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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the level of self-directed learning readiness among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia. This study also investigated whether there were relationships between the level of self-directed learning readiness and selected demographic variables such as gender, college, and age in the sample of undergraduate students in Saudi Arabia. This research utilized a quantitative design.

The Self-directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS), which was developed by Guglielmino, was utilized to measure the level of self-directed learning readiness among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University on the Riyadh campus. A total of 203 undergraduate students completed the SDLRS questionnaire.

Results were that the mean score of SDLRS among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Riyadh campus included 64 (32.52%) were students with below average 58-201 scores; 71 (34.98%) students with average 202-226 scores; and 68 (33.50%) were students with above average 227-290 scores.
age. However, there was a significant difference between the colleges. The results of the Tukey post-hoc test indicated that significant differences existed between the Sciences and Theoretical Studies College students and the Administration and Finance College and Computation and Information College students. The Sciences and Theoretical Studies College scored significantly lower than the other two colleges.
Chapter 1

Introduction

Individuals need to enhance their professional and personal growth through education. It opens the doors to widening one’s scope of understanding, which informs the need to ensure lifelong learning, age notwithstanding. Distance education can be defined as “planned learning that normally occurs in a different place from teaching and as a result requires special techniques of course design, special instructional techniques, and special methods of communication by electronic and other technology” (Moore & Kearsley, 1996, p. 1). From the years of early learning, teachers and instructors led learners about what to learn and how to do it (Merriam, 2002). Later, at certain points in life, especially for adult education, the burden of learning shifts from teachers to learners (Manning, 2007).

According to Levett-Jones (2005), self-directed learning (SDL) is an educational concept that has received increasing attention in recent years, particularly in the context of higher education. Knowles (1975) defined self-directed learning as

a process in which individuals take the initiative, with or without the help of others, in diagnosing their learning needs, formulating learning goals, identifying human and material resources for learning, choosing and implementing appropriate learning strategies and evaluating learning outcomes. (p. 18)
According to Merriam (2002), readiness for self-directed learning includes self-discipline, autonomy, effective organization, effective communication, acceptance of constructive feedback, engagement in self-reflection, and self-evaluation. Self-directed learning (SDL) requires various skills and attitudes to ensure successful independent study. Therefore, students have to analyze their current situations, support networks, study habits, and family situations (Caffarella, 2006). Self-directed learning (SDL) is a concept that has been of particular interest in the field of education, primarily adult education (Pilling-Cormick, 1994); however, according to Donaghy (2005), the literature continues to expand to include promising benefits for children and adolescents. Donaghy contends that self-directed learning remains one of the most broadly studied concepts in the realm of adult education over the past 30 years. As such, it has garnered both extensive praise and heavy criticisms, particularly for the distinction as an autonomous or supported learning process (Kerka, 1999). Finally, with the competitive nature of today’s learning environment, particularly at college and university levels, there is an increased responsibility for learners to accept accountability and initiative for their own learning. Many academic institutions include self-directed learning as a major part of their curricula (Kerka, 1999; Ramnarayan & Hande, 2005).

For adult learners, learning places emphasis on self-directed learning processes, skills, and systems rather than tests and content coverage.
(Brookfield, 1984). Therefore, individuals are expected to initiate personal challenge activities and develop personal qualities to enable them to pursue the activities successfully (Caffarella, 2006). In relation to this, self-directed learners demonstrate a better awareness of their responsibility in monitoring themselves, as they seek to make learning meaningful. They become curious to learn new things by trying and exploring new areas, concepts, and skills. Due to this, they view problems as challenges, enjoy learning, and desire change, which implies that self-directed adult learning requires enhanced motivation, persistence, independence, self-discipline, self-confidence, and achievement of a goal-oriented attitude (Abdullah, 2007). Therefore, there are benchmarks for determining levels of readiness.

Apart from its importance for survival and competition in general, self-directed learning is also viewed as an effective mode of learning for college students in particular since college learning requires that learners be self-directed (Cohen, 2012). According to Alturki (2014), the educational system in Saudi Arabia is transforming from a fully traditional system to a blended learning system. However, distance education has not been adopted in all universities in Saudi Arabia and is limited to specific disciplines.

**Statement of Problem**

According to Fisher, King, and Tague (2001), self-directed learning (SDL) is a method of instruction that can be defined in terms of the amount of responsibility the learners accept for their own learning. Self-directed
learning originated in the field of adult education and has been referred to as self-direction in learning, autonomous learning, self-planned learning, self-regulated learning, self-managed learning, self-education, and independent learning (Hiemstra, 2004). Clearly, there are conflicting views between the semantic and conceptual portrayals of self-directed learning (SDL), both as a process and also as a set of behavioral characteristics that are unique to the individual learner.

According to Alturki (2014), based on statistical data, the population of Saudi Arabia continues to rise. Among its current 20 million citizens, 9 million are immigrants. Also, the number of high-school graduates has been increasing during the past 20 years. In the 2012-13 academic year, 228,000 out of 310,000 students were admitted to universities or colleges, which means there is a gap between those graduating and the number of available places at universities, colleges, and other institutions such as community colleges. According to Al-Khalifa (2009), with increased personal and professional commitments, individuals find it difficult to learn through the normal college-based or university-based systems. Many people opt out of higher education or learning opportunities, because they cannot find time to be present for school learning sessions. Hence, self-directed learning has emerged as a useful approach to pursuing academic aspirations. However, despite this important fact, self-directed learning requires high levels of commitment, which means that individuals have to remain committed to
learning. In order to facilitate students’ self-directed learning, it is critical to assess students’ readiness (Klunklin, Viseskul, Sripusanapan, & Turale, 2010). This is because self-directed learning is not for all students, and it may cause anxiety and frustration in some students (Yuan, Williams, Fang, & Pang, 2012). Therefore, this study relied on this backdrop to identify self-directed learning readiness among undergraduate students in Saudi Arabia at a university specifically selected to address electronic learning, which could benefit from SDL.

The government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has continued to sustain new developments in the field of educational technology. In 2011, Saudi Electronic University (SEU) was established in Riyadh as an educational institution offering distance education services in the areas of Administration and Finance, Computation and Information, Health Sciences, and Sciences and Theoretical Studies (SEU, 2015).

The only research study found concerning self-directed learning readiness in Saudi Arabian students was conducted by Abo-Rokbah (2002) when he compared and contrasted readiness of self-directed learning between Saudi Arabian undergraduate students in King Abdul-Aziz University (KAAU) and Saudi Arabian undergraduate students in American universities. The result of the Abo-Rokbah’s (2002) study showed that there was no significant difference between Saudi Arabian students in an American university and in KAAU regarding their readiness for self-direction in learning
as measured by SDLRS. Also, there were no significant differences between the Saudi students who enrolled in American universities and those who enrolled in KAAU based on the number of attendance years related to their readiness for self-direction in learning as measured by SDLRS. Thus, there has been a lack of research on the level of self-directed learning readiness of undergraduate students in Saudi Arabia.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine the level of self-directed learning readiness for undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia. Also, this study investigated if there were significant differences between the level of self-directed learning readiness and selected demographic variables such as gender, college, and age in the sample of undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University on the Riyadh campus in Saudi Arabia. Moreover, this study provided an actual report about self-directed learning readiness of undergraduate students in Saudi Arabia in order to identify information for the potential inclusion of self-directed learning as a part of the educational system in Saudi Arabia.

**Research Questions**

This study determined the level of self-directed learning readiness among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia. Specifically, this study answered the following questions:

1. What is the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia?
2. Does the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia differ by gender?

3. Does the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia differ by college?

4. Does the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia differ by age?

**Significance of the Study**

According to Alturki (2014), the modern educational system in Saudi Arabia has been transforming from a fully traditional system to a blended learning system. So, this study can make a positive contribution to the educational system in Saudi Arabia through enhancing decision making on policy issues regarding the best learning approaches to promote online learning.

Saudi Electronic University was established in 2011 and is a unique university in Saudi Arabia, because it is the only university that provides blended learning. In order to facilitate student self-directed learning, it is critical to assess students’ readiness (Klunklin et al., 2010). This study may also help Saudi Electronic University to understand the readiness for self-directed learning among its students and help them improve their skills in preparation for entry into the job market. This study may encourage faculty members at Saudi Electronic University to review their syllabi to be more in line with the level of self-directed learning readiness of undergraduate students in Saudi Arabia.
Also, this study can expand knowledge about readiness for self-directed learning in Saudi Arabian students. Moreover, understanding the level of readiness can be useful, because it can help others understand appropriate methods of teaching SDL. It can also help to determine whether adult students could embrace this form of learning. Finally, the study could provide the basis for further research in this area given that knowledge about SDL is cumulative.

**Theoretical Framework**

This study was framed by the adult education theory of self-directed learning. Based on the literature of self-directed learning and andragogy, the two most prominent contributors and theorists of SDL mentioned include Knowles and Guglielmino. While there are many similarities in definitions and theories of these two individuals, each perspective has its own unique contributions to the field of SDL.

**Knowles.** Knowles is considered an influential figure in the field of adult education, particularly within the field of self-direction and informal learning processes for adults. Knowles (1980) defines andragogy as the art and science of helping adults learn. Additionally, Knowles (1975) believed that readiness to learn in adults was heavily shaped by the environment, particularly real-life situations who motivate people to learn. As such, Knowles is the primary figure who is identified with the development of SDL as a process, which Knowles defined as, “a process in which individuals take
the initiative, with or without the help of others, to diagnose their learning needs, formulate learning goals, identify resources for learning, select and implement learning strategies, and evaluate learning outcomes” (Knowles, 1975, p. 18). According to Smith (2004), Knowles was more known for his mark on the subject of andragogy, for which he is often referred to as the Father of Andragogy for his expressed, strong contentions that students should be self-directed in their learning abilities. Equally as important, was Knowles’ perception of the role of the educator, as he believed the educator was not a teacher, but rather a facilitator of learning.

**Guglielmino.** Another pioneer in the field of SDL is Guglielmino, who is most known for her development of the Self-directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS) (Guglielmino, Guglielmino, & Long, 1987). Guglielmino’s (2008) perspective of SDL can be addressed from three principles: context, activation, and universality.

Self-direction can occur within a variety of elements and situations that can range from an instructor-directed classroom, or one that is self-planned and self-conducted, particularly in response to personal or workplace-based needs or interests that could be conducted collaboratively or independently. Guglielmino and Guglielmino (2016) believe that from the standpoint of activation, the personal characteristics or attributes of the learner, which include the values, abilities, and attitudes of the individual, ultimately determine the implications of SDL. The element of universality
suggests that SDL exists along a continuum, meaning, it is present in every person in varying degrees. Further, Guglielmino reinforced much of Knowles’ vision of SDL and supported his perspective that SDL is akin to personal survival, in the sense that SDL contributes as much to individual survival, as it does to the survival of the human race and the basic abilities of human competence. Learning on one’s own is essentially a prerequisite for adaptive living in the new world (Knowles, 1975; Guglielmino, 2008).

Assumptions of the Study

Assumptions of the researcher related to the participants of this study included the following: the online survey was sufficient for this study and provided the data needed to determine the level of self-directed learning readiness (SDLR) of undergraduate students at the SEU in Saudi Arabia. Also, quantitative data were sufficient to identify significant differences between the self-directed learning readiness and selected demographic variables: gender, college, and age. Other assumptions included, all participants in this study were honest and they did their best to respond to all questions.

Limitations of the Study

This study included the following limitations, which could influence the results or generalizability of the research (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005). The first limitation was this study was conducted at Saudi Electronic University, so the results were not generalizable to other universities in Saudi Arabia.
Second, this study was limited to undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University, so the results are not generalizable to graduate students. Third, this study focused on undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University on Riyadh campus so the results cannot be generalized to other campuses of Saudi Electronic University. Fourth, the data collection for this study occurred during summer semester 2016, so students who were not registered for summer semester 2016 were not included in the sample. Fifth, a large number of students, who did not complete questionnaire for unknown reasons, were not included in the analyses.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were used

*Saudi Electronic University*—Saudi Electronic University is one of the 36 universities within the Ministry of Education system in Saudi Arabia. It offers higher education based on the applications and techniques of e-learning and blended learning.

*Self-directed learning*—Knowles (1975) defined self-directed learning as

a process in which individuals take the initiative, with or without the help of others, in diagnosing their learning needs, formulating learning goals, identifying human and material resources for learning, choosing and implementing appropriate learning strategies, and evaluating learning outcomes (p. 18).

*Self-directed Learning Readiness Scale* (SDLRS)—an instrument developed by Guglielmino (1977) that measures the readiness for self-
directed learning. SDLRS is also known as the Learning Preference Assessment (LPA) to avoid response bias.

*Undergraduate students*—Undergraduates in Saudi Arabia include students in a university or college who are working toward a bachelor’s degree. At SEU, typically the students are referred to as first year, second year, third year, forth year, and fifth year.

**Background of the Researcher**

As a native of Saudi Arabia, I am fluent in Arabic having obtained a bachelor degree in teaching the Arabic language. Subsequently, I taught language courses in high school through the Ministry of Education for five years. During these five years I obtained two masters’ degrees in curriculum and teaching methods from Al-Emam University and in adult and continuing education from King Saud University. After five years, I transferred to Kind Saud University as a lecturer. Upon completion of my doctoral degree, I expect to return to Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. I utilized the SDLRS instrument in this study because I am interested in SDLRS at Saudi Electronic University as well as other institutions of higher education. Institutions in Saudi Arabia have not addressed these issues. I hope to apply knowledge to my teaching when I return to Saudi Arabia.

**Organization of the Study**

This study consists of five chapters: Chapter 1 includes the statement of problem, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the
study, theoretical framework, assumptions of the study, limitations of the study, definition of terms, background of the research, and the organization of the study.

Chapter 2 includes the literature review related to purpose of the study. Topics include self-directed learning, definitions of self-directed learning, history of self-directed learning, theorizing self-directed learning, self-directed learning readiness, dimensions of self-directed learning readiness, Self-directed Learning Readiness Scale instrument, studies utilizing the SDLRS, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, higher education in Saudi Arabia, Saudi Electronic University, and a summary.

Chapter 3 discusses the research methods, including the design of study, variables, demographics, population and sample, instrument, data collection, data analyses, coding, and summary.

Chapter 4 describes the demographic characteristics of the sample, findings related to each research questions, observations, and summary. Chapter 5 includes the summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further research.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

The purpose of this study was to determine the level of self-directed learning readiness for undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia. This chapter presents a summary of literature review and it includes the following areas related to self-directed learning, definitions of self-directed learning, history of self-directed learning, theorizing self-directed learning, self-directed learning readiness, dimensions of self-directed learning readiness, Self-directed Learning Readiness Scale instrument, studies utilizing the SDLRS, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, higher education in Saudi Arabia, Saudi Electronic University, and a summary.

Self-directed Learning (SDL)

There are many perspectives on what SDL entails, specifically, as it relates to a function of learner personality characteristics and motivation, or SDL as a unique learning process, or potentially a combination of the two. Brockett and Hiemstra (1991) contend that there are two distinct characteristics of self-direction that include: (a) self-direction is a continuous effort by the learner to maintain control over all learning decisions, and (b) self-direction is the learner’s ability to obtain access and make decisions from a wide range of appropriate and available resources. Likewise, Candy
(1991) state that self-directed learning should not be confused with isolated study. Instead, self-directed learners are able to decisively and authentically exercise control over the purpose, content, and form of their own learning. Brockett and Hiemstra (1991) believe that in order for authentic control to be obtained, the learner must understand other alternate possibilities that exist from the basis of knowledge, with the intention of choosing among various potential options.

**Definitions of Self-directed Learning**

There are numerous definitions and varying perspectives on SDL; however, for purposes of this review of literature, the most prominent contributors and theorists of SDL mentioned there include: Knowles, Guglielmino, Brookfield, Brockett and Hiemstra, and Gibbons. While there are many similarities in definitions and theories, each perspective has its own unique contributions to the field of SDL.

Knowles (1975) defined self-directed learning as a process in which individuals take the initiative in designing learning experiences, diagnosing needs, locating resources, and evaluating learning. Guglielmino (1977) further identified the qualities of self-directed learning readiness as initiative, independence, and persistence in learning acceptance of responsibility for one’s own learning, self-discipline, curiosity, ability to learn independently, enjoyment of learning, a tendency to be goal oriented, and the view of problems as challenges rather than obstacles. Brookfield (1984) believed
that definitions of self-directed learning that emphasize independence to the exclusion of outside stimuli are dangerous, yet common. Brockett and Hiemstra (1991) contend that individual perceptions of SDL are dynamic and highly likely to change over time. Likewise, they believe that much of the ambiguity surrounding an exact definition has to do not with the specific definition that is offered, but rather, taking into account when it was offered. Gibbons (2002) states that, “SDL is any increase in knowledge, skill, accomplishment, or personal development that an individual selects and brings about by his or her own efforts using any method in any circumstance at any time” (p. 2). Kasworm (1983) contends that SDL can be best explained as a "set of generic, finite behaviors; as a belief system reflecting and evolving from a process of self-initiated learning activity; or as an ideal state of the mature self-actualized learner" (p. 1).

**History of Self-directed Learning**

According to Hiemstra (1994), SDL has existed since classical antiquity, whereby self-study served an important function within the lives and works of Greek philosophers Plato, Socrates, and Aristotle, to other historical examples of SDL that included Caesar, Alexander the Great, and Descartes.

According to Hiemstra (1994), the primary bulk of research interests in SDL has been over the previous three decades, as self-direction has become a major area in adult education research. Hiemstra argued that Houle’s research become the important research of SDL, because Houle (1961) laid
the groundwork for research in SDL, as he performed the first major study whereby information was obtained from 22 adult learners who were placed into three categories based on their reason for participation. These included: (a) goal-oriented reasons; (b) activity-oriented or fellowship reasons; and, (c) learning-oriented reasons with the primary focus on those who perceive learning as an end in itself.

As mentioned previously, Knowles’ research in adult education and the popularization of the term *andragogy*, which refers to the instructional processes within adult education, also provided the formalized framework for SDL in North America, specifically within his 1975 book on SDL. Hiemstra (1994) believed that Knowles’ work provided the foundational assumptions and definitions that would guide subsequent research. Shortly after Knowles’ book was published (1975), Guglielmino completed her dissertation in 1977, which developed the Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS) that currently serves as a highly useful instrument in measuring self-directed learning readiness, or to compare features of SDL with various other learning characteristics (Guglielmino, 2008).

As research intensified during the 1960s and 1970s, it was found that there were a variety of considerations and perspectives that were being used to define emerging concepts and concerns. SDL was being built on a variety of concepts from sociological to pedagogical, psychological to motivational and it appeared that there would not be a consensus on its theoretical
underpinnings. According to Pilling-Cormick and Garrison (2013), SDL was derived primarily from psychological concepts, particularly with focus on cognitive and metacognitive conceptualizations and functions. The last decade has seen a directional change that tends more to motivational and management processes as another way to define SDL. Furthermore, education can no longer be perceived to be a method of delivering information on what is known, particularly in a world where knowledge, facts, and skills may have a half-life of 10 years or less, making some knowledge irrelevant and obsolete based on the time span. This makes SDL a foremost component in continuing and ongoing education (Harvey, Rothman, & Frecker, 2003).

**Theorizing Self-directed Learning**

Merriam (2002) states that the primary question of how adults learn has been the subject of scholars and practitioners since the inception of adult education as a field of professional practice in the 1920s. Almost a century later, there is still no single theory or model that can fully explain how adults learn, particularly with attention to the varying contexts where learning takes place, or even learning as a distinct process. However, there are a myriad of theories, principles, models, and explanations that can better explain the process of adult learning, specifically with regard to self-directed learning.
**Humanistic.** According to Owen (2002), the humanistic theory is the most original concept that founded the study of SDL. The humanistic perspective also believes that learners are motivated to continue learning processes through self-actualization. The central question since the founding of adult education in the 1920s is: how do adults learn? (Merriam, 2002). Presently, there still remains no simple answer, theory, or model that comprehensively encapsulates all elements of adult education to better explain SDL and the contexts in which it accrues. This is also true of the entire process of learning itself (Merriam, 2002). Equally, the humanistic theory suggests that learner development and desire to learn are the primary responsibility of the learner (Owen, 2002).

That said, the concept most aligned with human theory in SDL is Knowles’ (1980) popularized notion of andragogy, also referred to the art and science of helping adults learn (Brookfield, 2003; Merriam, 2002). This is in contrast to pedagogy, which refers to the art and science of teaching children (Brookfield, 2003). Specifically, according to Merriam (2002), Knowles efforts focused on SDL in the adult learning process that includes these important elements: (a) moving away from dependency to increasing one’s own self-directedness; (b) drawing on one’s accumulated life experiences to facilitate the learning process; (c) readiness to learn when assuming new social or life roles; (d) problem-solving capabilities and desire
to apply new learning concepts; and, (e) motivation to learn derives more from internal than external factors.

**Personal responsibility orientation.** Brockett and Hiemstra (1991) were most explicit in their belief that SDL was a multidimensional process that cannot be bound to a singular definition or theory. Instead, they propose that self-directed learning comprises two separate, but related dimensions. The first dimension stated that self-directed learning is an explicit process whereby the learner assumes the primary responsibility for the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the learning process. The authors also stated that educators (or mentors) involved in the process play an instrumental role as facilitators. SDL is still a highly individualistic process, particularly in garnering the initial motivation and readiness to learn. The second dimension refers to the learner’s preference or desire to assume the responsibility for the learning process. Nonetheless, the notion of personal responsibility, as most notably described by Brockett and Hiemstra (1991) are the combination of the external characteristics that represent the instructional process, and the inherent characteristics of the learner, whereby the learner assumes the primary responsibility within the learning experience.

Brockett and Hiemstra (1991) further demonstrated the significance of personal responsibility in self-directed adult learning through the Personal
Responsibility Orientation (PRO) model that explains the connection between humanism and self-direction in adult learning applications.

**Behaviorism and neobehaviorism.** Brockett and Hiemstra (1991) also supported the notion that learning occurs in response to the reinforcement of the desired behaviors. This also suggests that human nature and behavior are strongly associated with the environmental influences that surround an individual, which is the foremost foundation of behaviorism. As such, the practice of self-directed learning is based on these three premises according to Brockett and Hiemstra (1991): (a) learning contracts, (b) skill-based instructional methods, and (c) self-modification.

Rostami and Khadjooi (2010) contend that the behaviorist learning orientation is particularly effective in demonstrating competencies and technical or psychomotor skills. Likewise, a foremost component of behaviorist theory is that it is most beneficial when the change in behavior meets the expected outcomes of the educational intervention. Further, immediate, corrective feedback is also needed in behaviorist learning applications, which is only effective if the behavior can be easily identified, and the feedback is provided immediately.

**Constructivism.** According to Flint and Johnson (2011), the constructivist theory of learning presupposes that students will effectively build their own understanding of the desired subject of learning, rather than
taking information passively through instructor delivery. As such, Flint and Johnson (2011) believe, instructors are instrumental in the process of engaging and supporting their students’ constructivism through effective listening techniques and asking questions that allow the student to develop their own conclusions that reinforce the overall objectives and goals of the course. In contrast, learning environments that are rigid present less control to the students, thereby reducing their autonomy and intrinsic motivation for learning (Douglass & Morris, 2014).

Rezaee and Mosalanejad (2015) also support the notion that self-regulation and self-direction in learning are the two primary skills that are representative of successful lifelong learning. This concept is also being promoted within the university learning environment, particularly as a way to provide extrinsic motivation to students; however, it is also important to examine the ways to empower students and learners to direct their own learning processes (Flint & Johnson, 2011). Specifically, engaging learners to reflect and evaluate the depth of their learning can help to identify areas that require further expansion and development. According to Pink (2011), when students have the intrinsic motivation to succeed, their performance will improve on higher cognitive tasks, further promoting the constructivist theory of SDL (Douglass & Morris, 2014; Pink, 2011).

**Critical perspectives.** There are a variety of criticisms of SDL and its associated concepts that have created considerable controversy and
discourse over the definitions and applications of SDL. Hiemstra (1994) suggests that *over-identification* of those researchers and practitioners associated with self-directed learning have resulted because of an undeveloped and inadequate theoretical base. Also, Brookfield believes that the lack of diversity in the study populations has created a biased research environment, as the majority of researchers in this field have studied populations that are white and middle-class.

**Self-directed Learning Readiness**

According to Fisher et al. (2001), the notion of self-directed learning readiness examines the degree that the self-directed learner takes personal control and acknowledges the freedom that is associated with learning what the individual considers important. The degree of control is dependent on the learner’s personality characteristics, attitudes, and abilities. Wiley (1983) states that self-directed learning readiness can by defined as the degree of the attitudes, abilities, and personality characteristics that the individual possesses for self-directed learning. The following are several assumptions associated with SDL readiness. First, there is the assumption that adults are innately self-directing, suggesting that SDL readiness exists along a continuum and there are varying degrees of SDL readiness present in every person. Second, self-direction competencies are challenging to develop. The best way to understand and exhibit self-directed behavior is to learn and practice autonomous behavior. The final assumption is that the
ability to practice SDL in one context can be generalized to other environments and settings. This may be the biggest challenge with defining SDL readiness, as high levels of readiness for SDL do not necessarily transfer to unfamiliar environments and contexts (Fisher et al., 2001).

As expressed previously, SDL readiness is considered to be highly individualized and representative along the continuum. As such, evidence has shown that students who possess low SDL readiness who are subsequently exposed to an SDL assignment, demonstrate high anxiety levels that are similar to the responses of learners who have high readiness for SDL and are exposed to environments that have increased levels of structure and teacher direction (Fisher et al., 2001; Wiley, 1983).

**Dimensions of Self-directed learning Readiness**

Adult education theory of self-directed learning and andragogy create overlapping dimensions that determine the level of readiness of adult learners in Saudi Electronic University on Riyadh Campus. The level of readiness requires that adult learners embrace certain salient issues to be able to confine their activities to success (Merriam, 2002). These factors include self-discipline, autonomy, effective communication, effective organization, acceptance of constructive feedback, and engagement in self-evaluation and self-reflection (Merriam, 2002). These factors merge into three critical areas that include self-management, self-monitoring, and motivation, which look into a learner’s current situation, family
responsibilities, study habits, and support network both at home and at school, which conform to the need to promote principles of good practice in self-directed learning (Center for Teaching Excellence, n.d.). The following are the three areas related to self-directed learning:

**Self-management.** According to the theory of self-directed learning and andragogy, adult learners within a self-directed learning environment can only be ready for learning when they have the ability to ensure effective self-management. Without this, it can lead to enormous challenges that impede the learning process. According to Garrison (1997), self-management involves task control issues, which focus on the social and behavioral aspects of adults to meet their self-directed learning programs, in relation to the external activities associated with their learning, which is critical because it assists in ensuring that a learner does not operate in isolation from the determinants in the shared world. It also requires material availability for supporting the learning process. Therefore, an adult learner has to shape the contextual conditions as self-management, self-discipline, and persistence toward performance of goal-oriented actions and to create the needed platform for effective learning. One of factors that comes into perspective includes management control. It defines freedom from influence or social independence required to be able to operate effectively during learning sessions. According to Garrison (1992), increased learner control results in enhanced responsibilities that help with the
construction of relevant meaning of the need to pursue self-directed learning.

**Self-monitoring.** Readiness has a relationship with how one can monitor all the self-conducted activities. Without proper self-monitoring, a person can easily veer off the learning process course (Leach, 2000). For adult learners, effective self-monitoring is crucial in creating the needed confines for better outcomes (Garrison, 1997). According to Loftin, Gibb, and Skiba (2005), through monitoring, it becomes easy to modify thinking in a way that complies with the learning goal or task.

**Motivation.** According to Galbraith (2004), motivational strategy is a deliberate action or process used by an instructor to enhance adult motivation to learn. Motivation plays a crucial role in the initiation and maintenance of effort towards learning (Howe, 1987). Yap (2009) states that an adult learner must have high levels of motivation to be ready to undergo the learning process. A lack of motivation clearly impedes the learning process and makes a learner unready for the process. According to Garrison (1992), motivational factors have massive practical influence on the cognitive activities that underpin human learning, which assists in meditating between control or context and cognition or responsibility during the learning process. Motivation ensures commitment towards self-directed learning. Therefore, with motivation, adults function positively in their learning situation. Adults may be externally motivated to learn. They may attend training sessions that enable them to keep their jobs or to advance
their careers.

In conclusion, together, self-management and self-monitoring create the appropriate environment that motivates adult learners to achieve the desired readiness for the self-directed learning process. The relation between the components of self-directed learning readiness is presented in Figure 1.

![Diagram of Self-directed Learning Readiness Components](image)

*Figure 1. Illustration of the components of the theoretical framework of self-directed learning readiness.*

**Self-directed Learning Readiness Scale Instrument (SDLRS)**

The best well-known assessment associated with SDL is the Self-directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS) developed by Guglielmino (1977). According to Merriam, Caffarella, and Baumgartner (2007), the SDLRS is the most extensively used assessment instrument within the field of SDL. It is also known as the Learning Preference Assessment (LPA) to avoid potential
participant biases based on perceptions of the words self-directed learning. Guglielmino developed the instrument as a way to effectively measure the complexities of the characteristics that define the readiness to participate in self-directed learning (Guglielmino et al., 1987; Merriam et al., 2007).

According to Guglielmino (2008), the SDLRS is the foremost instrument that is used for evaluating the individual perceptions of the attitudes and skills that are associated with SDL. Specifically, the scale is developed around eight important factors that consider both the personalities and attitudes that have been directly linked to self-directedness. Additionally, the instrument is used for researching the relationship between other personality-related variables and self-directedness. Further, the SDLRS test includes 58-items with a 5-point Likert scale for responses that range from “almost always true” to “almost never true”, with questions that are both positively and negatively phrased.

According to Guglielmino (1977), it is important to note that the SDL readiness score can be variable, meaning, that a person’s score can be changed and improved upon through attention to awareness and practice. Generally speaking, higher scores on the SDL readiness are associated with higher performance on projects that require individual applications of creativity, problem solving, and change (Dynan, Cate, & Rhee, 2008). In one study performed by Guglielmino (1989) who examined the SDL readiness of the average population as compared to successful
entrepreneurs, it was found that the mean readiness scores were 214 and 248, respectively (Dynan et al., 2008). According to Guglielmino (1978), individuals with high SDLRS scores usually prefer to determine their learning needs and to plan and implement their own learning. This does not mean that they will never choose to be in a structured learning situation. They may choose traditional courses or workshops as a part of a learning plan. On the other hand, individuals with average SDLRS scores may be successful in independent situations, but are not fully comfortable with handling the entire process of identifying their learning needs and planning and implementing the learning. Individuals with below average SDLRS scores usually prefer very structured learning options such as lecture and traditional classroom settings.

Studies Utilizing the SDLRS

The SDLRS has been used by many different organizations and in many different dissertations to measure self-directed learning readiness. This part of the literature review focuses on some of those dissertations that provide related research specific to this study.

Studies related to culture. Lee (1989) described the nature of continuing learning behaviors of the adults in Baptist churches in Taejon, Korea. He determined whether readiness for self-directed learning, personality for self-directed continuing learning, educational level, family income level, age, gender, and marital status were significant predictors of
the extent of continuing learning participation of those adults. The number of participants in this study included 50 adults. The results of this study showed the SDLRS score, more years in formal education, and age were significant predictors of the extent of continuing learning participation.

Chang (1990) studied the effectiveness of using learning contracts in all undergraduate student classes to investigate the relationships among contract learning, self-directed learning readiness, and learning preferences. The participants in this study included undergraduate students from National Taiwan Normal University. The major results showed that a lower level of readiness for self-directed learning when compared with the norm of American adults, a low preference for the abstract learning, but a strong preference for concrete learning. Contract learning had no significant impact on increasing the readiness for self-directed learning.

Churprina (2001) investigated the relationship between self-directed learning readiness and cross-cultural adaptability among U.S. expatriate managers. The sample for the study contained 56 respondents selected from managers with prior international experience who worked for Motorola. The findings showed that there was a significant positive relationship between self-directed learning readiness and cross-cultural adaptability. There was also a strong relationship between the total SDLRS score and sub scores on Emotional Resilience, Flexibility/Openness, Perceptual Acuity, and Personal Autonomy.
Abo-Rokbah (2002) compared and contrasted readiness of self-directed learning between Saudi Arabian undergraduate students in King Abdul-Aziz University and Saudi Arabian undergraduate students in American universities. The participants in this study were 328 Saudi students attending King Abdul-Aziz University and 161 from Saudi students attending an American university. The results of the study indicated that there was no significant difference between Saudi Arabian students in an American university and in King Abdul-Aziz University (KAAU) regarding their readiness for self-direction in learning as measured by SDLRS. Also, there were no significant differences between the Saudi students who enrolled in an American university and those who enrolled in KAAU based on the number of years in attendance related to their readiness for self-direction in learning as measured by the SDLRS.

Oliveira, Silva, Guglielmino, and Guglielmino (2010) explored self-directed learning readiness in a cross-cultural perspective, comparing some of the important findings of previous North American research to similar data from top companies in Portugal. This study included a sample of 145 managers and non-managers of top Portuguese companies. The findings of this study showed that there were significant relationships between self-directed learning readiness with performance level and with reported creativity and problem solving. Also, based on educational levels comparing non-college and education level, college educated students had higher
SDLRS scores. Age and gender were not significantly educated.

Prabjandee and Inthachot (2013) aimed to answer the following questions: What is the level of self-directed learning readiness among students in Colleges of Education in Thailand? Is there a difference in self-directed learning readiness across years of education? Is there a difference in self-directed learning readiness across majors? The number of participants included 148 students. The results showed that college students in Thailand reported possessing a moderate level in two dimensions of self-directed learning readiness: creativity and openness to learning. The other six dimensions (self-concept as an effective learner, initiative and independence in learning, informed acceptance of responsibility, love of learning, positive orientation to the future, and the ability to use basic study and problem solving skills) were at a high level. The researchers did find significant differences by major, although they did not specify where the differences were found.

Kan’an and Osman (2015) investigated the relationship between students’ self-directed learning readiness and their science achievement. The number of participants included 83 students from a secondary school in Qatar. The findings of the study showed that SDLRS total score significantly predicted the National Exam science subject score.

**Studies related to online learning.** Few studies using the SDLRS exist that especially address issues related to online learning. Corbeil

Corbeil (2003) described the strength and direction of the relationship between online technologies self-efficacy, self-directed learning readiness, and locus of control and student success as measured by academic performance and student satisfaction. The participants in this study were 191 graduate students in an online Master of Education in Educational Technology at the University of Texas at Brownsville and Texas Southmost College. The results of this study showed that there were statistically significant differences between the three predictor variables self-efficacy, self-directed learning readiness, and locus of control and student satisfaction.

Johnson (2003) examined the differences in student characteristics between completers and non-completers in online courses. The sample for this study was 454 community college students, 305 were online students and 149 were face-to-face students. The results showed there were no significant differences in student characteristics by age, ethnicity, financial aid eligibility, placement in developmental coursework, or self-directed learning readiness between completers and non-completers in online or face-to-face equivalent courses.

**Studies related to general learning style.** Canipe (2001) examined the relationship between self-directed learning readiness and learning styles. The samples of this study included 260 graduate students at
the College of Education and Behavioral Sciences at Morehead State
University in Morehead. The results of this study showed that there were no
significant differences between self-directed learning readiness and the four
learning styles as defined by Kolb’s Learning Style Inventory (LSI): Concrete
experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active
experimentation.

Knight (2012) examined the self-directed learning readiness in
executive fire officers in relation to the independent variables of personality
(using the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory): educational attainment, and
professional designation. This research utilized a quantitative design.
Results indicated significant relationships between education, attainment
personality type, and SDLRS scores.

Stockdale and Brockett (2011) assessed the reliability and validity of
an instrument to measure self-directed learning readiness among college
students based on an operationalization of the personal responsibility
orientation (PRO) model of self-direction in learning. The number of college
students was 518 and the 5-point Likert-type format was the tool used to
identify students’ reflection. The findings of 25-item personal responsibility
orientation to self-direction in learning scale (PRO-SDLS) indicated it to be a
highly reliable instrument in the selected sample of graduate and
undergraduate education students.
Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

According to Bowen (2008), Saudi Arabia is located at the Middle East as a crossroads of Europe, Asia, and Africa. It is surrounded by the Arabian Gulf on the East and the Red Sea on the West. It borders Jordan, Iraq, and Kuwait to the north, Yemen to the south, and Oman, United Arab Emirates, and Qatar to the East. The size of Saudi Arabia in comparison to Europe is about the size of Portugal, Spain, France, Italy, Germany, and United Kingdom together. The mountains in the west of the Kingdom are very rich in minerals with large deposits of limestone, gypsum, iron ore, gold, and copper. The eastern region has the richest reserve of oil in the world.

According to Nugali (2016), in 1902 Abdul al-Aziz Ibn Saud captured Riyadh and began a 30-year campaign to unify the Arabian Peninsula. In the 1930s, the discovery of oil transformed the country from an underdeveloped desert kingdom to one of the wealthiest nations in the region. Following Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990, Saudi Arabia accepted the Kuwaiti royal family and 400,000 refugees while allowing Western and Arab troops to deploy on its soil for the liberation of Kuwait the following year.

The political system abides by Arabic and Islamic laws as the basic legislative branch. The King appoints a Crown Prince to help him with his duties. There are 22 ministries that are part of the Cabinet. Each ministry specializes in a different part of the government. The Cabinet is advised by
a legislative body called the Consultative Council (Majlis Al-Shura). The Council proposes new laws and amends existing ones. It consists of 150 members that must be of Saudi nationality and highly-skilled to be able to handle their responsibilities (Royal Embassy of Saudi Arabia, 2015).

According to Rabie (1983), the oil in Saudi Arabia is considered as the most important export of the country. Oil accounts for 90% of the country's exports and 75% of the government revenues. Saudi Aramco, officially the Saudi Arabian Oil Co., is a Saudi Arabian national petroleum and natural gas company based in Dhahran. Jones (2010) mentions that Saudi Aramco's value has been estimated at up to US $10 trillion in the Financial Times, making it the world's most valuable company.

Alkhazim (2003) states that the education system in Saudi Arabia is free and mandatory for males and females until the high school level. Public undergraduate level education is also free for all citizens, plus the government provides students with a monthly salary during their study at the university. The government also offers a scholarship program to send young Saudi nationals to the most prestigious universities around the world for undergraduate and postgraduate studies. According to Hamdan (2005), the program offers funds for tuition and living expenses. An estimated 150,000 Saudi students received government scholarships to study abroad. The government allocates over 25% of the total budget to education.
including vocational training, and spends around 14 billion U.S. dollars on primary education and research (Hamdan, 2005).

**Higher Education in Saudi Arabia**

According to Albabtin (1997), higher education means all types of education that come after secondary school, such as higher institutions, university colleges, and professional training centers that aim at preparing the national cadres needed for preparing teachers, engineers, doctors, and a variety of other occupations. Alhoqeel (1994) states that there is a strong relation between higher education and the welfare of nations. In other words, higher education is the main source of creating higher skills for human factors as the major element of progress and development.

The aim of higher education is to contribute to the development of society, in order to achieve more advanced civilizations. It may be perceived that higher education graduated specialists or professionals can contribute to the development of the country (Albahashi, 2004). Moreover, it provides the educational sector with plans and basics to drive the society in various humanitarian and urban direction. Graduate scientists and researchers can contribute to science and progress in both community and humanitarian service to the country (Aldawood, 1995).

According to the Ministry of Higher Education (1994), higher education means: "All types of education that follows secondary education, or equivalent, and provided vocational training centers, higher institutes,
Pervious King Abdullah believed education to be critical to the development of the country. During his 10 years reign, the number of universities increased from 8-35 (Alamri, 2011). Higher education in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has witnessed special attention, because of the vision of the country toward providing the best level of education and as a result of the increasing social demand for this type of education.

As stated by Ab-Nofal (1992), study in this kind of education is based on the cognitive side only, and that the basic role of the University is scientific knowledge. Ab-Nofal believes the university to be most honest and full of value and the best place to obtain knowledge, where study and research are performed.

The post-secondary system of education in Saudi Arabia leads to a specific degree, similar to the educational system of the United States. The patterns and procedures of these educational systems have been adopted in accordance with Islamic systems, traditions, and customs (Abdulateef, 1997). According to Alghamdi (2002), the Higher Education Council is the supreme authority for post-secondary education affairs with the specific task of supervising and coordinating its institutions, with the sole exception of military education. The main aim of this Council is to manage and monitor the process of education in the university according to the policy and supervising the progress of education in university regarding all sectors. In
addition it holds coordinating authority between the different universities in the field of scientific degrees and departments, in addition to supporting research (Higher Education in Saudi Arabia, 2015).

**Saudi Electronic University**

The approval of King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia was issued according to a High Decree on September 7, 2011. He approved the establishment of the Saudi Electronic University (SEU) as an educational institution to provide higher education and lifelong learning, and to be complementary to the system of educational institutions under the supervision of the Council for Higher Education. SEU consists of the following colleges: Administrative and Financial Sciences, Computation and Information, Health Sciences, and Science and Theoretical Studies. The University offers undergraduate and graduate degrees, as well as offering courses in continuous learning and lifelong learning (Annalisa, 2016).

The main campus of SEU is located in the city of Riyadh. It expanded with the opening of educational centers in different regions in accordance with the approved plan of the University. Today, SEU has 10 campuses in addition to the Riyadh main campus. SEU aims to provide academic credits both internally and externally and helps to raise the quality of student output. The university offers higher education based on the best education models among the applications and techniques of e-learning and blended learning. These programs combine identified needs in labor market with attendance
through technical, transfer, and resettlement of the leading knowledge collaboration with universities, with faculty members who are both domestic and international. It also contains the content of refined education of quality academic resources in line with the requirements of the Saudi society, in addition to its support for the letter and the concept of lifelong learning for all members of Saudi society (Annalisa, 2016). SEU is an academic institution-governmental organization representing higher education needs. SEU provides an environment based on information technology using e-learning and blended learning techniques. Moreover, it offers degrees in programs and disciplines, which are aligned with and responsive to labor market needs with the requirements of development and lifelong learning and contributes to building the economy and the knowledge society in the kingdom and the delivery of its message of civilization globally (Abdulateef, 1997).

According to Annalisa (2016), SEU has a system, which provides e-courses and scientific content in an orderly manner that is easy to navigate. It is also easy to manage these courses, electronic monitoring of students and the learning process. SEU opens the way for students to browse scientific material and recorded lectures, in addition to attending live lectures using various communication technologies as computer and mobile devices. Most of the learning and content management systems share many of the characteristics that can be utilized in the following functions:
registration, scheduling, content delivery and tracking, communication and recording of grades and tests and homework. Among the most famous learning management systems utilized at SEU are the Blackboard System, Moodle and Sakai system, and the system of Tajseer.

According to SEU (2016), there are many rules and instructions that define the educational system and help students achieve their goals. The following are examples that come from the SEU website:

1. The minimum number of credits is 12 credits for each semester except for the summer semester. However, the maximum number of credits of study during each semester is 18 credits, again except for the summer semester. In the summer semester, the minimum number of credits is 6 while the maximum number of credits is 12.

2. The system of study relies on the blended method, which includes 75% of course time online and 25% face to face.

3. Minimum credits for the Bachelor’s degree is at least 120 hours including core courses and elective courses.

4. SEU relies on the Hijri calendar (based purely on lunar cycles) and each year consists of three semesters referred as first semester, second semester, and summer semester.

5. Students pay about $1000 for each semester including the summer semester. The number of courses does not impact the cost.
6. Each semester starts with an orientation week for new students. This orientation includes an overview about SEU, the rules for SEU, a tour around the University’s buildings, and some advice on how to deal with electronic courses.

7. SEU is the only institution in Saudi Arabia that allows students to work and attend school. All other institutions require students to not be employed. Although the age distribution of students at SEU was requested from several officials, no official source was able to provide the ages of SEU students.

**Summary**

The contribution of SDL to the field of education has produced numerous benefits and fostered an environment that is concerned with the development and strengthening of critical skills that include: problem solving, interpersonal skills, critical thinking, and creativity. As such, the environment where learning takes place is just as important as the personality attributes and characteristics of the learner, especially in terms of linking theoretical concepts with real-life learning situations (Rezaee & Mosalanejad, 2015). Furthermore, SDL has been identified as a critical skill for many students, particularly within today’s challenging and competitive academic environment. Moreover, the purpose of education, whether formal or informal, is to examine how learners take initiative and make the most
effective use of resources, as opposed to the passive intake of information, which is a core theme of SDL: allowing learners to acquire new knowledge more effectively and skillfully across the lifespan. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and how it operates potentially is based on Arabic and Islamic law. Higher education in Saudi Arabia has witnessed critical and important developing steps in Saudi Arabia. The viewpoint of the Kingdom considers higher education as one of the original sources of providing highly qualified and professional individuals in all fields of life.
Chapter 3

Methods

The purpose of this study was to determine the level of self-directed learning readiness for undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia. This chapter presents research methods used in this study including the design of study, variables, demographics, population and sample, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis.

Design of Study

This study determined the level of self-directed learning readiness of the undergraduate students at SEU in Saudi Arabia. The research design was based on online surveys, which involved the collection of information from a sample of individuals by asking them to respond to the survey questions. In survey research, the researcher selects a sample of participants from a population and administers a standardized questionnaire to them. Data were collected from the undergraduate students at the Saudi Electronic University on the Riyadh campus. The sampling strategy that the researcher utilized in this study was a convenience sample. The researcher used descriptive and inferential statistics to describe and analyze data.

Research questions

Four research questions were utilized to guide this study:
1. What is the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia?

2. Does the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia differ by gender?

3. Does the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia differ by college?

4. Does the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia differ by age?

**Variables**

This study included independent and dependent variables:

**Independent Variables.** The independent variables in this study were gender, college, and age.

**Dependent Variable.** For the purpose of this study, the dependent variable was the total score from the Self-directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS) among the undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia, a continuous variable.

**Demographics**

The survey began with demographic questions. Even though not all of this information was part of the statistical data analysis of the study, the information attempted to provide a better description of the sample participants. These questions included: gender (nominal), year of birthday (continuous), college (nominal), number of years of studying at the Saudi Electronic University (continuous), and number of courses taken at Saudi Electronic University (continuous). The gender variable had two levels: male
and female. The College variable had four levels: College of Administration and Finance, College of Computation and Information, College of Health Sciences, and College of Sciences and Theoretical Studies. The number of years had five levels: first year, second year, third year, fourth year, and fifth year. Finally, the number of courses was combined into categories based on the number of courses: 1-10, 11-20, 21-30, 31-40, and 41-50. Both the English and Arabic versions of the demographic questions are presented in Appendix A.

**Population and Sample**

The target population for this study was undergraduate students who attended Saudi Electronic University on the Riyadh campus and were taking at least one course during Summer 2016. Founded in 2011, the Saudi Electronic University on Riyadh campus had a 2016 enrollment of 4,490 undergraduate students. The number of student enrolled in SEU distributed by college and gender in 2016 is presented in Table 1.

The sample selected for this study included undergraduate students from the colleges of Administration and Finance, Computation and Information, Health Sciences, and Sciences and Theoretical Studies. The design of this study required two distinct statistical tests to answer the research questions: *t* test for independent samples and analysis of variance (ANOVA). Each testing method had a different associated value for medium effect size .25 and the suggested sample size while holding the power
constant at .80 and Alpha .05% (Cohen, 1992), a minimum of 179 participants was required. Therefore, the total minimum sample size for this study was 179 undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University on the Riyadh campus.

Table 1

Number of Student Enrolled in SEU by College and Gender in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Male n</th>
<th>Female n</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>%*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Finance</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>1541</td>
<td>34.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computation and Information</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>29.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences and Theoretical Studies</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>16.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2678</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>4490</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* May not equal 100 due of rounding

Table 1 presents the number of students enrolled in SEU distributed by college and gender in 2016. Nine hundred twenty-seven males and 614 females were students in the Administration and Finance College, 974 males and 348 females were students in the Computation and Information College, 453 males and 425 females were students in the Health Sciences College, 324 males and 425 females were students in the Sciences and Theoretical
Studies College. Two thousand six hundred seventy-eight (59.64%) were males and 1812 (40.36 %) were females.

**Instrumentation**

The instrument the researcher utilized included a demographic information sheet and the Self-directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS). SDLRS measured the level of self-directed learning readiness of undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University on Riyadh campus.

**Demographic Information Sheet.** The survey of this study began with five demographic questions: What is your gender? What year were you born? What is your current college? How many years have you studied at the Saudi Electronic University? And how many courses have you taken at the Saudi Electronic University? See Appendix A for a copy of the demographic information sheet in both English and Arabic.

To verify that there would be no problems associated with the translation and questions on the information sheet, a small pilot test was conducted with eight Saudi Students in Tampa. Based on their input, the changes were, the dots for spaces for the responses were changed to lines for the ease of writing responses since the dots seemed to confuse some of participants. The other change involved adding additional spaces between the questions for improved readability.

**Self-directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS).** The SDLRS developed by Guglielmino (1977) for measuring readiness for self-directed
learning has been used in a variety of studies and with a variety of populations. It is a 58-item, 5-point Likert-type scale designed to collect data on the participants' perceived SDL readiness based on eight factors, namely:

1. Attitude toward and joy of learning;
2. Self-confidence in abilities and skills for learning;
3. Complexity, adventure, and independence in learning;
4. Attraction to new and unusual situations;
5. Openness to learning situations;
6. Internal control;
7. Self understanding; and,

Guglielmino (1977, 2016) does not recommend using any of the domains independently and only recommends using the total score in research.

Statements designed to provide information on the above eight factors will be answered by having the students check mark one of five options on a Likert-type scale. The five options are: a) "Almost never true of me; I hardly ever feel that way"; b) "Not often true of me; I feel this way less than half of the time"; c) Sometimes true of me; I feel this way about half of the time"; d) "Usually true of me; I feel this way more than half of the time"; or f) "Almost always true of me; there are very few times I do not feel this way." See Appendix B for sample of the English version items of the SDLRS.
Based on results from a variety of studies, Guglielmino and Guglielmino (1982) suggested classification of an individual's level of readiness for self-direction in learning (the total score on the SDLRS) into three categories 58-201 below average, 201-226 average, and 227-290 above average. The Self-directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS) has been used by more than 500 major organizations around the world (SDLRS, 2015). More than 120,000 adults have taken the instrument and more than 95 doctoral dissertations have been completed using the SDLRS. According to SDLRS (2015), the adult form of the instrument has been translated into Spanish, Japanese, Chinese, Korean, German, Finnish, Greek, Portuguese, Italian, Malaysian, Indonesian, Dutch, Polish, Russian, Turkish, Lithuanian, Latvian, Farsi, Arabic, Thai, Nepali, and Afrikaans. This research used the Arabic version of the SDLRS. See Appendix C for sample of some Arabic version items of the SDLRS. Permission to use the Arabic version of the SDLRS was obtained from Guglielmino. See Appendix D for a copy of the permission letter from SDLRS.

**Reliability and Validity of the SDLRS.** Guglielmino (1977) developed the SDLRS based on a three-round Delphi technique. Through a factor analysis, she identified eight factors related to readiness for self-directed learning. The original instrument consisted of 41 items. She reported the reliability of the SDLRS as 0.87 (n = 307) based on a sample of subjects in Georgia, Virginia, and Canada. Also, based on a population of
3,151 individuals from the United States and Canada, a split-half Pearson product moment correlation with a Spearman-Brown correction produced a reliability coefficient of .94 (Guglielmino 1977). Most published studies on populations over 20 years age report similar reliability figures that fall within a range of .72 - .96. In addition to internal reliability estimates, Finestone (1984) and Wiley (1981) reported test-retest reliability coefficients of .82 and .79 respectively. Supported by Delahaye and Smith (1995), Durr (1992), Finestone (1984), Graeve (1987), Hassan (1981), Long and Agyekum (1984), McCune and Guglielmino (1991), Posner (1990), and Russell (1988), the SLDRS generally has an internal reliability coefficient between .72 to .96, and has test-retest reliability of 0.82 and .79, based on Finestone (1984) and Wiley (1981).

The SDLRS instrument was originally developed in English, but it has been translated to a variety of other languages, one of them is Arabic. Abo-Rokbah (2002) translated the SDLRS instrument to Arabic through the use of two official translation offices, which were the International Institute for translation and Global Nexus. Next, he had the two versions translated back into English through the use of two other official translation offices, which were Nusaiba International Translation Center and Al-Qabas Translation House. After the translation was completed, he conducted a pilot study. He asked 12 Saudi students to provide feedback about the clarity and ease of understanding and following. All 12 students completed the instrument and
give satisfactory comments about the SDLRS instrument and its questions. As a result of his pilot study, he decided to proceed with his research.

In order to examine the reliability of the SDLRS instrument Arabic version, Abo-Rokbah (2002) calculated Cronbach’s alpha (α). The result of the calculation was .8795, which indicates that the Arabic version of the SDLRS instrument in highly reliable.

**Interpretation.** SDLRS has a total range of scores from 58 to 290 and is divided into three levels of self-directed learning readiness: below average, average, and above average. Guglielmino (1989) interpreted each individual’s SDLRS score based on her sample. The interpretation of the SDLRS scores range and explanation of readiness is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

**Interpretation of SDLRS the Scores Range and Explanation of Readiness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDLRS Score range</th>
<th>Readiness for SDL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58-201</td>
<td>Below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202-226</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227-290</td>
<td>Above average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 explains that any score between 58-201 is considered as a below average level of SDLRS, any score between 202-226 is considered as
an average level of SDLRS, and any score between 227-290 is considered as an above average level of SDLRS. In other words individuals who score from 58 to 201 are considered to be the least self-directed in their learning. In comparison, individuals with scores from 227 to 290 are most ready for self-directed learning.

According to Guglielmino (1989), individuals with high SDLRS scores usually prefer to determine their learning needs and to plan and implement their own learning. This does not mean that they will never choose to be in a structured learning situation. They may choose traditional courses or workshops as a part of a learning plan. On the other hand, individuals with average SDLRS scores may be successful in independent situations, but are not fully comfortable with handling the entire process of identifying their learning needs and planning and implementing their learning. Individuals with below average SDLRS scores usually prefer very structured learning options such as lecture and traditional classroom settings.

Data Collection

Before starting to collect data for this study, approval from the Intuitional Review Board (IRB) from University of South Florida was required. See Appendix E for a copy of the USF IRB approval letter. Data were collected from the undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University on the Riyadh campus. Permission to administer the Arabic version of the SDLRS was approved by Saudi Electronic University. See Appendix F for
copies of both the English and Arabic approval letters. The sampling strategy that the researcher utilized in this study was a convenience sample. According to Creswell (2012), through using a convenience sample, the researcher can select participants because they are willing, available, convenient, and represent some characteristics the researcher seeks to study. The questionnaire was available online using the Qualtrics Survey Software. The researcher met with the Dean of Students Affairs at SEU on June 26 to arrange the distribution of survey. The Office of Students Affairs was asked to forward the link of the Arabic demographic questions and the Arabic version of the SDLRS to the undergraduate students who were enrolled in at least one course during summer semester 2016. The first mailing of the instrument was on June 28 and the second mailing was on July 3. See Appendix G for a copy of the Arabic email from SEU to the students. There were 270 uncompleted surveys that were not part of the analyses. The researcher thought the length of the questions might have contributed to the non completion of the SDLRS. Participants who thought there were only five demographic questions may have decided not to complete the survey.

Since contact with the Dean of Saudi Electronic University was needed, the researcher traveled to Saudi Arabia to meet with the Dean of Students Affairs at SEU on the campus. Data collection took place between June 28-July 8, 2016.
Data Analyses

The researcher utilized descriptive and inferential statistics to describe and analyze the data. To analyze the data from the participants, the SPSS program was used. In order to answer the research questions in this study, the researcher used different analyses for the quantitative statistics in this study.

Descriptive analyses including central tendency, frequencies, and percentages were used who provided a description of the sample from which data were collected regarding the independent variables in this study: gender, college, and age. After completing the data collection, the raw data were sent to Guglielmino to provide the calculated SDLRS scores for each participant using the SDLRS scoring system. She then returned the raw numbers as scored data that were used in the statistical analyses.

To answer the first question, the SDLRS scoring was used to determine the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University. The researcher described the SDLRS scores by using means, medians, standard deviations, variances, skewness, kurtosis, percentages, and range.

To answer research question two, independent means t tests were used to determine if there was a significant difference between the level of SDLRS and the selected demographic variable of gender.

To answer research question three, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was
used to determine if there was a significant difference between the level of SDLRS for the selected demographic variable of college. Since a significant difference existed between the mean score of SDLRS and the demographic variable of college, a Tukey test was used to determine where the significant differences existed.

To answer research question four, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the level of SDLRS and the demographic variable of age.

**Coding**

This study included five independent variables. In order to analyze the data, the researcher coded them. The variable of gender was coded as male = 1, and female = 2. The variable of college was coded as Administration and Finance College = 1, Computation and Information College = 2, Health Sciences College = 3, and Sciences and Theoretical Studies College = 4. The variable of age was coded as 18-27 years = 1, 28-37 years = 2, and 38-47 years = 3. The variable of years they have studied at the Saudi Electronic University was coded as first year = 1, second year = 2, third year = 3, forth year = 4, and fifth year = 5. The variable of courses they have studied at the Saudi Electronic University was coded as 1-10 = 1, 11-20 = 2, 21-30 = 3, 31-40 = 4, and 41-50 = 5.
Summary

This chapter discussed research methods used in this study. This study was quantitative study using questionnaires. The dependent variable was the total score of the Self-directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS) among the undergraduate students at SEU in Saudi Arabia. The independent variables in this study were gender, college, and age. The target population in this study was undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University on the Riyadh campus who were taking at least one course during summer semester 2016.

This study utilized the Self-directed Learning Readiness Scale instrument (SDLRS), which was developed by Guglielmino (1977) for measuring readiness for self-directed learning. The survey included the five demographic questions, which were gender, year of birth, college, number of years of studying at the Saudi Electronic University, and number of courses taken at Saudi Electronic University. This was followed by the 58 questions used to measure the readiness for self-directed learning. Descriptive and inferential statistics were utilized in this study to describe and analyze data.
Chapter 4

Findings

The purpose of this study was to determine the level of self-directed learning readiness for undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia. This chapter presents a description of the sample, findings by research questions, observations, and summary.

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

The target population in this study was undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia on Riyadh campus. Founded in 2011, the Saudi Electronic University on Riyadh campus has a 2016 enrollment of 4,490 undergraduate students. The total number of participants included 203 undergraduate students from Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia on the Riyadh campus. However, 270 students began, but did not finish the questionnaire. This study included demographic information collected by the demographic sheet presented as Appendix A.

Table 3 presents the numbers and percentages for gender. There were a total of 203 participants: 100 (49.26%) were male, and 103 (50.74%) were female. Although the percentages of all male and female enrolled in Saudi Electronic University were 59.64 and 40.36% receptively,
the percentage of participants by gender was larger for females. Personal communication from the Dean of Admissions and Student Affairs (A. Almayouf, July 26, 2016) indicated that females tended to respond to surveys in greater number than males.

Table 3

*Number and Percentages of Participants by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>50.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 203*

Table 4 presents the numbers and percentages for college. Fifty-eight (28.57%) were students in the Administration and Finance College, 65 (32.02%) were students in the Computation and Information College, 43 (21.18%) were students in the Health Sciences College, and 37 (18.23%) were students in the Sciences and Theoretical Studies College. Administration and Finance College and Computation and Information College had the largest number of participants responding, while the Health Sciences College and the Sciences and Theoretical Studies College had
smaller number of participants. Participants by colleges were similar to percentages of college enrollments (see Table 1).

Table 4

*Number and Percentages of Participants by College*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Finance</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computation and Information</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences and Theoretical Studies</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 203*

* May not equal 100 due of rounding

Table 5 presents the numbers and percentages by age. The age of participants ranged from 18 to 46 years. Age was divided into three groups: 18-27 years, 28-37 years, and 38-47 years. Eighty-three (40.89%) were students between the ages of 18-27 years, 95 (46.80%) were students between the ages of 28-37 years, and 25 (12.32%) were students between the ages of 38-47 years. Distribution by age was not available from any of the SEU administrators contacted.
Table 5

*Number and Percentages of Participants by Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-27 years</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>40.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-37 years</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>46.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-47 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(N = 203\)

* May not equal 100 due of rounding

Table 6 presents the numbers and percentages of participants by years. Sixty-seven (33.00%) were students in their first year at Saudi Electronic University (SEU), 52 (25.62%) were students in their second year at SEU, 44 (21.67%) were students in their third year at SEU, 35 (17.24%) were students in their forth year at SEU, and 5 (2.46%) were students in their fifth year at SEU.

Table 7 presents the numbers and percentages by courses. Seventy-eight (38.42%) were students who had taken between 1-10 courses, 48 (23.64%) were students who had taken between 11-20 courses, 33 (16.26%) were students who had taken between 21-30 courses, 22 (10.84%) were students who had taken between 31-40 courses, and 22 (10.84%) were students who had taken between 41-50 courses. The largest
numbers of participants were in their first year of school, while the second largest of participants were in either their first or second year depending on how many courses the students had enrolled in each semester. Together 62.06% of the participants took 20 or fewer courses.

Table 6

*Number and Percentages of Participants by Year in Saudi Electronic University*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forth Year</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 203
* May not equal 100 due of rounding

**Findings for Research Question 1**

What is the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia? In order to answer research question one, descriptive statistics for SDLRS scores were used.
Table 8 presents the total SDLRS scores, which ranged from 132 to 279. The mean score was 213.6, which was almost identical to the reported mean score of 214 for all adults, according to Guglielmino and Guglielmino (2016). In this study, there were three levels of readiness for self-directed learning: 64 (32.52%) students were at the below average 58-201; 71 (34.98%) students were at the average level, 202-226; and 68 (33.50%) students were at the above average level 227-290. Approximately one third of the students scored in each category. The standard deviation was 25.26 and a median of 215. The comparison of percentages of students scoring at each SDLRS levels is presented in Figure 2.

![Graph showing percentages of students scoring at each SDLRS levels](image)

**Figure 2.** Comparison of percentages of students scoring at each SDLRS levels.

*Note. N = 203*
In Figure 2, although the means of SDLRS score were in the average level, the spread of responses indicated an almost equal distribution of the number of individuals falling under each level. The histogram demonstrates that the average and above average levels accounted for 68.5% of the participants. Only 32.5% of the participants scored below average.

Table 7

*Number and Percentages of Participants by Number of Courses Taken at Saudi Electronic University*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>38.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 203
* May not equal 100 due of rounding

**Findings for Research Question 2**

Does the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at SEU in Saudi Arabia differ by gender? To answer research question two, an
independent means $t$ test was performed to determine if there was a significant difference between the level of SDLRS and gender.

**Independent means $t$-test assumptions.** There are three assumptions underlying the use of independent means $t$ test:

**Assumption of independence.** The design of the study established independence since there was no participant who belonged to more than one group in the same independent variable. During data collection, all participants completed their respective online surveys independently.

**Assumption of normality.** The Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests were utilized to test normality. Results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests are presented in Table 9. The Shapiro-Wilk test value was .46 and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test value was .20. The significance values of Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests were both greater than 0.05. These statistical tests suggest there was no evidence that the assumption of population normality had been violated.

**Assumption of homogeneity.** The Levene test was used to test homogeneity of variance. Results of the Levene test presented a $p = .671$ greater than .05, so the variances were not significantly different. Results of the independent means $t$ tests are presented in Table 10.

Females had a mean 216.28 that is six points higher than the male the mean of 210.83. Also, there was no significant result, $t = 1.54, p = 0.124$ between the level of SDLRS and gender. These results suggest that the
gender did not have any significant influence in the level of self-directed learning readiness (SDLR) among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia. This result was somewhat surprising, because women were not allowed to participate in higher education before 40 years ago. The expectation of differences in scores was due to this historical fact. Older women might have been more self-directed because they had no other way to learn.

Table 8

*Descriptive Statistics for SDLRS Scores for All Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>213.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>215.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>25.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>637.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>147.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>132.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>279.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N = 203*
Table 9

*Results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk Tests*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogorov-Smirnova</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapiro-Wilk</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: α = .05*

Table 10

*Independent T-test Results for Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>210.83</td>
<td>25.96</td>
<td>201.00</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>216.28</td>
<td>24.40</td>
<td>199.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: α = .05*

**Findings for Research Question 3**

Does the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at SEU in Saudi Arabia differ by college? This question was answered using a one-way ANOVA to determine if there was a significant difference between the level of
ANOVA assumptions. There are three assumptions that must be met for ANOVA:

**Assumption of independence.** All participants in this study had independent opinions. They also could not choose more than one option for each independent variable question. There was no relationship between the observation in each group and between the groups themselves.

**Assumption of normality.** The data in this study were normally distributed as mentioned in the findings of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests $p > .05$. See Table 9 for the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests.

**Assumption of homogeneity.** The results of the Levene for variable of college indicated that $p = .473$ was greater than .05, so the variances were not significant regarding the variable of college.

As shown in Table 11 at an alpha level of .05, the significance level was .018, which is therefore significant. There was a statistically significant difference in the mean score of SDLRS related to college. To know which of the specific groups differed, the researcher conducted a multiple comparison test using the Tukey post hoc test.
Table 11

Summary One-way ANOVA Table for College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>6333.52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2111.17</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>122509.36</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>615.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128842.88</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\alpha = .05$

Table 12 indicates that the Administration and Finance College had a mean 217.48 that was higher than the Computation and Information College mean of 215.83, the Health Sciences college mean was 215.02, and the Sciences and Theoretical Studies College mean was 201.92. College means were similar, in that three colleges were at the average level. However, the Sciences and Theoretical Studies College mean was lower and fall in the below average level. The result of the Tukey test indicated that the existence of significant differences at the .05 level between the students in the Administration and Finance College and students in the Sciences and Theoretical Studies College, who scored lower on the SDLRS. Also, there was a significant difference between the students in the Computation and
Information College and the Sciences and Theoretical Studies College who again scored lower on the SDLRS.

Table 12

*Multiple Comparisons Results by College*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>ST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>217.48</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>-2.46</td>
<td>-15.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>215.83</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>-13.91*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>215.02</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-13.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>201.92</td>
<td>15.56*</td>
<td>13.91*</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: α = .05  
* p > .05  
AF = Administrative and Financial College; CI = Computation and Information College; HS = Health Sciences College; ST = Science and Theoretical Studies College.

Findings for Research Question 4

Does the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at SEU in Saudi Arabia differ by age? To answer research question 4, a one-way ANOVA was performed to determine if there was a significant difference between the level of SDLRS and age. The 38-47 years age group had a mean of 219.76 that was higher than the 28-37 years age group (213.08), and the 18-27 years age group 212.33. Results of the Levene for variable of
age presented that \( p = .825 \) is greater than \( .05 \), so the variances were not significant regarding for variable of age.

As shown in Table 13, the significance value \( p = .421 \), which is greater than the alpha level of \( .05 \). This suggests that there were no significant differences between the level of SDLRS and age group.

Table 13

Summary One-way ANOVA Table for Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1108.77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>554.39</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127734.10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>638.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128842.88</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: \( \alpha = .05 \)*

**Observations**

During data collection, there were some observations that were not obvious during the data collection. Some participants used the Hijri calendar, which relies on lunar cycles, to write their birth year. For example, someone who used the Hijri calendar wrote 1403, which would be 1983 in the
Gregorian calendar. The researcher shifted the birth year to the Gregorian calendar by using http://www.islamicfinder.org/Hcal/index.php

Saudi Electronic University (SEU), especially the Dean of Admissions and Student Affairs, was very cooperative and supportive throughout the collection of data. SEU is very interested in the results of this research.

There were a large number of students ($n = 270$) who did not complete the SDLRS. Although the specific reasons for this are unknown, the researcher believes the length of the instrument may have been a factor.

**Summary**

This chapter described the research findings of this study. There were 203 undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University who completed the online survey of the Arabic version of SDLRS. The scores on the SDLRS ranged from 132-279 in this research. The mean score on SDLRS for the undergraduate students from Saudi Electronic University on the Riyadh campus was 213.60, which was the average level on the SDLRS. There were no significant differences by gender or age. There were significant differences by college with students in the Administration and Finance College and Computation and Information College scoring higher than the students in the Sciences and Theoretical Studies College.
Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to determine the level of self-directed learning readiness for undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia. This chapter presents a summary of the research, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further research.

Summary

The instrument was administrated to undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University during the summer semester 2016. The SDLRS was sent electronically through Qualtrics Survey Software. This study sought to determine the level of self-directed learning readiness among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Saudi Arabia. Also, this study investigated if there were relationships between the level of self-directed learning readiness and the selected demographic variables of gender, college, and age in the sample of undergraduate students at SEU.

This research utilized a quantitative design using descriptive statistics such as means, medians, modes, standard deviations, and variances, and inferential statistics such independent $t$ tests, ANOVA, and post hoc follow-up tests to describe and analyze the data. The dependent variable was the total score from the Self-directed Learning Readiness Scale (SDLRS) among
the undergraduate students at SEU. Independent variables in this study included gender, college, and age. Four research questions were used to guide this study:

1. What is the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at SEU in Saudi Arabia?
2. Does the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at SEU in Saudi Arabia differ by gender?
3. Does the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at SEU in Saudi Arabia differ by college?
4. Does the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at SEU in Saudi Arabia differ by age?

This research utilized the *Self-directed Learning Readiness Scale* (SDLRS), which was developed by Guglielmino (1977), to measure the level of self-directed learning readiness among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University on the Riyadh campus. The population of SEU during summer semester 2016 was 4490 undergraduate students; and the resulting sample of participants included 203 undergraduate students. The time of data collection was between June 28 and July 8, 2016 during the summer semester.

Results for question one found that the total SDLRS scores among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University on the Riyadh campus ranged from 132 to 279 with 64 (32.52%) students scoring below average
58-201; 71 (34.98%) were students at the average level 202-226; and 68 (33.50%) were students at the above average level 227-290. The standard deviation was 25.26 and median was 215. This result indicates that, although undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University on Riyadh campus had a mean at the average level of self-directed learning readiness, the overall picture indicated that the responses were equally distributed at each of the three SDLRS levels--one third of the participants scored at each level. Results for question two found that there was no significant result between the scores on the SDLRS and gender. Results for question three found statistically significant differences between in the means on the SDLRS and college. The results of the Tukey post-hoc test indicated that significant differences existed between the Sciences and Theoretical Studies College students and both the Administration and Finance College and the Computation and Information College students. The Sciences and Theoretical Studies College scored significantly lower than the other two colleges. The results for question four found that there was no significant result between the level of SDLRS and age.

**Conclusions**

The conclusions that can be drawn from this study are presented below:

Although the mean scores on the SDLRS for all students fell within the average level of SDL readiness, the actual distribution of scores was
different. For the most part, the SDL readiness scores were equal across the three levels. According to Guglielmino and Guglielmino (2016), scores follow bell curve centered on the mean score of 214. This is consistent with this study.

The level of self-directed learning by gender was similar. This is consistent with Prabjandee and Inthachot (2013) who reported no differences by gender in a variety of studies besides their own.

The Sciences and Theoretical Studies College had a SDL readiness score lower than the Administration and Finance College and Sciences and the Computation and Information College students. The only variable with differences was college. Prabjandee and Inthachot (2013) did find significant differences by major, but they did not specify where the differences were found. However, it should be noted that studies on student majors from other cultures may not be applicable in the Saudi Arabian context.

The level of self-directed learning by age was similar. Research conducted in other cultural setting either did not examine age as a variable or found no differences (Abo-Rokbah, 2001; Chang, 1990; Churpina, 2001; Lee, 1989; Oliveira et al., 2010).

**Implications**

There are several implications for practice based on the findings of the research.
This study contributes to possible improvements to the educational system in Saudi Arabia in general and SEU in particular. Determining the level of SDLRS among students may provide additional methods for students to learn the skills needed for SDL. It also may help faculty members review their syllabi to be in accord with the level of self-directed learning readiness among undergraduate students.

Saudi Arabia students have historically not been taught, or encouraged to be, self-directed learners. To increase potential SDLRS, the system of education in Saudi Arabia could provide courses and/or activities, which address the attainment self-directed learning skills.

Since the scores were equally distributed at all three levels of SDLR, SEU could identity students who reported the lower SDL readiness and work with them more specifically to improve their SDL skills.

The Administration and Finance College and the Computation and Information College had higher SDLRS scores than the Sciences and Theoretical College students. It is possible teachers and students in the Sciences and Theoretical Studies College rely on theoretical techniques, lectures, and memorizing. If the Ministry of Education wants to improve self-directed learning skills at SEU or any other university, attention to integration between theory and practice activities might improve self-directed learning skills. Again, attention to methods and techniques that
emphasize SDL skills could be more consciously implemented in the lower scoring colleges.

The participants were close in age, which may have accounted for similar results based on the variable of age. If the age of the students increases, differences in SDL may occur. Should that happen, SEU might need to address changes needed for the increased age range.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

There are several recommendations for future research. These recommendations include:

This study utilized quantitative methods to determine the level of SDLRS among undergraduate students at Saudi Electronic University in Riyadh campus. Conducting qualitative research studies such interviews and focus groups may provide greater insights into student SDLRS.

This study identified the undergraduate student perceptions about their self-directed learning readiness. Similar studies could be conducted with graduate students to determine whether there are similar or different perceptions about their self-directed learning readiness.

This study was conducted only with students at Saudi Electronic University. Other research could be conducted with the faculty and administrators at Saudi Electronic University.

This study relied on the Riyadh campus of Saudi Electronic University. Additional research studies could be conducted on the various campuses of
Saudi Electronic University to make compressions among the 10 other campuses of Saudi Electronic University.

This study investigated undergraduate students during summer semesters 2016. Future research studies could be conducted in all semesters at Saudi Electronic University.

This study included all years of studying at Saudi Electronic University. Additional studies could focus only on fifth year students, since these students could have more experience in self-directed learning at SEU.

This study focused only on Saudi Electronic University. Future studies could research other universities in Saudi Arabia. Comparisons could be made between Saudi Electronic University and other universities in Saudi Arabia.

The number of participants of this study included 203 undergraduate students. Conducting further research by increasing the number of participants may provide more information about SDLRS in Saudi Arabia.

This study included the demographic variables of gender, college, and age. A similar study could be conducted with different demographic variables including variables such as marital status, occupation, and nationality, since many students come from countries other than Saudi Arabia.

The participants in this study included similar ages of students. Further research may focus on older age students who grew up under different conditions such as the lack of availability of access to the larger
number of higher education institutions. In a similar fact, there was a lack of accessibility for woman for many years.

This study did not address the nationality of the students. Further research could focus only on students from other countries studying in Saudi Arabia undergraduate and/or graduate programs.

This study relied on the online student study at Saudi Electronic University. Similar studies could be made comparison between face-to-face students and online students.

This study investigated student at Saudi Electronic University. Additional research studies could be made comparing students at Saudi Electronic University and students at University of South Florida, since similar Adult Education Programs exist at both institutions. The researcher is familiar with both institutions.

Additional research could investigate why students did not complete the questionnaire. In this study, 270 students began, but did not finish the instrument. An attempt to identify why there was a high non-completion rate might help future researchers address this issue.
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Appendix A: Demographic Information Sheet

1. **What is your gender?** Please choose the appropriate response:
   - Male
   - Female

2. **What year were you born?** ________

3. **What is your current college?** Please circle only one:
   - Administration and Finance College.
   - Computation and Information College.
   - Health Sciences College.
   - Sciences and Theoretical Studies College.

4. **How many years have you studied at the Saudi Electronic University?** Please circle only one:
   - First year
   - Second year
   - Third year
   - Forth year
   - Fifth year
Appendix A continued

5. How many courses have you taken at the Saudi Electronic University? Please circle only one:

- 1-10
- 11-20
- 21-30
- 31-40
- 41-50
Appendix A continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ما هو جنسك؟</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ذكر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أنثى</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>من فضلك اكتب سنة ميالك؟</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ما هي الكلية التي تدرس فيها؟</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>كلية العلوم الإدارية والمالية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كلية الحوسبة والموحيسية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كلية العلوم الصحية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كلية العلوم والدراسات النظرية</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>كم عدد السنوات التي درستها في الجامعة السعودية الإلكترونية حتى الآن؟</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>سنة واحدة</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://usf.ax1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8mcBrz1Knight5x7Ct
طول المسار الرئيسي لمستوى التعليم

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>درجة تخرج</th>
<th>عدد سنوات</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ستين وخمسمائتين</td>
<td>١ - ١٠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ثلاث سنوات</td>
<td>١٠ - ١١</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>أربع سنوات</td>
<td>١١ - ١٢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سنتين</td>
<td>١٢ - ١٣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سنوات</td>
<td>١٣ - ١٤</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

كم عدد المواد الدراسية التي درستها في الجامعة السعودية الإلكترونية حتى الآن؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>عدد سنوات</th>
<th>٠١ - ٠٢</th>
<th>٠٢ - ٠٣</th>
<th>٠٣ - ٠٤</th>
<th>٠٤ - ٠٥</th>
<th>٠٥ - ٠٦</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>سنوات</td>
<td>٠٠ - ٠١</td>
<td>٠١ - ٠٢</td>
<td>٠٢ - ٠٣</td>
<td>٠٣ - ٠٤</td>
<td>٠٤ - ٠٥</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Sample Questionnaire (English Version)

**Part 3**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** This part of the questionnaire is designed to gather data on learning preferences and attitudes towards learning. After reading each item, please indicate the degree to which you feel that statement is true of you. Please read each statement carefully and circle the number of the response which best expresses your feeling. There is no time limit for the questionnaire. Try not to spend too much time on any one item, however. Your first reaction to the question will usually be the most accurate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS:</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I'm looking forward to learning as long as I'm living.</td>
<td>Almost never (1), Not often (2), Sometimes (3), Usually (4), Always (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I know what I want to learn.</td>
<td>Almost never (1), Not often (2), Sometimes (3), Usually (4), Always (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When I see something that I don't understand, I stay away from it.</td>
<td>Almost never (1), Not often (2), Sometimes (3), Usually (4), Always (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If there is something I want to learn, I can figure out a way to learn it.</td>
<td>Almost never (1), Not often (2), Sometimes (3), Usually (4), Always (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I love to learn.</td>
<td>Almost never (1), Not often (2), Sometimes (3), Usually (4), Always (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It takes me a while to get started on new projects.</td>
<td>Almost never (1), Not often (2), Sometimes (3), Usually (4), Always (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In a classroom, I expect the teacher to tell all class members exactly what to do at all times.</td>
<td>Almost never (1), Not often (2), Sometimes (3), Usually (4), Always (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I believe that thinking about who you are, where you are, and where you are going should be a major part of every person's education.</td>
<td>Almost never (1), Not often (2), Sometimes (3), Usually (4), Always (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I don't work very well on my own.</td>
<td>Almost never (1), Not often (2), Sometimes (3), Usually (4), Always (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. If I discover a need for information that I don't have, I know where to go to get it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I can learn things on my own better than most people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Even if I have a great idea, I can't seem to develop a plan for making it work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. In a learning experience, I prefer to take part in deciding what will be learned and how.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Difficult study doesn't bother me if I'm interested in something.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. No one but me is truly responsible for what I learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I can tell whether I'm learning something well or not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. There are so many things I want to learn that I wish that there were more hours in a day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. If there is something I have decided to learn, I can find time for it, no matter how busy I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Understanding what I read is a problem for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. If I don't learn, it's not my fault.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I know when I need to learn more about something.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. If I can understand something well enough to get a good grade on a test, it doesn't bother me if I still have questions about it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I think libraries are boring places.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The people I admire most are always learning new things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix C: Sample Questionnaire (Arabic Version)

ارجو قراءة كل فقرة من الفقرات المذكورة أدناه ثم اختيار الدرجة التي تشعر بأنها تتطابق معك:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>درجات الشعور</th>
<th>لا أشعر بذلك</th>
<th>قليلا جدا</th>
<th>جدا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>هكذا أشعر دوما</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هكذا أشعر دوما</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هكذا أشعر دوما</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هكذا أشعر دوما</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هكذا أشعر دوما</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هكذا أشعر دوما</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هكذا أشعر دوما</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هكذا أشعر دوما</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

لا أستطيع للتعلم ما دمت حيًا
أعرف ماذا آريد أن أتعلم
عندما أرى شيئًا لا أفهمه
ابحث عنه
إذا اردت تعلم شيء استمع إلى أجر وسيلة لتعلمه
أجد متعة في التعلم
أخذ وقتا طويلا كي أبدأ في البحث الجديد
في قاعة الدراسة أتوقع من الدروس أن يخبر الطلاب ما يفعلون
أعتقد أن التفكير حول ما أنا وضعي الحالي والتخطيط لنفسي يجب أن يكون جزءًا هاماً من
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https://usf.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe1/previewForm/SV_6mcORzIfYk5x7Ct
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Appendix D: Permission Letter from SDLRS

May 3, 2016

Mr. Mousa Alfaifi
University of South Florida
mousa14037@gmail.com
813 606-3666

Dear Mr. Alfaifi:

This correspondence certifies that you have my permission to use the Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale (Learning Preference Assessment) in your dissertation research for the number of uses that you purchased (210 copies of the Arabic version).

Lucy M. Guglielmino, Ed. D.
luguglielmino@rocamail.com
(772) 429-2425
website: http://www.lpasdlrs.com
Appendix E: IRB Approval Letter

4/12/2016

Mousa Alfaifi
L-CACHE - Leadership, Counseling, Adult, Career & Higher Education
4202 E. Fowler Avenue
Tampa, FL 33620

RE: Exempt Certification
IRB#: Pro00025277
Title: Self-directed Learning Readiness Among Undergraduate Students in Saudi Arabia

Dear Mr. Alfaifi:

On 4/12/2016, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) determined that your research meets criteria for exemption from the federal regulations as outlined by 45CFR46.101(b):

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:
(i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Approved Items:
protocol Guideline
concept Form (Arabic version)
Concept Form (English version)

As the principal investigator for this study, it is your responsibility to ensure that this research is conducted as outlined in your application and consistent with the ethical principles outlined in the Belmont Report and with USF HRPP policies and procedures.

Please note, as per USF HRPP Policy, once the Exempt determination is made, the application is closed in ARC. Any proposed or anticipated changes to the study design that was previously declared exempt from IRB review must be submitted to the IRB as a new study prior to initiation of the change. However, administrative changes, including changes in research personnel, do not warrant an amendment or new application.
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Given the determination of exemption, this application is being closed in ARC. This does not limit your ability to conduct your research project.

We appreciate your dedication to the ethical conduct of human subject research at the University of South Florida and your continued commitment to human research protections. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please call 813-974-5638.

Sincerely,

Kristen Salomon, Ph.D., Vice Chairperson
USF Institutional Review Board
Appendix F: Saudi Electronic University Approval Letter (English Version)

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Ministry of higher education
Saudi Electronic University
Vice Rectorate for Graduate Studies and Scientific Research
Deanship of scientific research

Dear Mr. Mousa Sulaiman Alfaifi

After considering the regulations that govern research instruments, the regulations that were approved by His Excellency the President of the University in the letter No. 4239 in 15/3/1436H, and considering the recommendation of the Supervisory Committee of Research Instruments with regard to your proposed study with the title:

“Self-directed Learning Readiness Among Undergraduate Student in Saudi Arabia”.

His Excellency the Dean of Graduate Studies and Scientific Research has approved the recommendation of the supervisory committee. We hereby inform you of his approval and let you know that you can start working on the research project.

Also, we hope that you provide this university with a copy of your PhD dissertation or any published studies that will be based on data that will be collected at this university.

Best regards,

Dean for Graduate Studies and Scientific Research
Prof. Abdellah Abdulrahman Alahdulajabar

Signature
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السلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته...

"Self-directed Learning Readiness Among Undergraduate Student in Saudi Arabia"

أفيدكم بصدور موافقة سعادة وكيل الجامعة للدراسات العليا والبحث العلمي على توصية اللجنة، وإياكمكم البدء بالعمل.

نأمل منكم تزويد الجامعة لاحقًا بنسخة من رسالة الدكتوراه وأي بحوث منشورة بناءً على هذه الدراسة.

وتقبلوا خالص التحية والتقدير...

وكيل الجامعة

للدراسات العليا والبحث العلمي

أ. د. عبد الله بن عبدالرحمن الحدل الجبار
Appendix G: Copy of Email From SEU to Students

From: Student affairs s.affairs@seu.edu.sa
Subject: استبانة
Date: June 28, 2016 at 1:25 PM
To:  

عزيزي الطالب/الطالبة

يعتزم الباحث/ موسى سليمان الفيقي القيام بإجراء دراسة بعنوان (مدى الاستعداد لدى طلاب الجامعة السعودية الإلكترونية بالرياض للتعلم الذاتي) تكرمك بالإجابة على هذه الاستبانة شرط إنجاز هذه الدراسة علمًا بأن المعلومات المقترحة من قبلكم سوف تستخدم للأغراض البحثية فقط

https://usf.ac2.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6mso0rzHtTkSxTCl
About the Author

Mousa S. Alfaifi was born in Faifa, Saudi Arabia in 1983. He got his high school diploma in 2000. After finishing his Bachelor’s degree in Teaching Arabic Language from Jazan University in 2004, he worked as a teacher at the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia. In 2010, he got his Master’s degree in Curricula and Teaching Methods from Al-Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University. In 2011, he obtained his Master’s degree in Adult and Continuing Education from King Saud University. After that, he transferred his work from Ministry of Education to King Saud University to work as a lecturer in the Educational Policies department with an Emphasis in Adult and Continuing Education. In 2012, he moved to the United States to achieve his dream of completing his Ph.D. in Adult Education.