INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.



University Microfilms International A Bell & Howell Information Company 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA 313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9431234

An exploratory study of self-directed learning readiness and pedagogical expectations about learning among adult inmate learners in Michigan

Dixon, Wills Barrington, Ph.D.

Michigan State University, 1992



AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF SELF-DIRECTED LEARNING READINESS AND PEDAGOGICAL EXPECTATIONS ABOUT LEARNING AMONG ADULT INMATE LEARNERS IN MICHIGAN

By

Wills Barrington Dixon

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

ABSTRACT

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF SELF-DIRECTED LEARNING READINESS AND PEDAGOGICAL EXPECTATIONS ABOUT LEARNING AMONG ADULT INMATE LEARNERS IN MICHIGAN

Ву

Wills Barrington Dixon

Self-Directed Learning (SDL) is a process in which individuals, with or without the help of others, take the initiative in diagnosing their learning needs, formulating goals, identifying human and material resources and evaluating learning outcomes. Pedagogical expectations are culturally influenced ideas people have about the kinds of activities that provide meaningful learning.

The purpose of this exploratory study was to investigate the relationships which exist between the selfdirected learning readiness (SDLR) of adult inmate learners and their expectations about learning, their age and their sex, in order to provide useful information for continued research into the use of SDL among inmate learners. The participants were a sample of 228 male and female adult inmates and involved 21 educational and vocational programs in various Michigan correctional institutions.

Three separate instruments measured the students' degree of SDLR and their preferences for the level of formality and kind of learning experience perceived as providing the most important learning. The major areas examined were: (1) level of formality preferred; (2) kind of learning experience preferred; (3) relationship between SDLR and level of formality; (4) relationship between SDLR and kind of learning experience; (5) relationship between SDLR and amount of formal schooling; (6) relationship between level of formality and kind of learning experience; (7) relationship between SDLR and the subjects' age; (8) relationship between SDLR and the subjects' sex. One-way ANOVA was used to test for significant relationships. The .05 level of significance was used.

The results of the study showed that the subjects considered low-formality settings more conducive to learning, as opposed to high formality, while sharing was the kind of learning experience most preferred, as opposed to input and self-awareness. No significant relationship was found between SDLR and level of formality. No significant relationship was found between SDLR and kind of learning experience nor between level of formality and kind of learning experience. Statistically significant relationships were found between SDLR and amount of formal schooling, age and sex.

It is concluded that (1) the mean degree of Self-Directed Learning Readiness of a large heterogeneous group cannot be predicted by level of formality or by kind of learning experience; (2) some prediction can apparently be made by the amount of formal schooling; (3) there may be a relationship between SDLR and age, as well as sex. Various recommendations were made with regards to continued research on Self-Directed Learning among adult inmate learners. This dissertation is dedicated

to the loving memory of my Grandmother,

Ruth Bestly Dixon.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation and heartfelt thanks to my major professor and committee chairman, Dr. Eldon Nonnamaker. I am very grateful for his patience, understanding and loving correction of weaknesses. Without his support and supervision this dissertation would not be possible.

To Paul who has always been prodding, to Yvonne for her assistance and encouragement, to Herman for his constant interest and kind words.

To the members of my guidance committee, Drs. Kay White, Howard Hickey and Gloria Smith. They have made me feel like they cared about me as a person, as well as about my scholarly pursuits.

To Mark, Crystal, Dahlia and Francoise, who from the start have made this possible in their own special, sacrificial way.

And finally, to my wife, Shawn, who has patiently and lovingly supported me throughout the years. I love you!

v

TABLE OF CONTENTS

P	age
CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	4
Research Questions and Hypotheses	7
Situational Background	9
Students in the System	10
Importance of the Study	11
Delimitations and Limitations	12
Demographic Characteristics	13
Assumptions	13
Definition of Terms	14
Overview	16
CHAPTER TWO - REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	18
Characteristics of Participants in	1.0
Adult Learning	18
Self-Directed Learning Among Adults	20
Expectations About Learning	23
Nature of the Adult Inmate Learner	28
Applicable Research Studies	30
Summary	32

CHAPTER THREE - RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	•	•	34
Description of Methodology	•	•	34
Research Design	٠	•	35
Variables Under Investigation	•	•	35
Independent Variables	•	•	36
Dependent Variable	•	•	37
Research Statements and Null Hypotheses	•	•	37
Sample	•	•	38
Instrumentation	•	•	39
Research Procedure and Data Collection	•	•	46
Data Analysis	•	•	49
Methodological Assumptions	•	•	50
Limitations	•	•	51
Summary	•	•	52
CHAPTER FOUR - PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS			
OF THE DATA	•	•	53
Overview	•	•	53
Sample Profile	•	•	53
Data Analysis Methods	•	•	56
Data Analysis	•	•	57
Summary	e	•	68
CHAPTER FIVE - OVERVIEW, SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS,			
IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	•	•	69
Overview	٠	•	69
Summary of Purpose and Procedure	•	•	69
Summary of Findings With Conclusions	•	•	71

CHAPTER FIVE - CONTINUED

Impl	lica	tions	for	Fut	ure	Re	ese	arc	h.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	78
Reco	omme	ndati	ons		•••	•	•	•••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	79
APPENDIX	A -	DATA	COL	LECT	ION	SI	TE	s.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	82
APPENDIX	в –	SDLR	s.	• •	••	•	•	•••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	85
APPENDIX	с –	INTE	RPRE	TATI	ON (OF	SD	LRS	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	88
APPENDIX	D ~	EXPE	СТАТ	IONS	OF	LE	EARI	NIN	G	INS	STF	RUN	1EN	IТ	•	•	•	•	90
APPENDIX	Е –	UCRI	HS C	ONSE	NT 1	FOF	RW	•••	•	•	•	ø	•	•	•	•	•	1	100
APPENDIX	F -	PART	ICIP.	ANTS	COI	NSE	INT	FO	RM	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	1	101
BIBLIOGR	APHY	• •		••	• •	•	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	1	L03

Page

.

LIST OF TABLES

.

•

יזמאיי	г Э 1]	Page
IADD	Possible Choices for Level of Formality and Kind of Learning Experience	•	-	•	•	•	•	•	•	-	•	•	41
TABL	E 4.1 Age of Subjects With a Frequency Distribution In Five Year Increments	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	54
TABLI	E 4.2 SDLRS - Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale Scores	•	•	•	ø	•	•	•	•	•		•	55
TABLI	E 4.3 Frequency Distribution for Level of Formality	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	59
TABLI	E 4.4 Frequency Distribution for Preference for Kind of Learning Experience	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	60
TABLI	E 4.5 Analysis of Variance on the Relationship Between Mean SDLRS and Level of Formality	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	63
TABL	E 4.6 Analysis of Variance on the Relationship Between Mean SDLRS and Kind of Learning Experience	•	•	•	•	•		•	•		•		64

......

TABLE 4.7 Analysis of Variance on the Relationship Between Mean SDLRS and Amount of TABLE 4.8 Analysis of Variance on the Relationship Between Level of Formality and TABLE 4.9 Analysis of Variance in the Relationship Between TABLE 4.10 Analysis of Variance on the Relationship Between

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The education of prison inmates is becoming increasingly recognized worldwide as an important practice in the field of adult education. In 1984, The International Journal of Adult Education proclaimed correctional education as a top priority area of interest (Hall, 1984). Also, at the international level, the Open University in England began in 1984 to sponsor international seminars involving experts in correctional education from around the world. The first of these seminars was titled, "Strategies for Education Within Prison Regimes," and the program (Normie et al., 1984) covered areas from organizing and managing correctional education to issues of policy, practice, methodology, and research. The theory and practice of adult education, and the accompanying principles of adult learning, stress the development of self-directedness to the learner, including emphasis on one's taking increasing responsibility for designing and evaluating one's own learning and, in general, learning how to learn and not merely how to be taught. Unfortunately, little has been written on how one might effectively apply the principles of self-directed learning to a correctional setting.

Background of the Problem

Educational programs in prisons present, among other problems, a participation problem. Many prisoners' ability

to learn is hampered by a lack of basic reading and computational skills. Research has increasingly shown a link between learning disabilities and delinquency. Thus, educators in adult correctional settings must cope with inmates who have neither academic skills nor attitudes appropriate for learning (MacNeil, 1980, pp. 208-221).

The problems of adult education in prison are further exacerbated by other factors. Adult inmates are generally well beyond the age associated with their expected educational attainment. It is not unusual for a thirtyyear-old prisoner to be performing at a fourth or fifth grade level. Very few available texts are appropriate for such adults and the inappropriateness of the material to the age and interest of the inmates often turn many away from educational goals. Adult learning curricula are unlike typical school curricula, but prison budgets seldom have the flexibility to permit the purchase of specialized aids and consequently, educational programs often have to make do with inadequate, outdated, and largely ill-suited materials. Todd Clear and George Cole (1990) indicated that disciplinary problems which are routine in the usual classroom are often worse in the prison setting. "Disruption, verbal abuse and intractability are ways in which participants frequently assert their maturity in the face of programs that treat them as children" (Clear and Cole, 1990, p. 346). It was further pointed out by the authors that education is often considered by both prisoners

and custody staff as an undesirable program assignment, carrying a status that aggravates the difficulties in the prison classroom. Data from the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) Annual Report (1990) suggest that it is a very small percentage of inmates who make adequate use of the educational opportunities in the prison system. One of the reasons for this very limited participation is that most of these inmates do not have environments or opportunities which encourage them to develop, grow and learn to take increasing initiative and responsibility for their own learning. In increasing the self-directedness of the adult learner, greater participation in adult learning can be realized. In stressing the importance of self-directedness, Dequidi (1984) referred to the "transforming of correctional institutions into centers for personal growth and transformation" (p. 71).

Statement of the Problem

There are many barriers contributing to the limited use of educational programs in the MDOC prison system by adult inmates. MacNeil (1980) has shown that adult learners who are allowed to become actively involved in the determination of what and how they learn become more involved in the overall learning process. Self-Directed Learning Projects have been used in other adult settings (Deguid, 1984) to increase participation in learning situations and is one alternative which educators in the correctional system may employ for the same purpose. The particular problem to

which this study is addressed is the determination of characteristics adult inmates have which would enable them to successfully participate in Self-Directed Learning (SDL). Operationally, SDL is a process in which individuals take the initiative of formulating learning goals, identifying human and material resources for learning, choosing and implementing learning strategies and evaluating learning outcomes (Knowles, 1975, p. 18). The information obtained from the study will, hopefully, serve as a guide which may be used by educators for developing instruments to identify inmates capable of benefitting from SDL.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to provide valuable and relevant information for further exploration of how adult educators may be able to identify adult inmates who can benefit from SDL strategies. There will be two major objectives:

- 1. To determine the level of Self-Directed Learning Readiness (SDLR) of sample of adult inmate learners. This measure will be obtained with the use of the Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS), a 34-item Likert scale designed by Lucy Guglielmino (1981) to determine the extent to which individuals picture themselves as possessing factors associated with self-directedness.
- To determine the relationships which exist between Self-Directed Learning Readiness and other

variables. The variables are:

- a) Inmates' expectations about learning with respect to three kinds of learning experiences. This is based on Ted Ward's conceptual framework of adult learning. Ward (1974) suggested that for effective learning to take place, there must be three types of experiences involved:
 - <u>Input</u> learning experiences which involve learners in receiving or coming into contact with some new information.
 - <u>Self-awareness</u> learning experiences which involve the learner in reflecting upon his/ her current situation.
 - <u>Sharing</u> learning experiences which involve learners putting into their own words or acting upon some new information, ideas or insights.
- b) Inmates' expectations about learning with respect to two levels of formality. Based on Ward's conceptual framework of learning, "levels of formality" refers to how structured, teacher controlled and authority oriented an instructional setting is (Ward, 1974). Two levels of formality--High Formality (HF) and Low Formality (LF)--were used in this study. Measures of the subjects' expectations

concerning levels of formality and kind of learning experience were obtained by the use of two instruments designed specifically for this study. The instruments, adapted from previous studies (McKean, 1977, Wilson, 1978 and McCue, 1982) are similar in construction and consist of pairs of photo pictures depicting adult learners and their instructors involved in various learning situations. Accompanying each photo is a caption with the words of the instructor describing the activity. The subjects are asked to indicate which of each pair of photo pictures they perceive to be providing the most important learning. A value is assigned to each choice.

c) Inmates' amount of formal schooling as indicated by the number of years the subjects completed in public or private school and broken down into the following categories:

> 0 - 08 years 9 - 11 years 12 years 13 - 14 years 15 - 16 years

Based on the relationships found to be existing among the variables, implications and recommendations have been made regarding the

use of SDL by teachers and educators in the MDOC.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following research questions were posed by the researcher to guide the study's inquiry.

 Do adult inmate learners perceive any one level of formality as providing more important learning than the other level?

2. Do adult inmate learners perceive any one kind of learning experience as providing more important learning than other kinds of learning experience?

3. Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their choice of level of formality?

4. Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their choice of kind of kearning experience?

5. Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' mean degree of SDLRS and their amount of formal schooling?

6. Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' choice of level of formality and their choice of kind of learning experience?

7. Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' mean degree of SDLRS and their age?

8. Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' mean degree of SDLRS and their sex?

In the present study multiple regression and analysis of variance procedures, as well as descriptive statistics, were used to analyze the data. This procedure investigated the relationship among the following variables: (1) Subjects' mean Self-Directed Learning Readiness Score (SDLRS), the single dependent variable; (2) Subjects' choice of Level of Formality, independent variable; (3) Subjects' choice of Kind of Learning Experience, independent variable; (4) Subjects' amount of Formal Schooling, independent variable; (5) Subjects' Age, independent variable; (6) Subjects' Sex, independent variable.

The following null hypotheses were investigated:

H₁ Subjects will not choose any one Level of Formality as providing more important learning than the other Level of Formality.

H₂ Subjects will not choose any one Kind of Learning Experience as providing more important learning than other Kind of Learning Experience.

H₃ There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' mean degree of SDLRS and their choice of Level of Formality as providing more important learning.

H₄ There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their choice of Kind of Learning Experience as providing more important learning.

H₅ There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their Amount of Formal Schooling.

H₆ There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' choice of Level of Formality and their choice of Kind of Learning Experience as providing more important learning.

H₇ There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' mean degree of SDLRS and their age.

H₈ There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' mean degree of SDLRS and their sex.

Situational Background

While the security of residents is the primary function of all correctional institutions, rehabilitation or treatment efforts are encouraged and even fostered as long as they do not interfere with the primary custodial functions. Part of the treatment program in all institutions is an education program which emphasizes basic reading, GED preparation and vocational training.

The secondary nature of education within the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) affects both the structure and function of the educational program within the institutions. Custody restrictions determine who will attend classes, when classes will be held and when a student will be pulled out of classes, either to attend other functions, to be disciplined, to go to court, or to be transferred to another institution. All of these actions can transpire with no prior warning to either the student or the teacher. The educational program and the teachers' operation within that program are forced to adapt to the mandates of custody.

They must make accommodations for the student who is gone for a day, a week, or even several months. According to Calvert (1982), the transitory student or the intermittent student is not the exception, as in public school, but the rule; few students are able to complete their education with no interruptions. Because of these constant interruptions in programming, the Michigan Department of Corrections has been compelled to develop a standardized, open-ended curriculum for all schools throughout the correctional network. The system adopted by the academic schools is a competency-based system utilizing standardized modules and reference materials for each course taught in any of the schools.

The ultimate goal of the high school program is a GED certificate and a vocational trade. The GED was implemented in lieu of the high school diploma because the average sentence being served in prison is approximately three years, too short a time period for completion of a high school program. Associate and Bachelor's Degree programs are offered by local community and private colleges.

Students in the System

While a few of the students attending institutional schools may have been students at the time of their incarceration, thus their education was interrupted only because they were sent to prison, most were school dropouts before their incarceration. Some lack only a few credit hours for completion of their high school diploma, while

others have never advanced past the sixth grade level. Some were involved in special education programs of their local schools, while others were involved in advanced academics in high school. The former may spend their entire sentence trying to learn to read, while the latter may spend only a minimum amount of time in the prison schools before acquiring a GED and progressing into a junior college program.

One thing all students have in common is that they have all relinquished some degree of freedom of movement to be confined for a time in an institution. This loss of freedom, according to Calvert (1983), manifests itself in myriad ways. Many are seeing their families disintegrate and are thwarted in their efforts to preserve their homes. Others are trying to gain their freedom from prison through the courts and must depend upon the efforts of others who, in reality, are not personally concerned about the welfare of the inmate. They dream of freedom and of returning to a community which may be seeking ways to keep them from returning. Most inmates are often locked into selfdefeating patterns that prevent them from making use of educational opportunities and need help often in nontraditional ways to overcome these self-defeating patterns.

Importance of the Study

This study provides information useful in the ongoing research on Self-Directed Learning and the implementation of

Self-Directed Learning strategies. Specifically, the entities expected to benefit from this study are the individual inmate learners, educators, and the correctional institution as a whole. Since some people are by nature more self-directed than others (Russell, 1988), it would be essential for education providers to be able to identify those inmates who would be most likely capable of benefitting from Self-Directed Learning. The results generated from this study may contribute to the body of knowledge necessary for this purpose.

Delimitations and Limitations

There are delimitations and inherent limitations which affected the outcome of this study.

Delimitations

First, the sample of subjects represented a specific population of adult felons in the MDOC, male and female learners in selected adult education programs. The selected programs allowed for a sample of inmates with a wide range of amount of formal schooling, which was representative of the range within the general inmate population. The findings in this sample have limited generalizability to similar inmate learners in institutions within the MDOC.

Limitations

The study is correlational, pointing to possible relationships between variables and does not seek to establish cause and effect relationships. The study consists of four descriptive constructs: amount of formal schooling, levels of formality, kinds of learning experience, and degrees of self-directed learning readiness.

Finally, only implications regarding the exploration of self-directed learning is made from this study and final questions about particular aspects of self-directed learning design will have to await answers through experimental studies.

Demographic Characteristics

The study involved a sample of 228 adult inmates, 191 males and 37 females, from various correctional institutions in Southern Michigan (Appendix A) and were involved as learners in various educational or vocational programs. The age range of the participants was from 21 to 54 years, while years of formal schooling was between grade four and college graduate. Participation was voluntary and involved the completion of three questionnaires before or after regular class periods.

Assumptions

Five primary assumptions guided this investigation. First, the researcher assumed that for their own maximum growth and development, adult inmate learners ought to be involved in self-directed learning and that to be able to identify and understand their preferences regarding levels of formality and kinds of learning experiences is an important step in exploring self-directed learning possibilities.

I WINDOW AND AN ADDRESS OF A DESCRIPTION OF A DESCRIPANTA DESCRIPTION OF A DESCRIPTION OF A DESCRIPTION OF A

Secondly, it is assumed that the three types of learning experiences suggested by the Ward model of effective learning (input, self-awareness and sharing) are necessary components to meaningful learning environments.

Thirdly, it is assumed that a person's formal school experiences has some relatedness to the degree of SDLR and to the kinds of learning experiences such a person considers important.

It is further assumed that the data gathering technique of viewing pictures and statements and subsequently responding to questions about them accurately measures a person's response to levels of formality and types of learning experiences.

Finally, it is assumed that the SDLRS accurately measures a person's degree of self-directedness.

Definition of Terms

Ethnopedagogy is a term coined by Berger (1978) and refers to the need of a teacher/trainer to be able to effectively adopt teaching/learning activities to the cultural viewpoints and experiences of learners.

Expectations refer to those conscious and unconscious evaluations which a person forms of another or of oneself, which leads one to treat others in such a manner as though the assessment were correct. Expectations are estimates of reality and imply the anticipation of the behavior most likely to actually occur if certain circumstances are created and put into action (Finn, 1972, p. 390). <u>Pedagogical Expectations</u> are what "a learner and leader/teacher expects to be the sociology (roles of a teacher and learner), content and procedures of an educational activity" (McKean, 1977).

Adult Inmate Learners are male and female inmates in institutions of the Michigan Department of Corrections who are 21 years old and over, engaged in one or more organized learning activities.

Learning refers to the acquisition of knowledge, attitudes, or skills and the mastering of behavior in which facts, ideas or concepts are made available for individual use (Verner, 1964).

<u>Self-Directed Learning</u> is a term used to describe educational procedures in which the learner is the major identifier of learning needs, desirable objectives, and beneficial applications. In self-directed learning, teachers and learners are involved in co-exploring the solutions to needs.

Level of Formality refers to how formal, structured, or ritualized an instructional setting is perceived to be. Instruments in this study will use pictures of instructional activities that represent two levels of formality, high and low. For the sake of clarity, they will be labelled Low and High levels of formality.

<u>Amounts of Formal Schooling</u> refers to the number of years of formal schooling of the subjects of the study.

A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR O

Types of Learning Experiences refers to experiences the learner is engaged in. Based on Ward's model, three types of learning experiences will be represented in the instrumentation: input, self-awareness, and sharing. All three types of experiences are necessary for effective learning.

- <u>Input</u> experiences involve learners in receiving or coming into contact with some new information.
- <u>Self-Awareness</u> learning experiences involve the learner in reflecting upon one's current situation.
- <u>Sharing</u> learning experiences involve the learner in putting into one's own words or acting upon some new information, ideas, insights. It is believed that all three types of experiences are necessary for effective learning (McKean, 1977, pp. 18-19).

Overview

The dissertation is composed of five chapters. The setting for the study is presented in Chapter I. A research problem was stated and a rationale for engaging in the study was presented. The basic research design and guiding questions were also identified.

Chapter 2 includes a selected review of the literature dealing with the characteristics of adult learners, adult learners in correctional settings, studies in self-directed learning and applicable research studies. In Chapter 3 a description of the research methodology is presented. The sample of subjects and the research instrument are discussed in detail. Also included are the steps in the development and validation of the research instrument. Field procedures and data collection procedures are discussed, concluding with a description of the kinds of statistical procedures used to analyze the data. The rationale for the use of the selected statistical procedures is also presented.

In Chapter 4 the findings of the study are presented. The research questions are restated along with the statistical hypotheses. The results of the tests of the hypotheses are reported along with their statistical significance. Descriptive statistics are reported which indicate some trends that were not discovered through the hypotheses testing.

Chapter 5 contains a brief summary of the discussion of Chapters 1 through 4. The findings are discussed, conclusions reached, and implications and recommendations suggested.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature covers related studies in the following areas: (a) characteristics of participants in adult learning; (b) studies on self-directed learning; (c) expectations about learning; (d) adult learning in correctional settings; (e) applicable research studies.

Characteristics of Participants in Adult Learning

The most closely related research literature focuses on background characteristics of participants in adult education. Such studies have been referred to by Knox (1965) as a "Clientele Analysis." The main thrust of such studies is to identify differences between participants and nonparticipants and to identify differences between participants of different adult education programs. Research on participation will be reviewed in this section because of the inference that can be made that when adult learners participate in a particular kind of program, it is probably because there is something about that program that meets with their approval, thus it is at least partially consistent with their pedagogical expectations.

In terms of the relationship between amount of schooling and use of certain kinds of instructional approaches, Brunner (1959) reports some research by Crile in which she found that the percentage of persons listing meetings as "the most helpful method of adult education"

increased with the educational level of the participants. Brunner also states, in summarizing various other studies, that the lower the educational status of the participants in a program, the greater their desire for demonstrations or case materials in teaching, regardless of the topic.

Carp, Peterson and Roelfs (1972) attempted to identify the relationship between amount of schooling and methods of learning preferred or used. They found that use of classes and lectures increased with educational level, with 20% of learners with only elementary school using lectures and classes, but 41% of the college graduates doing so. College graduates rated on-the-job training lower than most of the sample, and those with only elementary schooling rated discussion groups lower than most of the sample. Preference for lecture and classes by would-be learners followed a similar distribution as the learners.

In looking at location of learning, Richardson (1986) in his research on cooperative extension programs, found that for both would-be learners and learners, the use of the school system increased with educational level. He also found that the lower the level of schooling, the more people who were not involved in adult education felt that low grades in the past and little or no enjoyment in studying were barriers to their participation.

Cross (1981) found that only one fourth of the people who say they would like to learn prefer lectures, and they

are the better educated people in the upper socio-economic levels.

Dickinson and Verner (1967) found in a British Columbia study that "years of schooling completed" did not differentiate between dropouts and persistent attenders, unless the length of the course was considered. They found that people with less schooling were more likely to drop out of the longer courses.

Self-Directed Learning Among Adults

While the term self-directed learning has only come into wide usage over the past two decades, this approach to learning is firmly rooted in the history of adult education. Much of the current emphasis on self-directed learning appears to have developed from a foundation laid by Tough's (1979) study of adult learning projects. In his research, Tough found that nearly 70% of the learning projects undertaken by adult learners in his sample were planned primarily by the learners themselves, as opposed to a teacher or some other human or nonhuman source. This awareness of a heavy involvement of "self" has stimulated considerable interest in research on, and literature about, the self-directed phenomenon.

Some theorists, including Shattenberg and Tracey (1987) regard self-directed learning as a set of skills to be mastered, while others, including Cross (1981) and Mezirow (1985) view it as an instructional methodology or process that should be pursued both by instructors of adults and by

the students or learners themselves. Mezirow (1985) states that there is no such thing as a truly independent selfdirected learner, since most adults do not possess an adequate knowledge of the range of educational alternatives available to them and are inexperienced in critically examining the learning perspectives of their lives.

According to Hiemstra (1985), recent research has shown that most people have a tremendous ability and desire for learning that is self-directed in nature.

Penland (1978) investigated the self-learning pattern of adults who employ a wide range of community resources and materials for independent learning. One of the many conclusions drawn by Penland (1978) was that self-initiated adult learners are highly goal-oriented and have very individualistic patterns. Johnstone and Rivera's (1965) work revealed a high incidence of self-directed learning among adults.

Since 1971, numerous researchers have used learning projects interview schedules with samples from various segments of the adult population.

While traditional formal education for adults has been accepted, Tough (1968, 1971) conducted a series of studies to determine the following: if adults engage in educational activities outside the formal setting; how many learning projects a year were initiated; how long each learning project lasted; and, reasons why the learning projects were started. He concluded that the typical individual engages

in eight learning projects a year with the range being from one to 20 projects and with each project lasting an average of 90 hours. In addition, he reported that about 70% of the learning projects were planned by the individual learner. Adult learners gave the following reasons for initiating the learning projects: to complete a practical task (e.g., a home improvement project), to resolve a question (e.g., about foreign lands, unfamiliar animals, etc.), or to advance in employment (e.g., attending non-college credit seminars). His findings supported the belief that adults can be and are self-directed learners.

Since Tough's seminal research in the field of adult education was conducted, there has been an increased interest in this area.

Hammel (1985) investigated the self-directed learning activities of physicians in an attempt to discern the extent to which physicians use self-directed learning to remain current. The study reports that 89% of the learning projects were learner planned and that physicians do a major amount of their professional learning through self-directed learning activities. Other studies report similar findings and include law enforcement officers (Johnson, 1986), older adults (East, 1986; McGraw, 1982), low income urban adults (Walker, 1986).

While these studies yielded descriptive data demonstrating a strong preference by adult learners for self-direction, it was only possible to speculate about
characteristics that contributed to a learners' preference for self-directed learning. A major step in this research direction was the development of the Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS) by Guglielmino in 1977, revised in 1981. The SDLRS, which will be employed in the present study, was found to discriminate between high and low involvement in learning project activities, thus indicating high predictive validity for the scale. Hassan (1981) found significant relationships between self-directed readiness and the number of self-fulfillment projects, as well as level of formal education. High correlations with factors such as creativity, originality and self-concept have been demonstrated using the SDLRS.

Expectations About Learning

The literature suggests that the expectancy phenomenon is present in learning situations. A person gains expectations about what is considered valid learning experiences from numerous sources. A learner's pedagogical expectations are harmful when he or she lacks the ability to accurately and flexibly take into account new evidence. A person's degree of self-acceptance also influences the kinds of learning experiences utilized. In addition, significant others--peers, parents, teachers--help create a person's view of what experiences constitute significant learning.

The strongest finding of studies looking at participant characteristics is that there is a very high relationship between amount of formal schooling and amount of adult

education participation (Brunner, 1959; Johnstone and Rivera, 1965; Knox, 1965; Carp, Peterson and Roelfs, 1972; Okes, 1974; Hassan, 1981; McQue, 1982 and Cross, 1984).

The Johnstone and Rivera study (1965) is the landmark study on participant characteristics. It consisted of "a national survey of the educational activities of the adult population, based on a survey of the activities of members of some 12,000 American households" (p. xxviii). They comment on the strong relationship between amount of formal schooling and participation. "By far the most persistent finding in our investigation was that formal educational attainment plays a highly crucial role in determining whether or not one enters the ranks of adult students" (p. 21). They found that whereas only six percent of people with only a grade school education participated in adult education activities, twenty percent of those with a high school and 38 percent of those with a college education participated (p. 97).

Knox reported that there was a positive relationship between adult education participation and level of occupation, income, and education in all three studies, but that the highest degree of association was with the level of formal education (p. 233). Carp, Peterson, and Roelfs (1974) also surveyed a random sample of the general U.S. adult population. They reported that in the year immediately preceding their survey, 31% of the population was engaged in some form of adult learning, and another 46%

expressed a desire to do so. Their study showed that only 5% of the adult education participants had only a grade school education, while 21% of the participants were college graduates. However, the highest percentage of the participants were high school graduates with no college education; they were 38% of the participants.

Ward and his associates built upon the concept of ethnopedagogy as developed by Burger and have suggested the importance of "pedagogical expectations (Ward, Herzog, et al., 1974; Ward, 1973). One of the ethnopedagogical issues Ward identified is the learners' "acceptance and expectations of instructional procedures" (1973). He explains this by saying:

The most concrete evidence of the imposition of culture on the learning potentialities of people is their expectations of what constitutes a valid learning experience. What is accepted as a valid learning experience in one culture may be rejected in another. The wisdom of the elders, transmitted as legends and proverbs, may be profoundly respected as a learning experience or totally rejected as having no place in an educational system. A person may be culturally conditioned to accept the pedantic ways of the lecturing teacher in a formal classroom as a valid learning experience, tending to make him suspicious of discussion groups or instructional motion pictures (Ward, 1973, pp. 2-3).

It is currently not in fashion with some people to use the word "pedagogy" and its derivatives when discussing adult education. Malcolm Knowles has promoted the use of the word "androgogy" for referring to helping adults learn. Knowles' argument rests upon the Greek words from which the word "pedagogy" is based. It is claimed that the word in the Greek refers to the instruction of children. However, as an English word, "pedagogy" has not had such an exclusive meaning. Thus, it has been used widely in the field of education to refer to the instructional context and issues related to that context. It is with the intention of using the word "pedagogy" in its generalized meaning that Burger used the word in "ethnopedagogy," and it is with the same intention that it is used in this study to refer to expectations adults have about learning (Knowles, 1984).

The purpose of the ethnopedagogy studies of Burger and of Ward and his associates was to discover how to turn instructional activities to cultural expectations and practice. The emphasis has been primarily on adapting instructional activities to pedagogical expectations. Ward (1974) says that for effective learning, education should utilize instructional procedures that are recognizable to the learners as being learning experiences.

Three specific kinds of learning experiences will be explored in this study. Ward suggests that these three kinds form a model for effective learning. They are as follows.

<u>Input</u> learning experiences involve learners receiving or coming into contact with some new information.

<u>Self-Awareness</u> learning experiences involve the learner in reflecting upon his/her current situation.

Sharing learning experiences involve learners in putting into their own words or acting upon some new information, ideas, insights (McCue, 1982, p. 18).

Perceptions of what a person believes to be a good learning experience is partially shaped by what the person has continuously experienced and come to know as a teaching/learning situation. People's pedagogical expectations are also partially shaped by social norms and of activities as also valid. Thus, the student's expectations are increased or enlarged.

Modifying the discrepancy between instructional activities and pedagogical expectations by suggesting activities that may enlarge pedagogical expectations is necessarily the second step in a two-step process. The first step is identifying and describing the discrepancy. It was already noted from the literature on adult education that there is a potential discrepancy between adult learners' cultural background and the activities of selfdirected learning. Identifying and describing the discrepancy would also involve knowing for whom it is most severe and what the factors are which contribute to and maintain the discrepancy. Once potential discrepancies are better understood, hypotheses can be tested concerning potentially beneficial instructional activities to be employed by adult educators. Thus, the two-step process is: (1) identify and describe the discrepancy; and (2) modify the discrepancy.

The study will be important because it will focus on the first step of the process. It will attempt to begin building a basis for suggesting ways to modify discrepancies

between self-directed learning and adult learners' pedagogical expectations. It will do this by inquiring into the relationship between certain adult learner characteristics relating to self-directedness and pedagogical expectations. Based on the findings about these relationships, implications will be made relevant to the further exploration of self-directed learning and identifying those who are most capable of benefitting from it.

Nature of the Adult Inmate Learner

Educators are well aware that the characteristics of learners have (or should have) a significant role in determining the type of delivery system used to impart educational services. Indeed, Benjamin S. Bloom (1982), in his school-based learning model, incorporates "student characteristics" as one of the major classes of variables determining students' learning outcomes. Moreover, Bloom distinguishes between two types of student characteristics that heavily influence learning. Cognitive entry characteristics are the skills and level of learning competency demonstrated by students prior to taking on a new learning task. Affective entry characteristics are essentially the students' level of motivation to learn new tasks. Motivation is in turn influenced by the concept the students have of themselves as learners.

Bloom's notion of student characteristics is quite relevant to inmate-learner groups. Evidence suggests that

the cognitive learning level of many inmates at entry is relatively low. As of 1983, for example, less than half (40%) of all inmates in American jails and prisons had completed high school and a full 6% had received no schooling whatsoever or had only completed kindergarten (U.S. Department of Justice, 1983). Moreover, as Lucas (1983) and others have emphasized, inmates have frequently experienced failures in earlier or prior learning experiences and either are afraid or are disinclined to try their hand at new learning tasks. Thus, their affective entry level upon reaching correctional education systems is relatively low. These findings have serious implications for how educational systems and particularly postsecondary systems must be designed and implemented in order to be effective.

Cognitive and affective entry characteristics are not the only important student characteristics to consider. Inmate populations frequently display a disproportionate number of individuals who are learning disabled in some way. These learners require special resources and specially designed programs to help them overcome such disabilities. Also, inmate populations that are predonderantly female generally have a unique set of educational problems and needs (Chapman, 1980; Ryan, 1984; and the Wisconsin Department of Corrections, 1985). Thus, educators must tailor programs to take into account female inmate-learner needs.

Applicable Research Studies

Several studies have been done that provide both methodological and conceptual precedent for this research. These studies are reviewed in the following section:

The McKean Study. McKean's study (1977) was done for the purpose of discovering what adult learners expected to be important learning experiences. He utilized a photo instrument similar in design to the one used in the present study. He studied 225 adults from various adult educational programs in several Michigan communities and found that his particular sample considered low and medium formality settings more valid than high formality settings. He also found that the subjects considered sharing and selfawareness experiences more valid than input learning experiences. When correlating amount of schooling with levels of formality, there was an apparent trend away from high formality settings for those who had more schooling. In medium formality settings, sharing experiences were considered more valid and in high formality settings, input experience was considered more valid (pp. 56-69).

The Wilson Study. Wilson (1978) studied what a specific set of volunteer leaders believed were important learning experiences for others and why. A photo instrument depicting three levels of formality (low, medium and high) and three kinds of learning experiences (input, selfawareness and sharing) was used with 51 Girl Scout leaders on Oahu, Hawaii. In each learning situation, the same

question was asked: "Do you think these people are learning something important?" Probe interviews were given after the instrument was administered to determine why the subjects responded the way they did.

The results showed that subjects considered low formality settings most valid, followed by medium and high formality situations. The subjects judged input learning experiences as providing the most learning, followed by sharing and self-awareness.

Leaders preferred medium levels of formality with sharing experiences. Least preferred were low formality/sharing experiences. With input experiences, leaders preferred low formality settings. The least preferred was high formality/input experiences. With selfawareness experiences, leaders preferred low formality settings. Least preferred were high formality/selfawareness settings. Medium levels of formality, sharing experiences, input/low formality, self-awareness/low and medium formality, learning situations were all judged as more valid by leaders with less schooling than by leaders with more schooling (pp. 62-112).

The McCue Study. McCue (1982) investigated adult learners' expectations for curriculum in a specific continuing education program. He examined several key learner variables including level of formality preferred, kinds of learning experiences preferred and what instructional setting was preferred among 320 property

managers in ten cities. Years of formal schooling, majors in school, years of experience in property management and age were independent variables. Three instruments, including a photo instrument depicting two levels of formality (high and low) were used to probe the subjects regarding their expectations about learning experience, level of formality and importance of course content.

The results showed that low formality settings were considered more conducive for learning. Subjects preferred sharing, with input next, followed by self-awareness. The preferred instructional setting was the equipment room over small group and classroom. Low formal learning situations with sharing was preferred, as was equipment room and small group instructional settings. Preference for high formal learning situations was related to classroom as an instructional setting (pp. 150-152).

Summary

In the review of the literature, five major theoretical concerns for this study and specific studies which are germaine to this particular research were examined.

Firstly, the general characteristics of adult learners and the pioneer studies in the area of adult learning were examined. The nature of the self-directed learning phenomena was examined next, indicating the increased emphasis in this area of adult learning, particularly since the development of the SDLRS. The relationships of the adult learner's success to pedagogical expectations were

explored with the literature supporting the view that the perceptions of what a person believes to be a good learning experience is partially shaped by what the person has continuously experienced and come to know as a teaching/learning situation. Lastly, the nature of research done in adult learning in correctional settings was examined, indicating that there are many unique learning problems related to this unique population and that these problems require non-traditional solutions.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In Chapter three the methods used to investigate the relationships between adult inmate learners' SDLRS and their expectations regarding level of formality, kind of learning experience and amount of formal schooling are discussed. The research design, questions and hypotheses are outlined and the instrumentation and procedures used in the data collection and analysis are identified.

Description of Methodology

Through a correlational study, an attempt was made to discover the relationships which exist among the expectations adult inmate learners have about valid levels of formality, valid kinds of learning experiences, their degree of self-directed learning readiness and their amount of formal schooling. The statistical analysis used was measures of correlation. Borg and Gall (1990) indicate that correlational studies are used when individual differences are expected to be present which will manifest themselves as variations in scores. The researcher is primarily interested in the factors which will be related to the variations in these scores and which may shed light on adult inmate learners' expectations about learning and their level of self-directed learning readiness.

Research Design

The study was essentially a "one-shot case study" (Isaac and Michael, 1941, p. 36) justified on the grounds that the study is non-experimental. Three instruments were administered one time to each of the 228 subjects and the responses were analyzed. One instrument was used to measure the learners' perceptions about levels of formality and kinds of learning experiences considered to be valid learning activities. A second instrument measured the degree of self-directed learning readiness. The instruments were administered in classroom type settings during regular class hours or activity sessions and the length of time of administration was about 30 minutes.

Variables Under Investigation

The classifying or exploratory variables in this study were the expectation of learning with regards to level of formality, expectation of learning with regards to kind of learning experience and amount of schooling and were, therefore, the independent variables. The variable explained in light of the independent variables was the degree of self-directed learning readiness and was, therefore, the dependent variable. The assumption was that the degree of SDLR the subjects had could be predicted by their expectations about learning, as well as by the amount of formal schooling they've had. If such a relationship exists, this information could be used by educators to

.35

explore the development of an instrument for identifying adult inmates capable of benefitting most from SDL.

Independent Variables

Level of formality of an instructional activity refers to how structured, authority-oriented, and controlled a learner feels the learning activity must be to have important learning occur in his own experience. Formality was measured in two levels: high formal and low formal and was obtained by using the level of formality instrument. The instrument consisted of three pairs of photo pictures depicting adult learners and their instructors engaged in either a highly structured and formal learning situation or a low structured and informal learning situation. The question is asked, "In which of the following situations do you think these people are learning the most?" A choice is made from each pair by the subject making an "X" in a box below the picture.

The second independent variable is the kind of learning experience provided by an instructional activity and refers to the nature of experience the learner perceives as providing important learning. Ward (1966) and McKean (1977) described three basic kinds of learning experiences:

<u>Input</u>. The learner is involved in receiving or coming into contact with some new information.

<u>Self-awareness</u>. The learner is involved in reflecting upon his or her current situation, including abilities, interests, feelings, knowledge, and limitations.

Sharing. The learner is involved in putting into his/her own words or acting upon some new information, ideas, insights (McKean, 1977, p. 34).

The instrument used to obtain this data is discussed under the instrumentation section and is similar to that used to obtain the level of formality data with the exception that there are six pairs of photo pictures instead of three (Appendix B).

The third independent variable is the amount of formal schooling. These data are obtained by having the subjects fill out the educational information section on the SDLRS computer answer sheet.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in the study is the SDLRS obtained by the subjects responding to the 34 questions on the SDLRS ABE.

Research Statements and Null Hypotheses

The following research statements and null hypotheses identify the statistics which were examined and the relationships which were tested for among the independent and dependent variables:

Null Hypotheses

- H₁ Subjects will not choose any one level of formality as providing more important learning than the other.
- H₂ Subjects will not choose any one kind of learning

experience as providing important learning than the other kinds of learning experiences.

- H₃ There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' mean degree of SDLRS and their choice of level of formality.
- H₄ There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' mean degree of SDLRS and their choice of learning experience.
- H₅ There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' mean degree of SDLRS and their amount of formal schooling.
- H₆ There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' choice of level of formality and their choice of kind of learning experience as providing most important learning.
- H₇ There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' mean degree of SDLRS and their age.
- H₈ There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' mean degree of SDLRS and their sex.

Sample

The sample for this study was a convenience sample of 228 adult inmates, 191 males and 37 females participating in 21 adult education programs in various correctional institutions in Lower Southern Michigan. The smallest number of learners in a class was eight and the largest was seventeen. The classes included GED, adult basic education, college extension programs, college degree programs and vocational education (Appendix A). The age range of the subjects was 21 to 54 and they are similar to other adult inmate learners in other institutions throughout the MDOC. The institutions represented in the sample were the State Prison of Southern Michigan, the Robert G. Cotton Facility, the Scott Regional Facility, the Florence Crane Facility, the Egler Facility, Camp Waterloo, Western Wayne Correctional and Adrian Temporary Facility (Appendix A). The population of these institutions are similar to that of most other correctional institutions throughout Michigan and the educational and vocational programs which were included in the study are similar to those in most other correctional institutions in Michigan.

Instrumentation

The study made use of three instruments, the first two having been designed specifically but adopted from instruments used in other past studies (McKean, 1977; McCue, 1982 and Wilson, 1978).

The Level of Formality instrument measured expectations concerning the level of formality the subjects perceived to be most valid in providing learning. There were two levels of formality: High Formality labelled (HF) and Low Formality labelled (LF). The instrument consisted of three pairs of photo pictures with one picture in each pair representing a low formal setting and one picture representing a high formal setting. Each individual picture representing a low formal setting was matched against one picture representing

a high formal setting (Appendix B). The pictures were presented in a way that the formality issue was focused primarily on the activity role of the instructor in the picture. For a high formal situation, the instructor was clearly in control of the learning situation as seen in light of his posture and activity. For a low formal situation, the instructor was still a part of the activity, but it was obvious that the instructor control factor was diffused in a major way. At the top of each page on which the pair of pictures were presented the same question appears: "In which of the following situations do you think people are learning the most?" Each picture in the pair was labelled with a letter of the alphabet and the subject was asked to place an "X" in the box which represented the choice between the two pictured (Appendix D).

The possible combinations of pairs are shown in the Table 3.1 below.

In the first column, the nine pairs of photo pictures are indicated. The letters AB - QR in the second column identifies the pictures in each pair and is placed beside the box in which the subject records his/her choice. In column three, the kinds of learning experiences, input, self-awareness or sharing, describes the nature of the learning situation the learners are engaged in. In addition to the kind of learning experience, each photo-picture also portrays a level of formality indicated in column four.

TABLE 3.1 POSSIBLE CHOICES FOR LEVEL OF FORMALITY AND KIND OF LEARNING EXPERIENCE

Photo-	ID Letter	Learning	Level of
Picture	For Response	Experience	Formality
Pair No.	Box		
1	A	Input	High
	B	Input	Low
2	С	Self-Awareness	Low
	D	Sharing	High
3	E	Self-Awareness	High
	F	Sharing	Low
4	G	Input	Low
	Н	Self-Awareness	High
5	I	Sharing	High
	J	Sharing	Low
6	K	Sharing	Low
	\mathbf{L}	Input	High
7	М	Input	High
	N	Self-Awareness	Low
8	0	Self-Awareness	Low
	Р	Self-Awareness	High
9	Q	Sharing	High
	R	Input	Low

Two scores were obtained from the instrument. Subjects' choices among each one of three pairs of learning situations where setting was constant (See Table 3.1, pair 1, 5 and 8) were used to calculate a preference for level of formality. To obtain a score for level of formality, a preference for high formality in each pair was assigned a value of two and a choice for low formality was assigned a value of one. A consistent preference for a high level of formality would be a score of five or six. A score of three or four indicates a preference for low formality.

Validity Test for Level of Formality Instrument. To ensure the content validity of the Level of Formality instrument, a panel of four adult education instructors, two males and two females, were given the definition of "formal" used for this study in Chapter one. The researcher made sure that each panel member clearly understood how level of formality was being defined. They were then asked to do two things. First, each member of the panel was presented with the six pictures used to make up the nine pairs in the instrument. They were asked to label the picture by itself as to whether it represented a high formal situation or a low formal situation.

The percentage of agreement among all four panel members was 90%. There was a 90% agreement between the researcher and the panel members. Each panel member was then asked to independently label each one of the eighteen pictures as to whether it was a high formal situation or a low formal situation. There was an 80% agreement between how the researchers labelled each picture and how the panel members labelled them.

Reliability Test for Level of Formality Instrument. The Level of Formality instrument was attempting to measure the expectations that subjects had with regard to the level of formality. To ensure that the instrument elicited the same responses over time (stability validity) and was not vulnerable to changes in the subjects' mood, situation, or environment, the instrument was administered to fourteen people in two separate groups at one time and then readministered to the same groups one week later. There was a

test-retest reliability of .87. Thus, the instrument was considered stable over time.

<u>Kind of Learning Experience</u>. The Kind of Learning Experience component of the instrument utilized the pairs numbered 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 9 shown in Table 3.1 on Page 37. Each one of these pairs matched one setting against another setting so the subject was forced to make a choice between settings. Accompanying each photo is a caption with the teacher's instruction. The question asked was, "In which of the following situations do you think people are learning the most?" To obtain a score for preference for kind of learning experience, each time a particular setting was chosen a score of one was recorded. Out of the six pairs, a type of learning could be chosen a maximum of four times for a total score of four.

Validity Test for Kind of Learning Instrument. To ensure the content validity of the Kind of Learning instrument, a panel of four people was given the definition of kind of learning experience used for this research in Chapter one. The researcher made sure that each person clearly understood how kind of learning experience was being defined.

Each member of the panel was presented with the six pictures used to make up the nine pairs of the instrument. They were asked to label each picture as to what kind of learning experience they felt it represented. The percentage of agreement among all four panel members was

100%. There was a 100% agreement between the researcher and the panel members.

Reliability Test for Kind of Learning Instrument. The Kind of Learning Experience instrument is attempting to measure the expectations that subjects have with regard to the preference for kind of learning experience. To ensure that the instrument elicited the same responses over time (stability validity) and was not vulnerable to changes in the subjects' mood, situation, or environment, the instrument was administered to fourteen people in two groups at one time and then re-administered to the same groups one week later. There was a test-retest reliability of .84. Thus, the instrument was considerable stable over time.

Self-Directed Learning Readiness. The SDLRS instrument is a 34-item Likert scale designed to determine the extent to which individuals perceive themselves possessing factors associated with self-directedness. It was developed by Guglielmino in 1977, field-tested and revised in 1981. It has been translated into French, Spanish, Japanese, Chinese, Finnish and Italian and used in over 180 research efforts, including more than 50 masters theses and doctoral dissertations (Crook, 1985, p. 264). The instrument is cited in numerous articles and books relating to adult education and is generally recognized as the most valid and widely-used instrument of its kind. The 58 items are written in such a way as to ask for a response about learning preferences and attitudes. Each item is answered on a five-point scale: almost never true of me; not often true of me; sometimes true of me; usually true of me; almost always true of me (Appendix B).

Reliability Check for SDLR Instrument. Guglielmino (1981) reported a reliabillity coefficient of .87 for the scale subsequent to its 1981 revision. Crook (1985) did a validation study on the scale and reliability check also produced a correspondingly high reliability. A complete list of references including reliability studies can be found in Guglielmino's (1989) "Development of an Adult Basic Education Form of the Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale."

Validity Check for SDLR Instrument. Hassan (1981) reported validation support for the instrument. In his study of 77 randomly selected adults who were asked to complete the SDLRS, significant relationships were found between self-directed readiness, as measured by the SDLRS and the following:

 The number of learning projects conducted in the previous 12 months.

2. The type of learning projects conducted.

3. The demographic variables of age, sex, and level of formal education (Brockett, 1983, p. 173). It was found that the SLDLRS can discriminate between high and low involvement of learning activities, thus indicating high predictive validity for the scale. As indicated in Chapter 2, the SDLRS has demonstrated high correlations in other

studies with factors such as creativity, originality, and self-concept.

Demographic information including the Amount of Formal Schooling variable, as well as age and sex, were obtained by having the subjects enter the information in the appropriate sections on the SDLRS computer answer sheets. Amount of Formal Schooling categories were:

> 0 - 08 years 9 - 11 years 12 years 13 - 14 years 15 - 16 years

Research Procedure and Data Collection

The research data were gathered by using a questionnaire and instruments which took approximately 30 minutues to administer. The data were gathered from adult inmate subjects in various educational and vocational settings between April and June of 1992. Approval was sought and obtained from the Human Subjects Committee at Michigan State University prior to the beginning of data collection (Appendix E).

Prior to Data Collection. A pilot study of the instrumentation was run with 17 subjects in April of 1992. The instruments were administered then interviews were held with the subjects to determine its clarity and to uncover any flaws which may have been present. There were no major problems discovered with the instruments. Minor changes were made in the wording of the accompanying script for the Kind of Learning Experience instrument to clear up small ambiguities pointed out by the pilot group.

The pilot test allowed the researcher to also test the directions for administering the instruments and the overall questionnaire administration procedures. This pilot test provided a necessary step in making the data-gathering phase as efficient and accurate as possible.

During the time the instrument was being perfected, a schedule of data gathering sites was arranged. The final schedule included eight institutions and 21 groups or settings. Arrangements were made at each site to allow 30 minutes to give the directions and collect the data. At each data gathering site, the instructions and questionnaire administration was carried out personally by the researcher. In some cases, it was done prior to the beginning of the regular class period, while in other cases it was done after the regular class or during an extended break.

During Data Collection. Data gathering booklets containing all three instruments described above were prepared. The detailed step-by-step procedure for gathering the data was as follows:

- 1. Sealed data gathering booklet distributed.
- Introduction and statement of purpose of research (Appendix F).
- 3. Subjects were asked to open sealed questionnaire and follow as directions were given verbally for

the overall data gathering process.

- Gave directions and administered the SDLRS questionnaire.
- Gave directions and administered the Expectation of Level of Formality instrument.
- Gave directions and administered the Expectation of Kind of Learning Experience instrument.
- 7. The data gathering instruments were collected, placed in an envelope, labelled with the name of the institution and the group code and sealed to prevent against loss or confusion. Great care was taken to make sure that the coded SDLRS answer sheets and the corresponding Expectation of Learning instruments were kept together.

After Data Collection. To assure complete anonymity, the data questionnaires were not coded with identification numbers until after completion. Each questionnaire was numbered on the front cover and the last page. Each questionnaire was checked to make sure it was complete with the requested demographic information. There was no unusable questionnaires. Information from the Expectation of Learning instruments were transferred to the SDLRS computer answer sheets in the section marked "Special Codes." Demographic information with amount of schooling, age and sex were entered in the appropriate sections on the answer sheets. All the answer sheets were then sent for

processing and analysis. This was done at the Florida Atlantic University Academic Computing Center.

Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences was used to analyze the data. The data were measured using multiple regression measurements and analysis of variance. The level of significance was accepted at the .05 level.

The dependent and independent variables are listed below showing the combinations of correlations done to test for main effects and relationships among variables.

The first level of analysis was to determine if there were any differences among the subjects with regard to the five expectation variables listed below. Appropriate statistical analyses were performed depending on the type of each variable. The list below indicates the five expectation variables tested for main effects.

Tests for Main Effects

- 1. Level of Formality
- 2. Kind of Learning Experience

Tests for Correlations and Associations

- 1. SDLRS x Level of Formality
- 2. SDLRS x Kind of Learning Experience
- 3. SDLRS x Amount of Schooling
- 4. Level of Formality x Kind of Learning Experience
- 5. SDLRS x Age
- 6. SDLRS x Sex

Methodological Assumptions

There are several assumptions which underlie the study's design and procedures. Firstly, the researcher assumed that the subjects' responses to the question in the Expectation of Learning instrument, "In which of these situations do you think people are learning the most?", do indicate the degree of learning which the subjects considered occurring in each learning situation portrayed. It is assumed that the two levels of formality and the three kinds of learning experiences can be represented through pictures and statements.

In addition, the researcher assumed that preferences the adult learners have for kinds of learning experiences can be measured by asking them to make a forced choice between two possible kinds of learning experiences represented by the descriptive statements and pictures.

Second, the researcher assumed that pictures of learning settings can represent different levels of formality and that levels can be distinguished when a subject is asked to make a choice between levels represented by two pictures. Further, it is assumed that by asking the question, "In which situation do you think people are learning the most?", the subject's attention is focused primarily on the issues in the picture that are relevant for meaningful learning to be taking place.

The Self-Directed Learning Readiness scale is assumed to be a valid and reliable indicator of the subjects' ability to become involved in self-directed learning.

Limitations

This was an exploratory study which attempted to identify relationships between SDLR and adult inmates' expectations about learning and years of formal schooling. Conclusions from studying the relationships between the variables described above must be very tentative. Direct cause and effect relationships cannot be established even though meaningful relationships may be described, giving insights regarding Self-Directed Learning Readiness characteristics among adult inmate learners.

The subjects in the study belong to a discrete population of adult learners. Also the sample taken from that population was a convenience sample with no possibility for randomization. These two conditions tightly limit the generalizability of the study.

The study used new instruments to gather data. The instruments are developmental in nature. With such new instrumentation, the study is limited to what adult learners indicated as preferences regarding level of formality and kind of learning experience. Care must be taken in drawing conclusions from this preference-type research. Asking learners for preferences does not necessarily mean that their preference is what ought to be done to structure a productive learning experience. Merely giving learners

their choice does not ensure that the choice is going to promote self-directedness. Further, the reader cannot assume that, because the subjects of the study say that certain kinds of learning experiences and level of formality provide more important learning, in practice they use these levels or kinds of learning experiences. The links between what one believes, says and does are very complex and at times seemingly contradictory. A vast number of studies need to be conducted in order to provide more clarity concerning the differences, correlations and cause-effect relationships among believing, saying and behaving in order to provide educators with the tools to identify selfdirectedness in adult inmates.

Summary

Chapter three described the methods used to investigate the relationships among SDLRS (dependent variable) and expectations concerning level of formality, kind of learning experience and amount of formal schooling (independent variables) of 228 adult inmate learners in various correctional institutions in Michigan.

The research design, research questions and hypotheses, instrumentation and procedures for data collection and analysis were identified.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter contains the information gathered through this research along with related statistical analysis. Each of the two research statements and six research hypotheses is restated and accompanied by the findings.

Overview

The focus of this study examined a specific group of adult learners regarding relationships which may exist among their Degree of Self Directed Learning Readiness Score (SDLRS), the independent variable, their expectations about level of formality, and kind of learning experience as providing important learning, and their amount of formal schooling, their age and sex, all independent variables.

The purpose of this study is to provide basic and relevant information which adult educators may use to continue further research in identifying inmate learners most capable of benefitting from Self Directed Learning (SDL).

Sample Profile

The total sample consisted of 228 adult inmates, eighty-four percent male (191) and sixteen percent female (37). There were subjects from ages twenty-one (2) to the age of fifty-four (1). Sixty-three percent of the subjects were under the age of thirty-five and thirty-seven percent over 35. When the sample is divided into five-year

increments, between age twenty-one and fifty-five, the category with the most subjects is the group between the ages of thirty-one and thirty-five, with fifty-nine subjects. Four subjects did not identify their ages. The reported mean age is 33.08, the median is 32.0 and the mode is 26.0. Table 4.1 illustrates the range of ages for the entire sample. There are seven five-year increments with the age range of 21 through 55.

TABLE 4.1 AGE OF SUBJECTS WITH A FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION IN FIVE YEAR INCREMENTS

FIVE-YEAR INCREMENTS	NUMBER OF SUBJECTS IN EACH CATEGORY	
21 - 25 years 26 - 30 years	41 45	
31 - 35 years	59	
36 - 40 years	31	
41 - 45 years	30	
46 - 50 years	12	
51 - 55 years	06	

The only demographic information required of the sample were age, gender and grade, which will be discussed later in this chapter, being the basis of information for one of the independent variables.

Table 4.2 presents the statistical data for the SDLRS for the entire sample. In Table 4.2 value indicates a score which is a measure of the subjects' current level of SRLR. Frequency identifies the number of subjects having that particular score, while the percent column gives the percentage of the frequency totaling 100%.

TABLE 4.2 SDLRS SELF-DIRECTED LEARNING READINESS SCALE SCORES

Subjects' Converted SDLRS	Frequency	Percent	Cum. Percent
Subjects' Converted SDLRS 119.00 123.00 124.00 125.00 126.00 127.00 128.00 129.00 130.00 131.00 132.00 131.00 132.00 133.00 134.00 135.00 136.00 137.00 138.00 139.00 140.00 141.00 141.00 142.00 143.00 144.00 145.00 144.00 145.00 146.00 147.00 148.00 149.00 150.00 151.00 152.00	Frequency 1 2 1 1 1 4 5 4 5 3 6 14 10 14 13 2 8 9 7 4 8 9 7 9 11 6 11 5 9 8 9 7 8 9 7 8 9 8 9 7 8 9 7 8 9 8 9 7 8 9 8 9 8 9 7 8 9 8 9 7 8 9 9 11 6 11 5 9 8 8 9 8 8 9 8 8 9 8 9 8 8 9 8 9 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	Percent .4 .9 .4 .4 1.8 2.2 1.3 2.6 6.1 4.4 6.1 5.7 .9 3.5 3.9 3.1 1.8 3.5 3.9 3.1 1.8 3.5 3.1 2.6 2.2 3.1 3.9 4.8 2.2 3.9 4.8 2.2 3.9 4.8 2.2 3.9 4.8 2.2 3.9 3.1	Cum. Percent .4 1.3 1.8 2.2 2.6 4.4 6.6 8.3 10.5 11.8 14.5 20.6 25.0 31.1 36.8 37.7 41.2 45.2 48.2 50.0 53.5 56.6 59.2 61.4 64.5 68.4 73.2 75.9 80.7 82.9 80.4
153.00 154.00 155.00 156.00 157.00 158.00 159.00	8 2 5 4 5 2 2	3.5 .9 2.2 1.8 2.2 .9 .9	90.4 91.2 93.4 95.2 97.4 98.2 99.1
160.00 166.00 TOTAL	1 1 	.4 .4 100.0	99.6 100.0

Data Analysis Methods

The data analysis used a combination of descriptive statistics, multiple regression and one-way analysis of variance. A multiple regression equation used all variables which individually predict the criterion to make a prediction which is more accurate (Gay, p. 152). The oneway analysis is used when there is a single dependent variable and it determines whether or not there is a significant difference in means between variables.

The particular nature of the data analysis of the study presented inherent problems associated with multiple comparisons of tests among group means identified by Fletcher, Dan, and Young (1989). The authors cited the problem as "the increasing rate of false rejection errors" to multiple F tests of effects in multifactor ANOVAS and regression analyses. If the null hypothesis is true for each of n tests among a set of means, the authors indicated that the probability that at least one false rejection will occur p(e > 1) increases rapidly beyond the nominal alpha error rate as a function of n according to the Formula P (e > 1) = 1-(1-)ⁿ (p. 102).

These error rates, according to the authors, have serious implications for researchers. This problem has been addressed primarily in the literature on multiple regressions. Cohen and Cohen (1975) and Pedhazur (1982) both stress the importance of having a reasonably large

multiple R^2 (the proportion of dependent score variance accounted for by all independent variables simultaneously) for various regression models. The most commonly used treatment for correcting the problem is the Fisher's protection procedure, which recommends that the overall R^2 be significant before one declares any separately tested constituent independent variable to be significant (Fletcher, p. 103). For this study, the Bonferroni protection method would be more applicable. This method requires the alpha errors be controlled by simply distributing the alpha over the number of tests to be made. However, the practicality and usefulness of the procedure increases with the number of tests involved and is generally used when ten or more f tests are computed. Since the present study involved the analysis of only six tests, the procedure was not employed. A replication of the study, however, could involve the use of additional tests, for example, the race of the adult inmate learner, kind of crime, or combinations of levels of formality and learning experience, as well as other variables unique to the prison environment. It would then be necessary to use the protection procedure if the number of tests exceeded ten.

Data Analysis

The analysis section of Chapter Four is organized around the study's research questions, research statements and research hypotheses.

Analysis of Descriptive Statistics

Subjects' expectations about their choice of Level of Formality and Kinds of Learning Experiences were identified through descriptive statistics.

> Research Question 1: Do adult inmate learners perceive any one Level of Formality as providing more important learning than the other Level of Formality?

Null Hypothesis 1: Subjects will not choose one Level of Formality as providing more important learning than the other Level of Formality.

Table 4.3 presents the frequency distribution of the scores for the level of formality. There are four possible scores for level of formality: low, moderately low, moderately high and high.

Subjects were asked to indicate in which of the two pictures learners were learning the most. The setting was held constant and judgements were made in three different settings. A score of <u>one</u> was assigned for low formality and a score of <u>two</u> for high formality. If the subject was consistent in choosing low formality, a score of three results and if a subject was consistent in choosing high formality, a score of six results.

Table 4.3 indicates that 60.1% of the subjects thought that more effective learning was associated with low or moderately low formality, while 39.5% thought that more effective learning was associated with high formality or moderately high formality. The overall mean level of formality is 4.242.
Raw	Level of		Valid	
Score	Formality	Frequency	Percent	Percent
3	Low Formality	91	40.1	39.9
	Moderately Low			
4	Formality	46	20.3	20.2
	Moderately High			
5	Formality	34	15.0	14.9
6	High Formality	56	24.7	24.6
0		1	missing	. 4
	TOTAL	228	100.0	100.0
Total o	of Low Formality			60.1
Total %	& of High Formality	1		39.5
Overall	l Mean Level of For	cmality		4.242

TABLE 4.3 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR LEVEL OF FORMALITY

Therefore, based on the frequency distribution data, the research statement is not confirmed. The learners did choose the low level of formality as providing more important learning as opposed to the high level of formality.

> Research Question 2: Do adult learners perceive any one Kind of Learning experience as providing more important learning than any other Kind of Learning experience?

Null Hypothesis 2: Subjects will not choose any one Kind of Learning experience as more important in providing learning than any other Kind of Learning experience.

Table 4.4 presents the frequency distributions for the preference for kinds and combinations of learning experiences.

TABLE 4.4 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR PREFERENCE FOR KIND OF LEARNING EXPERIENCE

Combinations or	Total Number of	
Category of	Responses for	
Subjects' Choices	Each Choice	Percent
	4.5	0.0.1
Input	46	20.1
Self-Awareness	17	7.4
Sharing	48	21.0
Input and Self-Awareness		
(Equally)	36	15.7
Input and Sharing		
(Equally)	43	18.8
Sharing and Self-Awareness	5	
(Equally)	23	10.0
All Three Equally	15	6.5

n = 228

In the kind of learning experience instrument, a total of nine pairs of statements representing the three kinds of learning experiences were presented. The frequency Table 4.4 lay out the total number of times each kind of learning experience was chosen by itself or in some combination with another kind of learning experience. This is a calculated variable from the raw score choices for the purpose of data analysis. Preferences for kind of learning experience is calculated by taking each individual choice made by each subject and adding all scores for the individual choices within the various combinations to get the totals.

The total scores were isolated for each kind of learning experience by asking the question, "Did a subject have a higher score on input versus the other two, or sharing versus the other two, or self-awareness versus the other two?" If they did have a higher score on one kind than any other kind, they then were counted as having a preference for that kind of learning experience. If the subjects had higher and equal scores on a combination of two kinds when compared with a third, they were put into the category with a combination of kinds of learning experience. If the scores were equal on all three kinds of learning experience, another category was created labeled, "All three scores equal."

Table 4.4 indicates that 46 or 20.2% of the subjects always preferred input kind of learning experiences, with only 17 or 7.5% of the subjects always showing a preference for self-awareness kind of learning experiences. A total of 48 or 21.1% of the subjects always preferred sharing type learning experiences.

In combination, 36 subjects or 15.8% of the subjects preferred both input and self-awareness, 43 subjects or 18.9% preferred both input and sharing, 23 subjects or 10.0% preferred both sharing and self-awareness, with 15 subjects or 6.5% preferring all three kinds of learning experiences equally.

Therefore, when ranked according to strength of preference for kind of learning experience, there is a clear preference for combinations of different kinds of learning experiences, followed by sharing experience, then input experience. However, the results indicate that there is an

extremely small difference among preference for input, sharing and equal combination of input and sharing experiences. Only 17% of the subjects indicated a preference for self-awareness experience. The overall mean for kind of learning experience is 3.608. Further statistical analysis would be necessary to clarify the relationship between sharing, input and self-awareness.

Therefore, based on the frequency distribution data, the research statement was confirmed. The subjects in this sample did not show a significant preference for one kind of learning experience, but chose a some inbation of inut and sharing.

Research Hypotheses

The following six null hypotheses were used to guide the study based on the research questions.

1. SDLRS x Level of Formality

Research Question 3: Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their choice of Level of Formality?

Null Hypothesis 3: There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their choice of Level of Formality as providing as providing most important learning.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to test for relationships between SDLRS and level of formality. A significant relationship was found between the two variables (F = 3.815, P = .052 and R - Square = .017). Consequently, the null hypothesis was not rejected, significant at the .05 level. The results indicate that for this sample, SDLRS cannot be accurately predicted by their choice of level of formality as providing most important learning. The results of Hypothesis one is presented in Table 4.5.

		TAI	3LE 4	4.5		
ANALYSI	S OF	VARIAN	CE O	N THE	REL	ATIONSHIP
BETWEEN	MEAN	SDLRS	AND	LEVEL	OF	FORMALITY

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Р
Regression Residual	1 225	311.313 18360.202	311.313 81.601	3.815	0.052

Significant at .05 level

2. SDLRS x Kind of Learning Experience

Research Question 4: Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their choice of Kind of Learning Experience?

Null Hypothesis 4: There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their choice of Kind of Learning Experience.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to test for a relationship between SDLRS and kind of learning experience. No significant relationship was found between the two variables (F = .915, P = .485, and R - Square = .024). Consequently, the null hypothesis was not rejected, significant at the .05 level. The results indicate that for this sample, SDLRs cannot be accurately predicted by their choice of kind of learning experience as providing most important learning. The results of Hypothesis two is presented in Table 4.6.

			TA	BLE	4.	6		
ANZ	ALYSIS	OF V	ARIAN	NCE (ON	THE	RELATIC	NSHIP
BETWEEN	MEAN	SDLRS	AND	KIN	DC	DF I	EARNING	EXPERIENCE

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Р
Learn. Exper.	6	454.583	75.764	0.915	0.485
Error	220	18216.933	82.804		

Significant at .05 level

3. SDLRS x Amount of Formal Schooling

Research Question 5: Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their amount of Formal Schooling?

Null Hypothesis 5: There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their amount of Formal Schooling.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to test for a relationship between mean SDLRS and the subjects' amount of formal schooling. A statistically significant relationship was found between the two variables at the .05 level of significance (F = 6.170, P = .014 and R - square = .027). Consequently, the null hypothesis is rejected. The results indicate that for this sample, mean SDLRS can be predicted by the amount of formal schooling they have had. Specifically, the higher the number of years of formal schooling, the higher the mean SDLRS when compared to the national adult norms. The results of Hypothesis three is presented in Table 4.7.

				TAE	3LE	4.	7				
ANA	LYSIS	OF	VA	RIAN	CE	ON	\mathbf{T}	HE	RELATIO	NSHIP	
BETWEEN	MEAN	SDL	RS	AND	AM	OUN	т	\mathbf{OF}	FORMAL	SCHOOLI	ING

Source	DF	Sum of	Squares	Mean	Square	F-Ratio	Р
Regression Residual	1 226	4 181	96.228 76.913	49 8	6.228 0.429	6.170	.014

Significant at the .05 level

4. Level of Formality x Kind of Learning Experience

Research Question 6: Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' choice of Level of Formality and their choice of Kind of Learning Experience?

Null Hypothesis 6: There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' choice of Level of Formality and their choice of Kind of Learning Experience.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to test for a relationship between level of formality and kind of learning experience with regards to the subjects' preferences as to which provide the most important learning. The relationship between the two variables was found to be statistically significant at the .05 level (F = 8.456, P = .000 and R - Square = .187). Consequently, the null hypothesis is rejected. The strength of the relationship is extremely weak, the results suggesting that the subjects' choice of level of formality, the dependent variable in this relationship, can be predicted by their choice of kind of learning experience but without any statistically significant degree of accuracy. The results of Hypothesis four is presented in Table 4.8.

TABLE 4.8 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEVEL OF FORMALITY AND KIND OF LEARNING EXPERIENCE

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-Ratio	Р
Learn. Exper. Error	6 220	62.908 272.766	10.485 1.240	8.456	.000

Significant at the .05 level.

5. SDLRS x Age

Research Question 7: Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their age?

Null Hypothesis 7: There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their age.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to test for a relationship between SDLRs and the age of the subjects. A statistically significant relationship was found between the two variables at the .05 level (F = 5.989, P = .015 and R square = .026). The null hypothesis is rejected. The results suggest that for this sample, the subjects' degree of SDLR can be predicted by their age. Additional studies will be necessary, however, to authenticate or to clarify this since previous studies discussed in Chapter Two found no significant relationship between SDLRS and age. The results of Null hypothesis five is presented in Table 4.9.

TABLE 4.9 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SDLRS AND AGE

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Р
Regression Residual	1 222	479.945 17790.912	479.945 80.139	5.989	.015

Significant at the .05 level

6. SDLRS x Sex

Research Question 8: Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their sex?

Null Hypothesis 8: There will be no significant relationship between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their sex.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to test for a relationship between SDLRS and sex. The relationship between SDLRS, the dependent variable, and sex, an independent variable, was found to be statistically significant at the .05 level (F = 8.649, P = .004 and R Square = .037). The null hypothesis is rejected. The result of this analysis also does not concur with previous studies in the literature which indicated no significant relationship between SDLRs and sex. The results of Null Hypothesis Six is presented in Table 4.10.

TABLE 4.10 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SDLRS AND SEX

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Р
Regression Residual	1 226	688.289 17984.852	688.289 79.579	8.649	.004

Significant at the .005 level.

Summary

Data from this study provides information concerning Self-Directed Learning Readiness (SDLR) and its relationship with adult inmate learners' amount of formal schooling, and their expectations about level of formality and kind of learning experience as providing most important learning, their age and their sex. Descriptive statistics and a combination of multiple regression and one-way analysis of variance were used to generate the findings.

CHAPTER FIVE

OVERVIEW, SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overview

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the study, provide conclusions, offer implications, and suggest recommendations for further research. The first section of this study presents the summary of the purpose and procedure of the study, the second section summarizes the findings and provides conclusions, the third section suggests implications, and the final section provides recommendations for further research.

Summary of Purpose and Procedure

The purpose of this study was to inquire into the relationship which exists between adult inmate learners' Self-Directed Learning Readiness and their amount of formal schooling and expectations about learning with regards to level of formality and kind of learning experience. This information will hopefully contribute to the body of knowledge on Self-Directed Learning among adult inmates in Michigan.

Specifically, the study examined eight major areas: (1) what levels of formality adult learners perceived valid; (2) what kinds of learning experiences were perceived valid; (3) what relationship exists between mean SDLRS and subjects' choice of level of formality; (4) what relationship exists

between mean SDLRS and the subjects' choice of kind of learning experience; (5) what relationship exists between mean SDLRS and subjects' amount of formal schooling; and (6) what relationship exists between the subjects' choice of level of formality and their choice of kind of learning experience; (7) what relationship exists between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their age; (8) what relationship exists between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their sex. For each of the eight areas a research question was formulated followed by two research statements for the first two questions and six null hypotheses for the next six questions.

Chapter five presents a summary of the findings and the conclusions resulting from this investigation. The conclusions are specified and implications for further research are discussed.

Data were collected from a sample of 228 male and female adult inmate learners in a "one-shot case study" (Isaac and Michael, 1971, p. 36). The instruments measured the subjects' degree of Self-Directed Learning Readiness, their choice of level of formality as providing important learning and their choice of kind of learning experience as providing important learning. Information for the fourth, fifth and sixth variables, amount of formal schooling, age and sex were entered directly on the data sheet. Multiple regression and one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine relationships for the six null hypotheses, while

descriptive statistics were used to determine the results of the two research statements.

Summary of Findings with Conclusions

Research Question 1

Do adult inmate learners perceive any one level of formality as providing more important learning than the other level?

It was found that the low level of formality was chosen by a total of 60.1% of the subjects, as opposed to a 39.9% choice for high formality.

It was concluded that the subjects in the sample differed significantly in the level of formality setting they judged as providing more important learning.

Research Question 2

Do adult inmate learners perceive any one kind of learning experience as providing more important learning than other kinds of learning experience?

It was found that 7.4% of the subjects chose selfawareness as their preferred kind of learning experience, while 20.1% chose input and 21.0% chose sharing. The difference between the percentage who chose input and those who chose sharing is .09% and obviously quite small. No single kind of learning experience, therefore, was regarded as an overwhelming choice, although on the contrary, self awareness was seen as very unfavorable. In analyzing the results of the responses, it was found that there was an important distinction in the percentage when combinations are looked at. Thus, 18.8% of the subjects' choice would be for input and sharing, as opposed to 15.7% for input and self-awareness.

It was concluded that the subjects in the study did not indicate a clear preference for any one kind of learning experience. However, there was a high level of disregard for self-awareness experience. A choice for combinations of kinds of experiences would be highly favored.

These conclusions, with regards to level of formality and kind of learning experience as providing most important learning is consistent with the theoretical framework guiding this research. Both the Wilson study and the McCue study indicated a clear preference for low formality. There was a clear preference for low and medium levels in the McKean study, with combinations of low formality with sharing experience in the McCue and McKean studies. The Wilson study gave a clear indication, however, for input experience with low level of formality. The results of these findings underscore the fact that adult inmates, although considered to be a unique population, do develop pedagogical expectations largely as a part of a cultural experience. As such, it was suggested in Chapter One that an effective teaching/learning model is one in which all three kinds of learning experiences are utilized with an understanding of the nature of learning facilitated by each. The choice of low formality over high formality was not surprising, recognizing the high level of an authorityoriented setting the subjects wake up to each day. The

researcher anticipated the possibility of finding the opposite choice due to the fact that the study was done weeks after classes had begun and subjects may have gotten accustomed to that particular class structure.

```
Research Question 3
```

Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' mean degree of SDLRS and their choice of level of formality?

The study found no significant relationship between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their choice of level of formality as providing the most important learning at the .05 level of significance.

The failure to find a significant relationship between mean SDLRS and level of formality is incongruent with theoretical concepts found in the literature about adult learning (Fromin, 1941 and Russell, 1988), that elements such as control are shaped in childhood and once formed are difficult to change. Thus, if a child developed a need for high levels of control, the need would continue into adulthood. The reverse would be true as well. Tn an educational or learning setting, this would translate into individuals requiring low formality or low structured settings would meet the low control needs. It would seem logical, then, that with the study sample choosing low formality as providing the most important learning, there would be a significant positive relationship with their below mean degree of SDLRS.

Research Question 4

Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their choice of kind of learning experience?

No significant relationship was found between the subjects' mean degree of SDLRS and their choice of kind of learning experience as providing most important learning.

Although few studies have been found in the literature relating to learning experience and other aspects of adult learning, none has been found linking kinds of learning experience with SDLR, and consequently there is no basis for comparing the present finding with that of previous studies using similar variables. Research on learning styles by Dorsey and Pierson (1984) concluded that from the age of 18 to 33 the ability to be abstract increases and while this ability decreases from age 34 to 49, it increases again from age 60 to 65. The authors found that from age 18 to 49, the participants preferred an active role in learning and after that desired a more reflective role. Knowles (1980) and Cross (1981) also supported the view of this sharing type of learning situation as being positively related to SDL among adult learners. Failure to establish any significant relationship between mean SDLRS and the subjects' choice of learning experience in this study, therefore, appears to be somewhat incongruent with present-day theoretical concepts found so far in the literature. Further research of a more experimental nature will most definitely be needed with this population.

Research Question 5

Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' mean degree of SDLRS and their amount of formal schooling?

A statistically significant relationship was found at the .05 level between mean SDLRS and the subjects' amount of formal schooling at the .05 level of significance.

This result confirms the findings of previous research with regards to SDL and years of education. Roberts (1986) and Young (1986) found a positive relationship between SDLRS and other variables including educational level. The higher the educational level, according to these studies, the greater the degree of self-directed learning readiness. One study by Bivens, Campbell and Lerry (1963), however, attributed a loss of student self-direction in learning to school attendance. "By the time the students reach ninth grade, they have developed a strong habit of linear study methods that conflicts with self-direction in learning." The linear study methods the authors contend result from the students' dependence on an authority figure to tell them what is worth learning and their anxiousness to prepare for teacher-made tests which measure their "success" in learning, as opposed to an exploration of areas of knowledge based on their own interests for their intrinsic rewards. No subsequent research has been found relating to this particular aspect of self-directedness and with regards to adult inmate learners in the present study, this researcher sees this observation as particularly relevant.

Research Question 6

Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' choice of level of formality and their choice of kind of learning experience?

Statistically, there was a significant relationship found between the subjects' mean choice of level of formality and their choice of kind of learning experience at the .05 level.

There is no precedent study found in the literature exploring relationships between the means of these two variables as in the present study. The McKean and the Wilson studies discussed in Chapter two looked at combinations of individual levels of formality with individual kinds of learning experiences and the results show a consistent pattern of preferences. McKean found that correlations of medium formality with sharing experiences were considered most valid and in high formality settings, input was considered least valid (pp. 51-69). Although there was a significant difference in the age of the population studies, Wilson also found medium levels of formality preferred with sharing experiences, while the least preferred relationship was high formality with input experiences (pp. 62-112).

Limitations inherent in the methodology of this study may have contributed to the absence of any significant relationship between the two variables. A duplication of the McKean or the Wilson study with an adult inmate sample population may be a necessary next step in accurately determining whether or not adult inmate learners have the same kinds of expectations about learning as do the nonincarcerated population studied by McKean and Wilson.

Research Question 7

Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' mean degree of SDLRS and their age?

The study found a significant relationship at the .05 level of significance between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their age.

Evidence of a significant relationship between SDLRS and age raises questions due to the fact that three previous studies (Roberts, 1986; Young, 1986; and Bejot, 1981) found no significant relationship between SDLRs and age and sex, respectively, in their studies of management variables and nursing education. One question regarding this issue of sex could be, "To what extent are there cultural differences between males and females with respect to self-directed or other types of learning?" Sex roles are changing in the general population and there is little clarity about the causes of adherence to or deviation from group standards for males and females. No study has been found relating to self-directedness and sex or age in correctional settings.

Research Question 8

Is there a significant relationship between the subjects' mean degree of SDLRS and their age?

It was found that a statistically significant relationship exists between the subjects' mean SDLRS and their sex, significant at the .05 level.

As indicated in the conclusion relating to the finding between SDLRs and subjects' age, previous studies with noncorrectional populations found no relationship between SDLRs and sex. Additional studies will be necessary to systematically assess the relationship of these variables among this population.

Implications for Future Research

The increasing recognition of self-directed learning is, and has been throughout most of history, a predominant force in terms of adult choices and involvement has significant implications for adult inmate learners, as well as for the teachers and the institutions serving these inmates.

In his discussion of androgogy, Knowles outlines four assumptions about adults as learners and as such, they apply directly to inmate learners. These are:

 Their self-concept moves from one of being a dependent personality toward being a self-directed human being.

2. They accumulate a growing reservoir of experience that becomes an increasingly rich resource for learning.

3. Their readiness to learn becomes oriented increasingly to the developmental tasks of their social roles.

4. Their time perspective changes from one of postponed application of knowledge to immediacy of application, from one of subject-centeredness to one of performance-centeredness (Knowles, 1975, pp. 18-22).

There is little doubt that these assumptions provide a valuable foundation for understanding self-directed learners. The self-directed learner is an active learner, and the person who develops a high degree of selfdirectedness recognizes that learning is too important to turn all or most of its planning over to someone else.

This study has shown that different types of experiences can meaningfully exist at different levels of formality, so the correctional educator has different options in providing varied experiences for adult inmate learners. The implications for future research are many and varied and may include personality and pedagogical expectations, cultural experiences, and attitudes toward authority. The following recommendations for future research could continue to bridge gaps between educational programs and correctional institutions of Michigan and the expectations of adult learners.

Recommendations

On the basis of the findings in the study, the following recommendations are made:

 A replication of this research using a different kind of methodology, other than a one-shot case study, should be pursued.

2. The bases of the adult inmates' judgements need to be explored in more depth. Taped interviews and thought-bythought ratings would help to determine if certain levels of formality and kinds of learning experiences are related to specific bases of judgements.

3. Ethnographic research should further explore how attitudes of past schooling and significant teacher models relate to choices adult inmate learners make regarding level of formality and kind of learning experience in relationship to SDLR.

4. Further research which may contribute to the refining of the instruments used in this study would be helpful. The instrumentation techniques of using pictures to isolate perceptions and expectations is functional as a research tool, but further research that identifies how to compose the content of a picture in relation to the variable being studied (level of formality on structure and kind of learning experience) is needed.

5. The relationship between the SDLRS of particular inmate learner groups and combinations of levels of formality and kinds of learning experience should be investigated instead of the overall group means of these variables.

6. Personality measurements should be used to explore relationships between pedagogical expectations and SDLR of adult inmate learners.

7. Longitudinal studies should be done on a sample of inmate learners to determine actual SDLR skills.

8. Research should be conducted with inmate learners starting at the beginning of the quarter or semester and not halfway through, as in the present study.

9. Research should be done to clarify the relationships between SDLRS and adult inmates' age and sex.

A great deal of information is needed about adult inmates' SDLR before educational practitioners can even begin to relate to the benefits that can be experienced by adult learners who participate in SDL endeavors. The results of one-way analysis of variance in this exploratory study failed to uncover any significant relationship between mean SDLRs and the subjects' expectations about level of formality and kind of learning experience. Although this study did not provide definitive answers to a complex issue about adult inmate learners, it did provide new insights regarding adult learning, preference for structure and SDLR, as well as some directions which may help other researchers to uncover the relationships between SDLR and various characteristics of adult inmate learners.

It is hoped that these results, as well as the overall study, will provide seeds for thought and research which will better enable educational practitioners to better serve the inmate learner.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION SITES

IDENTIFICATION OF DATA COLLECTION SITES

The following list identifies the 20 groups comprising the research subjects. The particular program the subjects were involved in and the institutions are identified.

001-009 Academic GED Preparation State Prison of Southern Michigan South 010-020 Academic Jackson Community College Class-College Math State Prison of Southern Michigan South 021-033 Academic Jackson Community College Class-Sociology State Prison of Southern Michigan Central

034-049 Vocational Maintenance Trades State Prison of Southern Michigan-Maximum

050-066 Academic Adult Basic Education State Prison of Southern Michigan-Central

067-078 Academic Jackson Community College Class-History State Prison of Southern Michigan-Central

079-090 Academic Spring Arbor College Class-Psychology State Prison of Southern Michigan-South

091-102 Academic Paralegal Charles E. Egler Facility 103 - 114Academic Spring Arbor College Class-Computer Science Charles E. Egler Facility 115-124 Academic Adult Basic Education Robert G. Cotton Facility 125-136 Vocational Electronics Adrian Temporary Facility 137-146 Academic Community College Class-Criminal Justice Adrian Temporary Facility 147-155 Academic GED Preparation Huron Valley Men's Facility 156-163 Academic Jackson Community College Class-Business Administration Camp Waterloo 164-173 Vocational Automechanics Michigan Training Unit 184-191 Academic English Language State Prison of Southern Michigan Central

192-199 Academic Basic Education Scott Regional Facility

200-210 Vocational Food Management Program and Services Florence Crane Women's Facility

211-220 Academic GEd Preparation Florence Crane Women's Facilit6y

221-228 Academic Sociology Scott Regional Facility APPENDIX B

SDLRS

SDLRS-ABE

Name		Age
Sex	Race	Date of Birth
Learning Center		Today's Date

LEARNING GUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: These are some questions about how you like to learn best and how you feel about learning. Read each sentence and choose the one answer which is most true for you. Be sure to answer every question.

There are no wrong answers, so be sure to mark the answer which tells you how you feel. Usually the answer that comes to your mind first is the answer that is true for you.

Tico t	Use the following responses:		RESPONSES				
 I never feel like this. I feel like this less than half the time. I feel like this half the time. I usually feel like this. I feel like this all the time. Sample Item: (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) ITEMS: 		I never feel like this.	I feel like this less than half the time.	Half the time I feel this way.	I usually feel this way.	I feel like this all the time.	
1.	I know what I want to learn.	1	2	3	4	5	
2.	When I see something that I don't understand. I stay away from it.	1	2	3	4	5	
3.	If there is something I want to learn. I can find a way to learn it.	1	2	3	4	5	
4.	I love to learn.	1	2	3	4	5	
5.	I believe that a big part of my education should be thinking about what kind of person I am and what kinds of things I want to do with my life.	1	2	3	4	5	
6.	I know where to go to get information when I need it.	1	2	3	4	5	
7.	I can learn things by myself better than most people my age.	1	2	3	Ą	5	
8.	If there is something I have decided to learn, I can find time for it, no matter how busy I am.	1	2	3	4	5	
9.	Understanding what I read is a problem for me.	L	2	3	4	5	
10.	I knowwhen I need to learn more about something.	1	2	3	4	5	
11.	I think books are boring.	1	2	3	4	5	
12.	I can think of many different ways to learn about something new.	1	2	3	4	5	
13.	I try to think about how the things I am learning will fit in with the plans I have for myself.	1	2	3	4	5	
14.	I really enjoy looking for the answer to a hard question.	1	2	3	4	5	
15.	I have a lot of questions about things.	1	2	3	4	5	
16.	I'll be glad when I'm finished learning.	1	2	3	4	5	

Go on to next page

Use the following responses: 1. I never feel like this. 2. I feel like this less than half the time. 3. I feel like this half the time. 4. I usually feel like this. 5. I feel like this all the time. ITEMS:		I never feel like this.	I feel like this less than half the time.	Half the time I feel this way.	I usually feel this way.	I feel like this all the time.
17.	I'm not as interested in learning as some other people seem to be.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	When I decide to find out something, I do it.	1	2	3.	4	5
19.	I like to try new things, even if I'm not sure how they will turn out.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	I'm good at thinking of new ways to do things.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	I like to think about the future.	1	2	3	Ą	5
22.	A hard problem doesn't stop me.	1	2	3	Ą	5
23.	I can make myself do what I think I should.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	I am really good at solving problems.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	I become a leader in learning groups.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	I like talking about ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	I don't like learning things that are hard.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	I really <u>want</u> to learn new things.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	When I learn more, the world becomes more exciting.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	It's really my job to learn—the school and the teachers can't do it for me.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	I learn many new things on my own each year.	1	2	3	Ą	5
32.	I am a good learner in the classroom and on my own.	1	2	3	4	5
33.	People who keep learning are leaders. because they know what's happening.	1	2	3	4	5
34.	I like to see if I can solve hard problems.	l	2	3	4	5

`

.

•

APPENDIX C

INTERPRETATION OF SDLRS

HOW TO INTERPRET YOUR SDLRS SCORE

Your score is a measure of your current level of Self-Directed Learning Readiness.

If you score is between:	Then your readiness for self-directed learning is:			
58-176	Low			
177-201	Below average			
202-226	Average			
227-251	Above average			
252-290	High			

Some people have a low level of readiness because they have consistently been exposed to other-directed instruction. The most important thing to remember about your score is that it can be improved. Most persons with low or average levels of self-directed learning readiness can increase their skills with practice.

The average score for adults completing the questionnaire is 214. The standard deviation is 25.59. The SDLRS measures your readiness for self-directed learning. Research has suggested that individuals who have developed high self-directed learning skills tend to perform better in jobs requiring:

- 1. A high degree of problem solving ability.
- 2. A high degree of creativity.
- 3. A high degree of change.

. Persons with high SDLRS scores usually prefer to determine their learning needs and plan and implement their own learning. This does not mean that they will never choose to be in a structured learning situation. They may well choose traditional courses or workshops as a part of a learning plan.

Persons with average SDLRS scores are more likely to be successful in more independent situations, but are not fully comfortable with handling the entire process of identifying their learning needs and planning and implementing the learning.

Persons with below average SDLRS scores usually prefer very structured learning options such as lecture and traditional classroom settings.



HOW DOES YOUR SDLRS SCORE COMPARE WITH OTHER ADULTS?

You can determine how your score compares with the scores of other adults by looking at the diagram above. For example, if your score is 214, your self-directed learning readiness is average compared with all adults who have taken this test.

You can determine what percentile your score is by examining the table below.

lf your SDLBS	You are	lf your SDLBS	You are
Score is:	Percentile:	Score is:	Percentile:
141	Q	213	45
143	0	215	50
145	0	217	51
147	0	219	53
149		221	57
151	1	223	63
155	1	225	66
157	1	229	69
159	i	231	72
161	2	233	74
163	2	235	76
165	2	237	79
167	3	239	81
169	3	241	83
171	4	243	85
173	4	245	87
175	5	247	88
177	6	249	90
1/9	··· /	251	07
181	8	253	92
195	10	255	94
187	13	257	95
189	14	261	96
191	16	263	97
193	18	265	97
195	20	267	98
197	22	269	98
199	25	271	· 98
201	27	273	99
203	30	275	99
205	33 26	277	99
207	30 20	273	99
209	33	201	99+
211	42	. 285	99+

APPENDIX D

•

EXPECTATIONS OF LEARNING INSTRUMENT

v

Expectation of Learning Questionaire Directions

Look at the following pairs of pictures and answer the question at the top of the page. Mark your choice in each pair by placing an "X" in the large box (//) under the picture of your choice. Please only one "X" per page.

Pair 1

Photo 1

High Formality-Input

In this first picture, the students are seated in a regular classroom setting. The teacher is writing on the board. He says:

"Note that these two words have similar pronounciation but different spelling."



"A"

Photo 12

Low Formality/Input

In this picture, the students are sitting at a table enjoying a snack. The teacher is sitting with them and is discussing something important. The caption says:

"During the break, I'll get with you and explain this more clearly."





"B"

Pair 2

Photo 3

Low Formality/Self-Awareness

In the third picture, two students are sitting outside of the classroom on a lounge preparing for the next class. The caption says:

"During the break, look through your notes to make sure you understand the main concepts."



"C"

Photo 11

Low Formality/Sharing

Picture 11 shows students sitting at a table at the back of the classroom enjoying a snack and discussing a topic. The caption says:

"During the break, talk with other people what you have learned from participating in the project."







Pair 3

Photo 5

High Formality/Self-Awareness

In this picture, the teacher is sitting in front of the class while the students are working on their own. The instruction is:

"Class, I would like you to make a summary of the paragraph after you are through reading it"



"E"

Photo 11

Low Formality/Sharing

Picture 11 shows students sitting at a table at the back of the classroom enjoying a snack and discussing a topic. The caption says:

"During the break, talk with other people what you have learned from participating in the project."



пЕн

Pair 4

Photo 6

Low Formality/Input

In this picture, the teacher is assisting one student who needs help understanding something. The caption says:

"Sam, before the next class begins I'll get with you and explain this better"



"G"

Photo 10

High Formality/Self-Awareness

Picture 10 shows students sitting at a table. The teacher is sitting there also. The instruction is:

"Class, I would like you to make a list of questions that come to your mind after reading the passage."





Pair 5

Photo 9

Low Formality/Selfawareness

In this picture, two students are sitting in a classroom and each one is reviewing his assignment according to the instruction which says:

"After class today, go over the assignment and see if there are any points you have missed before you turn it in."



"I"

Photo 7

High Formality/Sharing In picture 7, the teacher is sitting in

front of the class while the students are discussing a topic with each other. The caption says:

" Now, pair up with the person across from you and explain the reason for your choice of answer to the question on the page"





Pair 6







96

Pair 7

Photo 8

High Formality/Input

This picture shows the students seated in the classroom and the teacher teaching. he says:

"Notice that the same answer can be obtained by using either of the two methods to solve the problem"



"M"

Photo 9

Low Formality/Selfawareness

In this picture, two students are sitting in a classroom and each one is reviewing his assignment according to the instructior which says:

"After class today, go over the assignment and see if there are any points you have missed before you turn it in."





Pair 8

Photo 3

Low Formality/Self-Awareness

In the third picture, two students are sitting outside of the classroom on a lounge preparing for the next class. The caption says:

"During the break, look through your notes to make sure you understand the main concepts."



Photo 10

High Formality/Self-Awareness

Picture 10 shows students sitting at a table. The teacher is sitting there also. The instruction is:

"Class, I would like you to make a list of questions that come to your mind after reading the passage."







Pair 9

Photo 2

High Formality-Sharing

The second picture is also that of a regular classroom setting. In this case, the teacher is allowing the students to share a learning experience. He says :

"Pair up with the person across from you and share how you would solve the problem."



Photo 6

Low Formality/Input

In this picture, the teacher is assisting one student who needs help understanding something. The caption says:

"Sam, before the next class begins I'll get with you and explain this better"





"0"



APPENDIX E

•

.*

UCRIHS CONSENT FORM

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

OFFICE OF VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH AND DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824-1046

April 3, 1992

Wills Dixon 921 H. Cherry Lane East Lansing, MI 48823

RE: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF SELF-DIRECTED LEARNING READINESS AND EXPECTATIONS ABOUT LEARNING AMONG ADULT INMATE LEARNERS IN MICHIGAN, IRB #92-121

Dear Mr. Dixon:

The above project is exempt from full UCRIHS review. The proposed research protocol has been reviewed by a member of the UCRIHS committee. The rights and welfare of human subjects appear to be protected and you have approval to conduct the research.

You are reminded that UCRIHS approval is valid for one calendar year. If you plan to continue this project beyond one year, please make provisions for obtaining appropriate UCRIHS approval one month prior to March 23, 1993.

Any changes in procedures involving human subjects must be reviewed by UCRIHS prior to initiation of the change. UCRIHS must also be notifed promptly of any problems (unexpected side effects, complaints, etc.) involving human subjects during the course of the work.

Thank you for bringing this project to my attention. If I can be of any future help, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

David E. Wright, Ph.D., Chair University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (UCRIHS)

DEW/pjm

cc: Dr. Eldon Nonnamaker

APPENDIX F

PARTICIPANTS CONSENT FORM

101

Michigan State University

Graduate Research

Consent Form

In signing the following statement, I agree to participate in the research project being conducted by Wills Dixon, and I acknowledge:

- 1. That I understand the purposes of the research project which have been explained to me;
- 2, That I understand that my identity will remain anonymous and all results will remain confidential;
- 3. That I am voluntarily participating in the research project with no expectation to benifit directly from the results;
- 4. That I am free to withdraw from participation at any time without consequence;
- 5. That if I want to find out about the results of the study, I may contact the teacher or instructor to whom the results will be made available.

Signature:_____

Date:_____

Questionaire Number:_____

CONSENT FORM

I confirm that my participation in Mr. Dixon's research by allowing my picture to be taken is voluntary. I understand that I can change my mind and be free to quit or not to have my picture used even after I have started to participate in the study. I understand that the pictures will be used in the strictest confidence only for the purpose of the study which has been explained to me and that my name or any personal information about me will not be used in the findings of the study. If I want to find out about the results of the study I may ask through the Adult Education Center, the Department of Administration in the College of Education at Michigan State University, or directly through the researcher.

I understand that this study may not directly benifit me but that it may help to provide information which may be of use to adult education services in the future.

Participant

Date

Researcher Date

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bejot, D.D. The Degree of Self-Directedness and the Choices of Learning Methods. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Iowa State University, 1981.
- Berger, E. "The Relations Between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Expressed Acceptance of Others." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 1952, 47, pp. 778-782.
- Bloom, Benjamin. Evaluation to Improve Learning. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1982.
- Brockett, R. "Self-Directed Learning and the Hard-to-Reach Adult." Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years. 1983 6.(8), pp. 16-18.
- Calvert, George M. <u>A Study of the Motivation of School</u> <u>Teachers in Penal Institutions</u>. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1982, pp. 18-19.
- Carp, A., Peterson and Roelfs, P. Learning Interests and Experiences of Adult Americans. Berkeley, California: Educational Testing Service, 1972. ERIC Microfiche # Ed 097 421.
- Clear, Todd R. and Cole, George F. American Corrections, Second Edition. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1990, pp. 345-347.
- Cross, K.P. Adults as Learners. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1981.
- Cross, K. Patricia. "Adult Learners: Characteristics, Needs and Interests." Lifelong Learning in America. Edited by Richard E. Peterson, et al. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1981.
- Denmark, Kenneth Lloyd. Factors Affecting the Identification, Recruiting and Training of Volunteer 4-H Adult Leaders in Texas. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Texas A & M University. 1971.
- Dewey, John. Experience and Education. New York: MacMillan Company, 1938.

- Duguid, S. "Strategies and Issues for Prison Education." <u>Convergence: International Journal of Adult Education</u>, 17 (4), 1984, pp. 70-71.
- East, J. The Relationship Between Self-Directed Learning Readiness and Life Satisfaction Among the Elderly. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, 1986.
- Eggert, James F. Instructional Activities Which Stimulate Behavioral Change as Perceived by Adult Participants. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University. 1991.
- Finn, Jeremy D. "Expectations and The Educational Environment." Review of Educational Research. Vol. 42, No. 3, 1972, p. 390.
- Fletcher, Harold J. "Controlling Multiple F Test Errors With an Overall F Test." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. February 1989, Vol. 25, N1, p. 101.
- Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Seabury Press, 1970.
- Guglielmino, L.M. Development of the Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Georgia, 1977.
- Guglielmino, Lucy M. and Guglielmino, Paul J. Learning Style Assessment. Guglielmino and Associates, Boca Raton, Florida, 1982.
- Hall, B. International Adult Education: Challenges and Responsibilities. Paper presented at the National Adult Education Conference, Louisville, KY, 1984.
- Hall-Johnson, Karen J. <u>The Relationship Between Readiness</u> for and Involvement in Self-Directed Learning. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Iowa State University, 1985.
- Hassan, A.M. An Investigation of the Learning Projects Among Adults of High and Low Readiness for Self-Direction in Learning. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Iowa State University, 1981.
- Hiemstra, R. "The Older Adult as Learning Participant." Occational Paper no. 1. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 198 304, 1980.

- Hummel, L. An Investigation of Physician Self-Directed Learning Activities. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1985.
- Jarvis, P. Adult and Continuing Education Theory and Practice. London: Croom Helm, 1983.
- Johnson, D. <u>A Study of Law Enforcement Officers'</u> <u>Participation in Continuing Education.</u> Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Kansas State University, 1986.
- Johnstone, J., and Rivera, R. Volunteers for Learning. Chicago: Aldine, 1966.
- Knowles, M. Self-Directed Learning: A Guide for Learners and Teachers. Chicago: Association Press/Follett, 1975.
- Lewis-Beck, Michael S. "Applied Regression: An Introduction." <u>Quantitative Applications in the Social</u> <u>Sciences</u>. Edited by John L. Sullivan and Richard G. Niemi. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1985.
- Light, Gail R. "Institutional Education Program Statistics." <u>Michigan Department of Corrections Annual</u> Report, March, 1990.
- Light, Gail R. <u>Michigan Department of Corrections 1990</u> Annual Report. Lansing, Michigan.
- McCue, James. <u>A Procedure for Identifying Adult Learners'</u> <u>Expectations for Curriculum in a Specific Continuing</u> <u>Education Program</u>. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, <u>Michigan State University</u>, 1982.
- McGraw, E. Older Adult Learners: Reasons and Preferences for Participating in Organized Learning Activities. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1982.
- McKean, Rodney Byron. Adult Learners' Pedagogical Expectations About Level of Formality and Type of Learning Experience. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1977.
- Mizirow, J. "A Critical Theory of Self-Directed Learning." In S. Brookfield, <u>Self-Directed Learning: From Theory</u> <u>to Practice</u>. (New Directions for Continuing Education) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985, no. 25, pp. 17-30.
- Noren, John W. K. <u>Self-Directed Learning Projects Among Lay</u> <u>Ministers in the Mormon Church</u>. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1990.

- Normie, G., Neale, K., and Pearson, A. <u>Strategies for</u> <u>Education Within Prison Regimes: International and</u> <u>Comparative Approaches</u>. Programme International <u>Seminar, Winston House</u>: Sussex, England, 1984.
- Penland, P..R. <u>Self-Planned Learning in America</u>. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 152 987.) 1978.
- Piaget, Jean. Science of Education and the Psychology of the Child. New York: Grossman Publishers, 1970.
- Purkey, William Watson. Self Concept on School Achievement. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Russell, J.W. Learner Preference for Structure, Self-Directed Learning Readiness and Instructional Methods. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Missouri at Kansas City, 1988.
- Schuttenberg, F. and Trarev, S. "The Role of Adult Education in Fostering Self-Directed Learning." Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, 10(5), 1987.
- Spirow, J. "The Future of Religious Education: Personal Reflections." <u>Religious Education</u>. 79(1), 1984, pp. 46-51.
- Staines, J.W. "The Self-Picture as a Factor in the Classroom." <u>The British Journal of Educational</u> <u>Psychology</u>. 28, 1958, pp. 97-111.
- Tough, A. The Adult's Learning Projects, 2nd ed. Austin, Texas: Learning Concepts, 1979.
- Vernor, C. Adult Education: Theory and Method. Chicago: Adult Education Association, 1962.
- Walker, J. The Relationship of Continuing Professional Education and Pastor Tenure Among Southern Baptist Pastors. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, North Texas State University, 1986.
- Ward, Ted. "Cognitive Processes and Learning." <u>Comparative</u> Educational Review. 17(1), 1973, pp. 1-10.
- Ward, Ted and Herzog, William J., Jr. Effective Learning in <u>Non-Formal Education</u>. East Lansing, Michigan: Program of Studies in Non-Formal Education, Michigan State University, 1974.
- Wilson, Kathleen K. Expectations About Learning Experiences in Nonformal Education: Girl Scout Leaders in Hawaii. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1978.