Quality of life of disabled people: prospects for lifelong learning pedagogy

Gabriella Aleandri*, Giaconi Catia*

Abstract: *This article faces a current topic in the National and International scene, rich in complexity and endowed of wide spaces of epistemological and professional reflection: the quality of life of disabled people and their inclusion in the world of education. The authors, who have worked as researchers in the domain of lifelong learning and of disability for several years, are now deepening this issue first by penetrating the wide semantic and conceptual spectrum of life quality and lifelong learning, passing then to outline some important passages of the Italian legislative process of inclusion of disabled people in the Universities. The attention is always polarised on the development of a new conception of lifelong and life-wide learning that includes among its aims the one of improving the quality of life of people with any condition of disadvantage, discomfort or disability.*

Riassunto: *L'articolo affronta un argomento attuale nello scenario nazionale ed internazionale, ricco di complessità e di ampi spazi di riflessione epistemologica e professionale: la qualità della vita dei disabili e la loro inclusione nel mondo dell'istruzione. Le autrici, da anni ricercatrici nel settore del lifelong learning e della disabilità, approfondiscono la questione addentrandosi prima nell'ampio spettro semantico e concettuale relativo alla qualità della vita e al lefelong learning per passare poi a delineare vie di inclusione dei disabili nelle Università e nell'Alta Formazione. L'attenzione è sempre polarizzata su una nuova concezione di lifelong e lifewide lerning che comprenda tra le sue finalità quella di migliorare la qualità della vita delle persone con qualsiasi condizione di svantaggio, disagio o disabilità.*

Keywords: *Lifelong e life-wide learning, inclusion, epistemology, disability, life plan, quality of life.*

* Il presente lavoro, pur essendo frutto di comune elaborazione e di condivisione di impostazione e contenuti può essere così attribuito: Catia Giaconi è autrice delle pagine da 119 a 129; Gabriella Aleandri è autrice da pagina 129 in poi.

ESS 2-2012.indd 119 8-11-2012 11:56:52

A complex horizon: quality of life

The National and International research lays the groundwork for a careful epistemological reflection on the issues of quality of life, of inclusion of disabled people in the world of higher education and in the perspective of lifelong and life-wide learning.

Inevitably these dimensions synergistically contribute to the achievement of a major contemporary challenge that is expressed in the enhancement of interventions and of policies aiming at the real inclusion of disabled people in the knowledge society and in the learning society.

Hence talking of quality of life and, in a specific way, quality of life of disabled people, necessarily involves a review of both a series of changes in our society and the scientific acquisitions and studies that can provide the sense of the importance of the issue.

First, advances in medical and social areas have marked a significant increase in the average life expectancy of people with sensory disabilities, but also with mental disabilities (Ferris, Bramston, 1994).

Secondly, the attention is focused on the scientific and clinical-rehabilitative field on one hand, and on functional abilities, on everyday life, on the adaptation to the environment (Gurland, Katz, 1992) on the other; on the necessary educational interventions, complemented with the medical ones, in order to extend the possibilities of social inclusion and of well-being in old age for people with disabilities (Cottini, 2008; Crispiani, Giaconi, 2009).

Finally, we must consider the documented validity, since the Nineties, of the training dimension and of the practical-professional one to improve the quality of life of people experiencing a situation of disadvantage or disability (Rowland, Perkins, 1988; Nehring et al., 1993; Giaconi, 2012).

In the background of these three conceptual focal points remain the established theories within psychology and the field of special pedagogy, which over time have noted down and proved "(…) the pedagogical assumption of educability [possibility to educate] at every stage of life, adulthood (and beyond) included" (Aleandri, 2011, 73) and in any "(… physical, personal and social condition" (Giaconi, 2012, 137).

Always at the basis of the thought we are developing also stays the importance of a systematic reading of the concepts of lifelong learning, of quality of life, of social inclusion for personal growth and for the opportunities of development (Microsystem); for programs and techniques

ESS 2-2012.indd 120 8-11-2012 11:56:52

of environmental improvement (Mesosystem) and for the efficiency and effectiveness of social policies (Macrosystem) (Schalock, Verdugo Alonso, 2006).

Starting from the above reflections, we go into the wide conceptual domain of "quality of life".

The extensive literature unfolds a plurality of definitions of QoL, as an exercise of identification and lexical clarification which closely interests the promotion of health, training, the conduct of social services, in order to seize its meaning, to evaluate or measure its expressions, to report its factors and its indicators, to deliberate its standards, to promote its implementation strategies.

Despite the opinion of the impossibility, or high relativity, of the production of Quality of Life definitions avoiding both the risk of simplification, or reduction of the variables at stake, and the excessive extension of the intervening factors, the QoL definitions considered by Schalock and Verdugo Alonso are many and frequent (Felce, Perry 1995; Schalock, Alonso, Cummins 1992; Hughes et al. 1995, ecc.).

And we are talking of rather homogeneous formulations as for the most part they are oriented to some basic convictions which can be recognised in the focus on the person's state of being, on the inextricable correlation with life quality of the family he/she belongs to, and, more generally, in the systemic view, or ecological view, that brings the vital condition of the individual to his/her next life contexts (Microsystem) or extended ones (Macrosystem).

No less important is the implementation of complexity brought by some studies, such as the accurate one by L. Cottini (2008), that connects quality of life with the temporal perspective of age advancement.

Always in this direction, the construct of *health*, or state of *well-being* of an individual, appears to be a central and decisive reference for any conceptual exploration about the QoL, because of their manifest interconnections. Quality and state of health, though not in total overlap, yet results to be in extreme reciprocity since if good health constitutes a factor of existential quality, by contrast, a quality life promotes and maintains with more probabilities the condition of biological and psychic health.

Even the state of well-being, as indicated in the definition of 1948 by the *World Health Organization*, is a concept that evolved over the decades towards a more and more inclusive form of components, and that was restated in *Quality of Life Research* of 1993 as a "state of complete physical,

ESS 2-2012.indd 121 8-11-2012 11:56:52

mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity", exhibits a multidimensional nature as a condition of balance and *wellness* on the following three dimensions: biological, psychological and social one.

We therefore refer to the full functional efficiency and in relation to the different and possible contexts of life, then the well-being is not an achieved or permanent status, but a condition of balance, as a consequence it lies along the continuum between pathology/illness and health/wellness; it is a well-being that can always be implemented, and that finds every person along the way more or less close or distant from one of the poles.

The perspective tends to widen towards the psychological components related to the self-realization and to the self-satisfaction, in other authors (Cowen, Manis, Mayman, Scheider, etc.) for which we refer to the organized review and discussion of Schalock and Verdugo Alonso and to the one of Cottini (2008).

Therefore, in the presence of pathological states, both the investigation of the quality factors and the exploration of the indicators of their relevance get more and more complicated because of the increase of factors at stake and, not less, because of the biological, psychological and behaviour condition of the sick or disabled person that can easily modify or evolve. This has opened up the scenario of *health related quality of life (HRQOL)* and of *quality of life in disables individuals* and, to a lesser degree, of researches dedicated to childhood of individuals suffering from diseases and disabilities.

Along this perspective we have seen the development of a further version of the critical aspects, of researches and of tools for evaluating the quality of life which underlines significant aspects such as physical efficiency, pain, emotional situation, satisfaction with the treatment, concern for the future, somatic experience, assessment of one's skills, etc. as Schalock and Verdugo Alonso have summarized (Schalock,Verdugo Alonso, 2006) referring to the international researches on this matter.

In the direction of childhood studies, we can find many multidimensional studies and measurement tools such as the *KINDL Questionnaires* (1998), the *AUQUEI Questionnaire* (1996) or the *Peds QL Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory* (1999), nevertheless – as Schalock and Verdugo Alonso (2006,105) report – there are still very few studies that take into account children point of view, and the assessment of QOL is often made, only in an indirect way (by outside observers, by parents, by people in charge for

ESS 2-2012.indd 122 8-11-2012 11:56:52

the children, etc.), moreover the employed tools are mostly derived from those used in studies of adults.

We can find the same elaboration of concepts and tools, through indicators and questionnaires when dealing with QoL of older people, about which we can refer to the review of L. Cottini (2008), and also when dealing with quality of life and school integration (Crispiani, Giaconi, 2009).

Equally rich in complexity is the literature directed to review the variety of models of QoL. In this direction, R.A. Cummins (1997) noted down seven factors of QoL that include the objective and subjective perspectives, the public and private aspects of a person: life conditions, health status, productivity, intimacy, safety, integration in the community, emotional status. Felce and Perry (1995) privilege five categories: physical well-being, material well-being, social well-being, emotional well-being, significant activities.

Then we have the multifactorial model, as a development of the SF-36 model by Health Survey and Gandek (1993), the model with eleven dimensions of Ruddick and Olivier (2005): general health status, physical pain, physical functioning, sensory functioning, memory functioning, vitality, mental status, physical role functioning, social role functioning, emotional role functioning, transitions in role status.

According to the view of a multidimensional approach to the phenomenon, which refers to multiple determinant factors, Schalock and Verdugo Alonso (2006, 45) individuate six *focus areas,* "key-factors of the existential status of a person":

1. regular and special education;
2. physical health;
3. mental health;
4. mental retardation and intellectual disabilities;
5. aging;
6. family.

Schalock himself is the author, together with others, of a multidimensional classification of factors of QoL that reduces the system to three categories and on these he builds up an individual survey questionnaire, the *Quality of Life Questionnaire* (1993):

a. personal characteristics;
b. objective conditions of life;
c. perception by others.

ESS 2-2012.indd 123 8-11-2012 11:56:52

The combination of these factors and dimensions generated a number of QoL models, some of which are particularly related to the condition of disabled persons: by summarizing these models and also referring to Bateson's classification of microsystem, mesosystem and macrosystem, Schalock and Verdugo Alonso (2006, 48), elaborate a division in eight fundamental dimensions:

- emotional well-being;
- interpersonal relationships;
- material well-being;
- personal development;
- physical well-being;
- self-determination;
- social inclusion;
- rights.

Cross-sectional studies reported by S. Soresi (2006) recognize the return – more frequently in the International studies – of the following dimensions:

1. psychological well-being and personal satisfaction;
2. experienced social relations;
3. employment;
4. physical and material well-being;
5. self-determination, autonomy and possibility of choice;
6. personal competence, adjustment in the community and the capability to live independently;
7. Community integration;
8. social acceptance, social status and adaptation;
9. personal development and fulfilment;
10. quality of residential environment;
11. free time;
12. standardization;
13. some demographic, social and individual aspects;
14. responsibility;
15. support received by services.

Cottini and Fedeli (2007) elaborated the *3C Model*, which is particularly sensitive to the aspect of the advancement of age of mental disabled

ESS 2-2012.indd 124 8-11-2012 11:56:52

people, and they organize their model on three existential "dimensions": centrality, control and continuity.

Not without contradictions and unresolved problems is the question of the determinability of the value of quality of life and its means of investigation, although in fact, different authors tend to credit measurement modes of psychometric type, oriented towards the myth of objectivity and of measurability of human behaviour, the analysis of the procedures in place do not seem to detect this type of procedure, except very partially.

S. Soresi (2006, 32) confirms that several authors have tried both an objective and a subjective perspective for the appreciation of QoL, as Edgerton, Alpern, Cummins, Emerson, French, or as *the Lifestyle Satisfaction Scale* of Heal and Chadsey-Rusch (1985), the *Quality of Life Questionnaire*, or other means such as the *Client Quality of Life Questionnaire* and the *Sponsor Questionnaire* by Brown et al. of 1989 on the macro and micro contexts of life of disabled people, etc.., but that nevertheless still remain serious problems in currently available assessment procedures. Moreover "the possibility of accomplishing surveys that can be sufficiently correct from a methodological point of view is in fact prevented, on the one hand, by the considerable amount of variables that contribute to specify the quality of life and, on the other hand, by the need to apply to multidimensional measures that cannot be easily recordable with people with mental retardation" (Soresi, 2006,34).

The assessment procedure in 14 items designed by S. Soresi and L. Nota (2002) *The assessment of quality of life of adult people with mental retardation* - QoL-RM, is partly a measuring model, and it is a psychometric tool of hetero-assessment not for individuals with mental retardation staying in specific institutes and rehabilitation centres. It is structured in three sections:

- Quality of the service received;
- Possibility to benefit from opportunities of social integration;
- Characteristics of the environments.

As shown, because of the critical and potential elements emerged from the analysis of National and International literature, we feel the need to establish new epistemological perspectives aimed at the full implementation of a respectful "life plan" (Pavone, 2009). The new concept of lifelong learning that we are going to outline surely allows a privileged way to achieve a better quality of life of all people over a lifetime, by adapting itself within

ESS 2-2012.indd 125 8-11-2012 11:56:52

the multiple interpersonal relationships and contexts with which it comes into contact and laying the groundwork for a possible inclusion.

The quality of life of disabled people through the processes of inclusion at university

The Italian approach is for inclusion of students with disabilities in a regular school with the assistance of a specialized teacher and psycho pedagogical services (Law No. 517/1977). This approach has materialized thanks to a precise legislative process, and has been gradually extended to every school (from primary school to university).

This intervention provides an overview of inclusion legislation in Italy with a focus on Inclusion of students with disabilities at University.

You can see in this slide the timeline of the Italian legislation on inclusion of students with disabilities at University.

- Law No.104/1992- Framework law for the assistance, the social inclusion and the rights of the disabled
- Law No.17/1999 – Review Act 104/92 for University.

Since 1992, when the law 104 was issued (Framework Law for the assistance, social integration and rights of persons with disabilities), the situation has slowly begun to improve, and the number of students with disabilities, over the years, has greatly increased, thanks to the affirmation of new technologies and specific regulations regarding school placement (especially the law 17/1999, integration and modification of the framework law of February 5th, 1992, n. 104 for assistance, social integration and rights of disabled and the DPCM 9 of April 2001, provisions for uniform treatment regarding the right to higher education (university education), in accordance with art. 4 of the Law of December 2nd, 1991, n. 390). The purpose of these legislative measures is not, of course, the "simplification" of the course of studies, but rather the removal of any obstacles which hinder the proper integration of the disabled student in the school system and in the university system.

Let us see now specifically the most significant parts of these regulations which cover the inclusion of disabled students in universities.

Act no. 104/1992 has made a significant contribution to a culture of inclusion. Law concerning the assistance, the social integration and the rights of disabled persons. Article 1 prescribes the 'full respect of the hu-

ESS 2-2012.indd 126 8-11-2012 11:56:52

man dignity, freedom and autonomy of disabled people and promotion of their inclusion within the family, school, employment and society'.

Law 104/1992 retains with priority that the instruction of disabled persons is accomplished through their insertion "in the common classes of the scholastic instruction of every order and grade…" (Art 12, paragraph 2). The attendance of common classes establishes, in fact, a fundamental tool for the achievement of the "development of the potential of the handicapped person in learning, communication, relations, and socialization" (Art 12, paragraph 3).

The law covers primary to university education (art. 12, paragraph 2).

The inclusion of students with disabilities at school and at University is realized through:

- "Technical equipment and teaching aids as well as any form of technical support, notwithstanding the individual's functional aids and promoting at the effective exercise of the right to education, also through agreements with specialized centers, having a function of pedagogical consulting, of production and adaptation of specific teaching materials "(article 13, paragraph 1, letter b).
- The programs of the universities of "appropriate intervention either for the need of the person or for the peculiarities of individual educational program" (Article 13 "School integration" paragraph 1 letter c).
- Assignments of professional interpreters to facilitate the frequency and the learning of deaf students (Article 13, paragraph 1, letter d).
- Specific appropriate technical and educational subsidies and support services of specialized tutoring (Article 13, paragraph 6-a).
- The possibility, for disabled students, to take exams, even university exams, using the necessary aids (Article 16 "Evaluating the Performance and exams", paragraph 4), in agreement with the teacher of the subject and with the support of the Tutoring service.
- An academic syllabus agreed with teacher in order to guarantee "individualized" tests and supported by specific aids (Article 16).

The law 17/99, which amended and supplemented the law 104/92, has provided funding and specific guidelines to the Italian universities regarding the activities to be implemented in favor of the disabled students.

In particular, this law established that each university should appoint a Delegate for Disabilities:"With coordinating, monitoring and supporting

ESS 2-2012.indd 127 8-11-2012 11:56:53

functions of all the initiatives for inclusion as part of the University" (Law no. 17/99, Article 1, addition of a 5-paragraph 5 of Article 16 of Law of 5th February 1992, n. 104).

At the same time it dictated that each university delivers services for the integration of disabled students with specific reference to:

- Specific technical and educational subsidies (Law no. 17/99, Article 1, integration of Article 13, 6-bis);
- Support of appropriate specialized tutoring services (Law no. 17/99, Article 1, integration of Article 13, 6-bis);
- Individualized treatment for passing examination and use of specific technical means in relation to the type, or the possibility of equivalent tests (Law no. 17/99, Article 1, replacement of paragraph 5 of Article 16 of Law of 5th February 1992, n. 104).

The text of this law has thus specified and defined a number of important rights for students, not only in terms of services but also in terms, for example, of equivalence of university courses and in terms of specificity of each student's path.

The "tutors" may be companions who are more advanced in their studies (including disabled), or boys and girls employed in the civil service helping disabled students to overcome the organizational difficulties and sometimes the content of university courses. It must also be guaranteed, even in universities, the removal of architectural barriers and the presence of assistants for the displacements of students in wheelchairs.

As for the delegates from the rector for disability, since 2001 was constituted the CNUDD – University National Conference of Delegates for Disability – an organism capable of representing the policy and activities of the Italian universities regarding students with disabilities and the issues related to disability. The main purpose of CNUDD is in fact to enable the exchange of information and experiences among universities and to share some guidelines for the activities of all universities activating all the services necessary to give effect to the rules laid down by Law 17/99 and trying to respond more adequately to the needs of disabled students in their university courses.

For the implementation of these laws, Program of Action of the Government for political Handicap (2000-2003) included:

- annual survey of the appointment of delegates
- recognition of the needs and problems of disabled students, to solve

ESS 2-2012.indd 128 8-11-2012 11:56:53

the problems of guidance, to participate in lessons, access to textbooks, etc.
- identification of supports for the autonomy, or transcription of texts in Braille, in large print, recordings, equipped computer stations (magnifying aids, speech synthesis, Braille, etc..), etc.

According to a Censis survey, made before the passing of the of law 17/1999, these were the reasons why people with disabilities abandoned their studies (*Table 1*)

Table 1. *The reasons why people with disabilities abandoned their studies*

	Total	Male	Female
Economic reasons	42,7	41,6	45,7
Did not wish to study anymore	19,7	23,0	10,0
Difficulties with studies	15,8	17,7	10,0
Health reasons	12,5	13,4	10,0
Failure in school support	10,4	9,6	12,9
The achieved degree was enough	10,0	9,6	11,4
They found a job	8,2	10,5	1,4
Distance of school from home	5,7	2,9	14,3
Inscription to a professional training course	5,4	7,2	-
Presence of architectural barriers	1,1	1,0	1,4
Lack of accompaniement services	0,7	-	2,9
Teachers' board	0,4	0,5	-
Other reasons	2,5	1,4	5,7

Source: Censis survey, 1997

Data on students with disabilities enrolled at the State University show a rising trend. For the academic year 2000-01 academic year 2007-08, students with disabilities increased from 4,813 to 12,403 members. (MURCINECA, 2008).

The distribution by type of disability shows that students with disabilities constitute the largest percentage (27.5%) of registered disabled people in the academic year 2006-07, while smaller percentages are found in cases

ESS 2-2012.indd 129 8-11-2012 11:56:53

of students with mental difficulties (3, 5%) and dyslexia (0.9%) (MUR-CINECA, 2007).

A strategic way for the quality of life: lifelong learning

After years of theorization and of practices which were mainly concerned with management and training, that followed a direction from above (wealthier classes) to bottom (middle classes), and aimed at a pervasive social control; some authoritative International scholars (such as Lengrand, Suchodolski, Schwartz) and Italian ones (Mencarelli, Lorenzetto), laid the foundations for new concepts of Lifelong learning and education (Aleandri, 2011).

Far from linear and simplistic readings, the current scientific literature offers a multidimensional and complex vision of lifelong learning as the way that "(…) allows people to implement the subjective but also universal value of the person and of his/her life plan, which express the dignity of the person in an original process of continuous development and growth" (*Ibidem*, 97).

First of all the education for adults includes both the dimension of the formal and informal lifelong learning and the dimension of the casual learning which is proper to a multicultural society. Referring to that division, the current International debate tends to organize and study the educational processes in relation to formal education, to non-formal education and to informal education.

Similarly, the multidimensional nature of the construct allows us to look at sites (places) for a global and permanent education with a particular attention to the process of lifelong learning as a focal point, a networking connection with earlier grades of schools, workplaces, other social institutions, National and International politics (policies); as well as a real chance of social inclusion, equality of opportunities, social justice and so on.

The multi-systemic evolution of this concept is easy to rebuild through the International debate, promoted by various supranational organizations, which arose starting from the second post-war period, aimed at promoting studies, reflections and programs related to adult education and to lifelong learning.

We start from 'the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), where you can find, among its objectives and

ESS 2-2012.indd 130 8-11-2012 11:56:53

projects, literacy programs, quality education and lifelong learning for all, training of teachers, conservation of cultural and natural heritage of the planet, of sustainable and intercultural development just through information and education. Specifically, it is possible to find a series of significant steps by reconstructing the various international conferences on adult education fostered by UNESCO, which over time have seen an attempt, on one side, to point out an international mission related to the responsibility of education and to the education towards responsibility, continuity and universality of adult education, and on the other side, to involve the delegates of the States in the developing world.

The General Conference of UNESCO of 2007 is exemplificative of what we have just stated. This conference in fact led to the approval of the Medium-term Strategy for 2008-2013, expressed through five global objectives, covering (Aleandri, 2011, 125):

1. implementation of a quality education and lifelong learning;
2. the relationship between scientific research and sustainable development;
3. research on emerging issues of ethical and social nature;
4. intercultural dialogue with a view to a culture of peace;
5. promotion of an "inclusive" model of knowledge society to be build up through information and communication.

With regard to the aims of lifelong learning, it seems appropriate to recall the objectives of lifelong learning strategy by G20 Meeting in March 2010 (*Table 2*), drawn to overcome the current global financial, economic and job crisis.

They concern the following issues:

- access to quality education and vocational training for all;
- matching education and training to the needs of the labour market with a systemic capacity to respond to change;
- employability and flexibility during life;
- continuous improvement and system renewal.

ESS 2-2012.indd 131 8-11-2012 11:56:53

Table 2

ANNEX

	ROLES	HOW ACHIEVED
GOVERNMENT	▸ Establish, maintain and improve a coordinated national education and training system incorporating the concept of lifelong learning. ▸ Respond to industry needs in developing quality education and training systems ▸ Anticipate future skills ▸ Invest in quality education and pre-employment training at all levels. ▸ Provide adequate resources for education and training to ensure high quality skills are developed and maintained. ▸ Reduce digital divide, especially in developing countries.	▸ Invest and create the conditions to enhance education and training at all levels. ▸ Provide training opportunities to young people, and develop youth employment programmes (including funded training). ▸ Encourage training at company level, e.g. through tax incentives. ▸ Effective consultation with key users of the system, particularly employers. ▸ Simple, transparent user friendly education and training systems. ▸ Facilitate and support a culture of life long learning. ▸ Ensure coordination between different ministries and departments.
BUSINESS	▸ Work through representative organisations to channel input to educators and governments. ▸ Participate in the design and implementation of education and training and polices, programmes etc. ▸ Train and retrain employees. ▸ Identify labour market needs and communicate to policy makers. ▸ Advocate continuous improvement in education and training.	▸ Identify current and forecast training needs. ▸ Provide training opportunities to employees internally or through training providers. ▸ Provide experiential training for learner-ships, apprenticeships and internships. ▸ Contribute data and intelligence via business and industry organisations. ▸ Actively participate in training and education policies and institutions.
INDIVIDUALS	▸ Access good initial education. ▸ Access continuing education / training. ▸ Take initiative and invest in themselves to develop transferable skills and competencies that are not job or employer specific. ▸ Pursue a career and life long employability, recognising this may include work in different industries and with different employers.	▸ Use training and education received. ▸ Maintain skills and employability, undertake re-training and ongoing education. ▸ Be flexible and adaptable to the use of new technologies and processes. ▸ Be mobile and flexible where possible in seeking and undertaking work. ▸ Undertake training to support work functions and tasks within the firm.

Source: Lifelong Learning Strategy - G20 Meeting. March 2010.

ESS 2-2012.indd 132 8-11-2012 11:56:53

On the way we are conducting, worthy of note are the studies conducted by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), which systematically publishes reports about international indicators of education systems since 1973. *Education at a Glance*, indeed, provides interesting data for comparative analysis among countries, which is useful for politics (policies) and for all stake-holders.

In this regard, it is interesting to quote the survey published in 2010 regarding some chapters which bring together the different indicators for the interesting discussion that we are developing.

First of all, in the following Table "Graduation rates at tertiary level" it is possible to observe the "students who complete tertiary education" (tertiary-type A education, tertiary-type B education and advanced research programmes, by age-specific graduation rates and by gender) (Table A3.1).

About Rates for tertiary-type B programme (first-time graduates), comparing to total OECD average (11 %) and to EU21 average (8 %), data show that Italy reached a very low percentage: only 1 %, like Mexico Poland and Slovak Republic, while Canada got 29 % in total, Japan, New Zealand and Slovenia 26 %.

ESS 2-2012.indd 133 8-11-2012 11:56:53

Table A3.1. Graduation rates at tertiary level (2010)

Sum of age-specific graduation rates, by gender and programme destination

		Rates for tertiary-type B programmes (first-time graduates)							Rates for tertiary-type A programmes (first-time graduates)							Rates for advanced research programmes					
					of which < age 30							of which < age 30							of which < age 35		
		Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Adjusted (without international students)	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Adjusted (without international students)	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)
OECD	Australia[1]	16	14	18	11	10	12	8	50	41	59	43	35	50	29	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Austria	12	13	11	8	9	7	8	30	25	34	25	20	29	22	2.2	2.5	1.9	1.6	1.8	1.4
	Belgium	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	1.5	1.7	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.1
	Canada[1]	29	23	34	22	19	26	21	36	28	45	33	26	41	31	1.2	1.3	1.0	0.7	0.8	0.7
	Chile	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
	Czech Republic	5	2	7	4	2	6	m	38	28	49	31	23	41	m	1.3	1.4	1.0	0.4	1.1	0.8
	Denmark	9	9	9	7	7	8	6	50	38	62	42	31	52	38	2.0	2.2	1.8	1.4	1.7	1.1
	Estonia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.2	0.2	0.2
	Finland	n	n	n	m	n	m	n	49	41	57	37	31	43	m	2.3	2.2	2.5	1.0	1.1	1.0
	France[1]	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	1.5	1.7	1.3	m	m	m
	Germany	14	9	19	m	m	m	m	30	28	32	25	24	27	24	2.6	2.8	2.3	2.1	2.2	1.9
	Greece	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	1.1	1.2	1.0	m	m	m
	Hungary	6	3	8	5	3	7	m	31	23	40	27	20	34	m	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.5
	Iceland	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	60	41	80	36	27	47	34	0.8	0.9	0.7	0.4	0.5	m
	Ireland	22	24	20	16	18	14	15	47	40	53	42	36	48	40	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.1	1.1	1.1
	Israel	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	37	31	43	27	21	33	m	1.5	1.4	1.4	0.1	0.1	0.1
	Italy	1	1	1	m	m	m	m	32	25	38	27	21	33	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Japan	25	18	32	m	m	m	m	40	44	36	m	m	m	m	1.1	1.5	0.6	m	m	m
	Korea	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	1.3	1.8	0.9	0.4	0.5	0.3
	Luxembourg	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Mexico	1	2	1	1	2	1	m	20	18	21	18	17	20	m	0.2	0.3	0.2	m	m	m
	Netherlands	n	n	1	n	n	n	n	42	37	47	39	33	44	37	1.8	2.1	1.5	m	m	m
	New Zealand	26	23	29	16	15	16	11	47	38	57	35	29	41	27	1.7	1.6	1.8	0.9	0.9	0.9
	Norway	n	n	1	n	n	n	n	42	30	53	34	26	44	34	1.8	2.1	1.7	0.9	1.0	0.7
	Poland	1	n	1	1	n	1	m	55	39	72	47	34	61	47	0.5	0.5	0.5	m	m	m
	Portugal	n	n	n	m	n	m	n	40	30	50	33	24	43	32	1.8	1.3	2.2	0.9	0.6	1.2
	Slovak Republic	1	1	1	1	n	1	m	49	34	65	38	28	48	38	3.2	3.2	3.2	2.1	2.1	2.1
	Slovenia	26	21	31	14	12	18	14	29	15	45	25	13	39	25	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.4	n	n
	Spain	16	15	18	15	14	16	m	30	22	37	27	19	34	m	1.1	1.1	1.0	0.7	0.7	0.7
	Sweden	6	5	8	4	4	5	4	37	26	47	26	20	33	23	2.8	2.9	2.9	1.6	1.8	1.5
	Switzerland	16	20	13	m	m	m	m	31	30	33	23	20	26	m	3.6	4.2	3.0	2.7	3.0	2.4
	Turkey	19	20	17	16	m	15	m	23	25	21	m	m	m	m	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3
	United Kingdom	12	10	15	7	6	8	m	51	45	57	43	38	47	m	2.3	2.4	2.1	1.6	1.7	1.5
	United States	11	8	14	m	m	m	m	38	32	45	m	m	m	m	1.6	1.5	1.8	m	m	m
	OECD average	11	9	12	8	6	9	m	39	32	47	33	26	40	m	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.0	1.1	0.9
	EU21 average	8	7	9	7	5	8	m	40	31	49	33	26	41	m	1.7	1.8	1.6	1.1	1.2	1.7
Other G20	Argentina[1]	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	0.1	0.1	0.2	m	m	m
	Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m		0.4	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2
	China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	2.4	2.6	2.2	m	m	m
	India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m		m	m	m	m	m	m
	Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	0.1	0.1	n	m	m	m
	Russian Federation	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	0.4	0.4	0.4	m	m	m
	Saudi Arabia	8	11	4	m	m	m	m	20	14	27	m	m	m	m	0.1	0.1	0.1	m	m	m
	South Africa[1]	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	0.1	0.2	0.1	m	m	m
	G20 average	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	1.0	1.1	0.9	m	m	m

Notes: Refer to Annex 1 for information on the method used to calculate graduation rates (gross rates versus net rates) and the corresponding typical ages. Mismatches between the coverage of the population data and the graduate data mean that the graduation rates for those countries that are net exporters of students may be underestimated, and those that are net importers may be overestimated. The adjusted graduation rates seek to compensate for that.

1. Year of reference 2009.

Source: OECD. Argentina, China, Indonesia: UNESCO Institute for Statistics (World Education Indicators Programme). Saudi Arabia: Observatory on Higher Education. South Africa: UNESCO Institute for Statistics. See Annex 3 for notes (*www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012*).

Please refer to the Reader's Guide for information concerning the symbols replacing missing data.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932664056

Source: OECD, EAG 2012

ESS 2-2012.indd 134 8-11-2012 11:56:53

About Rates for tertiary-type A programme (first-time graduates), total OECD average and EU21 average are nearly 40 %, instead Mexico reached only 20 %, Turkey 23 %, Italy 32 % (however lower than OECD and EU averages), while Iceland got the highest percentage (60 %), Poland 55 %, United Kingdom 51 %, and Australia and Denmark 50 %.

With regard to Rates for advanced research programmes, total OECD average is 1,6 % and EU21 average is a little higher than it, 1,7 %, Czech Republic and Mexico reached only 0.2 %, instead Switzerland obtained 3,6 %, Slovak Republic 3,2 % and Germany 2,6 %, while data are missing for Italy and Luxembourg.

Table A3.2 below shows trends in tertiary graduation rates from 1995 to 2010: in general, we can observe that OECD countries, in average, have doubled the percentage of graduation rates for tertiary-type 5A (first-time graduates), from 20% in 1995 to 39-40% in 2010, with a progressive increase. EU21 average had the same trend too: from 18 % in 1995 to 40 % in 2008 and 2010.

Iceland obtained the highest growth, even tripling the percentage, from 20 % in 1995 to 56 % in 2005, 57 % in 2008, a slight decline in 2009 (51 %), but another significant rising, 60 %, in 2010.

Poland achieved an high percentage too, from 34 % in 2000 to 55 % in 2010, with a progressive increase.

For Italy, instead, we can observe a particular way: first available data were for 2000, with a percentage of 19 %, doubled, to 41 %, in 2005, but with a decrease, about 33-32 % in 2008, 2009 and 2010.

About tertiary-type 5B (first-time graduates), OECD average had almost the same way, with a percentage of nearly 10 % from 1995 to 2010, so as EU21, with a percentage of 8 % from 1995 to 2010. New Zealand got the highest development, form 12 % in 1995 to 26 % in 2010. First available data for Italy were in 2005, with a percentage of 1 %, the same for 2010 too.

ESS 2-2012.indd 135 8-11-2012 11:56:53

Table A3.2. Trends in tertiary graduation rates (1995-2010)

Sum of age-specific graduation rates, by programme destination

		Tertiary-type 5A (first-time graduates)						Tertiary-type 5B (first-time graduates)					
		1995	2000	2005	2008	2009	2010	1995	2000	2005	2008	2009	2010
		(1)	(2)	(7)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(18)	(22)	(23)	(24)
OECD	Australia	m	36	50	49	50	**m**	m	m	m	16	16	**m**
	Austria	10	15	20	25	29	**30**	m	m	8	8	10	**12**
	Belgium	m	m	m	m	m	**m**	m	m	m	m	m	**m**
	Canada	27	27	29	37	36	**m**	m	m	m	29	29	**m**
	Chile	m	m	m	m	m	**m**	m	m	m	m	m	**m**
	Czech Republic	13	14	23	36	38	**38**	6	5	6	5	4	**5**
	Denmark	25	37	46	47	50	**50**	8	10	10	11	11	**9**
	Estonia	m	m	m	m	m	**m**	m	m	m	m	m	**m**
	Finland	21	40	47	63	44	**49**	34	7	n	n	n	**n**
	France	m	m	m	m	m	**m**	m	m	m	m	m	**m**
	Germany[1]	14	18	20	25	28	**30**	13	11	11	10	14	**14**
	Greece	14	15	25	m	m	**m**	5	6	11	m	m	**m**
	Hungary	m	m	33	30	31	**31**	m	m	4	4	5	**6**
	Iceland	20	33	56	57	51	**60**	10	5	4	4	2	**2**
	Ireland	m	30	38	46	47	**47**	m	15	24	26	26	**22**
	Israel	m	m	35	36	37	**37**	m	m	m	m	m	**m**
	Italy	m	19	41	33	33	**32**	m	n	1	1	1	**1**
	Japan	25	29	37	39	40	**40**	30	30	28	27	26	**25**
	Korea	m	m	m	m	m	**m**	m	m	m	m	m	**m**
	Luxembourg	m	m	m	m	m	**m**	m	m	m	m	m	**m**
	Mexico	m	m	17	18	19	**20**	m	m	1	1	1	**1**
	Netherlands	29	35	42	41	42	**42**	m	m	n	n	n	**n**
	New Zealand	33	50	51	48	50	**47**	12	17	21	21	24	**26**
	Norway	26	37	41	41	41	**42**	6	6	2	1	n	**n**
	Poland	m	34	47	50	50	**55**	m	m	n	n	n	**1**
	Portugal	15	29	32	45	40	**40**	6	8	9	2	1	**n**
	Slovak Republic	15	m	30	58	62	**49**	1	2	2	1	1	**1**
	Slovenia	m	m	18	20	27	**29**	m	m	24	26	26	**26**
	Spain[2]	24	29	30	27	27	**30**	2	8	15	14	15	**16**
	Sweden	24	28	38	40	36	**37**	m	4	5	6	6	**6**
	Switzerland	9	12	27	32	31	**31**	13	14	8	19	19	**16**
	Turkey	6	9	11	20	21	**23**	2	m	m	13	15	**19**
	United Kingdom	m	42	47	48	48	**51**	m	7	11	12	12	**12**
	United States	33	34	34	37	38	**38**	9	8	10	10	11	**11**
	OECD average	20	28	34	39	39	**39**	11	9	9	11	11	**10**
	OECD average for countries with 1995 and 2010 data	20	27				**40**	11	10				**10**
	EU21 average	18	27	34	40	39	**40**	9	7	8	8	8	**8**
Other G20	Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	**m**	m	m	m	m	m	**m**
	Brazil	m	10	m	m	m	**m**	m	m	m	m	m	**m**
	China	m	m	m	m	m	**m**	m	m	m	m	m	**m**
	India	m	m	m	m	m	**m**	m	m	m	m	m	**m**
	Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	**m**	m	m	m	m	m	**m**
	Russian Federation	m	m	m	m	m	**m**	m	m	m	m	m	**m**
	Saudi Arabia	11	13	18	21	19	**20**	n	3	5	6	6	**8**
	South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	**m**	m	m	m	m	m	**m**
	G20 average	m	m	m	m	m	**m**	m	m	m	m	m	**m**

Note: Years 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2006, 2007 are available for consultation on line (see *StatLink* below).
Up to 2004, graduation rates at the tertiary-type A or B levels were calculated on a gross basis. From 2005 and for countries with available data, graduation rates are calculated as net graduation rates (i.e. as the sum of age-specific graduation rates). Please refer to Annex 1 for information on the method used to calculate graduation rates (gross rates versus net rates) and the corresponding typical ages.

1. Break in time series between 2008 and 2009 due to a partial reallocation of vocational programmes into ISCED 2 and ISCED 5B.

2. Break in time series following methodological change in 2008.

Source: OECD. Saudi Arabia: Observatory on Higher Education. See Annex 3 for notes (*www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012*).

Please refer to the Reader's Guide for information concerning the symbols replacing missing data.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932664575

Source: OECD, EAG 2012

ESS 2-2012.indd 136 8-11-2012 11:56:54

Besides in Table A7.1 a, we wish to point out the data of the indicator "Employment rates, by educational attainment and gender (2010) (*Number of 25-64 year-olds in employment as a percentage of the population aged 25-64)*" and in a particular way the positive relation between education and employment.

Data showed below are very interesting because they overall confirm that employment rates increase with increasing educational level attainment, both men and women, although women rates are generally lower than men.

ESS 2-2012.indd 137 8-11-2012 11:56:54

Table A7.1a. [1/2] Employment rates, by educational attainment and gender (2010)

Number of 25-64 year-olds in employment as a percentage of the population aged 25-64

				Upper secondary education				Tertiary education		
		Pre-primary and primary education	Lower secondary education	ISCED 3C Short	ISCED 3C Long/3B	ISCED 3A	Post-secondary non-tertiary education	Type B	Type A and advanced research programmes	All levels of education
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
OECD	Australia	Men	67.0	81.1	a	88.8	85.3	91.7	88.3	90.3	85.9
		Women	37.3	60.1	a	74.1	66.3	80.7	75.4	80.9	69.6
	Austria	Men	x(2)	63.8	79.3	81.2	77.2	87.9	86.8	90.9	81.2
		Women	x(2)	50.3	64.5	71.4	73.5	82.4	79.7	82.3	70.0
	Belgium	Men	46.2	67.5	a	81.7	81.1	86.7	85.4	87.6	76.5
		Women	27.6	47.1	a	64.3	66.8	77.8	80.2	83.5	64.0
	Canada	Men	53.4	66.7	a	x(5)	77.1	80.9	84.3	85.1	79.4
		Women	31.8	51.4	a	x(5)	67.4	72.3	77.8	79.2	71.7
	Chile	Men	78.6	87.0	x(5)	88.4	88.2	a	88.4	86.5	86.3
		Women	39.0	46.3	x(5)	57.6	56.3	a	69.1	72.7	56.2
	Czech Republic	Men	c	54.4	a	80.8	87.1	x(5)	x(8)	91.0	83.0
		Women	c	39.0	a	59.6	69.2	x(5)	x(8)	75.0	63.7
	Denmark	Men	73.2	69.5	75.4	81.2	79.3	c	86.7	87.8	80.2
		Women	41.3	55.7	67.6	77.4	74.7	c	80.1	84.9	74.5
	Estonia	Men	c	49.7	a	69.8	73.3	70.2	74.2	84.4	70.7
		Women	c	45.8	a	62.4	66.6	61.9	77.1	80.6	69.4
	Finland	Men	47.2	68.3	a	a	75.9	90.4	82.0	89.3	76.3
		Women	41.3	55.6	a	a	71.3	92.5	81.5	82.5	73.0
	France	Men	47.4	71.0	a	78.0	80.8	c	88.0	86.2	76.3
		Women	36.6	57.9	a	68.6	72.0	c	82.2	79.9	66.9
	Germany	Men	56.8	68.6	a	81.3	63.4	86.3	88.9	90.9	81.8
		Women	35.8	51.8	a	71.3	55.4	80.3	83.7	82.3	70.5
	Greece	Men	70.6	79.5	82.0	83.3	79.2	83.3	81.2	85.8	79.3
		Women	36.8	46.8	63.9	54.5	50.0	62.5	72.3	76.2	53.9
	Hungary	Men	20.0	46.6	a	68.6	75.6	77.4	82.2	83.1	69.4
		Women	12.4	34.3	a	57.1	61.9	65.3	81.2	75.1	57.6
	Iceland	Men	78.1	80.5	84.6	89.0	76.4	87.5	91.0	91.3	85.8
		Women	c	71.0	83.6	80.4	71.6	81.7	91.6	86.7	79.1
	Ireland	Men	45.9	63.5	66.2	a	74.9	69.9	81.9	86.1	72.0
		Women	25.8	42.3	54.3	a	59.3	60.6	74.3	81.6	61.5
	Israel	Men	53.8	65.8	a	80.1	73.7	a	83.7	87.0	76.8
		Women	20.3	43.3	a	66.9	63.5	a	73.9	82.2	65.7
	Italy	Men	48.4	73.2	77.2	82.0	81.7	84.6	80.8	84.3	75.8
		Women	15.4	39.6	55.1	59.3	63.8	68.7	70.7	73.7	51.4
	Japan	Men	x(5)	x(5)	x(5)	x(5)	85.7	a	91.6	92.0	88.5
		Women	x(5)	x(5)	x(5)	x(5)	61.2	a	65.8	68.4	63.7
	Korea	Men	73.1	80.2	a	86.1	83.2	a	89.3	89.0	85.5
		Women	55.8	58.3	a	57.0	56.7	a	59.4	60.5	58.0
	Luxembourg	Men	70.3	78.5	78.9	79.5	83.7	76.8	89.5	91.5	83.6
		Women	54.2	48.5	53.0	56.2	67.2	72.6	78.1	77.8	65.1
	Mexico	Men	86.0	90.7	a	89.3	90.3	a	86.4	88.2	88.2
		Women	39.9	47.7	a	57.3	55.5	a	70.3	71.7	49.6
	Netherlands	Men	64.8	78.3	x(4)	81.0	87.8	83.3	84.9	90.2	84.0
		Women	37.4	54.0	x(4)	69.6	78.4	76.0	76.9	85.7	70.7
	New Zealand	Men	x(2)	73.3	86.5	86.4	88.4	90.2	88.7	91.6	86.2
		Women	x(2)	57.7	72.1	70.9	74.4	76.9	76.7	80.1	72.4
	Norway	Men	c	68.4	a	85.3	80.8	85.7	90.3	91.8	83.8
		Women	c	60.3	a	78.8	75.8	82.6	94.6	89.2	79.1

1. Year of reference 2009.

Source: OECD. See Annex 3 for a description of ISCED-97 levels, ISCED-97 country mappings and national data sources (*www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012*).

Please refer to the Reader's Guide for information concerning the symbols replacing missing data.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932663050

ESS 2-2012.indd 138 8-11-2012 11:56:54

Table A7.1a. [2/2] Employment rates, by educational attainment and gender (2010)

Number of 25-64 year-olds in employment as a percentage of the population aged 25-64

				Upper secondary education				Tertiary education		
		Pre-primary and primary education	Lower secondary education	ISCED 3C Short	ISCED 3C Long/3B	ISCED 3A	Post-secondary non-tertiary education	Type B	Type A and advanced research programmes	All levels of education
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
OECD	Poland	Men	x(2)	49.6	a	70.9	78.2	79.5	x(8)	88.8	74.3
		Women	x(2)	30.9	a	50.7	58.7	65.7	x(8)	82.0	60.1
	Portugal	Men	72.4	82.8	x(5)	x(5)	83.5	86.9	x(8)	85.9	78.1
		Women	56.8	70.2	x(5)	x(5)	76.5	70.7	x(8)	85.1	67.7
	Slovak Republic	Men	c	39.9	x(4)	73.0	82.3	x(5)	78.4	88.3	76.0
		Women	c	26.1	x(4)	53.3	67.8	x(5)	66.5	78.1	61.0
	Slovenia	Men	54.8	64.3	a	73.7	78.4	a	84.7	93.5	76.4
		Women	23.0	45.0	a	65.3	71.0	a	82.1	88.6	68.8
	Spain	Men	52.8	70.1	a	77.8	74.4	c	80.8	84.4	71.9
		Women	31.9	49.3	a	61.3	62.3	c	70.4	78.6	57.3
	Sweden	Men	61.8	78.5	a	x(5)	85.2	87.4	86.4	90.1	84.8
		Women	35.5	59.9	a	x(5)	78.1	76.9	83.1	88.9	78.4
	Switzerland	Men	68.9	78.3	87.0	87.2	78.1	87.5	95.3	91.0	87.9
		Women	57.4	62.3	74.3	74.5	67.7	80.6	88.8	81.1	74.9
	Turkey	Men	71.9	76.4	a	81.0	77.9	a	x(8)	83.2	75.7
		Women	24.4	21.2	a	30.9	27.0	a	x(8)	64.4	29.3
	United Kingdom	Men	c	53.7	75.7	82.4	83.9	c	87.2	88.7	81.2
		Women	c	34.2	59.2	73.0	72.6	c	78.3	80.9	68.8
	United States	Men	63.6	59.8	x(5)	x(5)	72.2	x(5)	78.6	86.1	75.7
		Women	39.5	42.8	x(5)	x(5)	63.5	x(5)	74.3	76.8	66.9
	OECD average	Men	60.3	69.1	79.3	81.0	80.1	83.7	85.5	88.3	80.0
		Women	35.7	48.7	64.7	63.8	65.4	74.4	77.2	79.3	65.0
	EU21 average	Men	54.2	65.3	76.4	78.0	79.4	82.2	83.9	88.0	77.8
		Women	34.1	46.9	59.6	63.3	67.5	72.4	77.7	81.1	65.4
Other G 20	Argentina		m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Brazil[1]	Men	83.4	87.4	x(5)	x(5)	88.8	a	x(8)	91.3	86.3
		Women	51.8	58.9	x(5)	x(5)	67.7	a	x(8)	81.5	61.2
	China		m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	India		m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Indonesia		m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Russian Federation		m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Saudi Arabia		m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	South Africa		m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	G20 average		m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

1. Year of reference 2009.

Source: OECD. See Annex 3 for a description of ISCED-97 levels, ISCED-97 country mappings and national data sources (*www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012*).

Please refer to the Reader's Guide for information concerning the symbols replacing missing data.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932665050

Source: OECD, EAG 2012

Another interesting and innovative indicator is about "Additional years of life expectancy at age 30, by level of educational attainment and gender (2010)", as shown in Table A11.1.

We can observe that data, overall, confirm additional years of life expectancy at age 30 progressively rising with higher level of educational attain-

ESS 2-2012.indd 139 8-11-2012 11:56:54

ment. Higher additional years are expected for women than men. Italy, at least for this indicator, reached a placement above the OECD average and European Union 21 average.

Table A11.1. Additional years of life expectancy at age 30, by level of educational attainment and gender (2010)

		Men			Women			Total		
		Below upper secondary education	Upper secondary education	Tertiary education	Below upper secondary education	Upper secondary education	Tertiary education	Below upper secondary education	Upper secondary education	Tertiary education
OECD	Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Austria	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Belgium	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Canada	45.9	48.3	50.9	51.6	53.6	55.2	48.8	51.0	53.1
	Chile	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Czech Republic	34.1	45.8	50.9	49.7	51.4	54.3	43.8	48.6	52.6
	Denmark	44.9	48.3	50.6	49.8	52.5	53.6	47.4	50.2	52.2
	Estonia	34.2	42.6	47.7	46.1	50.5	54.6	39.1	46.7	52.1
	Finland	45.3	47.7	51.0	52.1	54.2	55.3	48.4	51.0	53.3
	France	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Germany	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Greece	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Hungary	34.3	44.3	47.4	46.1	50.9	51.5	40.8	47.5	49.5
	Iceland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Ireland	45.3	49.2	51.7	50.2	53.4	55.3	47.2	51.2	53.4
	Israel	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Italy	48.3	53.0	53.2	54.2	56.7	56.9	51.3	55.0	55.1
	Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Korea	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Luxembourg	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Mexico	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Netherlands	47.9	50.1	52.3	50.0	55.3	56.3	50.6	52.6	54.5
	New Zealand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Norway	46.6	50.2	52.4	52.0	54.4	55.3	49.4	52.3	53.9
	Poland	37.3	43.6	49.3	49.0	51.4	53.8	43.0	47.4	51.7
	Portugal	47.1	48.7	50.0	53.3	53.7	54.3	50.2	51.1	52.3
	Slovak Republic	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Slovenia	40.4	48.0	50.9	50.9	54.3	55.0	46.3	51.0	53.0
	Spain	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Sweden	48.4	50.5	52.3	52.5	54.1	55.4	50.3	52.3	54.0
	Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Turkey	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	United Kingdom	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	United States	47.2	52.1	55.4	47.8	52.4	53.4	47.4	52.3	54.4
	OECD average	43.1	48.2	51.1	50.3	53.3	54.7	46.9	50.7	53.0
	EU21 average	42.3	47.6	50.6	50.3	53.2	54.7	46.5	50.4	52.8
Other G20	Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Indonesia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Russian Federation	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	G20 average	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

Note: Figures for Canada are based on the average between 1991 and 2006. Weighted average of "Level 3 (short of a university bachelor's degree)" and "Level 4: University degree (bachelor's or higher)" are used to calculate the figures for Tertiary education. Figures for Ireland are calculated based on the weighted average of figures for ages 20 and 35. Census (2006) is used to calculate the total figure. Figures for Italy are based on 2008. Figures for the Netherlands are based on the average between 2007-10. Figures for Slovania are based on 2009. Figures for the United States are based on 2005 using adjusted, revised state with 2003 degree-based education items presented in tables 8 and 9 of *http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/series/sr_02/sr02_151.pdf*.
Sources: EUROSTAT (2010): *http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/population/data/database*; Statistics Canada (2012): *http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/home-accueil?lang=eng&p2=50*; FitzGerald, Byrne and Znuderl (2011) for Ireland; CDC (2010): *http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/series/sr_02/sr02_151.pdf* for the United States. See Annex 3 for notes (*www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012*).
Please refer to the Reader's Guide for information concerning the symbols replacing missing data.
StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932665753

Source: OECD, EAG 2012

ESS 2-2012.indd 140 8-11-2012 11:56:54

From the data shown above, we can briefly note that Italy, in many indicators, ranked far below the OECD average and European Union average. So, pedagogists, policy makers, all stakeholders will be confronted a lot to do, many challenges in order to improve both processes and outcomes.

In conclusion, these authoritative contributions and studies have allowed us to establish and to re-launch the right to the prospect of lifelong learning as essential to the quality of life of people and in order to legitimize stable groundwork for a pedagogy of lifelong learning and education and to develop it. A way that combines the different places and times of the path of human growth and education and that looks at the person and at his/her realization that always hides behind any disadvantage, discomfort or disability.

Certainly one of the places to be re-evaluated are definitely the Universities, which can and must become an important and strategic site for lifelong education for all, so even (or, perhaps, especially) for people with disabilities.

Authors' Presentations: Gabriella Aleandri is Associate Professor at Department of Education, Cultural Heritage and Tourism, University of Macerata, Italy. Her main fields of interest and research are: lifelong and lifewide learning and education, adult education, educational policies, social education.
Catia Giaconi is Assistant Professor at Department of Education, Cultural Heritage and Tourism, University of Macerata, Italy. His main fields of interest and research are special need and education, special need and adult education.

References

Aleandri, G. (2003), *I sistemi formativi nella prospettiva dell'economia globale. Per una pedagogia del lifelong learning*, Roma, Armando.

Aleandri, G., Girotti, L. (2010), Educational research and Policy-making. Questions, Challenges and Perspectives for a pedagogical debate, *Education Sciences & Society*, (2), 64-117.

Aleandri, G. (2011), *L'educazione permanente nella prospettiva del lifelong e lifewide learning*, Roma, Armando.

Aleandri, G., Girotti, L. (2012), Lifelong learning and training: a never ending challenge and choice for educational system (paper WCES 2012), *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences.*

Bondioli, A, Ferrari, A.M. (a cura di) (2000), *Manuale di valutazione del contesto educativo*, Milano, F. Angeli.

ESS 2-2012.indd 141 8-11-2012 11:56:54

Brown, T. I. (ed.) (1988), *Quality of Life for Handicapped People*, Crom Helm, Beckenham.
Canevaro, A. (1999), *Alla ricerca degli indicatori della qualità dell'integrazione*, in Ianes D., Tortello M. (Ed.), *La qualità dell'integrazione scolastica,* Trento, Erickson.
Canevaro, A., Ianes, D. (2005), *Dalla parte dell'Educazione*, Trento, Erickson.
Canevaro, A. (2006a), *Le logiche del confine e del sentiero*, Trento, Erickson.
(2006b), *Discorso conclusivo.* In Lascioli A., Onder M. (a cura), *ATTI del Simposio internazionale di pedagogia speciale,* Verona, Libreria Editrice Universitaria.
— (a cura di) (2007), *L'integrazione scolastica degli. alunni con disabilità,* Trento, Erickson.
CERI-OECD (2007), *Evidence in Education. Linking research and policy*, Paris, OECD.
— (2008), *Innovating to learn, Learning to Innovate*, Paris, OECD.
Cole, R. (2001), «Nuovi orizzonti del miglioramento continuo», in T. Conti e P. De Risi (a cura di), *Manuale della qualità*, Milano, Il Sole 24 Ore.
Cottini, L, Fedeli, D. (2007), "Invecchiamento e qualità della vita. La QdV come quadro concettuale per l'analisi e l'intervento nel decadimento cognitivo delle persone con ritardo mentale", in *AJMR American Journal on Mental Retardation* – ed. italiana – vol. 5, n. 3, 375-382.
Cottini, L. (2007), "*Il progetto di vita per la persona in situazione di disabilità mentale: aiuti di qualità quando l'età avanza*", in Canevaro A. (a cura di), *L'integrazione scolastica degli alunni con disabilità,* Trento, Erickson.
— (ed.) (a cura di), *Disabilità mentale e avanzamento d'età. Un modello di intervento per una vita di qualità*, Milano, F. Angeli.
Crispiani, P., Giaconi, C. (2007), "Indicatori di qualità dell'integrazione scolastica dei disabili", in Canevaro A. (a cura), *Integrazione scolastica degli alunni con disabilità. Trent'anni di inclusione nella scuola italiana*, Trento, Erickson.
— (2009), *Qualità di vita ed integrazione scolastica*, Trento, Erickson.
Cummins, R. (1997), Self-Rated Quality of Life Scales for People with an Intellectual Disability; A Review, in *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disability*, n. 10, 199-216.
D'alonzo, L. (2003), *Pedagogia speciale*, Brescia, La Scuola.
Ferris, C., Bramston, P. (1994), Quality of life in the elderly: a contribution to its understanding, *Australian Journal on Ageing*, 13, 120-123.
Felce, D. (1997), Defining and applying the concept of quality of life, *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 41, 126-135.
Felce, D., Perry, J. (1995), Quality of Life: Its Definition and Measurement, in *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, n. 16, 51-74.
Giaconi, C. (2012), *Nella Comunità di Capodarco di Fermo*, Roma, Armando.
Gurland, B., Katz, S. (1992), *The outcomes of psychiatric disorder in the elderly: relevance to quality of life*, in J.E. Birren, R.B. Sloane; E.D. Cohen (Eds.), Handbook of mental health and aging. Los Angeles: Academic Press, 230-248.

ESS 2-2012.indd 142 8-11-2012 11:56:54

Heal, L. V., Chadsey Rusch, J. (1985), The Life Style Satisfaction Scale in *Mental Retardation*, n. 6.
Ianes, D. (2003), Come cambiano i bisogni: dall'integrazione degli alunni con disabilità all'inclusione dei molti alunni con bisogni educativi speciali, *Rassegna*, Bolzano, Istituto Pedagogico Provinciale, anno IX.
Levriero, A. (2001), *La Qualità nei servizi per disabili. Modelli operativi*, Brescia, Vannini.
Mckenna, K. (1993), Quality of Life: A Question of Functional Outcomes or the Fulfilment of Life Plans, in *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal,* n. 40.
Medeghini, R. (2006), *Dalla qualità dell'integrazione all'inclusione*. *Analisi degli indicatori di qualità per l'inclusione,* Brescia, Vannini.
OECD (2012), *Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators – 2012 Edition*, Paris, OECD (EAG 2012).
OMS (1993), *Quality of Life Reserarch,* USA.
OMS (2002), *ICF. Classificazione Internazionale del Funzionamento, della Disabilità e della Salute*, Ginevra 2001, Trento, Erickson.
Schalock, R. L., Keith, K. (1993), *Quality of Life Questionnaire,* IDS Publishing, Worthington, Ohio.
Schalock, R. L., Verdugo Alonso, M. A. (2006), *Manuale di qualità della vita. Modelli e pratiche di intervento,* Usa 2002, trad. it. Brescia, Vannini.
Soresi, S., Nota, L. (2002), La valutazione della qualità della vita di persone adulte con ritardo mentale – QdV-RM, in *Giornale italiano delle disabilità*, n. 2,10-26.
Soresi, S. (2006), "Introduzione" a Schalock R. L., Verdugo Alonso M. A. (2006), *Manuale di qualità della vita. Modelli e pratiche di intervento,* Usa 2002, Brescia, Vannini.

ESS 2-2012.indd 143 8-11-2012 11:56:54