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In this Chapter, the conclusion of the results of the study discussed in the preceding chapter had been drawn hypothesis-wise. The policy implications and certain recommendations for further research had also been described.

The current study was undertaken with a view to exploring the attitudes of the postgraduate students studying in the Manipur University towards Lifelong Learning. Altogether 1245 (male 557 and female 668) students selected out of a total population of 2131 students through the cluster sampling were involved in the study as sample. The Lifelong Learning Questionnaire developed by John R. Kirby, Christopher Knapper, Patrick Lemon and William J. Egnatoff (2010) was employed for collection of data. The questionnaire consists of 14 items under five dimensions, such as Goal Setting (5 items), Application of Knowledge and Skills (3 items), Self-direction and Evaluation (2 items), Locating Information (1 item) and Adaptable Learning Strategies (3 items). Internal consistency (Cronbach alpha) was 0.71 and reports to have a moderate level of reliability.

Statistical tools viz., mean, standard deviation, t-test and f-test were employed to test the hypotheses framed for the present study.

Next section deals with the discussion of the findings of the current study.
In the present section, hypothesis-wise conclusions had been drawn and discussed:

_Hypothesis 1: The global attitude of postgraduate students of Manipur towards Lifelong Learning is favourable._

The global attitude of postgraduate students of Manipur (n=1245) towards Lifelong Learning was found to be neutral with mean=3.0811 and standard deviation=1.3582. It may, therefore, be inferred that the attitude of the postgraduate students was neither favourable nor unfavourable towards Lifelong Learning.

As reported by Kirby _et al._ (2010) and Holdon (2010), positive attitudes towards Lifelong Learning were found from the studies on the US post-secondary students and university students respectively. In another research study conducted by Meerah _et al._ (2012), unfavourable global attitude was recorded among the Malaysian postgraduate students. Thus, the neutral finding of the current study was inconsistent with that of Kirby _et al._ (2010), Holdon (2010) and Meerah _et al._ (2012).
Hypothesis 2: The global attitude of postgraduate students towards Goal Setting is favourable.

The overall goal setting among the postgraduate students were found to be neutral (n=1245, mean=3.13, and σ=1.30). Three items under goal setting i.e., items L1, L6, and L9 (mean=3.08, σ=1.36; mean=3.10, σ=1.38; and mean=3.17, σ=1.29 respectively) were also reported to be neutral except for item L7 (mean=2.70 and σ=1.22) which reported unfavourableness and item L14 (mean=3.63, and σ=1.26) which reported favourable attitude.

It may be deduced that the attitude of the postgraduate students was neither favourable nor unfavourable towards Goal Setting.

Hypothesis 3: The global attitude of postgraduate students towards Application of Knowledge and Skills is favourable.

The overall Application of Knowledge and Skills among the postgraduate students was found to be unfavourable (n=1245, mean=2.26, and σ=0.79). Three items under Application of Knowledge and Skills, i.e., items L5, L10, and L12 (mean=2.44, σ=0.79; mean=1.95, σ=0.79; and mean=2.29, σ=0.80 respectively) were also reported to be unfavourable.

It may be construed that the attitude of the postgraduate students was unfavourable towards Application of Knowledge and Skills.
Hypothesis 4: The global attitude of postgraduate students towards Self-direction and Evaluation is favourable.

The overall Self-direction and Evaluation among the postgraduate students were found to be unfavourable (n=1245, mean=2.28, and σ=0.89). Item L8 (mean=2.84, σ=1.09) reported to be neutral whereas item L13 (mean=1.73, σ=0.70) reported to be unfavourable.

It may be figured out that the attitude of the postgraduate students were unfavourable towards Self-direction and Evaluation.

Hypothesis 5: The global attitude of postgraduate students towards Locating Information is favourable.

Postgraduate students (n=1245) on Item L11 under the dimension ‘Locating Information’ reported undecided or neutral attitude with mean=3.11 and σ=1.03.

It may be construed that the attitude of the postgraduate students were unfavourable towards Locating Information.

Hypothesis 6: The global attitude of postgraduate students towards Adaptable Learning Strategies is favourable.

Neutral attitudes were reported for items L3 and L4 (mean=2.66, σ=0.86 and mean=3.49, σ=1.02 respectively). Item L2 was found to be unfavourable among postgraduate students (mean=2.50, σ=1.11). Overall,
the Adaptable Learning Strategies was found to be unfavourable (mean=2.88, σ=0.99).

It may be speculated that the attitude of the postgraduate students were unfavourable towards Adaptable Learning Strategies.

**Hypothesis 7: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Lifelong Learning according to the sex of the students.**

The mean score between male (n=557, mean=3.13 and σ=1.35) and female (n=688, mean=3.04 and σ=1.36) was found to be neutral i.e. neither agree nor disagree regarding their inclination towards Lifelong Learning. Again, t-test was applied to test whether there was variation among the sex and was found to be statistically insignificant at $p \leq 0.05$ with $t$-value=1.209 (calculated $p$-value=0.842).

It is concluded that there is no divergence among the sexes with respect to the attitude of postgraduate students towards Lifelong Learning.

Similar findings were reported by studies conducted by Hojat, Veloski & Gonnella (2009) on clinicians and Arsal (2011) on fourth grade prospective teachers in the education faculty of a university located in Turkey. And, the present finding was found to be refuting with those of Meerah *et al.* (2012) on Malaysian population which reported females in better position.
Hypothesis 8: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Goal Setting according to the sex of the students.

No statistically significant differences could be found out on the items and overall Goal Setting between female and male postgraduate students at $p \leq 0.05$ level of significance.

It is concluded that there is no variation among the sexes with respect to the attitude of postgraduate students towards Goal Setting.

Hypothesis 9: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Application of Knowledge and Skills according to the sex of the students.

Difference on mean scores for item L10 was found to be statistically significant ($t$-value=-2.979, calculated $p$-value=0.008) between females ($n=688$, mean=1.89, $\sigma=0.70$) and males ($n=557$, mean=2.03, $\sigma=0.89$) at $p \leq 0.05$. However, for differences on mean scores on other two items and overall Application of Knowledge and Skills, it was statistically insignificant.

It is concluded that there is no disparity among the sexes with respect to the attitude of postgraduate students towards Application of Knowledge and Skills.
Hypothesis 10: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Self-direction and Evaluation according to the sex of the students.

Mean scores differences on items and overall Self-direction and Evaluation between female and male postgraduate students at $p \leq 0.05$ level of significance was found to be statistically not significant.

It is concluded that there is no contradiction among the sexes with respect to the attitude of postgraduate students towards Self-direction and Evaluation.

Hypothesis 11: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Locating Information according to the sex of the students.

Differences between females ($n=688$, mean=3.08, $\sigma=1.03$) and males ($n=557$, mean=3.13, $\sigma=1.03$) on Locating Information were found to be statistically not significant at $p \leq 0.05$ (t-value= -0.795, calculated p-value=0.420).

It is assumed that there is no differing among the sexes with respect to the attitude of postgraduate students towards Locating Information.

Hypothesis 12: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Adaptable Learning Strategies according to the sex of the students.

Difference on mean scores for item L4 was found to be statistically significant (t-value=3.448, calculated p-value<0.001) between females
(n=688, mean=3.58, σ=0.96) and males (n=557, mean=3.38, σ=1.08) at
p≤0.05. However, differences on mean scores on L2, L3 and overall
Adaptable Learning Strategies were statistically not significant.

It is assumed that there is no mismatched among the sexes with
respect to the attitude of postgraduate students towards Adaptable Learning
Strategies.

**Hypothesis 13: There is no significant difference in attitude towards
Lifelong Learning according to the subject of study.**

The mean scores on LLQ of the respondent were found to be neutral
for most of the subjects viz., Anthropology (mean=2.7241, σ=0.87),
Commerce (mean=2.6000, σ=0.68), Dance (mean=3.5000, σ=0.92), English
(mean=3.2500, σ=0.35), Economics (mean=3.2353, σ=0.47), Education
(mean=3.4746, σ=0.55), Geography (mean=3.1081, σ=0.72), History
(mean=2.9773, σ=0.45), Linguistics (mean=2.9672, σ=0.58), Library &
Information Science (mean=2.6207, σ=0.87), Manipuri (mean=3.2338,
σ=0.44), Mass Communication (mean=3.5000, σ=0.68), Management
Studies (mean=3.2373, σ=0.52), Philosophy (mean=2.9474, σ=0.68),
Physical Education & Sports Science (mean=3.5000, σ=1.01), and Political
Science (mean=3.3095, σ=0.44), whereas students of Adult Continuing
Education & Extension [ACEE] (mean=3.6364, σ=0.72), Chemistry
(mean=3.6038, σ=0.49), Biotechnology (mean=3.9500, σ=0.88), Earth
Science (mean=4.2105, σ=0.65), Hindi (mean=4.1842, σ=0.61), Life
Sciences (mean=3.7753, σ=0.42), Computer Sciences (mean=3.9286, σ=0.59), and Mathematics (mean=4.4706, σ=0.62) reported positive attitudes and students of Biochemistry (mean=2.1905, σ=1.01), Physics (mean=2.4287, σ=0.69) and Statistics (mean=2.2857, σ=0.89), showed negative attitude. F-test result showed that the difference on LLQ scores between postgraduate students of different subjects were found to be statistically not significant at p≤0.05 (f-value=0.792, calculated p-value=0.762). It is concluded that there is no distinction on the attitude of postgraduate students towards Lifelong Learning according to the subject of study.

It is concluded that there is no divergence in the attitude of postgraduate students towards Lifelong Learning according to the subject of study. The findings of the current study corroborates with findings by Arsal (2011).

**Hypothesis 14: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Goal Setting according to the subject of study.**

Differences on Item L1, according to subject of the respondents, were found to be statistically not significant at p≤0.05 (f-value=0.466, calculated p-value=0.990). Differences on Item L6 also showed statistically insignificant (f-value=0.711, calculated p-value=0.856) at p≤0.05. Result of f-test (f-value=0.221, calculated p-value=1.000) showed no significant difference on L7 among students of different subjects. No statistically
significant difference were reported for Item L9 (f-value=0.640, calculated p-value=0.918) according to the subjects of the postgraduate students. Difference on scores on L14 were also found to be statistically not significant at p≤0.05 (f-value=0.580, calculated p-value=0.955).

In sum, differences on all the items under Goal Setting according to the subject of study (t-value=0.523, calculated p-value=0.943) were statistically not significant at p≤0.05. It is concluded that there is no discrepancy in the attitude of postgraduate students towards Goal Setting according to the subject of study.

**Hypothesis 15: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Application of Knowledge and Skills according to the subject of study.**

There were no statistically significant difference on L5 according to subject of the postgraduate students at p≤0.05 (f-value=0.243, calculated p-value=1.000). Differences on scores of item L10 according to subject of study were also found to be statistically not significant at p≤0.05 (f-value=1.211, calculated p-value=0.214). The f-test result (f-value=0.489, calculated p-value=0.986) shows that difference on scores on L12 were also not statistically significant at p≤0.05. Overall, items under Application of Knowledge and Skills showed not significant differences according to subject of study (f-value=0.647, calculated p-value=0.733).
It is considered that there is no inconsistency in the attitude of postgraduate students towards Application of Knowledge and Skills according to the subject of study.

**Hypothesis 16: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Self-direction and Evaluation according to the subject of study.**

Mean score differences on L8 according to subject of study of the respondents were statistically insignificant at p≤0.05 (f-value=0.655, calculated p-value=0.907). Subject-wise difference on scores on L13 were also statistically insignificant at p≤0.05 (f-value=0.852, calculated p-value=0.680). Further, differences on mean scores on both the Items under Self-direction and Evaluation was found to be statistically not significant (f-value=0.753, calculated p-value=0.793).

It is considered that there is no incongruity in the attitude of postgraduate students towards Self-direction and Evaluation according to the subject of study.

**Hypothesis 17: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Locating Information according to the subject of study.**

F-test result on mean scores on item L11 between different subjects of study under Locating Information were statistically not significant at p≤0.05 (f-value=0.537, calculated p-value=0.973).
It is deliberated that there is no disputation in the attitude of postgraduate students towards Locating Information according to the subject of study.

**Hypothesis 18: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Adaptable Learning Strategies according to the subject of study.**

Mean score differences on L2 according to subject of study of the respondents were found to be statistically not significant at p≤0.05 (f-value=0.278, calculated p-value=1.000). There were no statistically significant difference on L3 according to subject of the postgraduate students at p≤0.05 (f-value=0.742, calculated p-value=0.823). The f-test result (f-value=0.693, calculated p-value=0.873) shows that difference on scores on L4 were also not statistically significant at p≤0.05.

Overall, items under Adaptable Learning Strategies showed no significant differences according to the subject of study (f-value=0.571, calculated p-value=0.898).

It is thought-out that there is no inconsistency in the attitude of postgraduate students towards Adaptable Learning Strategies according to the subject of study.
Hypothesis 19: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Lifelong Learning according to the School of Study.

F-test result showed that the difference on LLQ scores between postgraduate students of different schools of study were found to be statistically not significant at p≤0.05 (f-value=0.816, calculated p-value=0.515). We may infer that there is no distinction on the attitude of postgraduate students towards Lifelong Learning according to the school of study.

Studies by Kirby et al. (2010) on the US post-secondary students and Meerah et al. (2012) on Malaysian postgraduate students also reported similar findings.

Hypothesis 20: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Goal Setting according to the School of Study.

All the items under Goal Setting reported to be statistically not significant according different school of study at p≤0.05 (f-value=0.648, calculated p-value=0.641).

We may assume that there is no multiplicity on the attitude of postgraduate students towards Goal Setting according to the school of study.
**Hypothesis 21: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Application of Knowledge and Skills according to the School of Study.**

Statistically significant difference was observed for item L10 (f-value=2.886, p-value=0.021); whereas for other items under Application of Knowledge and Skills, it was statistically insignificant according to school of study at p≤0.05 with f-value=1.228 and calculated p-value=0.546.

We may consider that there is no variation in the attitude of postgraduate students towards Application of Knowledge and Skills according to the school of study.

**Hypothesis 22: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Self-direction and Evaluation according to the School of Study.**

No significant difference was found on mean scores of items under Self-direction and Evaluation (f-value=0.726, calculated p-value=0.581).

It is thought-out that there is no inconsistency in the attitude of postgraduate students towards Self-direction and Evaluation according to the school of study.
Hypothesis 23: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Locating Information according to the School of Study.

F-test result on mean scores on item L11 between different school of study under Locating Information was to be statistically not significant at p≤0.05 (f-value=0.590, p-value=0.670).

We may consider that there is no variation in the attitude of postgraduate students towards Self-direction and Evaluation according to the school of study.

Hypothesis 24: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Adaptable Learning Strategies according to the School of Study.

Under Adaptable Learning Strategies, differences according to school of study was found to statistically not significant for all the items viz., L2, L3 and L4 (f-value=0.165, p-value=0.956; f-value=0.992, p-value=0.411; & f-value=1.653, p-value=0.159 respectively). Overall, difference on Adaptable Learning Strategies according to School of Study was found to be statistically insignificant at p≤0.05 (f-value=0.936 and calculated p-value=0.508).

We may conclude that there is no dissimilarity in the attitude of postgraduate students towards Adaptable Learning Strategies according to the school of study.
**Hypothesis 25: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Lifelong Learning according to the area of residence.**

Students from both rural and urban areas were found to have neutral attitude towards Lifelong Learning. The t-test result shows that the difference on LLQ scores between postgraduate students according to area of residence (i.e., rural and urban) were found to be statistically not significant at p≤0.05 (t-value=0.429, calculated p-value=0.232).

We may consider that there is no variation in the attitude of postgraduate students towards Lifelong Learning according to the area of residence.

**Hypothesis 26: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Goal Setting according to the area of residence.**

Differences on Goal Setting according to area of residence was found to statistically not significant for all the items viz., L1, L6, L7, L9 and L14 (t-value=0.429, p-value=0.232; t-value=1.105, p-value=0.185; t-value=0.334, p-value=0.366; t-value=0.350, p-value=0.521; and t-value=0.227, p-value=0.399 respectively). Overall, difference on Goal Setting according to area of residence was found to be statistically insignificant at p≤0.05 (t-value=0.489 and calculated p-value=0.340).

Thus, there is no variation in the attitude of postgraduate students towards Goal Setting according to the area of residence.
Hypothesis 27: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Application of Knowledge and Skills according to the area of residence.

Statistically no significant difference was observed for items under Application of Knowledge and Skills according to area of residence at p≤0.05 with t-value= -0.621 and calculated p-value=0.485.

Thus, there is no dissimilarity in the attitude of postgraduate students towards Application of Knowledge and Skills according to the area of residence.

Hypothesis 28: There is no significant difference in attitude towards Self-direction and Evaluation according to the area of residence.

Mean scores differences on items and overall Self-direction and Evaluation students according to area of residence at p≤0.05 level of significance was found to be statistically not significant.

Thus, there is no divergence in the attitude of postgraduate students towards Self-direction and Evaluation according to the area of residence.
Hypothesis 29:  There is no significant difference in attitude towards Locating Information according to the area of residence.

Mean scores differences on item on Locating Information according to area of residence at p≤0.05 level of significance was found to be statistically not significant (t-value=0.407, calculated p-value=0.634).

It is considered that there is no changeability in the attitude of postgraduate students towards Locating Information according to the area of residence.

Hypothesis 30:  There is no significant difference in attitude towards Adaptable Learning Strategies according to the area of residence.

Under Adaptable Learning Strategies, differences according to area of residence was found to statistically not significant for all the items viz., L2, L3 and L4 (t-value= -0.244, p-value=0.162; t-value= -1.785, p-value=0.732; & t-value=0.236, p-value=0.912 respectively). Overall, difference on Adaptable Learning Strategies according to School of Study was found to be statistically insignificant at p≤0.05 (t-value= -0.597 and calculated p-value=0.602).

Thus, there is no deviation in the attitude of postgraduate students towards Adaptable Learning Strategies according to the area of residence.
Summing up, the attitude of postgraduate students of Manipur towards lifelong learning was found to be neutral; and variables, such as sex, subject of study, school of study and area of residence were not a determining factor for difference in the attitude towards lifelong learning. It has also been observed that there were no significant differences in Goal Setting, Application of Knowledge and Skills, Self-direction and Evaluation, Locating Information, and Adaptable Learning Strategies among the variables.

By way of suggestions, we need to create more conducive environment and generate awareness about the significance and importance of Lifelong Learning. Policies and programmes need to be framed, considering the needs of the learners. More avenues may be created. Various life-skill programmes should also be provided. Ordinances, Statutes and/or Acts to make Lifelong Learning mandatory need to be formulated.

It is recommended that the policy makers and programme framers should constitute an integrated system—complementary of the mutually reinforcing and of comparable standards, and they should contribute to creating and developing possibilities for Lifelong Learning. Supportive policies in the social, cultural, and economic sectors are required in order to
realize the full provision and utilization of Lifelong Learning for individual and societal improvement.

The success of Lifelong Learning depends on political commitment and political will backed by appropriate fiscal measures and reinforced by educational policy reforms and institutional strengthening. Suitable economic, trade, labour, employment and health policies will enhance learners’ incentives and contributions to societal development.

Societies should also insure a strong intellectual and scientific environment for Lifelong Learning. This implies for improving higher education and developing scientific research. Close contact with contemporary technological and scientific knowledge should be possible at every level of education.

Present system of education celebrates academic accomplishment. Cent percent emphasis is bestowed upon cognitive domain of learning. Affective and Psychomotor domains remain more or less unevaluated. Therefore, Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation (CCE) was not found to be a meaningful one. Determining to what extent individuals possess lifelong learning attitudes, competencies and eliminating the lacks in this field are considered essential for social development. Training individuals for lifelong learning could only be realized by teachers as lifelong learners. Teachers should assist students to develop habits of lifelong learning so as to enable themselves to the changes that they encounter in their lives and renew constantly. Teachers and facilitators need
to be trained, oriented and refreshed with new and innovative pedagogies so to enable them to develop in the learners the positive attitude towards learning throughout life.

Based on the outcomes of this study, it may be tentatively concluded that the postgraduate students have to be (more) aware of the coming changes and demands of their work, and the implications of that for their own development. They have to be, or get, prepared for that. This means more attention for acquiring competencies that deal with, for instance, new didactics, development and evaluation of training, entrepreneurial skills and not to forget the meta-cognitive and social communicative competencies.

Measures should be taken to encourage the public authorities, institutions or bodies engaged in education, voluntary associations, workers’ and employers’ organizations, to collaborate in the task of defining further and giving effect to the Lifelong Learning.

With regard to young people who have been unable to acquire an adequate standard of general education or a qualification, Lifelong Learning activities should, in particular, enable them to acquire additional general education with a view to developing their ability to understand the problems of society and shoulder social responsibilities, and to gaining access to the vocational training and general education which are necessary for the exercise of an occupational activity.

If people wish to acquire educational or vocational qualifications which are formally attested by certificates of education or of vocational
aptitude and which, for social or economic reasons, they have not been able to obtain earlier; Lifelong Learning should enable them to obtain the training required for the award of such certificates.

Individuals, even when very motivated to learn, find it difficult to articulate their learning plans and to elaborate and finance them, especially if they are aiming at a qualification awarded only at the end of a long study period. It is suggested that:

1. Guarantee universal access to learning for obtaining and updating skills.

Higher education institutions have a key contribution to make to the process of defining skills to be acquired. It is important that the skills are for citizenship as much as for employability. Apart from helping to define the skills to be acquired by learners, higher education institutions should assess which skills they can develop. While the institutions cannot guarantee universal access to learning, they can facilitate access, when they have the means and when they are willing to do more to draw in learners.

2. Raise investment in human resources for Lifelong Learning.

It is essential for governments to invest in training the teachers and the trainers for all stages of learning, therefore informal and non-formal as well as formal education. Government could help make teaching careers more attractive and lucrative. This would involve in addition to competitive salaries the improvement of staffing levels in some areas. The higher
education sector offers an interesting laboratory for experimentation. As
many professors approach retirement, a big turnover in teachers is foreseen.

There is an opportunity to define new teaching profiles and skills. Some people are willing to pay for learning. It is necessary to differentiate between those who have an income from a job and pay and those who cannot. It is also necessary to identify the motivated and the non-motivated learners.

Schemes to help motivate and/or fund the learner: individual learning accounts or career development loans, and incentives to learning providers in the form of special funds or fiscal deductions may have salutary effect.

3. Develop teaching and learning methods for Lifelong Learning:

Teaching in Lifelong Learning contexts has to be tied closely to research in new teaching methods. There is a great amount of experimentation, using information and communication technologies in various parts of the world in higher education institutions, sometimes to improve the on-campus learning experiences, at other times to deliver distance learning. In this context, there is evidence of efforts to develop new teaching and learning methods.

4. Improve the appreciation of learning, especially non-formal and informal.

Bridging across different sectors of formal education is not enough. Credit systems are powerful tool to improve the recognition of learning,
since credits may be transferred or accumulated. Validating prior learning is another tool to improve the recognition and appreciation of learning, but there could be confusion between accrediting prior experience and accrediting prior professional experience, as well as between validating learning with a formal qualification or through other methods. For the higher education, valuing learning is intimately linked with controlling quality.

The certification in one way or another of all knowledge and skills acquired until a certain exit-point could help reduce dropout rates and failure patterns in formal education. Such certification would also give Indian education a competitive advantage internationally.

5. Ensure access to quality information and advice about learning opportunities.

People need guidance about learning at all stages of their lives, not just on single courses, but also on possible learning combinations. The learners should receive institution-independent educational counseling, first from general structure, which could be located at local level. Transnational education, which is expanding dramatically in some disciplines and countries, should be included under the guidance structures: the student needs to know, especially if a course is accredited or not.

Second, the person should receive guidance and help to define the learning project directly from the institution of learning chosen. Careers
offices and student counselors need training to work in a more intensive
information managing and guidance context.

6. Provide Lifelong Learning opportunities as close as possible—in
their own communities, if supported by the appropriate ICT.

Citizens need learning close to them in the sense of ‘attainable’ and
in the sense of ‘relevant’. ICT as a tool can increase access by people
previously excluded from learning—provided that the digital divide
between those who have access to the equipment and those who have not is
reduced. Many higher education institutes have solid experiences of
building partnerships for regional development. Lifelong Learning can best
be delivered through partnership. They have longstanding relationships with
organizations in civil society. Upon this basis, they may participate in or
even house broadly based centers of Lifelong Learning meeting the needs
of different learners.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

The following recommendations are made to take up further research work.

Research work may be taken up in the following areas:

- Construction of a Lifelong Learning Questionnaire in an
  Indian setting may be made.
- Similar study incorporating more variables can be carried out.
- Similar studies on different levels of education can be done.
• Comparative studies within the states and among the states in the country can also be conducted.

• Comparative studies among the countries can also be conducted.

• Relationship between Lifelong Learning Attitude with IQ, EQ, Life Satisfaction, Mental Health, Resilience, Personality, etc., can be carried out.

• Lifelong Learning Attitude among exceptional children can also be studied.

• Studies on Lifelong Learning Attitude and Lifelong Learning Competencies among teachers and other professionals can be undertaken.

• Differences in Lifelong Learning Attitude between students of professional and non-professional courses can be taken up.

• Studies on Lifelong Learning Attitudes and Lifelong Learning Competencies among various occupational groups can be done.
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