International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)
Vol. 9, No. 1, March 2020, pp. 1~9
ISSN: 2252-8822, DOI: 10.11591/ijere.v9i1.20365

Lifelong learning tendencies of trainers in adult education

Şener Şentürk[1], Volkan Duran[2]
[1]Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Turkey
[2]Psychology Department, Iğdır University, Turkey

Article Info

Article history:

Received Oct 21, 2019
Revised Jan 12, 2020
Accepted Feb 27, 2020

Keywords:

Adult education
Life-long learning tendencies
Public education centers (HEM)
Trainers

ABSTRACT

Life-long learning competencies, skills and attitudes are of having significance for education processes. The study was designed based on the correlational survey model. Population consists of 354 trainers in Public Education Centers in Samsun. In terms gender, there was a significant difference in lack of regulation and lack of curiosity dimension in favour of females in terms of lifelong learning tendencies. It was found that as the age level increases, the tendency to persistence which is the sub-factor of lifelong tendencies increases. It was found that as the level of education increases, persistence level decreases and regulation skill increases. No statistically significant difference was found between the mean scores of lifelong learning tendencies in terms of professional seniority variable and mode of their work. It was seen that the trainers who did not receive pedagodical formation had higher tendency in the fields of motivation and persistence. It was found that there was a significant difference in the sub-dimension of lack of regulation of learning according to the existance of any curriculum related to their field of study in favour of saying "no".

Corresponding Author:

Şener Şentürk,
Curriculum and Instruction Department,
Ondokuz Mayıs University,
Kurupelit Campus, Samsun, Turkey.
Email: egitimhekimi@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, it is essential for countries to adapt to quickly evolving demands of our age. Such a shift also influences rapid adjustments in the social, societal and economic paradigms of science and technology, as well as the individual's aspirations [1]. Therefore, life-long learning competencies, skills and attitudes are of having significance for today's formal and informal education processes.

Lifelong learning is a very broad concept covering all kinds of formal and non-formal education activities. In the literature, public education, non-formal education and adult education are often used interchangeably. Formal education encompasses the educational programs developed to the goals of National Education shall formally providing people at certain age groups under the ceiling of the schools and formal education institutions [2]. Non-formal education, on the other hand, is a planned and systematic training outside the formal education system. Its aim is to give a second chance to those who cannot take the formal education, to prepare for a profession, to provide a wide range of education within the framework of development programs and to provide useful and quality information to those who lack education for various reasons [3].

The concept of lifelong learning was first used in the 1800s. In the 1970s, adult education came to the forefront within the scope of lifelong learning, and vocational training contributed to the lifelong learning process [4]. Although public education, non-formal education and adult education as well as life-long

learning concepts are related to overlapping areas, there are differences between them in terms of practices and policies governing these practices. In the classifications made by organizations such as EU, OECD and UNESCO regarding the lifelong learning activities, adult education has a separate title [5]. The qualities of adult learning, has been defined sometimes based on time duration or process, sometimes has been defined according to objectives and tasks, sometimes has been described according to the material or the techniques for teaching [6]. According to UNESCO, adult Education is defined as service which is usually provided for those aged 15 or over who are outside the ordinary scheme for schools and universities and organize on an on-demand basis [7]. Therefore, life-long learning is more broad term than adult learning encompassing many different developmental stages and ages. Adult learning is more specific in this regard because certain assumptions of it is specific in many ways [8]: Adults are more and more self-oriented when they maturate, and thus willing to evaluate their own teaching requirements (with the help of an adult teacher); Adults have more expertise in quantity and quality than younger individuals. This may imply,that they are more strongly committed to the set believes and teaching practices, which adult educator may have to contest whereas this may indicate they have a richer repertoire on which to build knowledge and share with others; That 'readiness to learn'of adults is oriented to the fulfilment of social roles-especially those related to work; Adults draw attention instead of subject-based knowledge oriented to the future to the problem-centered learning that is connected to their immediate context.

Altough life-long learning and adult education are different concepts, they are not totally distinct from each other and they have conceptual linkages in this respect both for any individuals and teachers. In order for teachers to be lifelong learning individuals, they should be trained with lifelong learning skills. Selvi [9] emphasized that teachers can improve their lifelong learning skills only after they become a lifelong learning individual. In this respect, Fenwick [10] mentions two trends that have been effective in teacher education since the 1990s. The first is to expand the professional development of future educators through the notion of lifelong learning, and the second is to integrate personal teaching skills in practice in culture. Therefore it is important to investigate life-long learning tendencies of teachers and trainers.

Lifelong learning has been shaped in the concept of adult education until 1970s and it has been considered as a process that emphasizes the importance of vocational education [4]. Hence, Turkey has been supported both public education and lifelong education through various educational institutions. For example, "Lifelong Learning Strategy Document" has been prepared in Turkey according to the Ministry of National Education Strategy Plan in 2009. The main purpose of this document is to create different learning environments for individuals to improve their knowledge and skills [11]. There are also many formal institutions providing life-long learnin service in this regard. Adult education training services in Turkey included [12]:

1) Public Education Centers (HEM): Literacy courses, vocational courses, sociocultural courses.
2) Vocational Training Centers (MEM): Apprenticeship, journeyman and craftsman training, short-term vocational courses.
3) Practical Girls' Art School: Short-term vocational courses for girls.
4) Private Education Institutions (Education and application school, business education center, science and art center)
5) Private educational institutions: Short-term vocational courses
6) Other institutions: Maturation Institute and Adult Technical Training Center.
7) Distance education services: Open Primary School, Open High School and Vocational and Technical Open High School

Life-long education is significant both for micro and macro levels. It is important for self-improvement as well as the development of countries. The main cause for lifetime teaching is known to be that information quickly changes in the world. People having lifelong learning tendecies are the ones who are ready for almost any change and struggle [13]. When the literature is examined, it can be seen that there are many studies in the literature regarding the concept of life-long learning. These studies generally include institutional arrangements for adult education and training; recognition of formal education system; financial support for adult students; educational institutions for adult students; occupational training fields; primary and secondary schools as functioning and consistent systems; social and cultural dependence on lifelong learning [14]. Hence in this study it is aimed to investigate social and cultural aspects of life-long learning tendencies in terms of demographic variable.

2. METHOD

2.1. Model

The study was designed based on the correlational survey model. Survey designs include techniques of studies aimed at describing an existing or previous condition. According to Karasar [15], in the survey

design, the event, individual or object that is the subject of the research is tried to be defined in its own conditions and as it is. Therefore, it is aimed to investigate life-long learning tendency levels of the trainers as it is.

2.2. Measurement tool

The Lifelong Learning Tendencies which was developed by Diker-Coşkun [5] was used in this study. The first two dimensions of the scale consisted of positive items expressing motivation (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6) and persistence (items 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12) for lifelong learning; the last two dimensions consisting from negative statements are the inability to regulate lifelong learning (items 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 18) and lack of curiosity about the reasons for this inability for this (items 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27). In the analysis of the items of the scale, points of the items in last two dimensions were reversed for the ease of the analysis. 6 point likert items were used. The minimum score that can be obtained from the scale is 27 and the maximum score is 162. Permission for using the scale was obtained by the researcher. The average of the responses of the teachers to the items of the sub-dimensions in the scale of lifelong learning tendencies of the teachers in the relevant range (1.00 - 1.83 Does not fit at all, 1.84 - 2.66 Partly does not fit, 2.67 - 3.49 Very little does not fit, 3.50 - 4.32 Fits very little, 4.33 - 5.15 Partly fits, 5.16 - 6.00 Very fits).

2.3. Analysis of the data

In Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test, although the distribution was not normal, the skewness and kurtosis values of the data were within normal limits (1.96 to -1.96). Field (2009) states that because the standard error of skewness is lower in large samples, the z value will grow, indicating that the distribution is not normal. In such cases, it is recommended not to use z in large samples. Therefore, the data were analyzed with normal distribution techniques as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. One-sample kolmogorov-smirnov test

		G	A	Gr	F	S	Wt	Ap	Cd	Ce	M
N		354	354	354	354	354	354	353	352	353	353
Normal Parameters[a..b]	Mean	1.2203	2.6017	1.5989	1.7599	1.8898	2.8588	2.5921	1.5568	1.4589	1.1416
	Std. Deviation	.41506	1.03595	.77320	.42776	1.31531	.52403	1.01026	.50316	.49902	.34918
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.482	.232	.354	.473	.327	.411	.371	.365	.362	.516
	Positive	.482	.137	.354	.287	.327	.329	.210	.312	.362	.516
	Negative	-.298	-.232	-.219	-.473	-.249	-.411	-.371	-.365	-.320	-.343
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		9.067	4.358	6,663	8.892	6.151	7.739	6.965	6.844	6.805	9.692
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

a. Test distribution is Normal.

Note: G: Gendert, A: Age, Gr: Graduation, F: Formation, S: Seniority, Wr: Working type, Ap: Aimed population, Cd: Curriulum development, Ce: Curriculum existance, M: Measurement

2.4. Population

Population consists of 354 trainers in Public Education Centers (HEM) in Samsun. The distributions of the participants in terms of gender, age, graduation, pedagogical formation, professional seniority, aimed population, preparedness of curriculum development and existance of any conducting curriculum can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. The distributions of the participants in particular

Variables	Particular	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Gender	Women	276	78.0	78.0	78.0
	Man	78	22.0	22.0	100.0
Age	20-29	70	19.8	19.8	19.8
	30-39	78	22.0	22.0	41.8
	40-49	129	36.4	36.4	78.2
	50 and above	77	21.8	21.8	100.0
Graduation	High School	203	57.3	57.3	57.3
	Associate Degree	92	26.0	26.0	83.3
	University	57	16.1	16.1	99.4
	Master's Degree and Phd	2	.6	.6	100.0
Pedagogical formation	Yes	85	24.0	24.0	24.0
	No	269	76.0	76.0	100.0
Seniority variable	1-5	204	57.6	57.6	57.6
	6-10	74	20.9	20.9	78.5
	11-15	21	5.9	5.9	84.5
	16-20	21	5.9	5.9	90.4
	21 and above	34	9.6	9.6	100.0
Job node of their work	Permanent Staff	4	1.1	1.1	1.1
	Contract Labor	65	18.4	18.4	19.5
	Paid Employment	262	74.0	74.0	93.5
	Other	23	6.5	6.5	100.0
Aimed population	Middle School	90	25.4	25.4	25.4
	High School	11	3.1	3.1	28.5
	Adult	206	58.2	58.2	86.7
	General	47	13.3	13.3	100.0
Curriculum development	Yes	157	44.4	44.4	44.4
	No	196	55.4	55.4	99.7
Conducting curriculum in their area	Yes	191	54.0	54.0	54.0
	No	163	46.0	46.0	100.0

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, the scores of teachers' sub-dimensions of lifelong learning tendency scales will be shown by descriptive analysis method. Afterwards, it will be examined whether the lifelong learning tendency scale has experienced significant changes according to the gender, age, graduation status, pedagogical formation training, occupational years and types of schools.

When the results of descriptive analysis was investigated, the average value of adult educators is found to be $\bar{x} = 5.74$ in the "motivation" dimension, is found to be $\bar{x} = 5.39$ in "persistence" dimension; is found to be $\bar{x} = 5.04$ in the "lack of regulation of learning"; dimension; is found to be $\bar{x} = 5.07$ "lack of curiosity" dimension. According to these results, it was seen that the motivation and persistence levels of the trainers were higher than the "lack of regulation of learning" and "lack of curiosity" levels as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Descriptive results of the life-long learning tendecy scale

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Motivation	354	4.00	6.00	5.7377	.32117
Persistence	354	3.00	6.00	5.3891	.52893
Lack of regulation of learning	354	1.00	6.00	5.0366	1.24716
Lack of curiosity	354	1.00	6.00	5.0664	1.08040
Valid N (listwise)	354				

Independent Sample T Test was used to find out whether the mean scores of lifelong learning tendencies of educators differed according to gender and the results of the analysis were given in Table 4.

According to Table 4, it was found that there was a significant difference in lack of regulation of learning according to gender variable. $t = 2.488$; $p <, 051$. According to this, it is seen that female trainers have better average in organizing learning than male trainers. However, Eta square analysis of the effect size of the difference showed that gender had a low (0.01) effect on Lifelong Learning Tendency. Similarly, there is also significant difference in lack of curiosity dimension in favour of females.

Table 4. The mean scores of lifelong learning tendencies of educators differed according to gender

	Gender	N	Average	ss	t	p	Significance
Motivation	Female	276	5.7535	.29198	1.750	.081	No
	Male	78	5.6817	.40537			significant
Persistence	Female	276	5.4183	.49656	1.957	.051	difference
	Male	78	5.2860	.62302			
Lack of	Female	276	5.1236	1.18967	2.488	.013	In favour of
Regulation of Learning	Male	78	4.7286	1.39743			females
Lack of	Female	276	5.1379	.97742	2.356	.019	
Curiosity	Male	78	4.8136	1.36241			

As a result of the variance analysis regarding the lifelong learning tendencies of the educators in different age groups, a statistically significant difference was found between the means of persistence subscale scores (F (3.350) = 2.833, p <0.05, n2 = 0.02) as shown in Table 5.

Table 5. The results of the variance analysis regarding the lifelong learning tendencies of the educators in different age groups

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Motivation	Between Groups	.473	3	.158	1.535	.205
	Within Groups	35.938	350	.103		
	Total	36.411	353			
Persistence	Between Groups	2.341	3	.780	2.833	.038
	Within Groups	96.418	350	.275		
	Total	98.759	353			
Lack of Regulation of Learning	Between Groups	2.668	3	.889	.570	.635
	Within Groups	546.395	350	1.561		
	Total	549.063	353			
Lack Of Curiosity	Between Groups	5.805	3	1.935	1.667	.174
	Within Groups	406.237	350	1.161		
	Total	412.042	353			

As a result of the Tukey multiple comparison to find out the groups as a source of this difference it was found that the difference stems from the 20-29 age group ($\bar{x}$ = 5.2927) and the 50 and older age group ($\bar{x}$= 5.5016). According to these results, as the age level increases, the tendency to persistence which is the sub-factor of lifelong tendencies increases.

As a result of variance analysis of lifelong learning tendencies, a significant difference was found between the mean scores of the sub-dimensions of persistence (F (3.350) = 2.884, p <0.05, n2 = 0.02) and lack of regulation in learning (F(3.350)= 2.976, p<0.05, n2=0.02) in terms of graduation levels as shown in Table 6.

Table 6. As a result of variance analysis of lifelong learning tendencies in terms of graduation levels

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Motivation	Between Groups	.279	3	.093	.900	.442
	Within Groups	36.132	350	.103		
	Total	36.411	353			
Persistence	Between Groups	2.383	3	.794	2.884	.036
	Within Groups	96.376	350	.275		
	Total	98.759	353			
Lack Of Regulation Of Learning	Between Groups	13.659	3	4.553	2.976	.032
	Within Groups	535.404	350	1.530		
	Total	549.063	353			
Lack Of Curiosity	Between Groups	4.229	3	1.410	1.210	.306
	Within Groups	407.812	350	1.165		
	Total	412.042	353			

As a result of the Tukey multiple comparison to find out the groups as a source of this difference, the difference in persistence sub-factor was found between high school graduates ($\bar{x}$= 5.4586) and undergraduate graduates ($\bar{x}$= 5.2689). and in the sub-factor of lack of regulation of learning, high school graduates ($\bar{x}$= 4.9021) and associate degree graduates ($\bar{x}$= 5.3168). According to these results, high school graduated educators have higher tendency to persistence than associate graduates. In terms of lack of regulation of learning, university graduates scores are higher than high school graduates. As the level of education increases, persistence level decreases and regulation skill increases.

As a result of the analysis of variance of lifelong learning tendencies of trainers in terms of professional seniority variable, no statistically significant difference was found between the mean scores of lifelong learning tendencies in terms of professional seniority variable (F (4.349) = 1.560, p> 0.05) as shown in Table 7.

Table 7. The results of the analysis of variance of lifelong learning tendencies of trainers in terms of professional seniority variable

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Motivation	Between Groups	.493	4	.123	1.198	.311
	Within Groups	35.918	349	.103		
	Total	36.411	353			
Persistence	Between Groups	1.997	4	.499	1.801	.128
	Within Groups	96.762	349	.277		
	Total	98.759	353			
Lack of Regulation of Learning	Between Groups	4.940	4	1.235	.792	.531
	Within Groups	544.124	349	1.559		
	Total	549.063	353			
Lack of Curiosity	Between Groups	7.401	4	1.850	1.596	.175
	Within Groups	404.640	349	1.159		
	Total	412.042	353			

As a result of the analysis of variance of lifelong learning tendencies of trainers in terms of mode of their work, no statistically significant difference was found between the mean scores of lifelong learning tendencies (F(3.353)= 2.011, p>0.05) as shown in Table 8.

Table 8. The lifelong learning tendencies of trainers in terms of mode of their work

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Motivation	Between Groups	.344	3	.115	1.112	.344
	Within Groups	36.067	350	.103		
	Total	36.411	353			
Persistence	Between Groups	1.217	3	.406	1.455	.227
	Within Groups	97.543	350	.279		
	Total	98.759	353			
Lack of Regulation of Learning	Between Groups	3.860	3	1.287	.826	.480
	Within Groups	545.203	350	1.558		
	Total	549.063	353			
Lack of Curiosity	Between Groups	6.167	3	2.056	1.773	.152
	Within Groups	405.874	350	1.160		
	Total	412.042	353			

Independent Sample T Test was used to find out whether the mean scores of lifelong learning tendencies of educators differed according to pedagogical formation that they took and the results of the analysis were given in Table 9.

Table 9. Independent Sample T Test was used to find out whether the mean scores of lifelong learning tendencies of educators differed according to pedagogical formation that they took

	Pedagogical Formation	N	Average	ss	t	p
Motivation	Yes	85	5.6761	.38129	-2.036	.042
	No	269	5.7571	.29785		
Persistence	Yes	85	5.2802	.62488	-2.189	.029
	No	269	5.4235	.49109		
Lack of Regulation of Learning	Yes	85	5.0647	1.32426	.238	.812
	No	269	5.0277	1.22424		
Lack of Curiosity	Yes	85	4.9691	1.27532	-.953	.341
	No	269	5.0972	1.01179		

According to the independent sample T Test results, there were significant differences in the sub-dimensions of motivation ($t = -2.036$; $p < .05$, $n2 = 0.1$) and persistence ($t = -2.189$; $p < .05$, $n2 = 0.1$)). It was seen that the trainers who did not receive pedagodical formation had higher tendency in the fields of motivation and persistence. 01% of the change in the tendency of trainers in lifelong learning is explained by formation training.

Independent Sample T Test was used to find out whether there is a significant difference between the lifelong learning tendency scores of educators according to whether or not there is a curriculum related to their field of study as given in Table 10.

Table 10. Independent Sample T Test according to whether or not there is a curriculum related to their field of study

	Program	N	Average	ss	t	p
Motivation	Yes	157	5.7584	.29941	1.124	.262
	No	196	5.7197	.33761		
Persistence	Yes	157	5.4276	.56207	1.216	.225
	No	196	5.3586	.50158		
Lack of Regulation of Learning	Yes	157	4.8385	1.39889	-2.655	.008
	No	196	5.1903	1.09091		
Lack of Curiosity	Yes	157	4.9792	1.18368	-1.326	.186
	No	196	5.1327	.98945		

According to the results of the independent sample T Test, it was found that there was a significant difference in the sub-dimension of lack of regulation of learning ($t = -2.655$; $p < .05$, $n2 = 0.1$) according to the existance of any curriculum related to their field of study. In non-curricular areas, trainers have a higher tendency to lack of regulation of learning. The result show that 01% of the change in the tendency of trainers in the field of lifelong learning is explained by the lack of curriculum.

According to descriptive results, it was seen that the motivation and persistence levels of the trainers were higher than the "lack of regulation of learning" and "lack of curiosity" levels. It seems that trainers positive self-image regarding life-long learning is higher than the negative sides in this respect. Tanatar and Alpaydın [16] has found similar findings with different samples consisting from 225 teachers were employed depending on the Ministry of National Education. The study of Şahin and Arcagök [17] also implies that teachers have positive self-perception regarding life-long learning tendencies. They found that teachers' motivation and persistence levels of lifelong learning tendencies are high, while levels of learning disability and lack of curiosity are in low levels. Kılıç [18] similarly found that the pre-service teachers' negative attitudes towards lifelong learning scores are below the medium of the life-long learning scale. Therefore, it is understood that trainers do not have negative attitudes that prevent them from gaining lifelong learning experiences in this regard. However in the study of Ayaz [19] all the dimensions of teachers are found to be high levels. These differences can be explained by sample differences as well as the self-perception of teachers regarding this issue.

According to T test results in terms gender, there was a significant difference in lack of regulation and lack of curiosity dimension in favour of females in terms of lifelong learning tendencies. This finding is contradicted with the some findings in which it is found that there is no significant differences in terms of lifelong learning tendencies. However, Kılıç [18] found similar findings regarding this issue. Accordingly, there is a significant difference pre-service teachers's positive attitude towards life-long learning in terms of gender variable in favor of girls. When the literature regarding the relationship between gender and Life-Long Learning Tendencies with different populations, it is seen that there are similar findings regarding in the literature showing significance difference on the behalf of females [5, 6, 20-25]. It is seen that gender has

an effective role for perceived life-long learning tendecies In this respect, it can be concluded that there might be severe variations in the opinions of males and females in the context of life-long learning tendencies. In terms of one interpretation, women can not benefit from the education system as much as males and, therefore it is probable that the motive of females to life-long learning is strong. Accordingly, females can engage in education activities that community and their relatives impose on them, while males have the opportunity to create more open decisions and engage in training courses that help their career life Kılıç [18]. However it should be noted that there are studies indicating that there is no significant differences in terms of gender [1, 14, 17, 26-29] as well as there are significant difference in favour of males [5]. This contradicted results shows that rather than gender, there might be more deep sociological constructs which are significant for life-long learning tendencies.

As a result of the variance analysis regarding the lifelong learning tendencies of the educators in terms of age, as the age level increases, the tendency to persistence which is the sub-factor of lifelong tendencies increases. However, when the literature is examined, Kılıç [18] found no significant relationship between persistence sub-dimension and the age variable. There are similar findings indicating significant differences, however these differences indicating different dimensions because of the usage of different measurement tools. This contradicted results indicate that age shouldn't be taken as an independent variable affecting life-long learning tendecies but rather it might be use as a mdiator variable for explaining the cause and effect relationships in terms of different variables.

The result of variance analysis of lifelong learning tendencies in terms of graduation levels indicates that as the level of education increases, persistence level decreases and regulation skill increases. Similarly, Şahin and Arcagök [17] determined that learning status is an effective variable in obtaining information and digital competencies which are sub-dimensions of lifelong learning. According to these dimensions, it is seen that the teachers with the lowest level of proficiency are associate degree teachers.The research conducted by Yaman and Yazar [30] shows that there is no significant difference between lifelong learning tendencies of teachers and the higher education institution they graduated from. These contradicted results might be stemmed from the fact that there is no homogenous education in Turkey, hence, different educational backgrounds and samples result in different perceived life-long learning tendencies.

As a result of the analysis of variance of lifelong learning tendencies of trainers in terms of professional seniority variable and mode of their work, no statistically significant difference was found between the mean scores of lifelong learning tendencies in terms of professional seniority variable and mode of their work. Similarly, the findigns of Ayaz [19] implies that is no meaningful difference in the life-long learning tendencies of teacher in terms of professional seniority variable. Contrary to this, some researchers found that there were significant differences in terms of their seniority levels. This can be also explained by sample differences. In this regard, according to the findings of this study it can be concluded that professional seniority variable and mode of their work are not effective variables in terms of lifelong learning tendencies of trainers.

According to the independent sample T Test results it was seen that the trainers who did not receive pedagodical formation had higher tendency in the fields of motivation and persistence. This is a suprising result in the context of the expectation that education should have positive effect on lifelong learning tendencies. However, this also implies the situation that the trainers who did not receive pedagodical formation needs more engagement in terms of life-long learning skills to improve their Professional life.

According to the results of the independent sample T Test, it was found that there was a significant difference in the sub-dimension of lack of regulation of learning according to the existance of any curriculum related to their field of study in favour of saying "no". In other words, Trainers who don't use curriculum based instruction are more prone to have problems in the regulation of learning which is compatible with the conceptual expectation of these notions.

4. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we found that as the age level increases, the tendency to persistence which is the sub-factor of lifelong tendencies increases. We also found that as the level of education increases, persistence level decreases and regulation skill increases. Additionally, no statistically significant difference was found between the mean scores of lifelong learning tendencies in terms of professional seniority variable and mode of their work. It was observed that the trainers who did not receive pedagodical formation had higher tendency in the fields of motivation and persistence. It was found that there was a significant difference in the sub-dimension of lack of regulation of learning according to the existance of any curriculum related to their field of study in favour of saying "no".

Quantitative, qualitative and mixed studies will be carried out in order to provide a more in-depth analysis in this issue. Different variables such as social, cultural, economic, population density, geographical

conditions can be used for subsequent researches. More importantly, life-long learning tendecies can be investigated through different relevant dependent variables.

REFERENCES

[1] Uzunboylu, H. & Hürsen, Ç. "Yaşam Boyu Öğrenme Yeterlik Ölçeği: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması," *Hacetepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, vol. 41, pp. 449- 460.

[2] Fidan, N. ve Erden, M. *Eğitime Giriş*, (1. Basım), Alkım Yayınevi, İstanbul, 1998.

[3] Güneş, F. *Yetişkin Eğitimi*, Ocak Yayınları. Ankara, 1996.

[4] Koç, M., Taş, S., Özkan, H.H. ve Yılmaz, E., *Türkiye'de Yetişkin ve Yaşam Boyu Eğitimine Yönelik Lisans Programı Önerisi*, I. Uluslararası Türkiye Eğitim Araştırmaları Kongresi, Çanakkale, 2009.

[5] Diker-Coşkun, Y. *Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşam boyu öğrenme eğilimlerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi* (Doktora tezi), Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara, 2009.

[6] Demirel, M. & Akkoyunlu, B. "Pre-service teachers' lifelong learning tendencies and information literacy self-efficacy perceptions," *10th International Educational Technology Conference*, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, İstanbul, 2010.

[7] Okçabol, R. *Halk Eğitimi (Yetişkin Eğitimi)*, Ed. 3, Baskı, Ankara, Ütopya Yayınevi, 2006.

[8] Knowles, M. *The adult learner: A neglected species*, Houston: Gulf Publishing, 1973.

[9] Selvi, K. "Teachers' lifelong learning competencies," *İJOCİS*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 61-69, 2011.

[10] Fenwick, T.A. "Fostering Teachers' Lifelong Learning Through Proffesional Growth Plans: A Cautious Reccomendation for Policy," *2001 Pan- Canadian Education Research Agenda Symposium Teacher Education/ Educator Training: Current Trends and Future Directions*, 2001 Laval University, Qubec City.1-21, 2001.

[11] Cansever, B. A. "Avrupa birliği eğitim politikaları ve Türkiye'nin bu politikalara uyum sürecinin değerlendirilmesi," *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 22-232, 2009.

[12] Kıvrak, E. *Avrupa Birliği ve Türkiye'de Yaşam Boyu Öğrenme Politikaları ve İstihdam İlişkisinin Değerlendirilmesi*, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara, 2007.

[13] Breivik, P.S. "*Information literacy for the sceptical library director*," *IATUL Conference Queensland University of Technology*, pp, 1-10, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia, http://educate.lib.chalmers.se/iatul/proceedcontents/qutpap/brei vik_full.html, 2000.

[14] Rasmussen, P. "Lifelong learning policy in two national contexts," *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 326-342, 2014.

[15] Karasar, N. *Bilimsel araştırma*, Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık, 2003.

[16] Tanatar, E. Alpaydın, Y. "The relationship between teachers ' work values and life long learning tendencies," *Turkish Studies*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 1775-1790, 2019.

[17] Arcagök, S. ve Şahin, Ç. "Öğretmenlerin yaşam boyu öğrenme yeterlikleri düzeyinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi," *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, vol. 16, pp. 394-417, 2014.

[18] Kılıç, H., ve Tuncel, Z. A. "İlköğretim branş öğretmenlerinin bireysel yenilikçilik düzeyleri ve yaşam boyu öğrenme eğilimleri," *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 26-37, 2014.

[19] Ayaz, C. *Öğretmenlerin yaşam boyu öğrenme eğilimlerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Bartın, 2016.

[20] Demiralay, R. *Öğretmen adaylarının bilgi ve iletişim teknolojilerini kullanımları açısından bilgi okuryazarlığı öz-yeterlik algılarının değerlendirilmesi*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara, 2008.

[21] Erdoğan, D.G. *Öğretmen adaylarının yaşam boyu öğrenme eğilimlerine etki eden faktörler*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora tezi, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Bolu, 2014.

[22] Gencel, İ. E. "Öğretmen adaylarının yaşam boyu öğrenme yeterliklerine yönelik algıları," *Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi*, vol. 170, pp. .237-252, 2013.

[23] Gregg, J.P. *Psychological implications and personal perceptions of lifelong learning adults in life satisfaction and self-esteem*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne University, USA, 1996.

[24] İzci, E.,& Koç, S. "The evaluatıon of the teacher candıdates' vıews on the lıfe long learnıng," *Adıyaman University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences*, vol. 5, no. 9, pp. 101-114, 2012.

[25] Kozikoğlu, İ. "Üniversite ve meslek yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin yaşam boyu öğrenme yeterliklerinin incelenmesi," *Journal of Instructional Technologies & Teacher Education*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 29-43, 2014.

[26] Doğan, S., Kavtelek, C. "Hayat boyu öğrenme kurum yöneticilerinin hayat boyu öğrenmeye ilişkin algıları," *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 82-104, 2015.

[27] Oral, B. ve Yazar, T. "International perspectives on new aspectes of learning in teacher education," *IPALTE 2013. 2-4 Ekim 2013*, Dicle Üniversitesi, Diyarbakır, 2013.

[28] Tunca, N., Şahin, S. A. ve Aydın,Ö. "Öğretmen adaylarının yaşam boyu öğrenme eğilimleri," *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 432-446, 2015.

[29] Yılmaz, M. "Lifelong Learning Tendencies of Prospective Teachers Receiving Pedagogical Formation Education," *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 6, no. 8, pp. 1684-1691, 2018.

[30] Yaman, F. ve Yazar, T. "Öğretmenlerin yaşam boyu öğrenme eğilimlerinin incelenmesi (Diyarbakır ili örneği)," *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 1553-1566, 2015.