

EDITORIAL

EDUCATION 2030 & ADULT LEARNING: GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES – BRIDGES OR GAPS?

This thematic issue of *Studies in Adult Education and Learning* was born out of the work done at the 10th Conference of the ESREA Research Network *Between Global and Local: Adult Learning and Communities* (BGL-ALC) which was held in Opatija in Croatia, from the 7th to the 10th of June 2018, organised by the Adult Education Institution DANTE (Ustanova za obrazovanje odraslih), an institution with vigorous roots in local and regional educational networks and active at a European level in numerous EU projects and cooperative efforts. The organisers of the conference together with the convenors of the BGL-ALC Research Network chose as a title for the conference: “Education 2030 & Adult Learning: Global Perspectives and Local Communities - Bridges or Gaps? Agendas, praxis and research”.

The background for the conference theme was the adoption in September 2015 by the United Nations (UN) member countries of a set of goals to do nothing less than end poverty, protect the planet, and ensure prosperity for all as part of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Each of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) agreed upon in 2015 has specific targets to be achieved in a 15-year period.

What was the idea behind such a theme? Organisers and convenors alike felt that the SDGs for Education needed to be examined critically according to their own institutional criteria and needed, too, to be put to the test in the light of different strands of research carried out in diverse national, social or cultural fields.

After all, the 2030 Agenda highlights education as a stand-alone goal (SDG 4), committed to providing inclusive and equitable quality education at all levels. Education is also included under several other SDGs, specifically those on health; growth and employment; sustainable consumption and production; and climate change. Education is therefore seen as a necessary precondition and key element in the achievement of the abovementioned goals. The overarching aim of SDG 4 is to provide comprehensive, holistic, and universal education that *transforms* the lives of individuals, communities and societies, “leaving no one behind”, as it has become fashionable to claim. By any means a tall order.

THE NETWORK AND SDGS

The task of achieving the Education 2030 goals embodies elements central to the research and work of the BGL-ALC Network. The 2030 Agenda stresses, for example, the vital and beneficial role of learning and education in communities and societies, recognising that learning is imperative for achieving sustainable development, equity, and inclusion.

However, the 2030 Agenda is faced with considerable challenges to its target of bridging the gap between the global and the local to ensure the attainment of specified goals for accelerated social development. By signing the document, governments committed themselves to translate global targets into achievable national targets based on their often very different, often very ambiguous education priorities, national development strategies and plans, based, too, on the ways their education systems are organised, their often far from adequate institutional capacities and, of course, on the dramatically unequal availability of resources. National governments, municipalities, towns, cities and regions have a responsibility as policy and decision-makers to address global education and learning goals.

If education and learning SDGs are to be achieved, active participation and collaboration between communities around the world, including all relevant sectors and stakeholders, are required. While any practical change will be driven by measures taken by national, regional and local governing institutions, this will obviously need to be supported by effective “multi-stakeholder” partnerships, which means that no simple solutions at local levels are immediately available and that new forms of cooperation, new social alliances, novel forms of struggle and mobilisation must be developed and put into practice. Implementing the Agenda 2030 will require national, regional and global mechanisms for governance, accountability, coordination, monitoring, follow-up and review, reporting and evaluation. It will also require “enabling strategies” — another favourite, yet ominously hollow-sounding formula that is presumably meant to mean “getting things done” — including new partnerships and financing models.

It will be imperative, too, to promote processes that generate engagement with the SDGs at the community level. The goals and targets set out in the 2030 Agenda can, if at all, only be achieved if members of local communities take responsibility for implementing the SDGs in their own context. We wanted to ask whether communities can realistically be engaged to make global goals set by the UN their own local goals. The conference also sought to ask how individuals and collectives might contribute to achieving the Agenda 2030 for adult learning.

Some of the further questions that it seemed important to consider together included, for example:

- How can cooperation between individuals and communities at national and transnational levels contribute to the development of genuine accessibility, equality and sustainability in adult learning? Sustainability, an obviously desirable target, remains often however, little more than a mere husk of a word, and means of measuring, or

even simply recognising sustainability, can be difficult to agree upon. (see here in particular the contributions in this thematic issue by Lucio-Villegas; Chinnasamy and Daniels; Bajner)

- If targets cannot be measured on the basis of political declarations alone, where must we begin? For a network like the BGL-ALC Research Network, and for ESREA as a whole, accessibility, equality, and sustainability of education provision and learning gains can and must be sought out and systematically researched in the *local life-world* of adult learners. (see Lucio-Villegas)
- To what extent do the SDGs for education impact on the global, to what extent on the local levels of social life? What are the real global and local challenges for adult learning? What is the role of the researcher? (see Lucio-Villegas; Chinnasamy and Daniels)
- What does it mean if educators are understood to be mediators, implementers and creators of local and global education policies? What is new in this role? What are the dangers, what are the potential gains? Is Adult Education likely to be absorbed even further than is already the case in many places into the commercialised notion of education as product-delivery? (see Chinnasamy and Daniels; Bajner)
- What role falls to researchers in interpreting global adult learning needs at the local level? The SDGs are grand concepts. Researching adult learning in the micro-context, effectively bridging the gap to SDGs, remains urgently important (for quite radically different research practices see on this Lindsay and Sereďyńska-Abou-Eid; Chinnasamy and Daniels; Khattab and Wong; Lucio-Villegas)
- What factors determine national and local communities' readiness and ability to implement global sustainable development goals for adult learning? Examples in this thematic issue remind us particularly of the after-effects on educational infrastructures of diverse social systems (see Vařatková and Dopita; Chinnasamy and Daniels; Khattab and Wong)
- Espousing the grand aims of the SDGs is relatively painless for national educational institutions. Closing the gaps between national policy contexts, global political commitments and pressing social problems can be difficult. This is an obvious field for participatory research for democracy and citizenship (see Lindsay and Sereďyńska-Abou-Eid; Lucio-Villegas)
- What forms do cross-sector collaborations in adult learning for a knowledge-based society take? Who is included, who excluded? (see Lindsay and Sereďyńska-Abou-Eid)
- What might holistic approaches to adult learning look like? How can participatory research, for example, connect different social agendas, praxis and research? (see here in particular Lucio-Villegas; Vařatková and Dopita)

However urgent, however noble the ultimate SDG targets are, and we do not call them into question, as a research network which has consistently taken as its point of departure the lived world of people in the global and the local and their experience of learning in the teeth of ingrained systemic inequalities, discrimination, chauvinism, neo-colonialism, as well as class and race prejudice, we preferred to err in the direction of scepticism and sought to pose questions and promote debate on all of the above.

The European “refugee crisis” and the new character of populisms claiming to represent a response to the arrival of the victims of war, civil war and economic pressure in themselves raised serious question marks in the direction of the workings of international agencies, their programmes and the translation of the latter into national policies. The local and the global in the light of the trade conflicts unleashed by President Trump; Chinese economic expansion, the New Belt and Road and the new scramble for limited natural resources; the continuing implosion of whole societies in Syria, Libya, Yemen, Afghanistan, Venezuela (the list is long); the erosion of social and political conquests in Turkey, Hungary, Poland, and latterly Italy; the threats and promises for grassroots political action posed by the political disaster of Brexit, the costs of which remain at best uncertain – all these questions and more were on our agenda when we came together in Opatija.

At the time of writing, the entire agenda sketched in above has been further sharpened by the dramatic turn in the global environmental debate which has raised the question of immediate action and placed it for the time being at the centre of the global agenda, and without any of the habitual empty phrases (thanks essentially to the effect of Greta Thunberg and movements like Fridays for Future). In this sense, it seems clear that our discussions in Opatija by the Adriatic in 2018 were useful, were productive, yes, and yet they obviously fell far short of the demands now facing us.

A possible response might be frustration and discouragement. Both of these sensations have been felt after tiring conferences in the last years and, it can be argued, they are also necessary and often salutary. They serve to spur us on to change ourselves and our research praxis. Being able to turn and look back from a different place sharpens our self-criticism and allows us to perceive what is consistent and good, what is useful, what is informative, what, too, is unresolved or still the object of debate.

The role of adult education and learning in community processes has changed and, under the pressure of the kind of local and global scenarios referred to above, continues to change and demand from us new analyses, and that we take up new positions in order to understand. We are not interested in adult education only as a question of developing skills to read, write, make calculations and so on, or to simply acquire competences to become “employable”, though the relative importance of each of these is clearly not in question. Adult education and learning, as has been pointed out already (Evans, Kurantowicz, & Lucio-Villegas, 2016, p. 2) can, however, be understood as well as a real process to help people to read the world and change it, a more general skill that is so important in the life of individuals and communities. To be able to interpret social reality can make all the difference. The six papers included in this thematic issue serve as examples of the very necessary work undertaken by researchers active in very diverse institutional or social environments in order to provide insights and materials without which at local and global levels the heterogenous learning environments in which we work cannot be sufficiently understood, questioned, or changed.

THE PAPERS

The first paper in this collection, “University teaching and learning in educational sciences: The case of andragogy in the Czech Republic”, written by two researchers of the Faculty of Arts of the Palacky University in the Czech Republic, Jana Poláčková Vašátková and Miroslav Dopita deals with the path taken by adult education in institutions of Higher Education in the Czech Republic and as such can be seen as representative of similar experiences in other post-Communist European countries. The authors argue that de-ideologization of Czech higher education was accompanied by many other changes after 1990 in the Czech Republic. In the context of local and global educational policy, the paper presents three periods of development of educational sciences including andragogy in Czech higher education after 1990, showing how changes influenced university teaching quality. In the research part, the study concentrates on changes made by its actors – notably professors/associate professors – involved in the development of the educational sciences in the Czech Republic since the 1990s. Analysis of semi-structured interviews shows that change in educational sciences was framed by limited access to foreign literature and significant personnel changes, including the return of qualified academics from abroad. The promotion of andragogy in the Czech Republic demanded the development of methodology and a critical approach to adult learning. For individual academics, the new focus privileged research over teaching, though interaction with students remains central for the interviewees.

Turning to consider the bigger picture of educational provision for adults, this time from the perspective of the overarching discourses of the programme documents that shaped the provision of adult education over decades, in her paper, “Lifelong learning redefined: From sustainability to generational learning”, Maria Bajner of the University of Pécs in Hungary sets out to identify the driving forces behind humanistic and utilitarian considerations in the opposing approaches of UNESCO and OECD, while it also addresses the role of political interventions that contributed further to confusion of the issues at stake. The author uses documentary analysis of studies and findings of international surveys to shed light on the ambivalent stances in educational documents towards the importance of lifelong learning. She argues that a shift in rhetoric from lifelong learning to generational learning is needed in order to eliminate what she calls the “doublespeak” of the documents. Her view is that the needs of younger generations in education are introduced too often to utilitarian values and economic expectations unmatched by educational processes. The ambivalence of the meaning of LLL may contribute, she argues, to a situation in which the jobs young adults are being trained for now might well disappear, and the curricula and learning material they are using today might well become useless or obsolete in 5-10 years. Bajner wishes to shed light on the ambivalent stances in UNESCO and OECD documents towards the importance of lifelong learning and to call attention to a move towards generational learning which she feels is undeservedly missed out from the political discourse on adult education.

Jayakumar Chinnasamy and Jeannie Daniels, respectively Research Student and Senior Lecturer in the School of Education, University of the West of Scotland, United Kingdom, address the relevance of the SDGs for the work of institutions of Higher Education in their paper entitled “The role of universities and educators in developing and implementing sustainable developmental goals”. The authors maintain that Universities and Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the UK are seen as having a social mission to deliver common good to society, both locally and globally. These institutions develop different policies due to global changes in Higher Education (HE), such as internationalisation and Sustainable Development (SD). Following UNESCO targets, they have an important role in setting sustainable developmental goals (SDGs) and also delivering them through teaching, research and other services. Effective delivery of SD practices relies, however, on educators who are directly involved in making the links between students and community. The authors point out that in practice educators are not everywhere involved in developing policies, which impacts on their ability to deliver. This research, set in Scottish HEs, investigates educators’ perceptions of internationalisation in HE, how the concept is constructed and delivered in their universities, and what – if any – involvement these educators have in developing policy. This paper argues that educators, especially HE educators, have potential that is neglected in developing SDGs.

Cora Lindsay and Renata Sereďyńska-Abou-Eid, from the School of Education at the University of Nottingham, United Kingdom, in their paper “Addressing the need for language support for the migrant and refugee community in the East Midlands, U.K.”, touch on a central problem facing local communities and their institutions impacted by increasingly critical global urgencies, often wholly unconnected historically or geographically to the communities in the host country and affected by nothing other than the pernicious mechanisms of globalisation in its most negative of forms. For migrants and refugees, language is clearly essential for dealing with officials, engaging with employment, receiving healthcare and feeling relatively comfortable in a new environment. Despite this, there is no uniform approach to English language support for incoming migrants or refugees to the East Midlands. This paper discusses the situation regarding language provision for these communities and identifies the gaps in current language provision which derive from reductions in government funding over recent years. It looks at a mixed methods doctoral study that sought to identify the language needs of the Polish community in the region and describes a University of Nottingham initiative to address the gap in ESOL provision for adult learners, both migrants and refugees, in the Nottingham area.

Amira Khattab (Dark Matter LLC and Michigan State University) and David Wong’s (Michigan State University, Associate Professor in the College of Education) paper, “Integrating Western and Arab leadership development practices: An example of the challenge bridging global and local adult learning perspectives”, discusses the choices facing non-Western (and, it has to be added, post-colonial and consistently authoritarian) societies in their attempts to conform with and fulfil international educational goals. Faced with an insufficiently skilled labour force, the authors argue, Arab countries are looking

to Western adult learning perspectives. However, Western practices, they write, cannot be implemented without consideration of regional culture. This large-scale study carried out by Khattab and Wong aims to identify best leadership development practices for Arab adult learners and examines how these practices might best fit with local cultural contexts. To determine effective practices for Arab leaders, the Delphi process was utilized to survey 24 experts in the field of executive education. In addition, eight experts were interviewed and 1,500 business leaders from 17 different countries were surveyed. Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) was used to examine indices for individual level relationships, as well as country level relationships. Findings suggest that adult learning practices must be “customized” to address the tension between global and local perspectives. Previous experience of Western practices is equally important. However, traditional schooling experiences may foster deep resistance to unfamiliar ideas and practices.

The authors’ use of the widely used, but equally widely criticised, schemata developed by Hofstede (and superficially deployed everywhere to achieve quick cultural “fixes”) to develop their analysis of the shortcomings of much HE experience in Arab societies could be the subject of a separate discussion here. At the same time, Khattab and Wong represent very much what the mainstream in professional education and personnel development argues and serve here as a useful ignition point for an important debate.

This collection of thematic papers is concluded fittingly by Emilio Lucio-Villegas of the University of Seville, Spain. In his contribution with the title “Too many evenings. Learning Democracy from a Participatory Budget Process”, Lucio-Villegas reflects on experiences linking adult education to citizenship and participation. As one of the founding convenors of the BGL-ALC Research Network, Lucio-Villegas unsurprisingly is convinced that citizenship is inseparably connected to social justice and social inclusion. He suggests in his paper that a key element in citizenship is participation in public issues which concern life in communities in order to build an egalitarian relationship among people. He connects here participation to a singular experience: to the Participatory Budget Experiment in the city of Seville from 2003 to 2007. He explores specific experiences within adult education through participatory research and the elaboration of teaching materials addressed to this end. Finally, he reflects in his paper on the consequences of these experiences for an emancipatory adult education that aims to teach and learn democracy.

BRIDGES OR GAPS?

The papers collected here represent something like a fixed image of research practices at the time of their presentation. They are certainly *not* representative of research practices and research methodologies of the general fields of adult learning, adult education, lifelong learning or beyond. They are in fact much too institution-bound and obviously nation-bound to stand as representative of the field as such. The conference Call attracted a good range of practices from an interesting range of research practitioners from around Europe. Their research preoccupations are mirrored in their theoretical concerns

and their broad methodological perspectives. Thus, we have first and foremost a European set of views, problems, concerns, rationales and solutions. Moreover, the concerns are inward-looking (discussion of university policy, development, history, professional identity), institution-based (the university and its pedagogy), policy-focused (funding, regulations, roll-out, outcomes), and the research discourse and methodological rationale are centred on outcome-oriented analyses. Thus, the papers – and this holds true, too, for two of the three open papers in this thematic issue – show a marked preference in their discussion for exposition, description and comparison. Documentary analysis is employed, for example, without a theoretical framework for the identification of significant content nor for its deconstruction. The employment of key documents remains de-contextualised. Evidence is presented with neither contextual support of a theoretically representative corpus – however limited – nor theoretical grounding. Elsewhere, theoretical approaches – to the use of narrative in research design, for example – are little more than sketched in, relying on unsupported statements regarding their analytical potential and providing later little or no detail of how such analysis (narrative analysis, content analysis, focus group analysis, cultural constructs like “power-distance”, for example, and so on) is conducted and what its intrinsic value for this research or other research activities might be. The very widespread practice of collecting individual or group data (the focus group is a frequently used format here) which is then cited out-of-context and essentially as convenient evidence, with none of the inconveniences that qualitative data notoriously possess (and rightly so) is represented here too, though the even commoner alternatives of summary and free interpretation of cumbersome quantities of real testimonies are more in evidence. A refreshing exception in the papers collected here is the employment of Polish-language transcripts in the original with English translations (see Lindsay and Sreedyńska-Abou-Eid), even though in limited form.

Of course, this criticism is as much criticism of the format of the conference paper and the post-conference publication of the revised papers as it may be of the papers themselves. Our work is constrained by limits – funding, recognition by peers, time limits for presentations, word-counts, peer-reviews and so on. Many of these are salutary, some are desirable, all are inevitable. The literature review here frequently triumphs over the analysis of research data because the paper format provides the researcher with enough space to summarise and condense though not enough to argue and challenge. We may regret that this is often so, but we should also recognise that the slower task of exposition and presentation is also a part of our practice that deserves our critical attention.

In sum, then, there are arguably some important methodological gaps in parts of the papers collected here. Notwithstanding, they take their place here because they provide histories and showcase experiences which act as important bridges for the rest of us in our own research.

In 2018 we discussed the impact of SDGs and the limits of policy. Our authors here address questions of central importance that transcend the local, as well as questions that take their origin in the global sphere and invest the local experience, impacting individuals

and communities as they unravel. It is to be hoped that with their various approaches these papers go some way to providing the means to read the experiences that have been, are currently, or will be among the problems that challenge us in our places of work and research.

Beside the six thematic papers, this issue also includes three open papers, a report and a book review. In their paper “Public school teachers’ experiences of profound learning”, Davin J. Carr-Chellman and Michael Kroth from the University of Idaho, US, discuss the role of a “teacher-as-lifelong-learner”, set qualities of profound learning and learners and through in-depth focus group research with public school teachers analyse teachers’ perceptions of profound learners and profound learning experiences. In the second paper “Adult literacy and basic education policies in a comparative perspective: Selected findings from four country cases”, Alexandra Ioannidou and Carolin Knauber from the German Institute for Adult Education (DIE) investigate the interplay between the polity, politics and policies of adult literacy and basic education, drawing on qualitative data from an international-comparative project which examined basic education policies across countries, and presenting findings from four countries: Austria, Denmark, England, and Turkey. In the third open paper “Concepts of quality in evaluation practices in higher education: instrumentalization of relativistic quality”, Jernej Širok from the Slovene Quality Assurance Agency discusses concepts of quality in higher education and by analysing evaluation reports of 485 study programmes, representing 49% of all accredited study programmes in Slovenia, argues that quality does not pursue the university’s higher ideals but rather systematically helps to move higher education into the field of economic and legal relations and adapt it to economic interests. The issue is brought to a close by a report from practice on “20 years of online education at DOBA” prepared by Jasna Dominko Baloh and a book review *The Position of Marginalized Groups in Society* by Aleksandra Šindić.

Rob Evans

REFERENCES

Evans, R., Kurantowicz, E., & Lucio-Villegas, E. (Eds.) (2016). *Researching & Transforming Adult Learning & Communities. The Local-Global Context*. Rotterdam: Sense.

UVODNIK

IZOBRAŽEVANJE 2030 IN IZOBRAŽEVANJE ODRASLIH: GLOBALNE PERSPEKTIVE IN LOKALNE SKUPNOSTI – MOSTOVI ALI VRZELI?

Ta tematska številka *Andragoških spoznanj* izhaja iz 10. konference raziskovalne mreže ESREA Med globalnim in lokalnim – Izobraževanje odraslih in skupnosti (Between Global and Local: Adult Learning and Communities, BGL-ALC), ki je potekala v Opatiji na Hrvaškem med 7. in 10. junijem 2018 v organizaciji Ustanove za izobraževanje odraslih DANTE. Ta institucija je močno vpeta v lokalne in regionalne izobraževalne mreže ter dejavna na evropski ravni v številnih projektih EU in v različnih oblikah sodelovanja. Organizatorji konference so skupaj s koordinatorji raziskovalne mreže BGL-ALC za naslov srečanja izbrali *Izobraževanje 2030 in izobraževanje odraslih: Globalne perspektive in lokalne skupnosti – mostovi ali vrzeli? Agende, prakse in raziskave*.

V ozadju konferenčne teme je bilo dejstvo, da so države članice Organizacije združenih narodov (OZN) septembra 2015 sprejele niz ciljev z ambicioznim namenom odpraviti revščino, zaščititi planet in zagotoviti blaginjo za vse kot del Agende 2030 za trajnostni razvoj. Vsak od skupno 17 ciljev trajnostnega razvoja (CTR), sprejetih v letu 2015, vključuje specifične kazalnike, ki naj bi jih dosegli v 15-letnem obdobju.

Kaj je bila motivacija za izbiro te teme? Tako organizatorji kot koordinatorji so bili mnenja, da je nujno CTR s področja izobraževanja kritično pretresti glede na lastne institucionalne kriterije in jih po potrebi tudi preizprašati v luči različnih raziskovalnih smeri v raznolikih nacionalnih, družbenih in kulturnih okoljih.

Ne nazadnje postavlja Agenda 2030 izobraževanje kot samostojen cilj (CTR 4) ter zavezuje k zagotavljanju inkluzivnega in enakopravnega kakovostnega izobraževanja na vseh ravneh. Izobraževanje je vključeno še v več drugih CTR, zlasti tistih na področju zdravja, gospodarske rasti in zaposlovanja, trajnostne potrošnje in proizvodnje ter podnebnih sprememb. Izobraževanje je torej predstavljeno kot nujni prvi pogoj in ključni element pri doseganju omenjenih ciljev. Glavni cilj CTR 4 pa je zagotoviti celovito in celostno izobraževanje za vse, tako, ki spreminja življenje posameznikov, skupnosti in družb, ter kot je modno reči, zagotavlja »enake možnosti za vse«. Nič od tega ni lahka naloga.

MREŽA IN CTR

Pri doseganju ciljev Izobraževanja 2030 so pomembni isti elementi, kot jih postavljata v ospredje raziskovanje in delo mreže BGL-ALC. Agenda 2030 na primer poudarja ključno in pozitivno vlogo učenja in izobraževanja v skupnostih in družbah ter prepozna, da je učenje nujno za doseganje trajnostnega razvoja, enakopravnosti in inkluzivnosti.

Vendar pa Agendo 2030 čakajo pomembni izzivi pri cilju premostiti vrzel med globalnim in lokalnim, da bi tako zagotovili doseganje specifičnih ciljev za hitrejši družbeni razvoj. S podpisom tega dokumenta so se vlade zavezale, da bodo globalne cilje prevedle v dosegljive nacionalne cilje glede na svoje pogosto zelo različne in zelo dvoumne izobraževalne prioritete, nacionalne razvojne strategije in načrte; glede na oblike organiziranosti izobraževalnega sistema, institucionalne zmožnosti, ki so pogosto daleč od zelenih; in pa seveda glede na izjemno neenako dostopnost virov. Nacionalne vlade, občine, velika in manjša mesta ter regije imajo kot odločevalci in določevalci politik odgovornost obravnava globalne izobraževalne in učne cilje.

Če naj dosežemo izobraževalne in učne CTR, je nujno aktivno delovanje in sodelovanje skupnosti po svetu, vključno z vsemi relevantnimi sektorji in deležniki. Medtem ko bodo za praktične spremembe nujni spodbujevalni ukrepi nacionalnih, regionalnih in lokalnih vladnih institucij, je jasno, da te potrebujejo podporo učinkovitih »večdeležniških« partnerstev, kar pomeni, da ni preprostih rešitev, ki bi bile takoj na voljo na lokalni ravni, temveč je treba razviti in udejanjiti nove oblike sodelovanja, nova družbena zaveznitva in inovativne oblike boja in mobilizacije. Implementacija Agende 2030 bo zahtevala nacionalne, regionalne in globalne mehanizme za upravljanje, zagotavljanje odgovornosti, koordinacijo, monitoring, spremljanje in pregledovanje, poročanje in evalvacijo. Zahtevala bo tudi »strategije omogočanja«, kar je spet eden tistih izrazov, ki se dobro slišijo; predvidoma pomeni nekaj takega kot »doseči, da se nekaj zgodi«, a zveni sumljivo nedoločno – vključno z novimi partnerstvi in modeli financiranja.

Nujno bo tudi spodbujati procese, ki prinašajo aktivno udejanjanje CTR na ravni skupnosti. Cilje in kazalnike v Agendi 2030 bo – če sploh – mogoče doseči le, če bodo člani lokalnih skupnosti prevzeli odgovornost za implementacijo CTR v svojem lastnem kontekstu. Vprašanje, ki smo ga želeli postaviti, je bilo, ali je, realistično gledano, mogoče spodbuditi skupnosti, da globalne cilje, kot jih je zastavila OZN, prepoznajo kot svoje lastne lokalne cilje. Konferenca je želela odgovoriti tudi na vprašanje, kako lahko posamezniki in kolektivi prispevajo k uresničitvi Agende 2030 na področju učenja in izobraževanja odraslih.

Med nadaljnjimi vprašanji, ki se nam jih je zdelo pomembno obravnavati, so bila na primer:

- Kako lahko sodelovanje med posamezniki in skupnostmi na nacionalni in nadnacionalni ravni prispeva k doseganju resnične dostopnosti, enakopravnosti in trajnostne naravnosti v izobraževanju odraslih? Čeprav je očitno zaželen kot cilj, trajnost pogosto ostaja samo mrtva črka na papirju, soglasje o metodah merjenja in samem

prepoznavanju pa je težko doseči (gl. še zlasti naslednje prispevke v tej tematski številki: Lucio-Villegas; Chinnasamy in Daniels; Bajner).

- Če ciljev ni mogoče meriti zgolj na podlagi političnih deklaracij, kje naj začnemo? Mreže, kot sta BGL-ALC in ESREA kot celota, se zmorejo in morajo prizadevati za in sistematično raziskovati dostopnost, enakopravnost in trajnost zagotavljanja izobraževanja in izobraževalnega napredka v *lokalnem življenjskem okolju* učečih se odraslih (gl. Lucio-Villegas).
- V kolikšni meri CTR na področju izobraževanja vplivajo na globalne in v kolikšni meri na lokalne ravni družbenega življenja? Kateri so resnični globalni in lokalni izzivi v izobraževanju odraslih? Kakšna je vloga raziskovalca? (Gl. Lucio-Villegas; Chinnasamy in Daniels.)
- Kaj pomeni, če izobraževalce razumemo kot mediatorje, izvajalce in ustvarjalce lokalnih in globalnih izobraževalnih politik? Kaj ta vloga prinaša novega? Katere nevarnosti in katere potencialne prednosti vključuje? Ali obstaja verjetnost, da bo skomercializirani koncept izobraževanja kot dobavljanja proizvoda marsikje še bolj kot doslej posrkal vase izobraževanje odraslih (gl. Chinnasamy in Daniels; Bajner)?
- Kakšna naj bo vloga raziskovalcev pri interpretiranju globalnih potreb v izobraževanju odraslih na lokalni ravni? CTR so velikopotezni koncepti. Raziskovanje izobraževanja odraslih v mikrokontekstu, ki dejansko premaguje vrzel do CTR, ostaja še naprej nujno (za radikalno drugačne raziskovalne prakse na tem področju gl. Lindsay in Seredyńska-Abou-Eid; Chinnasamy in Daniels; Khattab in Wong; Lucio-Villegas).
- Kateri dejavniki določajo pripravljenost in sposobnost nacionalnih in lokalnih skupnosti za implementacijo globalnih ciljev trajnostnega razvoja na področju izobraževanja odraslih? Primeri v tej tematski številki nas še posebej opozarjajo na učinke na izobraževalno infrastrukturo raznolikih družbenih sistemov (gl. Vašátková in Dopita; Chinnasamy in Daniels; Khattab in Wong).
- Zavzemanje za velikopotezne cilje CTR je za nacionalne izobraževalne institucije razmeroma enostavno. Premoščanje razlik med konteksti nacionalnih politik, globalnimi političnimi zavezami in perečimi družbenimi problemi pa je po drugi strani lahko težavno. To področje je očitna priložnost za participativno raziskovanje na področju demokracije in državljanstva (gl. Lindsay in Seredyńska-Abou-Eid; Lucio-Villegas).
- Kakšne oblike lahko v prizadevanju za družbo, temelječo na znanju, prevzame medsektorsko sodelovanje v izobraževanju odraslih (gl. Lindsay in Seredyńska-Abou-Eid)?
- Kakšni bi bili lahko holistični pristopi k izobraževanju odraslih? Kako lahko participativno raziskovanje na primer poveže različne družbene agende, prakse in raziskave (gl. še zlasti Lucio-Villegas; Vašátková in Dopita)?

Ne glede na to, kako nujni in plemeniti so brez dvoma cilji CTR, smo kot raziskovalna mreža, ki si za izhodišče tako v globalnem kot lokalnem smislu konsistentno jemlje resnični svet, v katerem ljudje živijo, skupaj z njihovo izkušnjo učenja v razmerah zakoreninjenih sistemskih neenakosti, diskriminacije, šovinizma, neokolonializma ter razrednih in rasnih predsodkov, nagnjeni k zdravi skepsi in postavljanju vprašanj, ki spodbujajo razpravo o vsem naštetem.

Evropska »begunska kriza« in nova narava populizmov, ki se predstavljajo kot odziv na prihod žrtev vojne, državljanske vojne in ekonomskih pritiskov, sami po sebi postavljata resna vprašanja glede usmeritev dela mednarodnih agencij, njihovih programov in udeležanja teh programov v nacionalnih politikah. Lokalni in globalni vidiki v luči trgovinskih konfliktov, ki jih je sprožil predsednik Trump; kitajska gospodarska ekspanzija, iniciativa »En pas – ena pot« in novo prerivanje za dostop do omejenih naravnih virov; nadaljnja implozija celotne družbe v Siriji, Libiji, Jemnu, Afganistanu, Venezueli (in še bi lahko nadaljevali); erozija doseženih družbenih in političnih standardov v Turčiji, na Madžarskem, Poljskem in v zadnjem času v Italiji; grožnje in obljube, ki jih političnemu delovanju navadnih ljudi prinaša brexit kot politična katastrofa, katere cena je najmanj negotova – vsa ta in še druga vprašanja so bila na našem dnevnem redu, ko smo se sestali v Opatiji.

V času, ko nastaja pričujoči zapis, je tu orisano agendo dodatno zaostril dramatičen preobrat v globalni razpravi o okolju, kjer se je pojavilo vprašanje takojšnjega ukrepanja, ki je vsaj v tem trenutku v ospredju globalnega zanimanja brez običajnih praznih public (za kar so zaslužni predvsem Greta Thunberg in gibanja, kot je Fridays for Future). V tem smislu se zdi jasno, da so bile naše razprave na jadranski obali v Opatiji leta 2018 sicer koristne in produktivne, a očitno še vedno veliko premalo glede na zahteve, s katerimi se soočamo danes.

Na to se lahko odzovemo s frustracijo in upadlim pogumom. Oba občutka sta nam po napornih konferencah v zadnjih letih dobro znana, lahko pa trdimo, da sta tudi nujna in celo koristna. Spodbujata nas, da spremenimo sebe in svojo raziskovalno prakso. To, da lahko pogledamo nazaj z drugega zornega kota, krepi samokritiko in nam omogoča, da zaznamo, kaj je konsistentno in dobro, kaj je uporabno, kaj je informativno in tudi kaj je še nerazrešeno in predmet razprave.

Vloga izobraževanja in učenja odraslih v skupnostnih procesih se je spremenila ter se pod pritiski lokalnih in globalnih scenarijev, ki smo jih predhodno opisali, še naprej spreminja ter od nas zahteva, da razvijamo nove analize in zavzemamo nove pozicije, da bi jo lahko razumeli. Izobraževanje odraslih nas ne zanima samo kot vprašanje razvijanja veščin branja, pisanja, računanja in tako dalje oziroma pridobivanja kompetenc, s katerimi postanemo »zaposljivi«, čeprav seveda ni mogoče dvomiti o njihovi relativni pomembnosti. Kot že vemo (Evans, Kurantowicz in Lucio-Villegas, 2016, str. 2), lahko namreč izobraževanje in učenje odraslih razumemo kot proces, s katerim resnično pomagamo ljudem, da interpretirajo svet in ga spreminjajo, kar je splošnejša večina ključnega pomena za življenje posameznikov in skupnosti. Če smo sposobni prebrati družbeno realnost, to lahko spremeni vse. Ta tematska številka prinaša šest člankov, ki lahko služijo kot primeri resnično potrebnega dela, ki ga opravljajo raziskovalci v med seboj zelo različnih institucionalnih ali družbenih okoljih, da bi zagotovili vpogled in gradivo, brez katerega heterogenih učnih okolij, v katerih delujemo, ne moremo zadostno lokalno in globalno razumeti, preizprašati ali spremeniti.

ČLANKI

Prvi članek z naslovom *Univerzitetno poučevanje in učenje v izobraževalnih vedah: primer andragogike v Češki republiki*, ki sta ga napisala raziskovalca Filozofske fakultete na Univerzi Palackega v Olomucu na Češkem Jana Poláková Vašátková in Miroslav Dopita, se ukvarja s potjo, po kateri je šlo izobraževanje odraslih v čeških visokošolskih ustanovah in ki jo lahko vidimo kot reprezentativno za podobne izkušnje v drugih postkomunističnih državah Evrope. Avtorja zagovarjata tezo, da so deideologizacijo češkega visokega šolstva po letu 1990 spremljale še številne druge spremembe. V kontekstu lokalne in globalne izobraževalne politike članek predstavi tri obdobja v razvoju izobraževalnih ved, vključno z andragogiko, v češkem visokošolskem prostoru po letu 1990 in pokaže, kako spremembe vplivajo na kakovost poučevanja. V raziskovalnem delu se avtorja osredotočata na spremembe, ki jih povzročajo akterji, zlasti redni in izredni profesorji, ki so vpleteni v razvoj izobraževalnih ved na Češkem, od začetka 90. let dalje. Analiza polstrukturiranih intervjujev kaže, da so se spremembe v izobraževalnih vedah dogajale v kontekstu omejenega dostopa do tuje literature in pomembnih kadrovskih sprememb, vključno z vrnitvijo kvalificiranih znanstvenikov iz tujine. Napredek andragogike je na Češkem zahteval razvoj metodologije in kritični pristop k izobraževanju odraslih. Za posamezne znanstvenike je novi fokus pomenil, da so dali prednost raziskovanju pred poučevanjem, čeprav je bila za udeležence raziskave na splošno še vedno v ospredju interakcija s študenti.

V članku z naslovom *Ponovna opredelitev vseživljenjskega učenja: od trajnosti do generacijskih načinov učenja* Maria Bajner z Univerze v Pécsu na Madžarskem obravnava širšo sliko na področju zagotavljanja izobraževanja za odrasle, tokrat s perspektive ključnih diskurzov v programskih dokumentih, ki skozi desetletja oblikujejo ponudbo izobraževanj za odrasle. Namen prispevka je identificirati gonilne sile v ozadju humanističnih in utilitarističnih vidikov v nasprotujočih si pristopih organizacij UNESCO in OECD, hkrati pa obravnava tudi vlogo političnih posegov, ki so dodatno prispevali k nejasnosti relevantnih vprašanj. Avtorica s pomočjo analize dokumentov – študij in ugotovitev mednarodnih raziskav – osvetli ambivalentna stališča do pomena vseživljenjskega učenja, ki jih najdemo v dokumentih s področja izobraževanja. Ob tem zagovarja mnenje, da je za odpravo t. i. dvojnega govora, kot ga imenuje, potreben retorični premik od vseživljenjskega učenja h generacijskemu načinu učenja. Avtorica meni, da so izobraževalne potrebe mlajših generacij prepogosto preveč povezane z utilitarističnimi vrednotami in ekonomskimi pričakovanji brez vzporednic v izobraževalnih procesih. Kot pravi, lahko dvojnost pomena vseživljenjskega učenja prispeva k možnosti, da bodo službe, za katere se mlajši odrasli zdaj usposablajo, izginile, danes aktualni učni načrti in učna gradiva pa bodo lahko čez pet ali deset let neuporabni in zastareli. M. Bajner si prizadeva osvetliti ambivalentna stališča dokumentov organizacij UNESCO in OECD glede pomena vseživljenjskega učenja in opozoriti na premik h generacijskemu načinu učenja, ki po njenem mnenju umanjka v političnem diskurzu o izobraževanju odraslih.

Študent raziskovalec Jayakumar Chinnasamy in izredna profesorica na Pedagoški fakulteti Univerze zahodne Škotske v Veliki Britaniji Jeannie Daniels obravnavata pomen CTR za delo visokošolskih institucij v članku z naslovom *Vloga univerz in učiteljev pri razvijanju in uresničevanju ciljev trajnostnega razvoja*. Avtorja ugotavljata, da se od univerz in visokošolskih institucij v Veliki Britaniji pričakuje družbeno poslanstvo v smislu prispevanja k skupnemu dobremu v družbi, tako lokalno kot globalno. Te institucije zaradi globalnih sprememb v visokem šolstvu razvijajo različne politike, na primer na področju internacionalizacije in trajnostnega razvoja. S tem ko zasledujejo cilje UNESCA, imajo pomembno vlogo pri postavljanju CTR in njihovem doseganju s pomočjo poučevanja, raziskovanja in drugih dejavnosti. Vendar pa je učinkovito zagotavljanje praks trajnostnega razvoja odvisno od učiteljev, ki so neposredno vključeni v proces povezovanja med študenti in skupnostjo. Avtorja poudarjata, da v praksi učitelji nimajo povsod besede pri razvoju politik, kar vpliva na njihovo sposobnost delovanja. Ta raziskava, ki se osredotoča na visoko šolstvo na Škotskem, ugotavlja, kako učitelji dojemajo internacionalizacijo v visokem šolstvu, kako je ta koncept zastavljen in udejanjen na tamkajšnjih univerzah ter kako – če sploh – ti učitelji sodelujejo pri oblikovanju politik. Članek zagovarja mnenje, da se potencial, ki ga imajo učitelji (zlasti v visokem šolstvu) pri razvoju CTR, ne upošteva dovolj.

Cora Lindsay in Renata Seredyńska-Abou-Eid, Pedagoška fakulteta Univerze v Nottinghamu, Velika Britanija, se v članku *Odziv na potrebe po jezikovni podpori za priseljence in begunce v East Midlands, Velika Britanija* dotikata osrednjega problema, s katerim se soočajo lokalne skupnosti in njihove institucije zaradi čedalje bolj perečih globalnih kritičnih situacij, ki so pogosto zgodovinsko ali geografsko povsem brez povezave z državo gostiteljico in pod vplivom zgolj najbolj škodljivih mehanizmov globalizacije v najslabši možni obliki. Jasno je, da je za priseljence in begunce jezik ključen za sporazumevanje z uradniki, urejanje zaposlitve, uporabo zdravstvenih storitev in relativno dobro počutje v novem okolju. Kljub temu v regiji East Midlands ni enotnega pristopa k zagotavljanju jezikovne podpore priseljencem in beguncem pri učenju angleščine. Članek obravnava trenutno urejenost jezikovne pomoči tem skupnostim in ugotavlja, kje v zadnjih letih zaradi zmanjšanja javnih sredstev nastajajo vrzeli. Temelji na doktorski raziskavi mešanih metod, katere cilj je bil identificirati jezikovne potrebe poljske skupnosti v regiji, in prinaša opis pobude Univerze v Nottinghamu, s katero želi ta zapolniti vrzel v zagotavljanju pouka angleščine za odrasle govorce drugih jezikov, tako priseljence kot begunce, v Nottinghamu in okolici.

Amira Khattab (Dark Matter LLC in Državna univerza v Michiganu) in David Wong (izredni profesor na Pedagoški fakulteti Državne univerze v Michiganu) v članku *Združevanje zahodnih in arabskih praks razvoja vodstvenih kompetenc: primer izziva premostitve razlik globalnih in lokalnih pogledov na učenje odraslih* razpravljata o izbirah, s katerimi se soočajo družbe zunaj Zahoda (pri čemer je treba dodati, da gre za postkolonialne in skoraj brez izjeme avtoritarne družbe), ko se poskušajo prilagoditi mednarodnim izobraževalnim ciljem in jih izpolniti. Avtorja zagovarjata tezo, da ob problemu premalo

kvalificirane delovne sile arabske države iščejo rešitev v zahodnih pogledih na izobraževanje odraslih. Vendar pa, kot pišeta, zahodnih praks ni mogoče implementirati brez upoštevanja kulture določenega območja. Cilj te obsežne študije A. Khattab in D. Wonga je bil identificirati najboljše prakse razvoja vodstvenih kompetenc za arabske učeče se odrasle in raziskati, kako bi se te prakse najbolje vključile v lokalne kulturne kontekste. Da bi ugotovila, katere prakse so učinkovite za arabske vodilne delavce, sta po delfski metodi anketirala 24 strokovnjakov na področju izobraževanja vodilnih delavcev. Dodatno sta intervjuvala osem strokovnjakov in anketirala 1.500 vodilnih delavcev v poslovnem svetu iz 17 držav. Z uporabo hierarhičnega linearnega modeliranja (HLM) sta proučila kazalnike odnosov tako na ravni posameznika kot na ravni države. Ugotovitve kažejo, da je treba prakse izobraževanja odraslih »prilagoditi« ter tako razrešiti trenja med globalnimi in lokalnimi vidiki. Predhodne izkušnje z zahodnimi praksami so enako pomembne, vendar pa lahko izkušnja tradicionalnega šolanja povzroči močan odpor do nepoznanih idej in praks.

Posebej bi lahko razpravljali o dejstvu, da avtorja pri analizi pogostih pomanjkljivosti visokega šolstva v arabskih družbah uporabljata dobro znane, a tudi močno sporne sheme, ki jih je razvil Hofstede (te se kot hitre kulturne »rešitve« površno uporabljajo tako rekoč povsod). Po drugi strani A. Khattab in D. Wong zelo dobro predstavita, kaj zagovarja prevladujoča struja v poklicnem izobraževanju in kadrovskem razvoju, in na tem mestu zastavita koristno izhodišče za nadaljnjo pomembno razpravo.

Primerno je, da ta tematski nabor prispevkov zaokroža članek Emilia Lucio-Villegasa z Univerze v Sevilji, Španija, z naslovom *Preveč večerov. Učenje demokracije na podlagi participativnega proračunskega postopka*. Lucio-Villegas razmišlja o izkušnjah povezovanja izobraževanja odraslih z državljanstvom in participacijo. Ne preseneča, da je avtor, eden od ustanoviteljev raziskovalne mreže BGL-ALC, prepričan, da je državljanstvo neločljivo povezano z družbeno pravičnostjo in družbeno inkluzivnostjo. V članku zagovarja mnenje, da je ključni element državljanstva sodelovanje pri javnih vprašanjih, ki zadevajo življenje v skupnosti, da bi se tako med ljudmi ustvarili enakopravni odnosi. Participacijo tu poveže z enkratno izkušnjo: eksperimentom s participativnim proračunom v Sevilji med letoma 2003 in 2007. Prek participativnega raziskovanja in podrobne obravnave namenskih učnih gradiv raziskuje te specifične izkušnje v okviru izobraževanja odraslih. Ne nazadnje v članku razmišlja o posledicah teh izkušenj za emancipacijsko izobraževanje odraslih, katerega cilj je poučevanje in učenje demokracije.

MOSTOVI ALI VRZELI?

Tukaj zbrani prispevki bolj ali manj kažejo zamrznjeno sliko raziskovalnih praks v času, ko so bili predstavljeni na konferenci. To nikakor ni splošno reprezentativna slika raziskovalnih praks in metodologij na področju učenja oziroma izobraževanja odraslih, vseživljenjskega učenja in sorodnih področij. Dejansko so preveč vezani na institucije in nacionalne države, da bi lahko predstavljali področje v celoti. Konferenca je pritegnila vrsto

prispevkov zelo različnih raziskovalcev iz celotne Evrope, katerih raziskovalna zanimanja se zrcalijo v teoretičnih usmeritvah in širših metodoloških vidikih. Tako gre v prvi vrsti za zelo evropski nabor pogledov, problemov, vprašanj, motivacij in rešitev. Ta zanimanja so nadalje introspektivna (razpravljanje o univerzitetnih politikah, razvoju, zgodovini, profesionalni identiteti), institucionalna (univerza in njena pedagogika) in osredotočena na politike (financiranje, regulacija, izpeljava, rezultati), raziskovalni diskurz in metodološka motivacija pa se osredotočata na analize, usmerjene k rezultatom. V prispevkih – in to drži tudi za dva od treh tematsko odprtih člankov v številki – je v razpravi razvidna jasna nagnjenost k razlaganju, opisovanju in primerjanju. Raba analize dokumentov na primer ni podprta s teoretičnim okvirom, v katerem bi identificirali pomembne vsebine oziroma ki bi omogočal dekonstrukcijo teh vsebin. Uporaba ključnih dokumentov ostaja dekontekstualizirana. Dokazna podpora je predstavljena brez kontekstualne opore v smislu teoretično reprezentativnega korpusa – naj bo ta še tako omejen – ali teoretične utemeljitve. Tudi drugje najdemo teoretične pristope – na primer vključevanje pripovedi v raziskovalno metodologijo – zgolj v obrisih, prispevki se pogosto zanašajo na nepodprte trditve glede analitičnega potenciala in podajajo malo ali sploh nič podrobnosti o izvajanju različnih analiz (narativna analiza, analiza vsebine, analiza fokusnih skupin, kulturni konstrukti, kot je na primer »oddaljenost moči«, in tako dalje) in o tem, kaj lahko same po sebi prispevajo k raziskavi ali drugim raziskovalnim dejavnostim. Prav tako najdemo zelo razširjeno prakso zbiranja podatkov o posameznikih ali skupinah (pogost format so tu fokusne skupine), ti pa se nato citirajo brez konteksta in so dejansko uporabljeni kot ugodno dokazno gradivo brez neugodnih pomislekov, zaradi katerih so kvalitativni podatki pogosto pod vprašajem (in prav je, da so), čeprav so še pogostejše alternative, kot na primer povzemanje in prosta interpretacija velikih količin resničnih pričevanj. Čeprav v omejenem obsegu, je svetla izjema med tu zbranimi prispevki uporaba transkribiranih besedil v izvirni poljščini z angleškim prevodom (gl. Lindsay in Sereďyńska-Abou-Eid).

Seveda gre pri tej kritiki ravno toliko kot za kritiko člankov tudi za kritiko samega formata konferenčnega prispevka in konferenčne publikacije v obliki predelanih člankov. Pri delu se soočamo z omejitvami – financiranje, priznanje kolegov, časovna omejitev predstavitve, štetje besed, recenzije in tako dalje. Številne med temi omejitvami so koristne, nekatere so zaželene, vse so neizogibne. Pogosto se dogaja, da pregled literature prevlada nad analizo raziskovalnih podatkov, saj format članka daje raziskovalcu dovolj prostora za povzemanje in zgoščanje, ne pa dovolj za razpravljanje in izzivalnost. To dejstvo lahko obžalujemo, vendar pa si moramo hkrati priznati, da je počasnost pri razlaganju in predstavljanju del naše prakse, ki zasluži kritično pozornost.

Če povzamemo, je torej nesporno, da se pri tu zbranih člankih pojavljajo pomembne metodološke vrzeli. Ne glede na to imajo v reviji svoj prostor, saj prinašajo zgodovinski vpogled in predstavljajo izkušnje, ki so pomemben most do vseh drugih, ki se ukvarjamo z raziskovanjem, in do naših raziskav.

Leta 2018 smo razpravljali o CTR in omejitvah politik. Tu predstavljeni avtorji obravnavajo tako vprašanja osrednjega pomena, ki presegajo lokalno raven, kot tista, ki imajo sicer

korenine v globalni sferi, a se umeščajo v lokalne izkušnje in ob tem pomembno vplivajo na posameznike in skupnosti. Upamo lahko, da raznoliki pristopi, ki jih uporabljajo ti prispevki, prinašajo orodja za pomoč pri razbiranju izkušenj, ki so in bodo še naprej izzivi v našem delovnem okolju in raziskovanju.

Poleg šestih tematskih člankov pričujoča številka vključuje tudi tri tematsko odprte članke, poročilo in knjižno recenzijo. V članku *Izkušnje učiteljev v javnem šolstvu s prodornim učenjem* avtorja Davin J. Carr-Chellman in Michael Kroth z Univerze v Idahu, ZDA, razpravljata o vlogi »učitelja kot vseživljenjsko učečega se«, navedeta značilnosti prodornega učenja in učečih se ter skozi poglobljeno fokusno raziskavo, v kateri so sodelovali učitelji v javnem šolstvu, analizirata, kako učitelji dojemajo udeležence in izkušnjo prodornega učenja. Drugi prispevek, *Pismenost odraslih in temeljne izobraževalne politike s primerjalne perspektive: ugotovitve iz štirih držav*, Alexandre Ioannidou in Carolin Knauber z nemškega Inštituta za izobraževanje odraslih (DIE) raziskuje interakcijo med političnimi enotami, politiko in posameznimi politikami na področju opismenjevanja in osnovnega šolstva za odrasle, pri čemer se avtorici opirata na kvalitativne podatke iz mednarodnega primerjalnega projekta, ki je proučeval politike osnovnega šolstva v različnih državah in predstavil ugotovitve za štiri države: Avstrijo, Dansko, Turčijo in Veliko Britanijo. V tretjem tematsko odprtem prispevku *Koncepti kakovosti v evalvacijskih praksah v visokem šolstvu: instrumentalizacija relativistične kakovosti* Jernej Širok (NAKVIS) obravnava koncept kakovosti v visokem šolstvu in na podlagi analize evalvacijskih poročil za 486 študijskih programov, kar pomeni 49 % vseh akreditiranih študijskih programov v Sloveniji, zagovarja mnenje, da kakovost ne zasleduje višjih idealov univerze, temveč namesto tega sistematično potiska visoko šolstvo na področje ekonomskih in pravnih odnosov ter ga prilagaja gospodarskim interesom. Številko zaključujeta poročilo iz prakse *20 let online učenja na DOBI* Jasne Dominko Baloh in ocena knjige *Položaj marginalizovanih grupa u društvu*, ki jo je pripravila Aleksandra Šindić.

Rob Evans

LITERATURA

Evans, R., Kurantowicz, E. in Lucio-Villegas, E. (ur.) (2016). *Researching & Transforming Adult Learning & Communities. The local-global context*. Rotterdam: Sense.