Chapter 2: Integrity, Completeness and Comprehensiveness of the Learning Environment: Meeting the Basic Learning Needs of All Throughout Life

JAN VISSER[1]

CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

In this chapter I argue that 'meeting the basic learning needs of all throughout life' is a challenge significantly more comprehensive and complex than that of 'providing basic education for all.' The original meaning of the verb 'to provide' (*pro videre*) is 'to foresee.' In conjunction with the word 'education' it is commonly interpreted as 'to furnish,' 'to supply,' or 'to deliver.' The notion of delivery is tied in with a paradigm that is worth challenging, namely the idea that learning consists of acquiring pieces of information or knowledge and that, in order for that to happen, such information should be delivered to the learner. In this view, information and knowledge are essentially conceived of as commodities. Similarly, the learner is seen as a recipient of information and of prompts to process information, rather than as a participant in a dialogic process to create meaning. Creating the conditions of learning, in that same view, boils down to an external intervention, aiming at optimizing what is being delivered to the learners, and how they are prompted to act upon it, so as to attain defined learning goals in the most effective and efficient ways possible. No doubt, multiple decades of research and practice, particularly within the instructional design tradition, have shown the considerable value of this view. Both the strength of past achievements and the need for fundamental review and reconceptualization stand out in the ongoing debate as reflected in such overview works as Jonassen (Ed.) (1996); Reigeluth (Ed.) (1999); Dills & Romiszowski (Eds.) (1997). These concerns have similarly been discussed in numerous special issues or special segments of *Educational Technology* since Volume 31, Number 5, introduced in that issue by Duffy & Jonassen (1991). A related debate has been going on in a series of issues of *Educational Researcher*, starting with Volume 25, Number 4, of which I particularly note Greeno's (1997) and Sfard's (1998) contributions. In addition, almost the entire Volume 23 of the *Review of Research in Education* focuses on these matters, particularly the chapters by O'Connor (1998) and Salomon & Perkins (1998).

Notwithstanding the important advances made, as they transpire from the above debate and developing innovative practice, many of our views of learning remain incomplete. Particularly, discourse and action continue to focus too exclusively on learning pursued for specific purposes and confined to narrowly defined contexts, such

D. Aspin, J. Chapman, M Hatton and Y. Sawano (eds.). International Handbook of Lifelong Learning, 447–472
© 2001 *Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Great Britain*

as the classroom and training environment, dealt with in isolation from one another, without recognizing the larger context of which they are part.

The importance of attending to contextual factors was brought out as early as 1978 by McAnany. It was later highlighted by Visser & Buendia Gomez (1989), particularly in relation to the often haphazard circumstances that surround interventions to facilitate learning in developing countries. If such circumstances are not taken into account in the design process, the outcome of the interventions is likely to depend more on context than on the conditions put in place by design. Jonassen & Rohrer-Murphy (1999) make the same point with reference to a different rationale, namely the consideration that learning and action are dialectically related, and that learning therefore is not a precursor to activity, but that it emerges from conscious engagement in and reflection on it. As "activity cannot be understood or analyzed outside the context in which it occurs" (p.62), there is a powerful argument for broadening the scope beyond the traditional boundaries of regular design and planning concerns. Tessmer & Richey (1997) also indicate the need not to limit design concerns to the intervention as such, but to consider the context of which learning, performance *and* design are part. Visser & Berg (1999) emphasize this need from a yet wider perspective, namely the *environmental* responsibility of the designer of learning conditions. If learning is to be conceived as all-pervasive and lifelong, and if it is engaged in by both individuals and communities, then any particular intervention cannot be seen as disjointed from the totality of the learning environment, nor must it be conceived of in isolation from the long-term learning history of the learning entity (or entities) involved. Any intervention, independent of the question how effective it is in terms of traditional design criteria, can therefore be anywhere between the extremes of being detrimental to the learning environment at large or contributing to its development in positive ways.

This consideration can be further placed in the context of an ecological vision of the learning environment. Visser (1999a) argues that an ecological vision is necessary to overcome the fragmentation of existing views of learning. Both a broadening and the development of multiple and complementary perspectives of the learning landscape are required. Attention to the whole is as much needed as care for detail. An ecological awareness is required to see how the different pieces of the learning environment as a whole hang together, interact with each other, function in the context of the whole, and allow the whole to acquire a meaning over and above the sum of its parts.

Flexibility is an important dimension of the learning ecology proposed in this chapter, and it has to do with more than just delivery mechanisms. There are other important criteria that characterize an environment[2] that is truly adequate for promoting and facilitating learning in the sense in which I refer to learning in this chapter, namely as an essential requirement for sustainable growth. Some of the key characteristics of such a learning environment have to do with its capability to accommodate interaction, collaboration, networking and adaptive growth and its ability to foster learning that is rooted in the real world, i.e. that goes beyond the traditional obsession with disciplinary knowledge and recognizes the wholeness – or consilience (O. E. Wilson 1998) – of knowledge.

LEARNING IN A TURBULENT WORLD

To place the above reflections in context, consider the following. Hominid beings, in varying stages of development, have populated the earth for millions of years. Ten thousand years ago the human population is estimated to have been some eight million worldwide. This was the time when, due to changing circumstances and necessity, agriculture became the norm, rather than an add-on to hunting and gathering, causing the human population to rise exponentially ever since (Tudge 1998). At the beginning of the Christian era our number is thought to have been some 250 to 300 million {the lower estimate is cited by Koestler (1989, originally published 1967); the higher estimate can be found in Sakaiya (1991)}.[3] Sixteen centuries later the global population had risen to 500 million. It took another two centuries for it to double to one billion. The three billion mark was reached only a century and a half later in 1960. At the time of writing, that number has doubled to six billion. "It took all of human history for the world's population to reach 1 billion in 1804, but only 156 years to reach 3 billion in 1960. Now, 39 years later, the number has doubled" (Vanderkam 1999).

What will happen next is an open question. Different predictions exist. One thing is clear, however – to quote Arthur C. Clarke (1992, p.169) only slightly out of context – "the future isn't what it used to be." We live in a time of turbulent change and it is here to stay for the foreseeable future. We have reached a critical point. The question 'What caused what?' may be irrelevant. However, the fact that we are reaching the limit of how the resources of the planet Earth can sustain the processes we have put in place has arguably something to do with the increasing population pressure. The phenomenon of explosive change, demonstrated by the demographic figures cited above, is reflected in many other areas, such as the development of technology and science. It can be argued that the dramatic changes in population growth would not have been possible had there not been similarly dramatic development in, for instance, agriculture and medical science. Reversing the direction of causality, it can equally be argued that, as we continued to multiply, there was an ever-greater need for technological solutions to the problems generated by demographic growth. We humans demonstrate an incredible capacity to drive things to the edge, thereby creating problems at an increasing rate that require solutions that themselves drive things even further to the edge, thus calling for problem solving at the subsequent level, and so on.

Koestler (1989/1967, p.319) has called this the age of climax. He notes that "our mind is willing to accept that things are changing, but unable to accept the *rate* at which they are changing, and to extrapolate into the future." Things become particularly problematic when even the rate of change is changing. Pais (1997, p.474) refers in another way to how such turbulent change boggles the mind and frustrates our capacity to manage the world the way we previously did. He refers to two time scales, one expressed in the roughly 20-year timeframe that marks the leadership of a particular human generation before it passes on to the next one, and the other "the period after which existing information and technology become obsolete. A critical point is reached when the second period becomes shorter than the first one." Pais goes on to suggest that then "the experience of the older generation is no longer all that helpful" and notes that the crucial changeover perhaps fell in the nineteen-sixties, i.e. a generation and a

half ago. Those old enough to remember may recall that, indeed, that was about the last time when school graduates could have the illusion that they had prepared themselves for life and that the time of learning was over. Until only a few decades ago it was therefore possible to conceive of learning – even though wrongly – as a process that could serve the purpose of adapting to change by having each generation prepare the schooling conditions for the next one. The need to attend to adjustments required in later life through the occasional refresher course or, if need be, retraining program, could then be seen as a sensible add-on correction to an otherwise adequate model.

CONSTRUCTIVE INTERACTION WITH CHANGE

The term 'learning' generally remains poorly defined in most of the educational literature. Often it is a taken-for-granted concept, implicitly defined as the consequence of instruction.[4] Consequently, we know much about the instructional process, but little about learning. A simple experiment shows the anomaly of this situation. Ask mature adults what their most profound and relevant learning experiences have been. Rarely will one get a response that is even slightly reminiscent of the above implicit definition.

To measure the effectiveness of instructional processes we look at learning outcomes. Such learning outcomes are typically defined in terms of particular skills, intellectual ones or motor behaviors, and sometimes tendencies to apply particular behaviors in appropriate circumstances, i.e. attitudes. Little do they reveal about why we acquire such skills and about the human and social processes involved. Particularly, the tendency to interpret learning as the result of instruction has resulted in serious under-attention to any form of learning that is not the consequence of an instructional intervention. Moreover, it hampers, as Burnett (1999) argues, creativity in thinking about new approaches to learning and of ways to facilitate it. Turning the argument around, and referring to Felman's (1982, p.21) discussion of statements by Socrates and Freud regarding the "radical impossibility of teaching," Burnett observes that "a *recognition* of the "impossibility" of teaching, enables and encourages the development of new and innovative approaches to pedagogy and learning."

I have referred above to what most essentially characterizes the present juncture in time: turbulent change and complexity in a world that is increasingly interconnected in the sense that what happens in one place and at one particular moment can – but does not necessarily – set off dramatic developments elsewhere. Popular books like Waldrop's (1992) *Complexity: The Emerging Science at the Edge of Order and Chaos* abound with compelling examples of everyday phenomena, in addition to those that pertain to the most profound questions posed by the scientific community, that leave little doubt about the relevance and necessity of any ordinary citizen's ability to understand such phenomena and to interact with them in intelligent and constructive ways. The ability to see the whole as well as the detail; the disposition not to feel trapped in a false dilemma of 'either-or' choices between different levels of the same reality; the readiness to appreciate the limitations of Aristotelian logic, these are all rapidly becoming essential ingredients of *literacy*, in a redefined sense, for those who are to play effective and responsible roles in the world of the twenty-first century.[5] The

need to move beyond narrow concerns with disciplinary knowledge in recreating the world of learning is argued by Nicolescu (1999) with particular reference to the four pillars of education proposed in the Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, *Learning: The Treasure Within*, (Delors *et al.*, 1996). Nicolescu thus calls for approaches that address "the open totality of the human being and not just one of its components" (p.6).

The question of complexity, its recognition not as a problem to be solved in terms of the paradigms of the past, but rather as a different level of dealing with reality, is crucial to the new meaning of literacy as alluded to in, for instance, the *Hamburg Declaration on Adult Learning* and the *Agenda for the Future* adopted by the Fifth International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA V) in July 1997. The Declaration (p.4) conceives of literacy broadly as "the basic knowledge and skills needed by all in a rapidly changing world." It refers to such literacy as "a fundamental human right," not only because it is "a necessary skill in itself," but particularly as it is often "one of the foundations of other life skills." The challenge to ensure that this human right can be asserted lies in more than the creation of the conditions of learning in the immediate sense. It will often mean, in the words of the Declaration, "the creation of preconditions for learning through awareness building and empowerment." While this distinction reveals a conception of learning that is more limited than the one advocated in this chapter, the point is well taken that the societal responsibility to meet the basic learning needs of all throughout life entails much more than merely establishing educational facilities in the traditional sense of the word. It specifically also implies creating a social and human environment in which learning is seen to be 'the right thing' to do and appreciated as something that is aesthetically pleasing. In short, it requires a culture of learning to have evolved in society.

The *Agenda for the Future* (p.16), published in conjunction with the *Hamburg Declaration on Adult Learning* (1997), specifies that "everywhere in the world, literacy should be a gateway to fuller participation in social, cultural, political and economic life." It must therefore be socio-economically and culturally relevant, allowing communities to "effect their own cultural and social transformations," enabling women and men to "understand the interconnections between personal, local and global realities." Connecting to personal experience, which involves body and mind together in an undivided way, implies naturally a sense of the complex, of the unity of knowledge, and of multiplicity of levels of reality. It requires strategies to facilitate learning that are radically different from much of current pedagogical practice (e.g. Lederman, 1999; Papert, 1993; Resnick, 1998; Resnick & Wilensky, 1998; Schank & Cleary, 1995; Schank & Cleave, 1995; Turkle & Papert, 1990; Wilensky, 1991).

In a sense, lifelong learning is a redundant notion. Any real learning cannot be but lifelong, as it involves the whole human being, i.e. all of one's life. The main reason why we needed the term may be because common discourse has likened learning to schooling, and schooling, in the common conception, is seen as restricted to the school age. Earlier literature on lifelong learning, such as the report to UNESCO of the International Commission on the Development of Education, *Learning to be: The World of Education Today and Tomorrow* (Faure *et al.* 1972), therefore puts considerable

Chapter 3: Innovative Teachers: Promoting Lifelong Learning For All

CHRISTOPHER DAY

THE CHANGING CONTEXTS OF TEACHING

Teaching now takes place in a world dominated by change, uncertainty and increasing complexity. As a reflection of this, government publications in Europe, North America and Australasia stress the technological, economic and social challenges which schools (and therefore teachers) face. They are confronted, it is said, by a number of changes which lead to contradictory demands. As a UNESCO paper put it:

"*On the one hand:*

- a commitment to education for all;
- an extension of the period of initial schooling;
- recognition of the growing importance of life-long education;
- more emphasis or general education for children and young people which prepares them for life rather than providing vocational skills for specific jobs;
- increasing emphasis on teamwork and co-operation;
- a consensus that general education should include attention to environmental issues, tolerance and mutual understanding

On the other hand:

- growing inequalities, deepening social differences and a break-down in social cohesion;
- an increase in alienation among youth and dropping out of school;
- high levels of youth unemployment and charges that young people are ill-equipped to enter the world of work;
- a resurgence of inter-ethnic tensions, xenophobia and racism as well as the growing influence of religious sects and problems of drugs and gangs, with associated violence;
- increasing emphasis on competition and material values".

(UNESCO, 1996)

Concern with the need to raise standards of achievement and improve their positions in the world economic league tables has prompted governments to intervene more

D. Aspin, J. Chapman, M Hatton and Y. Sawano (eds.). International Handbook of Lifelong Learning, 473–500
© 2001 *Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Great Britain*

actively in all aspects of school life to improve school systems over the last twenty years. Financial self-reliance and ideological compliance have become the twin realities for many of today's schools and their teachers (Hargreaves 1994, p.5). Externally imposed curriculum, management innovations and monitoring and assessment systems have often been poorly implemented; and they have resulted in periods of destabilization, increased workload, intensification of teachers' work and a crisis of professional identity for many teachers who perceive a loss of public confidence in their ability to provide a good service (Day *et al* 1996).

Whilst governments have introduced changes in different ways at different paces, change is nevertheless not optional but a part of the 'postmodern' condition which requires political, organizational, economic, social and personal flexibility and responsiveness (Hargreaves 1994). Little wonder that the postmodern condition represents more of a threat than a challenge for many teachers, or that many are confused by the 'loose-tight' paradox of partially decentralized systems, i.e. local decision making responsibilities, alongside increased public scrutiny and external accountability.

THE NEW PROFESSIONALISM?

Interventions, which some regard as a root and branch attack upon teacher autonomy or teacher professionalism, are welcomed by others as necessary change. Competing and contested definitions of what it means to be a professional lie at the heart of this controversy. Some argue that increased bureaucratic control of schools and intensification of teaching over the last twenty years have reduced individual teachers' areas of discretion in decision making, and led to 'chronic and persisting' overload which has effectively resulted in de-skilling and poor quality teaching (Harris 1996). The establishment of competency-driven, school-based apprenticeship models of pre-service teacher training and systems of in-service teacher development which emphasise short term training needs related to nationally rather than locally or individually defined priorities, are cited as examples of this in the UK. In England the National Curriculum has been described as '*a serial killer*' in the demands it makes upon teachers (Campbell & Neill 1994a), and there is widespread evidence of increased levels of stress and decreased morale.

From these perspectives, teachers are indeed on the way to becoming '*technicians*' whose job is to meet pre-specified achievement targets and whose room to manoeuvre, to exercise discretion – a hallmark of an autonomous professional – is thus increasingly restricted. An alternative view is expressed by David Hargreaves who identifies the shifts in culture, values and practices of teachers which have resulted from government reforms in England, but may be applied equally in many other countries of the world. He describes the '*piecemeal*' and '*fragmented*' emergence of a '*new professionalism*' and identifies trends in which teachers' work is becoming less isolated, their planning more collaborative, their teaching more outcome-oriented and their relationships with students and parents more overtly contractual. Crucially, he identifies a '*a post-technocratic' model* of professional education in which professional development is approached from four interconnected premises:

- teachers are understood to have life-long professional needs and these will be met only if treated as in the case of any learner, in terms of continuity and progression;
- for continuity and progression to be realised teachers' developmental needs must be assessed on a regular basis;
- schools devise a plan for development from which also flow needs for professional development if the schools development plan is to be implemented successfully;
- professional needs arising from personal sources (eg appraisal) have to be reconciled with school needs from institutional sources (eg a development plan).

In this model, all teachers are held to have rights to professional development, and opportunities must be distributed equitably (p.430). Hargreaves places two propositions '*at the heart of*' the new professionalism:

> "To improve schools, one must be prepared to invest in professional development; to improve teachers, their professional development must be set within the context of institutional development."
>
> (Hargreaves, D. p.436)

There are three conclusions which may be drawn from these perspectives and the contexts in which they are framed:

- The impact of the changing economic, social and knowledge contexts upon the education service as a whole has caused a move from the traditional post-war model of the autonomous professional. In particular, what students learn, what they must achieve as the outcome of learning and what standards apply are now explicitly the everyday business of government. Teachers are increasingly expected to conform to a social market model of education in which an increased range of stakeholders define learning needs.
- The circumstances in which teachers work and the demands made upon them are changing as communication technologies erode the role of teacher as exclusive holder of expert knowledge. As the social fabric of society becomes more fragmented, the educative role of schools becomes more complex. Higher expectations for higher quality teaching demands teachers who are well qualified, highly motivated, knowledgeable and skilful not only at the point of entry into teaching but also throughout their careers.
- A focus upon teachers' continuing career long professional development is now a key responsibility of governments, schools and teachers themselves. This is so because '*behaving as a professional*' involves:

> "displaying ... degrees of dedication and commitment, working long hours as a matter of course and accepting the open-ended nature of the task involved, which often impinge.. upon home and personal life .... it also entails maximum effort to "do the best you possibly can" and a constant quest for improved performance. At the same time it involves developing appropriate and caring relationships with students, which gave priority to their interests and well being, as well as dealing

"professionally" with colleagues, parents and other external agencies where appropriate. Finally, because of the complexities of the task of teaching and the obligation to meet varying individual needs, high levels of skill are necessary to respond intelligently to multiple demands in a complex and changing environment..."

(adapted from Helsby, Knight, McCulloch, Saunders & Warburton 1997, pp.9–10)

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHING STANDARDS

Acquiring the qualifications to become a teacher has always been a necessary but not a sufficient condition to succeed as a professional over a career span. Inevitably, subject knowledge needs to be regularly updated. Teaching organization, methods and skills also need revisiting as, on the one hand information becomes more accessible through advances in technology, whilst on the other, teaching pupils who are less socially compliant in conditions which are less conducive to promoting learning becomes more challenging. The maintenance of good teaching demands that teachers review regularly the ways in which they are applying principles of differentiation, coherence, progression and continuity. They also need to establish balance in the 'what' and the 'how' of their teaching and revisit their core 'moral' purposes. To be a professional means taking up a lifelong commitment to inquiring practice. Yet under normal circumstances, teachers' learning is limited by the development of routines 'single loop learning' (Argyris & Schon 1974) and taken-for-granted assumptions which limit their capacity to engage in the different kinds of reflection necessary for learning and change (Day 1999). Research tells us that there are both positive and negative reasons for providing a range of continuing professional learning and development opportunities:

Positive

- teachers' commitment to their work will increase student commitment (Bryk & Driscoll 1988, Rosenholtz 1989, Louis 1998)
- enthusiastic teachers (who are knowledgeable and skilled) work harder to make learning more meaningful for students, even those who may be difficult or unmotivated. (Guskey & Passaro 1994)

Teachers who are most likely to increase commitment to learning were identified by 12–16 year old students in England, over 4 years of interviews as those who:

- enjoy teaching the subject
- enjoy teaching students
- make the lessons interesting and link them to life outside schools
- will have a laugh but know how to keep order
- are fair

- are easy for students to talk to
- don't shout
- don't go on about things (eg. how much better others are)
- explain things and go through things students don't understand without making them feel small
- don't give up on students.

(Rudduck, Day & Wallace 1997)

Negative

- only 50% of the teachers looked forward to each working day in school. (Rivera-Batiz & Marti 1995)
- the demands of students for attention (in large classes) are likely to lead to staff exhaustion and burnout. (Esteve 1989)
- burnt-out teachers give less information and praise to students and interact less frequently with them. (Mancini *et al,* 1984)
- in UK, 23% of sample surveyed indicated having significant illness over the last year (Travers & Cooper 1996).

Teachers' visions of themselves as educationalists with broader purposes are likely to dim without continuing professional development (Farber 1991, Tedesco 1997).

UNDERSTANDING THE CHALLENGES OF LIFELONG LEARNING

David Hargreaves' call for investment in professional development within the context of institutional development is far from being realised. Most teachers still work in isolation from their colleagues for most of the time. Opportunities for the development of practice based upon observation and critique of that practice remain limited. Despite the best efforts of many school leaders to promote collegial cultures, they are most frequently at the level of planning or talking about teaching rather than at the level of examining practice itself. In this context, Barth's observation of the 'perilous place' of learning in the life of teachers is not, perhaps, surprising:

> "... the voracious learners are the beginning, first year teachers who care desperately to learn their new craft. The learning curve remains high for three or four years at which time the life of the teacher becomes highly routinized and repetitive. The learning curve flattens. Next September, the same as last September. After perhaps ten years, many observers report that teachers, now beleaguered and depleted, become *resistant* to learning. The learning curve turns downward. With twenty-five years of life in schools, many educators are described as 'burned out'....It appears that life in school is toxic to adult learning. The longer one resides there, the less the learning. Astonishing."
>
> (Barth 1996)

Chapter 4: Lifelong Learning and Tertiary Education: The Learning University Revisited

CHRIS DUKE

LIFELONG AND LEARNING – A CONCEPTUAL MORASS

The idea of lifelong learning is not new. Initially it entered the international literature from more esoteric origins some thirty years before the end of the twentieth century, mainly via the Council of Europe, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and Unesco (Faure 1972, OECD 1973, Lengrand 1975). It enjoyed a brief period of sustained attention in these circles. A modest volume of secondary and national-level policy studies and other analyses followed during the seventies, mainly around the concept of recurrent education.

The term itself and related conceptual analysis went out of general use for a generation. Deliberation was largely confined to sociological, philosophical and often exhortatory writings among adult and continuing educators, with books such as Knapper and Cropley (1985) and the *International Journal of Lifelong Education,* launched in 1982. The Unesco Institute for Education in Hamburg published a series of studies on lifelong learning, mainly to do with the school curriculum, but this line of inquiry dwindled away in the late seventies. The failure to engage the concept of lifelong learning within the institutional imperatives of school and schooling remains a problem.

From the outset the literature and its concepts have proved problematic They are often confused, and remain so today, as the 1998 OECD biennial Conference on Lifelong Learning and the Universities showed. Thus Paul Lengrand's 1975 volume was called *An Introduction to Lifelong Education* rather than *learning*. The OECD's view of recurrent education was however explicitly conceived as a *strategy for lifelong learning*, as the subtitle of the key 1973 OECD monograph reveals. The term favoured by the Council of Europe at the beginning of the seventies was *education permanente*, often translated into English, unfortunately and misleadingly, as 'permanent education'. This resonated with suspicion of educational imperialism expressed for example in Illich and Verne *Imprisoned in the Global Classroom* (1976). We return later to the confusion between 'education' and 'learning', since it persists in current discourse about lifelong learning and the role of, for example, tertiary education.

From another perspective however 'lifelong learning' has made giant strides since the sixties. This is not an unmixed blessing. Many forms of study, such as professional continuing education, and off-peak radio and television broadcast of study materials, as well as earlier forms of diploma and degree study, are publicised simply as lifelong learning. Often this is virtually a synonym for study by adults, usually post-full-time

D. Aspin, J. Chapman, M Hatton and Y. Sawano (eds.). International Handbook of Lifelong Learning, 501–528
© 2001 *Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Great Britain*

and post-experience. Lifelong learning is thus equated with adult or continuing education.

If the usage confuses meaning and allows educational providers to colonise the wider terrain of learning, at least it does accept that adults can and do go on learning, a new phenomenon within my own professional lifetime. When as a graduate I trained at Cambridge (UK) to qualify as a teacher, the received psychology, especially Piagetian, would have one assume that the learning cycle peaked with early adulthood. There was a plateau and it was all downhill from there, with diminishing powers towards senility. Later I encountered the work of the Belbins and the Hutchinsons who campaigned for the recognition that adults do learn, albeit with different strategies and styles, throughout life. Adult learning was a contested site; adult education a marginal activity unconnected to the real business of education, schools and colleges.

Simply to recall this earlier mindset brings home the magnitude of the lifelong learning revolution, and gives a context for the persisting confusion of education with learning, and for the trivialisation of 'lifelong learning' in the service of marketing courses. There is no longer anything remarkable about universities catering for older clients as well as school-leaver students; for people who combine diverse life-roles rather than occupy a discrete student identity in a phase of pre-mature socialisation and transition to full adult participation in society. In this sense acceptance of the term lifelong learning is a precondition for the idea that tertiary education can be for all, across society and throughout life.

The reappearance and increased volume of a literature of lifelong learning is evident. There is the 1996 Unesco Delors report, following the 1972 Unesco Faure report, which shifted priorities for education in support of lifelong learning, rather than question the premise. OECD has also returned to the subject with a series of publications (see in particular OECD 1996). 1996 was the European Year of Lifelong Learning. In Britain following the change of Government in 1997 (the previous Administration having vigorously espoused what it chose to call 'lifetime learning') lifelong learning became a central policy preoccupation of the Department for Employment and Education, its ministers and advisers. Taiwan nominated 1998 as its year of lifelong learning and opened its education system to scrutiny through an international conference early that year. In Malcolm Skilbeck's words from the perspective of a senior OECD administrator "after a bold, but in the event faltering, start several decades ago, the movement of lifelong learning for all is once again gathering momentum". In the same book it is stated that "today education and training, and the notion, values and ideals of lifelong learning, have come to be conceptualized and appraised in a very wide-ranging and sophisticated manner' (Chapman & Aspin 1997, pp.11, 9).

My perception differs. In practice I consider this still to be a conceptual morass, in which learning and education remain hopelessly confused. Lifelong learning as a grand idea is under threat: first from *trivialisation* (referred to above); secondly from *reductionism*, more obviously manifest in the notion of the learning society to which we turn in a moment. Thirdly there is the threat that it may fall out of favour or be dismembered since it has become a new 'contested space' – the site where old yet vital battles are now conducted over the core values and purposes of education. These are recognisable in general educational discourse across the generations, but more starkly perhaps in the

literature of adult education and training. Finally there is the scepticism which persists, in vigorously healthy form, in a 'deschooling' tradition about the colonisation of life and learning by the professions and agents of the State. All of this provides a not unproblematic context for universities and tertiary education in coming to grips with 'lifelong learning'.

Old and new ideological battles contest the values, mission and functions of education, the purposes of higher education, and the education of adults. Artificially dichotomous alternatives are common: liberal or general versus vocational; intrinsic versus extrinsic; education versus training; accredited or non-award-bearing. The economic is polarised against 'access and equity'. Personal development, occupationally related and civic or citizenship agendas and outcomes represent a broad typology of intent. At its most provocative, the forces of good and evil are ranged along the lines of education (training or indoctrination) for domesticity and learning for liberation. Age-old value propositions translate into child- or student-centred teaching (learning) methods versus more instructional or 'authoritarian' back-to-basics modes, especially at school. They cascade into a host of questions about the curriculum (in its obvious and more subtle or 'hidden' senses) at all levels and in most institutional settings.

The very term lifelong learning has encountered stringent critical opposition on just such grounds as these, notably in Canada and the UK. Boshier's paper to Taiwan's national lifelong learning conference characterised lifelong learning as Goliath and democratising lifelong (especially adult) education as David. Boshier sees lifelong learning as "nested in a notion of the autonomous free-floating individual learner as consumer" whereas lifelong education is committed to active citizenship and democracy. It has "lofty aspirations and a commitment to fellow citizens" whereas lifelong learning he experiences as "smarmy, self-assured, well staffed with handlers and analysts, an office in a smart city, and dressed in sharp business suits" (Boshier 1998).

In this sense nothing has changed. The same struggles about the good society, and about the part education plays in advancing or obstructing its coming, continue. Yet, without question, 'lifelong learning' has come of age as a popular, populist and commercially viable proposition; not just in the United States where it entered into common parlance maybe a decade earlier than in other English-speaking societies, but now globally. It would be difficult to find a nation in which educational policy is not committed rhetorically to enabling lifelong learning even though, and most obviously for the 'new Labour' UK Government, its practical attainment is a central policy dilemma. What has changed to bring this about?

THE CHANGING CONTEXT

The Cold War notwithstanding, the late sixties, when lifelong learning and related concepts of recurrent education, 'education permanente' and the learning society were developed, were a time of relative optimism. There was reliable economic growth, low unemployment, an apparently stable welfare state, a sense of social amelioration, and inexorably rising prosperity. The gulf between rich and poor within and between nations was narrowing rather than widening. Belief in managed progress seemed

reasonable. From about that time of student activism in higher education, much of this became and has remained perturbed, including the place and standing of higher education which was moving into what then seemed like rapid expansion. In 1973 Martin Trow predicted a transition from 'elite' towards 'mass' and eventually 'universal' higher education, led by the United States.

At this time of the flowering of high modernity and faith in the essentially liberal 'enlightenment project', there was also awareness of the rapidity of technological change and the shrinking of the world to a global village (Toffler 1970, McLuhan 1967). Harold Wilson had celebrated 'the white heat of technological change'. Students were protesting about the links between industry, the military, and university research. In the quarter century since the 1973 oil crisis the sense of instability, of runaway technological innovation, and of the forces of globalisation have transformed the environment within which higher or tertiary education takes place. As the century ends there are attempts to redress the balance and regain a sense of purpose in civic and social progress (see for example Giddens 1998).

At least six significant changes provide the context of the 'second generation lifelong learning' of the late nineties. In the words of one enthusiast "our global cultures have undergone a transformation... This transformation is our headlong race through an information revolution to a knowledge based society" (Jones 1996). Technological change, apparently ever-accelerating and with ever wider ramifications, especially through electronic innovations, is held to demand a continuous process of learning and adaptation so that people have the knowledge, skills and adaptability to keep up in a knowledge based society. It seems obvious that universities must be central to the development of such a society. Issues of wider participation and more purposeful updating must be on the university agenda if society is not to divide more between those who can and those who cannot cope and benefit.

A second significant change concerns a new preoccupation, in the European Union and beyond, with 'social exclusion' – the impact and cost to individuals, communities, and ultimately to national economies of exclusion from mainstream society and its benefits. In this context the idea of social capital has won attention. Again, higher education cannot but be affected by such issues, given the established policy agenda of equity, access and opportunity and the role of (higher) education as a means to achieving participation and prosperity. One consequence is that citizenship, 'the civic agenda', is reappearing in considerations of higher education, along with individual general education and development, and vocational skills acquisition. The social is thus added to the individual and economic HE agenda. The University of Ulster, reflecting the needs of its society and region, has appointed a Professor of Social Inclusion.

A third major factor in putting lifelong learning on the agenda of higher education relates to the information technology that is applied to learning. Whereas technological change generally implies rapid obsolescence of the curriculum in most occupational areas, the IT revolution in relation to teaching and learning suggests new means of accessing and 'delivering' information. Flexible and self-directed learning, mixed and multi-mode delivery, appear to offer new kinds of lifelong learning, with implications for higher education, possibly as the 'virtual university'.

A fourth significant factor is the emergence and continuing influence of economic rationalism, the fuel of globalisation. It may be that the tide has turned with the end of the twentieth century and some loss of confidence in the free market occasioned by the Asian economic crisis of 1998. European governments at this time were generally turning away from the drier forms of rationalism, which had already been modified by the Clinton Democratic Administration through much of the decade. The broadsheet press was alerting its readership to the wealth of the global corporations and the threat they represented to national sovereignty. *The Sydney Morning Herald* on 9 January 1999 pointed out that 71 of the world's largest economic entities were not nations but corporations, with Microsoft in 11th position overall. In Australia too, Mark Latham was following Blair in the UK in seeking a 'third way' between rationalism and the older welfare state (Latham 1998). Operating locally in this 'global village economy' is a new aspect of lifelong learning for the university.

Fifth, and underlying several other changes, among them rolling back the welfare state, the new demography of the late twentieth century includes fewer young people. Some societies are experiencing population decline. Populations are ageing significantly. Long years of life after retirement have put 'third age' education on the map and on the agenda of some universities. This represents a large growth in the proportion of the economically inactive in the total population. Rising participation among the young in upper secondary and tertiary education amplifies the shifting ratios. As the need rises, in economic and technological terms, and the demand increases and is manifest in rising aspiration and demand for education throughout life, the pressure on public revenue and the economy increases. Demographic change seems virtually to dictate a rolling back of the welfare state, reconfiguring the economics of higher education in user-pay directions.

Finally the sixties, an age of relative optimism and confidence in the future and in enlightenment, have given way to post-modernism with its permeating relativism. Rationality, the nature of knowledge, science itself have been cast into doubt. Peter Scott, writing about meaning and mass higher education, cites a favoured metaphor for post-modernism: " a shopping mall, an infrastructure that services unrelated enterprises devoid of authoritative contexts.. The results are not all bad... For example, oral tradition and popular memory are just as worthy of the historian's attention as the products of archival research. But the general effect is of incoherence on the grand scale" (Scott 1995, p.135).

What had been assumed to be the heart and essence of the modern university has thus been destabilised. The nature of knowledge, the processes of research and inquiry, as well as the utility and contribution of science, are all under scrutiny. *Context* has become more significant to scholarly inquiry. The nature, creation and application of knowledge is less confidently and self-evidently universal. Hence a paradox. With doubt cast on 'the scientific method' by the work of Kuhn (1970) and others, in an age of globalisation, research and the knowledge it yields have become more contingent, grounded, anchored and specific. The university of 2000 is more prone than the university of 1970 to anchor in its local region, context and culture, as a way of engaging with the overwhelming pace and ambiguity of the global.

Chapter 5: Universities as Centres for Lifelong Learning: Opportunities and Threats at the Institutional Level

RUTH DUNKIN AND ALAN LINDSAY

INTRODUCTION

The changing nature of employment and careers is causing governments, enterprises, educational providers and individuals to take seriously the concept of lifelong learning. Lifelong learning is a concept that has long been associated with the traditions of liberalism, highlighting the continuous development and growth of individuals within civilised societies. However, despite its potential to provide a broad integrating rationale for national educational policy, it is only in the past few years that the concept, with a new overlay of instrumentalism, has emerged as a practical policy for developed economies as they move into the Information Age. With the move of most developed countries into a post-industrial age, knowledge is seen as the primary resource for individuals and the economy overall. As both society's needs and knowledge itself undergo rapid change, the lifelong learning skills involved in reaching and remaining at the cutting edge of knowledge are becoming crucial employment skills. Those institutions that are successful in providing their graduates with a lifelong learning capacity will gain a significant competitive edge in the marketplace. Through considering case studies involving two Australian universities, Monash and RMIT Universities, this chapter canvasses the changes required to implement effective lifelong learning strategies in traditional universities. Such institutions face substantial barriers to the implementation of lifelong learning at all levels; that is, at the individual level, at the departmental and the faculty level, and the institution itself. In discussing these barriers, particular attention will be given to those orientations, or mindsets, prevailing within higher education institutions that must be changed if lifelong learning is to be embraced.

THE CONTEXT: THE AUSTRALIAN HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM AND THE NATIONAL POLICY FRAMEWORK

In contrast to many of their counterparts in other countries, Australian higher education institutions have long pursued a broad educational mission consistent with lifelong learning. The provision of part-time study options has been common and mature-age students have formed a sizeable part of the student population for many years. Many Australian universities offer distance education or open learning courses that have been developed with the goal of maintaining parity of esteem with on-campus courses.

D. Aspin, J. Chapman, M Hatton and Y. Sawano (eds.). International Handbook of Lifelong Learning, 529–544
© 2001 *Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Great Britain*

The first major reference to 'lifelong learning' in an Australian Government Report occurs in a report on the development of technical education (Kangan 1974). This report drew heavily on the UNESCO Commission report *Learning to Be* (Faure 1972) in proposing a broad educational rationale and an emphasis on reducing barriers to access to the non-higher education sector of post-secondary education in Australia. The Report's vision underpinned a brief period of renewal and broad development in technical and further education in Australia, but was soon overshadowed by a drive for narrower vocational training. This brief government enthusiasm for lifelong learning in the 1970s made little impact on policies in the higher education sector.

The next major development with a lifelong learning theme was the Open Learning Initiative, which emerged as a response to unmet demand for university places in the early 1990s. A consortium of eight institutions, with substantial government support, provided an open entry pathway to university study through single subjects and degree structures drawing on several institutions and provided in innovative independent study modes. Most recently, the West Report (1998), *Learning for Life* became the first major report for the Australian Government to adopt lifelong learning as a central part of its rationale for higher education. The Report clearly articulates a vision for higher education based on its contribution to lifelong learning and the 'learning society'. It proposes a 'lifelong learning entitlement' for all school-leavers and mature age students seeking access to higher education for the first time (West 1998, p.115). Regrettably while this report presents a supportable philosophical position, it does not provide a well-articulated and consistent set of policy recommendations.

The increasing emphasis on lifelong learning in educational policy discussions is fostering a renewed interest within higher education institutions. However, changes in the broader environment for higher education are shaping institutional responses towards lifelong learning. One key driver has been the Australian Government's evolving stance on cooperation and competition. After World War II, the Australian federal government gradually replaced the States as the major source for funding and policy direction in Australian higher education. Until the late 1980s, the key Government administrative mechanism was some form of 'buffer agency' advisory commission, which went through several manifestations but retained a core role of advising the Government on financial allocations that would promote the 'balanced and coordinated development' of the system (Tertiary Education Commission 1977, p.1). The higher education institutions, mostly established originally by the State governments with varying degrees of autonomy, were gradually brought into a system serving national needs. This approach fostered a broad view of educational needs and institutional responsibilities to society including the provision of courses, skills and attitudes that were not mainly directed to meeting labour market needs and economic development. Coordination and cooperation between institutions was encouraged. The policy environment supported liberal education and the broad development and growth of individuals and their communities.

However, by the late 1980s, cooperation and a coordinated system were seen as major sources of inefficiency and stagnation. To overcome these, the Government proposed a radical restructuring of the higher education system and encouraged the adoption of more corporate and business-oriented management approaches. 'Competition' was explicitly used to drive efficiency and responsiveness (Dawkins 1988, pp. 28 and 83).

Present government policy for higher education, as with other public sector policy, is strongly influenced by the view that cost-effective service provision of public services is best achieved by governments specifying more clearly the services that are required, or the needs to be met and leaving it to a deregulated market to deliver to those specifications. 'Competitive neutrality' concepts in the *National Competition Policy Review* (Hilmer 1993) protect new entrants to the market and ensure that those who have historically been publicly funded must compete on the same basis as new entrants. Governments have been re-cast as purchasers of services, rather than providers of those services. Australian governments have been increasingly deregulating the higher education system as a means of moving the system towards a market model and exposing institutions to greater competition. Restrictions on international fee-paying students were eased in the late 1980s, the capacity for charging fees for postgraduate courses was introduced in the mid-1990s and most recently, institutions have been given approval to to determine enrolment levels and admit a limited number of full-fee-paying Australian undergraduate students.

This trend towards greater competition has not just been driven by government policy. Other forces, including the growth in the number of universities, a levelling off in student demand, the globalisation of economies and communications, and the revolution in information technology, have also fostered an increase in competition between institutions.

But if competition and deregulation provide one set of forces affecting the way institutions are approaching lifelong learning, the changes in work for individuals and enterprises represent a second equally powerful set of demands upon them. Just as competition, globalisation and new technologies are impacting on universities, so too are these forces changing the face of entire sectors within developed economies. Enterprises are faced with new sources of competition, new players and new technologies are driving radical changes to the economic structures in which they must operate and the bases upon which they must compete (Porter 1985). In turn, the ways in which enterprises are adapting to these changes affects the ways in which individuals relate to employment. The widespread movements to de-layer, to downsize and to upgrade technological content of traditional production processes have led many to retrenchment. The decline of the manufacturing and commodity sectors and the parallel rise of the service sector have driven a demand for quite different profiles of skills. People in employment, as a result, face uncertain futures, multiple employers and a constant need to upgrade their technical and operational skills. Developed countries are seeking competitive advantage for both individuals and enterprises through continuous learning, innovation and creativity (Drucker 1992, Handy 1994). As a result, both individuals and enterprises are exerting demands for job-related skills education and training to underpin this enormous economic re-orientation. They look to governments, publicly funded institutions and new private providers to meet these demands.

This changing environment provides the context in which institutions are grappling with lifelong learning. The more instrumental and competitive era is less conducive to traditional notions of lifelong learning, and so it is no coincidence that universities, as well as governments, are adopting an instrumental approach to lifelong learning. Many

universities are thus seeking their own competitive advantage through providing their graduates with the lifelong learning skills to excel in this environment.

INSTITUTIONAL STRATEGIES

However, responses to these changes in government policy and the broader environment are by no means uniform. Educational institutions have formulated their missions in different ways and they are responding differently to the challenges. There are those which see their mission as responding directly to changes within the economic structures of their communities. Some face pressures resulting from declining demand in traditional student/ school leaver groups and seek to find replacement markets such as lifelong learners. Others have always seen their mission as supporting lifelong learning in the broad sense of fostering the ongoing development of individuals through education. The people of these institutions tend to rue the economic instrumentalism associated with the most recent push to lifelong learning.

While most universities are engaging with the demand for lifelong learning in some way, they all share a common experience in finding that the implementation of lifelong learning policies meets substantial cultural and organisational barriers within their institutions. Institutional leaders face major challenges as they seek to re-orient their institutions to respond to the demand for lifelong learning in whatever form it is articulated. Two Australian universities, Monash and RMIT, exemplify those institutions wishing to combine the traditional and instrumental approaches to lifelong learning in ways that build and extend their market reach to potential students of all ages and study preferences, and to corporate as well as individual clients. Both institutions are implementing learning and teaching plans that place lifelong learning at the centre of their operations. In their quest to foster lifelong learning, they are adopting a learner-centred approach to teaching and learning and looking to the new interactive communication technologies to assist in providing education where and when the learner wants it.

Four common elements underpin the strategies of the two institutions: a focus on graduate attributes, greater flexibility in awards, greater flexibility in delivery, and using cooperative alliances to enhance competitiveness.

The focus on graduate attributes is aimed at shifting the emphasis in teaching from mastery of course content to defining, teaching for, and assessing specific student outcomes. Many Australian institutions are specifying desired attributes for their graduates, usually by drawing on standard formulations of generic skills such as: communication, enquiry and research, critical thought and analysis, problem-solving, teamwork, numeracy, information literacy and effective use of technology.

Flexibility in award structures is regarded as an important part of the strategy both to foster lifelong learning and to gain a competitive market advantage. Hence, in recent years, many Australian universities have expanded their award structures. The traditional broad degree structures in arts, science and business, have been complemented by more specialist 'tagged' degrees such as the Bachelor of Arts (Asian Studies) or specialist degree titles such as the Bachelor of Journalism. Postgraduate programs have proliferated through specialist certificates and diplomas as well as professionally

oriented masters courses. Articulation between awards and progression pathways have been more explicitly defined to allow for staged career development and choice of exit point.

Improving student control over the time and place of learning is critical to making lifelong learning a reality. Many adult learners have extensive family and work responsibilities to juggle with their study requirements. Many are also in paid employment. Conventional print-based distance education has made an important contribution to reducing the time, place and other constraints on students. However, the long feedback cycles between academic and learners and the relative isolation of many learners led historically to high drop-out rates. Advances in communications and information technology have now made possible more interactive and real-time distance learning experiences featuring convenient and immediate communication with staff and among students. New flexible learning strategies are being introduced into universities which incorporate multimedia learning materials and communication systems (both synchronous and asynchronous) alongside conventional print-based learning packages/ materials.

The boundaries between on-campus teaching and distance education are blurring as these more flexible teaching modes are being increasingly used to provide for effective and convenient learning for all types of learners. The reduction or removal of requirements for attendance or time schedules will provide the most powerful contribution to the implementation of lifelong learning.

However, the effective use of technology poses major challenges for university managers. So far most use has been small-scale and exploratory. While considerable experience has been accumulated, most educational technology projects have been too limited in scope to be strategic or to become a core component of major courses and the predominant strategy retains at its core a belief in the desirability of some face-to-face interaction. To enable more extensive use, institutional managers will need to develop institutional-wide plans for technology in teaching and learning and make more strategic investments in technology applications.

The cost of introducing flexible learning into universities' offerings is leading many to argue the need for inter-university collaboration. The scale of planning and investment in technology-assisted teaching inevitably means a shift from the local-level control of courses by individual academics or small course teams to a more corporate approach. The high development costs of independent learning packages require sound commercial decisions based on potential markets. The development of sophisticated, highly interactive learning packages often requires levels of investment that are beyond the resources of a single institution. Thus, despite the increasingly competitive environment, or indeed to meet its imperatives, institutions need to form cooperative alliances to develop and deliver high quality flexible learning. The main contribution of these alliances to the implementation of lifelong learning is in the provision of flexible programmes and learning packages suitable for a diverse range of student backgrounds and needs, and able to be used where and when the student chooses. An important by-product of this cooperation may well be greater levels of credit transfer among consortium members.

Introduction and Overview

DAVID ASPIN, JUDITH CHAPMAN, MICHAEL HATTON AND YUKIKO SAWANO

"Lifelong Learning" is a concept whose time has come. The notion that education and learning are activities and processes that do not begin and end with the commencement and closure of people's attendance at formal institutions of schooling goes back in some cultural contexts as far as Plato and was given repeated expression in the writings of his successors – Augustine, Quintilian, Aquinas, Locke, Rousseau, Comenius, Kant and so on – finding its strongest emphasis in the twentieth century work of John Dewey. Different cultures have similar discourses on lifelong learning originating from their own thinkers or traditions such as Confucius. Such thinkers and writers were well aware that one of the chief characteristics by which human beings may be distinguished from other forms of organic entities and sentient creatures is their endless curiosity, their desire to have their questions answered, their awareness of the need to cope with and master change, and their propensity always to seek improvement in their situation. Human beings are endowed with these tendencies from the time of their birth and exercise them throughout their lives. For human beings, living and learning are nearly synonymous.

Of course there are times when that learning seems to be particularly rapid and pressing: the first five years of life are the times when the greatest cognitive gains are made, that equip individuals with the competencies, capacities and qualities that enable them to face and begin to master the enormous amounts of information and the complex kinds of skill which their living will require. Since the earliest times societies have determined this process should be carried out, at least initially and during these years of accelerating development in childhood, adolescence and youth, in institutions devoted to the purpose and under the direction and guidance of specially qualified and committed people serving the community's interest in developing the learning of its coming generation.

It seems to have been and still is widely accepted that attendance at such institutions and for such purposes should be compulsory until such a time as a society's young people may be deemed to have gained adequate information, mastered enough skills and developed into a state of sufficient maturity to be able to go on "under their own steam", so to speak, and to make decisions as to their own continuing patterns and pathways of development. At that point – when individuals may be regarded as having attained a degree of autonomy – comes the end of most of the compulsion. Learning after that becomes a matter of self-selection, with varying degrees of external prescription. Both require individuals to be aware of facts and possibilities about their situation in the world, to weigh the necessities or desirability of further learning, and to have the informed judgment and the settled disposition to make choices for themselves. All these capacities will come about as a result of further learning.

There was never a time when this was not true and it is to their credit that educational thinkers and writers such as those named realised this from the first. There were others, of course, who confused "learning" with mere "maturation" and "education" with schooling. The "New Romantics" (D.H. Hargreaves 1972, 1975) for example claimed that "the first impulses of Nature are always right" and believed that individuals, if left to themselves and without the "officious" interference of others, would tend to grow and learn "naturally" all those things that their existence required: learning would come about simply as an accretion of growth. Others – those "free thinkers", who believed in the kind of education that befitted the free person, the free mind and the free spirit, – held that there was a paradox inherent in a situation in which individuals were required to attend a "teaching and learning" institution on a compulsory basis; in this way, some held, individuals were being subjected to the contradiction of being "forced to be free"; for them, schools were inimical to the real enterprise of "education" and were analogous to "prison houses" whose shades, descending upon growing young people, would actually produce the contrary of the outcomes at which societies aimed in setting them up in the first place.

One similarity between such groups of thinkers was often to be found in the view that there came a time when such processes were complete: when people's natures had come to full fruition, when the education of people's minds and spirits had brought them to full and final maturity. For such thinkers, any formal attempt at education after such a "terminus ad quem" had been reached was redundant and otiose: people had reached a point when all further educational work was unnecessary, superfluous, and fruitless. There might, of course, be some occasional need for supplementary training in the acquisition of further skills or additional instruction in the knowledge required for application in the workplace. But these needs were very much "ad hoc" and could readily be provided and acquired on a piece-meal "need to know" basis.

In recent times, however, such views have changed. A harbinger of the rapid changes such thinking was about to undergo was the appearance in 1972 of the Report to UNESCO of the Committee chaired by M. Edgar Fauré entitled *Learning To Be: The World of Education Today and Tomorrow*, the main point of which was, in the words of Wain's summary (Wain 1993), as follows:-

> "Lifelong education" stands for a program to reconceptualise education totally according to the principle that education is a lifelong process. ... for a complete overhaul of our way of thinking about education, for a new philosophy of education and ... for a *program of action...* as the "master concept" for all educational planning, policy-making, and practice ... The[ir] ambition was that the word education would eventually become synonymous with lifelong education in people's minds ... (today's) world ... requires a lifelong education which is a "constant reorganising or reconstructing of experience".'

The Fauré Report was instrumental in creating a climate that was consonant with the times. Education and learning were becoming increasingly important throughout the lifespan as people were facing the increasing plethora of changes bearing in upon them as the twentieth century unfolded: change in the world of industry and commerce;

increasingly global patterns of economic development; the almost exponential increase in the growth and extension of knowledge; the revolutionary transformations of communication and interaction brought about by the revolution of information technology; the needs of indigenous peoples to experience culturally relevant lifelong learning. The Fauré report provided the site for a passionate argument that the only way that people could hope to face and deal with such changes was a state in which they would be involved in the activities of an "education permanente".

These arguments began to be articulated with all the greater force as those changes and developments began to exert such force on countries and communities that all experienced a kind of all encompassing transformation – in economy, in culture and in identity. It is not too much to say that the changes in the world effected by these transformations over the last thirty years have been no less radical and fundamental as the changes that came about as the result of the invention of the wheel and of the printing press. We are now living in a new age in which the demands are so complex, so multifarious and so rapidly changing that the only way in which we shall be able to survive them is by committing to a process of individual, communal and global learning throughout the lifespan of all of us.

A number of international bodies and agencies have taken cognisance of these transformations and the demands they impose upon societies and communities of the twenty first century and have developed and articulated policies that will, it is hoped, bid fair to enable citizens of the world in the twenty first century to face these challenges. It is now a declared policy of international bodies, such as OECD, UNESCO and APEC, and national governments such as those of Australia, China, Finland, Japan, Korea, Norway, Sweden, Taiwan and the United Kingdom that education has to be a lifelong undertaking and an investment in the future that is not restricted merely to the domain of economic advancement.

As we approach the turn of the century, policy-makers and educationalists across the international arena are grappling with the need to move from systems that emphasise a "front end" approach to education and training to the radically more unworked construct of lifelong learning. At this point in our history, then, as editors we have thought it useful in this volume to examine, from the discourse already available, some examples of the different forms, focuses and nexuses of thinking on this topic and offer some suggestions as to a way forward.

THE CONCEPT

It will become clear in this volume that one approach to conceptualising lifelong learning holds that it is concerned primarily with the promotion of skills and competences necessary for the development of general capabilities and specific performance in roles, activities and tasks that relate primarily, or in some cases entirely, to economic development and performance. Skills and competencies developed through programs of lifelong learning, using this approach, will have a bearing on questions of how workers perform their job responsibilities, as well as how they can adapt general and particular knowledge and competences to new functions. Taking this view, a more

highly educated and skilled workforce will contribute to a more advanced and competitive economy.

This economic justification for lifelong learning is highly dependent upon two prior assumptions: one, that "lifelong education" is *instrumental for* and *anterior to* some more ultimate goal; and secondly, that the purpose of lifelong learning is highly job-related and economic-policy-dependent. This approach, as we have seen from discussions at OECD (1996), UNESCO (1996), the European Parliament (1995) and the Nordic Council of Ministers (1995), has now been rejected as presenting too narrow and limited an understanding of the nature, aims and purpose of "lifelong education".

A second perspective rests upon different assumptions. Instead of "lifelong learning" being seen as instrumental to the achievement of an extrinsic goal, "education" is seen equally as an intrinsically valuable activity, something that is good in and for itself. Incorporated in this perspective is the belief that those engaging in lifelong education do so, not so much to arrive at a new place but "to travel with a different view" (Peters, 1965) and in that way to travel with a qualitatively better, richer and more elevated perspective from which to view the world. There is wide acceptance of the view that people engaging in educational activities generally are enriched by having their view of the world and their capacity for rational choice continually expanded and transformed by having access to the increased ranges and varieties of experiences and cognitive achievements, that the lifelong learning experience offers. Importantly, the benefits accrue at the individual and societal levels. This second view has been adopted by a variety of community groups.

In addition to opportunities for lifelong learning through traditional institutions and agencies in the community, there is a growing trend for lifelong learning activities to be offered by and through a host of non-traditional community initiatives. For indigenous peoples and many members of developing economies, these non-traditional community initiatives may in fact represent a return to tradition, rather than the creation of a new paradigm. In these cases, the transformation may reflect a return to lifelong learning.

Lifelong learning conceived of and offered through these channels, new or traditional, often offers people the opportunity to bring up to date their knowledge and enjoyment of activities which they had either long since laid aside or always wanted to do but were previously unable to pursue; to try their hands at activities and pursuits that they had previously imagined were outside their available time or competence; or extend their intellectual horizons by seeking to understand and engage with some of the more significant cognitive advances of recent times.

This is not to suggest that lifelong learning is an activity restricted or even primarily directed towards those who have passed the age when education in formal or institutional settings may be largely complete. In fact cognitive and skill development begins early and can continue throughout one's life. This is an indispensable part of one's growth and development as a human being, as well as a foundation for social and economic participation more broadly in society. Individual and community welfare is protected and promoted when communities arrange for lifelong learning to be available to the widest range of constituencies, through as many channels as possible and in as many forms as are viable. Smethurst (1995) puts this well:

> Is education a public or a private good? The answer is, neither: it is both. There is some education which is overwhelmingly a public good in that its benefits accrue very widely, to society at large as well as to the individual. Equally there is some education which, while benefiting society, confers overwhelming benefits on the individual learner. But much of education sits annoyingly between these two extremes, leading us, correctly, to want to influence the amount and type of it supplied and demanded, because society has an interest in the outcome, but also to note that it confers benefits on the individual above those societal benefits.

The argument that education is a public good supports the third version of lifelong learning, a notion held these days by an increasing number of institutions and organisations. It is widely agreed that the availability of educational opportunities over the whole of people's lifespans is a pre-requisite for informed and effective participation in society by all citizens (see Grace, 1994; McLaughlin, 1994; Smethurst, 1995). Similarly, such services as health, housing, welfare, and the legal system, along with education, constitute the infra-structure which people need in order to construct and realise a satisfying and fulfilling life in a society that is mutually supportive, inclusive and just.

For our part as educators, in conceptualising this volume, we have operated from the belief that there is a complex relationship between three major elements or outcomes of lifelong learning: education for a more highly skilled work force; personal development leading to a more rewarding life; and the creation of a stronger and more inclusive society. It is the interplay between these elements that differentiates and animates lifelong learning and this is in part why lifelong learning is a complex and multi-faceted process. The process itself begins in pre-school, continues through compulsory and post-compulsory periods of formal education and training, and is then carried on through the rest of the lifespan. It is actualised through provision of learning experiences and activities in the home, the work place, in universities and colleges, and in other educational, social and cultural agencies, institutions and settings – both formal and informal – within the community. This is the perspective that informs this publication.

THE POLICY CHALLENGE

The central elements in the triadic nature of lifelong learning, we believe, are interrelated and are fundamental pre-requisites for a wide range of benefits that governments and peoples widely across the international arena regard as important goals related to economic, personal and social policies. The adoption of policies for lifelong learning, we hope to show in this volume, will help achieve a variety of policy goals that include building a strong, adaptable and competitive economy, providing a fertile range of opportunities for personal growth and development, and developing a richer social fabric where principles and ideals of social inclusiveness, justice and equity are practised and promoted.

We need to point out, however, that, for the effective development of educational policies and lifelong learning practices widely across, in and through national and

Chapter 1: Towards a Philosophy of Lifelong Learning

DAVID ASPIN and JUDITH CHAPMAN

THE CONCEPT OF LIFELONG LEARNING FOR ALL

INTRODUCTION

In the daily life of those working in all kinds of educating institutions these days there is always so much to do connected with the realities of the financing, staffing, delivering and evaluating educational programs that there seems little time to concentrate on anything else. It is not surprising therefore to find that questions of a more profound kind are generally put to one side, either to await those rare opportunities when there will be an opportunity for more serious reflection or to consign such matters to the advice of "experts" or "theorists" whose time can be given over to such matters, separate and aside from the "real" problems. This is particularly so with philosophical questions. In this chapter we hope to show that attention to the philosophical questions that are part and parcel of thinking about lifelong learning is not only a crucial and indispensable element of the framework within which lifelong learning programs and activities are conceived and articulated, but also that the conclusions that are reached as a result of philosophical enquiries have *practical* implications for developing programs, curricula and activities of a lifelong learning character.

Philosophy is often thought of as "urbane and cultivated sermonizing" (O'Connor 1963) about the nature of reality and the place of human beings in relation to it, much in the sense that people speak of their "philosophy of life". This implies a set of beliefs, values and attitudes to what are seen as the weighty questions of life and death and/or the principles to be followed in our relations with other people. A similar sense of "philosophy" is found in uses where people talk of ideologies such as Marxism or economic rationalism, codes for living such as Bushido, or religious systems such as those of Islam, Judaism or Christianity. Such approaches to philosophy are widely known and much practised, but we think they have little to offer us here. However, neither do we feel that we ought to fly to the other extreme and apotheosize the model of philosophy associated with exponents of it such as Ayer (1936) and Austin (1962), which involves a highly technical and rigorous exercise in the analysis and clarification of the meanings of words.

As we see it, the adoption of an appropriate philosophical approach to enquiries about lifelong learning will depend, as much as anything else, upon the nature of the problem being looked into, the intellectual histories and interests of those tackling it,

D. Aspin, J. Chapman, M Hatton and Y. Sawano (eds.). International Handbook of Lifelong Learning, 3–34
© 2001 *Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Great Britain*

the outcomes at which they are aiming, the considerations that make their selection of particular categories, concepts, criteria and procedures significant or determinative in the framing of questions, the conduct of enquiries and the judgment of what shall count as valid answers or good theories, and the reflections that make certain moves in their arguments and theorising decisive.

Thus, in attempting to put into play our own version of philosophy, we need to be clear about the questions that we believe will loom large in our consideration of lifelong learning and the things that we hope will emerge from philosophical enquiries into it. Our own work in this area leads us to think that there is a number of topics, issues and problems that ought to be looked into and that these are concerned, among other things, with the planning, provision and assessment of activities in educating institutions concerned to promote and expand opportunities for lifelong learning experiences for all.

The first of these questions concerns the ways in which lifelong learning might be defined, characterised and understood; the second concerns how lifelong learning might be brought about; the third concerns the kinds of knowledge, understanding and skill that people might want or need to acquire and what the status of their claims to have acquired such knowledge might amount to; the fourth draws attention to the ways in which people will be able to learn, understand and make progress in their lifelong learning endeavours; and the fifth concerns the grounds on which lifelong learning programmes can be justified. Any or all of these will also therefore probably make some demand on a wider framework of philosophical, methodological, epistemological, pedagogical and ethical concerns within which lifelong learning undertakings are more generally to be understood and the ways in which substantive theories about them may be appraised, compared, criticized and, if necessary, improved or corrected.

In attempting to show how one might go about framing answers to such questions we shall need to draw upon the insights offered by a range of philosophical approaches. For example, the deeply held beliefs, values and attitudes, to which everyone is committed, are often hidden and only become explicit or "public" through the expression of our preferences, ambitions, political, economic or moral decisions, and through our observable involvement in a particular pattern or certain "form of life". It is, however, those hidden, underlying assumptions and preconceptions that are crucial in determining the influence of our theories not only upon our undertakings in promoting lifelong learning but also upon the aims and content of the kinds of programmes and activities we believe should be offered under the heading, in the name and for the purpose of preparing, promoting and providing opportunities for learning across the lifespan.

One element in our approach, therefore, will be some attempt to identify and throw light on some of the presuppositions that underpin and serve to define the 'form of life' within which we believe that lifelong learning enterprises are most appropriately located and take place. Such analysis is not undertaken simply for its own sake, however, but for particular reasons. It is undertaken, for one thing, in an attempt to promote clarity and soundness in our theoretical understanding. This is a task which we regard as being of vital importance, for it is obvious that one cannot promote clarity of thought, soundness of argument and rational decision-making among purveyors of and participants in lifelong learning programmes if we as policy-makers and educators

are unaware of or unclear about those elements, principles and criteria which lay the basis for decision-making about our own work, especially when these may not be self-evident but require public expression and justification.

Such analysis is also undertaken in the attempt to provide us with the second element in this study, which is devoted to the endeavour of developing a theory or set of theories and constructing a theoretical framework against which present day progammes and activities of lifelong learning could be tested to see whether the practice matches the principles. In this way we should be able to discover where there are weaknesses, deficiencies, omissions or errors and thus be able to determine what amendments, refinements or even wholesale restructuring might be needed in order to bring about a close "fit". The purpose of this kind of investigation, then, is to consider the theories with which we or other people active in the field are working and to engage in the crucial task of theory examination, theory comparison, and theory criticism, correction or even replacement. Philosophy viewed in this way becomes not merely an exercise of analysis for the purposes of clarification but an undertaking of theory criticism and construction in order that the undertakings themselves shall be based upon sound principles, such as those of economy, simplicity, coherence, consistency, fecundity and capacity for successful prediction (see Lycan 1988).

We see, then, two main characteristics in the version of philosophy with which we shall be working in this chapter. First, we see a need for a rigorous analysis and elucidation of those concepts, criteria and categories that are embedded and embodied in any lifelong learning undertaking, together with an examination of the presuppositions underlying them (the kind of activity described by Strawson (1958) as 'descriptive metaphysics'; see also Trigg 1973). Secondly, however, we are inclined to believe that there is a practical "pay-off" or creative element, which is concerned to point to the implications of such analysis – to settle what ought logically to follow from it with respect to putting on programmes of lifelong learning. And this will mean ensuring that the theory/ies embodied in those programmes will be the temporary best theory that fits the phenomena and helps us to answer the problems at the time when we look at them. In this respect our approach has much in common with the notion of philosophy as a process of tackling and attempting to solve problems (Popper 1972).

A Note of Caution

It is important to be clear about the nature and purposes of such a philosophical examination and indeed of the various approaches to these questions that follow. None of them purports to provide *the* answer to any of the questions raised therein; indeed this would not be a philosophical enterprise if that were to be the outcome aimed at. The analyses we engage in and offer, the elucidations of presuppositions, the comparison and criticism of competing theories presuppose canons of intelligibility and corrigibility that are not themselves immune from further criticism. Our willingness to put up hypotheses and conjectures that criticize or claim to refute the views of others is based upon the expectation that these will themselves be subjected in turn to rational criticism put forward by others. Any conclusions that we draw can only stand until such time as

they in turn are subjected to and refined or refuted by further rational and relevant argument. Such is the nature of this kind of activity.

However, just because such an activity is regarded therefore as only provisional in nature will not mean that it is pointless or unimportant. Any policy, undertaking or enterprise that attempts to influence the lives of other people for the better counts as, potentially at any rate, an intrusion into and an interference with these lives and as such it needs to be justified publicly if it is to be accorded any weight or acceptance, whilst the presuppositions on which such a policy is based ought also to be laid bare and rendered subject to scrutiny, rather than left hidden or unexamined. It is this public examination of such policies and the rigorous scrutiny of their implicit principles or explicit recommendations for action that we see as the prime responsibility of the philosopher.

In the language we have been employing, therefore, the questions about lifelong learning that we believe need to be tackled and, it is to be hoped, answered (even if only provisionally), may be categorised, at least initially, into the following:

- questions of meaning and definition
- questions of methodology
- questions of epistemology
- questions of the philosophical psychology of pedagogy/learning
- questions of ethics.

In the rest of this chapter we shall try to deal with the various issues arising in these areas of enquiry and to come to some tentative conclusions that might form a useful basis for theories of lifelong learning

THE PROBLEM OF MEANING AND DEFINITION

It is with the question of meaning that the problems of developing a philosophy of lifelong learning begin, for if we cannot easily understand or agree upon the terms being employed in our discourse in and about the topic, then we cannot proceed further to an examination of the validity of arguments employing or theories embodying them. Thus the analysis and clarification of terms becomes a prior stage in the conceptualization of lifelong learning matters, for it is upon them that all else that follows will depend.

Gelpi, one of the early writers on the topic of lifelong education (Gelpi, 1984), argued that there was a need for a clear definition of the term 'lifelong education'. The problem, he maintained, was that, while one could be reasonably clear about the meaning and applicability of such terms as "vocational education", "technical education" and "nurse education", no such clarity could be found in the case of terms with much less specific points of application, such as "lifelong education", particularly when a range of other apparently similar terms – "*education permanente*", "further education", "continuing education" and so on – were often used interchangeably with it and with each other.

Other writers on the topic have maintained that there is no point in trying to apply the term "lifelong education". They claim that such a term seeks to generalize the

reference of the notion of "education" to such a wide set of parameters as virtually to empty it of all meaning. Still others have acted as though the term "lifelong education" were simply another way of alluding to those educational endeavours and opportunities that were offered after the end of formal schooling and thus was interchangeable and synonymous with terms that had wider currency, such as "adult education", "careers education" or "recurrent education" (Stock 1979). Yet another group have commented that, while there may have been enough examples around in the history of educational philosophy of such key ideas as "liberal education" or "moral education" to offer discussants a reasonably firm point of purchase, there is so little said about "lifelong education" that there is almost nothing on which we can get a grip in our attempts to give a clear account of those elements that we may discern as being cardinal to or indicative of its meaning and application.

There is an important point to be made when one is considering the positions that have been taken in the past in respect to the concept of lifelong education and the arguments that have been put forward by various proponents of these positions. For it seems to us that differences in and between various versions of "lifelong education" are functions, not only of particular educational, moral or political commitments, but also of a particular meta-theory at work in the philosophy of lifelong education.

In some versions of the term, and in various attempts to produce a clear account of it, we may discern the presence and operation of a particular preconception. In many writers' work on lifelong education, for example, there is an implicit acceptance of the idea that (a) it is possible to arrive at some uniform descriptive account of the term "lifelong education", which all could then accept and take as a kind of *primum datum*; and that (b) if there were not such a definition already available, then there ought to be. The common postulate shared by many writers – particularly the earlier ones – seems to be that unambiguous agreement on the meaning and applicability of the term "lifelong education" or "lifelong learning" is conceivable, possible and attainable. In our reading of the various books, chapters and papers on this topic we find plenty of evidence that many writers seem to share this assumption and operate according to the logic and dictates of an empiricist approach to concepts and meaning (see Dave, 1975; Cropley, 1979; Gelpi, 1985; Lengrand, 1975, 1986; and Richmond and Stock, 1979).

The main feature observable in the work of such writers is their holding of preconceptions about definition that may be described as "essentialist". This is the notion that it is possible, and indeed philosophically proper, for participants in discussion about any term in educational discourse to employ the methods of etymological derivation, dictionary definition, or the sharp-cutting tools of conceptual analysis (looking for those cases that all can agree to be "central" or "peripheral" to allowable utterance employing the terms in question), in the endeavour to arrive at some kind of agreement about the separately "necessary" and conjointly "sufficient" conditions that will underpin and define the direction of discourse employing this term.

The notion that the quest for "essential" definitions was legitimate was held in an earlier era where students of education accepted the academic tenability and conformed to the dictates of the empiricist paradigm, tending only to engage in activities of conceptual analysis, pursuing philosophical enquiries and developing and applying research designs and instruments exclusively based upon it. This view – a

Chapter 2: Locating Lifelong Learning and Education in Contemporary Currents of Thought and Culture

RICHARD BAGNALL

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a picture of the ways and extent to which lifelong learning discourse is dependent on the broader cultural contexts of which it is a part. This is done by firstly articulating three progressive sentiments that may be seen as informing lifelong learning ideology, theory and advocacy. Against that more traditional background is then examined the sort of educational discourse that is generated in the contemporary cultural context, and which therefore prevails in contemporary lifelong learning policy and practice. It is argued that, although this context valorizes lifelong learning, the progressive sentiments are largely and substantively incidental to prevailing lifelong learning discourse, although they do give that discourse its aura of symbolic value. In so arguing, this work builds upon such recent critiques of contemporary lifelong learning discourse as those of Baptiste (1999), Boshier (1998), Collins (1998), C. Falk (1998), Rubenson (1996) and Wilson (1999).

THREE PROGRESSIVE SENTIMENTS

Lifelong learning ideology, theory and advocacy over the last four decades may be seen as informed, very largely, by three progressive sentiments: the individual, the democratic and the adaptive. The notion of an informing progressive sentiment is that of a stream, current or strand of commitment to cultural reform – one that is defined by a central programmatic purpose for reform of the cultural institutions affected (the educational institution in our case). That purpose, then, constitutes an organizing ideal to which advocacy is directed, around which theory is constructed, and in support of which evidence is gathered. It captures the ethical meaning and import of the educational ideal. The three progressive sentiments here recognized are seen as capturing the dominant currents of thought that have shaped our contemporary understanding of lifelong learning. However, their recognition and presentation here involves some degree of distillation from the cultural contexts in which they are embedded, and of separation from each other, for in educational theory and practice they are interrelated, being neither isolated from each other nor discrete in themselves. They combine in different ways and with different emphases to form the more conventionally recognized philosophical traditions in education: progressive, humanist, democratic socialist, liberal,

D. Aspin, J. Chapman, M Hatton and Y. Sawano (eds.). International Handbook of Lifelong Learning, 35–52
© 2001 *Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Great Britain*

and so on. They importantly cut across or transcend epistemology, although they are differently expressed within different epistemologies. They emerge, then, in the ideological commitments of philosophical traditions (and are expressed in particular educational ideologies) informing lifelong learning advocacy. Each does so in what may be termed its progressive, authentic or genuine form: that form which is directed to the achievement of human liberation, emancipation, progress and development, through the central programmatic purpose of the sentiment. Those ideologies, and their supporting theories of learning and education, therefore give expression to the progressive sentiments in various hybrid forms. The references here to exemplifying sources in each case must, accordingly, be seen as indicative only, and not as identifying evidence of any unalloyed sentiment.

The Individual Progressive Sentiment

The individual progressive sentiment is defined by its programmatic commitment to individual growth and development. It seeks liberation from ignorance (through individual enlightenment), from dependence (through individual empowerment), from constraint (through the individual transformation of perspectives), or from inadequacy (through individual development). Lifelong learning works that are strongly grounded in this sentiment include those of Brocket and Hiemstra (1991), Longworth and Davies (1996), Overly (1979), Taylor (1998) and Wain (1987).

The focus of its educational advocacy depends on the ideological emphasis given to each of the above-mentioned liberatory commitments. An emphasis on liberation from ignorance gives a focus on cognitive or intellectual development and understanding, commonly (but not necessarily) through the academic disciplines (Lawson 1979, Paterson 1979, Taylor 1998). An emphasis on liberation from dependence gives a focus on the development of skills and on socialization into social conventions and practices (Knowles 1980, Overly 1979). An emphasis on liberation from constraint gives a focus on the transformation and transcendence of frameworks of individual understanding and capability, particularly those acquired through passive acculturation (Barnett 1994, Collins 1991, Mezirow 1991). An emphasis on liberation from inadequacy gives a focus on individual growth and development (Dewey 1961, Houle 1980, Wain 1987).

Its case for lifelong learning is based, variously, on the vast breadth and depth, and the constant progressive advance, of human knowledge with which to come to grips (Paterson 1979, Taylor 1998), on the changing developmental needs of different life tasks at different periods or phases of individual development (Allman 1982, Havighurst 1972, Heymans 1992), on the continuing need for educational transformation in the vast expanse of human conformism (Barnett 1994, Brookfield 1984), and on the endless journey of individual growth in an evolving social context (Houle 1980, Wain 1987).

Although this sentiment focuses on individual development, it nevertheless tends to frame a perception of public benefit from education. This benefit is seen as being through the development of individuals who are more functionally independent, culturally informed and publicly aware (Houle 1980, Olafson 1973, Paterson 1979). The actions of such persons are seen as being more likely to be characterized by individual

responsibility and capability, an ethical orientation, and a sensitivity and responsiveness to others and to the public welfare. A society of such persons, then, is seen as being more likely to be one in which the monitoring and moderation of human action is largely individualized and collective – requiring only minimal state investment in surveillance, policing and administration of justice. Accordingly, this progressive sentiment tends to be associated with a perception of the public value of (lifelong) education as being high. Correspondingly, there tends to be the advocacy of state support (including financial support) for lifelong education and learning, for all citizens, to the limit of their ability to benefit from it, including that for adults, but particularly those who have been unable to capitalize on earlier educational opportunities (Commission on Social Justice 1994, Lawson 1982, Paterson 1979).

Through this sentiment, the educational institution tends to be seen as both important and importantly distinct from other social institutions. Individual development through education calls both for specialist educational expertise on the part of teachers and for specialist organizations through which it is undertaken. The nature of that expertise and the sorts of organizations, however, vary somewhat with the ideological emphasis: an emphasis on cognitive development commonly giving a commitment to teachers schooled in the academic disciplines, and to organizations reflective of academic values; an emphasis on liberation from dependence sees a focus on the formation of teacher capabilities in facilitating the development of autonomous, self-directed learners; an emphasis on transformation is more likely to see a commitment to teacher expertise in the management of learning situations and to similarly structured organizations; whereas an emphasis on individual growth is more associated with the development of interpersonal understanding, empathy and interpersonal skills in teachers (Barnett 1994, Cropley 1977, Goad 1984).

The Democratic Progressive Sentiment

The democratic progressive sentiment is defined by its programmatic commitment to social justice, equity and social development through participative democratic involvement. It seeks liberation from inherited authority of all forms, whether autocratic, oligarchic, theocratic, or whatever, and from oppression, servitude and poverty, in the creation of a truly civil society (Fauré *et al.* 1972, Gutmann 1987, Illich 1973, Walker 1992, White 1983). Education, then, is to serve and mirror those ends (Aronowitz & Giroux 1991, Freire 1972, Gelpi 1985).

The focus of its educational advocacy is on cultural reform through education – cultural reform in the directions noted above and through broadening access to any or all of the liberating learnings of the individual progressive sentiment (Gelpi 1984, Schuller 1979, Walker 1992). The purpose of education is to inform social action for the development of a more humane, tolerant, just and egalitarian society of liberated, empowered individuals, acting collegially in the public good. Education is seen as informing both social action itself and the reflective and discursive evaluation of that action: an on-going process of action and reflection, together commonly labeled 'praxis' (Freire 1972). It is seen as being directed particularly to the liberation of

oppressed, marginalized and exploited sectors of society. Education is therefore to be directed to achieving cultural change for the good of humanity as a whole.

Its case for lifelong learning is essentially that human liberation from oppression and exploitation calls for continuing vigilance and action as new forms of oppression are instituted or old ones revived in new forms (Fragniere 1976, Gelpi 1984, Illich & Verne 1976).

Lifelong education, accordingly, is seen as being, first and foremost, a public good. It is from the public good that the private, individual benefit flows (Fauré *et al.* 1972, M. Peters & Marshall 1996). The provision of education, correspondingly, is a state responsibility, calling for relatively high levels of state support, including financial support, for educational engagement by all citizens (Fauré *et al.* 1972, Fragniere 1976, Illich 1970).

Educational ideology that is strongly informed by this sentiment calls for teachers to be relatively well educated themselves, to be actively involved in cultural reform, to be committed to the democratic sentiment, and to be skilled in their role as teachers (Hatcher 1998). The important reflective and culturally critical aspects of educational change call for a degree of institutional autonomy in educational organizations, but one which, nevertheless, is engaged with broader social issues and public policy (Aronowitz & Giroux 1991, Walker 1992).

The Adaptative Progressive Sentiment

The adaptive progressive sentiment is defined by its programmatic responsiveness to cultural change. It seeks liberation from deprivation, poverty and dependence, through adaptive learning. Such development may be at any level of social organization – individual, organizational, national, global, or whatever, depending upon the learning need (Jessup 1969, Knapper & Cropley 1985, Kofman & Senge 1995, Kozlowski 1995, Longworth 1995).

The focus of educational advocacy, then, is on the creation of educational systems and policies that make it possible for individuals, organizations, etc. to keep pace with cultural change and to advance themselves in the changing cultural context (Evans 1985, Hiemstra 1976, McClusky 1974). Individuals are thereby enabled either to maintain themselves as contributing members of society, avoiding an otherwise inevitable slide into anachronistic irrelevance and dependence on welfare or others, or to develop themselves as contributing members of society, if they are already or are still dependent (Cropley 1977, Knapper & Cropley 1985). Organizations are enabled to maintain themselves as viable, thriving entities, in an increasingly competitive and global marketplace (Kofman & Senge 1995, Kozlowski 1995). And nations are enabled to provide a fiscal, political and social context that facilitates the development of their citizens and their interests, while providing welfare support for those who are deemed to need and deserve it (Carnevale 1991, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development 1996). Its progressive thrust is grounded in the freedom, particularly the negative freedom (i.e., freedom *from* restraint and constraint) to enjoy the good life, to contribute constructively to society, and to pursue one's interests.

Its case for lifelong learning is based on the impact of accelerating cultural change on the learning needs of individuals, organizations and nations. That impact is on adults as much as it is on children, and on the elderly as much as on those in middle age (Chapman & Aspin 1997, Cropley 1977, Evans 1985). Changing modes of work and employment, production and consumption, communication, exchange, and signification all impact on individuals throughout their lives, albeit in different ways. Through lifelong learning, then, education is seen as being directed to a process of lifelong adaptation to the changing cultural context (Hiemstra 1976, Jessup 1969). That context calls also, though, for education to be directed to the development of metacognitive skills, to allow learners to manage their own actions *as* lifelong learners (Knapper & Cropley 1985, Smith 1992).

Educational benefit through this sentiment has both public and private aspects, depending principally on the balance of perceived benefit. It tends to be focused, though, more strongly on the private, particularly in the post-compulsory sectors of education (Marginson 1993). Through education at that level, individuals or organizations are seen as the primary beneficiaries – through their enhanced or maintained capacity to profit within the changing cultural context. Public benefit tends, then, to be seen as secondary – as a consequence of private gains. From enhanced private security and advantage can flow generosity, altruism, beneficence and an active concern for the public good. State support for education thus tends to be seen as ideally limited to areas of welfare support, basic skills development, socialization, rehabilitation, and public education – areas, nonetheless, which constitute a large and important slice of educational activity (Jessup 1969). The state's role in other areas of educational reform is seen as being more that of regulation, of standard-setting and of establishing and maintaining frameworks for the recognition and transfer of adaptive learning (Melody 1997).

Educational ideology that is strongly informed by this sentiment calls for educational provision and engagement to be contextualized, to be optimally embedded in the adaptive life tasks to which the learning is directed (Gustavsson 1997, Kozlowski 1995). It calls for the cost of education to be privatized to the individuals, collectivities or organizations to the extent that those entities are seen as being its most direct and immediate beneficiaries (Marginson 1993). Correspondingly, good teachers are seen as those who bring relevant (particularly recent) life task experience and expertise to their teaching role, who have an appropriately responsive and open-minded attitude to change, and who have the requisite skills for effectively and efficiently transferring their relevant learning to others (Cropley 1977, Cropley & Dave 1978). Educational ideology and policy tend to have a strong element of enculturation into the ever-changing realities of lived experience, and of coping with the demands of those realities (Gee & Lankshear 1995, Ohliger 1974).

THE CONTEMPORARY CULTURAL CONTEXT

The foregoing three progressive sentiments may be seen as the dominant currents of reformist thought in recent decades of lifelong education and learning advocacy and

Chapter 3: Lifelong Learning and Personal Fulfillment

ROBIN BARROW AND PATRICK KEENEY

INTRODUCTION

The argument of this chapter will be that the concept of lifelong learning (as opposed to the rather ill-favored phrase itself) has a long and honourable history and should be actively promoted. However, this is on the important assumption that the concept is interpreted in such a way as to imply self-fulfillment through education, rather than in a narrowly utilitarian way that looks through an economic lens and sees no further than skills and training.

Certainly, the idea of lifelong learning must have seemed a given to Plato, and the suggestion that it is intrinsically tied up with personal fulfillment would surely also have occurred to him. In the most literal sense, the education advocated for the Guardians in the *Republic* is a lifelong process, with explicit reference being made to the (adult) ages appropriate for various studies. Indeed, Plato states unequivocally that "education ... commences in the first years of childhood and lasts to the very end of life"(*Protagoras*, 325). It is also clear that, while recognizing, even emphasising, the social utility of well educated persons, as we shall do below, (for the careful attention to the upbringing and education appropriate to all citizens in the *Republic* is intended to contribute to the harmony and happiness of the whole), for Plato a crucial part of the point of all this education is to realise or fulfill the individual to the utmost (Barrow 1975). What particularly characterises and distinguishes Plato's view, especially judged in the context of his times, is his argument that education is an intellectual and character-forming business, rather than a mere acquisition of skills or mastery of a trade, and that its ideal length or scope is not to be estimated by reference to any amount of information to be ingested, but to the need to ascend to ever higher and more abstract levels of understanding. It is true that Plato's epistemology inclines towards the idea that ultimately the world and all things in it can be known and hence that in principle there might be a finite limit to the answer of the time it takes to become educated. But the fact remains that, in practice, Plato saw the business of education as a thing of wonder and of the first importance, and something that would never actually be complete in this life.

The idea, then, of lifelong learning is nothing new. Our concern will now be with its role in a contemporary context.

THE ECONOMY AND THE KNOWLEDGE EXPLOSION

The phrase "lifelong learning" is very much a part of contemporary educational discourse, and as an idea it currently plays a significant part in a great deal of planning

D. Aspin, J. Chapman, M Hatton and Y. Sawano (eds.). International Handbook of Lifelong Learning, 53–60
© 2001 *Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Great Britain*

and practical activity. To this extent at least, our views are closer to Plato's than to those entertained at many other historical periods and in many other cultures. There seems to be a general sense, if not necessarily a well articulated claim, that, just as Plato thought, we should be doing a great deal more than apprenticing people to a trade, initiating them into a priesthood, conditioning them, indoctrinating them, or equipping them with various mechanical skills; we should be nurturing the personhood and cultivating the minds and manners of individuals, and this is not something that can be done by and completed in formal schooling alone. But given the ubiquity of the phrase and the popularity of the idea, it becomes important to examine and argue for a defensible interpretation of the concept. To make sure, in particular, that the general sense referred to becomes a reality when we put lifelong learning into practice, so that what we are subscribing to is truly worthwhile and educational.

Why should there be, at this time, such particular explicit and widespread concern with lifelong learning? In large part the impetus behind the emphasis on the idea is surely a consequence of various social, in particular economic, arguments. Cynics may no doubt attribute it more to the self-importance of theorists and the self-serving of educationalists. But, whatever the tendency of academics to latch on to some temporarily forgotten idea and run with it until it has turned to cliché, there are some fairly obvious reasons why we should be focusing on lifelong learning: many, perhaps most, individuals today change their job more than once during a lifetime; their circumstances in other respects (personal, social, economic) are equally likely to vary. To put it simply, it is no longer the case (if it ever was) that the body of understanding acquired by the end of formal schooling can possibly hope to see the individual through life.

In addition the so-called explosion in knowledge, the rapidity with which our understanding in certain fields advances, equally quickly renders yesterday's learning obsolete. Development in scientific knowledge is most commonly cited as the example here, but even archeologists or historians can be left behind if they fail to come to grips with new modes of collecting, sifting and analysing data.

That having been said, it is, in our view, possible, and in fact quite common, to overplay this particular point. First, there are clear differences between various disciplines, or types of inquiry, most notably that between those that are in some way necessarily progressively developmental and those that are not, such that it barely makes sense to talk of an explosion of knowledge or even (which is very different) a deeper understanding in respect of some of them. Science, for example, does build upon and advance on its past in a linear way, so that it both makes sense and is true to remark upon our vastly greater scientific understanding as compared with, say, that of the Greeks, and to point out that there is simply a whole lot more (and for many of us probably a whole lot too much) to be known. But mathematics is in a slightly different case: here our understanding is (we believe) refined and improved as we advance from our past; it is, we may say, a greater understanding. It may also be the case that this greater understanding implies in a literal sense something more to handle and that to rise to the heights of mathematical knowledge now takes longer than at any earlier time in our history. It may be the case, but it is not actually obvious that it is, and it does not seem to be logically necessary that it should be. When we turn to a form of inquiry such as philosophy or the performing arts, talk of an explosion of knowledge seem very inappropriate. Of course,

in a trivial sense there is more knowledge: the historians of philosophy, or painting, or practically anything, have more data or material to sift through. But philosophy should not be defined in terms of the books written on the subject, but rather of the ideas that are its subject matter. In this sense, while some would say our philosophical understanding was greater than Plato's, others would not, and in either case there is absolutely no reason to suppose that it must have taken A.J. Ayer longer than Plato to master the subject, or that the former's task was somehow more demanding than the latter's. (Both claims might be true, of course, but not for the reason advanced!)

The above digression seems to us worth making in order to deflect a rather too glib and misleading tendency to assume that, such is the state of the "knowledge industry" today, the sheer amount of what there is to be known is a sufficient reason for investing time and money into lifelong learning. The claim is generally vastly exaggerated and in any case pushes us down a dangerous path on which we identify education with acquiring knowledge in the sense particularly of information. It is understanding rather than knowledge in that sense that is our goal in education, and while there is in general probably more that is understood today than there was two thousand years ago, and while some subjects at least are considerably more complex and require more subtle understanding than before, it is not at all clear that it makes much sense to claim that the trouble is that it will obviously take a person longer today than two thousand years ago to educate themselves. To become a poet or a philosopher doesn't obviously take more time today than it ever did before. That having been said, and with this corrective in mind, it may of course be acknowledged that, broadly speaking, such facts as the ubiquity of new ideas and information, changing modes of communication, developing understanding, and the sheer extent of activity in some intellectual areas, may make one in some respects outdated in one's understanding in a conventional sense, if one ceases to advance at the end of formal schooling. Furthermore, it is the case, though it is not clear that it is primarily, if at all, for justifiable epistemological reasons, that the formal curriculum is under constant pressure to include more. Thus, the need to develop new understanding, the advances in understanding in some areas, the tendency for new emphases and approaches to be widely disseminated, and increasing demands on schooling (both formal and informal), combine to place the individual (where learning ceases with the completion of formal schooling) at an obvious disadvantage.

This is not only fairly uncontentiously the case, but it is in practice also probably the main reason for the current emphasis on lifelong learning. Pressure, whether direct or indirect, conscious or otherwise, from industry, business and government has led to the orthodoxy that individuals need to continue to learn, to retrain, to retool throughout their lives, if they are to serve their purpose as economic units.

SKILLS

Bearing the argument of the previous section in mind, one can say that during this century there has been a change of emphasis from the idea of specific training and the development of particular skills, through a belief in so-called generic-skill development, to the current focus on lifelong learning. This amounts to a shift from the assumption that

acquiring a trade (whether manual or intellectual) would suffice for life, by way of an assumption that one could learn how to be adaptable, to the assumption that one needs to continually learn new trades or re-learn one's trade (at the same time keeping one's information base up to date).

Thus, at the beginning of the century, the broad assumption was that one learnt enough to be a bricklayer, an accountant, a priest, a classics Don, and that, combined with learning certain social behaviours, attitudes and so forth appropriate to one's condition in life, would see one through. Little would change sufficient to render one's learning out of date. It is worth noting that adult education, which became a serious matter at the end of the last century, does not represent any real departure from this generalisation and is therefore not properly to be seen as the precursor of today's interest in lifelong learning. It was essentially no more than the provision of education to adults who had missed it (or part of it) as children, whether it involved instruction in literacy, handicrafts or whatever.

Perhaps the first major step in this century towards something like a concept of lifelong learning in a broader sense came with the widespread adoption of a belief in the possibility of cultivating generic skills such as that of learning how to learn or critical thinking. American psychologists of education seem to have been subconsciously wedded to the idea of generic skills for the longest of times, but it was in the sixties that the idea became more or less a part of progressive educational orthodoxy. Part of the thinking that was common at the time is not to be scorned: this was an ardent desire to replace the view that the learner was a passive receptacle into which the teacher placed information, with a view of the learner as an active agent who needed to be helped to process information and understand; a learner who thought critically about the material in question. And the idea that schools should be concerned primarily to cultivate such general abilities as that of being critical, of being caring, of learning how to learn certainly suggests some belief in education as an on-going business; for presumably the main purpose of focusing on learning how to learn is so that individuals will be free to go on learning for themselves through life. Indeed, much of the broader rhetoric of child-centred education at the time echoed the view that schooling was but a step on a journey that lasted for life and that the individual was a natural being (rather than a passive receptacle) that could and would continue to grow in a favourable environment such as the educative society it was hoped would be.

This is not the place to go into a detailed critique of a body of thinking that might be crudely summarized as: "right idea, false premise, wrong conclusion." But the "false premise" in question is the idea that there is such a thing as a generic skill of learning how to learn (or critical thinking or caring) that can meaningfully be taught to people. Broadly, as has been argued in detail elsewhere (Barrow 1990) there are serious problems in seeing intellectual abilities as skills (at any rate in anything like the same sense as say, discrete, physical skills), and more importantly in the idea of them as generic skills. There is also very often a confusion between tendencies or dispositions on the one hand and abilities or skills on the other: part of what it is to be a critical thinker is to have the inclination and tendency to look at things critically. This inclination, this disposition, is certainly neither an ability nor a skill in any sense, and is, incidentally,

quite compatible with being very bad at actually thinking critically (as anyone who has taught undergraduates probably knows.)

The argument in essence is as follows: the ability to think critically about, say, art is not some monolithic quality, some single indivisible attribute. The ability consists in various dimensions or facets. Secondly, some at least of these facets are clearly not skills such that they can be developed, exercised and trained on analogy with a physical skill (or set of skills) such as serving at tennis or riding a bike. For example, as already noted, the tendency, the disposition to think critically about art is clearly not a skill in this sense, but something to be nurtured by some means or other, as distinct from trained. Thirdly, and for our purposes much more crucially, the ability to think critically about art is one thing, the ability to think critically without qualifiers is quite another. In fact the latter is well nigh incoherent. The point is not that it doesn't make sense to conceive of someone thinking critically without reference to what they are thinking critically about, although this is also true. The main point is that, assuming critical thinking is good critical thinking and involves such things as understanding, being logical, and being clear, then critical thinking about art will be different in form from critical thinking in, say, science, politics, or philosophy. In each case the thinking needs to be logical, clear, and so on, but what constitutes logic, clarity, coherence, etc. "the form they take" are determined by the nature of the discipline or type of inquiry in question. In other words, in order to develop someone's capacity to think critically about art or science, it is logically necessary that they exercise their critical disposition (which may be, though need not be, generic) while studying art or science. The idea of a generic ability such that wherever I go, whatever the subject, even if completely new to me, I can be critical (other than in the different sense of disagreeable or antagonistic) is absurd.

There is still debate revolving round some of these views, but provided that it is understood that we are here only concerned with a partial verdict, we may say that the debate is effectively over. To put the matter in positive terms: the desire to develop individuals, who are both inclined to or have an aptitude for continued learning and critical thinking, and are able to continue learning in a critical fashion, will require developing understanding of both generic points of logic and reasoning, and also disciplined understanding of various types of inquiry and conceptual frameworks.

Thus, on this account, the sixties saw a movement towards the goal of a society of learners (particularly when we consider more specifically political educationalists' views such as those of the deschoolers), but it failed to deliver much, largely because the central ideal that there is some specific way(s) to equip the individual to carry on learning is incoherent (and, it may be added, the practical proposals to turn society into an educational environment were naive and unrealistic).

But while the view that one can learn to learn may have been in various respects confused and misconceived, and while the main impetus towards lifelong learning may be socio-economic, the paradox is that today we have a great opportunity to achieve the aims of those who believed in generic intellectual skills. For educationalists may reasonably argue that it is not the direct utility of learning that should be considered, but the intrinsic value of education, its value to the educated person, and its indirect utility that matters. The forces that have put an emphasis on lifelong learning have

Chapter 4: Political Inclusion, Democratic Empowerment and Lifelong Learning

PENNY ENSLIN, SHIRLEY PENDLEBURY AND MARY TJATTAS

Recent trends in social and political philosophy recognise the importance of inclusion in the attention they have paid to community membership and collective deliberation. But there are many "grades" or "gradations" of democratic involvement, demanding more or less inclusiveness and empowerment, and making greater or lesser demands on the capacities of those who are included. At the very least, political inclusion and democratic empowerment require universal franchise.

One of our most vivid memories of South Africa's first democratic election in 1994 was the image on television and in newspapers of elderly voters, in their Sunday best, waiting patiently in long queues to cast, with a visible pride, their very first vote. The ballot had been organised to be as inclusive as possible. Voters, literate or illiterate, were required to do no more than place a cross next to a picture of the leader of the party they supported. If the name of the party could not be read, all that was required was that they could recognise a visual representation. This is not to deny the role that voter education played in preparing people to participate in the election. But here was an instance of the romantic side of democracy, that is, of political inclusion and democratic empowerment that did not depend on even the most basic formal education.

Inspiring and important though this first democratic election was, democracy surely involves and demands much more than the mere placing of a cross on a ballot paper. The making of a cross is not a genuine act of democratic participation unless it is the result of some prior reasoning with an informed consideration of various possibilities and the context in which they present themselves. Arbitrary and coerced crosses may count in the tally of votes but they surely don't count as acts of democratic participation. Much more is required to get appreciably beyond this first democratic moment to deeper and ongoing democratic involvement, especially if we are aiming at a rich political and civic life with individual participation in decision-making about matters that fundamentally shape our lives. It requires at least a knowledge and understanding of the economy, political structures and processes, of current debates, controversies and competing policy options. It also requires capacities for independent and critical thought, for public presentation and appropriate motivation and attitudes.

Meeting these requirements could, paradoxically, both promote inclusion and empowerment for those who acquire these capacities, and also, for those who do not, foster exclusion and disempowerment. If this is a real danger, then a democratic state has a duty to provide enabling conditions for every citizen to meet the requirements. Lifelong learning is being touted as the way of fulfilling this duty.

D. Aspin, J. Chapman, M Hatton and Y. Sawano (eds.). International Handbook of Lifelong Learning, 61–78
© 2001 *Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Great Britain*

A critical take on lifelong learning by a number of authors has emphasised several problematic features. The first problem is that the programmatic use of lifelong learning as a UNESCO "master concept" (Fauré et al 1972) lacks coherence and has a number of illiberal characteristics. It lacks coherence because it denies a distinction between actual and desirable outcomes, and its illiberal characteristics are that it removes the grounding for both positive and negative rights to education (Bagnall 1990). A second problem is that lifelong learning rests uncritically on what Hughes and Tight (1995) call the myth of the learning society based on the assumptions of the inevitability of change and desirability of increasing productivity.

A more recent and nuanced account of life-long learning as explicated by Chapman (1996) includes a concern with achieving and sustaining a democratic polity and institutions that promote and practice equity, justice, and social inclusiveness. Chapman's triadic conception, the elements of which are democratic citizenship, economic progress and personal development, improves on conceptions that unduly emphasise economic productivity and hence vocationalism at the expense of individual and social development. However when applied in contexts of new democracies such as South Africa the triadic conception yields a number of worrying tensions (Pendlebury & Enslin forthcoming 2001). In this chapter we will argue that while lifelong learning does indeed have a crucial role in enabling democratic empowerment and political inclusion, the dominant conception of lifelong learning in much current educational policy cannot serve these noble ends. Part of our task in this chapter will be to suggest a rather different conception of lifelong learning. Of course, much depends on what is meant by political inclusion and democratic empowerment. It depends on what model of democracy it is supposed to prepare people to participate in, and on how far democratic participation can be expected to contribute to lifelong learning.

Someone unfamiliar with current educational policy agendas in Europe might take 'lifelong learning' to refer to learning across the human life span from cradle to grave. But this is not what is meant by the dominant current use of the term, which appears to exclude primary and secondary schooling as well as the education of adults who have either had no schooling or who have dropped out. It also appears to exclude such informal learning as might occur through watching television, doing a job with a more experienced fellow worker, or participating in the institutions of civil society. In its dominant current usage 'lifelong learning' refers to post-compulsory education, which in developed countries means accredited post-secondary or higher education. Pride of place has been given to lifelong learning in recent education policy in the United Kingdom and in the new agenda for higher education in the so-called learning society. The assumption here is that lifelong learning will meet the needs "of an increasingly sophisticated economy for a skilled and educated workforce" and fulfil the desire for "wider participation" (Taylor 1998, p.301). From an educational perspective, such policies have been controversial notwithstanding their wide support. While intended to broaden participation in education they have tended instead to emphasize economic competitiveness and to focus fairly narrowly on vocational skills and certification.

Beyond the confines of the developed western world, there is an additional problem with the dominant conception of lifelong learning – a problem not of focus but of

scope. In much of the developing world, post-compulsory education is more likely to be post-primary than post-secondary and, whatever the formal commitment to compulsory primary education, a substantial proportion of the adult population will not have completed primary school. South Africa is a case in point, despite being one of the more developed countries in Africa, if not the most developed. Under such circumstances lifelong learning can be limited neither to post-secondary and higher education nor to a narrow programme of vocational skills enhancement if it is to promote democratic participatory practice through political inclusion and democratic empowerment.

The relationships between inclusion and empowerment are complex and variable. Empowerment for some, even in democracies, may be exercised at the expense of inclusion and empowerment of others. Being included for the wrong reasons can be disempowering. Tokenism is an obvious example. But there are others – such as being included as an object of policy without being sufficiently empowered to influence that policy. Various rituals, such as consultative conferences, may be no more than pretences at inclusion and may in spite of good intentions further disempower the already disempowered.

If, in spite of this, inclusion and empowerment are what we are after, an interest-based conception of democracy won't do. Deliberative democracy seems to promise most by way of inclusion and empowerment in that it allows for the fullest expression of the principle of popular sovereignty, by providing for expressions and tests of consent that are not merely formal. Participation is the feature most often appealed to by those who argue for deliberative democracy over an interest-based conception in which collective decisions consist of little more than simple interest aggregation. Proponents of participatory democracy all seem to be committed to the view that public deliberative processes, allowing opportunities for participation, are essential to the rationality of collective decision-making processes, and for some, to the articulation of a "general will" and the public good.

Through an analysis of three recent conceptions of deliberative democracy, we will explore the role of lifelong learning in providing the conditions and capacities for genuine inclusion, particularly under conditions of diversity and inequality and where democratic traditions, institutions and procedures are nascent. What are the educational demands of each model of deliberation? What conception of lifelong learning might best meet these demands? And can the provision of lifelong learning and its associated costs, material and other, be justified with respect to promoting the goods of democratic empowerment and political inclusion?

The conceptions of deliberative democracy through which our argument proceeds we will call public reason (as exemplified by John Rawls), discursive democracy (as exemplified by Seyla Benhabib) and communicative democracy (as exemplified by Iris Young). We begin by considering each of the three models, examining their conceptions of and implications for inclusion and empowerment. We then examine the demands and promises of deliberative democracy and answer some common objections to it. Finally we consider the educational prerequisites of deliberative democracy and its possible educational consequences, with particular reference to lifelong learning.

THREE MODELS OF DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY

Public Reason

For political liberalism, the superiority of deliberative democracy is attributable to the centrality of reasoning and justification in establishing political legitimacy. Under conditions of pluralism, much attention must be paid to the question of what a "political reason" might be, what criteria a reason should meet to qualify as a public reason, and what guidelines of inquiry should be adhered to, while displaying a commitment to "substantive principles of justice." It is a vain hope to suppose that any method of reasoning, allowed free reign, will yield sufficient convergence for theory construction on the basis of shared premises since, as Weinstock says: "Practical reason, according to the fact of pluralism, speaks with many voices." (Weinstock 1994, p.174).

In the face of the 'fact of pluralism', political liberalism is concerned with delimiting and guaranteeing an area of agreement. If the outcomes of collective deliberation are to be legitimate, collective decision-making must meet certain constraints. These include not only the familiar ones that derive from ensuring that citizens be treated as equals, but also restrictions imposed by pluralism in the interests of inclusion (Cohen 1996, p.96).

> In an idealized deliberative setting, it will not do simply to advance reasons that one takes to be true or compelling: such considerations may be rejected by others who are themselves reasonable. One must find instead reasons that are compelling to others, acknowledging those others as equals, aware that they have alternative reasonable commitments, and knowing something about the kinds of commitments that they are likely to have. If a consideration does not meet these tests, that will suffice for rejecting it as a reason. If it does, then it counts as an acceptable political reason. (Cohen 1996, p.100)

The model of public reason provides an account of the matter and manner for deliberation, as well as the underlying institutional conditions for viable and legitimate procedures. For Rawls, viability and legitimacy are crucial if there is "...to exist over time a just and stable society of free and equal citizens, who remain profoundly divided by reasonable religious, philosophical, and moral doctrines." (Rawls 1993, p.4) The challenge to political philosophy, he continues, is to find a shared basis for settling the question about what institutions are most likely to secure democratic liberty and equality.

Given pluralism, Rawls's task is to find a publicly acceptable "political conception" of justice, which would permit a publicly recognised point of view from which citizens can examine before one another whether their institutions are just, and that would allow them to cite what are publicly recognised and shared reasons. This rests on the conception of a person as someone who can take part in social and political life, exercise its rights and respect its duties, i.e. a person as citizen.

> Public reason – citizens' reasoning in the public forum about constitutional essentials and basic questions of justice – is now best guided by a political

conception the principles and values of which all citizens can endorse. (Rawls 1993, p.10)

Rawls's conception of public reason then is part and parcel of a larger view that necessitates delimiting the political domain. Three features are crucial to this delimitation. First, the political conception is restricted to a specific range of subjects, namely, the basic structure – political, social, economic institutions. Second, it is independent and non-comprehensive. Third, it draws on fundamental ideas implicit in the public political culture of a democratic society, that is, in the political institutions of a constitutional regime and public traditions of their interpretation. The imperative to delimit the political domain is driven in large measure by the idea that a conception of justice that cannot "well order" a constitutional democracy is inadequate as a democratic conception. To do this, it must enjoy the conscious and willing allegiance of the citizens.

By articulating this political conception explicitly, citizens can, while affirming opposing reasonable comprehensive doctrines, endorse the conception of justice that well orders their society. Such activities of endorsing and affirming turn out to require specific discursive and argumentative procedures, collectively called "public reason." Rawls (1993) flatly states that the ideal of democratic politics requires that we try to meet the condition of explaining to one another the basis of our actions in terms each could reasonably expect that others might endorse as consistent with their freedom and equality. "Understanding how to conduct oneself as a democratic citizen includes understanding an idea of public reason" (Rawls 1993, p.218).

Rawls sees "public reason" as mandated by both the liberal principle of legitimacy and the ideal of democratic politics. The former requires that political issues be settled on the basis of reasoned agreement, the latter that we try to meet the condition of explaining to one another the basis of our actions in terms each could reasonably expect that others might endorse as consistent with their freedom and equality.

From the liberal principle of legitimacy and the ideal of democratic politics, Rawls derives the moral duty of civility. The duty of civility is to be able to explain to one another, in terms acceptable to all, how the principles and policies they advocate with respect to common interests and concerns can be supported by the political values of public reason. What are the implications of this democratic ideal for political inclusion and democratic empowerment? To answer this question we need to say more about the manner of deliberation in public reason – a manner requiring commitment to the rational norms of conversation.

This commitment explains political liberalism's emphasis on "conversational constraint" or "selective repression". The constraint is meant to apply to reasons that can be invoked to justify public policy, power relations, political structures and institutions, and the distribution of goods. Legitimacy for political liberalism is established through dialogue, but not just any dialogue will do. The moral component of public dialogue should be constrained, neutral, confined to those propositions on which all groups happen to agree, and should shun issues that provoke disagreement. These conventions are in effect in public political discourse at its best (as exemplified in constitutional reasoning). Ultimately the limitations imposed on reason are justified

Chapter 5: Lifelong Learning and the Contribution of Informal Learning

PAUL HAGER

INTRODUCTION

The burgeoning interest in lifelong learning during the 1990s has been influenced strongly by the scope and significance of the 1970s debate about lifelong education. This debate identified and clarified a continuum of understandings of the lifelong education concept. At one end of the continuum, a minimalist view of lifelong education envisaged a society in which there would be reasonably adequate provision of adult education for all of those who chose to patronise it. Arguably, there is already consensus about the desirability of a minimalist view of lifelong education, and, perhaps, many present industrialised countries are close to exemplifying it. However, many proponents of lifelong education were seeking much more than this. The other end of the continuum, a maximalist view of lifelong education, sought nothing less than a learning society. While learning societies can take various forms, proponents of lifelong education typically favoured one that was democratic, where the learning society was "a shared, pluralistic and participatory 'form of life' in Dewey's sense ... rather than a simple set of institutions and constitutional guarantees" (Wain 1987, p. 202; Wain 1993, p.68). Certainly such a learning society is yet to be realised. Nor is there any sign of consensus about the desirability of this maximalist view of lifelong education.

Since learning is clearly a wider notion than education, it might be expected that, unlike the case of lifelong education, understandings of lifelong learning would tend towards a maximalist view. That is, that the favoured notion of lifelong learning would embrace learning in any type of setting ranging from formal educational systems of all kinds, through diverse sorts of non-formal educational provision, to the limitless situations and contexts in which informal learning can occur. Certainly, a maximalist view of this sort is implied in much of the policy literature on lifelong learning. However, this chapter cautions that a major obstacle to the valuation of learning in all types of settings comes from the hegemony exerted by the formal education system in deciding what learning is to be valued and how it is to be assessed and accredited. This poses a problem for proponents of lifelong learning in most of its forms.

The hegemonic influence of the formal education system on the relative valuation of different forms of learning is illustrated by the usual way in which the non-formal and informal educational sectors are defined. They are defined by what they are perceived to lack in relation to the formal sector, i.e. formal assessment of learning and/or the

D. Aspin, J. Chapman, M Hatton and Y. Sawano (eds.), International Handbook of Lifelong Learning, 79–92
© 2001 *Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Great Britain*

awarding of formal credentials. Informal learning of most kinds is especially lacking in these kinds of characteristics that are valued in the formal education system.

Because informal learning covers such a huge diversity of settings the main arguments of this chapter will be given focus by concentrating on *informal learning at work*. This is an easy choice in that there is no doubt that informal learning at work accounts for the major share of research and writing on informal learning. However, while focusing the chapter on informal learning at work, the author believes that equivalent arguments can be developed for other types of informal learning.

Thus, the body of this chapter firstly examines critically major assumptions about learning that appear to weaken the claim of informal learning at work to be a main part of lifelong learning. Secondly, it discusses a range of research and literature that assist in a growing understanding of informal learning at work. Finally, the chapter draws together some themes that the discussion of informal learning at work suggests might be central to any plausible understanding of lifelong learning that approaches a maximal one.

It should be noted that the term 'informal learning at work' is used in the following discussion because the commonly employed alternative 'workplace learning' is ambiguous. The latter can refer to formal on-the-job training as well as the informal learning that occurs as people perform their work. In some cases it is used even to refer to formal training situations in vocational education institutions that involve simulated workplaces.

INHIBITING INFLUENCE OF TRADITIONAL ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT LEARNING ON THE RECOGNITION OF INFORMAL LEARNING

A major obstacle to informal learning at work being taken seriously as a component of a person's overall education is the way that it differs on very many criteria from activities that have traditionally been thought of as 'education'. While this is most obvious in the vast differences between informal learning at work and the learning that typically takes place in formal educational institutions, it is also the case that informal learning at work is very different from formal on-the-job training. These differences can be described as follows:

- Teachers/trainers are in control in both formal learning in educational institutions and in formal on-the-job training, whereas it is the learner who is in control (if anyone is) in informal learning at work. That is, formal learning is planned, but informal learning at work is often unplanned.
- The learning that takes place in educational institutions and in on-the-job training is largely predictable as it is prescribed by formal curricula, competency standards, learning outcomes, etc. Informal learning at work is much less predictable as there is no formal curriculum or prescribed outcomes.
- In both educational institutions and formal on-the-job training, learning is largely explicit (the learner is expected to be able to articulate what has been learnt, e.g. in a written examination, in oral answers to instructor questioning, or in being

required to perform appropriate activities as a result of the training). In informal learning at work, the learning is often implicit or tacit (the learner is commonly unaware of the extent of their learning) even though the learner might be well aware of the outcomes of such learning, e.g. that they are able to perform their job much better.

- In both formal classrooms and on-the-job training the emphasis is on teaching/training and on the content and structure of what is taught/trained (largely as a consequence of the three previous points). Whereas in informal learning at work the emphasis is on learning and on the learner.
- In both formal classrooms and on-the-job training the focus is usually on learners as individuals and on individual learning. In informal learning at work, the learning is often collaborative and/or collegial.
- Learning in formal classrooms is uncontextualised, i.e. there is an emphasis on general principles rather than their specific applications. While formal on-the-job training is typically somewhat contextualised, even here there is some emphasis on the general e.g. the training might be aimed at general industry standards. However, informal learning at work is by its nature highly contextualised.
- The learning that takes place in educational institutions and in on-the-job training is conceptualised typically in terms of theory (or knowledge) and practice (application of theory and knowledge). The learning that comes from informal learning at work, on the other hand, seems to be most appropriately thought of as seamless know how.

Given these trends, it is hardly surprising that formal learning/education has been seen as being much more valuable than informal learning. Informal learning at work is a paradigm case of informal education and, hence, tends to be undervalued particularly by those with a stake in the formal education system at whatever level. Historically, training has been viewed as the antithesis of education. It is only a slight caricature to say that training has been thought of as aimed at mindless, mechanical, routine activity in contrast to education which aims for development of the mind via completion of intellectually challenging tasks. Despite this 'chalk and cheese' conception of education and training, the trends just noted above show that in many key respects the two have more in common with one another than either one does with informal learning at work. One indicator of this is the rapid growth of formalised workplace training that incorporates externally accredited courses. This is occurring at all levels of the workforce from operatives through to senior managers. It is a trend that is expected to continue (Misko 1996) and will be discussed further later on in this chapter. In contrast, external accreditation of informal learning at work is still very rare.

One reaction to this situation would be to start from a minimalist lifelong learning option and use the characteristics of learning that are valued in formal education to seek to identify the best of informal learning, so that it could then be brought within the fold of learning that is recognised. This chapter rejects this approach, arguing not only for a more maximalist lifelong learning option, but proposing that a closer examination of informal learning has strong potential to enrich our understanding of learning in all settings. The lifelong learning concept provides an opportunity to move beyond narrow

understandings of learning that have flourished in formal educational systems and to question some little scutinised assumptions about what learning is valued. It should be noted that, in adopting this strategy, this chapter is not arguing that all learning is equally valuable. Rather, the position is the more modest one that there are compelling reasons for looking to extend the range of learning that is valued.

PERSPECTIVES ON INFORMAL LEARNING AT WORK THAT CAN ENRICH OUR VIEW OF LIFELONG LEARNING

Traditional understandings of occupational practice have largely ignored informal learning as a significant component. For more routine aspects of work, learning has been viewed as acquisition of the required behaviours via mechanistic training. For less routine work, a theory/practice approach has been favoured. Here the role of vocational preparation courses has been seen as providing the theoretical basis that workers can be apply to deal with workplace situations as they arise.

Various writers, but most notably Schön (1983), have drawn attention to the inadequacy of these common assumptions about occupational practice. Focusing on the preparation of professionals, Schön vigorously rejected "technical rationality", i.e. the view that professionals need to have command of a body of disciplinary knowledge, mostly scientific, which they then draw upon to analyse and solve the various problems that they encounter in their daily practice. Schön pointed out that this approach does not fit very well with what is known about the actual practice of professionals. For one thing, it is typical of real life practice that ready-made problems do not simply present themselves to the practitioner. A major role of professionals is to identify what the problems are in a given set of circumstances. Thus, according to Schön, it is a major mistake to locate professional education away from actual workplace practice. Conceptualising education and the workplace in this traditional dichotomous way inevitably divides theory from practice and creates the perennial problem of how to bring them together again when attempting to account for human action in the world. The research discussed in the remainder of this section signifies the wide recognition of the inability of theory/practice thinking to account for workplace practice. Even in cognitive psychology there has been a recognition of the need to "de-emphasise the spurious theory-and-practice connotations" that surround the declarative knowledge/procedural knowledge and similar distinctions because "they do not necessarily represent independent modes of functioning" (Yates & Chandler 1991, pp. 133–134).

This increasingly perceived inadequacy of theory/practice accounts of workplace performance has generated attempts in more recent work to think about these issues in different ways, ways that take more seriously the phenomenon of informal learning at work. A series of these newer approaches is now outlined and critically discussed.

One influential approach to taking informal learning at work seriously is to view it in terms of reflection on practice. For instance, Schön's proposed epistemology of professional practice centres on the "reflective practitioner" who exhibits "knowing-in-action" and "reflecting-in-action". Knowing-in-action is tacit knowledge in that though practitioners know it, they cannot express it. Thus it is akin to Polanyi's (1958) "personal

knowledge" which refers to the type of know how that is displayed in skilful performances which can be seen to follow a set of rules that is not known as such to the performer. According to Schön, knowing-in-action is underpinned by "reflecting-in-action" or "reflecting-in-practice". This spontaneous reflecting is variously characterised by Schön as involving practitioners in "noticing", "seeing" or "feeling" features of their actions and learning from this by consciously or unconsciously altering their practice for the better.

Schön's proposals have been influential in many arenas of professional education. However there has also been increasing questioning of his work and its influence (see, e.g., Newman 1999). A major criticism is that it is much clearer what Schön is against than what he is for. His proposal for "reflecting-in-action" is variously charged with being too vague. Gilroy (1993) challenges it on general epistemological grounds. Beckett (1996) goes further and questions the existence of "reflecting-in-action", particularly in those occupations where the action is typically "hot". "Hot" action in an occupation refers to situations where the "pressure for action is immediate" (Eraut 1985, p.128). This includes much of the work of teachers, surgeons, lawyers, nurses, etc. By contrast the work of a lawyer preparing a brief, of an architect developing a design, or of a doctor in a consulting room is much "cooler". Beckett's point is that while Schön's "reflecting-in-action" might appear to have some plausibility as an account of these latter cases, this concept is simply inappropriate for "hot" action situations in occupational performance. He develops an argument for "anticipative action" being a more explanatory concept for these cases, though accepting that this too is not without its difficulties.

Likewise, while the concept of "reflecting-in-action" has become very influential in the education of professionals, it has tended too often to suffer the usual fate of single factor cures to complex problems and become a cliché recipe. In teacher education, for example, the problem, as Calderhead (1989, p.46) points out is that "[r]eflective teaching has become a slogan, disguising numerous practices and offering a variety of idealised models for the training of teachers." (See also Adler 1991 and Newman 1996). An illustration of the aptness of Calderhead's claim is provided by Tremmel (1993, p.439) who outlines examples of attempts in teacher education courses to circumscribe Schön's "reflecting-in-action" into standardised stepwise procedures to be learnt and applied by novices. The very technical rationality that Schön is attacking has been deployed as a means of reducing his ideas to a routine formula.

Of course, Schön's is not the only work that places reflection at the core of informal learning at work. In fact many recent theorists rely in one way or another on the notion of reflection. It is important to gain some grasp of the range of connotations for the term 'reflection' in this work. It is perhaps worth noting that the basic idea is found in Dewey's writings (see, e.g., Dewey 1916). For Dewey, the good life for humans is one in which they live in harmony with their environment. But because the environment is in a state of continuous flux, so humans need to grow and readjust constantly to it so as to remain in harmony with it. Thus, for Dewey, education must instil the lifelong capacity to grow and to readjust constantly to the environment. Since, argued Dewey, inquiry, democracy, problem solving, active learning, reflective thinking, experiential learning, etc. are methods that are necessary for humans to learn to readjust effectively to the environment, these are the teaching/learning methods that must feature in education. Dewey argues that reflection is central to effective inquiry and problem solving,

Chapter 1: Schools and the Learning Community: Laying the Basis for Learning Across the Lifespan

JUDITH CHAPMAN AND DAVID ASPIN

INTRODUCTION

In this Chapter we propose a set of agenda for schools in the 21st Century, arising from the notion of the learning community and acknowledging the importance of schools as having a key function in the provision of an enduring basis for learning throughout people's lives. Drawing on our analyses of policy documents emerging from the work of inter-governmental agencies and national authorities, our study of the application of new thinking in social and political theory to the development of educational policy, and our analysis of data collected in the course of an investigation of "best practice" in schooling, we identify new directions in educational policy and practice and propose a set of agenda for schools committed to the idea of lifelong learning. We argue that the aims of this undertaking may be realised through the implementation of such important objectives as:

- The provision of educational opportunities throughout life that adhere to such principles and policy objectives as: economic efficiency and advance; social justice, social inclusion, and democratic participation; and personal growth and fulfilment.
- The re-assessment of traditional school curricula and pedagogies in response to the educational challenges posed by key economic and social changes and trends associated with and arising from the emergence of those developments coming to be known as the "knowledge economy" and "learning society" of the new "global age" of the 21st century.
- The re-appraisal and re-definition of places in which learning can take place and the creation of flexible learning environments that are positive, stimulating and motivating for a far more extensive range of learners and which overcome the constraints of standardised curricula, age- and subject-divisions, narrow timetables and rigid approaches to pedagogy.
- The acceptance of the importance of the idea of "value-added" learning consisting of increased emphasis on individualised instruction, the development and monitoring of personal development plans, assessment of success in achieving personal learning targets, and the development of cross-curricular competencies integrating cognitive growth and the emergence and the cultivation of moral awareness and the capacity for moral judgement and action.
- The awareness that, whilst schools may be starting to be seen as less important as primary authorities for and sites of the acquisition of knowledge, they are

D. Aspin, J. Chapman, M Hatton and Y. Sawano (eds.). International Handbook of Lifelong Learning, 405–446
© 2001 *Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in Great Britain*

becoming more important in the socialisation of young people and the nurturing of young people towards the development of a sense of moral understanding and a movement towards an acceptance of civic responsibility and the need for community involvement and service.

- The evolution of inter-connected learning pathways among and between schools, further and higher education institutions, employers and other education providers, impacting on the formation of relationships between schools and a wide range of constituencies and stake-holders in the community having and interest in and a concern for the education of citizens for tomorrow.
- Promoting schools as learning communities and functioning as centres of lifelong learning catering for the widest possible range of needs and interests among all members of the community.

In the revitalisation of schools, we argue that the school committed to the idea of lifelong learning will be strengthened in its mission through the development of:–

- a clearly articulated strategy for change built around a unifying concept
- a re-conceptualisation of the place and function of schools in the community
- a preparedness to re-culture the school
- a readiness to invest in people
- a willingness to adopt an evidence-based approach to change
- an expansion of the outreach of the school to the local, national and international community
- a commitment to maintaining the momentum of change, sharing good practice and celebrating success
- a commitment to the idea of leading for learning

AN INTEGRATED MODEL FOR LIFELONG LEARNING – IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY, GOVERNANCE, FUNDING

As we enter the 21st century consideration is being given to the range of purposes that have been hitherto articulated and instituted for education and the models that have been developed and applied for the provision of educational opportunity throughout life and the place to be taken by schools in such provision generally.

Policy

At a time when policy-makers and educators are beginning to examine anew some of the principles for educating children to prosper and grow in a changing social and economic environment, a number of questions are being addressed. If governments adhere to such principles and policy objectives as economic efficiency and effectiveness, social justice, democratic participation, social inclusion, equity, and personal growth, what implications arise for the provision and style of education for children

during the period of compulsory schooling? In respect to equity, for instance, gaps continue to exist in the provision of educational services for some young people labouring under disadvantage; school organisation, curriculum, teaching and assessment practices are not always favourable to the necessity of engaging all students in a broad-based achievement-orientated and complete cycle of compulsory schooling; and a divide remains between academic and vocational education and differentiated status persists between such programs and those emerging successfully from them. Questions also remain as to how new and still emerging technologies of learning are to be introduced in such a way that all students, irrespective of their socio-economic background, can enjoy the benefits of access to a high quality and empowering curriculum and experience educational success.

Considerations of policy documents issued by international agencies such as OECD and UNESCO, the European Parliament, the Nordic Council of Ministers, the Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation Forum, and governments in countries including Australia, Canada, Japan, Norway, the Netherlands, Singapore, Taiwan, the United Kingdom and the United States of America confirm the place of schools as vital elements in the whole spectrum of educational undertakings and initiatives in societies committed to realising the vision of lifelong learning for all their citizens.

A number of themes runs through the work of these international and governmental organisations. These include: the emergence of an awareness of the importance of the notions of the knowledge economy and learning society; an acceptance of the need for a new philosophy of education and training, with institutions of all kinds, formal and informal, traditional and alternative, public and private, having new roles and responsibilities for learning; the necessity of ensuring that the foundations for lifelong learning are set in place for all citizens during the compulsory years of schooling; the need to promote a multiple and coherent set of links, pathways and articulations between schooling, work, further education, and other agencies offering opportunities for learning across the lifespan; the importance of governments providing incentives for individuals, employers and the range of social partners with a commitment to learning to invest in lifelong learning; and the need to ensure that emphasis upon lifelong learning does not re-inforce existing patterns of privilege and widen the existing gap between the advantaged and the disadvantaged, simply on the basis of access to education (Chapman and Aspin 1997, p.16).

These most recent commitments from governments are based upon a new and integrated model for lifelong learning. In this the focus is on: lifelong provision – insofar as educational provision is available across the lifespan – from cradle to grave; new approaches to learning – providing learners with the skills and capacities by which they can learn according to their own learning styles, needs and purposes; and learning that is accessible to all – insofar as learning should be socially inclusive and providing all learners with the confidence to engage in learning at each stage in life [Longworth 1997, p.5].

This more holistic, seamless and integrated approach to lifelong learning constitutes a significant departure from traditional models of educational provision. Such models were characterised by:

- sharp divisions between sectors and providers
- compartmentalisation of territory and remit between different institutions operating in the provision of academic and professional/vocational courses and programs
- an emphasis upon on-campus attendance with little attention to the possibility of off-campus course availability or multi-mode delivery
- a distinction between the acquisition of knowledge and the development of generic lifelong learning skills and competencies, such as: self-starting curiosity, doing research, managing information, taking independent action and initiative in problem-solving, working with teams in the achievement of common goals, communication and literacy skills, adaptability and flexibility in response to challenge and change, and building and deploying creativity and imagination
- the assumption of sharp cognitive demarcations between discrete forms and categories of knowledge, distinctions between disciplines and subjects, and separations between theory and application.

By contrast, the core principles underpinning new approaches to lifelong learning provision [Fryer 1997, pp.28–31] reveal a commitment to:

- coherence as an overall education strategy for government
- equity in providing learning for the many, not the few
- valuing people before structures as the focus of policy and good practice
- providing variety and diversity
- acknowledging the need for quality and flexibility
- building upon effective and inclusive partnerships
- incorporating shared responsibility
- building on a multi-faceted "whole" government approach.

Governance

The issue of governance and management in this more integrated approach adds an important dimension to the question of the implementation of lifelong learning and the place of schools in educational provision. Governments tend to prefer to work on policies that can be broken up and distributed for responsibility. The missions of lifelong learning, however, cut across government departments and administrative bodies and divisions.

In response to this, governments might be well served by considering the creation of an over-arching Ministry of Lifelong Learning. It should be pointed out, however, that there are dangers inherent in establishing some kind of 'super Ministry' of lifelong learning in which the interests of the schooling sector might be subsumed.

It is interesting to note that some of the most effective attempts to apply lifelong learning policies and schemes have occurred in those settings, eg. in Japan and some Scandinavian countries, where there are strong traditions of municipal levels of government and genuine political power at the local level for initiatives to take effect and succeed.

It appears that economies and dis-economies of size and scale constitute a factor in determining approaches to lifelong learning governance and management, particularly at a time when governments will be assuming the role of facilitator and mediator rather than monopoly provider of educational services, incorporating a wide range of educational providers, both public and private.

Funding

The debate regarding the best model of provision and hence of funding for lifelong learning is still in train and the issue still unresolved. The key question is, what are the alternative models for the provision and funding of learning across the life-span, that will best address and cater for the whole range of learning needs, provide the right start for all young people in their lifelong learning endeavours, and at the same time be economically efficient, socially inclusive and ethically just? Some maintain that, so important are the imperatives for the continuance of access to learning opportunities throughout individuals' lives, the provision of funding and other resources should be an ongoing charge upon the public exchequer. Others argue that, so burdensome would be the costs of providing that sort of access on a continuing basis, the government can do little on its own and would need to enter various forms of partnership with a range of other providers and operate in a mixed economy of funding provision. Yet others believe that, once one individual's basic learning needs have been attended to at a minimal level of public provision, they should then make their own decisions about what kinds of further learning they need and what pathways of cognitive advance they wish to explore, and for what reason, and seek to secure the further education and training they need, with funds raised out privately of their own resources.

The issue comes down to this. It is widely agreed that, with the increasing need for education across the life-span, the provision and funding of the whole process of education, from cradle to grave, cannot be met from the public exchequer and from government sources alone. Many people argue in response that the whole issue of educational provision should therefore be opened up to the forces of the market place. Against these, however, there are those who argue that, in a society committed to social inclusion, social justice and democracy, governments have a responsibility, at the minimum, to ensure that all young people – and particularly those from marginal or disadvantaged parts of society, where a strong and supportive safety-net of equitable social provision might be needed – have access to an empowering education during the compulsory years of schooling, which will provide them with a strong basis for their lifelong learning endeavours later on. Those of this persuasion argue that governments must, at the very least, accept primary responsibility for educational provision during the compulsory years, if all members of society are to have the knowledge, information and skills required for them to participate effectively in the processes of democracy and the opportunities of economic advance, as well as seeking ways and means of raising the quality of their own personal life-styles.

Such arguments are, of course, a function of people's and groups' deepest moral, social and political preconceptions and commitments. Among and between such standpoints it is clear that there are major and, in some people's eyes, irreconcilable differences. Such