



Borut Mikulec¹ 

University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts,
Ljubljana, Slovenia

**Systematic
review**

Theoretical models and concepts of lifelong learning²

Summary: *On the one hand, a review of different models and concepts of lifelong learning shows that lifelong learning has certain common basic characteristics, i.e. it is lifelong (from “cradle to grave”), it is life-wide (it takes place in different contexts), and it focuses on learning. On the other hand, such an overview also shows that different models and concepts of understanding lifelong learning are in use and that lifelong learning is also a “slippery” and “ambiguous” concept, as it contains different and competing conceptualisations. Based on the analysis of relevant theoretical literature, we argue that lifelong learning is a multidimensional concept that combines different models and conceptualisations of lifelong learning and highlight the fundamental building blocks of a holistic understanding of lifelong learning.*


Keywords: *adult education, concepts of lifelong learning, international organisations, lifelong education, models of lifelong learning*

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to highlight different models and concepts of lifelong learning (LLL) that dominate theoretical conceptualisations in the international arena and to use these as a basis for

understanding a holistic model of LLL. On the one hand, a review of theories on LLL shows that LLL has three fundamental characteristics: it is lifelong, from “cradle to grave”; it is life-wide, taking place in the family, educational institutions, at the workplace, in communities, public spaces, etc.; it focuses on *learning* rather than on education and educational institutions (Schuetze & Casey, 2006; Elfert & Rubenson, 2022). On the other hand, such an overview also shows that different models and concepts

¹ borut.mikulec@ff.uni-lj.si,

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4500-3091>

² The paper is part of the project supported by the Slovenian Research Agency under Grant P5-0174.

Copyright © 2025 by the publisher Faculty of Education, University of Belgrade, SERBIA.

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original paper is accurately cited.

of understanding LLL are in use and that LLL is also a “slippery” and “ambiguous” concept, as it contains different and competing definitions (Aspin & Chapman, 2000; Jarvis, 2008). The paper thus argues that LLL is a multidimensional concept that combines different models and conceptualisations of LLL. Yet, even if LLL lacks conceptual clarity, it nevertheless has a certain commonsensical value, which explains the popularity or acceptance of the concept itself; like apple pie, it is hard to be against (Fleming, 2021).

In what follows, we first show how the concept of LLL has changed over time, highlight the importance of international organisations in conceptualising and promoting the concept, and identify and define different theoretical models and concepts of LLL. Based on the analysis carried out – the methodological framework represents an analysis of relevant theoretical literature –, we conclude by highlighting the fundamental building blocks of a holistically based understanding of LLL.

Historical context: from “permanent education” and “lifelong education” to “lifelong learning”

The concept of LLL has gone through different political narratives and has also changed over time (Elfert & Rubenson, 2022). The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) first adopted the concept of permanent education (*éducation permanente*) which originated in French communities in the late 1960s. It was seen as a socio-political project to change educational structures and society in order to mobilise learners as citizens to become agents of change at local level. In 1962, the Council of Europe formally adopted the concept of permanent education, which sought to promote equal educational opportunities throughout life and played an important role in its dissemination in the 1960s and 1970s, drawing on the insights of radical authors such as Freire and Gelpi (Hake, 2018, 2021).

In 1972, the concept of permanent education was transformed into lifelong education by the Faure Commission in the high-profile and well-known report *Learning to Be* (Faure et al., 1972). Lifelong education was envisaged as a key concept for the reform of the entire education system and was to result in a learning society (where access to education for all would be given) and education as an inalienable human right (a human rights-based approach). Lifelong education in a learning society encompasses youth and adults, formal and non-formal education, and cradle-to-grave education. It aims at the humanisation and democratisation of society, the holistic fulfilment of human beings and their potential, the fulfilment of their self and identity (Boshier, 2005; Hager, 2011; Elfert, 2015, 2017; Biesta, 2022).

Rubenson (2006), who identifies three generations of the concept of LLL, says that the first one – UNESCO’s conception of lifelong education in the 1970s – is part of a humanist tradition that sought a better society and quality of life (equality, democratisation), but remained at the level of vague ideas and utopian expectations (the so-called *humanist model of LLL*). In the late 1980s, in a period of rising unemployment, fiscal deficits, and in the context of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the debate on LLL became part of a political-economic imperative (neoliberalism) that emphasised the importance of science, technology, and skilled human capital (the second generation of LLL, which represents the so-called *strong economic model of LLL*). In this period and under the OECD, the focus shifted from (lifelong) education, i.e. systemic provision of education, to (lifelong) learning, to individuals taking responsibility for their own learning (English & Mayo, 2012). Since the late 1990s, under the influence of the European Union (EU), the economic aspect of LLL has softened somewhat, as the emphasis has shifted from promoting individuals’ employability to promoting individuals’ active citizenship, personal development and social inclusion. Nevertheless, even in its third generation, LLL is identified as an essen-

tial strategy for achieving a knowledge-based society dominated by economic objectives (the so-called *soft economist model of LLL*) (cf. Gravani & Zarifis, 2014).

The shift from lifelong education to LLL, from its humanistic to a more economic orientation, is also defined by the transition from adult education, which is the responsibility of the state and is a function of the democratisation of societies, to LLL as a preparatory school for adults to take responsibility for their own development and life choices (Milana, 2012; Wildemeersch & Olesen, 2012). The responsibility for saving the welfare state is shifted to individuals through the concept of LLL, who become personally responsible for continuously upgrading their knowledge in order to improve their employability or to survive in the labour market. With LLL, there is a shift from education to learning, from the collective to the individual, from employment to employability, from being unemployed to being a jobseeker (Biesta, 2006, 2012; Fejes, 2010). LLL follows very different interests from those envisioned by Faure for lifelong education and the learning society; LLL has moved from “learning to be” to “learning to be productive and employable” and has become an instrument of adaptation rather than a path to emancipation (Biesta, 2006, p. 170). In other words, the individual’s *right* to lifelong education has been replaced by his or her *duty* to LLL. If lifelong education is a right for all, this means that the state is obliged to realise this right (through adequate educational infrastructure and accessibility to it for all), but when LLL becomes a duty, individuals are responsible for their own updating of knowledge (Biesta, 2022).

The role of international organisations in conceptualising lifelong learning

International organisations such as UNESCO, OECD, EU, and World Bank, among others, have played – and continue to play – a crucial

role in the conceptualisation and promotion of LLL (e.g., Field, 2001; Hager, 2011; Biesta, 2022; Larson & Cort, 2022). In fact, since the 1970s, they have been the main proponents of the idea of LLL and have contributed significantly to its conceptualisation and implementation, although they do not necessarily define LLL in the same way (Dehmel, 2006; Schuetze, 2006; Lima et al., 2022). While UNESCO is considered to focus more on the humanistic dimension of LLL (Elfert, 2017), which promotes subjectification, socialisation and qualification domains of education³, the OECD, the World Bank and the EU are considered to focus more on the economic dimension of LLL, which in the case of the OECD and the World Bank promotes mainly the qualification domain, while in the case of the EU, in addition to the qualification domain, it also promotes the socialisation domain of education (Larson & Cort, 2022). Since the 1990s, under the influence of globalisation processes, they have interpreted LLL as a way of increasing human capital, enabling workers to acquire the skills to participate and compete in the global economy (Green, 2002). In this context, for example, LLL represents the European Commission’s core strategy for building a competitive European workforce capable of competing in the global marketplace (Griffin, 2006; Biesta, 2022).

In contrast to the focus of the LLL on economic competitiveness, the United Nations has recently adopted a different vision of the LLL in order to create a fairer and more sustainable global society. This is Agenda 2030 (United Nations, 2015), which includes 17 ambitious goals addressing the three dominant dimensions of sustainability: economic, social, and environmental. Within these goals, Goal 4 – ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promoting LLL for all – also plays a key role

³ Biesta (2012) highlights three fundamental domains of education: (a) qualification (through education, individuals become qualified to perform certain tasks), (b) socialization (through education, individuals become part of the existing social, political, and professional order), and (c) subjectification (through education, individuals become independent or autonomous subjects, unique and singular beings).

in achieving the other SDGs (cf. English &, Mayo 2021; Mikulec, 2021) and, according to Elfert and Rubenson (2022), signals the development of the fourth generation of the LLL concept. The centrality of LLL to the achievement of all 17 SDGs is also demonstrated by the recent handbook *Making life-long learning a reality* (UNESCO, 2022), which focuses on a holistic understanding of LLL, encompassing active citizenship (citizens' engagement in civil society and political life), improving employability, promoting people's health and well-being, and fostering cultural understanding. This understanding of LLL is expected to make an important contribution to the sustainable development of communities.

As UNESCO (2022, pp. 18-19) notes, a holistic understanding of LLL contains five fundamental characteristics: (1) it is inclusive of all age groups and provides education and learning opportunities for all people, regardless of their background; (2) it is inclusive to all levels of education (from pre-school to adult education) and provides links between them; (3) it is inclusive of all modalities of learning and education (formal and non-formal education, informal learning); (4) integrates all spheres and spaces of learning and education (e.g., schools, families, communities, workplaces, libraries, museums, online distance learning) and builds bridges between formal and non-formal education and informal learning environments; (5) integrates the diverse purposes of LLL (from developing people's capabilities and reaching their potential throughout their lives, to contributing to the development of a competitive economy and an inclusive society).

Lifelong learning models and concepts

Based on a review of the international literature, we have identified the following models and concepts of LLL.

Four models of lifelong learning

Schuetze and Casey (2006) identified four models of LLL. (1) The *emancipatory* or *social justice* model, which emphasises the notion of equal opportunities and life choices through education in a democratic community (LLL for all). (2) The *cultural* model, which aims at personal empowerment and self-fulfilment of individuals (LLL for self-fulfilment). (3) The *open society* model, where LLL is understood as a learning system for developed, multi-cultural, and democratic societies (LLL for all who are willing and able to participate). (4) The *human capital* model, where LLL is defined as the continuous training of the workforce and their skills to meet the needs of the economy and employers for a skilled and flexible workforce (LLL for employability).

As the authors note, the human capital model is nowadays the one most advocated by international organisations (e.g., World Bank, OECD, EU) on the one hand, and the one most criticised by critical authors in academia on the other, since it is seen as primarily serving neoliberal ideology and the discourse of the market, which directs education towards an entrepreneurial society in which the adult learner becomes the entrepreneur. As with all models, none of them exists in its pure form in any country, but hybrid forms exist in different countries with different emphases on one or more models.

The triangle of lifelong learning

Chapman and Aspin (1997; Aspin & Chapman, 2000) highlight the triadic nature of LLL, which serves three distinct purposes: (i) LLL for *economic progress and development*, (ii) LLL for *personal development and fulfilment*, (iii) LLL for *social inclusion and democratisation*. As authors note, all three dimensions of LLL are interlinked and mutually reinforcing; education for a more skilled workforce is at the same time education for a better democracy and a more fulfilling life. This understanding of LLL is essential for achieving: a more democratic society and a set of social institutions that pro-

mote and practise the principles of social inclusion, justice and equality; an economy that is robust and competitive; and a set of activities that provide personal satisfactions for individual members of society (Chapman & Aspin, 1997, p. 270).

Similarly, Biesta (2006, p. 173) conceives of a “triangular” understanding of the concept of LLL, linking its economic (acquiring new knowledge and skills for the world of work, employability, and financial well-being), personal (learning for a better life, personal development and fulfilment) and democratic functions (learning for the empowerment and emancipation of individuals, to live with others in a more democratic, equitable, and inclusive way). The author notes that the LLL triangle is today dominated by its economic function and argues for a more balanced approach to LLL that also gives value to its personal and democratic function, i.e. learning for diversity and living with others who are different from us.

Lifelong learning between the human capital model and the humanistic model

Based on a synthesis of different models of LLL, Regmi (2015) identifies the common features of two fundamental models on which he believes the different models of LLL are based: (1) the human capital model and (2) the humanistic model.

(1) The *human capital model* of LLL views education as an investment that individuals, societies, and nations can make to enhance their economic growth and well-being. This model of LLL is most closely associated with OECD ideas and is the dominant education system in Anglo-Saxon countries (USA, UK), but is also represented by other international organisations such as the EU and the World Bank. It is seen as the most important strategy for promoting economic growth, creating jobs, and building the most competitive knowledge-based economy. This model of LLL is based on the ideas of human capital theory, which argues that an increase in human capital – i.e., the skills and knowledge

that people can acquire – has a positive correlation with economic growth. The theory therefore recommends that investing in education is a better economic strategy than investing in other conventional and non-human capitals, such as agriculture and industry (Regmi, 2015, p. 135). Similarly, a more modern version of the human capital theory, the Knowledge Capital Theory, which the OECD uses in its research, including the Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC), argues that the cognitive level of a given workforce is a key determinant of economic growth (Rappleye & Komatsu, 2021).

Human capital theory is based on three key assumptions: competitiveness, privatisation, and human capital formation. First, competition between individuals, firms and countries is a necessary precondition for achieving economic growth and prosperity, with LLL used in its instrumental purpose (i.e., as a tool for achieving competitiveness). Secondly, the human capital model of the LLL provides support to the private sector in the management, financing and governance of the education system, thus promoting the privatisation of education. And thirdly, the final assumption of the model is its emphasis on developing competent and responsible citizens who invest in education. Competitive individuals constitute the basic infrastructure of the global knowledge economy; individuals benefit from LLL because, as they become more skilled and competent, they also benefit from better jobs and better incomes. By updating their skills, lifelong learners therefore not only contribute to improving their own economic status, but also help their countries to become more competitive (Regmi, 2015, pp. 136-139).

(2) The *humanistic model* of LLL has its roots in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states that everyone has the right to education, that education should be directed to the full development of the human personality, should strengthen fundamental freedoms

and should promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups. This model of LLL is promoted by UNESCO in the Faure (Faure et al., 1972) and Delors (Delors et al., 1996) reports and advocates creating a better world by reducing social inequalities, social injustices and ensuring human rights for all (cf. Elfert, 2017). In addition to UNESCO, other organisations, such as the International Council for Adult Education (ICAE), the World Social Forum (WSF) and a range of NGOs, are working to implement this model. The model is the closest to the so-called Nordic model of LLL (see below) (Regmi, 2015, pp. 141-142).

The humanistic model of LLL is based on three fundamental assumptions: citizenship education, social capital building, and enhancement of individual capabilities. First, LLL should enable learners to develop the appropriate dispositions to become active democratic citizens, active members of society capable of engaging in the public sphere and responding to political issues. Secondly, the purpose of the LLL is to strengthen cooperation and coordination between members of the community. The emphasis is thus on collectivism over individualism, which means that the focus is on the acquisition of capital that belongs to society (i.e., social capital)⁴. Investing in social capital not only enhances LLL by allowing frequent interaction between community members (i.e., collective learning), but also understands education as a public good, as the increase in social capital benefits all members of the com-

munity. And third, capabilities refer to people's freedom to lead and direct their own lives, with education and LLL playing an important role in enhancing individual capabilities (e.g., improved ability to eat healthily, lower mortality rates due to healthier lifestyles, active participation in community activities) (Regmi, 2015, pp. 143-145).

Both models of LLL have also been criticised. The first one because it supports economic and political agendas that benefit multinational corporations for economic profit under the banner of neoliberal globalisation; it tends to create flexible and competitive workers in the labour market; it neglects all education that is not directly linked to work; it understands education in purely instrumental terms; and it ignores economic structures and mobility in global labour markets that contribute to low wages, unemployment and underemployment. And the second, although more inclusive and democratic than the human capital model, because it still promotes educational outlooks of the Global North that are less applicable to the populations of the Global South (Regmi, 2015).

Fleming (2021) has also reached similar conclusions about the two fundamental models of LLL, based on an analysis of the different psychological (behaviourism, cognitivism, constructivism), andragogical (Knowles' model of andragogy, self-directed learning, experiential learning, Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences, transformative learning) and critical theories (critical pedagogy, radical adult education) that form the basis of LLL. Starting from Mezirow's theory of transformative learning, it distinguishes between: (i) *instrumental learning*, which is associated with control over the physical environment, where observed things and events can be empirically verified and demonstrated, what is known under learning and demonstration of skills, and competency-based methodology; (2) *communicative learning*, that is learning to understand oneself, others and the meaning of communication, and includes understanding intentions, values, beliefs, and

4 According to Bourdieu, social capital refers to the assets that individuals can produce based on their relationships with others, while Coleman and Putman in their interpretation of the social capital emphasise the features of social organizations, such as networks, norms, and trust, that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit. Social capital thus emphasises the important role that relationships between people and the values they share with their connections play in enabling cooperation for mutual benefit. In short, the networks in which people are involved represent the means and sources of learning that can provide people with greater access to information and skills, as well as the ability to use them (Field, 2005).

feelings while developing an autonomous and socially responsible behaviour. In this respect, Fleming (2021) notes that today, LLL is heavily dominated by skills, competences and instrumental learning, with less attention being paid to communicative learning, which is important for the LLL of democracy, the practice of active citizenship and the achievement of greater social justice and equality. Finally, the author points out that implicit in the concept of LLL is the potential not only for individuals and their work, but also for the increasingly challenging task of creating democratic, just and caring societies; LLL can be one of the key ideas that bind together a world that is constantly changing.

Lifelong learning models in the knowledge economy

Green (2006) identifies three models of the knowledge economy in the Western societies and how they relate to the LLL system from a political economy perspective: (a) the *neoliberal or market model*, which is typical of the USA and other Anglo-Saxon countries, (b) the *social market model*, which is typical of the countries of “core” Europe (Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands), and (c) the *social democratic model*, which is typical of the Nordic countries. LLL systems produce different types of skill distribution and different forms of socialisation, which directly or indirectly affect employment rates, productivity, income distribution, and social cohesion. As the author (Green, 2006, p. 320) notes, three dimensions of LLL achievement are key: the overall outcome of skills for the labour market; the distribution of these skills; and participation rates in adult education. First, LLL systems that introduce a high average level of labour market skills will contribute to a high overall labour productivity as skills are converted into productive outcomes. Second, LLL systems create different levels of inequality in the distribution of the skills they transfer to the labour market. And thirdly, LLL systems have an impact on employment rates, affecting both overall productivity and social cohesion. In partic-

ular, LLL systems with a high participation rate of adults in LLL, especially through active labour market policies, foster high employment rates, which represent one of the means of raising social cohesion through social inclusion.

(A) *The Anglo-Saxon model* tends to combine moderate labour productivity with high employment rates and high-income inequality, generating medium to high overall productivity on the economic dimension, and moderate social consumption and lower measures of social cohesion on the social dimension. LLL systems in the Anglo-Saxon model tend to produce moderate aggregate levels of skills in the labour market with a high degree of skill polarisation between elites and the low-skilled. These outcomes can contribute to rather moderate average levels of labour productivity, high levels of income inequality and lower levels of social cohesion. On the other hand, the LLL systems in Anglo-Saxon countries offer quite good opportunities for adult education. Relatively high levels of adult participation in LLL, especially when linked to active labour market policies, increase employment rates, making excluded workers more employable (Green, 2006, pp. 320-321).

(B) *The social market model* combines high labour productivity with lower employment rates and lower wage inequality, generating moderate to high overall productivity on the economic dimension and higher social consumption and social cohesion outcomes on the social dimension. The social market model produces common skill levels that have a positive impact on labour productivity. It also leads to a much narrower distribution of skills, at least among the adult labour force, which contributes to generating much higher levels of income equality. As labour market regimes serve to define most jobs as skilled and to enforce qualification requirements for entry into these jobs, they create strong barriers to the recruitment of unskilled workers. While apprenticeship schemes generally provide a smooth transition to employment, the employment prospects for

those who cannot secure an apprenticeship and who have not acquired a general education qualification are very poor (Green, 2006, p. 322).

(C) *The Nordic model* combines high labour productivity with high employment rates and relative wage equality, generating high overall productivity on the economic dimension and high social consumption and high social cohesion on the social dimension. The Nordic countries produce high aggregate levels and a narrow distribution of skills in the labour force, which, at the same time as reducing wage inequality, contributes to high labour productivity. High participation in adult education fosters high employment rates which, together with high productivity levels, lead to high overall productivity levels. High employment rates, together with low-income inequality and strong redistributive effects of social systems, reduce overall inequality and support social cohesion. LLL systems in the Nordic countries contribute to economic and social outcomes in two ways. First, they generate relatively equal levels of skills in both 15-year-olds and adults. Second, the high participation rates in adult education that characterise the Nordic countries, which are linked to active labour market measures – encouraging the retraining of the unemployed and those who are about to become unemployed – have a positive impact on employment rates. The high participation rate in LLL is also due to the extensive provision of general adult education, which can contribute to adult employability and serve as a forum for promoting community engagement, political awareness and social cohesion (Green, 2006, pp. 322-323).

The Nordic model of LLL is defined by three key features (Green, 2021): universally provided early childhood education, a comprehensive and relatively equal secondary education system and high participation in adult education. This model is rooted in a social democratic project that seeks to build an inclusive and equal welfare state that protects citizens from poverty and insecurity while pro-

moting social integration, solidarity, and social mobility. In addition, LLL is key to the active labour market policies adopted by the Nordic countries to reduce unemployment, support adaptation to technological change and raise national productivity and living standards. High levels of funding from employers and the state for general and vocational adult education are targeted at disadvantaged adults as a means of reducing inequalities and strengthening social solidarity.

Although the Nordic model of LLL has changed over the last two decades under the influence of global actors and global education policy, it still retains the core elements of the Nordic model of education (cf. Frimannsson, 2006; Rubenson, 2006; Lundahl, 2016), with early childhood and adult education being highly universal and at the heart of the Nordic model (Green, 2021). The universalist nature of adult education in the Nordic countries is reflected in the high participation in formal education, which according to PIAAC is between 68-70% in Denmark, Finland, Sweden and Norway (Green, 2021, p. 23). Employee participation in work-based learning is also high. Although inequalities in adult skills in the Nordic countries have increased since the mid-1990s (mainly at the expense of the 16-24 age group in the PIAAC sample), inequalities in adult skills opportunities in the Nordic countries are still slightly lower than in most country groups.

Conclusion

By examining the theoretical models and concepts of LLL, we have shown that LLL is a multi-dimensional concept that combines different models and concepts. This makes LLL a “contested” or “slippery” concept. Nevertheless, based on our analysis we can conclude that the holistic understanding of LLL encompasses three crucial dimensions: (1) *economic*, i.e. the acquisition of new knowledge and skills for the world of work, employability and financial well-being, enabling learners to participate

in better jobs and raising their income levels; (2) *personal*, i.e. learning for a better life, health, well-being, personal development and the holistic fulfilment of the human person and his/her potential; (3) *democratic*, i.e. learning to live with others in a more democratic, just and inclusive way, to humanise and democratise society, to promote active citizenship, enabling citizens to engage in civil society and political life. This kind of holistic understanding

of LLL is most evident in the Nordic model of LLL, which on the one hand enjoys high participation of adults in LLL, while on the other hand high funding from employers and the state for both general and vocational adult education contributes to the employability of the disadvantaged adults, reduces inequalities and strengthens social solidarity, political awareness, and social cohesion.

References

- Aspin, D. N., & Chapman, J. D. (2000). Lifelong learning: concepts and conceptions. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 19(1), 2–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/026013700293421>
- Biesta, G. (2006). What's the Point of Lifelong Learning if Lifelong Learning Has No Point? On the Democratic Deficit of Policies for Lifelong Learning. *European Educational Research Journal*, 5(3–4), 169–180. <https://doi.org/10.2304/eeerj.2006.5.3.169>
- Biesta, G. (2012). Have lifelong learning and emancipation still something to say to each other?. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 44(1), 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02660830.2012.11661620>
- Biesta, G. (2022). Reclaiming a future that has not yet been: The Faure report, UNESCO's humanism and the need for the emancipation of education. *International Review of Education*, 68(5), 655–672. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-021-09921-x>.
- Boshier, R. (2005). Lifelong Learning. In L. M. English (Ed.). *International Encyclopedia of Adult Education* (pp. 373–378). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chapman, J. D., & Aspin, D. N. (1997). *The school, the community and lifelong learning*. Cassell.
- Dehmél, A. (2006). Making a European area of lifelong learning a reality? Some critical reflections on the European Union's lifelong learning policies. *Comparative Education*, 42(1), 49–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060500515744>
- Delors, J., Mufti, I. A., & Amagi, I. et al. (1996). *Learning: The treasure within*. UNESCO Publishing.
- Elfert, M. (2015). UNESCO, the Faure Report, the Delors Report, and the Political Utopia of Lifelong Learning. *European Journal of Education*, 50(1), 88–100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12104>
- Elfert, M. (2017). *UNESCO's Utopia of Lifelong Learning*. Routledge.
- Elfert, M., & Rubenson, K. (2022). Lifelong Learning: Researching a Contested Concept in the Twenty-First Century. In K. Evans, W. O. Lee, J. Markowitsch, & M. Zukas (Eds.). *Third International Handbook of Lifelong Learning* (pp. 1–25). Springer Cham.
- English, L. M., Mayo, P. (2012). *Learning with Adults: A Critical Pedagogical Introduction*. Sense Publishers.
- English, L. M., & Mayo, P. (2021). *Lifelong Learning, Global Social Justice, and Sustainability*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Faure, E., Herrera, F., Kaddoura, A-R., Lopes, H., Petrovsky, A. V., Rahnema, M., & Ward, F. C. (1972). *Learning to be: The world of education today and tomorrow*. UNESCO.

- Fejes, A. (2010). Discourses on employability: constituting the responsible citizen. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 32(2), 89–102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2010.488353>
- Field, J. (2001). Lifelong education. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 20 (1–2), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638280010008291>
- Field, J. (2005). *Social capital and lifelong learning*. The Policy Press.
- Fleming, T. (2021). Models of Lifelong Learning: An Overview. In M. London (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Lifelong Learning* (2nd edn.) (pp. 35–56). Oxford University Press.
- Frimannsson, G. H. (2006). Introduction: Is there a Nordic model in education?. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 50(3), 223–228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313830600743233>
- Gravani, M. N., Zarifis, G. K. (2014). Introduction. In G. K. Zarifis, & M. N. Gravani (Eds.). *Challenging the 'European area of lifelong learning'* (pp. 1–13). Springer.
- Green, A. (2002). The Many Faces of Lifelong Learning: Recent Education Policy Trends in Europe. *Journal of Education Policy*, 17(6), 611–626. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093022000032274>
- Green, A. (2006). Models of Lifelong Learning and the 'knowledge society'. *Compare*, 36(3), 307–325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920600872449>
- Green, A. (2021). *Models of Lifelong Learning and Their Outcomes. How Distinctive is the 'Nordic Model' Now?*. <https://www.llakes.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/70.-Andy-Green-LLAKES-Research-paper-on-Nordic-model-19.10.2021-v.3.pdf>
- Griffin, C. (2006). Research and policy in lifelong learning. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 25(6), 561–574. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370600989244>
- Hager, P. J. (2011). Concepts and Definitions of Lifelong Learning. In M. London (Ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Lifelong Learning* (pp. 12–25). Oxford University Press.
- Hake, B. J. (2018). Éducation permanente in France en route to 'permanent education' at the Council of Europe? Revisiting a project social to create 'a long life of learning'. *History of Education*, 47(6), 779–805. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0046760X.2018.1484182>
- Hake, B. (2021). Mapping our way out? Critical reflections on historical research and the Faure report. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults*, 13(2), 125–141. <https://doi.org/10.3384/rela.2000-7426.3584>
- Jarvis, P. (2008). Introduction. In P. Jarvis (Ed.). *The Routledge International Handbook of Lifelong Learning* (pp. 1–5). Routledge.
- Larson, A., & Cort, P. (2022). Qualification, socialisation and/or subjectification – three international organisations' prioritisation of the purposes of adult education and learning from the 1970s to the 2010s. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 41(1), 91–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2022.2030422>
- Lima, L. C., Guimarães, P., & Mikulec, B. (2022). The debate on intergovernmental organisations and adult learning and education policies: intersections between the political and scientific fields. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 41(6), 572–596. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2022.2110619>
- Lundahl, L. (2016). Equality, inclusion and marketization of Nordic education: Introductory notes. *Research in Comparative & International Education*, 11(1), 3–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745499916631059>

- Mikulec, B. (2021). What Should Transform? Adult Education, Sustainable Development and Environmental Movements. *Andragoška spoznanja / Studies in Adult Education and Learning*, 27(1), 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.4312/as/9922>
- Milana, M. (2012). Globalisation, transnational policies and adult education. *International Review of Education*, 58(6), 777–797. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-012-9313-5>
- Rappleye, J., & Komatsu, H. (2021). Is knowledge capital theory degenerate? PIAAC, PISA, and economic growth. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 51(2), 240–258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2019.1612233>
- Regmi, K. D. (2015). Lifelong learning: Foundational models, underlying assumptions and critiques. *International Review of Education*, 61(2), 133–151.
- Rubenson, K. (2006). The Nordic model of Lifelong Learning. *Compare*, 36(3), 327–341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920600872472>
- Schuetze, H. G. (2006). International concepts and agendas of Lifelong Learning. *Compare*, 36(3), 289–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920600872381>
- Schuetze, H. G., & Casey, C. (2006). Introduction: Models and meanings of Lifelong Learning: progress and barriers on the road to a Learning Society. *Compare*, 36(3), 279–287. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920600872365>
- UNESCO (2022). *Making lifelong learning a reality*. UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.
- United Nations (2015). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/21252030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development%20web.pdf>
- Wildemeersch, D., & Olesen, H. S. (2012). Editorial: The effects of policies for the education and learning of adults – from ‘adult education’ to ‘lifelong learning’, from ‘emancipation’ to ‘empowerment’. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults*, 3(2), 97–101. <https://doi.org/10.3384/rela.2000-7426.relae5>

Борут Микелец

Универзитет у Љубљани, Факултет уметности,
Одсек за педагошке науке, Љубљана, Словенија

ТЕОРИЈСКИ МОДЕЛИ И КОНЦЕПТИ ЦЕЛОЖИВОТНОГ УЧЕЊА

Циљ овог рада је да идентификује различите моделе и концепте целоживотног учења који доминирају теоријским концептуализацијама у међународној арени и да их искористи као основу за разумевање холистичког модела целоживотног учења.

С једне стране, преглед теорија целоживотног учења показује да ово учење има три основне карактеристике: оно је доживотно, од „колевке до гроба”; то је цео живот, одвија се у породици, у образовним институцијама, на радном месту, у заједници, на јавним местима итд.; и усредсређено је на учење пре него на образовање и образовне институције. С друге стране, овај преглед такође показује да су у уједињеним различити модели и концепти разумевања целоживотног учења и да је целоживотно учење такође „клизав” и „двосмислен” концепт јер садржи различите и конкурентне дефиниције.

Методолошки оквир коришћен у раду представља анализу релевантне теоријске литературе. На основу тога представљени су следећи главни резултати.

Прво, рад показује како се концепт целоживотног учења мењао током времена, наглашавајући значај међународних организација – Организације Уједињених нација за образовање, науку и културу (УНЕСКО), Савета Европе, Организације за економску сарадњу и развој (ОЕЦД) и Европске уније (ЕУ) – у концептуализацији и промовисању концепта од хуманистичког до економског модела целоживотног учења. Друго, у раду се тврди да је целоживотно учење вишедимензионални концепт који комбинује различите моделе и концептуализације целоживотног учења. То су: (1) концептуализација четири модела целоживотног учења: модел еманципације или социјалне правде, културни модел, модел отвореног друштва и модел људског квалитета (Schuetze & Casey, 2006); (2) тријадна концептуализација целоживотног учења, која има три различите сврхе: целоживотно учење за економски напредак и развој, целоживотно учење за лични развој и осећање испуњености, целоживотно учење за социјално укључивање и демократизацију (Charman & Aspin, 1997; Biesta, 2006); (3) разлика између два основна модела: модела људског квалитета и хуманистичког модела (Regmi, 2015); (4) модели доживотног учења из перспективе политичке економије: неолберални или тржишни модел, модел социјалног тржишта и социјалдемократски модел (Green, 2006). Међутим, чак и ако целоживотном учењу недостигаје концептуална јасноћа, оно ипак има одређену здраворазумску вредност, што објашњава популарност или прихватање самог концепта.

Конечно, рад се завршава истраживањем основних темеља холистички заснованог разумевања целоживотног учења, које обухвата три кључне димензије целоживотног учења: (а) економску, односно стицање нових знања и вештина за свет рада, запошљавање и финансијско благостање, омогућавање ученицима да учествују у бољим условима и повећају ниво својих прихода; (б) личну, односно учење за бољи живот, здравље, благостање, лични развој и холистичко испуњавање људске личности и њених потенцијала; (в) демократску, тј. учење

да се живи са друґима на демократијскиј, ѿраведниј и инклузивниј начин, хуманизујући и демократијујући друштво, ѿромовишући активно ѿрађанство, омоћућавајући ѿрађанима да се укључе у ѿрађанско друштво и ѿолиѿички животи.

Кључне речи: *образовање одраслих, концепѿији целоживотиној учења, међународне ѿ-
јанизације, целоживотино образовање, модели целоживотиној учења*