Students' Ways to Learn English out of Class: a re-check

by Howard Doyle

Dept of International Studies
Kochi University

Abstract

In this replication study, a hypothesis developed during prior exploratory research (reported in Doyle 2009) using a smaller sample was tested: *that Japanese university students tend not to be conscious of options utilising self-access centers (SACs), computer assisted language learning (CALL) or other interactive electronic media for language learning outside of class classrooms.* The current study reported here used a larger similar sample of two classes of Kochi University English students, with an open-response data collection used in the original study and a closed Likert-Item questionnaire to test reliability of the results and to explore more deeply factors affecting the hypothesis. Findings in the current study support the original hypothesis: that students do not demonstrate consciousness of the above-mentioned learning options in the first instance. However, when prompted they show both awareness and positive attitudes towards SACs, CALL and electronic media comparative with other ways to learn English outside of class. Further analysis of student profile data raised speculative factors, including learning experience, attrition and relative success, as potentially affecting students' individual preferences for and repertoires of ways to learn outside of class. Implications include adaptation towards a culture of flexible learning in the institution to help solve problems inherent in the situation apparent in findings reported here.

大学生の授業外英語学習についての再検討

　Doyle（2009）では、「日本の大学生は授業外での英語学習法に関して SACs、CALL その他電子メディアテクノロジーを用いた学習があるということに気づいていない」という仮説を立てたが、本稿はその再検討を行う。本稿では Doyle（2009）よりも被験者を増やし、高知大学における2つの英語授業クラスの学生を対象とした。Doyle（2009）で用いたフリーアンサーの他、結果の信頼性をはかり、より深く影響要素を探るためにリッカート尺度選択紙を用いた。その結果は、「はじめは上記の学習法があるということに気づかない」という仮説をサポートするものであった。しかし、きっかけを与えられれば学生は電子メディアテクノロジーを用いた学習法に気づき、積極的な態度を示す

ことが分かった。また、学生の学習経験や失敗、成功といった要素が、授業外での英語学習法の選択に潜在的に影響を与えていることが示された。この結果から示唆されることとして、問題解決のための方法として、学習施設で柔軟な学習方法を養成することなどが考えられる.

People may prefer different ways to learn, fundamentally because they are different individuals. Even so, there remains common ground for learners to approach learning of subjects like English in similar preferred ways. In this sense, for instance, a class of students in a given culture or context may share preferred ways to learn based on what is available or what constraints there are. Further, though learning normally occurs in class, it is out of class where individuals' preferred approaches to learning kick in. After all, it is in life outside of classrooms where students become individuals living their lives and making choices such as how to learn another language if they need or want to.

Background to the Current Study

This short study (referred to here as the *current study*) is part development and part replication of a previous smaller scale study (reported in Doyle 2009, and referred to here as the *original study*) in which a class of second year intermediate-level students at Kochi University were asked to write about *Good* (ie effective) and also *Bad* (ie ineffective) ways to learn English outside of class. Though this was mainly exploratory research, an underlying hypothesis was being tested: *that students would mention ways incorporating computer-assisted language learning (CALL) online and other individual and interactive electronic technology*. Surprisingly none of these were mentioned at all, neither as Good or Bad ways to learn English.[1] This was also the opposite to findings in similar studies of Arabic-speaking learners of English in Bahrain (Malcolm 2004) and Chinese learners of English in New Zealand (Pearson 2004). It was speculated that students were either unfamiliar with or had not been shown, taught or immersed in a context of learning with through electronic technology. Moreover, this was seen to reflect that the students' culture of learning was more traditional and non-technological. This culture incorporated their experiences at high school, in their first year of university and their language-learning experiences outside of school. Interestingly, however, 18 out of a total 64 responses mentioned watching movies with and without sub-titles, English-language television, radio and music. This showed that while students were not ignorant of electronic media technology, the nominated media were

---

1 A similar, more dramatic finding was obtained in ongoing research by Parrish and Doyle (unpublished) replicating the same study using a much larger sample of similar students in two universities in Kyoto in Japan, where two classes of 27 and 30 students also failed to mention CALL, interactive and individual online media or use of self-access centres (SACs) even following orientation session in the university computer laboratory coincidentally taking place in a lesson one hour before.

commonplace and traditional artefacts in the culture of everyday life.

Recently many colleges and schools offer alternative, more flexible ways to learn. One way this occurs is in language laboratories (LLs), libraries and dedicated *self-access learning centres* (SACs). SACs and the like are various, but have one common characteristic – the teacher is not the focus or source of learning materials. SACs are also characterised by having different options available through traditional media (eg books, and other print texts) audiovisual (eg DVDs, audio CDs), CALL (commonly dedicated computer programs, software and hardware available on-site or online) and internet access, and also dedicated personnel such as language and literacy advisors. In a way, SACs can be defined as dedicated sites where ways to learn a language are made available for access by learners on a free or organised basis. In the original study, no mention of such places was made by any respondent. This suggested that SACs also were not a part of their existing learning culture or experience.

Another finding in the original study was a strong preference for socially interactive and communicative ways to learn (31 out of 64 responses), and a substantial rejection of traditional, study-relevant individual ways to learn which also occur in class (13 out of 17 responses), including *reading*, *studying gramma*r and *vocabulary*, *just doing homework*, and *translating*. Respondents were also asked to give reasons, which frequently related to level of interest and relevance to real-life contexts for using English. This was, to use McKay's (1993) terms, evidence of the students having *functional literacy* as learners - learning skills they bring to a classroom or any other language-learning context. Further, by rationalizing and explaining how and when to use different learning strategies for different purposes at different times, the students evidenced *technical literacy* skills, knowledge and social practices needed to succeed in a given field, in this case language learning. The cases of two independent language learners investigated by Murray (2004) demonstrate how this technical literacy development occurs over time as the life contexts of the learners change and also their language learning needs change.

In the original study open response data was eventually organised as three categories:
  • *Good Ways: individual* – any Way described as effective in which involvement of more than one participant is not apparent
  • *Good Ways: social:* any Way described as effective in which more than one participant is apparent, especially with interactive use of English
  • *Bad Ways:* any Way described or rated as ineffective

As the current study replicates the original one, this typology is maintained.

This report presents new findings of a larger study incorporating a larger sample then the original study and a compound data collection instrument aimed at improving reliability. After recounting development of the project and data collection, findings are presented and discussed pertaining tho the hypothesis and to some anomalous results. Finally, implications of the findings are discussed along with limitations in the current study and suggestions as to how to overcome them.

The Current Study

A key finding from the original study –

> *that Japanese university students tend not to be conscious of options utilising self-access centers (SACs), computer assisted language learning (CALL) or other interactive electronic media for language learning outside of class classrooms*

is being tested in the current study.

i.   Site and Context

Within the context of Kochi University, SAC and CALL facilities are present: two LLs frequently used for classroom-based lessons up on Level 5 of a building and not close to any of the main thoroughfares at the university. As well, TOEIC English exam preparation is available online through the university computer system. Students can access it in the university computer center in the library or remotely by logging in through their own university computer systems accounts. Students in both the original and current studies had been told about this exam preparation facility prior to data collection. Another feature of computer availability at Kochi University is that students at the university have their own notebook computers which they carry with them rather than relying on a large dedicated computer center.

ii.   Sample

In the two classes out of 36 students, 34 completed questionnaires were returned. These included from 32 Japanese and two Chinese exchange students aged between 18 and 23. Data from the Chinese students did not deviate from patterns in data from Japanese students. All were first-year Science majors in their mandatory English Conversation course. This compared with the group in the original study except for those students being Humanities students in an optional intensive English course.

Students had been placed in two classes on the sole basis of an interactive English conversation placement test with a supplementary written test. Students were ranked according to raw scores, the highest 16 students being placed in Class A, the next 20 in Class B. Both classes were classed approximately as post-elementary level. At the time, of data collection, these were the groups of

students most closely resembling the group in the original study.

Data Collection

In this replication study, similar open response data collection similar to the original study has been undertaken. Students were asked to make lists of what they thought were some Good Ways and some Bad Ways to learn English outside the classroom. They were also asked to write why they thought so.

To supplement this, a closed Likert-item questionnaire listing 50 ways to learn English outside of class was also used to test awareness of and attitudes to specific ways to learn. This list includes the 43 ways to learn mentioned by students in the original study, which act as a core typology of Ways to learn English outside of class. In this way interference from use of a different typology is controlled and the integrity of the original study in this replication is maintained. A further seven items relating to language laboratories, libraries or other self access centres (SACs), CALL and electronic technology were added in lieu of there being no data relating to such ways to learn English in the original study. These items (Nos. 33 to 39 in Table 2) were drawn from piloting of the questionnaire to students at Ritsumeikan and Doshisha Universities in Kyoto (Parrish and Doyle, unpublished)

Potentially, a significantly larger amount of data than in the original study was going to be collected and analysed. Therefore, the current study also has an exploratory purpose, especially in the analysis when data from the original study can be placed along side data from the current study.

This questionnaire was delivered in class under the supervision of the teacher used to collect data. After Part A on the first page was completed, students were asked to stop until the teacher told them to move onto Part B on the next two pages. Respondents were instructed not to look at Part B until they were told to, in order not to interfere with the unsolicited nature of this data collection. Then, respondents proceeded with Part B after being asked not to go back and alter their responses in Part A.

In this sense, the Likert item questionnaire in Part B acted as a separate data collection instrument from Part A. The open responses were placed first so as not to interfere with respondents recollection of and reflection on their choices of effective and ineffective ways to learn English. Only by following this was it possible to list 50 specific ways to learn English which would otherwise have made the whole data collection unreliable.

Results

i.   SACs, CALL, Electronic Media

Results from the first open response data are presented in Table 1 below (results for the original study being in parentheses at the top of each cell; results for SACs, CALL and Electronic Media at the bottom).

Class	'Good' ways: individual	'Good' ways: social (including overseas)	'Bad' ways (NB. *no 'social' ays mentioned*)
Overall			
2008 Intermediate (20 respondents)	(33)	(31)	(17)
2009 Post-Elementary Class A (14 respondents)	31	11	12
2009 Post-Elementary Class B (20 respondents)	39	9	16
By Category of Type to Learn English			
	Reading (5)	Instruction in out-of-class locations (3)	Reading (3)
A	3	1	0
B	12	0	16
	Study-relevant (including writing) (8)	Interaction and involvement with peers (3)	Study-relevant (including writing) (8)
A	7	2	5
B	1	1	8
	Listening (10)	Social interaction:local (17)	Listening (1)
A	9	6	1
B	13	5	0
	Visualizing+listening (8)	Social interaction: overseas (5)	Visualizing+listening (0)
A	8	2	0
B	10	1	0
	Other: individual (2)	Other: social (2)	Other (5)
A	0	0	3
B	3	11	6
	SACs/CALL/Online/ Electronic: individual (0)	SACs/CALL/Online/ Electronic: social (1)	SACs/CALL/Online/ Electronic (0)
A	4	0	0
B	0	0	0

Table 1: *Summary List of Frequency Scores Students' Good and Bad Ways to Learn English Outside of Classrooms* (NB. Scores from the original study are in parentheses next to each category heading) (Sources: Doyle 2009, own data)

Regarding the hypothesis there is minimal consciousness of SACs, CALL or using other electronic media to learn English outside of classrooms among the students when asked in

without prompts. There are four mentions of computers by two students in Class A: *computer program* [sic], *internet*, *software*. One of them also mentioned the *LL room* [sic]. The same student gave an extended rationale:

> *Everyday to listen to English conversation by CDs, internet soft and so on ... To go to LL room and to study English by using textbooks or the internet ... I can know English word and how to make myself in English* [sic]*... many things*

This student appears to have prior experience which was significant enough in her consciousness or successful enough in her English-learning experience to be recalled and explained. Though she and others could do the same for other categories of Ways to learn English, only data from her is significant regarding the hypothesis being tested. She is exceptional among 54 respondents in the original and current studies, and points to there being underlying factors affecting her but no other respondent.

	List of Ways to Learn English Outside the Classroom	Class A	Class B	2 groups' Mean Score
1	Reading newspapers	3.571	3.150	3.360
2	Reading English books	2.928	3.600	3.264
3	Reading books in English silently	3.643	2.600	3.121
4	Reading books in English aloud	3.428	3.200	3.314
5	Going to an English conversation school	3.428	3.600	3.514
6	Studying with a private teacher	3.428	2.650	3.014
7	Memorizing English words from a dictionary	2.785	2.900	2.842
8	Reviewing classwork after the lesson	3.571	3.100	3.335
9	Preparing for English tests	3.076	3.350	3.213
10	Writing and saying English words	3.857	3.500	3.678
11	Studying grammar	3.500	2.900	2.900
12	Studying vocabulary	3.500	3.550	3.525
13	Making a group rule, (eg. *speaking only in English for 30 minutes*).	3.643	3.050	3.346
14	Joining an English club (or circle)	3.643	3.050	3.346
15	Studying with students who are good at English	3.643	3.000	3.321
16	Studying only writing	1.928	1.950	1.939
17	Doing just the homework assigned by the teacher	2.214	2.500	2.357
18	Reading many English textbooks	3.000	2.800	2.900
19	Listening to the radio	3.714	3.200	3.457
20	Listening to radio news	3.285	3.050	3.167
21	Listening to radio English conversation programs	3.785	3.100	3.442
22	Listening to music in English	4.714	4.500	4.607
23	Listening to English songs and reading the lyrics (words)	4.357	3.950	4.153

24	Singing English songs	4.071	3.350	3.710
25	Listening to educational CDs related to what you study	3.571	2.800	3.185
26	Communicating with foreigners (of any nationality)	4.214	3.600	3.907
27	Talking to native-speakers of English	4.071	3.850	3.960
28	Talking to expert users of English	3.643	3.550	3.596
29	Talking to people in English while using a dictionary	2.857	2.950	2.903
30	Talking to exchange students	3.785	3.400	3.592
31	Watching English-language movies, TV programs or DVDs with other language subtitles	3.714	3.750	3.732
32	Watching English-language movies, TV programs or DVDs without any subtitles	3.428	3.050	3.239
33*	Using CD-ROMs on a computer	3.143	3.650	3.396
34*	Doing electronic mail and chat with other people in English	3.285	2.850	3.067
35*	Surfing the internet	3.000	3.450	3.260
36*	Using special English-study web-pages	3.071	2.650	2.860
37*	Using the library, college or school resource centers	3.857	3.450	3.653
38*	Using language laboratory (LL) or a self-access center (SAC)for learning languages	3.285	2.750	3.017
39*	Using your cell phone	2.928	3.700	3.314
40	Watching English-language movies, TV programs or DVDs with English subtitles	3.714	2.550	3.132
41	Studying abroad	3.143	3.250	3.196
42	Traveling overseas	3.285	3.200	3.242
43	Writing email to the overseas home-stay family after you come back home	3.643	3.050	3.346
44	Taking a class taught in English	3.500	3.400	3.450
45	Using English in daily conversation	3.643	3.400	3.521
46	Translating between your language and English	3.500	3.200	3.350
47	Making a study plan and setting learning goals	3.714	3.400	3.557
48	Trying to do things above your own English level	3.785	3.500	3.642
49	Learning English without a plan or goals	2.857	2.300	2.578
50	Going to your teacher's office	3.643	2.750	3.196
	Average overall	**3.460**	**3.110**	**3.285**

Table 2: *Average Levels of Agreement regarding Efficacy of Various Ways to Learn English Outside of Class by Group and Overall.* (NB: 1 = *Strongly Disagree* & 5 = *Strongly Agree*. '#'-denoted items 33 to 39 relating to SACs, CALL, internet and other electronic devices were added separately from Ways to learn English recorded in Doyle (2009)) (Items based on Table 1 in Doyle (2009))

Regarding closed responses in the Likert-item response data in Part B (see Table 2), very different data were recorded. Average scores for each class and overall mean scores are presented

in Table 2 above. Regarding items mentioning electronic media, computers or SACs, overall, three out of seven items recorded average scores above the overall mean, 3.285:

33*	Using CD-ROMs on a computer	3.143	3.650	3.396
37*	Using the library, college or school resource centers	3.857	3.450	3.653
39*	Using your cell phone	2.928	3.700	3.314

On a class basis, the lower level Class B rated four Ways above the overall mean, but on average the higher level Class A rated just three on or above the overall mean. The most popular Way in Class A was Item 37 (*Using the library, college or school resource centers*). In Class B the most popular was Item 39 (*Using your cell phone*), but it was the lowest-rated Way in Class A. Class B however rated Item 38 (*Using language laboratory (LL) or a self-access center (SAC) for learning languages*) the lowest.

Closer item-by-item analysis shows more differences between both classes than similarities, a characteristic of the contradictory nature of the Likert Item data. These data do form patterns at a more macro level.

For instance, the overall mean for the seven items' overall scores is 3.224, an insignificant 1.85% lower than the overall mean (3.285). This suggests that students' awareness of SACs, CALL and other electronic media are neither particularly higher nor lower than all the other Ways to learn English outside of class. Another finding is marked differences between the two classes' scores for each Item. Only one item (37. *Using the library, college or school resource centers*) shows a score range between the classes of less than 10%. A possible explanation for this is that it refers to traditional 'libraries' which are more commonly recognizable than more modern or technological SACs or resource centers.

A further anomalous point is the assumption that Science-major students could be assumed to be more familiar, more savvy or more conscious of technology in their everyday lives. Clearly this assumption is not generalisable, given the results from both parts of the questionnaire.

The only truly conclusive finding is that students in this sample are not generally conscious of SACs, CALL or other electronic media for learning English outside of classrooms. However, when prompted, such as by the Likert Item questionnaire, it is undeniable that they are aware of these options, though at an overall level not so different from alternative Ways to learn English outside of a classroom. This largely supports the hypothesis being tested in the current study.

ii.　　　Comparison of Three Groups

As a replication study, it is possible to take the data from the original study and consider them with the current study. To recall, the original study group was intermediate level and in an optional English program, in contrast to the mandatory English conversation classes of the other two post-elementary groups.

Table 3 shows comparative totals for the following typology of three categories of Ways to Learn English outside of class.

	Good ways: individual	Good ways: social	Total Good ways	Bad ways
Intermediate-level class, 2008 (20 respondents)	33	31	64	17
Ratio of Good ways per respondent: 3.200 Ratio of Bad ways per student: 0.850				
Post Elementary Level Class A (14 respondents)	31	11	42	12
Ratio of Good ways per respondent: 3.000 Ratio of Bad ways per student: 0.857				
False Beginner class B (20 respondents)	39	9	48	16
Ratio of Good ways per respondent: 2.400 Ratio of Bad ways per respondents: 0.800				

Table 3: *Comparison of Numbers of Good and Bad Ways to Learn English Outside of Classrooms in 3 Classes* (Sources: Doyle 2009 Table 1; own data)

The most striking finding from a comparison is that the higher level class mentioned the highest total of Good ways to learn English out side of class (a 3.2 per student) though Class A scored a close figure of 3.0 Good ways per student. The lower level class however was significantly lower (2.4).

Further, the intermediate level class contrasted with the other two classes with much stronger choices for Good ways: social – almost 50 percent of all the Good ways mentioned. This suggested that the higher level students were more likely to choose ways to practise or use English as ways to learn outside of class, such as occurs in social interaction. They also showed a bigger repertoire of Good ways to learn than the other two classes. The other two classes opted far more for individual ways to learn English outside of class in which they would be hearing or seeing English but not actually producing or using language in their preferred ways to learn, as shown above in Table 1.

Results for Bad ways showed surprising results. Ratios of Bad ways to learn English were all similar within a narrow 0.9 (lowest level class) to 0.857 (Intermediate–level class) range.

iii.   An Anomaly

Analysis data in Table 3 points to an anomaly: significant variation in the number and the types of Good ways to learn English, but very little variation in the results for Bad ways. No data were collected which could suggest an explanation for this anomaly. However student profile data for the two classes in the present study could be retrieved and analysed. These data included number of years learning English – generally six years in junior and senior high school. Also students' individual attitudes (eg *I love it (English)*, *I don't like it (English)*) and motivation to learn (eg *I really want to study it (English)*, *I don't want to learn (English)*) were recorded on a range of comments on a five-part Likert-item scale which could be quantified for analysis. Table 4 shows average ratings per student for each class. The higher-level Class A shows significantly higher attitude and motivation levels than Class B.

	Class A	Class B
Average Ratings of Attitude to English	3.750	3.050
Average Ratings of Motivation to Study English	4.431	3.300

Table 4: *Ratings of Students' of Classes A and B Attitudes to and Motivation for Studying English* (Source: Kochi University English Conversation Placement Test Questionnaire Data, Semester 2 September 2009)

Unfortunately there are no similar data available for the intermediate group in the original study. Still it is possible to speculate regarding an explanation for these findings.

Plausible Effects of Learning Experience, Success, Motivation and Attrition
i.   Learning Experience

There are certain common variables for the three groups. These include similar extended lengths of time (six to seven years), and experiences learning English in class from teachers with strong focus on language form, minimal communicative input, often for purposes of passing tests. Learning out of class frequently would have been closely tied to in-school agendas and in-class learning practices. In short, this means that students are not expected to learn English outside of a classroom except in ways which were tied to learning practices of their in-class lessons and curricula. This may explain limitations on the repertoires of ways to learn English outside of a classroom especially in lower level classes in the current study.

ii.   Relative Success Affecting Motivation

Another common variable is levels of relative success in in-class learning reflected, say, in test scores and homework as the main measures of success for the students. In other words, if they get high assessment results, students would assume they are having success learning English,

which would be reinforced at an institutional level – being in a higher class, achieving entry into higher level English programs, and so on. Failure to achieve these measures arguably could construe negative ideas and attitudes on students affecting their motivation to learn, and therefore affect development of learning strategies at an individual level. On the other hand success in institutionalised learning (eg. in-school, scores in tests) can affect motivation positively to the extent of developing students' interest in English and interest in learning more on their own. This supposition is supported by the cases studies of two independent learners by Murray (2004) in which over time the learners had learning success and proceeded to develop their own preferred ways to learn their languages based on their needs, preferences and experience of what worked and what didn't. Data from the original study being replicated here also support this.

iii.   Attrition

A further factor is attrition, the affect of an extended period of time in the same English-learning regime. None of the students in the original and current studies were novices – all had spent years learning English with varying success. If students have been having low success learning English over a six-to-seven year period, it is likely that they may avoid learning English if they do not have to learn it. This could even extend to the point of not trying to learn if there was no apparent need, let alone interest. On the other hand, if learners have consistently been experiencing success then they are more likely to

- be motivated to learn
- spend more time and effort reflecting on and trying different ways to learn
- reflect more on their own needs as learners and users of English
- develop technical literacies for affective learning

However, more data are needed to be able to support these hypotheses conclusively.

Limitations of the Current Study

The original aim of this study was to try to confirm the hypotheses developed in a previous study that ways to learn English involving SACs, CALL, internet or other electronic media were not part of the students' consciousness of ways to learn English. This hypothesis was largely supported by findings reported here. However comparative data analysis has raised other questions:

- Why a stronger inclination to learn English socially among higher level, ostensibly more successful learners than lower-level, ostensibly less successful learners?
- How can students be enabled to develop awareness of affective ways to learn English utilising a maximum of opportunities around them, including SACs, computer and other electronic media?

Using the Likert-item instrument in this study has given some insights into these issues. However further qualitative data could have enabled proper triangulation of findings reported here. To do this, interviews with individual learners, monitored focus-group discussions, diary studies or other longitudinal investigation could flesh out answers to these questions.

Implications of the Current Study

Two students out of 34 mentioned computers or the internet as ways to learn English out of class. This result shows that lack of awareness of them among students at Kochi University cannot be universal. In addition findings in the current study show that students in the university context might seem unconscious of these ways to learn English generally in the first instance, but are not unaware of them when prompted.

The Likert-item questionnaire data showed attitudes towards these Ways among the students which were comparable to other, more traditional and non-technological Ways to learn English outside of classrooms. However, inherent bias in the data collection process – namely each questionnaire item acting as a prompt – shows that students certainly may consider these options if they are specifically presented to them. This point acts as a limitation in the research reported here, but it does point to certain solutions to the problem of how students may develop effective learning strategies. These include:

- educating students as to how to learn effectively; and
- providing opportunities for them to learn outside of their classrooms at an institutional level.

A further implication is that, though SACs, CALL and other electronic media were not part of students' culture of learning in the past, there is potential for them to become part of the culture of learning inside the university.

These conclusions are obvious ones, but more difficult questions involve how to achieve these goals. Clearly the easier, cheaper and more achievable option in the short term is learner education. However, rather than on just the consciousness of students in schools, colleges and universities as independent learners, work needs to be done to shift the ethos of these institutions to be able to support a more flexible culture of learning. How to achieve all of these goals should be the focus of any further investigation.

References

Doyle, H. (2009). Japanese university students' awareness of learning English outside of class. In A. Stoke (Ed.), *JALT2008 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

Malcolm, D. (2004) 'Investigating successful English learners in Arab medical schools'. *Proceedings of the Independent Learning Conference 2003*, September 2004 (Downloaded on September 12, 2008 from http://independentlearning.org/ILA/ila03/ila03_malcolm.pdf）

McKay, S. (1993) *Agendas for Second Language Literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Murray, G. (2004) 'Two stories of self-directed learning'. *Proceedings of the Independent Learning Conference 2003*, September 2004 (Downloaded on September 12, 2008 from http://independentlearning.org/ILA/ila03/ila03_murray.pdf）

Pearson, N. (2004) 'The idiosyncrasies of out-of-class language learning: A study of mainland Chinese students studying English at tertiary level in New Zealand'. *Proceedings of the Independent Learning Conference 2003*, September 2004 (Downloaded on September 16, 2008 from http://independentlearning.org/ILA/ila03/ila03_pearson.pdf）