

Society for Educational Studies Final Report - January 2020

Adult education funding, civil society and the state: boldness and compromise in the 1918 Education Act and the 1919 Report on Adult Education

Introduction

This project has sought to examine the role of the Education Act 1918 in shaping adult education, and its influence on the Ministry of Reconstruction's Adult Education Committee (AEC) (1917-19) task "to consider the provision for, and possibilities of, Adult Education (other than technical or vocational) in Great Britain, and to make recommendations". This final report aims to contextualise historical research within contemporary debates on the future of adult education in the 21st century.

The research has contributed to a wider programme of policy and knowledge exchange as part of the development of the Centenary Commission on Adult Education, launched in November 2018 by a consortium of the University of Nottingham, the University of Oxford, the Co-operative College, the Raymond Williams Foundation, and the Workers' Educational Association. The Commission's remit mirrored that of its predecessor but its focus has been specifically for the 21st century.

Findings from the SES research have contributed to the Commission's own final report (published November 2019) on the anniversary of the 1919 Adult Education Report's publication. Insights into the workings of the 1919 AEC have been invaluable to the Commission.

Methodology – Interim and Final Reports

In phase one of our project, we undertook the majority of the empirical work which informed the interim report (completed September 2019). This included close examination of materials – letters, papers, initial drafts – in the National Archives for both the 1918 ("Fisher") Education Act and the Adult Education Committee's *Final Report* (Cmd 321, 1919). The research allowed us to examine histories relating to their evolution and impact over time and to draw policy attention to the focus of the *Final Report* on the importance of placing engaged democracy and community at the heart of a renewed or re-imagined adult education system.

The interim report examined the impact of the ethos of state independence and the non-vocational on the AEC's mode of work, as well as its relationship to the 1918 Act. We considered the tensions and compromises inherent in state leadership in adult education at the time of the 1919 Report, a point of contestation throughout the 20th century: some independent organisations refused state funding; others took it as a social right.

The thinking behind the interim report was also supported by a series of project meetings of the Adult Education 100 Commission (November 2018, January, March, May, July and September 2019) which facilitated the exchange of ideas and insights. It was further supported by a series of 20 interviews over July and August 2019 with key contemporary practitioners in adult, political and community education and new and emerging social movements who gave critical insights into contemporary relationships with the state (and funding connected with their work).

We presented our initial, historical findings as part of a colloquium presentation organised by the Society for Educational Studies at Oriel College, Oxford in September 2019.

In December 2019 two discussion meetings took place at Kellogg College, Oxford and at the University of Nottingham, School of Education. The events were promoted on Eventbrite and also targeted invitees with a role in shaping adult education today. This included historians of adult education, researchers on the economics and sociology of educational policy and its relation to changing labour market and administrative structures today and policymakers, managers and practitioners engaged in the provision and development of adult education. The workshops offered the space to consider important policy debates about the social and economic conditions which most effectively support adult learning. The workshops situated and explored the significance of the earlier empirical findings in the context of the broader social, economic and political history of the First World War and the 1920s, a turbulent period of change, and reflected on the implications for adult education, democracy and systems of work today at another critical political and democratic juncture. We considered the long-term impact of state intervention and juxtaposed this with the alternative, informal connections that emerge from grass roots adult learning in the 21st century context, asking how the state should relate to the world of adult and community learning and whether there is room for both voluntary sector-led and state sector-led adult/community education.

Historical/Archival Findings - 1918 Education Act and the 1919 AEC Report

The interim report examined the AEC's mode of work, as well as its relationship to the 1918 Act. It considered why the AEC took a more sceptical view than the 1918 Act of the potential of LEAs in shaping (adult) education and, given this scepticism, examined how it developed strategies and approaches to ensure the vitality of non-vocational adult education in an educational system organized around LEAs. It examined the response of the Board of Education to the Adult Education Committee's reports and, in particular, how the Board was influenced by the Committee's view of the significance of the voluntary sector and social movements in the development of (adult) education (or not), particularly the relationship between labour market conditions and their framing of adult education in relation to democracy, voluntarism and civil society.

1918 Education Act

The 1918 Act was clear that education, for all ages and of all types, should be supported and managed through state infrastructure and its primary focus was upon education for children and adolescents. What little indication there was of Government interest in adult education was primarily of a vocational nature. However, as a letter from the Board of Education, dated 12th February 1918, outlined, even the simple distinctions of 'vocational' and 'non-vocational' education proved problematic:

“subjects such as Modern Languages may have either a vocational or a non-vocational object, and the mere naming of the subject in a programme of work will leave this object uncertain. Again, a subject may be included in a course which is primarily designed for a particular vocation, but an individual student may attend the instruction for individual non-vocational purposes ... Much depends on the way in which a given subject is taught, and the

object with which it is taken by the individual student” (L. Welby Briggs, Board of Education letter, 12th February 1918).

Welby Briggs then went on to acknowledge that “the volume of non-vocational education for adults is comparatively small, and that much of it is not provided by Local Education Authorities”. Certain measures for improvement were proposed:

“The Board are impressed with the present unsatisfactory state of education in this direction, and in the draft of the proposed new Regulations for Continuation, Technical and Art Courses, they have included a paragraph in the Prefactory Memorandum, stating that one of the main ideas of educational administration on which the proposed changes in the Regulations rest is "the importance of continuing general education side by side with technical instruction, particularly by means of Grouped Courses for younger students, and of providing facilities for disinterested studies making for wise living and good citizenship”.

Furthermore, he suggested that the proposed new Local College infrastructure (“the coping stone of local education” – 1919 report, p.111) "should provide facilities for disinterested intellectual development by means of Classes in Literature, History, Economics, and other humane studies which make for wise living and good citizenship" (L. Welby Briggs, Board of Education letter, 12th February 1918).

The letter did at least suggest that there was Government awareness in 1918 of the importance of non-vocational adult education, even if it was not explicitly expressed in the Fisher Act. It is also interesting that Briggs places a strong focus upon non-vocational adult education as being conducive to “wise living and good citizenship”, a correlation that was also specifically emphasised in the 1919 Adult Education Report.

The AEC had a number of specific objectives which related to promoting democratic engagement and active citizenship. Democracy, the AEC argued, meant ensuring voluntary agencies and social movements were central in shaping and delivering adult education. The AEC, chaired by A.L. Smith, Master of Balliol, Oxford, included R.H. Tawney and Albert Mansbridge, founder of the WEA, sought to bolster the likelihood of this through a range of democratic institutions and mechanisms to enhance the influence of voluntary organisations (“an integral part of the fabric of national education”) in the adult curriculum. Their ambition was to oversee rebuilding “the national life on a better and more durable foundation”. The result was a network of adult education institutions and provision strongly linked to social movements (see list identified in the 1919 Report below¹). It was also a particular understanding of non-vocational. For the AEC, they identified both the importance of ‘Humane’ adult education, chiefly defined as life-enhancing learning through the arts, music, crafts, literature to meet the human need for personal development and self-expression – “the satisfaction of intellectual, aesthetic and spiritual needs” (I 54, 1919 Report) and also for ‘Civic’ education, specifically education conceived through a lens of collectivism and social responsibility

¹ Connected with universities – Tutorial classes and Summer Schools, Extension lectures and Summer meetings; Local Authorities – Education Committees, Public Libraries etc; Voluntary Organisations – a) Educational organisations: i/ The Workers’ Educational Association, ii/ The Adult Schools, iii/ The Council for the Study of International Relations, iv/ The National Home Reading Union; b) Organisations doing specifically educational work: i/ Religious Organisations, ii/ The Co-operative Movement, iii/ The Y.M.C.A and the Y.W.C.A (1919 Report, p. 2).

which focuses on the importance of social movements to effect change, particularly for working class people - "They demand opportunities for education in the hope that the power which it brings will enable them to understand and help in the solution of the common problems of society. In many cases, therefore, their efforts to obtain education are specifically directed towards rendering themselves better fitted for the responsibilities of membership in political, social and industrial organisations" (154).

They argued that "adult education is a permanent national necessity, an inseparable aspect of citizenship, and therefore should be both universal and lifelong" and that it "should be spread uniformly and systematically over the whole community". They were also motivated by the need to seek out new pedagogical approaches which engaged the adult, recognizing that this must both address specifically adult learning needs and approaches and encourage citizenship: "We need to think out educational methods and possibilities from the new point of view ... of the adult learning to be a citizen".

The 1919 AEC doubted that LEAs would promote a broad, life-wide, adult education curriculum which looked beyond the vocational: "We do not think that Local Authorities will, generally speaking, take bold steps for the provision of non-vocational subjects. Indeed, we believe that they are more likely to provide vocational studies" (§194). The AEC specifically argued that "by far the greater bulk of the work of Local Education Authorities in Great Britain is concerned with the children in the Elementary Schools" and consequently that the state should act as only as "a medium for encouraging and assisting the activities of Universities and Local Education Authorities, and the educational work of voluntary bodies. This we regard as the main function of the State so far as education is concerned" (§343). The 1919 Report stated that "In England and Wales by far the greater proportion of the provision made by Local Authorities for further education is primarily vocational in character" (1919 Report, p.206). The authors of the Report wrote that this is due to a combination of the LEA focus upon education amongst children and adolescents, of "a certain shamefacedness [amongst adults] about "going to school"". The primary, and perhaps most telling concern, however, was ideological and specifically political in that they outlined that:

"There is still a number of education committees who are unable to understand a desire for education of no direct utilitarian value, unless it be for purposes of personal accomplishment, and who suspect dark motives in the minds of those who desire such education. More especially is this so where the demand is for the study of problems which are controversial. It is within our knowledge that there are even today town councillors to whom the term "economics" is synonymous with "socialism". The majority of those who desire to study do so probably because of the interest they have already taken in industrial or other public affairs [trade unionists]...This is presumably the basis for the charge sometimes made by Local Authorities and even by some members of universities, that the classes 'encourage discontent and socialism'" (1919 Report, pp. 206-7).

One tutor was reputedly told upon requesting a room for educational meetings by a Local Authority official, "If we let you have a room you will make the place a den of anarchists" (1919 Report, p. 207). This tension and lack of trust was mutual in that the Report identified that some of the "workers" demonstrated a similar level of suspicion "towards such facilities for classes as are offered by the Local Authorities" (ibid.). Elsewhere in the Report, it was also recorded that "The fact that

there has been little demand made upon Local Authorities by adults for classes in non-vocational subjects is attributable not so much to lack of desire as to lack of knowledge as to the possibilities of obtaining suitable educational facilities from Educational Authorities and lack of confidence in their established methods” (1919 Report, p.105). This statement appeared to reinforce the sense of inappropriate pedagogical approaches, ideological tensions, and an uncondusive atmosphere in Local Authority-led educational courses for adults such that, “non-vocational adult education has not in the past thriven it” (ibid.). The Report was clear that competency in teaching technical education, described as primarily “utilitarian”, particularly with a focus on children and adolescents, did not make for good teaching of “humane adult education”.

The emphasis on the non-vocational in the 1919 Report was clear. It was equally evident that the AEC’s understanding of non-vocational education was nuanced and consistent with their perspectives on who was best placed to offer it and how it should be funded. Given the political dynamics described above, it is important to comment that the AEC argued that there should be no restrictions placed on how monies for adult education were utilised, in that learners, they argued, should be allowed to talk about political or complex issues and that the state “should not ... refuse financial support to institutions, colleges and classes, merely on the ground that they have a particular ‘atmosphere’ or appeal to students of this type or that. All that it ought to ask is that they be concerned with serious study.” (p.ref). This is in stark contrast to the attitudes demonstrated by some Local Authorities, as we have seen. This remains a persistent source of concern today for many voluntary bodies, in that charities/not for profit organisations who receive state funding for activities (including educational) are not allowed to engage in overtly (non-party) political or religious activities unless they have a specific exemption.

Though the 1919 Report did list certain LEAs which were supporting the development of adult education activities, it nonetheless concluded that “the most important agencies for the promotion of adult non-vocational education are to be found amongst voluntary organisations” (1919 Report, p.210). The report underlined the importance of such voluntary bodies still further, at various points, for instance: “It will not ... be denied that adult non-vocational education has owed its main inspiration to voluntary organisations, and particularly those established for educational purposes” (p. 112).

Critical to this central role of voluntary organisations for the AEC was their ability to create the right kind of socially responsive, flexible learning opportunities responding to the interests of adults at a local level: “Voluntary organisations, by their spontaneity and responsiveness to local needs, by their elasticity and the enthusiasm they evoke, are a safeguard against over-organisation and formalism and an encouragement to the growth of the social spirit” (ibid.).

There is some suggestion in the 1919 Report that the 1918 Education Act offered opportunity for greater co-ordination of education, including for adults, as well as a systematised national infrastructure: “In England and Wales, the Education Act of 1918 opens up new possibilities of growth and co-ordination. It enacts that, ‘With a view to the establishment of a national system of public education available to all persons capable of profiting thereby, it shall be the duty of the council of every county and county borough ... to contribute thereto by providing for the progressive development and comprehensive organisation of education in respect of their area ...’. Whilst the Act imposed no new statutory duties upon Education Authorities so far as adult education is concerned, the clause quoted may be reasonably interpreted as requiring them to take within their

purview all forms of education” (p.107). The AEC, clearly saw this development as an indication of positive change, whilst recognising that there was insufficient concrete or practical evidence to support it. This appears to have been disappointing for them, as they argued that “The field of adult education is so large that the active co-operation of LEAs is a vital need, and non-vocational adult education should be regarded as an integral part of their activities” (p.108).

Having examined the archives more closely, and specifically sub-committee work and reports which informed the Final Report, it was evident that the evolution of the Final Report was neither straightforward nor uncontroversial. There were numerous instances which demonstrated state and establishment anger and concern from senior government ministers/officials that the AEC had overstepped the mark and was flouting convention. To illustrate this issue it is worth quoting from perhaps the boldest of all the individual reports which focused on work and education - ‘Notes on Industry and Education’, by James Morton, who was described as an Employer of Labour (Textiles). Morton started out with a damning indictment on “degrading” work conditions and how this drives the worker to seek satisfaction not from his work but only outside it:

“It is only too evident in modern industry that there is little pleasure in work for work’s sake, that the doing of it does not satisfy the worker, that his chief concern is to get as big wages as he can for the least amount of time spent, and that he seeks his chief interest and pleasure outside his ordinary work. This is probably the main cause of the unrest and discontent so prevalent today” (Notes on Industry and Education, p.1).

Morton continued this theme and emphasised the need for education for the senses and the mind, the humane and the imaginative:

“So that to the extent that the work of our factories and workshops is dull and uninteresting, does it not mean that it is we ourselves that are dull, that we have not been educated to know the pleasure of interesting and beautiful things, and that until we reverse all this, and educate ourselves to feel and know, and want things of real interest, so long will the work that goes to the making of them be dull and monotonous?” (as above, p.3).

He berated school education for its slavish devotion to a cold bookish intellectualism which he believed did not attempt to engage with a child’s real world interests, his (sic) imagination or desire to make, shape and craft things: “the work has not become part of his real life” (p.5). Instead, he argued that school should play an important role in stimulating interest in both the intellectual and the manual and craft-based, enabling adults to better utilise their leisure time later in life and stimulating new interests, and argues that the distinction between vocational and non-vocational is a false one: “Every kind of education, manual, intellectual, moral, should ultimately be of value in after life to a man’s vocation, no matter what that vocation might be” (p.8).

Edward Troup, on behalf of the Home Secretary, expressed the Home Secretary’s deep displeasure about both the AEC’s interim report and, particularly, the Industrial report in a letter to the Secretary of the Ministry of Reconstruction. He identified that the Home Secretary saw the recommendations of the industrial report as anti-establishment and deeply prejudicial and would not be supporting the findings or conclusions of the Ministry of Reconstruction interim report as a consequence:

“Sir George Cave²...feels bound to express his regret that the Committee should have put forward a number of serious and far-reaching proposals on industrial matters outside the scope of their reference, without any consultation with the departments concerned and with little or no regard for the practicability of their recommendations. He feels that the Report may do much to embarrass the schemes which are now under consideration of the Home Office and other Departments for the improvement of industrial conditions, and, by the prejudice which it will tend to arouse against such methods as the shift system, may seriously interfere with production after the war” (Edward Troup, 9th July 1918, Whitehall).

Contemporary Research – Oxford and Nottingham workshops

The two workshops which took place in December 2019 examined the following key questions for adult education now and in the future:

1. What directions should adult education take in the years ahead? What role should it play in social, economic and personal development?
2. What role can and should the voluntary sector play in adult education today? How is this affected by austerity?
3. How should the state relate to the voluntary sector in the provision of adult education, if at all?

Key Findings

1. What directions should adult education take in the years ahead? What role should it play in social, economic and personal development?

Across both workshops there was a strong view that adult education still has a very important function to play in social, economic and personal development, despite mass compulsory education up to the age of 19. In personal development terms it promotes a sense of identity and high level self-respect, relating to *thymos*, the human desire for recognition and knowing that your place in society is respected. This is beneficial not only to individuals, but to society and the economy.

Many participants argued that the contemporary schooling system can fail people due to its rigid systems and narrow curriculum which do not suit everyone, along with the increasing focus on employment and employability. Adult education, at its best, offers access to a broader range of subjects, connected to the individual's human experience (life-wide education) with employability as part of it but not its sole focus.

It was suggested that societies have a metaphorical brain which is situated largely in its education system, where knowledge is received, created, codified, transmitted, certified and referred to. Having a society actively using critical thinking means also having a society that encourages constant informed debate. A society must always be ready to adapt, and it must, in adapting, pay attention to keeping its people co-operative; that can only be achieved by engaging the collective brain in critical thinking and so releasing the motivation of that widespread intelligence. This is education's ultimate rationale (see Redding 2019; Redding *et al* 2019).

² George Cave, 1st Viscount Cave, GCMG, PC was a British lawyer and Conservative politician. He was Home Secretary under David Lloyd George from 1916 to 1919.

Both workshop groups argued the case for universal and lifelong adult education for the good of society and economy, and for the well-being and improved mental health of the population. This is not simply the training of technical skills, but educating in a wide sense, acquiring knowledge, exchanging ideas and promoting independent critical thinking and judgement, encouraging greater awareness of how we are shaped by our social, political and economic circumstances.

Generally speaking, adult education's flexibility and creativity in terms of where it is offered and to whom were seen as crucial strengths. It was felt that, ideally, opportunities for Adult Education should be accessible throughout the country and at any age. The idea of inter-generational learning was emphasised, in mixed groups, and also the need to ensure that people of all ages can benefit from adult education. This could be achieved by returning to classes being offered beyond day time slots and into the evening and weekend. This mixing of people was felt to be core to adult education's pedagogical values and its ability to stimulate understanding and empathy across disparate groups in society.

It was recognised that there is a place for both face to face and online learning but that adult education's particular appeal is the group learning aspect and the collegiality. Learning communities are important. The Nottingham group shared several examples of AE that had reached people and been effective, such as the people in a school kitchen who worked together to gain City and Guilds qualifications and the WEA branch established at Boots in Nottingham. There was the view expressed at the Oxford workshop that adult education through community hubs throughout the UK would work well, with the local hubs providing the opportunity for lifelong learning, thus encouraging independent, critical thinking and constant informed debate. Adult education benefits from offering alternative spaces for learning. We see this already in children's homes, the Prison service, food banks, and men in sheds, amongst others. Joint working with university-based research projects (e.g. Parents and Science Gang) were also seen as important ways of generating knowledge exchange and benefiting from the educational opportunities arising from research projects and of supporting participatory research approaches between community members and academics.

The role of universities in offering taught adult education pedagogical practice as part of teacher training was also raised.

2. What role can and should the voluntary sector play in adult education today? How is this affected by austerity?
3. How should the state relate to the voluntary sector in the provision of adult education, if at all?

It was agreed in both workshops that the government should ideally play a leading role in providing adult education and that this should be proactive and co-ordinated, as a laissez faire attitude on the part of the government inevitably leads to increased inequality of take-up. In terms of an overarching philosophy or approach, the general view was that this is problematic in contemporary society, given the diversity of the population, so the main intent should be to make the system as flexible, accessible, diverse and pragmatic as possible.

One group argued that Local Authorities could be given funding, as they once were, to provide some AE. However, the general view in both workshops was that a good deal of energy can also be wasted in trying to convince governments to provide funding who are unlikely to, leading to a continuous state of uncertainty and stasis. In the past, the state has funded some adult education infrastructure – buildings, teaching staff, materials /resources etc – and, as we saw in the 1919 Adult Education report, much of the course provision/services has been offered by the voluntary sector, in the form of bodies such as the WEA. Voluntary sector-led provision has had the advantage of being able to deliver services which are flexible and are able to respond quickly to evolving needs at a local level.

Unfortunately, both workshop groups felt it unlikely that the state will provide much funding for adult education in the current social and economic context, despite the Centenary Commission Report, the findings of the Civic University Commission and others. A lack of government funding for adult education could facilitate an increasing move towards a US-style corporate sponsorship approach, which brings with it enormous inequality. For instance, some yoga/wellbeing courses for adults are hundreds of pounds, leading to a situation where health/wellbeing/lifestyle changes become the purview of those with money/an elite. With the demise of EU funding at government level, pressures are even greater on providing alternative education in disadvantaged areas. The lure of courses with accreditation or observable results becomes more potent and highly local non-fee paying, often highly creative but time intensive courses are the first to go.

It was suggested that the state could, however, introduce regulation, which could examine the plethora of private colleges and education schemes for overseas students which are currently unregulated and, at their worst, fraudulent. One of the Oxford groups commented that regulation in the 1919 Report was based on ensuring “serious study”. They argued that this would equate to a term like “quality”, measured in terms of “learning outcomes”, in contemporary society. Any regulation, it was suggested, could be undertaken by an independent regulative body, which could also examine the impact of short-termism in funding, poor or unregulated practice and private/corporate sector interests.

All groups felt that the voluntary sector must retain a strong campaigning role if it is to be understood and recognised as genuinely independent and as being able to speak truth to power. This can be compromised the more that sector bodies receive state funding and are charged with undertaking duties of service by and for the government. There was a strong view expressed that unfunded bodies – some user led groups, grassroots social movements, informal learning bodies (e.g. Philosophy in Pubs) – can actually be less compromised and often, therefore, have more power to challenge the state and to be courageous and creative in offering adult education/learning which may not follow a government line and may be political and/or consciousness raising.

Conclusion

The AEC's *Final Report* has proved to be an enduring template for adult education, committed to enriching the communities where people live and work, and to building community-led, democratically-orientated forms of education. Through most of the 20th century such adult education played a vital part in the social fabric. This helped shape, and became embedded in, the post-1945 social-democratic welfare state.

The AEC was deeply influenced by forward-looking appraisals of political, social and economic change - specifically, the extension of the franchise, industrial and occupational structures, emerging social movements and these are reflected in a number of its individual reports which impacted on the 1919 Final Report, as evidenced, in particular, in the Notes on Industry and Education report considered above.

The AEC has not been researched for some time. This research grant has allowed for a renewed focus on the makings of the 1919 Report at a time when adult education is no longer a 'fixture', ideologically or structurally, as in the 1970s (Jennings, 1980; Kelly, 1973; Taylor, 1976), and is essentially in deeply troubled times. Since the 1980s, despite rhetoric about "lifelong learning" for a "learning society", opportunities for, and institutions of, formal adult education have been largely swept away. With exceptions, what remains formally focuses on training young adults in workplace skills. However, grass roots, informal education and community activism, and 'horizontal movements' connected to important societal issues (e.g. climate collapse, gender politics, economic breakdown and industry, big business capitalism) have become new sources of spontaneous and responsive learning. Funding, however, remains a critical point of contestation, as the outline of the workshop discussions aims to show. Much of the old Local Authority grant aid monies, which were part of the funding fabric for 'innovative', and often less restricted, voluntary sector work have disappeared, with this process accelerating over the recent years of austerity-focused policy and the strictures of the (short-lived) Big Society which catalyzed numerous enduring tensions about the role of the voluntary sector, the nature of voluntarism and the ongoing withdrawal of the state from civil society.

There is also an important need to consider again who is best placed to offer adult education, as well as the forms it should (and, to some extent, already does) take. Some of the interviewees mentioned in the Methodology section above were clear that there are critical skills and aptitudes required in providing good quality adult education and meeting the pedagogical needs of adults. These include engaging with people where their own points of interest lie; the ability to foster trust; time, commitment and energy; knowledge and understanding of given communities; awareness of how to work with groups that both enables debate and discussion, on sometimes contentious and complex issues, whilst ensuring group members are supported.

This research has also allowed us to reflect on the AEC's perception that adult education was essential to building a democratic society, particularly at times of turbulence and change. As Arthur Greenwood wrote, the *Final Report's* "main argument" was that "responsible citizenship" would be "impossible so long as the industrial and social conditions prevailing before the war remain" (quoted Goldman 1995, p. 205). This remains an acute point of tension and one in which a critical, reflective and uncompromised adult education network should play an increasingly important role.

References

- Goldman, L. (1995). *Dons and Workers: Oxford and Adult Education since 1850*. OUP.
- Jennings, B. (1980). The Reception of the 1919 Report. In H. Wiltshire et al., (eds.), *The 1919 Report*. Nottingham University.
- Kelly, T. (1973). Two Reports: 1919 and 1973. *Studies in Adult Education*, 5(2), 113-123.
- Taylor, F. J. (1976). The Making of the 1919 Report. *Studies in Adult Education*, 8(2), 134-148.

Interim Report and Final Reports by Sharon Clancy, with support and input from David Conlon, on student placement in summer 2019, for which I would like to express my sincere gratitude.