



ISSN Print: 2394-7500
ISSN Online: 2394-5869
Impact Factor: 5.2
IJAR 2016; 2(3): 760-769
www.allresearchjournal.com
Received: 13-01-2016
Accepted: 15-02-2016

Dr. Prabha Vig
Assistant Professor,
Dept. of Lifelong Learning &
Extension Panjab University,
Chandigarh, India.

Dr. Komal Sharma
Assistant Professor Shivalik Hills
College of Education, Patti,
Nangal (Punjab), India.

Quality of Life Long learning: Its structure and line of action: A study of in-service teachers

Dr. Prabha Vig, Dr. Komal Sharma

Abstract

This research paper explored the differences on the basis of gender and marital status for In-service (n=300) teachers on the six indicators of Quality of Life Long Learning (QLLL) viz; creative aspect, personalization as self-regulated skill, adaptation, continuous professional improvement, flexibility and empowerment. A quantitative approach was followed to collect the data by using self-made questionnaire. Mean, Standard Deviation, t-ratios and Analysis of Variance were used as statistical tools to analyze the data. The results demonstrated that in-service teachers differ significantly on the basis of gender on all the six indicators whereas on the basis of marital status in-service teachers differ only on the two indicators namely continuous professional improvement and flexibility.

Keywords: Adaptation, Creative aspect, Empowerment, Flexibility, Gender, In-service, Marital Status, Personalization, Quality of Life Long Learning

Introduction

Rationale, Background and Justification

Quality of learning of teachers is a question of quality of teaching-learning process. Effective teaching and learning are substantially dependent on how the teachers particularly in-service, structure their lifelong learning process.

Day (1999) ^[29] professed that quality of Life Long Learning help teachers to gain a broader prospective and avoid being infringed in their own little box containing their own ways and ideas; self-confidence to achieve and establish oneself. He further vision that it contribute towards expanding one's own flexibility in terms of; instructions and ideas and develop competency as a survival skill.

According to European Commission (2007) ^[36] and Eyurdice (2009) ^[33] the era of globalization require a lifelong learning perspective to adapt to fast changes and evolves constraints or needs for teaching profession. The Commission further emphasized that in-service teachers' as part of their professional duty practice to improve their LLL perspective by way of salary progression and promotion, national policies and campaigns.

According to Vesco, Ross and Adams (2008) ^[99] the impact of teachers' learning is affected by active participation and team work of teachers and this could be vision by their inputs or output of learning process.

Darling-Hammond and Haselkorn (2009) ^[28] emphasized that teacher should possess powerful understandings of the subject they teach because it is only through this they can promote changes with respect to teachers practices, attitudes or beliefs and cultivate a culture which evolves mutual learning, commitment and good socialization process within the institutions, teachers and students.

According to EFA Global Monitoring Report (2013-2014) ^[34]; achieving quality is the basic need to strengthen teachers because education system worth and goodness depends upon its teacher. The report further emphasized that educational quality improves when the teachers support it and deteriorate if they do not.

Structure and Line of action

Life Long Learning and quality

Learning is an ultimate goal of education which can affect teachers whether pre-service or in-service by exploring their process of lifelong learning and related to it is its' quality.

Correspondence

Dr. Prabha Vig
Assistant Professor,
Dept. of Lifelong Learning &
Extension Panjab University,
Chandigarh, India.

According to Ferret and Smith (2010) ^[33] lifelong learning help teachers to become more confident in their practice by enhancing their awareness and understanding. This in turn, improve their level of performance and along with it their qualitative aspect of learning. It is obvious that lifelong education as formal, informal and non-formal education provide a wide range of awareness, empowerment and expertise to an individual that he becomes quality wise better from others.

Aspin and Chapman (2001) ^[7] treated lifelong learning as a triadic concept with three different entities conceived as; economic progress and development; personal development, fulfillment and social inclusiveness; democratic understanding and activity.

Australian Universities Quality Agency (2005) ^[9] identified quality as fitness for purpose.

Darling-Hammond and Branford (2005) ^[26] referred high quality teachers as those teachers who improve their quality on the basis of content that address their quality of learning. This in turn, promotes their higher level of performance and learning attached to it.

Lekoko and Medise (2011) ^[61] visualized lifelong learning as a torch for education which is relevant, appropriate and appreciated as learning by actions and interactions and is valued by events that constitute it

Rana (2012) ^[80] recognized lifelong learning as that learning which is continuous, collaborative, self-directed, active and broad in domain and covers all aspects of life that have emerged as a global educational challenge.

Quality of Life Long Learning

For the present research paper quality of lifelong learning is expressed in terms of; quality indicators which add 'value' or 'worth' for a teacher as an educator or educand.

Harvey and Green (1993) ^[48] perceived quality as an exceptional feature characterized by fitness of purpose which brings total transformation.

United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (2000) ^[95] conceived quality as; quality of learner, quality of learning environment, quality of contents, quality of processes and quality of outcomes.

Delmore and Shaker (2002) ^[30] visualized quality as degree of excellence for entire educational experiences by indicating that an individual can learn with keen desire and interest directed towards 'credit' in terms of high quality.

According to Global Monitoring Report of UNESCO (2004) ^[96] on 'Education For All'; good quality can be equated with education that prompts social change; analysis of social power in relation to formal knowledge which can be reproduced and transmitted with active participation of learners by their own learning experiences.

Wolf, Jenkins and Vignoles (2006) ^[102] proposed quality of lifelong learning as human capital accumulated after the cessation of an individual's first period of continuous education.

According to Shoulders and Hicks (2008) ^[74] the process involved in quality of lifelong learning depends on constant commitment of teacher who improves his learning by skills, abilities and motivation and side by side consolidates it by his gained experience through regular teaching and learning process.

Cohen (2010) ^[24] argued that there is no universal definition for quality and learning. He designed quality of learning by taking into consideration indicators like; creative aspect,

personalization, adaptation, continuous improvement, flexibility and empowerment for the purpose of research.

McNair (2012) ^[67] recognized that outcomes of quality of learning largely depend on academic and developmental needs of teachers' cohorts in accordance to their institutional contexts and culture.

Khany and Boghayeri (2014) ^[54] focused on teachers and found that effective teachers are creative and with these creative capacities they possess high quality of lifelong learning.

Operational Meaning and Definitions of the Terms Used

- **In-Service Teachers-** Teachers working in the colleges of education. Actually, they were the providers of education.
- **Gender-**It is a characteristic associated to males or females.
- **Marital Status-** It is considered whether the person is married or unmarried.

Operational definitions of quality of lifelong learning indicators indicating the line of action

On the basis of research studies conducted by Koroscik (1990) ^[56]; Rogoff (1990) ^[83]; Grossman (1991) ^[44]; Pajares (1992) ^[78]; Astin (1993) ^[8]; Boulton-Lewis, Wilss and Mutch (1996) ^[16]; Scala (1996) ^[86]; Livingstone (1998) ^[63]; Duxbury, Dyke and Lam (1999) ^[32]; Johnston (1999) ^[52]; Martindale (1999) ^[65]; Larrivee (2000) ^[58]; Guellec (2002) ^[45]; Uhlenbeck, Verloop and Beijaard (2002) ^[94]; Schellenkens, Pass, Jerong and Merriemborg (2003) ^[87]; Glastra, Hake and Schedler (2004) ^[40]; Chitpin and Evers (2005) ^[21]; Birenbaum and Rosenau (2006) ^[13]; Lessing and De Witt (2007) ^[62]; Williams and Baumann (2008) ^[101]; Ab. Hadi, Yunos and Kaprawi (2009) ^[1]; Gimeno, Seiz, de Siqueira and Martinez (2010) ^[39]; Al-Shalabi (2011) ^[4]; Aypay (2011) ^[11]; Meerah *et al* (2011) ^[68]; Eliasa (2012) ^[35]; Goel and Goel (2012) ^[41]; Chugunova and Voronchenko (2013) ^[22]; Kaur (2013) ^[53]; Lee, Zhang, Song and Huang (2013) ^[60]; Daronkolae, Esmaeili and Nikaeen (2014) ^[28]; Vaughn (2014) ^[98]; Saribas (2015) ^[84]; we can safely say that quality of lifelong learning for in-service and pre-service teachers can be determined by knowing their;

- Creative Aspect
- Personalization as Self-Regulated Skill
- Adaptation
- Continuous Professional Improvement
- Flexibility
- Empowerment

Creative Aspect

It is the potential of an individual which gets improved by being aware and recognizing issues like; individual differences; greater awareness, willingness to try new things, new ways to think and perform and divergent ways of doing things.

Florida (2002) ^[38] perceived creativity as a multidimensional phenomenon that manifests many fields and contexts.

Mullen (2003) ^[70] regarded teacher creative aspect as a qualitative approach based on creating innovative junctures among art education and research.

According to Oslo Manual (2005) ^[77] creativity is an ability to combine knowledge across science to technology; arts to design, arts to craft design, science to research and entrepreneurship.

Brewer and Chen (2007) ^[17] highlighted creativity as an expression of one's unique ideas.

Reilly, Lilly, Bramwell and Kronish (2011) ^[82] conceptualized creativity as divergent, conflictizing and subject to diverse perceptions for any human activity.

Al-Hattami, Muammar and Elmahdi (2013) ^[3] embarked creativity and innovation in teaching as an encouragement to teachers to become outstanding, by concentrating on domain and thus enhancing the learning outcomes simultaneously.

Khany and Boghayeri (2014) ^[54] conceived creativity as an asset for being successful. They further highlighted that teacher creativity index can be assessed on three main components; individual differences; expertise and management.

Personalization as Self-Regulated Skill

For the present study personalization was studied as a mean to achieve freedom of learners by engaging themselves in personal and meaningful learning.

Nias (1989) ^[73] revealed teaching as personal investment which requires one to view his job as a capacity to colonize personal life.

Jarvis (1992) ^[50] suggested personalization as engagement with learning by triggers. He further opined that it is preceded by triggers and these triggers lead towards individual readiness to respond, to overcome deterrents to participate in concepts.

Bentley and Miller (2004) ^[12] regarded personalization as a potential approach, to meet future educational needs, by providing alternatives that foster learning capacity among individual learners.

Craig (2010) ^[25] opined that teachers must integrate self and knowledge as one entity. This would allow them to turn their personal experiences into learning by critically re-examining their past experiences and knowledge into new context.

Adaptation

It is a process by which an individual learns to adjust with changes by taking into account; improvement, renovation, openness and sharing of possibilities and constraints associated to them.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (2001) ^[74] reported that attitudes towards knowledge has changed from 'know-what' to 'know-why' and 'know-how' to 'know-who'. The organization further stressed that knowledge management and adaptation have become very important for the teacher and his teaching because of knowledge transmission and knowledge acquisition.

Duffy, Miller, Kear, Parsons, Davis and Williams (2008) ^[31] defined adaptation as instructional decision in response to unanticipated student interaction outside the pre-planned lesson plan.

Report of Learning Workshop Group About Learning (2009) ^[82] regarded adaptation as learning to learn and understand demands which learning task involves viz; a) knowing about intellectual processes and how they work; b) generating and considering strategies to cope with the task; c) getting better at choosing the strategies that are appropriate for the task, d) monitoring and evaluating subsequent learning behavior through feedback on chosen strategies which have led to task success.

Gosper *et al* (2010) ^[42] advocated adaptation as competence to adjust with learning which enables the learner to adjust to the learning pace.

Varmecky (2012) ^[97] conceived adaptation as a situation to deal with real life problems. He further advocated that this phase is grounded by effective learning, real life learning, critical thinking, self-directed learning and meta-cognition.

Lee, Zhang, Song and Huang (2013) ^[60] perceived that adaptation of knowledge and its acquisition has direct or indirect influence on capacities of teachers' teaching and learning. They further highlighted that teacher conceptions and practices must be shaped and driven in accordance to globalization and demands of information society.

Continuous Professional Improvement

It is regarded as updation of knowledge in a way that gives satisfaction and encouragement teachers to take up those activities which bring improvement in their profession.

Pan (1997) ^[79] clarified continuous learning as that habit which continuous throughout the life of an individual mode of behavior that people continue to learn, if they have the ability to learn and respond intelligently to exponent increasing knowledge in a rapidly changing world.

Stark (1998) ^[92] conceived continuous improvement as heart of quality improvement. He further regarded it as a basis of satisfaction and development.

Day (1999) ^[29] advocated continuous professional development as a necessity for all teachers to keep pace with changes and renew their knowledge and vision in accordance to new teaching.

United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (2000) ^[95] perceived continuous improvement of teachers as their professional development which keeps teachers abreast of new knowledge and practices in the field of education.

Darling-Hammond and Branford (2005) ^[26] conceived continuous improvement as a mean to achieve high quality by helping teachers to acquire mastery of subject matter and pedagogy.

Mungekar (2008) ^[71] opined continuation of learning as a driving force to upgrade skills and knowledge by keeping oneself abreast with fast changing frontiers of knowledge.

Verna (2014) ^[100] revealed that level of teacher quality depends on his wealth of experiences and competencies and these can only be achieved through continuous improvement and innovation.

Flexibility

Flexibility in learning is mutable and depends on context and purpose. It is an ability to perceive a task from different points of view, different approaches or different strategies.

Chen (2003) ^[19] defined flexibility as students with flexible access to learning experiences w.r.t; time, place, pace, learning style, content assessment and pathways.

Singham (2005) ^[90] demonstrated that people who approach new situations with flexibility acquire new knowledge quickly and efficiently and are able to learn throughout their lifetimes.

Osborne (2006) ^[75] visualized flexibility as a way by which knowledge can be acquired and transmitted.

Hattangdi and Ghosh (2008) ^[46] referred flexibility as an approach which prepares one to improve his quality of learning and thus contributing towards economy.

Australian National Professional Standards for Teachers (2011) ^[10] highlighted that complex knowledge is required by teachers at all levels of teaching experience and expertise, from novice to experienced; for raising standards, accountability and excellence in teaching.

Houston, McCune and Osborne (2012) [49] conceived flexibility as widening of participation which allow students to access education by keeping in mind locations and modes and at time help individuals to choose institutions as well as degree of individuals.

Empowerment

It is the common concept used in various research literatures like; education, sociology, psychology and many other disciplines. It means enlightenment and more awareness.

Blanchard, Carllos and Randolp (2001) [14] studied empowerment under four dimensions like; sense of component, choosing of correct option, sense of efficacy and sense of meaningfulness.

Sen and Nair (2005) [88] perceived empowerment as learning to deal with forces of oppression along with conscious efforts to enhance quality of life and become agents of their own development.

National Assessment and Accreditation Council (2006) [72] defined empowerment as quality sustenance in education which involve twin aspects; a) making students responsible to handle the power to change things or decide the course of events; b) enhancing those skills which will enable them to think, act and face realities.

Chen (2011) [20] defined empowerment as that process which improves one’s self confidence and overcome sense of helplessness and disabilities.

Sivanesan and Sylvester (2015) [91] conceived employee’s empowerment in terms of; employee satisfaction, increased productivity and increased customer satisfaction. They further suggested that employment increase responsibility by employees building their morale and side-by-side improving their quality of work life.

Statement of the Problem

The title for the present problem is precisely stated as; Quality of Life Long Learning: Its Structure and Line of Action: A Study of In-Service Teachers

Objectives

- To work out gender differences among in-service teachers on six indicators of QLLL viz; creative aspect, personalization as self-regulated skill, adaptation, continuous professional improvement, flexibility and empowerment.
- To identify differences on the basis of marital status among in-service teachers on six indicators of QLLL viz; creative aspect, personalization as self-regulated skills, adaptation, continuous professional improvement, flexibility and empowerment.

Hypotheses

1. No significant differences will be observed among male and female in-service teachers on six indicators of QLLL viz; creative aspect, personalization as self-regulated skill, adaptation, continuous professional improvement, flexibility and empowerment.
2. No significant differences will be visualized between married and unmarried in-service teachers on six indicators of QLLL viz; creative aspect, personalization as self-regulated skills, adaptation, continuous professional improvement, flexibility and empowerment.

Design of the Study

The present study was conducted as per requirement of factorial design in which the effect of gender and marital status as independent variables varies at two levels (S1 and S2) and (M and U) were studied on dependent variable; the six indicators of Quality of LifeLong Learning viz; creative aspect, personalization as self-regulated skill, adaptation, continuous professional improvement, flexibility and empowerment.

Statistical Techniques Used

t-ratios and Analysis of Variance as statistical tools were employed for testing the hypotheses.

Questionnaire as a Tool

To measure Quality of LifeLong Learning of teachers a self-made questionnaire was developed which consisted of 3 parts namely: Section-A is pertained to Background Variables. It includes name, gender (male or female), address, education and qualification and marital status (married or unmarried); section-B consisted of thirty statements concentrating on; individual differences, greater awareness, willingness to try new things, new ways to think and perform and divergent ways of doing things, positive effect and variation in teachers’ lifelong learning by influencing his/her sociability, satisfaction, trustworthiness by understanding the content and appreciating its value by applying it in their lives inside and outside the educational institutions, updating of one’s knowledge, adopting different strategies such as; group discussion, freedom in thinking, combination of past, present and future forms of work, diversity and radical professional transition, capacities and skills by gaining self-confidence, meaningful participation at work and decision making process.

Methodology and Results

The statistical analysis pertaining to the main effects of S and M.S for creative aspect are given below:

Table 1: Summary Table of ANOVA for Main Effects of S and M Son Creative Aspect

Source of Variation	Symbol	Sum of squares	df	Mean Squares	F-value	Level of Sig.
Gender	S	241.203	1	241.203	13.090	0.01
Marital Status	M.S	0.403	1	0.403	0.022	-

The above table reveals that main effect of gender is statistically significant at 0.01 level whereas for marital status it is not significant even at 0.05 level. This reflects homogeneity in groups, whether married or unmarried. As

ANOVA confirms significant differences between in-service teachers on the basis of gender so, it is considered necessary to analyze them further by finding their t-ratios.

Table 2: t-ratio For Variable of Gender (S)

Levels	Symbol	N	Mean	SD	SE _M	Treatment Level	t-ratio	Level of sig.
Female	S1	152	16.21	4.736	0.387	S1-S2	3.491**	0.01
Male	S2	140	18.00	4.142	0.338			

** Significant at 0.01 Level of Confidence

To examine the differences between male and female in-service teachers, t-test is implied. The t-ratio for treatment level (S1-S2) is 3.491, which is significant at 0.01 level.

Thus, it can be inferred that male teachers (M=18.00) have scored significantly higher on creative aspect of QLLL as compared to female in-service teachers (M=16.21).

Table 3: Summary Table of ANOVA for Main Effects of S and M Son Personalization as Self-Regulated Skill

Symbol	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	Level of Sig.
S	1306.253	1	1306.253	65.474	0.01
M.S.	32.013	1	32.013	1.605	-

The above table reveals that main effect of gender is statistically significant at 0.01 level whereas those of marital status is insignificant even at 0.05 level. Since F-value for

gender (S) is significant, it is considered necessary to analyze it further to study the direction of variance; hence t-ratio is calculated.

Table 4: t- ratio for Variable of Gender (S)

Symbol	N	Mean	SD	SE _M	Treatment Level	t-ratio	Level of Sig.
S1	152	15.86	4.926	0.402	S1-S2	7.767**	0.01
S2	140	20.03	4.363	0.356			

** Significant at 0.01 Level of Confidence

The observation of means for gender given in table- 4 shows that mean of S2 (20.03) is higher than mean of S1 (M=15.86). This is further confirmed by finding t-ratio for the difference between the means of S1-S2, which is

significant at 0.01 level. Thus, it can be inferred that male teachers have scored significantly higher on personalization of QLLL as compared to female in-service teachers.

Table 5: Summary Table of ANOVA for Main Effects of S, F and M.S on Adaptation

Symbol	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	Level of Sig.
S	268.853	1	268.853	10.929	0.01
M.S.	19.253	1	19.253	0.783	-

** Significant at 0.01 Level of Confidence

The perusal of above table indicates that main effect of S is significant at 0.01 level whereas those for M.S is not significant even at 0.05 level. Since, F-value for gender is

significant, it is considered necessary to analyze it further by applying t-test.

Table 6: t- ratio for Variable of Gender (S)

Symbol	N	Mean	SD	SE _M	Treatment Level	t-ratio	Level of Sig.
S1	152	16.19	5.309	0.433	S1-S2	3.247**	0.01
S2	140	18.09	4.777	0.390			

** Significant at 0.01 Level of Confidence

The observation of means for different levels of gender indicates that mean of male teachers (M=18.09) is higher

than the female teachers (M=16.19); which shows significant differences between male and female in-service teachers.

Table 7: Summary Table of ANOVA for Main Effects of S and M S on Continuous Professional Improvement

Symbol	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value	Level of Sig.
S	466.253	1	466.253	17.985	0.01
M.S.	18.253	1	18.253	4.704	0.05

The perusal of table-7 reveals that main effects of gender and marital status are significant at 0.01 and 0.05 level respectively. This confirms that there are differences among male and female; married and unmarried in-service teachers

regarding their perceptions on continuous professional improvement. Since, F-values for S and M.S are significant, it is considered necessary to analyze them further by finding out their t-ratios.

Table 8: t- ratio for Variable of Gender (S)

Symbol	N	M	SD	SE _M	Treatment Level	t-ratio	Level of Sig.
S1	152	15.55	5.094	0.416	S1-S2	4.227**	0.01
S2	140	18.08	5.122	0.418			

** Significant at 0.01 Level of Confidence

The observation of means for two levels of gender shows that mean of S2 (18.08) is higher than mean of S1 (15.55). This is further confirmed by significant t-ratio (4.227) for differences between the means of S1-S2 level, significant at

0.01 level. Thus, it can be inferred that male teachers have scored significantly higher on continuous professional improvement than female in-service teachers.

Table 9: t- ratio for Variable of Marital Status (M.S)

Symbol	N	M	SD	SE _M	Treatment Level	t-ratio	Level of Sig.
M	147	17.05	5.375	0.641	M-U	4.813**	0.01
U	145	16.55	5.129	0.318			

** Significant at 0.01 Level of Confidence

The significant t-ratio for the differences between the means of treatment levels M-U reveals that married teachers have

scored significantly higher on continuous professional improvement than unmarried in-service teachers.

Table 10: Summary Table of ANOVA for Main Effects of S and M.S on Flexibility

Symbol	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-value	Level of Sig.
S	678.003	1	678.003	30.300	0.01
M.S	10.830	1	10.830	7.484	0.01

The above table reveals that F-values for gender and marital status are significant at 0.01 level. Since F-values for S and

M.S are significant, it was considered necessary to analyze them further by applying t-test.

Table 11: t- ratio for Variable of Gender (S)

Status	N	Mean	SD	SE _M	Treatment Level	t-ratio	Level of Sig.
S1	152	15.32	4.894	0.400	S1-S2	5.516**	0.01
S2	140	18.33	4.540	0.371			

** Significant at 0.01 Level of Confidence

The observation of means for two levels of gender in above table shows that mean of S2 (M=18.33) is higher than mean of S1 (M=15.32). Further significant t-ratio for difference in

the means of treatment levels S1-S2 reveals that male teachers have scored significantly higher on flexibility than female in-service teachers.

Table 12: t- ratio for Variable of Marital Status (M.S)

Symbol	N	M	SD	SE _M	Treatment Level	t-ratio	Level of Sig.
M	147	17.01	4.797	0.392	M-U	2.665**	0.01
U	145	16.63	5.102	0.417			

** Significant at 0.01 Level of Confidence

The observation of means for two levels of marital status shows that mean of married teachers (M=17.01) is higher than mean of unmarried teachers (M=16.63). This is further confirmed by finding t-ratio for M-U, which is significant at

0.01 level. The significant t-ratio (2.665) for differences between means of two groups (M-U) shows that married teachers have scored significantly higher on flexibility than unmarried in-service teachers.

Table 13: Summary Table of ANOVA for Main Effects of S and M.S on Empowerment

Symbol	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-value	Level of Sig.
S	496.653	1	496.653	22.630	0.01
M.S.	1.920	1	1.920	0.087	-

The table- 13 reveals that F-values for gender is 22.630 significant at 0.01 level. Further, F-value for marital status is 0.087, which is insignificant even at 0.05 level. To

distinguish in-service teachers from one another for different levels of gender; t-test was applied.

Table 14: t- ratio for Variable of Gender (S)

Symbol	N	Mean	SD	SE _M	Treatment Level	t-ratio	Level of Sig.
S1	152	16.17	4.980	0.407	S1-S2	4.564**	0.01
S2	140	18.74	4.785	0.391			

** Significant at 0.01 Level of Confidence

The above table shows t-ratio indicating differences in mean between S1-S2, is 4.564, significant at 0.01 level. Further, mean of S2 (M= 18.74) is higher than the mean of S1 (M=16.17). Thus, it can be inferred that male teachers have scored significantly higher on empowerment than female teachers.

interpreted differently by male and female teachers. It produces significant differences on all the six indicators of quality of lifelong learning, viz; creative aspect, personalization as self-regulated skill, adaptation, continuous professional improvement, flexibility and empowerment for in-service teachers. The findings of the present study get support with the findings of Lau and Li (1996) ^[59]; who found that boys are more creative than girls. The findings are also supported by research findings of Matheson and Rosen (2012) ^[66]; who found that women professors lag behind because of imbalance between personal and work life. The

Conclusion

The study reports significant differences in in-service teachers' quality of lifelong learning on the basis of gender which led us to conclude that quality of lifelong learning are

findings of the study at hand are in agreement with the research findings of Jeong (2007) ^[51]; who found that male teachers are more empowered than females because of their frequent discussion on subjects which demands intellectual indepth and openness. On the other hand, marital status wise there exists differences among in-service teachers on two indicators of quality of lifelong learning viz; continuous professional improvement and flexibility for in-service teachers. These findings are in agreement with the research findings of Antikainen (2001) ^[6] who conducted research in Finland and found that participation in learning varies with marital status and type of family and differences in marital status may be due to uneven participation of married and unmarried people in learning activities. These results are in contrast with the research findings of Thomas, Raynor and Al-Marzooqi (2012) ^[93] who conducted research in United Arab Emirates to determine effect of marital status and gender on undergraduate learning performance and revealed that marital status did not attribute towards the quality of learning performance and reading but it help spouses to assume additional responsibilities by being focused and propelling towards time management skill.

Taken together, the findings strongly highlight the need of regular assessment of gender and marital status of teachers in relation to quality of lifelong indicators and design effective strategies and improvement methodologies for them.

References

- Hadi Ab, MY b, Yunos JM, Kaprawi N. Readiness for life long and computer literacy among students in technical institutes in Malaysia. *Asian Social Science*, 2009; 5(3):77-83. Retrieved from J-Gate database.
- Adebile JA, Adeyemi BA. Enhancing quality assurance through teachers' effectiveness. *Educational Research and Review*, Retrieved on August, 10, 2009 from. 2008; 3(2):61-65. www.academicjournals.org/ERR.
- Al-Hattami AA, Muammar OM, Elmahdi IA. The need for professional training programs to improve faculty members teaching skills. *European Journal of Research on Education*, 2013; 1(2):39-45. Available Online at <http://iassr.org/journal>.
- Al-Shalabi N. Empowering learners: teaching American literature by shifting the focus from the instruction paradigm to the learning paradigm. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2011; 1(9):61-64.
- Anderson J. The content and design of in-service teacher education and development. Paper presented at the National Teacher Education Policy Conference, Midrand, 2001.
- Antikainen A. Is lifelong learning becoming a reality? The case of Finland from a comparative perspective. *European Journal of Education*, 2001; 36(3):379-394. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1503840>
- Aspin DN, Chapman JD. Lifelong learning: concepts, theories and values. *Proceedings of the 31st Annual Conference of SCUTREA: The Standing Conference on University Teaching and Research in the Education of Adults*. University of East London, UK, 2001, 38-41.
- Astin A. *What Matters in College: Four Critical Years Revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1993.
- Australian Universities Quality Agency. *Proceedings of the Australian Universities Quality Forum, 2005 Engaging communities*. Retrieved on Dec., 15, 2009, from <http://www.auqa.edu.au>.
- Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership Limited. *National Professional Standards for Teachers*. Retrieved on 2011 from. http://www.aitsl.edu.au/verve/_resources/AITSL_National_Professional_Standards_for_Teachers.pdf
- Aypay A. The adaptation of the teaching-learning conceptions questionnaire and its relationships with epistemological beliefs. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 2011; 11(1):21-29. Retrieved from ERIC database (EJ919887).
- Bentley T, Miller R. *Personalisation: Creating the Ingredients for Systematic and Society-wide Change*. A paper presented in personalised learning conference, London, 2004.
- Birenbaum M, Rosenau S. Assessment preferences, learning orientations, learning strategies of pre-service and in-service teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 2006; 32(2):213-225.
- Blanchard K, Carllos JP, Randolp A. *Empowerment Tales More Than a Minute*. San Francisco Barrett-Krothler Publishers Inc, 2001.
- Boden M. *The Creative Mind: Myths and Mechanisms*. Basic Books, New York. (Precis, with peer reviews, in *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 1990; 17:3.
- Boulton-Lewis GM, Wilss W, Mutch S. Teachers as adult learners: Their knowledge of their own learning and implication for teaching. *Higher Education*, 1996; 32(1):89-106.
- Brewer MB, Chen Y. Where (Who) are collectives in collectivism? Toward conceptual clarification of individualism and collectivism. *Psychological Review*, 2007; 114(1):133-151.
- Cheng YC. Profiles of organizational culture and effective schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 1993; 4(2):85-110.
- Chen DT. Uncovering the provisos behind flexible learning. *Educational Technology and Society*, 2003; 6(2): 25-30.
- Chen KP. A Study on the Impact of Empowerment on Employee Performance in the Automotive Industry in Malaysia. An unpublished M. A. Thesis, 2011. Open University, Malaysia. Retrieved on April 14, 2013 from: http://eprints.oum.edu.my/671/1/study_kok.pdf.
- Chitpin S, Evers CW. The role of professional portfolios for teachers: Challenges of developing professional knowledge, honing professional practice and managing teacher identities. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 2005; 39(2):79-82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2011.562863>.
- Chugunova S, Voronchenko T. Developing the conception of the lifelong learning in the academic discourse of Russia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 2013; 89:125-128. Doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.08.820.
- Clarke D, Hollingsworth H. Elaborating a model of teacher professional growth. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2002; 18:947-967.
- Cohen DK. Teacher quality: An American educational dilemma. In M.M. Kennedy (Ed.), *Teacher Assessment and the Quest for Teacher Quality*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2010.
- Craig C. Reflective practice in the professions: Teaching. In N. Lyons (Ed.), *Handbook of Reflection and Reflective Practice: Mapping a Way of Knowing for*

- Professional Reflective Inquiry. New York, NY: Springer, 2010, 189-214.
26. Darling-Hammond L, Branford J. Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and be able to do? San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
 27. Darling-Hammond L, Haselkorn D. Reforming Teaching: Are we missing the boat? Education Week, 2009; 30:36. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2009/04/01/27hammond.h28.html>.
 28. Daronkolaee MA, Esmaeili MR, Nikaeen Z. The relationship between dimensions of empowerment and performance of physical education teachers of the city of Tehran. *Annals of Biological Research*, 2014; 5(1):148-154. Retrieved on December 12, 2014 from <http://scholarsresearchlibrary.com/archive.html>.
 29. Day C. *Developing Teachers: The Challenges of Lifelong Learning*. New York: Routledge Falmer, Taylor & Francis Group, 1999.
 30. Delmore K, Shaker E. Management of quality in higher education. *University News*, 2002; 48(18):17-20.
 31. Duffy GG, Miller SD, Kear KA, Parsons SA, Davis SG, Williams JB. Teachers' instructional adaptations during literacy instruction. In Y. Kim, V. J. Risko, D. L. Compton, D. K. Dickinson, M. K. Hundley, R. T. Jimenez, K. M. Leander, & D. W. Rowe (Eds.), *57th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference*, 2008; 160-171. Oak Creek, WI: National Reading Conference.
 32. Duxbury L, Dyke L, Lam N. *Career Development in the Federal Career Service: Building a World-Class Work Force*. Ottawa, Canada: Treasury board of Canada Secretariat, 1999.
 33. Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency P9 Eurydice. *Gender Differences in Educational Outcomes: Study on the Measures Taken and the Current Situations in Europe*. Brussels: EACEA P9 Eurydice, 2009. Retrieved on April 12, 2013 from <http://www.eurydice.org>. Doi: 10.2797/3598.
 34. EFA Global Monitoring Report. *Teaching and Learning: Achieving quality for all*. Education for all, Summary, 2013-2014.
 35. Eliasa EI. Counsellor roles on students' lifelong learning understanding, (A psychological study based on ecological system theory). *Procedia- Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 2012; 46:5703-5706. Retrieved from the J-Gate database.
 36. European Commission. *Science Education Now: A renewed pedagogy for the Future of Europe*. Report by a High Level Group on Science Education. Brussels: EC, 2007.
 37. Ferret AJ, Smith JJ. Literacy skills in music class: Tool for pre-service teacher growth. *Visions of Research in Music Education*, 2010; 15. Retrieved on June, 25, 2013 from <http://www--usr.rider.edu/~vrme/>.
 38. Florida R. *The Rise of the Creative Class: How it's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*. New York: Basic Books, 2002.
 39. Gimeno A, Seiz R, de Siqueira JM, Martinez A. Content and language integrated learning in higher technical education using the inGenio online multimedia authoring tool. *Procedia- Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 2010; 2(2):3170-3174. Retrieved from J-Gate database.
 40. Glastra FJ, Hake B, Schedler PE. Lifelong learning as transitional learning. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 2004; 54(4):291-307.
 41. Goel DR, Goel C. Teacher education scenario in India: Current problems and concerns. *MIER Journal of Educational Studies, Trends and Practices*, 2012; 2(2):231-242.
 42. Gosper M, McNeill M, Phillips R, Preston G, Woo K, Green D. Web-based lecture technologies and learning and teaching: a study of change in four Australian universities. *ALT-J, Research in Learning Technology*, 2010; 18(3):251-263.
 43. Gronroos C. A service quality model and its marketing implications. *European Journal of Marketing*, 1984; 18(4):36-44.
 44. Grossman P. Why models matter: An alternate view on professional growth in teaching. *Review of Educational Research*, 1991; 6:171-180.
 45. Guellec D. L'émergence d'une économie fondée sur le savoir. In J.P. Touffut (ed.), *Institutions et innovation. De la recherche aux systèmes sociaux d'innovation*, Éditions Albin Michel, Paris, 2002.
 46. Hattangdi A, Ghosh A. Enhancing the quality and accessibility of higher education through the use of information and communication technology. *Quality Assurance in Education and Training*, 2008; 5(1):1-14.
 47. Hanushek EA. Some findings from an independent investigation of the Tennessee STAR experiment and from other investigations of class size effects. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 1999; 21(2):143-163.
 48. Harvey L, Green D. Defining quality. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1993; 18(1):9-34.
 49. Houston M., McCune V, Osborne M. *Flexible Learning and its Contribution to Widening Participation: A Synthesis of Research*, 2012. Evidence Net, Available at www.heacademy.ac.uk/evidencenet.
 50. Jarvis P. *Paradoxes of Learning: On Becoming and Individual in Society*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1992.
 51. Jeong EO. Empowerment of Korean women from a feminist perspective: A postmodern hermeneutical study, PhD Thesis, University of Pretoria, 2007. viewed <<http://hdl.handle.net/2263/30306>>
 52. Johnston R. Beyond flexibility: issues and implications for higher education. *Higher Education Review*, 1999; 32:55-68.
 53. Kaur K. Study of women empowerment in Kashmir in relation to social freedom. *Educationia Confab*, 2013; 2(9):6-14.
 54. Khany R, Boghayeri M. How creative are Iranian EFL teachers? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 2014; 39(10). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2014v39n10.2>
 55. Keung Ho K, Hung Yip K. Lifelong professional development of teachers: a suggestion for the overhaul of INSET. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 2003; 22 (5): 533-541. Doi: 10.1080/0260137032000081511.
 56. Koroscik JS. Novice-Expert Differences in Understanding and Misunderstanding Art and Their Implications for Student Assessment in Art Education. Paper presented at the American educational research association, Boston, 1990.

57. Lake JA. *Lifelong Learning Skills*. Ontario: Pembroke publishers, 1997.
58. Larrivee B. Transforming teaching practice: Becoming the critically reflective teacher. *Reflective Practice*, 2000; 1(3): 293–307. Doi: 10.1080/14623940020025561.
59. Lau S, Li WL. Peer status and perceived creativity: Are popular children viewed by peers and teachers as creative. *Creativity Research Journal*, 1996; 9(4):347–352.
60. Lee J, Zhang Z, Song H, Huang X. Effects of epistemological and pedagogical beliefs on the instructional practices of teachers: A Chinese perspective. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 2013 38(12). Retrieved on March 22, 2014 from <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol38/iss12/8>
61. Lekoko R, Medise O. An insight into an African perspective on lifelong learning: Towards promoting functional compensatory programmes. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 2011; 30(1): 5-17. Retrieved from the ERIC database (EJ913444).
62. Lessing A, De Witt M. The value of continuous professional development: Teacher perceptions. *South African Journal of Education*, 2007; 27(1): 53-67.
63. Livingstone DW. *The Education-Jobs Gap: Underemployment or Economic Democracy*. Boulder, Westview Press, 1998.
64. Lomax P. *Quality Management in Education: Sustaining the Vision through Action Research*. London: Routledge, 1996.
65. Martindale C. Biological Bases of Creativity. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Creativity*; 1999: 137-152. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
66. Matheson JL, Rosen KH. Marriage and family therapy faculty members' balance of work and personal life. *Journal of Marriage and Family Therapy*, 2012; 38(2): 394-416.
67. McNair TB. Seeking High-Quality, High-Impact Learning: The Imperative of Faculty Development and Curricular Intentionality, 2012. Association of American colleges and Universities, 14(3).
68. Meerah TSM, Lian DKC, Osman K, Zakaria E, Iksan, ZH, Soh, TMT. Measuring life-long learning in the Malaysian institute of higher learning context. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2011; 18: 560-564. Retrieved from J-Gate database.
69. Mills HR. *Teaching and Training: A Handbook for Instructors*. London: Macmillan Publishers, 1991. <http://www.ejinst.com>.
70. Mullen CA. Guest editor's introduction: a self-fashioned gallery of aesthetic practice. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 2003; 9(2): 165–181.
71. Mungekar B. Reforming and reconstructing India's Higher Education. *University News*, 2008; 46(19): 14-20.
72. National Assessment & Accreditation Council, NAAC. Awareness of quality among college students. *University News*, 2006; 46(09): 1-7.
73. Nias, J. (1989). *Primary Teachers Talking: A Study of Teaching at Work*. London: Routledge.
74. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development OECD. *Knowledge and Skills for Life: First Results from Pisa, 2000*. Paris, OECD, 2001.
75. Osborne M. Flexibility and Widening Participation. In: Osborne, M. and Young, D. (eds.) *Flexibility and Widening Participation*, 2006, Part 1. York: HEA.
76. Osiki JO. Reducing the perceived impact of mass academic failure on significant people through Multi-Behavior Techniques (MBTS). *International Journal of Emotional Psychology and Sport Ethics*, 2008; 10: 132–155.
77. Oslo Manual. Guidelines for Collecting and Interpreting Innovation Data, Third Edition. A joint publication of OECD and Eurostat, OECD; Frascati Manual, 2005.
78. Pajares MF. Teachers' beliefs and education research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Education Research*, 1992; 62: 307-332.
79. Pan DY. Lifelong learning: the whole DAMN (Desire, Ability, Means and Need) cycle- A Singapore perspective. *Lifelong Learning: Policies, Practices and Programs*, Retrieved from ERIC Database (ED 411877), 1997; 21.
80. Rana N. Role of ICT in lifelong learning. *Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, Retrieved from J-Gate database. 2012; 2(8).
81. Reilly RC, Lilly F, Bramwell G, Kronish, NA synthesis of research concerning creative teachers in a Canadian context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2011; 27:533-542. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.10.007>.
82. Report of Learning Working Group. About Learning. Accessed on 2009 from www.demos.org.
83. Rogoff B. *Apprenticeship in Thinking: Cognitive Development in Social Context*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
84. Saribas D. Investigating the relationship between pre-service teachers; scientific literacy, environmental literacy and life-long learning tendency. *Science Education International*, 2015; 26(1):80-100.
85. Sashkin M, Kiser KJ. Creating and Supporting a TQM Culture. In *Putting Total Quality Management to Work*. San Francisco: Berrertt- Koehler, 1993; 117-147.
86. Scala M. Going back to school: Participation motives and experiences of older adults in an undergraduate classroom. *Educational Gerontology*, 1996; 22(8):747-760.
87. Schellenkens A, Pass F, Jerong JG, Merriemborg V. Flexibility in higher professional education: A survey in business administration programmes in the Netherlands. *Higher Education*, 2003; 45:281-305.
88. Sen S, Nair, PM. *Trafficking in Women and Children in India*. Orient Longman, New Delhi, 2005.
89. Shoulders CD, Hicks SA. ADEPT learning cycles Enhance intermediate accounting student learning success. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 2008; 23(2):161-182.
90. Singham M. *The Achievement Gap in US Education: Canaries in the Mine*, Rowman and Littlefield education, 2005.
91. Sivanesan G, Sylvester CMJ. A study on employee empowerment and job Satisfaction in Chennai micro print private limited, Chennai. *International Journal of Management*, 2015; 6(1): 609-617. IAEME: <http://www.iaeme.com/IJM.asp>
92. Stark J. A Few words about –TQM. Retrieved on August 1998, 12, 2010 from <http://www.johnstark.com/fwtqm.htm>.
93. Thomas J, Raynor M, Al-Marzooqi A. Marital status and gender as predictors of undergraduate academic

- performance: a United Arab Emirates context. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives*, 2012; 9(2). <http://lthe.zu.ac.ae> page 1.
94. Uhlenbeck AM, Verloop N, Beijgaard D. Requirements for an assessment procedure for beginning teachers: Implications from recent theories on teaching and assessment. *Teachers College Record*, 2002; 104(2):242-272.
95. UNICEF. *Defining Quality*. A paper presented at the International working Group on Education meeting, Florence Italy by Jeanette Colby, 2000.
96. UNESCO. *EFA Global Monitoring Report: The Quality Imperative*. Paris, France: UNESCO, 2004.
97. Varnecky JH. Learning for life transitions. *Journal of Adult Education*, Retrieved from ERIC database (EJ997568), 2012; 41(2):1-11.
98. Vaughn M. Adaptive teaching: reflective practice of two elementary teachers' visions and adaptations during literacy instruction. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 2014; 1-18. Doi: 10.1080/14623943.2014.944143.
99. Vescio V, Ross D, Adams A. A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2008; 24:80-91.
100. Verna I. Continuous improvement in the university teaching: The TEM model. *European Scientific Journal*, 2014; 1:480-505.
101. Williams TL, Baumann, JF. Contemporary research on effective elementary literacy teachers. In Y. Kim, V. J. Risko, D. L. Compton, D. K. Dickinson, M. K. Hundley, R. T. Jimenez, K. M. Leander, & D. W. Rowe (Eds.), *57th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference*. Oak Creek, WI: National Reading Conference, 2008, 357-372.
102. Wolf A, Jenkins A, Vignoles A. Certifying the workforce: Economic imperative or failed social policy? *Journal of Education Policy*, 2006; 21(5):535-565.