Macrothink Institute™

Journal of Educational Issues
ISSN 2377-2263
2023, Vol. 9, No. 1

Investigation of Life Long Learning Tendencies of Undergraduate Students in Turkey

Sadık Yüksel Sıvacı

Faculty of Education, Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Burdur, Turkey

Tel: 90-533-544-0660 E-mail: sysivaci@mehmetakif.edu.tr

Mustafa Kılınç

Faculty of Education, Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Burdur, Turkey

Tel: 90-505-319-2868 E-mail: mustafakilinc1507@gmail.com

Mustafa Köroğlu (Corresponding author)

Faculty of Education, Erzincan Binali Yıldırım University, Erzincan, Turkey

Tel: 90-553-536-2142 E-mail: mustafa.koroglu@erzincan.edu.tr

Enes Demirel

Faculty of Education, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey

Tel: 90-543-943-3346 E-mail: enesdmrl08@gmail.com

Received: December 28, 2022 Accepted: January 25, 2023 Published: February 6, 2023

doi:10.5296/jei.v9i1.20614 URL: https://doi.org/10.5296/jei.v9i1.20614

Abstract

Investigation the lifelong learning tendencies of undergraduate students, who are legally adults, have gained their own learning responsibilities and are expected to strive for continuous self-improvement, is extremely important in terms of adapting to modern life and reaching the most accurate and up-to-date information against the ever-changing and developing information volume. In this context, the aim of the research is to determine the lifelong learning tendency levels of undergraduate students and to examine their lifelong tendencies in terms of various variables. The research is a study in survey model. The study

group of the research consists of 2713 undergraduate students studying at Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University in the 2020-2021 academic year. The "Lifelong Learning Tendency Scale" developed by Diker-Coşkun (2009) was used as the data collection tool. According to the results of the research, it was found that undergraduate students had a high level of lifelong learning tendency, and their lifelong learning tendency levels showed significant difference according to the variables of gender, age, grade level, cumulative grade point average, socio-economic level of the family, department and university satisfaction. It was also found that there was no statistically significant difference according to the place of residence variable. According to the findings, suggestions were made for increasing the lifelong learning tendencies of undergraduate students and for new studies.

Keywords: Lifelong learning, High school, Undergraduate student

1. Introduction

Learning is an existential process that is identical with life itself. Human being has been in a continuous learning process for various purposes since the Paleolithic Age, since the beginning of human history. While individuals had to learn the basic skills that would ensure the continuity of their lives in the old periods of history, sophisticated developments in different fields such as education, communication, culture, art, politics, technology and medicine revealed many new knowledge and skills that need to be learned. In today's modern societies, although the learning of individuals does not play a vital role in ensuring the continuity of life, as it was in the past, the natural tendency of people and the developments made learning essential (Candy, 2002). Learning is an ongoing process in individuals throughout their lifetime and in the breadth of their lives. Reischmann (2014) explained lifewide learning as continuous learning processes in daily life. Lifewide learning processes have a fairly wide scope, including formal, non-formal, and informal learning. Lifewide learning is intentional, and unintentional and can occur at any moment in life (Jackson, 2012). In the millennium age where important changes and transformations are experienced for individuals; situations such as strengthening adaptation skills against the challenges of the age, active participation in social, political and social life, developing employability skills, and benefiting from the innovations and opportunities brought by the age require a lifelong learning process (Lifelong Learning Declaration, 2000). In this sense, the idea of lifelong learning has become one of the important concepts of the 21st century by getting stronger all over the world.

Although lifelong learning is frequently mentioned in today's global information societies, it is known that the concept of lifelong learning began to be discussed in the international arena in the historical process, dating back to the 1970s (Dehmel, 2006). UNESCO plays an important role in bringing the concept to the agenda in the international arena. The reports of Faure (1972) and Delors (1996), published by UNESCO, have been influential in the international discussion of the concept of lifelong learning and the development of policies in this area. In particular, the use of the concept of lifelong learning in the Delors Report and the idea that the increasing need for labor in the world will be overcome with lifelong learning policies drew attention and year of 1996 was declared as the 'European year of lifelong

learning' and in 2000, the 'Lifelong Learning Declaration', which advocates the idea that lifelong learning has become a great need was published (Field, 2001). Following the publication of the Lifelong Learning Declaration (2000), the interest in lifelong learning has increased all over the world and both researchers and international organizations have brought different definitions by considering the idea of lifelong learning from different perspectives. Lifelong learning; is a process that encompasses all learning activities carried out by the individual in all life contexts such as home, school, workplace throughout his life in order to develop existing knowledge and skills, to acquire new knowledge and skills needed in the face of innovations and changes brought by the age, to actively participate in information societies, to increase employability and personal satisfaction, also integrates learning and life (UNESCO, 2016).

OECD (2001) on the other hand; defined it as all of the learning that an individual has realized in different contexts throughout his life, and stated lifelong learning directly as a key to economic development. Jarvis (2007) considered lifelong learning as a whole of progress and development, including the experience of individuals. In essence, lifelong learning is not only a process that strengthens the individual's ability to adapt to changing conditions, develops knowledge and skills, and supports participation in employment, but also has a structure that strengthens the individual's ability to think critically and act freely (Delors, 1996).

The main objectives of lifelong learning are as follows (European Union Commission, 2002; OECD, 2001):

(a) To create an inclusive society by providing opportunities for all humanity to reach quality education that will be created by taking into account personal needs and demands.

(b) To equip people with the knowledge and skills to actively participate in all areas of public life, including political and social life.

(c) To allow everyone to learn at their own pace by emphasizing self-directed learning processes.

(d) To gain the knowledge and skills needed against all kinds of innovations and changes.

The increase in the need and interest in lifelong learning as a result of the rapid changes experienced all over the world has made it necessary for countries and international organizations to develop policies in order to implement the idea of lifelong learning at all levels of education. The 'Bologna Declaration' formed by the education ministers of European countries in 1999 and the 'Prague Declaration' of 2001, which was realized with the participation of the education ministers of European countries and announced at the end of the meeting, are important and decisive documents in this field (Jakobi & Rusconi, 2009). 1999 Bologna and 2001 Prague Declaration basically, mentioned that lifelong learning is an important element in higher education and that improving competitiveness, social cohesion and quality of life in a knowledge-based society and economy will be possible with lifelong

learning.

In the papers, it was stated that in order to realize the mentioned thoughts, higher education has a great role in the formation of lifelong learning thought and universities are expected to be active in the process by taking a supportive attitude towards the lifelong learning processes of the students. Candy (2000), on the other hand, mentioned that universities have an important role in lifelong learning processes, that the lifelong learning activities carried out by university students within and outside the universities are very important and explained the connections of universities with lifelong learning in three ways:

(a) Vertical Links: While access to university was possible for a minority in the past, access to higher education today has become more accessible. In this way, the diversity of undergraduate students and, in parallel, learning has increased; many universities have had to establish links that go all the way to vocational high schools and even to the first years of secondary education. All these vertical connections had supported the learning process of individuals.

(b) Ancillary Links: In terms of lifelong learning, it has become more evident that universities do not have a monopoly on providing learning opportunities. The significant increase in the amount of knowledge and the high cost of education and research infrastructure have led universities to encourage students to increase their knowledge and skills by working in other institutions.

(c) Advanced Links: The third dimension of universities in the context of lifelong learning is the postgraduate education processes with graduate students. Universities' response to the demands of the education market in the face of changing conditions is directly related to the lifelong learning needs of students.

Emphasizing the place and importance of universities in lifelong learning processes by international organizations, countries and different researchers has paved the way for different studies on university students in the world and in Turkey regarding lifelong learning processes (Atacanlı, 2007; Bulaç & Kurt, 2019; Diker-Coşkun & Demirel, 2012; Drewery, Sproule & Pretti, 2020; Gencel, 2013; İzci & Koç, 2012; Karakuş; 2013; Kirby et al., 2010; Poyraz, 2014; Selvi, 2011; Şahin & Arcagök, 2014; Wielkiewicz & Meuwissen, 2014).

The increase of studies on lifelong learning on universities and university students, which undertake a mission that facilitates and supports the lifelong learning processes of individuals in the world and in Turkey, and the shift of interest in this direction has made it important to determine the lifelong learning tendencies of students in universities. However, it is seen that most of the studies conducted in Turkey to determine the lifelong learning tendencies of university students are carried out for pre-service teachers and the studies covering all undergraduate students are few and insufficient. In this context, the aim of the research is; determining the lifelong learning tendencies of undergraduate students. In line with this general purpose, answers to the following questions are sought:

(1) What is the lifelong learning tendency of undergraduate students?

(2) Do the lifelong learning tendencies of undergraduate students show a statistically significant difference according to the variables of gender, age, grade level, weighted grade point average, place of residence, family socioeconomic level (sel), university and department satisfaction?

2. Method

2.1 Research Model

In this study, the survey model, one of the quantitative research models, was used. The screening model is a research model that aims to reflect the past or present situations as they are (Karasar, 2020).

2.2 Working Group and Participants

The study group of the research consists of 2713 under graduate students studying at Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University in the 2020-2021 academic year. Table 1 provides information on the demographic characteristics of the participants.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics and percentages of participants

Categorical Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Female	1817	67.0
	Male	896	33.0
Age	20 years and below	897	55.4
	21 years and above	721	44.6
Grade Level	1	1101	40.6
	2	637	23.5
	3	476	17.5
	4	499	18.4
Weighted GPA	2.50 and below	263	9.7
	2.51-3.00	637	23.5
	3.01-3.50	1083	39.9
	3.51-4.00	730	26.9
Place of residence	Village	494	18.2
	District	751	27.7
	City	502	18.5
	Big city	966	35.6
Family Socio-Economic Level	Low	400	14.7
	Medium	2237	82.5
	High	76	2.8
University Satisfaction	No	210	7.7
	Partially	1191	43.9
	Yes	1312	48.4
Department Satisfaction	No	155	5.7
	Partially	775	28.6
	Yes	1783	65.7

According to Table 1, the proportion of women in the study group was 67%; the proportion of men is 33%. While 55.4% of the students are 20 years old and below, 44.6% of them are 21 years old and above. Most of the participants are in the 1st year (40.6%) and consist of

students with a general average of 3.01-3.50 (39.9%). While those residing in the metropolitan area constitute 35.6% of the research, the socioeconomic level of the majority of the students is medium (82.5%). Moreover, 48.4% of the undergraduate students are satisfied with the university they study and 65.7% of the undergraduate students are satisfied with the department (programme) they are studying.

2.3 Data Collection Tool

"Lifelong Learning Tendency Scale (LLTS)" developed by Yelkin Diker Coşkun in 2009 was used in the research. The scale consists of 27 items in 6-point likert type. Below the median score (94.5) on the scale is "low" lifelong learning tendency; above (94.5) means "high" lifelong learning tendency. The scale consists of 4 sub-dimensions. These are "motivation in lifelong learning", "persistence", "lack of regulating learning" and "lack of curiosity". While the "motivation in lifelong learning" and "perseverance" sub-dimensions of the scale do not contain negative items, the "deprivation in regulating learning" and "lack of curiosity" sub-dimensions consist of negative (reverse) items. The "motivation" sub-dimension of the LLTS consists of items 1-6, the "perseverance" sub-dimension 7-12, the "organizing learning" sub-dimension 13-18, and the "curiosity" sub-dimension 19-27. The minimum score of the LLTS is 27. And its maximum score is 162. The Cronbach Alpha Coefficient of the lifelong learning scale was found to be 0.89 (Coşkun, 2009) According to the results of the repeated reliability analysis in this study, the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated as 0.91. In the sub-dimensions of the scale, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was found. The reliability coefficients were found to be 0.91 for the motivation sub-dimension, 0.91 for the perseverance sub-dimension, 0.72 for the learning regulation sub-dimension, and 0.84 for the lack of curiosity sub-dimension, respectively. In this context, the reliability of the scale for internal consistency seems to be at a good level. Finally, exploratory factor analysis was performed, and it was seen that the LCIAS explained 47.27% of the total variance. Confirmatory factor analysis was applied to evaluate compliance with the prescription. According to the indicators in determining the goodness of fit (Bentler, 1990; Steiger, 1990); RMSEA value was reported as 0.05 (perfect fit), CFI value 0.939 (good fit), TLI value 0.933 (good fit), SRMR value 0.033 (perfect fit). The items in the data collection tool are given in Appendix A.

2.4 Analysis of Data

In the study, in order to compare the mean scores of undergraduate students in determining their lifelong learning tendencies, first of all, descriptive statistics values were calculated for different variables in the answers given by undergraduate students to each of the scale items, and the normality of the distribution and the homogeneity of the variances were tested. In analysis, *undergraduate* students; T-test for Independent Samples was used in comparisons of the total scores obtained from YBOI according to the variables of "Gender" and "Age"; and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the total scores obtained from the scale for the variables "Class Level, Weighted Grade Point Average, Place of Residence, Family SEL, University Satisfaction, and Department Satisfaction".

In order to determine the source of the difference in F values that were significant according

to the one-way analysis of variance, LSD was used in case of homogeneity of variance and Dunnett's C Test was used in cases where the variance was not homogeneously distributed. For the evaluation of the scale, the median score of the scale (94.5) (Diker-Coşkun & Demirel, 2010) was taken into consideration.

3. Results

In this research, by determining the lifelong learning tendency levels of undergraduate students; according to the variables of gender, age, grade level, weighted grade point average, place of residence, family socioeconomic level, satisfaction with the university, and satisfaction with the department, there are significant differences between the mean score values of undergraduate students' lifelong learning tendency levels.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics on the lifelong learning tendency

	N	Min	Max	X	Ss	Skewness	Kurtosis
Lifelong Learning Tendency	2713	70	162	128.08	18.78	-.450	-.373

According to Table 2, the lowest score obtained by undergraduate students in LLTS is 70, and the highest score is 162. It is seen that the mean and standard deviation values of the scale are $\bar{x}$ = 128.08 and Sd = 18.78. When the scores obtained from the lifelong learning tendency scale are examined; it can be said that the skewness and kurtosis coefficients are close to zero, so the scores obtained from the scales show a normal distribution. Considering the middle score of the scale (94.5) (Diker-Coşkun & Demirel, 2010) for the evaluation of the scale, it is noteworthy that the lifelong learning tendencies of undergraduate students are high. Another aim of the study is to examine the lifelong learning tendencies of undergraduate students in terms of various variables. In Table 3, the scores obtained from the scale were compared according to gender and the results of the t Test for Independent Samples are given.

Table 3. Comparative independent samples t-Test results

Categorical Variables	Categories	N	X	Ss	Sh	Sd	t	p	η^2
Gender	Female	1817	129.5	18.29	0.43	2711	5.59	0	0.011
	Male	896	125.23	19.46	0.65				
Age	20 years and below	1119	126.32	18.83	0.56	2711	-4.11	0	0.006
	21 years and above	1594	129.33	18.66	0.47				

In Table 3, the gender and age status of the individuals; mean score, standard deviation values,

t values, significance values (p) and etasquare (η^2) values showing the effect size are given. According to Table 3, it is seen that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of undergraduate students according to their gender ($t_{2711} = 5.59$, $p < 0.05$) and age ($t_{2711} = -4.11$, $p < 0.05$). When the findings in Table 3 are examined, it is seen that the mean score of women's lifelong learning levels ($\bar{x} = 129.5$; Sd = 18.29), the mean score of lifelong learning levels of men's lifelong learning levels ($\bar{x} = 125.23$; Sd = 19.46), it is seen that the mean score of lifelong learning levels of 20 years old and below undergraduate students ($\bar{x} = 126.32$; Sd = 18.83) is significantly lower than the mean score of lifelong learning levels of 21 year old and over undergraduate students ($\bar{x} = 129.33$; Sd = 18.66). According to the cut-off points for the interpretation of Cohen's (1988) latency, significant differences were found for the gender category at the "moderate" ($0.01 \leq \eta^2 = 0.011 \leq 0.06$) and for the age categories at the "low" level ($\eta^2 = 0.006 \leq 0.01$). Since the other categorical variables were more than 2 categories, Anova analysis was performed and the results are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Comparative Anova test results

Categorical Variables	Categories	N	X	Ss	Sd	F	p	η^2	Significant Differences
Grade Level	1	1101	127.73	18.71	3	3.349	0.018	0	4 > 1
	2	637	126.96	18.24					4 > 2
	3	476	128.04	19.66					
	4	499	130.36	18.64					
Weighted GPA	2.50 and below (1)	263	123.98	20.91	3	10.634	0	0.01	2&3 > 1
	2.51-3.00 (2)	637	126.92	19.13					4 > 1
	3.01-3.50 (3)	1083	127.88	18.35					4 > 2
	3.51-4.00 (4)	730	130.9	17.92					4 > 3
Place of Residence	Village (1)	494	126.71	19.71	3	1.254	0.289	-	-
	District (2)	751	128.47	18.81					
	City (3)	502	127.88	17.75					
	Bigcity (4)	966	128.61	18.79					
Family Socio-economic Level	Low	400	125.64	19.96	2	4.013	0.018	0	2 > 1
	Medium	2237	128.51	18.51					
	High	76	128.56	19.55					
University Satisfaction	No	210	122.91	21.37	2	39.954	0	0.02	3 > 2
	Partially	1191	125.46	18.67					3 > 1
	Yes	1312	131.30	17.88					
Section Satisfaction	No	155	119.94	21.57	2	67.945	0	0.04	3 > 2
	Partially	775	122.99	19.24					3 > 1
	Yes	1783	131.01	17.61					

According to Table 4, the mean scores obtained from LLTS did not show a significant difference according to the residence status of undergraduate students ($F_3 = 1.254$, $p > 0.05$). It is seen that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of lifelong learning in terms of grade levels ($F_3 = 3.349$, $p < 0.05$, $\eta^2 = 0$), grade point averages ($F_3 = 10.634$, $p < 0.05$, $\eta^2 = 0.01$), family socio-economic status ($F_2 = 4.013$, $p < 0.05$, $\eta^2 = 0$), university satisfaction ($F_2 = 39.954$, $p < 0.05$, $\eta^2 = 0.02$) and department satisfaction ($F_2 = 67.945$, $p < 0.05$, $\eta^2 = 0.04$) of undergraduate students ($p < 0.05$). According to the cut-off points of Cohen's (1988) interpretation of etasquare, significant differences were found at the "low level" ($\eta^2 \leq 0.01$) for grade level and family-sel categories, and "moderate level" ($\eta^2 \leq 0.06$) for grade point average, university and department satisfaction.

When the averages of the groups are examined, it is seen that the lifelong learning tendencies of the 4th grade students ($\bar{x} = 130{,}36$; Sd = 18.64) are significantly higher than compared to the 1st ($\bar{x} = 127.73$; Sd = 8.71) and 2nd grade students ($\bar{x} = 126.96$; Sd = 18.24); those with a GPA between 3.51-4.00 ($\bar{x} = 130.9$; Sd = 17.92) are significantly higher than those with a lower average of 2.50 and below ($\bar{x} = 123.98$; Sd = 20.91), 2.51-3.00 ($\bar{x} = 126.92$; Sd = 19.13), 3.01-3.50 ($\bar{x} = 127.88$; Sd = 18.35) and those with a GPA between 3.00-3.50 and 2.51-3.00 are significantly higher than 2.50 and below. Moreover; it is seen that those with a medium ($\bar{x} = 128.512$; Sd = 18.51) family socioeconomic level (SEL) are significantly higher than those with a low ($\bar{x} = 125.64$; Sd = 19.96) SEL level, those who are satisfied with their university ($\bar{x} = 131.303$; Sd = 17.88) are significantly higher than those who are partially satisfied ($\bar{x} = 125.462$; Sd = 18.67) or dissatisfied ($\bar{x} = 122.91$; Sd = 21.37), and those who are satisfied with the department they study ($\bar{x} = 131.014$; Sd = 17.61) are significantly higher than those who are partially satisfied ($\bar{x} = 122.99$; Sd = 19.24) and dissatisfied ($\bar{x} = 119.942$; Sd = 21.57).

4. Discussion

In the study, the lifelong learning tendencies of undergraduate students were determined and compared in terms of various variables. According to the general results of the study, considering the scale median score (94.5) (Diker-Coşkun & Demirel, 2012) regarding the evaluation of YBIE, it was concluded that undergraduate students' tendencies towards lifelong learning were high. This finding shows that the undergraduate students participating in the research are individuals who are willing to learn and aware of their lifelong learning needs. When the relevant literature is examined, studies that are similar to the results of the research are encountered. For example, in Demirel and Akkoyunlu's (2010) studies, it was stated that undergraduate teacher candidates have a high level of lifelong learning tendencies. Kılıç (2014), on the other hand, stated in his study with pre-service teachers that the participants' perceptions of lifelong learning were at a 'moderate' level. In the study by Tunca, Şahin, and Aydın (2015) in which they researched the pre-service teachers' tendencies towards lifelong learning, it was stated that the lifelong learning tendencies of the pre-service teachers were low, unlike the research findings. The reason for such a difference between lifelong learning tendencies in studies can be explained with the difference in the group participating in the research and the use of different research methods.

It is remarkable that the lifelong learning tendencies of undergraduate students do not show a statistically significant difference according to the place of residence. With this result, the negative effects of the place of residence in lifelong learning processes are eliminated, with features such as making learner mobility a reality lifelong learning and developing innovation and creativity and creating an individual learning environment offered by innovative technologies based on information communication technology, which are used extensivelye specially among undergraduate students. It can be said that it was removed (Redecker, Ala-Mutka & Punie, 2010). Nowadays, when learning processes are becoming more and more individualized, self-managed learning processes are very important. Livingstone (2001), emphasizes self-managed learning, where the responsibility for learning lies with the individual, he mentioned the importance of learning and that individuals plan by their own needs in today's societies. The goals, contents, tools, and applications to be used in self-managed learning are completely determined by the individual. In this context, the self-managed learning processes of undergraduate students, who have to constantly follow current developments and acquire new knowledge and skills, are very critical.

When the relevant literature is examined, a study by Gökyer and Türkoğlu (2018) similarly did not find a significant difference between the place of residence of the families and the lifelong learning tendencies of the students. This result supports the research findings.

When the lifelong learning tendencies of undergraduate students according to the grade level were examined in the study, it was concluded that the lifelong learning tendencies of the 4th grade who are undergraduate students were significantly higher than the 1st and 2nd grade students. This result can also be interpreted as the positive effect of universities, which aim to develop students' skills such as research, discovery and problem solving, on students. The high tendency of lifelong learning of students who have been trained to develop skills such as research, discovery and problem solving for 4 years can be explained by the right education and learning processes provided by the university in this direction. Another study supporting this view was conducted by Scheuch (2007), and it was concluded that students in higher grades participated in more research activities than students in lower grades. For this reason, the fact that the lifelong learning tendencies of the 4th grade students are higher than those of the lower grade students can be interpreted as a result of the education, research and consultancy activities taken at the university for 4 years. In Coşkun and Demirel's (2012) study, when undergraduate students' tendencies towards lifelong learning were analyzed in terms of grade level, it was stated that the result was significantly different in favor of senior students. In the study conducted by Dindar and Bayraktar (2015), it was concluded that, unlike the research findings, class level is not a predictor of lifelong learning.

Another variable in the study that predicts the lifelong learning tendencies of university students is grade point average. According to the research results; Those with a weighted GPA between 3.51 and 4.00 had a significantly higher lifelong learning tendency than those with a lower average (2.50 and below). In other words, students with high academic success have a high tendency towards lifelong learning. Günç et al. (2012) reported that lifelong learners should have skills such as information and communication technology, mathematics, science, problem solving skills and learning to learn. When evaluated in this context, it is an

expected result that students who are academically successful have a high tendency towards lifelong learning. In his study, Coşkun (2009) concluded that students who see themselves as "good" and "very good" in terms of academic success, supporting the research findings, have higher lifelong learning tendencies than others.

When the effect of the socio-economic status of the families of the students participating in the study on lifelong learning was evaluated, the lifelong learning tendencies of the students who described their families' socio-economic levels as 'moderate' were found to be significantly higher than those who described them as 'low. In the study of Çoskun (2009), similar to the research findings, it was concluded that the lifelong learning tendencies of the students who describe their socio-economic status as 'moderate' are higher than the other students, Gökyer and Türkoğlu (2018), Dindar and Bayraktar (2015), Kılıç (2014), it has been revealed that the income level of the family is not a predictor of the student's lifelong learning tendency. When the research findings and other related studies are examined, it can be said that the lifelong learning tendencies of undergraduate students are neither completely dependent on financial situation nor completely independent of financial situation.

In the study, when the lifelong learning tendencies of undergraduate students are examined by gender, it is seen that the lifelong learning tendencies of women are significantly lower than that of men. When the relevant literature is examined, studies are found that evaluate the effect of gender in terms of lifelong learning tendency. In the study conducted by Diker-Coşkun (2009) with university students, unlike the research findings, female students have a higher lifelong learning tendency than male students. İzci and Koç (2012) and Kılıç (2014) found that women have higher lifelong learning tendencies than men in their study with pre-service teachers. Şahin et al. (2010) stated in their study that gender is not a factor affecting lifelong learning tendencies. The reason for such a difference in lifelong learning tendencies according to gender in different studies can be explained by the diversity of the research group and the research method.

In the study, it was determined that individuals aged 20 and under have lower lifelong learning tendencies than individuals aged 20 and over. This can be explained by the fact that as the age level of individuals increases, their experiences and activities such as participating in more education and learning processes increase. In a study conducted with pre-service teachers, Kılıç (2014) concluded that, in support of the research findings, lifelong learning tendencies of individuals increase as they get older. In the study of Dikmen, Denat, Filiz, and Başaran (2016), it was concluded that, unlike the research findings, the age levels of individuals do not have an effect on their lifelong learning tendencies.

Another variable that predicts lifelong learning tendency in the research is satisfaction with the department and university. According to the results of the research, the lifelong learning tendencies of the undergraduate students who are satisfied with the department they study and the university were found to be significantly higher than those who are partially satisfied and dissatisfied. Undergraduate students who are satisfied with their department and university, were found to be significantly higher than those who are partially satisfied and dissatisfied. It is an expected result that undergraduate students who are satisfied with their

department and university have a higher life-long learning tendency than those who are not satisfied. it is effective on many different issues (Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005). In this context, it can be said that the education and learning experiences of undergraduate students with department and university satisfaction are more active and positive, increasing their lifelong learning tendencies.

In line with the results obtained from the research, informative conferences, seminars and workshops can be organized to increase the lifelong learning tendencies of undergraduate students at universities. Studies can be renewed according to different variables (department of education, psychological well-being, community membership, frequency of technology use and number of friends) that predict students' lifelong learning tendency levels. Differences between advantaged and disadvantaged groups can be determined through outlier sampling and additional measures can be taken to increase the lifetime of disadvantaged groups.

References

Atacanlı, M. F. (2007). *Investigation of lifelong learning behavior of Ankara University Faculty of Medicine students by years using the learning preference assessment scale* (Master's Thesis, Ankara University, Ankara). Retrieved from https://dspace.ankara.edu.tr/xmlui/handle/20.500.12575/32067

Bentler, P. M. (1990). Fit indexes, Lagrange multipliers, constraint changes and incomplete data in structural models. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 25*(2), 163-172. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr2502_3

Bologna Declaration. (1999). *Joint declaration of the European ministers of higher education*. Bologna. Retrieved from http://www.ehea.info/page-ministerial-conference-bologna-1999

Bulaç, E., & Kurt, M. (2019). Examining the lifelong learning tendencies of teacher candidates. *Amasya University Journal of the Faculty of Education, 8*(1), 125-161. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/amauefd/issue/45794/532829

Candy, P. (2000). Reaffirming a proud tradition universities and lifelong learning. *The Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education and SAGE Publications, 1*(2), 101-125. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787400001002002

Candy, P. (2002). *Information literacy and lifelong learning*. Retrieved from https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?

Commıssıon of the European Communıtıes. (2000). *A memorandum on lifelong learning*. Brussels. Retrieved from https://uil.unesco.org/document/european-communities-memorandum-lifelong-learning-issued-2000

Coşkun, D. Y. (2009). *Examining the Lifelong Learning Tendencies of University Students in Terms of Some Variables* (PhD Thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara). Retrieved from https://avesis.hacettepe.edu.tr/yayin/125644c6-0a74-4309-8ff6-2d6936659553/lifelong-learning-tendencies-of-university-students

Dehmel, A. (2006) Making a European area of lifelong learning a reality? Some critical reflections on the European Union's lifelong learning policies. *Comparative Education, 42*(1), 49-62. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060500515744

Delors, J., Mufti, I. A., Amagi, I., Carneiro, R., Chung, F., Geremek, B., … Nanzhao, Z. (1996). *The treasure within: Report to UNESCO of the international commission on education for the twenty-first century*. Paris: UNESCO. https://doi.org/10.7788/ijbe.1996.24.1.253

Demirel, M., & Akkoyunlu, B. (2010). *Lifelong learning tendencies and information literacy self-efficacy perceptions of teacher candidates* (Proceedings Book 2, pp. 1126-1133). 10th International Educational Technology Conference, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1137983.pdf

Diker Coşkun, Y., & Demirel, M. (2012). Lifelong learning tendencies of university students. *Hacettepe University Journal of the Faculty of Education, 42*(1), 108-120. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/298457731_Lifelong_learning_tendencies_of_university_students

Dikmen, Y., Denat, Y., Filiz, N. Y., & Başaran, H. (2016). Lifelong learning trends in nursing students. *Journal of Human Rhythm, 2*(1), 0-0. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/johr/issue/40171/477895

Dindar, H., & Bayraktar, M. (2015). Factors effecting students' lifelong learning in higher education. *International Journal on Lifelong Education and Leadership, 1*(1), 11-20. https://doi.org/10.25233/ijlel/2015-v1i1p2

Drewery, D. W., Sproule, R., & Pretti, T. J. (2020). Lifelong learning mindset and career success: Evidence from the field of accounting and finance. *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning, 10*(3), 567-580. https://doi.org/10.1108/heswbl-03-2019-0041

European Commıssion. (2002). *European report on qualıty ındıcators of lıfelong learnıng*. Brussels. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED481329

Evin Gencel, İ. (2013). Pre-service teachers' perceptions on lifelong learning competencies. *Education and Science, 38*(170), 237-252. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279057748_Prospective_Teachers'_Perceptions_towards_Lifelong_Learning_Competencies

Field, J. (2001). Lifelong education. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 20*, 1-2. 3-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638280010008291

Gökyer, N., & Türkoğlu, İ. (2018). Lifelong learning tendencies of university students. *Fırat University Journal of Social Sciences, 28*(2), 125-136. https://doi.org/10.18069/firatsbed.460929

İzci, E., & Koç, S. (2012). Evaluation of pre-service teachers' views on lifelong learning. *Adıyaman University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 5*(9), 101-114. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/adyusbd/issue/1394/16461

Jackson, N. J. (2012). CHAPTER A1 Lifewide Learning: History of an idea. *Lifewide Learning, Education & Personal Development e-Book* (pp. 1-30). https://doi.org/10.1108/20423891111179641

Jakobi, A. P., & Rusconi, A. (2008). Opening of higher education? A lifelong learning perspective on the bologna process (WZB Discussion Paper SP I 2008-502). Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung. Retrieved from https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/47651/1/585746109.pdf

Jarvis, P. (2007). *Adult Education and lifelong learning theory and practice*. Routledge London and New York. Retrieved from https://www.routledge.com/Adult-Education-and-Lifelong-Learning-Theory-and-Practice/Jarvis/p/book/9780415494816

Karakuş, C. (2013). Lifelong learning competencies of vocational school students. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching, 2*(3), 26-35. Retrieved from http://jret.org/FileUpload/ks281142/File/04.karakus.pdf

Kılıç, Ç. (2014). Perceptions of pre-service teachers towards lifelong learning. *Journal of Education and Instructional Research, 3*(4), 79-87. Retrieved from http://www.jret.org/FileUpload/ks281142/File/08a.kilic.pdf

Kirby, J. R., Knapper, C., Lamon, P., & Egnatoff, W. J. (2010). Development of a scale to measure lifelong learning. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 29*(3), 291-302. https://doi.org/10.1080/02601371003700584

Livingstone, D. W. (2001). *Adults' Informal Learning: Definitions, Findings, Gaps, and Future Research* (NALL Working Paper No. 21).

Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin, 131*(6), 803-855. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.131.6.803

OECD. (2001). Lifelong learning for all policy directions. *Education Policy Analysis*. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=DEELSA/ED/CERI/CD(2000)12/PART1/REV2&docLanguage=En

Poyraz, H. (2014). *The relationship between teachers' lifelong learning profiles and perceptions of being supported by their institutions* (Master's Thesis, Sakarya University, Sakarya). Retrieved from https://acikerisim.sakarya.edu.tr/handle/20.500.12619/74776

Prague Communiqué. (2001). *Towards the european higher education area*. Prague, Czech Republic. Retrieved from http://www.ehea.info/page-ministerial-conference-prague-2001

Reischmann, J. (2014). *Lifelong and lifewide learning-a perspective.*

Şahin, Ç., & Arcagök, S. (2014). Examination of teachers' level of lifelong learning competencies in terms of various variables. *Adıyaman University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 7*(16), 395-417. Retrieved from: https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/adyusbd/issue/1387/16301

Şahin, Ü., Sarıtaş, E., & Çatalbaş, G. (2020). Lifelong learning tendencies of primary teacher candidates. *Pamukkale University Faculty of Education Journal, 48*, 374-389. https://doi.org/10.9779/pauefd.572500

Scheuch, K. L. (2007). *Faculty research orientation, undergraduate research activities and student outcomes* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Florida). Retrieved from https://www.proquest.com/openview/17b7df7a0862619d673f026f028e78bf/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750

Selvi, K. (2011). Teacher's lifelong learning competencies, *Uluslararası Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Çalışmaları Dergisi, 1*(1), 61-69. Retrieved from https://www.ijocis.com/index.php/ijocis/article/view/52

Steiger, J. H. (1990). Structural model evaluation and modification: An interval estimation approach. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 25*(2), 173-180. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr2502_4

Tunca, N., Alkın Şahin, S., & Aydın, Ö. (2015). Lifelong learning tendencies of teacher candidates. *Journal of Mersin University Faculty of Education, 11*(2). Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/mersinefd/issue/17397/181922

UNESCO. (2016). *Lifelong learning* (Technical Note). Retrieved from https://uil.unesco.org/fileadmin/keydocuments/LifelongLearning/en/UNESCOTechNotesLLL.pdf

Wielkiewicz, R. M., & Meuwissen, A. S. (2014). A lifelong learning scale for research and evaluation of teaching and curricular effectiveness. *Teaching of Psychology, 41*(3), 220-227. https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628314537971

Notes

Note 1. Part of this work presented as an oral presentation at the VII. International Congress on Education and Social Sciences.

Appendix A

Lifelong Learning Tendency Scale (LLTS)

No.	Please read the following statements carefully and mark the extent to which they apply to you.	Very suitable	Partially suitable	Very little suitable	Not very suitable	Partially unsuitable	Not suitable at all
1	Developing new knowledge and skills in different fields to improve mysely is exactly suitable for me.						

2	If I believe that I will achieve my own personal development. I can easily learn all kinds of information.						
3	One of my main goals in life is to increase my personal development by constantly gaining new knowledge and skills.						
4	Even if I have sufficient financial means. I continue to get new knowledge and skills for my self improvement.						
5	Learning new things all the time is my passion.						
6	I am more willing to learn new knowledge and skills than my friends.						
7	I like to spend most of my time carrying research to learn.						
8	Although my schedule is I create opportunity to learn new knowledge and skills on my own.						
9	I set aside a budget that I separate from my private expenses to learn new knowledge and skills.						
10	I hunker down myself to acquire new knowledge and skills without any obligation.						
11	While achieving my primary goals. I also try to get new knowledge and skills that are not related to them.						
12	Even though the subject I have learned is difficult and complex. I try to learn it in the best way.						
13	I do not believe that it will be beneficial for me to get new knowledge and skills in subjects that are not related to my profession.						
14	It does not make sense to me to constantly gain new knowedge and skills just for my personal development.						
15	I do not care about the contributions of those arround me to my learning process.						
16	I do not use information sources related to my profession, except for compulsory situations.						
17	I think I will have difficulty in learning a new knowledge or skill related to my profession.						
18	My self-evaluation of what I have learned prevents me from learning new subjects.						
19	I do not want to waste my time doing research if it is not compulsory (for exam, project, etc.).						
20	I prefer to devote the time I will spend for my personal development to my loved ones.						

21	If I am not responsible for the subjecs I have learned (if there is a seminar, etc.). I do not find it necessary to make an effort to complete my deficiencies.						
22	Unless it is compulsory. I think that attending courses and seminars just because I will learn new things will waste my time.						
23	I do not allocate time to learn about a subject just because I am curious about it.						
24	I think that the libraries are boring places.						
25	I prefer to take care of my hobbies. instead of making an effort to learn new things except when it is necessary.						
26	I do not want to make an effort to learn new information and skills if it will put me in a financial trouble.						
27	It bothers me that I feel that I constantly have to learn new knowledge and skills.						

Note. * "Lifelong Learning Tendency Scale (LLTS)" developed by Yelkin Diker Coşkun in 2009 was used in the research.