FLLLEX – The Impact of Lifelong Learning Strategies on Professional Higher Education in Europe: Survey of Expectations of Lifelong Learners and Businesses – Report

FLLLEX – The Impact of Lifelong Learning strategies on Professional Higher Education in Europe: Survey of Expectations of Lifelong Learners and Businesses – Report

Authors
Stefan Humpl, Barbara Kölbl, Karin Kuchler, Sigrid Nindl, Andreas Schranz

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Introduction

1.1 Basic informations about the project FLLLEX

The objective of the project is to identify challenges and implications of LifeLong Learning (LLL) incorporation into European higher education institutions (HEI's), with special attention given to the recognition of prior learning and to different aspects of the management and services within higher education institutions. HEI's remain a preferential partner in most countries for the governing bodies responsible to implement the national goals of LLL. HEI's have a particular role to fulfil in the landscape of lifelong learners, businesses and business training providers. The project would like to assess this role within the wider landscape of LLL, as determined by the national policies and as perceived by the institutions themselves.

The approach focusses on a system analysis of professional higher education habits within different European countries. The focus is on an institutional rather than on a policy level and attention is given to the comparison among practices in LLL education across the European Union. The project takes into account challenges in implementing a LLL strategy (mainly for HEI's) and examples of good practice and will finish with generalizations and policy recommendations.

Assessing the impact of LLL on HEI's started with an overview of the different strategies concerning LLL, assembling policies and expectations in the concerned countries. This is done in Work Package 1 "National and European policies for the implementation of LLL". Definitions on lifelong learners were provided for the further project.

On the basis of the overview of the different strategies concerning LLL, a survey was conducted: The survey targeted on gaining knowledge on the expectations of important stakeholders in LLL: the learners (Work Package 2: "Survey of expectations of Lifelong Learners"), the businesses (Work Package 3: "Survey of expectations of businesses") and the business training providers / higher education institutions (Work Package 4: "Survey of the (business) training providers") were asked about their motives and/or barriers to engage in LLL. Differences and matching goals in relation to the national policies shall be identified on the basis of those results shall be identified. This information serves HEI's in better defining their role within the LLL landscape.

In order to assess if the HEI's match up with the expectations of the different stakeholders, a self-assessment tool was prepared in Work Package 5 "Development of a self-assessment tool", based on the crucial indicators for LLL as defined by the other stakeholders in the survey. It focusses on policy, curricular aspects (design, flexibility), management of programmes, RPL, internal processes (academic – administrative), student counselling, quality assurance, and others if identified during the process. The results of the self-assessment (as carried out by each institutional partner in Work Package 6: „Self-assessment of the Higher Education Institutions") are reviewed by a panel of experts, one of whom is connected to a policy-making body within the concerned country. This is Work Package 7 („Review of the self-assessment"). The

goals of the last three work packages are to provide benchmarking for the individual institutions, to test the tool before further dissemination in Europe and to gather information for broader policy proposals of LLL. On the basis of those results a package (including self-assessment tool, good practices and policy advise) is developed which will be distributed by the national organisations in the consortium among their members (Work Package 8: „Focus seminar on LLL strategies"). The overall management of the project is carried out from within Work Package 9 („Project management").

The FLLLEX project is an EU funded project within the framework of the Transversal Programme. It has started in January 2010 and will run until the end of August 2012. The project was initiated and is supported by EURASHE, the project coordinator is KHLeuven – Leuven University College. The consortium includes 24 partners from 10 European countries. The project is supported by a grant within the EU funded Lifelong Learning Programme. You can discover further information on the FLLLEX project at its website: www.flllex.eu.

In this report the results of the surveys of expectations of Lifelong Learners (WP2) and Businesses (WP3) will be presented and discussed in the context of relevant literature.

1.2 Survey of expectations of Lifelong Learners (Work Package 2)

A survey and an outline of the expectations of potential and existing learners was made in view of Life Long Learning. The WP started by drafting a typology of lifelong learners based on an extensive literature research. Several target groups of lifelong learners were identified. A survey of expectations of Lifelong Learners was conducted. The expectations of those different groups towards LLL were listed and compared to the matrices which summarize the national policies.

Both the typology of learners and the expectations will determine the make-up and the choice of indicators of the self-assessment tool in Work Package 5 because HEI's will have to identify to which type of lifelong learners they wish to cater their activities. This choice will influence the policy, management and structure of the concerned institution.

1.3 Survey of expectations of Businesses (Work Package 3)

In the context of Work Package 3 a survey was made of the expectations of a selected number of businesses and enterprises. As they form the second leg in the triangle of learners, enterprises and educational organisations, (being both HEI's and business training providers) their input was necessary to evaluate the impact of existing strategies of LLL programmes. A questionnaire was developed. Elements which were con-

sidered are: e.g. training of staff dealing with work placements, Work Based Learning, relation between vocational training – work placements – businesses. Interviews were conducted via telephone and data will also be collected via a questionnaire.

The outcome is this report identifying the main obstacles for businesses to engage in the LLL programme, the major driving forces for a business to participate in LLL, the main expectations businesses have of the LLL programme and their relation with HEI's.

2 Description of Lifelong Learning Market within the partner countries

2.1 Introduction

This Chapter presents a summary of the results presented in WP11 which comprised a meta-analysis of policies and statistical information on lifelong learning adult participation and higher education in the European Union in general and the countries investigated in FLLLLEX in particular, i.e., Ireland, Belgium (Flanders) Lithuania, UK (Scotland), Turkey, Finland, the Netherlands and France.

Lifelong learning has not been clearly defined so far.[2] According to the OECD, the four main aspects of the concept are a systemic view, the centrality of the learner, the motivation to learn and multiple objectives of education policy.[3] Stakeholders of lifelong learning are individuals, employers and the community.[4]

2.2 Lifelong learning and the European Union

Lifelong learning was made the core principle of EU education and training policy-making in 1997 in the Amsterdam revision of the Maastricht Treaty.[5] With the Lisbon Strategy of 2000 it was made part of the bigger scope of both economic and social EU policy. Lifelong learning therein became the necessary precondition for the knowledge-based type of economy and society the EU has been aiming at since then. Along with it the Open Method of Coordination was introduced which heralded the beginning of greater involvement into member state policy making by the EU. The Memorandum on Lifelong Learning issued the same year brought forth an EU definition of lifelong learning comprising all learning experiences in an individual's life to social, civic or employment ends.[6] The latter, however, were given precedence over social and personal ends.[7]

The Leuven/Louvaine-la-Neuve Declaration 2009 stresses the importance of Lifelong Learning as part of the social dimension of the European Higher Education area's ongoing reform. The need for partnerships between institutions, students and employers is stated explicitly.[8] The EUA Prague Declaration 2009 explicitly addresses the necessity to integrate potential tertiary students in conjunction with enterprises as part of broad-scale political efforts against the current economic crisis: „Tapping unused po-

---

1 Stokes, Ann, und Richard Thorn. *Flllex Work Package 1: National Policies for the Implementation of Lifelong Learning.* Dublin: Institutes of Technology Ireland.
2 p. 10
3 p. 9
4 p. 10
5 p. 28
6 p. 29
7 p. 30
8 Leuven/Louvaine-la-Neuve Communiqué (2009), p. 3

tential: through commitment, implementation and financing of lifelong learning across Europe to meet the goals set out in the European Universities' Charter on Lifelong Learning, to provide additional retraining and up-skilling while also reaching out to those who wish to enter higher education for the first time. This requires working together with both governments and business to develop and fund appropriate incentive measures, for example through redirecting unemployment benefits into covering the costs of people going back to universities. At European level structural/social funds should also be used to support such measures".[9] This is reinforced by naming the widening of participation, and thus the implementation of lifelong learning, as the first of 10 proposed success factors for European Universities.[10] Last but not least, the need for universities to embrace enterprises as partners in higher education, and taking all partners' needs into account in the development of new curricula, is also cited as a success factor.[11]

EURASHE's Statement for the Leuven Conference 2009 also underlines the necessity of identifying both students and enterprises (amongst others[12]) as stakeholders. They note that while in this is already implemented in Quality Assurance, said stakeholders also begin to be regarded in governance structure as well as the development of curricula.[13] Furthermore, EURASHE address lifelong learning as part of the social dimension of the European higher education reform, in spite of defining „youngsters" as their primary target student group.[14] The commitment to Lifelong Learning as integral principle of professional higher education was reiterated in 2010, however, the stakeholder approach to managing the needs of institutions, students and employers alike was not addressed again.[15]

2.3 Lifelong learning in Ireland

Tertiary education in the Republic of Ireland is provided by seven universities and 14 institutes of technology as well as several private colleges. Awarding for HEIs other than universities and the Dublin Institute of Technology lies with the Higher Education lies with the Higher Education and Training Awards Council HETAC.[16]

Irish policy-making regarding lifelong learning has been vast and is accompanied by funding programs, its main aim being social inclusion by education and the support of lifelong learning in a broader context. There is a Minister for State within the Department of Education and Science responsible for Adult Education and Educational Disadvantage.[17]

---

9 EUA Prague Declaration (2009), p. 5 (author's emphasis).
10 EUA Prague Declaration (2009), p. 6.
11 EUA Prague Declaration (2009), p. 7.
12 In this statement EURASHE identify non-profits as employers along with enterprises.
13 EURASHE Statement (2009), p. 2.
14 EURASHE Statement (2009), p. 4.
15 EURASHE 10 Commitments (2010), p. 3-4.
16 Stokes/Thorn, p. 52.
17 p. 52.

Table 2.1

Lifelong learning: Ireland, EU Average, EU Benchmarks

	Ireland		EU Average		EU Benchmarks	
	2000	2008	2000	2008	2010	2020
Early leavers from education and training (age 18-24)	14.6%**18**	11.3%	17.6%	14.9%	10%	10%
Higher Education attainment (age 30-34)	27.5%	46.1%	22.4%	31.1%	-	40%
Adult participation in lifelong learning (age 25-64; 4 weeks period)	5.9%**19**	7.1%	8.5%**20**	9.5%	12.5%	15%
Investment in Education (Public spending on educ, % of GDP)	4.28%	4.86%**21**	4.91%	5.05%**22**	-	-

Source: CEC, 2009b

Of the rising number of participants in higher education, 7% took part-time courses in 2006. The number of mature students (defined as 23 years of age or older) has risen from 1.6% in 1986 to 12.8% in 2006; the Higher Education Authority of Ireland (HEA) estimates that 24% of all beginning students in 2006 entered by non-standard route. In 2008 the National Access Office published the *National Plan for Equity of Access to Higher Education 2008-2013 set objectives for mature students to make up 27% of all higher education entrants by 2013, and the for 30% to enter higher education by non-standard route.***23**

2.3.1 Gaps

Funding remains inadequate. While participation in higher education in Ireland has increased significantly, several groups of potential students remain underrepresented according to the Bologna Progress Report 2008, particularly regarding students with a low socio-economic background, mature students, special needs students and students from ethnic minorities. Another gap is the *lack of flexibility* of access and forms of learning; especially the absence of part-time programs constitutes a major barrier for the target groups of Irish higher education policy. *Progression in NFQ*, that is, the mobility between further education and ISCED level 6 or from ISCED 6 to ISCED 7 respectively, is also limited. In connection to this is the *limited recognition of prior learning.* Lastly *legislation* is another difficult area as Ireland does not have a legal base for paid educational leave.**24**

2.4 Lifelong learning in Belgium (Flanders)

Higher Education in Flanders is provided by universities and Higher Education Colleges (HEC) named Hogescholen. Academic bachelor degrees are awarded by both, whereas professional bachelor degrees are awarded by hogescholen only. Non-tertiary

---

18 = 2002.
19 = 2003.
20 = 2003.
21 = 2006.
22 = 2006.
23 Stokes/Thorn p. 53.
24 p. 57-58.

adult education is divided into adult basic education (offered by Centers for Adult Basic Education CBEs), secondary adult education and higher vocational education (offered by Centers for Adult Education CVOs). Along with CVOs, HECs offer continuing non-degree education as well as re-employment agencies. Non-formal and informal learning is acknowledged within the framework of the Socio-Cultural Education Strategy in the area of the Recognition of acquired competences. Policy making is situated with the Higher Education Policy Unit and the Project Strategic Education and Training Policy within the Flemish Ministry of Education and Training.[25]

Flemish conceptualization of lifelong learning is based on the international understanding of lifelong learning as an integration of all learning experiences. It is however expanded by the notion of "lifewide" learning that indicates an end to learning beyond utilitarist or economic means.[26]

Table 2.2

Lifelong learning: Belgium, EU Average, EU Benchmarks

	Belgium		EU Average		EU Benchmarks	
	2000	2008	2000	2008	2010	2020
Early leavers from education and training (age 18-24)	13.8%	12.0%	17.6%	14.9%	10%	10%
Higher Education attainment (age 30-34)	35.2%	42.9%	22.4%	31.1%	-	40%
Adult participation in lifelong learning (age 25-64; 4 weeks period)	8.6%[27]	6.8%	8.5%	9.5%	12.5%	15%
Investment in Education (Public spending on educ, % of GDP)	6.0%[28]	6.0%	4.91%	5.05%[29]	-	-

Source: CEC, 2009b

Unlike most of the European Union, participation rates in lifelong learning have declined in recent years. Which is partly due to especially the Flemish demographic make-up of a decreasing number of people aged 15-65. However within the workforce participation is low as well. The OECD reported in 2008 that 3.9% of low-skilled workers, 8.6% of mid-skilled and 18% of highly skilled Flemish people took part in training. [30]

The Pact 2020 signed by the Flemish government and social partners in 2008 states that the participation of adults aged 25 to 64 years old is to be increased to 15% by 2020. The National Action Plan for Social Inclusion issued by the government of Belgium 2008-2010 sets a focus on raising the participation in lifelong learning also, especially regarding people with little initial training. Financial allowances for further training include paid educational leave paid by employers backed up by a fund, regardless of whether the education pursued is or is not connected to the students' occupation. Furthermore, within an entrepreneurial portfolio system, small and medium sized enterprises can attain up to EUR 5000 in government funding for training, mentoring and education if they cover 50% of the costs. Lastly, employees in Flanders can purchase training vouchers that cover 50% of programs offered by recognized provid-

---

[25] p. 62-63.
[26] p. 63.
[27] = 2004.
[28] = 2001.
[29] = 2006.
[30] p. 64.

ers up to a cap of EUR 250. Financial Allowance in regards to higher education include low tuition fees and financial incentives for HEIs to enroll and graduate a higher number of grant recipients.[31]

2.4.1 Gaps

Even though *funding* has been addressed in recent policy development, inadequate funding continues to be a barrier – the majority of students in continuous education are sponsored by their employers rather than by public means. While the *recognition of prior learning* is well established on legislative level, students seem to be uninformed about RPL. *Participation* of adult learners is also hindered by the difficulty of combining work, family and study. Particularly underrepresented groups in the higher education include people from the lower socio-economic strata, low-skilled migrants and migrant families, special needs students and men in the first cycle of higher education. The OECD reported in 2008 that people with a low level of education and people over 50 years of age received only 23.7% or 19.7 % of training vouchers respectively ion 2006.

2.5 Lifelong learning in Lithuania

Higher education in Lithuania is provided by 15 state as well as 7[32] non-state universities and 13 state as well as 11[33] non-state colleges of higher education. There are 63 general education schools for adults as well as 78 vocational schools and 10 labour market training centers offering continuous education for adults. Responsibility in policy making lies with the Ministry of Education and Science as well as, in part, with the Ministry of Social Security and Labour.[34]

Table 2.3

Lifelong learning: Lithuania, EU Average, EU Benchmarks

	Lithuania		EU Average		EU Benchmarks	
	2000	2008	2000	2008	2010	2020
Early leavers from education and training (age 18-24)	16.5%	7.4	17.6%	14.9%	10%	10%
Higher Education attainment (age 30-34)	42.6%	39.9%	22.4%	31.1%	-	40%
Adult participation in lifelong learning (age 25-64; 4 weeks period)	5.9%[35]	4.9%	8.5%[36]	9.5%	12.5%	15%
Investment in Education (Public spending on educ, % of GDP)	5.90%	4.84%[37]	4.91%	5.05%[38]	-	-

Source: CEC, 2009

Participation in lifelong learning in Lithuania is comparatively low in regard to the EU-average, as is public funding in education. The Ministry of Education and Science

[31] p. 66-68.
[32] In 2009/10.
[33] In 2009/10.
[34] p. 72.
[35] = 2004.
[36] = 2003.
[37] = 2006.
[38] = 2006.

reports that in 2008 every fourth resident held higher education, and furthermore that 79% of graduates from general education and 7% of graduates form vocational schools enrolled in HEIs. Demographic development in Lithuania has been negative insofar that deaths have been outnumbering births since 1994 and migration from Lithuania is high. Part-time education, on the other hand, represents an expanding field with 40% of all students taking extramural and 6% of students attending evening classes. Non-formal education too was at the high percentage of 55 in 2008.[39]

The National Strategy of Lithuania from 2003 aims 60% of Lithuanian youth to acquire higher education by 2012. Life-long learning has been defined within the Strategy for Ensuring Lifelong learning in 2008. Its focus is on the development of an integrated an efficient system of lifelong learning aimed at better employability, integration into society and an improved quality of life.[40]

Financial support is offered in the form of tax of tax relief on income tax for students and for money spent on education costs by employers in regions with high unemployment rates. Funding for students in higher education is offered in form of student's basket which can be taken to any HEI of the student's choice; quotas for student's baskets are set by the Ministry of Education. Eligibility for the basket is based on the candidates grades and qualifications as well as priorities. Students not eligible are offered state-guaranteed loans.[41]

2.5.1 Gaps

Participation in lifelong learning continues to be low in Lithuania. Barriers are constituted by limited societal integration and a first tongue other than Lithuanian in regard to ethnic minorities. Furthermore, people living in cities participate more than people in rural areas, and women do so more than men. The *recognition of prior learning* is not systematized within Lithuania's higher education framework. *Funding* is provided mostly by the government thus lacking diversification. Also, lifelong learning activities offered by HEIs are subject to payments as they are considered services. *Qualifications* of the Lithuanian people do not match their labour market's demands while lifelong learning is still comparatively underdeveloped. In policy-making, lifelong learning continues to be a *transversional* in that it is not made central to policy but rather placed as addition.[42]

2.6 Lifelong learning in Scotland

Higher Education in Scotland is provided by 14 universities and 6 other institutions. Further education is offered by 43 public colleges in Scotland that cover both vocational and non-vocational education as well as, within limits higher education courses.[43]

[39] p. 73-74.
[40] p. 75.
[41] p. 76-77.
[42] p. 77-79.
[43] p. 82.

Political responsibility for education lies with the First Minister for Scotland while day-to-day operations are placed with the Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning with support by the Minister for Children and Young People and the Minister for Schools and Skills. Higher Education funding is organized by the Scottish Funding Council. The definition of lifelong learning in Scotland is multifaceted and both driven by economic purposes and social inclusion as well as personal development.[44]

Table 2.4

Lifelong learning: United Kingdom, EU Average, EU Benchmarks

	United Kingdom		EU Average		EU Benchmarks	
	2000	2008	2000	2008	2010	2020
Early leavers from education and training (age 18-24)	18.2%	17.0%	17.6%	14.9%	10%	10%
Higher Education attainment (age 30-34)	29.0%	39.7%	22.4$	31.1%	-	40%
Adult participation in lifelong learning (age 25-64; 4 weeks period)	27.2%[45]	19.9%[46]	8.5%[47]	9.5%	12.5%	15%
Investment in Education (Public spending on educ, % of GDP)	4.46%	5.48%[48]	4.91%	5.05%[49]	-	-

Source: CEC, 2009

Participation rates in lifelong learning in the UK[50] are twice as high than the EU-average but have not progressed since 2000; higher education attainment is also comparatively high. In Scotland, the number of entrant students in higher education increased by 4.8% in 2008/09. 82% of all student are part-time. The population of Scotland is both growing older and becoming smaller, and the OECD expects this development to continue over the next few decades.[51]

Funding is aimed at widening social access to higher education especially. Tuition and Graduate Endowment fees have been abolished. HEIs are offered financial incentives for enrolling part-time students and students from deprived backgrounds. Part-time students are also granted tuition waivers and there is a grant to encourage access to universities from colleges.[52]

2.6.1 Gaps

Participation in higher education by people from deprived areas and men is comparatively low. Only 12% of the entire student population of Scotland come from the most deprived 20% of the entire population. The *recognition of prior* learning is practiced mostly in the newly founded universities rather than traditional ones and serve

---

[44] p. 82.
[45] = 2003.
[46] = break.
[47] = 2003.
[48] = 2006.
[49] = 2006.
[50] There are no separate figures regarding the Scottish education system available from the EU.
[51] p. 83-84.
[52] p. 86-87.

for gaining credit rather than as entry route. Lastly, the *Scottish government approach* sets a bigger emphasis on the human approach than on social inclusion.[53]

2.7 Lifelong learning in Turkey

Higher education in Turkey is provided by 146 universities 95 of which are state funded and 51 by non-profit organizations, higher technology institutes and vocational higher schools, which are independent. While admission to higher education is dependent on passing the centralized entrance examination, distance learning is offered by the Anadolu University without this premise. The Turkish degree system features a vocational degree (associate degree diploma) that is awarded upon a 2 year cycle in vocational higher schools. 36 Universities offer continuous education programs.[54]

Political responsibility for education lies with the Ministry of National Education. Higher education is governed by the Council for Higher Education. Lifelong learning also involves other institutions both public and private. Lifelong learning as a governing principle is still a very new concept in Turkey. Evening education programs are offered by most universities. Distance education is offered by 14 universities in the area of short cycle degrees and 16 universities offer distance programs on graduate level.[55]

Table 2.5

Lifelong learning: Turkey, EU Average, EU Benchmarks

	Turkey		EU Average		EU Benchmarks	
	2000	2008	2000	2008	2010	2020
Early leavers from education and training (age 18-24)	59.3%	46.6%	17.6%	14.9%	10%	10%
Higher Education attainment (age 30-34)	-	12.4%	22.4%	31.1%	-	40%
Adult participation in lifelong learning (age 25-64; 4 weeks period)	1.8%[56]	1.8%	8.5%[57]	9.5%	12.5%	15%
Investment in Education (Public spending on educ, % of GDP)	2.59%	2.86%[58]	4.91%	5.05%[59]	-	-

Source: CEC, 2009

Overall education attainment levels are comparatively low in Turkey. In higher education the enrollment rate was 18.8% in 2005/06. Adult participation in lifelong learning is at only 1.8%. The population of Turkey is very young compared to other European countries; by 2020 70% are projected to be of working age.[60]

---

[53] p. 88-89.
[54] p. 92.
[55] p. 93.
[56] = 2006.
[57] = 2003.
[58] = 2006.
[59] = 2006.
[60] p. 93-94.

While no higher education student in Turkey is exempt from tuition fees financial support is offered to students from middle or low income backgrounds in form of a centralized state grant and loan system which is both need and merit based.**61**

2.7.1 Gaps

Turkey is subject to a vast *East-West divide* with its rural East being disadvantaged economically, education wise and in regards to employment rates which is a barrier to the nationwide implementation of lifelong learning. Several new universities established in all parts of the country are hoped to further regional development. *Stakeholder involvement* in Turkey is limited by the relatively small civil sector with few non-governmental organizations. *Participation rates* are very low with 60% of the workforce having at the most graduated from basic education. Access to basic education is limited by gender, geographic and socioeconomic background, with the overall illiteracy rate at 12.5%, 4.7% of men and 20.1% of women. Turkey lacks a framework for the *recognition of prior learning. Funding* of HEI's is mostly by the state and thus lacks diversification. Furthermore, there is a much higher *demand of highly educated persons* in Turkey than the education system provides for. Lastly the *quality of vocational higher schools* in Turkey is poor.**62**

2.8 Lifelong learning in Finland

Higher education in Finland is provided by 16 universities, 25 universities of applied sciences. Universities are mostly state funded whereas most universities of applied sciences are financed municipally or privately. Access routes include the matriculation examination, a post-secondary level vocational qualification, a at least three-year vocational qualification or a degree from a Finnish University of Applied Science. Admission to universities of applied sciences hinges on completing upper secondary education or vocational education and training. Adult education is offered on all levels, most of which takes place in liberal education institutions offering language and ICT courses as well as upper secondary schools for adults.**63**

Political responsibility lies with the Ministry of Education in conjunction with the Finnish National Board of Education. Lifelong learning is defined as guiding principle of education it is however focused on economic growth.**64**

61 p. 97.
62 p. 99.
63 p.101-102.
64 p. 102.

Table 2.6

Lifelong learning: Finland, EU Average, EU Benchmarks

	Finland		EU Average		EU Benchmarks	
	2000	2008	2000	2008	2010	2020
Early leavers from education and training (age 18-24)	9.0%	9.8**65**	17.6%	14.9%	10%	10%
Higher Education attainment (age 30-34)	40.3%	45.7%	22.4%	31.1%	-	40%
Adult participation in lifelong learning (age 25-64; 4 weeks period)	22.4%**66**	23.1%	8.5%**67**	9.5%	12.5%	15%
Investment in Education (Public spending on educ, % of GDP)	5.89%	6.14%	4.91%	5.05%**68**	-	-

Source: CEC, 2009

The population of Finland will become older over the next decades with a projected 27% of people 66 years or older by 2040 and the percentage of people of working age to fall to 58%. Finland has a higher rate of participation in most areas than what is EU average. 45.7% of adults between the age of 30 and 34 have completed higher education; adult participation in lifelong learning is at a rate of 23.1% which is more than twice of the EU average.**69**

Key initiatives in lifelong learning in Finland include a subsidy for further and continuous education for include vouchers for further education for disadvantaged groups, course mobility between Finnish universities, second-chance programs, rural educational institutions and continuing education courses that can be accredited for tertiary education.**70** Financial allowance consists of all higher education being free of charge and need based financial support for students as well as the student grant loan and housing supplement.**71**

2.8.1 Gaps

Student subsidies does not further equity as it is available to all students regardless of their financial background. The *divide* between the rural north and the urban south means that students from the north have to move away to attend tertiary education. *Recognition of prior* learning remains difficult regarding universities. *Participation* in lifelong learning is high however people of low educational attainment, employees of small companies and business owners, unemployed people people from rural areas, men and people over the age of 55 remain underrepresented. Furthermore,, it is unclear as of now wether the creation of *polytechnical/professional universities* will yield the intended equity effect.**72**

65 = break, provisional.
66 = 2003.
67 = 2003.
68 = 2006.
69 p. 102-103.
70 p. 103-104.
71 p. 105-106.
72 p. 106-107.

2.9 Lifelong learning in the Netherlands

Higher education in the Netherlands is provided by universities (wetenschappelijk onderwijs/WO) and universities of applied science (hogescholen/HBO). They have separate access routes: entrance to higher professional education in HBOS can be gained with a diploma of secondary vocational education, while entrance to WOs hinges on a pre-university school-leaving diploma or a HBO qualification or a HBO propaedeutic certificate.[73]

Political responsibility lies with the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. While policy-making is centralized, administration and management are decentralized and lies with municipal authorities. Funding is organized by the Central Funding of Institutions Agency.[74]

Table 2.7
Lifelong learning: Netherlands, EU Average, EU Benchmarks

	Netherlands		EU Average		EU Benchmarks	
	2000	2008	2000	2008	2010	2020
Early leavers from education and training (age 18-24)	15.4%	11.4%[75]	17.6%	14.9%	10%	10%
Higher Education attainment (age 30-34)	26.5%	40.2%	22.4%	31.1%	-	40%
Adult participation in lifelong learning (age 25-64; 4 weeks period)	16.4%[76]	17.0%	8.5%[77]	9.5%	12.5%	15%
Investment in Education (Public spending on educ, % of GDP)	4.96%	5.46%	4.91%	5.05%[78]	-	-

Source: CEC, 2009

The labour force population of the Netherlands is aging which the government attempts to counter both by keeping people in the workplace longer and stimulating lifelong learning for people who are unemployed. As of 2004 36% of professionals aged 25-44 had attained higher education. It is hoped that by 2020 this rate will go up to 50%. Across the entire population the rate of higher education attainment was 40.2% in 2009. Adult participation in lifelong learning is above the EU average at 17%, even though there has been little growth in the past five years.[79]

The comprehensive policy framework for lifelong learning in the Netherlands includes the facilitation of 45 regional partnerships comprised of educational institutions, local government, the employment service and business community that implement lifelong learning on a regional level.[80] Recognition of prior learning comprises both formal and informal learning and allows for mobility from professional to higher education. A large variety of delivery modes is available to Dutch students as well as a targeted

[73] p. 110.
[74] p. 110-111.
[75] = break.
[76] = 2003.
[77] = 2003.
[78] = 2006.
[79] p. 111-112.
[80] p. 113.

measures for disadvantaged groups consisting of funding for universities aimed at supporting students from ethnic minorities and special needs students.[81]

Financial support is offered in the form of a basic grant, a loan to cover tuition fees and free public transport tickets available to all students. A supplement is awarded to students from low-income families.[82]

2.9.1 Gaps

Recognition of prior learning remains to be within in the autonomy of educational institutions. Furthermore, it remains to be seen whether prior learning assessment and recognition encourages youth to leave education early because it appears an attractive alternative. Adult *participation* in higher and further education is still limited in regards to ethnic minorities and special needs students, even though their participation has increased in recent years. The *individual learning accounts* introduced in the Netherlands to encourage continuous learning may not present employees with long-term perspectives. Higher professional education in the Netherlands has a high first-year *drop-out rate.*[83]

2.10 Lifelong learning in France

The higher education landscape of France is highly diversified as there are 3500 institutions of three types – universities, établissements publics à caractére administratif (EPA) , private institutions and schools of higher education (instates ou écoles supérieures privés) - and different types admission conditions.[84] Access to higher education is dependent on the attainment of the baccelaureat, a diploma attesting the completion of secondary education and first level tertiary education, or the national higher education diploma.[85]

Political responsibility lies with the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Higher Education and Research. Lifelong learning as a guiding principle of all areas of education and training was adopted by the French government in the mid-2000s.[86]

---

[81] p. 114-115.
[82] p. 115.
[83] p. 116-117.
[84] p. 119.
[85] p. 120.
[86] p. 120.

Table 2.8

Lifelong learning: France, EU Average, EU Benchmarks

	France		EU Average		EU Benchmarks	
	2000	2008	2000	2008	2010	2020
Early leavers from education and training (age 18-24)	13.3%	11.8%[87]	17.6%	14.9%	10%	10%
Higher Education attainment (age 30-34)	27.4%	41.3%	22.4%	31.1%	-	40%
Adult participation in lifelong learning (age 25-64; 4 weeks period)	7.1%[88]	7.3%	8.5%[89]	9.5%	12.5%	15%
Investment in Education (Public spending on educ, % of GDP)	6.03%	5.58%[90]	4.91%	5.05%[91]	-	-

Source: CEC, 2009[92]

Higher education attainment in France, at a rate of 41.3% is by far higher than both the EU average and EU benchmarks set for 2020. Adult participation in lifelong learning, however is below average at 7.3%.[93]

Important features of legislative implementation of lifelong learning in France is the individual right to training that allows for 20 hours of training each year for every employee, which can also be consumed concurrently over the course of 6 years. Also, up to half of the training may be financed even if it should take place outside of work. The reform of higher education is aimed at reaching a rate of 50% holders of higher education in each age group.[94] Recognition of prior learning is systematized for both formal and informal learning in the Validation of Acquired Experiences.[95] Financial allowance for students in higher education of both direct and indirect student aid is offered, among others, in form of needs based grants, a national emergency grant fund, state-guaranteed bank loans as well as measures to improve living conditions and health care. Tertiary study allocations are offered to students facing difficult circumstances and returning students over the age of 26.[96]

2.10.1 Gaps

Adult *participation* rates are comparatively low. The *mixed higher education system* is characterized by a non-equitable distribution of funding and high drop-out rates. The complicated *structure of higher education* in France is in itself a barrier as funding, organization and accessibility vary a great deal. *University Institutes of Technology* offer shorter yet better funded professional courses within the organizational framework of public universities have become academic preparatory studies rather than professional

---

[87] = break.
[88] = 2003.
[89] = 2003.
[90] = 2006.
[91] = 2006.
[92] p. 121.
[93] p. 120.
[94] p. 122.
[95] p. 123.
[96] p. 123-124.

propaedeutics which is what they were designed for. Indirect *student funding* by tax relief results in a bottom-up redistribution.[97]

[97] p. 124-125.

3 Typologies of Lifelong Learners

This chapter offers a review of research perspectives on typologies of adult learners re-entering formal education, and introduces the typology that was picked as a basis for our survey.

3.1 Description of Typologies of Lifelong Learners

Most research on undergraduates in higher education has been based on the assumption that an undergraduate student would be 17-22 years old, as is the traditional student profile that defined institutional practice as well. Hence higher education was mostly understood to be a bridge to adulthood for young people. It was with the changing demography of students in higher education that these presumptions were challenged.[98] Topics include comparisons of performance according to age cohort, motivation for pursuit of education, adaption into college environment and particular needs of adult students.[99]

Formal adult education so far has not been studied extensively; within the field of study the areas of interest comprise Second Chance Education, continuing higher education including professional doctorates, the process of the formalization of corporate programs, participation in formal education and paid work as part of a life course and the transitioning period from education to professional life.[100]

Adult education research in the late 1800s and early 1900s was focused on who is participating and for which reasons are they participating in adult education. There were few inquiries, however, that related one question to the other. Accordingly, few comprehensive typologies have been drawn up from the data so far.[101] Kasworm (1990) relates inquiries focused on adult students' motivation for entering formal education within the broader area of studies focused on adult students entering into and adapting to a higher education environment. Very often no distinctive pattern of motivation could be identified, prompting the suggestion that patterns could be established for certain groups of adult students only.[102] Amongst them Houle's typology of 1961 can be considered as seminal; it was extended considerably by Roger Boshier's Work who developed the Education Participation Scale based on Houle's research.[103, 104]

98 Kasworm, Carol E. 1990. "Adult Undergraduates in Higher Education: A Review of Past Research Perspectives." Review of Educational Research 60 (3): 345 -372. doi:10.3102/00346543060003345, p. 345.

99 Kasworm, Carol E. 1990. "Adult Undergraduates in Higher Education: A Review of Past Research Perspectives." Review of Educational Research 60 (3): 345 -372. doi:10.3102/00346543060003345.

100 Hefler, Günter, and Jörg Markowitsch 2010. "Formal adult learning and working in Europe: a new typology of participation patterns." Journal of Workplace Learning 22 (1/2) (February 23): 79-93. doi:10.1108/13665621011012870, p. 2.

101 Hefler, Günter, and Jörg Markowitsch 2010. "Formal adult learning and working in Europe: a new typology of participation patterns." Journal of Workplace Learning 22 (1/2) (February 23): 79-93. doi:10.1108/13665621011012870, p. 3.

102 Kasworm, Carol E. 1990. "Adult Undergraduates in Higher Education: A Review of Past Research Perspectives." Review of Educational Research 60 (3): 345 -372. doi:10.3102/00346543060003345, pp. 351.

103 Günter, and Jörg Markowitsch 2010. "Formal adult learning and working in Europe: a new typology of participation patterns." Journal of Workplace Learning 22 (1/2) (February 23): 79-93. doi:10.1108/13665621011012870, p. 3.

Houle's typology had been drawn from in-depth interviews with 22 adult students. It identified three types of learners:

1) goal-oriented learners for whom education is a mean to another end, which is a personal need of theirs
2) activity oriented learners for whom the social aspect of higher education is important. For this group education is an end in itself.
3) learning-oriented learners for whom education is also an end in itself, they participate in order to acquire knowledge.[105]

Boshier (1977) developed the education participation scale (EPS) based on Houle's findings.[106] It comprised 14 factors and 48 items.[107] Morstain and Smart used the EPS to test Houle's typology on the largest scale to date on 611 evening class students. They drew up six factors of motivation from the resulting data:

1) social relationship
2) external expectations
3) social welfare
4) professional advancement
5) escape/stimulation
6) cognitive interest.[108]

Blair, McPake and Munn (1995) note that this approach has three limitations. Firstly, Morstain and Smart did not allow for a potential change in motivations during the course of study. Secondly they assumed that students could pinpoint their motivations quite clearly. And lastly, life circumstances are not taken into account. As a result, motivational typologies can account for psychological aspects of adults returning to education, but can only partially explain why they return.[109]

Another focus of research on motivations of adults entering higher education has been on women. While in studies with this scope no particular motivational pattern

104 Kasworm, Carol E. 1990. "Adult Undergraduates in Higher Education: A Review of Past Research Perspectives." Review of Educational Research 60 (3): 345 -372. doi:10.3102/00346543060003345, p. 353.
105 Blair, Amy, Joanna McPake, and Pamela Munn. 1995. "A New Conceptualisation of Adult Participation in Education." British Educational Research Journal 21 (December): 629-644. doi:10.1080/0141192950210506. See also: Houle, Cyril O. 1988. The Inquiring Mind: A Study of the Adult Who Continues To Learn. Second Edition. Oklahoma Research Center for Continuing Professional and Higher Education, OCCE/200 McCarter Hall, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73037-0003 ($12).
http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED365848.
106 Scanlon, Lesley 2008. "Adults' motives for returning to study: the role of self-authoring." Studies in Continuing Education 30 (March): 17-32. doi:10.1080/01580370701639869, p.22. See also: Boshier, Roger. 1971. "Motivational Orientations of Adult Education Participants: a Factor Analytic Exploration of Houle's Typology." Adult Education Quarterly 21 (2) (January 1): 3 -26. doi:10.1177/074171367102100201.
Boshier, Roger, and John B. Collins 1983. "Education Participation Scale Factor Structure and Socio - Demographic Correlates for 12 000 Learners." International Journal of Lifelong Education 2 (January): 163-177. doi:10.1080/0260137830020205.
107 Kim, Ahjin, and Sharan B. Merriam 2004. "MOTIVATIONS FOR LEARNING AMONG OLDER ADULTS IN A LEARNING IN RETIREMENT INSTITUTE." Educational Gerontology 30 (June): 441-455. doi:10.1080/03601270490445069, p. 443.
108 Blair, Amy, Joanna McPake, and Pamela Munn 1995. "A New Conceptualisation of Adult Participation in Education." British Educational Research Journal 21 (December): 629-644. doi:10.1080/0141192950210506. P. 634 See also: Morstain, Barry R., and John C. Smart. 1977. "A Motivational Typology of Adult Learners." The Journal of Higher Education 48 (6) (November 1): 665-679. doi:10.2307/1979011.
109 Blair, Amy, Joanna McPake, and Pamela Munn 1995. "A New Conceptualisation of Adult Participation in Education." British Educational Research Journal 21 (December): 629-644. doi:10.1080/0141192950210506. p.634.

could be established either, their life situation seemed to be the deciding factor in their decision to enter higher education. Furthermore, Reehling found in 1980 that, while external motivation seemed to be predominant upon entering, internal motivation increased the longer the women she interviewed had been pursuing their studies.[110]

Blair, McPake and Mun refer to Cross (1986) in relating the students' life situation to the re-entering formal education. This way it is possible to take into account how their studies relate to their work life – whether they choose to study in order to enter a different field, or progress in their current profession. Findings in this context have been that women and blue-collar workers or people who had a low education background seek education in order to find better jobs. Men were found to plan to advance in their job and people of high economic status were found to pursue education for personal interest.[111]

Life transitions as a motive in research on adult higher education was first explored by Aslanian and Brickell in 1980 as well as Sewall in 1982 and 1984, who focused their his inquiry on potential triggering events; however, no such events as entry motives could be identified. Rather, they found that the motivation had been present before but entry had been hindered by barriers.[112] They identified seven kinds of life transitions, a life transition being a past, present or future change in the learners' life as articulated by them: Career, family, leisure, art, health, religion, and citizenship. Barriers and transitions were set in the framework of a life schedule within which a return to education could be understood. This approach, however, rests on a coherency which cannot always be surveyed, as Blair, McPake and Munn note.[113]

Both motivational typologies and life transition theory focus on individual factors for adults' return to formal education. Blair, McPake and Munn identify four types of research on external factors – barriers – which can hinder adults' entry:

1) Situational Barriers: individual circumstances such as lack of time or money as well as domestic commitments.
2) Dispositional Barriers: negative attitude towards one's capability of learning or classroom settings.

110 Kasworm, Carol E. 1990. "Adult Undergraduates in Higher Education: A Review of Past Research Perspectives." Review of Educational Research 60 (3): 345 -372. doi:10.3102/00346543060003345, pp. 353. See also: Reehling, Jean E. 1980. "They Are Returning: But, Are They Staying?" Journal of College Student Personnel 21 (6) (November): 491-97. Mohney, Carol, and Wayne Anderson. "The effect of life events and relationships on adult women's decisions to enroll in college." Journal of Counseling & Development. http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/1988-24826-001.
111 Blair, Amy, Joanna McPake, and Pamela Munn 1995. "A New Conceptualisation of Adult Participation in Education." British Educational Research Journal 21 (December): 629-644. doi:10.1080/0141192950210506. p.635.
112 Kasworm, Carol E. 1990. "Adult Undergraduates in Higher Education: A Review of Past Research Perspectives." Review of Educational Research 60 (3): 345 -372. doi:10.3102/00346543060003345, p. 353. See also: Aslanian, Carol B., and Henry M. Brickell 1980. Americans in Transition: Life Changes as Reasons for Adult Learning. College Board Publication Orders, Box 2815, Princeton, NJ 08541 ($10.75). http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED195687. Sewall, Timothy J. "A study of adult undergraduates: What causes them to seek a degree?" Journal of College Student Personnel. http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/1985-18662-001.
113 Blair, Amy, Joanna McPake, and Pamela Munn 1995. "A New Conceptualisation of Adult Participation in Education." British Educational Research Journal 21 (December): 629-644. doi:10.1080/0141192950210506. p.635.

3) Institutional barriers: information not being offered in an appropriate manner, elitist self-portrayal of education institutions, lack of facilities such as affordable child care.
4) Sociocultural barriers: disapproval by the social environment.[114]

Blair, Mcpake and Munn present an approach that accounts for both external and internal factors by presenting the re-entry in the context of goals (purposes), which relate either to employment or to personal satisfaction, and are divided into reactive and proactive, and conditions (circumstances), divided into supply (education policy and provision) and demand (personal and individual circumstances).[115]

In her survey of adult life-long learners in Austria, which is part of the European research project on lifelong learning, Rammel (2006) found that that their employer's participation in their education had a positive impact on students' confidence in finishing their program, especially in female students. She also found that students who had previously attained a higher education level where more prone to express autonomous motivation for pursuing further education as opposed to students who had attained a low level and mostly expressed motivation in the area of social control.[116] She, too, notes that that the relation of motivation and participation proved to be particularly difficult to survey.[117]

3.2 Description of Typology of Hefler/Markowitsch

Hefler and Markowitsch (2009) present a new approach to a typology of adult learners in formal education. Their proposal is based on research conducted within the Lifelong Learning 2010: Towards a Lifelong Learning Society in Europe: The contribution of the Education System project.[118] Hefler and Markowitsch present a life-cycle based approach to formulating a typology of adult learners in formal education based on a qualitative analysis of 89 cases studies.

Hefler and Markowitsch critique existing motivational typologies for not being able to take social dynamics into accord. Furthermore, motivational typologies are based on the assumption that the decision to re-enter education is predominantly voluntary, which is not the case with employer training. In order to be able to survey the interaction between the individuals' motivation for pursuing formal adult education and the employers' motivation to support them, they suggest a life-cycle model as basis. They reason that participating in a formal education program – as opposed to pursuing non-formal education - means making a life-course altering decisions, as it means a "temporary reorganization" of the adult students' time frames as well as a potential change in their portfolio, self-awareness and professional prospects.[119]

---

[114] Blair, Amy, Joanna McPake, and Pamela Munn 1995. "A New Conceptualisation of Adult Participation in Education." British Educational Research Journal 21 (December): 629-644. doi:10.1080/0141192950210506. p.636.
[115] Blair, Amy, Joanna McPake, and Pamela Munn 1995. "A New Conceptualisation of Adult Participation in Education." British Educational Research Journal 21 (December): 629-644. doi:10.1080/0141192950210506. p.637-642.
[116] However, as Rammel herself notes, this may in part be attributed to the former group being surveyed with questionnaires, whereas the latter was interviewed in person.
[117] Rammel (2006), p. 85
[118] http://lll2010.tlu.ee/
[119] Hefler, Markotwitsch (2010), p. 4

Helfer and Markowitsch go on to develop nine types of students along the axes of life course, educational program, occupation, achieved level of education and existing educational ladder by way of a three-step method. First, the 113 cases were grouped by individual characteristics, the educational program, and career plans. In the next step the types were constructed in relation to the importance of participation within the life-cycle, and the relations between the individual's work and their studies as well as their prior educational attainment and the qualification they were pursuing. After laying a stronger focus on the relationship between the career development and formal education, all cases were assigned within the typology.[120]

The chart shows the typology of lifelong learners (Hefler/Markowitsch). For the focus of the survey the group "Work" / "Reinforcing" with "strong, clearly visible relation" between content and tasks is suggested. This means, the sub-types progressing, adapting, specialising, peaking are relevant.

Table 3.1

Typology

Focus	Main Type	Sub-types	Description	Relation Contents / Tasks	Start of programme before / after joining career
Education	Completing	Finishing	Working while studying without particular connection of work and education	Insignificant	Before
		Entering	Being hired in late phases by an employer in need of graduates	Strong, clearly visible relation	Before
	Returning	Returning	Returning to education and overruling a temporary transition to work	Insignificant	After
	Transforming	Transforming	General transformation using education as a basis	No relation	After
Work	Reinforcing	Progressing	Progressing in the current field by at least one step on the educational ladder	Strong, clearly visible relation	After (exceptional: before)
		Adapting	Making one step in the current field, in parallel to an existing one not relevant in the field	Strong, clearly visible relatioin	After
		Specialising	Completing one programme as a specialisation	Strong, clearly visible relation	After
		Peaking	Completing a formal programme designed for experienced professionals in the field	Strong, clearly visible relation	After
	Compensating	Compensating	Compensating the restriction of an existing pathway	Insignificant	After

Source 3s

Patterns of Participation with focus on education are the following:

Completing:
 ___ *Finishing:* working while completing formal education (without particular connection of work and education)
 ___ *Entering:* being hired in late phases by an employer in need of graduates

---

[120] Hefler/Markowitsch (2010), p. 5.

Returning: returning to education and revising a temporary transition from learning to work (desire to "return to school" from full-time job and to take up studies again)

Transforming: transformation of the existing career pathway and/or individual development (formal AE as basis for a significant break with existing career pathway)

Reinforcing: reinforcing an existing career pathway (use offers of formal AE to solve developmental issues or to support progress within the chosen line of occupational/professional development)

___ progressing in the current field (one step ahead)
___ adapting to the current field (in relation to qualifications)
___ specialising: completing a program as specialization
___ peaking: completing a program for professionals (often ISCED 6)

Compensating: compensation for shortcomings of an existing career pathway (less important than other four strategies)

This survey of WP2 addresses people who already take part, whereas people, who don't take part at HE, are not addressed. Also other categories could be used for the typology, this has to be seen as a suggestion. The suggestion was seen as a "safe choice", by addressing target groups based on this typology which are the main groups within higher education and which are all focused via HE. The partners in the workshop accepted this suggestion.

3.3 Conclusion

Most typologies of adult learner have set their focus on either external or internal factors for their re-entering formal education. Workplace considerations so far have been represented either as an internal factor, such as the motivation to change career paths, or to progress in an established field, or as external factors of hindrance. In the context of our survey, the life-cycle approach of Hefler and Markowitsch is used to grasp the interplay between employers' motivation to support employees in re-entering formal education and their employees motivation in regards to their employment.

4 Survey of Expectations of Lifelong Learners

The survey of Lifelong Learners focussed on getting knowledge about the situation and the expectations of Lifelong Learners. For that concern the typology of Lifelong Learners was a base of the survey. As target groups of the Lifelong Learners were people in the participating nations specified, who are studying at HEIs and working at the same time. The Lifelong Learners were asked about their studies, their motives to study and possible barriers to engage in LLL. The results are listed and compared to provide a basis for the choice of indicators of the self-assessment tool in WP 5.

A questionnaire in a web based format was designed and addressed to the target groups of Lifelong Learners in the participating nations. The link to the questionnaire was spread via the network of all partners of the consortium to the target groups.

This chapter shows the results of the survey of Lifelong Learners.

4.1 Methodology of the survey

A web-based questionnaire was developed for conducting the survey. Every partner was responsible for spreading the link to the questionnaire to the national target groups. Because there should have been at least a participation of approximately 100 answered questionnaires per country, the questionnaire was to be sent to 400-500 students per partner (returning rate is usually 15-20%). The questionnaire for Learners was provided in English. After showing a low participation rate – even after a broad extension of the time frame – translated versions in Dutch, Finnish, Lithuanian, Turkish and French were provided.

The participation of at least 100 answered questionnaires was achieved in the following countries: Finland, Ireland, Turkey, Lithunia and Belgium. In Scotland, Netherlands and France less than 100 answered questionnaires are counted (tab. 4.2).

The time flow of the survey is shown in table 4.1.

Table 4.1
Time flow of the survey Lifelong Learners

	2010									2011			
	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	01	02	03	04ff
Developing questionnaire (in English)	X												
Data collection		X	X	X									
Data collection - extension					X	X	X	X					
Translation of questionnaire									X				
Data collection - extension										X	X	X	
Data analysis and report												X	X

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The survey contained demographic items concerning personal variables and the description of the employment and the studies of the respondents. The general conditions of LLL included the topics recognition of prior learnings, travelling to the HEI, conditions of employment and study, getting advice to study and financing the study. Furthermore the motives to commitment to LLL and the satisfaction with the study were asked.

4.2 Demographics

First of all this chapter shows the demographic data of the students who participated in the survey.

Most of the students are from Finland (36%), Ireland (18%), Turkey (12%), Lithunia (11%) and Belgium (10%). A little bit smaller is the rate of participation of students from Scotland (5%), Netherlands (4%) and France (2%). Students from 'other Country' named countries like e.g. Denmark, Germany, Latvia, England or Nigeria.

Table 4.2
Country of residence (Item 0)

	Frequency	Percentage
Finland	555	36%
Ireland	279	18%
Turkey	185	12%
Lithunia	171	11%
Belgium	149	10%
Scotland	69	5%
Netherlands	55	4%
France	30	2%
Other Country	32	2%
Total	1.525	100%

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The verbal descriptions of the results in this chapter generally refer to the data in total to the countries Finland, Ireland and Turkey.

4.2.1 Personal variables

Table 4.3
Age (Item 1)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
< 20 years	3%	3%	-	1%
20-29 years	55%	58%	25%	77%
30-39 years	21%	16%	39%	17%
40-49 years	15%	16%	26%	4%
50 years or older	5%	7%	9%	2%
n	1.508	550	276	184

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The median of the age of the students is 27 years. As the table above shows the youngest students are the one from Turkey with a median of 24 years and the oldest are the one from Ireland with a median of 35 years. Students from Finland are in average 26 years old.

Table 4.4
Gender (Item 2)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Male	29%	17%	41%	47%
Female	71%	83%	59%	53%
n	1.519	554	279	185

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

71% of the participants are female. In comparison of the countries the Finnish participants have the biggest part of female students and the Irish and Turkish students the smallest one.

Table 4.5
Children (Item 3)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Yes	29%	33%	45%	10%
No	71%	67%	55%	90%
n	1.493	543	273	181

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

In the matter of children 29% of the participants have at least one child. Participants from Ireland show the highest rate.

Table 4.6

Responsibility for family care (Item 4)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Yes	44%	62%	39%	21%
No	56%	38%	61%	79%
n	1.511	553	276	183

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

In the duty of family care are 44% of the participants. The table above shows that students from Finland have the highest rate concerning responsibility for family care (62%).

Table 4.7

Responsibility for childcare / homecare (Item 4)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Childcare	20%	27%	25%	7%
n	1.525	555	279	185
Homecare	41%	62%	29%	18%
n	1.525	555	279	185

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Matters for homecare are more frequent than childcare. In both cases participants from Finland show more duties of responsibility than their colleagues from other countries. It is obvious that the participants from turkey have the lowest rates, because they are the youngest participants of the study.

Table 4.8

Highest Education Level (Item 5)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Lower secondary education	6%	1%	5%	15%
Upper secondary education	39%	63%	12%	17%
Post-secondary, non-tertiary education	14%	10%	22%	18%
First stage of tertiary education	34%	18%	54%	44%
Second stage of tertiary education	2%	0,2%	2%	6%
Other	5%	7%	5%	0%
n	1.288	489	213	157

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Concerning the prior learning 39% of all participants pointed out, that their highest education level can be found at the upper secondary education. Respondents from Ireland and Turkey mainly achieved the first stage of tertiary education. [121]

---

[121] The attended, graduated or not applicable education level and the year of graduation are listed in the appendix.

Table 4.9

Finished trainings at a higher education institute in addition to the current study within the last 12 months (Item 16)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
No further training	76%	82%	67%	58%
One further training	17%	13%	23%	29%
Two further trainings	5%	3%	6%	9%
Three further trainings	2%	1%	2%	2%
More than three further trainings	1%	1%	2%	3%
n	1.434	537	258	160

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

In addition to the current study the majority of the respondents didn't finished a further training (76%). 17% of all students did finished one further training. Most frequently students from Turkey (29%) visited a further training.

4.2.2 Employment

This chapter deals with different aspects of employment.

Table 4.10

Employment (Item 6)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Yes	63%	65%	85%	47%
No	37%	35%	15%	53%
n	1.517	551	279	183

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Employed are 63% of the participants. As the table above shows 85% of the Irish students are working.

Table 4.11

Reasons for having no employment (Item 6.8)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
I solely concentrate on my current education	56%	63%	8%	68%
In addition to my current training I am on maternity leave.	4%	5%	-	2%
In addition to my current training, I am searching for a job	32%	23%	70%	27%
Other	8%	9%	23%	3%
n	547	192	40	90

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The main reason for being not employed is the concentration solely on the current education (56%). Nevertheless, 70% of the non-working participants from Ireland are searching for a job. The verbal answers given to the option "other" are retirement or being graduated and searching for a job.

Table 4.12

Working hours per week (Item 6.1)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
1h - 10,9h	7%	15%	1%	4%
11h - 20,9h	18%	30%	9%	6%
21h - 30,9h	11%	10%	6%	5%
31h - 40,9h	52%	41%	66%	35%
41h >	12%	4%	17%	50%
Median	37,5h	28,0h	39,0h	40,0h
Minimum	1h	1h	6h	3h
Maximum	80h	72h	60h	70h
n	882	324	226	79

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The median of the working hours per week is over all participants 37,5 hours and ranges between one and 80 hours. The participants from Finland show the lowest rate concerning the weekly working hours (28h).

Table 4.13

Sector of the company (Item 6.2)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Health and social work	17%	26%	5%	2%
Education	16%	7%	14%	58%
Wholesale and retail trade: personal and household goods	9%	13%	8%	1%
Public administration and defence; compulsory	7%	6%	7%	7%
Financial intermediation	6%	3%	14%	1%
Hotels and restaurants	6%	10%	2%	1%
Manufacturing	5%	-	10%	8%
Transport, storage and communication	5%	4%	7%	3%
Other community, social and personal activities	4%	2%	8%	-
Consulting	3%	3%	3%	2%
Electricity, gas and water supply	2%	3%	1%	2%
Real estate, renting and business activities	2%	1%	4%	-
Agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing	2%	1%	3%	2%
Construction	2%	1%	1%	5%
Social security	2%	1%	0,4%	1%
Activities of households	1%	1%	-	-
Extra-territorial organisations and bodies	0,3%	1%	-	-
Repair of motor vehicles, motorcycles	0,2%	1%	-	-
Other	13%	17%	13%	7%
n	955	357	236	87

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The students predominantly work in the Health and social work sector (15%) and in the education sector (16%). In the category "other" sector advertising, marketing and media are most frequent.

Table 4.14

Work position (Item 6.3)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Self-employed with employees	3%	2%	2%	8%
Self-employed without employees	4%	4%	3%	2%
Employed	90%	90%	93%	85%
Assist family member	1%	-	1%	4%
Other(s)	2%	4%	1%	1%
n	952	358	234	85

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

In general the respondents are employed (90%). The students from Turkey show the lowest rate in this matter (85%) and the highest concerning being self-employed with

employees. The respondents mentioned as "other" working position, being volunteer, retired or a (graduated) student.

Table 4.15

Starting year of the employment or self-employment (Item 6.4)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
1970-1979	1%	1%	1%	-
1980-1989	5%	5%	4%	3%
1990-1999	13%	10%	13%	3%
2000-2005	23%	14%	34%	30%
2006-2011	59%	70%	49%	64%
Median	2007	2008	2005	2007
Minimum	1971	1977	1975	1988
Maximum	2011	2011	2010	2010
n	789	322	185	33

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The most students started their work for the actual employer within the last five years (59%). Respondents from Ireland tend to have their employment relationship a little bit longer.

Table 4.16

Responsibility for employees (Item 6.6)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Yes, permanent	18%	11%	30%	27%
Yes, occasionally (e.g. within projects)	21%	17%	21%	28%
No	61%	72%	49%	45%
n	951	355	236	85

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Permanent or occasionally responsible for employees are 39% of the respondents. The highest responsibility rate can be found among students from Turkey (55%) or Ireland (51%).

Table 4.17

Travel as part of the work (Item 6.6)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Yes	27%	18%	40%	38%
No	73%	82%	60%	62%
n	949	357	232	86

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Table 4.18

Percentage of travel activity as monthly work time (Item 6.6)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
1%-25%	68%	16%	82%	87%
26%-50%	11%	14%	10%	10%
51%-75%	6%	12%	4%	-
76%-100%	15%	58%	5%	3%
Median	15%	90%	10%	10%
Minimum	1%	2%	1%	5%
Maximum	100%	100%	100%	80%
n	220	43	83	30

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

27% of all students do travel within their work. More respondents from Ireland (40%) and Turkey (38%) do travel within their work than students from Finland (18%). But on the other is the rate of travel activity as work time among the Finnish respondents definitely the highest one (Median 90%).

Table 4.19

Approx. annual income (net) including bonuses, (social) benefits etc. in Euro (Item 6.7)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
< 1.000	6%	1%	2%	33%
1.000-1.999	4%	2%	-	8%
2.000-4.999	5%	3%	1%	1%
5.000-9.999	11%	11%	3%	26%
10.000-14.999	14%	22%	5%	18%
15.000-19.999	9%	9%	5%	4%
20.000-24.999	14%	12%	19%	4%
25.000-29.999	11%	12%	15%	1%
30.000-34.999	8%	8%	13%	-
35.000-39.999	6%	7%	11%	3%
40.000-49.999	7%	8%	13%	-
50.000 >	6%	7%	13%	1%
Median	20.000	20.000	30.000	8.107
Mean	21.418	22.776	31.712	8.467
Minimum	173	300	200	315
Maximum	100.000	100.000	100.000	51.885
n	787	304	190	73

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

As the table above shows the approximately annual income (net) is €20.000,--. Students from Ireland have with an annual income of €30.000,-- the highest salary and students from Turkey with €8.107,-- the lowest one.

4.3 Description of study/course

In this chapter the studies or courses of the respondents are described concerning duration, field, acquired degree, expenditure of time and methods of instruction.

Table 4.20
Starting year of the current study (Item 7)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
before 2005	2%	0,4%	3%	6%
2005	2%	0,4%	1%	9%
2006	5%	2%	7%	14%
2007	10%	9%	9%	15%
2008	21%	22%	20%	20%
2009	29%	27%	42%	12%
2010	31%	39%	18%	24%
n	1.483	547	271	174

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

More than 80% of the students started their current studies between 2008 and 2010. As the table above shows did the majority of students from Turkey start their study between 2006 and 2010.

Table 4.21
Year of graduation (Item 8)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
2010	14%	1%	47%	16%
2011	36%	32%	39%	38%
2012	26%	32%	13%	27%
2013	14%	21%	2%	10%
2014	8%	13%	-	4%
2015	1%	1%	-	2%
after 2015	1%	0,4%	-	3%
n	1.470	549	266	172

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The year of graduation is for more than the half of all respondents in the year 2011 or 2012. Almost the half of the Irish students already completed their study in 2010.

Table 4.22
Duration of the study (Item 8.1)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
up to 1/2 year	6%	6%	13%	1%
> 1/2 year up to 1 year	2%	2%	4%	
> 1 year up to 2 years	27%	12%	55%	36%
> 2 years up to 3 years	18%	15%	12%	11%
> 3 years up to 4 years	42%	62%	14%	27%
> 4 years up to 5 years	4%	2%	2%	19%
> 5 years up to 6 years	1%	0,2%	-	4%
> 6 years	0,4%	-	0,4%	1%
n	787	304	190	73

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The duration of the study takes for 42% of all students between 3 and 4 years. As the table above shows the duration of the study varies among the countries. In Finland the majority (62%) can be find as well in the group of 3 to 4 years. More than the half of the Irish students has a shorter study period with 1 up to 2 years. In Turkey the main durations are 1 to 2 years and 3 to 4 years. (36% respectively 27%).

Table 4.23
Field of study (Item 9)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Business and Administration	36%	34%	61%	34%
Humanities and Social Sciences	15%	15%	11%	14%
Health Sciences	13%	20%	1%	3%
Engineering Science	9%	7%	3%	22%
Information Technology	6%	3%	12%	2%
Education	5%	1%	3%	10%
Natural, Physical, Chemical and Mathematical Sciences	3%	2%	-	4%
Fine and Applied Arts	2%	1%	1%	1%
Architecture and Building	1%	-	0,4%	3%
Mass Communication and Information Science	1%	0,4%	-	1%
Law	0,2%	-	0,4%	1%
Other(s)	10%	17%	8%	5%
n	1.503	550	275	176

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Business and Administration is definitely the most frequent field of study among the respondents. Over all nations 36% of the students study Business and Administration. Respondents from Ireland have a significant higher part in this field (61%). Humanities and Social Science as well as Health Science are in top ranking of the study field. This is corresponding with the sector of the company where the students work. The

study field education is not that often as it could be assumed because of the frequency in the sector of the company. However, students from Turkey show the highest rate within the field of study and the sector of the company. In the category "other" are e.g. Tourism and Business Enterprise & Community Development frequent.

Table 4.24
Acquired degree (Item 10)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Bachelor	69%	88%	49%	38%
Master	14%	10%	16%	34%
PhD	3%	-	-	18%
Certificate	7%	0,4%	26%	6%
Other(s)	8%	2%	9%	3%
n	1.500	553	273	177

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

With the degree "Bachelor" the most students will finish their studies. This is rate is especially among the students from Finland high (88%), but not that high among the Irish or Turkish respondents. In Ireland the "Certificate" is as well frequent (26%) and in Turkey – although here are the youngest students - the "Master" and the "PhD". In the category "other(s)" are named different vocational trainings as well as "Diploma", which couldn't be categorized clearly.

Table 4.25
Hours per week for study - e.g. learning time, attendance, travel (Item 11)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Up to 10h	23%	14%	46%	17%
11-20h	32%	30%	41%	33%
21-40h	38%	46%	13%	44%
Over 40h	7%	9%	-	6%
n	1.499	554	274	176

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The time respondents are spending for their study varies between the countries. As the table above shows are the hours spreading in a similar way in Finland an in Turkey. The students have a weekly effort of 11-20 hours or 21-40 hours. The effort seems to be little bit lower in Ireland with up to 10 hours or 11-20 hours. The minority spends more than 40 hours per week for their studies.

Table 4.26

Invested time in: courses (Item 12)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
0%	7%	6%	8%	6%
1%-25%	23%	24%	19%	21%
26%-50%	42%	43%	45%	43%
51%-75%	23%	24%	23%	25%
76%-100%	5%	4%	5%	6%
n	1.399	528	243	159

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Table 4.27

Invested time in: homework and independent learning (Item 12)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
0%	1%	2%	2%	1%
1%-25%	26%	19%	24%	42%
26%-50%	43%	42%	47%	38%
51%-75%	19%	25%	17%	13%
76%-100%	11%	12%	10%	6%
n	1.399	528	243	159

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Table 4.28

Invested time in: travel (Item 12)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
0%	18%	14%	28%	23%
1%-25%	77%	83%	67%	65%
26%-50%	5%	3%	5%	11%
51%-75%	0,2%	0,4%	-	1%
76%-100%	0,1%	-	-	
n	1.399	528	243	159

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Table 4.29
Invested time in: other (Item 12)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
0%	67%	74%	77%	48%
1%-25%	25%	22%	14%	38%
26%-50%	6%	2%	5%	11%
51%-75%	1%	1%	2%	3%
76%-100%	1%	1%	1%	
n	1.399	528	243	159

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The tables above (table 4.25 – table 4.27) show the different activities the respondents spend in their studies. The asked categories are: courses, homework and independent learning, travel and other. The most time is spent for homework and independent learning and for courses. In the category "other" are activities like library, internship, administration and free time or social activities listed.

Table 4.30
Working time per week is adequate to learn the contents of teaching (Item 13.1)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
I agree	40%	33%	51%	44%
I slightly agree	40%	45%	30%	41%
I rather don't agree	12%	16%	7%	6%
I don't agree	7%	6%	10%	5%
not applicable	1%	1%	3%	4%
n	1.490	553	273	171

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

For the students is the working time per week adequate to learn the contents of teaching (approx. 80%).

Table 4.31
Working time per week is adequate to perform work and study (Item 13.2)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
I agree	29%	24%	41%	32%
I slightly agree	34%	33%	34%	43%
I rather don't agree	16%	19%	12%	13%
I don't agree	15%	18%	11%	11%
not applicable	5%	7%	1%	2%
n	1.489	553	274	169

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

For 63% of all respondents is the working time per week adequate to perform work and study. The rate of the Finnish students is in this matter little bit lower (57%). 75%

of the Irish and Turkish students have enough time to coverage the duties of work and study.

Table 4.32

Working time per week is adequate to have enough spare time for my personal life (e.g. family, hobby) (Item 13.3)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
I agree	26%	23%	32%	26%
I slightly agree	28%	26%	26%	29%
I rather don't agree	22%	24%	20%	22%
I don't agree	23%	27%	21%	22%
not applicable	1%	0,4%	1%	1%
n	1.492	554	270	172

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Enough spare time for the personal live have 54% of all students. Approximately in this range are also the students from Finland, Ireland or Turkey.

Table 4.33

Time of attended and preferred classes (Item 14)

	Total		Finland		Ireland		Turkey	
	attend	prefer	attend	prefer	attend	prefer	attend	prefer
During the day	79%	80%	81%	87%	56%	56%	82%	83%
In the evening	44%	48%	34%	48%	78%	73%	46%	44%
At the weekend	20%	24%	19%	28%	48%	41%	18%	21%
Block courses	18%	54%	14%	75%	22%	36%	40%	43%
Others	8%	12%	6%	15%	10%	10%	10%	10%
n	562 – 1.028		285 - 511		49 - 179		39 - 135	

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The table above shows the summarized results of the time when the respondents currently attend and at which time they would prefer to visit classes.[122] In general the majority of the students have day courses and also prefer them. The exception is the situation in Ireland. Irish respondents mainly have classes in the evening. The biggest difference between the percentage of attended and preferred classes can be find in the category block courses. First and foremost students Finland would prefer to have more block courses than it is actually possible.

---

[122] The detailed results are listed in the appendix.

Table 4.34

Current used and preferred methods of instruction (Item 15)

	Total		Finland		Ireland		Turkey	
	current	prefer	current	prefer	current	prefer	current	prefer
Lecture by experts	81%	91%	77%	93%	94%	91%	86%	94%
Groups works	78%	71%	83%	72%	75%	70%	67%	76%
Job-related projects	64%	79%	70%	79%	63%	74%	54%	93%
Distance learning on the basis of books/scripts	60%	62%	73%	75%	47%	42%	48%	48%
Case studies	57%	72%	53%	73%	74%	76%	54%	77%
Internships	49%	73%	53%	79%	8%	36%	34%	76%
E-learning	46%	70%	48%	81%	53%	68%	28%	67%
Individualised personal teaching	40%	74%	44%	87%	29%	62%	57%	78%
Other(s)	8%	18%	6%	24%	8%	8%	15%	24%
n	418 – 1.336		206 - 521		40 - 248		25 - 148	

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The table above shows the summarized results of the currently used and the preferred methods of instruction.[123] First and foremost is the lecture by experts used and preferred. Furthermore is the preferred percentage everywhere higher except in Ireland. The highest difference between the current used and the preferred percentage can be found in Turkey (43% - job related projects) and in Finland (43% - individualised personal teaching). In the category "other(s)" combinations of methods (e.g. distance learning and contact, group works related to job) can be found.

4.4 General conditions for Lifelong Learning

This chapter shows the general conditions for Lifelong Learning. Different aspects like the recognition of prior learning, satisfaction with the studies, support of the employer and the advice to study were asked to the students.

[123] The detailed results are listed in the appendix.

4.4.1 Recognition of prior learning

Table 4.35
Recognised prior learning (Item 18)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Yes, on the basis of formal learning	31%	28%	32%	40%
Yes, on the basis of other qualification (e.g. in-company training)	8%	4%	13%	11%
Yes, on the basis of work experience	14%	17%	16%	13%
Yes, other(s)	4%	7%	2%	3%
No	44%	44%	37%	34%
n	1.436	537	266	160

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

For the majority of the students prior learning were recognised for the actual study (56%). Prior learning on the basis of formal learning were most frequently recognised followed by prior learning on the basis of work experience.

Table 4.36
Did you gather information about recognition of prior learning? (Item 17)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Yes	40%	37%	54%	36%
No	60%	63%	46%	64%
n	1.449	541	269	161

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Information about recognition of prior learning got 40% of the participants. Bit more than the half of the respondents from Ireland gather some information about recognition of prior learning.

Table 4.37
Information source of the possibility of recognition of prior learning (Item 17.1)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
My higher education institute	64%	86%	46%	48%
Employer	9%	0,5%	24%	12%
Other students or graduates	6%	5%	4%	5%
Media	5%	1%	6%	9%
Colleagues	5%	1%	7%	12%
Friends and family	4%	1%	8%	9%
Another education institution	3%	2%	3%	-
Other(s)	4%	2%	3%	5%
n	578	201	144	58

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Most frequently the respondents got information about the possibility of prior learning from their higher education institute (64%). First and foremost was the higher education institute for students from Finland an information source (86%). In Ireland the employer gave relevant information to the 24% of the students.

Table 4.38

Getting information about the recognition of prior learning was … (Item 17.2)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
… easy	38%	31%	45%	45%
… rather easy	41%	49%	37%	25%
… rather complicated	16%	16%	15%	14%
… complicated	5%	5%	2%	16%
n	573	199	143	56

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

In the experience of the respondents it was easy to get information about the recognition of prior learning. First and foremost this was the case for students from Ireland (82%). 16% of the respondents from Turkey quoted a complicated process of getting information.

Table 4.39

Satisfaction with the received information about recognition of prior learning (Item 17.3)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Satisfied	46%	32%	61%	51%
Rather satisfied	40%	45%	35%	37%
Rather not satisfied	9%	14%	2%	5%
Not satisfied	5%	8%	2%	7%
n	567	195	141	57

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The respondents were satisfied with the information about recognition of prior learning (86%). This is the case for almost every one of the Irish students (96%).

Table 4.40

Knowledge about the recognition of prior learning as factor to start the study (Item 17.4)

Recognition of prior learning was…	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
…a critical factor to start	27%	10%	47%	49%
…among others a factor to start	33%	15%	44%	38%
…has not been relevant to start	40%	75%	9%	13%
n	567	197	144	55

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

In general the knowledge about the recognition of prior learning was a factor to start the study (60%). Looking at the countries the situation is different. As the recognition

of prior learning is a factor for students from Ireland (91%) it is not that important for the most students from Finland (75%).

Table 4.41
Satisfaction with the process of recognition of prior learning (Item 18.1)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Satisfied	51%	35%	67%	59%
Rather satisfied	35%	42%	29%	33%
Rather not satisfied	11%	17%	4%	6%
Not satisfied	4%	6%	1%	2%
n	790	297	166	102

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The respondents are satisfied with the process of recognition of prior learning (86%). Also in this matter the students from Ireland show the highest satisfaction (96%).

4.4.2 Travel to the higher education institute

Table 4.42
Travel time to the higher education institute (Item 19)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Less than 15 minutes	22%	22%	31%	24%
15 – 30 minutes	34%	33%	28%	40%
31 – 60 minutes	28%	31%	28%	17%
More than 60 minutes	16%	15%	14%	19%
n	1.375	524	254	145

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The table above shows the travel time to the higher education institute. Respondents from Turkey have the shortest travel time.

Table 4.43
Travel time to the higher education institute (Item 20)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Public transport	36%	41%	2%	54%
Car, motorbike, etc.	50%	40%	93%	26%
Bicycle	4%	6%	1%	1%
Solely by foot	10%	13%	4%	18%
n	1.371	523	250	146

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Half of the respondents go by car or motorbike to their higher education institute. The rate of the mobile students is high in Ireland (93%) and low in Turkey (26%). In Turkey the public transport is used most frequently (54%).

4.4.3 Employment and study

Table 4.44
Did you inform your employer about your actual study? (Item 23)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Yes	80%	81%	88%	82%
No	20%	19%	12%	18%
n	1.314	501	245	131

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The majority of the students informed their employer about the study. The respondents could note, why they did not inform their employer. The most frequent statement is "have no employer". However, some respondents didn't gave any information to the employer, because they think it is a private matter or because of managerial reasons.

Table 4.45

Provided and important support by the company (Item 24)

	Total		Finland		Ireland		Turkey	
	p	i	p	i	p	i	p	i
Flexible working hours	58%	78%	67%	80%	58%	76%	58%	86%
Use of company-internal resources (e.g. internet, printer, etc.)	46%	65%	37%	62%	63%	70%	70%	80%
Possibility to lower the weekly working hours	36%	68%	49%	73%	17%	50%	36%	76%
Educational leave	36%	66%	25%	56%	49%	71%	66%	86%
Exemption for exam preparation	35%	66%	29%	58%	42%	72%	58%	83%
Financial aid	26%	58%	8%	42%	51%	74%	41%	80%
Possibility to learn during working hours	25%	60%	21%	49%	24%	68%	47%	86%
Integrating higher education into the career plan	22%	63%	11%	52%	34%	76%	42%	90%
Information about company-internal support	20%	60%	9%	53%	36%	70%	38%	78%
Information about higher education	19%	40%	7%	26%	35%	63%	52%	74%
Information about government support	10%	52%	3%	39%	14%	67%	32%	73%
Childcare	4%	25%	0,2%	16%	2%	24%	20%	66%
Other support	10%	19%	9%	19%	12%	14%	23%	50%
n	399 – 1.103		201 - 434		50 - 218		18 - 104	

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.
p=provided, i=important

The table above shows the support which is provided to the respondents by the company and which would be important for the respondents. The respondents are supported by the employer with flexible working hours (58%) and the possibility to use company-internal resources like internet, printer etc. (46%). This is also the kind of support, which would be important for the students. To integrate higher education into the career plan would be an important support for Turkish and Irish students. The biggest difference between the provided and the important support can be find at the items information about government support, information about company-internal support and integrating higher education into the career plan.

Table 4.46

Provided support by the employer to enable the study (Multiple responses possible) (Item 37)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Creation of individual career plans	13%	10%	15%	23%
Finding replacements for the employees in higher education	10%	14%	4%	11%
More information about the supply of higher education	9%	3%	16%	18%
Offering information about tax relief for higher education	7%	3%	13%	13%
Offering information about government grants for higher education	7%	2%	11%	16%
Expanded supply of higher education specialised for the operative demand	5%	2%	8%	11%
Consulting services to evaluate the demand of competences	4%	2%	5%	11%
Organising higher education with other companies	4%	2%	5%	9%
Consulting services to determine measures of higher education	3%	1%	4%	8%
Other(s)	7%	6%	11%	1%
n	1.525	555	279	185

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The employers of the respondents provide individual career plans (13%) and replacements for employees in education (10%) to enable higher education.

4.4.4 Advice to study

Table 4.47

Who advised you before your decision to study and have you been satisfied with the advice? (rather) satisfied (Item 25.1 – 25.8)*

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Friends and family	64%	57%	78%	82%
My higher education institute	52%	37%	78%	67%
Media	38%	45%	28%	39%
Other students or graduates	37%	26%	54%	64%
Colleagues	37%	27%	66%	64%
Employer	22%	8%	60%	41%
Another education institution	22%	22%	26%	36%
Other(s)	24%	12%	39%	38%
n	625 - 997	337 - 465	64 - 147	29 - 89

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.
*) Response options: satisfied – rather satisfied – rather not satisfied – not satisfied – I didn't use this advice.

The respondents got advice form their friends and family (64%) and from their higher education institute (52%) before they decided to study. By interpreting the table above

it is to keep in mind that there is also the response option "I didn't use this advice" (see appendix). As a big part of the open answers (category "other(s)") the respondents named "myself".

4.4.5 Financing the study and financial support

Table 4.48

Percentage of finance the study: own savings (Item 28.1)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
0%	33%	42%	19%	29%
1%-25%	15%	21%	8%	9%
26%-50%	14%	11%	22%	15%
51%-75%	4%	5%	4%	3%
76%-100%	34%	21%	47%	44%
n	1.262	498	237	117

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Table 4.49

Percentage of finance the study: financial support of the employer (Item 28.2)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
0%	75%	80%	59%	71%
1%-25%	4%	5%	3%	9%
26%-50%	9%	8%	18%	7%
51%-75%	3%	3%	3%	3%
76%-100%	9%	3%	17%	10%
n	1.262	498	237	117

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Table 4.50

Percentage of finance the study: government aid (Item 28.2)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
0%	52%	31%	88%	69%
1%-25%	11%	12%	4%	7%
26%-50%	15%	23%	5%	15%
51%-75%	6%	12%	1%	3%
76%-100%	16%	23%	2%	6%
n	1.262	498	237	117

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Table 4.51

Percentage of finance the study: other (Item 28.2)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
0%	76%	60%	94%	74%
1%-25%	9%	16%	2%	7%
26%-50%	4%	7%	2%	4%
51%-75%	3%	4%	1%	4%
76%-100%	8%	12%	2%	10%
n	1.262	498	237	117

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The tables above (table 4.47 – 4.50) show how the respondents finance their study. The four categories (own savings, financial support of the employer, government aid and others) were given as response categories and the sum of the four answers had to be 100%. Own savings are the biggest part of financing the study followed by government aid and financial support of the employer. Respondents from Finland are drawing more government aid than their colleagues from Ireland or Turkey. First and foremost are in the category "other" family members listed.

Table 4.52

Information about opportunities for support (Item 29)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Yes	61%	73%	44%	43%
No	39%	27%	56%	57%
n	1.278	504	241	116

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

In general 61% of the respondents found information about opportunities for support. Respondents from Finland had a higher rate of these information sources (73%). The majority of the students from Ireland (56%) and Turkey (57%) did not find any information about opportunities for support.

Table 4.53

(Rather) satisfied with different sources of advice about the possibilities of financial support (Item 29.1a – 29.1h)*

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
My higher education institute	48%	44%	45%	53%
Friends and family	47%	52%	31%	65%
Other students or graduates	35%	39%	28%	43%
Media	29%	34%	11%	37%
Employer	24%	9%	58%	41%
Colleagues	19%	14%	26%	44%
Another education institution	11%	7%	18%	25%
Other(s)	18%	18%	24%	15%
n	564 - 985	298 - 481	63 - 139	34 - 75

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

*) Response options: satisfied – rather satisfied – rather not satisfied – not satisfied – I didn't use this advice.

The respondents got (rather) satisfying advice about the possibilities of financial support form their higher education institute (48%) and from their friends and family (47%). For respondents from Finland (52%) and Turkey (65%) the advice from friends and family was (rather) satisfying. The employer was the best source for students from Ireland (58%). By interpreting the table above it is to keep in mind that there is the response option "I didn't use this advice" (see appendix). As a big part of the open answers (category "other(s)") the respondents named institutions like social welfare, government or job centre.

Table 4.54

Sufficiently informed about the possibilities of financial support (Item 30)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Yes	60%	69%	49%	41%
No	40%	31%	51%	59%
n	1.265	502	236	116

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

60% of the respondents feel sufficiently informed about the possibilities of financial support. The table above shows that students from Ireland and Turkey have a lack of information in the matter of financial support.

Table 4.55

Relevance of financial support for the decision to study (Item 31)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
The support was a critical factor to start my study	27%	21%	35%	42%
The support was among others a factor to starting my study	23%	18%	26%	25%
The allowance has not been relevant to starting my study	50%	61%	39%	33%
n	1.217	506	217	102

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Financial support was for 50% of the respondents a factor to start the study. The financial support was a little bit more important for students form Ireland (61%) and Turkey (67%).

Table 4.56

Amount invested in the study, in Euro (Item 32)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
up to 250	11%	19%	6%	13%
251 - 500	16%	20%	17%	17%
501 – 1.000	19%	16%	11%	13%
1.001 – 2.500	20%	17%	21%	13%
2.501 – 5.000	15%	12%	23%	8%
5.001 – 10.000	12%	12%	12%	24%
10.001 – 20.000	5%	3%	9%	11%
> 20.000	1%	-	1%	1%
Median	1.446	1.000	2.200	1.802
Mean	3.165	2.687	3.925	4.858
Minimum	14	50	90	14
Maximum	45.039	20.000	25.000	45.039
n	724	185	191	71

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The respondents invest approximately €3.165,-- in their study. The range varies between €14,-- and €45.039. Looking at the median it is obvious that students from Ireland spend the highest amount (€2.200,--) and students from Finland the lowest (€ 1.000,--).

Table 4.57

For the studies as appropriate considered financial support, in Euro (Item 33)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
up to 250	10%	4%	5%	17%
251 - 500	16%	19%	15%	20%
501 – 1.000	21%	31%	23%	6%
1.001 – 2.500	21%	13%	25%	16%
2.501 – 5.000	15%	17%	17%	19%
5.001 – 10.000	12%	13%	11%	11%
10.001 – 20.000	4%	3%	5%	8%
> 20.000	1%	1%	-	3%
Median	1.250	1.000	1.500	1.802
Mean	3.079	3.302	3.029	3.975
Minimum	20	100	50	20
Maximum	45.000	30.000	20.000	22.520
n	497	72	133	64

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

For the respondents the appropriate amount as a financial support €1.250,-- (median) is. The range varies between €20,-- and €45.000,--. The students from Turkey consider with €1.802,-- the highest amount.

Table 4.58
Maximum amount to invest in the study, in Euro (Item 34)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
up to 250	8%	6%	2%	38%
251 - 500	12%	8%	8%	20%
501 – 1.000	17%	21%	21%	8%
1.001 – 2.500	23%	20%	22%	11%
2.501 – 5.000	21%	25%	23%	6%
5.001 – 10.000	12%	12%	14%	3%
10.001 – 20.000	5%	4%	10%	3%
> 20.000	3%	4%	1%	12%
Median	2.000	2.000	2.500	450
Mean	4.181	4.842	4.798	4.409
Minimum	1	1	90	10
Maximum	50.000	50.000	30.000	36.031
n	616	138	155	66

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The maximum amount the respondents would invest in their study is €2.000,-- (median) and varies between €1,-- and €50.000,--. Students from Ireland would spend € 2.500,-- - that is among the three compared nations the highest contribution.

4.5 Motives for Commitment to Lifelong Learning

This chapter deals with the different reasons, why the participants decided to study, which problems are resulting because of studying and working and which support would be helpful.

Table 4.59
Motives to study (Multiple responses possible) (Item 26.1-26.13)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
To advance prospects for personal growth	62%	68%	70%	45%
To gain knowledge and skills in a special field of interest	55%	59%	49%	40%
To increase chances of finding a job	51%	69%	34%	34%
To receive an academic title	39%	38%	45%	37%
To advance skills essential for the job	38%	28%	51%	48%
To increase motivation	29%	25%	38%	26%
To gain knowledge and skills for everyday life	26%	27%	27%	18%
To meet people	20%	23%	16%	14%
To gain a promotion	13%	7%	25%	16%
To become self-employed	11%	9%	6%	15%
To avoid job loss	9%	4%	15%	15%
Other(s)	6%	9%	2%	1%
n	1.525	555	279	185

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The main reasons, why the respondents study is to advance prospects for personal growth (62%), to gain knowledge in a special field of interest (55%) and to increase chances of finding a job (51%). To advance the skills essential for the job are relevant motives to study for the students in Ireland (51%) and in Turkey (48%). Most frequently the participants are saying, that they are forcing the study because they want change their career.

Table 4.60

Problems that result from the actual study (Multiple responses possible) (Item 27.1-27.14)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Reduction of free time	61%	61%	75%	42%
Stress	53%	59%	50%	51%
Financial problems	36%	49%	27%	28%
Less time to meet the job demands	21%	19%	23%	25%
Less time for learning	19%	20%	17%	16%
Excessive demands	16%	16%	25%	12%
Lack of career-development possibilities	11%	12%	7%	11%
Family problems	10%	8%	11%	6%
Problems with the arrival and departure to/from the educational centre	10%	10%	5%	10%
Problems to organise childcare	7%	8%	11%	3%
Threat of finding other employer	6%	6%	3%	4%
Problems with fellow students	4%	5%	1%	6%
Problems with colleagues at work	3%	1%	1%	9%
Other(s)	5%	7%	2%	1%
n	1.525	555	279	185

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

As it is to be expected time is a problem that results from studying and working. So have the participants' problems with the reduction of free time (61%) and stress (53%). Financial problem (36%) are in this ranking on the third place. Here it is also to mention, that some respondents don't think that there are problems resulting from their study as they noted in the open category "other(s)".

Table 4.61

Wished support from politics and public authorities (Multiple responses possible) (Item 35)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
More allowance for employed students	54%	68%	50%	35%
Tax relief for higher education	54%	54%	71%	31%
Support especially designed for employed students	44%	57%	41%	25%
Information about the job market	28%	21%	34%	25%
Publication of analysis regarding education and job market (e.g. analyses of needs)	19%	15%	23%	18%
Government-arranged childcare especially for employed students	16%	16%	15%	18%
Other(s)	3%	4%	1%	1%
n	1.525	555	279	185

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

From politics and publics authorities respondents would like to have more financial support like more allowance for employed students and tax relief for higher education (each with 54%)

Table 4.62
Wished support from the higher education institute (Multiple responses possible) (Item 36)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Flexibility when job-related requirements increase	40%	49%	41%	32%
Timetable adaptation to employed students	40%	52%	37%	28%
Improvement of the recognition of prior learnings (or experience)	36%	37%	44%	30%
More possibilities for distance learning	35%	46%	32%	23%
Upgrade of the quality of teaching	34%	49%	16%	26%
More internet possibilities at the high education centre	18%	15%	22%	19%
Modularisation of the study	17%	9%	21%	17%
Media coverage about possible studies	15%	13%	20%	10%
Other(s)	3%	3%	2%	1%
n	1.525	555	279	185

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

From the higher education institute the respondents would like to have more flexibility when job-related requirements increase and as well timetableadaptions to employed students (each with 40%). In Finland would also be an upgrade of the quality of teaching (49%) important.

4.6 Satisfaction with the study

The general satisfaction and the satisfaction with different aspects of the actual study are described in this chapter.

Table 4.63
General satisfaction with the actual study (Item 21)

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Yes	86%	80%	94%	83%
No	14%	20%	6%	17%
n	1.362	521	252	139

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The respondents are in general satisfied with their actual study (86%). First and foremost this applies to students from Ireland (94%).

Table 4.64

Satisfaction with the actual study: (rather) satisfied with different aspects of the study (Item 22.1 – 22.10)*

	Total	Finland	Ireland	Turkey
Personal contact with students	90%	90%	92%	90%
Personal contact with teachers	81%	73%	90%	81%
Professional knowledge of the teachers	80%	69%	90%	81%
Content	74%	60%	90%	73%
Kind of lessons	70%	60%	87%	70%
Career orientation	70%	67%	83%	59%
Necessary work	69%	63%	87%	68%
Pedagogic-didactical knowledge of the teachers	69%	57%	81%	66%
Organisation at the higher education institute	68%	60%	82%	67%
Other(s)	12%	6%	22%	35%
n	472 - 1.370	208 - 528	76 - 258	34 - 135

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

) Question: "Are you satisfied with…"; Response options: satisfied – rather satisfied – rather not satisfied – not satisfied – not applicable.

The table above shows the satisfaction of different aspects of the actual study of the respondents. The students are (rather) satisfied with the personal contact with students (90%) and teachers (81%) as well as with the professional knowledge of the teachers (80%). This ranking is among the nations the same. The Irish students have the highest satisfaction rates in all aspects. The Finnish students have in comparison among the three nations the lowest rates except career orientation. In this matter the Turkish respondents are with 59% the bottom of the table.

4.7 Types of learners

Further analyses haven been carried out to specify possible differences between the five main types of learners as proposed by Hefler and Markowitsch (2010).

Because of the fact, that the Questionnaire for Learners didn't contain an item that directly referred to this typology, the classification of the participants was deduced from the patterns of answers to the question about their motives to study. So, it should be noted that this classification needs to be considered as an approximation.

The table below shows the frequency of each type of learners in the sample of this survey.

Table 4.65

Types of learners

	Frequency	Percentage
Completing	137	12%
Returning	100	9%
Transforming	353	31%
Reinforcing	177	15%
Compensating	388	34%
Total	1155	100%

Source: 3s Survey Learners, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Concerning the learners' country of residence, it becomes apparent that in some cases certain types of learners are over- or underrepresented. For example, among the Finnish participants the frequencies of Returning, Transforming and Reinforcing Learners deviate from the average (40%). Differences of a similar kind also arise for Ireland, Lithuania and Turkey.

Table 4.66

What is your country of residence? (Item 0)

	Total	Compl.	Ret.	Transf.	Reinf.	Comps.
Belgium	10%	8%	9%	10%	7%	12%
Finland	40%	40%	60%	51%	19%	35%
France	2%	2%	4%	2%	2%	1%
Ireland	18%	5%	8%	16%	27%	23%
Lithuania	10%	26%	4%	7%	5%	11%
Netherlands	4%	1%	3%	5%	6%	4%
Scotland	4%	2%	4%	4%	7%	5%
Turkey	10%	14%	6%	5%	22%	10%
Other country	2%	2%	2%	1%	4%	1%
n	1147	136	100	350	176	385

Source: 3s Survey Learners, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

In the group of Reinforcing Learners the gender ratio is almost balanced, in the other groups of types of learners 67% to 79% are women.

The highest education level of Completing, Returning and Transforming Learners is most frequently "upper secondary". The majority of Reinforcing Learners and – to a lower extent – Compensating Learners completed a first-stage tertiary education. The relative number of employed learners is somewhat higher within the groups of Reinforcing, Compensating and Transforming Learners than within the groups of Completing and Returning Learners. In general, these results are consistent with the definitions of the types of learners.

4.7.1 Differences between the types of learners

In this section, it is reported in which aspects of their expectations of Lifelong Learning the five main types differ remarkably. First and foremost, this concerns the question about the provision of support by the company.

Table 4.67

What kind of support is provided by your company? (Item 24)

	Total	Compl.	Ret.	Transf.	Reinf.	Comps.
Educational leave	37%	37%	17%	26%	54%	44%
Financial aid	25%	18%	8%	18%	47%	26%
Integrating higher education into the career plan	21%	18%	13%	13%	42%	22%
Information about higher education	19%	17%	7%	14%	39%	17%
Information about company-internal support	19%	17%	10%	12%	41%	18%
n	845-888	86-89	71-76	250-263	135-145	301-318

Source: 3s Survey Learners, 05/2010 - 03/2011.
*) This table aggregates the number of "is provided"-answers to the five separate questions about each aspect.

Referring the aspects mentioned in the table above, there is a clear tendency that Reinforcing Learners receive more support by their companies than the other types of learners. For Compensating Learners the chance for educational leave is also above the average. The percentage of Returning Learners with this possibility is the lowest one.

No differences between the types of learners could be found with regard to flexible working hours, the possibility to lower the weekly working hours, exemptions for exam preparation, childcare, information about government support, the possibility to learn during working hours, the use of company-internal resources (e.g. internet, printer, etc.) and "Other" support. Overall, the most frequently provided kinds of support are flexible working hours (59%) and the use of company-internal resources (46%).

Table 4.68

Who advised you about the possibilities of financial support and have you been satisfied with the advice? – Employer (Item 29.1)

	Total	Compl.	Ret.	Transf.	Reinf.	Comps.
Satisfied	16%	5%	3%	10%	34%	20%
Rather satisfied	7%	8%	7%	7%	6%	6%
Rather not satisfied	3%	-	-	2%	6%	4%
Not Satisfied	7%	3%	1%	5%	11%	9%
I didn't use this advice	67%	85%	89%	76%	43%	61%
n	808	78	73	249	131	277

Source: 3s Survey Learners, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

In the table above, it can be seen that the employers' advice about the possibilities of financial support generally have not been used by the majority of learners. However, the Reinforcing Learners reported more satisfaction with their employer's advice than the other types of learners. Across all types of learners, the participants were most satisfied with the advice from their friends and families (28%) and their higher education institutes (27%).

4.7.2 Further type-specific information for higher education institutes

Though there are no or rather slight differences between the types of learners regarding the aspects highlighted in this section, the type-specific information given here might be useful for higher education institutes.

Table 4.69
What kind of support from your higher education institute do you wish for your education? (Multiple responses possible) (Item 36)

	Compl.	Ret.	Transf.	Reinf.	Comps.
Flexibility when job-related requirements increase	46%	56%	50%	51%	57%
Timetable adaptation to employed students	50%	51%	51%	47%	56%
Improvement of the recognition of prior learning (or experience)	44%	34%	40%	56%	52%
More possibilities for distance learning	46%	38%	48%	41%	48%
Upgrade of the quality of teaching	57%	59%	45%	33%	43%
More internet possibilities at the high education centre	24%	13%	21%	27%	27%
Modularisation of the study	23%	16%	17%	30%	26%
Media coverage about possible studies	18%	15%	18%	22%	24%
Other(s)	2%	8%	5%	1%	2%
n	109	85	319	153	344

Source: 3s Survey Learners, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Completing Learners most frequently wish for upgrades of the quality of teaching and timetable adaptations to employed students. Upgrades of the quality of teaching would also be appreciated by Returning Learners, as well as flexibility when job-related requirements increase. Transforming Learners and Compensating Learners primarily want timetable adaptations to employed students and flexibility when job-related requirements increase. Most Reinforcing Learners' wishes refer to improvements of the recognition of prior learning or experience and to flexibility when job-related requirements increase.

All five types of learners prefer classes during the day and lectures by experts. There are also no differences between the types concerning what they rather dislike: courses

at the weekend and distance learning on the basis of books or scripts. Reinforcing Learners prefer internships to a lesser extent than the other types (Items 14 and 15).

The majority of learners received information about the possibility of recognition of prior learning from their higher education institute. The percentages reach from 51% (Reinforcing Learners) to 77% (Completing Learners). 20% of the Reinforcing Learners were informed by their employers. Knowledge about the recognition of prior learning was the most relevant factor to start their study for Reinforcing and Completing Learners (Items 17.1 and 17.4).

The organisation at the higher education institute was rated as (rather) satisfying by 68% of all participants. Returning Learners tend to have been a little less satisfied than the other types of learners. That's also true for the higher education institutes' general advice for prospective students. The higher education institutes' advice about the possibilities of financial support were used by 61% of the learners. There is a tendency that Completing Learners were more satisfied with those advice than the other types of learners. Financial support was a critical factor to start a study for 27% of the learners, for 50% it wasn't relevant (Items 22, 25, 29.1 and 31).

4.8 Summary of results

In total 1.525 students participated in the survey. 98% of the respondents are from the eight aim countries of the FLLLEX-project. The remaining 2% are from different – first and foremost – European countries. In average the respondents are 27 years old and almost three quarter are female. In general the highest achieved education level is an upper secondary education. The working respondents spend in average 37,5 hours per week for their job and have an approximately annual income of €20.000,--. Participants from Ireland earn more and participants from Turkey less than the average.

The study takes about three or four years and the main field of study can be find in Business and Administration. Followed by Humanities and Social Sciences as well as Health Sciences which correspondents with the sector of the company. First and foremost the acquired degree is a Bachelor. The weekly effort of time is varying, but the biggest groups can be found in the categories 11 to 20 hours and 21 to 40 hours per week. For the most students the working time is adequate to learn the contents of teaching. This rate is getting a little bit down concerning the performance of work and study as well as having enough spare time for personal life.

More than 60% of the participants got prior learning recognised for their study. But not even half of the respondents gathered information about recognition of prior learning. Most frequently the information source of the possibility of recognition of prior learning was the higher education institute. But it was more or less easy for the respondents to get information in this matter. The respondents were more or less satisfied with the quality of the received information on the one hand and with the process of recognition on the other.

The employers support the respondents with flexible working hours and the use of company-internal resources. This kind of support is as well important for the partici-

pants. The biggest differences between provided and important support are the integration of higher education into the career plan, information about company-internal support and information about government support. But to enable the study employers do provide the creation of individual career plans.

The most important motive to study is to advance prospects for personal growth. But also to gain knowledge and skills in a special field of interest and job-related reasons played a decisive role. The reduction of free time and stress are the main problem the participants have to handle. To support Lifelong Learning for working adults the respondents wish from politics and public authorities more allowance for employed students and tax relief for higher education. From the higher education institute the participants wish flexibility when job-related requirements increase as well as timetable adaption to employed students. Although the students were satisfied with the process of recognition of prior learning they wish an improvement of the recognition of prior learnings.

5 Survey of Expectations of Businesses

The survey of expectations of business targets to businesses and enterprises to gather information about the handling of vocational training within different business organisations. A web based questionnaire was developed. This questionnaire was on the one hand spread by the partner per country within their nation. On the other hand the web based questionnaire could be used for interviews conducted by phone or personal. The statistical data, which was gathered by the interviews, identifies the major driving forces as well as the obstacles to engage in LLL-programmes.

5.1 Methodology of the survey

A web-based questionnaire was developed. This questionnaire was used for a quantitative online survey as well as a basis for interviews by phone. The partners per country were responsible for the interviews and also to contact the businesses and interview partners. The partners had to contact at least approximately 40 stakeholders to get feedback from 20 of them (per partner country). The partners needed to contact them before sending them the link to the web-based questionnaire, because otherwise the stakeholders wouldn't answer it (approx. 50% returning rate, if contacted via phone beforehand). The advantage of phone interviews is an easier control of the returning rate as well as the possibility of conducting the interview in the national language.

The time flow of the survey is shown in table 5.1.

Table 5.1
Time flow of the survey LifeLong Learners

	2010									2011			
	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	01	02	03	04ff
Developing questionnaire (in English)	X												
Data collection (quantitative and per phone)		X	X	X									
Data collection - extension					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Data analysis and report												X	X

Source: 3s Survey Students, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

20 or more than 20 companies were reached in Ireland, Netherlands and Turkey. The other countries reached less than 20 companies.

The main topics of the survey were demographic datas (e.g. branche, number of employers etc.), the promotion of LLL (including motives and obstacles of the engage of LLL), assumptions about the staff's point of view and the cooperation with different educational organisations.

The following chapters are showing the results of the survey of businesses.

5.2 Demographics

To begin with, this chapter summarizes the demographic data concerning the participating businesses.

Most of the companies were seated in Ireland (24%), Netherlands (23%), Turkey (20%) and Lithunia (16%). Further participants were from Belgium (7%), Scotland (5%), Finland (2%), France (1%) and United Kingdom (1%; named as "other country").

Table 5.2
Country of residence (Item 0)

	Frequency	Percentage
Ireland	24	24%
Netherlands	23	23%
Turkey	20	20%
Lithunia	16	16%
Belgium	7	7%
Scotland	5	5%
Finland	2	2%
France	1	1%
Other Country	1	1%
Total	99	100%

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

12 of the businesses didn't give any information about their countries of residence. Hence, a sum of 111 companies filled in the questionnaire.

This sample size has to be kept in mind when interpreting the results of the survey of the businesses' expectations. However, a closer look at the enterprises' point of view might contribute to getting a better idea of the conditions for Lifelong Learning.

The verbal descriptions of the results in this chapter generally refer to the data in total, but also noticeable differences between Ireland and Turkey are outlined. The country-specific results for Finland are not reported because of the fact that only two Finnish businesses participated in this survey.

Table 5.3
Sector (Item 1)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Education	15%	9%	25%
Manufacturing	15%	26%	20%
Health and social work	7%	4%	-
Public administration and defence; compulsory social security	6%	9%	5%
Construction	5%	-	20%
Financial intermediation	5%	9%	-
Wholesale and retail trade: personal and household goods	5%	13%	-
Other community, social and personal activities	4%	9%	5%
Transport, storage and communication	3%	4%	-
Agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing	2%	-	5%
Electricity, gas and water supply	2%	-	-
Hotels and restaurants	2%	4%	-
Real estate, renting and business activities, consulting	2%	-	-
Repair of motor vehicles, motorcycles	1%	-	-
Other(s)	25%	13%	20%
n	99	24	20

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The businesses predominantly work in the education sector or in the manufacturing sector (15%, respectively). 7% are part of the health and social work sector, 6% belonged to public administration, defence or compulsory social security. In the category "other" sector information technology, advertising and media were most frequent.

Table 5.4
Number of employees (Item 2)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Up to 50 employees	32%	38%	21%
51 to 250 employees	33%	38%	53%
More than 250 employees	35%	25%	26%
n	97	24	19

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

As shown in the table above, the participating companies were almost equally distributed to the three categories in terms of the number of employees.

Table 5.5

Approximate annual turnover (Item 2.1)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Less than € 1.000.000,–	23%	20%	100%
€ 1.000.000,– to € 4.999.999,–	38%	40%	-
€ 5.000.000,– to € 9.999.999,–	8%	-	-
€ 10.000.000,– to € 14.999.999,–	3%	10%	-
€ 15.000.000,– to € 19.999.999,–	5%	10%	-
€ 20.000.000,– and more	23%	20%	-
n	39	10	2

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

61% of the businesses estimated their approximate annual turnovers to be lower than €5.000.000,–, another 23% achieve turnovers of €20.000.000,– and more. The median of the approximate annual turnovers amounted to €2.891.600,–.

Table 5.6

Does your company have a policy or guidelines with regard to participation in educational activities? (Item 3)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Yes	59%	52%	35%
No	38%	43%	65%
I don't know	3%	4%	-
n	98	23	20

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Being asked about the existence of a policy or guidelines regarding the employees' participation in educational activities, 59% of the companies answered with "yes", and 38% stated to have no policy or guidelines concerning this matter.

Table 5.7

When does your company enable higher education for employees? (Multiple responses possible) (Item 3.2)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Employees wish to study	79%	79%	80%
Reorganisation of the company or departments	23%	25%	10%
Reward for performance	16%	13%	5%
Never	8%	17%	10%
Other(s)	16%	-	-
n	98	24	20

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

A look at the table above reveals that the companies first and foremost enable higher education when the employees wish to study (79%). In 23% of the businesses higher

education for the employees is due to a reorganisation of the company or departments. As an "other" reason to enable higher education job requirements were mentioned.

Table 5.8

Criteria used to select employees for participation in higher education (Item 5)*

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Qualification requirements	47%	26%	15%
Responsibility for employees	45%	22%	21%
Duration of employment	29%	38%	11%
Travel activity	16%	4%	29%
n	94-98	23-24	17-20

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

*) This table aggregates the number of "yes"-answers to the four separate questions about each criterion.

The most frequently named criteria for the selection of employees to participate in higher education were qualification requirements and responsibility for employees. In Ireland the employees are primarily selected by the duration of employment, in Turkey travel activity is the main criterion.

36% of the companies (systematically) assess the competences of an employee for a certain higher education, mostly at application (43%) or at an annual update (40%).

Table 5.9

Is there a defined budget for educational activities within your company? (Item 4)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Yes	45%	38%	5%
No	48%	58%	90%
I don't know	8%	4%	5%
n	103	24	20

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

In 45% of the businesses there is defined budget for educational programmes. The median amounted to €10.695,–. 48% usually do not budget a certain amount for their employees' further education. In the Turkish enterprises this percentage is significantly higher (90%).

5.3 Promotion of Lifelong Learning

This chapter deals with different aspects of the promotion of Lifelong Learning in the participating companies.

Table 5.10

Is higher education promoted by your company and/or do your employees come up with own suggestions? (Item 6)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Higher Education is promoted: The company makes suggestions to the employees.	15%	33%	5%
Higher Education is promoted: Employees make suggestions to the company.	28%	21%	30%
Higher Education is promoted: The company as well as employees make suggestions.	39%	25%	25%
Higher Education is not promoted.	19%	21%	40%
n	108	24	20

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Suggestions referring to higher education are usually made by both companies and employees (39%). 19% of the companies do not promote higher education. With 40%, the number of Turkish companies that do not promote higher education is quite clearly above average.

Table 5.11

Fields of study promoted by the companies (Item 7)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Business and Administration	31%	47%	25%
Humanities and Social Sciences	11%	5%	17%
Information Technology	11%	37%	8%
Education	8%	-	-
Engineering Science	8%	5%	17%
Natural, Physical, Chemical and Mathematical Sciences	8%	5%	8%
Health Sciences	4%	-	-
Law	1%	-	-
Mass Communication and Information Science	1%	-	-
Other(s)	16%	-	25%
n	83	19	12

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The primarily promoted fields of study are Businesses and Administration, Humanities and Social Sciences as well as Information Technology. In general, it can be stated that these results correspond with the data regarding the sectors in which the companies work.

Table 5.12

Degrees pursued by the staff (Multiple responses possible) (Item 8)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Bachelor	71%	63%	33%
Master	57%	42%	92%
PhD	29%	16%	83%
Certificate	53%	74%	8%
Other(s)	13%	26%	-
n	75	19	12

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The degrees most frequently pursued by the staff are Bachelor degrees (71%), Master degrees (57%) and certificates (53%). In Ireland the employees tend to achieve certificates and Bachelor degrees, whereas in Turkey the employees prefer Master and PhD degrees.

Table 5.13

Support provided by the company (Multiple responses possible) (Item 10.1)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Flexible working hours	70%	94%	73%
Educational leave	51%	72%	27%
Financial aid	49%	72%	9%
Use of company-internal resources (e.g. internet, printer, etc.)	32%	33%	9%
Integrating higher education into the career plan	26%	17%	18%
Exemption for exam preparation	25%	44%	9%
Possibility to learn during working hours	25%	11%	18%
Possibility to lower the weekly working hours	24%	33%	18%
Information about higher education	17%	33%	9%
Information about company-internal support	14%	17%	-
Information about government support	7%	11%	9%
Childcare	3%	-	9%
Other support	4%	6%	-
n	76	18	11

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The table above makes clear that the employees attending higher education are supported by flexible working hours (70%), educational leave (51%), financial aid (49%) and the permission to use company-internal resources (32%).

Table 5.14

Support used by the staff (Multiple responses possible) (Item 10.2)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Flexible working hours	73%	94%	82%
Educational leave	50%	78%	18%
Financial aid	47%	78%	9%
Use of company-internal resources (e.g. internet, printer, etc.)	29%	28%	9%
Integrating higher education into the career plan	22%	17%	9%
Exemption for exam preparation	28%	44%	18%
Possibility to learn during working hours	18%	11%	-
Possibility to lower the weekly working hours	23%	33%	27%
Information about higher education	18%	33%	18%
Information about company-internal support	14%	17%	-
Information about government support	5%	11%	9%
Childcare	3%	-	-
Other support	4%	6%	-
n	78	18	11

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

Flexible working hours (73%), educational leave (50%), financial aid (47%) and the permission to use company-internal resources (29%) are also considered as the kinds of support predominantly used by the staff.

Table 5.15

Do you encourage your employees to get a degree from college or university by ... ? (Multiple responses possible) (Item 14)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Creation of individual career plans	40%	50%	67%
More information about the supply of higher education	40%	92%	17%
Consulting services to evaluate the demand of competences	16%	-	-
Offering information about government grants for higher education	14%	33%	17%
Expanded supply of higher education specialised for the operative demand	10%	-	-
Offering information about tax relief for higher education	10%	17%	-
Consulting services to determine measures of higher education	9%	8%	17%
Organising higher education with other companies	9%	8%	-
Finding replacements for the employees in higher education	5%	-	17%
Other(s)	19%	-	17%
n	58	12	6

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

The businesses encourage their employees to get a degree from college or university first and foremost by offering more information about the supply of higher education and by creating individual career plans (40%, respectively). A part of the open answers concerning "other" aspects of encouragement can be summarized as sort of general support (material and non-material) of the employees' wishes to study.

Table 5.16

Factors that prevent the companies from taking more actions concerning further education for the employees (Multiple responses possible) (Item 18)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Costs of further higher education	47%	65%	50%
Absence of a replacement for the employee undertaking higher education	34%	30%	38%
The offers of higher education do not suit our needs	18%	15%	6%
Threat of changing employers after the degree	16%	25%	6%
Temporary bottlenecks of the staff	10%	15%	-
Lack of information about further higher education	9%	20%	6%
Scepticism regarding the effects of higher education	8%	10%	
Too extensive organisation of further higher education	6%	-	19%
Problems of estimating the demand for further higher education	3%	-	6%
Other(s)	18%	5%	6%
n	77	20	16

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

As the crucial obstacles to take more actions concerning further education the companies named its costs (47%), the absence of replacements for the employees undertaking higher education (34%) and the mismatch between the companies' needs and the available offers of higher education (18%).

Table 5.17

Did any of the educational actions taken in the last two years lead to the following results in your company regarding ... ? (Multiple responses possible) (Item 13)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Significant improvement of skills and expertise	60%	87%	56%
Raise in satisfaction and more involvement	58%	80%	56%
Gain in efficiency	31%	60%	22%
Development of innovations	28%	27%	-
Raise in salary of the staff concerned	26%	33%	-
Organisational changes within the company	25%	33%	11%
Networking with new consumers, other companies, etc.	20%	27%	22%
Increase in sales	18%	20%	11%
Cost reduction	15%	47%	-
Other(s)	15%	-	-
n	65	15	9

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

In 60% of the businesses educational programmes taken in the last two years resulted in significant improvements of skills and expertise, and 58% reported raises in satisfaction and more involvement. Further effects of higher education were gains in efficiency (31%) and the development of innovations (28%).

5.4 Assumptions about the staff's point of view

The businesses were also asked about the motives of their employees to study and about the problems employees undertaking higher education are faced with.

Table 5.18

Motives to study (Multiple responses possible) (Item 11)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
To advance skills essential for the job	90%	94%	100%
To advance prospects for personal growth	79%	94%	70%
To gain knowledge and skills in a special field of interest	59%	81%	30%
To increase motivation	41%	69%	60%
To gain a promotion	35%	88%	20%
To gain knowledge and skills for everyday life	25%	50%	20%
To receive an academic title	24%	44%	40%
To increase chances of finding a job	18%	31%	30%
To avoid job loss	15%	31%	-
To meet people	12%	19%	10%
To become self-employed	4%	-	10%
Other(s)	1%	-	-
n	68	16	10

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

A large number of companies (90%) assume the advance of skills essential for the job to be the main motive to study. 79% are of the opinion that their employees study to advance the prospects for personal growth, and 59% think that their employees do so to gain knowledge and skills in a special field of interest.

Table 5.19

Problems that result from undertaking higher education (Multiple responses possible) (Item 12)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Reduction of free time	62%	79%	67%
Stress	51%	50%	56%
Less time to meet the job demands	43%	36%	67%
Less time for learning	20%	7%	11%
Financial problems	11%	29%	-
Problems to organise childcare	10%	21%	-
Threat of finding other employer	10%	7%	11%
Family problems	8%	7%	-
Lack of career-development possibilities	8%	21%	-
Excessive demands	7%	21%	11%
Problems with colleagues at work	3%	7%	-
Problems with the arrival and departure to/from the educational centre	3%	7%	-
Other(s)	8%	-	-
n	61	14	9

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

For the staff the main problems that result from undertaking higher education are reduction of free time (62%), stress (51%) and less time to meet the job demands (43%).

5.5 Cooperation with educational organisations

Some items of the questionnaire were concerned with the cooperation between the participating companies and educational organisations. The answers are overviewed in this chapter.

Table 5.20

Whom do you usually select to execute the training of your staff? (Multiple responses possible) (Item 15)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
University college	51%	75%	-
Private consultant	50%	44%	20%
University	40%	19%	70%
Short term educational centre	37%	38%	10%
Job employment service of the state	9%	-	-
Other(s)	13%	6%	10%
I don't know	4%	6%	20%
n	70	16	10

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

For the execution of trainings the businesses tend to select university colleges (51%), private consultants (50%) or universities (40%). The Irish companies usually cooperate with university colleges (75%), whereas the Turkish companies prefer universities as cooperation partners (70%). These country-specific results might explain the differences between Ireland and Turkey regarding the predominantly pursued degrees in both countries (Certificates/Bachelor vs. Master/PhD; see Table 5.12).

Table 5.21

Why do you select this partner? (Multiple responses possible) (Item 16)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Proven results	65%	69%	30%
Reputation	63%	88%	50%
The staff simply likes it	16%	31%	-
Financial support from external funds	10%	19%	10%
Other(s)	22%	-	-
I don't know	6%	6%	30%
n	68	16	10

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

For the selection of their cooperation partners the businesses generally rely on proven results (65%) and reputation (63%).

Table 5.22

Do you have a close cooperation or even agreement with a nearby university college? (Item 17)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Yes	55%	67%	70%
No	41%	33%	20%
I don't know	4%	-	10%
n	71	15	10

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

More than the half of the participating companies (55%) stated to have a close cooperation or an agreement with a nearby university college.

Table 5.23

Why do you NOT have a close cooperation or even an agreement with a nearby university college? (Multiple responses possible) (Item 17.1)

	Total	Ireland	Turkey
Has never been proposed	72%	80%	50%
They do not offer anything interesting	17%	20%	-
Too expensive	17%	-	50%
Bad reputation	6%	-	-
Below our 'standard'	6%	-	-
Too 'young' in terms of student population	6%	-	-
Other(s)	11%	20%	-
n	18	5	2

Source: 3s Survey Businesses, 05/2010 - 03/2011.

For 72% of the businesses that do not cooperate with a nearby university college, the reason for that is that a cooperation or agreement has never been proposed.

5.6 Summary of results

In total, 111 companies from 10 countries participated in the survey of expectations of businesses. In 81% of the businesses higher education is promoted. In most cases it is suggested by both companies and employees (39%).

Almost 60% of the participating enterprises do have a policy or guidelines regarding the participation of their staffs in educational activities. The employees are predominantly selected for higher education programmes due to qualification requirements (47%) and responsibility for other employees (45%).

Employees who attend higher education are supported by the provision of flexible working hours (70%), educational leave (51%) and financial aid (49%). Furthermore, the employees are encouraged to study at colleges or universities by the creation of indi-

vidual career plans and by being given more information about the supply of higher education (40%, respectively). As the main factors that prevent the companies from taking more actions concerning further education for their employees, they most frequently named the costs of further higher education (47%) and the absence of replacements for the employees in higher education programmes (34%).

Usually the businesses select university colleges (51%) or private consultants (50%) to execute the training of their staffs. 55% of the companies stated to have a close cooperation or even an agreement with a nearby university college.

6 Annexes

6.1 Literature

Aslanian, Carol B., and Henry M. Brickell 1980. Americans in Transition: Life Changes as Reasons for Adult Learning. College Board Publication Orders, Box 2815, Princeton, NJ 08541 ($10.75). http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED195687.

Blair, Amy, Joanna McPake, and Pamela Munn 1995. "A New Conceptualisation of Adult Participation in Education." British Educational Research Journal 21 (December): 629-644. doi:10.1080/0141192950210506.

Boshier, Roger 1971. "Motivational Orientations of Adult Education Participants: a Factor Analytic Exploration of Houle's Typology." Adult Education Quarterly 21 (2) (January 1): 3 -26. doi:10.1177/074171367102100201.

Boshier, Roger, and John B. Collins 1983. "Education Participation Scale Factor Structure and Socio - Demographic Correlates for 12 000 Learners." International Journal of Lifelong Education 2 (January): 163-177. doi:10.1080/0260137830020205.

Cross, K. Patricia 1981. Adults as Learners. Increasing Participation and Facilitating Learning. Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, P.O. Box 62425, San Francisco, CA 94162 ($15.95). http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED200099.

Crossan, Beth, John Field, Jim Gallacher, and Barbara Merrill 2003. "Understanding Participation in Learning for Non-traditional Adult Learners: Learning careers and the construction of learning identities." British Journal of Sociology of Education 24 (January): 55-67. doi:10.1080/01425690301907.

Hefler, Günter, and Jörg Markowitsch 2010. "Formal adult learning and working in Europe: a new typology of participation patterns." Journal of Workplace Learning 22 (1/2) (February 23): 79-93. doi:10.1108/13665621011012870.

Houle, Cyril O. 1988. The Inquiring Mind: A Study of the Adult Who Continues To Learn. Second Edition. Oklahoma Research Center for Continuing Professional and Higher Education, OCCE/200 McCarter Hall, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73037-0003 ($12). http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED365848.

Kasworm, Carol E. 1990. "Adult Undergraduates in Higher Education: A Review of Past Research Perspectives." Review of Educational Research 60 (3): 345 -372. doi:10.3102/00346543060003345.

Kim, Ahjin, and Sharan B. Merriam 2004. "MOTIVATIONS FOR LEARNING AMONG OLDER ADULTS IN A LEARNING IN RETIREMENT INSTITUTE." Educational Gerontology 30 (June): 441-455. doi:10.1080/03601270490445069.

Mohney, Carol, and Wayne Anderson. "The effect of life events and relationships on adult women's decisions to enroll in college." Journal of Counseling & Development. http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/1988-24826-001.

Morstain, Barry R., and John C. Smart 1977. "A Motivational Typology of Adult Learners." The Journal of Higher Education 48 (6) (November 1): 665-679. doi:10.2307/1979011.

Rammel, Stephanie. National Report Austria (draft). Towards a Lifelong Learning Society in Europe: the Contribution of the Education System Subproject 3. Donau Universität Krems.

Reehling, Jean E. 1980. "They Are Returning: But, Are They Staying?" Journal of College Student Personnel 21 (6) (November): 491-97.

Scanlon, Lesley 2008. "Adults' motives for returning to study: the role of self-authoring." Studies in Continuing Education 30 (March): 17-32. doi:10.1080/01580370701639869.

Sewall, Timothy J. "A study of adult undergraduates: What causes them to seek a degree?" Journal of College Student Personnel. http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/1985-18662-001.

Stokes, Ann, und Richard Thorn. Flllex Work Package 1: National Policies for the Implementation of Lifelong Learning. Dublin: Institutes of Technology Ireland, o. J.

Vermeersch, L., and K. De Rick 2008. "Lifelong Learning 2010-subproject 4. SMEs and the participation of workers in formal learning. Case studies: Belgium (Flemish Community)."

6.2 Questionnaire for Learners

The questionnaire for learners can be divided in the parts "demographic", "training", "description of study" and "motive to study". Every item is listed below.

Demographic

0) What is your country of residence?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○   Belgium
- ○   Finland
- ○   France
- ○   Ireland
- ○   Lithuania
- ○   Netherlands
- ○   Scotland
- ○   Turkey
- ○   Other country: *Textbox*

1) How old are you?
Only numbers may be entered in this field
Textbox

2) What is your gender?
Please choose one of the answers.
- ○   Male
- ○   Female

3) Do you have children?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○   Yes
- ○   No

if yes: How many?
Textbox
Only numbers may be entered in this field

4) Do you have responsibility for family care?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○   Yes
- ○   No

if yes: Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐   Childcare
- ☐   Homecare

5) Please specify your prior learnings! Specify if you attended or graduated and the year of graduation (excluding your current studies).

	attended	graduated	not applicable
0 Pre-primary education (e.g. kindergarden)	○	○	○
1 Primary education (first stage of basic/compulsory education, e.g. primary school)	○	○	○
2 Lower-secondary education (second/final stage of basic/compulsory education, e.g. general secondary school)	○	○	○
3 Upper secondary education (e.g. medium-level secondary technical and vocational colleges	○	○	○
4 Post-secondary, non-tertiary education (e.g. higher-level technical and vocational colleges)	○	○	○
5 First stage of tertiary education (e.g. bachelor, master, diploma study)	○	○	○
6 Second stage of tertiary education (e.g. doctorate study, habilitation)	○	○	○
Other(s)	○	○	○

Year of graduation - Pre-primary level of education

Textbox

Only numbers may be entered in this field

Year of graduation - Primary level of education

Textbox

Only numbers may be entered in this field

Year of graduation - Lower-secondary level of education (sub-categories 2A, 2B and 2C *)

Textbox

Only numbers may be entered in this field

Year of graduation - Upper secondary level of education (sub-categories 3A, 3B and 3C*)

Textbox

Only numbers may be entered in this field

Year of graduation - Post-secondary, non-tertiary education (sub-categories 4A, 4B and 4C*)

Textbox

Only numbers may be entered in this field

Year of graduation - First stage of tertiary education : not leading directly to an advanced research qualification (sub-categories 5A and 5B*)

Textbox

Only numbers may be entered in this field

Year of graduation - Second stage of tertiary education: leading to an advanced research qualification
Textbox
Only numbers may be entered in this field

Year of graduation - Other(s)
Textbox
Only numbers may be entered in this field

6) Are you employed?
Please choose one of the answers.
- ○ Yes
- ○ No

6.1) How many hours per week do you work?
Hours/week: *Textbox*

6.2) What is the sector of the company where you work?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing
- ○ Manufacturing
- ○ Electricity, gas and water supply
- ○ Construction
- ○ Wholesale and retail trade: personal and household goods
- ○ Repair of motor vehicles, motorcycles
- ○ Hotels and restaurants
- ○ Transport, storage and communication
- ○ Financial intermediation
- ○ Real estate, renting and business activities
- ○ Consulting
- ○ Public administration and defence; compulsory
- ○ Social security
- ○ Education
- ○ Health and social work
- ○ Other community, social and personal activities
- ○ Activities of households
- ○ Extra-territorial organisations and bodies
- ○ Other
  Other: *Textbox*

6.3) In which position do you work?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Self-employed with employees
- ○ Self-employed without employees
- ○ Employed
- ○ Assist family member
- ○ Other(s)
  Other(s): *Textbox*

6.4) **Since when are you self-employed or employed by your current employer?**

Textbox
Only numbers may be entered in this field

6.5) **Are you responsible for employees?**
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Yes, permanent
- ○ Yes, occasionally (e.g. within projects)
- ○ No

6.6) **Do you have to travel as part of your work?**
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

What % of your monthly work time?
Textbox %

6.7) **Approx. annual income (net) including bonuses, (social) benefits etc. in your national currency**

Textbox
Only numbers may be entered in this field

6.8) **I am not employed, but ...**
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ I solely concentrate on my current education.
- ○ In addition to my current training I am on maternity leave.
- ○ In addition to my current training, I am searching for a job.
- ○ Other

Please specify your current study!

7) When did your current study begin?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ before 2005
- ○ 2005
- ○ 2006
- ○ 2007
- ○ 2008
- ○ 2009
- ○ 2010

8) In which year will you complete your current study?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○   2010
- ○   2011
- ○   2012
- ○   2013
- ○   2014
- ○   2015
- ○   after 2015

8.1)   How long does your current study take?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○   one or some weeks
- ○   one or some months
- ○   one year
- ○   more than one year

How many weeks?   *Textbox*
How many months?   *Textbox*
How many years?   *Textbox*

Training

9) Which is the field of your study?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○   Business and Administration
- ○   Engineering Science
- ○   Humanities and Social Sciences
- ○   Natural, Physical, Chemical and Mathematical Sciences
- ○   Information Technology
- ○   Health Sciences
- ○   Mass Communication and Information Science
- ○   Architecture and Building
- ○   Education
- ○   Law
- ○   Fine and Applied Arts
- ○   Other(s)
  Other(s):   *Textbox*

10)   Which degree will you acquire with your current studies?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○   Bachelor
- ○   Master
- ○   PhD
- ○   Certificate
- ○   Other(s)
  Other(s):   *Textbox*

11) **How many hours per week on average do you spend in your study? (e.g. learning time, attendance, travel)**
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Up to 10h
- ○ 11-20h
- ○ 21-40h
- ○ Over 40h

How many hours? *Textbox*

12) **What percent of the previously specified time do you invest in the following activities?**
Only numbers may be entered in these fields
Total of all entries must equal 100

Courses	*Textbox*	%
Homework and independent learning	*Textbox*	%
Travel	*Textbox*	%
Other	*Textbox*	%
Other: *Textbox*		

13.1) **The working time per week for my actual study is adequate to learn the contents of teaching.**
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ I agree
- ○ I slightly agree
- ○ I rather don't agree
- ○ I don't agree
- ○ not applicable

13.2) **The working time per week for my actual study is adequate to perform work and study.**
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ I agree
- ○ I slightly agree
- ○ I rather don't agree
- ○ I don't agree
- ○ not applicable

13.3) **The working time per week for my actual study is adequate to have enough spare time for my personal life (e.g. family, hobby).**
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ I agree
- ○ I slightly agree
- ○ I rather don't agree
- ○ I don't agree
- ○ not applicable

14) **When do you normally attend classes and when would you prefer them?**

	currently	currently not	not applicable	I would prefer	I would not prefer	not applicable
During the day	O	O	O	O	O	O
In the evening	O	O	O	O	O	O
At the weekend	O	O	O	O	O	O
Block courses	O	O	O	O	O	O
Other(s)	O	O	O	O	O	O

Other times:
currently: *Textbox*
I would prefer: *Textbox*

15) **Which methods of instruction are used for your current studies and which would you prefer**

	currently	currently not	not applicable	I would prefer	I would not prefer	not applicable
Lecture by experts	O	O	O	O	O	O
Individualised personal teaching	O	O	O	O	O	O
E-learning	O	O	O	O	O	O
Distance learning on the basis of books/scripts	O	O	O	O	O	O
Case studies	O	O	O	O	O	O
Groups works	O	O	O	O	O	O
Internships	O	O	O	O	O	O
Job-related projects (Planning, performance, analysis and reflection during the study)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Other(s)	O	O	O	O	O	O

Other methods of instruction:
currently: *Textbox*
I would prefer: *Textbox*

16) **Did you finish a training at a higher education institute in addition to your current studies within the last 12 months (e.g. like a one-day course or either a four-year-degree programme)?**
Please choose one of the answers.

○ No further training
○ One further training
○ Two further trainings
○ Three further trainings
○ More than three further trainings

17) **Did you gather information about recognition of prior learning?**
Please choose one of the answers.

○ Yes
○ No

17.1) **Who informed you about the possibility of recognition of prior learning?**
Please choose one of the answers.

○ Employer
○ My higher education institute
○ Another education institution
○ Media
○ Friends and family
○ Colleagues
○ Other students or graduates
○ Other(s)
  Other(s):   *Textbox*

17.2) **Getting information about the recognition of prior learning was ...**
Please choose one of the answers.

○ ... easy
○ ... rather easy
○ ... rather complicated
○ ... complicated

17.3) **Have you been satisfied with the information you received about the recognition of prior learning?**
Please choose one of the answers.

○ Satisfied
○ Rather satisfied
○ Rather not satisfied
○ Not satisfied

17.4) **How relevant to your decision to study was your knowledge of the recognition of prior learning?**
Please choose one of the answers.

○ Recognition of prior learning was a critical factor to start my study
○ Recognition of prior learning was among others a factor to start my study
○ Recognition of prior learning has not been relevant to start my study

18) **Have prior learnings (e.g. parts of another study oder work experience) been recognised for your actual study?**
Please choose one of the answers.

○ Yes, on the basis of formal learning
○ Yes, on the basis of other qualification (e.g. in-company trainings)
○ Yes, on the basis of work experience
○ Yes, other(s)
○ No
Other(s): *Textbox*

18.1) **I was satisfied with the process of recognition of prior learning.**
Please choose one of the answers.

○ Satisfied
○ Rather satisfied
○ Rather not satisfied
○ Not satisfied

Description of study

19) **How much time do you need to travel to your higher education institute?**
Please choose one of the answers.

○ Less than 15 minutes
○ 15 – 30 minutes
○ 31 – 60 minutes
○ More than 60 minutes

20) **How do you primarily travel to your higher education institute?**
Please choose one of the answers.

○ Car, motorbike, etc.
○ Bicycle
○ Solely by foot

21)   **Are you generally satisfied with your actual study?**
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○   Yes
- ○   No
      Why not   *Textbox*

22)   **Are you satisfied with your study in regards to:**

	Satisfied	Rather satisfied	Rather not satisfied	Not satisfied	Not applicable
Personal contact with teachers	○	○	○	○	○
Personal contact with students	○	○	○	○	○
Career orientation	○	○	○	○	○
Kind of lessons	○	○	○	○	○
Necessary work	○	○	○	○	○
Pedagogic-didactical knowledge of the teachers	○	○	○	○	○
Professional knowledge of the teachers	○	○	○	○	○
Content	○	○	○	○	○
Organisation at the higher education institute	○	○	○	○	○
Other(s)	○	○	○	○	○

Other(s):   *Textbox*

23)   **Did you inform your employer about your actual study?**
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○   Yes
- ○   No
      Why not?   *Textbox*

24) **What kind of support is provided by your company and what kind of support would be important? (multiple responses possible)**

	Is provided	is not provided	not applicable	would be important	would not be impor-tant	not applicable
Flexible working hours	O	O	O	O	O	O
Possibility to lower the weekly working hours	O	O	O	O	O	O
Educational leave	O	O	O	O	O	O
Exemption for exam preparation	O	O	O	O	O	O
Financial aid	O	O	O	O	O	O
Childcare	O	O	O	O	O	O
Integrating higher education into the career plan	O	O	O	O	O	O
Information about higher education	O	O	O	O	O	O
Information about company-internal support	O	O	O	O	O	O
Information about government support	O	O	O	O	O	O
Possibility to learn during working hours	O	O	O	O	O	O
Use of company-internal resources (e.g. internet, printer, etc.)	O	O	O	O	O	O
Other support	O	O	O	O	O	O

Other support, which is provided: *Textbox*
Other support, which would be important: *Textbox*

25) **Who advised you before your decision to study and have you been satisfied with the advice?**

	Satisfied	Rather satisfied	Rather not satisfied	Not satisfied	I didn't use this advice
Employer	O	O	O	O	O
My higher education institute	O	O	O	O	O
Another education institution	O	O	O	O	O
Media	O	O	O	O	O
Friends and family	O	O	O	O	O
Colleagues	O	O	O	O	O
Other students or graduates	O	O	O	O	O
Other(s)	O	O	O	O	O

Other(s): *Textbox*

Motive to study

26) **Why did you start your current studies?**
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ To advance skills essential for the job
- ☐ To advance prospects for personal growth
- ☐ To gain knowledge and skills in a special field of interest
- ☐ To gain knowledge and skills for everyday life
- ☐ To meet people
- ☐ To increase chances of finding a job
- ☐ To become self-employed
- ☐ To avoid job loss
- ☐ To receive an academic title
- ☐ To gain a promotion
- ☐ To increase motivation
- ☐ Other(s)
  Other(s): *Textbox*

27) **Which problems result from your actual study?**
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ Less time to meet the job demands
- ☐ Reduction of free time
- ☐ Less time for learning
- ☐ Financial problems
- ☐ Stress
- ☐ Excessive demands
- ☐ Lack of career-development possibilities
- ☐ Family problems
- ☐ Problems to organise childcare
- ☐ Problems with the arrival and departure to/from the educational centre
- ☐ Problems with fellow students
- ☐ Problems with colleagues at work
- ☐ Threat of finding other employer
- ☐ Other(s)
  Other(s): *Textbox*

28) **How do you finance your study?**
Only numbers may be entered in these fields
Total of all entries must equal 100

Own savings	*Textbox*	%
Financial support of the employer	*Textbox*	%
Government aid	*Textbox*	%
Other(s)	*Textbox*	%
Other(s): *Textbox*		

29) **Did you find information about opportunities for support?**
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

29.1)   Who advised you about the possibilities of financial support and have you been satisfied with the advice?

	Satisfied	Rather satisfied	Rather not satisfied	Not satisfied	I didn't use this advice
Employer	O	O	O	O	O
My higher education institute	O	O	O	O	O
Another education institution	O	O	O	O	O
Media	O	O	O	O	O
Friends and family	O	O	O	O	O
Colleagues	O	O	O	O	O
Other students or graduates	O	O	O	O	O
Other(s)	O	O	O	O	O

Other(s):   *Textbox*

30)   Do you feel sufficiently informed about the possibilities of financial support?

Please choose one of the answers.

- O   Yes
- O   No

31)   How relevant was the financial support for your decision to study?

Please choose one of the answers.

- O   The support was a critical factor to start my study
- O   The support was among others a factor to starting my study
- O   The allowance has not been relevant to starting my study

32)   How much have you invested in your studies - approx. amount in your national currency

Textbox

33)   How much financial support do you consider as appropriate for your studies - approx. amount in your national currency

34)   What is the maximum amount you would be prepared to invest in your studies - approx. amount in your national currency?

Textbo

35) **What kind of support from politics and public authorities do you wish for your education?**
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ Tax relief for higher education
- ☐ Information about the job market
- ☐ Publication of analysis regarding education and job market (e.g. analyses of needs)
- ☐ More allowance for employed students
- ☐ Government-arranged childcare especially for employed students
- ☐ Support especially designed for employed students
- ☐ Other(s)
  Other(s): *Textbox*

36) **What kind of support from your higher education institute do you wish for your education?**
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ Improvement of the recognition of prior learnings (or experience)
- ☐ Media coverage about possible studies
- ☐ Modularisation of the study
- ☐ Flexibility when job-related requirements increase
- ☐ Timetable adaptation to employed students
- ☐ More possibilities for distance learning
- ☐ Upgrade of the quality of teaching
- ☐ More internet possibilities at the high education centre
- ☐ Other(s)
  Other(s): *Textbox*

37) **What kind of support is provided by your employer to enable your study?**
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ Offering information about tax relief for higher education
- ☐ Offering information about government grants for higher education
- ☐ More information about the supply of higher education
- ☐ Expanded supply of higher education specialised for the operative demand
- ☐ Consulting services to evaluate the demand of competences
- ☐ Creation of individual career plans
- ☐ Consulting services to determine measures of higher education
- ☐ Finding replacements for the employees in higher education
- ☐ Organising higher education with other companies
- ☐ Other(s)
  Other(s): *Textbox*

38) **In conclusion, we would like to invite you to make any general comments** about **motives and/or barriers to engage in the process of lifelong learning or general comments about the project FLLLEX.**
Textbox

Thank you very much for your time and participation!

6.3 Questionnaire for Businesses

The questionnaire for businesses can be divided in the parts "demographic", "training", "description of study" and "motive to study". Every item is listed below.

Demographic

0) What is the country of residence of your company?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Belgium
- ○ Finland
- ○ France
- ○ Ireland
- ○ Lithuania
- ○ Netherlands
- ○ Scotland
- ○ Turkey
- ○ Other country: *Textbox*

1) In which sector is your company working?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing
- ○ Manufacturing
- ○ Electricity, gas and water supply
- ○ Construction
- ○ Wholesale and retail trade: personal and household goods
- ○ Repair of motor vehicles, motorcycles
- ○ Hotels and restaurants
- ○ Transport, storage and communication
- ○ Financial intermediation
- ○ Real estate, renting and business activities, consulting
- ○ Public administration and defence; compulsory social security
- ○ Education
- ○ Health and social work
- ○ Other community, social and personal activities
- ○ Activities of households
- ○ Extra-territorial organisations and bodies
- ○ Other(s)
  Other(s): *Textbox*

2) Number of employees
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Up to 50
- ○ 51-250
- ○ >250

2.1) **Annual turnover of your company (approximum sum in your national currency)**

Textbox

3) Does your company have a policy or guidelines with regard to participation in educational activities?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ I don't know

3.1) **Are these guidelines defined?**
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

3.2) **When does your company enable higher education for employees?**
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ Reorganisation of the company or departments
- ☐ Employees wish to study
- ☐ Reward for performance
- ☐ Never
- ☐ Other(s)
  Other(s):   *Textbox*

4) Is there a defined budget for educational activities within your company?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ I don't know

4.1) **What's the annual budget for your educational programmes? (approximum budget in your national currency)**

Textbox

5) What criteria are used to select employees for participation in higher education?

5.1)   **Is duration of employment a criterion to select employees for participation in higher education?**
Please choose one of the answers.

- O   Yes
- O   No
- O   Irrelevant
- O   I don't know

- O   selection in case of duration of employment of less than 2 years
- O   selection in case of duration of employment of 2-5 years
- O   selection in case of duration of employment of more than 5 years

5.2)   **Is responsibility for employees a criterion to select employees for participation in higher education?**
Please choose one of the answers.

- O   Yes
- O   No
- O   Irrelevant
- O   I don't know

5.3)   **Is travel activity a criterion to select employees for participatin in higher education?**
Please choose one of the answers.

- O   Yes
- O   No
- O   Irrelevant
- O   I don't know

5.4)   **Is the qualification requirement for an employee applied as a criteria for participating in higher education? (e.g. essential knowledge to gain other responsibilities within the company)**
Please choose one of the answers.

- O   Yes
- O   No
- O   Irrelevant
- O   I don't know

5.4.1)   **If yes**
Please choose one of the answers.

- O   Qualification requirements are announced by the employee
- O   Qualification requirements are declared by the company
- O   Both
- O   Don't know

5.5) **Do you (systematically) assess the competences of an employee for a certain higher education?**
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ Irrelevant
- ○ I don't know

5.5.1) **When does the assess happen?**
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ At application
- ☐ At an annual update
- ☐ Before training
- ☐ After training
- ☐ Other(s)
  Other(s):   *Textbox*

5.6) **Other criteria to select employees for participation in higher education:**

Textbox

Training

6) Is higher education promoted by your company and/or do your employees come up with own suggestions?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Higher Education is promoted: The company makes suggestions to the employees.
- ○ Higher Education is promoted: Employees make suggestions to the company.
- ○ Higher Education is promoted: The company as well as employees make suggestions.
- ○ Higher Education is not promoted.

Please describe the higher-education possibilities promoted by your company

7) Which fields of study are normally promoted by your company?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Business and Administration
- ○ Engineering Science
- ○ Humanities and Social Sciences
- ○ Natural, Physical, Chemical and Mathematical Sciences
- ○ Information Technology
- ○ Health Sciences
- ○ Mass Communication and Information Science
- ○ Architecture and Building
- ○ Education
- ○ Law
- ○ Fine and Applied Arts
- ○ Other(s)
  Other(s):   *Textbox*

8) Which degrees are pursued by your staff?
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ Bachelor - how many employees?   *Textbox*
- ☐ Master - how many employees?   *Textbox*
- ☐ PhD - how many employees?   *Textbox*
- ☐ Certificate - how many employees?   *Textbox*
- ☐ Other(s) - how many employees?   *Textbox*
  Other(s):   *Textbox*

Description of study

9) How much time does your staff usually need to travel to their educational centre / training school?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Less than 15 minutes
- ○ 15 – 30 minutes
- ○ 31 – 60 minutes
- ○ More than 60 minutes

9.1)   How many days are your employees actually absent for their studies?
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Approximately 1-5 days
- ○ Approximately 6-10 days
- ○ Approximately 11-14 days
- ○ Approximately 15 and more days
  How many days?   *Textbox* (approx.)

10.1) What kind of support is provided by your company?
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ Flexible working hours
- ☐ Possibility to lower the weekly working hours
- ☐ Educational leave
- ☐ Exemption for exam preparation
- ☐ Financial aid
- ☐ Childcare
- ☐ Integrating higher education into the career plan
- ☐ Information about higher education
- ☐ Information about company-internal support
- ☐ Information about government support
- ☐ Possibility to learn during working hours
- ☐ Use of company-internal resources (e.g. internet, printer, etc.)
- ☐ Other support
  Other Support: *Textbox*

10.2) What kind of support is used by the staff?
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ Flexible working hours
- ☐ Possibility to lower the weekly working hours
- ☐ Educational leave
- ☐ Exemption for exam preparation
- ☐ Financial aid
- ☐ Childcare
- ☐ Integrating higher education into the career plan
- ☐ Information about higher education
- ☐ Information about company-internal support
- ☐ Information about government support
- ☐ Possibility to learn during working hours
- ☐ Use of company-internal resources (e.g. internet, printer, etc.)
- ☐ Other support
  Other Support: *Textbox*

Motive to study

11) **Why does your staff want higher education?**
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ To advance skills essential for the job
- ☐ To advance prospects for personal growth
- ☐ To gain knowledge and skills in a special field of interest
- ☐ To gain knowledge and skills for everyday life
- ☐ To meet people
- ☐ To increase chances of finding a job
- ☐ To become self-employed
- ☐ To avoid job loss
- ☐ To receive an academic title
- ☐ To gain a promotion
- ☐ To increase motivation
- ☐ Other(s)
  Other(s): *Textbox*

12) **Which problems result from staff undertaking higher education?**
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ Less time to meet the job demands
- ☐ Reduction of free time
- ☐ Less time for learning
- ☐ Financial problems
- ☐ Stress
- ☐ Excessive demands
- ☐ Lack of career-development possibilities
- ☐ Family problems
- ☐ Problems to organise childcare
- ☐ Problems with the arrival and departure to/from the educational centre
- ☐ Problems with fellow students
- ☐ Problems with colleagues at work
- ☐ Threat of finding other employer
- ☐ Other(s)
  Other(s): *Textbox*

13) **Did any of the educational actions taken in the last two years lead to the following results in your company regarding:**
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ Significant improvement of skills and expertise
- ☐ Raise in satisfaction and more involvement
- ☐ Raise in salary of the staff concerned
- ☐ Gain in efficiency
- ☐ Increase in sales
- ☐ Cost reduction
- ☐ Development of innovations
- ☐ Organisational changes within the company
- ☐ Networking with new consumers, other companies, etc.
- ☐ Other(s)
  Other(s): *Textbox*

14) **Do you encourage your employees to get a degree from college or university by:**
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ Offering information about tax relief for higher education
- ☐ Offering information about government grants for higher education
- ☐ More information about the supply of higher education
- ☐ Expanded supply of higher education specialised for the operative demand
- ☐ Consulting services to evaluate the demand of competences
- ☐ Creation of individual career plans
- ☐ Consulting services to determine measures of higher education
- ☐ Finding replacements for the employees in higher education
- ☐ Organising higher education with other companies
- ☐ Other(s)
  Other(s): *Textbox*

15) **Whom do you usually select to execute the training of your staff?**
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ Private consultant
- ☐ Short term educational centre
- ☐ Job employment service of the state
- ☐ University college
- ☐ University
- ☐ Other(s)
- ☐ I don't know
  Other(s): *Textbox*

16) **Why do you select this partner?**
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ Financial support from external funds
- ☐ Reputation
- ☐ Proven results
- ☐ The staff simply likes it
- ☐ Other(s)
- ☐ I don't know

Other(s):   *Textbox*

17) **Do you have a close cooperation or even agreement with a nearby university college?**
Please choose one of the answers.

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ○ I don't know

Why do you NOT have a close cooperation or even an agreement with a nearby university college?
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ Has never beed proposed
- ☐ They do not offer anything interesting
- ☐ Bad reputation
- ☐ Below our 'standard'
- ☐ Too expensive
- ☐ Too 'young' in terms of student population
- ☐ Other(s)

Other(s):   *Textbox*

18) **Which factors prevent your company from taking more actions concerning further education for employees:**
Please choose one or more options from the list. Multiple answers are possible.

- ☐ Temporary bottlenecks of the staff
- ☐ Absence of a replacement for the employee undertaking higher education
- ☐ Costs of further higher education
- ☐ Problems of estimating the demand for further higher education
- ☐ Lack of information about further higher education
- ☐ The offers of higher education do not suit our needs
- ☐ Too extensive organisation of further higher education
- ☐ Scepticism regarding the effects of higher education
- ☐ Threat of changing employers after the degree
- ☐ Other(s)

Other(s):   *Textbox*

19)   **In conclusion, we would like to invite you to make any general comments about motives and/or barriers to engage in the process of lifelong learning or general comments about the project FLLLEX.**
Textbox

Thank you very much for your time and participation!

6.4 Guidelines for the surveys in WP2 and 3 (Sigrid)

3s provided the following guidelines for the surveys in WP2 and 3:

Introduction

The web-based survey within work package 2 and 3 targets on gaining knowledge on the expectations of important stakeholders in Lifelong Learning: the learners and the businesses will be asked about their motives and/or barriers to engage in Lifelong Learning. Differences and matching goals in relation to the national policies will be identified.

These guidelines should provide you with helpful information for conducting the surveys of expectations of Lifelong Learners (work package 2) and the survey of expectations of businesses (work package 3).

Key data

The following chart shows the basic essentials for conducting the surveys (target group, methodology, sample size and deadlines).

Table 7.1
Methodology and deadlines for conducting the surveys

	Survey of expectations of Lifelong Learners	Survey of expectations of businesses
Target group	Students (own institution; partner institutions in own country; in institutions you'll have interviews within WP4	Human resource specialists, employer organisations (chambers of commerce, chambers of industry) – different branches & sectors
Methodology	Send link of web-based questionnaire to students	1) Contact approx. 40 stakeholders before sending the link to the web-based questionnaire; 2) Conduct 2 interviews based on the questionnaire in language of the country
Sample size (per partner)		
number of students / stakeholders to contact	approx. 400-500 per partner country	approx. 40 per partner country
number of returned questionnaires	minimum of 100 per partner country	minimum of 20 per partner country
Deadline	14th of June 2010	14th of June 2010

Target group & sample size

Survey of expectations of Lifelong Learners

The target group of the survey of expectations of Lifelong Learners are students at higher education institutions. Please send the link to the web-based questionnaire to as many LLL students as possible: within your own institutions, within partner institutions in your countries, within institutions you will have interviews within the context of work package 4.

The questionnaire targets to address specific target groups of LifeLong Learners in the concerned countries, underrepresented in existing surveys.

Besides sending the link to the target groups, you also may provide a link to the survey via the website of your institution.

The data of the students, and so is their mailing address, is subject to privacy regulations. That is why the universities may prefer to send the link to the web-based questionnaire themselves to their students.

There should at least be a returning of approximately 100 questionnaires per country. The returning rate of such surveys is usually 15-20%, which means that the questionnaire has to be sent to 400-500 students per partner.

Please provide 3s with the number of persons who received the link of the web-based questionnaire. We need this information to calculate the response rate.

Survey of expectations of businesses

The target group of the survey of expectations of business is a selected number of business and enterprises within your country: Basic contacts would be employer organisations, such as chambers of commerce or chambers of industry. A good setting of different branches and sectors should be reached; a part of the questionnaire should be delivered to companies from the business and finance sector for a possible sectoral analysis.

The target group of the survey of expectations of businesses are employees, who are working in the field of educational policy of the company. Though we cannot expect that each company has an educational policy or guidelines, we should aim people working in the field of human resources. People with the following job title could be considered, e.g.:

__Human resource managers
__Human resource assistants
__Education coordinators
__Education specialists

There should be at least a returning of 20 questionnaires per partner country. In order to get a high response rate, it is necessary to contact the stakeholders before sending them the invitation to the web-based questionnaire and to inform them about the intentions and targets of the survey. Otherwise the stakeholders probably wouldn't answer the questionnaire (approx. 50% returning rate, if contacted via phone beforehand). It is also possible to do interviews based to the questionnaire. It is suggested to conduct 2 interviews (via phone, skype or personal) on the basis of the questionnaire.

A letter of support from an official organisation (like chamber of commerce) might be helpful (e.g. in NL this helped in earlier surveys to get a good response).

Please provide 3s with the number of persons who received the link of the web-based questionnaire and the number of persons you contacted. We need this information to calculate the response rate.

Background information for participants of the surveys

For both surveys it is necessary to send some background information about the intention of these surveys. Please use the official FLLLEX project brochure, if available, or the document "FLLLEX_Information.pdf" (see attached file).

Furthermore the introduction text of the web-based survey can be used to offer background information (see chapter 4.1 and 4.2). Following you'll find a suggestion for the text for the invitation per mail to the survey. You may translate it into your country language.

Survey of expectations of Lifelong Learners: Suggestion for accompanying mail

Dear ...,

we ask you to participate in the following questionnaire. The survey seeks to gain knowledge on the expectations of important stakeholders in lifelong learning: the learners, the businesses and the business-training providers will be asked about their motives and/or barriers to engaging in the process of lifelong learning. The survey will identify differences and matching goals in relation to the national policies. Your answers can make a valuable contribution to finding the mismatches between the stakeholders in the lifelong learning process.

The questions concern your individual situation (for example, description of your current education, recognition of prior learning and funding) and your opinion on possible improvements. It will take approx. 15 minutes to fill in the questionnaire.

All data will be handled anonymously and with absolute confidentiality!

To participate, follow this link:
http://www.3s.co.at/flllex_survey_learners

If you have any further questions or are interested in the survey results, we invite you to visit the project's homepage: http://www.flllex.eu/

We thank you for participating in this survey and wish you the best for your personal development and much success for your future.

Yours sincerely,

Survey of expectations of Businesses: Suggestion for accompanying mail

Dear ...,

we ask you to participate in the following questionnaire. The survey seeks to gain knowledge on the expectations of important stakeholders in lifelong learning: the learners, the businesses and the business-training providers will be asked about their motives and/or barriers to engaging in the process of lifelong learning. The study will identify differences and matching goals in relation to the national policies. Your answers can make a valuable contribution to finding the mismatches between the stakeholders in the lifelong learning process.

The following questions concern a general overview about the situation of further education in your company (for example, internal education guidelines and promotion of higher education) and your personal opinion on possible improvements. It will take approx. 15 minutes to fill in the questionnaire.

All data will be handled anonymously and with absolute confidentiality!

To participate, follow this link:
http://www.3s.co.at/flllex_survey_businesses

If you have any further questions or are interested in the results of the survey, then we invite you to visit the homepage of the project: http://www.flllex.eu/

We thank you for participating in this survey!

Yours sincerely,

6.5 Results in details

The results of the surveys in detail are attached to this report:

___ FLLLEX_Businesses_Survey_Results.xls
___ FLLLEX_Learners_Survey_Results.xls
___ FLLLEX_Learners_Typology_Results.xls