In France, Greece and Spain the pattern of partnerships is mixed although the dichotomy between the public and the private sector is not always clear cut. In France for instance educational leave is subsidised by the state and most partnerships involve some tripartite relationship between the companies, the universities and the state.

We do not have statistics for the total number of partnerships in each country but in the institutions investigated the volume of partnerships was proportionate to the volume of LLL provision. Thus, in general, Open Universities were involved in more partnerships than other universities. The Open University of the UK, for instance, had partnerships with over 300 organisations.

3.6.1.3 Partnerships were organised through various communication channels and at various levels within the institutions. Liaison offices with outside bodies are now standard in all universities. The majority of partnerships at the institutional level went through such offices and channelled to the appropriate units which took part in the negotiations. In some British universities there were also special entrepreneurial centres. In Germany, «Concerted Action for Continuing Education» was initiated in the 1990s headed by the federal Ministry of Education

and Research. As a result interest groups elaborated common positions for various areas of continuing education and industry and employers made a significant contribution to this by addressing their own positions and demands to the universities. Continuing education for teachers was also centrally organised in Greece, France, Germany and Sweden. At the other end of this high level organised communication between universities and outside bodies there was an ad hoc pattern, observed in most countries, where individual members of staff took initiative to organise LLL courses for specific partners or clients. A substantial volume of LLL provision was organised in this manner.

3.6.2 Market relations and financial issues

3.6.2.1 The introduction of LLL to the universities and their external partnerships raise the important issue as to how far higher education should be a matter of state or private provision and to what extent the universities can engage in market relations in a competitive way as enterprises do. Moreover, if LLL provision at university level is open to all, the problem of its funding becomes a central issue. Time and money did not allow our project to explore these questions which obviously would entail a separate research project. We were able, however, through our data to get a general impression of the trends and issues involved.

3.6.2.2 Financial cuts or squeeze on education by the state and the search for funds outside have forced most universities in all countries of the research to engage in market relations in one way or another. This does not mean that universities became entrepreneurial institutions in Clark's (1998) sense but it does mean that they have been infused with a competitive spirit. LLL, because of its demand-lead character, encourages this competitive spirit and challenges the universities to enter market relations in a serious way. The response as we have seen varies from country to country and from institution to institution and depends on factors, often mentioned in this report, namely tradition and legal and constitutional frameworks of university state relationships. Thus, in Greece, because of late socio-economic development and a political culture there is an assumption amounting to an ideology and even dogma that the funding of higher education is matter for the state. In Sweden, also, there is a strong tradition of education as a public resource, but universities have been encouraged to enter market relations. In Britain, Germany, France and Spain the universities are making a lot of money by selling continuing education. Despite variety, however, there is a common pattern characteristic of all the institutions investigated in this research. They are all becoming increasingly open to the challenges posed not only by LLL but by socio-economic developments in general. Concerning

the implementation of LLL, in most institutions it constitutes an important financial motive, if nothing else, and all of them are aware that its pursuit involves key terms such as flexibility networking and partnerships.

Section Four: Conclusions and policy implications

1. In this section, we state conclusions and policy implications under the following headings:

- I. How the project advanced the state of the art.
- II. The contribution of the European collaborative effort.
- III. The key results from the project, both in general and for each of the seven countries.
- IV. Policy and practice applications.
- V. The trans-national applicability and relevance of the results.
- VI. The need for further research.

I. How the project advanced the state of the art.

2. This project is one of the few **empirical** studies on Life Long Learning that has been conducted in a range (28) of universities across a range of seven different EU countries. In doing so, it advanced the state of the art in that it conceptualised and analysed literature, documents and fieldwork data in a new area of higher education research. Indeed, the project advanced the state of the art by showing the conceptual complexity and the multifaceted character of LLL at the empirical level. Although the partners did not produce a new methodology they patiently conceptualised and analysed the official and academic literature and published preliminary results in the *European Journal of Education* about the state of the art in each country. They also produced national reports for each country, three thematic documents on key issues running across the seven countries, and then summarised the whole in this report. This elaborate process was undertaken within a framework of four meetings of all participants and a constant flow of communication, mainly through e-mail. Despite a modest budget the project has been able to advance the state of the art considerably. It showed that the rhetoric employed in international and government policies about LLL is a far cry from the complexity of the concept of LLL and the problems of its actual implementation. It further showed that the concept of LLL itself is in urgent need of definition if it is to be implemented on a large scale at university level. But above all the state of the art has been advanced by showing that LLL provision on a large scale at universities would entail substantial changes at all levels and would amount to a revolution in higher education provision as we know it.

In practice, influences and references to LLL policy are evident in different kinds of regulations, measures, activities etc that makes it almost impossible to compare particular “LLL activities” (operationalised in particular measures, activities etc) in one country with similar LLL activities in another country. Such comparisons are often misleading, as a particular LLL activity in one country might be a special and novel, non-traditional, and non-regular activity, while the same kind of activity in another country might be part of the regular and well consolidated activities of all higher education institutions. So our research contributes particularly to the state of the art by advocating that a more nuanced selection of indicators of LLL activities should be promoted for international comparisons of LLL provision at national as well as at European and international level

II. The value of the European collaborative effort

3. The European collaborative effort has contributed greatly to the success of the project by demonstrating both the differences and commonalities of thought and tradition which exist in the different countries. The comparative exercise indicated both the dynamics and the potential as well as the obstacles of research in higher education at a European level. Concerning policies especially the project showed how national policies of LLL converge or diverge with policies of the EU and other international organisations and how policies and their implementation differ from country to country. However, the collaborative effort showed clearly that higher education in any country involves substantive international dimensions which can be explored best by international teams of researchers.

III. The key results from the project, both in general and for each of the seven countries.

How far has LLL taken hold?

4. In proposing policy and practice implications of our study we offer conclusions for action at both the level of systems and at the level of academic work. As a basis for this part of the exercise, we begin by making an appraisal, drawn from our research sources where possible, of the extent to which LLL has taken hold in the seven countries.

5. Our analysis of LLL implementation and impact must be tentative. It is based on national official documentation which will inevitably look in hope to the future rather than to present realities, and on studies of only four universities in each of seven countries. Moreover, life-long learning is subject to so many definitions, and used as a label for such diverse activities, that any accurate summation of its viability must be conditional. Courses that provide for LLL may not be recognised as such. Indeed, some teachers would maintain that all university education prepares students for LLL.

6. Notwithstanding these reservations, it is clear that there is awareness almost everywhere of the importance of providing appropriate education well beyond the years of formal higher education provision and for wider social, ethnic and age groups. This is for motives ranging from the need to enhance economic performance to the desirability of personal development. But there are large gaps between policy intention and the stated commitments of many academics, and actual delivery of LLL policies. In almost all countries, LLL has relatively low status. Institutional and academic survival and status depend still on research and scholarship outcomes, and to some extent on the capacity to attract school leavers to full time courses. There are financial obstacles to its promotion. Resources are rarely dedicated to it by national authorities. It may not be counted as part of the teaching load or otherwise rewarded even though producing curricula and texts for distance learning may constitute a distinct and additional task.

7. Yet it moves forward. As we first briefly review progress in each country it will be seen that some changes are evident, if more at the level of appreciation and consciousness than as definable action.

England

8. In England, LLL policies are exhortatory rather than prescriptive or backed up by earmarked funds. Many believe that the traditional and largely humanistic tradition of teaching and learning already provides the basis for life long learning. Extending access to higher education has been strongly associated with LLL developments, notably in the success of the Open University in reaching new populations and those with previous experience of higher education. Mature students are well represented at undergraduate level. A significant expansion of access has been to postgraduate certificate and Master's courses developed in the name of CPD. Universities are showing themselves to be increasingly interested in meeting the lifetime learning aspirations of their alumni, many or most of whom they still expect to come to them at a young age.

9. There has been a shift in thinking about the value of higher education for the culture of society and the personal development of individuals to its role in the economy and individual careers. The shift from knowledge to skills has emerged as strong. There has been an expansion of multi-disciplinary, inter-disciplinary and domain-based provision, particularly in continuing professional development. The extent to which life long learning of itself has led to innovations in courses and programmes is contestable. Modularisation is well established in the majority of universities but this has not been widely translated into flexible patterns of study. LLL innovation has primarily been in the mode of delivery, particularly distance learning, rather than in learning objectives or outcomes. The most successful forms of LLL, for example the Open University's distance learning, are costly and require a large scale activity. National policies on student finance continue to militate against some modes of study, notably part time degrees.

France

10. In the French institutions surveyed, significant efforts have been made to make the supply of courses more flexible, whether in terms of curriculum conceptions, alternative delivery or certification. The issue is, therefore, to organise and strengthen these limited and often fragile experiments into a university policy. LLL is more developed in disciplines where the "outside reference" is strong, i.e. in business administration, engineering, education, among others. In fields where it is lacking, the development of the discipline is the sole reference to organise the development and transfer of knowledge and LLL meets with great resistance.

11. Despite the official status conferred by the 1984 Law, LLL is still seeking legitimacy in most French universities. Courses need to reach a "critical mass", supported by appropriate organisational arrangements. To achieve this, strong leadership is required to overcome the natural tendency towards fragmentation at work in most universities. Some significant steps aimed at encouraging LLL financially have recently been taken by the government, but they fall short of requirements. Many individual course directors have few inhibitions in designing and marketing their "products", in selecting their clients or users, and in accommodating the modes of delivery to the specific needs of returning adults. Because these initiatives often rest with individuals, they are fragile and seldom self-sustainable in the long run. The regulations governing the use of academic staff are also an obstacle on the road to responsiveness.

Germany

12. In Germany 'a novel spirit of reform can be felt' and at numerous universities modified course concepts are being tested successfully. Yet although continuing education is one of the statutory duties of universities, it is still attributed little importance. Compared with the total number of undergraduates and the total number of first degree courses, the proportion of

continuing academic education at universities can be estimated to be less than 5 per cent, with great differences between individual universities, German states and academic disciplines. There are, however, promising aspects of LLL: economic organisations are fully represented on higher education policy bodies, and many universities are developing infra-structural arrangements for organising LLL.

Greece

13. As a result of recent legislation significant LLL provision has been introduced in Greek universities, particularly in new postgraduate programmes and the Open University which has already registered over 5,000 students at undergraduate and post-graduate level; the prospects are that it will serve over 20,000 learners between 23-50 years of age within the next five years. Yet the legislation on PSE (Programmes of Elective Studies) had a limited and even hostile reception. Only five out of nineteen universities offered to implement such programmes and at one opposition by staff and students caused it to be abandoned. The PSE together, however, enlisted 2051 students and these programmes are said to be of high standard and very promising. These embryonic structures are likely to develop into significant LLL provision. The KEK (Centres for Vocational Training) in the universities, on the other hand, seem to remain marginal structures with low prestige.

14. Because of the powerful influence exercised by international organisations- the EU in particular- and the national Department of Education, there cannot be an explicit, autonomous, long term strategy for LLL at institutional level because of the complex and centralised structure of the whole system and the relation between institutions and the state.

Norway

15. Norwegian universities are attempting to retain their commitment to research based teaching on a high level whilst advancing continuing education. In this the division into a binary system enables them to sustain their intention to provide offerings different from college courses. The universities are required to observe national regulations, but there is evidence of innovation in multi-disciplinarity, distance learning, the use of IT, and connections with economic institutions.

Spain

16. LLL policy has never been defined in Spain and its development has been a bottom-up process driven by market forces. Yet LLL activities (mostly as continuing education) have grown enormously in less than two decades; Spanish universities offer more than 2,500 programs of this type, and innumerable short courses and other smaller activities. This growth is in response to the rigidity of university curricula and the slowness to adapt their content to the demand for working qualifications required by the new environment, as well as the social and professional prestige of some type of LLL studies. Because of a severe decrease in the birth rate, LLL is becoming a strategic need for the future of universities. Also, LLL activities are categorised as separate financially from regular programmes for both institutions and teachers and there are thus financial incentives.

17. LLL activities are more innovative, dynamic, student-focused than regular activities in universities. In many cases they are a model to be followed by the rest of teaching. However, despite the dynamism not everything is positive. Although LLL activities are mostly based on

public universities, they work as a private system. Students have to pay the full cost and grants are scarce. It is assumed that people enrolled in the programs are working and can afford them, but most are relatively young graduates, many of them unemployed or just starting a professional career and their resources can be limited. The second source of conflict is that teachers and institutions may forget the main purpose of LLL activities that bring extra resources and are, in many cases, more interesting from a personal point of view.

Sweden

18. Within Swedish higher education, the general assumptions entailed in LLL were already prevalent from the main elements of the 1977 reform. There was broad acceptance of the importance of a lifelong learning perspective, a large proportion of non-traditional students among the regular students, a wide variety of tertiary programmes, modularization of undergraduate education, an emphasis on the ‘third task’ of higher education, to serve society and a direct link between study aid and point-production. There was also frequent use of individually initiated in-service training or further education. The reforms of 1993 also reflected influences from lifelong learning ideals, by opening up a more flexible usage of institutions’ facilities and allowing for a more individualised view on how higher education facilities ought to be used. The proportion of programmes was to be reduced and more emphasis put on separate courses, as a tool for meeting individual demands. Students were also to be offered freedom of choice between alternative courses

19. It is difficult, however, as in the UK, to identify institutional arrangements aiming particularly at providing lifelong learning within Swedish higher education. These are embedded in the tasks of the central organisation of the universities, the faculties and, in some cases, within individual departments. The policies are often presented under headings that together constitute mainstreaming and nationally promoted policy areas: “internationalisation”, “information”, “external relations”, “social collaboration” and “quality” as well as “pedagogical renewal” and “new structures of knowledge”. However, as these ideas lack institutional stability, it is difficult to be sure how seriously the universities have responded to lifelong learning demands in terms of policies and practice.

20. But at the institutional level, there is evidence of lifelong learning practices in curriculum development that aim at creating interdisciplinary studies and problem-based learning. There are also local development projects to encourage teachers to develop their teaching towards more student-oriented learning. However, these developmental trends are seldom argued for with any references to lifelong learning. References are made to the familiar body of normative educational ideas from the 1960s and 1970s and to the more recent notions of Learning Society and Knowledge Society.

21. There are also obstacles at the national level to a more flexible usage of lifelong opportunities in higher education:

a) The principle that studies should be free of charge and all students treated equally prevents institutions from offering different types of educational opportunities (with the exception of commissioned education) to different categories of students.

b) The resource allocation system does not give institutions economic incentives for offering the students part-time courses and IT-based distance-education. The interest of institutions in offering summer courses, distance education, and commissioned education and similar

activities, has faded. It is most rewarding for institutions to concentrate on long programmes for regular students. Regulations restrict an active engagement in non-regular activities on undergraduate level. The regulative framework for external activities is more diffuse or restrictive than supportive in e.g. certification of students in commissioned education in terms of academic points, the restrictions on teachers' payment for additional activities. The institutions have not yet, with some exceptions, established efficient organisations for their external activities directed to non-regular students. One main reason, it is argued by the institutions, is that such organisations cannot bear their own costs.

22. Thus, the universities do not use their space of action for flexible usage of resources to provide non-regular activities in ways that go beyond the traditional and well-accepted definition of lifelong learning and challenge established principles of a public (and free of charge) educational system.

Academic norms and values

23. Our general impression is that although academic staff and/or whole departments realise that it is not 'politically correct' to reject the idea of LLL, they accord it a rather low status on the academic prestige scale where research is on top. When put under pressure from institutional decision-makers they tend to come up with symbolic activities 'to keep the wolves at bay', in the words of one interviewee quoted in the British report. LLL is not taken very seriously in these cases and the tendency is to point proudly to the number of undergraduate and postgraduate students in a department or to research income. In Germany a typical argument is the burden of an overload of regular students and a prioritisation of research. Those departments engaging in LLL provisions are looked down upon. There is a tendency to attribute their involvement to a need to fill gaps in income from traditional students and/or to difficulties in filling places and thus to threats of merger or even closure. Such attitudes were mentioned explicitly in the British and the German national report but could be found implicitly in some of the other reports as well.

24. At most universities the role of disciplines and the related structure of faculties and departments, as well as the disciplinary organisation of curricula, are still strong. There is also scepticism about the idea of subordinating content to process in learning and teaching.

25. Overall, there is little evidence from our study that, as yet, there has been much change in the hierarchy of rewards and reputations in the academic community that might reflect or promote widespread changes in conceptions of knowledge or its organisation in universities, even if lifelong learning policies do represent significant challenges in this respect.

26. This resume of progress in the seven countries, the substance of which can be pursued in the national reports, shows substantial movements in governmental statements of intention, widespread commitment to or acceptance by institutions and academics of the ideals of life long learning, but several lacunae remain between commitment and intention and the purposive establishment of national and institutional policies that will bring the ideals to life.

IV Policy and practice implications: general points

27. There are general and overriding points that need to be made about how research findings can be converted into policy conclusions. First, one of the most important conclusions of our project is that LLL policies advocated in international and national

documents are multi-dimensional. There is no single LLL package. LLL policies incorporate objectives, economic, social, political and individual, that are not necessarily or easily reconcilable. For example, concepts in which lifelong learning are grounded, such as the knowledge society or the network society, indicate that such societies are likely to be as stratified as their predecessors. Strategies for economic development, regional, national or international may not enhance social inclusion or democracy.

28. Secondly, it is important that the various dimensions of LLL policies are analysed at national level. The analysis might focus on: how far LLL can provide a value framework for the universities' educational policies; ways of reconciling the various dimensions, and the aspects that are likely to need strongest political and economic support; the connections between LLL and other policies, past and present. The importance of this is partly that policies that are delivered consecutively (in other words 'one damned thing after another') tend to invite cynicism and delaying tactics if they are difficult to implement for some reason. It can too easily be assumed that this is the flavour of the month and will soon be abandoned for something else.

29. Thirdly, institutions should be encouraged to develop comprehensive strategies, in which they, too, aim to identify their main objectives and how these might best be clustered and/or, where appropriate, insinuated into all their policy areas. For example, most institutions now have international, local and regional policies with which they should link their primary goals and identity with the relationships and activities they wish to develop in these contexts. In the context of a regional policy, where the university is identifying its economic function vis a vis the region, it might make sense to think about the relationship between CPD and the universities' capacities for research, development and consultancy in the context of its plans for partnerships with key industries in the region. In other words, LLL should be thought about holistically and not as an add-on.

30. The lists of practical actions that follow in the next section are, therefore, likely to be unhelpful unless they are linked to or follow from the work of a more holistic analysis, otherwise they could be in danger of encouraging the setting up of yet another set of bureaucratic institutions. The emphasis should be on seeing how these proposals for action can be linked with existing aims, policies and bodies.

Policy and practice implications: the components of LLL

31. We attempt below to state policy implications in a concrete form which will enable policy-makers and practitioners to identify its components and consider the extent to which their present policies and practices meets the LLL mandate.

31.1 Setting objectives and definitions of LLL.

LLL invites a range of definitions and objectives, some potentially conflicting with each other. At a minimum, these multiplicities of objectives should be recognised and debate begun on the priorities to be followed by universities and their constituent parts. This would include deliberation of EU recommendations and decisions and the results of this and similar studies.

A careful analysis of objectives and definitions, together with an assessment of their costs and benefits, would help those in the active field to decide where to place their efforts.

31.2. Establishing roles of national authorities

Our evidence is that LLL is affected by the role of central government and its relationships with universities, which vary greatly between countries. Whilst the more relaxed regimes might be criticised for 'benign neglect' of this policy field, so that incentives are weak or not easily identified, and student aid and teachers' conditions of service are inimicable to LLL development, other regimes sustain petty regulatory restrictions on teachers' hours of working, or the format of courses and programmes.

Possible actions are that changes in some national laws and regulations are needed which not only facilitate new educational provision and forms of teaching and learning but also support and promote them. At minimum, petty regulations should be reviewed and abandoned. Countries ought to review, in the light of this research, whether the national system provides an adequate system of incentives and guidance enabling further advancement of LLL. This may lead to measures which increase the autonomy of higher education institutions and their leeway for decision-making in financial and staff matters.

More detailed points emerging from field work were that central authorities should:

- clarify their LLL policies and the funding to be allocated to them;

- establish minimum criteria and a common accreditation system between universities that is recognised in the academic and/or professional world;

- establish common and, where necessary, more open criteria for admissions to LLL courses;

- set up a study of training needs and expert working groups to identify the trends and LLL interests in the socio-economic environment;

- establish a training accreditation system; plan and co-ordinate the authorities involved in training, with the aim of assigning resources; run courses protected by legislation;

- establish regulations directed at guaranteeing quality;

- clarify the legislation that regulates the time dedicated to the teaching of this type of activity.

- define the LLL functions of HE as against further education. There is uncertainty about the extent to which universities should be using scarce and specialist resources in providing for training in basic and generic skills.

31.3 *Establishing roles of institutions*

Many institutions in all countries avow commitment to LLL but are restricted by lack of resources that can be ear-marked for it, regulatory restrictions on the reformulation of teaching patterns, or faculty reluctance to move away from traditional academic tasks. Some country reports, however, point to the need for stronger institutional leadership on LLL.

Other specific proposals emerging from field work were that institutions should:

define LLL policies within mission statements and University Plans.

create adequate university roles and structures (eg vice-rector and inter-faculty committees) to ensure that the university's LLL mission is actualised;

set up policies or specific structures to identify needs and to anticipate the demands for LLL;

identify faculty skills needed in LLL when making appointments;

review academic profiles. The roles that academics might play have now multiplied; it is unrealistic for them all to be combined in single individuals. University staffing policies should incorporate an analysis of these roles, the different ways in which they might be combined and which of the combinations are likely to be applicable in their institution. The analysis could then be opened up to debate in the university. Conclusions would feed into recruitment, pay, promotion, staff development, staff appraisal policies. The development of staffing policies for various dimensions of LLL would be subsumed within this process.

review rewards systems for those developing and carrying out LLL practices;

identify training priorities in each professional field; create a framework that gives structure and context to training activities;

improve management and create administrative co-ordination along the lines of a 'one-stop service';

with top sliced money, give priority to and support higher quality proposals; allocate resources to distance learning courses;

adapt the range of courses to suit the needs of external users of the university; win company-training contracts;

establish control mechanisms and indicators that guarantee a minimum standard of quality;

fully utilise resources by means of interdepartmental collaboration;

allocate budget for specific needs of LLL;

identify facilities required for LLL provision eg library loans, cafeteria and other opening times on campus;

install technology to overcome barriers to distance learning.

31.4. Establishing roles of departments and individual academics.

LLL places heavy obligations on departments and individual academics. They must remain as the primary custodians of standards and academic values whilst being open and active in forwarding LLL. The tasks are at several levels:

promote an approach to the updating of knowledge, a more practical approach. What does it mean to promote the motivation and capacity for lifelong learning in all students and how that might be achieved;

consider how far the teaching materials or methods developed for distance learning can or should contribute to conventional degree and other programmes

work through patterns of relationships with types of students different from the traditional full-time school leaver or post-graduate students. Collective and individual retraining might be necessary;

adopt a more calculative approach to work burdens so that an appropriate balance, which will vary between individuals, is struck on the time allocated to standard teaching, research, general administration and LLL.

31.5. Funding arrangements: institutional.

In virtually every country, universities feel under financial constraint and our research indicates that LLL in any of its forms requires resources additional to that allowed institutions and their component units. Whilst some revenue from LLL activities can be expected, - some entrepreneurial centres do well financially- many students are both unemployed and unfunded, and the willingness of employers to pay for education and training varies according to the subject studied. Fee income is unlikely to be a solution to funding problems.

The specific proposals are:

central government should clarify its expectations of institutional investments in LLL, and fund them accordingly;

central government should clarify who is to pay for LLL: the state, or employers or students;

institutions should optimise their fee incomes from LLL, but differentially according to likely yields from different subject areas and so as not to disturb the balance between the different LLL objectives.

31.6. Funding arrangements: students

Whilst some LLL students may be financed by employers, or, if qualified, receive grants as full-time students many part-time students may be unemployed and unable, under national regulations, receive either grants or loans. Review of student funding arrangements may be necessary.

31.7. Staffing arrangements and incentives

Several issues affecting faculty arise from LLL:

Reference has already been made to the need for staff recruitment criteria, retraining and for departmental analysis of work burdens within which LLL must be accommodated. The analysis of faculty profiles, mentioned above, would form a basis for this work.

Other points are:

Staff payment for extra LLL duties. Universities are patchy in their willingness to allow LLL to achieve full momentum by allowing staff to generate modest additions to income to encourage them to undertake curriculum development and extra teaching and other associated LLL work. But there is also a danger that this will lead to neglect of other teaching and scholarly duties, particularly if LLL is allowed to become a privatised activity, using university's reputation, resources and time for private gain. Remuneration adequate as incentives should be worked out within comprehensive agreements about total duties.

31.8. Relationships with economic organisations and partnerships.

Many universities, their units and individual academics have relations with economic or public service organisations. In Sweden, the positive aspects of this are known as the 'third obligation' that universities owe to society.

The dangers of a privatised form of these relationships have been noted above. The important practical point is to make sure that arrangements are regularised so that there are no losers, including the employing university and its regular students.

Particular points made have been:

improve the relationships between the university and business. Extend these relationships to include companies located in a wider geographical region;

systematic contacts should be set up with chambers of commerce, professional societies, unions and university graduates;

negotiations should be conducted with companies, so that they allocate funds to support training places through an approved university-business institution.

31.9. Curriculum content

In all countries, irrespective of degrees of national regulation, curriculum content remains primarily the terrain of the academics. Policy in this field cannot, and probably should not, be prescribed by non-professionals and policy-makers. For the most part, the educational changes implied by LLL concern modes of transmission and teacher-student relationships rather than content.

It is likely, therefore, that primary role of central or institutional policy-makers in this zone should be to provide teachers with, and expect them to participate in, training in which new thinking about the curriculum is available for critique and personal internalisation. The following points are relevant:

whilst some of the educational assumptions associated with LLL are contestable, they helpfully invoke discussion about the nature of the curriculum and its modes of transmission. The issue and how to face them should form an important part of the work plan of national Institutes of Learning and Teaching where they exist;

the main claim of LLL to changing curriculum is to make it to meet the needs of late recruits to HE. This would invoke development of different concepts of curriculum, e.g. curricula that are negotiated with or customised for different types of students;

some academics, however, feel that traditional and systematic teaching and learning are a preparation for a life of learning. Curriculum development for LLL should therefore include identification and acknowledgement of aspects of undergraduate and graduate traditional courses that could and do enhance LLL. Some of the rhetoric of LLL mistakenly seeks to reject aspects of traditional forms of education that are as suitable for new types of entrants to HE as are those specifically associated with LLL.

31.10. Modes of delivery

The issues that arise on modes of delivery are two kinds. The first concerns the extent to which the curriculum should be negotiable with students and capable of starting from their own experience and knowledge. The second concerns the physical modes of transmission.

On the first, issue, as with curriculum content, these are primarily matters for professional rather than macro-policy concern, but should form part of the discourse underlying faculty training for LLL. Such training should hold up for test and adaptation the following points:

- infusing traditional courses with attitudes and forms of learning that enhance self consciousness as to learning capacities and styles, self-dependency and flexibility of working attitudes;

- infusing existing undergraduate and graduate traditional courses with 'transferable skills', for example, team working and specific skills of communication and mastery of IT;

- encouraging students to identify their current and future learning needs, particularly in the context of career development, and to take responsibility for discovering how to meet them. This includes identifying sources of advice;

- recognition and exploitation of experiential learning;

- linking learning with personal development within employment.

The use of IT is fully acknowledged in all systems though it may generate costs for both universities and students. So, too, distance learning, available through both open and standard universities is well established, though it requires large numbers of students to make possible the specific curriculum development, text production and IT systems necessary for it.

31.11. Accreditation and QA

For the most part, universities and national systems, when it is within their legal functions, require LLL provision to be equivalent in standards to and subject to the same quality assurance as standard courses. The largest diversion between countries concerns entry qualifications where some countries and institutions allow for relatively unqualified entrants into higher education whereas others seek to sustain standards of entry equal to that of standards full –time students.

Review of entry requirements and assessment procedures to meet the likely educational characteristics of different groups of students seems a necessity in some countries, on the assumption that access remains a key objective of LLL. .

V. Trans-national applicability and relevance of the results

32. One of our important conclusions is that LLL is developing on the basis of what already exists and is rooted in national higher education cultures rather than supra-national policy proposals. Many of the detailed project findings, to be found in the seven national reports and the three thematic analyses, will be important to the seven contributory countries where the responsibility for higher education remains.

31. Before considering the trans-national applicability and relevance of the results, it is necessary to note the extent to which the project has revealed country differences in policy cultures and relationship to international and national policies

Power structures

32. The most important trans-national finding is that country systems and their prime actors in the universities start from very different cultural and developmental points. This affects aspects of LLL at all of the systems level. The impact of international bodies on national LLL policy making differs. For example, Greek higher education policy in general and for LLL in particular is strongly conditioned by EU and other internationally inspired policies. Almost all of the other six countries, however, depend more on their own educational traditions.

33. The relationship between the state and the universities also differs widely. The extent of change through LLL is determined as much by the fundamental nature of existing political and administrative structures as by the intrinsic characteristics of LLL itself. LLL intentions do not differ greatly from country to country or university to university. But the constitutional contexts differ enormously. They vary from highly centralised regimes, of which Greece perhaps is the most obvious example, to systems, such as the UK, which despite strong centralising policies, allows universities to respond to exhortations to LLL at their own volition. In the middle, Germany exhibits forms of voluntaristic corporatism. The forms of the exercise of influence/power range from the administration of legal requirements that universities shall participate in LLL and continuing education to financial inducements or exhortation and persuasion.

34. But it would be facile to assume that those countries which have been most prescriptive in endorsing LLL practices necessarily produce the most vigorous growth. It was safer to assume that where there is national prescription more systematic knowledge of what is happening becomes available.

35. From our seven national empirical studies, we conclude that many of the shifts recorded in the project are evidence of increased permeability and susceptibility to external influences rather than a shift in power. That is true of many of the examples of relationships not only with national and supra-national bodies but also with the private sector (see below). And it is a generalisation that seems to apply to all seven countries. Change through LLL is likely because the very definition of LLL assumes that universities will cater for groups concerned with knowledge relevant to non-academic concerns, that reference groups will be found beyond the invisible colleges of academics and will include powerful groups in the economy as well as older and more assertive students.

36. Similarly, responsiveness to EU policies depends on the extent to which national systems have a linear managerial relationship with universities. A system that rules by decree or legal requirements is more likely to empathise with, and to be responsive to, supranational nudges from the EU.

Changes in institutional power structures

37. Is LLL likely to cause changes in internal structures and power relationships? In some universities in some countries visible structures for LLL have been created in the form of central coordinating offices and the creation of vice-rector roles who may include LLL among their responsibilities. To some extent, reluctance to structure LLL, through the creation of vice-rectorally led entities or university committees, may stem from the belief that LLL is already implicit in higher education practice. Or, more obviously, as exemplified in France and some other countries, through academic reluctance to yield power or engage in new style activities. Yet there is recognition of the need for more explicit organisational arrangements for LLL which might contribute to a shift in traditional power relationships. .

38. In some systems, there are shifts in teacher-student relationships, although that may be more in prediction or intention than in actual educational practice. To carry through such changes as many teachers avow would involve a major shift in the pedagogic values of practitioners who pride themselves more on their expertise than on their interactivity and accessibility. The intention and modelling are there, but the extent to which new practices are pervasive is uncertain. The impacts on students of LLL is a key area for investigation which would have taken us well beyond our remit and resources.

Relationships with economic institutions

39. There is the issue whether universities have yielded some of their authority to industry and business or other external customer groups. Only a generation ago, universities were regarded as sacred territory concerned only with the disinterested search for truth. Our evidence is that in virtually every country, universities are responsive to external demands for services. This may derive from social principle, that universities have a moral duty to provide expertise to society and economy, as is explicit in the Swedish case, or from institutional or personal self-interest and the need to sell services in order to survive. In many countries there has been privileging of economic motives modelled on assumptions about the primacy of 'industrial' goals and to academic efficiency. LLL policies in part derive from these assumptions.

40. Different practices may follow these changes: universities may work with clients to consider the content of LLL. Such relationships affect research and teaching agendas, although faculty will always have the last word on the content and methods of what will be pursued. We

have noted that in some countries (eg Germany), economic organisations are strongly represented in government's higher education consultative bodies. For the most part, however, the external groups are not so much in a command position as in a negotiating, exchange and market relationship with universities in which resources and support are given in return for market-defined but specialist services. In many universities in some countries entities are created within universities to support the move towards LLL.

41. Thus we cannot say that LLL has brought about large shifts in power although in some countries it has brought about or created the expectation of a growth of internal structures. How far LLL will cause further and stronger power displacements is uncertain and may depend on the extent to which academics may be prepared to negotiate relationships with sponsors and clients in which academic values may be sustained alongside or as part of new provisions to meet new needs.

Relevance to Europe as a whole

42. The most important results that are relevant across Europe or large parts of it are:

(1) LLL or any similar initiative requires thought and action at several levels ranging from change in curriculum and modes of its delivery to power and management systems. But these can only be effected by taking seriously the differences in starting points from which individual universities and countries can move.

(2) Notwithstanding the power of particularity in universities, there are some surprising changes evident in some unlikely places. For example, systems and institutions that have been quite rigid in their curricula and modes of their delivery have made substantial efforts to adapt them to the needs of the non-traditional groups that have been recruited for LLL. A trans-national study such as this can encourage those attempting to cause change through transmission of examples of change taking place elsewhere.

(3) Adaptation to new modes can result from changing professional commitments on the part of faculty, though the evidence of wide-spread faculty conservatism is widespread and strong. It can also be achieved by pursuit of institutional or individual self-interest, including the need to survive at a time of changing resource allocations and organisation. This makes change doctrines potentially more persuasive.

(4) The degree of explicitness of LLL national policies varies greatly. In Germany, for example, LLL is one of five thematic currently initiated by the Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Research, and involves educationalists, experts and persons representing the interests of economic and social spheres. Greek policy is also explicit. In the UK official statements of intent tend to relate to a raft of policies, some but not all implicating LLL, which the government encourages rather than requires institutions to pursue. The Scandinavian countries can lay some claim to initiating the LLL movement though relying on institutional initiatives to make it happen. Success in implementing LLL policies is not clearly related to any one pattern of national policy implementation.

VI. The need for future research effort

43. The researchers are clear that a continuing research effort on LLL is necessary. The necessary areas of research are much those that have been covered, necessarily briefly, in this project. We enumerate areas for further work below:

a. *Particular characteristics of national systems that affect their ability to sponsor LLL.*

This would include such characteristics as degrees of centralisation; extent to which institutions are enabled or restricted by degrees of legalisation, and other manifestations of national policies.

b. *Definitions*

Our project has undertaken a great deal of work on the multiple and conflicting definitions of LLL. We have not been able to make any assessment either within countries or between them of the extent to which particular definitions are dominant in practice. A kind of 'epistemic audit' would be possible and useful. This could encompass an inventory of latest national and international policy statements as well as definitions of LLL in university mission statements and those of participants.

c. *Legal and regulative frameworks*

Further work on analysing the effects of Legal and Regulative Frameworks would be useful

Topics a. and b. above would yield to largely documentary analyses. The key research areas would require a combination of such work with empirical field work as follows

d. *Institutional and departmental policies and academic responses*

This theme would examine, over a substantial international sample, how far institutions have configured themselves to facilitate LLL, and what has been departmental response, both organisational and in terms of content and style of teaching and learning.

e. *The curriculum*

This theme is central. There should be monitoring of the content of LLL in terms of changes in curriculum, the extent to which it involves experiential learning and is otherwise adaptive to the previous experience, knowledge and needs of LLL students. It would take note of the stabilities and changing concepts of the curriculum, and in the modes of transmission. At a more ambitious level, it could consider the extent to which changes in teaching and learning are leading to or are dependent on changes in the nature of knowledge.

In some systems, there are shifts in teacher-student relationships, although that may be more in prediction or intention than in actual educational practice. To carry through such changes as many teachers avow would involve a major shift in the pedagogic values of practitioners who pride themselves more on their subject-specialist expertise than on their interactivity and accessibility. The extent to which new practices are pervasive is uncertain. The impacts on students of LLL is a key area for investigation which would have taken us well beyond our remit and resources.

Other themes include:

the roles of students and employing organisations in identifying individual and general CPD needs;

the patterns of participation in lifetime (post-23) learning and how do these relate to careers

f. Access

Monitoring of changing patterns of recruitment and access to HE as a result of LLL would be a key task. It would encompass analysis of obstacles to access. The difficulty would continue to arise from the fact that much LLL is implicit rather than clearly identified as such.

g. Academic criteria, quality procedures, accreditation and certification, quality assurance

As part of the assessment of educational changes, it would be important to assess how far quality criteria are affected by enhancements in LLL. Concretely, admission requirements and standards and forms of assessment would be criteria in this.

h The relationships between LLL and employment: partnerships

i. Resources, budgets, costs, student support

A sophisticated analysis of costs and outcomes of LLL would be requisite

The issue of how far higher education should be a matter of state or private provision and the extent to which universities can engage in market relations in a competitive way could usefully be investigated.

Concluding evaluation

44. The national reports lead to the conclusion that lifelong learning policies are far from firmly embedded in universities in the seven countries under study. It is rare for LLL policies to have been translated explicitly into effective operational policies by universities. If this has happened, the implementation has been either left to individual or departmental initiative or was the responsibility of central units that tended to operate in isolation. Policies may also have been modified in a way that meets other and more dominant institutional objectives and have been adjusted to structural and organisational characteristics of the higher education system.

45. Even in those countries and institutions where lifelong learning policies were most fully accepted, there was scepticism amongst academic staff towards them on a number of grounds. Some believed that lifelong learning and associated values or goals, such as independent learning or developing the capacity to transfer knowledge and skills, were parts of traditional higher education. It can also be argued that the extent to which, for example, independent learning is seen as something new is a matter of national higher educational culture. The study traditions at most Scandinavian and Continental universities have always been characterised by a large degree of autonomous or independent learning.

46. At the same time, there is obviously movement in the awareness of the need for LLL, of the need to view critically existing patterns of curriculum and delivery, of the importance of reconsidering access policies and of relating LLL to the needs of society and the economy as

well to those of as new groups of students. Explicitness of policies, of resourcing and of structures remain the principal deficits of matters susceptible to policy development. Tackled well they could constitute a frame for action by academics willing to lead on new initiatives.

Section 5: Dissemination and/or exploitation of results

The partners discussed the challenging question of the exploitation and dissemination of the results at the planning stage of the project and found that there are many channels open for a realistic and effective communication of these results to various stakeholders and social partners. Because of the many forms of dissemination available and the substantial cost entailed to finance them the partners did not include costs for dissemination in the budget of the research proposal submitted to the European Commission intending to submit a new proposal for dissemination at the end of the project. This is still pending to be done.

The partners, however, adopted a strategy for dissemination envisaged to operate at two levels: the national which is the responsibility of the partners to disseminate the results in their own country, and the European international, which will be the responsibility of the project consortium as a whole.

At the national level methods and forms of dissemination and exploitation are bound to vary from country to country but the consortium as a whole discussed general plans which include:

- a) Workshops, seminars and conferences addressed to various categories of stakeholders. These activities are envisaged to involve academic practitioners, administrators, politicians of relevant departments and employers' and learners' representatives. Workshops and seminars may involve single or mixed categories of stakeholders. In such venues well structured agendas with the results, the issues involved and problems arising thereof could be discussed very fruitfully and even form a basis for policy making. Financing such activities may involve education and employment departments of individual states as well as non government organisations and companies from the private sector.
- b) Direct mailing of the national, the thematic and the general report to key stakeholders and social partners.
- c) Dissemination through the press and the media in short non-technical articles in serious national newspapers and non-academic journals. Also small discussion panels of selected key stakeholders on specific T.V. programmes can reach wide audiences.
- d) Publication of articles and perhaps in book form of the national reports.
- e) Dissemination of the results through the web-page of the institutions of the partners.

At the international/European level our strategy for dissemination includes:

- a) Publication and dissemination of the general report and perhaps the thematic reports through the European Commission.
- b) Publication in international journals. As mentioned already earlier in this report preliminary results have been published already at an issue (September 2000) of the *European Journal of Education* and a second issue is planned for September 2001.
- c) Publication of a book with the main findings and the policy implications of the results.
- d) The organisation of a conference at European level inviting a small number of key persons from the academic sector, the EU, and other social partners. The size of this activity and whether it can take place at all will depend on whether financing sources can be found.

The activities of dissemination already carried out by each partner, apart from the list of publications annex 4, include:

France

Translation and dissemination of the national report. “*De la formation continue a la formation tout au long de la vie : Etude des pratiques actuelles dans quatre universites francaises* ».

French authorities have been approached to elicit their interest in extending the methodology used in the report to other French universities.

Germany

Three papers on lifelong Learning in Germany have been delivered to international conferences on higher education by Dr. Barbara Kehm and Dr. Irena Lischka.

Greece

The national report *Lifelong Learning and the Universities in Greece* has been disseminated to various stake holders.

The national report was also placed in the web page of KEKMOKOP, Panteion University Athens

WWW.kekmokop.panteion.gr

A day conference on *Lifelong Learning and the Universities* has been planned for May 2001.

Norway

A report delivered to a Commission on Higher Education. A summary published in the Commission report NOU 2000-14 by the Norwegian Institute for Studies in Research and Higher Education.

Four papers by Dr. Ellen Brandt on Lifelong Learning and the universities in Norway delivered in national and international conferences.

Spain

Two papers delivered by Prof. J. Gines Mora on Lifelong learning and the universities in Spain.

Sweden

A report commissioned by the Swedish National Agency for Higher Education on Lifelong Learning: ideas and realities in Swedish higher education, presented by Prof. Berit Askling et al.

Prof. Askling also presented the results of the national project to staff, students and the steering group of Goteborg university.

UK

Researchers from the team of the project have used the results and conceptualizations of the research for another project for the Irish Higher Education Authority on access of mature students to higher education.

Section 6: Acknowledgements and References

The consortium of this project expresses their thanks to the European Commission, DG Research, for the financing of this shared cost project.

The consortium also wishes to thank all the institutions investigated in the study and all those who accepted to be interviewed and provided so much important and useful information without which this project could not materialise.

References.

- Alesi, B. and Kehm, B. (2000) «The Status of Lifelong Learning in German Universities» in *European Journal of Education* vol. 35, no.3 pp. 301-315
- Baganll, R. (1990) «Lifelong Education: The institutionalisation of an illiberal concept.» *Educational Philosophy and Theory.* 22, 1, pp.1-7
- Barnett, R. (1997) *Higher Education: A Critical Business.* London: Open U.P.
- Barnett, R. (1998) «In for the learning society?» *Higher Education Quarterly* 52, 1, pp. 7-21
- Bates, T. (1995) *Technology, Open Learning and Distance Education.* London: Routledge
- Bauer, M. et al (2000) *Transforming Universities: Changing Patterns of Governance, Structure and Learning in Swedish Higher Education* London: Jessica Kingsley
- Becher, T. and Kogan, M. (1992) *Process and Structure in Higher Education.* London: Hinemann
- Beduwe, C. and Espinasse, J-M. (1995) «L' Université et ses publics» *Education et Formations*, March 1995
- Bell, D. (1973) *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society.* New York: Basic Books
- Bohm and Stehr (1986) *The Knowledge Society: The growing impact of scientific knowledge on social relations.* Dordrecht: Reidel publ.co.
- Brandt, E. (2000) «Policies for Lifelong Learning and Higher Education in Norway: correspondence or contradiction?» *European Journal of Higher Education.* 35, no.3, pp>271-283
- Clark, B. R. (ed.) (1993) *The Research Foundations of Higher Education: Germany, Britain, France, US, Japan.* Berkley: Univ. of Cal. Press
- Clark, B. R. (1998) *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities.* Oxford: Elsevier
- Cropley, A. (1980) «Lifelong Learning and Systems of Education: An Overview» in Cropley, A. (ed.) *Towards a System of Lifelong Learning: Some Practical Considerations.* Oxford: Pergamon Press
- Dearing Report (1997) (National Committee of Enquiry into Higher Education) *Higher Education in a Learning Society.* London: NICHE
- DfEE (Department for Education and Employment) (1996) *Lifelong Learning: A Policy Framework.* London: DfEE
- DfEE (1998) (Government response to Fryer Report) *The Learning Age: A New Renaissance for a New Britain.* (London, Stationary Office, CM 3681)
- DfEE (1998a) (Government response to Kennedy Report) *Further Education for the New Millennium.* (London Stationary Office)

- Drucker, P. (1993) *Post-Capitalist Society*. London:Heinemann
- Elzinga, A (1985) 'Research, Bureaucracy and the Drift of Epistemic Criteria' in Wittrock B et al (eds) in *The University Research System, the Public Policies of the Homes of Scientists* . Stockholm. Almqvist and Wicksell
- Etzioni-Halevy, E (1985) *The Knowledge Elite and the Failure of Prophecy*. London: George Allen
- EURIDICE (2000) *Lifelong Learning: The contribution of education Systems in the Member States of the EU*. Euridice, European Commission. March, 2000
- European Commission (199) *Setting Targets for Lifelong Learning in Europe*. ELC/01/99EN
- European Commission (2000) *Lifelong Learning and Employment Strategy* ELC/006/00/EN
- Fryer Report (1997) *Learning for the Twenty-First Century*. London: NAGCELL
- Geertz, C. (1983) *Local Knowledge*. New York: Basic Books
- Gibbons, M. et al (1994) *New Production of Knowledge. The dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies* London: Sage
- Giddens, A (1984) *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Giddens, A. (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Griffin, C. (1999) «Lifelong Learning and Social Democracy» in *International Journal of Lifelong Education*. 18(5) pp. 329-342
- Griffin, C (1999a) «Lifelong Learning and Welfare Reform» *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 18(6) pp. 431-452
- Hasan, (1999) «Lifelong Learning: Implications for Education Policy» in Tuijman, A. and Schuller, T (eds.) *Lifelong Learning: Policy and Research*. London: Portland Press
- Henkel, M. (2000) *Academic Identities and Political Change in Higher Education*. London: Jessica Kingsley
- Jallade, J-P. (2000) «Lifelong Learning in French Universities: The state of the Art» *European Journal of Education* vol. 35 no.3. 301-315
- Jarvis, P. (1995) *Adult Continuing Education: Theory and Practice* 2nd ed., London:Routledge
- Jarvis, P. (1999) *Adult Learning in Social Context*. London: Croom Helm
- Jordan, G. And Schubert, K. (1992) «A preliminary Ordering of Policy Network Labels» *European Journal of Political Research*. Vol. 21.
- Kogan, M. (2000) «Lifelong Learning in the UK» *European Journal of Education*. vol.35, no. 3, pp. 341-359
- Kogan, M. et al (2000) *Transforming Higher Education*. London:Jessica Kingsley
- Kogan, M. and Hanney, S. (2000) *Reforming Higher Education*. London:Jessica Kinksley
- Knapper, C, and Cropley, A. (1991) *Lifelong Learning and Higher Education*. London: Kogan Page, 2nd ed.
- Kumar, K. (1995) *From Post-industrial to Post-modern Society: New Theories of the Contemporary World*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Lawson, K. (1982) « Lifelong Education: Concept or Policy?» *International Journal of Lifelong Education*. 1, 2. pp. 97-108
- Longforth, N. and Davis, D. (1996) *Lifelong Learning*. London: Kogan Page.
- Lnundgrem, U. (1997) *Frame Factors and the Teaching Process*. Stockholm:Almqvist and Wicksell
- Massuda, Y. (1981) *The Information Society as Post-Industrial Society*

- Bethesda, M.D: World Features Society
- Mora, J-G. (1997) «Market trends in Spanish higher education»
Higher Education Policy, 10, pp. 187-198
- Mora, J-G. et al (2000) «Lifelong Learning in Spanish Universities: the market inside the public system.» *European Journal of Education*, 35 (3)
- OECD (1996) *Lifelong Learning for All*. Paris:OECD
- Neave, G. And van Vught, F. (1991) *Prometheus Bound: The Changing Relationship Between Government and Higher Education in Western Europe*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Oosterbeek, H. (1995) *Essays on Human Capital Theory*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam Press
- Papadopoulos, G. (1994) *Education 1960-1990: The OECD Perspective*. Paris:OECD
- Pesmatzoglou, S. (1996) «Communications Education and European Identity» in *First European Conference on Adult Continuing Education* Athens: General Secretariat of Adult Education.
- Smith, R. (1994) «Learning to Learn: Adult Education» in *International Encyclopedia of Education*. 2nd ed., Oxford: Pergamon Press vol. 6 pp. 3345-3349
- Sutton, P. (1994) «Lifelong Learning and Continuing Education» *International Encyclopedia of Education*. 2nd ed., Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp.111-120
- Teichler, U. (1998) *Changing Patterns of the Higher Education System: The Experience of three decades*. London: Jessica Kingsley
- Teichler, U. (1999) «Lifelong Learning as Challenge for Higher Education: The state of knowledge and future research tasks.» *Higher Education Management*. 11 (1) pp.37-54
- Tight, M. (1998) «Lifelong Learning: Opportunity or compulsion?» *British Journal of Educational Studies*. 46, 3
- Tight, M. (1998a) «Education, Education, Education: the vision of lifelong learning in the Kenedy, Deating and Fryer reports.» *Oxford Review of Education*. 24 (4)
- Titmus, C. (1994) «Concepts, principles and purposes of adult education» *International Encyclopedia of Education*. 2nd ed., Oxford; Pergamon Press. pp. 111-120
- Tuijman, A. (1994) «Adult Education: Overview» *International Encyclopedia of Education*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp.143-152
- Tuijman, A. and Schuller, T. (eds.) (1999) *Lifelong Learning: Policy Research*. London:Portland Press
- UNESCO (1972) *Learning to Be* Paris:UNESCO
- UNESCO (1996) *Education for All: Achieving the Goal*. Paris:UNESCO
- UNESCO (1996a) *Learning: The treasure within*. Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the 21st Century. Paris: UNESCO
- UNESCO (1997) *A European Agenda for Change for Higher Education in the 21st Century*. Palermo.
- Wain, K. (1993) «Lifelong Education, and adult education; the state of theory» *International Journal of Lifelong Education*. 12(2)p.86-89
- Watson, D. and Taylor, R. (1998) *Lifelong Learning and the University: A post-Dearing Agenda*. London: Falmer Press

Yin, RK (1984) *Case Study Research* London Sage

Section 7: Annexes

ANNEX 1: List of Institutions Included in the Study

France

The University of Nanterre

The University of Lille-USTL

CNAM (Concervatoire National des Arts et Metiers)

CNDE (Centre National d'Enseignement a Distance)

Germany

Free University of Berlin

Technical University Darmstadt

Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg

Open/Distance Learning University Hagen

Greece

The National Technical University of Athens (EMP)

The University of Ioannina

The University of the Aegean

The Open University

Norway

The University of Oslo

The University of Bergen

The Norwegian University for Science and Technology

The University of Trompso

Spain

The University of Leon

The University of Salamanka

The Technical University of Valencia

The National University of Distance Education

Sweden

Uppsala University

Goteborg University

Karlstad University

Vaxjo University

UK

The Open University

Brunel University

Leicester University

University of East London

ANNEX 2: General Interview Schedule

Policies

1. How do you define understand LLL? What does it mean to you?
2. Do EU policies have an impact/influence on your LLL programmes?
How? What are your ways of exploiting these policies?
3. Do national policies have an impact on your LLL Programmes? How?
4. Are there institutional policies for LLL? Are there any future policies and an overall strategy?
- 4a Are there any departmental policies on LLL?
5. How are these polices operationalised? (Budgets, staffing, structures)?
6. Do academic criteria from invisible colleges affect LLL policy and thinking in your institution/ department?

Curricula

7. How far have LLL courses, programmes and other provisions been innovative?
8. Who are they for? (For both new and old style providing)
9. What are their learning contents and objectives?
10. Do they involve different conceptions of knowledge?
11. Do they involve different modes of delivery? (ODL. etc., staff involvement outsiders)?
12. How are LLL courses funded? (Sources, management, allocation fees)?
13. How are LLL course accredited? Internal (university), external (state, employers, unions, professional associations)?
14. What are the quality assurance arrangements?

Roles, Structure, Power, partnerships and market relations

15. Has LLL given rise to new administrative decision making structures?
16. Has LLL given rise to new roles? (Director of LLL programmes etc.)?
17. Has LLL given rise to new power relations? (Institutional; departmental; teacher-learner; internal/external i.e. employers, unions, government)?
18. Has LLL given rise to new (external) partnership formations and market relations within your institution? department?

ANNEX 3: List of agreed deliverables

Review of Literature Report (delivered, June 1999)

Thematic reports

Lifelong Learning: University Policies and International Policies (delivered, December 2000)

The Implications of Lifelong Learning for Conceptions of Knowledge and its Organisation In Universities (delivered, December 2000)

Lifelong Learning and Power Relations and Structures (delivered, December 2000)

National reports

From Continuing Education to Lifelong Learning: A survey of current practice in four French Universities (delivered, December 2000)

Lifelong Learning at Universities in Germany: Report on the Situation (delivered, December 2000)

Lifelong Learning: The Implications for the Universities: Greece (delivered, December, 2000)

Lifelong Learning: The Implications for Spanish Universities (delivered, December 2000)

Lifelong Learning in Swedish Universities (delivered, December 2000)

Lifelong Learning: the Implications for the Universities. UK Policies and University Practices (Delivered, December 2000)

Lifelong Learning in Norwegian Universities: A survey of Policies and Practices (Delivered, December 2000)

Final Report

Lifelong Learning: the Implications for the Universities in the EU (Delivered in draft form, February, 2001 and in final form 20 March 2001)

ANNEX 4. List of publications from the project

Askling Berit and Foss-Fridlitzius Rita “Lifelong Learning and Higher Education: the Swedish Case” *European Journal of Education*. Vol.35, No. 3, Sept. 2000. pp. 257-269

Brandt Ellen “Policies for Lifelong Learning and for Higher Education in Norway: correspondence or contradiction?” *European Journal of Education* vol.35, no.3, Sept. 2000. pp. 271-283.

Alesi Betina and Kehm Barbara “The Status of Lifelong Learning in German Universities” *European Journal of Education*. Vol.35, no 3, Sept.2000. pp.285-300

Kehm Barbara “The state of the art in German Policies of lifelong learning” *Higher Education Management*. vol.11 no.3, 1999. pp.25-39

Jallade Jean-Pierre “Lifelong Learning in French Universities:the state of the Art” *European Journal of Education*. Vol.35 no.3, Sept.2000. pp. 301-315

Mora Jose-Gines and Vidal Javier “Lifelong Learning in Spanish Universities: the market inside the public system”. *European Journal of Education*. Vol. 35, no.3, Sept.2000. pp. 317-327

Kokosalakis Nikos “Lifelong Learning and the Universities in Greece: the state of the art.” *European Journal of education*. Vol.35, no. 3, Sept. 2000 pp. 329-342.

Kokosalakis Nikos “Lifelong Learning in European Universities: a preliminary assessment” (Editorial) *European Journal of Education*. Vol.35, no.3. Sept. 2000. pp. 253-255.

Kogan Maurice “Lifelong earning in the UK.” *European Journal of Education*. Vol. 35, no 3, Sept.2000. pp.341-359