*English Language & Literature Teaching,* Vol. 17, No. 3 Autumn 2011

# The Relationship between L2 Use outside of Class and Oral Proficiency Development

**Seongwon Yun**
(Hanyang University)

**Yun, Seongwon. (2011). The relationship between L2 use outside of class and oral proficiency development. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 17*(3), 309-326.**

This study examines the relationship between second language use outside of class and oral proficiency development. It first identifies out-of-class activities of international graduate students in the U.S. and the average time spent speaking English in those out-of-class activities. Interviews and student self-measurements of time spent speaking English each day were used to investigate the types and quantities of out-of-class activities. In addition, two sets of student oral proficiency test scores were collected. Correlation analysis is used to find out the relationship of the variables between the most salient out-of-class activities and oral proficiency gains. The findings indicate that second language use outside of class is important for international graduate students to improve their oral proficiency. This is especially true with regularized interaction such as talking at work and the average time spent speaking in English a day outside of class. This study suggests that learners of English in an ESL environment should be encouraged to take part in out-of-class activities in addition to English use in the classroom in order for them to improve their oral proficiency.

**[second language use outside of class/oral proficiency development]**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Language acquisition requires that learners have access to the target language so they may have opportunities to use the target language for real purposes in their ordinary lives. In the literature on second-language (L2) acquisition, a number of studies have emphasized the role of learning context and learning opportunities. Hymes (1972) emphasized that knowing what goes on outside the school setting is required for understanding what goes on inside. In relation to L2 use in out-of-class activities in which second language speakers participate, many studies have investigated whether the

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

amount of language use might be a predictable variable of ESL learners' performance on certain types of proficiency tests. Some researchers have found that ESL adult learners with a greater amount of informal L2 use outside of class are more proficient than those with less (Kim, 2000; Perdue, 1993; Segalowitz & Freed, 2004; Seliger, 1977; Spada, 1986). On the other hand, others have found that ESL adult learners with greater opportunities to use L2 outside the classroom setting do not appear to benefit any more than those with little or no informal contact with the L2 (Day, 1985; Krashen & Seliger, 1976). Possible explanations can be made for these conflicting results of relationship between learner's oral interaction and oral proficiency improvement in terms of the ways how researchers have constructed and operationalized learner's oral interaction and oral proficiency.

The present research explores the relationship between L2 use outside of class and oral proficiency. The underlying assumption is that linguistic input and interaction in the classroom are not sufficient for them to develop their oral proficiency since many graduate students take a small number of class hours and most of the classes are lecture-based instead of group discussion. As a result, if they do not have enough outside classroom interaction, it is assumed that they do not have enough speaking opportunities in their ordinary lives. Insufficient oral interaction might result in slowing down their second language development. The purpose of study is to investigate the relationship between language use outside of the class and oral proficiency development by categorizing and analyzing the types and quantities of language activities in which international graduate students in the U.S. are involved outside of class. It is hypothesized that students who have more opportunities in out-of-class activities will have more oral proficiency improvement.

The specific research questions addressed in this paper are:

1. What are the out-of-class activities in which international graduate students in the U.S. get involved and what amount of time do they spend each day speaking the target language in the out-of-class activities ?
2. What is the relationship between second language use outside of class and oral proficiency development?

This paper is organized as follows: first, previous research is described in the area of oral interaction outside of class and oral proficiency development; second, a description of the participants and the programs in which they were enrolled is provided; third, the measure used to collect information on learners' language use outside of class is described; fourth, the instrument used to gather data on the subjects' proficiency is described; and finally, the results of the study are presented and discussed suggesting how differences in type and amount of oral interaction contributed to variations in international graduate students' improvement in L2 oral proficiency.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

## II. BACKGROUND

### 1. Oral Interaction and Oral Proficiency Development

Many researchers have constructed oral interaction in different ways. Different ways of constructing oral interaction may affect the research findings to investigate the effects of oral interaction on certain oral proficiency measurements. In his functional analysis of speaking, Bygate (1987) emphasized the qualities of oral interaction explaining that learners are required to negotiate meaning, and generally manage the interaction in terms of who is to say what, to whom, when, and about what. Kasper and Rose (2002) interpreted oral interaction from the view point of pragmatics. According to them, in a narrow sense, oral interaction refers to encounters in which at least two participants are co-present and engaged in a joint activity. They differentiated oral interaction from social interaction in a wide sense that can be extended to encompass all sorts of written and mixed forms of communication.

Seliger (1977) defined practice as "any verbal interaction that requires L2 use and consists of an output speech act by the learner and input speech act from some other speaker (p.263)." He separated practice from covert activity of practice such as listening to the radio, watching TV and reading because he explained that there was no way to tell when a learner was actively focused on language input in such situation. He grouped adult ESL students in an intensive program into "high input generators (p.265)" and "low input generators (p.265)" based on a quantitative measure of verbal interaction in L2 classes. Then he compared performance or achievement with language tests in relation to the amount of language contact outside of the classroom. He found that measures of interaction could have predicted performance on a test of English structure (Lado-Fries), the Queens College English Language Institute Test of Aural Comprehension, and a close test. He concluded that interaction type was a determining variable in the acquisition of L2. Two qualitative studies (Back, 2009; Paek, 2002) examined in what ways Korean university students studying in English-speaking countries use English in their daily lives. Both of their findings show that although the Korean students have a strong desire to develop their English speaking skills, they are reluctant to participate in social events both on and off campus. Their reluctance stems from their Korean cultural background which emphasizes face-maintenance (Back, 2009) and a preference for mono-cultural settings (Paek, 2002). Thus the Korean students spent time outside of class mostly with other Koreans. The researchers point out the importance of cultural background as a strong factor that is embedded in the participants' behaviors outside of class. Although considerable attention has been devoted to the relationship between learner's language use and oral proficiency

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

improvement, however, it remains unclear what out-of-class activities and what amount of time a day help international graduate students develop their oral proficiency.

## 2. Relationship between Second Language Use Outside of Class and Oral Proficiency Improvement

In order to investigate whether differences in out-of-class activities and the amount of time spent can contribute to variation in the proficiency of L2 learners, it is necessary to design studies examining the effects of the amount of time spent speaking a target language in each setting. In an effort to assess the extent to which learners spent time speaking the L2 outside of class, a document entitled "The Language Contact Profile (LCP)" has been used by many researchers (Bialystok, 1978; Day, 1985; Deweay, Freed, Segalowitz, & Halter, 2004; Freed, 1995; Seliger, 1977; Spada, 1986). The LCP, designed for both before- and after-study experiences, asks students to self-report prior formal exposure to the L2 and time spent using the L2 in out-of-class activities (reading, writing, speaking, and listening), time spent using the L2 (how much, what type, and with whom), and the proportion of time they spent using the L2 and their L1. Even though some studies (Bialystok, 1978; Kang, 1999; Segalowitz, & Freed, 2004; Seliger, 1977; Spada, 1985) find both quantitative and qualitative differences in learners' out-of-class contact with the second language development on certain types of proficiency tests, there are some problems with the studies.

First, most of the studies mentioned above used a self-report of learners to measure their types and amounts of oral interaction by administering LCP questionnaire only once or twice. However, asking learners only once or twice to estimate how much time on average they spent speaking L2 relies on learner's memory and recall which can be flawed. Second, the process of coding issues emerges. Some studies (Day, 1985; Kang, 1999; Seliger, 1977; Segalowitz, & Freed, 2004; Spada, 1986) interpreted the types and the amount of time learners spent speaking L2 by giving points. For example, in Spada's (1986) study, if a subject reported spending 2-4 hours a day engaging in conversation in English, this response was given two points. However, if a subject watching television 2-4 hours a day, this response was given one point. Quantifying the input and interaction by giving points to the number of hours in this way, can result in losing the features of raw data in terms of the real types and amounts of time each participant differentiated. Furthermore, even though Seliger (1977) separated the other types of practice such as watching TV and listening to radio from the real language use focused on face to face conversation, the measurement he used was not appropriate to test oral proficiency. The tests he used were a test of English structure (Lado-Fries), the Queens College English Language Institute Test of Aural Comprehension, and a close test. As a result, the

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

research findings in relation to the effect of learner's oral interaction on proficiency achievements remain unclear and questionable. It would seem, therefore, that further investigations are needed in order to examine how to measure the types and the quantities of oral interaction, oral proficiency, and the relationship between these variables.

## III. RESEARCH DESIGN

### 1. Participants

Participants were eight male international graduate students who were enrolled at a U.S. university in a language development course for candidates for international teaching assistants. The course focuses on pronunciation, fluency, grammar and comprehensibility. The participants ranged in age from 21 and 27. They included five Indians, one Japanese, one Malaysian, and one Turkish. Eight students were in their master's programs. Three of them majored in mechanical engineering, two of them in chemical engineering, two in geology and one in mathematics. The Speaking Proficiency English Assessment Kit (SPEAK) score of 50 is required for them to get an international teaching assistantship. The SPEAK is an institutional oral proficiency version of the TSE, the Test of Spoken English by the Educational Testing Service, ETS. The SPEAK scores range from 20 to 60 in 5 point increments.

In the class there is a particular emphasis on test taking strategies and extensive speaking practice outside of class in order for them to prepare for the SPEAK. The students' SPEAK scores were provided to the author for the purpose of the present study. All of the participants got 45 at the first SPEAK before the semester began. The median score of the first SPEAK of eight participants was 45.41, the highest score was 47.08, and the lowest score was 42.5. They took the second SPEAK about 100 days after the first test during the semester. The class lasted for ten weeks. Each student was able to practice three exercises a class from the textbook that includes the same tasks at the SPEAK, such as giving directions, picture description, graph explanation, and announcement sections.

### 2. Instruments

Interviews with individual participants were used to investigate out-of-class activities of each participant and to determine a self-estimate of L2 use in out-of-class activities. The individual interview was held before the second SPEAK. Each interview took about

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

an hour and the whole interviews took about eight hours. It was tape recorded and notes were taken. The interview questions were based on a questionnaire that included the amount of time that the participants spoke in the target language, the types of activities they did, who they spoke with, and how they prepared for the test. The questions were grouped into categories, including talking with friends out of class, talking at school, talking at home, talking on the phone, talking in social groups, talking while shopping, eating out, and doing hobbies, the average time spent speaking in English a day, and self-evaluation of English use and oral interaction and oral proficiency test preparation. Since all of the participants were graduate students, talking at school was divided in detail into the sub-categories such as classroom, study groups, visiting professors, peer talk, break time, lunch time, and talking at work. The interview questions are included in the Appendix A. All participants were asked to report self-estimate of L2 use at the interview. They were also asked to keep the records of the amount of time they spoke English a day for a week on a log, including with whom, where, how long and about in what kinds of out-of-class activities they spoke in English. In addition, in order to compare the differences in the results of their SPEAK, two sets of the test scores were collected: the scores before the semester began and the ones ten weeks after the semester began.

## 3. Data Analysis

First, the oral proficiency gains from the differences between the first SPEAK scores and the second test scores were reported. Next, the results of the self-estimate of L2 use reported at the interview were summarized in terms of the outside activities and the amount of time spent. Third, the independent variables, the outside activities selected to be analyzed statistically were 1) talking with friends, 2) talking at work, 3) talking at home, and 4) the average time spent speaking English a day. These four independent variables from the self-estimate of L2 use were compared to the results of their oral proficiency gains, the dependent variable. Spearman Rank Order Correlation was conducted to examine whether there was a significant relationship between the oral proficiency gains and each of the four variables. A correlation is useful when a study examines the linear relationship between two (or more) normally distributed variables. Thus, this study uses Spearman Rank Order Correlation to find out the relationship between the four independent variables (types of out-of-class activities) and the other dependent variable (oral proficiency gains). Although the number of the participants in this study is relatively small, correlation analysis can be conducted because it examines the relationship among the five variables mentioned above. Fourth, the results of the

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

self-measurement of average L2 use recorded in each participant's log for a week were summarized in relation to the four variables selected for correlational analysis. Finally, Spearman Rank Order Correlation was conducted to investigate whether there was a significant relationship between the oral proficiency gains and the out-of-class activities at the self-measurement of L2 use that the participants recorded for a week.

## IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Results

1) Proficiency Measures

Table 1 presents the scores of the first and the second SPEAK in a rank order from the student who made the highest gain to the student who made the lowest gain (All tables presented in the present study are followed by this ranking order). Three students passed the second SPEAK and five students failed. However, all of the eight participants made some gains. G who made the most gains and N who made the second highest gains have passed the test. M and T did not improve very much at the second SPEAK. M made the second lowest gains and T made the least gains.

**TABLE 1**

**Proficiency Test Scores**

| Participants | First test result (Exact Score) | Second test result (Exact Score) | Pass or Fail | Score Gain between 1st and 2nd tests |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| G | 45 (47.08) | 55 (52.91) | Pass | 5.83 |
| N | 45 (45.83) | 50 (50.41) | Pass | 4.58 |
| A | 45 (46.24) | 50 (49.16) | Pass | 2.92 |
| JT | 45 (43.74) | 45 (47.08) | Fail | 3.34 |
| E | 45 (43.33) | 45 (46.66) | Fail | 3.33 |
| J | 45 (42.5) | 45 (44.58) | Fail | 2.08 |
| M | 45 (45.41) | 45 (47.08) | Fail | 1.67 |
| T | 45 (44.16) | 45 (44.99) | Fail | 0.83 |

2) Self-estimate of L2 Use Reported at the Interview

Table 2 shows the average amount of the time each participant spent a day for the selected four variables, including talking with friends, talking at work, talking at home, and the average time spent speaking English a day.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

**TABLE 2**

**Self-estimate Time of L2 Use per Day (1=1hour)**

| Participants | Talking with friends | Talking at work | Talking at home | The average time spent speaking English a day |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| G | 3.5 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| N | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| A | 1.5 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| JT | 0 | 1.5 | 1 | 2 |
| E | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| J | 0.5 | 0.33 | 0 | 1 |
| M | 1 | 0.5 | 2 | 1.5 |
| T | 1 | 0.33 | 0 | 1 |

3) Correlations between Oral Proficiency Gains and the Self-estimate of L2 Use

Spearman Rank Order Correlation was carried out between the four variables collected from the self-estimate of L2 use at the interview and proficiency gains. The results of these correlational analyses are presented in Table 3.

**TABLE 3**

**Correlations between Oral Proficiency Gains and the Self-estimate of L2 Use**

| | Correlation coefficient | Sig. (1-tailed) |
|---|---|---|
| Talking with friends | -.037 | .466 |
| Talking at work | .663 | .037* |
| Talking at home | .113 | .395 |
| The average time spent speaking English a day | . 894 | .001* |

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed)

The results indicate that there was a significant moderately strong positive correlation between talking at work and oral proficiency gains. However, there were not significant correlations between talking with friends and oral proficiency gains; and between talking at home and oral proficiency gains. The most significant strong positive association was made between the average time spent speaking in English a day and oral proficiency gains.

4) Self-measurement of L2 Use on the Log

The participants recorded the amount of time they spoke English each day on their logs for a week. The average time per day they spoke in English is presented in Table 4 in relation to talking with friends, talking at work, talking at home, and the average of the total time spent speaking English a day.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

**TABLE 4**

**Self-measurement of the Average L2 Use per Day (1=1hour)**

| | Talking with friends | Talking at work | Talking at home | The average time spent speaking English a day |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| G | 2.33 | 2.0 | 0 | 4.5 |
| N | 1.33 | 1.66 | 0.45 | 3.6 |
| A | 0.5 | 1 | 0.66 | 2.25 |
| JT | 0.66 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 2.5 |
| E | 0.75 | 0.25 | 0.5 | 1.75 |
| J | 0.5 | 0.47 | 0 | 1.07 |
| M | 0.2 | 0.66 | 0.33 | 1.35 |
| T | 0.4 | 0.25 | 0 | 0.9 |

5) Correlations between the Self-measurement of L2 Use and Oral Proficiency Gains

Spearman Rank Order Correlation was conducted to investigate if there was a relationship between the self-measurement of L2 use and oral proficiency gains. The results of these correlation analyses are shown in Table 5.

**TABLE 5**

**Correlations between Oral Proficiency Gains and the Self-measurement of L2 Use**

| | Correlation coefficient | Sig. (1-tailed) |
|---|---|---|
| Talking with friends | .946 | .000* |
| Talking at work | .790 | .010* |
| Talking at home | .122 | .387 |
| The average time spent speaking in English a day | .952 | .000* |

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed)

The results indicate that there was a significant strong positive correlation between talking with friends and oral proficiency gains; there was a significant moderately strong positive association between talking at work and oral proficiency gains; and there was a significant strong positive correlation between the average time spent speaking in English a day and oral proficiency gains. However, there was not a significant correlation between talking at home and oral proficiency gains.

## 2. Discussion

1) Types and Quantities of Oral Interaction in L2 Outside of Class

The amount of time a day international graduate students spent speaking English in out-of-class activities ranged from minimum 1 hour to maximum 3 hours at the self-estimate and the median was 2 hours. However, the self-measurement from the log was

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

different ranging from minimum 54 minutes and maximum 4 hours and 30 minutes. The median was the same as 2 hours at the self-estimate and the self-measurement. Students overestimated or underestimated the time they spent speaking English when asked to report at the interview compared to self-measurement of L2 use as reported in their weekly log. For example, G who made the most gains at the SPEAK answered as self-estimate at the interview: talking with friends, 3.5 hours; talking at work, 2 hours; and the total amount of time spent speaking English a day, 3 hours. On the other hand, he answered differently at the self-measurement: talking with friends, 2.33 hours; talking at work, 2 hours; and the total amount of time spent English a day, 4.5 hours.

The participants spent most of their time speaking English with friends and at work. Six out of eight students answered that their classes were more lecture style and they did not talk much in the class. In addition, all students measured their speaking English time at home as less than one hour per day because they either live alone or live with friends who speak the same first language. Even though the present study analyzed statistically the four salient variables, the other types of activities (e.g. study groups, visiting professors, talking while shopping etc.) should also be considered in terms of the types and the amount of time the participants spent speaking English a day. However, the problem here is that the other types of activities are not regular routines so it is difficult to keep records and compare. For example, in relation to study group, four students answered they did not have any study group. However, one student answered that he joined a study group every other day and talked for 30 minutes at one session; the other student also joined a study group but he talked very little.

2) The Relationship between Language Use Outside of Class and Oral Proficiency

The findings of this study support the hypothesis that students who have more participation in out-of-class activities have more oral proficiency improvement than those less involved. Both statistical analyses showed that there was a significant strong positive correlation between the average time spent speaking English a day and oral proficiency gains from the self-estimate at the interview and from the self-measurement on the log. Asking the students separate questions such as talking with friends, talking at home, talking at work is less reliable than asking them the total amount of time spent speaking English a day. This explains why the results were contradictory from other researchers investigating the relationship between oral interactions measured by self-reports and oral proficiency gains since they asked the students separate questions to report how much they spent speaking L2 in such and such situation. The students probably found it difficult to estimate the amount of time spent on separate activities.

The variable, talking with friends outside of class showed counter results between the

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

self-estimate and the self-measurement. There was not a significant correlation between talking with friends and oral proficiency gains at the self-estimate. However, there was a significant strong positive correlation between talking with friends and oral proficiency gains at the self-measurement. These results can be interpreted that at the interview, the question itself separated talking with friends who are native speakers of English from peer talk outside of classroom. Some students have the concept that classmates who are native speakers of English are all friends, but others think the opposite and they put talking with classmates into peer talk categories which are separate from talking with friends. Asking the students separate questions between talking with friends and talking with peers outside of the classroom made them either redundant or confused. However, when they recorded the amount of time they spent speaking English on their log, they included the amount of time they spent talking with either friends or classmates in the same category as talking with friends outside of class.

Talking at work and oral proficiency gains showed the correlations at both self-estimate and self-measurement. In his functional analysis of speaking, Bygate (1987) suggested that oral interaction can be characterized in terms of routines, which are conventional and therefore predictable ways of presenting information of interaction. This seems to be true because talking at work at the self report is consistent with the self-measurement since working hours are already set up every day and the activities at work are conventional.

3) Comparing two students who made the most and the least gains

The following excerpts of the interview transcripts show the fuller pictures of the importance of language use outside of class by presenting a contrast between two participants: G who made the most improvement and T who made the least improvement on their oral proficiency tests.

G:

*"I've been here for about five months. Most of my friends are Americans. I speak most of the time in English. Maybe 80-85% I speak a day is English. I hardly speak Hindi here because even when I meet my Indian friends, we speak in English due to different dialects except for roommates. I think I speak English for about 3 or 4 hours a day. I enjoy Latin dance club a lot so I hang out very often with people I met there. I talk with my American friends on the phone for about 40 minutes every day. I go to the recreation center with them too. Most of the time, I study together with my American friends. I tutor American undergraduate students*

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

*on how to do the experiment at the chemistry lab three times a week. I think I have no problem to communicate with people in English. My problem was how to adjust my Indian accent to American accent. Since I got here, I monitor what I said and try to adjust my pronunciation, especially when Americans don't understand what I said."*

T:

*"I've been in the States for about 6 years. I graduated from the college here but I almost didn't speak in English. That was possible because most of friends were Japanese and I majored in Math. We didn't speak at all in the class. Most of my friends here are Japanese or international students. We have few Americans in the class. I don't speak English very often. Maybe I speak 30% English and 70% Japanese here. I'm still nervous when I talk to Americans. However, I study English very hard. I meet my literacy tutor every week for an hour and I got pronunciation correction. This semester, I had a tutor from Dr. Ha as well. I practice English every day. I record some parts of TV news such as weather forecast and try to imitate the way they speak, then I record my voice and listen to that. I sometimes talk to myself in English to practice. Now, I failed SPEAK test nine times so I don't know what to do to improve my English."*

G, an Indian student, has been in America for a relatively short period of time, about five months. T, a Japanese student, has been in America for a relatively long period of time, about six years. It is obvious that length of residence itself does not ensure the success to oral proficiency improvements. The case of G suggests that it is important for international students participate in out-of-class activities in order to significantly improve their oral proficiency. Based on the interview excerpts, one might conclude that ethnic or cultural background determines the level of out-of-class English speaking activities. This would be an important factor if the study was addressing the question of conditions associated with the level of out-of-class English speaking activities. The purpose of the study, however, was not to find out why some participants are more active in participating in out-of-class activities than others. This study focuses on the level of activity and its relationship to language proficiency improvement and not the conditions explaining the different levels of activity. Regardless of other variables such as personality and ethnic background, it is important to point out for the purpose of the present study that the two students illustrated above differed in the types and the amount of time spend in out-of-class activities.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

## V. CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study indicate that second language use in out-of-class activities is important for international graduate students to improve their oral proficiency. This is especially true with regularized input and interaction such as talking at work and participating in club activities, which resulted in the students having large differences on oral proficiency gains. Furthermore, both self-reports (self-estimates) and self-records (self-measurements) were reliable in the overall amount of time spent speaking in L2 and the regularized routines such as talking at work. However, self-reports showed that they were less reliable than self-measurements if asked about non-conventional activities such as talking at home or talking with friends. As a result, it is suggested that at least double measurements such as self-report and self-measurement be more reliable to measure language use of learners. In addition, there is a need for more research to investigate the impacts of each type of these interactions on the L2 abilities of learners. Many studies in second language acquisition have placed more emphasis on the interactions at school; however, as shown by this study, interactions in out-of-class activities can really help us better understand the relationship between second language use and oral proficiency development. As students search for various ways to improve English, research needs to further investigate other potential benefits of out-of-class activities as well. Finally, learners are required to be aware of the importance of second language use in out-of-class activities so that they can try to have more opportunities of L2 use outside of class to improve their oral proficiency.

It should also be noted that any implications of its findings must be regarded with caution in view of the following: (1) the sample size was small and therefore the study needs to be replicated in order to generalize its findings; (2) although an attempt was made to distinguish between variation in types and amounts of learners' L2 use, other instruments need to be developed which will capture more information regarding qualitative aspects of oral interaction; and (3) the study took place over a relatively short period of time, measuring learner's second language use based on the self-report at an interview and the self-measurement on a week-long log, and therefore the long-term effects of the types and the amounts of language use outside of class on oral proficiency gains might be different.

## REFERENCES

Kang, S. (1999). Relationships between the use of ESL learning strategies and English language proficiency of Asian students. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 5*(1), 1-25.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Back, J. (2009). Korean university students' progress in developing social interaction with native speakers in the UK. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 15*(3), 1-31.

Bialystok, E. (1978). Language skills and the learners: The classroom perspective. In C. Blatchford & J. Schachter (Eds.), *On TESOL '78* (pp. 224-231). Washington, DC: TESOL.

Bygate, M. (1987). *Speaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Day, R. (1985). The use of the target language in context and second language proficiency. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 257-271). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Dewey, D. P., Freed, B. F., Segalowitz N., & Halter, R. (2004). The language contact profile. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*, 349-356.

ETS (1996). *Speak rating scale*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Freed, B. F. (1995). What makes us think that students who study abroad become fluent? In B. F. Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 123-148). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Hymes, D. (1972). *Reinventing anthropology.* New York: Random House.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). Pragmatic development in a second language. *Language Learning, 52,* Supplement 1.

Kim, I. O. (2000). Relationship of onset age of ESL acquisition and extent of informal input to appropriateness and nativeness in performing four speech acts in English: A study of native Korean adult speakers of ESL. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61,* 1265.

Krashen, S., & Seliger, H. (1976). *The role of formal and informal environments in second language learning.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Paek, J. (2002). What else? Korean students interaction with English-speaking people. *Modern English Education, 3*(2), 37-67.

Perdue, C. (1993). *Adult language acquisition: Crosslinguistic perspectives: Vol. 2. The results.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Segalowitz, N., & Freed, B. F. (2004). Context, contact, and cognition in oral fluency acquisition: Learning Spanish in at home and study abroad contexts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26,* 173-199.

Seliger, H. (1977). Does practice make perfect? A study of interaction patterns and L2 competence. *Language Learning, 27*, 263-278.

Spada, N. (1986). The interaction between types of contact and types of instruction: Some effects on the second language proficiency or adult learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 8*, 181-199.

Spada, N. (1985). Effects of informal contact on learners' L2 proficiency. *TESL Canada Journal 2*, 51-62.

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

# APPENDIX A

Interview Questions

1. Talking with friends

Do you have friends who are native speakers of English?

If yes,

How did you initiate the relationship?

How often do you meet them? (regular or irregular?)

What kinds of activities do you do together?

Where and when do you usually meet your friend?

How long do you usually meet your friend at a time?

On average, how much time do you actually speak with them at one meeting?

If no,

Do you want to make friends who are native speakers of English?

On average, how much time do you speak in English with your friends a day?

2. Talking at school

1) Classroom

How many classes are you taking?

Are your classes more lecture-style or group discussion?

How often do you talk to your classmates? (NS, Non-NSs, Same language groups?)

On average, how much time do you speak in English in the class a day?

2) Study Group

Do you join any study groups?

If yes,

How often do you join the study groups?

How long does it usually take?

How much time do you think do you usually speak in study group?

On average, how much time do you speak in English in your study group a day?

3) Visiting Professors

Do you go to see your professors during their office hours?

If yes,

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

How often?
How long do you speak with them?
On average, how much time do you speak in English with your professor a day?

4) Peer Talk

Do you often talk in English with your peers outside of classroom?
On average, how much time do you speak in English with your peer outside of classroom a day?

5) Break Time

What do you usually do during your break?
Who do you usually speak with in English during your break time?
On average, how much time do you speak in English during your break time?

6) Lunch Time

Who do you have lunch with?
If you have lunch with somebody,
What languages do you usually speak with him/her?
How much time do you think you usually speak in English during lunch time a day?
On average, how much time do you speak in English during lunch time a day?

7) Talking at Work

Are you employed on campus?
If yes,
What kind of job do you do?
How many hours a week do you work?
On average, how much time do you speak in English during working hours a day?

3. Talking at home

Who do you live with? (NS, Non-NSs, Same language groups?)
What language do you speak at home?
On average, how much time do you speak in English at home a day?

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

4. Talking on the phone

Who do you usually talk with on the phone?
What language do you usually speak on the phone?
How much do you speak on the phone?
On average, how much time do you speak in English on the phone a day?

5. Talking in social groups

Do you join any American social group?
    If yes,
    What kind of group do you join?
    What do you want to get from the group meeting?
    How often do you join the group? (regular or irregular?)
    How many hours at a time do you spend on group meeting?
    What kinds of activities do you do?
    If no,
    Do you want to join any group? (What kind of group?)
On average, how much time do you speak in English in your social group at a time?

6. Talking while shopping

How often do you go shopping?
Who do you usually go shopping with? (NS, Non-NSs, Same language groups?)
On average, how much do you speak in English going shopping at a time?

7. Eating out

How often do you eat out?
Who do you usually eat out with? (NS, Non-NSs, Same language groups?)
On average, how much time do you speak in English while eating out at a time?
Average time spent speaking in English a day
How much do you think you spoke in English yesterday?
On average, how much time a day do you speak in English?
Do you think you speak English enough? Why do you think so?

8. Self-evaluation of English use and interaction

How long have you been in America?

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre

Do you think your speaking ability in English improved? Why do you think so?
Do you think you speak in your native language more here or speak in English more?
Do you think you interact with NSs of English enough? Why do you think so?

9. Oral proficiency test preparation

What do you do in order to improve English? (study, interact with NS, watch TV, etc.)
How do you prepare to pass the SPEAK test?
Do you do your assignment at home from the language skills class such as exercises including the practice of pronunciation and intonation?
Do you practice English by yourself? If so, how do you do that?

**Examples in: English**
**Applicable Languages: English**
**Applicable Levels: College**

Seongwon Yun
English Communication, Division of Performative Humanities
Hanyang University
#309, College of Humanities, 17, Haengdang-dong, Seongdong-gu,
Seoul 133-791, S. Korea
Tel: 02-2220-2474 Fax: 02-2296-8557
Email: seongwony@hanyang.ac.kr

Received in July 15, 2011
Reviewed in August 20, 2011
Revised version received in September 15, 2011

교보문고 KYOBO Book Centre