

Positions and Preferences: Faculty Goes for Lifelong Learning, a View from Turkey

Halil İbrahim Haseski¹ & Hatice Ferhan Odabaşı²

¹ Department of Computer Education and Instructional Technology, Faculty of Education, Manisa Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey

² Department of Computer Education and Instructional Technology, Faculty of Education, Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey

Correspondence: Halil İbrahim Haseski, Department of Computer Education and Instructional Technology, Faculty of Education, Manisa Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey

Received: October 7, 2017

Accepted: November 1, 2017

Online Published: November 7, 2017

doi:10.5430/ijhe.v6n6p19

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n6p19>

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate academics' lifelong learning positions and preferences. The research was designed as survey research. The participants consisted of 230 academics from Faculty of Education of Anadolu University in Turkey. Data were collected using a survey form which had items about the factors that affect lifelong learning process of academics. It was found that lifelong learning survey scores of participants vary according to their departments, branches, ages, seniorities, genders and academic titles. It was also found that academics of education faculty mainly participate in scientific and teaching activities in lifelong learning.

Keywords: Academics, Lifelong learning positions, Faculty of education, Turkey

1. Introduction

Today, lifelong learning (LL) is significant in providing development opportunities to all based on equality and independent of all restrictions and supporting individuals to keep the pace with innovations, learn in different fields and to accomplish self-realization (Dinevski & Dinevski, 2004; Dunn, 2003; Laal, 2012). LL, which is equally important for all sections of the society, is sine qua non for academics, who produce science and train students in the universities, in improving their knowledge and skills.

Several activities and plans were conducted in Turkey to support the development of instruction and faculty members. For this purpose, several decisions were taken in five-year development plans developed by State Planning Organization since 1963 such as providing resources to the universities for scientific research, focusing on training qualified academics, encouraging successful individuals to become academics, promotion of scientific competition among institutions, developed universities providing assistance to other universities in training faculty members and supporting scientific research (Özdemir, 2006). Parallel to the plans and decisions, the opportunities provided by the universities in Turkey promote educational, professional and personal improvement of academics and assist them to become a part of the LL process. Turkish universities provide memberships to scientific publication databases for academics to assist them in obtaining knowledge and conducting research in their fields. Furthermore, university libraries provide access to various resources almost in every subject field. On the other hand, project grants provided by both the universities and The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey to support the scientific research in the institutions compensates for the necessary material required for the studies conducted by academics and supports them in their scientific development. In addition, the opportunities provided by technological advances offer both instructional and learning facilities for the academics. Information and communication technologies of our age facilitate sharing of information and experiences of scientists across different universities and enable research conducted in cooperation and support professional and personal development of academics.

Bologna Process, Mevlana Exchange Programme and Erasmus Programme that provide assignments and training of academics in different universities and cooperation on research promote their professional development. Furthermore, panels, seminars and on-the-job training courses organized in universities create opportunities for academics to improve their proficiency in their fields. Various clubs that are organized in different areas of interest in universities,

present opportunities for academics to improve themselves in a wide variety of areas such as arts, sports and sciences in Turkey.

In addition, several non-formal education services are organized outside the universities in Turkey. These facilities are organized by ministries, local governments such as provincial, district and town authorities, independent institutions such as Turkish Directorate of Religious Affairs and Turkish Radio and Television Corporation, professional organizations such as workers' unions and small business associations, volunteer organizations such as community centers, Red Crescent Society, The Turkish Foundation for Combating Soil Erosion, for Reforestation and the Protection of Natural Habitats. Faculty members could independently participate in training courses provided in their fields of interest and could benefit from self-improvement opportunities in Turkey.

Related studies reported that designing systematic applications with the assistance of technology-aided media in higher education was significant in professional development (Aggarwal, 2013; Hall, 2016; Latchem, Odabaşı & Kabakçı, 2006), data collection tools were developed within the framework of certain factors deemed efficient for the process (Günük, Odabaşı & Kuzu, 2014; Kirby, Knapper, Lamon & Egnatoff, 2010; Uzunboylu & Hürsen, 2011), and studies that assessed the specifications of education, which aims professional development of academics in the universities, were conducted (Banks, 2002; Brown, 2001; Soran, Akkoyunlu & Kavak, 2006). Furthermore, in the literature, there are studies that identified the current status of the importance academics assigned to the subject matter and their competences in the field (Duta & Rafaila, 2014; Köğce et al., 2014; Yavuz-Konokman & Yanpar-Yelken, 2012).

Although there are studies in the literature, which aimed to identify the present status of academics on LL, it could be argued that the context of these studies was limited to some dimensions of LL process. On the other hand, LL processes of academics are affected by many factors specific to the nature of their profession. Thus, in order to provide more effective and efficient support to academics in the way of LL, specialty studies that aim to investigate LL with respect to factors specific to academic profession are in need.

The purpose of the present study was to investigate LL positions of faculty members that work in the faculty of education based on the factors which affect LL process of academics that were obtained by Haseski and Odabaşı (2016) and to investigate their LL activity preferences. The following research questions were posed consistent with the general purpose of the present study:

1. What are the mean scores that faculty members of education faculty received in Lifelong Learning Survey (LLS)?
2. How are these survey scores distributed based on department, branch, gender, age, seniority, academic title and survey items?
3. What are their preferences for the activities they participated related to LL?

2. Method

2.1 Study Design

The study was designed with survey model to determine the current LL positions of academics. Survey models are research approaches that aim to describe present situation (Karasar, 2008).

2.2 Participants

The universe of the study was faculty members in Anadolu University Faculty of Education during 2014 – 2015 academic year spring semester. The whole study universe was approached and 230 faculty members participated in the study in a willing way.

Education Faculty of Anadolu University was selected for the study. Because Anadolu University is a prominent and well-established institution on distance education and LL (Kaya, 2014) with the "Lifelong Education" slogan in Turkey (Anadolu University, 2014; Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education, 2012). Furthermore, the institution provides significant financial support and opportunities for academics to conduct scientific activities. On the other hand, the faculty of education has special importance since it undertakes the mission of training of preservice teachers who will educate society in the future.

Percentages and frequencies of the distribution of study participants in departments and branches they work at are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of participants based on departments and branches.

Departments	\bar{x}	%	Branches	\bar{x}	%
Foreign Language Education	52	22.61	English Language Education	27	11.73
Primary Education	48	20.87	Education for Children with Intelligence Disabilities	24	10.43
Special Education	47	20.43	Computer and Instructional Technologies Education	22	9.57
Educational Sciences	38	16.52	Arts Teaching	22	9.57
Fine Arts Education	23	10.00	Classroom Teaching	19	8.26
Computer Education and Instructional Technologies	22	9.57	Psychological Counseling and Guidance	16	6.96
Total	230	100	German Language Education	14	6.09
			Educational Management Inspection Planning and Economy	14	6.09
			Education for Hearing-Impaired	14	6.09
			Primary School Mathematics Education	13	5.65
			French Language Education	12	5.22
			Social Studies Education	9	3.91
			Education for Children with Superior Intelligence	9	3.91
			Educational Programs and Instruction	8	3.48
			Pre-school Education	7	3.04
			Total	230	100

Percentage and frequency values for the distribution of the study participants based on gender, age, seniority, and academic title are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Distribution of participants based on gender, age, seniority, and academic title.

Variables	f	%	Variables	f	%
Gender			Seniority		
Female	129	56.09	1-10 years	145	63.04
Male	101	43.91	11-20 years	43	18.70
Age Range			21-30 years	27	11.74
22-30	115	50.00	31 years and over	15	6.52
31-40	50	21.74	Academic Title		
41-50	39	16.96	Research Assistant	137	59.57
51-60	21	9.13	Assist. Prof.	52	22.60
61 and over	5	2.17	Assoc. Prof.	25	10.87
			Professor	16	6.96
			Total	230	100

2.3 Data Collection Tool

Authors designed the LLS to determine LL positions of faculty members. A qualitative research was conducted by Haseski and Odabaşı (2016) as a preliminary research before the design of the survey form. The objective of the preliminary research was to identify the factors academics considered significant for the LL process. Data for the preliminary research were collected via semi-structured interviews using written interview forms with 65 participants, who were working as research assistants, assistant professors, associate professors and professors in 17 faculties in Anadolu University. As a result of content analysis conducted on collected data, environmental and personal factors which contained many sub factors effective on LL process of academics were identified. Survey form items were then designed based on the above mentioned factors.

Büyük öztürk et al. (2013) stated that survey design process should include the phases of problem definition, item determination, obtaining expert views, and finalizing the survey with a pilot study. Using this method, an item pool including 50 survey items aimed to determine LL positions of academics was formed and the views of 7 experts in the field of Computer Education and Instructional Technologies were requested to determine the content validity for these items. 40 items were selected and organized into a 5-point Likert-type form based on expert views. The form was then reviewed once more by the same experts and their views on face validity were obtained and the form was reedited. Finally, the survey form was reviewed by 3 assessment experts and 1 language expert and reorganized based on their views for the pilot study. LLS was tested with 10 faculty members from Anadolu University Faculty of Education universe and finalized based on the received feedback. Items of LLS and related source codes are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3. LLS items and source codes.

Item	Source Code
1. I acquire new knowledge and skills to improve my inadequacies.	Self-assessment
2. I do not require information-communication technologies when learning new information.	Information-communication technologies
3. I set targets for subjects to learn in the future.	Individual goals
4. I have high motivation for learning.	Motivation
5. I acquire new knowledge and skills on subjects that I have an interest in.	Curiosity
6. ...	Openness for innovation
7. I cooperate with others to acquire new knowledge and skills.	Openness for cooperation
8. I acquire new knowledge as a result of my interaction with others.	Effective communication skills
9. My desire to advance academically motivates me to acquire new knowledge and skills.	Desire for academic advancement
10. Intensity of my academic work limits my learning in different fields.	Obligation to work with an academic focus
11. I continuously spend effort to reach my learning goals.	Perseverance in learning
12. Financial problems force me to utilize different learning resources.	Financial problems
13. I do not participate in academic exchange programs.	Academician exchange programs
14. ...	Institutional opportunities
15. ...	Support of the academic work environment
16. My interactions with students (student questions, ideas, etc.) motivate me for learning.	Interaction with students
17. Excessive course load limits my learning in different areas.	Excessive course load
18. My domestic responsibilities prevent me to peruse different learning possibilities.	Family

19. My social circle encourages me in learning.	Environmental qualities
20. ...	Social culture
21. I utilize media (TV, radio, newspapers, etc.) to learn.	Media
22. I am always eager to learn.	Eagerness to learn
23. ...	Individual's psychological condition
24. Academic structure, which necessitates development, motivates me for learning.	Structure of academics that is exigent for improvement
25. My institutional tasks (administrative tasks, consulting, coordinating, etc.) limit my learning in different areas.	Excessive work load
26. ...	Mentality of institutional management
27. I do not attempt to learn to improve on my shortcomings.	Self-evaluation
28. ...	Institutional support
29. ...	Government policies
30. I try to acquire new knowledge in fields outside my expertise.	Obligation to work with an academic focus
31. My love for my profession increases my eagerness to learn.	Love for the profession
32. ...	Mobbing
33. Opportunity to contribute to science increases my eagerness to learn.	Scientific contribution
34. I acquire new knowledge and skills to stay professionally up to date.	Following the current in the field
35. I acquire new knowledge and skills to keep up with the times.	Keeping up with the times
36. Obligation to acquire new knowledge worries me.	Eagerness to learn
37. I acquire new knowledge and skills to assist people around me.	To be helpful to people around
38. ...	Being a role model for people around
39. I acquire new knowledge and skills to update the courses I instruct.	Updating courses
40. I do not plan my future learning.	Individual goals

In addition to these items, LLS also contained seven questions to determine the participants' departments, branches, genders, ages, seniorities, academic titles and preferences for the activities related to LL.

2.4 Data Collection Process

Prior to data collection in the study, an application was presented to Anadolu University Ethics Committee and the ethical approval to conduct the study was obtained. Then, data collection process was started. Before applying the data collection tools, the objective of the study, its content, how the collected data would be used and their rights and privacy principles were presented to the participants by the researchers verbally. In this context, identities of the participants were kept confidential. Thus, faculty members accepted to participate in the study and responded LLS form in a willing way.

2.5 Data Analysis

Data collected with the survey form were analyzed with SPSS 21 software and descriptive statistics were calculated regarding to research questions. Before the analysis of data, negative survey items were reverse coded and mean survey scores for participants were calculated. Since internal consistency coefficient was higher than .70, it could be stated that LLS had high level of reliability (Cronbach's alpha=.86) (Özdamar, 2013).

3. Results

3.1 Findings Regarding to First Research Question

Descriptive statistics on the distribution of mean score of LLS are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics on mean score of LLS.

n	Min.	Max.	\bar{x}	Sd.	Skewness	Kurtosis
230	3.03	4.80	3.90	.343	.217	-.241

It was determined that LL positions of the participants were above the midpoint of the 5-point Likert scale. Since skewness and kurtosis values were between -1 and +1, it could be stated that mean survey score was within the normal distribution range (Huck, 2012).

3.2 Findings Regarding to Second Research Question

Mean scores of the participants based on their departments and branches are listed in Table 5.

Table 5. Mean scores of the participants based on their departments and branches.

Department	\bar{x}	%	Branch	\bar{x}	%
Primary Education	4.02	17.21	Education Inspection Economy	4.05	6.91
Computer and Instructional Technologies	3.92	16.78	Management Planning and Economy	4.05	6.91
Educational Sciences	3.90	16.70	Pre-school Education	4.05	6.91
Foreign Language Education	3.89	16.65	Educational Programs and Instruction	4.04	6.89
Special Education	3.83	16.40	Primary School Mathematics Education	4.03	6.88
Fine Arts Education	3.80	16.27	Social Studies Education	4.02	6.86
Total	3.90	100	Classroom Teaching	4.00	6.82
			English Language Education	3.93	6.71
			Computer and Instructional Technologies Education	3.92	6.69
			Education for Children with Intelligence Disabilities	3.91	6.67
			German Language Education	3.87	6.60
			French Language Education	3.84	6.55
			Arts Teaching	3.80	6.48
			Education for Hearing-Impaired	3.76	6.42
			Education for Children with Superior Intelligence	3.73	6.36
			Psychological Counseling and Guidance	3.66	6.24
			Total	3.90	100

Based on these data, the department with the highest mean score was Primary Education Department ($\bar{x}=4.02$). The branch with the highest mean survey score was Educational Administration, Supervision, Planning and Economics ($\bar{x}=4.05$).

Mean scores of the participants based on gender, age, seniority and academic titles are listed in Table 6.

Table 6. Mean scores based on gender, age, seniority and academic title of the participants.

Variables	\bar{x}	%	Variables	\bar{x}	%
Gender			Seniority		
Female	3.93	50.38	21-30 years	4.01	25.36
Male	3.87	49.62	31 years and over	3.98	25.18
Age Range			11-20 years		
61 and over	4.11	20.76	1-10 years	3.85	24.35
51-60	3.97	20.05	Academic Title		
31-40	3.95	19.95	Assoc. Prof.	4.08	25.73
41-50	3.93	19.85	Professor	4.03	25.41
22-30	3.84	19.39	Assist. Prof.	3.90	24.59
			Research Assistant	3.85	24.27
			Total	3.90	100

Data presented in the table demonstrated that as the participants' ages, seniority and academic title increased, generally mean scores had a tendency to increase as well.

Mean scores and standard deviation values based on each survey item are listed in Table 7.

Table 7. Mean scores for each survey item.

Survey Items	\bar{x}	Sd.
6. ...	4.56	0.55
1. I acquire new knowledge and skills to improve my inadequacies.	4.55	0.52
5. I acquire new knowledge and skills on subjects that I have an interest in.	4.50	0.50
8. I acquire new knowledge as a result of my interaction with others.	4.43	0.60
35. I acquire new knowledge and skills to keep up with the times.	4.38	0.54
31. My love for my profession increases my eagerness to learn.	4.36	0.69
34. I acquire new knowledge and skills to stay professionally up to date.	4.35	0.55
23. ...	4.33	0.77
4. I have high motivation for learning.	4.27	0.71
33. Opportunity to contribute to science increases my eagerness to learn.	4.26	0.68
16. My interactions with students (student questions, ideas, etc.) motivate me for learning.	4.22	0.75
24. Academic structure, which necessitates development, motivates me for learning.	4.21	0.88
30. I try to acquire new knowledge in fields outside my expertise.	4.19	0.69
39. I acquire new knowledge and skills to update the courses I instruct.	4.19	0.77
7. I cooperate with others to acquire new knowledge and skills.	4.18	0.84
28. ...	4.18	0.89
37. I acquire new knowledge and skills to assist people around me.	4.17	0.67
22. I am always eager to learn.	4.14	0.73
14. ...	4.13	1.00
3. I set targets for subjects to learn in the future.	4.10	0.94
21. I utilize media (TV, radio, newspapers, etc.) to learn.	3.94	0.95
38. ...	3.91	0.91
11. I continuously spend effort to reach my learning goals.	3.88	0.78

26. ...	3.88	1.05
9. My desire to advance academically motivates me to acquire new knowledge and skills.	3.86	1.01
32. ...	3.75	1.19
19. My social circle encourages me in learning.	3.69	0.90
10. Intensity of my academic work limits my learning in different fields.	3.38	1.10
17. Excessive course load limits my learning in different areas.	3.33	1.17
20. ...	3.27	1.11
12. Financial problems force me to utilize different learning resources.	3.14	1.17
15. ...	3.12	1.26
25. My institutional tasks (administrative tasks, consulting, coordinating, etc.) limit my learning in different areas.	2.94	1.13
29. ...	2.79	1.11
18. My domestic responsibilities prevent me to peruse different learning possibilities.	2.73	1.16
13. I do not participate in academic exchange programs.	2.44	1.15
2. I do not require information-communication technologies when learning new information.	1.81	1.04
40. I do not plan my future learning.	1.70	0.67
36. Obligation to acquire new knowledge worries me.	1.61	0.55
27. I do not attempt to learn to improve on my shortcomings.	1.49	0.53

Results showed that mean scores for the responses to survey items differed based on both items and effective factors. It could be stated that mean scores of participants in items relevant to individual factors, which are effective on LL, were comparatively higher. On the other hand, mean scores of survey items related to environmental factors effective on LL differed based on the type of factor.

3.2 Findings Regarding to Third Research Question

In the context of the third research question, participants were asked the names of the types LL activities that were performed by academics as determined by conducted preliminary qualitative study and they were asked to rank the related activities based on their frequency of participation between 1 (most frequent participation) and 6 (least frequent participation). Arithmetic mean for each activity is listed in Table 8.

Table 8. Participants' preferences for LL activities.

Rank	Activities	\bar{x}
1	Scientific Activities	2.50
2	Teaching Activities	2.96
3	Sports Activities	3.70
4	Social Activities	3.72
5	Administrative Activities	3.94
6	Personal Development Activities	4.02

Data presented in Table 8 demonstrated that the participants primarily attended scientific activities ($\bar{x}=2.50$).

4. Discussion

Scores obtained on the survey demonstrated that mean survey score received by the academics of faculty of education was above the midpoint on 5-point Likert-type scale. This could be interpreted as LL positions of the participants were above average, however, there was still room for development. Therefore, academics of faculty of education should be supported more effectively in the terms of factors with low mean score by the institution.

It was observed that academics prioritized professional development in LL at Faculty of Education of Anadolu

University. One reason of this situation could be that financial opportunities offered to academics are focused on professional development in the institution and conducting LL activities on other fields depends on academics' preferences without obligations and financial support by institutions. Other reason could be that academic promotion criteria are focused on scientific activities in the higher education system in Turkey. This situation could be seen as a shortcoming in terms of supporting academics' holistic development in LL. For this reason, new academic promotion criteria for academics of faculty of education should be determined including artistic, sportive, cultural and civil social activities. Furthermore, different from the current situation in Turkey, financial support should be provided for the participation of academics of faculty of education in congresses, symposiums and exhibitions activities not only in their science fields, but also in different fields that they were interested in.

It was determined that mean survey score of female participants was a little higher than the mean survey score of male participants. Similar to this finding, studies that could be found in the literature determined that females' dispositions and positive attitudes towards LL were higher than males (Diker-Coşkun & Demirel, 2012; Gencel, 2013; Jenkins, 2006; Kılıç, 2014). Several other studies conducted in European countries identified that there was a difference in participation in LL based on gender, while other studies argued that there was no difference (Chlon-Dominczak & Lis, 2013). Based on these determinations, in further studies, the role of gender in LL in fine detail should be examined to provide a more comprehensive perspective on the subject matter.

It was identified that mean survey scores of study participants differed based on their departments and branches. Consistent with this finding, Gencel (2013) and Diker-Coşkun (2009) reported that university students' LL dispositions and their position of LL proficiencies differed based on the faculties and departments they attend. Furthermore, it was identified that as the participants' age group, seniority and academic titles increased, their scores in LL survey generally increased as well. When it is considered that experience and ability positions of the individual promote self-development (Günük, Odabaşı & Kuzu, 2012; Knapper & Cropley, 2000; Rotwell & Kazanas, 1998), it could be argued that the above mentioned finding was consistent with the results found in the literature. On the other hand, a decrease was observed in survey scores of the participants with the highest seniority and academic title position, contrary to above mentioned tendency. The reason of these differences could be inefficient individual or environmental factors that were effective on LL. However, further studies should be conducted to understand the reasons pertaining to these findings and to provide a more comprehensive perspective. In addition, the effects of gender, age, seniority and academic titles on LL could be investigated separately and together in more detail. In the current situation, the same LL opportunities are offered to academics regardless of the differences of age, gender, academic title, seniority and scientific branch in Turkey. In the direction of these findings, learning needs of academics of faculty of education based on related variables could be identified and specialized LL support based on the academics' requirements of genders, academic titles, scientific branches they study, age and seniority positions could be provided in faculty of education. Furthermore, the university could allocate a specific budget for each academics of faculty of education to use it based on their developmental requirements in a flexible manner different from the current status that gives opportunities for only scientific development in Turkey.

It was observed that mean scores for the responses to survey items differed based on both items and effective factors. It could be stated that mean scores of participants in items relevant to individual factors, which are effective on LL, were comparatively higher. Although academics had comparatively higher scores in terms of individual factors, there was still room for development. In further studies, effective individual factors for LL should be examined in detail and academics of faculty of education should be supported to improve themselves in terms of these factors more by institution.

Based on the findings, mean scores of survey items related to environmental factors effective on LL differed based on the type of factor. It was considered that it was due to the differences between the existence and qualities of environmental factors. Also, it could be stated that average responses of participants in survey items related to professional factors were comparatively higher. On the other hand, it was observed that, in the field of self-improvement, participants' mean scores related to the desire to advance in academics encouraging learning and position of utilization of academician exchange programs were lower than survey average score. In further studies, the reason of this situation should be examined in detail and academics of faculty of education should be supported in appropriate way regarding the findings.

Regarding the environmental factors affecting LL, it was observed that mean scores of academics of education faculty obtained from their responses to survey items on employer institution and work environment were in different positions. In this context, it was observed that the participants utilized the opportunities provided by the institution for self-improvement, and the scores related to the fact that these opportunities positively affected their learning

processes were above the survey average. On the other hand, it could be stated that existing work environment did not significantly affect positively academics' eagerness to learn. Although excessive course load and intense academic studies did not significantly limit their learning in different areas, they were almost indecisive on the subject matter. In a related study conducted by Özdemir (2006), it was reported that Turkish academics considered they had excessive workload. When it is considered that individuals' workload could be restrictive for self-development (Clapper, 2010), further studies should be conducted to clarify this situation on the subject matter. In addition, it could be expressed that academics of faculty of education considered supportive attitude of the administration of institution had positive effects on learning processes, since they scored around survey average on related survey items. However, in the context of LL, positions and management approaches of both faculty and university administration and their incentives and deterrents for the LL process of academics of faculty of education could be investigated in detail.

Mean scores of the responses on survey items related to learnings acquired within the context of social relationships were at different positions. Participant scores related to the situations where they acquired new knowledge as a result of relationships with others, cooperated with others to acquire new knowledge when necessary, acquired new knowledge and skills to assist individuals in their social circle and to be a positive role model for them were higher than survey average score. On the other hand, scores obtained by academics of education faculty related to their social circles encouraging them to learning were below study average score. Similar to this situation, participants considered that LL culture of the society they live in did not significantly facilitate their self-development and they were close to being indecisive on the issue. When it is considered that characteristics of the environment and society influence the individual (Jarvis, 2012; Medel-Añonuevo, Ohsako & Mauch, 2001), this could be due to the lack of awareness in the society about LL. Furthermore, although faculty members stated that their domestic responsibilities limited them, mean scores for this view was below survey average score. When it is considered that responsibilities that came with marriage limit self-development of individuals (Gouthro, 2005), this could be due to the significant lack of effective management on the part of academics of their domestic responsibilities and responsibilities related to self-improvement. Based on this finding, academics of faculty of education should be supported to plan and organize their personal life more effectively by seminars and other educational activities.

It was observed that mean scores of the survey items related to the influence of individual's financial condition on learning process was not higher than survey average score. In a related study conducted by Özdemir (2006), it was found that Turkish academics were not satisfied with their salaries. Although project grants, trainings, seminars, scholarships, memberships of scientific journals, libraries, academician exchange programs and scientific prizes were provided for the improvement of the academics themselves, based on this finding, financial conditions should be enhanced more for academics of faculty of education in all developmental areas within the context of LL process.

When the results of the study were considered within the context of Anadolu University, extensive financial opportunities, training and seminars for academic development that the institution with "Lifelong Education" slogan provides were significant and beneficial in promoting LL position of faculty members. On the other hand, as could be understood from the preferences of participants on the LL activities they participated, related endorsements were generally focused on professional development of academics. Based on the study results, members of the university administrative board should be well informed about all dimensions of LL, they should plan LL strategies of the university in detailed and use the resources effectively for the development of academics of faculty of education in all dimensions of LL.

It is necessary to be researched LL process of academics of faculty of education comprehensively for more effective support in their way of LL. For this reason, the current status of negative factors affecting LL process of academics of faculty of education such as financial, physical and social inadequacies of the work environment, excessive workloads, incapability of management of domestic responsibilities should be investigated in a detailed way and new plans should be developed to eliminate the shortcomings. Besides, action researches could be conducted on improving the quality of educational activities provided for academics of faculty of education in the institution within the context of LL. In addition, similar studies could be conducted in different faculties using the survey developed in the present study and their LL positions could be identified and compared. Furthermore, the developed survey could be transformed as a scale to collect data from all universities in Turkey and current status of academics in LL could be identified and statistical models also could be developed to demonstrate the relational structure between LL factors of the scale.

References

- Aggarwal, N. (2013). Faculty development in a flexible learning context. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 1329-1332. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.038>
- Anadolu University (2014). *Yaşamboyu öğrenme*. [Lifelong learning] Retrieved 10.10.2014, from <http://aof.mezun.anadolu.edu.tr/yboyuogrenme.htm>
- Banks, C. H. (2002). *A descriptive analysis of the perceived effectiveness of Virginia Tech's Faculty Development Institute*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Virginia Technology University, USA.
- Brown, L. A. (2001). *An evalution of faculty development in technology*. (Unpublished master thesis). The University of Alaska Anchorage, USA.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2013). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* [Scientific research methods] (15th ed.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Chlon-Dominczak, A., & Lis, M. (2013). *Does gender matter for lifelong learning activity?* Retrieved 25.07.2015, from <http://www.neujobs.eu/sites/default/files/D16.2A.pdf>
- Clapper, T. C. (2010). Beyond Knowles: What those conducting simulation need to know about adult learning theory. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing*, 6(1), e7-e14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecns.2009.07.003>
- Diker-Coşkun, Y. (2009). *Investigation of life long learning tendency of undergraduate students' in terms of some variables*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences, Turkey.
- Diker-Coşkun, Y., & Demirel, M. (2012). Lifelong learning tendencies of university students. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 42, 108-120.
- Dinevski, D., & Dinevski, I. V. (2004). The concepts of university lifelong learning provision in Europe. *Transition Studies Review*, 11(3), 227-235. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11300-004-0014-z>
- Dunn, E. (2003). *Life through learning; learning through life, the lifelong learning strategy for Scotland: Summary*. Retrieved 12.03.2014, from <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/47032/0028820.pdf>
- Duta, N., & Rafaila, E. (2014). Importance of the lifelong learning for professional development of university teachers - needs and practical implications. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 127, 801-806. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.358>
- European Commission (2001). *Making a European area of lifelong learning a reality*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Gencel, İ. E. (2013). Prospective teachers' perceptions towards lifelong learning competencies. *Education and Science*, 38(170), 237-252.
- Gouthro, P. A. (2005). A critical feminist analysis of the homeplace as learning site: expanding the discourse of lifelong learning to consider adult women learners. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 24(1), 5-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/026037042000317310>
- Günüşç, S., Odabaşı, H. F., & Kuzu, A. (2012). Factors affecting lifelong learning. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(2), 309-325.
- Günüşç, S., Odabaşı, H. F., & Kuzu, A. (2014). Developing an effective lifelong learning scale (ELLS): Study of validity & reliability. *Education and Science*, 39(171), 244-258.
- Hall, M. (2016). Playing the academic development game with control and clarity. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 21(4), 259-261. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2016.1228191>
- Haseski, H. İ., & Odabaşı, H.F. (2016). Öğretim elemanlarının yaşamboyu öğrenmeye yönelik görüşleri [Faculty's point of views regarding lifelong learning]. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(4), 331-363. <https://doi.org/10.17569/tojqi.79489>
- Huck, S. W. (2012). *Reading statictics and research* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Jarvis, P. (2012). *Adult learning in social context*. Oxon: Routhledge.
- Jenkins, A. (2006). Women, lifelong learning and transitions into employment. *Work Employment and Society*, 20(2), 309-328. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017006064116>

- Karasar, N. (2008). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* [Scientific research methods] (14th ed.). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kaya, H. E. (2014). Lifelong learning and Turkey. *Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 47(1), 81-102.
- Kılıç, Ç. (2014). Pre-service teachers' perceptions towards life long learning. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching*, 3(4), 79-87.
- Kirby, J. R., Knapper, C., Lamon, P., & Egnatoff, W. J. (2010). Development of a scale to measure lifelong learning. *International Journal of Lifelong Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 29(3), 291-302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02601371003700584>
- Knapper, C., & Cropley, A. J. (2000). *Lifelong learning in higher education* (3rd ed.). London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Knowles, M. (2009). Yetişkinlerde öğrenme konusunda yeni bir teknoloji [A new technology for adults' learning]. In A. Yıldız and M. Uysal (Eds.), *Yetişkin eğitimi* [Adult education] (pp. 127-144). İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayıncıları.
- Köğce, D., Özpinar, İ., Mandacı Şahin, S., & Aydoğan-Yenmez, A. (2014). Instructors' views on standards for the 21th century learners and lifelong learning. *Dicle University Journal of Ziya Gökalp Faculty of Education*, 22(2014), 185-213.
- Laal, M. (2012). Benefits of lifelong learning. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 4268-4272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.239>
- Latchem, C., Odabaşı, F. H., & Kabakçı, I. (2006). Online professional development for university teaching in Turkey: A proposal. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 5(3), 20-26.
- Medel-Añonuevo, C., Ohsako, T., & Mauch, W. (2001). *Revisiting lifelong learning for the 21st century*. Retrieved 25.07.2015, from <http://www.unesco.org/education/uie/pdf/revisitingLLL.pdf>
- Özdamar, K. (2013). *Paket programlar ile istatistiksel veri analizi* [Statistical data analysis using computer softwares] (Vol. 1). Ankara: Nisan Kitabevi.
- Özdemir, Ç. (2006). *Türkiye'de öğretim elemanları* [Faculty members in Turkey]. Ankara: Gazi Yayınevi.
- Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education (2012). *Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı ile Anadolu Üniversitesi'nden Avrupali Türk'lere hayat boyu öğretim protokolü* [Lifelong learning protocol for Turkish people who live in Europe from Anadolu University and Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education]. Retrieved 10.10.2014, from <http://hbogm.meb.gov.tr/www/milli-egitim-bakanligi-ile-anadolu-universitesi8217nden-avrupali-turklere-hayat-boyu-ogretim-protokolu/icerik/31>
- Rotwell, W. J., & Kazanas, H. C. (1998). *Mastering the instructional design proves: A systematic approach* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Soran, H., Akkoyunlu, B., & Kavak, Y. (2006). Life-long learning skills and training faculty members: A project at Hacettepe University. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 30, 201-210.
- Uzunboylu, H., & Hürsen, Ç. (2011). Lifelong learning competence scale (LLLCS) : The study of validity and reliability. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 41, 449-460.
- Yavuz-Konokman, G., & Yanpar-Yelken, T. (2012). *Öğretim elemanlarının yaşam boyu öğrenme yeterliklerine ilişkin görüşleri* [Views of faculty members regarding lifelong learning competencies]. Paper presented at the meeting of 2nd National Curriculum and Training Congress. 27-29 September, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Turkey.