Article

A Framework for Quality Assessment in Community Education: Five Critical Dimensions Analysis

Wen Tang [1],*

[1] School of Open Learning, Jiangsu Open University, Nanjing, 210036, China

* Correspondence: Wen Tang, School of Open Learning, Jiangsu Open University, Nanjing, 210036, China

Abstract: Community education assessment frameworks for this field remain underdeveloped. This article examines five critical dimensions of quality assessment in community education: alignment of educational objectives, effectiveness of educational processes, adequacy of educational resources, sustainability of educational services, and comprehensive benefits of community courses. Through analysis of current literature and theoretical perspectives, the article synthesizes knowledge and identifies best practices for each dimension. The research reveals significant interrelationships between these dimensions and highlights the need for contextually sensitive assessment approaches. The proposed framework offers community education providers, and stakeholders a systematic approach to evaluating and enhancing educational quality while addressing the unique characteristics of community-based learning. Recommendations for implementation and future research are provided to strengthen quality assessment practices in community education.

Keywords: community education; quality assessment; practical dimensions; educational objectives; effectiveness; sustainability; resources; benefits

1. Introduction

Community education (CE) represents a vital component of lifelong learning ecosystems, providing accessible educational opportunities outside traditional academic institutions [1]. Defined broadly as organized learning activities designed for and with communities to address local needs and enhance quality of life, CE encompasses diverse programs including adult basic education, vocational training, recreational classes, health education, and cultural enrichment [2]. Despite its significance, quality assessment frameworks specifically designed for CE remain less developed compared to those for formal educational sectors [3].

The unique characteristics of CE — including its voluntary participation, diverse learner populations, varied instructional settings, and community-responsive objectives — necessitate distinctive approaches to quality assessment [4]. Conventional evaluation frameworks developed for K-12 or higher education often prove inadequate when applied to CE contexts, failing to capture its distinctive purposes and outcomes [5].

The need for vigorous quality assessment frameworks has intensified due to increasing demands for accountability from funders and policymakers, resource constraints that compel providers to demonstrate value, and growing recognition of lifelong learning's importance to economic development and social cohesion [6,7].

This article addresses this gap by proposing a comprehensive framework organized around five critical dimensions of quality assessment in CE:

1) Alignment of educational objectives with community needs and expectations.
2) Effectiveness of educational processes including curriculum design, instructional approaches, and assessment methods.

3) Adequacy of educational resources encompassing human, physical, and financial assets.
4) Sustainability of educational services regarding programmatic, financial, and institutional continuity.
5) Comprehensive benefits including individual, community, and societal impacts.

2. Theoretical Background

Quality assessment in CE draws from multiple theoretical traditions. Adult learning theories, particularly andragogy and transformative learning theory, emphasize learner-centred approaches and perspective transformation as quality indicators [8,9]. Social constructivism and situated learning theory highlight the importance of social context and communities of practice in effective learning [10,11].

Community development theories, including asset-based community development and participatory action research, advocate for approaches that emphasize community strengths, participation, and empowerment [12,13]. Critical pedagogy frames quality CE as that which promotes critical consciousness and catalyses social change [14].

Program evaluation theories also inform quality assessment frameworks. Utilization-focused evaluation and empowerment evaluation provide methodological approaches consistent with CE's values of participation and responsiveness to emerging needs [15,16].

The integration of these theoretical perspectives suggests that quality in CE is multi-dimensional, contextual, and value-laden, encompassing both objective and subjective elements.

Current approaches to quality assessment in CE include outcome-based assessment, process-oriented assessment, participatory assessment, systems-based assessment, and mixed-methods assessment. Despite these varied approaches, several gaps persist, including inadequate accounting for CE's distinctive characteristics, emphasis on easily measured outcomes while neglecting tangible benefits, failure to address the interconnectedness of quality dimensions, inadequate attention to equity considerations, and lack of practical implementation guidance.

3. Five Dimensions

3.1. Dimension 1: Alignment of Educational Objectives

3.1.1. Definition and Importance

Alignment of educational objectives refers to the degree of congruence between program goals and community needs, learner aspirations, organizational mission, and societal priorities. This dimension is foundational to quality assessment because it establishes relevance and purpose — essentially addressing whether a program is "doing the right things" before considering whether it is "doing things right" [17].

The importance of objective alignment is well-established in adult education literature. Programs with well-aligned objectives demonstrate higher participation rates, improved learner persistence, greater stakeholder support, and more sustainable impact.

In CE specifically, alignment acquires additional significance due to the field's responsiveness to local contexts and voluntary participation nature. Unlike compulsory education with standardized curricula, CE programs must continuously justify their relevance to participants and communities. As McGivney notes, "Adult learners vote with their feet", withdrawing from programs that do not address their perceived needs or interests [18].

3.1.2. Key Elements and Indicators

Comprehensive assessment of objective alignment encompasses several key elements and corresponding indicators:

Community needs assessment evaluates how systematically and inclusively programs identify and prioritize CE's needs. Indicators include the recency and comprehensiveness of needs assessments, diversity of community voices represented, and methods used to identify both expressed and unexpressed needs. High-quality CE programs employ multiple strategies including surveys, focus groups, key informant interviews, community forums, and analysis of demographic data.

Learner-centeredness examines how educational objectives incorporate learner goals, prior knowledge, and lived experiences. Indicators include mechanisms for learner input into objective setting, differentiation to accommodate diverse learning goals, and responsiveness to learner feedback. Research by Prins et al. demonstrates that programs allowing negotiation of learning objectives show higher persistence rates and greater learner satisfaction [19].

Organizational alignment assesses consistency between program objectives and organizational mission, values, and capacity. Indicators include explicit connections to institutional strategic plans, adequate resource allocation, and staff support for program goals.

Cultural relevance and inclusivity evaluate how objectives respect and reflect cultural diversity within communities. Indicators include culturally responsive goal formulation, attention to diverse learning traditions, and objectives addressing social inequities.

Transparency and communication examine how clearly objectives are articulated and communicated to stakeholders. A study by Comings et al. found that explicit communication of objectives contributed significantly to adult learner persistence [20].

3.1.3. Challenges and Best Practices

Several challenges complicate the assessment of objective alignment in CE, including diverse stakeholders with potentially competing priorities, the dynamic nature of community needs, balancing expressed and unexpressed needs, formulating objectives that are both specific and flexible, and the risk of "mission drift" when funding priorities drive objective formulation.

Best practices for assessing and strengthening objective alignment include participatory planning processes involving diverse stakeholders, regular needs assessment cycles, theory of change mapping, cultural competence development, and multi-level objective frameworks.

3.2. Dimension 2: Effectiveness of the Educational Process

3.2.1. Definition and Importance

The effectiveness of the educational process encompasses the design, implementation, and assessment of learning experiences that facilitate achievement of intended outcomes. This dimension focuses on how teaching and learning occur — the instructional methods, learning environments, assessment approaches, and learning interactions that constitute the educational experience.

Process effectiveness is critical to quality in CE for several reasons. First, adult learners are particularly sensitive to process quality, often judging educational experiences by how learning occurs as much as what is learned. Second, effective processes are essential for translating well-aligned objectives into actual outcomes. Third, research consistently demonstrates that process variables significantly influence learner persistence, satisfaction, and achievement in voluntary educational settings.

CE presents distinctive process considerations compared to formal education due to its voluntary nature, learner diversity, limited instructional time, and often less structured learning environments.

3.2.2. Key Elements and Indicators

Assessment of educational process effectiveness encompasses several key elements with corresponding indicators:

Curriculum design evaluates the organization and sequencing of learning content. Indicators include alignment with objectives, logical progression, appropriate scope and depth, relevance to learner contexts, and balance between structure and flexibility. Research by Smith and Hofer demonstrates that curriculum quality significantly predicts learner achievement in adult basic education settings [21].

Instructional approaches examine teaching methods and learning activities. Indicators include appropriateness for content, responsiveness to diverse learning styles, active engagement, authentic application, and balance between instructor guidance and learner autonomy. A meta-analysis by Dunst and Trivette found that participatory adult learning strategies produced significantly better outcomes than traditional didactic approaches [22].

Learning environment assesses physical, social, and psychological conditions for learning. Indicators include physical comfort and accessibility, psychological safety, collaborative climate, respect for diversity, and conduciveness to focused engagement.

Assessment practices evaluate how learning is monitored and documented. Indicators include alignment with objectives and instructional methods, appropriate balance of formative and summative assessment, authenticity, learner involvement in assessment, and constructive feedback mechanisms.

Instructor competence examines facilitator knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Indicators include content expertise, andragogical skill, cultural responsiveness, relationship-building ability, and reflective practice. Research consistently identifies instructor quality as one of the strongest predictors of program effectiveness in adult education.

3.2.3. Challenges and Best Practices

Several challenges complicate the assessment of educational process effectiveness in CE contexts, including the diversity of instructional models, limited preparation of many community educators, tension between fidelity to evidence-based practices and responsiveness to local contexts, balancing structure with flexibility, and capturing relational and affective dimensions of the educational process.

Best practices for assessing and enhancing educational process effectiveness include multi-method process evaluation combining observation, self-assessment, learner feedback, peer review, and outcome analysis, evidence-based practice adaptation, professional learning communities, learner-centred quality improvement, and process documentation systems.

3.3. Dimension 3: Adequacy of Educational Resources

3.3.1. Definition and Importance

Resource adequacy refers to the sufficiency, quality, and appropriateness of assets supporting educational programs, including human resources (staff, volunteers, community partners), material resources (facilities, equipment, learning materials), and financial resources (funding, in-kind contributions).

Resource adequacy is particularly critical in CE due to several factors. First, CE often operates with constrained and unpredictable funding, creating resource vulnerabilities that can undermine program quality. Second, diverse learner populations may require specialized resources to address varied needs, learning styles, and accessibility requirements. Third, community settings often lack the established infrastructure of formal educational institutions, necessitating creative resource development and management.

Research demonstrates strong relationships between resource adequacy and educational outcomes in community contexts. A longitudinal study by Smith and Hofer found that resource constraints, particularly instructional time and professional development

opportunities, significantly limited program effectiveness in adult basic education [21]. Similarly, resource adequacy was identified as a key predictor of program sustainability and impact in family literacy programs.

However, resource adequacy should not be equated with abundance. As Kretzmann and McKnight's asset-based community development approach emphasizes, effective CE often involves identifying and leveraging underrecognized local resources rather than focusing solely on external inputs [12].

3.3.2. Key Elements and Indicators

Comprehensive assessment of resource adequacy encompasses several key elements with corresponding indicators:

Human resource adequacy evaluates the sufficiency and capabilities of personnel supporting educational programs. Indicators include staff-to-learner ratios, professional qualifications, diversity representation, professional development opportunities, and volunteer engagement. Research identifies instructor qualifications and stability as significant predictors of program quality in adult education [23].

Physical resource adequacy examines facilities, equipment, and learning materials. Indicators include accessibility, safety, appropriateness for learning activities, technological infrastructure, and learning material quality and relevance.

Financial resource adequacy assesses funding sufficiency, stability, and flexibility. Indicators include cost-per-learner benchmarks, funding diversification, financial reserves, and resource allocation aligned with program priorities.

Information resource adequacy evaluates access to knowledge assets supporting program design and implementation. Indicators include current research access, program data systems, knowledge management practices, and professional networks.

Resource equity examines whether resources are distributed in ways that promote educational access and success for all learners. Indicators include targeted resource allocation for underserved populations, accommodations for diverse learners, and removal of resource-based barriers to participation.

3.3.3. Challenges and Best Practices

Several challenges complicate the assessment of resource adequacy in CE, including difficulty establishing appropriate benchmarks, capturing the contribution of in-kind and volunteer resources, differentiating between resource quantity and effective utilization, accounting for inequities in resource distribution, and assessing resource adequacy in collaborative initiatives.

Best practices for assessing and enhancing resource adequacy include resource mapping through community asset mapping and resource network analysis, cost-benefit analysis examining resource efficiency, equity audits assessing resource distribution, resource diversification strategies, and technology optimization to extend limited resources.

3.4. Dimension 4: Sustainability of Educational Services

3.4.1. Definition and Importance

Sustainability in CE refers to the capacity of programs to maintain quality, relevance, and viability over time while adapting to changing conditions. This dimension encompasses programmatic sustainability (continuing to meet educational needs), financial sustainability (maintaining resource adequacy), organizational sustainability (preserving institutional capacity and commitment), and ecological sustainability (operating in environmentally responsible ways).

Sustainability is increasingly recognized as a critical quality dimension in CE for several reasons. First, meaningful educational impact often requires extended engagement rather than one-time interventions, particularly for complex learning goals such as literacy

development or community capacity building. Second, the trust and relationships fundamental to effective CE develop over time and can be damaged by program discontinuity. Third, the cyclical nature of funding and policy attention to adult education creates vulnerability that must be actively managed.

Research demonstrates that sustainability challenges significantly affect CE quality and impact. A longitudinal study by Comings et al. found that program discontinuity was a major factor in limited adult literacy gains [24]. Similarly, funding instability contributed to staff turnover, inconsistent services, and diminished outcomes in workforce education programs.

However, sustainability should not be equated with stasis. As English and Mayo emphasize, sustainable programs demonstrate "dynamic stability" — maintaining core functions while continuously adapting to evolving community needs, emerging evidence, and changing contexts [25].

3.4.2. Key Elements and Indicators

Comprehensive assessment of sustainability encompasses several key elements with corresponding indicators:

Programmatic sustainability evaluates the ability to maintain educational services aligned with community needs. Indicators include program retention trends, succession planning, knowledge management systems, and adaptive planning processes.

Financial sustainability examines the stability and diversification of funding sources. Indicators include funding diversity, reserve levels, cost-sharing arrangements, social enterprise development, and financial planning horizons.

Organizational sustainability assesses the institutional capacity and commitment supporting educational programs. Indicators include leadership development, governance structures, staff retention, organizational learning systems, and institutional positioning.

Community ownership evaluates the degree to which programs are embedded in and supported by their communities. Indicators include local leadership development, community resource contribution, volunteer engagement, and community advocacy for programs.

Environmental sustainability examines program operations' environmental impact. Indicators include resource conservation practices, environmental education integration, ecological footprint measures, and climate resilience planning.

3.4.3. Challenges and Best Practices

Several challenges complicate the assessment of sustainability in CE, including tension between short-term accountability demands and long-term sustainability planning, difficulty attributing sustainability to specific program characteristics given external influences, challenge of assessing adaptive capacity, capturing the contribution of intangible assets, and the multi-level nature of sustainability factors.

Best practices for assessing and enhancing sustainability include sustainability self-assessment tools, scenario planning to anticipate potential sustainability challenges, developmental evaluation tracking program evolution and adaptation, social network analysis mapping relationship structures supporting program sustainability, and community capacity building to develop local leadership and ownership.

3.5. Dimension 5: Comprehensive Benefits of Community Courses

3.5.1. Definition and Importance

The comprehensive benefits dimension examines the range of positive changes resulting from CE, including immediate learning outcomes, longer-term individual impacts, community-level effects, and broader societal contributions.

Benefit assessment in CE is distinctive because of the field's characteristically diverse and multifaceted aims. Unlike formal education with more standardized outcome expectations, CE programs simultaneously pursue varied benefits including skill development, personal growth, social connection, civic engagement, economic advancement, cultural expression, and community development.

Research demonstrates the importance of comprehensive benefit assessment in CE. A longitudinal study by Manninen et al. across six European countries found that narrowly focused outcome measures captured less than half of the benefits participants identified from CE programs [26]. Similarly, research by Schuller reveals that the most significant impacts of adult learning often occur in domains not targeted by formal program objectives or conventional assessment measures [27].

3.5.2. Key Elements and Indicators

Comprehensive assessment of educational benefits encompasses several key elements with corresponding indicators:

Individual cognitive benefits evaluate knowledge and skill acquisition. Indicators include subject matter mastery, skill application, critical thinking development, and further learning engagement.

Individual non-cognitive benefits examine psychological, social, and identity-related changes. Indicators include self-efficacy development, motivation enhancement, identity transformation, wellbeing improvement, and social connection. A longitudinal study by Hammond found that these non-cognitive benefits often preceded and enabled more visible outcomes such as employment or educational progression [28].

Community-level benefits assess collective impacts beyond individual participants. Indicators include social capital development, community problem-solving capacity, collective efficacy, civic engagement, and cultural vitality.

Economic benefits evaluate material impacts for individuals and communities. Indicators include employment outcomes, income changes, economic mobility, local economic activity, and return on investment.

Equity and inclusion benefits examine how programs address disparities and promote participation among marginalized groups. Indicators include closing achievement gaps, increasing educational access, developing cultural responsiveness, challenging discrimination, and building inclusive community capacity.

Intergenerational benefits assess impacts that transfer across generations. Indicators include parenting practices, family learning activities, educational aspirations for children, and intergenerational communication.

3.5.3. Challenges and Best Practices

Several challenges complicate the assessment of comprehensive benefits in CE, including attribution problems, capturing long-term and cumulative benefits, measuring less tangible but significant benefits, accounting for unintended consequences, and addressing benefit interrelationships across individual, community, and societal levels.

Best practices for assessing comprehensive benefits include Wider Benefits of Learning frameworks capturing multidimensional outcomes, mixed-method impact assessment combining quantitative and qualitative approaches, contribution analysis addressing attribution challenges, ripple effect mapping visually documenting the spread of program benefits, and longitudinal assessment designs tracking benefits over extended periods.

4. Discussion

The five quality dimensions discussed function not as isolated components but as an interconnected system. Understanding these relationships is essential for holistic quality assessment and improvement in CE.

Several key interconnections assure particular attention. First, alignment of educational objectives fundamentally shapes all other dimensions by establishing purpose and direction. Objectives influence process design by defining desired learning experiences resource requirements by specifying necessary inputs, sustainability parameters by establishing continuity priorities, and benefit assessment by defining success criteria.

Second, resource adequacy and process effectiveness demonstrate bidirectional relationships. Resources enable effective processes through appropriate staffing, materials, and facilities, while effective processes maximize resource impact through efficient utilization and creative adaptation.

Third, sustainability and comprehensive benefits exhibit mutually reinforcing connections. Demonstrable benefits strengthen stakeholder support and resource commitment, enhancing sustainability, while sustainable operations enable long-term benefit accumulation and documentation.

Fourth, process effectiveness and comprehensive benefits are linked through implementation fidelity and adaptation. Effective processes translate well-aligned objectives into actual outcomes, while benefit assessment provides feedback for process refinement.

These interconnections suggest that siloed evaluation of individual dimensions risks missing critical quality factors emerging from dimension interactions, quality improvement interventions targeting one dimension will likely affect others, feedback loops in quality assessment systems are important, and systems thinking in quality assessment has significant value.

5. Conclusions

This article has examined five critical dimensions of quality assessment in CE: alignment of educational objectives, effectiveness of educational processes, adequacy of educational resources, sustainability of educational services, and comprehensive benefits. For each dimension, we have analysed key elements and indicators, identified assessment challenges, and discussed best practices.

Several overarching conclusions emerge from this analysis. First, quality assessment in CE requires multidimensional frameworks that capture both instrumental and intrinsic aspects of educational experiences. Second, effective quality assessment balances standardization with contextualization. Third, participatory approaches to quality assessment strengthen both validity and utility. Fourth, quality assessment should be developmental rather than merely judgmental, focusing on continuous improvement.

These conclusions suggest several implications for practice. CE providers should develop integrated quality assessment frameworks addressing all five dimensions while tailoring specific indicators to local contexts and priorities. They should invest in assessment capacity building among staff, participants, and community partners to support meaningful engagement with quality processes. Providers should implement feedback systems that connect assessment findings with strategic planning, resource allocation, and professional development.

For policymakers and funders, these conclusions suggest the importance of balanced accountability systems, capacity-building support for quality assessment, and stable, adequate funding to enable meaningful quality assessment and improvement processes.

For researchers, these conclusions highlight several promising directions for further investigation: developing validated assessment tools for dimensions currently lacking robust measures, examining how quality dimensions interact in diverse CE contexts, exploring how equity considerations can be more fully integrated across all quality dimensions, and investigating how digital technologies might enhance quality assessment while preserving CE's relational core.

As CE continues to play a vital role in lifelong learning ecosystems, developing sophisticated yet practical approaches to quality assessment becomes increasingly important. The five-dimensional framework proposed in this article offers a foundation for

this essential work — helping providers, policymakers, and researchers collaborate to strengthen educational quality while honouring CE's distinctive character and contributions.

References

1. S. B. Merriam and Y. Kee, "Promoting community wellbeing: The case for lifelong learning for older adults," *Adult Educ. Quart.*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 128–144, 2014, doi: 10.1177/0741713613513633.
2. L. Tett, *Community Education, Learning and Development*, 3rd ed. Dunedin, New Zealand: Dunedin Academic Press, 2010.
3. B. Findsen and M. Formosa, *International Perspectives on Older Adult Education*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2016. ISBN: 9783319249377.
4. S. D. Brookfield, The Power of Critical Theory: Liberating Adult Learning and Teaching. San Francisco, CA, USA: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
5. R. S. Caffarella and S. R. Daffron, *Planning Programs for Adult Learners: A Practical Guide*, 3rd ed. San Francisco, CA, USA: Jossey-Bass, 2013. ISBN: 9781118415436.
6. A. Belzer and J. Kim, "We are what we do: Adult basic education should be about more than employability," *J. Adolesc. Adult Lit.*, vol. 61, no. 6, pp. 603–608, 2018, doi: 10.1002/jaal.693.
7. J. Field, "Is lifelong learning making a difference? Research-based evidence on the impact of adult learning," in *Second Int. Handb. Lifelong Learn.*, D. Aspin, J. Chapman, K. Evans, and R. Bagnall, Eds. Springer, 2012, pp. 887–897. ISBN: 9789400723597.
8. M. S. Knowles, E. F. Holton, and R. A. Swanson, *The Adult Learner: The Definitive Classic in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, 9th ed. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2020. ISBN: 9780367417659.
9. J. Mezirow, Learning as Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory in Progress. San Francisco, CA, USA: Jossey-Bass, 2000.
10. L. S. Vygotsky, *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard University Press, 1978. ISBN: 9780674576292.
11. J. Lave and E. Wenger, *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1991. ISBN: 9780521423748.
12. J. P. Kretzmann and J. L. McKnight, Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets. Skokie, IL, USA: ACTA Publications, 1993.
13. A. McIntyre, *Participatory Action Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage, 2007. ISBN: 9781483389394.
14. P. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 30th anniversary ed. New York, NY, USA: Continuum, 2000. ISBN: 9780826412768.
15. M. Q. Patton, *Utilization-Focused Evaluation*, 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage, 2008. ISBN: 9781412958615.
16. D. M. Fetterman and A. Wandersman, *Empowerment Evaluation Principles in Practice*. New York, NY, USA: Guilford Press, 2005. ISBN: 9781593851149.
17. E. Boeren, Lifelong Learning Participation in a Changing Policy Context: An Interdisciplinary Theory. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. ISBN: 9781137441836.
18. V. McGivney, *Fixing or Changing the Pattern? Reflections on Widening Adult Participation in Learning*. Leicester, UK: National Institute of Adult Continuing Education, 2001.
19. E. Prins, B. W. Toso, and K. A. Schafft, ""It feels like a little family to me": Social interaction and support among women in adult education and family literacy," *Adult Educ. Quart.*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 335–352, 2009, doi: 10.1177/0741713609331705.
20. J. Comings, B. Garner, and C. Smith, Eds., *Review of Adult Learning and Literacy, Volume 7: Connecting Research, Policy, and Practice*. New York, NY, USA: Taylor & Francis, 2023. ISBN: 9781000941913.
21. C. Smith and J. Hofer, *The Characteristics and Concerns of Adult Basic Education Teachers*. National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy, 2003.
22. C. J. Dunst and C. M. Trivette, "Meta-analysis of implementation practice Research," in *Handb. Implement. Sci. Psychol. Educ.*, B. Kelly and D. F. Perkins, Eds. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2012, pp. 68–91. ISBN: 9780521197250.
23. S. Reder and J. Bynner, Eds., *Tracking Adult Literacy and Numeracy Skills: Findings from Longitudinal Research*. London, UK: Routledge, 2008. ISBN: 9781135903305.
24. J. Comings, A. Sum, and J. Uvin, New Skills for a New Economy: Adult Education's Key Role in Sustaining Economic Growth and Expanding Opportunity. Boston, MA, USA: Massachusetts Institute for a New Commonwealth, 2000.
25. L. M. English and P. Mayo, *Lifelong Learning, Global Social Justice, and Sustainability*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021. ISBN: 9783030657789.

26. J. Manninen and M. Meriläinen, "Benefits of lifelong learning," *BeLL survey results*, 2011.

27. T. Schuller, The Paula Principle: How and Why Women Work Below Their Level of Competence. Melbourne, Australia: Scribe Publications, 2017.

28. C. Hammond, "Impacts of lifelong learning upon emotional resilience, psychological and mental health: Fieldwork evidence," *Oxford Rev. Educ.*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 551–568, 2007, doi: 10.1080/0305498042000303008.