

# **People and Work Unit**

Community University of the Valleys  
Partnership

## **'What are the true costs of Community based learning?'**

Final Report

**Rhodri Bowen  
Dr Duncan Holtom &  
Dr Sarah Lloyd-Jones**

**September 2005**

32 Monmouth Road  
Abergavenny  
Monmouthshire  
NP7 5HL

Tel: 01873 850975  
Fax: 01873 855190  
E-mail: [peoplework@btconnect.com](mailto:peoplework@btconnect.com)

Uned **Pobl a Gwaith**

## **Executive Summary**

Although community-based learning is widely advocated as a way of helping reengage non-traditional learners, there is very little published literature on the costs of providing community-based learning. What little evidence is available, suggests that the cost of recruiting and retaining non-traditional learners is greater than that the costs for traditional learners. However, there is no research looking specifically at the costs of a community-based approach to recruiting, retaining and providing learning for non-traditional learners.

In order to provide a better understanding of the true costs of community-based learning, this research aimed to assess the costs for non-traditional learners of overcoming the range of situational, institutional, informational and dispositional barriers they face and to identify how and to what extent, community-based learning meets those costs. Thus for example, if the barrier is a caring responsibility such as having children, the research documents and assesses the work of community-based learning providers in meeting the (financial) cost of providing childcare and the (emotional) cost for a learner of leaving their children in a crèche.

The research suggests that Community University of the Valleys Partnership (CUVP) organisations recognise that the non-traditional learners they work with face a wide range of barriers. However, in practice, their main focus has been upon enabling learners to overcome situational and informational barriers. For example, all the CUVP organisations we spoke to use learning based within the community and actively recruit non-traditional learners; most offer free courses and childcare.

Some of the costs of working with non-traditional learners, such as the income forgone by providing free courses, are the same for any provider working with non-traditional learners. However, in comparison to colleges and universities, some of the costs of working with non-traditional learners are significantly greater for community-based providers, because it is harder for them to generate economies of scale. Nevertheless, the community-based model offers, arguably, a more effective way of working with non-traditional learners. The estimated cost of a model community-based learning centre serving 300 learners is £300,000/year.

Institutional and dispositional barriers tend to be more complex to address than informational and informational barriers, as they often depend upon providers' institutional cultures. This makes the cost of these responses extremely hard to quantify. For example, an organisation's response to a learner's fear of returning to learn might be to foster a warm, friendly and supportive atmosphere. This may involve the costs of increased tutor time to 'chat' outside teaching hours, less durable but more comfortable furnishings, small groups learning together or activity based learning away from a 'classroom' environment.

The success of CUVP organisations in minimising situational barriers is evident in the difficulty some learners had in identifying any financial costs they had incurred as a result of their participation in learning. Nevertheless, many learners reported significant emotional costs such as fear and anxiety. These are rooted in dispositional barriers. Providers try to minimise such costs by, for example, surpassing people's expectations of learning through the quality of provision, premises and support. Nevertheless, these expectations can be difficult to challenge as they are often embedded in the beliefs of the communities that non-traditional learners live in, meaning that non-traditional learners still often incur significant emotional costs.

Because choices about participation in learning are a function of both its expected cost and value, even if people expect learning to be of benefit, they may also fear its emotional and financial costs. The challenge, then, is to ensure that the perceived benefit is sufficient to justify the expected costs. This can be done both by providers minimising the costs (financial and emotional) and by them offering opportunities that give real benefits.

The research shows how these expectations of costs and value tend to change as people's lives change. So, for example, having a young child may create emotional and financial costs that block a parent's participation. However, as the child grows older and starts asking for help with homework, that child may invest learning with sufficient value for their parents to return to learning. By having a sustained 'presence' in a community, CUVP organisations are well placed to respond to these fluctuating

learning interests. Community-based learning is visible and available when people need it.

Very low levels of educational self-efficacy is perhaps the most entrenched dispositional barrier, because for those who don't believe they can learn, the expected cost of learning (humiliation, wasted effort and confirmation of low intelligence) will always outweigh any perceived value of learning. Low levels of educational self-efficacy appear to be the source of many of the emotional costs associated with learning, such as fear and anxiety. In such cases people may respond to the informal learning opportunities some CUVP organisations offer in preference to even the most basic course offered directly by a college or university. Such opportunities, however, can be difficult to fund since they fail to meet funding bodies criteria.

Community based provision has the potential to tackle many of the deep-rooted causes of the dispositional barriers that hold non-traditional learners back. There are numerous examples of good practice amongst CUVP organisations in this respect. However, much of this provision has been supported by the European Social Fund (ESF) in the last decade, and it is clear that the existing funding provided by ELWA is not sufficient to sustain the additional cost of community-based learning as ESF funding declines.

## Abbreviations

ACE	Adult and Continuing Education
ACL	Adult and Community Learning
CCETs	Community Consortia for Education and Training
CeLL	Centre for Lifelong Learning, University of Glamorgan
CLA	Community Learning Account
CLL	The Centre for Community and Lifelong Learning, University of Newport
CQFW	Credit and Qualifications Framework
CUVP	Community University of the Valleys Partnership
DACE	Department for Adult and Continuing Education, University of Swansea
ELWA	Education and Learning Wales
ESF	European Social Fund
FE	Further Education
FEFCW	Further Education Funding Council Wales
HE	Higher Education
HEFCW	Higher Education Funding Council Wales
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council England
ILA	Individual Learning Accounts
LEA	Local Education Authorities
NPFS	National Planning and Funding System
OCN	Open College Network
WAG	Welsh Assembly Government
WCVA	Wales Council for Voluntary Action
WEA	Workers Education Association
WEFO	Welsh European Funding Office

# 1. Introduction

1.1. The Community University of the Valleys Partnership (CUVP) “aims to widen participation in higher learning by bringing learning closer to home and by making it more relevant to all parts of our communities”<sup>i</sup>. This widening participation objective is shared by both Westminster and Welsh Assembly Governments.<sup>ii</sup> Nevertheless, there is debate about how it can best be achieved, and provision within the community is only one of a number of possible approaches.<sup>iii</sup> The model used by many CUVP organisations has historical antecedents in the work of organisations like the WEA but the current manifestation is a relatively new one, largely enabled by ESF monies.<sup>iv</sup>

1.2. Realising the aspiration of lifelong learning is a key WAG goal. Lifelong Learning is seen as having the potential to enhance economic growth and social cohesion, reduce inequality, and raise levels of health and well-being.<sup>v</sup> This report:

- demonstrates the potential role that community-based learning can play in realising this aspirations;
- highlights some of the key challenges facing the sector; and
- indicates the level of funding required to meet the true cost of community-based provision.

1.3. As such, this research is potentially of interest not only to those working in what had traditionally been known as adult and community education, but to those working in a range of fields including social justice, health and community regeneration.

1.4. This report defines ‘community-based learning’ as learning that is:

- led by a community, be it a geographical community or a community of interest;
- provided as part of a structured programme;
- aimed at learners aged 16 and over; and

- that enables people to progress, should they wish.

1.5. In order to assess the ‘true cost’ of providing and participating in community-based learning, the research team identified and assessed:

- The types of learners CUVP providers were targeting or working with (e.g. single mothers);
- the barriers to learning faced by these groups (e.g. caring responsibilities);
- the institutional responses adopted by CUV partners in response to these barriers (e.g. providing free childcare);
- the cost implications of these institutional responses; and
- the costs experienced by learners (emotional, practical and financial).

1.6. The question of institutional costs proved to be a sensitive one. A number of CUVP organisations were reluctant to publicise figures in this report, even if they were placed in the public domain, through for example, accounts. A number of participants pointed out there is difference between legal requirements to submit accounts and highlighting figures in a report designed for dissemination and discussion. Given this need for confidentiality, the report does not identify institutions or individuals by name. The figures supplied by interviewees were also augmented by figures drawn from the People and Work Unit’s own experience of community-based projects. These costings were synthesised to calculate the costs of a ‘model’ community development centre presented in Section 7.

**1.7. Structure of this Report:** In addition to the executive summary there are nine chapters, each of which has a short boxed summary of the key points discussed in the chapter.

- This first introductory section of this paper outlines the context for the research.
- The second section discusses the methodological approach used in the course of the research.
- The third section discusses the different barriers that non-traditional learners face, and that CUVP organisations can help them overcome.
- The fourth and fifth section outlines the different institutional responses of CUVP organisations to the barriers the learners they worked with faced and the cost implications of these responses.
- The sixth section discusses the costs for learners of participation in learning.
- The seventh and eighth section discusses the role of the expected cost and benefit of learning as perceived by learners and the role of self-efficacy in structuring choices about participation in learning.
- The ninth and final section outlines the conclusions and the next steps for the research.
- The report is accompanied by details of interviewees in an Annex.

## 2. Methodology

### Summary

- The report is based upon fieldwork that involved semi-structured interviews with fourteen CUVP organisations and fifty-seven of their learners over a five-month period (November 2004-March 2005).
- The results of the interviews were analysed in light of the wider literature examining community-based learning in South Wales and the UK as a whole.

2.1. This report draws upon a thorough literature review and a series of interviews conducted with both learning providers and learners themselves. A semi-structured interview schedule was developed and all CUVP organisations were invited to take part. In practice, not all CUV partners felt able to participate, and fourteen CUVP organisations were visited or participated in telephone interviews over a five-month period (November 2004-March 2005). This was complemented by interviews with fifty-seven of their learners. Further details of interviewees are provided in Annex 1.

2.2. The initial round of interviews with learners yielded some useful information on costs, particularly financial costs. However, it proved difficult to explore more sensitive issues, such as low levels of confidence or the fear and anxiety that we suspected were the source of some of emotional costs of learning. Moreover, it was difficult to judge what weight to attach to different costs. In response, interviews with CUVP organisations were used to generate a framework that listed ten barriers, six potential costs and eight likely benefits associated with learning. These barriers, costs and benefits were used as the basis for three voting exercises with different groups of learners.

2.3. Each of the barriers, costs and benefits were written on pieces of paper and laid out on a table in turn. Learners were given five sweets each and invited to 'vote' for the most important barrier or barriers to learning they faced. If, for example, they thought "no confidence" was by far the most important barrier, they could put all five sweets on "no confidence". If, however, they thought that "no confidence"

was important, but so was “caring responsibility” they could put three sweets on “no confidence” and two on “caring responsibility” or vice versa. Learners were therefore free to ‘vote’ with their sweets in any way that wanted. The exercise was then repeated for the most significant costs and then the most significant benefits of learning.

2.4. This approach to voting proved a simple, if somewhat crude, instrument and much of the interest for a researcher lay with the debate and discussion that it could stimulate, rather than the voting itself. In particular, asking people why they voted in particular ways could be very revealing. It was at this point that people often opened up and talked about sensitive issues such as lack of confidence, negative experiences of school, bullying and the like.

2.5. The effectiveness of ‘voting’ in opening up sensitive issues for discussions appears to rest upon the way in which it enables these sort of issues to be addressed in a more indirect way. In particular, it gives people choices rather than forcing them to articulate the answers directly (you can ‘vote’ for no confidence, rather than telling the interviewer and/or group that you lacked confidence). The approach also helps puts people at ease: it involves the use of sweets and it’s a different sort of exercise, not a game as such, but often a little fun.

2.6. The results from the interviews with providers and learners were analysed in light of the wider literature on community-based learning and the analysis forms the basis for this report. Three reports were produced during the study: a Baseline Report, Interim Report and Final Report and each was fed back to, and discussed with CUVP organisations. This process considerably strengthened the research as their feedback helped validate the research findings.

### 3. Literature on the Costs of Community Based Learning

#### Summary:

- Community based learning is recognised as one way of helping re-engage non-traditional learners.
- Although there is very little published research on the financial costs of delivering community-based learning, research commissioned by HEFCE indicates that the cost of recruiting and retaining non-traditional learners is greater than that the costs for traditional learners.

3.1.Despite recent increases in participation, there are still substantial numbers of people in the CUVLP area who are not and who have not recently participated in learning. For example, research conducted NIACE Dysgu Cymru for ELWA suggest that although roughly two fifths of the population of South East and South West Wales have participated in learning in the last three years (41% and 43% respectively), roughly one third have not participated in learning since leaving school (31% and 34%) (2002 figures).<sup>vi</sup> This means that large numbers of people are not engaged in learning. These are variously described as ‘hard to reach’ and ‘non-traditional’ learners.<sup>vii</sup>

3.2.Community based learning is seen as one way of re-engaging non-traditional learners<sup>viii</sup> and funding bodies have invested in community-based learning. Nevertheless, there is very little published literature on the costs to individual providers of this approach to provision.<sup>1</sup> The only significant research identified by the review was a WCVA study commissioned by ELWA into the costs of delivering community-based learning and a Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) study into the cost implications of widening participation for the Higher Education sector.

---

<sup>1</sup> Figures are available on the aggregate spending, of for example, local authorities on Adult and Community Based Learning and there has been research commissioned by NIACE Dysgu Cymru into the level of ESF funding for learning.

3.3. At the point of writing this report ELWA had only published the executive summary of the research conducted by the WCVA.<sup>ix</sup> The HEFCE study<sup>x</sup> indicates that

“students from non-traditional backgrounds are significantly more expensive to recruit, retain and progress through their HE careers than the traditional ‘norm’”<sup>xi</sup>

3.4. This finding fits with anecdotal evidence cited in the literature<sup>xii</sup>, and our own research findings outlined in the following sections.

## 4. Assessing the Needs of Non-Traditional Learners

### Summary

- CUVP organisations are working with non-traditional learners.
- Non-traditional learners face a range of barriers, such as situational, institutional, informational and dispositional barriers.
- Research suggests that situational and dispositional barriers are the most important barriers facing potential learners in the CUVP area.

4.1. Given the CUVP’s commitment to widening participation, the groups of learners that partner organisations in the CUVP tend to target and work with are non-traditional learners.<sup>xiii</sup> This is reflected in the profile of the learners we spoke to<sup>2</sup> and a survey of CUVP learners conducted in 2002<sup>xiv</sup>. This section discusses the range of potential barriers that non-traditional learners face.

4.2. **Barriers to Learning:** The work of K.P. Cross, developed by Veronica McGivney and the National Literacy Agency<sup>xv</sup> provides a typology of four types of barriers that ‘non-traditional’ learners face (outlined in table 1 below).

---

<sup>2</sup> The majority of learners were female and that there were significant numbers of: young mothers; older learners; economically inactive learners; and learners who had negative experiences of compulsory education.

**Table 1. Barriers to Learning**

<b>Barrier</b>	Examples given
<b>Situational</b> barriers are linked to the current life circumstances of potential learners.	<p><i>"I did a one year hairdressing [course] then got pregnant".</i></p> <p><i>"I trust the family {to look after my children}, but not the creche".</i></p> <p><i>"If you're working, [it's] much harder"</i></p> <p><i>"Timing of courses is an issue for people who work"</i></p>
<b>Institutional</b> barriers are the characteristics of the institutions that alienate or exclude certain people.	<p><i>"..I suspect ...[we are] seen as very much as a white middle class university"</i></p> <p><i>"reception was quite helpful, but college, to me, they don't give you enough information, [they] give you sheets, ask you to sort it out, 'go back, [you] need this', 'this', 'this'...very frustrating! I hate forms."</i></p> <p><i>"they [tutors at the local college] just don't seem to get on with people...no respect."</i></p>
<b>Dispositional</b> barriers are negative attitudes, beliefs or assumptions about learning	<p><i>"Children could suffer if you go to uni"</i></p> <p><i>"Friends [were] the only thing I got from school".</i></p> <p><i>"Memories of school were horrendous, therefore [it was a ] big step"</i></p> <p><i>"..low self-esteem"</i></p> <p><i>"..haven't got the confidence or ability to do the course"</i></p>
<b>Informational</b> barriers are a lack of appropriate information	<p><i>I "just didn't know what I wanted to do".</i></p>

4.3. The research concluded that learners face a range of barriers, and different groups of learners often face different barriers.<sup>xvi</sup> For example, caring responsibilities are often more of a barrier for women than men. Nevertheless, the research conducted for this study and that undertaken for other studies<sup>xvii</sup> suggest that overall **situational** and **dispositional barriers** are the most significant barriers for potential learners in the CUVP area. The following section discusses how CUVP organisations have sought to minimise these costs for learners.

## 5. Institutional Responses

### Summary:

- The main focus of CUVP organisations is upon enabling learners to overcome situational and informational barriers. For example, all the organisations use learning based within the community and actively recruit learners; most offer free courses and childcare.
- CUVP organisations also recognise institutional and dispositional barriers, but these are often more complex to address than situational and informational barriers. There is also less consistency in the way in which institutions have responded to them.

5.1. The diversity of learners that CUVP organisations work with is reflected in the range of barriers to learning that the different organisations have identified. The barriers and institutional responses identified also reflect the organisations' histories as institutions. For example:

- the organisations were established with different aims;
- they are often staffed by people with a very strong commitment to social justice and equally strong ideas about how this is best achieved; and
- they rely upon different sources of funding which, in turn, influences what they are able to provide.

5.2. All these factors both enable and constrain the type of learning provision organisations offer, and the support they can offer to help learners overcome potential barriers. This section discusses the types of barriers that organisations have sought to address and the following section discusses the cost implications of these institutional responses.

5.3. Some types of **situational barriers** are widely recognised. All of the CUV partners interviewed recognised that the cost of courses was a potential barrier, for example, and all but one, provided **free** or **subsidised courses**, or **grants** for at least some groups of learners (e.g. learners receiving state benefits). Where

providers themselves are not able to offer this, some indicated that they were able to enable learners to access financial support from other sources such as Individual Learning Accounts.

5.4. All of the CUVP organisations interviewed recognised caring responsibilities as a potential barrier. All but one provided some access to **childcare** provision and most offered **flexible hours** for courses (e.g. finishing before 3pm so that parents could still pick up their children from school). Childcare was also identified by a number of respondents as an attraction in its own right. As one interviewee explained, young mothers could leave their children in the crèche and have a break. One provider also identified non-childcare caring responsibilities, such as caring for an elderly or sick relative, and discussed approaches to allowing people to **study from home**.

5.5. All of the CUVP organisations interviewed also identified that lack of learning provision within people's communities was a potential barrier citing, for example poor public transport links, and the value of their delivering some, if not all, of their **provision within the Community**. **Some also** offered, or were exploring, **community transport** (including minibuses, taxis etc).

5.6. Two of the CUVP organisations interviewed highlighted potential barriers linked to physical disability and offered **disabled access, hearing loops and equipment for the partially sighted**.

5.7. **Institutional barriers** are the characteristics of the institutions that alienate or exclude certain people. The majority of the CUVP organisations interviewed in the course of this research identified accessibility as a barrier to learners. As noted, they therefore delivered some or all of their provision within the communities they worked with and (5.5) some offered special support for people with disabilities. However, another significant issue of access is the alienation some potential learners can feel from learning, often as a result of previous experience. A number of providers emphasised the importance of meeting these learners' needs and interests by recognising, and working to overcome, their fears and low expectations. For example, some providers:

- Adopted **learner centred approaches**, with a flexible responsive curriculum and a wide range of courses;
- Sought to **promote the relevance** of learning by linking courses to community activities such as food hygiene courses in the community café or child health courses linked to playgroups;
- ran courses in rooms that people **feel comfortable** in, and that lacked the associations with previous negative experiences of compulsory education that, for example, colleges hold for some learners;
- sought to keep procedures for signing up to courses as informal and **user-friendly** as possible;
- used **local people** as the ‘face’ of the institution (e.g. recruitment); and
- provided advice and guidance about other institutions’ rules and procedures (e.g. advice on benefits, access to other learning providers).

5.8. **Informational Barriers** are created by a lack of appropriate information and an overlap with dispositional barriers: the negative attitudes, beliefs or assumptions about learning held by learners. Because the CUVP organisations work with non-traditional learners, they all **actively seek to recruit potential learners**. The scale of the challenge was illustrated by one provider who indicated that despite its active presence within the community for almost two decades and biannual leaflet drops, a survey had indicated a substantial numbers of people in the community they served were not aware of them, or of the courses they offered; indeed, a number of respondents to the survey identified a need for courses the centre was already providing.

5.9. Informational barriers were addressed primarily through **advertising**. In keeping with other types of learning provider most CUVP organisations use:

- Posters,
- Leaflet drops
- Advertisements in newspapers; and
- Schools to distribute information

- 5.10. However, as community-based organisations they are also able to employ informal mechanisms and link in to local networks. Most relied heavily upon **word of mouth** recommendations and **personal contact** through for example, knocking on doors and talking to people using their café or crèche in order to recruit learners. Several providers also use their community development workers to ‘signpost’ potential learners to possible courses.
- 5.11. Some providers also mentioned running **special events** such as Christmas lunches, summer fayres or entertainment evenings; or had introduced **leisure programmes** like line dancing classes designed to attract people to their centres. Some centres were also running community services such as after-school clubs that brought different types of people into the building. These types of personal contacts often address both informational and dispositional barriers. By putting a local ‘**friendly face**’ to the institution, these initial contacts can help providers begin to engage people who feel inhibited from participating, because, for example:
- they lack confidence;
  - they have had negative experiences of compulsory education; or
  - they feel ‘too old to learn’.
- 5.12. A number of providers emphasised that making this first contact was often the biggest barrier that had to be overcome.
- 5.13. Some providers also highlighted the importance of having **credibility** in their community and of using local staff able to empathise and relate to the groups they worked with.
- 5.14. The majority of the providers interviewed emphasised the importance of taking time and not rushing learners. For example, some used **taster and introductory courses** to help people slowly build the confidence, and made testing and accreditation optional.

- 5.15. The majority of the respondents interviewed emphasised the importance of **support** and **personal contact** to encourage and retain non-traditional learners once they had started a course.
- 5.16. Once learners were involved, many providers highlighted the importance of **information, advice and guidance** so that people could identify progression routes that suited them. All those who highlighted this issue were keen to stress that it was up to learners to choose how they would progress and important that they respected the learners' decisions. This may mean, for example, that progression is not to a higher level. Indeed many providers went to considerable lengths to find opportunities for horizontal progression. In many cases, learners were reported to want to repeat the same course but providers were unable to offer it because of funding restrictions that prevent people repeating a course. In response, some providers offered a succession of similar courses based around the same theme (e.g. sugar craft).
- 5.17. As noted, there are over-laps between the different barriers, and a number of cross-cutting themes emerged. In particular, in order to effectively address these barriers, CUVP organisations often worked in **partnership** with other providers (most notably colleges and universities) and other community development organisations (most notably, Communities First partnerships).
- 5.18. In order to effectively identify potential barriers, CUVP organisations needed effective **channels of communication** to the communities they work with. Organisations interviewed identified a range of strategies, including:
- community participation on their management boards;
  - recruiting local staff;
  - outreach work;
  - running pilot courses to gauge demand; and
  - research (e.g. questionnaires) and monitoring and evaluation of learner participation and requests.

5.19. Interestingly, one provider indicated that their involvement in community-based learning had significant costs for the organisation in terms of the hostility from other organisations it generated, given the political nature of the learning they supported (e.g. learning that encouraged learners to question the way other organisations worked). However when the issue was raised most providers indicated that community-based learning was a benefit to the organisations, raising their profile within the community and with other organisations in a positive way.

## 6. The costs of overcoming barriers to Learning

### Summary

- The most expensive institutional response to the range of barriers faced by non-traditional learners is the provision of learning within the community as opposed to more mainstream provision on a central site (e.g. college or university).
- The most significant components of the cost of community-based provision are the cost of the buildings and staff.
- In order to provide an indication of the cost of provision, the costs of a ‘model community-based learning centre’ serving 300 people were calculated to be approximately £300,000 a year.
- Effective action to address dispositional barriers, such as building credibility within the community and fostering a friendly supportive institutional culture have a cost, but are difficult to quantify.
- Community based learning has a very important role to play as a ‘stepping stone’ for those unable to directly progress to more mainstream provision. Providing the support necessary to enable people to do this has costs, but again, these are difficult to quantify.

6.1. **Venues.** The cost implications of the institutional responses of CUV partners to the barriers faced by their learners varied. By far the largest single cost is provision within the community, particularly if buildings are used solely or primarily for

community-based learning. Although many providers use buildings rented on peppercorn rents (e.g. local authority owned buildings), and therefore do not bear the all costs themselves, the value of these buildings is considerable, particularly given the investment made in some of them to refurbish them and to equip them as learning centres.

6.2. A number of partners interviewed emphasised the importance of accessible, clean, warm and friendly buildings, and this is recognised as a key part of good practice.<sup>xviii</sup> One provider contrasted the greater numbers of learners using a centre based within the centre of town with centres outside.

6.3. Many centres have a café and crèche as part of their facilities and consider them an integral part of their learning provision, as they serve as a way of recruiting and retaining learners.

6.4. Centres of the standard required, with the range of facilities many offer are inevitably costly. Estimates of the value of buildings used ranged from a £150,000 to almost £1.5million for a new purpose built community centre (including IT suite, community café, internet lounge, multi-purpose hall, healthy living centre, crèche, training and meeting rooms and a multi use games area outside the centre). On top of the capital costs, overheads for buildings of this size are considerable.

6.5. Where the rooms used by providers were rented, the rates ranged from £4/hour to £10/hour.

6.6. **Staff Costs** The costs of **staffing** these centres is also considerable, with teams of between 10-20 people common. A typical provider, might have:

- A Coordinator
- Centre Manager
- Development officers x 2
- Administrative Officer
- Café Staff x 2

- Crèche staff x 4
- Caretaker/cleaner

and staff costs of £200,000-£250,000.

6.7. The time needed to underpin the provision of learning opportunities was identified. Many providers interviewed talked about the considerable amount of time that senior staff had to spend to secure pieces of short term project funding to sustain their centres. There was a concern from some respondents that the amount of time they spent ‘chasing money’ reduced the amount of time they would have liked to have spent on other areas of their work (e.g. management and development),

6.8. Some respondents cited the cost of complying with funders' monitoring requirements such as for European funding, in terms of staff time.

6.9. Several respondents also identified the significant amounts of time they spent networking and building partnerships. As noted above, partnership working was part of the strategy organisations' adopted to develop community-based learning, indeed their membership of CUV indicates its importance to them. Partnerships were considered important means of not only delivering learning but also, for example, recruiting learners, sharing good practice and accessing funding. But the time needed to make partnership work effective was taking its toll, particularly as the number of strategic and operational partnerships increases.

6.10. Given the importance of personal contact to help overcome dispositional barriers, many staff also devoted considerable amounts of their time to providing support to learners, ranging from formal careers advice through trained advisors, to informal chats. The importance attached to this, indicates that there are considerable intangible costs in terms of recruiting and retaining staff with an appropriate attitude and approach toward learners. Interestingly few respondents identified significant training costs. This may reflect the short termism that short

term project funding can produce, leaving organisations uncertain about their futures and therefore reluctant to invest in their staff.

6.11. In addition to the core staff costs, organisations were paying tutors fees that ranged from £10 to £35/hour.

6.12. The majority of organisations interviewed had an unpaid board of directors. This body of people performed a crucial management and monitoring role. They also frequently involve local people who provide both local intelligence on need and access to informal information networks. In many cases board members gave a considerable amount of their time to the organisations they worked with. In one case a board members also provided professional legal services on a pro bono basis.

6.13. **Advertising and promotion:** As already identified, in addition to personal contact with learners, all the providers were engaged in more formalised recruitment through advertising by, for example, posters and leafleting. While these could often be produced in house and distributed by staff or volunteers they still carry a cost and the costs of advertising in local newspapers can be substantial. One provider commented that advertising in regional papers such as the Western Mail or Evening Post had proved ineffective and they therefore relied upon local papers. Although the costs of advertising in local papers are lower, they are not insignificant: one provider had found that two adverts in a local paper would generally be required to recruit sufficient numbers for a course, costing around £800 in total.

6.14. In addition, special events and activities designed to bring people into the centre (see 5.11) also involve costs and can be very difficult to find funding for.

6.15. **Customised provision:** The flexibility many providers sought to offer also has cost implications, particularly where bespoke courses are required or where, for example, courses are run outside of normal office hours. In many cases, this coupled to the small numbers of learners involved, minimises the potential for economies of scale to be realised. In some cases, pilot research projects are being

undertaken to explore new approaches, entailing significantly higher costs. The actual financial implications of these factors are difficult to quantify though.

6.16. **Transport:** By providing courses within communities, most providers had sought to minimise the need to provide transport. Nevertheless, one of the providers had in the past run two minibuses. At an average of 200 miles per week and 40p per mile, this would create a cost of £80 per week or over £4000 a year. Another provider is planning to explore the demand for community transport, although this will not only be for community-based learning.

6.17. **Free courses:** Providing courses on a free or subsidised basis also has a cost, given the income forgone. Organisations were more likely to be able to raise funds to cover this cost, for example through European funding that supports the provision of the course.

6.18. **Income generation :** The organisations interviewed were able to offset some of these cost through **revenue generating** activities such as:

- Crèches
- Café
- Renting rooms for conferences.

6.19. The actual financial contribution of these revenue generating activities is hard to gauge, particularly as many are relatively new initiatives and might be expected to run at a loss initially. Moreover, as noted, many providers saw services such as a café or crèche as an integral part of their learning provision and could therefore justify running them at a loss if required. Nevertheless, several providers also considered them as valuable social enterprises in their own right, with the potential to cross subsidise other elements of learning provision. Indeed, one provider was actively exploring establishing social enterprises primarily to fund community-learning provision.

6.20. A number of providers saw learning provision itself as a source of income, given the fees paid by larger institutions to them in return for the use of rooms. Several providers estimated that although the amounts involved would not cover staff costs, they more than covered other direct overheads.

6.21. Table 2 outlines the possible costs for a 'model' community-based learning centre serving approximately 300 learners. The figures are based upon those supplied by providers and calculations based upon the People and Work Unit's own project work with CUVP organisations.

**Table 2. The Model Centre, serving approximately 300 learners**

Costs		Direct cost borne by provider		Indirect costs, typically borne by third party
		Annual Cost	One off capital cost	
<b>Buildings - one off capital cost</b>				£200,000
<b>Overheads (excluding staff costs)</b>		£25,000		
<b>Café (excluding staff costs)</b>			£50,000	
<b>Crèche (excluding staff costs)</b>			£20,000	
<b>Equipment (including ICT suite) [<sup>3</sup>]</b>			£10,000	
<b>Staff [<sup>4</sup>]</b>	Coordinator	£33,000		
	Centre Manager	£27,500		
	Development officers x 2	£44,000		
	Administrative Officer	£20,000		
	Café Staff x 2	£29,000		
	Crèche staff x 4	£48,000		
	Caretaker/cleaner	£12,000		
<b>Staff Training</b>		£1,000		
<b>Tutors [<sup>5</sup>]</b>		£36,000		
<b>Volunteers [<sup>6</sup>]</b>				£3,095
<b>Board of Directors [<sup>7</sup>]</b>				£5,760
<b>Recruitment and advertising [<sup>8</sup>]</b>		£5,000		
<b>Community activities budget</b>		£5,000		
<b>Evaluation</b>		£6,000		
<b>Annual Reports</b>		£2,000		
<b>Total</b>		<b>£293,500</b>	<b>£80,000</b>	<b>£208,855</b>

<sup>3</sup> Costed on basis of 10 x PCs and printers + furniture

<sup>4</sup> Including on-costs

<sup>5</sup> Costed at £20/hour. Each course 30 weeks, 2 hours/week (60 hours/course). For 300 learners, 10 people per course (30 courses/year). Total of 1800/hours/year

<sup>6</sup> Costed at 5 volunteers, doing an average of 1 hour every two weeks (total of 638 hours/week), paid £4.85/hour

<sup>7</sup> Board of 8 people, meet for 2 hours, every month (total of 192/hours/yr). Charged at £30/hours

<sup>8</sup> Costed on the basis of £3,000 for press advertising, £2,000 for in-house printing of leaflets and posters.

6.22. These costs are relatively easy to quantify and are reflected in the costings we calculated for the ‘Model Centre’ which indicated that it costs around £300,000 a year to staff and run a base for community learning. CUVP organisations were invited to comment on the costings for the Model Centre in order to validate or invalidate them. Five organisations responded. Three confirmed that they felt that the figures were about right for a centre of that size. One indicated that most of the figures were a little high with the exception of the training budget, which was too low. The fifth highlighted some of the problems in gauging the true economic cost given a range of income generating activities that some centres undertook. Overall, we feel that this feedback validates the model and assuming that the figures are of an approximate order of magnitude, it is clear that costs of this size cannot be covered by ELWA funding alone.

6.23. In addition to these direct financial costs, a number of providers identified costs linked to helping potential learners overcome dispositional barriers. For example, providers stressed the importance of:

- the credibility and reputation of the organisation in the community; and
- the need for staff to have empathy with learners and to be credible in their eyes.

6.24. In effect, the community organisation as a whole, through its status and profile within the community acts a ‘learning broker’ that helps catalyse change in potential learners’ lives.<sup>xix</sup> However the financial costs associated with this, such as building and maintaining a strong reputation within the community, while potentially significant, are much harder to quantify.

6.25. This model for widening participation in learning, which relies upon a long-term physical presence within the community, has significant cost implications compared to the alternatives (e.g. attracting more learners directly to existing educational institutions like colleges and universities). It also means that the cost per student increases because each provider works with relatively small numbers

of students. Nevertheless, the study suggests that community-based learning can play an important role as a ‘stepping stone’ for those people who feel that the step straight up to further or higher education is too great for them.

6.26. The importance of the type of ‘first step’ learning that community-based providers can offer is recognised by ELWA, however ELWA is also keen to stress the importance of progression<sup>xx</sup>. The argument for encouraging progression is partly economic. Precisely because community-based learning is more expensive to provide (on a per student basis), there is an economic case for enabling and supporting people to progress to ‘mainstream’ providers (e.g. Further and Higher Education institutions), so that community-based providers can target their resources upon recruiting and supporting new cohorts of learners.

6.27. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that enabling and supporting vertical progression is not simply about targeting scarce financial resources on those most in need. It is also about ensuring that learners achieve their full potential. In some cases it appears that learners overcome some initial barriers to learning and reach a ‘comfort zone’. It may also be easier for providers to offer courses at lower levels. Learners may have derived important benefits from this, but it is important that providers are also willing to challenge learners who could achieve more.

6.28. We recognise that vertical progression will not suit everyone. Nevertheless, where, for example, a learners’ aim is to secure employment, enabling and supporting them to do a succession of low-level course may not be in their best interests. Equally, where, for example, the main benefit that learners identify is the social interaction, paying for a tutor may not necessarily be the best or most cost effective way of enabling this, and it may be more worth exploring ways to support and facilitate more informal learning.<sup>xxi</sup>

6.29. We are not advocating abandoning people. Like the CUVP organisations we spoke to, we recognise that learners face a range of barriers and often need intensive support to engage, continue and progress in learning. The CUVP organisations we spoke to recognised the potential for learning to empower people and not simply to get them into work. However, there was some evidence that this

recognition could be an inhibitor to progression. Even when providers have strong links to other institutions there was evidence of assumptions being made about *which* learners would progress, based on the courses they were taking. Providers need to recognise that if learning is effective, some learners will change their expectations and interests. The way they progress can take a variety of routes. It might be vertical progression to a higher-level course or to further and higher education institutions. It may be a horizontal progression, as learners develop the knowledge, skills, and confidence they need to widen their interests but want to study at the same level.<sup>xxii</sup> It may also mean supporting and enabling people to organise their own ‘classes’, be they sugar craft, creative writing or quilt making.

## 7. The costs for learners of participation in learning

### Summary:

- CUVP organisations have invested considerable amounts of time and money in order to try to minimise the barriers and consequent costs that learners face. This means that many of the financial costs, particularly for learners on lower level courses have been minimised and in some cases, effectively eliminated.
- Even where financial costs have been eliminated, learners still incurred significant emotional costs caused by a fear of failure; a concern that participation would harm others, most notably children; and negative reactions of other people.
- Overall, there is no clear relationship between the level of cost and level of study. For example, financial costs tend to increase as learners progress, whilst some emotional costs, such as opposition from partners also tend to increase as learners progress. However, other emotional costs such as the fear of failure, tended to decrease as learners progressed.

**7.1. Financial Costs:** The most commonly identified cost was the financial costs of participation. This represents an important situational barrier for those in financial poverty. The main types of financial costs identified by learners were:

- Course fees;
- Ancillary costs (e.g. books and equipment); and
- Travel costs.

7.2. *Course Fees*: Many providers offer free or subsidised courses and most learners did not identify course fees as a cost. Nevertheless, a minority of those we spoke to were paying course fees<sup>9</sup>, and particularly for higher-level courses such as University degrees, these can be considerable, running to over three thousand pounds<sup>10</sup>.

7.3. *Ancillary Costs*: Although only a minority of learners identified course fees as a cost, large numbers identified a range of ancillary costs for items such books and equipment. In some cases these could be quite substantial, for example, some of the learners interviewed indicated they had spent £500-£600 on equipment over the last 3 years. Another learner estimated that they had spent approximately £1000 on books over the last 18 months. This latter figure is high and probably reflects both the learners' interest in the subject and the level of study. Textbooks of around £10 per course are probably more the norm for lower level courses.

7.4. Equipment and book costs of this order of magnitude are likely to put off learners on low incomes, although the all those interviewed were willing to pay. Indeed, for example, one centre involved had provided equipment they could share, but learners felt that it was important to have their own. Other centres have secured funding for books and benefit from schemes such as the book boxes from Swansea University. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that this research has only sampled learners who are willing to bear these costs. Non-learners may also be unaware of free or subsidised courses or grants that could assist them (Bates & Aston, 2004).

---

<sup>9</sup> Full rate fees range from £70-£80 for a 30-week course (2 hours/week), with fees cut by half for pensioners and to £5 for people on benefits.

<sup>10</sup> 30 Credit DACE course cost £287.50, meaning. Open University rates vary according to the course studied. For a non-residential humanities degree they are currently around £245 for a 30-credit module. 360 credits are required for a B.A. Honours degree.

7.5. *Travel Costs*: By providing courses within the community, CUVP organisations have minimised travel costs for many learners. We did come across small numbers of learners who were travelling considerable distances to access one centre. However, it was clear that there were alternatives closer at hand and that they had actively chosen to travel, and incur the financial costs of that travel, because of the quality of learning offered at the particular centre. <sup>11</sup>

7.6. The research illustrated that vertical progression tended to increase the costs of participation, particularly if learners moved onto higher-level courses that were not available within their community.

7.7. No learners identified other types of costs, such as childcare, because the centre they attended either provided childcare, or because they received in kind support from friends and family. The latter is a hidden, if unmonetised cost, but the research was not able to quantify it.

7.8. **Non-financial Costs**: When asked about “costs” a small number of learners identified the cost of time taken up in learning, particularly for learners in full time employment or those who were carers. Participation in learning implies an opportunity cost, of forging other alternative activities and some respondents suggested this was why there tended to be a relatively large proportion of older learners. A lack of time is another example of a situational barrier. However, with the exception of mothers who were concerned about the potential impact that their participation in learning might have upon their children, time was not considered a significant cost by most learners

7.9. The research also indicated that learners had had to overcome a range of social and cultural barriers to learning. No learner we interviewed explicitly identified the experience of overcoming them as a “cost” *per se*. Nevertheless, we feel it is appropriate to treat them as a form of emotional cost. Although most people equated “cost” with financial costs and therefore did not describe the negative emotions such as fear, and anxiety, that their participation in learning had aroused,

---

<sup>11</sup> The reasons cited included the flexibility of the timetable at the centre which suited their work

as costs, it is clear that these emotions meant they had to expend effort and incurred loss or suffering in the process. Therefore we feel that they can be properly considered as an emotional “cost”.<sup>12</sup>

7.10. The research suggests that emotional costs can be significant, and form the basis for many of dispositional barriers to learning. Three broad types of emotional cost were identified by learners:

- Costs caused by the a **concern that participation in learning will harm others** (e.g. children); and
- Costs caused by the **fear and anxiety that participation in learning can create** (fear of being 'out of my depth' and of failure); and
- Costs caused by the **negative reaction of others** (partners, friends and family);

7.11. *Fear and Anxiety*: Many learners appeared to have had to overcome a range of dispositional barriers to learning. The most common of these was a perception that learning would be very difficult, or in one, case apparently impossible. This perception created an intense fear of humiliation and failure in some learners, and appeared to be linked to the level of the course they were attending: lower levels of fear were reported by groups engaged in more informal or ‘disguised’ learning (e.g. Language and Play Projects) compared to learners engaged in higher level, more formalised learning. This fear meant that learners had placed themselves in what they expected or feared would be an extremely uncomfortable situation.

7.12. There was limited evidence that this anxiety and stress could be manifested in physical symptoms. For example, learners with one CUVP organisation experienced significant increases in heart rate as a result of the anxiety caused by their participation in learning.<sup>xxiii</sup>

7.13. The source of these dispositional barriers and the consequent emotional costs that learners incurred appeared to be rooted in three inter-linked causes:

---

patterns better; the atmosphere of the centre in question; and its “Welsh culture”.

<sup>12</sup> The Oxford English dictionary defines cost as “...to require as an effort, to involve as a loss or sacrifice”

- Negative prior experiences of learning, most notably school;
- A lack of self-confidence or self belief in their efficacy as learners; and
- Societal norms about who is and isn't a 'learner' (e.g. that learning is only for young people).

7.14. These factors meant that many learners, most notably those engaged on lower level, less formalised learning, had a weak educational self-concept. That is to say, they did not see or consider themselves to be natural 'learners', and they were therefore fearful of failure, exposing them to the risk of semi-public humiliation. However, the research suggested that the direct relationship between the level and formality of learning and the level of fear broke down as learners continued to progress, as their experience of success enhanced their educational self-efficacy and lessened their fears of failure<sup>xxiv</sup>.

7.15. *Concerns that participation in learning will harm others.* 'Voting' exercises conducted with two groups of women suggests that the potentially negative impact of participation in learning upon their children is a major concern for mothers.

7.16. *Negative reactions of others:* A small number of women we interviewed commented on the negative reaction of their partners to their participation in learning. For example, as one learner commented as a result of her participation in learning:

*"I have changed, I still love him [husband] don't know if he still loves me. I'm not going to stop [though] that's for sure."*

*"I've just drifted away, made new friends, I find them [old friends] boring."*

There was also some evidence that learners' attitudes to partners could change as a result of participation:

*"If I knew I could get a better job, I wouldn't give a damn about my partner."*

7.17. Partners' negative attitudes were attributed primarily to “jealousy” (e.g. they’ll “think you’re having affairs”); changing interests; and sexism (e.g. “A women place is in the home” mentality). The women who identified these costs were all involved in or contemplating higher-level courses (e.g. foundation and degree courses). The research indicates that other groups of women who were engaged in lower level courses, that conformed to social norms about ‘appropriate’ education for women (e.g. Language and Play Projects) did not experience these costs. This might indicate that participation in this type of course was considered less threatening by male partners.

## 8. The Impact of Cost upon Learner Choices

### Summary

- Our research suggests that relatively few barriers are an absolute bar on participation. Instead they serve primarily to increase the emotional and financial costs of participation.
- Choices about whether to participate in learning are primarily a function of expectations of the cost of learning and its value.
- Expectations are formed by the interaction between people’s biography and their locality.
- Informational barriers mean that there is often a mismatch between people’s expectations and their experience of the cost and value of learning.
- Although expectations can be unfounded they still create powerful dispositional barriers to learning and this may help explain why some people overcome situational barriers that appear to hold other people back. It may also suggest that not all potential learners realise how low the financial cost of learning would actually be.

8.1. Our research involved people who were already engaged in some learning and this means there is limit to what we can say about the costs experienced by non-learners. We suspect, but cannot be sure, that many of the situational barriers overcome by many of the learners we spoke to (e.g. financial poverty and caring responsibilities) blocked the participation of non-learners. Although many CUVP organisations had minimised many situational costs, it was clear that some of the

learners we spoke to had overcome situational barriers such as caring responsibilities that might have held back others. In understanding why these situational barriers seem to hold some people back, but not others, we feel that dispositional barriers are the key factor.

8.2. It is important to stress that we are not suggesting that situational barriers are unimportant. There is considerable evidence that they are an important barrier facing learners in the CUVP area.<sup>xxv</sup> For example, there was evidence from our research that some situational barriers, such as pregnancy, were an absolute bar that forced learners, at the very least, to suspend their participation in learning. For those in very isolated communities with limited access to transport or for those working irregular shift patterns, the situational barrier they face may block participation in classroom-based learning. However, this research demonstrates that given the investment in community-based learning, many of the situational barriers that people face are minimised, along with the consequent costs associated with participation.

8.3. In order to understand why some people from deprived communities are participating in learning whilst many more of their peers are not<sup>xxvi</sup>, we used a theoretical framework for understanding learner choices based upon rational choice theory<sup>xxvii</sup>. This model suggests that people's choices are informed by their assessment of the relative costs and benefits of different choices.

8.4. The concept of 'rationality' we have used differs from classical rational choice theories, in that it does not mean objectively rational choices predicated upon perfect knowledge. Instead it is based upon the notion of 'bounded rationality' in which people's choices are informed by expectations of cost and benefit that are often founded upon incomplete or even incorrect information<sup>xxviii</sup> – in effect, informational barriers. Indeed, the research indicated that there were often significant differences between peoples' *expectations* and their *actual experience* of learning and its value. For example, current learners often reported that they didn't expect the learning experience to be so much fun and that they didn't expect to have learnt so much or to have made so much progress. Of course, a lack of knowledge of learning could equally mean challenges were not expected, indeed

many learners we spoke to were surprised by how challenging participation seemed at first, although they had usually subsequently overcome these anxieties:

*“Never thought I had to do that [talk out aloud in front of the group], bit of a shock...but everyone’s in the same boat”*

*“If I’d known in advance [that I’d be going to college for an access course] I’d have run a mile...thought I was just going to do spelling”*

8.5. The research suggests that learners’ decisions to participate in learning were motivated by a wide range of reasons. That is to say, the value learners expected to gain from their participation in learning differed markedly. For some, most notably mothers, it was being able to help their children that mattered most. For others, most notably older learners, it was the social interaction that mattered most. For others, particularly those on higher-level courses, it was the sense of achievement and joy of learning that mattered most. For others, particularly those on IT courses, it was the support it might offer in finding work. For example, as one respondent put it:

*“Qualifications open new doors”*

8.6. However, this expectation of the value of learning might only be realised if learners received appropriate careers advice, encouragement to progress and developed the wider (soft) skill set they needed to secure employment:

*“I don’t know where to start to find a job, or what to do?”*

*“I thought the diploma would help, but...social services [the learners’ previous employer] were happy to leave me where I was”.*

8.7. Interestingly, the research suggested that learners’ calculations of both cost and value had often changed as their lives changed. For example, the research indicated that young children could be both a situational barrier that forced some people to suspend or stop learning, and a catalyst for re-engagement in learning amongst

others such as mothers who wanted to help their children. They might still believe that learning will be challenging, frightening even, however, they could now see a real value to it:

*[I] used to hide from education...[you] don't draw attention to yourself, hide: [be] 'the quiet one'....it was children that catalysed it [returning to learning]: they were passing you, the girls doing GCSEs – I couldn't help [them] no more...You'll do anything for your kids, no matter how humiliating”.*

*“I passed the computer course, then pulled out because I got pregnant”.*

*“Wanted to do something with my life: kids doing computers at school [it] helps me help them”.*

8.8. Other life events that had altered situational barriers and led learners to reassess their interest in learning included ill health and losing a job.

8.9. Given the substantial difference between expectations and experience, we strongly believe that it is important that learning providers try to place themselves in potential learners' shoes and to ‘see’ through their eyes, so that they better understand what potential learners ‘know’ about the learning experience and its value. In particular it may suggest that not all potential learners realise how low the financial costs of learning would actually be.

8.10. The research indicates that what people ‘know’ about learning is shaped by:

- Their interpretation and memories of their past experiences of learning – or their biography; and
- The stories and beliefs about learning prevalent in their community or locality.

8.11. Thus, for example, key factors included whether people considered themselves to have succeeded at school:

*“Memories of school were horrendous, therefore [it was a ] big step”*

*“Can’t compare with school...not under pressure, if [you] don’t want to do it, you don’t have to”.*

and the attitudes of friends and family:

*“My husband thought I’d gone clean off...she’s gone back to school!? Friends thought I was mad. Children thought it was wonderful...[But] my husband would say ‘you’re neglecting them’” ... thinks I’ll run off with someone...[that] women’s place is in the home”.*

*“moved away from the friends you were with... [at school, it’s] ... better when you’re not with so many, that’s when you go off the rails. I’m, easily led...take drugs, mitch school...my mother tried her best, I realise that now. Sent me out to [the] school bus, but I might not go”.*

8.12. People's attitudes and beliefs may be derived from both from personal experience and from what they are told or see about them in their community. However, although poor school experiences and living in a community with low skill levels may mean it is *likely* that a person will have a dispositional barrier to learning, the picture is more complex. Crucially the research suggests that a range of factors, including peoples’ expectations, self-efficacy (discussed further in the following section) and self-image mediate personal experiences of learning.

8.13. The relationship between personal experiences of learning and its value and the beliefs and attitudes of the community is a complex one. Community knowledge is crucial since it can invest learning with value or strip such value away. Communities where the jobs people hold are unskilled, where people with qualifications move away and where there is common experience of ineffective training programmes or compulsory involvement in learning that has provided little benefit are poor environments to nurture learning in. However, it is also true that in such communities, individual success in learning can have a significant 'ripple' effect in challenging perceptions. In this context, community-based

learning provides the opportunity to invest individual achievement with a wider community benefit.

- 8.14. Because personal experience is mediated by factors such as prior-expectation, self-efficacy and self-image, different people often have different experiences of the same course or institution. For example, one person may rise to the challenge and experience a sense of success, while another from the same community and with the same educational background, may not, may give up and therefore experience a sense of failure. Each will probably tell very different stories about the same course and institution to their friends and family:

*“one of my friends...was doing computers [with me], but she's lacking in confidence and didn't come back”.*

- 8.15. Changing what potential learners ‘know’ about learning and its value will not be easy. For example, strategies designed to address informational barriers (e.g., people not knowing courses are available), such as leaflet campaigns, will not be enough unless they also address dispositional barriers (such as the perception that learning isn't enjoyable or useful). Nevertheless, because what both a potential learner and their community ‘knows’ about learning, is rooted, at least in part, in personal experiences of learning institutions, learning providers *can* change what potential learners’ and their communities ‘know’ about learning and its value.

- 8.16. The role played by personal experiences and received 'knowledge' (what others in the community say) in shaping what people know about learning, highlights the importance of ensuring that every learners’ experience of learning is as positive as possible. This means that potential institutional barriers need to be dismantled. For example, cold and unfriendly buildings and staff are likely to erect or reinforce dispositional barriers in the hearts and minds of potential learners, and all those they talk to.

*“they [Tutors at the local college] just don't seem to get on with people...no respect.”*

*“reception was quite helpful, but college, to me, they don’t give you enough information, [they] give you sheets, ask you to sort it out, ‘go back, [you] need this’, ‘this’, ‘this’...very frustrating! I hate forms.”*

*“I wouldn’t leave my kids down the crèche. We know the people [who run it]!”*

8.17. In contrast, positive experiences are more likely to predispose an existing learner to continue and progress, and to ensure that the stories they tell to other people in the community about that course and institution are positive. In effect they will become ‘learning brokers’ or ‘intermediaries’<sup>13</sup> in their own right:

*“I was dragged here by [Name omitted]”*

*“knew she’d done a bit of computers, said why don’t you come down, [tutor’s name omitted] very nice.”*

8.18. Providers we spoke to understand this and consistently highlighted the importance of positive publicity through ‘word of mouth’ recommendations and through establishing ‘credibility’ within the communities they serve. Learners’ comments supported this:

*“We’ve known people in the centre for a long time”*

*“Knew all about the activities last year, they’ve [previous learners’] all done so well”.*

8.19. There are of course limits on what an individual learning provider can achieve. In particular, changes in other institutions can also impact upon people’s life circumstances and their beliefs about learning. For example, changes to the Benefit

---

<sup>13</sup> Learning brokers are organisations who help bridge the gap between potential learners and providers. Learning intermediaries are individuals who act as mentors or guides for learners. They are often described as “charismatic” because they help catalyse change in potential learners lives. They include friends, relatives, teachers, artists, anyone indeed, including strangers, who help stimulate a change in a person’s life (Owens, 2002).

system can make participation in learning more or less financially attractive. The value that local employers place upon qualifications can alter the value that individuals place upon qualifications. However, as the following section outlines, perhaps the hardest expectation for providers to change is the belief amongst some non-traditional learners that they cannot learn; what might be thought of as low educational self-efficacy.

## 9. Self-Efficacy and Learner Choice

### Summary

- Low levels of self-efficacy are potentially one of the most robust dispositional barriers, because learners with low levels of self-efficacy are less likely to try learning in the first place and more likely to fail if they do try.
- Because people don't generally attempt the impossible, for those who don't believe they can learn, considerations of the costs and value associated with learning are largely irrelevant. It therefore represents a more deep-rooted challenge than changing expectations about the cost and value of learning.
- The research suggests that low levels of self-efficacy may explain why some learners experience higher emotional costs, such as fear and anxiety.

9.1. Self-efficacy is a term used to describe a learners' subjective assessment of their ability to learn. A low level of educational self-efficacy is particularly hard to challenge as the most powerful way of building it is through personal success.<sup>xxix</sup> The problem is that those learners with low levels of self-efficacy are less likely to try learning in the first place and more likely to fail if they do try, than learners with higher levels of self-efficacy. This is because:

- potential learners' self-efficacy is often a decisive factor in explaining patterns of participation in learning, because as a general rule, people don't attempt the impossible;<sup>xxx</sup> and
- if a learner expects to succeed, they are more likely to succeed, if they expect to fail, they are more likely to fail, because: they have greater levels of motivation and interest if they expect to succeed; and because they have greater resilience

or staying power – they keep going in the face of adversity – if they expect to succeed.

9.2. In targeting their work at non-traditional learners community-based learning providers have to develop processes to build self-efficacy and these have cost implications.

9.3. Of course, objective ability is a factor; self-belief is no substitute for ability. Believing you can succeed at college or university may be valuable but is not a sufficient condition for success. You also need a range of soft and hard skills. Nevertheless, levels of self-efficacy tend to be self-fulfilling: those who expect to succeed tend to, and this success reinforces their self-belief; those who don't tend to either not try, or try and fail, reinforcing their lack of self-belief.<sup>xxxii</sup> This may help explain what Wiltshire calls: “the iron law of education - the more education people have had, the more likely they are to want more and the more competent they will be at getting it.”<sup>xxxiii</sup>

9.4. Self-efficacy helps explain why those students who have ‘failed’ academically and who have been constantly told by teachers and parents that they can't learn, internalise a self-belief that they can't learn, that they're ‘thick’, that college and university are for ‘other people’.<sup>xxxiii</sup> Some research suggests that non-learners may erect situational barriers such as a ‘lack of time’, because the dispositional barriers they face, such as low educational self-efficacy, mean that they fear participation in learning but are unwilling to acknowledge, or are even unaware of, the underlying cause of their non-participation.<sup>xxxiv</sup>

9.5. In relation to the costs of learning, the research suggests that if, for example, a potential learner does not believe they could succeed at college or university, they are unlikely to even consider it as an option, and a consideration of cost and benefits is rendered irrelevant.<sup>14</sup> Low levels of self-efficacy therefore represent a

---

<sup>14</sup> The research threw up exception to this: a learner cited previously who explained that they didn't expect to succeed, but felt that they had to try for the sake of their children. On the face of it, the case is difficult to explain. It may be that the learner in question entertained some slight hope of success, alongside an expectation that if they succeeded, learning would have real value for them, because they could help their children. It may be that they felt they had to in order to try to help their children, even

potentially more complex challenge than changing expectations about the cost and value of learning by for example, enhancing existing learners' experience of learning, so that stories about learning in a community become more positive.

9.6. Self-efficacy is not determinative of outcomes. Appropriate support and encouragement can help even those who expect to fail, to succeed. The problem is that it is hard to engage such people in the first place. Although less effective than personal success, self-efficacy can be enhanced by watching "similar others" succeed at a particular task through "social persuasion", such as encouragement and constructive feedback from people learners' respect and have faith in.<sup>xxxv</sup> The way some CUVP organisations have promoted role models of success, people from the community who have succeeded, represents one way of addressing this challenge. This approach is similar to the 'learning broker' or 'learning champion' role discussed in the previous chapter. However, it requires learning brokers to not only spread positive stories about education, but to represent themselves as role models which others could emulate and to actively encourage people not only to join up but to believe that they could learn. It also requires that these learning brokers are viewed by the target audience as "similar others". There is disadvantage within as well as between communities and it cannot be assumed that just because a person lives in a neighbourhood his or her success will be inspirational to all who live there.

9.7. The importance of self-efficacy was supported by the research, as with one notable exception, all the learners we interviewed had some faith in their ability to learn. They might have expected their participation to be difficult, in some cases they were fearful of failure and consequent humiliation, but they believed there was at least a chance that they could succeed, and they expected that success to have real value for them. The research also suggests that the expected emotional cost of learning associated with fear and anxiety are lower for those who have higher levels of self-efficacy, because, for example, they are less fearful of failure.

---

if they felt they were doomed to fail. Irrespective of the explanation, it remains an isolated case and we do not feel that it invalidates the findings.

9.8. There was also some evidence that learners engaged in more informal and lower level learning did not feel able to engage in higher level and more formal learning, suggesting that such involvement should not be assumed to be building confidence in learning.

9.9. Because as the research has demonstrated, participation in learning is not a cost free activity, Self-efficacy may be a necessary, but is not a sufficient condition to explain participation in learning; learners also need to value learning. There was however some evidence that the expected costs and value of learning was linked to self-efficacy, because for example, those who expected to succeed, anticipated a lower risk of failure, they experienced lower levels of fear and anxiety and their expectations of the value of learning were higher, because they were more confident that they would realise it.

## 10. Conclusions and Recommendations

### Summary

- Community based learning is costly, but this investment can reduce the costs, both financial and risk based, that learners incur when they participate in learning. Crucially community-based learning can also help change expectations, enabling it to engage those unwilling or unable to progress directly to more mainstream provision.
- Success within a community-based setting can enhance learners' educational self-efficacy so that they believe they can progress. This, in turn, because of the community-based setting, can influence wider community beliefs about the value of learning.
- Nevertheless, many learners will need support and encouragement to enable community-based learning to act as a stepping-stone to more mainstream provision.
- There is some evidence that for people who do not believe they can learn, calculations of costs and benefit are largely irrelevant. Changing expectations of cost and benefit therefore represents one response, but it may be necessary to complement this with work specifically designed to enhance potential learners educational self-efficacy.
- Community based learning has a very important potential role in re-engaging non-traditional learners and furthering the aspiration of building a learning country. However, the funding streams that have sustained much of the expansion of community-based learning, most notably the ESF, are not sustainable, and the CUVF is one a number of organisations that could explore how this funding gap could be met.

10.1. **The true cost of community-based learning:** Community based learning carries costs to both learner and provider. For the provider, the costs are associated with:

- The provision of facilities and opportunities to relatively small cohorts of learners which mean that the economies of scale available to mainstream providers are not possible; and
- The fact that community-based learning targets non-traditional learners, and providers are frequently seeking to recruit learners from communities where there is little credibility given to involvement in learning.

10.2. For the learner, the costs are associated with:

- The fact the involvement in community-based learning is frequently a return to learning after a long period away (sometimes decades) and therefore a new and highly challenging experience;
- The fact that the learner has to change his or her life in some way to take part in learning and the repercussions of this on family and friends; and
- The risk that involvement in learning may be a negative experience.

10.3. **Reducing Costs to Learners:** CUVP organisations have successfully minimised many of the financial costs associated with participation in learning. However, significant emotional costs remain. Many providers have sought to reduce these costs by, for example, providing warm, friendly and supportive learning environments. This often means that learners' expectations prove unfounded and their experience of learning is much less emotionally costly than they had anticipated. Nevertheless, for many non-learners dispositional barriers, most notably a lack of self-belief in their ability to learn, means that learning is quite simply irrelevant to them. They consequently never give learning chance, and never have a chance to have their expectations changed by experience.

10.4. The challenge of re-engaging potential learners who have little faith in their ability to learn is considerable. Many of the measures taken by CUVP partners to address dispositional barriers, such as building credibility within the community and nurturing a friendly supportive image and atmosphere, are important. The research suggests they help encourage people who want to learn but who would not feel comfortable or confident enough in mainstream provision, such as colleges

and university. Nevertheless, they will not be sufficient to re-engage people who don't believe that they can learn. The type of outreach work and intensive support offered by some CUVP organisations can help, but it may need to be supported by complementary approaches, such as promoting role models of success and actively encouraging people not only to join up, but to believe that they could succeed.

10.5. **Progression:** Learners face a range of barriers that block or hinder their participation in learning. For many, these mean that the step from non-participation straight into further and higher education is too large for them to either contemplate or manage.<sup>15</sup> Therefore community-based learning has an important role to play as a 'stepping stone' to enable people to access to higher-level qualifications either through study in their community or at central college or university site.<sup>xxxvi</sup> There was evidence from the research that success within a community setting had enhanced a number of learners' educational self-efficacy and they were therefore interested in progression to higher-level mainstream provision (e.g. college and university) where such qualifications could be secured.

10.6. Progression is often challenging for learners, and for the CUVP to assist them it is important that learners' are supported through appropriate advice, guidance and encouragement. Moreover, learners' progression routes often do not follow a direct linear path and transitions between providers are often difficult.<sup>xxxvii</sup> We found evidence of good practice, with well-established progression routes facilitated by the CUVP and its constituent organisations. Nevertheless, a commitment to progression did not appear to apply to all groups of learners. In particular, there was evidence of CUVP organisations enabling groups of older learners to do a succession of similar courses at the same level. Such 'horizontal progression', it is argued, values learning for its own sake and gives people a chance to continue learning without having to sacrifice comfort and safety. This is a persuasive argument but the research found evidence that it was being applied to whole groups of learners when, we have identified, individuals within groups may have very different aspirations and interests. Learning should, it could be argued, have the capacity to challenge and stimulate as well as inform and retain learners

and, given the costs of community learning to both provider and learner, we **recommend that CUVP organisations critically reflect on how progression can be supported for all groups of learners.**

10.7. **The Funding Gap:** Since 2000, ESF monies have helped fund a substantial expansion and enhancement of community-based learning. Because existing ELWA funding for learning does not cover all the costs of providing community-based learning, the sustainability of this expansion and enhancement of community-based learning is threatened by the end of the current ESF funding cycle in 2006.

10.8. Given the potential funding gap and ELWA's proposals to "reconfigure" the funding and planning of community-based learning<sup>xxxviii</sup>, we suggest that this it is important that the CUVP engages in dialogue with ELWA about the future funding of community-based learning. Many CUVP organisations have good contacts with people within ELWA<sup>16</sup>, the Welsh Assembly Government<sup>17</sup>, and other key organisations such as Estyn<sup>18</sup> and the Welsh European Funding Office (WEFO). **We recommend that that the CUVP explores the feasibility of putting together a lobbying group to take this issue forward.**

10.9. One possible approach for making the case for additional funding for community-based learning would be on the basis of 'scale effects'. There is already, for example, a weighting for educational deprivation in-built into the National Planning and Funding System, and this should benefit many community-based learning providers. Nevertheless, where a large college and a small community-based learning provider both work with learners from educationally deprived areas, the college would be able to benefit from economies of scale that a

---

<sup>15</sup> See e.g. McGivney, V. (2003). *Adult Learning pathways: through routes or cul-de-sacs*, NIACE: Leicester.

<sup>16</sup> Suggestions for who to take the report too included Mike Hopkins, The Director, of ELWA; The David Morgan, Director of SE Wales, and Shelia Thompson, Senior Learning Policy Manager,

<sup>17</sup> Suggestions for who to take the report too included Andrew Davies, The Minister for Economic Development, Richard Davies, the director of the Department for Training and Education, Alan Burge, The Head of the Communities First Directorate, members of Jayne Davidson's Senior Staff and Howell Frances

<sup>18</sup> Suggestions for who to take the report too included Elizabeth Kidd, Elaine Alison, Liam Killey and Enid Hankins

smaller provider would be unable to generate. Therefore, as our research suggests, the cost per student would be commensurably higher for the smaller provider.

10.10. In making the case for additional funding, it will be important that the additional costs of community-based learning can be justified by reference to the benefits: its ‘value added’. Our research indicates that learners derive important benefits from their participation in community-based learning and community learning providers are able to support ‘hard to reach groups’. Moreover, community-based learning can play an important role in fostering local cultures of learning. For example, the grandparent who returns to learning to help their grandchildren may not be ‘learning to earn’ themselves, but are enriching and strengthening their community and supporting future generations’ learning (and earning potential). Nevertheless, much of the evidence on benefits remains anecdotal<sup>xxxix</sup> and there may therefore be a case for undertaking further research designed to assess these benefits. The current evaluation of the CUVP (undertaken by NFER) may provide some of the evidence required.

10.11. ELWA’s response will inevitably be restricted by the resources it has available. Increases in community-based learning would need to come from reallocations of existing funding and this is likely to be fiercely resisted by other learning providers. Therefore, as one interviewee suggested, we **recommend that the CUVP explore whether resources could also be secured from other funding areas, such as health**. The adoption of a broad notion of health that encompasses “well-being”<sup>xl</sup> suggests that learning could be fitted within the health agenda. Both NIACE and Health Challenge Wales are supporting this agenda.<sup>xli</sup>

10.12. In addition to seeking additional funding, we **recommend that the CUVP continue to explore opportunities to enhance partnership working, in order to pool resources and expertise and reduce the impact of scale effects**.

10.13. In order to conserve scarce resources, we also **recommend that the CUVP explore whether better use could be made of existing services (e.g. childcare), rather than trying to provide and fund them themselves**.

## **Annex 1: Interviewees**

### **Learning providers**

- Derith Powell, Director, Amman Valley Enterprises
- Sharon James, Manager, Amman Valley Enterprises
- Michelle Lenton-Johnson , Manger, Bryncynon Strategy
- Natalie Solomon, Development Officer, BDP Development Trust
- Melvin Gray, Manager, Clydach Development Trust
- Judith James, Information Officer, The Department of Adult Continuing Education, University of Wales Swansea
- Heather Pudner, Widening Access, Reaching Wider Manager, The Department of Adult Continuing Education, University of Wales Swansea
- Julie Bibby, Joint Co-ordinator DOVE Workshops
- Jan Macullum, Manger, Glynneath Training Centre
- Kay Hardman, Finance officer, Glynneath Training Centre
- Jane Williams, Assistant Director, the Open University
- Gary Foreman, Manger, Penywaun Enterprise Partnership
- Dr. Robert Payne, Head of Glamorgan Outreach, University of Glamorgan

- Paul Nagle, Manger, the Telecentre and Business School (TABS)
- Terry Burns, Tutor Organiser, WEA
- Elaine Williams, Finance Manager, Ystalfera Development Trust
- Dave Waddington, Director of RISE
- Jeremy Gass, Community University of the Valleys (East) Project Co-ordinator & Certificate of Higher Education Programme
- Mike Hughes, Head of Lifelong Learning, Swansea County Council and Chair of Community Learning Wales
- Julia Jones, Project Manager, ELWA Funding Team
- Margaret Jones, Head of College, YMCA Community College
- Rhysian Jones, Community University of the Valleys Project Co-ordinator
- Frances Thyer, Communities First Support Network
- Shelia Thompson, Senior Learning Policy Manager, ELWA
- David Thornley, WEFO

## 2. Profile of Learners

Estimated Age	Male	Female	Total
<21	0	4	4
21-30	11	14	24
31-50	2	13	15
>50	1	12	13
<b>Total</b>	14	43	57

<sup>ii</sup> Community University of the Valleys partnership Website, <http://www.cuv.org.uk/about.htm> [Accessed, 18th January 2005]

<sup>ii</sup> Department for Education and Skills. (2003). The future of higher education, <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/hegateway/strategy/hestrategy/pdfs/DfES-HigherEducation.pdf> [Accessed, 17th January 2005]; National Assembly for Wales, (2001b). *The Learning Country: A Paving Document*. Cardiff: National Assembly for Wales

<sup>iii</sup> Stuart, M. 2003. 'Editorial', *Journal of Access Policy and Practice*, 1(1); Elliot, G. 2001, Editorial: Challenging the Common Theory of Lifelong Learning, *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 6(3), 2001

<sup>iv</sup> NIACE Dysgu Cymru, 2005, European Funding and Adult Learning for Wales Post 2006,

<sup>v</sup> See e.g. Deacon, A. (2002). *Perspectives on Welfare*. Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press; Kilpatrick, S., J. Field & I. Falk. (2001) Social Capital: An analytical tool for exploring lifelong learning and community development, CRLRA Discussion Paper Series ISSN 1440-480X; Roberts, K (1995). *Youth & Employment in Modern Britain*. Oxford University Press; National Assembly for Wales (2002). 'Health in Wales: Chief Medical Officer's Report', Cardiff: National Assembly for Wales

<sup>vi</sup> Aldridge, F. & N. Horrocks, (2003) Moving Forward: The Niace Dysgu Cymru Survey On Adult Participation In Learning In Wales

<sup>vii</sup> See e.g. McGivney .V (1990). *Education's for Other People: Access to Education for Non-participant Adults*, Leicester: NIACE

<sup>viii</sup> See e.g. Estyn, 2004, 'Widening participation in adult community-based learning: A survey of best practice',

[http://www.estyn.gov.uk/publications/Widening\\_Participation\\_Adult\\_Education.pdf](http://www.estyn.gov.uk/publications/Widening_Participation_Adult_Education.pdf) [Accessed, 20th August 2004]; McGivney .V , 1990). *Education's for Other People: Access to Education for Non-participant Adults*, Leicester: NIACE

<sup>ix</sup> Collis, B. 2004, *Community Centred Learning: Listening To The Communities Of Wales. Validation Of The Delivery Model For Learning Community Accounts. Executive Summary*. Unpublished Paper, Cardiff: WCVA

<sup>x</sup> Boxall, M., S. Amin, A. Baloch (2002). *Determining the Costs of Widening Participation: Report of Pilot Study*. PA Consulting for Universities UK and the Higher Education Funding Council for England

<sup>xi</sup> Boxall, M., S. Amin, A. Baloch (2002). *Determining the Costs of Widening Participation: Report of Pilot Study*. PA Consulting for Universities UK and the Higher Education Funding Council for England

<sup>xii</sup> See e.g. ESTYN (2004). 'Widening participation in adult community-based learning: A survey of best practice',

[http://www.Estyn.gov.uk/publications/Widening\\_Participation\\_Adult\\_Education.pdf](http://www.Estyn.gov.uk/publications/Widening_Participation_Adult_Education.pdf) [Accessed, 20th August 2004]

<sup>xiii</sup> See e.g. McGivney .V (1990). *Education's for Other People: Access to Education for Non-participant Adults*, Leicester: NIACE

- <sup>xiv</sup> CUVP 2002, Partnership Facilitator Project, January 2001 - December 2002: Final Evaluation Report, <http://www.cuv.org.uk/publications/final%20report-draft3.doc> [Accessed, 18<sup>th</sup> January 2005]
- <sup>xv</sup> Adapted from K.P. Cross (1981) as developed by Veronica McGivney (1990) and the National Literacy Agency.
- <sup>xvi</sup> See also Crookes, S. (2001).. A report on the literature available on participation in post-compulsory education, [www.cuv.org.uk/publications/participation%20literature.pdf](http://www.cuv.org.uk/publications/participation%20literature.pdf) [accessed, 18<sup>th</sup> January 2005] on this
- <sup>xvii</sup> See e.g. Aldridge, F. & N. Horrocks, (2003) *Moving Forward: The Niace Dysgu Cymru Survey On Adult Participation In Learning In Wales*. Cardiff: ELWA ; Gorard, S. & Rees, G. (2002). *Creating a Learning Society: Learning careers and policies for lifelong learning*, Bristol: The Policy Press
- <sup>xviii</sup> Estyn (2004a). 'Widening participation in adult community-based learning: A survey of best practice', [http://www.estyn.gov.uk/publications/Widening\\_Participation\\_Adult\\_Education.pdf](http://www.estyn.gov.uk/publications/Widening_Participation_Adult_Education.pdf) [Accessed, 20th August 2004]Community University of the Valleys (N.D). 'Aiming high: Quality in Community Learning. Guidance for partners. Swansea: CUV Partnership
- <sup>xix</sup> Owens, J., (2002) *A Review Of Different Approaches To Skill Development Within Communities*, <http://www.elwa.ac.uk/elwaweb/elwa.aspx?pageid=617>[Accessed, 22nd December 2004]
- <sup>xx</sup> As for example, Mike Hopkins, director of ELWA reiterated in a press-statement made on 7th September 2004, <http://www.elwa.org.uk/elwaweb/elwa.aspx?pageid=3652> [Accessed, 29<sup>th</sup> March 2005]
- <sup>xxi</sup> See also e.g. Coffield, F. (ed.). (2000) *The Necessity of Informal Learning*, Bristol: the Policy Press on this point.
- <sup>xxii</sup> See e.g. McGivney, V. (2003). *Adult Learning pathways: through routes or cul-de-sacs*, NIACE: Leicester.
- <sup>xxiii</sup> Personal Communication, Martin Yarnitt
- <sup>xxiv</sup> See e.g. Ceri, J., 1993, Apprehension and achievement – twin poles of the adult learning experience, GWERIN Occasional Paper Number 4 July 2003 on this.
- <sup>xxv</sup> See e.g. Cornwall, R. (2005), *Tackling Social Exclusion and Ensuring Social Justice Through Economic Activity in Merthyr Tydfil*. Unpublished Paper; Aldridge, F. & N. Horrocks, (2003) *Moving Forward: The Niace Dysgu Cymru Survey On Adult Participation In Learning In Wales*. Cardiff: ELWA; Gorard, S. & Rees, G. (2002). *Creating a Learning Society: Learning careers and policies for lifelong learning*, Bristol: The Policy Press
- <sup>xxvi</sup> Aldridge, F. & N. Horrocks, (2003) *Moving Forward: The Niace Dysgu Cymru Survey On Adult Participation In Learning In Wales*. Cardiff: ELWA.
- <sup>xxvii</sup> See e.g. the edited collection by Coleman, J. and T. Fararo (Eds), *Rational Choice Theory* (1992). Newbury Park: SAGE Publications
- <sup>xxviii</sup> Simon, H.A., (1987), 'Bounded rationality' in: J. Eatwell, M. Millgate & P. Newman (eds.): *The New Palgrave: A Dictionary of Economics*. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan
- <sup>xxix</sup> Bandura, A. (1994) Self-efficacy. In Ramachaudran, V. S. (ed.) *Encyclopaedia of Human Behaviour*. Vol. 4. New York: Academic Press, pp.71-81 cited in Cornawll, R. 1999, *The Significance of Self-efficacy in Enabling or Disabling the Participation of Long-term Unemployed Adults in Lifelong Learning*, Unpublished Mphil Dissertation, University of Wales Swansea.
- <sup>xxx</sup> Foucault, M. (1969) [1972]. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, London: Routledge
- <sup>xxxi</sup> Bandura, A. (1994) Self-efficacy. In Ramachaudran, V. S. (ed.) *Encyclopaedia of Human Behaviour*. Vol. 4. New York: Academic Press, pp.71-81; Bandura, A. (1997), *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company), cited in Cornawll, R. 1999, *The Significance of Self-efficacy in Enabling or Disabling the Participation of Long-term Unemployed Adults in Lifelong Learning*, Unpublished Mphil Dissertation, University of Wales Swansea.
- <sup>xxxii</sup> Wiltshire 1997, cited in Cornwall, R. (1999), *The Significance of Self-efficacy in Enabling or Disabling the Participation of Long-term Unemployed Adults in Lifelong Learning*, Unpublished Mphil Dissertation, University of Wales Swansea.
- <sup>xxxiii</sup> See e.g. McGivney, V (1990). *Education's for Other People: Access to Education for Non-participant Adults*, Leicester: NIACE
- <sup>xxxiv</sup> See e.g. Taylor, S. and Spencer, L. (1994) *Individual Commitment to Lifetime Learning: Individuals' Attitudes: Report on the qualitative phase*. Sheffield: Employment Department. (Research Series, No. 31).; McGivney, V. (2000). *Fixing or Changing the Pattern*. NIACE, Leicester
- <sup>xxxv</sup> Bandura, A. (1994) Self-efficacy. In Ramachaudran, V. S. (ed.) *Encyclopaedia of Human Behaviour*. Vol. 4. New York: Academic Press, pp.71-81, cited in Cornawll, R. 1999, *The Significance*

---

*of Self-efficacy in Enabling or Disabling the Participation of Long-term Unemployed Adults in Lifelong Learning*, Unpublished Mphil Dissertation, University of Wales Swansea

<sup>xxxvi</sup> “The partnership aims to widen participation in higher learning by bringing learning closer to home and by making it more relevant to all parts of our communities”.

<http://www.cuv.org.uk/about.htm> [Accessed, 30th march 2005]

<sup>xxxvii</sup> See e.g. McGivney, V. (2003). *Adult Learning pathways: through routes or cul-de-sacs*, NIACE: Leicester.

<sup>xxxviii</sup> ELWa, (N.D.). Community Learning Strategic Framework: ELWa Proposal on the Reconfiguration of Adult and Community Learning,

[http://www.elwa.org.uk/elwaweb/doc\\_bin/ELWa%20Corporate/ELWa\\_Proposal\\_on\\_the\\_Reconfiguration\\_of\\_Adult\\_and\\_Community\\_Learning.pdf](http://www.elwa.org.uk/elwaweb/doc_bin/ELWa%20Corporate/ELWa_Proposal_on_the_Reconfiguration_of_Adult_and_Community_Learning.pdf) [accessed, 30th march 2005]

<sup>xxxix</sup> See also e.g. Estyn (2004). ‘Widening participation in adult community-based learning: A survey of best practice’,

[http://www.estyn.gov.uk/publications/Widening\\_Participation\\_Adult\\_Education.pdf](http://www.estyn.gov.uk/publications/Widening_Participation_Adult_Education.pdf) [Accessed, 20th August 2004]

<sup>xl</sup> Wanless (2003) *The Review of Health and Social Care Services in Wales*, The Report of the Project Team advised by Derek Wanless, June 2003

<sup>xli</sup> See e.g. the recent conference: *Learning and Health: a shared Responsibility*, held at the Millennium Centre, Cardiff bay, 23 March 2005