Hacettepe University Graduate School of Educational Sciences

Department of Foreign Language Teaching

Program in English Language Teaching

**LIFE-LONG LEARNING COMPETENCIES OF PROSPECTIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS IN COMPARISON WITH THEIR MENTORS**

Yiğit Savuran

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2014

# LIFE-LONG LEARNING COMPETENCIES OF PROSPECTIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS IN COMPARISON WITH THEIR MENTORS

# İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMEN ADAYLARININ MENTORLARINA KIYASLA YAŞAM BOYU ÖĞRENME BECERİLERİ

**YİĞİT SAVURAN**

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. ARİF SARIÇOBAN**

**Supervisor**

Submitted to the Graduate School of Educational Sciences of Hacettepe University as a Partial Fulfillment to the Requirements for the Award of Master's Degree in English Language Teaching program

2014

This work named "Life-Long Learning Competencies of Prospective English Language Teachers In Comparison With Their Mentors" by Yiğit SAVURAN has been approved as a thesis for Master's Degree in the program of English Language Teaching by the below mentioned Examining Committee Members.

Head
Prof. Dr. Mehmet DEMİREZEN                    ………………………………….

Supervisor
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN                ………………………………….

Member
Prof. Dr. İsmail Hakkı MİRİCİ                      ………………………………….

Member
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Paşa Tevfik CEPHE            ………………………………….

Member
Assist. Prof. Dr. Hüseyin ÖZ                       ………………………………….

This thesis has been approved as a thesis for Master's Degree in the department of English Language Teaching by board of directors of the Graduate School of Educational Sciences.

Prof. Dr. Berrin AKMAN
Director

# ETHICS

In this thesis study, prepared in accordance with the spelling rules of Graduate School of Educational Sciences of Hacettepe University;

I declare that

- all the information and documents have been obtained in the base of the academic rules
- all audio-visual and written information and results have been presented according to the rules of scientific standards
- in case of using other works, related studies have been cited in accordance with the scientific standards
- all cited studies have been fully referenced
- I did not do any distortion in the data set
- and any part of this thesis has not been presented as any other thesis study at this or any other university.

08/01/2014

YİĞİT SAVURAN

# LIFE-LONG LEARNING COMPETENCIES OF PROSPECTIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS IN COMPARISON WITH THEIR MENTORS

**Yiğit SAVURAN**

## ABSTRACT

This study tries to define the lifelong learning competencies of participants. Relevant literature, which covers almost all the studies oriented to lifelong learning, was reviewed. The key competencies defined by European Union were analyzed. Communication in foreign languages, which is one of the key competencies, was examined and studies towards it were presented. To find the levels of the participants for different competency types, a scale adopted from Uzunboylu and Hursen (2011) was used. Thanks to that scale, which consists of two sections - demographic information and competency types, it was possible to make comparisons, as well. There were three different groups of participants in the study; 1) prospective English language teachers (N=83), 2) their mentors (N=15), and regular English language teachers (N=30). The collected data was analyzed and interpreted via SPSS 17.0 software. The obtained data indicated significant results. In most of the competency types, which are generally related to modern technology, students were detected to be more competent than the other participants. However, in other competency types, which are related to knowledge and experience, mentors were more competent than the other participants. Comparisons made with reference to participants' demographic information indicated that while gender and years of experience of the participants' did not cause any differences, their ages and departments of graduation created statistically significant differences.

### Key Words

Lifelong Learning, Key Competencies, Competency Levels, Communication in Foreign Languages

**Advisor:** Assoc. Prof. Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN, Hacettepe University, Department of Foreign Languages Teaching, Program in English Language Teaching

# İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMEN ADAYLARININ MENTORLARINA KIYASLA YAŞAM BOYU ÖĞRENME BECERİLERİ

## Yiğit SAVURAN

## ÖZ

Bu çalışma İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının mentorlarına ve diğer İngilizce öğretmenlerine kıyasla hayat boyu öğrenme yeterliklerini belirlemeye çalışmıştır. Hayat boyu öğrenmeyle ilgili yapılan neredeyse tüm çalışmaları kapsayan ilgili alan taraması yapılmıştır. Avrupa Birliği tarafından belirlenen Temel Yeterlikler incelenmiştir. Bunlardan biri olan Yabancı Dillerde İletişim özellikle incelenmiş ve ona yönelik çalışmalar sunulmuştur. Katılımcıların farklı yeterlik türlerindeki seviyelerini belirlemek için Uzunboylu ve Hursen (2011)'in geliştirdiği ölçek çalışmaya uyarlanmıştır. İki bölümden – kişisel bilgiler ve yeterlik türleri – oluşan bu ölçek sayesinde karşılaştırmalar yapmak mümkün olmuştur. Çalışmaya üç farklı katılımcı grubu eşlik etmiştir; 1) İngilizce Öğretmeni Adayları (S=83), 2) Onların mentorları (S=15), 3) İngilizce Öğretmenleri (S=30). Toplanılan veri SPSS 17.0 yazılımı aracılığıyla analiz edilmiş ve yorumlanmıştır. Veriler oldukça farklı önemli sonuçlar ortaya koymuştur. Modern teknoloji ile ilgili olan pek çok yeterlik türünde İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının diğer katılımcılardan daha yeterli olduğu saptanmıştır. Fakat uzmanlık ve bilgi gerektiren diğer yeterlik alanlarında mentorların diğer katılımcılara oranla daha yeterli oldukları gözlemlenmiştir. Katılımcıların kişisel bilgilerine referansla yapılan karşılaştırmalarda, cinsiyetin ve hizmet süresinin bir fark yaratmadığı ancak yaşın ve mezun olunan bölümün istatiksel farklar ortaya konduğu kaydedilmiştir.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** Hayat Boyu Öğrenme, Yeterlik Alanları, Yeterlik Düzeyleri, Yabacı Dillerde İletişim

**Danışman:** Doç. Dr. Arif Sarıçoban Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

*To my beloved mother,*
*the greatest lifelong learner I've ever seen…*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**LIST OF TABLES**

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

xiv

**BG:** Bulgaria

**CAI:** Competencies of acquiring information

**CDM:** Competencies of decision-making

**CEFR:** The Common European Framework of Reference

**CIE:** Competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship

**CLHL**: Competencies of learning how to learn

**CoE**: The Council of Europe

**CZ**: Czech Republic

**DC**: Digital competencies

**EC**: The European Commission

**ECML**: The European Center for Modern Languages

**ELP**: The European Language Portfolio

**EU**: The European Union

**EP**: The European Parliament

**EFTA**: The European Free Trade Association

**EQF**: The European Qualifications Framework

**ETF**: The European Training Foundation

**HR**: Croatia

**HU**: Hungary

**LV**: Latvia

**IT**: Information Technologies

**OECD**: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

**RO**: Romania

**SMC**: Self-management competencies

**SPO**: The State Planning Organization

**TUIK**: Turkish Statistical Institute

**UNESCO**: United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization

**WB**: World Bank

**WTO:** World Trade Organization

# 1. INTRODUCTION

In today's world, education greatly influences cultural, economic and social life quality of people of all ages. Therefore, in competitive environments, education is the key element that shows the place people have in society.

Reform movements in education have a great variety all over the world. There are some similarities in the problems that nations have about education. Though each nation tries to solve its problems according to its own conditions, it must bear the approaches of other nations in mind. (Türkoğlu, 2005).

The issue of education is being shaped on the basis of the current trends and situations in the world, as it has always been. Consequently, states, governments, and unions all around the world consider themselves as the key elements that shape education. As Althusser (2003) points out in his study where he analyzes the ideological functions of the state, education is one of the ways that sovereign classes of the current order use to make their own cultures and lifestyles accepted.

Education is such a general and interactive concept that it cannot be regarded apart from neither the social conditions nor the changes and trends in the world. Apple (1995), in his study that handles the education and ruling party relation, states that neoliberal attacks that spread the world economically and ideologically require that the trends in educational policies should be seriously considered. According to Duman (2000), adult education bears great responsibilities in directing the social changes; therefore, it becomes a vital issue.

One of the priorities of European Union is to increase the investments towards its people and their education. This priority will help increase the life qualities of European people, make the European industry more competitive, and reach the strategic aims of Lisbon that are based on social agreement. Besides, the

contribution that it will make to the democracy and law superiority of the member countries, to a common understanding of different cultures, and to integrating the common values is also outstanding.

In order to reach the aims of Lisbon Strategy, as the European Parliament states on its 23.01.2002 European Union sentence,

> "the context of the educational systems should be identified not only focusing on economy and business world, but also trying to improve the sense of European citizenship, the ability of communicating, cross-cultural understanding, and social skills" (EP and the Council, 2006, p 211).

Lifelong learning that sets the basis of this research is an approach that covers all the learning activities of the people that they perform throughout their lives to develop their knowledge, skills, and attitudes with a personal, social and/or employment viewpoint in order to orient themselves to changing conditions of the world.

As the nature of the development suggests, the awareness related to this approach can only be raised by offering the individual fine education opportunities which start in pre-school period.  With the raised lifelong learning awareness, educational systems, which will integrate the EU's strategic aims and member countries' national priorities on the issue of the increasing and varying demands of the individuals related to education and learning, has been changing suitably with the conditions of our world.

Changing employment opportunities in the globalizing world and EU aims revealed some key competencies that all EU citizens should have in order to crate the lifelong learning culture. EU countries maintain their studies with cooperation and coordination on the issues of re-regulating the educational systems so that they help individuals gain these competencies and making reforms that will ease lifelong learning.

The purpose of the European educational policy is to offer more jobs and maintain the development by raising the quality of all educational stages in the process of lifelong learning. In addition to this, its aim is to help member countries regulate the national policies by sharing of the experiences. The target in this area is to develop and support the interactivity, cooperation and mobility so that EU teaching and learning systems may become so quality that they would be taken as a reference all around the world. Within the scope of lifelong learning, three basic areas are identified; political cooperation, Information Technologies (IT), and language learning. In addition to them, there are IT-based content, service, pedagogy, and developing applications (EP and the Council, 2006, p.5). To organize the national policies of EU member countries with reference to the studies and regulations related to key competency areas that these titles are included, EU keep their studies go on.

Taking all the aforementioned points above, the current research will try to analyze the lifelong learning competencies of prospective English language teachers of a state university in Turkey. The study will also seek answers for other questions with special references, which will be shown in the following sections. Since Turkey has a very rich youth population and has been trying to be a full member of EU for a long time, the study bears a great significance. Lifelong learning is a vital element for the members of EU and is considered to be inevitable in all the stages of life and education.

## 1.1.    Statement of the Problem

In recent years, we have been experiencing tremendous changes in almost all the areas of life. Technology offers us more and more innovations as the days pass, which brings easiness and difficulties at the same time. With the increasing communication facilities, cross-continental economic, cultural and political relations have developed. In this era of great changes, education has experienced lots of transitions.

In order to have a more clear understanding of the so-called transitions, it will be useful for us to analyze what directions those transitions have gone and what kind of effects they have had on the education system in Turkey. Therefore, a special emphasis on lifelong learning, which is on the agenda nowadays, is highly needed. In this aspect, when we analyze the EU's and similar institutions' such as WB's, OECD'S and WTO'S approaches to the subject, we will be able construct a firm frame.

As we mentioned earlier, education cannot be considered apart from other factors in life. According to Sayılan (2006), behind such global concepts as "knowledge society, knowledge economy, information technologies, education reforms, performance criteria, lifelong learning, e-learning", there are neo-liberal policies that have been going on for 25 years.

Market rules are felt in all the areas of life and this is the dominant viewpoint in the world today. Not being affected by this sovereign viewpoint is inevitable for the field of education. However, this reality is ignored most of the time. The concept of education itself bears meaningful and strong connotations, and that's why, we tend to ignore the effects of economic powers. Yet, as long as we keep our ignorance on this issue, it will be harder for us to understand current trends.

In his study where he handles the basic education problem of Turkey in the context of lifelong learning, Sayılan (2005) underlines that on the basis of lifelong learning's place in the 1960s world when the expectations and hopes related to modernization had not been shattered and on the basis of optimistic assumptions such as with the development of learning and teaching opportunities, the inequalities in education would be overcome, the welfare society of the post-war period would be shaped with the national development and social state. When we consider the issue today, how realistic will it be to be as much optimistic as that? Again in the same study, it is emphasized that liberal paradigm has been more important in adult education and public

education areas, personal development has turned into an understanding of individuals' faster and more effective getting qualified, and those who stay behind these processes are ignored.

It is observed that in the basis of lifelong learning strategies of EU, there is a trend oriented to supply the skilled labor to strengthen the economies of the member countries. However, the council, which focuses on lifelong learning studies under the frame of EU, needed to define new key competencies in 2002. Entrepreneurship, which was highly on demand in the market, was included in those new competencies.

Redefining lifelong learning competencies was not a random act. It was one of the actions that globalization brought upon us. As an economic organization, OECD's regarding lifelong learning as one of the key concepts in education since 1996 is also related to the actions of bringing education together with liberal paradigm. Besides, EU does not hide its concern that rapid social and economic changes, rapid movements towards knowledge-oriented society, and Europe's ageing population require a new approach in education. All these changes are happening on the basis of "data-owning society" or should be.

Okçabol and Gök (1995) agree with the idea that education is a basic right that helps people develop their skills without being discriminated against their class, gender, language and religion. When we have a look at the educational aims of EU, promoting private sectors in education is included in the aims. The issue here is, it is suggested that data-owning society should be centered and all the regulations must be designed for it.

According to Ercan (2005), since 1980s when the free market started to be considered as a vital concept, one of the areas that started to experience changes is public sphere. Education, which is one of the must services of public sphere, has been drawn to the attention of private sector and this action

has caused the largest sections of the public not benefiting from the key education services.

A transition from lifelong education to lifelong learning in 1990s triggered EU to make new decisions and actions. The Union tried hard to carry out the potential outcomes of that transition for its members. Turkey has been one of the followers of this trend and tried to place itself in the process. However, education is a delicate area and rather than the market's, the individuals' interests should be taken into consideration.

We need an environment where the children, the adolescents and the adults learn together, the knowledge is transferred between the generations, and learning something outside school is considered as important as learning something in the school. It is a must to mind one's improvement of himself. This will be reached not only paying attention to the learning or education but also caring one's improvement (Torres, 2001).

Lifelong learning is such a complicated concept that it makes us feel compulsory to question whether it functions as an effective tool in decreasing the inequalities in education and society and in serving people to help them develop themselves or not. Based upon this need, the meanings that lifelong learning hold onto it and their responses in daily life should be analyzed.

Bearing all the abovementioned points in mind, education carries an utmost importance for all the people in the world and it must be well shaped if we want to raise stronger generations in terms of academic and cultural development. However, education cannot be considered apart from economic relations of a country so private sector in education has always played an important role in these processes. Besides, the foreign language skills of the individuals in a country are also vital in terms of lifelong learning and education.

The problem of this research stems from the need to define the lifelong learning competencies of prospective English language teachers in comparison with their mentor teachers and current teachers.  As we said earlier, lifelong learning is a key concept of education and bears strong relationships with the economy of the country and it is also highly related with language development of the individuals; therefore, it is requisite for us to define the prospective language teachers' lifelong learning competencies. If we can make a clear and strong frame of the lifelong learning competencies of the teachers of the future, we can make more reliable comments on the effects of lifelong learning studies and their possible reflections for the future of our country.

## 1.2.      Significance of the Study

The era that we live in now is called "information age" and the society that this era requires is called as "knowledge society". Being educated and informed and constantly improving oneself thanks to being literate are the basic features that a person living in the information age needs to have. In the knowledge society where the information increases incrementally, independent learning and knowledge literacy skills such as lifelong learning, maintaining learning, and organizing the autonomous learning process are deeply needed (EC, 2007).

The rapid improvement of knowledge and technology causes new information to be produced in a fast way. Therefore, information loses its actuality and even becomes old. The knowledge that an individual gains in formal education institutions starts to age when the formal education is finished or even before it finishes. In this case, the individual needs to constantly educate, change and renew himself. Today's individuals' modernizing, receiving the changes instantly, knowing their rights and responsibilities, and benefiting from the knowledge will be possible due to facilities and opportunities that formal and non-formal education institutions and their common studies will offer to the society (Yılmaz, 2000, p.34).

Globalization and modernization has created a world where the individuals' depending on each other has increased. In the 21st century, mankind needs to understand a large part of the information to interpret on the world and to possess changing technology. Nations, on the other hand, have to provide environmental sustainability and equalize the economic growth with social welfare. Hence, the competencies that the individuals need to fulfill their personal aims are becoming complicated since they require a lot more than just having the basic skills. That's why the basic competency areas in EU Lifelong Learning Policy are that important.

The stage of economic development and the adjustment with the global world make the countries focus on studying on human resources. Adjustment is a factor that directly influences the employment rates. Falling behind the studies that are made in this area will affect the welfare of the society. It is regarded as inevitable that the young population in Turkey will become together with the EU's demographic change. Thus, it is important to analyze the lifelong learning studies that will contribute both to Turkey and its citizens' life quality.

Bearing all the aforementioned points in mind, this study may contribute a lot to the lifelong learning studies and efforts that the EU has been sustaining since the late 1990s. Besides, it will give us a chance to analyze the key competencies in lifelong learning area and to establish systems that will offer education opportunities to the individuals. Since the study focuses on the lifelong learning competencies of language teachers in Turkey, it may enable us to make sophisticated interpretations on the relations between language learning and teaching studies and lifelong learning processes. What's more, it will be crucial to have a look at the lifelong learning competencies of language teachers from a candidate country for the EU since language is the key element for developing lasting relationships among the member and candidate countries of a union.

**1.3. Purpose of the Study**

The European Union follows its countries in the scope of lifelong learning policy with certain and timed criteria and the innovations that globalization brings upon those countries. The lifelong learning concept in Turkey that has been discussed in recent years is faraway from being definitely understood.

Lifelong learning has become a need in order to adapt the new conditions that the society brings. Not only the individuals have to perfect their personalities and have a voice in their environment by being active with their knowledge, skills and competencies, but also they need to improve those skills and competencies in order to be successful in the constantly changing academic and economic conditions by trying hard to adjust themselves to them.

With this study, it is aimed to define the lifelong learning competencies of prospective English language teachers at Anadolu University in Turkey in comparison with their mentors and current English language teachers working in different educational institutions in Turkey. It is also aimed to define the competencies of the participants in different categories to be able to make comments on how they differ among each other in terms of those categories. The research questions of the study are as follows:

1. What are the levels of lifelong learning competencies of prospective English language teachers with reference to;
   a- self-management competencies,
   b- competencies of how to learn,
   c- competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship,
   d- competencies on acquiring information,
   e- digital competencies,
   f- competencies of decision-making.

2. What are the levels of lifelong learning competencies of English language mentors with reference to;

   a. self-management competencies,

   b. competencies of how to learn,

   c. competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship,

   d. competencies on acquiring information,

   e. digital competencies,

   f. competencies of decision-making.

3. What are the levels of lifelong learning competencies of English language current (classroom/regular) teachers with reference to;

   a. self-management competencies,

   b. competencies of how to learn,

   c. competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship,

   d. competencies on acquiring information,

   e. digital competencies,

   f. competencies of decision-making.

4. Is there a statistically significant difference between lifelong learning competencies of prospective English language teachers, their mentors, and English language current (classroom/regular) teachers?

5. Is there a statistically significant difference between lifelong learning competencies of prospective English language teachers, their mentors, and English language current (classroom/regular) teachers with reference to;

   a- department,

   b- age,

   c- gender,

   d- experience?

## 1.4. Scope and Limitations

The current study scrutinizes the lifelong learning competency levels of prospective English language teachers (n:83) studying their last year at Anadolu University in Eskişehir, Turkey. After their competency levels are defined, it is aimed to compare their levels with their mentor teachers (n:15) working at different state primary, secondary and high schools in Eskişehir and with current teachers (n:30) working in private and state educational institutions in Turkey. Hence, we can say that we have 3 groups of participants.

A lifelong learning competency scale (LLLCS) consisting of six categories and 51 items, and developed and used by Uzunboylu, H. and Hürsem, Ç. (2011) has been used in the study and it forms the only data collection tool of the study. The scale is divided into two parts. In the first part, the participants are asked to answer the five questions that are related to their demographic information such as occupation, gender, age, years of experience, and department. In the second part, there are six categories named as self-management competencies (13 items), competencies of how to learning how to learn (12 items), competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship (10 items), competencies on acquiring information (6 items), digital competencies (6 items), competencies of decision-making (4 items).

Based on the number of participants and the data collection tool, we are to say that the study covers the lifelong learning competencies of the individuals in a certain and straight way. Using a statistics analysis software, it presents us the competency levels of the participants in terms of different categories.

One of the limitations of the study is that the prospective language teachers, whose number is 83, are chosen from one university. Another limitation may be the number of the respondents in total, which is 128. Since the prospective ELT teachers form the largest group of the study, their age group may be another limitation. They are generally between 18-30 years old.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In this section of the study, firstly the definition and scope of lifelong learning is given. Then the historical and theoretical bases of it is described. Then the key competencies for lifelong learning are presented. Lastly, lifelong learning within communication in foreign languages, which is also a key competence, is analyzed in detail and the works and academic studies carried out in that field are indicated.

### 2.1. Definition and Scope of Lifelong Learning

Regarded as continuous learning, unlimited learning, adult education or public education in different sources, lifelong learning has become one of the features that an individual needs to achieve. Before handling the concept of lifelong learning, it will be useful for us to define it. Learning is an action that is continuous, achieved in formal or non-formal ways, and requires motivation for success. Learning does not simply mean knowing the answers for questions or providing knowledge from various sources and it is not easily assessed via tests and exams. The learning process is an adventure that starts in pre-school years and goes beyond the retirement years; shortly, it continues throughout one's life. OECD regards the issue in the same way and defines lifelong learning as an activity that has no end. As we can understand, lifelong learning does not have a definite ending in one's life; therefore, the starting period of it gains utmost importance. Studies suggest that 50% of human brain's learning capacity develops in the ages of 5-6; hence, learning needs to be facilitated especially in pre-school years. (Kahlert, 2000, p.4; Pillary, Wills and Boulton-Lewis, 2008, p.219).

John Dewey, Eduard Lindeman and Basil Yeaxle first used the concept of lifelong learning in the 1920s. These scientists reckoned that education is a constant part of our daily lives. Lindeman in his book titled "The meaning of Adult Education" in 1926 and Basil Yeaxle in his book titled "Lifelong Learning" in 1929 handled the concept of lifelong learning (Ayhan, 2005, p.2). In the report prepared by UNESCO in 1972, the topics, which are the basis for the educational policies and encourage

the society to learn, were discussed (Ayhan, 2005, p.6). The first topic was "continuous learning" and the other one was "learning society". Both of these two concepts are in the scope of lifelong learning, as we can understand form the definition.

Lifelong learning is known as all the learning activities that are performed throughout the life aiming to develop knowledge and skills individually or publicly in either formal or non-formal ways. Learning can scatter through all the stages of life; from pre-school to retirement years, from the formal education in schools to vocational trainings in work places. We can even learn when watch TV or visit a museum or use a new technology. Hence, we can say that learning cannot be limited with educational institutions. Although there have been attempts to draw a border for lifelong learning, as its name suggests, it states an unlimited learning (Calimera, 2005, p. 2; Edwards and Usher, 2008, p. 60). Lifelong learning describes that activities towards learning and teaching can occur in all the stages of life as time and places change and easy and useful learning can be achieved in family, work, society lives and in one's spare times. Lifelong learning is also considered as activities aimed to improve knowledge and skills in academic, vocational and resting and fun basis (Ayhan, 2005, p.7; Purcell, 2008 p.207). Longworth (2008, p.183) points out that one who wants to learn anything in anywhere and anyhow can learn it via lifelong learning. Besides, he makes it clear that when learning is over, improvement is also over.

In the 20th century when the lifelong learning became the trend topic in politics, education was regarded as an individual right; learning gained importance in terms of a richer and more sophisticated individual development. UNESCO regarded the education as the center of masses and claimed that lifelong learning and education would be institutionalized and offered to all individuals equally (IFLA, 2000; Singh, 2002, p. 15-16). Latham (2000) states that a new learning culture should be developed in the 21st century. There is a trend towards informal education in the society. The successful countries in the era of knowledge society are likely to deal with lifelong learning studies now and in the future. As an

illustration, studies suggest that in Australia, more than 80% of the population considers learning anything even if it is not useful for their profession is quite important.  The key for the learning society is to make use of learning in its best way in daily life. Bearing this in mind, a contemporary education system needs to take the terms "continuousness" and "education everywhere" into its center (Duman, 2005, p. 35).

Lifelong learning is an umbrella term that involves every kind of education and learning (A Memorandum, 2000, p.4); therefore it is not easy to differentiate the terms lifelong education and lifelong learning and they can be used interchangeably. However, in UNESCO's Adult Education Terms Dictionary, it is considered that life itself is a continuous learning process and lifelong learning includes individuals' both intentional and random acts of learning experiences (UNESCO, 1997, p.19-20).

Along with the general descriptions, there are many other detailed definitions of lifelong learning. Some of these definitions focus on the time concept while others focus on the learning concept.

According to Sutherland (cited in Rogers, 2006, p.111) lifelong learning is a simile pointing out the limitlessness in learning. In Kahlert's definition (2000, p.2) lifelong learning is to acquire information from various sources and learning opportunities.

European Council defends that lifelong learning needs to contain all the formal and informal learning activities from pre-school years to the retirement days (Hake, 2005, p.19). Şimşek and Ay (2007) defined lifelong learning as a concept that includes lifelong education and it covers formal education's activities and individuals' own learning practices. According to another approach to the subject, lifelong learning means more than an educational process and it is naturally open to every person since each individual constantly learns something as a result of the interactions that he experience with the nature and people even if he doesn't

get educated formally (Ünal, Tural and Aksoy, 2005, p.136). Sezer (2005, p. xviii), made various lifelong learning definitions.

> "a process starting from the infant years and continuing through adult years that covers formal education's all levels and distant education processes…oriented to make the participants learn and understand, based on humanistic sources, a planned series of actions that can happen at any stage of the life"

In Pulman Principles Handbook (2002, p.9-10) a definition pointing out the time and learning concepts at the same time is given. In this source, lifelong learning is a cycle that starts in very early ages and continues in adult years, containing all the stages of formal education and distant education whether it is documented with a grade, certificate, a degree or not. Again under the same title, lifelong learning idea is expressed active and independent information searching and ability to acquire information.

Again in the same book, lifelong learning is defined as a concept for everybody, everywhere as such;

> "lifelong learning meets the needs of all the people regardless of their age, class or gender, including the ones who are registered in a curriculum and need special supports and the ones who are not registered in a curriculum and need to improve their skills or want to get a certificate or a degree in any stage of their lives" (Pulman, 2002, p.51)

Lifelong learning requires maintaining learning and organizing one's own learning process. In order to perform lifelong learning, competencies such as acquiring new knowledge and skills, performing, initializing and assessing them, digital literacy, and media literacy are needed (EC, 2007, p.1)

According to Sweeting (2000, p.261), there are neither the same or different at all definitions of lifelong learning. Although the definitions may change through person, time and place, there are some common points in all the definitions and they are listed as follows:

- Learning starts in pre-school years and continues until post-retirement years.
- It covers the formal and informal educational processes
- It is a must for the future's knowledge society
- It is needed in order to adapt to social changes
- It makes each individual benefit from universal learning opportunities regardless of their age, gender and status
- It accepts the importance of learning outside of the educational institutions
- It help people acquire the skills of finding knowledge, improving and using it independently and actively,
- It motivates people to autonomous learning
- It provides limitless learning or acquiring lifelong information

Bearing all these points in mind, lifelong learning is defined in this study as "all the activities, both goal-oriented and random acts, aimed to develop knowledge and skills individually or socially whether formal or informal".

## 2.2. Historical and Theoretical Bases of Lifelong Learning

### 2.2.1. Historical Bases of Lifelong Learning

It is not difficult to say that lifelong learning was not mentioned in the previous centuries. It is more of a term of 20th century and so on. Lifelong learning, as it will be discussed in the following chapters, is considered with such concepts as globalization and knowledge society. With the constantly changing conditions all around the world especially with the technological developments, education cannot be left separate from those changes and innovations. Hence, education has been experiencing a great number of changes by meeting the needs of the era that we live in.

Lifelong learning finds its place in universal sources as a basic educational right. For example, the 26th item of UN Human Rights Universal Declaration says;

> "Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit" (UN, 2013).

In a report by OECD (1973), lifelong learning is considered as a need in global economy and competition in terms of vocational mobility and individual learning. After this report, lifelong learning concept was ignored and little work was done for the following 20 years.

When it comes to EU, it is needless to say that the continuous development of individuals has utmost importance. Regarding the main purposes and foundation rules, we can say that lifelong learning has a vital position within the countries of Europe and the studies towards it shall be discussed below.

### 2.2.1.1. Studies in the European Union

From the very first years of its foundation (1959), aimed to develop economically at first and named as EEC (European Economic Community), EU did not attempt to perform any serious projects in education until 1970s. Starting from the 1980s, programs regarding different educational areas were taken into effect.

The first official study regarding lifelong learning is *Green Paper* (EC, 1993), which was prepared to make the unemployed to find jobs again by making the vocational education systematic. The study highlighted the efforts that could be made to provide current workforce with popular technological developments through vocational training.

*White Paper* (EC, 1995) prepared by the Commission with the title "Teaching and Learning: Towards the Learning Society" focuses on the encouragement needed

to teach, analyze and discuss everything. It defined five principles related to lifelong learning issue:

- Stimulating acquiring new information
- Approximating school and business world
- Coping with anomie
- Being competent in three of European languages
- Evaluating capital investments and educational investments on the same basis

White Paper also reveals the actions to be taken in member countries and precautions to be taken within the Union. Besides, it announces that 1996 would be the European Lifelong Learning year in accordance with the decision of the Council and EP.

## 2.2.1.1.1. 1996 - Europe Lifelong Learning Year

The purpose of this action was to raise awareness towards lifelong learning in the Union, perform better co-operations with small businesses. It also aimed to found Europe teaching and learning area to define academic and vocational competencies in the Union.  The issues chosen for this Europe year are listed as follows (EC, 1996):

- The importance of high quality education
- Developing a vocational education which will increase the youth's competencies
- Encouraging individuals to be educated and taught
- Setting better relations between business world and educational institutions
- Raising awareness of the social partners and families
- Making the formal and informal education more European

The Commission report of 15 September 1999 (COM, 1999) evaluated the European year of lifelong learning and revealed that it highly achieved its aims within the Union. With a firm co-operation among the participant countries, more than 2000 projects were delivered to national agencies. 550 of them were performed via more than 4000 events such as conferences and seminars. Previously a special area only for its experts, lifelong learning became a point of focus and created a huge effect in the Union politics.

**2.2.1.1.2. Lisbon and Feira Summits**

The Lisbon Summit on 23-24 March in 2000 revealed a new 10-year strategic plan for the EU stating the purpose as to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge based economy with better projects and bigger social unity in the capacity of sustainable economic development. Presidents and prime ministers of the member countries expressed that in order to reach such a difficult aim, they not only needed radical changes in Europe Economy but also a program oriented to make the social welfare and educational systems contemporary. They completed the Lisbon strategic aim in 2002 with the item "to make Europe the world leader in terms of education and teaching systems' quality until 2010". Hence, with the open method of coordination, which would help the member countries share their experiences and good applications, lifelong learning concept came to the forefront.

As a result of the June, 2000 Feira Summit, the Council wanted the Commission and member countries to develop a strategy that would provide all the Europeans to reach lifelong learning opportunities. Published as a consequence of this, Lifelong Learning Memorandum paved the way to a long process of consultation among member countries. This process resulted in Europe Lifelong Learning Area consisting of more than 12.000 people from member countries, Europe Economic Area countries, candidate countries, union institutions, organizations of social partners, and non-governmental organizations.

### 2.2.1.1.3. A Memorandum on Lifelong Learning

This document of the Commission published on 30, October 2000, pointed out that the time to take action towards lifelong learning had come and included the transforming process which was a part of the knowledge society and the adaptation process to it. In order to make lifelong learning a part of our daily lives and create the *Europe of the Citizens*, it suggested a more flexible use of the resources and revealed six key messages: *key competencies for everybody, more investment in person, innovations in learning and teaching, valuing learning, re-assessment of guidance and consultation studies, making learning activities closer to home.* The targets of these six messages are listed below:

- Acquiring the competencies needed for the sustainable participation in knowledge society and guaranteeing the participation of everybody.
- Increasing the investments on human resources paying attention to the citizens of EU
- Creating effective teaching and learning materials for sustainable lifelong learning.
- Developing techniques for participation in formal and informal education and for the understanding and assessment of the outcomes of it
- Providing everybody to reach the learning opportunities throughout their lives in Europe
- Making lifelong learning opportunities close to the students with IT based facilities in their learning environments.

### 2.2.1.1.4. Concrete Future Purposes for Teaching and Learning Systems

In order to bring a broad and consistent approach to national education policies, Lisbon Europe Council (2000) initiates "a general view responsibility focusing on common interests and priorities with respect to national differences for concrete future purposes for educational systems". Being invited by the Educational Council, the Commission offered a series of purposes with the contributions of

member countries;

- To increase the learning standards in Europe
- To improve the teacher and tutor education
- To increase the level of literacy and mathematical skills
- To provide accessibility to learning in every stage of life with broader opportunities
- To provide opportunities for lifelong learning
- To make learning more appealing
- To create internal consistency in educational systems
- To focus on education and social accordance relation
- To update the definitions of key competencies for knowledge society
- To assist everybody reach the IT facilities
- To improve the vocational skills and individual competencies
- To publicize the teaching and learning to local places, to Europe and to the world
- To improve foreign language teaching studies
- To increase the mobility and exchange programs
- To strengthen the relations with business world
- To improve entrepreneurship
- To make use of the sources in the most effective way
- To develop quality security systems
- To develop new partnerships with schools

## 2.2.1.1.5. European Area of Lifelong Learning

This rescript of 21 November 2001 (COM, 2001) of the Commission focuses on reaching the European lifelong learning area in the program of "Teaching and Learning 2010" in Lisbon strategy and hence transforming through knowledge society. In order to reach this, it is pointed out that a synergy is needed with the youth, employment, social partners, and research policies.

The member countries undertake the role of developing appropriate strategies until 2006, and in the core point of those strategies, lays the key role of the students, the importance of the equality of opportunities, the need for quality learning possibilities.

The commission suggested "lifelong learning strategy components" and "action priorities" which would help member countries in their education policies and put the item of "transforming the traditional educational systems" to the first place among those components. Other components are:

- Forming associations between public service providers such as schools and universities and civil society
- Differentiating the needs of learning and business world's
- Providing enough sources by promoting public and special investments
- Increasing the accessibility of learning by rising the number of learning centers in workplaces and facilitating learning at the job giving special effort to the disabled, to the minority and people from rural areas
- Creating a learning culture, which will promote students, increase attendance, and showing effects for learning at every age.
- Setting assessment and quality management centers.

### 2.2.1.1.6. Barcelona Summit and Lifelong Learning Resolution

The council summit of March, 2002 approved the work plan oriented to perform educational aims of Stockholm Summit and suggested a closer partnership between higher education and vocational training. The program integrates the vocational teaching and learning "Copenhagen Process" and higher educational "Bologna Process".

The Council's Resolution of 27 June 2002 approved the Commission's November 2001 rescript of "Providing the European Area of Lifelong Learning". The resolution points out that lifelong learning is the guiding principle for education policies and suggests performing radical, broad, consistent and appropriate

strategies in Europe. The efforts should focus on these areas:

- Equipping all the citizens with the competencies they need
- Creating learning environments that are open to everybody, appealing and accessible.

Within this framework, the member countries were wanted to put lifelong learning strategies into practice until 2006. The strategies should include all the levels and aspects of the systems and be introduced with the participation of all the sides. The Council's 2002 resolution report (Council, 2002), regarding the "national strategies for lifelong learning studies in Europe" stated that the national strategies were so different from each other and there were so many things to do so as to achieve a rich lifelong learning culture.

According to the report, most of the member countries put the lifelong learning into their priorities; however, the legal regulations were so weak. Policy and strategy documents were much of importance. Although the lifelong learning concept was regarded as a key principle for various teaching and learning systems, it was not possible to claim that it was the dominant figure for the national strategies of member countries.

## 2.2.1.1.7. Benchmarks for Europe Teaching and Learning Systems and Related Reports

The Commission published a rescript on 20 November 2002 to ease the assessment of teaching and learning systems and to define the benchmarks. The benchmarks pointed out "concrete, assessable aims" under six categories;

- Investment in teaching and learning
- School drop-outs
- Graduates of mathematics, science and technology
- The secondary school graduates

- Key competencies
- Lifelong learning

The rescript calls the Council to accept the European benchmarks below that include the aim of being reached by the member countries until 2010:

- The ratio for school drop-outs is to be lowered below the EU average compared to 2000
- By increasing the number of graduates in this field, the man and woman inequality in the number of graduates of mathematics, science and technology, is to be lowered by at least 50%
- The number of graduates of secondary schools is to be higher than 80% in the group of 25-64 year-olds.
- The number of unsuccessful students in reading, mathematics, and science in the group of 15 year-olds is to be lowered by 50% compared to the year of 2000
- The level of participating in lifelong learning in Europe is to be at least 15% in the group of 25-64 year-olds and this level is to be not lower than 10% in any of the member countries

The rescript claimed that the most challenging situation in teaching and learning systems for the Union was the issue of lifelong learning. The EU average in the year 2002 was 8.4%, while in the most successful countries (The UK, Finland, and Denmark) this average was 19.6%.

Table 2.1 below shows the ratio of the participants of lifelong learning in 2002 in EU in comparison via benchmarks. The EU's average point of 8.5 shows that 8-9 people out of 100 participated in any lifelong learning activity in any period of a month. When we have a look at the distance to the target, there is a 4.6 point of difference with the effect of the countries that are to join the EU with 2004 and 2007 expanding studies. In the countries that will join the Union, the participation ratio is significantly lower (5.0) in the group of 25-64 year-olds. In the research,

participation in a teaching and learning activity at least a month ago was a must.

**Table 2.1: The Ratio of the people participating in teaching and learning in the group of 25-64 year-olds (%) (2002)**

|  | 2002 | Aim for 2010 | Difference |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **European Union** | 8.5 | 12.5 | 4.0 |
| **Countries to join the EU** | 5 | 12.5 | 7,5 |
| **AB + Countries to join the EU** | 7.9 | 12.5 | 4.6 |

Source: Eurostat, Labour force survey.*"Education & Training 2010" The Success of the Lisbon Strategy Hinges on Urgent Reforms.* 6905/04 EDUC 43, p. 40

The first Progress Report regarding Lisbon objectives was accepted as the Commission's and the Council's "Common Interim Report" in February 2004. The report emphasized that little work had been done in 15 member countries, countries in negotiations with the EU, the candidate countries, and 30 countries of EFTA within 29 teaching and learning indicators and the framework of the benchmarks that were given above. It defined 3 action areas for success for the year 2004;

- Focusing on investments and reforms in important fields
- Putting the lifelong learning strategies into action in member countries until the end of 2006.
- Improving common reference documents such as EQF and Key Competencies Framework

The 2005 Report of the Commission continued to analyze the progress and achievements on the basis of national reports. It highlighted that Lisbon Strategy was a key factor in the changes in national educational policies and reform movements were in the right direction. It was detected that most of the countries had some preparations regarding lifelong learning such as strategy documents or national action plans and some other countries promulgated framework laws. Contrary to this positive progress, some negative sides such as not all the related sides and the levels and aspects of the issue were included in the process were

also revealed; in other words, it was asserted that strategies were still not consistent and extensive.

**2.2.1.1.8. Integrated Action Plan in Lifelong Learning Area: Lifelong Learning Program 2007-2013**

The Commission published "The rescript of Public Education Programs for the New Generation after 2006" in March 2004 based on the rescript of "2007-2014 Political Difficulties and Budget Tools" that it published in February. This rescript bears great importance as it suggested an integrated lifelong learning program for 2007-2014 period paying attention to the curricula of the current member countries. The Commission's proposal of July 2004 to EP and the Council offered an integrated action plan for lifelong learning program.

The general aim of this program is to develop exchange programs so that the citizens of the Union can have the chance of seeing and meeting new cultures and people. By doing this, it is also aimed that the education system can be a model to all of the world. As a result of this, the improvement of the society can be achieved via improved knowledge society, sustainable economic development, more good projects, and bigger social interaction. In order to reach this general aim, there are some specific objectives of the program, as well;

- Contributing the development of the quality lifelong learning and supporting high performance and innovation in the systems and applications
- Making the European Area of Lifelong Learning real
- Aiding the accessibility, appealing and quality of the opportunities
- Enhancing social agreement, active citizenship, cross cultural dialogue, gender equality and personal development
- Supporting the creativity, competition, employment, and entrepreneurship within the Union
- Contributing the participation of disabled groups and handicapped people to the lifelong learning activities

- Supporting language learning and language change
- Improving the IT-based sources

The lifelong learning program 2007-13 encompasses all the European programs in the field of lifelong learning. It is therefore based on the previous programs for the period 2000-06: Erasmus, Socrates, Leonardo da Vinci, eLearning and the Jean Monnet action.

## 2.2.1.2. Studies in Turkey

In today's world, the common values such as the individuals' development and the workforce they create, their ability to adapt themselves to constantly changing conditions in the competitive world, democratization, the superiority of law, the freedom of speech and entrepreneurship are quite as important as being economically strong.

Trying to be a member of the Union and a global power in its own region, Turkey attempts to revise and improve its education system in terms of Lisbon aims. The Ninth Progress Plan (2007-2013), thus, points out that the National Education system is to educate its people as;

> "developed in critical thinking skills, democratic, loyal to Atatürk principles, libertarian, initiated the national and moral values, open to new ideas, feels personal responsibility, contributes to contemporary civilization, inclined to science and technology use, values the art, highly competent, and creative being" (SPO. Ninth Progress Plan 2007-2013, p. 85).

It also aims to make the country "growing in stability, sharing its income more fairly, owning a competitive power, turning into a knowledge society, having completed the adaptation process for being a member of the EU" (SPO. Ninth Progress Plan 2007-2013, p.3). Although a lot of work has been done in recent years in the area of education and shaping the schools in this respect, it is crystal clear that more work should be done.

The biggest challenge of Turkey in improving its people is its population, which is about 74 million by the year 2012. Approximately 20 million of this population is the group of 0-14 year olds.  TUIK (Turkish Statistical Institute) anticipates that by the year 2020, there will be 40 million people in the group of 15-44 year olds, 10 million in the group of 45-64 year olds. In other words, the 15-64 year olds group, which will be in their working period, will constitute 70% of the whole population. This increase will offer rich opportunities by investing in education and improving lifelong learning culture.

ETF's 2006 Turkey report indicates that the most challenging trouble in education is to provide an increase in the level of completed education in adults as well as primary and secondary schools and the quality of the education (ETF, 2006). An educational reform which will be carried out in a strategy involving social partners and non-governmental organizations will help the country in adapting EU benchmarks in employment and socialization.

### 2.2.1.2.1. The situation of Turkey for EU Educational Benchmarks

Turkey holds a negative place in such indicators as the number of students, the share of education in the budget, and income per capita considering many other countries. As an illustration, in Holland, which is the most densely populated country of Europe with 16.5 million people, the number of students is 3.5 million and the income per capita is 31.700 dollars while in Turkey, whose population is 72 million, the number of students is about 20 million and the income per capita is about 6000 dollars (Turkish Educational Statistics (TES) 2005-2006). The education expense per student is about 4000 dollars in Europe countries while it is only 390 dollars in Turkey. The table 2.2 below shows a reflection of this situation precisely.

The level of completing the general education of the work force consisting of approximately 60% of the primary school graduates or dropouts is considerably low compared to EU-25. The education process is 6.8 years in men and 5.3 years

in women. The rate of dropouts is a problematic situation. When we have a look at the Table 2.2, the dropouts in the 18-24 year-olds group is significantly higher than EU-25 average (approximately 37 points) and 43 points higher than 2010 aim.

**Table 2.2: The situation of Turkey for EU Educational Benchmarks**

| Comparison Area | Concrete Aim 2010 | EU-25 | New members or Candidate Countries | TURKEY |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The ratio School Drop-outs in EU (2004) (18-24 year-olds) | Max. 10% | 15.9% | BG 22.4% RO 23.6% HR 8.4% | 52.9% |
| The low level of reading in the group of 15 year olds. | A decrease by 20% at least | CZ 19.4% HU 20.5% LV 18% | BG 40.3% RO 41.3% | 36.8% |
| The ratio of participating in lifelong learning in EU (25-64) | Min. 12.5% | 9.4% | BG 1.3% RO 1.6% HR 2.1% | 2.3% |

Source: European Training Foundation (ETF). Turkey – Country Analysis 2006. Retrieved from: 21.01.2013, http://www.etf.europa.eu, p. 2.

In reaching the education facilities, there are such problem areas as being a woman, living in rural areas, enrolling in schools, dropping out, and graduation rates. The 12.5% of the population (20.1% of women and 4.7 of men) are illiterate. More importantly, despite the efforts of the government, vocational high schools are still not appealing for many students because of the strong prejudices against them. Besides, the pre-school education for 3-6 year olds is limited (15%) and it is not supported by the budget.

The participation of 25-64 year-olds in lifelong learning studies is 2.3% in Turkey, which is higher than Romania (1.6&) and Bulgaria (1.3%); however, it is considerably lower than EU-25 average (9.4%) and the aim for 2010 (12.5%) and most of the educational studies are based on basic skill practices. There is an urgent need in expanding and improving the vocational training of the adults.

**2.2.1.2.2. Reform Studies in Education**

In SPO Midterm Program, for the education, which holds the first place in the areas of investment, it is aimed to popularize the pre-school education, develop new programs for primary and secondary education, create a flexible and multi-program structure, increase the financial and organizational and scientific characteristics of the higher education, structure a more competitive framework, include private sector in every stage of education.

Within this respect, the Ministry of Education carries out many remediation and improvement studies. Among these, there are re-constructing of the organization, campaign for computer-assisted education, generalizing of basic education and improving it, reform movements for secondary and higher education and a new construction of teacher-training programs.

One of the most significant steps in renewing in pre-school education is the decision of opening one or two kindergartens in each school depending on its size. Besides this, there are some other important projects such as "Pre-School Parent-Child Education Project", "Early Childhood Development and Education Project", "Supporting and Popularizing Pre-School Education Project", "Mobile Kindergarten Project", and "Information Technology and Pre-School Education Project".

Reform studies for primary education focus on the education facilities in rural areas. The main objectives of the studies are to improve the conditions of children in rural and village areas, support the children that are out of basic education, rehabilitate the accessibility of education, and making girls and woman reach the secondary and higher levels of education with such campaigns as "*Haydi Kızlar Okula (The Girls' Education Campaign)".*

The reform movements for secondary education involve making the compulsory education 12 years, increasing the share of vocational training, making the standards of vocational training more contemporary and appropriate for EU,

turning into program and variety approach rather than school variety. Based on the principles of ENQA (the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education), the Ministry of Education initiated vocational programs that are to train quality intermediate staff that the economy requires in terms of socio economic needs and lifelong learning standards.

When it comes to the higher education, the reform studies are bound to Bologna Process. In all the universities, the studies towards ECTS (European Credit Transfer System), preparing diploma supplements, academic assessment centers, setting up student clubs and councils, and developing international student/staff mobility programs.

The current innovations studies in education aiming to improve the educational system in an extensive and comprehensive way include the generalizing of the pre-school education, making the secondary school class system adaptive to International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED, 97), developing school facilities, setting a teacher training system, bringing IT in educational settings, integrating secondary school curricula with higher education systems (EC, 2005)

The priorities of Turkey for innovation and investment studies in educational system are gathered into 4 areas:

- Increasing the physical capacity and facilities of schools
- Developing a curriculum suited to contemporary needs of the society.
- Improving the teacher training and quality of teachers
- Setting up a solid IT infrastructure

Within the practices of lifelong learning programs, studies towards developing new materials appropriate to student-centered learning and supplementary course materials are focused on. In order to increase the quality of education and providing equal accessibility, course books are given to the students without being charged in state schools.

**Table 2.3: Turkey's Participation fees for the year 2011. (All in Euros)**

| PROGRAM/AGENCY | NATIONAL CONTRIBUTION | EU SUPPORT | TOTAL COST |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Lifelong Learning + Youth in Action** | 32.799.000 | 51.301.000 | 84.100.000 |
| **Culture 2007-2013** | 450.000 | 1.040.000 | 1.490.000 |
| **European Environment Agency (EEA)** | 2.188.900 | 938.100 | 3.127.000 |
| **PROGRESS** | 360.000 | 40.000 | 400.000 |
| **European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (subject to the ratification of the MoU)** | 60.000 | 90.000 | 150.000 |
| **CIP/EIP** | 4.247.025 | 1.415.675 | 5.662.700 |
| **CIP/ICT** | 1.640.160 | 410.040 | 2.050.200 |
| **Customs 2013** | 114.564 | 44.331 | 158.895 |
| **7th Framework Programme (*)** | 65.259.070 | 12.327.930 | 77.587.000(**) |
| **Total** | **107.118.719** | **67.607.076** | **174.725.795** |

(*) The remaining funds available under 2010 Programme will be used to support Turkey's contribution for the 7th Framework Programme.
(**)The participation fee shown on this Fiche takes into account the total sum of 7th Framework and EURATOM.

In the academic year of 2005-2006, within the process of curriculum innovation, all of the inspectors (2.800) and classroom teachers (230.000) were trained. The concept of in-service training was gained importance among teachers and regarded as a continuous development process with respect to lifelong learning. Distance learning facilities and conferences and seminars in local schools or education centers are examples of this movement.

Turkey became a full member of the "Lifelong Learning and Youth in Action" program on 1, January 2007. Before and since then, it participated many lifelong learning activities both institutionally and individually. Table 2.3 below shows the participation rates and budgets in details (Project Fiche, 2010).

Within the Lifelong Learning and Youth in Action program, Turkey has participated a lot of mobility programs since 2007. The aim here is to enable people at all stages of their lives to take part in learning experiences, as well as helping to develop the education and training sector across Europe (EC, 2012). Table 2.4 below shows Turkey's share in mobility programs.

**Table 2.4: Projects supported by the National Agency of the country in 2011**

| Strand of the Programme | Budget allocated Decentralised Funds (in Mio€) | Number of institutions involved | Number of participants |
|---|---|---|---|
| Comenius (Schools) | 9,5 | 1408 | 6108 |
| Erasmus (Higher Education) | 29,8 | 117 | 122541(*) |
| Leonardo da Vinci (Vocational training) | 17,6 | 2426 | 7217 |
| Grundtvig (adult education) | 2,5 | 408 | 2758 |
| **Total** | **59,4** | **4345** | **28337** |

 *: Number covers students (mobility and placements) and teaching staff (mobility and training) for the academic year 2010/11

### 2.2.2. Theoretical Bases of Lifelong Learning

Lifelong learning is gaining prevalence and the number of academic studies of it has increased. Some researchers published information that was focused on language and expression. This makes it possible to begin serious discussion. Some researches independently developed the concepts in historical and social

terms and have been drawing attention. Therefore some approaches towards lifelong learning has been identified in different sources.

In this study, the classification of J. Field (2002) was taken into consideration and each approach will be examined under his framework.

## 2.2.2.1. Liberal Approach

Society's concept of "learning community" is in action and is used more and more. The entire community will learn but will the descendants? What is its status? Unfortunately it is difficult to get a positive answer to these questions. "Human capital" is a new concept that should be considered and developed. The aim of the capital can be better understand. According to Nicoll (2002) if it is examined within a liberal framework, the increasing pressure to respond to global markets, and a competitive environment, it will be easier to understand the concept of lifelong learning.

Using the liberal approach, the economy can be a restriction and lifelong learning is viewed as life-saving. Life and death has come to be seen as human capital. Looking after the main capital is seen as a way to look after the maximum efficiency of the capital. In this way we can use the competitiveness of the global markets and we can breathe easier.

## 2.2.2.2. Discursive Approach

The discursive approach of lifelong learning policies in the White Book is the critical approach. This approach is seen as policy in the text (Field, 2002).

Derrida and Foucalt are proponents of this approach and have developed their thesis using discourse. This means that there is a message behind every word used. It is preferable to say what is actually meant. Edwards and Nicoll (cited in Taylor, 2004) remind the reader of the rhetoric and metaphors used to influence.

Thus, by looking at the documents we can infer the meaning of lifelong learning by the language used. Each concept and expression will reflect a different point of view.

In reviews regarding lifelong learning, Nicoll and Edwards examined the language used and developed a critical perspective. In theory, the social and cultural structure contributed to their position. However, they did not use a new method. They examined the issue with a critical eye. The studies only solve the problems they examine. These perceptions are clear to those who understand the message (Field, 2002).

### 2.2.2.3. Neo-Marxist Approach

A common point of view of lifelong learning policies is that responding to competitive global markets needs to implement reductionist and utilitarian practices (Field, 2002).

Central to the Neo-Marxist approach is the questions of privatization. Discussion of the commercialization of lifelong learning activities and the capitalist neo-liberal approach is advocated. In this context, citizens, instead of those in the political arena, are redefined as lifelong learning consumers. Learning itself is put into the press. Your position in society is determined by your skills and how you adapt to new conditions. In other words, it is referred to the discovery of the concept of individualized learning and the personal responsibility associated with it and the risk of slipping. In this way the role of the state is reduced (Bagnall, 2005).

The neo-Marxist approach is similar to the classical Marxist approach; the competitive power of the capitalist market to produce a surplus is a valuable bonus. By itself, adopting the Marxist approach in an age of global capitalism will lead to unpredictable results. In this way the Neo-Marxists are quite pessimistic (Field, 2002).

Discussing the Marxist approach to education in general will be a beneficial look and help refine the subject. One of the inherent features of the Marxist approach is that one of the State's primary tasks is education. According to Korolyov (1989) the properties of future Marxist education are as follows:

- Eliminating the class discrimination among the different people in society will help develop versatile skills;
- The free development of each individual in society will push inequality to the front;
- As a result, the educational fields are interrelated and exhibit a versatile technological (Polytechnic) education with respectable and practical scientific training;
- At a certain point the manufacturer cannot increase the social production without versatile and more skilled people.

The Marxist approach to education began dealing with lifelong learning two centuries ago. This is another area where the individual and social planes have different requirements and it is important to resolve the differences in the appropriate approaches.

Jones (2005) states that is a global phenomenon. The education market is practiced internationally. Privatization is a policy of the World Bank, the OECD, and is implemented by organizations such as the EU. It looks as if the privatization of lifelong learning is becoming a global phenomenon. The EU, OECD, and WB are global players and should appropriate the results.

The reorganization of schools and the emphasis on lifelong learning gives more weight to privatization. The OECD also said that in the traditional sense the teacher's role is to provide information. Instead of centrally planned education it is transferred to the private sector (Hirtt, 2003).

Today's Human Resource Development Specialists say the thesis is correct that adult education includes acquiring skills in the workplace. But they forget that a large part is outside the market. Instead of pursuing profits in the capital market, members of society don't care who wins. Thus, earning money by developing human resources by teaching are closely connected (Cunningham, 1993).

### 2.2.2.4. Authoritarian Approach

According to the authoritarian approach, lifelong learning is a dimension of the authoritarian approach. Reorganization of the society with lifelong learning playing a greater role with different rules for different abilities is an option. The advocates of this point of view see social control in society as a way for the state to provide lifelong learning (Field, 2002).

This approach is based on the authoritarian discipline of social life. The purpose of this is to ensure compliance with the application of customization. Lifelong learning, comes out in the press from the coded regulations. This will mean the creation of identification. Social relations will be highly regulated. Each type of relationship will be governed by certain rules (Bagnall, 2005).

The authoritarian approach looks at the impact of the variables that are not related to the Marxist approach and reveals the differences. It also provides a way to balance the approach. Single authoritarian approaches can be seen as negative by society and it can be difficult to instill a desire for change or to see its potential. Official documents written here with a very short span between its realization and acceptance (Field, 2002).

According to Field (2002), England is focused on the outputs of the authoritarian approach. The New Labour movement has emerged as a response and Frank Coffield is its best known advocate. Coffield believes that lifelong learning is a new form of social control. His colleague, Kathryn Ecclestone, continues where he left the authoritarian aspects lifelong learning and examines the risk aversion of

Western society.

Authoritarian's link with lifelong learning cannot come to a consensus among themselves. Unification of the points of the authoritarian approach is its current goal. At a glance from the outside the governmental role is necessary and the attitude of society needs to change in regards to the role new regulations will play.

## 2.2.2.5. Disengagement Approach

The disengagement approach seems to support privatization. According to this approach the differences between lifelong education and lifelong learning are deeply rooted. First, human development and the environment will benefit and move forward by removing existing inequalities and while not hiding anything. In this sense, only the lifelong training policies may be associated with life-long education. Otherwise, the concept of life-long learning will be discharged (Bagnall, 2005).

However, when observing the other approaches except the liberal approach there is an attitude of distance towards learning. What is more, the concept as handled today is increasingly subjected to criticism.

## 2.3. Key Competencies for Lifelong Learning

The European Union has many challenges to meet and overcome when facing the deteriorating conditions and competitive countries and globalization. The most important primary challenges faced are economic competitiveness, social inclusion and social demographic changes.

The issue of increasing the development and employment suited to the Lisbon development strategy while maintaining social harmony is the biggest economic challenge of Europe. Elsewhere in the world the rapid progress in innovation, improved quality of education and economic competitiveness have shown their

importance in these factors. In this context, it is essential for today's job market to meet the needs of a productive and happy society in a manner that allows the individual to continuously improve. Therefore, adult education needs to transform into lifelong learning and it is of the utmost importance to make youth a priority.

However, today we observe a striking difference between the stated goals and political discourse. For example, in 2004 one third of the European workforce of 72 million workers were unskilled. By 2010 only 15% of jobs will be unskilled while 50% will need advanced education or training and this reveals a difference between projections and reality.

In addition to this, a significant portion of the European population is still not capable to understand and use printed information on a daily basis. Therefore, there is no doubt that this section of the study on the acquisition of basic competencies of citizens is a difficult goal for Member States.

Meanwhile, European society is facing demographic changes and this will have a powerful influence on the economy and education services. The European population is aging and the number of people below the age of 24 will decrease by 15% over the next 30 years. Within the same period one in three Europeans will be over 60 and one in ten over 80 years of age. A reduction in the number of young people entering the labor market coupled with one third of the population in the 55-64 age range and unskilled workers over the age of 40 will require increased expenditures and adaptability. An aging population and a lack of skills in certain industries can be partially mitigated by immigration but this brings up the serious difficulties in language and cultural differences. Furthermore, the recognition of qualifications is often undervalued because these attributes are underutilized in the labor market (Coulombe, et all, 2004).

In addition, recent reports on poverty and social exclusion held in all the Member States reveals that they are facing a problem. Due to low levels of education, unemployment, rural isolation, and various environments and conditions, many

people cannot participate effectively in public life as a citizen. Professional and ICT access to daily life has ceased to be a problem, but this highlights other areas of ignorance: Those who are not computer literate in an increasingly digital environment are deprived of fundamental knowledge and possibilities.

These common solutions to the problems are put on the table as "What are the core competencies that give direction to the lifelong learning and adult education required of EU citizens?" and the research of this section seeks to define proficiency and answer questions to basic competencies; in this regard the progress made in research and studies published in the light of regulations and resolutions of the general framework and development process for exploring the "Key Competencies" subsection.

### 2.3.1. Definition

Before we examine the sense in which the research topics of proficiency/competence are used in EU documents, which are often confused with each other, it is essential to determine the competence and proficiency in English. The word competence, in the Cambridge Dictionary means "the ability to do something well"; Merriam Webster's Dictionary states "necessary or appropriate skills and qualifications"; in the narrow sense "the knowledge to speak and understand a language" and in Longman's Dictionary it is defined as "the ability to do what is necessary". "Proficiency" is defined as "sufficient condition; specialized information providing the power to perform a task, competence, strength to fulfill the task".

In regards to the November 10th, 2005 draft of the Commission's "foundation for lifelong learning competencies", competence is defined as "experience, information and special features of used as an effective description of capacity" and it is attributed to specific information that applies to the situation, skills, and attitudes from a combination of different sources. Key competencies are defined as the key skills that support participation in social life, active citizenship, personal

happiness, and employment.

In the OECD DeSeCo project the concept of competence is "an individual with wider social objectives due to a higher level of integration competence". Accordingly, competence is:

- the ability to respond to complex demands;
- related information, cognitive skills, attitudes, values, motivations and emotions that are defined as a combination of, based on, and guided by the current conditions in the action.

The concept of key competencies in education in schools is planning how to teach proficiency and the traditional approach. Employers need to be able to communicate with the companies of the outside world when necessary; safely use various computer applications, which can operate independently or as a team, self-sufficient, innovative and different cultural approaches that can look for people in an environment where education systems adapts to a new profile. Educational programs (curricula) frequently contain a program that is installed which can be removed. Teachers are requested to reach the desired goals. Everyone is aligned at the same speed at the same and is expected to progress in small increments. According to the Working Group, key competencies include personal happiness and development of all individuals, the need to be included and employable with versatile skills and attitudes. These competencies should be developed by the end of compulsory education and lifelong learning should be developed as the next part of the learning foundation.

The definitions of competency can be applied to many different situations and environments and can be transferred; few reach the goal and can manage to solve different problems and tasks which emphasizes their versatile functionality. Furthermore, life, work and experience in education are a prerequisite for adequate levels of personal performance. The concept of recognition of qualifications is attributed to two dimensions; (1) Official recognition, competence

is the process of making an official status or by giving a certificate of recognition of competence acquired through education or natural skill, (2) Social recognition, competencies are recognized by economic and social parties.

It is also evident that competencies in the way of life cannot be directly changed by formal schooling alone. Developmental psychology shows that the development of competency does not end in adolescence. In this case, key competencies reveal the importance of continual emphasis on lifelong learning. In this context, the following section will examine the communiques and resolutions of the EU and identify the general framework and development of the relevant procedures relating to key competencies.

## 2.3.2. General Framework and Development Process

The European Commission Directorate of General Education and Culture's "Education and Training Program" to be completed in 2010 under the November 2004 title "Lifelong Learning for Key Competencies – A European Reference Framework" reported to the Commission on 10 November 2005 about this subject and sought the approval and advice of the EU Council.

However, it is worth examining the background of the development of key competencies of lifelong learning. In fact, in the context of following the developments of the information society it is not only a question of which competencies everyone needs, but also the necessity of finding the answer to the question: what do these emerging competencies contain. Furthermore, under the competence framework set forth by the Lisbon Summit it is essential to complete compulsory education and at the same time update the education of lifelong learning. Finally, the question then arises of whether it is possible to determine a particular level of a "key" competency.

**2.3.2.1. Work Group for Key Competencies and Europe Reference Levels**

After approving the details of the study program, the Commission will work to target 13 Member States, EFTA/EEA countries and other partner countries and the groups with European level partnerships. The working group on key competences started working in 2001. Adult learners, school dropouts, and those with special needs especially need to focus on finding answers to the group's following questions:

1. What will the new skills be?
2. How can these skills be more successfully integrated into the curriculum?
3. How do we ensure and sustain lifelong learning?

The first progress report delivered February 2002 of the Group, Council and Commission's "Education and Training 2010 work program" in accordance with the 2004 European Joint Interim Report identified eight key competencies of knowledge, skills and attitudes that give the format to revise the key competency framework.

In May 2003, while continuing the Group's efforts, the Council accepted five European reference levels as a benchmark criteria. Literacy, dropping out of school, secondary education completion and adult participation in lifelong learning is closely related to the development and application of key competencies. Data from 2005 on literacy and low success rate of completing secondary education for 15 year olds suggests that further progress is not guaranteed. Developments in other areas is very low compared to the control level. At this rate the percentage of school dropouts is expected to increase to 14%, above the control level of 10%. Likewise, the participation of 12.5% of adults in lifelong learning by 2010 cannot be reached with an annual growth rate of 0.1-0.2%.

The operation of the Working Group ended with the publication of "Key Competencies for Lifelong Learning: A European Framework of Reference" by the Commission in November 2004. The report puts for the framework of principles and definition of eight key competencies and the refines the aspects of knowledge, skills and attitudes.

At nearly the same time, on November 3, 2004 the High Level Group of the Lisbon Strategy evaluated the points reached in the published report. The report of the Lisbon Strategy entitled "Facing Challenges" and also known as the "Kok report" targets implementation in the Member States of the necessary political commitment and highlights the inability for decisive action and political leadership urgently needed to focus on five policies: Information Society, Domestic Market, Business Climate, Labor Market and Environment Sustainability.

The report "Labor Market" covering the field "It is not sufficient for the population of Europe to follow the pace of the evolving job market they must take on additional characteristics and this requires that both high and low skill jobs are available." indirectly exposes the importance of bringing emphasis to the key competencies. "Lifelong learning is not a luxury, it is a requirement" appropriately refers to the necessity of a Europe that has a highly educated, creative and vibrant labor force by bringing together education and training, systems development and the development of dynamic, young graduates with the right skills employed in value-added and appropriate industries. In addition, it needs to be stressed that the aging of the working population and school dropouts need to be equipped with the skills to integrate them into the labor market.

Meanwhile, on November 29, 2004 the Commission released a publication entitled the "New Indicators in Education and Training" Workbook. The Joint Interim Report proposed new strategies that are planned for key competency fields in line with the demands of other particular competencies and to acquire and indicator of their development. Cooperation among the Member States and the Commission aimed at the development of activities that will include the development of standard

benchmarks or indicators with activities occurring over short (less than one year), medium (one to three years) and longtime spans (more than three years).

## 2.3.2.2. Definition and Selection of Competencies (DeSeCo)

The results of the Lisbon Summit and the ensuing detailed work study can be achieved through lifelong learning of basic skills by focusing on the OECD key competencies of DeSeCo project and identified in the European framework as a successful life and well-functioning society. All along, the OECD has demonstrated in numerous scientific studies the importance of acquiring working literacy and computational skills in daily life. Carried out in 2003, the study "Adult Literacy and Life Skills Survey" puts forward that numerical skills and professional activity have a direct correlation among each other; a lower level of numeracy can lead to a higher probability of professional or vocational stagnation. On the other hand, the reading and mathematical skills of individuals today are insufficient to help meet the demands of today's world.

The starting point of the DeSeCo project was the question "Do people require competence for a successful life and a healthy functioning society". The main features of this combines competency models and the prerequisite knowledge of reasonable psychosocial skills in the crucial format. Accordingly, the distinguishing features of key competences are:

- Starting a business, especially one using specialized technical knowledge and skills, requires competence to eliminate the management of a specific qualification is "essential for all important individuals";
- held "in common";
- "Only the accumulation of knowledge, facts and essential skills reflect this practice beyond the critical point" is required.

The major outcomes of the DeSeCo project have created a frame of reference where it is crucial to identify and rank key competences. Only the EU's framework of key competencies for lifelong learning in the OECD's international skills assessment survey can be organized according to an underlying conceptual framework of these core competencies into three broad classes. According to this, everyone should be able to

- effectively interact in life with their surrounding ICT we adapt and take advantage of a series of life 'tools" such as language, symbols and words, and information and news from the field;
- interact with groups made up of different types (heterogeneous) in formats that include establishing good relationships with other groups, collaboration and managing conflict resolution skills;
- act autonomously by assuming responsibility for their own lives.

To see the "big picture" arranged by these three classes; we must manage the ability to select the required skills, understand the context of people's lives, it requires and understanding of their value systems, their analysis, discovering their background.

## 2.3.3. Key Competencies

The European level aimed at closing Community programs that lacked basic skills to give support to projects such as the Leonardo da Vinci and Grundtvig actions located within the Socrates program.

However, the Commission presented to the European Parliament and Council the opinion "key competencies for lifelong learning" regarding the Draft Recommendation of November 10, 2005, facing the national implementation of the best decisions that were taken at regional and/or local levels and  it is the responsibility of the Member States to provide students in those Member States with a primary education that emphasizes key competencies and in light of the

deficiencies of the European reference levels for education and are encouraged to close them. Even if adult education expresses the need, it will take the cooperation of all parties concerned to create the relevant structures.

The key competencies are named in the Working Group's report "Key Competences for Lifelong Learning - A European Reference Framework" with the idea that the principles put forward by these ideas are examined in the following section.

### 2.3.3.1. Principles

The framework developed for key competencies locates the definition of principles as well as some of the limitations. Observation of a knowledge society, for the first time Europe prepared a balanced and comprehensive list of key competencies based on these principles which are symbolically named below:

1. "Reference tools": People from all levels of lifelong learning will learn to adapt the learning environment to their own needs and policy makers are responsible for building open learning opportunities which are intended to be "reference tools".

2. "Key competencies in lieu of fundamental skills": Mostly known as "vital" skills at a basic level of literacy and numeracy are very restrictive in the sense that they are used in a manner that basic skills such as the knowledge, skill, ability and attitude to be predisposed to learn basic proficiency and competency in the compound have been rather literal. According to a Working Group report, the "key competencies", is indispensable for the three areas of life;

   a. Personal happiness and lifelong development (cultural wealth): Key competencies gives them the opportunity to achieve their

personal goals shaped by a person's personal interests, ambitions and willingness to continue learning throughout their life.

b. Active citizenship and participation (social wealth): Key competencies give everyone the permission to participate in community life as an active citizen.

c. Employment capacity (human wealth): Every individual has the capacity to find the proper job in the labor market.

3. "Additional general, flexible and transferrable competencies": For any particular specialized basic skill a particular solution for one problem may be insufficient for another. Society is constantly changing and from time to time individuals are also faced with the challenging demands of changing from one state to another. In order to be successful at a task basic skills are needed alongside more general, flexible and transferable skills. "Computer literacy" is a good example of this. Basic Information Communication Technologies (ICT) skills may be sufficient in only a few cases, while in most cases, but for the appropriate level of efficiency in the use of this technology it is important to use critical-thinking and have a broader understanding of the media-related needs.

4. "Proficiency of competence measurement is limited": PISA and IALS measuring tools such as literacy and numeracy skills are clues regarding the level of competence. The Council of Europe's Common European Framework of Reference for Languages while devising a measurement on the level of competence in foreign languages with some research in "learning how to learn" is ongoing. In addition, it is appropriate to determine the level of competence in basic skills and to include several national measuring tools for the development of policies at various levels. Some of the basic framework qualifications

can be measured, but it is important to remember that measuring the vertical competencies together with the general purpose equivalents is helpful but more complicated.

5. "Overlap": Among the eight areas and specific fields of knowledge, skills and attitudes listed there is a certain level of overlap. Therefore, each competency should be regarded as a combination of the above three elements.

6. "Common connotations of different semantic concepts": Concepts such as interpersonal and social competencies used in the fields of solidarity (solidarity), compromise (compromise) and tolerance (tolerance) carry different connotations in different socio-linguistic environments and is an example of this situation. Indeed, the "compromise" of social skills is seen as a positive in some countries, while in others "compromise" carries a completely negative connotation. In addition, the limit of "tolerance" is open to question.

## 2.3.3.2. The Suggestion of the Commission to EP and the Council

The recommendation of the Commission, Common European Framework of Reference and Council of the European Parliament will form the basis of the decision that determines the eight key competences:

1. The main language of communication;
2. Communication in foreign languages;
3. Mathematical competence and key competencies in science and technology;
4. Digital competence;
5. Learning how to learn;
6. Interpersonal, intercultural and social competences with

qualifications of citizenship;

7. Entrepreneurship;
8. Cultural awareness and expression.

Personal happiness and the development of key competencies for active citizenship, social inclusion and employment are competencies that need to be emphasized for all individuals. By the end of their initial training youths are expected to be equipped for adult life at the appropriate level. Afterwards, as part of the need to keep up with changes indicates further development in lifelong learning.

The basic skills of language, literacy, numeric and IT proficiency support all learning activities and are expressed as a prerequisite of learning how to learn. In each of the eight key competences, critical thinking, creativity, initiative, problem solving, risk assessment, decision-making and management plays an important role in a constructive sense.

## 2.3.3.3. The Suggestions of the EP and the Council to Member Countries

In this regard the European Parliament advices the Council and the Member States,

- Primary education and training provides the means for all youths to gain key competencies and should ensure that they continually develop,
- To identify youths who require extra support to realize their educational potential and be given the appropriate support,
- The continual development of key proficiencies of adults throughout their lifetime and to pay attention to special target groups,
- Suitable instruction and teaching infrastructure to include the continuous support of students whose learning requirements are different and take measure to ensure their access,

- "Key Competencies" will facilitate the sharing of best practices to learn from peers and as a reference tool in order to take advantage of the issues make it easy to get a reference in the Commission's intention to put forward a recommendation.

The Commission recommended in all matters to the Member States who intended to help youths that in addition to "Key Competencies" the social policies that will benefit the Community Education and Training programs and four years after the adoption of the EP bill the Council had gained experience and will present a report covering the highlights with implications for the future.

The Education, Youth and Culture Council meeting of May 18-19, 2006 concluded in the section titled "key competencies for lifelong learning" in relation to the Draft Recommendation of the Council that the general approach than go without a change. Pending the results of the European Parliament's first reading, this issue is stated that an agreement with the AP. In the declaration, the subject of education in "key competencies" was a Council decision to allow access to the qualified majority needed to make a decision and the AP method to follow-up is also included.

## 2.3.3.4. The Advisory Jurisdiction of the EP and the Council

The above-mentioned process of the EP and the Council entitled "Key Competencies for Lifelong Learning" was recommended to be published December 18, 2006". In making the decision on the Treaty establishing the European Community, especially items 149 and 150; the Commission did not change the Draft Recommendation; the opinion of the Economic and Social Committee was taken by co-decision of the Committee of the Regions in light of Article 251 in the Treaty.

The recommendation to the Member States and the European Community is intended to provide essential contributions to meet future requirements. This contribution, especially for youths to make them ready for adult life will allow the development of basic education and training systems in support of key competencies; business life is meant to make the development of these competencies possible with a coherent and comprehensive lifelong learning policy as the next learning experience.

The decision of the supplemental study includes the basic competencies related to the "Common European Framework". This framework, with the goal of agreeing on European indicators to determine the level of the 2010 Education and Training Work Program, increased the exchange of information between the Member States and the Commission to facilitate the national reform of the policy makers as a basis that acclaims the education and training service providers, social partners and the learners themselves. In this context, Member States used key competences of the "Application Framework" as a reference tool and, accordingly, to gain access to the full literacy including lifelong learning as part of key competencies taking into consideration the issues listed below to determine a recommendation:

- basic education and training of all youths in key competencies with the resulting education and work experience forming a backdrop to life and makes them ready for their adult lives at a level that provides the tools necessary for development.
- Arrangements should be made available for youths in need of special support arrangements as a result of adverse economic, personal, social, cultural or educational conditions.
- Adults can develop and update key competencies throughout their lives.
- In this context, special focus is required of individuals who want to improve their skills to target groups, national, regional and / or local environments.

- The proper infrastructure is needed for the continual education and training of adults including teachers and trainers, approval and assessment procedures, lifelong learning and support with equal access to the labor market for those learners.
- For every individual adult education is regulated for consistency, but employment policy, social policy, cultural policy, innovation policy, and other policies that affect young people are accessible through collaborations between social partners and other stakeholders.

Recommendation of the Key Competencies' main purposes are disclosed in the following way:

- In the information society, personal happiness, active citizenship, social cohesion and employability are required to identify and define the key competences;
- Member States, by the end of the basic education of youths there are essential lessons that will develop proficiency in their adult life for implementing and later forming the basis of business life; adults develop and update their key competences throughout their lives to support the work relationship;
- On a European level and a national level to assist policy makers identify and decide on goals such as training service providers, employers and students themselves and to provide these reference tools throughout Europe;
- to create a framework for the next steps of the Education and Training 2010 work program, within the scope of the Community Education and Training Programs at the Community level.

In accordance with this Recommendation, the Commission's new Lifelong Learning Program calls for key competency project proposals of Member States for the year 2007 to identify priorities. Accordingly, the Grundtvig sub-program, the

first priority in multilateral projects is integrating adult learners with learning experiences into the common framework for key competences for lifelong learning. Under this priority are these projects,

- basic competencies such as literacy, mathematical competence, science, and digital technology competencies are required for the development of basic skills;
- Learners must adapt to the changing expectations of society and the labor market in order to gain social, cultural and intercultural competences, such as helping in the development of transversal competences;
- Approved adult learners are offered to develop common and natural ways of learning;
- Provide a qualification that takes into account the different requirements of adult learners.

Commission of the European Communities (COM) decided on these eight key competences: 1) Communication in mother tongue, 2) Communication in foreign languages, 3) Mathematical competence and basic competences in science and technology, 4) Digital Competence, 5) Learning to Learn, 6) Social and civic competences, 7) Sense of Initiative and Entrepreneurship, 8) Cultural awareness and expression. (COM, 2005)

The competence of communication in foreign languages, which sets the basic of this research, is analyzed below in detail.

## 2.4. LIFELONG LEARNING WITHIN COMMUNICATION IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Bringing together the important elements of different definitions, Demirel (1987) describes language as "a system that uses sound as a communication tool to create a thinking society". On the other hand, language makes us human, is the

most direct expression of culture and gives us identity. The historian Braudel (cited in Güvenç, 1995) establishes the relationship between language and identity as "Language Is Identity (L'Identité, c'est la langue)". Consequently, each language has its own special identity and values and is a product of its history that views the world from a unique perspective. Nowadays, language and cultural diversity, as with biological diversity, are increasingly viewed as phenomena that are good and beautiful in their own right.

Language is regarded as an element of culture and a system of seemingly random symbols or sounds used by a group of people mainly to communicate with each other, express cultural identity, social relationships as well as to provide a source of pleasure such as in literature.

Today, over six billion people in 195 independent countries speak 6000-7000 different languages. 225 of these languages are native to Europe. Usually it is the native tongue that is recognized, but in reality almost half of the world's population is bilingual or plurilingual meaning that they speak two or more languages. Scientific and technical vocabulary is very large and the European languages contain more than 50,000 words, but people use only a few hundred in everyday life.

## 2.4.1. Definition

Language and culture are living things and are in constant change. People influence each other through forms of speaking and writing. The public network (internet) offers new possibilities of development for languages as well as new communication tools. Languages continuously interact with each other by borrowing words back and forth. For example, over the centuries more than 350 languages have taken words from English and all of the European languages contain English words.

Languages are different from each other in terms of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary and rhetoric. There are large differences in the number of consonants and vowels. In Europe this number varies between 25 (i.e. Spanish) and 60 (i.e. Irish). The sizes of alphabets to represent these sounds varies: For example, while the Turkish alphabet meets all the sounds, English exhibits a very irregular structure.

The majority of a native language is acquired during the first five years of life. All children learn their mother tongues naturally and with the same ease. One language is not any more difficult than another. In their first year, babies produce a wide range of various sounds, producing intelligible words by the end of the first year, compound sentences by the end of the third and possess a vocabulary of a few thousand words by the end of the fifth.

The mother tongue is most often defined as the language that was learned first or that the user knows best. On the other hand, two different languages used equally well are "perfectly bilingual". However, with many a "first" and "second" can be distinguished because the second or third language was learned in or after school. According to Karaağaç (2007), most languages can be learned or acquired; but only one of them can be learned if a person is a member of only one community and does not cross the road at any time from infancy to the time of passing. Bilingualism is a complex phenomenon. Contrary to popular belief, bilingual individuals rarely exhibit the same level of competency in both languages. Some are able to speak perfectly in two languages, while others speak with an accent. Some can to speak in a particular language, others can only write.

For the survival of a language, it is imperative that parents and children speak naturally and interact on a daily basis. Experts say that by the end of the century only half of the world's current language will have survived. All traces of a particular language will be erased within two generations if it is not as children grow up.

There are many reasons that a language is not used. They include, community or habitat destruction through disease or by physical destruction of the environment with the most common cause being active or political hostilities where the more powerful group's language establishes economic and cultural domination. Whatever the cause, the result is the same: The loss of a unique resource for humankind.

Bilingualism makes it easier to learn another language through the development of critical-thinking skills and makes the development of mutual understanding with other people and cultures easier by overcoming barriers to communication to establish closer ties. More importantly, speaking several languages gives a competitive and economic edge with multinational companies as compared to those who are monolingual.

Language families are associated with each other. Many of the major European languages are members of the Indo-European language family and are predominantly concentrated in three broad groups: Germanic, Latin and Slavic language families. Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Icelandic, German, Dutch, English and Yiddish languages are members of the Germanic language family. Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese and Romanian are the most prominent examples of the Latin language. Among the Slavic languages Russian, Ukraine, White Russian, Polish, Czech, Slovak, Slovenian, Serbian, Croatian, Macedonian, Bulgarian, are the most widely spoken. These groups located in the Celtic language family, Irish, Scottish Gaelic, Welsh (Welsh) and Breton; the Baltic language family includes Latvian and Lithuanian. Greek, Albanian and Armenian each make up single member families. The Basque language of the Indo-European language family is an exception and its source is not exactly known.

There are also representatives of other European language families. In the north are the Ural languages such as Finnish, Estonian and Hungarian; in the southeast are the Altai languages of Turkish and Azerbaijani Turkish. Between the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea in the relatively small region of Georgia and Abkhaz people

speak Caucasian languages which have about 40 members. Maltese, Hebrew and Berber are members of the Afro-Asiatic languages.

The Latin alphabet is used in the majority of European languages and the Cyrillic alphabet is used in some Slavic languages. Greek, Armenian, Georgian and Yiddish each have their own alphabets. The most common members of other language families used in Europe are Arabic, Chinese and Hindu and each has their own script and alphabet.

In many European countries many regional or minority languages are used and some have gained official status. The Russian Federation has the most number of languages spoken, depending on the criteria the number is between 130 and 200. Some regional and minority languages have gained official status in the regions where they are spoken, for example, in Spain, Basque, Catalan and Galician (Galician). In the United Kingdom it is Welsh, Frisian in the Netherlands and in Norway, Sweden and Finland the use of the Sami language is legally assured.

Increasingly in daily life Europeans are confronted with a foreign language. The reason the European continent is largely becoming multilingual is due to immigrants and those seeking asylum. Around 300 different languages are spoken in city of London alone. In other major cities, especially in Western Europe, the number of different languages spoken varies between 100-200. Among the most widely spoken of these languages are Arabic, Hindi, Punjabi, Kurdish and Turkish and Chinese. However, these languages are spoken by a small minority, and their future is threatened.

## 2.4.2. As a Key Competence

In a world and Europe, where cultural and linguistic diversity is rich, foreign languages proficiency has long been seen as an indispensable economic and social resource. This competence is not limited to technical skills in a particular language. Openness to different cultures and respect for its representatives is also

part of success. Learning other languages and competencies through education paves the way for a wider perception of identity and belonging and opens doors to the development of a wealth of professional options and free-time activities.

Communication in foreign languages, which is one of the eight key competencies that are the subject of the research in the draft Commission, is defined as follows (COM, 2005):

> *In the broadest sense communication in the mother tongue and foreign languages share basic skill sets: The ability to express, interpret and understand thoughts, feelings and facts, both orally and in written form (listening, speaking, reading and writing) in all social and cultural environments (education and training, workplace, home and leisure) in line with their own desires and requirements. Communication in foreign languages also includes such skills as intercultural understanding and compromise. An individual's competence varies depending on four dimensions, needs/interests, language set, history and environment.*

This is directly related to the basic language proficiency definitions of some concepts given as follows:

- State language: The official language of one's country. The State Language is the official language at all times.
- Official language: The language that is used in a country as a whole or in a particular area of public administration or law.
- Regional/minority languages: Polish is an artificial or non-immigrant language traditionally used by a certain part of the population of a country. There are region specific languages such as France's Breton;  the Yiddish and Romani languages can be spoken in Slovakia but they usually speak Hungarian, and like other border countries the official language in a country where the language is spoken by a minority and do not belong to a particular geography.
- Non-indigenous languages: Languages spoken in immigrant communities in the EU such as the Turkish and Hindic languages spoken in Germany and the United Kingdom.
- Foreign language: From the definition in the Eurobarometer survey,

"the official language of the country of residence of the participants' native language".

The Commission listed the necessary information relating to qualification, skills and attitudes, in the draft the following way:

A functional language proficiency in foreign languages requires the speaker to be aware of patterns and expressions with knowledge of the language and the vocabulary oral communication. It is important that society's traditions and cultural dimensions reflect information about the diversity of the language.

Required skills that maintain and address the needs of an individual involve verbal message comprehension, speaking to initiate, text reading and understanding. In addition, individuals should be able to use learning aids in their own language as part of lifelong learning.

A positive attitude, interest in intercultural communication and an interest in foreign language includes a respect for diversity and cultural differences.

## 2.4.3. General Framework and Development Process

Nearly all of the Europeans live in multilingual settings within Europe or even in their own countries. To illustrate, they can come across many languages in their daily lives, trains or buses, on TV, newspaper or radio, on the manual of a product they buy. Therefore, the general knowledge or understanding towards the variety and development of European languages should be increased. Increasing the curiosity towards language and being tolerant to languages used within the country are highly needed. This requires learning each other's languages and teaching own language to others.

In this section, legislations, organizations and programs oriented to increase and improve the studies towards communication in foreign languages and language education are presented.

## 2.4.3.1. Europe Language Policy Division

The Council of Europe's language training policies aims to simplify the development of democratic citizenship and social integration through multilingualism, linguistic diversity, mutual understanding. The Councils linguistic diversity and language learning actions in the field of developing education are within the language policy framework of the European Cultural Convention and Language Policy Division since 1957. The Department located in Strasburg developed transparent tools and standards for the Member States that will help to develop consistent language policy. These tools and standards are used in many parts of the world, not just in Europe, and the establishment of European for modern languages are vital for their contribution to institutions of the European Union. The department of the European Cultural Convention executes intergovernmental needs and addresses the medium term program of the 48 countries.  These programs and the European Centre for Modern Languages programs complement each other.

The medium-term program covering the years 2006-2009 within the framework of activities of the Department, analysis and policy development of multilingualism; caters to three areas of European standards in quality and transparency in minority language education policy. The four main inter-related project objectives are as follows:

- Project 1: Educational language policy and standards;
- Project 2: Language Education Policy Profiles;
- Project 3: Europe transparency and quality standards for competency;
- Project 4: European Language Development Portfolio.

Furthermore, the department has developed a helpful reference book for Member State language exams, the Common European Reference Framework for Languages (pilot manual) will help to adapt the trial guide and is one of its most important policy instruments.

## 2.4.3.2. European Centre for Modern Languages (ECML)

By a decision, the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe was established on 8 April 1994 by eight member states and started operations in 1995 with an office in the city of Graz, Austria and in 1998 the Council became a permanent institution. There are 33 members. Turkey is not yet a member. The goal of Europe is to make itself into a continent where there are no dividing lines and a prerequisite is to expand language education and learning by expanding opportunities. Strategic objectives are:

- Focus on language teaching and learning practices,
- To improve efficacy in the area between dialogue and exchange,
- To train the trainers,
- Support associated network programs and research projects.

ECML engages in international projects to achieve these goals for language learning programs. The Center's first medium-term program implemented between the years of 2000-2003 and the second medium-term program covered the years 2003-2007. Four main themes build on the program's projects and are carried out under the headings language and social diversity, multicultural society communication, language teachers for professional development and reference tools for language learning with new technologies and innovative approach themes. Other programs are planned to cover the years 2008-2011 and focus on the educational themes of assessment, continuity of language learning, content and language integrated learning and plurilingual.

Since its founding, 40 studies have been published as a result of 121 international and 27 regional workshops, 132 specialist and network meetings and 6 conferences. Since their adoption in 2001, celebrations of the European Day of Languages are when the European Council is held in conjunction with the Department of Language Policy. The quarterly publication and website is "The European Language Gazette".

## 2.4.3.3. European Day of Languages

The 2001 European Year of Languages was a symbol of the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers, held each year on September 26 and attended in 45 countries it is intended to celebrate the continuity of partnerships and networks. At the same time, the objectives of the European Year of Languages are:

- Society, multilingualism and language instruction for the development of intercultural understanding and warn about the importance of diversifying;
- To protect and improve integration of Europe's rich language, and to promote cultural diversity.
- In and out of school, education, business, or only to enjoy the mobility and changes with the aim to encourage lifelong language learning for other purposes.

In Europe, language instruction and linguistic diversity attract attention to the importance of celebrating Language Day and in 2003 the Secretary General of the Council of Europe Dr. Walt Schwimmer said "Linguistic diversity is one of Europe's strengths" and is an integral component of the European continent's linguistic richness and cultural diversity. In addition, with the dominance of English in everyday communication highlights the ongoing process of the Council of Europe's language education and its contribution to the protection of regional and minority languages.

The European Day of Languages goals are to enlighten the general public starting at any age in the educational institutions or in the workplace including the importance of lifelong learning; enrich the cultural life of everyone in the class already exists as a phenomenon that highlights and promotes the linguistic diversity of the school; special precautions regarding language policy or proposed policy thrive on discussion platforms and non-governmental organizations, associations, and companies such as voluntary organizations, including appeals to all European citizens.

### 2.4.3.4. The European Language Portfolio (ELP)

The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe's Recommendation in 1998 per the European Language Policy Division in order to develop multiculturalism and multilingualism as a pilot project was launched on October 17, 2000 by the Standing Conference of Education Ministers.  The decision was signed to adopt the conclusions taken by the members of the Council in all countries at the end of the 2001-2002 academic year and it introduced the European Language Portfolio which is a document that can register information in order to learn a language at or outside of school for adults over the age of 16.

The purpose of developing mutual understanding between European citizens will provide foreign language teaching standards and certification of individual's mobility of language skills, respecting different cultures, protection of the cultural and language differences, language school programs in different countries, providing each other with harmony, the project consists of three parts:

- Updated regularly by the owner, the language certificates, stored in a complimentary role in all of Europe, is also accepted as a Common Reference text (OBM), defined according to a language proficiency level panel as a Language Passport;
- The Council of Europe and the European Union's common work, developed online or downloaded to the user's computer by installing

the standard language passport for adults that can be filled out in the electronic version of the Europass Language Passport;

- and each person's experience of a language learners review, planning and assessment process designed to guide a detailed Language History and language competencies presenting examples of personal work in a Language File (dossier).

The European Language Portfolio models vary from country to country and according to the level of education and status. The recommendation for all models will be to receive an accreditation number from the Council of Europe.

## 2.4.3.5. Language Variety and Improving Language Teaching

The Resolution of the Council on 14 February 2002 subjected to "2001 - European Year of Languages within the framework of supporting the implementation of the objectives development of linguistic diversity and language learning" points out that (O.J. of the E.U., 2002)

- Language knowledge is required to be a basic skill and would facilitate social integration and social cohesion and every citizen can effectively take part in the European information society;
- All European languages and cultures have the same value and dignity as an integral part of European culture and civilization.

The policy of the Council in conjunction with the decision the Member States is to encourage the knowledge of at least one other language other than the mother tongue,

- for the realization of this objective in the context of lifelong learning all necessary measures must be taken in schools,
- encourage students and language teachers to take advantage of the European programs direction,
- to facilitate the recognition of diplomas,

- maintain and develop linguistic diversity,
- and the European Council's development approved the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages invitation to develop competency in language knowledge based systems.

The Council's task for the Commission was to prepare and present the draft to improve language learning and linguistic diversity by the beginning of 2003.

## 2.4.4. Foreign Language Teaching Within Lifelong Learning

English is now a bridge language in today's world; in other words, it is one of the ways that help us learn other languages. Consequently, the individuals throughout their whole lives must gain strategies and experiences, which will ease the learning process of English and other languages. With this key point, English is also the lingua franca of the world and plays a vital role in the process of globalization. Steger (2003) defines globalization as a multidimensional phenomenon that paves the way for interdependence and communication by people's recognizing the strong relations in local and distant places, and related with increasing, expanding and deepening social processes.

The four main dimensions of the globalization are economic, political, cultural, and ideological. There are some approaches to globalization, as well. Hyperglobalist, skeptical and transformationalist views on globalization are under debate in the academic world. According to hyperglobalists, as a result of globalization, traditional national states join the global market economy where all the networks are international and this shapes the new economic, social and political world order. Skeptics regard that the interdependence in globalization is a concept of old empires and today's national states shape the international trade and politics. Transformationalists reckon globalization as the leading power that creates the basic sociopolitical transformations, which are the results of today's important, fast, economic, social and political changes (Dewey, 2007).

English language gains utmost importance here. Among the definitions above, interdependence, relation and communication come to the forefront. English is the one that supplies these aspects. English provides the dependence, relation and communication between the local and distant places on Earth as the lingua franca of the world. As an illustration for this, the number of people whose mother tongues are not English but can use English is higher than the number of people who acquire and use English as their mother tongue. However, based on the three approaches to the globalization English holds different places. To the hyperglobalist view, English is discussed under the concepts of language imperialism, and international hegemony. Skeptical view regards English as a language taught by the norms of a mother tongue and needless to change the way it is taught. Transformational view considers that English should be regarded as lingua franca and should be assessed in the constantly changing sociopolitical world order.

According to Giddens (2003, p. XXIII), the world became a multicenter place after the collapse of Soviet Union and September 11 attacks. The EU does not have any armed force but tries to increase its effectiveness on Earth such as Russia, South Korea, China, and India. These countries have become one of the political powers in the world and this shows that non-western countries now also have the power in global politics. The political and economic multicenterness that globalization has brought now removes the differences between local and global places. Especially, Information Technologies (IT)'s conveying of the data so quickly unravels the concept of *glocalization,* which means thinking globally and acting locally. In this context, pluralism and diversity gains importance and such terms as linguistic and cultural imperialism and the norms of a native speaker are now under debate (Robertson, 1995, p.25-31).

According to Canagarajah (2005, p. XV-XVII), globalization changes the norms of teaching of English as a foreign language within the contexts mentioned above. Especially, with the easy access of information, democratization and pluralism come to the forefront and local places gain importance. In the teaching of English

as a foreign language, local norms instead of the USA and Britain are now applicable. However, accepting these new norms is not easy; the factors that prevent multilingual teaching such as the prestige of English, economic popular value judgments, teachers' not having awareness of multilingualism and diversity yet distract these norms.

As it is suggested in the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), Canagarajah (2005, p. XXVI) recommends a flexible approach to language and the abundance of the competencies in the definition of the multilingualism and multi competencies in linguistic communication. Dewey (2007, p. 347) claims that raising a linguistic awareness in classes towards the social use of the language, making studies on receiving linguistic variety, and transforming lifelong multilingualism awareness into education would be the good steps.

Canagarajah (2005) summarized the changes in the teaching of English as the lingua franca in his *Changes in Education* table as shown below (p. XXV);

**Table 2.5: Changes in Education**

| Old Approach | New Approach |
|---|---|
| • "target language" | • "repertoire" |
| • "text and language are a congener" | • "text and language are as combined" |
| • "joining in a society" | • "navigating between societies" |
| • "focusing on rules and traditions" | • "focusing on strategies" |
| • "correctness" | • "agreement" |
| • "language and discourse are stable" | • "language and discourse are changeable" |
| • "language is context based" | • "language transforms the context" |
| • "learning the rules of grammar" | • "metalinguistic awareness" |
| • "text and language are transparent" | • "text and language are fictional" |
| • "first language and first culture are problematic" | • first language and first culture are sources" |

Based on the table above, in the old approach, the aim is to teach the language while in the new approach it is aimed to improve the repertoire to use the language in a set of objectives;   the text and language is considered as the same phenomenon in the old approach while they are a combined structure in the new

approach; language is learnt to participate in a society in the old approach while it is considered as a facility that provides functioning in more than one language in the new approach; focusing on the rules and traditions of language and learning these are given priority in the old approach while focusing on strategies in the learning and using of the language and metalinguistic awareness are given priority in the new approach; correctness is the key term in the old approach while agreement via using that language is the key term in the new approach; the old approach regards the language as stable and context-based while the new approach regards it dynamic and context transforming; the old approach does not approve the use of first language and culture while the new approach uses these to a certain extent (Sarıçoban, 2010) as a source during the classes.

Kumaradilevu (2003, p.545) created a macro strategic framework for foreign language teaching and the local contexts in which English is taught based on para-methodological approach.
Canagarajah (2003) included these macro strategies in his detailed table as follows:

- Learning opportunities must be increased
- The disagreement between the teacher's teaching and student's inferring from this teaching must be minimized
- The interaction between teacher-student and/or student-student must be for real communication
- Learner autonomy must be supported
- Linguistic awareness must be supported
- Students must be aided to find linguistic rules via their intuitional experiences
- Linguistic input must be given in context
- Linguistic skills must be presented in an integrated way
- The social, economic, political, and educative context in which the learning occurs must be recognized
- Cultural consciousness must be improved

Another project that supports the foreign language teaching for lifelong is *Multilingualism Project: Learning the Tertiary Language – German after English*. The European Center for Modern Languages and Goethe Institute carried out this project between 2000-2003. The term of "Third Languages" was used for the third, fourth, etc. languages learnt after the first foreign language upon the mother tongue (Hufeisen and Neuner, 2004, p. 5). The aim of the project was to find answers to the question of how the knowledge of language and learning experiences of an individual that he has previously acquired (mother tongue, first foreign language) affects the learning of the tertiary languages. The preparations and findings were discussed in five different conferences during the project.

According to Neuner (2004, s. 19-23), in the teaching of the tertiary languages and raising an awareness and consciousness towards language we need to be aided by the mother tongue teaching, students' viewing their first language consciously and making experiments with their own language will help them learn the tertiary languages. In addition to linguistic awareness, language learning awareness must also be improved; this awareness will lead to learning how to learn, thus, will pave the way for learning foreign languages for lifelong. Neuner (2004) summarizes the principles of tertiary language teaching as follows:

1. Conscious Learning: Raising language and language learning awareness
2. Understanding: Base and starting point for learning
3. Orientation of Context: interesting topics, assignments and materials for learners
4. Orientation of Texts: Texts that students can analyze the system of the language inductively and the choice of parallel texts using general and detailed learning strategies
5. Being economic in the process of learning: preparing effective teaching and learning processes using common words, similar texts, strategies, similarities between the grammatical rules.

As it can be seen above, there are some common points among the principles of Neuner (2004), Kumaradilevu (2003), Canagarajah (2005) such as linguistic

awareness, autonomy, students' being directly related to topics, making use of strategies in learning a language, using local cultures as a source. Therefore, it can be inferred from here that the teaching of English language can function as a bridge in the teaching of other languages.

The teaching of the first language should prepare the students for the learning of other foreign languages by improving the strategies and language awareness in order to understand words and texts. Language teaching results in learning of other languages. Foreign languages that are learnt after the first foreign language can use its outputs systematically (Krumm, 2004).

The learners can make great use of the experiences that they gained in the learning process of English while learning other foreign languages. Within this respect, foreign language teaching can be diversified. Foreign language teaching is not a performance of English only. These experiences may lead the learners to learn languages throughout their whole lives by supporting their autonomous way of studying and increasing their intrinsic motivation. Rampillon (2004) points out that the young and adult population must be convinced for lifelong learning concept in today's rapidly changing world as the information that we have doubles in every six years; besides this, new words are coined to the languages and they change as well; therefore, the youth need to improve their competencies towards languages.

## 2.4.5. Academic Studies in Foreign Language Teaching Within Lifelong Learning

Bearing all the aforementioned points in mind, one cannot deny the importance of lifelong learning for all of areas of life. Lifelong learning also holds an important place for the scientific world and it has been the focusing point of the many academic studies. Since language learning is one of the vital areas within the concept of lifelong learning, there are some studies dealing with the place of

foreign language teaching and learning in the context of lifelong learning. Some of these works are presented below.

Using the same lifelong learning scale with this research, Özcan (2011) investigated the perceptions of competence of the 87 English language teachers teaching the 4th and 5th grade students. She found out that the mean scores of teachers' perception level towards lifelong learning was in the "most" competent level (4,04 out of 5). When it comes to the level of lifelong learning competency in relation to gender, while there were no significant differences between male and female teachers in the sub-scales "(1) competence for self-direction", "(2) learning to learn", "(3) sense of initiative and entrepreneurship", and "(4) decision-making", in the subscales of "(1) obtaining knowledge" and "(2) digital competence" the male teachers regarded themselves more competent than the female ones. When we analyze level of lifelong learning competency in relation to education levels of the teachers, whereas there were no significant differences between teachers with bachelor degree and teachers with master or PhD degree in the sub-scales "(1) competence for self-direction", "(2) learning to learn", "(3) sense of initiative and entrepreneurship", and "(4) decision-making", in the subscales of "(1) obtaining knowledge" and "(2) digital competence" teachers with master or PhD degree perceived themselves more competent than teachers with bachelor degree.

Soltay (2007) conducted a study with pre-service, novice and experienced teachers, focusing on the decision-making skills, which is one of the competency areas of the survey that was used in this research. She hypothesized that the perception of the student teachers towards efficacy in classroom management would be lower than the perceptions of novice and experienced teachers'. She affirmed her hypothesis with her findings. However, although she hypothesized that the decision-making skills of the experienced teachers would be more than the novice and prospective teachers, there were no significant differences between the skill levels of experienced, novice and prospective teachers based on both statistical analysis and observation. With this result, she confirmed the

findings of the Nunan and Lamb (1996), which asserted that the ability to manage a classroom successfully is not directly related to expertise in teaching.

Analyzing the relation between mentor teachers and pre-service teachers of English in terms of guidance and feedback, Koç (2008) found out that cooperating teacher frequently carried out their mentoring roles. Their feedbacks were generally on moral support and teaching performance. They didn't pay much attention to the facilitation of socialization of pre-service teachers with other mentor teachers or prospective teachers. The cooperating teachers and student teachers got almost the same scores in terms of mentor roles. The difference in their scores was at a statistically significant level when it comes to 'providing facilitative information to enhance classroom performance' and providing moral support.

Otten and Ohana (2009) in their study related to the trainers, who are referred as people delivering non-formal education to young people with various capacities, revealed eight key competencies. Among those eight competencies the first and the second key competencies are respectively communication in mother tongue and communication in foreign language. Based on the specific competence requirements and key contents, they defined a formula for the training and learning objective of these competencies as follows;

> *"To enable learner/trainers to communicate and develop intercultural discourse in the group educational setting through the practice of a structured and culturally sensitive use of language, in their mother tongue and/or the foreign language they habitually use in European non-formal educational activities with young people and trainees."* (p. 15).

We can, thus, conclude that competency in language, both in mother and foreign ones, play vital roles for the development of participants of lifelong learning studies with regard to the trainers and students. A lack of competency level, especially in foreign language competence may lead to undesirable results.

The key competencies of lifelong learning and the competence of communication in foreign languages were examined by Güngör (2007). He found out that EU regards the competence of communication in foreign languages as vital since there are 23 official languages within the union and high levels of competence in foreign languages means high levels of communication and internalizing the concept of the EU citizen. The study of Eurobarometer (2006) named "Europeans and Languages" revealed that the rate of those who are able to communicate in two foreign languages apart from the mother tongue is 28%, and the rate of those who are able to communicate in one foreign language apart from mother tongue is 56%. The most common languages used in the Union are English with 47% (mother tongue of 13%), German with 30% (mother tongue of 18%), French with 23% (mother tongue of 12%), Italian with 15% (mother tongue of 13%), and Spanish with 14% (mother tongue of 9%). One of the main objectives of the EU is to make its citizen to be able to communicate in at least three languages (1 mother language + 2 foreign languages). There are many studies and projects of the Union towards reaching this aim.

Can (2011) has investigated the use of strategies in English as a foreign language course books within the concept of lifelong learning. He has hypothesized that if effective strategies are developed in learning the first foreign language – English – the learners can use them beneficially in while learning other foreign languages; therefore, they can improve themselves for their lifelong learning competencies in order to adopt themselves to the criteria of being a European citizen. Based on his results, he suggests that the use of *metacognitive*, *cognitive* and *socio-emotional* strategies in course books will lead the learners to develop proficient learning styles and thus become lifelong learners. He also recommends that prospective and in-service English as a foreign language teachers should be trained in the use of these strategies so that their awareness to the issue would be increased.

## 3. METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the design of the research, the participants of the study, and data collection process is given first. The reliability of the data is also presented in this section. In the end, the data analysis section indicates which techniques are used to analyze the data of the study.

### 3.1. The Research Design

In this research, the descriptive research design, which enables the researcher to reveal and describe the current situation, is used. Descriptive analysis is a research approach that aims to describe a past or current situation as in their bare facts. The case, individual or object that is subject to the research is tried to be described in their own conditions or as they really are (Karasar, 2005).

Referred as "correlational" or "observational" in some resources, descriptive research is defined as any study that is not experimental. It does not answer the questions of "how", "why", or "when". The only question that it takes into account is the question of "what". The statistical analysis of a descriptive research design yields what the situation is, while most of the other research designs are inferential and yields the cause and/or effect of the situation.

### 3.2. The Participants of the Study

As we stated earlier, three different groups of participants are the subject of this research. The first group consists of prospective English Language Teachers studying their last academic year (in the academic year of 2012-2013) in their departments. The participants of this group were chosen from Anadolu University, Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching Department (N= 83). The second group of participants consists of the mentor teachers of the prospective ELT teachers of the first group. Since the students are in their last academic year, they have "School Experience" course. As a requirement of this course, they go to different state primary, secondary and high schools and teach there in the

supervision of the mentor teachers. Therefore, the participants of the second group are chosen randomly among these mentor teachers working in different schools in Eskişehir province (N= 15).  The third and last group of participants are chosen randomly among English language teachers working in state primary, secondary, and high schools and at the universities in Eskişehir province (N= 30). The participants are asked to fill in the demographic information at the beginning of the scale (Appendix 1). Based on the data that come from that scale, we can give the detailed information about participants in numbers in Table 3.1 below:

**Table 3.1: Distribution of Participants**

| Occupation | Gender | | Age | | | Experience | | | | | Department | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | female | 18-22 | 23-30 | 31+ | No | 1-3 | 4-5 | 6-10 | 10+ | ELT | ELL | ALL | LIN | Tr & In |
| | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N |
| Student (83) | 17 | 66 | 41 | 42 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mentor (15) | 5 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Teacher(30) | 15 | 15 | 0 | 22 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 4 |
| **Total (128)** | 37 | 91 | 41 | 74 | 13 | 83 | 7 | 9 | 21 | 8 | 97 | 10 | 6 | 11 | 4 |

### 3.3. Data Collection

The "Lifelong Learning Competency Scale (LLLCS)" designed by (Uzunboylu & Hursen, 2011) is used as the only data collection instrument in this research. LLLCS consists of two sections. In the first section, there are five questions related to the participants' demographic information. The questions in this part about the participants' occupation, gender, age, years of experience, and their departments of graduation. In the second section of the scale, there are 51 questions aiming to define the lifelong learning competencies of the participants in six different sub-dimensions; 1) Self-management competencies (SMC), 2) Competencies of learning how to learn (CLHL), 3) Competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship (CIE), 4) Competencies of acquiring information (CAI), 5) Digital competencies (DC), 6) Competencies of decision-making (CDM). The scale that they developed

is used without changing any part in the second section of it. That's why, there are no questions for the other two competency areas that the EU decided.

To develop the scale, they went through four important stages; (1) diagnosing the problem in the research and establishing aims, (2) interviewing a number of teachers and academicians in the field and giving a composition writing study to the interviewed teachers, (3) preparing an item pool for the scale and doing a content analysis, (4) making the item pool revised by a number of specialists. Then, they did a pre-application study for the scale. After re-consulting the views the teachers and specialists the number of items were dropped to 66 from 70. Having applied the scale to 300 teachers and the statistical analysis, 15 items, whose load factors were below 0.40, were taken out of the scale. They decided to make the scoring of the  51 items likert-type and the items in the  LLLCS were designed as "Never", "A little", "Medium", "A lot" and "All" and graded as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Since the LLLCS used in this research consists of six sub-dimensions, it is safer for us to give the reliability of each sub-dimension separately.  Table 3.2 below shows us the Cronbach's Alpha values of each sub-dimension.

The Cronbach's Alpha reliability of all the sub-dimensions is found as reliable since they are all above the acceptable level of .70. The 13-item scale of self-management competencies is .86; the 12-item scale of competencies of learning how to learn is .85; the 10-item scale of competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship is .85; the 6-item scale of competencies of acquiring information is .81; the 6-item scale of digital competencies is .89; the 4-item scale of competencies of decision-making is .83. When the reliability analysis of the scale for all 51 items is done, it is found out that the scale is highly reliable since it has .95 Cronbach's Alpha score.

**Table 3.2: Reliability of the Data Based on Sub-Dimensions**

| Type of Competency | N of Items | Cronbach's Alpha |
|---|---|---|
| a. Self-management competencies | 13 | .86 |
| b. Competencies of learning how to learn | 12 | .85 |
| c. Competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship | 10 | .85 |
| d. Competencies of acquiring information | 6 | .81 |
| e. Digital competencies | 6 | .89 |
| f. Competencies of decision-making | 4 | .83 |
| All Sub-dimensions | 51 | .95 |

When the literature is reviewed, we can see some different data collection methods. These methods can be classified into four general categories; face to face, mail, phone, and computer applications (Aiken, 1997). For the collection of the data in this research, face to face method was applied. The "Lifelong Learning Competency Scale (LLLCS)" was given to all groups of participants. The necessary permissions were granted from the Ministry of Education and Anadolu University. The data collection instrument (LLLCS) was given to the subjects based on their voluntary request to participate and they were informed about the necessary parts on the instrument.

## 3.4. Data Analysis

For the analysis of the data SPSS 17.0 packet program is used. The estimated value level of 0.05 is interpreted as meaningful. The reliability of the data is examined by the coefficient of Cronbach's Alpha.

Based on our research questions, different types of tests are applied to analyze our data. For the first three questions, which ask the lifelong learning level of the participants, descriptive statistics test is used. For the fourth question, which asks whether there is a statistically significant difference in the lifelong learning competency level of the participants, Analysis of Variance between groups (ANOVA) is used. For the fifth question, which asks whether there is a statistically significant difference in the lifelong learning competency level of the participants in relation to their gender, age, experience and department, Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) is used.

# 4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This chapter provides the detailed analysis and the results of the data. First, the levels of the participants for different competency types are presented. Then the multiple comparisons of the levels of the participants for all competency types and the differences in those subscales are presented. Finally, the effect of the participants' demographic information on those differences is analyzed and given in detail.

## 4.1. Lifelong Learning Competency Levels of the Participants

Regarding our first three research questions, in order to define the lifelong learning competencies of the participants, descriptive statistics for each sub-dimension based on their occupation (students, mentors, and teachers) is used. Results obtained from that statistical analysis are given in different sub-categories with different tables below.

### 4.1.1. The Levels of the Participants for Competencies Self-Management

Table 4.1 below shows us the levels of the students, mentors, and teachers for self-management competencies.

**Table 4.1: Self-Management Competency Levels of the Participants**

|  | *Descriptive Statistics* | | |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | Mean | SD |
| **Students** | 83 | 3.61 | .52 |
| **Mentors** | 15 | 3.92 | .27 |
| **Teachers** | 30 | 3.51 | .42 |

In self-management competencies mentors have the highest level ($M=3.92; N=15; SD=.27$) followed by the students ($M=3.61; N=83; SD=.52$) and teachers ($M=3.51; N=30; SD=.42$). Based on the data above, it can be said that in self-management competencies, all of the participants (students, mentors, and teachers) regard themselves in between *medium* and *a lot* competent by getting scores between *3.0* and *4.0* (students: *3.61*; mentors: *3.92*; teachers:*3.51*). Additionally, it can be inferred from here that all of the participants are closer to the level of *a lot* competent ($M>3.5$).

### 4.1.2. The Levels of the Participants for Competencies of Learning How to Learn

The levels of the three different groups of the participants for competencies of learning how to learn are indicated in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2: Learning How to Learn Competency Levels of the Participants**

|  | *Descriptive Statistics* | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | Mean | SD |
| **Students** | 83 | 3.60 | .51 |
| **Mentors** | 15 | 3.65 | .29 |
| **Teachers** | 30 | 3.38 | .34 |

In competencies of learning how to learn, mentors have the highest level ($M=3.65; N=15; SD=.29$) followed by the students ($M=3.60; N=83; SD=.51$) and teachers ($M=3.38; N=30; SD=.34$). In this subscale, students, mentors and teachers perceive themselves in between *medium* and *a lot* competent by getting scores between *3.0* and *4.0* (students: *3.60*; mentors: *3.65*; teachers: *3.38*); however, while students and mentors are closer to the level of *a lot* competent ($M>3.5$), teachers are closer to the *medium* competent level ($M<3.5$).

### 4.1.3. The Levels of the Participants for Competencies of Initiative and Entrepreneurship

For the competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship, the levels of the participants are presented below in Table 4.3.

**Table 4.3: Initiative and Entrepreneurship Competency Levels of the Participants**

| | *Descriptive Statistics* | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | N | Mean | SD |
| **Students** | 83 | 3.74 | .53 |
| **Mentors** | 15 | 3.43 | .19 |
| **Teachers** | 30 | 3.30 | .42 |

In competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship, while students have the highest level (*M=3.74; N=83; SD=.53*), mentors (*M=3.43; N=15; SD=.19*) and teachers (*M=3.30; N=30; SD=.42*) followed them. These data shows us that all of the participants (students, mentors, and teachers) perceive themselves in between *medium* and *a lot* competent by getting scores between *3.0* and *4.0* (students: *3.74*; mentors: *3.43*; teachers :*3.30*). In this sub-dimension it is clear that whereas students are close to the level of *a lot* competent (*M>3.5*), mentors and teachers are closer to the level of *medium* competent (*M<3.5*).

### 4.1.4. The Levels of the Participants for Competencies of Acquiring Information

The following Table 4.4 demonstrates the levels of the participants for competencies of acquiring information.

**Table 4.4: Acquiring Information Competency Levels of the Participants**

| | Descriptive Statistics | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | N | Mean | SD |
| **Students** | 83 | 3.73 | .69 |
| **Mentors** | 15 | 3.11 | .35 |
| **Teachers** | 30 | 3.36 | .36 |

In competencies of acquiring information, students have the highest level (*M=3.73; N=83; SD=.69*) but teachers' level is higher than (*M=3.36; N=30; SD=.36*) mentors' (*M=3.11; N=15; SD=.35*). The levels of the participants in this subscale yields results in favor of students. Although, all of the participants regard themselves in between *medium* and *a lot* competent with scores between *3.0* and *4.0* (students: *3.73*; mentors: *3.11*; teachers: *3.36*), students are closer to a lot competent (*M>3.5*) while mentors and teachers are closer to the *medium* competent level (*M<3.5*).

### 4.1.5. The Levels of the Participants for Digital Competencies

The participants' levels for digital competencies, which comprise outstanding scores, are given below in Table 4.5.

**Table 4.5: Digital Competency Levels of the Participants**

| | Descriptive Statistics | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | N | Mean | SD |
| **Students** | 83 | 3.97 | .76 |
| **Mentors** | 15 | 2.83 | .39 |
| **Teachers** | 30 | 3.03 | .55 |

In digital competencies, students have the highest level *(M=3.97; N=83; SD=.76)* followed by teachers (*M=3.03; N=30; SD=.55*) and mentors (*M=2.83; N=15; SD=.39*). The analysis of the mean scores of the participants for digital competencies reveals significant results. In this sub-dimension, students and teachers perceive themselves in between *medium* and *a lot* competent with the

scores between *3.0* and *4.0*. However, while the students are very close to *a lot* competent level with a mean score of *3.97*, teachers are very close to *medium* competent level with a mean score of *3.03*. In contrast to those two groups of participants, mentors regarded themselves between *a little* and *medium* competent level with a mean score of *2.83* yet being closer to *medium* level (*M>2.5*).

### 4.1.6. The Levels of the Participants for Competencies of Decision-Making

Table 4.6, which indicates us the levels of the participants for competencies of decision-making, is demonstrated below.

**Table 4.6: Decision-Making Competency Levels of the Participants**

|  | *Descriptive Statistics* | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | Mean | SD |
| **Students** | 83 | 3.70 | .52 |
| **Mentors** | 15 | 2.91 | .27 |
| **Teachers** | 30 | 2.85 | .42 |

In competencies of decision-making, whereas students have the highest level (*M=3.70; N=83; SD=.65*) mentors *(M=2.91; N=15; SD=.43)* and teachers (*M=2.85; N=30; SD=.37*) followed them. In this subscale, only students regard themselves in between *medium* and *a lot* competent level with a mean score of *3.70*. However, it can be said that they are closer to *a lot* competent level *(M>3.5)*. Mentors (*M=2.91*) and teachers (*M=2.85*) perceive themselves in between *a little* and *medium* competent level yet they are closer to *medium* competent level with their mean scores (*M>2.5*).

### 4.2. Multiple Comparisons of Lifelong Learning Competency Levels of the Participants

Related to our 4th research question that was stated before, multiple comparisons of the lifelong learning competency levels of the participants are analyzed in this section. The aim here is to present statistically significant differences among the

participants' lifelong learning competencies based on their occupation. In order to reach this aim, Analysis of Variance between groups (ANOVA) is used. The results of this test are shown in the Table 4.7 below in detail. Additionally, Robust Tests of Equality of Means (Appendix 2) and Test of Homogeneity of Variances (Appendix 3), which shows the reliability of the results, are given in appendices.

As it can be seen in table 4.7, there are statistically significant differences in all sub-scales. In self-management competencies, there is a statistically significant difference between students and mentors (p=.023; p<.05) and mentors and teachers (p=.008; p<.05). However, in competencies of learning how to learn, there is a statistically significant difference only between students and teachers (p=.021; p<.05). When it comes to the differences in levels of the participants for initiative and entrepreneurship, there is a statistically significant difference between students and mentors (p=.023; p<.05) and teachers and students (p=.000; p<.05). Similarly, in the competencies of acquiring information, statistically significant differences are found between students and mentors (p=.000; p<.05) and students and teachers (p=.004; p<.05). Likely, in the digital competencies, there are statistically significant differences between students and mentors (p=.000; p<.05) and students and teachers (p=.000; p<.05). Again, in competencies of decision-making, there are statistically significant differences between students and mentors (p=.000; p<.05) and students and teachers (p=.000; p<.05) at the same value.

**Table 4.7: Multiple Comparisons of Lifelong Learning Competency Levels of the Participants**

| Dependent Variable | (I) occupation | (J) occupation | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| SMC | Student | Mentor | -4.04410* | 1.76234 | .023* | -7.5320 | -.5562 |
| | | Teacher | 1.30924 | 1.33814 | .330 | -1.3391 | 3.9576 |
| | Mentor | Student | 4.04410* | 1.76234 | .023* | .5562 | 7.5320 |
| | | Teacher | 5.35333* | 1.98637 | .008** | 1.4221 | 9.2846 |
| | Teacher | Student | -1.30924 | 1.33814 | .330 | -3.9576 | 1.3391 |
| | | Mentor | -5.35333* | 1.98637 | .008** | -9.2846 | -1.4221 |

| | | | | | | | |
|------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|---------|
| CLHL | Student | Mentor | -.57751 | 1.53960 | .708 | -3.6246 | 2.4695 |
| | | Teacher | 2.72249* | 1.16901 | .021* | .4089 | 5.0361 |
| | Mentor | Student | .57751 | 1.53960 | .708 | -2.4695 | 3.6246 |
| | | Teacher | 3.30000 | 1.73532 | .060 | -.1344 | 6.7344 |
| | Teacher | Student | -2.72249* | 1.16901 | .021* | -5.0361 | -.4089 |
| | | Mentor | -3.30000 | 1.73532 | .060 | -6.7344 | .1344 |
| CIE | Student | Mentor | 3.14859* | 1.36314 | .023* | .4508 | 5.8464 |
| | | Teacher | 4.58193* | 1.03503 | .000** | 2.5335 | 6.6304 |
| | Mentor | Student | -3.14859* | 1.36314 | .023* | -5.8464 | -.4508 |
| | | Teacher | 1.43333 | 1.53643 | .353 | -1.6074 | 4.4741 |
| | Teacher | Student | -4.58193* | 1.03503 | .000** | -6.6304 | -2.5335 |
| | | Mentor | -1.43333 | 1.53643 | .353 | -4.4741 | 1.6074 |
| CAI | Student | Mentor | 3.76707* | 1.01868 | .000** | 1.7510 | 5.7832 |
| | | Teacher | 2.26707* | .77348 | .004** | .7363 | 3.7979 |
| | Mentor | Student | -3.76707* | 1.01868 | .000** | -5.7832 | -1.7510 |
| | | Teacher | -1.50000 | 1.14818 | .194 | -3.7724 | .7724 |
| | Teacher | Student | -2.26707* | .77348 | .004** | -3.7979 | -.7363 |
| | | Mentor | 1.50000 | 1.14818 | .194 | -.7724 | 3.7724 |
| DC | Student | Mentor | 6.87952* | 1.16418 | .000** | 4.5755 | 9.1836 |
| | | Teacher | 5.74618* | .88396 | .000** | 3.9967 | 7.4956 |
| | Mentor | Student | -6.87952* | 1.16418 | .000** | -9.1836 | -4.5755 |
| | | Teacher | -1.13333 | 1.31218 | .389 | -3.7303 | 1.4636 |
| | Teacher | Student | -5.74618* | .88396 | .000** | -7.4956 | -3.9967 |
| | | Mentor | 1.13333 | 1.31218 | .389 | -1.4636 | 3.7303 |
| CDT | Student | Mentor | 3.16466* | .65157 | .000** | 1.8751 | 4.4542 |
| | | Teacher | 3.43133* | .49473 | .000** | 2.4522 | 4.4105 |
| | Mentor | Student | -3.16466* | .65157 | .000** | -4.4542 | -1.8751 |
| | | Teacher | .26667 | .73440 | .717 | -1.1868 | 1.7201 |
| | Teacher | Student | -3.43133* | .49473 | .000** | -4.4105 | -2.4522 |
| | | Mentor | -.26667 | .73440 | .717 | -17201 | 1.1868 |

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

**. The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level.

In order to understand the source of these differences, a descriptive test for each subscale for all participants is applied. The results from this test are shown in Table 4.8 below.

**Table 4.8: Descriptive Statistics for Differences in Competency Types**

|  |  | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | | Minimum | Maximum |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |  |  |
| SMC | Student | 83 | 3.61 | .52 | .05 | 3.49 | 3.72 | 2.62 | 5.00 |
|  | Mentor | 15 | 3.92 | .27 | .07 | 3.76 | 4.07 | 3.31 | 4.31 |
|  | Teacher | 30 | 3.51 | .42 | .07 | 3.35 | 3.67 | 2.69 | 4.38 |
|  | Total | 128 | 3.62 | .49 | .04 | 3.54 | 3.71 | 2.62 | 5.00 |
| CLHL | Student | 83 | 3.60 | .51 | .05 | 3.49 | 3.71 | 2.67 | 4.92 |
|  | Mentor | 15 | 3.65 | .29 | .07 | 3.49 | 3.81 | 3.33 | 4.42 |
|  | Teacher | 30 | 3.38 | .34 | .06 | 3.25 | 3.51 | 2.50 | 3.92 |
|  | Total | 128 | 3.55 | .46 | .04 | 3.47 | 3.64 | 2.50 | 4.92 |
| CIE | Student | 83 | 3.74 | .53 | .05 | 3.63 | 3.86 | 2.80 | 5.00 |
|  | Mentor | 15 | 3.43 | .19 | .04 | 3.32 | 3.53 | 3.00 | 3.80 |
|  | Teacher | 30 | 3.30 | .42 | .07 | 3.14 | 3.46 | 2.70 | 4.50 |
|  | Total | 128 | 3.60 | .51 | .04 | 3.51 | 3.69 | 2.70 | 5.00 |
| CAI | Student | 83 | 3.73 | .69 | .07 | 3.58 | 3.89 | 1.83 | 5.00 |
|  | Mentor | 15 | 3.11 | .35 | .09 | 2.91 | 3.30 | 2.67 | 3.83 |
|  | Teacher | 30 | 3.36 | .36 | .06 | 3.22 | 3.49 | 2.50 | 4.33 |
|  | Total | 128 | 3.57 | .64 | .05 | 3.46 | 3.68 | 1.83 | 5.00 |
| DC | Student | 83 | 3.97 | .76 | .08 | 3.81 | 4.14 | 2.17 | 5.00 |
|  | Mentor | 15 | 2.83 | .39 | .10 | 2.61 | 3.05 | 2.17 | 3.67 |
|  | Teacher | 30 | 3.03 | .55 | .10 | 2.82 | 3.24 | 2.00 | 4.50 |
|  | Total | 128 | 3.62 | .83 | .07 | 3.47 | 3.77 | 2.00 | 5.00 |
| CDT | Student | 83 | 3.70 | .65 | .07 | 3.56 | 3.85 | 2.00 | 5.00 |
|  | Mentor | 15 | 2.91 | .43 | .11 | 2.67 | 3.16 | 2.25 | 3.75 |
|  | Teacher | 30 | 2.85 | .37 | .06 | 2.71 | 2.99 | 2.25 | 3.50 |
|  | Total | 128 | 3.41 | .70 | .06 | 3.29 | 3.53 | 2.00 | 5.00 |

LSD post-hoc tests reveal a significant difference between students' and mentors' competence level in self-management competencies. Students mean in this subscale is *3.61* (*SD=.52; N=83*) while the mentors' is *3.92 (SD=.27; N=15*). Similarly, there is a statistically significant difference between mentors (*M=3,92; SD=,27; N=15*) and teachers (*M=3.51; SD=.42; N=30*). The total average score for

the self-management competencies (*M=3.62; N=128; SD=.49*) indicates that mentors whose mean scores are higher than *3.62* are more competent than students and teachers whose scores are lower than *3.62*.

In competencies of learning how to learn, a statistically significant difference is found only between students and teachers. Students' mean in this subscale is *3.60 (N=83; SD=.51)* while teachers' is *3.38 (N=30; SD=.34)*. Besides, the total score for the competencies of learning how to learn in the table 4.8 (*M=3.55; N=128; SD=.46*) shows us that students whose mean scores are higher than *3.55* are more competent than teachers whose score is lower than *3.55*.

In competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship, there are statistically significant differences between students and mentors and students and teachers. Students' mean score in this subscale is 3.*74; (N=83; SD=.53)* while mentors' is *3.43 (N=15; SD=.19)* and teachers *3.30 (N=30; SD=.42)*. The total average score for this sub-scale in the Table 4.8 shows that *(M=3.60; N=128; SD=.51)* by getting a higher score than *3.60*, students are detected as more competent than mentors and teacher who get lower than the *3.60*.

Similar to competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship, statistically significant differences are found between students and mentors and students and teachers in competencies of acquiring information. The means of the participants in this subscale reveals results in favor of students. While students' mean in this category is *3.73 (N=83; SD=.69)* teachers' is *3.36 (N=30; SD=.36)* mentors' is *3.11 (N=15; SD=.35)*. Supporting these values, the total average score for the competencies of acquiring information in the Table 4.8 (*M=3.57; N=128; SD=.64*) reveals that students – with a higher score than *3.57* - are more competent in acquiring information compared to mentors and teachers whose scores are lower than *3.57*.

In digital competencies – similar to competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship and competencies of acquiring information – statistically significant differences are found between students and mentors and students and teachers. Students mean

in digital competencies is *3.97 (N=83; SD=.76)* whereas teachers' is 3*.03 (N=30; SD=.55)* and mentors' is *2.83 (N=15; SD=.39.* Bearing the total average score for this sub-scale (*M=3.62; N=128; SD=.83*) in Table 4.8 in mind, it can be inferred that students are more competent than mentors and teachers when their mean scores are compared to the average score.

In competencies of decision-making, statistically significant differences are detected again between students and mentors and students and teachers. Whereas students' mean here is *3.70 (N=83; SD=.65)* mentors' is *2.91 (N=15; SD=.43)* and teachers is *2,85 (N=30; SD=.37)*. The total average score for this sub-scale in the Table 4.8 (*M=3.41; N=128; SD=.70*) supports these results. Students are more competent in decision-making competency level with a higher score than *3.41* (*M=3.70*) when compared to mentors (*M=2.91*) and teachers (*M=2.85*) whose scores are lower than *3.41.*

**4.3. Multiple Comparisons of Lifelong Learning Competency Levels of the Participants in Relation to Their Demographic Information**

Based on our 5th research question, which was stated above, it is aimed to present statistically significant differences among the participants' lifelong learning competencies in relation to their demographic information such as their gender, age, years of experience, and department of graduation. In order to reach this aim, Multivariate Analysis of Variance between groups (MANOVA) is used and the only the sections, where statistically significant differences are found, are taken into consideration. The results of this test of between-subject effects are shown in Table 4.9 below in detail.

**Table 4.9: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects**

|  | Dependent Variable | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| age | DC | 91.553 | 1 | 91.553 | 5.542 | .020* |
|  | SMC | 68.017 | 1 | 68.017 | 1.818 | .180 |
|  | CLHL | 41.759 | 1 | 41.759 | 1.409 | .238 |
|  | CIE | 30.736 | 1 | 30.736 | 1.325 | .252 |
|  | CAI | 64.722 | 1 | 64.722 | 5.009 | .027* |
|  | CDT | 13.302 | 1 | 13.302 | 2.499 | .117 |
| department | DC | 16.205 | 1 | 16.205 | .981 | .324 |
|  | SMC | 340.311 | 1 | 340.311 | 9.094 | .003** |
|  | CLHL | 143.920 | 1 | 143.920 | 4.857 | .029* |
|  | CIE | 108.755 | 1 | 108.755 | 4.688 | .032* |
|  | CAI | 4.223 | 1 | 4.223 | .327 | .569 |
|  | CDT | 9.089 | 1 | 9.089 | 1.708 | .194 |

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

**. The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 4.9 above shows us that the participants' age and departments of graduation create statistically significant differences in different subscales. The participants' age does not cause a difference in self-management competencies, in competencies of learning how to learn, in competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship, and in competencies of decision-making. However, it creates a statistically significant difference in competencies of acquiring information (p=.027; p<.05) and in digital competencies (p=.020; p<.05). Apart from these, the participants' department of graduation does not cause a difference in competencies of acquiring information, in digital competencies, and in competencies of decision-making. However, it causes statistically significant differences in self-management competencies (p=.003; p<.05), in competencies of learning how to learn (p=.029; p<.05), and in competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship (p=.032; p<.05). In order to understand the source of these

differences, descriptive statistics based on these two independent variables (age and department) are applied on these subscales and the results are shown in tables 4.10 and 4.11 below.

**Table 4.10: The effect of participants' age on Competencies of Acquiring Information and Digital Competencies**

| occupation | age | | CAI | DC |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Student | 18-22 | Mean | 3.88 | 4.09 |
| | | N | 41 | 41 |
| | | Std. Deviation | .55 | .69 |
| | 23-30 | Mean | 3.59 | 3.86 |
| | | N | 42 | 42 |
| | | Std. Deviation | 79 | .82 |
| | Total | Mean | 3.73 | 3.97 |
| | | N | 83 | 83 |
| | | Std. Deviation | .69 | .76 |
| Mentor | 23-30 | Mean | 3.18 | 2.96 |
| | | N | 10 | 10 |
| | | Std. Deviation | .34 | .39 |
| | 31+ | Mean | 2.96 | 2.56 |
| | | N | 5 | 5 |
| | | Std. Deviation | .36 | .25 |
| | Total | Mean | 3.11 | 2.83 |
| | | N | 15 | 15 |
| | | Std. Deviation | .35 | .39 |
| Teacher | 23-30 | Mean | 3.40 | 3.20 |
| | | N | 22 | 22 |
| | | Std. Deviation | .40 | .52 |
| | 31+ | Mean | 3.25 | 2.58 |
| | | N | 8 | 8 |
| | | Std. Deviation | .23 | .40 |
| | Total | Mean | 3.36 | 3.03 |
| | | N | 30 | 30 |
| | | Std. Deviation | .36 | .55 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 18-22 | Mean | 3.88 | 4.09 |
| | | N | 41 | 41 |
| | | Std. Deviation | .55 | .69 |
| | 23-30 | Mean | 3.48 | 3.54 |
| | | N | 74 | 74 |
| | | Std. Deviation | .66 | .78 |
| | 31+ | Mean | 3.14 | 2.57 |
| | | N | 13 | 13 |
| | | Std. Deviation | .31 | .34 |
| | Total | Mean | 3.57 | 3.62 |
| | | N | 128 | 128 |
| | | Std. Deviation | .64 | .83 |

MANOVA test reveals us that there are significant differences in the mean scores of the participants based on their occupation with reference to their age in competencies of acquiring information and in digital competencies. In competencies of acquiring information, students score highest (M=3.73, N=83, SD=.69) followed by teachers (M=3.36, N=30, SD=.36) and mentors (M=3.11, N=15, SD=.35). These values can be supported by the total scores of competencies of acquiring information in Table 4.10 above. While the students' mean score is higher than the total average score (M=3.57, N=128, SD=.64), mentors' and teachers' scores are lower than the total average score.

Significant differences in the mean scores of the participants based on their occupation with reference to their age are also found in digital competencies according to the results of MANOVA. Similar to competencies of acquiring information, in digital competencies students score highest (M=3.97, N=83, SD=.76) followed by teachers (M=3.03, N=30, SD=.55) and mentors (M=2.83, N=15, SD=.39). The total scores for digital competencies in Table 4.10 above reinforces these results. Whereas the students' mean score is higher than the total average score (M=3.62, N=128, SD=.83), mentors' and teachers' scores are lower than the total average score.

**Table 4.11: The effect of participants' department in SMC, in CLHL, and in CIE**

| occupation | department | | SMC | CLHL | CIE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Student | ELT | Mean | 3,61 | 3,60 | 3,74 |
| | | N | 83 | 83 | 83 |
| | | Std. Deviation | ,52 | ,51 | ,53 |
| | Total | Mean | 3,61 | 3,60 | 3,74 |
| | | N | 83 | 83 | 83 |
| | | Std. Deviation | ,52 | ,51 | ,53 |
| Mentor | ELT | Mean | 3,98 | 3,63 | 3,42 |
| | | N | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | | Std. Deviation | ,39 | ,23 | ,10 |
| | Non-ELT | Mean | 3,89 | 3,66 | 3,44 |
| | | N | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| | | Std. Deviation | ,22 | ,32 | ,22 |
| | Total | Mean | 3,92 | 3,65 | 3,43 |
| | | N | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| | | Std. Deviation | ,27 | ,29 | ,19 |
| Teacher | ELT | Mean | 4,00 | 3,67 | 3,70 |
| | | N | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| | | Std. Deviation | ,35 | ,26 | ,40 |
| | Non-ELT | Mean | 3,33 | 3,27 | 3,15 |
| | | N | 22 | 22 | 22 |
| | | Std. Deviation | ,29 | ,31 | ,33 |
| | Total | Mean | 3,51 | 3,38 | 3,30 |
| | | N | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| | | Std. Deviation | 5,57292 | 4,16623 | 4,33391 |
| Total | ELT | Mean | 3,65 | 3,61 | 3,72 |
| | | N | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| | | Std. Deviation | ,52 | ,48 | ,51 |
| | Non-ELT | Mean | 3,51 | 3,39 | 3,24 |
| | | N | 32 | 32 | 32 |
| | | Std. Deviation | ,37 | ,36 | ,33 |
| | Total | Mean | 3,62 | 3,55 | 3,60 |
| | | N | 128 | 128 | 128 |
| | | Std. Deviation | ,49 | ,46 | ,51 |

MANOVA test indicates that there are statistically significant differences in the mean scores of the participants based on their occupation with reference to their departments of graduation in self- management competencies, in competencies of learning how to learn, and in competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship.

93

Regarding the total mean scores in table 4.11 above, it can inferred that studying at an English Language Teaching (ELT) department yields higher results in these subscales when compared to the participants from other departments (ELL, ALL, LIN, Tr&In). In self- management competencies, total score is 3.62 (N=128, SD=.49). However, the ELT participants' mean is 3.65 (N=96, SD=.52) while the Non-ELT participants' mean is 3.51 (N=32, Std=.37). In competencies of learning how to learn, ELT participants (M=3.61, N=96, SD=.48) score higher than the total average (M=3.55, N=128, SD=.46) while Non-ELT participants (M=3.39 N=32, SD=.36) score lower than the total average. When it comes to the competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship, again, ELT participants score (M=3.72, N=96, SD=.51) higher than the Non-ELT participants (M=3.24 N=32, SD=.33) based on the total average scores (M=3.60 N=128, SD=.51).

# 5. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, findings, interpretations and discussions are provided by looking through the results of the tests that were applied for different research questions. The findings and discussions are divided into five different categories as this study has five different research questions.

## 5.1. Findings and Discussion for Research Question 1

*Research Question 1: What are the levels of lifelong learning competencies of prospective English language teachers with reference to;*

a) *self-management competencies,*
b) *competencies of learning how to learn,*
c) *competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship,*
d) *competencies on acquiring information,*
e) *digital competencies,*
f) *competencies of decision-making.*

**Table 5.1: Levels of Prospective English Language Teachers for Different Competency Types**

| Competency Type | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|
| Self-Management Competencies | 3.61 | .52 |
| Competencies of Learning How to Learn | 3.60 | .51 |
| Competencies of Initiative and Entrepreneurship | 3.74 | .53 |
| Competencies on Acquiring Information | 3.73 | .69 |
| Digital Competencies | 3.97 | 76 |
| Competencies of Decision-Making | 3.70 | .65 |
| Total | 3.72 | .63 |

In order to answer this research question, descriptive statistics is applied for different competencies above for the students. The means of the 83 students that they get for each competency type are shown below in Table 5.1 above.

As it can be inferred from the table above, the prospective English language teachers regard themselves most competent in digital competencies (M=3.97, SD=.76). This might be the result of their age. Since they are last year college students, they can be accepted as young adults. This assumption is reinforced when you have a look at the distribution of participants in the previous chapter (Table 3.1). 41 of the students are between 18-22 years old while 42 of them are between 23-30 years old. There are such items in *Digital Competencies* subscale as "ability to use the Internet", "ability to use chat programs", "ability to save data in computer" and so on. Therefore it might be concluded that as students are young adults of this study, they are familiar with the use and requirements of today's technology and this situation leads them to be most competent in digital competencies.

Another finding that can be revealed form Table 5.1 above is that students perceive themselves least competent in competencies of learning how to learn and self-management competencies, respectively, when their total scores (M=3.72, SD=63) are examined. The reason for this situation might be the relation of these competencies with career and experience. Since this group of participants is in their start of their careers, they do not have much experience and knowledge on how to improve themselves in professional terms. When some items such as "following the programs of all learning activities", "ability to pose question without hesitation in the process of learning", and "ability to choose documents that contribute to the career development" in competencies of learning how to learn and such items as "ability to take new decision for career development" and "ability to conduct projects on career development" in self-management competencies are taken into consideration, it can be argued that the lack of students' experience results in being least competent in these fields.

**5.2. Findings and Discussion for Research Question 2**

*Research Question 2: What are the levels of lifelong learning competencies of English language mentors with reference to;*

  *a- self-management competencies,*

  *b- competencies of learning how to learn,*

  *c- competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship,*

  *d- competencies on acquiring information,*

  *e- digital competencies,*

  *f- competencies of decision-making.*

Descriptive statistics is applied for different competencies above for the mentors. The means of the 15 mentors that they get for each competency type are shown below in Table 5.2 below.

**Table 5.2: Levels of Mentors for Different Competency Types**

| Competency Type | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|
| Self-Management Competencies | 3.92 | .27 |
| Competencies of Learning How to Learn | 3.65 | .29 |
| Competencies of Initiative and Entrepreneurship | 3.43 | .19 |
| Competencies on Acquiring Information | 3.11 | .35 |
| Digital Competencies | 2.83 | .39 |
| Competencies of Decision-Making | 2.91 | .43 |
| Total | 3.30 | .32 |

Table 5.2 above indicates that mentors perceive themselves most competent in self-management competencies (M=3.92, SD=.27). The reason for this result might be their experience and knowledge in their professional careers. When the years of experience of mentors are examined in Table 3.1, which was presented in the previous chapter (p. 76), it can be revealed that they have higher years of

experience compared to other groups of participants. Another reason for this result might be their expertise in guiding prospective language teachers. Since they act as consultants to the prospective teachers in their processes to become teachers, mentors have a higher practice in daily life problems or the troubles in terms of managing themselves. The items in this competency type such as "group leadership in activities in career field", and "taking responsibility individually in team work" are good examples of this result.

Another finding that can be yielded from Table 5.2 above is that mentors regard themselves least competent in digital competencies (M=2.83, SD=.39). This result is probably highly related to the age of them. Since the items in this competency type like "Benefit from online internet tools such as online journals, newspapers, videos" and "Benefit from online news-group" are directly linked to being familiar with the use of technology, mentors might have difficulty in following the trends and expertise in using computer and Internet.

## 5.3. Findings and Discussion for Research Question 3

*Research Question 3: What are the levels of lifelong learning competencies of English language current (classroom/regular) teachers with reference to;*
- *a- self-management competencies,*
- *b- competencies of learning how to learn,*
- *c- competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship,*
- *d- competencies on acquiring information,*
- *e- digital competencies,*
- *f- competencies of decision-making.*

The levels of the 30 teachers for different competency types are calculated via descriptive statistics that are given in Table 5.3 below.

**Table 5.3: Levels of Teachers for Different Competency Types**

| Competency Type | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|
| Self-Management Competencies | 3.21 | .42 |
| Competencies of Learning How to Learn | 3.38 | .34 |
| Competencies of Initiative and Entrepreneurship | 3.30 | .42 |
| Competencies on Acquiring Information | 3.36 | .36 |
| Digital Competencies | 3.03 | .55 |
| Competencies of Decision-Making | 2.85 | .37 |
| Total | 3.23 | .41 |

One finding that can be revealed from the table above is that teachers regard themselves most competent in competencies of learning how to learn (M=3.38, SD=.34) and competencies of acquiring information (M=3.36, SD=.36). This finding might be highly related to their occupation as teachers. The concept of learning by teaching is reinforced via this result. Since teaching is a complex phenomenon and requires learning at the same time, teachers tend to learn a lot in their jobs together with their learners (Cortese, 2005). Therefore, it might be concluded that teachers tend to be most competent in learning how to learn because of their jobs. Teachers are found to be competent in acquiring information, as well. This situation is also related to the former result. Since they are teachers, they can be highly professional in finding ways to achieve information. Such items as "ability to form healthy relations in the process of acquiring information" and "expressing opinions easily on any issue" in this competency type support these results.

Table 5.3 above also shows us that teachers perceive themselves least competent in competencies of decision-making (M=2.85, SD=.37). The reason of this result might be the effects of such items as "Able to predict the risks one can encounter at work" and "Ability of pre-planning each stage to reach targets in career development process". This type of items that test the teachers'

farsightedness and determination might lead to be least competent in this competency type as teachers are usually regarded steady and static in their jobs.

## 5.4. Findings and Discussion for Research Question 4

*Research Question 4: Is there a statistically significant difference between lifelong learning competencies of prospective English language teachers, their mentors, and English language current (classroom/regular) teachers?*

In order to find the answer for this question, ANOVA test was applied and the results of it were given in the previous chapter. In order to interpret those results in a more detailed way, an item-based means table (Table 5.4) based on occupation is given below.

### Table 5.4: Item-Based Means for Occupation

| A. SELF-MANAGEMENT COMPETENCIES | Students | | Mentors | | Teachers | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | M | Std | M | Std | M | Std | M | Std |
| 1. Ability to take new decision for career development | 3.52 | .929 | 3.73 | .458 | 3.50 | .572 | 3.54 | .812 |
| 2. Being able to be aware of lacks in the process of individual development | 3.90 | .674 | 3.93 | .458 | 3.40 | .621 | 3.79 | .672 |
| 3. The ability of self-assessment in learning process | 3.82 | .735 | 4.13 | .743 | 3.60 | .724 | 3.80 | .743 |
| 4. Ability to work cooperatively with colleagues | 3.77 | .915 | 3.93 | .458 | 3.43 | .679 | 3.71 | .834 |
| 5. Group leadership in activities in career field | 3.40 | .811 | 4.07 | .799 | 3.57 | .626 | 3.52 | .794 |
| 6. Knowing how to self-motivate in career development | 3.63 | .893 | 3.93 | .458 | 3.53 | .730 | 3.64 | .128 |
| 7. Constant self-motivation in learning a new subject | 3.70 | .852 | 3,87 | .640 | 3.53 | .860 | 3.68 | .832 |
| 8. Taking responsibility individually in team work | 4.07 | .823 | 4,00 | .756 | 3.57 | .568 | 3,95 | .787 |
| 9. Actively participating all activities in any field | 3.33 | .885 | 3.75 | 1.095 | 3.50 | .630 | 3.42 | .865 |
| 10. Presenting creative ideas upon encountering problems at work | 3.75 | .853 | 3.87 | .640 | 3.73 | .868 | 3.76 | .830 |
| 11. Ability of adjusting easily to new opinions in career | 3.55 | .753 | 4.20 | .676 | 3.50 | .820 | 3.62 | .785 |
| 12. Ability to conduct projects on career development | 3.28 | .860 | 3.87 | .516 | 3.43 | .679 | 3.38 | .805 |
| 13. Constantly studying new subjects that one is learning | 3.27 | .871 | 3.73 | .458 | 3.37 | .765 | 3.34 | .818 |
| TOTAL | 3,61 | .52 | 3.92 | .27 | 3.51 | .42 | 3.62 | .49 |

| B. COMPETENCIES OF LEARNING HOW TO LEARN | Students | | Mentors | | Teachers | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | M | Std | M | Std | M | Std | M | Std |
| 14. Ability to determine the available opportunities for career development | 3.52 | .786 | 3.13 | .352 | 3.10 | .403 | 3.28 | .699 |
| 15. Following the programs of all learning activities , related to your field of career | 3.22 | .870 | 3.93 | .258 | 3.37 | .669 | 3.34 | .806 |
| 16. Ability to pose question without hesitation in the process of learning | 3.35 | .833 | 3.33 | .617 | 3.60 | .498 | 3.41 | .747 |
| 17. To be able to be curious on any subject in one's field of career. | 3.52 | .771 | 3.67 | .488 | 3.33 | .711 | 3.49 | .732 |
| 18. Ability to form concept maps in acquiring knowledge on the subject one is interested in | 3.25 | .909 | 3.53 | .516 | 3.53 | .571 | 3.35 | .809 |
| 19. Ability to choose the significant points on a subject one is learning | 3.71 | .804 | 3.93 | .458 | 3.33 | .606 | 3.65 | .749 |
| 20. Ability to choose documents that contribute to the career development | 3.49 | .755 | 3.67 | .816 | 3.37 | .615 | 3.48 | .732 |
| 21. Ability to choose materials that facilitate learning | 3.96 | .833 | 3.87 | .516 | 3.57 | .679 | 3.86 | .781 |
| 22. Ability to concentrate on the new information in the learning process | 3.82 | .799 | 3.53 | .640 | 3.47 | .681 | 3.70 | .767 |
| 23. Ability to be aware of the problems one encounter in the process of learning | 3.71 | .708 | 3.87 | .516 | 3.33 | .547 | 3.64 | .673 |
| 24. Ability to use language effectively in the process of learning | 3.77 | .786 | 3.60 | .632 | 3.37 | .669 | 3.66 | .758 |
| 25. Ability to form empathy in the process of learning | 3.96 | .756 | 3.80 | .561 | 3.20 | .847 | 3.77 | .818 |
| **TOTAL** | **3.60** | **.51** | **3.65** | **.29** | **3.38** | **.34** | **3.55** | **.46** |

| C. COMPETENCIES OF INITIATIVE AND ENTERPRENEURSHIP | Students' | | Mentors' | | Teachers' | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | M | Std | M | M | Std | Std | M | Std |
| 26. Ability to take decision on any issue | 3.65 | .818 | 3.47 | .516 | 3.23 | .679 | 3.53 | .773 |
| 27. Ability to adjust to informational change in your field of career | 3.59 | .716 | 3.47 | .640 | 3.28 | .702 | 3.50 | .711 |
| 28. Ability to turn the created opinions into action at work | 3.72 | .801 | 3.53 | .516 | 3.40 | .621 | 3.62 | .742 |
| 29. Ability to notice the information one needs in your career field | 3.65 | .772 | 3.53 | .516 | 3.40 | .724 | 3.58 | .738 |
| 30. Ability of self-direction in achieving the targets | 3.81 | .788 | 3.20 | .414 | 3.13 | .681 | 3.58 | .790 |
| 31. Ability to choose the best learning environment to reach the targets | 3.81 | .833 | 3.47 | .516 | 3.40 | .724 | 3.67 | .795 |
| 32. Ability to listen attentively what is said in the professional development activities | 3.98 | .796 | 3.27 | .594 | 3.40 | .675 | 3.76 | .801 |
| 33. Ability to transfer the accumulated knowledge into daily life | 3.76 | .774 | 3.47 | .516 | 3.30 | .794 | 3.62 | .775 |
| 34. Being always eager in learning new things about career | 3.76 | .919 | 3.60 | .632 | 3.23 | .898 | 3.62 | .906 |
| 35. Ability to suggest solutions for any problem in the field | 3.76 | .774 | 3.47 | .516 | 3.30 | .794 | 3.59 | .789 |
| **TOTAL** | **3.74** | **.53** | **3.43** | **.19** | **3.30** | **.42** | **3.60** | **.51** |

| D. COMPETENCIES ON ACQUIRING INFORMATION | Students' | | Mentors' | | Teachers' | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | M | Std | M | Std | M | Std | M | Std |
| 36. Ability to form healthy relations in the process of acquiring information | 3.61 | .824 | 3.07 | .704 | 3.13 | .507 | 3.44 | .781 |

| | Students' M | Students' Std | Mentors' M | Mentors' Std | Teachers' M | Teachers' Std | Total M | Total Std |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 37. Expressing opinions easily on any issue | 3.80 | .838 | 3.20 | .862 | 3.43 | .568 | 3.64 | .811 |
| 38. Facilitate transition of information via e-mail | 3.48 | .967 | 3.00 | .535 | 3.50 | .630 | 3.43 | .867 |
| 39. Access to information on internet through search engines such as Google | 4.12 | .875 | 3.27 | .594 | 3.40 | .563 | 3.85 | .861 |
| 40. Utilizing mobile phones in accessing to new information | 3.60 | 1.126 | 3.07 | .704 | 3.33 | .802 | 3.48 | 1.027 |
| 41. Benefit from social utility websites such as face book, twitter in the process of gathering information | 3.82 | 1.095 | 3.07 | .258 | 3.37 | .669 | 3.63 | .980 |
| **TOTAL** | **3.73** | **.69** | **3.11** | **.35** | **3.36** | **.36** | **3.57** | **.64** |

| E. DIGITAL COMPETENCIES | Students' | | Mentors' | | Teachers' | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | M | Std | M | Std | M | Std | M | Std |
| 42. Ability to save data in computer | 4.19 | .917 | 3.00 | .378 | 3.10 | .724 | 3.80 | .984 |
| 43. Ability to use Internet | 4.40 | .715 | 2.93 | .594 | 3.17 | .747 | 3.94 | .945 |
| 44. Benefit from online internet tools such as online journals, newspapers, videos | 4.07 | .880 | 2.73 | .704 | 3.07 | .868 | 3.68 | 1.011 |
| 45. Benefit from online news-group | 3.69 | 1.081 | 3.00 | .655 | 3.00 | .695 | 3.45 | 1.010 |
| 46. Ability to use chat-programs such as chat, and msn | 3.57 | 1.222 | 2.60 | .737 | 2.93 | .691 | 3.30 | 1.126 |
| 47. Facilitate sharing information on internet with colleagues | 3.96 | 1.041 | 2.73 | .704 | 2.97 | .928 | 3.59 | 1.105 |
| **TOTAL** | **3.97** | **.76** | **2.83** | **.39** | **3.03** | **.55** | **3.62** | **.83** |

| F. COMPETENCIES OF DECISION-MAKING | Students' | | Mentors' | | Teachers' | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | M | Std | M | Std | M | Std | M | Std |
| 48. Ability of pre-planning each stage to reach targets in Career development process | 3.73 | .898 | 2.93 | .458 | 3.03 | .615 | 3.48 | .869 |
| 49. Ability to solve problem that hinder promotion in your career field | 3.55 | .859 | 3.07 | .799 | 2.87 | .507 | 3.34 | .835 |
| 50. Able to predict the risks one can encounter at work | 3.75 | .730 | 2.80 | .414 | 2.77 | .774 | 3.41 | .846 |
| 51. Ability to guess how much time is required in learning a new subject | 3.80 | .761 | 2.87 | .743 | 2.73 | .583 | 3.44 | .867 |
| **TOTAL** | **3.70** | **.65** | **2.91** | **.43** | **2.85** | **.37** | **3.41** | **.70** |

In self-management competencies, a statistically significant difference was found between mentors and students and mentors and teachers. In order to analyze the reason of this difference, top five items SMC in terms of their total scores are going to be analyzed here. The first of those items is the 8th item (Taking responsibility individually in team work; M=3.94, SD=.787); The second of those items is the 3rd item (The ability of self-assessment in learning process; M=3.80, SD=.743); The third of those items is the 2nd item (Being able to be aware of lacks in the process of individual development; M=3.79, SD=.672); The fourth of those items is the 10th item (Presenting creative ideas upon encountering problems at work; M=3.76, SD=.830); The fifth of those items is the 4th item (Ability to work

cooperatively with colleagues; M=3.71, SD=.830). When all of these items and the scores that the participants get for them are analyzed, it can be seen that mentors' score is higher than the other participants in all of the top five items. With this result, it can be concluded that mentors created a significant difference here with their score for such items that test one's leadership, experience and self-control.

A significant difference was found between students and teachers in competencies of learning how to learn. In order to give a clearer picture, again the top five items based on the total scores are analyzed here. The first of those items is the 21st item (Ability to choose materials that facilitate learning; M=3.86, SD=.781); The second of those items is the 25th item (Ability to form empathy in the process of learning; M=3.77, SD=.818); The third of those items is the 22nd item (Ability to concentrate on the new information in the learning process; M=3.70, SD=.767); The fourth of those items is the 24th item (Ability to use language effectively in the process of learning; M=3.66, SD=.758); The fifth of those items is the 19th item (Ability to choose the significant points on a subject one is learning; M=3.65, SD=.749). As it can be understood, students get higher scores in the top five items, which are generally about finding proper ways to learn how to learn.

In the rest of all the competency types, students created statistically significant differences. While there are no differences between mentors and teachers, there are significant differences between students and mentors and students and teachers in CIE, CAI, DC, CDM. When the total average scores for all of the items in these subscales are examined, it can be seen that students get higher means than the average scores for each item in each competency type. Additionally, for all of the 26 items in four remaining subscales, students' scores are higher than the mentors' and the teachers'. This is a very significant result. Since students are young participants of the study, their getting higher scores than teachers and mentors in CIE, CAI, DC might have been an expected result. The only surprising result here might be the students' higher mean scores than the teachers' and mentors' for competencies of decision-making. Since decision-making can sometimes require expertise, mentors' and teachers' getting higher scores than

students might have been an expected finding.

## 5.5. Findings and Discussion for Research Question 5

*Research Question 5:  Is there a statistically significant difference between lifelong learning competencies of prospective English language teachers, their mentors, and English language current (classroom/regular) teachers with reference to;*
>    a)  *department,*
>    b)  *age,*
>    c)  *gender,*
>    d)  *experience?*

MANOVA test was applied to find the answer for this question. It was observed that while the gender and the experience of the participants did not create any difference, their ages and departments created statistically significant differences.

It was concluded that significant differences are found in the mean scores of the participants in terms of their occupation with special reference to their age in two of the subscales; competencies of acquiring information and digital competencies. The detailed analysis of this result was shown in Table 4.10 in the previous chapter (p.89) by looking at the total average scores. When we a have a closer look at the same table again and analyze the variances for different age groups, it is clear that the scores support our results. Both in CAI and DC, the mean scores of the 18-22 (respectively; M=3.88, N=41, SD=.55 / M=4.09, N=41, SD=.69) year-old students is higher than the 23-30 year-old students (respectively; M=3.59, N=42, SD=.79 / M=3.86, N=42, SD=.72). Similarly, both in CAI and DC, the mean scores of the 23-30 (respectively; M=3.18, N=10, SD=.34 / M=2.96, N=10, SD=.39) year-old mentors is detected as higher than the 31+ year-old mentors (respectively; M=2.96, N=5, SD=.36 / M=2.56, N=5, SD=.25). Likewise, both in CAI and DC, the mean scores of the 23-30 (respectively; M=3.40, N=22, SD=.40 / M=3.20, N=22, SD=.52) year-old teachers is found as higher than the 31+ year-old teachers (respectively; M=3.25, N=8, SD=.23 / M=2.58, N=8, SD=.40). Bearing

these significant findings in mind, it might be concluded that as the age of the participants increases, their mean scores for CAI and DC decrease. Being relatively a young participant results in being relatively more competent in those two types of competencies.

Another result that came out of MANOVA test was that the mean scores of the ELT graduates are higher than Non-ELT graduates in three of the subscales; self-management competencies, competencies of learning how to learn, and competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship. The detailed analysis of this result was given in the previous chapter with the Table 4.11. The reason of this finding might be effect of the courses offered in ELT departments in Turkey. Since an ELT graduate is a person who took educational sciences courses such as instructional principles and methods, classroom management, educational psychology, and some teaching skill requiring courses such as teaching methodology, teaching language skills, and materials adaptation and development in his undergraduate program, he can be expected to be more competent in those three subscales.

## 6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final chapter of the study reveals a summary and the findings of the study and recommendations for further research. Findings that come from the analysis of the data are summarized here in order to shed light on the overall results. Finally, some recommendations based on our findings and related to the study area of this research are presented for the readers.

### 6.1. Summary and Conclusion

Lifelong learning, which sets the basis of this research, has been the center of many academic and governmental studies since the late 1980s. As the governments and education policy makers have gained a rich understanding and the importance of the lifelong learning, they have started to involve lifelong learning in many educational programs and it has been the focusing point of many academic journals and books. Especially, the European Union handles the issue of lifelong learning in a very systematic and professional way. The units of EU has given much effort to improve people's participation to lifelong learning studies within the member and candidate countries for more than 30 years. Therefore, many international and national programs have been developed and many countries, including our own country, has been working hard in order to make their citizens join the lifelong learning activities.

One of the studies aimed to define and improve the scope of lifelong learning was the identification of lifelong learning competencies. After demanding studies, Commission of the European Communities (COM) decided on eight key competences in 2005;

1) Communication in mother tongue
2) Communication in foreign languages
3) Mathematical competence and basic competences in science and technology

4) Digital Competence

5) Learning to Learn

6) Social and civic competences

7) Sense of Initiative and Entrepreneurship

8) Cultural awareness and expression. (COM, 2005).

As it can be understood, the first two types of competencies are related to language studies. This situation indicates the utmost importance of language in being competent in terms of being a lifelong learner. Consequently, it was regarded as a need to conduct a study based on one of these types of competency areas. Communication in foreign languages was selected a key area since foreign language learning and teaching studies hold a great place in many countries, especially in our own country.

In order to carry out a research in this competency area, it was logical to test the levels of the foreign language prospective teachers, mentors and regular teachers. To reach that specific aim, a "Lifelong Learning Competency Scale (LLLCS)" designed by (Uzunboylu & Hursen, 2011) was used in this study. The scale consists of two parts. The first parts involves five questions related to the participants' demographic information. In the second part, there six different subscales with different item numbers, consisting 51 items in total. The levels of the English Language Teaching department last-year students, their mentors, and regular teachers were tried to be identified for different competency areas in the scale. The results that were obtained after the analysis of the data were really significant and intriguing.

The prospective language teachers regarded themselves most competent digital competencies out of six different competency types. This was thought to be related to their age. Additionally, they regarded themselves least competent in self-management competencies. This result was also thought to be related to their age since they are still college students and they lack the necessary knowledge and expertise in being competent enough to manage themselves as the items in

self-management competencies generally require having some kind of proficiency in one's job.

The mentors, who work in different schools as the supervisors of those prospective language teachers, regarded themselves most competent in self-management competencies. This situation was also regarded to be related to the same reasons that was mentioned in the previous paragraph. In addition to this, since they work as mentors of these students, they have the skills of guiding them in the very first times of their careers.

The regular English language teachers, who work in different schools, perceived themselves most competent in competencies of learning how to learn. This finding was considered to be the result of their working experience as a teacher. Since the concept of teaching paves the way for learning at the same time, the teachers have the tendency to improve themselves in becoming more competent in learning how to learn. Another result was that the teachers regarded themselves least competent in competencies of decision-making. This result was reckoned to be the result of their profession's being not open to risks and unsafe innovations.

Another question of the study was whether there were statistically significant differences between the participants for those six different subscales. In self-management competencies, mentors created a difference to the students. When the item-based means of that subscale were taken into consideration, the reason of that difference was thought to be the items that test the participants' self-control, knowledge, wisdom and expertise. In competencies of learning how to learn, a statistically significant difference was found between students and teachers. This result might be the only contradictory finding of the study since students regarded themselves more competent than the teachers. As it was mentioned above, learning how to learn should require a kind of expertise in finding appropriate ways to learn and it should be supplied with experience. For all of the remaining types of competencies, statistically significant differences were found between students and mentors and teachers. Prospective ELT teachers created a difference here

since those types of competencies are mostly related to being young and having necessary knowledge to be competent in those areas.

The last question of the research whether the demographic situations of the participants had an effect on the competency areas based on their occupation. While it was found that the experience and the gender of the participants did not create any statistically significant differences, their age and departments of graduation were a cause of difference in different subscales. The age of the participants was the cause of the difference in digital competencies and competencies of acquiring information. This result did not come as a surprise since the items in these are closely related to modern day's technology. Reinforcing these results, it was also found out that as the age of the participants increases, their competency levels in these subscales decrease. Another finding was that the ELT graduates were found to be more competent in self-management competencies, competencies of learning how to learn, and competencies of initiative and entrepreneurship than the Non-ELT graduates. The reason of this difference was thought to be the result of the courses offered in the undergraduate program of ELT. The educational sciences courses that the ELT graduates take during four years of their training to become a teacher might lead them to be more competent in those competency types.

To sum up, various differences were found throughout the study. The content of the LLLCS and the relatively rich number of the participants helped the researcher to analyze comprehensive data; a lot of different results and findings, therefore, were discovered and presented in detail with explanations.

## 6.2. Recommendations

Based on the results of our study, it can be concluded that while prospective English language teachers are mostly competent in many competency areas that are related with technology, they still lack the necessary skills to be competent in other competency types. Therefore, they need guidance on how to become

competent in self-management competencies. Programs oriented to give those kind of novice teachers guidance and consultancy might be developed so that they can benefit from the experienced teachers. Those programs may aim to include both the native and non-native teachers of English language from all over the world to give lectures and share their ideas with those novice teachers.

Another recommendation might be to develop the mentors' and teachers' level in digital competencies and competencies of acquiring information. Since lifelong learning is a very broad concept and also includes lifelong education, the foreign language teachers must be trained to improve their digital skills. The technology is developing day by day, and most of the language classes require the use of technological devices and the internet. In-service trainings must be given to the teachers all around the country to make them more familiar with the integration of technology with their teaching practices.

This research was conducted with a limited group of participants. Using the same scale or other scales, the competency levels of the students, teacher, or may be the academicians from other fields should be tested so that more general interpretations could be made and a richer understanding towards lifelong learning key competency areas could be developed and transferred to other fields.

All in all, the current research might be really useful if the results and the findings of it are examined closely. When the overall results are interpreted, it can be said that the competency areas that EU decided are mostly related to being young, following the current science and technology, and being educated well in good educational institutions formally and/or informally. In other words, being competent requires a complex and long-lasting process. Hence, it can be suggested that if a country wants its citizens be competent within the concept of lifelong learning, it should give its largest importance to education.

# REFERENCES

A memorandum on lifelong learning. (2000, 30 October) [Comission Staff
      Working Paper]. Retrieved on October 18, 2013 from:
        http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/lll/life/memoen.pdf

Aiken, L. R. (1997). Questionnaires and inventories: Surveying opinions and
      assessing personality. New York: J. Wiley.

Althusser, L. (2003). *İdeoloji ve devletin ideolojik aygitlari,* (Çev. A. Tümertekin).
      İstanbul: İthaki Yayınevi

Apple, M.W. (1995) Education and power, (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Ayhan, S. (2005). Dünden bugüne yaşam boyu öğrenme. *Proceedings of
      Lifelong Learning Symposium.* PegemA Pub. Ankara

Bagnall, R.G. (2005). Dealing with difference by creating dependency? A
      critique of the dependency thesis in lifelong learning and adult education.
      Paper presented at the 35th Annual SCUTREA Conference, University of
      Sussex, England, UK. Retrieved on September 30, 2013 from:
        http://brs.leeds.ac.uk/~beiwww/el.htm

Calimera Guidelines Learning (formal and informal): Cultural applications: Local
      institutions mediating electronic resources. (2005). Retrieved on October
      12, 2013 from:
      http://www.calimera.org/Lists/Guidelines%20PDF/Learning_(formal_and_inf
      ormal).pdf

Can, T (2011). *Yaşam boyu öğrenme bağlaminda yabanci dil olarak ingilizce Ders kitaplarinda strateji kullanimi.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Istanbul University.

Canagarajah, S (2003). *"Foreword." From intention to practice: Considerations Of Language diversity in the classroom.* Ed. G. Smitherman and V.Villaneuava, (Studies in Writing and Rhetoric.) Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2005*). Reclaiming the local in the local language policy and practice*, Lawrance Earlbaum Associates, NJ, USA. Retrieved on November 12, 2013 from:
http://www.google.com.tr/books?hl=tr&lr=&id=0A4iwSxpj44C&oi=fnd&pg=PA25&ots=Od11zDcin6&sig=uBHCc7Kv5yS1KfSuqyvUpB7MA&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false

Commission of the European Communities, COM (1999). Implementation, results and overall assessment of the European Year of Lifelong Learning (1996), Report from the 447 final, 15 September 1999.

Commission of the European Communities, COM (2001). Making a European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality: Brussels. Retrieved on September 18, 2013 from:
http://EurLex.Europa.Eu/Lexuriserv/Lexuriserv.Do?Uri=Com:2001:0678:Fin:En:Pdf on

Commission of the European Communities, COM (2005) Proposal for Recommendatın of the European Parliament and of the Councıl on Key Competences for Lifelong Learning. 548 final, 2005/0221(COD). Brussels, 10.11.2005 Retrieved on October 9, 2013 from:
http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/ll-learning/keycomp_en.pdf on 12.05.2013

Cortese, C. G. (2005). Learning through teaching. *Management Learning*, 36, 87-115.

Council of the European Union (2002), Council Resolution of 27 June 2002 On Lifelong Learning. Official Journal of the European Communities C 163/1

Coulombe, S., J.F. Tremblay and S. Marchand, (2004) *International Adult Literacy Survey, Literacy Scores, Human Capital and Growth across Fourteen OECD Countries*, Statistics Canada, Ottawa.

Cunningham, P.M. (2003). Let's Get Real: A Critical Look at the Practice of Adult Education. *Journal of Adult Education* 22:1, USA. Retrieved on September 6, 2013 from:
http://www.nl.edu/academics/cas/ace/resources/phylliscunningham_insight.cfm

Demirel, Ö (1987). *Yabancı dil öğretimi: İlkeler, yöntemler, teknikler*. Ankara: İttaki Yayınevi.

Dewey, M. (2007). English as a Lingua Franca and Globalization: An Interconnected Perspective, *Blackwell Publishing Ltd. International Journal of Applied Linguistics. Vol. 17. No: 3. pp. 332- 54.*

Duman, A. (2000) *Yetiskinler Eğitimi*. Ankara: Ütopya Yayınevi

Duman, A. (2005). Türkiye'de yaşam boyu öğrenme siyasalarını oluştur(a)mamanın dayanılmaz hafifliği. *Proceedings of Lifelong Learning Symposium.* PegemA Pub. Ankara

Edwards, R., Usher, R. (2008). Atroubled space of possibilities: lifelong learning
and the postmodern. P. Sutherland and J. Crowther (eds.), Lifelong
learning: concept and contexts (ss. 58-67). London: Routledge.

Ercan, F. (2005). *Türkiye'de Sosyal-Politik-Ekonomik Panoroma*, Petrol-İş
Annual, İstanbul.

Eurobarometer. (2006) Europeans and Their Languages. Special Eurobarometer
243/Wave 64.3, November – December 2005. Publication: February 2006.
Retrieved: November 20, 2013 from
http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/%20ebs_243_%20en.pdf

European Commission. (1993) Green Paper on the European Dimension of
Education. COM (93) 457 final, 29 September 1993. Retrieved on July 15,
2013 From: http://aei.pitt.edu/936/

European Commission. (1995) "White Paper on Education and Traning: Teaching
and Learning: Towards the Learning Society". Brussels, Retrieved on July
15, 2013 from:
http://europa.eu/documents/comm/white_papers/pdf/com95_590_en.pdf

European Commission, (1996). European year of lifelong learning (1996).
Retrieved on November 5, 2013 from:
http://europa.eu/scadplus/leg/en/cha/c11024.htm

European Commission. (2005) Implementing the 'Education and Training 2010'
Work Programme, 2005 Progress Report: Turkey. Brussels, December
2005.

European Commission, (2007). Comenius: Success Stories – Europe Creates
Opportunities. (Online). Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the
European Communities. Retrieved on September 18, 2013 from:
http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/comenius/success-
stories_en.pdf

European Commission, (2012). *Facts & Figures about EU mobility programmes*
*In Education, Training, Research and Youth May 2012.* Retrieved on
September 9, 2013 from
http://ec.europa.eu/education/focus/doc/mobilityfigures.pdf.

European Parliament and the Council (2006). *Establishing an Action*
*Programme in the Field of Lifelong Learning. 15.11.2006.* Brussels,
Decision No 1720/2006/EC

European Training Foundation (ETF) (2006). Turkey – Country Analysis 2006.
Retrieved On June 8, 2013 from: http://www.etf.europa.eu/

Eurostat (2010). Labour force survey*"Education & Training 2010" The Success*
*of the Lisbon Strategy Hinges on Urgent Reforms.* 6905/04 EDUC 43, p. 40

Field, J. (2002). Knowing states of power: exploring the uneasy relationship
Between Policy and lifelong learning. Paper presented at SCUTREA, 32nd
Annual Conference, University of Stirling. Retrieved on November 12, 2013
from
http://www.leeds.ac.uk/bei/index.html

Giddens, A. (2003) Runaway World: How Globalisation Is Reshaping Our Lives. Routledge, New York USA. Retrieved on October 6, 2013 from: http://www.google.com/books?hl=tr&lr=&id=KPMtVIsNowC&oi=fnd&pg=PR 11&dq=runaway+world:+how+globalisation+is+reshaping+our+lives&ots=30 q68mgo44&sig=4cb4tfSoXMc4Qe3OJdgWtTysk-E#v=onepage&q=runaway%20world%3A%2

Güngör, H. F. 2007 "*Avrupa Birliği için Yaşam Boyu Öğrenim Temel Yeterlikleri ve Bu Yeterliklerden "Yabancı Dillerde İletişim" Bağlamında Türkiye'nin Durumu*", (Master's Thesis), Retrieved on October, 31 2013 from tez2.yok.gov.tr (208437).

Güvenç, B. (1995) *Türk kimliği: Kültür tarihinin kaynakları.* Boyut Publications: İstanbul

Hake, B. (2005). "AB Politikaları ve Bilgi Ekonomisi: Yaşam Boyu Öğrenme İçin Stratejik Bir Rol". *Proceedings of Lifelong Learning Symposium.* PegemA Pub. Ankara

Hirtt, N. (2003). The "merchandization" of Education: Not Only GATS, Intervention de N. Hirtt au Forum Europeen de L'Education a Berlin. Retrieved on October 18, 2013 from: http://www.skolo.org/spip.php?article1598&lang=fr

Hufeisen, B. & G. Neuner (2004). The Plurilingualism Project: Tertiary Language Learning – German after English, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg

IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations) (2000) *The role of public libraries in lifelong learning - a project under the section of public libraries*, Retrieved on September 20, 2013 from : http://www.ifla.org/VII/s8/proj/rolepublib.htm

ISCED (1997). International Standard Classification of Education.

      Retrieved on October 6, 2013 from:
http://www.uis.unesco.org/Library/Pages/default.aspx

Jones, K. (2005). Remaking Education in Western Europe, *European*

      *Educational Research Journal*, Volume 4, Number 3,p. 230. Retrieved on
November 18, 2013 from:
http://www.wwwords.co.uk/rss/abstract.asp?j=eerj&aid=2511&doi=1

Kahlert, M. (2000). Lifelong Learning--A Public Library Perspective // ALIA

      2000. Capitalising on Knowledge: The Information Profession in the 21st
Century (Canberra, Australia, October 23-26, 2000). Retrieved on
September 30, 2013 from:
http://conferences.alia.org.au/alia2000/proceedings/maureen.kahlert.html

Karaağaç, G (2007). "*Türkçe'nin Dünya Dillerine Etkisi.*" Proceedings of Lefke

      Literature Meeting. 29-30 Nisan 2007.

Karasar, N. 2005. *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi.* Ankara. Nobel Yayıncılık.

Koç, E. M. (2008) *An Investigation Of Cooperating Teachers' Roles As Mentors*

      *During The Teaching Practicum At Distance B.A. Program In ELT At*
*Anadolu University Open Education Faculty.* (Master's Thesis) Retrieved on
November 14, 3013 from tez2.yok.gov.tr (231091).

Krumm, H.J. (2004). "Language Policies and Plurilingualism." In Hufeisen, B. &

      G. Neuner, (eds.): The Plurilingualism Project: Tertiary Language Learning
– German after English, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg, pp. 35-
49.

Kumaradivelu, B. (2003). "Critical Language Pedagogy: a Postmethod Perspective on English Language Teaching", *World Englishes*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 539- 550, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., Oxford, UK

Korolyov, F. (1989). Lenin ve Eğitim. Istanbul: Sorun Yayınları.

Latham, M. (2000). Libraries in the 21st century learning society. APLIS, 13 (4), 146-152. Library, Information Science & Technology Abstract

Lisbon European Council (23 and 24 March 2000). Presidency conclusions., Item 27. Retrieved on September 15, 2013 from: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/00100r1.en.htm

Longworth, N. (2008). *Learning cities, learning regions, lifelong learning implementers.* P. Sutherland, J. Crowther (eds) Lifelong learning: concept and contexts (ss. 183-195). London: Routledge.

Neuner, G. (2004). "The Concept of Plurilingualism and Tertiary Language Didactics", in Hufeisen, B. & G. Neuner, (eds.): The Plurilingualism Project: Tertiary Language Learning – German after English, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg, pp. 13-34

Nicoll, K. (2002). 'Lifelong learning': the altering state of policy. Paper presented at SCUTREA, 32nd Annual Conference, University of Stirling. Retrieved on September 15, 2013 from: http://www.leeds.ac.uk/bei/index.html

Nunan, D. & Lamb, C. (1996). *The self-directed Teacher: Managing the learning process.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

OECD (1973). *Recurrent Education: A Strategy for Lifelong Learning* OECD, Washington DC.

O.J. of the E.U., (2002). Council Resolution of 14 February 2002 on the
promotion of  linguistic diversity and language learning in the framework of
the implementation of the objectives of the European Year of Languages.

Okçabol, R. - Gök, F. (1995) *Kriz Karşısında Eğitim Politikaları*. Petrol-İş 1993
1994 Annual, İstanbul: Petrol-İş Union, No:36

Otten, H. & Ohana, Y. (2009). *The Eight Key Competencies For Lifelong
Learning: An Appropriate Framework Within Which To Develop The
Competence Of Trainers In The Field Of European Youth Work Or Just
Plain Politics?* IKAB. Retrieved on October 1, 2013 from:
http://www.ikab.de/reports/Otten_Ohana_8keycompetence_study_2009.pdf

Özcan, D. (2011). "Evaluation of 4th And 5th Classes Teachers Competence
Perceptions towards Lifelong Learning". *International Journal of Learning
and Teaching*, Vol 3, No 1

Pillary, H., Wills, L. & Boulton-Lewis G. (2008) *Work and Learning: implication
for lifelong learning in workplace*. P. Sutherland, J. Crowther (eds), lifelong
learning: concept and context (p.219-229). London: Routledge

Project Fiche (2010). Union Programs and Agencies, Retrieved on September
23,2013
From:http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/turkey/ipa/2010/140_tr2010.0465
.01unionprogrammesandagencies.pdf

Pulman (Public Libraries Mobilising Advanced Networks) Handbook (2002).
Retrieved on September 18, 2013 from:
http://www.kutuphaneci.org.tr/genel/pilkeler.pdf

Purcell, R. (2008). *Lifelong Learning in the community; social action*. P. Sutherlnadi J. Crowther (eds), lifelong learning; concepts and contexts (p. 207-217), London: Routledge.

Rampillon, U. (2004). "Learning Strategies for the L2 to L3 threshold: the minimum profile", in Hufeisen, B. & G. Neuner, (eds.): The Plurilingualism Project: Tertiary Language Learning – German after English, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg, ss. 85-102.

Robertson, R. (1995). "Glocalization: time-space and homogeneityheterogeneity." In M. Featherstone, S. Lash,and R. Robertson (eds.): Global Modernities. London: Sage. (pp. 25-44) Retrieved on September 17, 2013 from:
http://www.google.com/books?hl=tr&lr=&id=0A4iwSxpj44C&oi=fnd&pg=PA25&ots=Od11zDcin6&sig=uBHCc7Kv5yS1KfSuqyvUpB7MA#v=onepage&q&f=false

Rogers, A. (2006). Learning: Concepts and Contexts in International Journal of Educational Development, *Science Direct 28 (1) 110-111.*

Sarıçoban, A. (2010). Should native language be allowed in foreign language classes? *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, *38*, 164-178.

Sayılan, F. (2005). Yaşamboyu Öğrenme Bağlamında Türkiye'nin Temel Eğitim Sorunu. *Proceedings of Lifelong Learning Symposium.* PegemA Pub. Ankara

Sayılan, F. (2006). Küresel Aktörler ve Eğitimde Neoliberal Dönüşüm. *News Bulletin of Geology Engineers Chamber,* Volume: 2006/4, Ankara

Sezer, S. (2005). Sayın Semra Sezer'in konuşması. *Proceedings of Lifelong Learning Symposium.* PegemA Pub. Ankara

Singh, M. (2002). The global and international discourse of lifelong learning from the perspective of UNESCO. K. Harney, A. Heikkinen, S. Rahn, M. Schemmann (eds.), Lifelong learning: one focus, different systems (p. 11-22). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Soltay, E. Ö. (2007). *The Decision Making Skills Of Student Teachers, Novice And Experienced Teachers Of English In Classroom Management.* (Master's Thesis), Retrieved on October, 13 2013 from tez2.yok.gov.tr (210256).

SPO. Ninth Progress Plan 2007-2013. Vision of Turkey in Ninth Progress Plan. Retrieved on November 29, 2013 from: http://www.kalkinma.gov.tr/DocObjects/View/13744/plan9.pdf

Steger, M. B. (2003) *Globalization: a very short introduction,* Oxford University Press, New York, USA

Sweeting, A. (2000). The Introduction of the book "Lifelong Learning: policies, Practices and programs" *International Journal of Educational Development*, 20 (3) 261-263

Şimşek, S. & Ay, O. (2007). Yaşam Boyu Öğrenme Kavramının Avrupa Birliği Süreciyle Birlikte Türkiye'de Ele Alınış Biçimi. . Proceedings of The problems and Solution Suggestions of Formal Education in Turkey. Turkish Ministry of Education, 11-12 June 2007. Ankara.

Taylor, S. (2004). Researching educational policy and change in "new times": using critical discourse analysis, *Journal of Education Policy Vol.19,No.4,July2004*. Retrieved on September 20, 2013 from: http://eprints.qut.edu.au/archive/00001201/01/1201_2.pdf

Torres, R.M. (2001). "*Lifelong Learning* in the North, *Education for All* in the South?", in: *Proceeding,* International Conference on Lifelong Learning: Global Perspective in Education (Beijing, 1-3 July 2001). Beijing: BAES.

Turkish Educational Statistics (TES) 2005-2006. *Statistical Analysis of the Expenses per Year*. p. 62, 81,200, 265. Retrieved on September 13, 2 013 from: http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1018

Türkoğlu, A. (2005), *Avrupa Birliği Sürecinde Eğitimi Etkileyen Faktörler.* Journal of Turkish Ministry of Education Publications Office, Volume 166

Ünal, L. I.; Tural, N.K. & Aksoy, H.H. (2005). Vocational Education and Life Long Education: An Economy-Politic Evaluation. Ankara: Institute of Education Sciences and Pegema Publications,136-151.

UN, 2013. UN Human Rights Universal Decleration. Retrieved on September 17, 2013 from: http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/

UNESCO International Education Bureau (1997). Adult Education Terms Dictionary (2nd edition)

Uzunboylu, H. – Hürsen, Ç. (2011) Lifelong Learning Competence Scale (LLLCS): The Study of Validity And Reliability. *H. U. Journal of Education 41: 449-460 [2011]*

Yılmaz, E. (2000). Bilgi çağında kütüphanelerin eğitimdeki yeri ve önemi.Çağdaş Eğitim, 269, 31-39.

# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX 1: Lifelong Learning Competency Scale (LLLCS)

**DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

Please read the statements below carefully and write your responses in the spaces provided. With questions consisting of choices, please mark the most appropriate choice with a tick (√).

**Gender:** ☐ Male  ☐ Female

**Age:** ☐ 18-22  ☐ 23-30  ☐ 31+

**Years of Experience:** ☐No experience  ☐ 1-3  ☐ 4-5  ☐ 6-10  ☐ 11+

**Department:** ☐ English Language Teaching (ELT)  ☐ English Language and Literature (ELL)  ☐ American Language and Literature (ALL)  ☐ Linguistics (LIN) ☐ Translation and Interpreting (Tr&In)  ☐ OTHER

This scale aims to reveal your personal competency levels in different fields ranging from digital competence to self management skills. The information you will give holds invaluable vision, thus precise predictions about your future steps can be made. Please spare only 15 minutes of your valuable time. Please read the statements below and tick (✓) the most appropriate option that suits you. **Make sure that your responses reflect your true and sincere thoughts.**

| LIFE- LONG LEARNING COMPETENCY SCALE | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A. SELF-MANAGEMENT COMPETENCIES** | Never | A little | Medium | A lot | All |
| | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1.Ability to take new decision for career development | | | | | |
| 2. Being able to be aware of lacks in the process of individual development | | | | | |
| 3. The ability of self-assessment in learning process | | | | | |
| 4. Ability to work cooperatively with colleagues | | | | | |
| 5. Group leadership in activities in career field | | | | | |
| 6. Knowing how to self-motivate in career development | | | | | |
| 7. Constant self-motivation in learning a new subject | | | | | |
| 8. Taking responsibility individually in team work | | | | | |

| | Never | A little | Medium | A lot | All |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. Actively participating all activities in any field | | | | | |
| 10. Presenting creative ideas upon encountering problems at work | | | | | |
| 11. Ability of adjusting easily to new opinions in career | | | | | |
| 12. Ability to conduct projects on career development | | | | | |
| 13. Constantly studying new subjects that one is learning | | | | | |

| **B. COMPETENCIES OF LEARNING HOW TO LEARN** | Never | A little | Medium | A lot | All |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 14. Ability to determine the available opportunities for career development | | | | | |
| 15. Following the programs of all learning activities , related to your field of career | | | | | |
| 16. Ability to pose question without hesitation in the process of learning | | | | | |
| 17. To be able to be curious on any subject in one's field of career. | | | | | |
| 18. Ability to form concept maps in acquiring knowledge on the subject one is interested in | | | | | |
| 19. Ability to choose the significant points on a subject one is learning | | | | | |
| 20. Ability to choose documents that contribute to the career development | | | | | |
| 21. Ability to choose materials that facilitate learning | | | | | |
| 22. Ability to concentrate on the new information in the learning process | | | | | |
| 23. Ability to be aware of the problems one encounter in the process of learning | | | | | |
| 24. Ability to use language effectively in the process of learning | | | | | |
| 25. Ability to form empathy in the process of learning | | | | | |

| **C. COMPETENCIES OF INITIATIVE AND ENTERPRENEURSHIP COMPETENCIES OF INITIATIVE AND ENTERPRENEURSHIP** | Never | A little | Medium | A lot | All |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 26. Ability to take decision on any issue | | | | | |
| 27. Ability to adjust to informational change in your field of career | | | | | |
| 28. Ability to turn the created opinions into action at work | | | | | |
| 29. Ability to notice the information one needs in your career field | | | | | |
| 30. Ability of self-direction in achieving the targets | | | | | |

| | Never | A little | Medium | A lot | All |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 31. Ability to choose the best learning environment to reach the targets | | | | | |
| 32. Ability to listen attentively what is said in the professional development activities | | | | | |
| 33. Ability to transfer the accumulated knowledge into daily life | | | | | |
| 34. Being always eager in learning new things about career | | | | | |
| 35. Ability to suggest solutions for any problem in the field | | | | | |

| **D. COMPETENCIES ON ACQUIRING INFORMATION** | Never | A little | Medium | A lot | All |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 36. Ability to form healthy relations in the process of acquiring information | | | | | |
| 37. Expressing opinions easily on any issue | | | | | |
| 38. Facilitate transition of information via e-mail | | | | | |
| 39. Access to information on internet through search engines such as Google | | | | | |
| 40. Utilizing mobile phones in accessing to new information | | | | | |
| **41.** Benefit from social utility websites such as face book, twitter in the process of gathering information | | | | | |

| **E. DIGITAL COMPETENCIES** | Never | A little | Medium | A lot | All |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **42.** Ability to save data in computer | | | | | |
| **43.** Ability to use Internet | | | | | |
| 44. Benefit from online internet tools such as online journals, newspapers, videos | | | | | |
| **45.** Benefit from online news-group | | | | | |
| **46.** Ability to use chat-programs such as chat, and msn | | | | | |
| 47. Facilitate sharing information on internet with colleagues | | | | | |

| **F. COMPETENCIES OF DECISION-MAKING** | Never | A little | Medium | A lot | All |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 48. Ability of pre-planning each stage to reach targets in Career development process | | | | | |
| 49. Ability to solve problem that hinder promotion in your career field | | | | | |
| 50. Able to predict the risks one can encounter at work | | | | | |
| 51. Ability to guess how much time is required in learning a new subject | | | | | |

# APPENDIX 2: Robust Tests of Equality of Means

**APPENDIX 2**

**Robust Tests of Equality of Means**

|      |       | Statistic[a] | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|------|-------|--------------|-----|--------|------|
| asum | Welch | 8,541        | 2   | 45,405 | ,001 |
| bsum | Welch | 4,982        | 2   | 43,867 | ,011 |
| csum | Welch | 13,107       | 2   | 55,851 | ,000 |
| dsum | Welch | 14,483       | 2   | 45,621 | ,000 |
| esum | Welch | 45,134       | 2   | 46,252 | ,000 |
| fsum | Welch | 40,351       | 2   | 40,693 | ,000 |

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

## APPENDIX 3 : Test of Homogeneity of Variances

**Test of Homogeneity of Variances**

|      | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|------|------------------|-----|-----|------|
| asum | 3,211 | 2 | 125 | ,044 |
| bsum | 4,320 | 2 | 125 | ,015 |
| csum | 6,848 | 2 | 125 | ,002 |
| dsum | 9,844 | 2 | 125 | ,000 |
| esum | 4,647 | 2 | 125 | ,011 |
| fsum | 4,249 | 2 | 125 | ,016 |

# CURRICULUM VITAE

## PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: Savuran, Yiğit

Nationality: Turkish (TC)

Date of Birth: 11 February 1988

Place of Birth: Ödemiş / İzmir

Marital Status: Single

E-mail: yigitsavuran@gmail.com

## EDUCATION

High School*:* Ödemiş Anatolian Teacher Training High School (2002-2006)

Undergraduate*:* Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education, Program in English Language Teaching (2006-2010)

## WORK EXPERIENCE

English Language Instructor at Ankara University, School of Foreign Languages (2010 – 2011)

English Language Instructor at Anadolu University, School of Foreign Languages (2011 - ……..)