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Abstract

The purpose of this study is to make a comparative analyse of goals, structure, and legal liability in adult education systems in England, Denmark, and Turkey. Since these countries are member, ex-member, or candidate countries of the European Union, the Union’s lifelong learning policies were also taken into consideration while doing the comparison. The method of the research is comparative adult education. This study does not include human subjects, thus ethics committee approval decision is not needed. The goals, structure, and legal liability of England, Denmark, and Turkey’s adult education systems were compared. The findings showed that these three countries’ adult education targets are parallel with the EU’s lifelong learning goals. According to the analyses of the adult education structure, it has been noted that the local governments are active in England. In Denmark, three different stakeholders can be seen and they reach a wider group. On the other hand, Turkey’s adult education is a public service. Whereas local authorities are responsible for legal liability in England, state and associations are responsible for it in Denmark. The central government is responsible for legal liability in Turkey. It was showed that the adult education provision in Denmark is much more withstanding than the one in Turkey and England.
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Recently, using adult education (AE) concept discourse has become widespread as part of lifelong learning (LLL). In recent years, national and international organizations working in this field have preferred LLL concept instead of AE (Milana, 2012). It is seen that LLL concept is being frequently used and discussed in different platforms such as: governments, academics, and media (Nicholls, 2000). Especially, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization’s (UNESCO) Faure Report called “Learning To Be” helped the concept to get out and spread. According to this report, educational provisions went out of school and educational fields related to daily life needs have been developed with the help of LLL. As it is understood from this emphasis, learning process in LLL concept has been expanded to all educational fields for individuals’ different educational needs during their lifetime. In this context, it involves formal learning, nonformal and informal learning. Moreover, LLL means acquiring and updating knowledge, value, skills, and competencies throughout an individual’s life (Demirel and Yaşcı, 2012).

The increase in the emphasis on LLL in educational policies is parallel with the spread of globalization discourses (Rizvi and Lingard, 2000). Hence, the emphasis of LLL has increased even more with globalization discourses. It is stated that it is being boosted because of the need for global power and creating knowledge society in most of the European Union (EU) countries (Prokou, 2004). Thus, 1996 was an important year for the European Commission (EC). It was the European Year of LLL and therefore, the concept started to be used widely in Europe.

Lately, it is seen that the EU’s LLL policies have structured AE systems of the EU member and candidate countries. Green (2005) examined different LLL models of countries in his study and he stated that the main differences in these models can be grouped in three models:

- Formalised social partnership: Austria, Germany, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden.
- State-led social partnership: France, Luxemburg, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Greece, and Turkey.

In this study, Green’s classification was taken as the basis, and it is aimed to compare England, Denmark, and Turkey’s AE systems. During the comparative analyses, goals, structure, and legal liability aspects were taken into consideration within the context of the LLL policies of the EU. Several questions were asked to reach the general aim of the study. The researchers tried to investigate what kind of LLL perspective is suggested to member/candidate countries by EU; how EU’s LLL policies reflect on the aim and goals of AE in these countries; what are the common features and distinctness in the structure of these education systems are; what the common features and distinctness in the legal liability in these education systems are.
In this study, the comparative adult education method is used. In this method, England, Denmark, and Turkey’s AE systems were examined. The elements of AE systems are examined separately and similarities and differences were tried to be determined. The following elements of the AE systems of the countries were compared in the year of this study: Aims and goals, the structure of the AE systems, and legal liability.

The compared countries were chosen according to the classification in Green’s (2005) study in which the author states that the important differences occur especially between voluntary partnership, formalised social partnership, and state-led social partnership. Therefore, the compared countries were chosen according to these three models. In the study, England was chosen for voluntary partnership, Denmark was chosen for formalised social partnership, and Turkey was chosen for state-led social partnership. The AE systems of these three countries were compared.

The data were collected with document analyses. A literature review was done for document analyses, then the categories were determined to make the comparison in the context of AE systems. These categories were chosen from Eurydice which collects and gives information about the education systems of the European countries. Taking these categories from Eurydice made reaching the data easy. The structure and legal liability of AE were basically taken from Eurydice categories. Besides Eurydice data, the publications and websites of universities and ministries of education and educational networks were used to collect data.

The EU has published numerous policy papers related to LLL since 1993 and its LLL objectives were set in 1993. Moreover, the EU’s latest policy document including LLL was Education and Training 2020 (ET 2020) (EC, 2009). In 2011, the EU published the implementation of the Strategic Framework for the European cooperation in education and training (ET, 2020) — ‘Education and Training in a smart, sustainable and inclusive Europe’. Therefore, 15 policy papers published first in 1993 and 2011 were used in this study. This is a document analysis study. The data got within the scope of research questions were analysed with descriptive analysis. In the descriptive analysis process, a literature review was done in accordance with the research aim, the sub-categories related to LLL policies were determined, and the data were collected within the frame of these sub-categories. The similarities and differences were presented in accordance with comparative education method. Based on research questions, a frame was developed for data analysis, and the data were chosen according to this frame, organised, similarities and differences were brought together, tables were formed and interpreted.

The goals of AE, structure and legal liability in AE systems of these countries were compared according to the data taken from Eurydice, and the similarities and differences were presented. Moreover, while interpreting these similarities and differences, the interpretations were addressed to the countries’ economic, social, and political structures. Therefore, the data were not just written one by one, but also the
reasons for similarities and differences were tried to be explained in accordance with
the nature and aim of the comparative education. Moreover, this study does not
include human subjects, thus ethics committee approval decision is not needed.

Results
In this part, the researchers tried to present what kind of LLL perspective is
suggested to member/candidate countries by the EU; how the EU’s LLL policies
reflect on the aim and goals of AE in these countries; what are the common features
and distinctness in the structure of these education systems are; what the common
features and distinctness in the legal liability in these education systems are.

EU’s Lifelong Learning Policy
When the basic papers published by the EU are examined, it is seen that the EU
wanted to use LLL to become competitive and dynamic knowledge based economy.
The relationship between personal development and social development is underlined
and it is emphasised that competitiveness is inevitable. Hence, Field (2010) stated that
the EC mentioned LLL and especially competitiveness, employment, and
development. Similarly, Smith (2002) noted that LLL policies are trying to integrate
employment and education, and it became the basic subject of the European Council
Meeting in 2000 in Lisbon for the EU’s strategy of continuous economic growth and
social cohesion.

Growth, Competitiveness, Employment (EC, 1993) paper is an indicator that
shows education is degraded to a process that produces human capital and education
is formalized in the direction of employment markets. The following emphasis in
White Paper draws attention:

All measures must therefore necessarily be based on the concept of developing,
generalizing and systematising lifelong learning and continuing training. This
means that education and training systems must be rethought in order to take
account of the need ... The establishment of more flexible and more open systems
of training and the development of individuals’ ability to adapt will become
increasingly important, both for businesses, so that they can make better use of
the technological innovations they develop or acquire, and for individuals, a
considerable proportion of whom may well have to change their line of work
four or five times during their lives (EC, 1993, s.120).

As it can be understood from the emphasis in White Paper, human capital which
increases competitiveness, renewing oneself continuously, produces knowledge, and
learning to learn has become the main indicator of education policies. As to education,
it is degraded to developing the competencies of human capital in labour market.

In ET 2020 strategic framework, the first objective is making LLL and mobility
a reality. It is especially emphasised that LLL is very essential for employment in this
objective:
Strategic objective 1: The challenges posed by demographic change and the regular need to update and develop skills in line with changing economic and social circumstances call for a lifelong approach to learning and for education and training systems that are more responsive to change and more open to the wider world. ... In particular, work is needed to ensure the development of national qualifications frameworks based on relevant learning outcomes and their link to the European Qualifications Framework ... Further efforts are also required to promote adult learning, to increase the quality of guidance systems, and to make learning more attractive in general — including through the development of new forms of learning and the use of new teaching and learning technologies (EC, 2009. p.3).

As it is seen, ET 2020 strategic objective one generally repeats the EU’s objectives set in 1993. The emphasis is on enhancing skills, practicing coherent and comprehensive LLL strategies in the EU member countries, developing national qualifications frameworks which is coherent with the European Qualifications Framework, recognizing learning outcomes, increasing the quality of guidance systems, and encouraging mobility for all.

Accordingly, education is standardised with qualification frameworks. In addition to standardization, education has started to be measured via international standard tests. Thus, competition in education has been moved to an international level. This standardization and measurement with international tests have become a current issue in countries. Moreover, education of adults who are out of formal education or in labour market has become essential. Adults’ gaining new skills also draws attention. The main reason for the point on LLL is to make these targets real. Generally, it can be said that four priorities are emphasised in all the documents published by the EU between 1993 and 2011. These priorities are labour market and employment, social inclusion and active citizenship.

As a result, emphasised words in most of the EU publications are economic growth, competitiveness, and employment. Personal and social development are linked directly with economic development, and it is stated that competitiveness is inevitable. Eventually, competition in education has moved to an international level with qualification frameworks and international tests. In particular, the importance of gaining new skills for adults has been underlined. To reach these targets, LLL is underlined.

It is observed that the public nature of AE has depreciated significantly with the start of its being mentioned with LLL concept. Programmatic integrity of AE is broken up as a consequence of the reduction in public funds and commercialization. Neoliberal policies and human capital approach bring vocational training into the forefront (Sayilan, 2001). Hence, Prokou (2004) also stated that global trends support LLL in most of the EU countries and correspondingly there is an increase in employment-oriented educational programs while there is a decrease in the general AE programs. In other words, recently while the vocational training aspect of AE has
been organised according to the demands of the market and has been linked to international standards, socialist aims and social aspects of AE have been assigned to civil society (Sayilan, 2001).

**Comparing the Goals of AE in England, Denmark, and Turkey**

LLL policies, accordingly goals of AE, in England focus on gaining skills to work force and follow a policy which serves labour market. Kogan (2000) stated that there is no legal and regulatory framework related to LLL in the United Kingdom, and government policies in this field are encouraging, but loud and clear policies have not been determined. Conditions related to LLL and AE have been set with Skills Strategy in England. In this strategy, it is underlined that individuals and employers should contribute to the educational costs since especially public funds are limited. The goals of AE in England have taken shape with a market approach by neoliberal policies. The clear indicator of this is that LLL and AE are in “Skills for Sustainable Growth: Strategy Document” (Department for Business, Innovation and Skills [BIS], 2010). With “Rigour and Responsiveness in Skills (BIS, 2013)” strategy which is updated in 2013, the goals of AE in England have been focused on the working force’s gaining qualifications, and with this strategy, a policy which serves the market has been followed. The goal and target are building a flexible system that prepares all the conditions to train workers with the demands of employers. Kogan (2000) states that LLL is associated with competitiveness, being market-oriented, and the needs of industry and business world in various policy documents.

In Denmark, there is an AE system that aims to increase participation in democratic life, personal development, and life quality; ensuring equality with education, and improving vocational competencies. In Denmark’s LLL strategy document, the goal of LLL starts with equal opportunity for all (Danish Ministry of Education [DMoE], 2007). However, after that, it is stated that education should be compatible with labour market. Besides, guidance and counseling services takes place in goals. These services include a guidance and counseling which helps adults to choose a proper education program for themselves and attend LLL. Moreover, a strategy that aims the recognition of prior learning and a transparent education system is adopted. It is seen that Denmark’s LLL strategy has been affected by globalization and it reflects EU’s LLL policy with its goal which states that a global approach in educational programs will enhance cooperation in international platforms (DMoE, 2007). Hence, Larson and Milana (2011) also expressed that AE policies are shaped by global competition and Lisbon Strategy, AE is used as a tool of labour market and economy policies, and AE is considered as a way of increasing competitiveness.

In the Turkish Republic, which has a central administration and a high young population rate, the Turkish Ministry of Education (TMoE) manages all the educational activities from the center. Turkey, 69th in the human development index, has been a candidate member of the EU since 1999 (United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], 2015).
In Basic Law of National Education No. 1739, the specific goals of non-formal education which includes AE can be summarised as teaching reading and writing, providing continuous education, providing educational opportunities which help to comply with the scientific and technological developments of the era, and provide employment which comply with employment policy for economic development.

Turkey, while continuing the EU harmonization studies, prepared 2009-2013 and 2014-2018 Lifelong Learning Strategy Documents and shaped the goals of AE and LL. The first document prepared for the 2009-2013 period is one-to-one adaptation of EU’s LL strategy documents with regard to content and format. As to 2014-2018 Lifelong Learning Strategy Document, it focuses especially on generation of LL culture and awareness in the society, increasing access to LL, increasing opportunities and provision, developing a lifelong guidance and counseling system, developing the system of evaluation of previous learning, and developing a LL monitoring and evaluation system. In both Denmark and Turkey’s strategy documents, there is a focus on recognition of previous learning and guidance and counseling services.

According to Bağcı (2011), in the EU membership process Turkish education system has been tried to be harmonised with the EU countries’ systems. In this membership process, Turkey’s education system was tried to be compatible with the EU’s system, and LL documents have been prepared based on the EU documents related to LL. For this reason, there are many similarities between the EU’s and Turkey’s documents in terms of the language used, educational needs, and goals. Bağcı (2011), noted that although Turkey has distinctive problems related to LL and need special solutions for these problems, dynamics of the EU membership and globalization are based in Turkey’s LL policies, and Turkey’s distinctive problems are ignored. Thus, Yıldız (2012) also pointed out that basic documents that leads Turkey’s education are formed with a neoliberal approach and according to the demands of the market.

In a general review, the first and the most important remarkable thing is that these three countries are affected directly by the EU’s LL policies. However, all countries are not affected at the same level and in a similar way. Countries’ own AE history and LL models make this level different. In England, LL policies and accordingly AE goals focus on gaining quality to employees and follow a policy that serves to market. In Denmark and Turkey, although the LL strategy documents are prepared according to EU’s LL strategy, the right to AE is prioritised. For Denmark, this situation can be explained by having an organized and democratic society coming from the past. Regarding Turkey, the goals of LL focus on providing continuous education opportunities, providing educational opportunities that are compatible with the scientific and technological needs of the era, and providing employment that are compatible with the employment policies for economic development. The reason for the emphasis on especially generation of LL culture and consciousness in the society, increasing opportunities and provision, increasing access to LL, developing
a lifelong guidance and counseling system, developing the system of evaluation of previous learning, and developing a LLL monitoring and evaluation system in 2014-2018 Lifelong Learning Strategy Document is results from the higher shortcomings in these fields.

Comparing the Structure of AE in England, Denmark, and Turkey

In England, Denmark, and Turkey which are representing three different models, the structure of AE systems are different from each other. As can also be seen in Table 1, in England, representing voluntary partnership, there is a structure in which private and voluntary organizations focusing on vocational education are active. In Denmark, representing formalised social partnership, there is a structure which is conducted by public and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). In Turkey, representing state-led social partnership, there is a structure mostly conducted by the public and focused on vocational education. Especially in Turkey, it is remarkable that there are different organizations. While in Denmark, the AE structure is separated into three groups, in Turkey it is separated into eight different groups which are mostly public bodies. All these institutions are organised and inspected by the TMoE.

Table 1
The Structure of AE in Three Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>The Structure of AE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>Further Education Colleges (FE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Learning Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private or Voluntary (Third) Sector Training Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open and Distance Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Non-Formal AE (NGOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General AE (AVU) (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational AE (State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>TMoE / Directorate General for Lifelong Learning (DGLL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TMoE / Directorate General for Vocational and Technical Education (DGVTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Education Centers/DGLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maturation Institutions/DGLL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance Education Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Education Institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2016 BIS was responsible for AE in England. Giving the responsibility to a department whose name includes business and skills shows that the main goal of the AE is perceived as providing job and skills-building to individuals. There are many different organizations providing AE under the coordination of this Department. The most common of these organizations are Further Education Colleges which organise
especially vocational and technical courses. As can also be seen in Table 1, the other institution which provides AE is community learning providers. These institutions include local authorities and voluntary organizations and provide these services in AE centers, community centers, libraries, schools, children centers, and other places. Institutions which are providing AE with the public fund are Private or Voluntary (Third) Sector Training Organizations. Just like further education colleges, they see job provision as the main goal and provide work-based learning provisions. Apart from these, there are National Extension College (NEC) which provides open and distance education, Futurelearn: Massive Open Online Course platform, Learndirect, and Open University.

Statistical Office of the European Union-EUROSTAT 2016 published Lifelong Learning Statistics in 2016. According to these statistics, participation in AE in England (20.1%) is considerably higher than in Europe (16.6%). With this high participation rate, there is a structure of an AE containing organizations focused on business, skills, and providing jobs in England. The main role of AE was providing individuals’ basic educational needs and contributing their personal development, but it is seen that this role is replaced by providing job. AE reaches the aim of providing job for individuals by using the current organizational structure. High participation rates also show that individuals’ preferences are determined by the market condition.

When the structure of AE in Denmark is examined, three different structures that provide AE can be seen at first (DMoE, 2016c). As it is also shown in Table 1, these are non-formal AE, general AE and vocational AE. According to EUROSTAT 2016 Lifelong Learning Statistics, the participation rate to AE in Denmark is 37.4%. This can be interpreted as a clear indicator of the fact that AE provisions are successful in Denmark. First of all, continuing comprehensive non-formal AE by different organizations and providing predominantly general AE besides vocational education show that the tradition of a famous educator called Nikolai Frederik Severin Grundtvig has been retained. Detailed information related to Denmark’s non-formal AE activities is given in Eurydice (EAEAC Eurydice, 2016b). Non-formal AE activities are carried by NGOs without any exams. In this context, university extension courses, day folk high schools, evening schools, and folk high schools provide AE. DMoE (2016a) states that non-formal AE is provided to general and academic insight and skills with the help of about 1800 evening schools and voluntary activity in associations. The indicator of the success of Denmark’s AE provisions is that each year about 700,000.00 people attend these independent non-formal AE activities. Besides, the university extramural department provides distance learning. Day folk high schools provide non-formal AE for those who are out of formal education, personally or socially vulnerable to provide job for them. Private independent boarding schools are also the AE organizations that provide courses about home economics, arts and crafts. The courses’ main targets are the interpretation and meaning of life, AE and democratic education. Denmark’s non-formal AE provision reveals that AE is being carried successfully with four different organization types throughout the country (DMoE, 2016a).
Apart from non-formal AE, there is also a general AE provision in Denmark. The aim is to improve or supplement adults’ knowledge and skills in general subjects. There are three levels of AE including preparatory AE, general AE, and single subject courses. This structure is parallel to Denmark’s formal education system, and individuals can reach education at all levels and enter exams throughout their lifetime (EAEAC Eurydice, 2016a).

There is also an adult vocational training provision for employees who have low skills in Denmark. However, this provision is not as common as non-formal AE provision. Moreover, social stakeholders take an important part in the management, assigning priorities, development, and organization (EAEAC Eurydice, 2016a). Financing this provision by the public is another important difference in Denmark’s AE system.

AE is carried out by DGLL under the TMoE in Turkey as it is seen in Table 1. Unlike Denmark, AE is formed with a centralised structure. DGVTE under the TMoE is also a part of this structure. Curriculums, course durations, many elements related to trainers are determined by the TMoE. Public education centers, maturation institutions, open schools, and distance education institutions also take place in this structure. Besides these, private education institutions and private courses also provide non-formal AE services. According to EUROSTAT 2016 Lifelong Learning Statistics, the participation rate to AE in Turkey is 11.2%. This rate is below the EU’s rate (16.6%). This rate was reached with especially young people who attend vocational courses. The participation rate in courses which improve adults’ general skill and socio-cultural courses are lower. Moreover, although there is less focus on vocational training in the strategy document, focusing on vocational training in the AE structure is quite a few, and most of the courses are aimed at providing in AE jobs.

Comparing the Legal Liability in AE in England, Denmark, and Turkey

In England, Denmark, and Turkey which are representing three different models, the legal liability in AE systems are different from each other. As can also be seen in Table 2, in England, representing voluntary partnership, the legal liability is on local authorities. In Denmark, representing formalised social partnership, the legal liability is on social partners. In Turkey, representing state-led social partnership, the legal liability is on the state. The LLL models of these countries are parallel to the distribution of legal liability in these countries.
Table 2

Legal Liability in AE in Three Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Legal Liability in AE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| England   | Responsibility was given to local authorities with 2009 Act  
          | -Department of Education (DfE) (Regulation Responsibility)  
          | -Skills Funding Agency (SFA) (Financial Responsibility)  
          | -The Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation (Ofqual) (Inspection Responsibility)  |
| Denmark   | -The Act on General AE 2008  
          | -The Act on Adult Vocational Training Courses  
          | -The Act on Non-Formal AE Activity |
| Turkey    | -TMoE.  
          | -Statutes (1739, 6764, 3308, 5544)  

In England, legal liability related to planning, implementation, and financing of AE was given to local authorities with the 2009 Act. However, the legal liability was on local authorities before 1993. Between 1993 and 2009, incorporated further education colleges became independent from local authorities and in 2009 all responsibilities were given to local authorities again. While AE has been in the jurisdiction of BIS since 2016, Theresa May, the prime minister, gave the duty to the Department of Education. As it is understood, the role of AE was seen as providing jobs and improving skills since 2016. The organizations which are responsible for AE were generally organizations focused on skills and employment: Sector Skills Councils, National Skills Academies, Local Enterprise Partnerships, Education and Training Foundation, Association of Colleges, and Association of Employment and Learning Providers. As it is shown in Table 2, the Skills Funding Agency (SFA) is responsible for the financial issues of AE organizations under BIS. Ofqual is the one that is responsible for the inspection of AE organizations.

In Denmark, general AE is regulated with The Act on General AE 2008 Statute No 311 by DMoE. Besides, The Act on Adult Vocational Training Courses and The Act on Non-Formal AE Activity are the acts used for legal liability in AE. Moreover, in accordance with formalised social partnership model, many non-governmental organizations share the responsibility. In Denmark, Denmark Adult Education Association, Adult Education Centers (VUC) Leaders Union, and social partners (workers union and employers foundation) takes the responsibility in vocational AE (DMoE, 2016b).

Having a centralised model, there are four different statutes which are regulating AE in Turkey. These statutes are Basic Law of National Education No. 1739, Decree Law on Organization and Duties of Ministry of National Education No. 6764, Vocational Education Law No. 3308 and Vocational Qualifications Institution Law No. 5544. Apart from these statutes, there are two by-laws. These by-laws are

When we compare these three countries in the context of legal liability, in England although there are superior institutions that are responsible for organization, financing, and inspection, responsibility and executive function are on local authorities. Whereas in Denmark, although the responsibility is shared with social partners, the regulation is carried out with laws and acts. When it comes to Turkey, AE is regulated with laws, by-laws, and directives in a detailed way and under the control of the centralized administration. It is seen that the distribution of the legal liability in the countries is compatible with their LLL models stated by Green’s (2005) classification. In England which represents the voluntary partnership model, the responsibility is on local authorities. In Denmark, although the state shares the responsibility with social partners, it keeps the regulation and inspection on itself with laws and statutes. In Turkey which represents state model, the legal liability is on state with laws, by-laws, and directives.

Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

Since the 1990s, the EU’s LLL policies are shaped by the effects of globalization. Especially, the human capital approach has become the main determiner of the education policies. According to this human capital approach, the most important element is the individuals who will increase competition, renew themselves continuously, produce knowledge, and know learning to learn. There is an increasing focus on the fact that individuals have to change their job four or five times in their lifetime, and they have to improve their skills because of this. Having a lack of knowledge and skills is seen as the reason for unemployment for individuals. For that reason, it is emphasized in various publications that LLL has to be more flexible and serve the market.

In the Lisbon Summit, LLL is emphasized as being the center of the development in labour market policies. In particular, it is stated that new key competencies that will be gained through LLL need to be identified. It is underlined that one of the essential fields for the EU’s being the most agonistic and knowledge-based economy is LLL, and LLL has been loaded with a charge of educating human resources needed for a new era. In the European Area of Lifelong Learning, the duty of LLL is stated as creating a European area where there is a more flexible and rich labour force.

In all most all the documents published by the EU, there is a strong emphasis on economic growth, competitiveness, and employment. Competitiveness is presented as an inevitable element by linking personal and social development with economic development. Accordingly, education has been standardized with qualification frameworks and assessed with international tests. As a result of this standardization and international tests, competition in education has moved to an international level. In particular, great importance was given to the education of adults who are out of formal education or who entered working life. The importance of gaining new skills
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The four priorities emphasized in the EU’s policy documents since the 1990s are labour market, employment, social inclusion, and active citizenship. The EU gives LLL the duty of improving individuals’ competitiveness and employability skills to develop the knowledge-based economy. Besides this, the EU gives LLL the duty of including all citizens and teaching active citizenship to realise its goal of only Europe Citizenship.

Although the EU does not specify a common education policy among member countries, it is seen that the AE policies of the compared countries are compatible with EU’s common principles and values in the field of education. However, each country has not affected by the EU’s LLL policies at the same level. Countries’ own AE history and LLL models make this effect level different.

The EU’s AE strategy plays an important role in the competition, employment, social inclusion, and active citizenship policies, and the goals of AE are shaped accordingly. There is an emphasis on improving adults’ skills and competencies throughout their lifetime in the EU’s ET 2020 strategy (EC, 2009). Especially, the attention is drawn to the services for adults who are lack of key competencies and did not complete primary education.

It is seen that the AE goals of the compared countries are parallel with the LLL goals of EU. In England, LLL policies and AE goals are focused on qualified employees and follow a policy that serves the market. In Denmark, among the goals of LLL are equal opportunity for all and education which is compatible with labour market. Besides, guidance and counseling services, the recognition of prior learning and a transparent education system are aimed at the strategy. It is seen that Denmark’s LLL strategy is highly affected by globalization and the EU’s LLL policies with its goal which states that a global approach in educational programs will enhance cooperation in international platforms. With the effect of their LLL model and high numbers of associations and unionization, there is participation in democracy, personal development, increasing life quality, ensuring equality with education, and improving vocational competencies among Denmark’s AE goals. Denmark has an educational tradition that is equalitarian and respects the rights of minorities, so this education tradition decreases the affection rate of market conditions on AE. There are providing jobs, teaching read-write, and providing continuous education among the goals of AE in Turkey.

When the structure of AE in England is examined, it is seen that there are mostly technical and vocational courses in further education colleges which are in the center of AE and organised by local governments. Moreover, Private or Voluntary (Third) Sector Training Organizations see providing job as the main aim, and they provide apprenticeship and work-based learning provisions. Besides these, it is seen that open and distance learning is run. When the structure of AE in Denmark is examined, it is seen that AE activities are carried out comprehensively by not only public bodies but
also by different organizations like associations and unions. Another remarkable point in Denmark is that there are general AE services apart from non-formal AE services. This structure is parallel to the formal education system and adults can attend education at any level. In Turkey, AE is a public service that is carried by DGLL under the TMoE. Public education centers that are under the DGLL and common all over the country implements the curriculum prepared by the state. In particular, since the associations are not common and strong, and there is no strong and wide NGO structure in Turkey, associations and NGOs do not have as many AE activities like the ones in Denmark.

When the legal liability in AE is examined in these countries, it is seen that the legal liability was given to local authorities with the 2009 Act in England which represents the voluntary partnership model. Whereas in Denmark, the legal liability in AE is regulated with the Act on General Adult Education 2008. Moreover, with the Act on Adult Vocational Training Courses and The Act on Non-Formal AE Activity the legal liability was also shared by different organizations. Denmark, representing formalized social partnership model, shares the responsibility of AE with social partners, but it gives the inspection responsibility to the state by laws. In Turkey which represents the state model, the legal liability in AE is regulated with laws, by-laws, and directives by the TMoE. It can be said that the distribution of legal liability in AE in these countries is parallel with their LLL models.

In the light of this study, lifelong learning and adult education services, which should be seen as a public service, should not be left entirely to the regulation of the market. On the other hand, it is clear that these services cannot be carried out successfully only with the regulation and financing of the state. For this reason, it is important that social partners such as NGOs and employee representatives take responsibility and role in the education and learning of adults, but it is also important that the state also should play an effective role both as a supervisor and financier. Another important issue that emerged in this comparative study is the fact that a centralized management system does not serve an effective and efficient lifelong learning and adult education. In the field of education, as in all public areas, it is seen that a more effective and efficient lifelong learning and adult education service is provided in countries where regional and local governments are given more authority. For this reason, while developing lifelong learning and adult education policies, it is thought that it would be beneficial to adopt a model where the state will assume the role of supervision and financier, cooperation with social partners and where local governments are more active. For future studies, it is recommended to conduct comparative studies that examine lifelong learning and adult education policies and systems in countries where local governments are active and studies that analyse the opinions of social stakeholders.
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Amaç ve Önem


 Yöntem


Bulgular

AB’ince yayımlanan belgelerin birçoğunda vurgulanan sözçükler; ekonomik büyüme, rekabet edilebiliyor ve istihdamdır. Hem bireylerin gelişimi hem de topluman gelişimi doğrudan ekonomik ilerleme ile ilişkilendirilmiş ve rekabet edilebiliyor olduğun göz ardı edilemeyeceği belirttilmiştir. Nihayetinde Avrupa Yeterlilik Çerçevesi gibi uluslararası nitelik çerçeveleri ve uluslararası sınavlarla eğitimde rekabet uluslararası boyutlara taşınmaktadır. Özellikle yetiştiricilere yeni yeterliliklerin kazandırılmasıının önemine vurgu
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Tartışma, Sonuç ve Öneriler

Karşlaştırma yapılan üç ülkenin yetişkin eğitimi hedeflerinin AB’nin söz konusu hedefleri ile koşut olduğu görülmektedir. İngiltere’de bu politikalar ve hedefler meslek edindirmeye odaklanırken Danimarka’da yetişkin eğitiminin erişiminde eşitliğin altı çizilmişdir. Türkiye’nin politikasında ve hedeflerinde ise İngiltere gibi meslek edindirmeye vurgu yapılmakla birlikte okur-yazarlık ile eğitimin sürekliliği de yer almaktadır.


Bu araştırma bireysel üzerinde yapılmadığı için etik kurul onayı gerekmektedir.