SUMMARY

Abbreviations Used: LLL- Life Long Learning; QLLL- Quality of LifeLong Learning; R.I- Reading Interest

Despite empirical support from related literature, the present study was conducted to measure teachers’ quality of lifelong learning and reading interest for in-service and pre-service teachers. Many of the previous studies undertaken, explore and measure only one or single aspect of QLLL (Meerah et al 2011; Eliasa 2012; Chugunova and Voronchenko 2013; Lee, Zhang, Song and Huang 2013; Daronkolaee, Esmaeili and Nikaeen 2014) and R.I (Ainley, Hidi and Berndorff 2002; Hidi and Renninger 2006; Kirby, Ball, Geier, Parrila and Wade-Woolley 2011; Schroeder 2013). Going through these reviews, the present study address the problem by understanding and connecting QLLL and R.I with indicators which binds them. The research adopted a quantitative approach for collecting data from 32 colleges of education situated in Punjab. A self made questionnaire as tool was developed to compare 300 in-service with 300 pre-service teachers. To understand the comparison between in-service and pre-service teachers; 2 X 3 X 2 factorial design was employed where gender, faculty and marital status were taken as independent variables and quality of lifelong learning and reading interest as dependent variables. To match and identify differences between in-service and pre-service teachers, mean, standard deviation, ANOVA, t-ratios, Pearson’s product moment method were used as statistical tools to analyze the data.

In comparative part, teachers were compared on the basis of demographic variables; gender [(male and female)]; faculty to which one belongs (Humanities, Languages and Sciences) and marital status (married and unmarried). In correlation part, correlations were studied between six indicators of quality of lifelong learning and six for reading interest for the total sample of in-service; pre-service and for the total sample of teachers.

The findings emerged from this study are; male and female in-service teachers differ significantly from each other on every indicator of quality of lifelong learning whereas, pre-service teachers’ differ significantly from each other only on flexibility aspect of QLLL.
Faculty wise differences were observed among in-service teachers indicating that science teachers are qualitative wise better in their lifelong learning aspect than teachers from faculty of humanities and languages. On the other hand, insignificant differences were observed when pre-service teachers connect themselves with indicators of quality of lifelong learning viz; creative aspect, personalization as self-regulated skill, adaptation, continuous professional improvement, flexibility and empowerment and on its total score.

Explaining the differences marital status wise, the undertaken study projects that married in-service teachers differ significantly from unmarried teachers on two indicators of QLLL viz; continuous professional improvement and flexibility. It further recognized that married pre-service teachers follow significant criteria to adapt QLLL when compared with unmarried teachers.

Looking at the results obtained by reading interest, it was found that male in-service teachers’ score significantly higher on every indicator of R.I when compared with pre-service teachers. This means in-service teachers’ reading interest depends upon diversity of indicators whereas; insignificant differences were observed between male and female pre-service teachers on all the indicators of R.I viz; suitability, background knowledge, novelty, selectivity, sequence order and fluency in reading.

The results further report that faculty wise, humanities teachers prefer and appreciate sequence order and novelty in reading interest more than languages and sciences pre-service teachers. On comparison it was viewed that pre-service teachers from faculty of humanities capture their reading interest more with fluency and sequential order when compared with languages and science teachers.

Further, married in-service teachers appreciate their reading interest more with selectivity and sequence order when compared with unmarried teachers. Assessing the differences marital status wise, it was observed that no significant differences were observed on any of the six indicators of reading interest for pre-service teachers.

The study also exhibit positive and significant correlation between different indicators of QLLL and R.I for total sample for in-service; pre-service and for both of them.