

WCLTA 2011

Assessment of music education courses of public education center in the direction of the trainees opinions in the process of lifelong learning

A. Aylin Can *, Utku Yüksel **

*Assistant Prof. Dr., Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey

**Graduate Student, Marmara University Institute of Educational Sciences Fine Arts Education Section, Istanbul, Turkey

Abstract

“LifeLong Learning” that came to the fore as an EU project in today’s information age, in the process of the emergence of new education approaches, has become an emphasized topic in the field of education. Public Education Centers that provide service oriented towards the process of Lifelong Learning become crucial in terms of their contributions to personal and social development. In this context, this study aims to analyze the opinions of the music trainees in Kadiköy Public Education Center about the programs, education and the efficiency of the courses according to educational status and age variables. In the study, solution offers have been formed about what the rearrangements may be that the change necessitates.

Keywords: Life Long Learning, Public Education Center, Music Education.

1. Introduction

In today’s society, it is seen that the flow of information has gained speed with developing technology and globalising world order. Along with the developments, education is in a continual change and development. In the light of new education paradigms, the developments in today’s education are important as different education processes are put into practice. World countries, as the result of their approach, have entered into a period that their reforms oriented towards their education system have been put into practice. Accordingly, LifeLong Learning that developed as an EU project has gained importance in person education in terms of its education oriented approaches.

LLL approach comes up as a process that takes a second change on the people who kept away from education in any period of his time. This approach has been expressed in European Commission (2000) as “*learning activities that is maintained in every moment of life and, along with knowledge and skill, that will benefit to survive in personal, social and economic life*”.

* A. Aylin Can. Tel.:+90-532-265- 45- 56
E-mail address: canaaylin@gmail.com

LLL means gaining and updating of all kinds of knowledge, skill and quality in the process from birth to death. LifeLong Learning, which goes beyond the borders of *formal* education and includes all kinds of *informal* education, enables people's adaptation to information society by creating opportunity for the development of knowledge and efficiency (Candy, 2002). Recently, it has started to be assessed as an approach model within the scope of education in Turkey, like in other countries (MOE, 2009). Turkey has entered into the process of LLL in paralel with EU membership process.

Within the scope of Globalisation- EU process and Lisbon Common Education Goals, LifeLong Learning is included in 9. Development Plan and 17. National Education Council; and, it was projected as cabinet decree that a '**LifeLong Learning Strategy Paper (LLLSP)**' will be prepared by MOE in Turkey as part of 60. Government adjustment program for EU acquis. 'MOE **Apprenticeship and Non-formal Education General Directorate (ANECD)**' has been made responsible for running the secretariat of LLL Executive Council that was projected to be established with LLLSP which was accepted with the resolution of Higher Planning Council dated 05/06/2009 and numbered 2009/21(Gönültaş, 2010). Accordingly, Public Education Centers that date back to old times in Turkey have been reformed LLL process oriented and have become one of the most important institutions serving for the process. P.E.C.s, reaching 960 in number, have gained importance in terms of providing a second education opportunity within the process. It is seen that personal education activities have gained intensity in terms of social and cultural courses given in the process of LLL. It is thought that the activities towards art education will provide gain for the process.

The aim of the art is to excite human in his *integrity*, to enable him to see his life as the same as another's life and to embrace others' lives which might be his. Art is necessary for that human can know the world and change it (Fischer, 1990). Education via art aims for conformist and balanced personalisation of humans (Bilgin, 2011).

The contribution that art education provides, in terms of personal development to the process of forming today's information society, was emphasised once more. That is why, it is thought that artistic activities made through LLL will benefit for the development of individual and the transformation of society into an information society. The place and the importance of art in the development stem from "the quality of human-art relationship" and especially "the versatile function of art in human life", in the structural integrity of human. In respect to this, artistic development should be seen as a whole with all personal-social and economic developments rather than restricting it to only cultural development (Uçan, 1994).

Music has a crucial role in the existence of individual and a strong effect on the emotions of human. (Hallam, 2001). As music education, a subbranch of art education, contributes to the intellectualisation of individual, the activities made for that purpose matters.

The rearrangement of music education as a subbranch of art education in terms of personal and social development in the process of LLL gains importance along with its activities for P.E.C.'s current status. In this direction, current situation assessment of music activities performed in P.E.C.s in the process of LLL matters. The music education in our country should be developed in a sound and planned way within the process.

When viewed from this aspect, it is thought that the assessment of the efficiencies in P.E.C. as the process of rearrangement will contribute to the process. In this study; it is aimed to reveal the current situation by considering the problem sentence 'How are the music education courses given in P.E.C. in LLL process assessed by trainees in terms of education and the efficiency of the courses?' and to reveal what the arrangements that might contribute to the change may be within LLL process.

In the study, music courses in Kadıköy Public Education Center are analysed. Current situation assessment was made according to the opinions of the trainees, educated in the center, about the efficiency of P.E.C. courses in accordance with education and age variables.

2.Method

General screening model was used in the study. Screening models are research approaches that aim to describe a situation in the past or at present as it is. Mentioned event, individual or object is tried to be described in its own

conditions. No effort is made to change or affect it in any way (Karasar, 1991, 77). Survey data results, which are prepared for the study, are analysed with SPSS for Windows 17 program. In the study, in which demographical variables are evaluated within LLL, the opinions of 89 music trainees educated in K.P.E.C. are analysed. Within the survey questions, it is analysed whether the perception of trainees about the assessment of program, education and courses in P.E.C. change according to education status and age variables. In the survey, single direction variance analysis (ANOVA) was made to determine whether the assessments change according to education status variable; and *post-hoc Scheffe* (significant difference) test was made to research in which groups there are changes.

3. Findings

Table 1: ANOVA test that is made to determine whether the perception of trainees about the assessment of program and education change according to education status variable. (N=89)

A. The Assessment of Program and Education	Education Status	n	\bar{X}	Ss	ANOVA		Significant Difference (Scheffe)
					F	P	
01. Do you think that the course you have taken has contributed to you?	Primary/ Secondary (1)	19	2,74	0,45	0,71	0,494	-
	High School (2)	40	2,58	0,50			
	University (3)	30	2,63	0,49			
02. P.E.C. do you think that music education you have taken helps in terms of realising your personal goals?	Primary/ Secondary (1)	19	2,78	0,48	4,06	0,022*	1 to 2, 3
	High School (2)	40	2,35	0,48			
	University (3)	30	2,40	0,51			
03. P.E.C. do you think that the education you have taken has contribution for personal skill acquisition?	Primary/ Secondary (1)	19	2,63	0,60	0,59	0,556	-
	High School (2)	40	2,48	0,51			
	University (3)	30	2,50	0,51			
04. P.E.C. do you think that the education you have taken contributes to your learning skill?	Primary/ Secondary (1)	19	2,58	0,51	1,75	0,180	-
	High School (2)	40	2,33	0,47			
	University (3)	30	2,43	0,50			

*Difference is significant at the level of $p < 0,05$.

In the research, it is analysed with ANOVA that there is no significant difference in the opinions of trainees about the program and education of P.E.C in accordance with education status variable and there is found out just one significant difference for one opinion (Table 12). It is found out that the education status of the trainees cause a significant difference in their assessment about the question “02. P.E.C. do you think that music education you have taken helps in terms of realising your personal goals?” ($F = 4,06$ and $p < 0,05$). According to post-hoc Scheffe test (significant difference test); trainees of Primary/ Secondary School graduate (Group 1) think more than High School and University graduates (Group 2-3) that the music courses they have taken contribute to realising their personal goals (\bar{X} Primary/ Secondary School=2,78; \bar{X} High School=2,35 and \bar{X} University=2,40).

Table 2. ANOVA test that is made to determine whether the perception of trainees about the assessment of the efficiency of courses change according to education status variable. (N=89)

B. The Assessment of the Efficiency Of P.E.C. courses	Education Status	n	\bar{X}	Ss	ANOVA		Significant Difference (Scheffe)
					F	P	
01. Do you think that the course you have taken is efficient?	Primary/ Secondary (1)	19	2,47	0,70	0,84	0,435	-
	High School (2)	40	2,43	0,55			
	University (3)	30	2,27	0,64			
02. P.E.C. do you think that the materials used in your education are deficient?	Primary/ Secondary (1)	19	1,43	0,70	7,55	0,001*	3 to 1, 2
	High School (2)	40	1,35	0,48			
	University (3)	30	2,03	0,74			
03. Do you think that the materials used in your education in P.E.C. are sufficient?	Primary/ Secondary (1)	19	2,16	0,65	6,94	0,002*	3 to 1, 2
	High School (2)	40	2,10	0,60			
	University (3)	30	1,63	0,56			
04. Do you think that the materials existing in P.E.C. are brought into use adequately?	Primary/ Secondary (1)	19	2,37	0,68	10,05	0,000**	3 to 1, 2
	High School (2)	40	2,25	0,54			
	University (3)	30	1,70	0,60			
05. Do you think that the program limit applied in P.E.C. contributes enough to the program content?	Primary/ Secondary (1)	19	2,38	0,61	4,93	0,009*	3 to 1, 2
	High School (2)	40	2,30	0,58			
	University (3)	30	1,93	0,74			
06. Do you think that course hours applied in P.E.C. contribute in a sufficient level to your education?	Primary/ Secondary (1)	19	2,84	0,38	9,01	0,000**	1 to 2, 3
	High School (2)	40	2,38	0,54			
	University (3)	30	2,10	0,76			
07. Do you think that daily course hours in P.E.C. contribute to a qualified learning?	Primary/ Secondary (1)	19	2,68	0,51	9,77	0,000**	1 to 2, 3
	High School (2)	40	1,95	0,60			
	University (3)	30	1,80	0,66			
08. Do you think that P.E.C. schedule contents contribute adequately to your education?	Primary/ Secondary (1)	19	2,68	0,58	9,47	0,000**	3 to 1, 2
	High School (2)	40	2,43	0,53			
	University (3)	30	1,87	0,62			
09. Do you think that P.E.C. building is physically qualified for education?	Primary/ Secondary (1)	19	2,26	0,73	4,91	0,010*	3 to 1, 2
	High School (2)	40	2,23	0,58			
	University (3)	30	1,80	0,61			
10. Do you think that teachers and personnel working in P.E.C. contribute enough to the education?	Primary/ Secondary (1)	19	2,74	0,45	1,10	0,338	-
	High School (2)	40	2,55	0,60			
	University (3)	30	2,50	0,57			
11. Do you think that P.E.C. is supported adequately by the units it is dependent on?	Primary/ Secondary (1)	19	2,00	0,47	1,19	0,310	-
	High School (2)	40	2,00	0,60			
	University (3)	30	1,80	0,61			

12. Do you think that P.E.C. works co-ordinated with the units it is dependent on?	Primary/ Secondary (1)	19	2,11	0,57	0,62	0,539	-
	High School (2)	40	2,00	0,64			
	University (3)	30	1,90	0,66			
13. Do you think that the size of the class in which you have been educated in P.E.C. affects the education?	Primary/ Secondary (1)	19	2,05	0,85	0,77	0,467	-
	High School (2)	40	1,88	0,76			
	University (3)	30	2,10	0,80			

Difference is significant at the level of $p < .001$ and *Difference $p < .05$

It is found out that the education status of the trainees causes a significant difference for 8 of the opinions presented for the Assessment of The Efficiency of P.E.C. Courses (Table 13):

- University graduate trainees (Group 3) think more than Primary/ Secondary School and High School graduate trainees that the materials used in their educations are deficient (\bar{X} Primary/Secondary School=1,43; \bar{X} High School=1,35 ve \bar{X} University=2,03).
- University graduate trainees (Group 3) think less than Primary/ Secondary School and High School graduate trainees that the materials used in their educations are sufficient. (\bar{X} Primary/Secondary School=2,16; \bar{X} High School=2,10 ve \bar{X} University=1,63).
- University graduate trainees (Group 3) think less than Primary/ Secondary School and High School graduate trainees that the materials used in their educations are brought into use adequately (\bar{X} Primary/ Secondary School=2,37; \bar{X} High School=2,35 and \bar{X} University=1,70).
- University graduate trainees (Group 3) think less than Primary/ Secondary School and High School graduate trainees that program limit applied in P.E.C contributes enough to the program content (\bar{X} Primary/Secondary School=2,38; \bar{X} High School=2,30 ve \bar{X} University=1,93).
- Primary/ Secondary School graduates (Group 1) think more than High School and University graduate trainees that the program applied in P.E.C. contributes enough to their education in terms of course hours (\bar{X} Primary/Secondary School =2,84; \bar{X} High School=2,38 and \bar{X} University=2,10).
- Primary/ Secondary School graduates (Group 1) think more than High School and University graduate trainees that daily course hours in P.E.C contributes to a qualified learning (\bar{X} Primary/Secondary School=2,68; \bar{X} High School=1,95 and \bar{X} University=1,80).
- University graduates (Group 3) think less than Primary/ Secondary School and High School graduate trainees that the schedule content in P.E.C contributes adequately to their education (\bar{X} Primary/Secondary School =2,68; \bar{X} High School=2,43 and \bar{X} University=1,87).
- Lastly, University graduates (Group 3) think less than Primary/ Secondary School and High School graduate trainees that P.E.C. building is physically qualified for education (\bar{X} Primary/Secondary School=2,26; \bar{X} High School=2,23 and \bar{X} University=1,80).

Table 3. ANOVA test that is made to determine whether the perception of trainees about the assessment of the program and education change according to age variable. (N=89)

C. The Assessment of Program and Education	Age	n	\bar{X}	ss	ANOVA		Significant Difference (Scheffe)
					F	p	
01. Do you think that the course you have taken has contributed to you?	10-16 (1)	23	2,70	0,47	2,24	0,113	-
	16-20 (2)	36	2,50	0,51			
	20 and above (3)	30	2,73	0,45			

02. P.E.C do you think that music education you have taken helps you in terms of realising your personal goals?	10-16 (1)	23	2,43	0,51	3,26	0,032*	3 to 1, 2
	16-20 (2)	36	2,33	0,48			
	20 and above (3)	30	2,68	0,49			
03. P.E.C. do you think that the education you have taken has contribution to personal skill acquisition?	10-16 (1)	23	2,61	0,50	3,29	0,027*	2 to 1, 3
	16-20 (2)	36	2,36	0,54			
	20 and above (3)	30	2,63	0,49			
04.P.E.C do you think that the education you have taken has contributed to your learning skill?	10-16 (1)	23	2,43	0,51	0,39	0,679	-
	16-20 (2)	36	2,36	0,49			
	20 and above (3)	30	2,47	0,51			

*Difference is significant at the level $p < .05$

It is examined with ANOVA whether there is change in the trainees’ assessment of P.E.C in terms of program and education in accordance with age variable and significant different was found for two opinions (Table 6). It is found out that the age of the trainees’ cause a change in their assessment about the question “02. P.E.C do you think that music education you have taken helps you in terms of realising your personal goals?” ($F = 3,26$ and $p < 0,05$). According to post-hoc Scheffe test (significant difference test) which is made to research between which age groups there is change; the trainees of 20 and above (Group 3) find the contribution of music courses in realising their personal goals higher than the trainees in the other two age groups (Group 1-2) ($\bar{X}_{aged\ 10-16} = 2,43$; $\bar{X}_{aged\ 16-20} = 2,33$ and $\bar{X}_{aged\ 20\ and\ above} = 2,68$).

It is found out that the ages of the trainees cause significant differences in their assessment about the question “03. P.E.C. do you think that the education you have taken has contribution to personal skill acquisition?” ($F = 3,29$ and $p < 0,05$). According to Post-hoc Scheffe test; trainees in 16-20 age group (Group 2) find less than the other two age groups (Group 1-3) that the music courses they have taken contribute to personal skill acquisition ($\bar{X}_{aged\ 10-16} = 2,61$; $\bar{X}_{aged\ 16-20} = 2,36$ and $\bar{X}_{aged\ 20\ and\ above} = 2,63$).

Table 4. ANOVA test that is made to determine whether the perception of trainees about the assessment of the efficiency of P.E.C. courses change according to age variable ($N = 89$)

The Assessment of the Efficiency of P.E.C. Courses	Age	n	\bar{X}	ss	ANOVA		Significant Difference (Scheffe)
					F	P	
01. Do you think that the course you have taken is efficient?	10-16 (1)	23	2,48	0,59	0,40	0,671	-
	16-20 (2)	36	2,33	0,59			
	20 and above (3)	30	2,37	0,67			
02. P.E.C. do you think that the materials used in your education are deficient?	10-16 (1)	23	1,48	0,67	3,22	0,047*	3 to 1, 2
	16-20 (2)	36	1,47	0,56			
	20 and above (3)	30	1,80	0,76			
03. Do you think that the materials used in your education in P.E.C. are sufficient?	10-16 (1)	23	2,40	0,56	8,49	0,000**	1 to 2, 3
	16-20 (2)	36	1,84	0,63			
	20 and above (3)	30	1,63	0,56			
04. Do you think that the materials existing in P.E.C. are brought into use adequately?	10-16 (1)	23	2,35	0,49	3,82	0,026*	3 to 1, 2
	16-20 (2)	36	2,21	0,67			
	20 and above (3)	30	1,77	0,68			

05. Do you think that the program limit applied in P.E.C. contributes enough to the program content?	10-16 (1)	23	2,35	0,65	1,46	0,238	-
	16-20 (2)	36	2,14	0,64			
	20 and above (3)	30	2,03	0,72			
06. Do you think that course hours applied in P.E.C. contribute to your education in a sufficient level?	10-16 (1)	23	2,65	0,49	3,89	0,024*	3 to 1, 2
	16-20 (2)	36	2,49	0,65			
	20 and above (3)	30	2,07	0,70			
07. Do you think that daily course hours in P.E.C. contribute to a qualified learning?	10-16 (1)	23	2,57	0,59	10,16	0,000**	1 to 2, 3
	16-20 (2)	36	1,92	0,55			
	20 and above (3)	30	1,90	0,66			
08. Do you think that P.E.C. schedule contents contribute adequately to your education?	10-16 (1)	23	2,57	0,59	3,62	0,031*	1 to 2, 3
	16-20 (2)	36	2,22	0,64			
	20 and above (3)	30	2,13	0,57			
09. Do you think that P.E.C. building is physically qualified for education?	10-16 (1)	23	2,48	0,59	6,42	0,003*	1 to 2, 3
	16-20 (2)	36	2,00	0,63			
	20 and above (3)	30	1,90	0,61			
10. Do you think that teachers and personnel working in P.E.C. contribute enough to the education?	10-16 (1)	23	2,70	0,56	0,85	0,431	-
	16-20 (2)	36	2,50	0,61			
	20 and above (3)	30	2,57	0,50			
11. Do you think that P.E.C. is supported adequately by the units it is dependent on?	10-16 (1)	23	2,09	0,52	1,11	0,333	-
	16-20 (2)	36	1,89	0,58			
	20 and above (3)	30	1,87	0,63			
12. Do you think that P.E.C. works co-ordinated with the units it is dependent on?	10-16 (1)	23	2,13	0,63	1,58	0,212	-
	16-20 (2)	36	2,03	0,65			
	20 and above (3)	30	1,83	0,59			
13. Do you think that the size of the class in which you have been educated in P.E.C. affects the education?	10-16 (1)	23	1,87	0,82	0,35	0,707	-
	16-20 (2)	36	2,03	0,77			
	20 and above (3)	30	2,03	0,81			

**Difference is significant at the level $p < 0,001$ and *Difference $p < 0,05$

It is found out that the ages of the trainees cause a significant difference in 7 opinions presented for the Assessment of the Efficiency of P.E.C. Courses (Table 7):

- The trainees aged 20 and above (Group 3) think more than the other age groups that the materials used in their education are deficient. ($\bar{X}_{aged\ 10-16}=1,48$; $\bar{X}_{aged\ 16-20}=1,47$ and $\bar{X}_{aged\ 20\ and\ above}=1,80$).
- The trainees aged 10-16 (Group 1) think more than the other age groups that the materials used in their education are sufficient ($\bar{X}_{aged\ 10-16}=2,40$; $\bar{X}_{aged\ 16-20}=1,84$ and $\bar{X}_{aged\ 20\ and\ above}=1,63$).
- The trainees aged 20 and above (Group 3) think less than the other age groups that the materials used in their educations are brought into use adequately ($\bar{X}_{aged\ 10-16}=2,35$; $\bar{X}_{aged\ 16-20}=2,21$ and $\bar{X}_{aged\ 20\ and\ above}=1,77$).
- The trainees aged 20 and above (Group 3) think less than the other age groups that the program applied in P.E.C. contributes adequately in terms of course hours ($\bar{X}_{aged\ 10-16}=2,65$; $\bar{X}_{aged\ 16-20}=2,49$ and $\bar{X}_{aged\ 20\ and\ above}=2,07$).
- The trainees aged 10-16 (Group 1) think more than the other age groups that daily course hours in P.E.C. contributes to a qualified learning ($\bar{X}_{aged\ 10-16}=2,57$; $\bar{X}_{aged\ 16-20}=1,92$ and $\bar{X}_{aged\ 20\ and\ above}=1,90$).

- The trainees aged 10-16 (Group 1) think more than the other age groups that the program content in P.E.C. contributes adequately to their education ($\bar{X}_{aged\ 10-16}=2,57$; $\bar{X}_{aged\ 16-20}=2,22$ and $\bar{X}_{aged\ 20\ and\ above}=2,13$).
- Lastly, the trainees aged 10-16 (Group 1) think more than the other age groups that P.E.C. building is physically qualified for education ($\bar{X}_{aged\ 10-16}=2,48$; $\bar{X}_{aged\ 16-20}=2,00$ and $\bar{X}_{aged\ 20\ and\ above}=1,90$).

4. Conclusion and Discussion

LLL process in Turkey has developed in line with EU membership and continue to develop in the process of the rearrangement of the existing institutions. Lasting of education a lifetime is possible when people has the education means after school education; in that, with adult education, or if it is uttered with a traditional notion used for years in our country, with public education (Miser, 2002).

In this direction, the determination of the function and the efficiency of P.E.C.s existing in Turkey will be useful as it will contribute for the developments oriented towards the process. After the current situation assessment of P.E.C. in line with LLL, to make necessary rearrangements is an expectable situation within the process. In line with the findings in the study;

1. In terms of the assessment of the opinions of P.E.C trainees about program and education according to education status variable;

1.1 The opinions of Primary/ Secondary School graduate trainees, about that the music education they have taken in P.E.C helps them realizing their personal goals, was found more significant than High School and University graduates. In fact, this result can be interpreted as the result of a general opinion. It can be expressed that, with the rise in educational level, the activities oriented towards the realization of personal goals are evaluated more elaborately.

2. In terms of the assessment of the opinions of P.E.C trainees about the efficiency of the courses according to education status variable;

2.1 It is seen that the opinions of University graduate trainees about the efficiency of courses centers on the view that there are deficiencies about the institution. Their opinions about that the materials used in P.E.C are deficient, not sufficient and not brought into use adequately are remarkable as it shows that there are physical deficiencies about the institution. In this direction, it is seen that the thought that P.E.C. remains incapable in physical aspect dominates.

2.2 When the opinions of University graduate trainees about the applied program, criticisms about the time and content of the program are arised. At the stage of forming the programs in P.E.C.s, it is thought that rearrangements oriented towards the process may be deficient. It can be stated that the acquired findings are important in respect to the rearrangement of P.E.C programs according to their purposes in LLL process.

2.3 It is stated by Primary/ Secondary School graduate trainees that the education applied in line with the current program is found adequate in terms of weekly course hours and it contributes to a qualified learning. In light of these results, it can be stated that the expectations of people oriented towards the course hours increased in direct proportion to the rise in educational level.

2.4 In the opinions of University graduate trainees about the content of the schedule, the ideas that there are deficiencies in the efficiency of the programs dominates. Also, it is seen that the ideas of University graduate trainees about that P.E.C can not provide physically proper environment for education dominates.

3. In terms of the assessment of the opinions of P.E.C trainees about the program and education of the courses according to age variable;

3.1 It is seen that the education activities applied in P.E.C. dominates positively in the realization of personal goals according to the trainees aged 20 and above. This result reveals that the education activities in P.E.C. is found significant as it provides a second education chance for people of all ages. In terms of the trainees aged 16-20, contrary to trainees of the other age groups, the idea that the education activities in P.E.C. contributes little to personal skill acquisition dominates.

4. In terms of the assessment of the opinions of P.E.C trainees about the efficiency of the courses according to age variable;

4.1 It is seen that the materials used in P.E.C change according to age variable. These results have revealed that, depending on the rise of the age level, the sufficiency of the materials in P.E.C.s is not in a level to respond the needs of the individuals.

4.2 The opinions of the trainees aged 20 and above dominate in the ideas that the materials are not brought into use adequately and that the program applied in P.E.C.s are sufficient in terms of course hours.

4.3 In the trainees aged 10-16, it is seen those daily course hours and schedules contribute to their education adequately.

4.4 It is found out that the trainees aged 10-16 does not have the view that P.E.C has a physically negative affect on education.

5. Recommendations

Recommendations based on the results of the research are as follows:

1. In order that P.E.C.s provides education chance for all ages in LLL process, programs oriented towards age groups should be formed. The programs should be arranged in line with the purposes of LLL and should be proper for all ages; which will contribute to the process as it will serve for the purposes of the process.
2. P.E.C.s that reached the number 960 in Turkey and became widespread countrywide should not have any physical deficiency in today's information and technology age. P.E.C.s have a long history in terms of institutionalizing it in our country. In this direction, it is thought that the necessary physical arrangements will be solved by dependent institutions and non-governmental organizations.
3. In LLL process, current programs applied in P.E.C.s should be revised. It is thought that the arrangements made in this direction should be made with today's education and with an approach serving for LLL process.
4. In the activities of LLL process oriented towards music education, it is proposed that arrangements should be made in P.E.C.s for the perception of the general purposes of the process (Conferences, seminars, etc.).
5. It is proposed that the courses of music education in P.E.C.s should be formed in a supporting way that people can take the music in their lives.
6. It should be enabled that LLL process takes place in schedules of the institutions raising music educators in Turkey and academicians should be raised in this area.
7. With the purpose of following new practices about LLL process, it should be enabled that P.E.C.s run projects together with similar institutions abroad.
8. During determination and solving of the physical problems by dependent institutions and non-governmental organizations, joint works should be done. In this direction, providing active participation about the process should be adopted.

9. It is suggested that the educators working in P.E.C. should attend conferences and seminars at specific times in order that they can evaluate LLL process.
10. P.E.C should raise local public's awareness in order not to fall behind the developments and to enable personal and social development oriented towards the process. It should be enabled that, necessary arrangements and plannings should be made on the areas related to music education thats aims to form the information society.

References

- European Commission (2000). *A Memorandum on Lifelong Learning*. Retrieved Sep 23, 2011, from Bruxelles.www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/MemorandumEng.pdf
- Bilgin, K. F. *Kişilik Gelişiminde Öğrenci Merkezli Sanat Eğitiminin Önemi(The Importance of Student Centered Art Education in Individual Development)*, Bilim ve Aklın Aydınlığında Eğitim(Education in the Light of Science and Mind), p. 135, May 2011, pp. 83-86.
- Fischer, E.(1990). *Sanatın Gerekliği(Necessity of Art)*. İmge Press, p. 11-12. Ankara.
- Gönültaş, S. (2010). Hayat Boyu Öğrenme [Lifelong learning]. Ankara. Retrieved May 23, 2011, from http://212.175.131.61/www.isggm.gov.tr/htdocs/files/hafta/s_gonultas.pdf
- Hallam, S. "Learning in Müzik", **Issues in Müzik Teaching**, Florence:Routledge, [61-75] 2001a.
- Karasar, N. (1991). **Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi(Scientific Method of Research)**, Ankara.
- MEB (MOE). (2009). Hayat Boyu Öğrenme Strateji Belgesi ile Eki Türkiye Hayat Boyu Öğrenme Strateji Eylem Planı (LifeLong Learning Strategy Paper and its attachment, Turkey LifeLong Learning Strategy Action Plan). Ankara. Retrieved April 14, 2011, from <http://mesbil.meb.gov.tr/genel/hayat%20boyu%20%C3%B6%C4%9Frenme%20dokuman.pdf> .
- Miser, R. (2002). "Küreselleşen" Dünyada Yetişkin Eğitimi (Adult Education in "Globalising" World). *Ankara University Institution of Education Sciences Print, year: 2002, volume: 35, issue: 1-2*.
- Uçan, A. (1994). *Müzik Eğitimi Temel Kavramlar- İlkeler- Yaklaşımlar (Music Education Basic Notions, Principles and Approaches)*. Müzik Ansiklopedisi Yayınları (Music Encyclopedia Press). p. 91- .Ankara.