English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 24, No. 4 Winter 2018

Understanding of Out-of-Class English Learning of Korean Students in Relation with Affective Factors and Motivation*

Jaeho Choi
(Sangmyung University)

Choi, Jaeho (2018). Understanding of out-of-class English learning of Korean students in relation with affective factors and motivation. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 24*(4), 21-40.

With the advent of computing and the internet technology, language learners have a myriad of opportunities for authentic target language experience beyond classrooms. While the potential of out-of-class language learning has been acknowledged by researchers and educators, there is a lack of empirical studies on various factors relevant to out-of-class learning. This study examines Korean college students' practices of out-of-class learning in relation with affective factors and motivation. Two types of out-of-class learning are classified as explicit and implicit language learning and affective factors include L2 WTC (Willingness to communicate), foreign language classroom anxiety, and perceived English communication competence. Explicit and intrinsic motivation is examined in terms of its predictability of the hours of out-of-class activities. For the study, 103 college students majoring in English education participated and responded to survey questions. The data were analyzed to reveal how students did out-of-class activities, how motivation influenced out-of-class learning, and how the out-of-class learning affected L2 WTC, anxiety and perceived English communication competence. The findings were presented with discussions and suggestions for further studies.

[Out-of-class/implicit & explicit learning/L2 WTC/foreign language anxiety/ language learning motivation/communication competence]

I. INTRODUCTION

There is no doubt about the importance of English as a communication tool in globalized societies. English is a predominant language for international communication

* This research was supported by a 2018 Research Grant from Sangmyung University.

in the areas of politics, economy, academy, arts, and entertainment (Crystal, 2003). The internet has accelerated the expansion of communication in English (Warschauer, 2000), and English is a core subject in secondary education in many non-English-speaking countries, which aim to equip younger generations with competitive communication skills for the globalized society.

While the importance of English education has widely perceived by educators and policy makers both in English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries, the goals of English education are different between English-speaking and non-English-speaking countries. In English speaking countries, including the U.S., Canada, and the United Kingdom, English learning has focused on the ESL (English as Second Language) education for immigrants and international students. With the increasing non-English speaking population, these countries concern how their people develop sufficient English competency for responsible citizens (Kroll, 2003). English in non-English speaking countries, such as Korea, Japan, and China, is a foreign language, EFL (English as Foreign Language). The goal of EFL education is to educate students to be competitive communicators in the globalized society. In addition to the educational focuses, ESL and EFL provide different environments of English use. While ESL learners are exposed to immense opportunities for English communication out-of-class, most of English use is limited in language classrooms in EFL situations.

In spite of the obvious differences between ESL and EFL, instructional practices in EFL are mostly borrowed from ESL research and practices. The dependence of EFL education on ESL is partly caused by the lack of EFL research. L2 (second language) English learning and education has been researched and practiced mostly in ESL contexts. In addition, most studies and instructional practices of English learning, which have been fostered in ESL conditions, are concentrated on in-class learning. As a result, EFL education and instructional focuses have been centered on classroom practices aligned with ESL teaching principles.

However, the increasing research on EFL and changing environments of English use in EFL situations has yielded attentions on specific EFL contexts and out-of-class activities. In EFL context, the importance of out-of-class is more prominent than in ESL in that active participation in communication is a key for L2 acquisition but EFL students' language experiences are mostly confined to learning in school. EFL classes do not provide sufficient time and chances to develop English proficiency. According to Hato (2005), K-12 students in Japan, which has similar English learning contexts with Korea or China, usually spend 920 hours in English classrooms while Nakashima (2006 cited by Fukuda & Yoshida, 2013) suggests 2,000 to 5,000 hours for a basic proficiency in a second language. Due to the lack of time for language learning, English learning needs to be expanded beyond the English classrooms in EFL situations. However, while

the opportunities to access authentic communication in English were limited to English classrooms in EFL in the past, nowadays, EFL learners can access authentic English in their daily lives out of class, especially through the internet. In a non-English speaking country, such as Korea and Japan, the opportunities to use English have drastically increased through globalization and the network technology, the internet. For instance, many tourists, alien workers, and immigrants are visiting or working in Korea. In addition, the number of Koreans who go abroad is increasing. The internet technology presents ample opportunities to use English as people communicate with ones of other languages, listen to music, watch dramas and movies, and access various information which is disproportionately in English. The changes are pandemic across the globalized world, including China, Japan, and other non-English speaking countries (Crystal, 2003).

With the benefits of enabled communication in English, out-of-class language learning has been acknowledged as an alternative resource to overcome the lack of authentic materials of English and communication opportunities in EFL classrooms (Hyland, 2004). Nunan (1999) points that the authentic English communications brought through the internet are particularly valuable to EFL learners who access the authentic language resources out of class (Nunan, 1999). In his instructional suggestions how to integrate in-class and out-of-class instruction, He proposes to allocate out-of-class learning on a ratio of three to one. For instance, three hours of out-of-class learning are recommended for every hour of in-class language learning.

Notwithstanding the instructional potential of out-of-class, research has not presented in-depth understanding of out-of-class learning in terms of types of activities, students' practices, motivators, and effects in EFL learning contexts. First, while language learning is classified as implicit or explicit in general, the types are not fully examined in relation with students' practices and language learning in the out-of-class context. Second, motivational aspects of out-of-class activities are intuitively clear, inferring that the motivated learners tend to participate in the activities actively. However, the types of motivation and types of out-of-class activities need to be explored together considering interrelations between them. In addition, the examination of out-of-class effects needs to be conducted in terms of affective aspects. The effects of out-of-class have been examined mainly in cognitive aspects of language learning, such as language proficiency, grammar and vocabulary knowledge, and language achievement. Thus, the affective aspects of students require further studies for comprehensive understanding of the effects of out-of-class learning.

Thus, to address aforementioned research needs, this study examines students' out-of-class activities by types, relationship between motivation and types of out-of-class learning, and the effects of out-of-class learning on affective aspects in language learning. The research inquiry aims to answer the following research questions.

1) How many hours do Korean college students spend on two types of out-of-class learning: implicit and explicit language learning?
2) Does the motivation influence the amount of time for two types of out-of-class learning, respectively?
3) Does the amount of time on out-of-class learning have effects on learners' affective factors including willing to communicate (WTC), anxiety, and perceived English confidence?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Out-of-Class Language Learning

1) Definition and Types of Out-of-Class Learning

The Out-of-class learning is any types of learning beyond classrooms, which are characterized as self-directed and naturalistic (Benson, 2001). Richards (2015) proposes that the out-of-class language learning provides authentic and meaningful language experience as he introduces various available out-of-class language learning activities supported by the innovative technology.

While various types of out-of-class activities are available by Benson's (2001) definition of any types of learning beyond classrooms, Benson (2001) classifies them into three types of out-of-class learning depending on how implicitly or explicitly learners pursue language learning: self-instruction, naturalistic language learning, and self-directed naturalistic language learning. In self-instruction learning, language-focused learning activities are mainly employed by learners, such as self-studies for grammar learning and test preparation. The naturalistic language learning refers to the authentic and natural involvement in communication with native speakers without intentional learning of linguistic knowledge. The self-directed naturalistic language learning is learners' active creation or search of language learning situations where they do not explicitly focus on linguistic knowledge.

The types of out-of-class activities of Benson (2001) can be re-classified into implicit and explicit learning, which are commonly used terms to language instruction in classrooms. Implicit learning is defined as learning without cognitive awareness of learning objects and processes. It is rather unconscious of learning purposes. On the other hand, explicit learning involves awareness of learning, such as linguistic knowledge in language learning. In second language learning, explicit learning includes grammar rule learning and explicit explanation of linguistic features while implicit

learning focuses on meaning and authentic language use within a context. (Ellis, 2008). Depending on the way of language learning, the self-instruction is classified as the explicit learning of language while the other two types are implicit learning, which emphasizes authentic and interactive language interactions. Drawing on the classification, out-of-class learning encompasses 1) activities to learn a language explicitly (Lin, 2016; Na & Yoon, 2016), 2) activities for implicit language learning (Chan, 2016; Cole & Vanderplank, 2016; Guo, 2011; Hyland, 2004; Peters, 2018), and 3) both type of learning (Cheng, 2015; Lai, Zhu, & Gong, 2015).

2) Learners' Perceptions and Preferences

Most EFL students perceive the value of English learning but do not invest sufficient time to foster English proficiency (Fukuda & Yoshida, 2012; Inozu, Sahinkarakas, & Yumru, 2010; Lafaye & Tsuda, 2002). In addition, students prefer activities for receptive language skills to productive skills, such as speaking and writing. The findings are similar regardless of learners' first language backgrounds including Turkey (Inozu et al., 2010), Japan (Lafeye & Tsuda, 2002), and Malaysia (Maros & Saad, 2016).

Lafeye and Tsuda (2002) surveyed 518 Japanese university students and reported that students understood the usefulness and importance of English but were not motivated to study it. It is supported by national surveys in Japan, which report that college students usually study English less than an hour weekly beyond classrooms (Benesse Educational Research & Development Center, 2008 cited by Fukuda & Yoshida, 2013).

In addition, although learners enjoy various English resources for out-of-class activities, many studies reveal that learners prefer activities for receptive language skills to the tasks for productive skills (Chik, 2007; Hyland, 2004; Park, 2008; Pickard, 1996; Wu, 2012). With 20 German-speaking learners of English, Pickard (1996) researched the favored out-of-class learning activities. The study results indicate that the most-cited activities are for reading and listening, receptive language skills, due to the accessibility of materials. In addition, Hyland (2004) investigated the out-of-class English activities of pre-service teachers in Hong Kong and found that the learners actively participated in out-of-class English learning favoring receptive skills of reading and listening rather than speaking. Maros and Saad (2016) presented similar preference of English learners' choice of out-of-class activities. International students in Malaysia mentioned "watching" as the most favorite language learning activity, which involved seeing, listening, and reading. In Wu's (2012) study with ESL students in Hong Kong, the types of most common out-of-class learning were watching films and TV programs, reading, and listening, which concern with receptive skills, while students perceived speaking is the most useful activity to improve English. The research findings show that students

mostly enjoy implicit out-of-class learning, and they prefer passive learning of receptive skills while they value the usefulness of active interactions for productive language skills (Wu, 2012).

3) Effects of Out-of-Class Learning

Since the potential of out-of-class learning to assist language learning were suggested by Hyland (2004) and Pickard (1995), research focus has been drawn to out-of-class language learning. However, studies on second language learning have been concentrated on in-class learning (Pearson, 2004). In spite of the dearth of related research, meaningful findings have shed light on how language learning is influenced or assisted by out-of-class activities.

The benefits of out-of-class learning have been reported in cognitive domains of language learning in diverse first language situations. For instance, Peters (2018) reports the positive effects of out-of-class learning to gain vocabulary knowledge of Flemish EFL learners. Inozu et al. (2010) also report that out-of-class experiences of Turkish college students contributed to the development of vocabulary, reading, listening, grammar, speaking, and writing. While out-of-class activities helped the students develop English skills in general, the receptive skills were more benefited by the experiences than the productive skills. Richards' (2009) comparative research of English language achievement suggests that frequent exposure to authentic English through out-of-class activities can contribute to language learning in EFL conditions. The benefits of out-of-class language learning are found in other areas, such as oral proficiency (Sundqvist, 2011), standardized English proficiency test results (Larsson, 2012), and grammatical and lexical knowledge and the occurrence of fossilized errors (Cole & Vanderplank, 2016). Additionally, Chan's (2016) case study with six native Cantonese-speaking college students in Hong Kong identifies frequent use of popular cultures in English among the highly proficient English learners. Chan (2016) attributes the participants' English proficiency to their self-initiated out-of-class learning utilizing English-medium popular culture including English TV series, online digital media, and social networking.

2. Motivation and Affective Aspects

1) Motivation

The early formation of motivation model for L2 learning was done by Garder and Lambert (1959, 1972). They suggest two types of orientation toward L2 learning:

integrative and instrumental orientations. The integrative orientation is to pursue authentic contact and identification with L2 community. On the other hand, the instrumental orientation is a desire to utilize L2 for practical goals. However, follow-up studies have presented contradicting results on Gardner and Lambert's conceptualization of L2 orientation. For a complementary model of L2 motivation, the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation has been suggested (Brown, 1994; Williams & Burden, 1997). Deci and Ryan (1985, 1995) have devised the self-determination theory drawing on the conceptualization of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Two types of motivation—extrinsic and intrinsic—are widely applied in fields of education as well as L2 learning. The extrinsic motivation refers to motivation to behave to achieve practical purposes, such as academic or professional achievement, reputation, or monetary gains. The intrinsic motivation is willingness to engage in actions because of satisfaction, enjoyment, or the sense of self-achievement. Motivation studies propose that more intrinsically motivated learners perform better in L2 performance and learning (Ehrman, 1996; Ramage, 1990; Tachibana, Matsukawa, & Zhong, 1996).

In terms of out-of-class learning, motivation may predict learning practices, specifically learning hours. Wu (2012) examines the relationship between students' beliefs and their-out-of-class activities. The study shows that students who believe the importance of English learning and have strong confidence participate in out-of-class activities more actively (Wu, 2012). Due to the autonomous nature of out-of-class learning, students' participation in out-of-class is dependent on students' motivation. While motivation is known to be influential to increase study time on out-of-class learning (Fukuda & Yoshida, 2013), the rigid examination of interrelationship between students' motivation and time spent for out-of-class learning has not been researched enough.

2) Affective Aspects

Although the effects of out-of-class have been discussed on cognitive gains of language learning mainly, affective aspects of learners need to be examined in that learners' affection is another critical predictor of language acquisition. For the positive reinforce of language learning, willingness to communicate (WTC) and language confidence are widely accepted to be important factors for communication performance in L2. On the other hand, anxiety is the best known negative affection influencing language learning and performance.

WTC is the voluntary intention to start or continue conversation with interlocutors (MacIntyre, 2007). L2 WTC (Willingness to communicate) is a key learner characteristic which decides active participation in L2 communication and is known to be a major instructional goal in communicative language learning (MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, &

Donovan, 2003). Under the L1 situations, WTC means a stable trait of an individual who favors or declines to communicate (McCroskey & Baer, 1985). However, the nature of WTC is substantially complex in the second language context. While the WTC in L1 is more stable and personal trait, L2 WTC is complex and fluctuating, which involves in various factors including personality, environments, and culture. Due to the situational aspects of L2 WTC, regional studies examine the cultural and environmental factors influencing L2 WTC. For instance, Peng and Woodrow's (2010) study targets the Chinese EFL learners, and Khajavy Ghonsooly, Hosseini Fatemi, and Choi (2016) examine WTC in Iranian EFL context. The indications of research suggest that L2 WTC needs to be understood as a complex entity involving individual, environmental, and cultural factors (MacIntypre, 2007). Peng (2012) suggests an ecological approach including micro-, meso-, exo-, macro-system to understand L2 WTC. According to his model, leaners' experiences of out-of-class, a type of meso-system, constantly interact with their personal traits, classroom interactions, and environmental and cultural contexts (Peng, 2012). Another positive affective factor is perceived competence which is the overall personal belief about one's communicative capability (MacIntyre, Dörnyei, Clément, & Noels, 1998). Wu's (2012) study reveals the positive correlations between out-of-class learning and the level of confidence. Personal beliefs, such as confidence, self-efficacy, and perceived competence, are likely to positively correlate with out-of-class performance and achievement.

Anxiety has known to be negative in language performance and learning in general (Horwitz, 2001; Horwitz, Horwitzh, & Cope, 1986; Young, 1986). For instance, Woodrow (2006) examines L2 anxiety and finds its connection with oral language achievement. Tsui (1996) presents that L2 learners experience intensive anxiety during L2 writing. In addition, cultural background influences the level of L2 anxiety. For instance, learners from Korean Japan, and China, which has been greatly influenced by Confucianism, were reported to be more anxious in speaking in English than European and Vietnamese students (Woodrow, 2006). Watkins and Biggs' (2001) identification of differences between Confucian heritage learners and western learners support the results of Woodrow's (2006) study.

III. METHODS

1. Participants and Procedure

For the study, 103 college students who major in English Education participate in the research from a university in Seoul, Korea. They are pre-service teachers taking classes

on English language, English education, and general pedagogy. They consist of 39 freshmen (37.9%), 20 sophomores (19.4%), 27 juniors (26.2%), and 17 seniors (16.5%). Most of them expect to be an English teacher in the secondary schools in Korea. Students majoring English education were invited to participate in a survey study, and research participants volunteered to respond to survey questionnaires. The survey questioned demographic information, time for two types of out-of-class learning, motivation, L2 WTC (willing to communicate), foreign language anxiety, and perceived confidence of English. The survey was conducted online through a learning management system of the university. Participants were asked to access their online class site and answer to the survey questions via computers or their smart devices. The digitized responses were automatically collected and stored at the online site. The data were analyzed using SPSS Statistics 23 for the research questions.

2. Measures

For the study, the survey questionnaires contain a survey of study hour and four scales of WTC, anxiety, competence, and motivation. The internal consistency of each measure of four scales ranged from .82 to .95, which shows the very high reliability of the instruments.

1) Hours of Out-of-Class Learning

Students were asked how many hours they spend for out-of-class English learning weekly. Their out-of-class learning activities were divided into two categories: implicit language learning activities and explicit learning activities. The implicit language learning includes Benson's (2001) naturalistic and self-directed naturalistic language learning, and the explicit language learning corresponds to Benson's self-instruction. The questions were "In a week, how many hours do you spend for learning activities directly related to English language learning, such as grammar study, pronunciation practice, and test preparation?" and "In a week, how many hours do you spend for activities in English, such as watching movies and listening to music, which do not directly intend to learning English language?"

2) L2 Willingness to Communicate

Willingness to Communicate in L2 was measured by the instrument developed by Peng and Woodrow (2010). They modified Weaver's (2005) WTC questionnaires for English L2 WTC. Pend and Woodrow's questionnaires consist of ten questions in six point

Likert scale from 1 (never) to 6(always). The instrument asks language learner's willingness to communicate in English for each statement, such as "I am willing to ask my group mates, in English how to pronounce a word in English," "I am willing to do a role-play in English at my desk, with my peer," and "I am willing to give a short self-introduction without notes in English to the class." Peng and Woodrow's (2010) questionnaires were translated into Korean. The internal reliability measured by Cronbach's α was .91.

3) Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety

Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale devised by Horwitz (1986) was adopted for the study. The measurement consists of 33 questions to gauge the level of anxiety in various situations in a foreign language classroom with 7-point Likert scale from 1 (never anxious) to 7 (very anxious). The sample questions are "I never feel quite sure of myself when speaking in my foreign language class," "I keep thinking that the other students are better at languages than I am," and "I am afraid that my language teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make." The internal reliability measured by Cronbach's α was .94.

4) Perceived English Communication Competence

Six questions developed by Pend and Woodrow (2010) were employed for the study and translated into Korean. The questions were about learners' perceived communication competence in English. For each question, participants marked their communication competence for each communication task from 1 (below 10%) to 10 (100%). Sample items are as follows: "I am able to do a role-play standing in front of the class in English (e.g., ordering food in a restaurant)," "I am able to give my peer sitting next to me directions to my favorite restaurant in English," and "I am able to translate a spoken utterance from Korean into English in my group." The internal reliability measured by Cronbach's α was .95.

5) Motivation

The motivation for learning English was measured with 18 questions from Noel, Pelletier, Clement, and Vallerand's (2000) instrument. The questions consist of nine items for extrinsic motivation and nine items for intrinsic motivation measuring the level

of motivation from 1 (never agree) to 7 (totally agree) in Likert scale. They were translated into Korean. The sample questions for explicit motivation are "In order to get a more prestigious job later on" and "Because I would feel ashamed if I couldn't speak to my friends from the second language community in their native tongue." The examples of intrinsic motivation questions are "For the satisfied feeling I get in finding out new things" and "For the pleasure I get from hearing the second language spoken by native second language speakers." The internal reliability for explicit motivation was .82, and the reliability for intrinsic motivation was .89.

IV. RESULTS

1. Q1: Hours on Out-of-Class Learning

The descriptive statistics of weekly hours on out-of-class learning are presented in Table 1. Students spend 11.46 hours in average for out-of-class English learning activities. However, there is significant difference between explicit and implicit learning hours (t=5.51, p<.001). Students spend more hours on explicit learning than on implicit. In addition, the deviation of implicit learning hours (SD=7.02) is similar with the explicit (SD=6.92) in spite of smaller mean (M=3.90) than the explicit (M=7.56). It indicates that the hours of implicit learning fluctuate more between students than the hours of explicit learning. In addition, the hours of explicit and implicit learning are positively correlated, and correlation coefficient between them is significant at the level of α=.01*:* r=.53.

TABLE 1

Weekly Hours of Out-of-Class Activities

Type	*N*	*Min*	*Max*	*Mean*	*SD*
Explicit	103	0.00	40.00	7.56	6.92
Implicit	103	0.00	50.00	3.90	7.02
Total	103	0.00	80.00	11.46	12.21

In addition, most students are reluctant to invest time for implicit learning, which is represented by the fact that 78% of students spend less than 5 hours in a week for implicit language learning. Even in the explicit learning, 40% of students do not study English out-of-class (see Table 2).

TABLE 2

Number of Students by Hours of Out-of-Class Learning in a Week

Type	Less than 5hrs (%)	5-10hrs (%)	10-15hrs (%)	More than 15hrs (%)	Total (%)
Explicit	41(40%)	36(25%)	22(21%)	4(4%)	103(100%)
Implicit	80(78%)	15(15%)	2(2%)	6(6%)	103(100%)

2. Q2: Influence of Motivation on Out-of-Class Activities

The descriptive statistics of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are presented in Table 3. Students' responses from 1 to 7 each question were summed, and the possible range of the sum is from 8 to 63. The results show that students have motivation slightly above the medium, which is 36, and they are more intrinsically motivated (t=-5.87, p<.001).

TABLE 3

Sums of Scales for Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation

Type	*N*	*Min*	*Max*	*Mean*	*SD*
Extrinsic	103	15.00	60.00	37.50	10.23
Intrinsic	103	18.00	63.00	44.72	10.71

The influence of explicit and intrinsic motivation on out-of-class activities was examined respectively in terms of hours of implicit and explicit learning. To test if the motivational factors, extrinsic and intrinsic motivation, predict the hours of out-of-classroom learning, multiple regression analysis was employed for the hours of the implicit, explicit, and total learning. In predicting hours of implicit learning, both extrinsic and intrinsic motivation was not significant to contribute to the hours of implicit learning as shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Summary of the Multiple Regression Predicting the Hours of Implicit Learning

	Variables	*b*	*SE B*	*β*	*t*	*p*
Step 1	Constant	-.60 (-6.48, 5.23)	2.96		-.20	.84
	Intrinsic	.10 (-.03, .23)	.06	.15	1.56	.12
Step 2	Constant	.70 (-6.17, 7.56)	3.46		.20	.84
	Intrinsic	.12 (-.02, .25)	.07	.18	1.71	.09
	Extrinsic	-.05 (-.19, .09)	.07	-.08	-.73	.47

Note. R^2= .02 for Step 1; ΔR^2 = .005 for Step 2

In predicting hours of explicit learning, intrinsic motivation accounted for 10% of the variance in the increase of hours of explicit learning, F=11.27, p=.001. However, extrinsic motivation was not significant to predict the hours (see Table 5).

TABLE 5

Summary of the Multiple Regression Predicting the Hours of Explicit Learning

	Variables	*b*	*SE B*	*β*	*t*	*p*
Step 1	Constant	-1.60 (-7.16, 3.96)	2.80		-0.57	0.57
	Intrinsic	0.20 (.08, .33)	0.06	0.32	3.36	0.00
Step 2	Constant	-1.24 (-7.75, 5.28)	3.28		-0.38	0.71
	Intrinsic	0.21 (.08, .34)	0.06	0.32	3.26	0.00
	Extrinsic	-0.01 (-.15, .12)	0.07	-0.02	-0.21	0.83

Note. R^2= .10 for Step 1; ΔR^2 = .0004 for Step 2

The examination of influence of motivation reveals that the intrinsic motivation significantly influences the hours of explicit out-of-class activities while the extrinsic motivation does not contribute to the time variances of any types of learning activities.

3. Q3: Effects of Out-of-Class Activities

The descriptive statistics of L2 WTC, anxiety, and competence are presented in Table 6. The possible range of sum of 10 WTC questions is from 10 to 60 with medium of 40. Students' responses show that students have medium level of L2 WTC (M= 38.05). Anxiety can range from 33 to 231 with medium of 132. Students have anxiety lower than the medium (M= 102.24). The possible range of competence is from 6 to 60. Students were less competent with their English communication proficiency than the medium level.

TABLE 6

Sums of Scales for L2 WTC, Anxiety, and Competence

Variables	*N*	*Min*	*Max*	*Mean*	*SD*
L2 WTC	103	14.00	59.00	38.05	9.55
Anxiety	103	56.00	148.00	102.24	21.18
Competence	103	11.00	60.00	39.20	13.42

Multiple regression analysis was employed to examine whether the hours of learning predicts the variances of L2 WTC, foreign language anxiety, and perceived English communication competence in terms of the hours of explicit and implicit learning. The results show that the hours of implicit learning predicts 5% of the variance in the increase of L2 WTC while explicit learning does not have significant contribution to L2 WTC, F change = .07, p=.06 (see Table 7).

TABLE 7

Summary of the Multiple Regression Predicting L2 WTC

	Variables	*b*	*SE B*	*β*	*t*	*p*
tep 1	Constant	36.83 (34.74, 38.92)	1.05		34.91	0.00
	Implicit	0.31 (.05, .57)	0.13	0.23	2.37	0.02
Step 2	Constant	37.06 (34.33, 39.78)	1.37		26.98	0.00
	Implicit	0.33 (.02, .65)	0.16	0.25	2.13	0.04
	Explicit	-0.04 (-.36, .27)	0.16	-0.03	-0.26	0.80

Note. R^2= .05 for Step 1; ΔR^2 = .001 for Step 2

Analysis of anxiety and perceived English competence indicates that hours of both types of learning do not account for the variance of foreign language classroom anxiety (Table 8 & 9).

TABLE 8

Summary of the Multiple Regression Predicting Anxiety

	Variables	*b*	*SE B*	*β*	*t*	*p*
Step 1	Constant	102.10 (97.34, 106.87)	2.40		42.51	0.00
	Implicit	0.04 (-0.56, 0.63)	0.30	0.01	0.12	0.91
Step 2	Constant	100.53(94.35, 106.72)	3.12		32.23	0.00
	Implicit	-0.11(-0.82, 0.59)	0.36	-0.04	-0.32	0.75
	Explicit	0.29 (-0.43, 1.00)	0.36	0.09	0.79	0.43

Note. R^2 =.0001 for Step 1; ΔR^2 = .006 for Step 2

TABLE 9

Summary of the Multiple Regression Predicting English Competence

	Variables	*b (Interval)*	*SE B*	*β*	*t*	*p*
Step 1	Constant	38.54 (35.54, 41.55)	1.52		25.43	0.00
	Implicit	0.17 (-.21, .55)	0.19	0.09	0.89	0.37
Step 2	Constant	38.87 (34.95, 42.80)	1.97		19.69	0.00
	Implicit	0.20 (-.25, .65)	0.23	0.10	0.89	0.38
	Explicit	-0.06 (-.51, .39)	0.23	-0.03	-0.26	0.80

Note. R^2 =.008 for Step 1; ΔR^2 = .001 for Step 2

The analysis of the effects of hours of learning on students' affective aspects of language learning shows that the hours of implicit learning accounts for the increase of L2 WTC. The other affective factors were not explained by the hours of both implicit and explicit learning.

V. DISCUSSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The investigation of Korean college students' practices of out-of-class English learning reveals the pattern of out-of-class English learning, the predictors of out-of-class learning, and the effects of the learning on affective aspects of language learning.

Congruent to the previous study, many students are not active to participate in out-of-class activities. It is more obvious in implicit language learning, which presents students' preference of direct language learning activities. The inclination towards explicit language learning may attribute to the competitive educational environment in Korea. Most colleges set minimum English proficiency level for graduation requirement, which is usually the score of standardized English proficiency tests, such as TOEIC and TEPS. In addition, companies and governmental organization also require the standardized English scores or give a standardized English test. Thus, Korean students may be pressured to prepare for the test, so that they prefer explicit language learning activities. Maria Oh's (2015) observation of out-of-class English learning of a Korean elementary student from a low-income family reveals that the girl's motivation for out-of-class English learning is more oriented by explicit motivation, showing off her English to other students, which implies competitive circumstance in Korean society. The results indicate that social and cultural context has considerable influence on the types and motivation of language learning. The emphasis on communicative language learning in the 2015 National Curriculum needs to lead meaning-based English use and learning in class and out-of-class.

In prediction of out-of-class learning, intrinsic motivation was the predictor of explicit language learning. Due to the autonomous nature of out-of-class learning, there is no doubt that the intrinsic motivation would encourage out-of-class learning. However, the fact that implicit learning was not benefited by intrinsic motivation needs further research. The plausible explanation of the fact can be attributed to students' focuses on explicit language learning which is more effective to succeed in standardized English tests. The emphasis on the standardized test scores in Korea may yield the inclination towards explicit language learning in out-of-class as well as in in-class practices. Therefore, even though students may have intrinsic motivation to improve their English, they assign their time for explicit language learning first. However, shown in the significant correlation between explicit and implicit learning hours, intrinsically motivated students spend more time in implicit learning as well as in explicit learning. The finding indicates that even though implicit learning of out-of-class has been suggested to be more effective for a second language acquisition (Cole & Vanderplank, 2016), cultural and social conditions and environment may influence learners' choices of types of out-of-class activities and their practices of learning activities.

In terms of effects of out-of-class, the results suggest that implicit language learning induces willingness to communicate in L2. With the emphasis on communication competence and communicative language learning, L2 WTC is an important trait of learners. Thus, the finding is promising for communicative and interactive language learning in-class and out-of-class. However, there were no significant effects of out-of-class learning on foreign language classroom anxiety and perceived communication competence. The statistical insignificance can be attributed to the limited hours of out-of-class learning. The average hours of out-of-class may not enough to develop the more persistent and trait-like learner characteristics, anxiety and competence. On the contrary, L2 WTC is known to be influenced by situations, and thus can fluctuate depending on context (MacIntyre, 2007). For better understanding the results, further studies are required with various ranges of out-of-class learning time.

In spite of reported benefits of out-of-class learning, there are insufficient empirical data to understand learning out-of-class. For instance, while L2 research on classroom instruction has extensively examined the roles of explicit and implicit instruction of language, out-of-class learning has not been researched the causes and effects of the different types of learning. In addition, although this study suggests possible relationships between out-of-class practices and affective aspects of learning and motivation, other factors, such as cultural and environmental factors, also involve in out-of-class language learning. However, with increasing global interactions in which learners have myriad of chances of out-of-class learning, further studies need to examine the differences of implicit and explicit learning in out-of-class situations, various causes and effects of out-of-class learning focusing on affective and motivational aspects, and complicated interactions between variables.

REFERENCES

Benesse Educational Research & Development Center. (2008). Daigakuseino Gakushu Seikatsu Jitaichosa Hokokusho [Report on University Students' Studies and Lifestyles]. Retrieved February 8, 2011, from the World Wide Web: http://benesse.jp/berd/center/open/report/daigaku_jittai/hon/index.html

Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by principles*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Chan, H. W. (2016). Popular culture, English out-of-class activities, and learner autonomy among highly proficient secondary student in Hong Kong. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 4*(8), 1918-1923.

Cheng, C. (2015). Perceptions of and experiences with vocational college English majors' out-of-class English learning in Taiwan. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 6*(4), 737-748.

Chik, A. (2007). From learner identity to learner autonomy: A biographical study of two Hong Kong learners of English. In P. Benson (Ed.), *Learner autonomy 8: Teacher and learner perspectives* (pp. 41-60). Dublin: Authentik Language Learning Resources.

Cole, J., & Vanderplank, R. (2016). Comparing autonomous and class-based learners in Brazil: Evidence of the present-day advantages of informal, out-of-class learning. *System, 61,* 31-42.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour*. New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1995). Human autonomy: The basis for true self-esteem. In M. H. Kernis (Ed.), *Efficacy, agency and self-esteem* (pp. 31-49). New York: Plenum.

Ehrman, M. (1996). An exploration of adult language learner motivation, self-efficacy, and anxiety. In J. L. Oxford (Ed.), *Language learning motivation: Pathways to the new centur*y (pp. 81-103). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition (2nd ed.).* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fukuda, S. T., & Yoshida, H. (2013). Time is of the essence: factors encouraging out-of-class study time. *ELT Journal, 67*(1), 31-40.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, R. C. (1959). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology, 13*, 266-272.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury.

Guo, S. (2011). Impact of an out-of-class activity on students' English awareness, vocabulary, and autonomy. *Language Education in Asia, 2*(2), 246-256.

Hato, Y. (2005). Problems in top-down goal setting in second language education: a case study of the "Action Plan to Cultivate Japanese with English Abilities". *JALT Journal, 27*(1), 33-52.

Horwitz, E. K. (1986). Preliminary evidence for the reliability and validity of a foreign language anxiety scale. *TESOL Quarterly, 20,* 559–562.

Horwitz, E. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21*, 112-126.

Horwitz, E., Horwitz, M., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal, 70*(2), 125-132.

Hyland, F. (2004). Learning autonomously: Contextualizing out-of-class English language learning. *Language Awareness, 13*(3), 180-202.

Inozu, J., Sahinkarakas, S., & Yumru, H. (2010). The nature of language learning experiences beyond the classroom and its learning outcomes. *US-China Foreign Language, 8*, 14-21.

Khajavy, G. H., Ghonsooly, B., Hosseini Fatemi, A., & Choi, C. W. (2016). Willingness to Communicate in English: A Microsystem Model in the Iranian EFL Classroom Context. *TESOL Quarterly, 50*(1), 154-180.

Kroll, B. (2003). Introduction: Teaching the next generation of second language writers, In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing* (pp. 1-14). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lafaye, B. E., & Tsuda, S. (2002). Attitudes towards English language learning in higher education in Japan, and the place of English in Japanese society. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 11*(3), 145-161.

Lai, C., Zhu, W., & Gong, G. (2015). Understanding the quality of out-of-class English learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, *49*(2), 278-308.

Larsson, B. (2012). *English out-of-school activities: A way of integrating outwards?* Unpublished master's thesis. University of Gävle, Gävle, Sweden.

Lin, T. (2016). An investigation of the relationship between in-class and out-of-class efforts on student learning: Empirical evidence and strategy suggestion. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 16*(4), 14-32.

MacIntyre, P. D. (2007). Willingness to communicate in the second language: understanding the decision to speak as volitional process. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(4), 564-576.

MacIntyre, P., Baker, S., Clément, R., & Donovan, L. (2003). Talking in order to learn: Willingness to communicate and intensive language programs. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 59*, 589-607.

MacIntyre, P. D., Dörnyei, Z., Clément, R., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *Modern Language Journal, 82*(4), 545-562.

Maros, M., & Saad, N. S. M. (2016). The out-of-class language learning strategies of international students in Malaysia. *International Journal of Asian Social Science, 6*(8), 478-486.

McCroskey, J. C., & Baer, J. E. (1985, November). *Willingness in communicate: The construct and its measurement.* Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, Denver, CO.

Na, S., & Yoon, H. (2016). Effects of in-class and out-of-class writing assignments on L2 writing strategy use and writing quality. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 25*(2), 195-205.

Nakashima, K. (2006). Bokokugoigaino kotobawo kodomoga manabuigi: bairingarukyouikukarano shiten [Reasons for children to learn another language: from the perspectives of bilingual education]. *BERD 5,* 18-22.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching & learning.* Florence, KY: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Oh, Maria. (2015). One low-income child's English learning motivation at a community child center. *Journal of Elementary Education Research, 27*(1), 1-9.

Park, Myongsu. (2008). Out-of-class listening activities. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 14*(1), 59-74.

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.* Paper presented at the meeting of The Independent Learning Conference, Melbourne, Australia.

Peng, J. (2012). Towards an ecological understanding of willingness to communicate in EFL classrooms in China. *System, 40*, 203-213.

Peng, J., & Woodrow, L. (2010). Willingness to communicate in English: A model in the Chinese EFL classroom context. *Language Learning, 60*(4), 834-876.

Peters, E. (2018). The effect of out-of-class exposure to English language media on learners' vocabulary knowledge. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 169*(1), 142-168.

Pickard, N. (1995). Out-of-class language learning studies: Three case studies. *Language Learning Journal, 12*(1), 35-37.

Pickard, N. (1996). Out-of-class language learning strategies. *English Teaching Journal, 50,* 150-159.

Ramage, K. (1990). Motivational factors and persistence in foreign language study. *Language Learning, 40*, 189-219.

Richards, J. C. (2009). The changing face of TESOL. Plenary Speech at TESOL Convention and Exhibit, Denver, Colorado, United States. Retrieved from May 23, 2018, from the World Wide Web: http://www.professorjackrichards.com/wp-content/uploads/changing-face-of-TESOL.pdf

Richards, J. C. (2015). The changing face of language learning: Learning beyond the classroom. *RELC Journal, 46*(1), 5-22.

Sundqvist, P. (2011). A possible path to progress: Out-of-school English language learners in Sweden. In P. Benson & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Beyond the language classroom: The theory and practice of informal language learning and teaching* (pp. 106–118). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tachibana, Y., Matsukawa, R., & Zhong, Q. X. (1996). Attitudes and motivation for learning English: A cross-national comparison of Japanese and Chinese high school students. *Psychological Reports, 79*, 691-700.

Tsui, A. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In K. M. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom* (pp. 145-167). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Warschauer, M. (2000). The changing global economy and the future of English teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(3), 511-535.

Watkins, D. A., & Biggs, J. B. (2001). *Teaching the Chinese learner: Psychological and pedagogical influences.* Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Weaver, C. (2005). Using the Rasch model to develop a measure of second language learners' willingness to communicate within a language classroom. *Journal of Applied Measurement, 6*(4), 396-415.

Williams, M., & Burden, B. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woodrow, L. (2006). Anxiety and speaking English as a second language. *RELC Journal, 37,* 308-328.

Wu, M. M. F. (2012). Beliefs and Out-of-Class Language Learning of Chinese-Speaking ESL Learners in Hong Kong. *New Horizons in Education, 60*(1), 35-52.

Young, D. (1986). The relationship between anxiety and foreign language oral proficiency ratings. *Foreign Language Annals, 19(5),* 439-445.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Elementary, Secondary, and Tertiary

Jaeho Choi
Dept. of English Education, College of Education
Sangmyung University
20 Hongjimun 2-Gil, Jongno-gu
Seoul, 03016, Korea
Email: 21clearn@gmail.com

Received in October 16th, 2018
Reviewed in November 27th, 2018
Revised version received in December 5th, 2018