

University as a cathedral:
Lifelong education and the role of the university in the European context

Pepka Boyadjieva Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences,
Sofia, Bulgaria;

Kevin Orr Huddersfield Centre for Research in Education and Society (HudCRES),
University of Huddersfield, Queensgate, Huddersfield, UK

Abstract

The paper discusses the main issues which emerge for the university as an institution in the European context from the development of the lifelong learning paradigm. It focuses on both the opportunity-creating and tension-provoking presence of the lifelong learning concept in the university's institutional environment. The analysis is based on a thematic review of articles published in the *International Journal of Lifelong Education* during the four decades of its existence. The paper argues that: (1) the implementation of lifelong learning requires a profound change in the systemic characteristics of the university institution and cannot be limited to the establishment of departments of adult and continuing education; (2) without being uncritically perceived, lifelong learning is a strategy that can help universities successfully address some of their main problems and continue to develop as a key institution of societies in the 21st century and (3) in the European context, the institutional model that can embody the paradigm for lifelong learning and at the same time contains the possibility of preserving the specificity of university as an institution, is best symbolised by a cathedral.

Key words: university, lifelong learning, university models, cathedral

Introduction

The Western-European model of university – the central institution for providing higher education in modern societies – has a history of almost a millennium. During this long period, it has faced many challenges and has been subjected to various pressures and influences. Nor has the university remained (and could not remain) immune to the radical shifting in understandings of education, which we have witnessed for several decades – the substitution of the concept of ‘education’ with ‘lifelong education/learning’ and, likewise, of ‘mass-scale school education’ by the idea of a ‘learning society’. The ‘invasion’ of the lifelong learning paradigm into the sphere of higher education has provoked

different changes in the learning process, student body, academic environment and university organisation , prompting both positive expectations and critical arguments.

Against this background the present article aims to answer the following research question: How has the incorporation of the lifelong learning paradigm influenced the development of the university as an institution in the European context? Based on a thematic analysis of articles, published in the *IJLE* during the four decades of its existence, we will reveal and discuss the main issues which emerge for the university as an institution from the development of the lifelong learning paradigm. We will also take into account some other literature in order to situate the discussions in the *IJLE* within a broader scholarly context and to demonstrate their academic and public relevance. The analysis will focus on both the opportunity-creating and tension-provoking presence of the lifelong learning concept in the university's institutional environment. More concretely, we will start with outlining our methodology and theoretical considerations. Then the European policy context which has framed the relationship between the lifelong learning and university development will be analysed and the main challenges facing contemporary universities will be identified. This will be followed by a discussion of universities' institutional strategies regarding lifelong learning and the emerging threats and opportunities. Our analysis has led to the following main conclusions: (1) the implementation of lifelong learning requires a profound change in the systemic characteristics of the university institution and cannot be limited to the establishment of departments of adult and continuing education; (2) without being uncritically perceived, lifelong learning is a strategy that can help universities successfully address some of their main problems and continue to develop as a key institution of societies in the 21st century and (3) in the European context, the institutional model, which can embody the paradigm for lifelong learning and at the same time contains the possibility of preserving the specificity of university as an institution, is best symbolised by a cathedral.

Theoretical and methodological considerations

Since its establishment the *International Journal of Lifelong Education (IJLE)* has become a much-needed discussion platform for a variety of topics, voices and approaches. The mapping of all articles published in the journal over the 40 years since its inception (Nylander et al., 2022), demonstrates that topics related to higher education have become more pronounced during the last decades. Although with varying intensity, especially increasing recently and referring mainly to the Western global region, the journal has published numerous articles that have analysed widening access to higher education, students' motivation and diversification of higher education institutions. Surveying the research territory based on some of the distinguishing words in the topics derived from the published articles shows that the words "university" and "higher education" are associated mainly with descriptive research approaches (Nylander et al., 2022),

In order to reveal how the incorporation of lifelong learning has influenced the university institution, we went beyond this general picture and carried out a thematic analysis of selected articles.

We started with the full pool of 1,280 articles, published between 1982 and 2020, excluding book reviews. However, we were not interested in all articles that refer to higher education issues. In accordance with our research question we defined two thematic groups of words and used them as criteria for selection of relevant studies: “university” and “lifelong learning, continuing education, adult education/learning, adult student”. One of the co-authors, together with another colleague, carried out independently a screening of articles based on titles and abstracts. The aim was to identify all articles in which the word “university” and at least one of the words from the second group appears, e.g. “university” and “lifelong learning”, or “university” and “continuing education”, or “university” and “adult education/learning”, or “university” and “adult/mature student”. There was about a 90% coincidence in the identified articles. After discussion between the two researchers the final pool included 39 articles. These publications were studied by the two co-authors and the main topics, arising from the incorporation of the lifelong learning paradigm in the European university model were identified. The selected articles provide a rich body of research which discusses issues, such as: the motivation and experiences of adult learners in the university; to what extent the universities have capacity to build learning environments to suit adult learners; how adult students’ experiences influence on other family members (Lee, 2014; O’Shea, 2015; Mallman & Lee, 2017; Hardy et al., 2019; Siivonen & Filander, 2020); the role of higher education for developing lifelong capacity and skills for learning in students (Li, 2017); academic staff’s own experience in lifelong learning (Dahl & Millora, 2016) and the role of universities in the training of adult educators (Shak, 1984). Another strand of research investigates whether and how the acceptance of the lifelong learning paradigm affects university as an institution – its mission, structure, access procedures, degrees offered.

While acknowledging the close connection between the two streams of research, the present article focuses on the second one, the development of the university as an institution of lifelong learning.

Viewing the university as an institution means acknowledging that it contains regulative, normative and cognitive-cultural dimensions and is a social phenomenon which is relatively autonomous and standardised around the world in terms of its structure, mission, norms and values (Meyer et al., 2007; Scott & Davis, 2016). Despite this, considering mainly the role of state for shaping the structure and priorities of universities as well as universities’ engagement with the wider society distinctive university models of could be defined, such as “Confucian” model in East Asia and Singapore (Marginson, 2011), Chinese model (Marginson and Yang 2021) and African model (Preece et al., 2011). The *IJLE* has included only few articles which discuss the development of lifelong learning in African universities (Preece et al., 2011; Tagoe, 2012a; 2012b) and in universities in Hong Kong (Young, 2011). These studies clearly reveal that there is a specific socio-political context, traditions and cultural values in specific African countries (e.g. the colonial past, the lack of individualistic attitudes and the tradition of community engagement, for example) which determine how lifelong learning is interpreted and adopted. A more substantial body of research is therefore needed to analyse in depth the social and

cultural context and how the incorporation of the lifelong learning has influenced the development of an African university model or that of other settings. The present article focuses on a Western-European model of university, which is widely spread around the world and to which most of the articles in the *IJLE* refer. However, we do acknowledge that it is worth in the future the *IJLE* pursuing a more inclusive approach by providing a broader platform for discussing different university models and thus creating possibilities for comparative analyses and greater sensitivity towards diverse higher education systems.

University, social dimension of higher education and lifelong learning: the European policy context

In its 1996 report to UNESCO, the International Commission on Education for the 21st Century identified lifelong learning as one of the four main functions of universities (Delors et al., 1996). In 1998, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development organised a conference on lifelong learning and universities. The Conference of European Ministers of Higher Education in 2003 underlined “the important contribution of higher education in making lifelong learning a reality” and argued that enhancing the possibilities for lifelong learning in higher education “must be an integral part of higher education activity” (Realising the European Higher Education Area, 2003, p. 6). Gradually, lifelong learning has been included in the European Union’s Bologna Process. At the meeting of the Ministers of Higher Education in 2001, the social dimension of higher education was defined “as an essential element of the European Higher Education Area” and lifelong learning strategies as necessary “to face the challenges of competitiveness and the use of new technologies and to improve social cohesion, equal opportunities and the quality of life” (Prague Communiqué, 2001, p. 2). As John Holford (2004, p. 16) emphasises,

[t]his represented an important shift for the Bologna Process. For the first time, it acknowledged that higher education had responsibilities of a broader public kind, and pointed to a conceptualisation not in terms of making higher education more efficient, or more European, but of improving its ‘social characteristics’. The initial association with lifelong learning suggested, perhaps, some sense that universities should be looking outward, beyond the ‘traditional’, post-school, student group.

Holford (2014, p. 17) also outlines that the term ‘social dimension’

was introduced into Bologna at the same time as lifelong learning, and in the early years the two seem often to have been quite closely coupled, at least in the language of ministerial communique’s. By 2005, however, this association had receded; the Bergen communique’

reaffirmed the commitment to the social dimension, though in rather general terms, and made no link to lifelong learning.

The conference in Bergen in 2005 placed special emphasis on “the development of national and European frameworks for qualifications as an opportunity to further embed lifelong learning in higher education” and creating opportunities for flexible educational pathways in higher education, including through the accreditation of non-formal and informal learning (Bergen Communiqué, 2005, p. 3). In May 2006, in a communiqué dedicated to the modernisation of universities, the European Commission outlined that

universities need to grasp more directly the challenges and opportunities presented by the *lifelong learning agenda*. Lifelong learning presents a challenge, in that it will require universities to be more open to providing courses for students at later stages in the life cycle. It presents an opportunity for universities which might otherwise risk to see enrolments of students directly from school fall over coming years in view of coming demographic change” (Communication... Delivering on the Modernisation Agenda, 2006, p. 7, emphasis in the original).

The weakening of the link between the social dimension of higher education and lifelong learning in the policy discourse reflects “external events, and the shifting emphases of EU policy”:

From late 2007, the world economy encountered a succession of crises; these quickly led to recession across Europe. From early 2010, the crisis took on a particularly sharp character within the Eurozone. In this context, the stress in EU social and employment policies on ‘flexicurity’ became even more pronounced (Holford, 2014, p. 20).

How to evaluate these developments? Are they another “European fashion” imposed by Brussels officials? Are they something really new, or are just new expressions of old practices? And probably the most important question – how do they relate to the very idea of the (European) university as an institution and the main challenges it faces in contemporary societies?

Main problems facing contemporary universities

Universities around the world today face many challenges that not only create problems for their functioning, but also test their identity as higher education institutions. These are challenges that arise from the changed context in society as a whole, in science and in the wider realm of education. Tapper and Palfreyman (2000) define the main problems facing contemporary universities as the three ‘Ms’:

marketization, massification, and managerialism. The three ‘Ms’ have created a completely new situation in higher education because they undermine the traditional essence and founding principles of the university. As Duke (2002, pp. 26-27, 29) argues

[t]he assumed essence of the modern university has been destabilized. The nature of knowledge, the processes of research and inquiry, and the utility and contribution of science are all under scrutiny. . . Demand for increased volume, and for the production and reproduction of a technically skilled and economically viable workforce confront the self-concept of the donnish scholar.

In summary, the main challenges, facing modern universities, especially evident in the 21st century, are:

- the introduction of market principles into higher education and, as a consequence, the increased role of universities in reproducing and creating inequalities. Editors of the 2012 special issue of the *IJLE* on lifelong learning, university and the public good quote Holmwood, who suggests that

for the first time the university is being addressed as an instrument to extend social inequality. The promotion of the market mechanism in higher education is set to reproduce and solidify inequalities, rather than to dissolve them. We can no longer, then, avoid the issue of the university’s social mission and, in particular, its role in social justice (Editorial, 2012, p. 532).

- the deepening criticism of universities for their ‘closeness’ and detachment of their own goals from the needs of knowledge society (Orr and Hovdhaugen, 2014)

- the strengthening of competition in higher education, due to the creation of the European educational area and diversification of institutions offering educational services; the development of a non-university education sector and the emergence of different institutional forms of the university – entrepreneurial, corporate, virtual (Duke, 2002);

- the trends in most countries towards an aging population and the continuing dominant orientation of universities towards young and unemployed people: “the *new demography* of the late 20th century had fewer young people. Some societies are experiencing population decline. Populations are ageing significantly. Long years of life after retirement put third age education on the agenda” (Duke, 2002, p. 26; Editorial, 2012; Orr and Hovdhaugen, 2014);

- “the changing nature of the life-course from a linear to a more dynamic and complex model. Increased longevity, coupled with the changing nature of work (e.g. more IT and home-based), employment (e.g. insecurity), and family structures (e.g. more single households and ‘patchwork’

families), suggest the need for a new view of the stages of life” (Talmage, Mark, Slowey & Knopf, 2016, p. 542);

- the criticism towards higher education that it remains insufficiently inclusive (Orr and Hovdhaugen, 2014) and the changing profile of students, more and more of whom want to combine learning with some form of work.

Those universities that fail to meet the above challenges will become not only socially irrelevant, but also endangered in their very existence. It is worth outlining that all these challenges are related to the increased importance in modern societies of the need for constantly improving one’s knowledge and skills. The articles in the *IJLE* provide evidence how the incorporation of lifelong learning in the university’s mission affects the main ingredients of the university organisation – access procedures, learning process, degrees offered, institutional partnerships.

Lifelong learning as a possibility for a profound change in university institution

Lifelong learning is significantly different from the well-known forms of continuing education. Although the terms ‘continuing education’, ‘recurrent education’ and ‘lifelong learning’ have very often been used interchangeably we share the view

that it is still useful, indeed important, to maintain a distinction between *lifelong education* as a basic concept and objective enshrining the right of citizens to take part in systematic education of their choice throughout life, *recurrent education* as a strategy of provision that makes this range of opportunities for study possible and the different senses in which *continuing education* is used (Duke, 1982; Himmelstrup et al., 1981). This enables us to keep in sight lifelong education and recurrent education as an alternative goal and an alternative strategy bound up with progressive values. It helps us to perceive the distance between the ideas underpinning them and the emerging realities of the more stunted and more directly economically-related continuing education” (McIlroy, 1987, p. 28, emphasis in the original).

The analysis of *IJLE* articles shows that without being seen as a panacea, lifelong learning is a strategy that can help universities tackle some of their major problems successfully and continue to develop as key institutions of societies in the 21st century. Lifelong learning is associated with a fundamental change in traditional patterns of personal behaviour, and therefore in the factors shaping the higher education system. For example, as already mentioned, some of the indisputable challenges facing higher education stem from the unfavourable demographic trends in most European countries mainly related to population aging. In classical modern society, the system of higher education has a pyramidal character – the number of students is greatest in the first year, and in subsequent years, as in other forms

of education, the number gradually decreases. As Holford (2014, p. 22) outlines “[t]he principal ‘philosophical’ statements on which this idea of the university is based assumed that the people inhabiting universities—as students—would come from the youth of a social elite”. Orienting universities to create opportunities for lifelong learning would result in the overturning of the old pyramid – students who complete their first degree will be fewer than those who return to universities to achieve a second specialism or to attend short-term qualification courses. And this means that not only those who have just acquired secondary education, but also people of all age groups and with different professional status will be oriented towards higher education.

The adoption of the “philosophy” of lifelong learning requires a profound change in the systemic characteristics of the university institution, in its objectives and in the content and organisation of university education. This change covers all academic levels and processes – individual, departmental, faculty, the institution as a whole. Therefore, the practical implementation of lifelong learning is a complex task that involves targeted and systematic efforts to re-assess all elements of traditional educational practice – from access to higher education, its curriculum, the adopted assessment mechanisms and organisation of the learning process to ways of students’ graduation.

There is a long tradition in providing continuing education by Western universities through their Departments of Adult and Continuing Education (e.g. Taylor & Ward, 1984; Fleming, 2013). However, while this kind of department can be regarded as a part of an institutional response to lifelong learning, their establishment is not enough to transform the university into an institution of lifelong learning having in mind also that they “are usually situated on the periphery of their institutions, often physically as well as metaphorically” (Fleming, 2013, p. 349). Lifelong learning is far from being a mere quantitative increase in the number of postgraduate or vocational retraining courses offered to adult learners. The incorporation of the idea of lifelong learning requires a change in the universities’ institutional environment as a whole, and not just the creation of a separate department for continuing education. In this sense, lifelong learning is not an amendment, “an appendix to what universities have always done” (Kokosalakis, 2000), but a strategy and an activity “rooted in structural modifications at all levels of the university institution” (Osborne, Sandberg, Tuomi, 2004, p. 151).

A comparison between traditional continuing education in universities and their development as lifelong learning institutions shows essential differences in terms of:

a) status – continuing education is an additional activity, complementary to the main functions of the university, while the development of universities as lifelong learning institutions means that lifelong learning is defined as a systematic feature of the modern university;

b) structure – continuing education is generally organised by specially created centres or departments, while lifelong learning is a strategy for the organisation and the activities of all structural units of the university;

c) scope – continuing education is mainly associated with improving the professional qualifications of already graduated students, while lifelong learning is oriented to all types of knowledge and aspects of personal development of people of different ages and at different stages of their realisation;

d) form – continuing vocational training and liberal education are carried out through courses for additional qualification and retraining, while the implementation of lifelong learning involves various forms and – most importantly – subordination and organisation of the entire learning process to the need for people to have opportunities and develop abilities for lifelong learning;

e) curricula – continuing education is based on specially designed courses and programmes aimed at students involved, while lifelong learning can be realised only if all curricula in a given university are consistent with it, use and incorporate students' prior knowledge and skills (regardless of where and how they are acquired) and contribute to the formation of abilities and motivation to participate in a variety of educational forms throughout life.

Strategies for developing universities as institutions for lifelong learning

Reflecting on his earlier publication *The Learning University* from 1992, Duke (2002, p. 30) outlines that this book

suggested a paradigm shift. It addressed new discourse invading the university. Coming from a perspective of adult continuing education, it took staff development and organizational learning seriously. It predicted that universities would adapt as their clientele and core business shifted from 'finishing school' to a more balanced 'service station' lifelong learning mode. Adult continuing education—extension or outreach—was transforming the university, formerly marginal business permeating the whole institution, bringing the outside world inside and breaking down the walls.

The articles published in the *IJLE* over the last four decades show that this process of permeating of lifelong education into and so transforming the whole university institution has developed slowly and with tensions. The analysis of the practices in different countries and universities reveals that – on the one hand – there are diverse institutional strategies for linking the functioning of a university with the paradigm of lifelong learning, and – on the other – a core of common principles in different strategies can be identified.

The study of Müller et al (2015, p. 545) maps developments in Denmark, Finland, Germany and England and shows “that institutional responses to lifelong learning play a significant role in all the countries studied, even in Denmark and Finland despite their more stringent national approach to lifelong

learning”. It identifies the following factors as essential for opening universities and easing access to higher education for those engaging in lifelong learning: (1) the establishment of transition paths from secondary education and working life into higher education; (2) the promotion of links between higher education, businesses and adult education; (3) the recognition of all forms of learning; (4) the flexibilization of study formats; and (5) the design of a curriculum that suits all from an institutional perspective.

The results from case studies of specific universities, published in the *IJLE* (Young 2008; Fleming, 2013; Orr & Hovdhaugen, 2014; Müller et al., 2015), are in line with other studies (e.g. Duncan & Lindsay, 2001) and taken together highlight some core elements that underlie universities’ institutional strategies for lifelong learning:

- further development of the principle of student-centred learning, as well as diversification of the places and ways of learning mainly through the use of information technologies;
- flexibility in the offered degrees and qualifications; traditional educational diplomas are supplemented by specialised certificates and diplomas for completed individual courses or a certain combination of courses;
- shifting the emphasis in the learning process from mastering the content of individual courses to defining and evaluating specific student results;
- building networks and partnerships – strengthening contacts with other higher education institutions and business organisations.

The learning process – oriented towards the student and to the formation of abilities

The adoption of the lifelong learning paradigm presupposes further development of the understanding of the principle of student-centred learning. It should not be limited to creating opportunities for active participation of students in the educational process, but should also include a change in the content of education and its goals, whereby the emphasis shifts *from the acquired knowledge to the formed abilities*.

This understanding of the principle of student-oriented learning requires emphasising:

- the active involvement of the previous knowledge and skills of the student in the learning process and acquisition of new knowledge and skills based on them;
- the development of motivation and skills for lifelong education and learning;
- the predominant use of teaching methods that require the active participation of students;
- linking training in all disciplines with the formation of analytical, communication, and social competencies.

Within the “philosophy” of lifelong learning, education is understood not only as the quality and volume of knowledge achieved by the individual, but mainly as a developed ability to improve. Therefore, the organisation and assessment of the learning process are guided by the need of students to acquire certain knowledge and to form abilities and motivation for lifelong education.

In their study of 34 Australian universities Pitman and Broomhall (2009: 445) find that 62%, i.e. 21 out of 34 universities, mention skills for lifelong learning among the skills they strive to develop in their students. The authors discuss the concept of graduate attributes, through which the universities have tried to position themselves as key players in the development of a culture of lifelong learning in their graduates. It is worth highlighting the understanding of “lifelong learning both as a cycle and continuum”:

Universities see it as their role to provide their students with ‘graduate attributes’ through the application of their academic programs. However, this addresses only one direction of flow of the lifelong learning cycle; that is their contribution as providers of skills or attributes. . . . At the conclusion of the degree program (it is hoped), students will have learnt more and leave with greater skills than that with which they commenced; particularly generic skills or attributes. Should they, after a break, return to postgraduate studies, their previous output skills, plus any new learning acquired, could become their new input skills and so on (Pitman & Broomhall, 2009, pp. 450-451).

‘Second chance’ routes into universities: flexibility of training and variety of diplomas offered

Diversifying routes for access to universities is one of the main institutional mechanisms for widening participation and developing universities as institutions for lifelong learning. In their study Orr and Hovdhaugen (2014) compare the approaches for providing second chance routes in three countries - Germany, Norway and Sweden. The authors outline that “[e]ach of these countries has organized its second chance routes in a different manner, according to different historically dominant principles in each educational system, the national regulation of higher education admissions and in light of differing obligations for the receiving institutions of higher education” (Orr & Hovdhaugen, 2014, p. 46). Thus, in Sweden all pupils that graduate from upper secondary school are entitled to formal access to higher education whereas in Norway, only pupils that have completed an academic upper secondary education diploma are granted direct access to higher education. On its part, the education system in Germany is characterized with an early selection and tracking into academic or vocational stream and only the academic route leads to higher education. According to Orr & Hovdhaugen (2014, p. 58) this very “tight link between academic success in the school system and eligibility to enter higher education” is one of the main reasons why participation through second chance routes in Germany remains low in comparison with the other two countries:

This means that introducing second chance routes into the German system effectively calls this tight link into question. However, the second chance routes mainly come from the vocationally

orientated side of the education system. In that sense, they exist outside of the entitlement model, which can thus be maintained as the regular route.

In the case of Norway “[d]uring the first years of the new access regime about 5% of applicants used accreditation of competences instead of an upper secondary education diploma”. The data for 2010 “show that nearly 9% of students entered higher education via alternative routes, and that this figure rises to 16% amongst students from low education backgrounds and 24% amongst students with delayed transition” (Orr & Hovdhaugen, 2014, p. 58).

At the same time, the developments related to some of the introduced “alternative routes into higher education are often contested and challenged as unfair, in giving one group preferential treatment over the rest” (Orr & Hovdhaugen, 2014, p. 56). Although data show that under-represented groups especially profit from the second chance routes and that they are increasingly widely used, the study concludes that these routes “will remain a contested policy measure in the future” (Orr & Hovdhaugen, 2014, p. 45). The authors outline some important tensions that should be taken into account and further investigated:

(i) legislation and policy might encourage the routes, but implementation remains limited (Germany), (ii) a broad practice is evident, but it is mainly focussed on certain institutions of higher education and certain fields of study (Norway) and (iii) reintegration of second chance routes into the main system of entry may limit the impact of these routes for under-represented groups (Sweden). (Orr & Hovdhaugen, 2014, p. 59).

The practical realisation of lifelong learning requires the establishment of flexibility as a basic organising principle of university education. This means a significant increase in students’ choices in all areas of university education – access, methods, organisation, support, completion – accompanied by the application of mechanisms to ensure its quality. In particular, these are:

- expanding and diversifying the access to the university by creating opportunities for improving the qualification without the need to complete a full programme, but only separate courses, and giving credits for available professional experience;

- offering different ways of learning that allow learning to be successfully combined with work and family commitments (Talmage, Mark, Slowey & Knopf, 2016);

- greater market orientation of the courses and their compliance with the requirements of employers (Duncan & Lindsay, 2001, p. 535).

Despite the increased interest towards diversifying routes to higher education the conclusion is “that HE is still heavily weighted to cater to traditional students who enter university directly after school

to study full time. Part-time, evening, weekend and blended learning courses are in short supply, although they could help to increase participation” (Müller et al., 2015, p. 542).

The “developing periphery” of the university - strategic partnerships

Creating strategic alliances with other organisations from all social spheres is key to realising the lifelong learning paradigm. The strategic partnerships of modern universities are not limited to their own field of higher education. The university, as an institution for lifelong learning, is essentially an institution of partnerships. Only by expanding the links with different organisations and building cooperation networks is the university able to meet the diverse needs of people of different ages, with different education and status. “University without walls”, “bridging university”, “permeability of borders”, “the university as an open system” – these are just some of the expressions used to denote the new place of the university in the social space.

There is no doubt that such a vision is a serious challenge to the centuries-old university traditions and, above all, to the ideas of institutional autonomy, academic freedom, and “disinterested, driven only by intellectual curiosity” research, as well as to the image of the university as a critic and corrective of society. That is why the function of managing partnerships, of “borders with other institutions” acquires special importance. According to some authors, it requires as much attention as, for example, the quality of research and training (Duke, 2001, pp. 524-5).

Partnerships with institutions and organisations in key social areas and with key positions in social governance are particularly important. A sine qua none condition for a lifelong learning university is not just to be part of the stakeholder community, but to be a leading player in it (Duke & Tobias, 2001). According to Charles West, president of one of America's most prestigious research universities, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, it is probably much more important to collaborate between universities than to compete between them in determining the future of higher education (West, 2005, p. 6). This opinion deserves attention because it was expressed by a president of a leading university, for whom we can have no doubt that he does not appreciate the role of competition as a stimulus for innovation and improvement of university education. It seems that there is a paradox – in an increasingly competitive environment, universities can achieve their goals and offer flexible and high-quality education only through the creation of alliances for cooperation (Duncan & Lindsay, 2001, p. 533). On the one hand, modern society – through the development of information technologies and the political and economic opening of more and more countries – creates conditions for more effective and larger partnerships between universities. On the other hand, however, building of various educational alliances is a way to improve the provision of finance and the engagement of staff, and thus – the quality of the educational process. Without denying the existence of local universities, different forms of cooperation between universities from the same or different countries are increasingly being established today, between universities and business organisations and even so-called meta-universities are emerging,

electronically based on global collaboration between researchers, faculty and students. Partnership is also needed in order to understand the learning needs of adult learners: “a participatory inquiry approach is required. Communities must be invited to identify their learning needs to ensure that the community service provided is relevant and useful” (Preece et al., 2011, p. 730).

The development of the Bologna Process – and above all the introduction of the credit system – makes it possible for universities to cooperate in organising training. The idea is for students to complete the individual courses at the university where the best scientists in this field are. There is currently no consensus on how to achieve the building and management of partnerships – whether through a centralised unit or by “increasing the number of units that are more willing than traditional academic departments to reach beyond traditional university boundaries to connect external organisations and groups” and to build a “growing periphery for development” (Clark, 1998, p. 6).

The case of the Open University in the UK

Universities have responded differently to lifelong learning according to the size and system of HE in their country (Trow 1973) and to the institution’s own specific structure and relationship to society (see for example Brennan & Cochrane 2019). The broad landscape of the UK’s universities, which includes both old and new universities, clearly demonstrates the diversity in institutional responses to the ‘invasion’ of lifelong learning. Here we will briefly discuss the United Kingdom’s Open University as the preeminent example of an institution expressly constructed to implement lifelong learning in higher education through part-time courses and flexible access to resources, while also being an active research university. Since its foundation in 1969, over 2 million students have enrolled on Open University courses, and it has inspired the formation of similar institutions such as Indira Gandhi National Open University in India and the Open University in Hong Kong (Holford et al., 2018, p. 147). The creation of the UK’s Open University was driven by a Labour government that envisaged the institution as a means to widen opportunity for mature, working-class students, women especially (Weinbren, 2015, pp. 5-6; 10). Harris (1976) noted that even the OU’s system of teaching was influenced by political and administrative demands as much as students’ needs. Subsequently, it has also had political support from Conservative governments.

The Open University’s foundation is illustrative of the three arguments made at the beginning of this article, above all that the implementation of lifelong learning requires a profound change in the systemic characteristics of the university institution. While the new university drew on well-established traditions of adult education in Britain, it also incorporated modern technologies to provide access to lectures and other resources, through specially produced television programmes for example. The approach to subject was also innovative: Weinbren (2015, p. 249) describes how the aims of one course

“were attitudinal, sensory and subjective rather than cognitive, relating to feeling rather than knowledge.”

Though widely considered to be successful, the Open University has experienced crisis over recent years. The government’s tripling of undergraduate student fees from 2006 led to a 30 percent drop in Open University student numbers by 2017 (Tuckett, 2017, p. 230). Severe cuts to staffing and to overall provision that were threatened by the former vice-chancellor of the Open University led in 2018 to a vote of no confidence from staff and his subsequent resignation (Holford et al., 2018, p. 147). To return to the second of the arguments this article makes, the experience of the Open University suggests that lifelong learning may be a strategy that can help universities successfully develop as key institutions in the 21st century, but only within a sympathetic political and economic context. The cathedral needs to be built and then properly maintained.

Challenges for the development of the university as an institution for lifelong learning

To the extent that it is perceived as a profound shift in university education and institution, it is only natural that the realisation of lifelong learning will face a series of challenges. The essential thing in this case is that overcoming some of them is connected not only with the policies and practices of the universities themselves, but also with actors external to the field of higher education – the state, business, communities.

Widening participation – social inclusion or raising inequalities?

It is argued that there is a gradual change in the admission norms in higher education from a principle of ‘inherited merit’ through the norm of equality of rights (formal equality) to a principle of equality of opportunity (Goastellec, 2008) which has led to “a worldwide tendency to high-participation systems in higher education, systems that enrol more than 50 per cent of the school-leaver age cohort” and to higher education that “is becoming more socially inclusive at a rapid rate and on a worldwide scale” (Marginson, 2016, p. 34). However, diversity of students in higher education cannot by itself be taken as an indicator of greater ‘equality’ within the system because “the unevenness persists as regards to who studies what and where” (Archer, 2007, p. 637). A huge number of studies have been published which suggest the stable and persistent effect that socioeconomic background has on access to higher education (e.g. Blossfeld & Shavit, 1993; Pfeffer, 2008; Ilieva-Trichkova & Boyadjieva, 2014).

The *IJLE* took part in this discussion with a special issue, titled “Lifelong learning and higher education in Europe 1995–2011: widening and/or narrowing access?”, which “examines how social equity of access to higher education in Europe has changed over the 15 years since the European Union adopted lifelong learning as a key policy theme”. It is outlined that this

‘era of lifelong learning’ has coincided with two major geo-political developments: first, the resurgence of capitalism in post-socialist eastern and central Europe; and second, the period of rapid enlargement of the EU, from 12 member states and 350 million people in 1994 to 27 member states and over 500 million people by 2007 (Riddell, Weedon & Holford, 2014, p. 1)

Based on the main arguments of the published articles in this special issue the editors (Riddell, Weedon & Holford, 2014, p. 6) argue that

there is a need to reassess the relationship between higher education participation and the distribution of social and economic goods. The Bologna Process, somewhat belatedly, emphasized the potential of higher education to contribute not only to economic prosperity but also to social justice and cohesion. Whilst there is clearly a thirst for higher education across Europe, it is evident that, to date, universities have tended to contribute to rising inequality by rationing access to the most valuable qualifications. If higher education is to be a force for social change, then there is a need for a radical reappraisal of the social dimension of the Bologna Process.

The main mechanism through which the higher education system reinforces and even increases social inequalities is its internal stratification. Thus, Gallacher’s study (2014, p. 104) reveals that although the “expansion of higher education has created new opportunities for students from the less advantaged social classes. . . they are much more likely to gain entry to the less prestigious post 1992 and college sectors, than to the more elite ancient universities, or even the 1960s institutions”. The problem which arises is how the top universities can be stimulated to open their doors to people from low-status families and at the same time to preserve their high academic standards. In this regard Waller et al. (2014,p. 704) claim:

The target for the top universities in countries around the world should not be to perpetuate long-standing social inequalities, but to challenge and overcome them. Why do the ‘best’ universities have first choice of the ‘best’ students? Why not take on academically lower performing younger people (and their older peers), who have nonetheless demonstrated the capacity to benefit from university study, and turn them into the best graduates? Being able to perform such ‘academic alchemy’ would indeed be a demonstration of merit and go some way to tackling wider social inequalities that riddle developed and underdeveloped nations alike.

State policy in higher education, neoliberalism and public good

The development of universities as institutions for lifelong learning depends on the adequacy of the existing regulatory and information base. The role of state is essential for:

- guaranteeing the institutional autonomy of universities;
- providing additional funding on a competitive basis for lifelong learning activities;
- linking the accreditation of universities with their activity in the field of lifelong learning;
- carrying out periodic surveys of the needs of the economy and the requirements of consumers

in relation to the knowledge and competencies of workers.

The experience of different countries shows the existence of specific government policies. For example, the Australian government has developed the concept of “competitive neutrality”, according to which institutions that have historically been publicly funded compete with new ones under the same conditions. Another element of its policy is to support the de-regulation of the higher education system (Duncan & Lindsay, 2001, p. 531). An analysis of the Swedish experience (Askling & Foss-Fridlitzius, 2001) supports the conclusion that the decentralisation of higher education and granting of greater autonomy to higher education create more favorable conditions for the development of lifelong learning compared to the centralised management of the system. Other authors point out to the positive role of deduction of tax for expenses for self-education and the expansion of student financial assistance in Hong Kong (Young, 2008).

Holmwood (2014, p. 63) argues that “English higher education has ‘leapfrogged’ the USA to become the leading edge of neoliberal reforms”. He analyses the changing policies for higher education in the UK since the Robbins report (1963) and demonstrates the emergence of a neoliberal knowledge regime, which subordinates higher education to the market, encourages stratification between institutions and extends the role of for-profit providers. The neoliberal knowledge regime creates severe problems for lifelong learning, because within it “[f]rom a role in the amelioration of social inequality, universities are now asked to participate actively in the widening inequalities associated with a neoliberal global market order” (Holmwood, 2014, p. 62).

Back in the 80s of last century in Western Europe – and in Britain even in the 70s – it was noted

a shift from a model which treated higher education as part of the welfare state, an instrument for individual development, the transmission of broad cultural values and an efficient labour force, to a model which places a far greater emphasis on the last. This change is seen as a response to economic recession (McIlroy, 1987, p. 32).

The trends, triggered by the unfolding of neoliberal ideas, were very influential on both the development of the university as an institution, as well as on the place and character of continuing and lifelong education in it. They were defined as

an attempt to make the ivory tower a conveyor belt for industry that is every bit as intense, if not more so, than the similar strategies adopted at other levels of the educational system. . . Public expenditure on the universities has been cut back significantly and a determined attempt mounted by the state to inject market relations into their operation, bring them closer together with capital and drastically modify the welfarist and humanist ingredients in the post-war compromise on the functions of the university (McIlroy, 1987, pp. 35, 38).

Focusing on British experience, McIlroy (1987, p. 38) shows that the tradition of continuing education in British universities to place a strong stress “on democracy and on critical inquiry, on the responsibility of tutor and class to decide curriculum and method, to confront as wide a range of issues as possible involved in the particular problem or subject under scrutiny and to follow the argument wherever it might lead” has been gradually substituted with an understanding of continuing education as “a means of redeploying resources, maintaining organizational ballast and perhaps regaining some of the thunder of the Open University. . . Whilst in the universities rhetoric about recurrent and lifelong education began to emerge, there was little systematic thinking and far more reactive *ad hoc*” (McIlroy, 1987, p. 39).

McIlroy analyses many policy documents and shows how continuing education as a category had gradually been “soaked in vocationalism” (McIlroy, 1987, p. 39). He points out to the report of the University Grants Committee (UGC) Working Party on Continuing Education, published in 1984, which defines continuing education as “vital to create and maintain an adaptable and innovative population capable of exploiting the knowledge explosion for the economic and social benefit of the nation” and highlights the UGC’s recommendation that in order to ensure that provision was ‘fully adequate to national needs’

universities should make continuing education central to their functions giving it status equal to existing research and teaching and making it an integral part of the function of each staff member. To leave matters to the extra-mural department would not be to respond adequately; there was a need for the function to be placed in a powerful organizational setting within the university (McIlroy, 1987, p. 47, emphasis added).

Preservation of academic standards

The centuries-old existence of universities has been marked by the establishment of a specific academic culture and values based on the classical understanding of research and academic teaching as autonomous and value-neutral processes. To a large extent, these are the values that have become a hallmark of belonging to the academic community.

The development of science in the societies of modernity – the emergence of “mode 2 science” (Nowotny, Scott & Gibbons, 2001) – has challenged traditional academic values and rethought the functions of higher education. In some countries, as early as the late 1970s, a new, third mission of universities was institutionalised – to research and teaching was added commitment to the community in which a university operates, participation in the development of the social environment and the provision of educational services in response to its needs (Askling & Foss-Fridlitzius, 2001; Osborne, Sandber & Tuomi, 2004, pp. 150-153). An amendment to the German Higher Education Act of 1997 recognises continuing education as part of the mission of higher education institutions and equates it with research and training (Alesi & Kehm, 2000, p. 286). In such a situation, universities face the challenge not only of developing a new culture – the culture of lifelong learning, but also of combining it with their traditional values. However, studies show that even in the UK, a country with well-established traditions in the field of lifelong learning, this role has not been perceived as a convincing strategy in most universities (Henkel, 2001, p. 277). The problems that arise are different in nature and complexity. There is no doubt that it takes time and resources to establish a new culture (Liu & Wan, 1999, p. 463). This process is hampered by the fact that it leads to a kind of clash between different values and norms of academic life – between rigorous academic education and pragmatically oriented education; between the intellectual, based on universal values, position and the point of view engaged with local interests; between the requirements of the logic of research and the logic of immediate social needs and the market; between unlimited creative inquiry and entrepreneurial spirit. At the same time, the clash is inevitably not only at the level of values, but also at the level of power. First of all, as lifelong learning can become a significant source of funding for universities, there are naturally fears that those who have more money will secure more power. Secondly, as already mentioned, the realisation of lifelong learning requires the establishment of close partnerships with non-academic institutions. However, it is logical to assume that the academic community will resist the “admission” of external organisations to issues that have traditionally been only in its power (Holttä, 2000).

A key issue for any higher education system is access to it – what should be the admission criteria so as to ensure both social justice and democratisation of education and upholding high academic standards? The focus on lifelong learning exacerbates this problem, because there are wide-spread fears that the opening of higher education to “atypical” social groups – older, working, interrupted – will threaten its quality. “The fear of falling standards when becoming more open” (Müller et al., 2015, p. 546) is widely shared in the academic community. In Duke’s (2002, p. 29, emphasis in the original) words “*Quality and standards stalk the arena, in a new more means worse debate*”. However, there are arguments to claim that it is just the adoption of a lifelong learning strategy that can allow universities to be responsive to social needs without becoming “fast food outlets” and without “betraying” traditional academic values. As far as lifelong learning presupposes the understanding of the quality of education as conformity to a certain goal and is based on the differentiation of the outcome of education, it makes

possible to define and to stick to different academic standards for obtaining different academic degrees and for a completion of a course or a module.

The academic prestige of lifelong learning

As with any activity – and especially with any innovation – the realisation and success of lifelong learning depends crucially on the professional competence and motivation of the people involved. It is widely believed that the prestige of participation in lifelong learning among university professors is lower than the prestige of their involvement in master's and doctoral programmes (Alesi and Kehm 2000; Jallade 2000). It is also argued that one of the factors that determines continuing education's marginal status in the university is “the lower professional status of faculty compared to the professional status of mainstream academics” (Fleming, 2013, p. 337).

According to some authors, “courage is needed to convince academics attached to the traditional elitist paradigm of the university's role that linking to regional needs is not a betrayal of academic standards and poor marketing” (Duke, 2001, p. 522). However, it seems that in this case it is not a question of some initial and unchangeable situation, but of a situation conditioned by specific social (normative and institutional) circumstances and practices. It is well known, for example, that the academic career of teachers depends mainly on their scientific output, and therefore it is only natural that their activity should be concentrated on research. Germany is hardly the only country in which inclusion in forms of lifelong learning is not regulated as part of the responsibilities of teachers and does not even have clear mechanisms for its remuneration (Alesi & Kehm, 2000, p. 294). It can therefore be safely assumed that the negative attitudes towards lifelong learning engagement can be overcome on the basis of the promotion of good practice, accompanied by adequate changes in institutional rules, e.g. addressing engagement in forms of lifelong learning as part of the total workload of teachers, or developing a system for additional payment of this commitment. By the way, data from empirical research show that in some countries (Norway, for example) the attitude of academic teachers towards participation in forms of lifelong learning is not negative and this activity is perceived as a source of satisfaction (Brandt, 2000, p. 274).

In lieu of a conclusion: Three paradigms for university education and three models of university

Already in 1963 C. Kerr (1963, pp. 8–9) ascertained that “[t]he university is so many things to so many people that it must, of necessity, be partially at war with itself”. Gradually it has become evident that the *raison d'être* of higher education in contemporary societies consists simultaneously of three purposes or activities – teaching, research and service.

The classical paradigm of university education finds its clearest expression in the German university ideal of the early 19th century (Humboldt, [1809] 1964) and in Newman's ideas (Newman,

1852). The ideas of the great German thinkers of the late 18th and early 19th century which stimulated the establishment of Berlin university in 1809, as well as Newman's ideas and their relevance for the development of modern universities around the world are long-debated issues that deserve special attention. What is important for the present analysis is the fact that both these models "assumed that university students would be young: the university was, in an important sense a 'finishing school', intellectual and cultural" and the university's function "was to serve the (male) youth of social elites" (Holford, 2014, p. 13). This model of university is symbolised by the idea of the ivory tower – something beautiful, but inaccessible and with a vague purpose for the general public.

A kind of negation of this model is the vision of the university as a *shopping mall*, which offers many different educational services and in which each visitor can find what s/he is looking for. This is the university as the embodiment of the understanding of education as equivalent to any other market service and therefore directly subordinated to the requirements of consumers. However, although "those involved in adult and continuing education have always argued that the university should turn more to the real world, should seek involvement in great events, should seek to influence ordinary lives", they have also emphasised that the university should seek to do so

by an open-ended method of critical probing by seeking to question and to subvert. There is a stronger case than ever today for breaking down the ivory tower. But that surely should be to make the university available to all sectors of the community (McIlroy, 1987, p. 51, emphasis added).

Lifelong learning offers a concept of education that allows both preserving the intrinsic value of education and taking into account its dependence on social and individual needs and its ability to influence social development and personal biographies.

The institutional university model, which can embody and realise the educational paradigm for lifelong learning and at the same time contain the possibility of difference and diversification, is best symbolised by *a cathedral* – the university as a cathedral that is in society and is part of it and at the same time is a special place, a space separated from the wider social environment (Duke, 2001). As Duke (2002, p. 30) explains

[w]ithout rejecting the economic or the political system, the university as cathedral affords alternative, critical perspective as part of but somewhat apart from, the world: a location and a community for individual and societal reflection and reflexivity. This could help re-balance the civic against the political, popular with high culture, the environment with production and consumption. The university will interact with agencies across other social sectors and fields of discourse, remaining a meeting place, a concourse, community and campus.

In this sense, the development of universities as lifelong learning institutions does not mean their transformation into the so-called “entrepreneurial” and “corporate” universities (Clark, 1998; Salmi, 2001). It is a matter of affirming and clearly distinguishing a new – third, together with research and teaching – mission of universities – cooperation with society (Osborne, Sandberg & Tuomi, 2004, pp. 150-153). Thus, the university as a lifelong learning institution will cease to be difficult to access as an “ivory tower”, and as a cathedral will open its “heavy doors” to more visitors, but retaining a space, subordinate only to the eternal human values and the strictest academic criteria. Because the university is a place for receiving not only knowledge, but – like the cathedral – also intellectual and spiritual consolation.

This understanding of the university affirms and calls for its public character:

A university at the service of the public, in Dewey’s sense, is a university that should properly be regarded as a public university. This would not be the only function of a university, but it is a necessary function and it is one that would place social justice at its heart. Anything less and the university is just another private corporation in which a corporate economy has become a corporate society (Holmwood, 2011, pp. 25–26).

It is important to be emphasised that there are different types of cathedral – those with centuries-old history like Notre Dame or newly built like the one in Washington; as impressive as Cologne Cathedral or smaller like Lincoln Cathedral. And this means that different countries could have their “own Oxford and Bologna University”, as well as their “own Open University or University of Bremen”.

References

Alesi, B. and B. M. Kehm (2000). The status of lifelong learning in German universities. *European Journal of Education*, 35(3), 275-300. doi: [10.1111/1467-3435.00027](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-3435.00027)

Archer, L. (2007). Diversity, equality and higher education: A critical reflection on the ab/uses of equity discourse within widening participation. *Teaching in Higher Education* 12 (5–6), 633–653. doi:[10.1080/13562510701595325](https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510701595325).

Askling, B. and R. Foss-Fridlitzius (2001). Lifelong learning in Swedish Universities: a familiar policy with new, *European Journal of Education*, 36(3), 255-263. doi: [10.1111/1467-3435.00065](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-3435.00065)

Blossfeld, H.-P., Shavit, Y. (1993). Persistent inequality. Changes in educational opportunities in thirteen countries. In Y. Shavit, H.-P. Blossfeld (Eds.), *Persistent inequality. Changing educational attainment in thirteen countries* (pp. 1–23). Boulder, San Francisco, Oxford: Westview Press.

Brandt, E. (2000). Policies for lifelong learning and for higher education in Norway: Correspondence or contradiction. *European Journal of Education*, 35(3), 271-283.

Brennan, J. & Cochrane, A. (2019) Universities: in, of, and beyond their cities. *Oxford Review of Education*, 45 (2), 188-203. doi: 10.1080/03054985.2018.1551198

Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities. Organizational pathways to transformation*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Dahl, K.K.B. & Millora, Ch. M. (2016). Lifelong learning from natural disasters: transformative group-based learning at Philippine universities. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 35(6), 648-663. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2016.1209587

Delivering on the Modernisation Agenda for Universities: Education, Research and Innovation (2006). Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament, COM(2006) 208 final.

Delors, J. et al. (1996). *Learning: The treasure within*. Paris: UNESCO.

Duke, Ch. (2001). Lifelong learning and tertiary education: The learning university revisited. In D. Aspin, J. Chapman, M. Halton and Y. Sawano (Eds.) *International Handbook of Lifelong Learning* (pp. 501-528). Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Duke, C. and Tobias, R. (2001). *Lifelong learning and the university in the 21st century*. Canterbury, UK: Centre for Continuing Education, University of Canterbury.

Duke, C. (2002). The morning after the millennium: Building the longhaul learning university. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 21(1), 24–36. doi: [10.1080/026013700110099470](https://doi.org/10.1080/026013700110099470)

Duncan, R. and Lindsay, A. (2001). Universities as centers for lifelong learning: Opportunities and threats at the institutional level. In D. Aspin, J. Chapman, M. Halton and Y. Sawano (Eds.), *International handbook of lifelong learning* (pp. 529-544). Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Editorial (2012). Lifelong education, universities and the public good. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 31(5), 531-534. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2012.729387

Fleming, J. (2013). The expanded developmental periphery: framing the institutional role of university continuing education units. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 32(3), 335-352. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2012.737378

Gallacher, J. (2014). Higher education in Scotland: differentiation and diversion? The impact of college-university progression links. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 33(1), 96-106. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2013.873215

Goastellec, G. (2008). Globalization and implementation of an equity norm in higher education: Admission processes and funding framework under scrutiny. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 83 (1): 71–85. doi:[10.1080/01619560701649174](https://doi.org/10.1080/01619560701649174).

Harris, D. (1976). Educational technology at the Open University: A short history of achievement and cancellation. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 7(1), 43 –53.

Hardy, M., Oprescu, F., Milllear, P. & Summers. M. (2019). Baby boomers' development of resources and strategies to engage as later life university students. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 38(5), 503-514. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2019.1634156

Henkel, M. (2001). The UK: the home of the lifelong learning university? *European Journal of Education*, 36(3), 277-289. doi: [10.1111/1467-3435.00067](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-3435.00067)

Holford, J. (2014). The lost honour of the Social Dimension: Bologna, exports and the idea of the university. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 33(1), 7-25. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2013.873210

Holford, J., Hodge, S., Milana, M., Waller, R. & Webb, S. (2018). University renewal: “The times they are a-changing”? *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 37(2), 147-150. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2018.1467669

Holmwood, J. (2011). The idea of a public university. In J. Holmwood (Ed.), *A manifesto for the public university* (pp. 12–26). London: Bloomsbury.

- Holmwood, J. (2014). From social rights to the market: neoliberalism and the knowledge economy, *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 33(1), 62-76. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2013.873213
- Holtta, S. (2000). From ivory towers to networks in Finish higher education. *European Journal of Education*, 35(4), 265-474. doi: [10.1111/1467-3435.00040](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-3435.00040)
- Humboldt, v. W. Antrag auf Errichtung der Universität Berlin (V, 1809). In W. v. Humboldt. Werke in fünf Bänden. Hrg. von A. Flitner und K. Giel, B. IV. Berlin, 1964.
- Humboldt, v. W. Der Königsberger und der Litauische Schulplan (IX, 1809). In W.v. Humboldt. Werke in fünf Banden. Berlin, 1964.
- Ilieva-Trichkova, P., Boyadjieva, P. (2014). Dynamics of inequalities in access to higher education: Bulgaria in a comparative perspective. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 4 (2), 97–117. doi: [10.1080/21568235.2013.857946](https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2013.857946)
- Jallade, J.-P. (2000). Lifelong learning in French universities: the state of the art. *European Journal of Education*, 35(3), 301-315. doi: [10.1111/1467-3435.00028](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-3435.00028)
- Kehm, B. and I. Lischka (2001). Lifelong learning in German universities. *European Journal of Education*, 36(3), 305-316. doi: [10.1111/1467-3435.00069](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-3435.00069)
- Kokosalakis, N. (2000). Editorial. *European Journal of Education*, 35(3), 1-3.
- Lee, S. (2014). Korean mature women students' various subjectivities in relation to their motivation for higher education: generational differences amongst women. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 33(6), 791-810. doi: [10.1080/02601370.2014.972997](https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2014.972997)
- Li, Z. (2017). Citizenship education 'goes global': extra-curricular learning in an overseas campus of a British civic university. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 36(6), 662-678. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2017.1375565
- Liu, S. S. and Wan, C. C. (1999). Integrating lifelong learning in the university management. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 18(6), 453-464. doi: [10.1080/026013799293513](https://doi.org/10.1080/026013799293513)

- Lucas, S. R. (2001). Effectively maintained inequality: Education transitions, track mobility, and social background effects. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 106 (6), 1642–1690. doi: [10.1086/321300](https://doi.org/10.1086/321300)
- Mallman, M. and Lee, H. (2017). Isolated learners: young mature-age students, university culture, and desire for academic sociality. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 36(5), 512-525. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2017.1302012
- Marginson, S. (2011). Higher education in East Asia and Singapore: Rise of the Confucian model. *Higher Education*, 61(5), 587–611. doi: 10.1007/s10734-010-9384-9
- Marginson, S. (2016). *Higher education and the common good*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Publishing.
- Marginson, S. and Yang, L. (2021). Individual and collective outcomes of higher education: a comparison of Anglo-American and Chinese approaches. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 20(1): 1-31. doi:10.1080/14767724.2021.1932436
- McIlroy, J. (1987). Continuing education and the universities in Britain: The political context. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 6(1), 27-59. doi: 10.1080/0260137870060103
- Meyer, J. W., Ramirez, F. O., Frank, D. J., & Schofer, E. (2007). Higher education as an institution. In P. J. Gumport (Ed.), *Sociology of higher education. Contributions and their contexts* (pp. 187-221). Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Müller, R. Remdisch, S., Köhler, K., Marr, L., Repo, S. & Yndigegn, C. (2015). Easing access for lifelong learners: a comparison of European models for university lifelong learning. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 34(5), 530-550. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2015.1030350
- Nylander, E., Fejes, A., & Milana, M. (2022). Exploring the themes of the territory: A topic modelling approach to 40 years of publications in *International Journal of Lifelong Education* (1982–2021). *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 41(1), 27–44. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2021.2015636
- Newman, J. H. (1852). *The Idea of a University* (1965 ed.). London: Dent.
- Nowotny, H., P. Scott, M. Gibbons (2001). *Re-Thinking science: Knowledge and the public in an age of uncertainty*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Orr, D. and Hovdhaugen, E. (2014). 'Second chance' routes into higher education: Sweden, Norway and Germany compared. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 33(1), 45-61. doi: [10.1080/02601370.2013.873212](https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2013.873212)

O'Shea, S. (2015). Filling up silences—first in family students, capital and university talk in the home. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 34(2), 139-155. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2014.980342

Osborne, M. J., H. Sandberg, O. Tuomi (2004). A comparison of developments in university continuing education in Finland, the UK and Sweden. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 23(2), 137-158. doi: [10.1080/0260137042000184183](https://doi.org/10.1080/0260137042000184183)

Pfeffer, F. T. (2008). Persistent inequality in educational attainment and its institutional context. *European Sociological Review*, 24 (5), 543–565. doi: [10.1093/esr/jcn026](https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcn026)

Pitman, T. and Broomhall, S. (2009). Australian universities, generic skills and lifelong learning. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 28(4), 439-458. doi: [10.1080/02601370903031280](https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370903031280)

Preece, J. with contributions from David Croome, Mankatso Ntene & Nomazulu Ngozwana (2011). Nurturing lifelong learning in communities through the National University of Lesotho: prospects and challenges. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 30(6), 713-732. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2011.624645

Riddell, S., Weedon, E. and John Holford, J. (2014). Lifelong learning and higher education in Europe 1995–2011: widening and/or narrowing access? *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 33(1), 1-6. doi: [10.1080/02601370.2013.873216](https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2013.873216)

Salmi, J. (2001). Tertiary education in the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities. *Higher Education Management*, 13(2), 105-128.

Scott, W. R., and Davis, G. F. (2016). *Organisations and organizing. Rational, natural and open system perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

Shak, Th. (1984). A university training programme for adult educators in Hong Kong: A research study. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 3(4), 327-335. doi: 10.1080/0260137840030407

Siivonen, P. and Filander, K. (2020). 'Non-traditional' and 'traditional' students at a regional Finnish University: demanding customers and school pupils in need of support. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 39(3), 247-262. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2020.1758814

Tagoe, M. A. (2012a). Sixty years of university-based education in Ghana: challenges and prospects of making transition into a lifelong learning institution. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 31(2), 135-156. doi: [10.1080/02601370.2012.663798](https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2012.663798)

Tagoe, M. A. (2012b) Incorporating cultural action models in university-based adult education: the Ghanaian experience, *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 31:5, 591-605, doi: 10.1080/02601370.2012.693956

Talmage, C. A., Mark, R., Slowey, M. and Knopf, R. C. (2016). Age friendly universities and engagement with older adults: moving from principles to practice. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 35(5), 537-554. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2016.1224040

Tapper, T. and D. Palfreyman (2000). *Oxford and the decline of the collegiate tradition*. London: Woburn Press.

Taylor, R. and Ward, K. (1984). University adult education and the community perspective: The Leeds 'Pioneer Work' project. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 3(1), 41-57. doi: 10.1080/0260137840030105

The European Higher Education Area-Achieving the Goals. Communique of the Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education, Bergen, 19-20 May, www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-main_doc/050520_Bergen_Communique.pdf

Towards the European Higher Education Area. Communique of the Meeting of European Ministers in Charge of Higher Education in Prague on May 19th 2001. www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-main_doc/010519Prague_Communique.pdf

Trow, M. (1973). *Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education*. Berkeley, CA: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

Tuckett, A. (2017). The rise and fall of life-wide learning for adults in England. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 36(1-2), 230-249. doi:10.1080/02601370.2017.1274546

Waller, R., Holford, J., Jarvis, P., Milana, M. & Sue Webb, S. (2014). Widening participation, social mobility and the role of universities in a globalized world. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 33(6), 701-704. doi: 10.1080/02601370.2014.972082

Weinbren, D. (2015). *The Open University: A history*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

West, Ch. M. (2005). World class universities: American lessons. *International Higher Education*, *The Boston College Center for International Higher Education*, 38, 6-7.

Young, E.C.M. (2008). Continuing education in a lifelong learning society: The Hong Kong model. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 27(5), 525–533. doi: [10.1080/02601370802051660](https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370802051660)