

การใช้สัญญาการเรียนรู้เพื่อพัฒนาความเข้าใจในการอ่าน
ภาษาอังกฤษและความสามารถในการเรียนรู้แบบนำตนเองของ
นักศึกษาระดับปริญญาตรี

Using Learning Contracts to Improve English
Reading Comprehension and Self-directed
Learning Ability of Undergraduate Students

รศ.เสาวภา วิชาดี*
Saovapa Wichadee

* สถาบันภาษามหาวิทยาลัยกรุงเทพ, อ. คลองหลวง จ. ปทุมธานี
Language Institute, Bangkok University, Klongluang, Pathumthani.

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อพัฒนาความสามารถในการอ่าน ทักษะการเรียนรู้ ด้วยการนำตนเองของนักศึกษาระดับปริญญาตรี กระบวนการเรียนการสอนในการศึกษาครั้งนี้เปิดโอกาสให้นักศึกษาได้วางแผนกิจกรรมการเรียนรู้ด้วยตนเองโดยใช้สัญญาการเรียนเพื่อให้บรรลุเป้าหมายที่ตั้งไว้ การศึกษานี้ใช้รูปแบบ quasi-experiment ทำการทดลองกับนักศึกษาที่ลงทะเบียนเรียนวิชา EN 112 ในภาคการศึกษาที่ 2/2009 ทำการสุ่มนักศึกษาจำนวน 2 กลุ่มโดยการสุ่มแบบกลุ่มสำหรับการทดลอง เครื่องมือที่ใช้ในการทดลองนี้ได้แก่แบบทดสอบการอ่านเพื่อความเข้าใจและแบบสอบถามวัดความสามารถในการเรียนด้วยการนำตนเอง สถิติที่ใช้ในการวิจัยได้แก่ การวิเคราะห์ความแปรปรวนทางเดียว การทดสอบค่าที ค่าเฉลี่ยและส่วนเบี่ยงเบนมาตรฐานในการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูล ผลการวิจัยแสดงให้เห็นว่านักศึกษามีคะแนนเฉลี่ยการอ่านภาษาอังกฤษและความสามารถในการเรียนด้วยการนำตนเองสูงขึ้นทั้งสองกลุ่ม แต่คะแนนเฉลี่ยด้านความสามารถในการอ่านและการเรียนด้วยการนำตนเองของทั้งสองกลุ่มไม่แตกต่างกันอย่างมีนัยสำคัญทางสถิติที่ระดับ .05

คำสำคัญ การเรียนด้วยการนำตนเอง การอ่านเพื่อความเข้าใจ สัญญาการเรียนรู้

Abstract

The objectives of the study were to study the effects of learning contracts on English reading comprehension and self-directed learning skills of undergraduate students as well as investigate their opinion on the use of learning contracts. The instructional process in the study allowed students to plan their own activities and tasks in a learning contract in order to achieve learning goals. Using quasi-experimental design, the study was conducted with 80 students enrolled in EN112 course in the second semester of 2009 academic year. Two classes were randomized by cluster sampling for the experiment. One section was assigned to be a control group, and another one was used as an experimental group. Three research instruments included a reading comprehension test, a self-directed learning questionnaire, and an opinion questionnaire on the use of learning contracts. The One-way ANCOVA, paired sample t-test, independent t-test, mean, and standard deviation were used for data analysis. The results reveal that students in both groups gained higher English reading mean scores and self-directed learning ability at the significance level of .05. However, the reading scores and self-directed learning ability of both groups were significantly different at the level of .05. Moreover, students had a high level of opinion on using contracts in learning English.

Keywords : self-directed learning, reading comprehension, learning contract

Introduction

Recently, self-directed learning has played an important role in language instruction. With the belief that students should be able to direct themselves appropriately to achieve learning goals and gain more self-directed learning skills, the Ministry of Education has fostered self-directed learning in educational practice at all levels, especially in higher education where lifelong learning has been identified as an important ability for Thai graduates. From this perspective, learning should be student-centered, self-directed as far as possible, problem-based where appropriate, and collaborative in nature. The concept of self-directed learning (SDL) originated in the field of adult education, and many terms used closely to this kind of learning include independent learning, self-planned learning, autonomous learning, and self-education (Roberson, 2005). The core concept of self-directed learning, as given in the Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, involves learners' taking charge of their own learning. SDL is based on the autonomous, independent individual who chooses to undertake learning for personal growth (Merriam and Caffarella 1999). Self-directed learning particularly concerns learners' selection of learning contents and methods to achieve their learning goal. It helps learners to be able to control their

own learning and rely more on their self-instruction, corresponding to the definition proposed in the National Education Act which emphasizes life-long learning. Basically, learners need to have a certain learning capacity in order to become successful learners. According to Littlewood (1996), the capacity refers to ability and willingness to assume learning responsibility. The ability includes both the knowledge and skills for carrying out whatever choices the learners see appropriate for their learning. Willingness means the motivation and the confidence that the learners have for taking responsibility for their learning. Regan (2003) states that since self-directed learning (SDL) can be learned and taught, it is necessary to examine what motivates learners to be more self-directed. Some learners might need specific guidance and feedback to motivate them towards self-directed learning.

To help students direct their own learning processes efficiently, numerous techniques can be employed to build up self-directed skills in learners, and one of those is using learning contracts. Teachers can teach students to set up their learning goals and make plans for learning tasks. Learning contracts, which are often used in self-directed study, independent learning, and the classroom, allow students to be more involved in their learning -- to

become active participants in acquiring the knowledge rather than passive recipients. Knowles (1981) defines the learning contract as, "an alternative way of structuring a learning experience; it replaces a content plan with a process plan" (p.39). It is an agreement between a student and institution or faculty member to acquire knowledge systematically either in the classroom or independently. Therefore, many users of learning contracts call them "learning plans", "learning commitments", "study plans", "learning agreements", or "self-development plans" (Knowles, 1981).

According to Anderson & Boud (1996), the learning contract helps the learner to identify his or her own learning needs and to develop learning objectives and strategies consistent with those needs. Therefore, the main advantages of a learning contract are as follows: 1) it creates flexible learning and can be tailored to suit the individual learner, 2) it enhances self-reflection, learning to learn and self-management, and 3) it provides learners with clear goals and pathways for achieving these, based on their own learning needs. Knowles (1986) points out that self-directed learners need to understand the need to learn something -- how it will benefit them if they learn it or what the consequences will be if they do not -- before they are willing to invest time

and energy in learning it. In the process of drafting a learning contract, learners are subtly challenged to think through why they are undertaking to learn something. So, learning contracts are almost always individualized plans for learning and provide the flexibility to enable different learners to time their learning according to their readiness to learn. That is why learning contracts challenge learners to tap into the intrinsic motivators. As such, Chung (2008) proposed a self-motivated contract in which the students set their own goals in learning. Adjusted to have more freedom for them, this contract needs not to be shown to anyone. It is a contract that students can keep for their own reference. The overall purpose is to trust students in goal-settings. The types of conditions in the contracts can be skills-developing or examination-driven. In sum, learning contracts are tools that encourage students to become active participants in their learning.

A number of research studies have used learning contracts in the field of language teaching, investigated their attitudes towards self-directed learning as well as examined their self-directed abilities. Khomson's work (1997) examined the development of a self-directed learning model using learning contracts and projects to increase English reading comprehension of upper secondary school

students. Two classes were randomly selected for experimentation. The findings revealed that the English reading comprehension scores of both groups were not different. The scores of the low ability students in the experimental group were significantly higher than those of the controlled group at the .01. The post-test scores of the experimental group were significantly higher than the pre-test scores at the .01 level. In addition, the self-directed learning scores in both groups were not different. The post measurement scores of the experimental group were significantly higher than the pre measurement scores at the .01 level. In addition, Lee (1998) conducted a study to investigate the outcome of self-directed learning program for tertiary students in Hong Kong. In doing so, she designed a classroom based self-directed learning program and implemented it in the Language and Communication course for the first-year students at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University. There were two different kinds of learners who engaged in self-directed learning practice: the more enthusiastic learners and the less enthusiastic learners. Results from the interview indicate that the more enthusiastic group had more positive attitude towards the program and had strong beliefs about their own strengths as language learners while the less enthusiastic group had low self-esteem as

language learners. Moreover, Chung (2008) reported a contract learning strategy in a graduate-level online class, examining whether a sample of 28 students' level of motivation could indeed be predicted by their online behavior. Results from the study found that the students' online behavior was not a predictor for their motivational status, though there were age and gender differences in their online behavior. The students felt more self-directed and motivated during contract learning, but what they really liked was being able to select assignments that were relevant to their interests and needs.

Learning contracts had an impact on learners not only in the language teaching field, but in other fields such as nursing and computer education. Bintahprasitthi (1997) studied the learning achievement and self-directed learning readiness of nursing students who learned by using learning contracts and those who learned by traditional method. Seventy subjects of the first year students from Police Nursing College were divided into two groups of 35, randomly assigned to the experimental and control group. These groups were match-paired. The research instruments were the learning contracts lesson, the achievement test and the Self-Directed Learning Readiness Scale. The major findings indicate that achievement test scores and self-directed learning readiness

scores of the control group were significantly higher than the experiment group at a level of .05. However, the self-directed learning readiness score of the experimental group after experiment was significantly higher than before experiment at a level of .05. Similarly, Kanasawat (2009) studied the effects of using learning contracts in E-Learning system on motivation and learning achievement of undergraduate students with different levels of prior knowledge in a Foundations of Computer for Education subject. The research samples consisted of 120 students from the Faculty of Education at Chulalongkorn University in the 2003 academic year. The findings show that there were statistically significant differences at .05 level on learning achievement between students using learning contracts and without learning contracts. There were statistically significant differences at .05 level on achievement motivation between students using learning contracts and those not using learning contracts.

From the literature review above, research on the use of learning contracts has shown both positive and negative outcomes in terms of learning achievement and learner motivation. As such, the researcher still feels interested in using this learning tool with Bangkok University students for two reasons. First, as the nature

of learning contracts is to teach students to plan, monitor, and evaluate themselves without other people's need, this is a way to promote independent learning. So, this process is believed to help them to be more self-directed. To prove this, a self-directed learning ability questionnaire (Guglielmino, 1977) is used as an instrument in this study. Second, students' setting their own goals will enable them to realize their own ability and select what is most suitable for themselves. As such, they are likely to develop their reading ability based on their performance. Therefore, the present study was conducted to find out whether using learning contracts contributes to reading ability and self-directed learning ability. The findings will provide a new approach to learning that increases the students' reading proficiency and learning motivation.

This study contains three research objectives as follows:

1. To study the effects of using learning contracts on reading comprehension scores of Bangkok University students
2. To study the effects of using learning contracts on self-directed learning of Bangkok University students
3. To investigate the students' opinion on using learning contracts

II. Methodology

2.1 Subjects

This study was quasi-experimental research, conducted with first-year students enrolled in EN112: Fundamental English II in semester 2/2009 at Bangkok University. Since students had been already assigned to their sections by the Records Office, it was not possible to randomly select samples out of the population. Thus one section was chosen to be a control group while another section was an experimental group. Each group consisted of 40 students from the School of Communication Arts. In this study, the independent variable is the teaching method while the dependent variables are the students' English reading ability, self-directed learning ability, and their opinions on learning by a contract.

2.2 Research Instruments

Three instruments were used in this study. The first one was a 50 item multiple-choice test of reading skill. The readings in the test were developed by the researcher based on EN 112 course objectives and students' proficiency level in terms of length, vocabulary and grammatical points. The selected seven readings had varied topics. Then the test was examined by three teachers of English from the Language Institute to assume language accuracy and content validity. The value of coefficient alpha after

piloting with other 40 students was .86. The same test was used as a parallel test for pre-and post-testing phases. That is, the researcher administered the test twice and employed an alternate form of the test from the first administration to the second. The readings were not discussed in class. The second instrument was a self-directed ability questionnaire created by Guglielmino (1977) and widely used in educational research. It was used to measure self-directed learning readiness of the students. SDLRS has 58-items, pertained to 8 factors as follows: 1. openness to learning opportunities, 2. self-concept as an effective learner, 3. initiative and independence in learning, 4. informed acceptance of responsibility for one's own learning, 5. a love to learn, 6. creativity, 7. future orientation, and 8. the ability to use basic study skills and problem-solving skills. It is a Likert type scale questionnaire designed to measure a degree to which learners perceive themselves as having the skills and attitudes concerning the term "self-directed learning." The scale is structured with a 5-point scale for responses, ranging from almost always true to almost never true. The inventory was submitted for evaluation by 3 experts who have experienced in language teaching more than 5 years. To determine validity each item must get a score more than 80 percent, and all of

the experts (100%) agreed that the items could measure a specific learning style pattern of learners. The validated questionnaire was pilot tested with 20 non-subject students to test for readability and understanding of the items. The validated learning style inventory was processed for determining an internal consistency, reliability coefficient, with 40 non-subject students, by the coefficient alpha technique. The reliability value was .85, implying that the questionnaire is reliable. The last instrument was an opinion questionnaire towards using learning contracts, investigating how the students feel about it. It consisted of ten items. The Likert five-rating scale (1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4= agree, and 5 = strongly agree) was used for a post-study survey in an experiment group. The draft questionnaire items were checked for their content validity by three experts in English teaching field. The items with IOC index higher than 0.6 are acceptable. In order to test the proper reliability of the questionnaire, the questionnaire was piloted with 40 undergraduate students during the first semester of academic year 2009 at Bangkok University and calculated for proper reliability value by using Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha.

2.3 Experimental Instrument

A learning contract or a learning plan was a tool to make students become more active and self-directed. It was an agreement between students and instructors, which involved determining the number and type of assignments required for particular scores. In this study, the researcher employed a learning contract designed by Knowles (1986), which students were required to complete based on five elements as follows:

- The specific learning objectives to be accomplished;
- The resources and strategies to be used in accomplishing them;
- The evidence that will be collected to indicate the extent to which the objectives have been accomplished;
- How this evidence will be judged or validated;
- The target date for completing each objective. (Knowles, 1981, p. 62)

In order to improve their reading abilities, students in the experimental group were asked to choose at least 6 out of 20 reading passages from the teacher's website to read and do assignments provided in various forms: multiple choice, filling in the blanks, and answering questions. This process helped to increase the degree of independence as students had an opportunity to select the readings they like. Meanwhile, they could see the

scores indicated in each assignment, so they could calculate how many points they would get if they were able to complete all assignments correctly and in accordance with what they had specified in the contract. In the process of drafting a learning contract, students were subtly challenged to think through why they were undertaking to learn something. After indicating what they planned to do outside class on assignment, they were asked to sign the one-page contract and submit it to the teacher. So, learning contracts are always individualized plans for learning because they provide the flexibility to different students. Apart from choosing the readings they would like to read, they could time their learning according to their readiness to learn. Finally, all assignments were done in a form of report and sent to the teacher for grading on last week. Students were informed that scores they gained from the reading tasks was a part of course requirement, not for the tests. In contrast, students in the control group studied 6 passages selected by the teacher, answered the questions, and did some exercises. However, a supplementary sheet of reading strategies was distributed and explained to both groups as a tool for reading improvement.

2.4 Data Collection and Analysis

This empirical study was carried out in two classes where the researcher was the teacher. The data collection was done for 13 weeks. For the pre-instructional period, the subjects in two groups were pre-tested to determine their English reading comprehension. Right after finishing the test, they were given a self-directed questionnaire to examine their self-directed learning abilities. The intervention period took place during weeks 2-14. A learning contract was used with the experimental group only. For the post-instructional period, two groups were post-tested and given a self-directed learning questionnaire. After that, only the experimental group rated their opinion towards the use of learning contracts on a 10-item questionnaire. The data obtained from the tests and the questionnaires were analyzed quantitatively. The mean scores before and after the experiments were compared by using paired sample t-tests to reveal changes in performance of reading comprehension and self-directed abilities. Students' reading comprehension and self-directed learning mean scores of the two groups were compared using independent t-tests and One-way Analysis of Covariance. Moreover, the scores of the opinion questionnaire were calculated by using mean and standard deviation and interpreted in a form of level to indicate how students

in the experimental group perceived using learning contracts. A mean score of 1-1.50 indicates having an opinion at a very low level, 1.51-2.50 at a low level, 2.51-3.50 at a moderate level, 3.51-4.50 at a high level, and 4.51-5.00 at a very high level.

III. Results of the Experiment

Part I: The Effects of Using Learning Contracts on Students' Reading Comprehension

This part presents the scores of reading proficiency of the students in both groups. Descriptive and inferential statistical

procedures were employed to analyze the data of pre- and post-tests. Then the findings were examined in light of two research questions:

Research Question 1: Will students improve their reading ability after they are taught through learning contract and by the traditional method? If so, to what extent?

This research question explores students' English reading score improvement after the treatment by comparing the scores of pre-and post-tests by paired samples t-test as shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Comparisons of Pre-and Post- Reading Mean Scores of Two Groups

Reading Score	Before		After		t	p
	\bar{X}	S.D.	\bar{X}	S.D.		
Control Group	23.27	6.35	30.40	6.79	12.89	.000
Experimental Group	23.10	5.78	33.57	6.01	23.27	.000

Before the intervention, the mean scores of students in the control and experimental groups were 23.27 and 23.10, and those scores increased to 30.40 and 33.57 respectively. From a t-test analysis, the English reading comprehension post-test mean score of students in the control group was significantly higher than the pre-test mean score ($t(39) = 12.89, p < .05$).

This means that the students improved their reading comprehension through studying with the traditional way. The results also indicate that students in the experimental group who were exposed to using learning contracts made a significant improvement ($t(39) = 23.27, p < .001$) on their English reading comprehension after 13 weeks.

Research Question 2: Is there any difference in the students' reading scores between the two groups?

Table 2 Comparison of Reading Comprehension Scores between Control Group and Experimental Group

Group	\bar{X}	S.D.	df	t	p
Control (n=40)	30.40	6.35	78	2.21	.033
Experimental (n=40)	33.57	6.01			

To see the efficacy of the intervention, students' reading scores obtained from the post-test of the two groups were analyzed to see if there was a statistically significant difference. Table 2 indicates that the overall mean score of the experimental group was much higher than of the control group (33.57, 30.40). Also, a t-test analysis shows a significant difference between two tests at a level of .05.

Part II: The Effects of Using Learning Contracts on Students' Self-directed Learning Ability

This part presents the scores of self-directed learning in both groups. Descriptive and inferential statistical procedures were employed to analyze the data before and after the intervention.

Research Question 3: To what extent do Bangkok University students improve their self-directed learning ability?

Table 3 Comparisons of Pre- and Post- Self-directed Mean Scores of the Two Groups

Reading Score	Before		After		t	p
	\bar{X}	S.D.	\bar{X}	S.D.		
Control Group(n=40)	204.25	15.57	213.73	16.24	5.77	.000
Experimental Group(n=40)	196.18	15.85	217.40	15.50	8.26	.000

From Table 3, we can see that students' self-directed ability after the treatment were significantly higher than that before the treatment at a level of .01 in both groups. However, it's interesting to see that students in the experimental group improved their self-directed ability more than those in the control group.

The result shows that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of self-directed learning ability of the two groups before the treatment ($t(78)$, $p < .05$). So, the post mean scores of the two groups cannot be compared with an independent t-test. The one-way ANCOVA

was, therefore, used instead. In this analysis, the pre-self-directed learning ability was the covariate, the teaching methods was the independent variable, and the post self-directed learning ability was the dependent variable used to perform the statistical analysis. The test for homogeneity of regression coefficients reveals that the assumption of homogeneity was met and thus it can be further analyzed by the One-way ANCOVA.

Research Question 4 : Is there a difference in the students' self-directed learning ability between 2 groups?

Table 4 A Comparison of Self-directed Learning Ability between the Control Group and the Experimental

Group after the Intervention					
Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Intercept	3754.192	1	3754.192	24.241	.000
Pre-self-directed					
learning ability (covariate)	7738.764	1	7738.764	49.970	.000
Group	1448.417	1	1448.417	9.353	.003
Total	3737309.00	80			

From data analysis, it was found that the students' self-directed learning ability after the treatment was affected by their previous self-directed learning. After removing the influence of covariate, the statistical results show that a significant difference existed at $p < .05$ in self-directed learning mean scores between the two

groups. That is, self-directed learning ability of the students who were taught by the traditional method was lower than that of the students who studied by using learning contracts.

Part III : The Results of Students' Opinions on Using Learning Contracts in Learning

Table 5 Mean, Standard Deviation, and Level of Opinion of the Students in the Experimental Group

Statement	\bar{X}	S.D.	Level
1. A learning contract helped me achieve my goal.	4.30	.56	high
2. A learning contract gave me a guideline to study on my own.	4.15	.58	high
3. A learning contract helped me to understand the contents well.	3.68	.57	high
4. A learning contract made me realize what I have to do and have more responsibility to accomplish my work as promised.	3.80	.69	high
5. A learning contract enabled me to become mature and self-disciplined.	4.10	.55	high
6. Using a learning contract made me more self-directed.	4.00	.64	high
7. Learning through a learning contract didn't give me too much burden.	3.83	.78	high
8. A learning contract encouraged me to study from a variety of sources.	3.90	.71	high
9. A learning contract encouraged me to acquire knowledge on my own.	4.03	.59	high
10. I could control my own learning when I used a learning contract.	4.13	.56	high
Total	3.99	.30	high

From Table 5, the overall mean score of opinion toward the use of learning contracts was at a high level ($\bar{x} = 3.99$). Among 10 items, the third highest mean scores were no. 1 “A learning contract helped me to achieve my goal.” ($\bar{x} = 4.30$) followed by no. 2 “A learning contract gave me a guideline to study on my own.” ($\bar{x} = 4.15$), and no.10 “I could control my own learning based on this learning.” respectively ($\bar{x} = 4.13$). These items were at a high level. The lowest mean score was no. 3 “A learning contract helped me to understand the contents well”, which was also at a high level ($\bar{x} = 3.68$).

IV. Discussion and Conclusion

This study was carried out to determine whether the use of learning contracts is a useful strategy for teaching reading in Thailand. The findings are discussed according to the research objectives as follows.

First, the increased reading score of students in the experimental group provides sufficient support that the use of learning contracts helps them to be successful in planning, monitoring as well as evaluating their own learning. These effective results were evidenced by the higher mean scores obtained from the pre- to post-tests in the experimental group (23.10: 33.57). In addition, that the scores

of both groups were significantly different can be assumed that it was partly a result of learning contracts. This positive outcome proves that learning contracts are not only practical but also efficient. This is probably because learning contracts help the students to identify their own learning needs and to develop learning objectives and strategies consistent with their needs (Anderson & Boud, 1996), so they tend to be more active and motivated. On the contrary, students in the control group who studied with the traditional way had teachers tell them what they had to learn and how. Their learning was rather passive. The findings of the present study were in accordance with Kanasawat (2009) that there were statistical significant differences at .05 level on learning achievement between students using learning contracts and those not using learning contracts. However, this finding was in contrast with Khomson’s work (1997), who found no significant differences between the two groups.

Second, the increase of self-directed learning ability in the experimental group and a significant difference between the two groups after the intervention indicate that self-directed behaviors can be learned and cultivated through systematically designed instruction (Costa & Kallick, 2004). The result suggests that teacher-directed learning or the tradi-

tional way of teaching might not motivate students to learn well enough. In contrast, using a learning contract gives students an opportunity to actively engage in their learning process and demonstrate a high degree of desire and control over the pursuit of their learning goals. This kind of learning doesn't block the students' opinions or ideas. Actually, with the university's policy, the students have been encouraged to be creative through various types of learning activities both inside and outside classes, and they are accustomed to receiving new learning experiences. When they were given a chance to plan their own learning, they could adjust themselves quickly and accepted it easily. The concept of self-directed learning is also in accordance with Bangkok University's policy on creativity which aims to encourage students to be independent and creative. Such findings generally lend support to the published research of Kanasawat's work, confirming that learning contracts are considered helpful to the students in working autonomously. However, the finding was not in accordance with Binthaprasitthi (1997) who found that self-directed learning readiness scores of the control group were significantly higher than the experiment group at a level of .05.

Third, students in the experimental group had a high level of opinion towards

learning by using contracts. This positive opinion might be because they believed that learning contracts helped them see where they were heading for. This reason can be supported by the response from the questionnaire, indicating that students chose "helping them achieve the goal" the most. Furthermore, having positive opinions indicates that students benefited from learning contracts. When they like this strategy, they tend to be more active in learning. This active performance resulted in higher learning achievement and self-directed learning ability. This is consistent with the findings reported by Chung (2008) who found that students felt more self-directed and motivated after learning with learning contracts. Also, the finding can be supported by Lee's research (1998) stating that the more enthusiastic group had more positive attitude towards the program and had strong beliefs about their own strengths as language learners while the less enthusiastic group had low self-esteem as language learner.

V. Implications for Future Practice

Although the findings help to clarify that a contract learning strategy is useful for EFL classes, some issues should be taken into consideration before using it. First, using a learning contract might work well with adults as they seem to have more responsibility than younger learners.

Second, to respond to learners' satisfaction, various kinds of activities should be provided for them to select. Third, learners need to have more chances to reflect on what they are doing. In other words, feedback should be given continually. This

is a way to monitor the learners' progress. If problems occur during the learning process, teachers and learners can discuss and solve those problems together. In this way, learners will be sure that they are not working alone.

References

- Anderson, G and Boud, D (1996) "Introducing Learning Contracts: A Flexible Way to Learn" **IETI**, **33,4**. pp. 221-227
- Binhaprasitthi, S (1997) **Effects of Using Learning Contracts on Learning Achievement and Self-directed Learning Readiness of nursing students** Master's thesis Chulalongkorn University.
- Chung, Siaw-Fong (2008) "Putting Students' Differences in Perspectives: An Introduction to the Individual Developing Model" **Asian EFL Journal**, **7, 2**. pp.45-57
- Costa, A L and Kallick, B (2004) **Assessment Strategies for Self-directed Learning** Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Gibbons, M (2002) **The Self-directed Learning Handbook: Challenging Adolescent Students to Excel** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Guglielmino, L M (1977) **Development of the self-directed learning readiness scale** Doctoral dissertation. University of Georgia
- Kanasawat, J (2000) **Effects of Using Learning Contract in e-learning System Upon Motivation and Learning Achievement of Undergraduate Students with Different Levels of Prior Knowledge in Foundations of Computer for Education Course** Master's thesis. Chulalongkorn University.
- Khomson, K (1997) **The Development of a Self-directed Learning Model in English Reading Comprehension for Upper Secondary School Students** Master's degree thesis. Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand
- Knowles, M S (1986) **Using Learning Contracts** San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers
- Lee, I (1998) "Supporting Greater Autonomy in Language Learning" **ELT Journal**, **52, 4**. pp. 282-290
- Littlewood, W (1996) "Autonomy: An Autonomy and a Framework" **System**, **24,4**. pp. 421-427
- Merriam, S B and Caffarella, R S (1999) **Learning in Adulthood** San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Regan, J (2003) "Motivating Students toward Self-directed Learning" **Nurse Education Today**, **23,8**. pp. 539-599
- Roberson, D (2005) **Self-direct Learning: Past and Present**. ERIC document No. ED49043