

# **Teachers and Trainers in Adult Education and Lifelong Learning**

Professional Development in Asia and Europe

29-30 June 2009 in Bergisch Gladbach/Germany

**AGASTIN, B., Co author Bernice Jacinth, A.**

## **CHARACTERS OF LIFE LONG LEARNERS AND NON LIFE LONG LEARNERS AMONG TEACHERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION SECTOR IN INDIA**

Deutsches Institut für Erwachsenenbildung  
German Institute for Adult Education

URL: <http://www.die-bonn.de/asem/asem0918.pdf>

Published: 10.06.2009

State of information: June 2009

This document is published with the following [creative commons](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.0/de/) licence:



<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.0/de/>

## **Contents**

1. Introduction .....	<b>3</b>
2. RESEARCH DESIGN .....	<b>4</b>
2.1. Analysis .....	<b>5</b>
3. Conclusion .....	<b>8</b>
References .....	<b>8</b>

## 1. Introduction

Education is a liberalising force and in our age it is also a democratizing force, cutting across the barriers of caste and class, smoothing out the inequalities induced by birth and other circumstances, remarked the former Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi

While the number of our universities and the number of our students proliferate, the level of edification does not keep pace. We continue to churn out ethical illiterates and moral idiots, thus lamented Nani Palkhiwala, a former Indian ambassador to US and a constitutional expert and a barrister. Indian education continues to be value agnostic and value neutral.

Dr. Mortimer Adler, the chairman of the Board of Directors of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, said that true education can begin only after one leaves the school or college. All that a school or college can do is to arouse intellectual curiosity and prepare you for life long education later. Nani Palkhiwala said while addressing the SNTD women's university, Bombay that they should resolve to return to the people a part of the benefits they have derived.

The state funded universities, teachers and the students and in general all the beneficiaries of the state funded education should give back to the society, to generate something to be given to the society that which it would need in future, in addition to its present need. When market is introduced in field of higher education this objective of education faces a crisis. Who would create a public good by spending his personal money for receiving education. Any rational individual would try to maximize his utility function by earning sufficiently enough to keep his family happy.

What education is for?

Is it for creating private good or public good?

. Throughout the world, one purpose of education expressed in various ways, is to create social links between individuals on the basis of shared references. This process is one of continuous creation and calls for contribution from everyone. This will be possible if education has fostered in everyone the ideal, the spirit and the practice of democracy. It calls for the development of capacity in the individual to behave as a true citizen, aware of the collective interests and anxious to play a part in the democratic life. The function of the universities is not merely to send out technically skilled and professionally competent men and women but equally it is their duty to produce in them the quality of compassion the quality that enables the individuals to treat one another in a true democratic spirit, the Indian philosopher Dr. Radhakrishnan said.

Inclusive participatory democracy has to be first practiced in schools and colleges. The challenge before the country at the beginning of the twenty first century, as envisaged Dr. Abdul Kalam, the former president of India is to become a developed society by the year 2020. This requires not only the early ushering in of a vibrant, knowledge driven economy, but also the creation of a new society where justice and human values prevail.

The challenges in higher education were once nation centric. Now due to the inclusion of trade in services in world trade debate, competence is the hallmark of growth. Competency in higher education includes faculty competency, administrative service competency and quality in other miscellaneous services rendered in the process of education.

When it comes to faculty competency the life long learning character of the faculty matters. Gone are the days when somebody completed education, he or she was considered a master in the subject. Each day one has to update him or her to be retained as a faculty. The hire and fire policy will soon replace the fixity of tenure and the security till the date of retirement. There are three types of learning. The formal learning, the non-formal learning and informal learning. Only those who learn continually will be able to stand in the global market. Yes education is treated like a commodity the client satisfaction is to be aimed at.

Education is treated as a private good by some and public good by others. The consumption of any good, if it is non competitive is a public good. If there are 1000 jobs and we create 2000 educated people to compete for those jobs, then education is a private good and when we educate people to create opportunities for those 2000 and also to create opportunities for the society as a whole. The educated people will have to create value to the products or service they supply to mankind. For that the faculties must be committed to the cause of learning, they should be learning people rather than learned people.

Higher education in India is now no longer funded by the state alone. The private players in the technical and non-technical higher education have made their impact in India.

## **2. RESEARCH DESIGN**

Study Area: The state of Tamil Nadu, one of the federal states of India is the study area.

LL Learners : Those who have obtained a score of 50 and above.

Non LL Learners; Those who obtained less than 50.

Achievement Motivation: The score obtained by the validated instrument (Udai Pareek)

Sample size: The number of teachers included in the study are 100, 50 each from state funded and self funded arts and science colleges in Tamil Nadu.

Data used: Primary data

## 2.1. Analysis

TABLE (1) SHOWING LLL SCORE OF TEACHERS IN STATE FUNDED AND SELF FUNDED HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN INDIA( Tamil Nad)

	State Funded	Self Funded
Mean LLL score	51.36	57.82
Standard Deviation	18.70	12.69

The table (1) shows that the mean score of Life Learning is 51.36 among teachers in state funded institutions and it higher by nearly 6.5 in self funded institutions. Though the mean is higher among teachers in self funded institutions, the standard deviation is lower indicating that it is a more homogenous group in case of LL learning and in state funded institutions the standard deviation is high indicating that a few are have a high LLL score compared to the teachers in self funded institutions.

TABLE (2)SHOWING THE TYPE OF LEARNERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN INDIA

Type of Learners	State Funded	Self Funded	Total
LLL	25	33	58
Non LLL	25	17	42
	50	50	100

The teachers are classified based on the LLLscore as Life long learners and Non Life long learners. It is found that 58 per cent of the teachers in higher education institutions are Life long learners and 42 per cent are Non life long learners. And among teachers in state funded institutions, the Life long learners and Non Life long learners are equally distributed and in self funded institutions 66 per cent are Life long learners and 34 per cent are Non life long learners.

TABLE(3) SHOWING THE LOGIT MODEL OF CHARACTERS OF LL LEARNERS AND NON LL LEARNERS AMONG TEACHERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN INDIA

Name of the Variables	Significance level of the variable	Odds ratio
Spouse earning (no income)	0.037*	0.126
Spouse earning (1 to 15,000INR)	0.129+	0.236
Spouse earning (>15,000INR)	Reference	1
Trade Union	0.179+	0.403
State/Self	0.159+	0.363
Sex	0.397	1.174
AM (<26)	Reference	1
AM (26 and above)	0.000**	22.43

\*\* refers to very high significance \* high significance + less significance

The factors determining the Life long learners and Non Life long learners are ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION, SEX, TYPE OF FUNDING OF THE INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH THEY WORK, ACTIVE IN TRADE UNION AND SPOUSE EARNING.

The spouse earning factor has been classified into three based on the income level. The teachers with no income from spouse have nearly 87 per cent less likelihood of being life long learners, compared to the reference category of teachers who have more than 15000 INR as their spouse's monthly income. The teachers who have a monthly income upto 15000INR (approximately 230Euros) have a greater likelihood of being a life long learner by nearly 10 per cent, compared to the teachers with their spouse not having income. This may be due to the sense of security that they have and also they are capable of spending money for academic activities or atleast they are ready to forego the income that they could get from other activities other than learning. When compared to the reference category ( teachers whose spouse have greater than 15000 INR per month as income) the teachers who have a monthly income upto 15000 from their spouse have roughly 75 per cent less likelihood of being lifelong learners.

Teachers who are active in trade union activities may not have, it seems, time to be life long learners as the data reveals that people who are active in trade union activities have 60 per cent less likelihood of being life long learners, as defined by the study.

The teachers in state funded institutions have 65 per cent less likelihood of being lifelong learners. The factor sex is not a significant factor in determination of a teacher being a life long learner.

The factor achievement motivation is a very significant factor in determining a teacher to be a life long learner. Compared to the teachers who have a low score of achievement motivation ( reference category) the teachers who have a high score have 22 times higher likelihood of being a life long learner.

TABLE (4) FACTORS ADVERSELY AFFECTING CREATION OF PUBLIC GOOD BY TEACHERS IN STATE FUNDED HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN INDIA

Serial No.	Factor	Mean Score	No. of respondents Marked this factor	Rank
1	Unfair Management practice	38.17	24	6
2	No monetary incentive	68.18	40	1
3	No recognition	48.23	46	3
4	Opportunity cost of LLL high	39.06	35	5
5	Not our responsibility to create public good	39.06	18	5
6	No team work	42.76	13	4
7	Required funds not available	58.66	50	2
8	Lack of institutional infrastructure	34.71	07	7

The purpose of education is to create a public good and when higher education is subsidized the society expects the institutions to create public good and thereby maximize the welfare of the society. But there are a number of factors affecting the creation of public goods like building consumer movement, better citizens, less human rights violation, contribution to mitigate the environmental problems and the like. The other factors in the order of importance as calculated by using the Garretts Ranking Technique are required funds not available, no recognition, no team work, opportunity cost of LLL high.

The first factor that affects the creation of public good by teachers is lack of monetary incentive for the work. For example, the teachers who shoulder additional responsibilities do not get necessary compensation package, feel a few teachers.

TABLE (5) FACTORS ADVERSELY AFFECTING CREATION OF PUBLIC GOOD BY TEACHERS IN SELF FUNDED HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN INDIA

Serial No.	Factor	Mean Score	No. of respondents	Rank
1	Unfair Management practice	32.9	10	8
2	No monetary incentive	38.62	13	6
3	No recognition	36.40	10	7
4	Opportunity cost of LLL high	57.47	45	2
5	Not our responsibility to create public good	69.14	50	1
6	No team work	41.26	38	4
7	Required funds not available	40.17	46	5
8	Lack of institutional infrastructure	48.81	48	3

In contrast to the factors in the opinion of teachers which adversely affects the creation of public good, the teachers in self funded institutions feel that it is not their responsibility to create public good. This is the first important factor. The other factors in descending order of importance are opportunity cost of LLL high, lack of institutional infrastructure, no team work, required funds not available, no monetary incentive.

### **3. Conclusion**

The higher education institutions in India which are state funded have a few teachers who have high LLL score compared to self funded institutions. But the mean score of the LLL is high among teachers of self funded institutions.

The factors that determine the characters of LLLearners and Non LL Learners are Achievement motivation, spouse earning, funding pattern of the institution of work, and activeness in trade union activities.

### **References**

Latika Sharma, Teaching for Democracy: An exercise in Constructing meaning, University News, vol47, No.5, 2009

Nani A.Palkhivala, We the Nation, The lost decades, New Delhi, UBSPD.

Commission staff working paper(2000), A memorandum on Life Long learning, Brussels.