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PREFACE

This literature review provides an overview of the main lines of discussion and enquiry around social capital and adult learning and literacy. It was written as a background paper for The Centre for Literacy’s 2010 Summer Institute on workplace literacy and essential skills (LES). The Institute focus was “what counts and why”, an effort to better understand the outcomes of workplace LES initiatives and how to measure them. Initial research turned up considerable debate about human and social capital outcomes of learning and how these might relate to workplace education settings.

Most of the literature on social capital in connection to adult learning and literacy has appeared in the last decade. This review surveys that literature summarizing findings and analyses from major studies. It describes and defines the concept and its growing importance, and focuses on the social capital outcomes of programs and their measurement.

Research was conducted between April 20 and May 10, 2010. Most sources consulted were available online at the time of writing (see Bibliography for web links). The review is divided into seven sections, plus concluding remarks, three appendices and a bibliography.
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LITERATURE REVIEW
Social Capital Outcomes of Adult Learning and Literacy Initiatives
How Do We Measure Them?

INTRODUCTION

The literature on social capital as it relates to education in general looks at the various outcomes for individuals, their families, communities and society. Recently policymakers internationally have focused on the concept of social capital in the adult learning and literacy fields, but its specific connection with workplace LES remains largely unexplored. Workplace LES programs have long reported so-called soft outcomes, especially confidence, and other identity shifts, and studies have linked these outcomes to the development of social capital. Recent work on social capital in adult learning and literacy contexts suggests that adults who acquire skills through learning or training interventions need social capital in order to apply or transfer the skills into everyday use. This finding has potential implications for workplace LES, in terms of both research and practice.

After examining definitions of social capital and its relationship to human capital, this review looks at some of the benefits of social capital identified in the literature and how human capital and social capital approaches inform education policies. It identifies research that shows enhanced social capital as an outcome of adult literacy and learning programs and discusses how this outcome can benefit employers. Finally, the review discusses how social capital relates to current essential skills frameworks internationally, and describes various recent attempts to measure social capital outcomes of adult literacy and learning programs.

1) WHAT IS SOCIAL CAPITAL?

Human and Social Capital — Definitions
The terms social capital and human capital, although often linked, refer to different concepts. Human capital refers to the knowledge and abilities that individuals possess, while social capital refers broadly to the social connections and understandings between people that enable them to work together, live together and learn from each other, i.e. resources of the collectivity. Taken together, these resources, held by individuals, communities and society, are essential to individual and collective wellbeing and progress.

Human capital, the older of the two concepts, dates back to the work of Adam Smith in the late eighteenth century. As currently used, it was first developed in the mid-twentieth century by American economists in the context of a post-industrial economy focused on services, advanced technology, and value-added processes (Balatti and Falk 2002: 282; Lo Bianco 2005: 6; Schuller 2004: 14). Common definitions of human capital today refer to the abilities, skills and knowledge possessed by individuals that allow them to be productive, function effectively economically and socially, and contribute to economic progress (Balatti and Falk 2002: 282; Schuller 2004: 14; Hartley and Horne 2006: 7).
In the past decade, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has defined human capital more broadly as: “the knowledge, skills, competencies and attributes embodied in individuals that facilitate the creation of personal, social and economic wellbeing” (Healy and Côté 2001: 18). Echoing the OECD, Feinstein and Sabates (2007: 4) of the Centre for Research on the Wider Benefits of Learning (UK) specify that human capital is “an immediate outcome of learning” that includes “a wide range of cognitive skills, technical and vocational skills, social and communication skills, resilience and self-concepts”.

Social capital was originally theorized in classic texts of political economy and sociology by Alexis de Tocqueville, Émile Durkheim and Max Weber (Healy and Côté 2001: 40-41; Schuller 2004: 16-17). Its current form dates to the latter decades of the twentieth century (Balatti and Falk 2002: 282). The growing interest in social capital and its application to understanding and promoting wellbeing is reflected in a burgeoning academic literature across disciplines and policy research and documents (PC 2003: 5; Schuller 2004: 17).

The difficulty of defining social capital is a recurring theme in the literature, where there are many debates about its meaning (Harper 2001: 3; Hartley and Horne 2006: 6). This is largely due to the differing interests and methodological approaches of the disciplines in which the concept is studied, including anthropology, sociology, economics and political science (Healy and Côté 2001: 40). However, the definition below adopted by the OECD in 2001 is now widely employed as a “common basis for international comparability” (Edwards 2004: 5):

The networks together with shared norms, values and understandings facilitate co-operation within or among groups. Networks relate to the objective behaviour of actors who enter into associative activity. Shared norms, values and understandings relate to the subjective dispositions and attitudes of individuals and groups, as well as sanctions and rules governing behaviour, which are widely shared (Healy and Côté 2001: 41).

While human capital relates to individuals and their attributes, social capital relates to connections between people — to family, friendships, the workplace, the neighbourhood and broader community, church, school, and local organizations (social, cultural, health, governmental) and institutions — and what these connections can potentially offer to “help people to advance their interests by co-operating with others” (Field 2005). Key elements of social capital are shared norms, values and understandings anchored in and promoting trust, tolerance, goodwill, reciprocity and a desire to act in a mutually beneficial and supportive manner (McEwin 2000; Healy and Côté 2001: 41; Falk 2001: 316; PC 2003: 9; Lo Bianco 2005: 6; Tett and Maclachlan 2007: 151).

2) THE BENEFITS OF SOCIAL CAPITAL

Communities and Society
Social capital has been described as the “oil” that keeps the economic and social wheels of society rolling smoothly (Falk 2001: 316), or the “glue” that holds society together by facilitating cooperation within or between groups of people (Grootaert 1998: iii). A number of studies have linked social capital to many social, economic and political benefits. It is increasingly viewed as “integral to healthy, productive societies” (Westell 2005: 17).
The work of political scientist Robert Putnam (*Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, Simon and Schuster, 2000) posits a critical connection between social capital on the one hand, and social inclusion, civic engagement and overall communal health and democracy on the other. His work has led to numerous studies investigating the role of social capital in contributing to more effective government, promoting better health and reducing crime in communities (PC 2003: viii-xl, 24-50). Another strand of research highlights importance of social capital to economic progress, underscoring that “the way in which the economic actors interact and organize themselves to generate growth and development” is what generates value from national wealth embodied in natural, produced and human capital (Grootaert 1998: 1; Healy and Côté 2001: 39).

**Individuals**

Discussions of the benefits of social capital have also been strongly influenced by the analyses of sociologists Paul Bourdieu (*Outline of a Theory of Practice*, 1972) and James Coleman (*Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital*, 1988). Their work focused on the individual’s relationship to social capital, presenting it as a resource that individuals can accumulate and use to their benefit and advantage. Conversely, the lack of social capital can hold people back, preventing them from achieving their goals and adversely affecting their quality of life. For Bourdieu, social capital was a source of “material or symbolic profits” promoting social mobility, and was a critical resource for individuals, families, groups and social classes (Preston 2004: 121). For Coleman, “social capital… is productive, makes things possible, more doable… much more can be accomplished” (Coleman 1998: S98-100).

**Learning**

Coleman’s analysis of social capital also showed its importance for education. In his conception, social capital facilitates learning by providing learners with access to the knowledge and skills, or human capital of others. In other words, human capital needs social capital to fully develop and be passed on to others (Coleman 1988: S109-12).

Since Coleman’s pioneering work, further scholarship has advanced the idea that social capital is important to learning and therefore warrants study. In 2001, the OECD called for more research “clarifying the links between human and social capital to explore how social networks can promote the education of individuals and how education can promote social capital” (Healy and Côté 2001: 70; Balatti and Falk 2002: 296-7). A 2006 Canadian study that brought together academics from a variety of disciplines to examine “the factors affecting and outcomes associated with the development of human capital” concluded that, “[i]t seems clear that the density and quality of social networks are key influences on both the acquisition and utilization of human capital” (Saunders 2006: 9). Recent studies on the social outcomes of adult learning and literacy interventions further explore this crucial link and have generated strong evidence confirming that social capital is an important component of the learning process.1

---

1 See the discussion of these studies on p.10 of this review (“Human and Social Capital and the Acquisition and Transfer of Knowledge and Skills”).
3) HUMAN CAPITAL, SOCIAL CAPITAL AND THE LEARNING AGENDAS OF KNOWLEDGE-BASED SOCIETIES AND ECONOMIES

Policy Interest
The growing policy interest and research into social capital are connected to global concerns about issues of social cohesion, equality, justice and educational achievement in increasingly diverse, multicultural societies, as well as issues of civic engagement, political stability and community wellbeing.

Influential international organizations such as the OECD and the World Bank have commissioned extensive research into various aspects of social capital (PC 2003: 1, 5; Andersen and Larsen 2006: 141-42), while policy documents have begun to acknowledge these concerns (Kerka 2000; PC 2003: 1, 5; Andersen and Larsen 2006: 141-42). The UK government’s latest statement on its Skills for Life strategy (DfIUS 2009: 3) is an excellent example. Presenting at the 2010 Summer Institute, Jan Eldred of the UK’s National Institute of Adult Continuing Education (NIACE) underscored the growing global shift towards looking beyond mere “numbers, dollars or economic performance” to attitudes that help promote social engagement, community involvement and citizenship. According to Eldred, this shift catapults the vital issue of social capital to the forefront and points to bringing human and social capital together as a way to increase happiness generally, and, from a more purely economic perspective, improve performance and boost productivity.

In Australia, the Productivity Commission and the Bureau of Statistics have conducted intensive work collecting and analyzing data on social capital (PC 2003: 5; Edwards 2004: 9-10). In 2004, the Australian Bureau of Statistics produced “a broad conceptual framework for statistics on social capital, as well as a set of possible indicators for measuring aspects of social capital” (Edwards 2004: vii). This framework, which has informed recent studies of social capital and adult learning and literacy in Australia, is discussed in Section 7 of this review.

Challenging the Dominance of the Human Capital Model
For decades the dominant policy approach to education and learning has focused exclusively on developing human capital as a means of achieving specific economic outcomes. The newer policy interest in social capital represents a shift towards a more nuanced approach in which human and social capital are understood as mutually reinforcing, and a broader range of outcomes is seen as important.

Human Capital Theory of Education and Learning
Described as “the most influential economic theory of education” since the 1960s (Fitzsimmons and Peters 1994), the human capital model, as interpreted and applied in industrialized countries for decades, views learning as primarily a tool to promote economic prosperity and growth (Kerka 2000; Schuller 2004: 14; Wolf, Jenkins and Vignoles 2006: 535-6; Feinstein and Sabates 2007: 4; Cruikshank 2008: 51-2, 59). In this understanding, the link between education and economic outcomes (Desjardins and Schuller 2006: 11) is made through human capital development, i.e. the acquisition by individuals of all ages of knowledge and skills deemed necessary for employers to remain productive and for states to achieve a competitive edge in the global “knowledge wars” (Balatti and Falk 2002: 281; Cruikshank 2008: 51-2).
**Human Capital and Adult Learning and Literacy**

In the areas of adult learning and literacy, as well as workplace LES more specifically, the thrust of educational policies informed by human capital theory has been to promote “the continuous upgrading of skills… as an investment in human capital” (Kerka 2000) aimed at generating economic outcomes at the micro (employer) and macro (state) levels. Workplace LES is viewed as basically a “tool to boost productivity and bolster the economy” (READ Society 2009: 7; Page 2009: 6). In Canada, lifelong learning policies, in distinct contrast to earlier adult education philosophy and practice, have increasingly been tied to the development of skills to meet the challenges of the new global economy and rapidly changing technologies (Cruikshank 2008: 59). This emphasis on “perpetual training” of the workforce, on the acquisition of literacy, numeracy and technical skills, has also driven policy since the 1990s in the UK (DfIUS 2009: 3), the US (ASTD 2003: 5, 7, 10), New Zealand (Fitzsimmons 1994), and Australia (Balatti, Black and Falk 2006: 9).

**Critique**

Critics of these human capital/economic outcomes-driven educational policies have characterized them as overly narrow, selective and simplistic in their approach, reducing individuals — defined exclusively as workers, producers and consumers — to mere economic enablers. They have also criticized the model for divorcing the learning needs and experiences of individuals from the non-economic, personal and social aspects of everyday life related to the many roles they play beyond the workplace (Kerka 2000; Desjardins 2003: 11-12; Duke, Osborne and Wilson 2005), and for favouring learning activities “that can show a visible and quick return” (Kerka 2000; Cruikshank 2008: 67-8).

These dissenting voices call for “a more holistic, imaginative and generous attitude to education’s benefits, beyond qualifications, certifications [and] economic benefits…” (Schuller, Hammond, Preston 2004: 192), or a “new balance in making policy and measuring what is achieved” (Duke, Osborne and Wilson 2005), acknowledging that education and learning often produce impacts or “ripple effects” in learners’ homes, workplaces and communities. These impacts are often referred to in the literature as the “wider benefits” of learning (Benseman and Tobias 2003: 129).

**Social Capital — Education, Wellbeing and Social Capital**

It is against this backdrop that social capital has recently entered into policy discourse. Researchers are increasingly noting that human capital also produces non-economic benefits such as improved physical or mental health, less crime, greater social inclusion and integration, and healthier communities (Healy and Côté 2001: 31-6; Desjardins 2003: 11-12; Saunders 2006: 9; Desjardins and Schuller 2006: 11). All these elements of wellbeing have been linked in the literature to social capital and are evident in the work of influential agencies and projects, some of which are described below.

**The SOL Project - OECD**

The OECD has done important work to help build a “consensus that the links between personal, social and economic wellbeing and education need to be better understood and communicated to policy makers and the wider public” (Desjardins and Schuller 2006: 12). In 2005, the OECD’s Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI) in cooperation with the OECD INES Network B (responsible for devising indicators on the outcomes of education) launched
“Measuring the Social Outcomes of Learning” (SOL), a long-term project designed to inform economic and social policy related to education and lifelong learning.

The project, still underway, involves in-depth investigations into “the nature of the link between learning and wellbeing, and how such linkages, if warranted, could be used as policy levers to improve wellbeing through education, and to achieve greater equity in the distribution of wellbeing” (Desjardins and Schuller 2006: 12). European data collected in the past few years point to a potentially significant connection between social capital and lifelong learning, a concept that has moved to the fore in the field of adult education and in policy agendas more broadly, most recently linked to concerns over citizenship. The research bears out hypotheses about “the mutually beneficial relationship between social connectedness and lifelong learning” (Field 2005).

The Centre for Research on the Wider Benefits of Learning
Feeding into the SOL Project is the work of The Centre for Research on the Wider Benefits of Learning (WBL) in the UK, which conducts research into “the benefits gained from learning across the life course.”

Social Interactions, Identity and Wellbeing Program - CIFAR
The Social Interactions, Identity and Wellbeing Program at the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research (CIFAR) focuses on wellbeing, investigating its various components and the factors or elements that promote it, including social capital. Drawing on a diverse body of research from across the social sciences, its investigations “have demonstrated that, contrary to popular belief, money is not the sole measure of happiness and wellbeing”. They found that social factors, including identity, sense of community, family and friends, good health, and good government are “far more important to people’s sense of wellbeing than their income”.

Social Capital — Adult Learning and Literacy
The shift away from an exclusive focus on human capital and economic outcomes to a broader understanding of the concept and its connection to social capital and other non-economic social outcomes has also begun to be reflected in adult literacy and learning policy.

Ireland offers a good example. The philosophy of adult literacy education articulated in the 2005 Guidelines for Good Adult Literacy Work by the National Literacy Agency (NALA) says explicitly that literacy has “personal, social and economic dimensions… [that] increase the opportunity for individuals and communities to reflect on their situation, explore new

---

2 For details on the project, go to: [http://www.oecd.org/document/9/0,3343,en_2649_35845581_33706505_1_1_1_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/9/0,3343,en_2649_35845581_33706505_1_1_1_1,00.html). In Canada, HRSDC is now funding research into the non-economic outcomes of learning, in connection with the OECD/SOL Project. The project seeks to generate Canadian data, which has been lacking to date. Private communication from Maurice Taylor (University of Ottawa), 29 April 2010.

3 [http://www.learningbenefits.net/AboutWBL/AboutWBL.htm](http://www.learningbenefits.net/AboutWBL/AboutWBL.htm). The results of WBL’s first major fieldwork project, combined with analyses of large-scale European datasets, were published in 2004 in, Tom Schuller et al, eds., The Benefits of Learning: The Impact on Health, Family Life and Social Capital (New York). These results, as they pertain to social capital, are discussed in various sections of this review, below.

possibilities and initiate change.” (Bailey 2007: 15). In Australia, researchers have been calling for a “new national policy on adult literacy which takes account of a “triple bottom line” involving economics, social capital and community development” (Balatti, Black and Falk 2006: 11).

In Canada, a 2009 report by the Canadian Council on Learning states that, “Adults are influential role models — as learners and as active citizens — for their children, colleagues and their communities. Thus, the fostering of adult-learning opportunities contributes to social capital and social cohesion” (CCL 2009: 11). In a similar vein, Connecting the Dots, a study on accountability in adult literacy in Canada, highlighted the need for a more balanced approach that takes account of the skills and competencies associated with the theories of both human capital and social capital. The study found evidence that human capital and social capital are not mutually exclusive nor need they be in competition with each other; in fact they “should be aligned if Canadians are to achieve the goal of economic and social wellbeing for all” (Page 2009: 6).

4) SOCIAL CAPITAL AS AN OUTCOME OF ADULT LEARNING AND LITERACY PROGRAMS

Social Capital Outcomes of Adult Learning and Literacy Programs — Research

Research by The Centre for Research on the Wider Benefits of Learning and, more recently, in connection with SOL, provides strong evidence that “learning plays a key part in moving the life course in directions that improve quality of life and contribute to the building of social capital” (Bynner and Hammond 2004: 178). These reports acknowledge, however, that the pathways from education to social capital outcomes are complex, and that this and related issues require further investigation.

If studies of the social capital outcomes of education generally “are in their infancy”, the role of social capital, specifically in adult literacy and learning, has been investigated even less (Balatti, Black and Falk 2006: 8, 41). In relation to workplace LES, this review was unable to identify a single study connected to social capital.

However, as this paper was being written, a pilot project to measure the social capital outcomes of workplace LES was being reviewed by the Ontario government in Canada as part of the province’s new Community Workforce and Essential Skills Literacy Initiative. This research project, guided by Professor Maurice Taylor of the University of Ottawa, will draw on the recent work of SOL and Australian researchers, including Balatti and Falk (whose findings are discussed below), to construct and pilot indicators to measure social capital outcomes of workplace LES programs and pedagogical approaches most suited to generating these outcomes.5

Social Capital Outcomes of Adult Learning and Literacy Interventions

Impact studies on the general outcomes of adult learning and literacy interventions have been conducted in Canada (Bossort, Cottingham and Gardner 1994; Lefebvre et al 2006: 7-8), the UK (Metcalf 2009: ix-x, 5 61-3, 84; Eldred 2004: 31-46 and 2006: 6-7), Australia (McGrath 2007: 5 Private communication from Maurice Taylor (University of Ottawa), 29 April 2010.
These studies, as well as related discussions (Sticht 1999, 2000, 2006, 2007), and literature surveys such as those produced by Benseman and Tobias (2003), Westell (2005), (Gray 2006), Hartley and Horne (2006), and Salomon (2009), point overwhelmingly to social capital as an almost ubiquitous outcome of adult learning and literacy interventions internationally in the past twenty years. They find that adults participating in adult learning and literacy programs in community, educational or workplace settings have a greater ability to reach out to, communicate with and become involved with others, whether at work, at home with the family, or in the community, even though few of these interventions set out to achieve such outcomes.

A number of studies are looking specifically at the social capital outcomes of adult learning and literacy programs, as well as the connections between human and social capital. They seek to define these outcomes more precisely, understand the impacts on learners’ lives and identify pedagogical approaches best suited to producing social capital outcomes. They also look at areas of policy concern, such as family stability, educational achievement, health, social inclusion and integration, and community and civic participation.

These investigations, using greater methodological rigour, confirm the outcomes related to social capital documented in the earlier, more general literature.

**Relationships, Networks and Social Activities Generally**

The new research establishes links between participation in adult learning and literacy programs and increased social activity and social networking. This was found in a recent two-phase study of over 600 literacy and numeracy learners in Scotland (Tett and Maclachlan 2007: 150, 165), a longitudinal study of adult literacy learners in California (Macdonald and Scollay 2009: 324), as well as work with South Australian adults participating in learning programs at local community centres (Raferty 2002: 7-8). Further Education practitioners in the UK in a large-scale survey in 2002 also pointed to the development of social networks as an important outcome of their work with adult learners (Preston and Hammond 2002).

In Australia, a study involving fifty-seven students enrolled in VET (Vocational Education and Training) reported that the courses produced social capital outcomes for 80 percent of the learners, in the form of “changes in the number and nature of attachments they had to existing and new social networks… and in the way they interacted with people in their networks”. The study also found that social capital outcomes “had a positive impact on students’ social environments, education and learning, employment and quality of working life”. On the basis of these results, the researchers suggested that “…social capital outcomes are indeed a valuable result of participation in adult literacy and numeracy courses, contributing to the student’s quality of life” (Balatti, Black and Falk 2006: 5-7; see also Priest 2009: 3).

Balatti and Falk also investigated the social capital outcomes of participation in the Adult Community Education Sector (ACE). Their study of ten programs provided “strong evidence” that learners built social capital through engaging in new interactions with people, accessing networks and resources that had previously been beyond their reach, and helping build new networks (Balatti and Falk 2002: 292-94).
Family and Education
Other studies explore how adult literacy and learning influences relationships at home, particularly among parents and children. Confirming Coleman’s earlier work, these studies agree that learners become better parents, in that they are more patient and understanding and better at listening to and supporting their children. By engaging their children more, serving as role model learners, and becoming more involved in their education at home and in the community, parents actively nurture the literacy behaviours and educational achievement of their children (Brassett-Grundy 2004: 85; Macdonald and Scollay 2009: 324). This “intergenerational transmission of educational success” is fundamentally important not only to individuals, but to the broader society, as it is “a key element in equality of opportunity” (Feinstein, Duckworth and Sabates 2004: iv-v; 84-5).

Health
Social capital outcomes of adult learning and literacy have also been linked to improved health because “social networks and links between people provide resilience and protection that are important for the prevention of ill-health”. Furthermore, social capital promotes social cohesion, which has been shown to have “a demonstrable effect on health…” (Feinstein et al 2006: 287).

Social Integration and Inclusion, Community and Civic Participation
A number of recent studies explore the connection between adult learning and literacy and social capital outcomes related to learners’ interactions within their communities and, more broadly, in society. These demonstrate that learners become more engaged in their communities, thus less isolated, as a result of attitude shifts. These shifts are expressed in a greater sense of “connectedness”, confidence, increased trust, tolerance (for people of different ethnic backgrounds or ages), open-mindedness and respect for authority (Preston and Hammond 2002; Balatti and Falk 2002: 292; Preston 2004: 124, 129; Preston 2004 a: 155; Westell 2005:10), as well as reduced prejudice, racism and political cynicism (Feinstein et al 2003: vi-vii; Preston and Feinstein 2004; Bynner and Hammond 2004: 174-5; Feinstein et al 2006: 287).

Civic engagement or participation in connection with adult learning and literacy has, as yet, been little studied, but researchers believe that “there are good reasons to think that adult education would have effects on civic and social engagement” (Campbell 2006: 32). Early work into this question has shown that “taking courses between the ages of 33 - 42 predicted greater levels of civic and political participation” (Bynner and Hammond 2004: 175).

5) POTENTIAL BENEFIT TO EMPLOYERS
Research into the social capital outcomes of adult learning and literacy programs has focused on the impacts on individuals, communities and society at large. As noted, some studies mention impacts in the workplace, but so far none has actually studied the issue. This gap is connected to the limited discussion in the literature of the broader issue of how social capital benefits organizations or enterprises (Capelli 2001: 7). That said, there is sufficient indirect evidence to suggest that the development of social capital among workers could have positive impacts in the workplace and contribute to employer gains.
Co-evolution of Human and Social Capital

Acquisition and Transfer of Knowledge and Skills
Recent studies confirm that social capital facilitates learning. For instance, Balatti, Black and Falk studied VET participants in Australia and found that the relationships or networks they developed with other learners, with staff and with their class in general “provided them with opportunities to learn or to implement what they had learnt” (2006: 5). The researchers concluded that it was the interaction that occurred within and between these networks that produced the human capital or skills gains, and also accounted “significantly” for further social capital outcomes in learners’ lives more broadly (Balatti, Black and Falk 2006: 5-7). In an earlier article, the researchers had argued along similar lines that human capital and social capital “co-evolve” (Balatti and Falk 2002: 284).

For employers, these findings suggest that a workplace LES program can facilitate relationship-building and networking among staff that in turn enhances their ability to acquire, apply and teach those skills. As Falk observed, “interactions embedded in networks operationalise information and put it into circulation for others to use” (2001: 316). Through their interaction, human and social capital can jointly “enhance people's learning and response to change” (Falk 2001: 313).

Social Capital in the Workplace

Facilitator of Learning and Effective Employee Interaction
The relationship building and networking among staff that could be fostered by successful workplace LES programs would not only facilitate learning, but also make for a better workplace. The general literature on organizations and training supports the idea that employers gain by promoting social capital among their workers. In a 2001 paper about why certain employers choose to retrain their workers rather than hire new, more appropriately skilled people, Wharton Professor Peter Capelli offered some insights based on studies exploring the role of social relationships in the workplace. He suggested that they:

- “facilitate” the development of knowledge and skills (human capital) “by making the internal transfer of knowledge easier” (echoing the findings of Balatti, Black and Falk).
- “facilitate trust”, enabling employees to work more effectively together to achieve collective goals (teamwork). (2001: 7-8).

This suggests that social capital is a valuable asset and that employers have good reason to retain it by retraining their employees rather than bringing in new people, which would require some rebuilding of working relationships within the company (Capelli 2001: 7-8). Capelli found that preserving social capital through retraining is particularly important to those workplaces that rely to a large extent on teamwork, which explains why such organizations “are more likely to invest in training” (2001: 9).
The importance of social capital to employers was noted in a recent report on the impact of workplace LES programs in small- and medium-sized enterprises in Nova Scotia, Canada. Employers emphasized positive changes in “communications soft skills” or interpersonal abilities when asked to identify the direct benefits to the company of these programs. For these businesses, the ability of their employees to interact well, forging effective working relationships, contributed to “significant changes in the workplace as a social environment”. Although the employers in this study were not able to quantify the positive changes, they “expressed confidence that [workplace LES] training was generating significant gains in productivity and bottom line business outcomes “down the road”” (PRC 2008: 69-70).

Trust

Trust is an essential element of social capital. Recent work conducted by CIFAR’s Social Interactions, Identity and Wellbeing Program based on Canadian and US surveys has found that “the climate of trust in the workplace is strongly related to subjective wellbeing”. As the researchers noted, given that workplace trust is very valuable to workers and “probably also good for productivity”, finding ways to generate social capital in the workplace is a worthwhile investment, one that has nevertheless been “unrecognized” or neglected to date — (Helliwell, Huang and Putnam 2009: 1, 9).

The Importance of Self-Confidence

The social capital outcomes of adult learning and literacy programs have been shown to be intimately connected to increased self-confidence. Improved self-confidence among workers participating in workplace LES program allows them to be more independent, better able to carry out tasks and to relate to managers and colleagues in formal and informal situations, as well as heightening their sense of achievement at work. A more confident worker also tends to be more inclined to pursue further learning (Eldred 2006: 7). Other employer surveys also show the importance businesses place on their employees’ attitudes, beginning with self-confidence, which many see as ultimately contributing to improved productivity (PRC 2008: 70-71; Salomon 2009: 19; Hollenbeck and Timmeney 2009: 18).

6) SOCIAL CAPITAL IN ESSENTIAL SKILLS FRAMEWORKS

Essential skills policies are now implicitly acknowledging these social capital outcomes in the workplace, and this is reflected in current essential skills frameworks.

For example, Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (HRSDC), which defines essential skills as “the skills needed for work, learning and life”, has developed a framework that includes oral communication, working with others and continuous learning among its nine essential skills. Although these skills themselves are not “social capital”, including them implies that direct interaction and relationships with others contribute to optimal work performance and skills enhancement.

---

6) See ‘Measuring Self-Confidence’ in Section Seven of this review (starting on p.17)
7) The other skills are reading text, document use, numeracy, writing, thinking skills and computer use. See, http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/workplaceskills/essential_skills/general/understanding_es.shtml
The OECD, through its DeSeCo (Definition and Selection of Key Competencies) Project, has identified a small set of ‘key competencies’ that individuals need to “face the complex challenges of today’s world”. These competencies, defined as “psychosocial resources (including skills and attitudes)” fall into three broad intersecting categories (OECD-DeSeCo 2005: 4):

- ability to use a wide range of tools to interact effectively with the environment (“use” means understand and adapt, while “tools” refers to physical tools, such as information technology; and socio-cultural tools, such as language)
- ability to interact in heterogeneous groups (covers engagement with others)
- ability to act autonomously (includes taking responsibility for managing one’s own life and situating it within the broader social context)

Here, social capital is embedded in the framework more explicitly than in the HRSDC model. In its discussion of the second category, i.e. interacting in heterogeneous groups, the project description refers directly to social capital and connects its development to “key competencies… required for individuals to learn, live and work with others” [emphasis mine]. These competencies, which are associated with “social skills”, “intercultural competencies” or “soft skills” (OECD-DeSeCo 2005: 12-13), include:

- the ability to relate well to others (through empathy and respect for diversity), which allows individuals to initiate, maintain and manage personal relationships, for instance with colleagues and customers — an increasingly important ability in the workplace and for economic success, as “changing firms and economies are placing increased emphasis on emotional intelligence”
- the ability to cooperate, which calls for individuals to provide leadership and support to others, and demonstrate commitment to a group and its goals (by presenting ideas and listening to those of others, discussing and debating, constructing alliances, negotiating, and making sound decisions) — of growing relevance in work settings, where an organization’s goals are often achieved through the joint efforts of work teams or management groups
- the ability to manage and resolve conflicts (by analyzing the issues and understanding all positions, reframing the problem and prioritizing needs and goals) — of fundamental relevance to any workplace

7) MEASURING THE SOCIAL CAPITAL OUTCOMES OF ADULT LEARNING AND LITERACY INITIATIVES

Measuring Social Capital
A recent review of over 500 sources on social capital and related issues across disciplines found “considerable debate and controversy over the possibility, desirability and practicability of measuring social capital”. There is agreement, though, that identifying sound and appropriate approaches is necessary and that much more work is needed in this difficult area. Another salient point in this review and repeated in other literature is that, given the complexity of the concept

---

8 See also, [http://www.oecd.org/document/17/0,3343,en_2649_39263238_2669073_1_1_1_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/17/0,3343,en_2649_39263238_2669073_1_1_1_1,00.html)
and the various definitions, “it is not likely to be represented by any single measure or figure” (Claridge 2004; Grootaert 1998: 10).

In this vein, it has been suggested, for example by the OECD, that social capital measures should

- be as comprehensive as possible in terms of how they cover key dimensions, namely networks, values and norms
- aim for a balance between the attitudinal/subjective and the behavioural aspects of social capital
- take account of the cultural context in which the behaviour or attitudes are being measured (Harper 2001: 14):

“Comparing people’s interpretations of how things happened or are expected to happen” is also discussed in the literature (Claridge 2004). There is a call for a combined quantitative/qualitative methodology and the incorporation of multi-method, multi-disciplinary approaches (Hartley and Horne 2006: 5-7).

The ABS Social Capital Framework

As noted earlier, the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) has been intensively researching social capital in the past decade in connection with a host of national policy concerns across government departments. In 2004, drawing on a significant body of international literature, data, surveys and expertise, they produced a Social Capital Framework that describes social capital in all its various aspects. The framework includes a range of related indicators (Edwards 2004).

These tools are important not only because they are rigorously grounded and comprehensive, but they have also informed important recent studies of social capital in relation to adult learning and literacy (Hartley and Horne 2006: 22).

The ABS Framework adopts the OECD’s widely used definition of social capital (“networks, together with shared norms, values and understandings which facilitate cooperation within or among groups”), and conceptualizes it as one of four types of resource (the others being national, produced economic, and human capital). It is the interaction between social capital and these other resources in a particular “context of cultural, political, institutional and legal conditions” that contributes to “wellbeing” (Edwards 2004: 5).

[See Appendix One for more on the ABS Framework’s suggested indicators providing evidence of the four key elements of social capital (Edwards 2004: 21-26, 67, 85, 103) as well as its bank of social capital questions.]

Recent Studies on Adult Learning and Literacy

The latest research into the social capital outcomes of adult learning and literacy initiatives points to promising approaches to measurement, and provides tools that might be appropriately applied to workplace settings. In general, these studies:

- gathered and analyzed data through the use of multiple methods, of both a quantitative (for example, coding, statistical analyses of various kinds, including multivariate) and qualitative nature
sought to reflect the diversity of programs offered and learners participating in the adult learning and literacy sector being investigated
• relied primarily on interviews (semi-structured, or structured/using a questionnaire, open and closed questions) as a means of gathering data
• allowed sufficient time for outcomes to become apparent

Balatti, Black and Falk: Model of Building and Using Social Capital
The measurements of social capital outcomes in the recent Australian studies on ACE (Balatti and Falk 2002: 288-9) and VET (Balatti, Black and Falk 2006: 6, 13) are grounded in the ABS Social Capital Framework described above and the OECD’s eight areas of socio-economic concern (1982), which were adopted by the ABS in 2001. The eight areas are: health, education and learning, employment and the quality of working life, time and leisure, command over goods and services, physical environment, and social environment and personal safety. Evidence of social capital was sought in these domains.

The studies also used the Falk and Kilpatrick (2000) Model of Building and Using Social Capital: which presents social capital as “the knowledge and identity resources available to the community for a common purpose.” The knowledge and identity resources are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE RESOURCES</th>
<th>IDENTITY RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• networks, internal and external to the community</td>
<td>• self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• skills and knowledge available (i.e. human capital)</td>
<td>• norms, values, attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• precedents, procedures, rules</td>
<td>• vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• communication sites</td>
<td>• trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• value/attitudinal attributes of community</td>
<td>• commitment to community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here social capital is built up from interactions between people for a common purpose. The interactions draw upon, and add to, these knowledge and identity resources and result in learning for those involved. (Balatti and Falk 2002: 285).

Applying the ABS Social Capital Framework
In their related work on Vocational Education and Training (VET), Balatti, Black and Falk (2006: 6, 13) collected data related to possible social capital outcomes, coded them for twelve indicators adapted from the ABS Social Capital Framework, and assessed them using the OECD’s eight areas of socio-economic concerns (see above). The indicators were devised to show changes in the four key elements of social capital delineated by ABS (see Appendix One):

1. **network qualities** — change in: trust levels, beliefs about personal influence on the student’s own life and that of others, action to solve problems in the student’s own life or that of others, and beliefs and interaction with people who are different from the student
2. **network structure** — change in: the number and nature of attachments to existing and new networks, the number or nature of the ways that the student keeps in touch with others in their networks, and the nature of memberships
3. **transaction within networks** — change in: the support sought, received or given in the networks to which the student is attached, and the ways the student shares information and skills and can negotiate

4. **network types** — change in: the activities undertaken with the main groups with which they interact, and the activities with groups that are different from the student

*Dymock and Billet — A Portfolio of Instruments*

Dymock and Billet highlight the importance of taking into consideration “the diversity and complexity of learners’ needs, motivations and outcomes” and “paying special attention to the language adopted in the instruments so that these can be easily used by tutors and their students” (2008: 3). They drew on national and international research to identify potential assessment instruments to measure or capture the “wider benefits of learning” from non-accredited adult language, literacy and numeracy learning in Australia. From a literature review they identified seven “wider benefits”.

During discussions prior to this selection, various issues and concerns were highlighted. Increased confidence was “strongly supported” as a valuable outcome to be tracked and that could be detected and measured through changes in learners’ behaviour. Engagement with others and social capital were “generally” regarded as strong outcomes as well; however, there were doubts as to whether these could actually be observed and measured. In the end, the research group agreed on five instruments “most favoured” and a sixth tool was created to provide as “comprehensive” a choice as possible. (Dymock and Billet 2008: 17). (See Appendix Two for the Six Instruments.) The instruments overlap to a certain extent and each has a slightly different emphasis, but this was intended to allow “some leeway to meet particular needs”.

The main finding of the study was that no single instrument was “most preferred across all sites”. Consequently, the researchers recommended use of a portfolio of instruments, or “a range of instruments and approaches… to assess and acknowledge learning outcomes that are specific to particular learners or cohorts of learners.” (Dymock and Billet 2008: 8). However, it was also found that the language used in the instruments was too difficult for many learners, especially ESL learners (Dymock and Billet 2008: 20) and recommended that terms be made simple enough for learners to understand or for instructors to explain easily, and suggested that key terms, such as “confidence”, be defined at the top of the instrument.

*Measuring Social Capital Outcomes: Scottish Adult Literacy Learners*

In their work with Scottish adult literacy learners, Tett and Maclachlan selected four broad indicators of social capital that they believed represented the defining characteristics identified in previous research (2007: 154-5). These were:

**Tett and Maclachlan’s Social Capital Indicators (2007)**

- identification with and attitudes towards the neighbourhood
- social and civic engagement
- feelings of safety and belonging
- social contacts and supportive networks
Measuring Social Capital Outcomes: Aboriginal Adult Literacy Learners in British Columbia

An action research project conducted as part of Connecting the Dots, a recent study on accountability in adult literacy in Canada, drafted a tool “that could name and measure literacy progress for learners engaged in activities that focused on social capital development” (BC-ART 2009: 3). The study, done in a remote rural community in British Columbia, was developed in response to a growing realization among practitioners of the importance of “foster[ing] capacity within individuals to build and sustain trustworthy relationships”.

The researchers came away with a deeper understanding of literacy and broadened their definition of the term to include both human and social capital development (BC-ART 2009: 4). As in the work of Dymock and Billet, they also found that:

- The issue of language is important in that concepts might be understood by learners, but not necessarily the language or vocabulary used to describe them. An introductory session with learners to familiarize them with the language is therefore important.
- Learner goals should be tracked for eight to ten weeks, and then new ones should be set to avoid loss of interest.
- A visual should be used to help remind learners and instructors of the goals.

Appendix Two of the study’s final report includes the draft tool, which has not been posted online because it is still in the draft stage and, not yet necessarily applicable to other settings.

The tool seeks to capture the “real-life learning” that takes place in reciprocal relationships in our every day lives.

**BC-ART ‘REAL-LIFE’ LEARNING (2009)**

Generally this involves:
- Learners engaging as citizens and acting as decision makers
- Learners engaging in meaningful community development projects together
- Learners actively building and fostering relationships

The study used a “Social Capital Rubric” including five indicators of social capital in a grid of statements that reflect learners’ progress:

**BC-ART SOCIAL CAPITAL RUBRIC (2009)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Social Capital</th>
<th>Statements of Learners’ Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>goodwill</td>
<td>avoidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sense of belonging</td>
<td>awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social trust</td>
<td>wake up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclusiveness</td>
<td>engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civic responsibility</td>
<td>access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organizer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The rubric and accompanying learner assessment and goal setting tools aimed to:

- provide a language and a point of discussion around social capital competencies
- supply a frame for learners to set goals around social capital
- heighten intent and awareness around behaviour

**Measuring Self-Confidence**

*The Soft Outcomes of Adult Learning and Literacy Initiatives*

Recent research into the wider benefits of adult learning and literacy and, more narrowly, of their social capital outcomes confirms the findings of earlier, broader studies — that learners experienced important soft outcomes, such as increased self-confidence, self-esteem, improved morale and job satisfaction (Balatti and Falk 2002: 292; Benseman and Tobias 2003; 129, 132-41, 155; Birch et al 2003: 30-31; Stanwick, Ong and Karmel 2006: 10; Lefebvre et al 2006: 7-8, 14-15; McGrath 2007: 229; Tett and Maclachlan 2007: 150, 153, 159, 160-63; Wolf 2008: 1; Taylor, Evans and Mohamed 2008: 6, 9-11; Metcalf 2009: ix-x, 4, 40, 56, Macdonald and Scollay 2009: 321; Benseman 2009: 5). As noted in several reviews of international literature on adult learning and literacy as well as workplace LES, these soft outcomes are reported in almost every study (Benseman and Tobias 2003: 26-9, Westell 2005: 1-3, 5, 7-8; Gray 2006: 55; 31-4; Salomon 2009: 5-6).

**Self-Confidence — A Key Outcome of Adult Learning and Literacy Programs**

Among these outcomes, confidence appears to be a key element in learning, a finding noted as early as 1979 in Charnley and Jones’ “The Concept of Success in Adult Literacy” which claimed “confidence is the foundation on which progress is made in literacy” (69). Recent studies exploring the wider benefits and social capital outcomes of adult learning and literacy view increased self-confidence as part of a crucial identity shift among learners (Lefebvre et al 2006: 3-4, 27-8; Tett and Maclachlan 2007: 150, 153, 160-62; Dymock and Billett 2008: 9), a change in self-perception. In this process of personal growth (Westell 2005: 26; Hammond 2004: 46-7), learners see themselves as capable of learning (Tett and Maclachlan 2007: 160-62), achieving (Benseman and Tobias 2003), doing (Macdonald and Scollay 2009: 321) and belonging (Hammond 2004: 46-7).

The identity shift not only makes learners happy and fosters a sense of wellbeing, but also facilitates learning, in terms of both skills acquisition (human capital) and the development of social capital. Several studies describe a “positive cycle of development” (Benseman and Tobias 2003: 131), or a process in which skills acquisition fosters confidence, which leads to more skills achievement as well as the development of social capital (Benseman and Tobias 2003: 131; Eldred et al 2004: 31-46 and 2006: 6-7; Macdonald and Scollay 2009: 321). Balatti, Black and Falk point out, however, that interactions in this process are complex, since improved social capital in itself has been shown to lead to skills acquisition and increased self-confidence (2009: 12). Echoing this, an earlier 2006 study of how adult literacy learners in Ontario perceived their progress, found that increased self-confidence is both an outcome and facilitator of other outcomes related to learning, i.e. of human and social capital development (Lefebvre et al 2006: 7-8, 27-8). It concluded that, “This high degree of interaction and influence between multiple outcomes, whether they are specific literacy skills or non-academic in nature,
promotes a more holistic view of learning and hence measuring progress” (Lefebvre et al 2006: 27-8). Tett and Maclachlan also concluded in their 2007 study (150, 163), that the key to learning was the “virtuous circle” of social capital that began in the learning environment of the adult literacy intervention.

It must be emphasized, however, that self-confidence and social capital are not synonymous.

CONCLUDING REMARKS
Interest in social capital has grown in the past decade. This can be explained by the concerns governments have about issues of social stability, integration and equity, civic participation and educational achievement, all linked to the notion of wellbeing. Related exploration of the wider benefits of learning is also fuelling discussion. As a result of this development, the once narrow, arguably over-simplified application of human capital theory to national education and training drives appears to be moving towards a more comprehensive or holistic understanding of learning, as both a process and a source of positive outcomes for individuals, employers, families, communities and society at large.

In the area of adult learning and literacy, a growing body of research is linking social capital to outcomes of learning interventions. Important in this connection is the development in recent years of useful approaches to measuring the social capital outcomes of adult learning and literacy programs. The emerging studies show that these outcomes are intimately connected to skills acquisition, or the building of human capital, as well as to soft outcomes. Key among the latter is self-confidence, which has long been reported in the literature and is relevant not only to learners and their lives broadly understood, but also to employers. Given the centrality, researchers have designed several instruments to measure confidence among learners.

Social capital as it relates specifically to workplace LES has yet to be studied. However, the research conducted in the larger field of adult learning and literacy suggests that social capital outcomes can be expected and fostered in workplace settings. It also appears that businesses can gain from helping workers to develop self-confidence and social capital in the interests of maximizing their skills acquisition and transfer, as well as interacting more effectively with their fellow workers, supervisors and management. These issues call for further investigation.
Appendix One: The Key Elements of Social Capital and Related Indicators in the ABS Framework

The Key Elements of Social Capital and Related Indicators

The indicators included with the ABS Framework are “suggested” rather than definitive, and are intended to generate “discussion and debate on what items might be best collected to measure social capital” (Edwards 2004: 21). They are meant to provide evidence of the four key elements of social capital (Edwards 2004: 22-26, 67, 85, 103):

1. **Network qualities**, which “describe the norms and values that may exist within networks, and serve to enhance the functioning of networks — for this element, indicators would relate to: **norms** (trust and trustworthiness, reciprocity, sense of efficacy (in connection with community/others), cooperation, acceptance of diversity and inclusiveness); and **common purpose** (social participation, civic participation, community support, friendship, economic participation, membership in professional/technical/work organizations, associations, or cooperatives)

2. **Network structure**, whose “features… influence the range and quality of resources accessible to an individual — for this element, indicators would relate to: **size** (nearby relatives and friends, acquaintance with neighbours, supports in time of crisis, links to institutions); **frequency/intensity and communication mode** (face-to-face, phone, e-mail, other); **density and openness** (relatives and friends, only friends, formal networks); **transience and mobility** (physical and within networks across the lifespan); and **power relationships**

3. **Network transactions**, which reflect the dynamic nature of relationships “for a purpose, maintained by supportive and productive interactions” — for this element, indicators would relate to: **sharing support** (giving and receiving); **sharing knowledge, information and introductions**; **negotiation** (discussion, conflict resolution, mediation); and **applying sanctions**

4. **Network types**: **bonding** (refer to “relationships that you have with people like you… that develop between people of similar background and interests, usually include family and friends, provide material and emotional support, and are more inward-looking and protective”); **bridging** (refers to “relations with friends, associates and colleagues with different backgrounds, for example different socioeconomic status, age, generation, race or ethnicity”); and **linking** (refers to “relations within a hierarchy of different social layers, where power, social status and wealth are accessed by different groups… involves relationships with those in authority and positions of power and is useful for garnering resources. Relationships between the government and communities are included here.”)


Bank of Social Capital Questions
The framework document provides an exhaustive list of possible indicators connected to the social capital elements outlined above (Edwards 2004: 26-108). Appendix Three of the document (Edwards 2004: 118-42) presents questions used to measure social capital excerpted from a select range of international surveys. A social capital question bank with a wider range of questions was evidently compiled by the ABS and will eventually appear on the social capital theme page of the ABS website.9

Appendix Two: Dymock and Billet’s Six Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DYMOCK AND BILLET’S SIX INSTRUMENTS (2008)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Changes in confidence (adapted from the Catching Confidence grid (Eldred et al, see below))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Learner outcomes: personal, social, economic (adapted from Foster, Howard and Reisenberger (1997), A Sense of Achievement: Outcomes of Adult Learning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Individual learner profile (adapted from individual profiling using soft outcomes indicators developed through the European Social Fund and adapted by the Welsh Department for Work and Pensions (Department for Work and Pensions, Wales (2003), A Practical Guide to Measuring Soft Outcomes and Distance Travelled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Learner indicator of success (adapted from Eldred’s list of indicators of success identified by literacy learners, with the addition of a ranking scheme which provides for charting of progress: (2002), Moving on with Confidence: Perceptions of Success in Teaching and Learning Adult Literacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Criteria for achievement (based on Charnley and Jones (1979). The Concept of Success in Adult Literacy, which outlines “emergent criteria” of literacy achievement and includes selected items from their lists of indicators in five categories: personal, social, socio-economic, cognitive and enactive achievements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Skills and wider outcomes (a composite instrument developed by the researchers from their review of research and the interview responses and provides for examples under four headings: skills outcomes, personal outcomes, social outcomes and vocational outcomes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 This page can be accessed at: http://www.abs.gov.au/websitepbs/c311215.nsf/22b99697d1e47ad8ca2568e30008e1bc/3af45bbd431a127bca256c22007d75ba!OpenDocument
Appendix Three: Some Recent Tools for Measuring Self-Confidence

Self-confidence, like other soft outcomes, is not easily quantified or measured. It has traditionally been viewed as an “intangible”. Given its strong and persistent presence as an outcome in studies over the past twenty years, however, researchers have been working to devise appropriate tools to detect changes in self-confidence among learners. Here are some examples:


*Catching Confidence* was a small-scale action research study that conducted “qualitative research into learners’ and practitioners’ views on the development of confidence in relation to learning” in the UK. Its goal was to develop a tool that would “evidence” or “capture” confidence (Eldred et al 2004: 4 and 2006: 2-3). The result was a visual and interactive tool, or GRID composed of statements that people could agree or disagree with relating to confidence for different life situations in various settings, including at the learning centre, at home, socially with friends and at work or out and about (Eldred et al 2004: 18 and 2006: 3-4):

```
ELDRED ET AL’S GRID STATEMENTS FOR CAPTURING CONFIDENCE (2004)

“I am confident…”:

• when meeting new people
• I can learn new things
• I can learn from this programme
• that I can use what I learn in daily life
• to speak in a group
• to speak to one other, unfamiliar person
• when writing things down
• that I have valuable skills to offer
• in organising my day to day affairs
• in situations which might be difficult
• I can do the things I want

“I feel I am generally a confident person”.
```

The instrument was designed to be easy to understand and applicable to different learning environments, serving a variety of people with diverse learning needs (Eldred et al 2004: 18). The GRID and supporting materials are included in Appendices 2-6 of Eldred et al 2004 (62-68)

Effective use of the GRID during the study led the researchers to conclude that, “…while confidence is difficult to view in terms of absolute measures, it is possible to catch and articulate changes in confidence” (Eldred et al 2006: 8). The researchers also found that the GRID (Eldred et al 2004: 24:
• powerfully supported learners in recognizing changes in confidence in and beyond learning situations
• was most effective when the language and presentation was “adapted to fit particular groups of learners and their learning environment”, when sufficient time was allowed for the activity, and when it was part of the learning experience

_Tett and Maclachlan (2007)_

Tett and Maclachlan constructed a tool to measure self-confidence in their work with Scottish adult literacy learners. After reviewing existing instruments, the researchers decided to design a new one that could provide “a straightforward means of measuring change over time that would not be too intrusive into learners' lives and would be easily understood” (2007: 158). The method adopted “picked out relevant scenarios for the learners that were grounded in situations they would face in their everyday lives”. Responses to each scenario were scored, with 1 representing ‘very uncomfortable’ and 4 ‘very comfortable’:

---

**Tett and Maclachlan’s Tool for Measuring Changes in Self-Confidence (2007)**

Scenarios asked _how confident_ learners were when:

- meeting new people
- making phone enquiries
- joining a group of strangers
- discussing things with officials
- discussing things with a doctor
- speaking up in a meeting
- complaining about poor service
- defending their position in an argument
- agreeing within the family
- being interviewed

---

_Benseman (2009) — The Upskilling Partnerships Programme_

The research component of the _Upskilling Partnerships Programme_, a New Zealand government initiative to upskill the literacy and numeracy of the workforce, also developed a tool to measure changes in learners’ confidence. The tool, as yet unpublished, revolves around the question: “How confident are you...?” Learners were asked this question (at the outset of the program and the end) as it applies to ten different situations or interactions:

---

10 I would like to thank John Benseman for sharing the tool with us.
Related to bonding social capital:
- talking to friends
- talking to [authority figure they know – e.g. supervisor at work, minister]
- talking to [health professional – e.g. doctor, dentist]
- talking to relatives/workmates

Related to bridging social capital:
- phoning a government department [e.g. IRD, MSD, Immigration]
- meeting and talking to new people
- talking to a large group of people [e.g. church, work or public meeting]
- making a complaint [e.g. shop, restaurant]
- being interviewed [e.g. job, government department]
- asking someone for help with reading or writing problem

Learners rated their responses on a scale of 1-10 and their totals were calculated out of 100. All of the questions point to some degree of social capital development in connection with increased self-confidence, with the first four related to relations with similar people or people known to the learners (bonding), and the second six to relations with people who are different or in authority (bridging, and also linking).
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