İNSAN VE TOPLUM BİLİMLERİ
ARAŞTIRMALARI DERGİSİ
Cilt: 6, Sayı: 1, 2017
Sayfa: 571-590

Investigating High School Students' Use of Extramural English: A Scale Development Study

Abdullah COŞKUN
Assist. Prof. Dr., Abant Izzet Baysal University, School of Foreign Languages
coskun_a@ibu.edu.tr
Hakan Tahiri MUTLU
Res. Asst., Abant Izzet Baysal University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences

Abstract

For students learning English as a foreign language (EFL), using English outside the classroom is as important as participating in the classroom activities. By developing the Extramural English Use Scale, this study aims to explore the frequency of high school students' Extramural English (EE) in relation to the listening, speaking, reading and writing skills depending on different variables. 292 students in a state high school in Turkey were given the 5-point Likert type scale including 34 items, and the data were analyzed using SPSS 22.0. After the reliability and validity analysis, independent samples t-test, ANOVA and Pearson correlation analysis were used to reveal whether the frequency of EE use differs depending on the variables of gender, course selection and perceived English level. It was found that the frequency of EE use differs depending on these variables. It was also revealed that the frequency of EE use is low, and thus it is suggested that students should be encouraged to engage in EE activities.

Keywords: Extramural English, English as a Foreign Language

Lise Öğrencilerinin Sınıf Dışı İngilizce Kullanımlarının İncelenmesi: Bir Anket Geliştirme Çalışması

Öz

İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenenler için sınıf dışında İngilizceyi kullanmak sınıf içi etkinliklere katılmak kadar önemlidir. Bu çalışmanın amacı, Sınıf Dışı İngilizce Kullanma Ölçeğini geliştirerek lise öğrencilerinin dinleme, konuşma, okuma ve yazma becerileri ile ilgili sınıf dışı İngilizce kullanım sıklığını farklı değişkenler açısından incelemektir. Türkiye'deki bir devlet lisesinde eğitim gören 292 öğrenciye 34 maddeden oluşan 5'li Likert tipi bir ölçek verilmiştir ve veriler SPSS 22.0'de analiz edilmiştir. Ölçeğin geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik analizi yapıldıktan sonra, sınıf dışı İngilizce etkinliklere katılma sıklığının cinsiyet, ders seçimi ve algılanan İngilizce seviyesi değişkenlerine göre farklılık gösterip göstermediğini belirlemek için bağımsız örneklem t testi, ANOVA ve Pearson korelasyon analizleri kullanılmıştır. Sınıf dışı İngilizce kullanım sıklığının bu değişkenlere göre farklılık gösterdiği saptanmıştır. Ayrıca, öğrencilerin sınıf dışı İngilizce kullanım sıklığının düşük olduğu açığa çıkarılmıştır ve bu nedenle öğrencilerin sınıf dışında İngilizce etkinliklere katılması teşvik edilmelidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sınıf Dışı İngilizce, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce

1. Introduction

Even though the foreign language seems to be mostly learned in the classroom, the extracurricular leisure activities done outside of the classroom walls provide significant contribution to the foreign language learning process. It is often argued that when students engage in foreign language learning activities outside the classroom, their learning speed accelerates (Nunan & Richards, 2015). Also, being exposed to the foreign language outside the classroom means reinforcing the language learned in the classroom, and it is essential in terms of being aware of the foreign language used in everyday life.

Language learners are somehow involved in language learning activities outside the classroom. Sundqvist (2009, p.1) coined the term 'Extramural English' (EE) to refer to any type of English activities in which learners are exposed to English outside the classroom. There are many possibilities to engage in EE activities, such as reading English books (Pickard, 1996), watching English television programs (Brooks, 1992), reading English newspapers (Hyland, 2004), listening to English music (Jourdain, 1998) or radio (Freed, 1995), playing digital games (Sundqvist, 2009) and keeping an English diary (Tuan, 2010). As can be understood from this list, these activities are generally carried out for entertainment purposes outside the classroom, and at the same time, these leisure time activities are believed to help English learners to improve their language skills (Ibadurrahman, 2011).

Students who are successful in the English learning process are often reported to engage in EE activities in their daily life (Nunan & Richards, 2015; Lai & Gu, 2011; Borrero & Yeh, 2010; Sylvén, 2004; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2009). According to many researchers, being exposed to EE provides cognitive contribution to the foreign language learning process and motivates language learners to learn more (Victori & Lockhart; 1995; Wenden, 2001). In addition, it is emphasized that students should be directed to EE activities as a complement to the mainstream classroom activities (Vaughan, Nickle, Silovs, & Zimmer, 2011; Dörnyei & Skehan, 2003).

It is pointed out that the language learning process is an ongoing process to be continued outside the classroom (Hyland, 2004; Nunan, 1989; Sundqvist, 2009). Especially in today's world, where terms such as 'student autonomy' (Little, 2007; Thanasoulas, 2000; Reinders, 2010) and '21st Century Skills' (Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2015) are frequently mentioned, there is a need to learn a foreign language, to reach digital information by using it, and to be self-reliant in using this language in daily life. Therefore, students should be aware of the fact that learning English requires being exposed to it outside the classroom. They should also be encouraged to try a new mode of learning known as 'self-instruction' which is away from institutional controls such as grades, feedback and assessment, mandatory attendance, and

prescribed curricula (Takahashi, 2014). Echoing the benefits of out-of-class language learning, Takahashi (2014, p.164) underlines the following advantages of self-instruction: "... its capacity to provide ample input and many opportunities for practice because it happens outside the classroom without a time limit."

2. Extramural English in Different Contexts

Several studies have examined the relationship between EE activities and different language skills. For instance, there have been many studies dealing with the relationship between the use of English outside the classroom and vocabulary learning (Sundqvist, 2009; Sundqvist & Wikström, 2015; Webb & Rodgers, 2009), writing (Olsson, 2012), general English proficiency (Uuskoski, 2011; Freed, 1995), pronunciation (Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2009), speaking (Peterson, 2011) and translation skills (Kuppens, 2010). In country-based surveys, it is understood that the countries where students regularly use EE rank first in the English Proficiency Index reports each year (EF Education First, 2014, 2015, 2016). For example, in a study comparing the English learning contexts of eight European Union countries, the results regarding Sweden and Norway were found to be promising (The Swedish National Agency for Education, 2004). In the study, it was discovered that the English proficiency of the students in these countries is higher because of the high level of participation in EE activities in daily life.

In another study in Sweden, Larsson (2012) delved into the effect of EE activities on students' scores in the National Test of English and came to the conclusion that students who were not exposed to EE activities had the tendency to gain lower grades on the test than students who carried out EE activities more frequently. On the other hand, to attract attention to the benefits of EE activities, Richards (2015) refers to European countries where proficiency in English is very high (e.g., Finland) and moderately high (e.g., Italy) (EF Education First, 2015). He justifies the difference between countries on the same continent by suggesting that English movies on TV and cinemas in the northern countries are shown in English with subtitles while in other countries they are generally dubbed. Similarly, Sundqvist and Sylvén (2014) state that many advertisements in Sweden use English expressions to convey their message; therefore, many people are exposed to authentic English in their daily lives. However, in other EFL contexts, such as Japan, exposure to the target language is quite limited outside the classroom (Takahashi, 2014; Adachi, 2009).

As can be seen from the introduction and concise literature review above, the frequency of EE activities were explored in different countries (e.g., Finland, Sweden, Spain, Korea, Japan), and the impact of EE use on the English proficiency was investigated. However, to the best knowledge of the researchers, no studies have been carried out on this issue in Turkey. Moreover, studies in Turkey are more concerned with classroom learning

processes and concrete learning outputs as in most other EFL contexts (Sundqvist & Sylvén, 2014; Sylvén, 2004). As there is a need to explore the frequency of EE use in EFL contexts (Hyland, 2004; Palfreyman, 2006), the main purpose of the current study is to develop the 'Extramural English Use Scale' to investigate the frequency of high school students' EE use in relation to the four language skills (i.e., listening, speaking, reading and writing) and whether the frequency differs according to the variables of gender and course selection (i.e., science-oriented, foreign language-oriented, Turkish/Math-oriented). Additionally, as there is a lack of empirical research focusing on the relationship between EE use and English proficiency (Higgins, 2009), this study also aims to explore the relationship between the English levels perceived by students and the frequency of EE use in Turkey. In line with these aims, the following research questions were formulated:

1. How often do high school students participate in EE activities?
2. Does the frequency of participation in EE activities differ depending on the gender variable?
3. Does the frequency of participation in EE activities differ depending on the course selection variable?
4. Is there a significant relationship between perceived English levels and the frequency of EE activities?

3. Method

In this study, a 5-point Likert type scale was developed to reveal the frequency of high school students' EE activities. In order to develop the 'Extramural English Use Scale' including EE activities related to listening, speaking, reading and writing, the relevant literature was reviewed and similar scales were examined (Sargsyan & Kurghinyan, 2016; Sundqvist, & Sylvén, 2014; Pearson, 2004; Sundqvist, 2009; Hyland, 2004; Hoyt, 2015; Barbee, 2013; Olmedo, 2015; Lukkarinen, 2013; Toffoli & Sockett, 2010; Knight, 2007; Ocak & Hocaoğlu, 2014; Tonoian, 2014). Although there are many scales dealing with EE use, none of them categorize EE activities under basic language skills.

After the review of literature, the scale was developed. Feedback on the scale was obtained from an assessment and evaluation expert as well as a foreign language teaching expert. In line with feedback, necessary changes were made in the scale. Including four sub-dimensions and 34 items, the Likert-scale ratings for this instrument are as follows: 1 (never), 2 (rarely), 3 (sometimes), 4 (often) and 5 (always).

3.1. Participants

The high school where this study was carried out was chosen based on the convenience sampling among other Anatolian high schools in the city. Only the students who were available on the day of data collection participated in the study. Out of 292 students, 49.3% were female while the remaining 50.7% were male. Among the participants, 21.2% were in grade 9, 19.5% in grade 10, 34.6% in grade 11 and the remaining 24.7% were in grade 12. In terms of the optional courses students select starting from the 11th grade, 33.6% of them selected science-oriented courses, 19.5% selected Turkish/Math-oriented courses, and 6.2% selected foreign language-oriented courses. 9th and 10th grade students had not selected any optional courses.

3.2. Data Analysis

SPSS 22.0 was used in the analysis. First of all, the validity of the scale was shown by using exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis. Afterwards, the reliability of the scale was assessed by the Cronbach's alpha analysis used to determine internal consistency. Also, the mean, standard deviation, median, minimum and maximum values were calculated. T-test and ANOVA analyses were conducted to determine whether the frequency of EE use differs depending on the gender and course selection variables. Finally, Pearson correlation analysis was applied to find out the relationship between the frequency of EE use and perceived English level.

4. Validity and Reliability

4.1. Exploratory Factor Analysis

An exploratory factor analysis was performed to reveal the validity of the scale, and the results are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Exploratory Factor Analysis

KMO and Bartlett Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		,940
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	7586,257
	df	561
	Sig.	,000

Since the KMO coefficient is 0.940, the sample size in the survey is sufficient. As a result of the Bartlett's Test, the p (Sig.)=0.000<0.05 was found. In other words, the data set fulfilled the multiple normality assumption (Akgül-Çevik, 2003; Hair, Tatham, Anderson, & Black, 1998), and thus confirms the feasibility of factor analysis. The exploratory factor analysis of 34 items in the scale resulted in a four-factor structure. The factors emerging as a result of this analysis and the relevant findings are presented in Table 2 and Table 3.

Table 2. Scale's Total Variance Explained

	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	14,576	42,872	42,872	6,021	17,709	17,709
2	2,478	7,289	50,161	5,054	14,863	32,572
3	1,926	5,665	55,826	4,867	14,313	46,885
4	1,522	4,476	60,302	4,562	13,416	60,302
5	,988	3,393	63,695			
6	,953	2,803	66,498			
7	,901	2,651	69,148			
8	,860	2,530	71,678			
9	,768	2,258	73,936			
10	,747	2,196	76,132			
11	,716	2,105	78,238			
12	,657	1,933	80,170			
13	,615	1,809	81,979			
14	,584	1,719	83,698			
15	,538	1,583	85,281			
16	,489	1,437	86,718			
17	,471	1,384	88,102			
18	,442	1,300	89,402			
19	,425	1,250	90,652			
20	,403	1,186	91,837			
21	,368	1,081	92,919			
22	,325	,957	93,875			
23	,296	,871	94,747			
24	,290	,854	95,601			
25	,248	,730	96,331			
26	,225	,662	96,993			
27	,211	,620	97,612			
28	,188	,552	98,165			
29	,161	,472	98,637			
30	,129	,380	99,017			
31	,121	,357	99,374			
32	,085	,249	99,623			
33	,080	,236	99,859			
34	,048	,141	100,000			

The results of the exploratory factor analysis of the scale are illustrated in Table 2. From the table, it can be realized that there are 4 factors which are higher than the eigenvalue of 1. The variance explained by the first factor is 17.709; the variance explained by the second factor is 14.863; the variance explained by the third factor is 14.313, and the variance explained by the fourth factor is 13.416. The total variance explained was found to be 60.302%. The total variance explained is sufficient because it exceeds 50%.

Table 3. Scale's Rotated Component Matrix

Rotated Component Matrix					
		Component			
		1	2	3	4
R8	I play online video games that I think contribute to my English reading skills	,881			
R1	I read literary works in English (e.g., stories/novels)	,712			
R9	I use smart phone applications that I think contribute to my English reading skills	,701			
R3	I read English newspapers/magazines	,639			
R6	In social life, I read English texts that I do not understand and learn new words	,534			
R2	I read English comics	,519			
R5	I read English texts on different websites	,486			
R4	I read English texts on social media (e.g., Facebook)	,456			
R10	I read English manuals and product descriptions	,411			
R7	On the Internet, I use search engines in English	,379			
W7	I play online video games that I think contribute to my English writing skills		,816		
W5	I write to native English speakers via internet		,753		
W6	I write English stories/compositions		,647		
W3	I write English e-mails		,644		
W1	I keep an English diary		,626		
W8	I use smart phone applications that I think contribute to my English writing skills		,613		
W2	I write English comments on foreign social sharing platforms		,603		
W4	I send English messages to my friends (e.g., SMS/WhatsApp)		,539		
S6	I play online video games that I think contribute to my English speaking skills			,858	
S1	I speak to native English speakers via internet			,752	
S7	I use smart phone applications that I think contribute to my English speaking skills			,699	
S4	I attend an English course to have speaking practice			,632	
S3	I speak English with foreign tourists in social life			,535	
S2	I speak English with my friends			,501	
S5	I participate in overseas programs to improve my English speaking			,428	
L8	I play online video games that I think contribute to my English listening skills				,844
L6	I listen to English music				,745
L7	I listen to the lyrics of English songs and learn their meaning				,727
L4	I watch English videos and clips (e.g., Youtube)				,639
L9	I use smart phone applications that I think contribute to my English listening skills				,634
L1	I watch English movies/series/animations in Turkish subtitles				,591
L3	I watch English channels				,560
L5	I listen to English radio				,516
L2	I watch English movies/series/animations with subtitles				,363

To apply the confirmatory factor analysis, it is necessary to have at least three variables that measure each latent variable. In addition, the factor weight should be 0.30 and above (Kalaycı, 2010). The results of the analysis on Table 3 show that the scale has structural validity.

4.2. Naming Factors

The emerging factors need to be given names. This naming process is based on the common feature of the variables in the factor (Nakip, 2006). The following are the four factors obtained from the exploratory factor analysis and the appropriate names for these factors.

Table 4. Naming Factors

Item No	
	Factor 1: Reading
R8	I play online video games that I think contribute to my English reading skills
R1	I read literary works in English (e.g., stories/novels)
R9	I use smart phone applications that I think contribute to my English reading skills
R3	I read English newspapers/magazines
R6	In social life, I read English texts that I do not understand and learn new words
R2	I read English comics
R5	I read English texts on different websites
R4	I read English texts on social media (e.g., Facebook)
R10	I read English manuals and product descriptions
R7	On the Internet, I use search engines in English
	Factor 2: Writing
W7	I play online video games that I think contribute to my English writing skills
W5	I write to native English speakers via Internet
W6	I write English stories/compositions
W3	I write English e-mails
W1	I keep an English diary
W8	I use smart phone applications that I think contribute to my English writing skills
W2	I write English comments on foreign social sharing platforms
W4	I send English messages to my friends (e.g., SMS/WhatsApp)
	Factor 3: Speaking
S6	I play online video games that I think contribute to my English speaking skills
S1	I speak to native English speakers via Internet
S7	I use smart phone applications that I think contribute to my English speaking skills
S4	I attend an English course to have speaking practice
S3	I speak English with foreign tourists in social life
S2	I speak English with my friends
S5	I participate in overseas programs to improve my English speaking skills
	Factor 4: Listening
L8	I play online video games that I think contribute to my English listening skills
L6	I listen to English music
L7	I listen to the lyrics of English songs and learn their meaning
L4	I watch English videos and clips (e.g., Youtube)
L9	I use smart phone applications that I think contribute to my English listening skills
L1	I watch English movies/ series/animations in Turkish subtitles
L3	I watch English channels
L5	I listen to English radio
L2	I watch English movies/series/animations with subtitles

4.3. Cronbach's alpha Analysis

Cronbach's alpha coefficient values for each factor of the 'Extramural English Use Scale' were calculated to assess the reliability of the scale.

Table 5. Cronbach's alpha coefficient values

	Factor 1: Reading	Factor 2: Writing	Factor 3: Speaking	Factor 4: Listening	Overall
N of Items	10	8	7	9	34
Cronbach α	0,90	0,85	0,79	0,84	0,95

Table 5 shows that each factor of the scale has reliability with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient value, the lowest of which is 0.79. The scale was found to have internal reliability as a whole with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient value of 0.95.

5. Findings

The findings are presented under each relevant research question below.

1. How often do high school students participate in EE activities?

Table 6. Mean Scores

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Writing	292	1,00	5,00	2,0531	,84574
Listening	292	1,00	5,00	3,0000	,89474
Speaking	292	1,00	5,00	2,0925	,81798
Reading	292	1,00	5,00	2,3658	,96818

Considering the mean sores in the sub-dimensions of the scale in Table 6, it is realized that the students marked 'rarely' for the writing, reading and speaking sub-dimensions, and 'sometimes' for the listening sub-dimension. It is also understood that participants mostly performed listening activities, whereas the activities that were the least frequent among the participants were related to the writing skill. The ranking from the most frequent to the least frequent type of EE activity can be summarized as follows: 'listening'> 'reading'> 'speaking'> 'writing'.

2. Does the frequency of participation in EE activities differ depending on the gender variable?

In order to seek an answer to this research question, t-test was used because there are two variables that belong to gender.

Table 7. Independent Sample T-test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means				
	F	**Sig.**	**t**	**df**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	**Mean Difference**	**Std. Error Difference**
Writing	3,332	,069	3,672	290	,000	,35597	,09694
			3,665	282,09	,000	,35597	,09713
Listening	,011	,915	,160	290	,873	,01675	,10491
			,160	288,94	,873	,01675	,10495
Speaking	1,625	,203	2,681	290	,008	,25405	,09474
			2,677	284,53	,008	,25405	,09489
Reading	,067	,796	2,034	290	,043	,22924	,11272
			2,032	287,78	,043	,22924	,11282
Total	,579	,447	2,253	290	,025	,21400	,09497
			2,251	287,04	,025	,21400	,09506

As a result of the t-test presented in Table 7, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference depending on the gender variable in the skills with a p-value (sig.) less than 0.05. The frequency of EE use related to 'writing', 'speaking' and 'reading' skills differs depending on the gender variable while there is no significant difference for the 'listening' skill. Significant difference was also revealed in terms of the total scores of EE frequency depending on gender.

Table 8. Mean Scores and Standard Deviation by Gender

Gender		Writing	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Total
Female	Mean	2,2335	3,0085	2,2212	2,4819	2,4863
	Std. Deviation	,88515	,91115	,85395	,99204	,84124
Male	Mean	1,8775	2,9917	1,9672	2,2527	2,2723
	Std. Deviation	,76868	,88150	,76362	,93390	,78111

The mean scores of EE use frequency presented in Table 8 illustrate that the girls participate more in writing, speaking and reading-related EE activities, and their total EE use frequency is higher than that of boys. On the other hand, as far as the listening-related EE activities are concerned, the average score was found approximately the same.

3. Does the frequency of participation in EE activities differ depending on the course selection variable?

To find an answer to this research question, ANOVA was used because there are more than two variables in terms of course selection.

Table 9. ANOVA Analysis

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Writing	Between Groups	26,164	3	8,721	13,802	,000
	Within Groups	181,982	288	,632		
	Total	208,146	291			
Listening	Between Groups	16,768	3	5,589	7,446	,000
	Within Groups	216,195	288	,751		
	Total	232,963	291			
Speaking	Between Groups	26,505	3	8,835	15,128	,000
	Within Groups	168,202	288	,584		
	Total	194,708	291			
Reading	Between Groups	34,018	3	11,339	13,678	,000
	Within Groups	238,759	288	,829		
	Total	272,778	291			
Total	Between Groups	25,295	3	8,432	14,375	,000
	Within Groups	168,935	288	,587		
	Total	194,231	291			

As a result of the ANOVA test illustrated in Table 9, depending on the courses selected by the students, there is a significant difference in the frequency of EE activities related to skills with a p-value (sig.) less than 0.05. Therefore, it is decided at the 5% significance level that the frequency of all the EE activities (i.e., writing, reading, speaking, listening and total) differ based on the optional courses selected by the students starting from the 11th grade.

Multiple comparisons were made to determine which selected courses the difference results from.

Table 10. Tukey Multiple Comparison Test

	(I) Major	(J) Major	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Writing	Science	Turkish-Math	-,07118	,13241	,950
		Foreign Language	-1,09311*	,20384	,000
	Turkish-Math	Science	,07118	,13241	,950
		Foreign Language	-1,02193*	,21492	,000
	Foreign Language	Science	1,09311*	,20384	,000
		Turkish-Math	1,02193*	,21492	,000
Listening	Science	Turkish-Math	,02327	,14433	,999
		Foreign Language	-,87894*	,22218	,001
	Turkish-Math	Science	-,02327	,14433	,999
		Foreign Language	-,90221*	,23425	,001
	Foreign Language	Science	,87894*	,22218	,001
		Turkish-Math	,90221*	,23425	,001
Speaking	Science	Turkish-Math	-,02519	,12730	,997
		Foreign Language	-1,05151*	,19597	,000
	Turkish-Math	Science	,02519	,12730	,997
		Foreign Language	-1,02632*	,20662	,000
	Foreign Language	Science	1,05151*	,19597	,000
		Turkish-Math	1,02632*	,20662	,000
Reading	Science	Turkish-Math	-,10985	,15167	,887
		Foreign Language	-1,33821*	,23349	,000
	Turkish-Math	Science	,10985	,15167	,887
		Foreign Language	-1,22836*	,24617	,000
	Foreign Language	Science	1,33821*	,23349	,000
		Turkish-Math	1,22836*	,24617	,000
Total	Science	Turkish-Math	-,04574	,12758	,984
		Foreign Language	-1,09044*	,19640	,000
	Turkish-Math	Science	,04574	,12758	,984
		Foreign Language	-1,04470*	,20707	,000
	Foreign Language	Science	1,09044*	,19640	,000
		Turkish-Math	1,04470*	,20707	,000

In Table 10, the variables with a p (sig.) value of less than 0.05 are the variables that cause the difference in the frequency of EE use. Thus, there are significant differences between the students who selected foreign language-oriented courses and those who selected other courses in terms of writing, speaking and total EE use frequency. Also, from the differences among the mean scores, it can be realized that the students who participate in writing and speaking-related EE activities are mostly those who selected foreign language-oriented courses. Their total EE use is also higher than their counterparts who selected other courses.

4. Is there a significant relationship between perceived English levels and the frequency of EE activities?

In an attempt to reveal the relationship between the frequency of EE use and perceived English level, students' perceived English levels were analyzed first. Afterwards, Pearson correlation analysis was used, and the Pearson's correlation coefficient was calculated. Finally, the mean scores were examined.

Table 11. Students' Perceived English Levels

English Levels	N	%
Low	75	25,7
Medium	146	50,0
Good	64	21,9
Like a native speaker	7	2,4

As can be realized from Table 11, 25.7% of the students indicate that their English level is low while half of them believe that their level is medium. On the other hand, 21.9% of the participants state that their English is good, whereas only 2.4% feel that their English is like their mother tongue.

Table 12. The Relationship between EE use and English Level: Pearson Correlation

		EE Use (Total)	Writing	Listening	Speaking	Reading
Perceived English Level	Pearson Correlation	,598	,591	,508	,572	,550
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000

All the p (sig.) values in Table 12 are less than 0.05, and thus there is a significant relationship between the perceived English level and the frequency of EE use. There is a moderate level of significant and positive correlation between the English level and the frequency of EE use (related to writing, listening, speaking, reading and total). According to these results, it can be inferred that the increase in frequency of EE use may affect the increase in the perceived English level.

Table 13. Mean Values of EE Use by Perceived English Levels

Students' Perceived English Levels		Writing	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Total
Low	Mean	1,4433	2,3541	1,4629	1,6733	1,7334
	Std. Deviation	,62137	,67997	,56406	,70026	,58604
Medium	Mean	1,9872	3,0259	2,0783	2,3432	2,3586
	Std. Deviation	,67908	,83465	,67843	,84681	,67981
Good	Mean	2,7754	3,5868	2,7589	3,0687	3,0475
	Std. Deviation	,75435	,74456	,77450	,87376	,69707
Like a native speaker	Mean	3,3571	4,0159	3,0408	3,8286	3,5606
	Std. Deviation	,71235	,59982	,59883	,54380	,50028

From Table 13 illustrating the mean frequencies of EE use according to the English levels perceived by the students, it can be concluded that participation in EE activities increases as the perceived English level increases. As the English level increased, the most noticeable increase was found in the frequency of EE activities related to the listening skill, and this is followed by the EE activities related to the reading skill. For this reason, it would be fair to state that the increase in reading and listening-related EE activities is more likely to lead to an increase in the perceived English level.

6. Discussion and Suggestion

By developing the 'Extramural English Use Scale', this study examined the frequency of high school students' speaking, writing, listening and reading-related English use outside the classroom in terms of different variables.

The first research question of the study was 'How often do high school students participate in EE activities?' Analyzing the relevant data, the researchers came to the conclusion that students 'rarely' took part in writing, reading and speaking-related EE activities while they 'sometimes' participate in the listening-related EE activities. As can be understood from this finding, the frequency of EE use was generally low in the context of the study. Given the positive contribution of EE activities to the language learning process (Sundqvist, 2009; Sundqvist & Wikström 2015; Webb & Rodgers, 2009; Olsson, 2012; Uuskoski, 2011; Freed, 1995; Hyland, 2004; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2009; Peterson, 2011; Kuppens, 2010), students in the context of this study need to be directed to EE activities.

It was also revealed that the participants mostly took part in listening-related EE activities and the 'listening' activities were followed by 'reading', 'speaking' and 'writing' activities respectively. As can be inferred from this sequence of skills, the frequency of EE use related to receptive skills (i.e., listening and reading) is higher than the frequency of EE use related to productive skills (i.e., speaking and writing). Regarding this finding, Sundqvist (2009) argues that the speaking and writing-related EE activities are more useful for language development than the activities performed only by reading or listening. In other words, the importance of activities that require writing or verbal communication in English is emphasized. Although watching English TV channels/movies and English reading contributes to learning English vocabulary (Webb & Rodgers, 2009; Nation, 2013; Cobb, 2007; Olsson, 2012), EE activities (e.g., playing computer games) that improve speaking and writing skills are more effective in the English language learning process (Sylvén & Sundqvist, 2012; Peterson, 2011).

The second research question was 'Does the frequency of participation in EE activities differ depending on the gender variable?' Pertaining to this research question, it was uncovered that female students are more frequently involved in EE activities than boys. Likewise, it was discovered in another study that girls take part in EE activities more actively than boys,

especially to socialize on the Internet (Dufour et al., 2016). A statistically significant difference in terms of the frequency of EE use was also found between boys and girls by Grau (2009). In some other studies, it was also concluded that male language learners are more likely to participate in EE activities than their female counterparts (Sylvén, 2004; Olsson, 2012; The Swedish Media Council, 2010). Conversely, in another study, no significant relationship was revealed between gender and EE activities (Shen, Tseng, Kuo, Su, & Chen, 2005).

The third and the fourth research questions were as follows: 'Does the frequency of participation in EE activities differ depending on the course selection variable?' and 'Is there a significant relationship between perceived English levels and the frequency of EE activities?' Related to the third research question, it was found that the students who selected foreign language-oriented courses participate more frequently in EE activities than other students. As for the fourth research question, it was revealed that as the perceived English level increases, participation in EE activities also appears to increase. Numerous studies have also shown that learners' exposure to the foreign language outside the classroom positively influences their foreign language development (Nunan & Richards, 2015; Lai & Gu, 2011; Sylvén 2004; Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2009; Sundqvist & Sylvén, 2016; Uuskoski, 2011; Peterson, 2011; Sundqvist 2009, Piirainen-Marsh & Tainio, 2009; Oscarson & Apelgren, 2005).

Based on the above findings and the relevant discussion, the following suggestions can be made to the teachers, parents and researchers:

- Now that supporting learners to construct quality extramural language learning experiences is vital (Stickler & Emke, 2011), it is recommended that English teachers should take on the responsibility for encouraging the students to take part in EE activities. To do this, Henry (2013) advises teachers to think about the type of EE activities that can contribute to the learning process of their students and to lead students to EE activities by considering their age, gender and interests. Henry also argues that students' awareness of EE activities can be raised by bringing out-of-class activities (e.g., watching English TV programs) into the classroom as authentic materials. It can also be suggested that teachers should tell the students how to improve their English outside the classroom themselves at the beginning of the term. Moreover, teachers can prepare a list of EE activities to share with their students. It may also be advisable for students to keep dairies to write down their EE activities every day. From time to time, these dairies can be collected to check how often they involve in EE activities, and necessary suggestions can be made for each student.

- Parents can take an active role in encouraging students to engage in EE activities. As Gao (2006) suggests, if the parents are curious about foreign languages, become role models for their children in terms of language

learning outside the classroom and participate in language learning activities with their children, it will become easier for the student to get accustomed to engaging in EE activities.

- Researchers who would like to carry out further research related to EE can use the scale developed in this study. Furthermore, the scale developed for the EFL context of Turkey can be easily adapted for contexts where other languages are learned as foreign languages. Since this study is quantitative, researchers who would like to study EE may also collect qualitative data by conducting interviews with students. Additionally, as this study is only limited to students' perceived English levels, it can be recommended that reliable and valid English proficiency tests can be administered to students to determine the relationship between students' EE use and their English levels. Finally, by carrying out experimental studies, researchers can investigate whether there are differences in the English levels of two groups of students who are exposed and not exposed to EE activities.

References

Adachi, R. (2009). Motivation of English Learning and Intercultural Communication: a Case of Japanese College Students. *Bulletin of Universities and Institutes*, 37, 119-143.

Akgül, A. & Çevik, O. (2003). *İstatistiksel Analiz Teknikleri.* Emek Ofset, Ankara.

Barbee, M. (2013). Extracurricular L2 input in a Japanese EFL context: Exposure, attitudes, and motivation. *Second Language Studies*, 32(1), 1-58.

Borrero, N. & Yeh. C. J. (2010). Ecological English language learning among ethnic minority youth. *Educational Researchers*, 39, 571-581.

Brooks, F. B. (1992). Communicative competence and the conversation course: A social interaction perspective. *Linguistics and Education*, 4(2), 219-46.

Cobb, T. (2007). Computing the vocabulary demands of L2 reading. *Language Learning & Technology,* 11(3), 38-63.

Dörnyei, Z. & Skehan, P. (2003). Individual farks in second language learning. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 589-630). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Dufour, M., Brunelle, N., Tremblay, J., Leclerc, D., Cousineau, M., Khazaal, Y., Légaré, A., Rousseau, M., & Berbiche, D. (2016). Gender Difference in Internet Use and Internet Problems among Quebec High School Students. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*. 61(10), 663-668.

EF Education First. (2014, 2015, 2016). *EF EPI English proficiency index*. Retrieved from http://www.ef.com.tr/epi/regions/europe/

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: John Benjamins.

Gao, X. (2006). Strategies Used by Chinese Parents to Support English Language Learning. *RELC*, 37(3), 285-298.

Grau, M. (2009). Worlds apart? English in German youth cultures and in educational settings. *World Englishes,* 28(2), 160-174.

Hair, J. F., Tatham, R. L., Anderson, R. E., & Black W. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Prentice Hall, New York.

Higgins, C. (2009). Language in and out of the classroom: Connecting contexts of language use with learning and teaching practices. *Language Teaching*, 42(3), 401-403.

Hoyt, B. (2015). *Out-of-class activities and ELT pedagogy: autonomous homework with a teacher.* MA thesis. College of Arts and Law of the University of Birmingham.

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

Ibadurrahman, I. (2011). *Out-of-class language learning: Case study of Indonesian senior high students in Bandung.* Retrieved from: http://www.slideshare.net/IhsanIbadurrahman/lit-review-10281266

Jourdain, R. (1998). *Music, the brain, and ecstasy: How music captures our imagination*. New York: Harper Collins.

Kalaycı, Ş. (2010). *SPSS Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli İstatistik Teknikleri.* Asil Yayınları, Ankara.

Knight, T. L. (2007). *Beyond the Classroom Walls: A Study of Out of Class English Use by Adult Community College ESL Students*. MA thesis, Portland State University.

Kuppens, A. H. (2010). Incidental foreign language acquisition from media exposure. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 35(1), 65–85.

Lai, C. & Gu, M. (2011). Self-regulated out-of-class language learning with technology. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 24(4), 317-335.

Larsson, B. (2012). *English out-of-school activities: A way of integrating outwards?* MA thesis. University of Gävle, Gävle.

Little, D. (2007). Language learner autonomy: Some fundamental considerations revisited. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 14-29.

Lukkarinen, M. (2013). *Aiming at the English language proficiency objectives of the national core curriculum for basic education through video games.* Retrieved from http://herkules.oulu.fi/thesis/nbnfioulu-201305201301.pSerb

Nakip, M. (2006). *Pazarlama Araştırmaları: Teknikler ve SPSS destekli uygulamalar.* Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Understanding language classrooms*. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.

Nunan, D. & Richards, J. C. (2015). *Language Learning Beyond the Classroom*. New York and Oxford: Routledge.

Ocak, G. & Hocaoğlu, N. (2014). Öğrencilerin İnternet Ortamında İngilizce Kullanmalarına Yönelik Tutumları. *Afyon Kocatepe University Journal of Social Sciences*. 16(1), 1-30.

Olmedo, M. I. (2015). *English Language Learning beyond the Classroom Walls*. MA thesis. Barcelona: Univesitat de Barcelona.

Olsson, E. (2012). *Everything I read on the Internet is in English*. On the impact of extramural English on Swedish 16-year-old pupils' writing proficiency. Göteborg: Gothenburg University.

Oscarson, M. & Apelgren, B. M. (2005). *Nationella utvärderingen av grundskolan 2003. Engelska år 9.* Ämnesrapport 251. Stockholm: Skolverket.

Palfreyman, D. (2006). Social context and resources for language learning. *System*, 34(3), 352-370.

Partnership for 21st Century Learning. (2015). *P21 Framework Definitions*. Retrieved from http://www.p21.org/storage/documents/docs/P21_Framework_Definitions_New_Logo_2015.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.* Paper presented at the Independent Learning Conference 2003, Melbourne, Australia.

Peterson, M. (2011). Digital gaming and second language development: Japanese learners interactions in a MMORPG. *Digital Culture & Education*, 3(1), 56-73.

Pickard, N. (1996). Out-of-class language learning strategies. *English Teaching Journal*, 50, 150-59.

Piirainen-Marsh, A. & Tainio, L. (2009). Other-repetition as a resource for participation in the activity of playing a video game. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(2), 153-169.

Reinders, H. (2010). Towards a classroom pedagogy for learner autonomy: A framework of independent language learning skills. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(5), 40-55.

Richards, J. C. (2015). The Changing Face of Language Learning: Learning Beyond the Classroom. *RELC Journal*, 46(1), 5-22.

Sargsyan, M. & Kurghinyan, A. (2016). The use of English language outside the classroom. J*ournal of Language and Cultural Education*, 4(1), 29-47.

Shen, L., Tseng, C., Kuo, S., Su, Y., & Chen, M. (2005). A Preliminary Study of College Students' Out-of-Class English Learning Activities. *CHIA-NAN ANNUAL BULLETIN,* 31, 464-475.

Stickler, U. & Emke, M. (2011). Tandem learning in virtual spaces: Supporting non-formal and informal learning in adults. In P. Benson & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Beyond the language classroom* (pp.146-160). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sundqvist, P. (2009) *Extramural English matters: Out-of-school English and its impact on Swedish ninth graders' oral proficiency and vocabulary*. PhD thesis, Karlstad: Karlstad University Studies.

Sundqvist, P. & Sylvén, L. (2014). Language-related computer use: Focus on young L2 English learners in Sweden. *ReCALL*, 26(1), 3–20.

Sundqvist, P. & Wikström, P. (2015). Out-of-school digital gameplay and in-school L2 English vocabulary outcomes. *System*, 51, 65–76.

Sylvén, L. (2004). *Teaching in English or English teaching? On the effects of content and language integrated learning on Swedish learners' incidental vocabulary acquisition.* Gothenburg, Sweden: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Takahashi, C. K. (2014). Second Language Self-Instruction: Definitions and Characteristics. *Intercultural Communication Review*, 12, 157-165.

Thanasoulas, D. (2000). What is learner autonomy and how can it be fostered? *The Internet Journal,* 6(11).

The Swedish National Agency for Education. (2004). *Engelska i åtta europeiska länder: En undersökning av ungdomars kunskaper och uppfattningar (Rapport 242)* Stockholm: Skolverket.

Toffoli, D. & Sockett, G. (2010). How non-specialist students of English practice informal learning using web 2.0 tools. *Asp*, 58, 125–144.

Tonoian, L. (2014). *English language learning inside and outside the classroom in Portugal.* MA thesis, University of Lisbon.

Tuan, L. T. (2010). Enhancing EFL learners' writing skill via journal writing. *English Language Teaching*, 3(3), 80-81.

Uuskoski, O. (2011). *Playing video games: A waste of time…or not?- Exploring the connection between playing video games and English grades.* Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.

Vaughan, N., Nickle, T., Silovs, J., & Zimmer, J. (2011). Moving to their own beat: Exploring how students use Web 2.0 technologies to support group work outside of class time. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 10(3), 113-127.

Victori, M. & Lockhart, W. (1995). Enhancing metacognition in self-directed language learning. *System*, 23(2), 223-234.

Webb, S. & Rodgers, M. P. H. (2009). Vocabulary Demands of Television Programs. *Language Learning*, 59(2), 335-366.

Wenden, A. (2001). Metacognitive knowledge. In Breen, M.P. (Ed.), L*earner contributions to language learning. New Directions in Research* (pp. 44-64). Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.