

**REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
SAKARYA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

**EFFECTS OF CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES ON SECOND
LANGUAGE LEARNERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

MASTER THESIS

MOHAMMAD KAZEM

SUPERVISOR

ASSIST. PROF. DR. MEHMET KAYA

JUNE 2016

**REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
SAKARYA UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

**EFFECTS OF CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES ON SECOND
LANGUAGE LEARNERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

MASTER THESIS

MOHAMMAD KAZEM

SUPERVISOR

ASSIST. PROF. DR. MEHMET KAYA

JUNE 2016

DECLARATION

I declare that the prepared thesis is my own work and all academic ethics are considered, quotes and sources regarding the topics are referenced in this work.

Signature

Mohammad Kazem

SIGNATURES OF THE JURY MEMBERS

This master's degree dissertation titled "Effects of Co-curricular Activities on Second Language Learners in Higher Education" prepared in the Department of Higher Education, has been accepted and approved by the jury.

President: (Signature)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mübin KIYICI

Member: (Signature)

(Advisor) Assist. Prof. Dr. Mehmet KAYA

Member: (Signature)

Assist. Prof. Dr. Filiz GÜLTEKİN

I confirm that the above names and signatures belong to the faculty members.

14.6/2016

Signature



Assoc. Prof. Dr. Halil İbrahim SAĞLAM

Director of the Institute

PREFACE

Today, almost all of the higher education institutions are opening second language learning departments and a large number of students are officially learning a foreign language as their second language. In addition, in the current mobile and evolving educational system, higher education professionals are searching for more effective and better methods of learning and teaching for improved and productive educational system inside their institutions. Among all curriculum types, co-curricular activities are one of the youngest methods that enable students to take part actively in learning process. Furthermore, a special branch under the name of student development is opened in some higher education institutions to organize and facilitate co-curricular activities for learners. This study focuses to investigate the effect of co-curricular activities on second language learns in higher education context specially it tries to find the influence of these activities on four main skills, listening, reading, speaking and writing, of the language.

I would like to deeply thank and appreciate Mr Assist. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali Hamedođlu, and Mr Assist. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Kaya for their useful directions, assistance and supervising my dissertation. In addition, I would also like to thank my dear friends, Ali Mert Erdođan, Özgür Taşcı, and Abbas Çakır for their assistance during my thesis.

Mohammad Kazem

Sakarya – 2016

ABSTRACT

EFFECTS OF CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES ON SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

KAZEM, Mohammad

Master Thesis, Department of Educational Science

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Mehmet KAYA

May 2016. xvi + 94 Pages.

Second language learning (L2) is seen in most of the higher education institutions and co-curricular activities as the outside-classroom activities performed and practiced by students or learners are considered extremely important for developing academic skills and experiences of the students. The aim of this study is to evaluate the effects of co-curricular activities on second language learners in higher education. This research measures out the influence of these activities on four main language skills: listening, reading, speaking and writing in Sakarya University. To evaluate this process, a quantitative research model was conducted with the participation of 153 student of Sakarya University both from department of English Language Teaching and School of Foreign Languages. The survey result was analysed applying T-test, correlation test and descriptive statistics test. The survey was combined of four main sections: listening, writing, speaking and reading and there were 34 quantifiers in the questionnaire plus 19 sub skill belonging to four mentioned main skills, listening, reading, speaking and writing. The outcome of the study shows that there were significant relationships between activities and the skills.

Keywords: Second Language Learning, Co-Curricular Activities, Higher Education

ÖZET

DERS DIŐI ETKİNLİKLERİN YABANCI DİL ÖĞRENMEYE ETKİSİ

KAZEM, Mohammad

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Eğitim Bilimleri Ana Bilim Dalı

Danışman: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mehmet KAYA

Mayıs 2016. xvi + 94 Sayfa.

İkinci dil öğrenimi çoğu yükseköğretim kurumunda görülmektedir ve dil öğrenmekte olan kişiler tarafından gerçekleştirilen, müfredat dışı aktiviteler olarak da bilinen ders dışı etkinlikler akademik beceri ve tecrübe kazanmada son derece önemli olarak nitelendirilir. Bu çalışmanın amacı yükseköğretimde ders dışı etkinliklerin ikinci bir dil öğrenimi üzerindeki etkilerini değerlendirmektir. Sakarya Üniversitesi'nde yapılan bu araştırmada, bahsedilen etkinliklerin dinleme, okuma, konuşma ve yazmadan oluşan temel dil becerileri üzerindeki etkileri incelenmiştir. Bu süreci değerlendirmek için Sakarya Üniversitesi'nin İngilizce Öğretmenliği bölümünde ve Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu'nda öğrenim gören toplam 153 kişinin katılımıyla nicel bir araştırma modeli uygulanmıştır. Anket sonuçları T testi, bağıntı testi ve betimleyici istatistik testi gibi testler uygulanarak analiz edilmiştir. Anket, dinleme, yazma, konuşma ve okumadan meydana gelen dört ana bölümün birleştirilmesiyle oluşturulmuştur ve bu bölümlerle ilgili olarak 34 değişken ve 19 alt beceri bulunmaktadır. Yapılan bu çalışmanın sonuçları aktiviteler ile beceriler arasında belirgin bir ilişkinin var olduğunu göstermiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İkinci Dil Öğrenimi, Ders Dışı Etkinlikler, Yükseköğretim

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	iv
Signature of the Jury Members	v
Preface	vi
Abstract	vii
Özet	viii
Table of Contents	ix
List of Tables	xiv
List of Figures	xvi
Chapter I, Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of the Study	3
1.2 Research Question.....	4
1.3 Research Sub-questions	4
1.4 Significance of the Study	4
1.5 Limitations of the Study.....	5
1.6 Definitions	5
1.7 Abbreviations	6
Chapter II, Literature Review	7
2.1 Curriculum Overview.....	7
2.1.1 Quality Development of Curriculum.	9
2.1.2 Explicit curriculum.....	10

2.1.3 Implicit curriculum	11
2.1.4 Hidden curriculum	11
2.1.5 Procedure of Curriculum	12
2.2 Introduction to Extra-Curriculum	12
2.3 Theoretical Approaches towards Second Language Learning and Co-Curriculum Activities	13
2.3.1 Creative Construction Theory or the Naturalistic Approach	14
2.3.2. Communicative Language Teaching.....	16
2.3.3 The Cognitive Approach.....	17
2.3.4 Language Transfer	18
2.3.5 Interaction Hypothesis and Comprehensible Output Hypothesis	19
2.3.6 Language Proficiency.....	20
2.3.7 Co-curricular Activities.	23
2.3.7.1 Theories of Learning	27
2.3.7.2 Chickering’s Theoretical Framework	32
Chapter III, Methodology.....	36
3.1 Research Model.....	36
3.2 Site Selection and Sampling.....	36
3.3 Data Collection Tools	36
3.4 Data Collection.....	37
3.5 Data Analysis.	38
Chapter IV, Findings.	39

4.1 Demographical Statistics about Participants	39
4.2 The Relationship among Activities Frequency	40
4.3 Homogeneity and Heterogeneity of Distribution and Contribution of Activities in Listening Section.....	41
4.4 Homogeneity and Heterogeneity of Distribution and Contribution of Activities in Reading Section	43
4.5 Homogeneity and Heterogeneity of Distribution and Contribution of Activities in Speaking Section.....	45
4.6 Homogeneity and Heterogeneity of Distribution and Contribution of Activities in Writing Section	46
4.7 T-Test Results of the Listening Section	48
4.7.1 T-Test Result of Listening Frequency According to Departments	48
4.7.2 T-test Result of Effect on Understanding the Main Idea According to Departments	49
4.7.3 T-Test Result of Effect on Understanding Details According to Department ..	50
4.7.4 T-Test Result of Effect on Accent Familiarization According to Departments.....	51
4.7.5 T-Test Result of Effect on predicting discussion direction according to Departments	52
4.8 T-Test Results of the Reading Section.....	53
4.8.1 T-Test Result of Reading Frequency According To Departments.....	53
4.8.2 T-Test Result of Effect on Vocabulary Building According To Departments .	54

4.8.3 T-Test Result of Effect on Skimming and Scanning According To Departments	55
4.8.4 T-Test Result of Effect on Text Summarizing According To Departments	56
4.8.5 T-Test Result of Effect on Reading for Main Idea According To Departments	57
4.8.6 T-Test Result of Effect on Reading for Details According To Departments.....	58
4.8.7 T-Test Result of Effect on note-taking according to Departments	59
4.9 T-Test Results of the Speaking Section	60
4.9.1 T-Test Result of Speaking Frequency According to Departments	60
4.9.2 T-Test Result of Effect on Fluency According to Departments	61
4.9.3 T-Test Result of Effect on Speaking with Expand Description According to Departments	62
4.9.4. T-Test Result of Effect on Pronunciation and Intonation According to Departments	63
4.9.5 T-Test Result of Effect on Grammatical Structure in Speaking According to Departments	64
4.10 T-Test Results of the Writing Section.....	65
4.10.1 T-Test Result of Writing Frequency According to Departments.....	65
4.10.2 T-Test Result of Effect on Timed-Writing According to Departments	66
4.10.3 T-Test Result of Effect on Using Signal Words According to Departments..	67
4.10.4 T-Test Result of Effect on Outlining According to Departments	68
4.10.5 T-Test Result of Effect on Sentence & Word Variety in Writing According to Departments	69

4.10.6 T-Test Result of Effect on Identifying Relevant Ideas According to Departments	70
Chapter V, Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations	71
5.1 Discussion	71
5.2 Conclusions	74
5.3 Recommendations	75
References	77
Appendices	89
Appendix-1. Survey Questionnaire	89
Appendix-2. Survey Permission Letter	93
Background and contact information	94

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Demographical Statistics of the Participants	39
Table 2. Correlation Among Activities Frequency	40
Table 3. Descriptive Statistics in Listening Section.....	41
Table 4. Descriptive Statistics in Reading Section	43
Table 5. Descriptive Statistics in Speaking Section.....	45
Table 6. Descriptive Statistics in Writing Section	46
Table 7. T-test Result of Listening Frequency According to Departments	48
Table 8. T-test Result of Effect on Understanding the Main Idea According to Departments	49
Table 9. T-test Result of Effect on Understanding Details According to Departments	50
Table 10. T-test Result of Effect on Accent Familiarization According to Departments	51
Table 11. T-test Result of Effect on Predicting Discussion Direction According to Departments	52
Table 12. T-test Result of Reading Frequency According to Departments	53
Table 13. T-test Result of Effect on Vocabulary Building According to Departments	54
Table 14. T-test Result of Effect on Skimming and Scanning According to Departments	55
Table 15. T-test Result of Effect on Text Summarizing According to Departments	56

Table 16. T-test Result of Effect on Reading for Main Idea According to Departments	57
Table 17. T-test Result of Effect on Reading for Details According to Departments	58
Table 18. T-test Result of Effect on Note-Taking According to Departments	59
Table 19. T-test Result of Speaking Frequency According to Departments.....	60
Table 20. T-test Result of Effect on Fluency According to Departments.....	61
Table 21. T-test Result of Effect on Speaking with Expand Description According to Departments	62
Table 22. T-test Result of Effect on Pronunciation and Intonation According to Departments	63
Table 23. T-test Result of Effect on Grammatical Structure in Speaking According to Departments	64
Table 24. T-test Result of Writing Frequency According to Departments	65
Table 25. T-test Result of Effect on Timed-Writing According to Departments	66
Table 26. T-test Result of Effect on Using Signal Words According to Departments	67
Table 27. T-test Result of Effect on Outlining According to Departments	68
Table 28. T-test Result of Effect on Sentence & Word Variety in Writing According to Departments	69
Table 29. T-test Result of Effect on Identifying Relevant Ideas According to Departments	70

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Storey Model: Enhanced Student Learning Achievement Using Curricular and Co-Curricular Activities in Post-Secondary Education.....	25
--	----

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The university students' years are spent only somewhat in the classrooms, libraries and laboratories. Also students dedicate considerable time to outside-class activities or co-curricular activities. Student organizations, clubs and other programs support to make college pleasurable and memorable. These outside-class activities are vital to the formative, full, college experience. And there is plenty of evidence that co-curricular activities convey benefits beside enjoyment.

Campus activities narrowly connected to classroom education are referred to as co-curricular activities (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). In contrast between co-curricular and extra-curricular activities, Chickering and Reisser explain that extra-curricular activities are mainly connected to social events for students while co-curricular activities are linked with classroom learning.

The school experience can offer students the assistance to grow and create information, skills, and capacities for achievement in the workforce and for aspiring career opportunities. For some people, this opportunity is accomplished habitually by joining in post-secondary education instantly after high school. For others, the college experience is recognised non-traditionally, that is, later in grown-up life or in preparation for new vocations. Whether these students are traditional or non-traditional, the decision exists for public college students to maximize their skills by winning advantage of numerous opportunities to strengthen their learning both inside and outside the classroom (Storey, 2010).

Inside-classroom activities are to reinforce success in learning and understanding course purposes and content matter and are commonly connected to obviously articulated official learning outcomes. Outside-classroom activities can also help to

reinforce the accomplishment of learning objectives but might not necessarily be part of a particular program or curriculum. Frequently the outside-class involvement comprises membership in organizations, student clubs and volunteerism, campus leadership opportunities or athletic team participation. A huge number of students join in the outside-the-classroom activities when the event is linked closely or relative to the courses that students are learning in the classroom (Kuh, 2000).

Involvement in co-curricular activities is generally thought as outside-classroom events at many higher education institutions and it is considered as one of various strategies to help students achieve their learning objectives and to meet institutional learning outcomes.

A historical view of the outside-class activities shows that post-secondary student development began in the 20th century during postsecondary education reform era, such as the formerly mentioned GI Bill and Higher Education Act of 1965 in the United States. The American Council on Education printed a description in 1937 called the Student Personnel Point of View. The view that colleges need student development departments to contribute with evaluating, supervising, and rising the extracurricular ..., social life and preferences of students were supported by this document (American College Personnel Association, 2008). ACE (American Council on Education) recognized that interests and social life of students through expert campus departments can support methods to create a satisfying college experience. Leaders thought of the student development opportunities that outside-class activities were non-essential to the total learning understanding before these steps in post-secondary education reform. From the 1900s up to the 1950s, student development specialists were regarded as substitute parents, certifying students' proper behaviour and welfare (Hernandez, 1989). Higher education leaders distinguished the value of student development professionals away from unofficial post-secondary chaperones near the 1950s.

Extracurricular and co-curricular activities belong to the category of student involvement. Student involvement has positively been connected to many features of academic success, such as GPA (Grade Point Average), retention, and confidence-building (Astin, 1985, 1999; Bergen-Cico & Viscomi, 2013).

Today, almost every higher education institution includes at least one department of second language (L2) learning and Language proficiency is one of the important aspects while considering the second language (L2) learning. Oller (1983) expresses that language proficiency is not a single unitary skill, but consists of various separate related structures in addition to a general construct. Furthermore proficiency can be observed as an aim and so is defined in terms of standards or objectives. Then these can act as criteria by which to evaluate proficiency as an empirical reality, that is, the actual performance of given groups of learners or individual learners (Stern 1983). Stern also states that proficiency ranges from zero to native-like proficiency. The zero is not absolute because the second language learner as speaker of at least one other language knows the language and how it functions. Complete competence is hardly ever reached by second language learners.

This study investigates the effects of co-curriculum activities on (L2) learners, English language sample, in higher education. The research was conducted through quantitative research model including questionnaires with participation of 153 students at Sakarya University, and the data analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 20. Chapter two of this study presents the literature review on official curriculum and its types, introducing extra-curriculum, and theoretical approaches towards second language learning, and clarifies the connection between co-curricular activities and second language learning.

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to explore the extent to which involvement in co-curricular actions enhances the achievement of second language learners' learning outcome in higher education level. As Storey states achievement of student-learning outcomes (academic achievement) consequences from the purposeful overlap among co-curricular activities, curricular activities, and student learning outcomes. Curricular activities are typically coordinated in academic divisions, while student services divisions frequently organize co-curricular activities (Storey, 2010). It is also believed by Williams that co-curricular activities raise the students' success.

—These [student services] professionals are involved in teaching and learning, much of which occurs outside the formal classroom, and they form collaborative programs both inside and outside the college to address the diverse need of students and to foster student success (Williams, 2002).

This study investigates the connections between co-curricular activities and the second language learners in higher education level by probing through students' participation in co-curricular activities. By filling this gap, both curricular and co-curricular activities together are more likely to have encouraging effects on students' learning.

1.2 RESEARCH QUESTION

How do co-curricular activities affect the second language learners in higher education?

1.3 RESEARCH SUB-QUESTIONS

1. How do co-curricular activities affect second language learners' listening skill?
2. How is reading skill of the second language learners influenced by co-curricular activities?
3. Does second language learners' speaking skill change by participation in co-curricular activities?
4. How is writing skill of the second language learners affected by co-curricular activities?

1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study identifies the effects of co-curricular activities on second language learners in higher education and discovers whether these activities can enhance the achievement of students. This study also provides colleges and universities' student development centre leaders and members with quantitative evidence as to how co-

curricular programs can improve student learning when related to institutional learning outcomes.

As a result, this study focuses on co-curricular events and their effects on second language learning students at universities only, but also it can be beneficial to low educational institutions.

According to a course advertisement, “*Makale Yazma Kursu*”, which means writing article on the wall of Institute of Health Science of Sakarya University (2014), somehow there have been outsid-classroom activities performed in Sakarya University. In addition, Institute of Health Science of Sakarya University (2016), presents Project Writing Training (*Proje Yazma Eğitimi*). The mentioned courses are a few examples of the activities that do not belong to the main curriculum of the university and meanwhile, they have been organized to improve the writing skill of the participants. Although the mentioned events are continuously seeking methods to enhance writing skill, but this study investigates the influences of such activities usually conducted by students themselves. If co-curricular activities can contribute to enhanced student learning, university leaders could help support the visibility of co-curricular activities inside their particular institutes.

1.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study is limited to;

- Participation of 153 second language learners, English language sample, from Education Faculty of Sakarya University, and,
- 2015 – 2016 academic years.

1.6 DEFINITIONS

Student Personnel Point of View: *The view that colleges need student development departments to contribute with evaluating, supervising, and rising the extracurricular ..., social life and preferences of students were supported by this document (American College Personnel Association, 2008).*

1.7 ABBREVIATIONS

ACE: American Council on Education

CO: Comprehensible Output

EPAS: The Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards

GPA: Grade Point Average

LAD: Language Acquisition Device

L1: First language

L2: Second language

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

TL: Target Language

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 CURRICULUM OVERVIEW

The term "curriculum" arose as a Latin word meaning "a race" or "the course of a race". It in turn originates from the verb *currere* which means "to run or to proceed"). For the first time, as an educational context, it was in the *Professio Regia*, a work by University of Paris. Professor Petrus Ramus issued afterward in 1576. This word appears subsequently in University of Leiden archives in 1582. The origins of the word appear narrowly connected to the Calvinist desire to carry better order to education (WEB1). The University of Glasgow also mentioned to its study course as a "curriculum" by the seventeenth century, producing the first recognized usage of this term in English in 1633. By the 19th century, European universities regularly stated to their curriculum to define both the complete study course (for example for a degree in surgery) and specific courses and their content. The primary need is to get some clarity about the term 'curriculum'. It is a term used with numerous meanings and several different definitions:

The curriculum is seen as an agreement among educational professionals, communities, and the state on what students should take on throughout particular stages of their lives. In addition, curriculum describes what, when, why, where, how, and with whom to learn. Another definition states that, the curriculum is the total learning skill which is provided by a school. It contains the course content, (e.g. the syllabus), the employed methods, (e.g. strategies), and other features, like values and norms, which refer to the way of the organization of the school (WEB1). According to WEB1 the next definition is presented saying that curriculum can belong to the whole program provided by a country, state, district, school or classroom and a it is

the classroom which is assigned units of the curriculum by the way defined by the school itself.

Other theories describe curriculum as process and education as development, curriculum as product and education as instrumental and curriculum as content and education as transmission (Kelly, 2004). One of the first perspectives taken into consideration was the idea of the curriculum as a place to grow understanding. Kelly claims that curriculum outcome should be described in terms of intellectual development and cognitive functioning rather than in connection with quantities of knowledge taken in or in terms of behaviour changes. He highlights the outcomes for curriculum planning (Kelly, 2009): (1) knowledge rejection base for planning of curriculum, (2) obvious statements of the fundamental educational foundations or processes, and (3) education as a development process. Debating the curriculum in higher education level should like discussing learning of the students experience as is highlighted by other authors (Oliver et al. 2008; Letschert 2004; Davis 2011; Litzinger et al. 2011). By integrating the procedure of intellectual improvement, student learning develops commonly (Totté & others). As Holloway and others (2009) believe, “input” curriculum orientation lead to an “outcomes” competency of students orientation. So it is mostly well suited for professional training since, contrasting to the academic disciplines that extent of knowledge describes preparation, for the professions competence is the symbol of active preparation.

A second viewpoint taken is the concentration on a process approach extra to the product approach. The product approach is introduced by Tyler’s (1949) somewhat mechanistic conceptual interpretation of planning quality curriculum by displaying four questions: (1) What is to be accomplished? (2) What learning experiences will help accomplish the purposes? (3) How can these learning experiences be effectively organized? (4) How can the effectiveness of the learning be evaluated?

Stenhouse (1975) supported a process approach. He proposed to choose content, develop education strategies, sequence experiences of learning, and assess strengths of students and weaknesses emphasizing on empiricism: a curriculum process was designed for not only be an outline to be followed but also a proposal to be tested. Knight (2001) also claims for a process approach by emphasizing the necessity of progression and coherence in a curriculum. He refers to Jerome Bruner’s idea of the

spiral curriculum (Bruner 1960), stating “*Bruner depicted a good curriculum as a spiral of repeated engagements to improve and deepen skills, concepts, attitudes and values, and extend their reach. The spiral curriculum has coherence, progression and, I claim, value*”.

2.1.1 Quality Development of Curriculum

Totté & others declare that to struggle successfully with the complexity of curriculum work on curriculum related matters, four closely interconnected circles of quality development are proposed. They say that experiencing all components connected by a circle permits their alignment. If one of these components is changed, other components will be influenced as well. Also going through circles gives the meaning of consideration of the agendas and perspectives of various stakeholders and probing for the best compromise or answer. The focus of changing was partially motivated by the ‘paths’ defined by Stark and Lattuca (1997), showing how adjustment and evaluation function in their curriculum model.

These four cycles are: (1) *the quality circle of the planned curriculum* which proposes the renewal and evaluation of the curriculum plans with the expectations of the influencing stakeholders. In this cycle, finding out expectations from the society and labour market for graduates in discipline are necessary to plan or adjust a curriculum as well as the input from the associated research communities is essential and the educational philosophy is proposed to be harmonized to recent research on teaching and learning. (2) *the implementation of a curriculum* which this circle connects the planned curriculum with aligned curriculum . It explores the way the intentions are understood. In an experimental way the planned curriculum can be observed as a suggestion that can be examined by collecting proofs on experiences of students’ learning (Stenhouse, 1975). A curriculum map recommended exhibiting the link between learning outcome and its realization in courses or course modules, learning areas and assessment because curriculum maps permits identifying the real or potential shortages in the curriculum through consultation of stakeholders. (3) *the aligned curriculum* introduced as a curriculum that includes all courses of the curriculum ordered in a definite sequence and are organized in main courses

(compulsory), in optional modules or as selective courses. This echoes a progressive curriculum (Knight 2001). Attitudes and skills require to be attained through different courses with increasing complexity. In a coherent curriculum learning ways specify how learners transfer learning and expand their understanding entering one course to the next. The alignment between these courses is essential to balance learning, teaching, and assessment strategies in a way that the planned learning consequences can be recognized (Litzinger et al. 2011). (4) *the aligned course* which is echoed in the structure for educational design, it was first describe by Elen (2002). As he presented it “is a general concept that promotes if-then reasoning’s” concentrating the educational design procedure on the constructive alignment (Biggs 1999, Fink 2003) of the different units of a course (e.g. learning activities, learning objectives, student characteristics, the learning environment and context, evaluation strategies). In an active educational framework these units are coherently and consistently applied and aligned to each other.

Consequently, curriculum is introduced as the formal and informal process and content by which students achieve knowledge and understanding, alter attitudes, and develop skills, appreciations, and values by the support of an academic institution. That is to say, curriculum can be introduced as the overall experience. From this perspective, curriculum is not merely the selected and delivered content, but the planned and unplanned activities which individuals participate in it as students (NAHE). The word ‘curriculum’ within the higher education context can give different meanings to different groups (Barnett and Coate 2005; Fraser and Bosanquet 2006).

2.1.2 Explicit Curriculum

Explicit curriculum is introduced as courses which are taught, the recognized "mission" of the school, and the knowledge and abilities that the school looks for successful students to obtain (WEB1). This type of curriculum constructs a program’s formal educational framework and consists of the courses and the curriculum (2008 EPAS, EP 2.0) Therefore, the explicit curriculum considered as

being designed of the instruction and courses inserted in a program's curriculum (Holloway, 2008).

If an institution has a special mission (e.g., teaching students to be global citizens) this special mission also requires to be mirrored in the program mission, core competencies, goals, and practice behaviour as brought in the explicit curriculum of the program. (Petracchi & Zastrow, 2010).

2.1.3 Implicit Curriculum

Implicit curriculum is introduced as lessons that rise from the school culture and the attitudes, behaviours, and expectations that describe that culture, the unintended curriculum (WEB1). It is said that social work educators are not the first people to welcome the effects of this type of curriculum. Literature on the term of the implicit curriculum emerges from two other foundations, elementary and secondary education and medical education (Bogo & Wayne, 2013). In fact, for more than 50 years, the concept was present in education literature, initially developed from supervisions in the elementary school education (Jackson, 1968; 1990). The concept is directed to the attitudes, values, and expected behaviours that educators and administration bodies may accidentally convey through a bunch of policies and practices informally. Eisner (2002) states that implicit curriculum in a school is the values it teaches for the type of place it is. The school is a kind of place that through the subordinate results of different methods to teaching, by the type of prize system that it practices, by the organizational framework it serves to keep its existence, by the physical features of the school plant, and by the furniture and equipment it uses and the environment it makes. These appearances found some of the dominant units of the school's implicit curriculum. However these characteristics are rarely publicly announced, but in intuitive way they are recognized by students, parents, and teachers. And due to the salience and pervasive features of schooling, what they teach can be among the very important lessons that a student learns.

2.1.4 Hidden Curriculum

The hidden curriculum is introduced as things that students learn, because of the approach in which the procedure of a school is organized and planned, but which are

not in themselves openly comprised in planning or in the consciousness of the responsible people for the school organization (Kelly, 2009). The term itself is credited to Philip W. Jackson and it doesn't always mean a negative. Hidden curriculum could benefit learners and students in all educational organizations if its potential is recognised. Likewise, it does not only include the physical environment of a school, but the relations formed or not formed among learners or even learners and educators (Jackson, 1986). This type of curriculum is the set of impacts that plays a role at the organizational structure and culture level. Considering the link between educational interventions and the hidden curriculum is thought to help explain another observation. That is to say that educational interventions integration into the everyday clinical work of learners is related with improved outcomes (Agrawal & others, 2008).

2.1.5 Procedure of Curriculum

According to WEB1, the process of a curriculum is a multi-step, constant and cyclical procedure. The process progresses from evaluating the current program, to designing a developed program, to applying a new program and back to assessing the reviewed program. Curriculum can be ordered into a procedure: (1) *diagnosis of needs*, (2) *formulation of objectives*, (3) *selection of content*, (4) *organization of content*, (5) *selection of learning experiences*, (6) *organization of learning experiences*, (7) *determination of what to evaluate and of the ways and means of doing it*.

2.2 INTRODUCTION TO EXTRA-CURRICULUM

Extra-curricular activities are introduced as those activities that happen outside the official curriculum. They can be challenging to include in a higher education context and usually mean different things to different people. They might include paid or voluntary projects, work, and short term or continues appointments (Tchibozo & Pasteur, 2007). Extra-curricular events are thought a part of the overall social experience for the higher education learners (Bloland, 1987; Tchibozo, 2007; Tinto, 1987). The term, "extra" in extracurricular activities is an elective component to

curricular learning. It suggests that all of the students do not participate in these types of activities (Storey, 2010). Employability: Yorke (2004) defines “student employability” as a set of achievements e.g., understandings, skills, and personal attributes that make graduates more probable to achieve employment and success in their selected professions, which helps themselves, the community, the workforce, and the economy. Student engagement is introduced as a term involved with the communication between the effort, time, and other related resources invested by institutions and their students proposed to enhance the experience of the students and optimise the learning outcomes and improvement of the students and the reputation of the institution and the performance (Trowler, 2010). Trowler presents the following purposes and aims of the engagement: improving learning, improving throughput rates and retention, equality or social justice, curricular relevance, institutional benefit, marketing, and economics of engagement.

Furthermore, tertiary education specialists can identify extra-curricular activities as not essentially relevant to the learner’s learning experience since some extracurricular activities incline to concentrate more on the social facets. Extra-curricular activities, such as precise celebrations provide by the institution, can support students to learn more about their schools and are able ultimately offer a means of interaction socially that profits their higher education experiences (Storey, 2010).

2.3 THEORETICAL APPROACHES TOWARDS SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING AND CO-CURRICULUM ACTIVITIES

Second Language Acquisition, abbreviated (SLA), discusses the education of how learners learn a second language, shortened (L2), beside their first language shown as (L1). However it is referred as second language acquisition, still it is the procedure of learning any language after the native language. It can be the second, third or fourth language so, any other language separated from the first language is named a second language, usually abbreviated as (SL), or also is mentioned as a target language (TL) (Stefánsson, 2013).

Stefánsson describes that by being actively engaged in the educational environment, the student is continuously connected with the second language through normal day by day routines and it is really important in second language learning to pay attention to the learning environment.

He focuses on three theories which are described as below. They are: The Creative Construction Theory, Communicative Language Teaching and the Cognitive Approach.

2.3.1 Creative Construction Theory or the Naturalistic Approach

This method is founded on the hypothesis that language acquisition is innately affected and that people are born with a specific system of language which they call on afterwards. Many methodologist and linguists support these hypotheses of innateness. One of the leading proponents, Chomsky, argues that each person owns a set of innate characteristics of language which is responsible for a child's mastery of her or his native language in a short period of time (Brown, 2002). The mechanism, which is called the 'language acquisition device' (LAD), 'governs all human languages, and determines what possible form human language may take' (Dulay, Burt, Krashen 1982).

Some linguistics experts, particularly Stephen Krashen, highlight the contrast between learning and acquisition. Acquisition is believed to be a subconscious procedure which directs to fluency while learning, on the other side, is a conscious method which exposes itself in connection with learning structures and rules. Moreover, Krashen claims for three internal mainframes that function when students acquire or learn a new language. They are, the subconscious 'filter', the 'organizer' plus the conscious 'monitor' (Dulay, Burt, Krashen 1982). The 'organizer' specifies the organisation in the language system of the learner, using incorrect grammatical patterns as temporary precursors of grammatical forms, the systematic incidence of mistakes in the learner's words as well as a usual order in which structures are learnt. The 'filter' is in charge for the extent to which the student's learning is affected by social conditions like motivation and affective influences such as anxiety or anger. The 'monitor' acts as an accountable for conscious learning. The students

correct the errors in their language use according to their self-consciousness and age (Dulay, Burt, Krashen, 1982).

Krashen's Input Hypothesis is a very controversial theoretical perspective in second language acquisition. It is built on a set of five unified theories: (1) *The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis* in this hypothesis, Krashen argues that acquisition and learning are not the same and there is a difference between them. He believes that acquisition is 'a subconscious and intuitive process of constructing the system of a language, not unlike the process used by a child to 'pick up' a language' and recognizes Learning as a conscious procedure in which 'learners attend to form, figure out rules, and are generally aware of their own process' (Brown, 2002). (2) *The Monitor Hypothesis* which has no relationships with acquisition but it has a link with learning. The learned system functions just as a 'monitor' or an editor, making tiny changes and refining what the acquired system produces. In Krashen's opinion, three situations are essential for monitor usage - sufficient time, focus on form, and knowing the rules (Lightbown, Spada, 1995). (3) *The Natural Order Hypothesis* which expresses that people acquire a language's rules in a specific order that is anticipatable (Lightbown, Spada, 1995). Though, it does not give the meaning that every acquirer will achieve grammar structures in precisely the same way. It says rather that, generally, definite structures are likely to be learned early and others to be acquired later (Krashen, Terrell, 1983). (4) *The Input Hypothesis* which states that it is essential for the learner to understand the language which is a little bit outside his or her present degree of competence. It means that if an acquirer is on a level "i" the input he achieves should be $(i + 1)$ and that is to say the language that students are supposed to learn should be just far enough beyond the learners' present competence that they are able to understand most of it but again it is challenged to make improvement (Brown, 2002). (5) *The Affective Filter Hypothesis* expresses that it is not difficult for an acquirer to learn a language when he or she is not angry, tense, bored or anxious. As Dulay and Burt state, performers with maximum attitudes own a lower influential filter. The meaning of a low filter is that the performer is more accepting to the language input (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). Krashen's expectations were hardly disputed. Psychologists such as McLaughlin have object Krashen's unclear difference between conscious (learning) and subconscious (acquisition)

processes. Brown states that second language learning is a procedure in which various degrees of acquisition and learning can both be helpful, belonging to the learner's strategies and styles. Moreover, the (i +1) formula which is offered by Krashen brings out the question how "i" and "i+1" should be defined. Furthermore, what is inferred of the 'silent period'? Krashen declares that after a specific period of time, the silent period, speaking will emerge to the acquirer, which gives the meaning that the learners probably start to speak due to understandable input. Yet, there is no data regarding what will occur to the acquirers, for whom speech will not 'emerge'; 'for whom the silent period might last forever' (Brown, 2002).

2.3.2. Communicative Language Teaching

The communicative approach has shown its appearance in the British language teaching tradition era in the late 1960s and in general in the developments of both North America and Europe. This approach is different from traditional methods because it is learner centred. Likewise, linguists say that there is a necessity to concentrate on utterance proficiency in teaching of a language and that communicative language teaching can complete this need (Stefánsson, 2013). Stefánsson also states that there are a lot of reasons for the quick growth of Communicative Language Teaching e.g., the effort of the Council of Europe in the area of communicative program design; the theoretic ideas of the communicative method found speedy use by the writers of textbooks; and there was an overpowering receipt of these new ideas by British language teaching experts and the centres of curriculum development. Supporters of this approach express that the aim of teaching a language is communicative competence. Additional aim is the improvement of techniques for the teaching of the four main language skills (listening, reading, speaking, and writing). Furthermore, these four skills construct the foundation of the interdependence of the language and the communication (Richards & Rodgers, 1986).

As Littlewood states, a very important feature of communicative language teaching is systematic attention to functional features as well as structural features of the language (Littlewood, 1981). Another important aspect is group and pair work. By

this approach learners will be able to work in pairs or groups and attempt to answer difficult tasks with their current available language knowledge (Altenaichinger, 2003). Also, Howatt differentiates between a strong and a weak version of communicative language teaching. The weak type, which appears to be standard by now, emphasizes the importance opportunities for the learners for the usage of the language for communicative purposes. The strong type titles that the language is obtained through communication engagement (Howatt, 1984). As stated above, there has been a wide approval of the communicative approach. It is similar to the more common learning viewpoint often called as ‘the experience approach’ or ‘Learning by doing’ (Richards, Rodgers, 1986). In general, Communicative Language Teaching concentrates on contextual and communicative aspects in the usage of the language and it is experience-based and learner-centred. However there are numerous supporters but also there are many opponents, who criticise this method and the relatively diverse approaches in which it is translated and practiced. Nonetheless, it is an idea of teaching language that origins from a communicative language and language use model, and that pursues to interpret this into a scheme for an educational system, for teacher and learner roles, for materials, and behaviours, and for classroom activities and techniques (Richards & Rodgers, 1986).

2.3.3 The Cognitive Approach

Cognitive psychologists state that one of the key elements of second language learning is the construction of an information structure which is able to eventually be entitled on automatically for understanding and speaking. In the beginning, learners need to build up an overall knowledge of the target language that they need to learn and produce. After a huge portion of practice and experience they can use specific fragments of their knowledge rapidly and without understanding that they did it. Slowly, this usage becomes automatic and the students could concentrate on other parts of the language (Stefánsson, 2013). As far as the event of ‘restructuring’ is involved, psychologists say we do not have to learn the things we know and use automatically through a regular build-up of automaticity but they can be founded on the interaction of knowledge people already have obtained. Perhaps it may be based

on the learning of new information which in some way ‘fits’ into a current existing system and probably, in fact, ‘restructure’ the system (Lightbown & Spada, 1995).

2.3.4 Language Transfer

First language syntactic transfer, also called L1 transfer, happens when the speakers use processing approaches from their first language into the second language. This occurrence of first language transfer is debated, and is either believed to powerfully affect SLA and therefore be a necessary part in models of the L2 acquisition process (MacWhinney, 2004).

Proofs for syntactic first language transfer were appeared in a chain of studies performed within the structure of the Competition Model (Bates & MacWhinney, 1982). The purpose of these studies was to identify the cues that applicants apply when recognizing the subject of a sentence. Kilborn and Cooreman (1987) created indications for a fractional deployment of first language cue preferences in second language subject identification functions for second language English first language Dutch speakers. Gass (1987) stated transporting effects from first language Italian to second language English but not from first language English to second language Italian. McDonald (1987) questioned first language and second language speakers of Dutch and English to label the receiver in subject of transitive sentences or dative constructions and found indications that second language speakers primarily adopt cue weights shift from the first language, but progressively carry over second language strategies with continued second language exposure. In addition to Competition Model studies, other indications for influences of transfer that reduce as second language exposure time rises can be seen for relative clause attachments in Dussias’s work (2003) and for German subject and object relative clauses in Hopp’s work (2006). Furthermore first language transfer was stated by Frenck-Mestre and Pynte (1997) where French and English speakers displayed signs of reluctance when they were reading explicit second language sentences that may have been ambiguous in their first language, suggesting first language transfer. Flynn (1989) and Espinal (1985) stated the first language transfer for subordinate clause embedding and cross-linguistic structural priming studies, that the operating of a sentence in the first language influences the production of a sentence in the second language may also be

translated as instances of first language transfer (Desmet & Declercq, 2006; Hartsuiker, Pickering, & Veltkamp, 2004; Salamoura & Williams, 2007; Schoonbaert, Hartsuiker, & Pickering, 2007).

2.3.5 Interaction Hypothesis and Comprehensible Output Hypothesis

CO or (Comprehensible Output) hypothesis expresses that people obtain language when they try to convey a message but do not manage and have to attempt again. Ultimately, they reach at the correct form of their speaking, their speaking mate eventually understands, and they gain a new form they have shaped (Krashen, 1998). The initiator of this type of hypothesis is Merrill Swain (Swain, 1985), and does not argue that comprehensible output is accountable for all or even most of the speakers' language competence. Rather, the argument is that "sometimes, under some conditions, output facilitates second language learning in ways that are different form, or enhance, those of input" (Swain and Lapkin, 1995). The Comprehensible Output hypothesis is related to what is usually named the "interaction hypothesis," and it is the hypothesis that learners learn the language from interacting with other people. As mentioned in this way, the interaction hypothesis is not clear, it is vague. These questions are frequently asked regarding this hypothesis: Is it the only way to learn a language or is it one way to acquire language? Is interaction just helpful or is it necessary? Also, what happens during interaction that leads to language acquisition (Krashen, 1998)?

Krashen has claimed that a component of interaction which does not cooperate to language learning is the output created by the language learner. Furthermore, he adds that there is proof that a powerful type of the interaction hypothesis, one which defend that interaction is essential for language learning, is not correct. That type of hypothesis rejects that learning or acquisition can happen from listening and reading. Moreover, to the huge data viewing that reading can develop language improvement, the outcomes of Ellis et. al. (1994), approve that learning is possible without participation in the interaction in fact. The weaker version of this hypothesis is that interaction may happen to be a good source of (CO) or comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982).

Krashen presents the theory of acquisition without output and adds that there are many studies that approve that levels of language and literacy competence can be developed extremely in high levels without any language production at all (Krashen, 1994). In addition, laboratory researches display that topics commonly acquire tiny but important amounts of new words knowledge from a single disclosure to an unacquainted word in a understandable text (Nagy, Herman, and Anderson, 1985), enough to account for predicted words and terms improvement, and alike consequences have been described for second language improvement (Pitts, White, and Krashen, 1989; Day, Omura, and Hiramatsu, 1991; Dupuy and Krashen, 1993). It has been claimed that the same influence occurs for spelling too (Krashen, 1989). Also, case histories of those who have advanced very high levels of competence were seen from input only (e.g., Richard Boydell suffered from cerebral palsy disease and learned language only by reading and listening, see Krashen, 1985; Malcolm X and Richard Wright, discussed in Krashen, 1993). Ellis (1995) is another additional investigation of Ellis (1994) offers another case of learning without output. The "premodified", a group that did not do any speaking activities at all, made limited but pure achievements in words, obtaining, actually, more vocabulary each minute than another group which interacted with the native people (Krashen, 1998). In conclusion, Krashen (1998) outlines that the (CO) hypothesis has many difficulties: (1) Output, particularly comprehensible output is very rare to make an actual support to linguistic competence. (2) Without output there is the possibility of high levels of linguistic competence. (3) There is no direct data proving that comprehensible output directs to language learning, but there is some proof that proposes that learners do not appreciate being "pushed" for speaking.

2.3.6 Language Proficiency

When considering the language proficiency, literature provides readers with different range of definitions. For example, Schleppegrell and Christian believe that success in academic language needs the skill to interact in the educational setting in the ways which are specific to educational institution culture in the society (1986). Another short definition by Bachman (1990) introduces language proficiency as the ability in language use. One more approach towards proficiency by Oller (1983) expresses that

language proficiency is not a single unitary skill, but consists of various separate related structures in addition to a general construct. Furthermore proficiency can be observed as an aim and so is defined in terms of standards or objectives. Then these can act as criteria by which to evaluate proficiency as an empirical reality, that is, the actual performance of given groups of learners or individual learners (Stern 1983). Stern also states that proficiency ranges from zero to native-like proficiency. The zero is not absolute because the second language learner as speaker of at least one other language knows the language and how it functions. Complete competence is hardly ever reached by second language learners. By looking at proficiency in its educational context, a different definition come across and the term 'proficiency' depends to the examinee's skills in a specific area of competency in order to determine the extent to which they can work in a real language use situation (Farhady et al. 1983). Krashen and Lee Brown (2007) add that academic language proficiency is considered to be a “central goal of language teaching programs: We want our students to be able to use their second language for demanding tasks, for business, science, politics, etc beyond carrying out daily conversation”. They divide it by two proposing that academic language proficiency consists of two central components: (a) knowledge of academic language: knowledge of the special language used in school and the professions and (b) knowledge of specialized subject matter: consists of knowledge of math, science, history, etc.

The substantial evidence that Oller and his colleagues (1980) have gathered to show is that academic and cognitive variables are powerfully related to some measures of all four general language skills, so listening, speaking, reading and writing, raises an important issue for the evaluation of entry and exit criteria in bilingual programs. According to Snow, the procedure of education consists largely of teaching in decontextualized language usage. Cummins presents a similar conclusion as well when he declares that situations requiring academic language proficiency vary in two dimensions: contextualized vs. decontextualized and cognitively demanding vs. cognitively undemanding (Schleppegrell & Christian 1986). Hernandez-Chavez, Burt and Dulay (1978), present that language proficiency deals with multiple factors along three separate parameters: 1) the linguistic components, 2) modality, and 3) sociolinguistic performance. The linguistic component involves lexicon, semantics,

syntax and phonology; modality includes production and comprehension through the reading and writing through the written channel oral channel and; sociolinguistic performance includes the dimensions of domain style, variety and function. Oller (1978, 1979; Oller & Perkins 1978) argues that "there exists a global language proficiency factor which accounts for the bulk of the reliable variance in a wide variety of language proficiency measures". This item is strongly connected to IQ and to other elements of academic achievement and it is about equally well appraised by listening, speaking, reading and writing factors. Then four major aspects run throughout the debates of academic language. First, academic language takes place in the school culture and asks for knowledge of the ways of that culture for being successful. The student must have the knowledge of using language in school, including conventions of speaking and writing in communication and academic performances, and knowing what is important, valuable, and unique for the school (Schleppegrell and Christian 1986). Hakuta and others (2000) believe that educators have come to distinguish between verbal language proficiency, concentrating on speaking, and academic English proficiency that focuses hugely on reading skill.

According to Alptekin's report, to strengthen the language proficiency The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) introduce strategies dividing them into two major categories: direct and indirect. Each one consists of three subcategories. Direct strategies include memory, cognitive, and compensation strategies and indirect strategies support and manage language learning without essential engaging the target language directly. They are formed of metacognitive, affective, and social strategies (Alptekin 2007). Apart from above definitions and approaches towards language proficiency, the connection between academic achievement and language proficiency is lost as students approach native like proficiency levels (De Avila 1990). The main goal of language proficiency is leading the individuals to success and in Savignon's opinion (1983) communication happens in an infinite types of conditions and success in a specific role belongs to one's understanding of the context and on the former experience of a similar kind. Research has regularly shown that learners have to drill the target language to accomplish proficiency (Savignon, 1997; Xiao & Luo, 2009). Moreover, there are four chief constituents in communicative competence: (I) linguistic, (II) sociolinguistic, (III) discourse, and

(IV) strategic competence (Brandl, 2007; Canale & Swain, 1980). Linguistic competence discusses the knowledge of vocabulary and grammar. Sociolinguistic competence discusses the skill to speak the most suitable word or phrase in a specific situation. Discourse competence discusses the capability to begin, contribute to, and finish a dialogue in a coherent and consistent method. Strategic competence discusses the skill to communicate efficiently and fix communication when difficulties occur (Brandl, 2007; Canale & Swain, 1980). The learning strategies of L2 learners assist to improving the competence of communicative ability. Learning strategies are defined by Oxford (1990) as the “steps taken by students to enhance their own learning. Oxford (1990) expresses that the “development of communicative competence requires realistic interaction among learners using meaningful, contextualized language. Learning strategies help learners participate actively in such authentic communication”. Finally, this type of interaction can ultimately direct to better communicative competence, and so, lead to “improved proficiency and greater self-confidence”.

2.3.7 Co-Curricular Activities

Co-curriculum activities are defined as campus programs narrowly linked to classroom learning (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). As The Glossary of Education states: “*Co-curricular refers to activities, programs, and learning experiences that complement, in some way, what students are learning in school—i.e., experiences that are connected to or mirror the academic curriculum*”. This website specifies that co-curricular activities normally are defined by their separation from educational curricula. For instance, they are not graded, they do not permit learners to achieve academic credit, they can occur outside of institution or after regular school time, and they can be activated by other organizations. Usually, the outside-classroom engagement includes student clubs and organizations membership, athletic team participation, volunteerism, or campus leadership opportunities. A huge number of students attend in the outside-classroom events when the activity is connected closely or relative to what learners are learning inside the class (Kuh, 2000).

To clarify the influence of extra-curricular activities than co-curricular activities, higher education experts can observe extra-curricular events as not required related to the student learning practices because many extracurricular activities incline to concentrate more on the social sides. Furthermore, extra-curricular activities, like institution's precise occasions, may help learners to know more regarding to their schools and can eventually afford a means of social contact that profits their higher education experiences (Storey, 2010). She adds that higher education specialists can exchange the definitions of co- and extra-curricular activities as both reference the general social events of the college and negative effects of outside-classroom activities, regardless of their co- or extra-curricular purpose, may be influenced by the types of activities accessible among various kinds of higher education institutions.

To comment on the influence of the cu-curriculum activities on education the tertiary research (Astin, 1993; Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, Andreas, Lyons, Strange, Krehbiel & MacKay, 1991; Tinto, 1987) specifies that students engaged in activities placed in campus outside-class events as a section of their university experience are more effective in their learning and improvement. In numerous tertiary institutions, engagement in co-curricular activities, generically thought of as outside-classroom activities, is viewed as one of various strategies to assist learners achieve their learning goals and to meet institutional learning outcomes and student learning outcomes are known as measurements of how much an individual student or a group of students can know at the end of a degree program (Halpern, 1987). CMAACC (Chicago Metropolitan Area Community College), a pseudonym, allocates curricular learning through eight overall education learning outcomes and eighteen related objectives, as presented below (identified on CMAACC's website). All of career-related and academic subjects contain task suitable materials to offer input as to student success in each of the fields: (1) reading, (2) writing, (3) scientific literacy, (4) quantitative literacy, (5) critical thinking, (6) technology literacy, (7) information literacy, and (8) global awareness.

Storey (2010) presents a model that show the the achievement of student-learning outcomes which mainly focuses on academic achievement. This model results from

the meaningful overlap of the curricular activities, co-curricular activities and student learning outcomes and the model is shown in figure1.




Figure1. Storey Model: Enhanced Student Learning Achievement Using Curricular and Co-Curricular Activities in Post-Secondary Education.

Engstrom and Tinto claim that in numerous post-secondary organizations, curricular and co-curricular programs are not considered however they have interdependent relations with each other (Engstrom & Tinto, 2000). Due to co-curricular activities existence outside the main curriculum setting, a silo influence can occur where curricular and co-curricular events function as independent entities contributing to student learning (Schroeder, 2005). These entities are described by loosely connected independent fiefdoms and principalities, each detached from the other and from any mutual institutional goal or surpassing value. In addition, by filling the gap between students' learning in curricular and co-curricular activities finding the connection between academic achievement, e.g., general institutional education learning outcome, and attendance in co-curricular activities, both curricular and co-curricular events are more likely to affect positively on aligning student-learning objectives with the educational goals and values of the institution (Kuh, 2000).

As the definition of co-curricular activities introduces this term as the campus events narrowly linked to classroom learning, it states that student learning concludes from these practices and a study to evaluate the achievement of student learning outcomes

concluding from attendance in co-curricular programs is essential (Storey, 2010). She states that co-curricular events are able to support classroom-based learning as well as providing learners an opportunity for campus engagement and personal improvement outside their classroom. She also mentions that post-secondary learning directors once believed that university learners' priorities were firmly connected to academic course-work and any practices outside the classroom were presumed as social experiences and not necessary to academics of the students.

The SPPV (Student Personnel Point of View) persuades higher education leaders to identify that learners who are reaching their full potential include outside-classroom practices that assist improve learning in classroom, even though these experiences comprise leisure or social activities.

In early 1960s, the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), allied with the National Council on Higher Education, started the Tomorrow's Higher Education project or THE, which defines essential procedures for applying effective university student improvement methods. Evans, Forney, and Guido-DiBrito (1998) present that THE Project reinforced universities and colleges responsibility to student development opportunities in campus. The mentioned Project affirmed positive university learners development initiatives on the campus were needed methods to help the learners' reach their completest learning skills. The personnel of Student development were displayed as organizers who could help students in providing the opportunity for student's personal integration (Leach, 1989). Both THE, and SPPV Projects are higher education projects that corroborate a necessity for student development experts in universities and colleges (Storey, 2010). In addition, Evans, Forney, and Guido-DiBrito (1998) state that from 1960 to present, a burst of evolving theory associated with students has opened its way into the literature of many areas of study, as well as student affairs. Investigators wished to expose how sorts of factors in university students' practices linked to development. Finally, if learning in classroom is with with co-curricular engagement, it can assist to improve students for professional, personal, and career achievement and success (Storey, 2010).

2.3.7.1 Theories of learning

There are numerous learning theories in literature and this study presents some of the approaches regarding to theories of learning. Knowles, Holton, and Swanson (2005) classify learning theories, developed from the psychology discipline, as either theories of Behaviourist or Connectionist; or theories of cognitive or gestalt. Behaviourism is introduced as a learning theory constructed on trained behaviours as suggested by psychologist B. F. Skinner (1985): A huge part of the social environment which is called a culture comprises possibilities of strengthening in the form of advice, instructions, maxims, rules of conduct, the laws of science, religions and government. With their assistance members of a group convey the things they have learned to new members, then these new members behave one of the following two reasons: their behaviour is either sprightly formed and kept by possibilities of reinforcement or it is supervised by descriptions of those contingencies.

In behaviourist theory, university students can learn as a reaction to classroom motivation and can be helpful for that learning reinforcement with continuing disclosure to a topic. Likewise, behaviourism covers including learning opportunities, like sharing issues with other classmates to drawing out answers that reinforce their learning. Anyway, Garcia (1993) claims that the basics of behaviourism characterizes operant conditioning that do not study biological causes while clarifying learning behaviours. Thus, behaviourism analyses learning that is centred on precise trained behaviours. This sort of anticipated learning proposes that each individual responds to learning in a similar way. In higher education, though, behaviourism could not be an appropriate theory of learning because it is realized to eliminate the individual learning freedom (Garcia, 1993).

Connectionism Learning Theory was offered by psychologist Edward Thorndike. According to Thorndike (1932), learning reactions are because of the connections shaped with the stimulus, items, in reading and hearing, and in writing and speaking. University students can create contacts to items read or heard, both outside and inside the classroom. Although, Walker (2008) claims that the connectionism success belongs to its implementation in an educational or psychological setting. In higher education, the kinds of stimuli that are used to assist learning material differ with

trainers in the classroom or staffs outside the classroom. Therefore, connectionism is not able to guarantee that learners will constantly make specific connections to learning.

On the other hand, Purposeful Behaviourism is a theory of cognitive learning recommended by psychologist Edward Tolman (1925), who describes that learning can happen, in connection with (1) seeking of a goal or purpose seeking, (2) a group of innate or acquired primary exploratory impulses (initial cognitive hunches), and (3) the learning of a set of ending adjustments also called as final cognitions. Therefore, co-curricular engagement is able to benefit university students pursue to understand an issue, understand this topic with initial thoughts, then give opinion about this section under debate, and eventually approve understanding with upcoming applications. However, Pepper (1934), discovers that the level in which purposeful behaviourism arises belongs to the individual and her or his detestation to learning. In higher education, purposeful behaviourism is not able to secure achieving further knowledge if learners reject learning. Thus, inside or outside-classroom learning involvements require accounting for different kinds of learners.

Max Wertheimer, psychologist, suggests Gestalt theory, that concentrates on skills of upper order thinking. King, Wertheimer, Keller, and Crochetiere (1994) describe that Gestalt learning supports the concept that "...the world is a sensible coherent whole, that reality is organized into meaningful parts, and that natural units have their own structure". Co-curricular involvement is able to help with one portion of a university students' successive learning procedure by connecting the students' life experiences to their learning. In addition Marks (1998) approves Gestalt learning applications in the processes of group learning. Though, group learning varies from evolving in group discussions. Group learning proposes the usage of sharing or reflection experiences in the past to describe existing understanding. Weisberg and Alba (1981) claim that principles of Gestalt learning ignore the usage of past skills to support the thorough knowledge of existing learning. Learners registered in higher education are able to ascribe current university learning to their previous education. Thus, Gestalt theory is hard to implement in higher education sites because numerous programs and issues in universities and colleges persuade the usage of reflection to support understand learning, which is not similar to the opinions of Gestalt theory.

The above learning theories (gestalt, cognitive, connectionism, and behaviourism) inside the psychology system refer to student learning in higher education in various methods. While the mentioned learning theories may help to clarify aspects that cooperate the learning, these theories by themselves are not able to create a direct link regarding university students or education. Theories of psychological learning defend the base to learn. Though, different kinds of students propose that trainers have to evaluate the chances for learners to learn in various styles. Psychological learning theories are not able to support different modes of learning required for various learners in post-secondary education except they start by integrating characteristics of the mentioned various theories together. So, student learning may be upgraded if beliefs of learning are accepted in the higher education structure.

Multiple intelligences, for instance, is one kind of learning that splits itself from a theory of old-style psychology-based learning. Multiple intelligences the theory that focuses on education and learning, which was produced by Howard Gardner, educator, (1998), who agrees that multiple intelligences corroborate individualization of student learning. Gardner defines the multiple intelligence attributes as logical mathematical, linguistic, musical, bodily kinaesthetic, spatial, naturalist tendencies, and inter- and intrapersonal. Therefore, there are various ways for students to learn depended upon their own characteristic power or strong points. Waterhouse (2006) considers that limited experiential evidence enquires the credibility of the theory of multiple intelligence and its advantage to students' learning in the settings of education. Thus, learning theories based on education, like multiple intelligences, can increase its reliability with the assistance of supporting tenets of multiple intelligence empowers in different learning structures. These extra settings of learning are able to comprise outside-classroom involvement, like co-curricular actions.

Knowles called the word "andragogy" which means "the art of adult learning" supported by the bases of various learning theories that are based on psychology. In Knowles' opinion, adult learning may arise when university staffs understand these four points of andragogy: (1) being self-directing is a psychological need for adults, (2) the analysis of their own experience is their richest resource for learning, (3) as they become experienced the necessity to learn for the purpose to confront

developmental jobs, they become ready to learn, and (4) their adjustment towards learning is one of concern for instant application.

Learning theories in higher education should permit for occasions that inspire the reflection of the student and his or her experience. The reflections and experiences are districted and reinforced in several settings, evolving with a good shape learner. For instance, Kolb's (1984) Experiential Learning Theory supports experience and reflection for students learning: Field placement, Internships, work or study assignments, role plays and structured exercises, gaming simulations, and other methods of education based on experience play a bigger role in the curricular program of undergraduate or professional programs.

Yeganeh and Kolb (2009) propose that learning happens in four situations that contain experiencing, and reflecting, and thinking, and acting: Immediate actual involvements (experiencing) are the foundation for supervision and reflections and these reflections are distilled and assimilated into abstract ideas (thinking) from which fresh implications for action is able to be drawn. The implications may be actively verified and serve as direction in providing new experiences.

Tinto (1987) introduces Interactionalist Theory and claims that development of students can be connected with larger links in their obligation to college opportunities (like inside or outside-classroom activities) and their aspiration to achieve their school degrees. In his Interactionalist Theory (2004) Tinto defends the idea that the students' primary degree of commitment, graduation and institutional goal, also affects their level of future commitments. In line, the larger the level of both commitment to the goal of graduation and subsequent institutional commitment, the larger the chance the learner will insist in university. Theory of Tinto, designated for implementation in higher education, proposes that organizations have to recognize ways for learners to enhance campus connections, like attending in outside-classroom learning involvements. The mentioned experiences can assist learners increase knowledge and gain their tenacity to prolong learning beyond and through university graduation.

Recognizing students' learning through campus engagement is able to show how co-curricular activities cooperate with student development in the higher education

institutions. Astin introduces the Theory of Involvement regarding this issue. Astin (1999) explains his Theory of Involvement stating that student engagement refers to the quality and quantity of the psychological and physical energy that learners install in the post-secondary education experience. Such engagement comes in numerous shapes, such as engagement in academic activities, attendance in extracurricular events, and making contact with faculty members and institutional personnel. In accord with the theory, the better the students' engagement at the university, the better will be the sum of student learning and personal improvement. For a lot of post-secondary students, organizing coursework with outside-campus work, commuting schedules and personal commitments is necessary. Furthermore, Astin (1993) defends the act of student engagement at campus, plus the students of community colleges, because the development of students appears to be eased if the students devote a suitable amount of time attending classes, studying, and using a personal computer, including involving in academically associated actions that would be tended to elicit a great level of student engagement: interdisciplinary courses, honour courses, college internship programs, study-abroad programs, cultural or racial awareness workshops, taking essay exams and class presentations, independent research projects. In addition, Astin (1993) complements the above-mentioned idea with the belief that a wide spectrum of affective and cognitive outcome is influenced negatively by types of engagement that either take away the students from the campus physically or separate the student from peers: to live at home, to commute, to be employed off campus, to be employed full-time, and to watch television.

The thought that Astin's Theory of Involvement set priorities on how each individual acts an essential role in defining the nature and extent of development under the quality of involvement and effort with the resources delivered by school was supported by Pascarella and Terenzini (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). This effort and quality of institutional supplies is able to either enhance or create a necessity for bigger exposure to departments of students development and its educated personnel (Storey, 2010). Astin's theory of Involvement for English language learners leads straight into developing communicative skill, which is called as the ability or

competence to communicate (Canale & Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983; Hymes, 1972; Oxford, 1990).

2.3.7.2 Chickering's theoretical framework

Arthur W. Chickering presents the Theory of Identity Development introducing Chickering's vectors. These vectors focus on (a) developing competence, (b) managing emotions, (c) moving through autonomy toward interdependence, (d) developing mature interpersonal relationships, (e) establishing identity, (f) developing purpose, and (g) developing integrity (Chickering & Reisser, 1993).

Developing competence, the first vector, covers three parts: (I) intellectual competence, (II) manual and physical competence, and (III) interpersonal competence. Intellectual competence is capable of helping learners to be alert of their environment and their duties in the process of learning. For instance, classroom learning can help with this improvement. For example, abilities in questioning, listening, communicating and reflecting, can be constructed in every subject that involves learners in actively probing for important knowledge rather than passively getting material packaged beforehand (Chickering & Reisser, 1993).

Interpersonal competence helps learners develop their relationships and communications with others. A range of university experiences improve student's interpersonal communications, explained in the following: acquiring knowledge to communicate diplomatically and directly includes great trial and observation and mistake. Students start to feel a general sense of efficiency in their interactions with affirmative experiences. Students learn to be adjusting in reducing intensity or taking initiative, in holding back or self-disclosing, in testing the waters or expressing opinions. (Chickering & Reisser, 1993)

Various interpersonal experiences for students can be supported by Co-curricular activities. Eventually, different classes, programs, activities, or services as a section of the entire college student experience support empowering the developing competence vector: Universities that assist learners take real steps grounded on their readiness and ability level lay the foundation stones for a long-range growth, even if the steps contain pre-university skills like reading and writing, selective courses in

music or art, or extracurricular interpersonal meets. It is due to this growth of developing assuredness and mastery, not through the quantity of credits achieved in the direction of graduation that the improvement of competence takes place. (Chickering & Reisser)

Managing emotions, the second vector, is defined as the first becoming more attentive of senses and after that as learning elastic control and appropriate ways of integration or expression (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). Co-curricular and curricular engagement can assist students to observe these kinds of feelings as it links to the university students' experiences.

Moving through autonomy toward interdependence, The third vector, involves three constituents explained below: (I) Emotional independence that means freedom from repetitive and persistent requirements for affection, reassurance, or approval of others; (II) instrumental independence that means the capability to solve problems and continue activities in a self-directed method, and the confidence and freedom to be mobile for pursuing adventure or opportunity; (III) interdependence meaning an awareness of an individual's place and obligation to the benefit of the bigger community (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). Storey states that the learners' disclosure to interdependent programs supports accomplishment of the mentioned vector. For instance, university experiences that engage the learners in taking decision in group and the learning institutions assist cancel out these non-assertive, shy, or aggressive trends.

Developing mature interpersonal relationships, the fourth vector, is explained as the following: Connections are the relationships with other people that own a deep influence on student's life. Students learn lessons about how to manage and express emotions, how to share on a deeper level, how to rethink the first impressions, how to identify differences, and how to make meaningful commitments through them. Students may have achieved some knowledge of the importance of interdependence and may have already improved some interpersonal skills, but accomplishment in structuring time-tested relations that increase development and sustain us through life needs other kinds of attitudes and skills (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). To comment on the achievement of improving mature personal relationships Chickering and

Reisser state that two components are influential: (a) appreciation and tolerance of differences and (b) capability for intimacy (1993). Therefore, engagement in co-curricular involvement groups can benefit learners communicate honestly and create friendships.

Establishing identity, the fifth vector, is a progressive awareness of emotions and values, competencies, confidence in bonding with others and standing alone, and moving off intolerance toward self-esteem and openness (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). Co-curricular activities and curricular involvement are able to help learners to learn their life goals, who they are, or other influences to grow an improved sense of self.

Developing purpose, the sixth vector, involves a growing ability to be deliberate, to simplify goals, to evaluate opinions and interests, to create plans, and to continue in spite of all barriers (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). There are three regions affect the success of developing purpose: (1) aspiration and vocational, (2) personal interests, and (3) family and interpersonal commitments (Chickering & Reisser). Thus, engagement in co-curricular activities can assist learners to obtain the areas mentioned above.

Eventually, developing integrity, the last vector, is explained by below, overlying periods: (a) Humanizing values that means usage of honourable thinking in harmonizing one's self-interest with the interests of one's fellow man and to shift away from automatic application of inflexible views, (b) personalizing values that means deliberately confirming central beliefs and values while respecting other ideas, and (c) developing congruence meaning to match one's own values with socially accountable behaviour (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). In addition humanizing values comprises a developed interaction with others. A developing change happens when learners can get outside polarized behaviours while thinking to a new synthesis that integrates both caring and honesty, both empathy and power, both exception and rule (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). Furthermore, personalizing values contains openings for learners to explore or reinforce their core beliefs and values. For instance, university personnel can be of very important support by encouraging students to discover their way themselves, e.g., by communicating,

acting, and performing in the world (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). They add that a lot of students know very well what they should do, but they are faced with actual-life temptations and pressures, so they return to what is most self-protective and comfortable (Chickering & Reisser).

In conclusion, language learning can be more effective if students are able to be regularly exposed to the target language. Although in most L2 learning settings, it is not enough for students to rehearsal the target language if they just practice the classroom instruction. In this situation, co-curricular events can be observed as an attachment to classroom tutoring. Not only can co-curricular programs deliver numerous opportunities for students to practice the target language in context, but also these activities act as an entrance to developing autonomous learners (Xiao & Luo, 2009).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1 RESEARCH MODEL

The model of the study is chosen according to the goal and objectives of the research. In this study, Effects of Co-curricular Activities on Second Language Learners in Higher Education, a quantitative research model was used conducting questionnaires based on practice frequency and contribution of activities to language skills of students.

3.2 SITE SELECTION AND SAMPLING

The environment and sampling of the research takes place in Sakarya University in 2015 – 2016. A total number of 153 students participated in this study, 75 joining from English Education department of Education Faculty and the rest 78 participating from School of Foreign Language. A questionnaire containing 34 items regarding the effect of co-curricular activities were conducted in this study.

3.3 DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

To collect data in this study, a survey questionnaire was selected (see appendix A). The researcher began analysis after all data were collected. The questionnaire was designed based on four main language skills and their sub skills so each section involved its related variables. A total number of 34 activities were selected for the

questionnaire. The questionnaire was a modification of an instrument developed by Storey (2010) in her study of Bridging the Gap: Linking Co-Curricular Activities to Student Learning Outcomes in Community College Students in National-Louis Universit, Illinois. Storey (2010) developed her survey instrument based on the co-curricular influences on college students' reading, writing, scientific literacy, quantitative literacy, critical thinking, technology literacy, information literacy and global awareness skills.

Questions in the questionnaire (see Appendix A) concentrated mainly on the following: listening, reading, speaking and writing abilities of the second language learners. The findings of the study review the effects of the co-curricular activities on second language learning with the results of the applied analysis. In addition, TOEFL iBT skills, WEB1, WEB2, WEB3, WEB4, WEB5 and WEB6 were also helpful source for modification of the survey. Credibility of data in this was considered and as Patton (2002) emphasized that credibility in the study must contain a level of neutrality. Therefore, the researcher has reduced the bias during data collection process.

3.4 DATA COLLECTION

The data gathered in this study was collected from 153 participants in Sakarya University, Sakarya. Among these participants, 148 of them were Turkish students and the rest 5 were speakers of other languages. 75 of these participants were students of English Language Teaching (ELT) department of Education Faculty and 78 were students of other departments who were attending English preparatory classes in The School of Foreign Languages in Sakarya University (See table 1). Data collection procedure was approved by the Ministry of National Education of Turkey and Sakarya University (See appendix B) and was conducted between April 3rd 2016 and April 9th 2016.

3.5 DATA ANALYSIS

Participants were asked about the frequency and effect of each item, co-curricular activity, on the skill belonging to the four main skills, listening, reading, speaking and writing, in the survey questionnaire. Frequencies applied the same for all activities and participants were asked to mark “*Never*”, “*Once a month*”, “*Once a week*”, “*Twice a week*”, “*Every other day*”, and “*Every day*”. In addition, the effect of each item on every skill was coded from 1 to 5 that 1 = “no positive effect”, 2 = “little positive effect”, 3 = “effective”, 4 = “very effective” and 5 = “extremely effective”.

To find the solutions for the research sub-questions, first data from the participants were collected and then analysis such as: frequency, percentage, mean (\bar{x}), relationships (r), standard deviation (sd), variance (v), and probability (p) were performed on the variables through Pearson correlation analysis, t-test group statistics analysis, and descriptive statistics analysis tests. This procedure was analysed in IBM SPSS Statistics 20. The results of the analysis on four main language skills, listening, reading, speaking and writing, were presented through tables and explanations in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV FINDINGS

4.1 DEMOGRAPHICAL STATISTICS ABOUT PARTICIPANTS

As shown in the following table, 153 participants participated in the survey. Among these participants, 148 of them were Turkish students and the rest 5 were speakers of other languages. 75 of these participants were students of English Language Teaching (ELT) department and 78 were students of other departments who were attending English preparatory school in Sakarya University. Table 1 shows the details.

Table 1. Demographical Statistics of the Participants

N	Native Language		Department	
	Turkish	Other	English Language Teacher	Other
153	148	5	75	78
Frequency (%)	96.7	3.2	49	50.9

4.2 THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG ACTIVITIES FREQUENCY

Table 2. Correlation among Activities Frequency

Reading Frequency		Speaking Frequency		Writing Frequency		Listening Frequency		
p	r	p	r	p	r	P	R	
						.00	.543**	Writing Freq.
				.00	.736**	.00	.662**	Speaking Freq.
		.00	.751**	.00	.682**	.00	.660**	Reading Freq.
.00	.638**	.00	.624**	.00	.520**	.00	.848**	Understand main idea
.00	.641**	.00	.612**	.00	.511**	.00	.872**	Understand details
.00	.657**	.00	.588**	.00	.463**	.00	.858**	Accent familiarization
.00	.622**	.00	.590**	.00	.562**	.00	.769**	Predict discussion direction
.00	.611**	.00	.671**	.00	.829**	.00	.550**	Timed-writing
.00	.716**	.00	.710**	.00	.802**	.00	.652**	Use signal words
.00	.612**	.00	.639**	.00	.786**	.00	.559**	Outlining
.00	.685**	.00	.674**	.00	.751**	.00	.626**	Sentence and word variety
.00	.636**	.00	.620**	.00	.716**	.00	.571**	Identifying relevant ideas
.00	.661**	.00	.792**	.00	.587**	.00	.666**	Fluency
.00	.713**	.00	.811**	.00	.613**	.00	.700**	Speaking with expand description
.00	.674**	.00	.768**	.00	.552**	.00	.694**	Pronunciation & intonation
.00	.696**	.00	.788**	.00	.566**	.00	.702**	Grammatical Structure in Speaking
.00	.750**	.00	.584**	.00	.511**	.00	.626**	Vocabulary building
.00	.749**	.00	.609**	.00	.524**	.00	.655**	Skimming & scanning
.00	.710**	.00	.603**	.00	.592**	.00	.599**	Text summarizing
.00	.738**	.00	.577**	.00	.540**	.00	.595**	Reading for main idea
.00	.747**	.00	.573**	.00	.527**	.00	.605**	Reading for details
.00	.723**	.00	.566**	.00	.572**	.00	.562**	Note-taking

N = 153

According to table2 there is a significant positive relationship between four language skills' frequency, $r (151) \geq .463$ and $\leq .872$, $p < .0$. It suggests that if the participation in co-curricular activities increased in one skill, the participants' involvement increased in other skills as well.

4.3 HOMOGENEITY AND HETEROGENEITY OF DISTRIBUTION AND CONTRIBUTION OF ACTIVITIES IN LISTENING SECTION

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics in Listening Section

Listening Activities	Frequency Descriptive			Contribution Descriptive											
				Understanding Main Idea			Understanding Details			Accent Familiarization			Predicting Dis. Direction		
	X	SD	V	X	SD	V	X	SD	V	X	SD	V	X	SD	V
Listening to audio books	2.8	1.7	61.2	2.9	1.6	57.3	2.6	1.5	58.4	2.7	1.5	57.7	2.3	1.3	57.8
Listening to songs	4.3	1.8	42.6	3.0	1.4	47.2	2.8	1.3	45.3	3.3	1.5	44.9	2.6	1.3	52.5
Listening to podcasts	3.0	1.6	52.4	3.1	1.6	52.4	2.9	1.5	53.3	2.9	1.6	53.4	2.6	1.4	54.3
Listening to radio	2.3	1.4	62.3	2.4	1.5	61.1	2.3	1.4	61.3	2.6	1.7	63.7	2.2	1.3	60.9
Watching favourite TV programs	3.4	1.7	50.1	3.3	1.6	46.6	3.0	1.4	46.2	3.3	1.6	46.8	2.9	1.4	46.7
Using websites	3.3	1.8	54.0	3.0	1.5	51.7	2.8	1.4	50.3	2.8	1.5	52.3	2.6	1.3	51.1
Joining group activities	2.2	1.4	65.8	2.3	1.5	63.1	2.2	1.4	62.9	2.2	1.3	61.9	2.1	1.3	63.0
Other	1.2	0.9	74.8	1.1	0.7	58.0	1.2	0.7	62.1	1.1	0.7	58.0	1.1	0.6	55.2

N=153

According to table 3, the results in frequency descriptive suggests that the total mean of the participants in *listening to audio books*, *listening to podcasts*, *watching favourite TV programs*, *listening to songs* and *using websites* performed the activity *once a week*, $x =$ between 2.68 and 3.51. In addition, the total mean of participation in *listening to radio* and *joining group activities* declines to *once a month* in the frequency section of the listening skill, $x =$ between 1.84 and 2.67. Meanwhile, the total mean of participants have reported *listening to audio books* as very effective for understanding the main idea, details and accent familiarization, $x =$ between 2.41 and 3.20, but this total mean of participants selected this activity as only effective for predicting discussion direction, $x =$ between 1.61 and 2.40. Also the participants reported *listening to songs* as very effective activity for improving understanding the

main idea, understanding details and predicting discussion direction, $x =$ between 2.41 and 3.20, but extremely effective for accent familiarization. *Listening to the podcasts* is reported as very effective activity for all the mentioned skills, $x =$ between 2.41 and 3.20, *listening to the radio* as effective for understanding the main idea, details and predicting discussion direction, $x =$ between 1.61 and 2.40, but very effective for accent familiarization, $x =$ between 2.41 and 3.20, *watching favourite TV program* was reported as extremely effective for understanding the main idea and accent familiarization, $x =$ between 3.21 and 4, but very effective for understanding details and predicting discussion direction, $x =$ between 2.41 and 3.20, *using websites* was reported as very effective activity for all mentioned skills, $x =$ between 2.41 and 3.20 and finally, joining to group activities were reported as an effective activity for the mentioned skills in the listening section, $x =$ between 1.61 and 2.40.

In comparison to sub-skills, *understanding main idea, understanding details, accent familiarization and predicting discussion direction*, the report shows that the participants have different viewpoints from each other regarding the effects of the activities on the mentioned skills, $v > 25$.

4.4 HOMOGENEITY AND HETEROGENEITY OF DISTRIBUTION AND CONTRIBUTION OF ACTIVITIES IN READING SECTION

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics in Reading Section

Reading Activities	Descriptive			Contribution																	
				Vocabulary Building			Skimming & Scanning			Text Summarizing			Reading for Main Idea			Reading for Details			Note-taking		
	X	S	V	X	S	V	X	S	V	X	S	V	X	S	V	X	S	V			
Reading short stories	3.6	1.8	5.6	3.6	1.5	42.8	3.2	1.4	43.1	3.2	1.5	4.1	3.3	1.5	45.7	3.2	1.5	47.2	2.7	1.3	5.2
Reading film subtitle	3.6	1.8	5.0	3.3	1.4	42.7	3.2	1.4	44.5	2.6	1.3	5.7	2.9	1.4	48.6	2.6	1.5	55.6	2.5	1.3	5.9
Reading favorite topics	3.4	1.8	5.4	3.2	1.6	49.2	3.1	1.5	49.2	2.7	1.4	5.1	3.0	1.5	50.7	3.1	1.6	51.8	2.6	1.4	5.9
Newspaper reading	2.5	1.4	5.8	2.5	1.5	59.2	2.7	1.6	57.8	2.4	1.4	5.9	2.7	1.6	59.2	2.5	1.4	57.9	2.3	1.4	5.5
Joining reading groups	2.0	1.4	7.6	2.2	1.6	71.9	1.9	1.3	68.2	1.8	1.2	6.1	1.9	1.3	67.8	1.9	1.3	68.7	1.8	1.2	6.0
Reading jokes	3.0	1.8	5.9	2.8	1.5	54.8	2.3	1.3	57.8	1.1	1.3	5.9	2.2	1.3	59.5	2.1	1.3	59.7	2.0	1.2	5.0
Reading ads and brochures	2.4	1.5	6.2	2.4	1.4	61.1	2.2	1.4	60.3	2.2	1.3	5.6	2.3	1.3	58.0	2.2	1.4	60.9	2.0	1.2	5.9
Reading books	2.5	1.5	5.9	3.1	1.7	53.6	3.1	1.6	54.3	2.9	1.6	6.4	2.9	1.7	56.5	2.9	1.6	56.4	2.7	1.6	5.8
Other	1.0	0.3	3.5	1.0	0.2	23.8	1.0	0.2	23.8	1.0	0.2	3.8	1.0	0.2	16.0	1.0	0.2	23.8	1.0	0.3	3.5

N=153

According to table 4, the results in frequency descriptive shows that the total mean of the participants in *reading short stories* and *reading subtitles* are involved practicing *twice a week*, $x =$ between 3.52 and 4.35. The level of participation declines to *once a week* in *reading favourite topics* and *reading jokes*, $x =$ between 2.68 and 3.51. In addition, the total mean of participation in *newspaper reading*, *joining reading groups*, *reading ads and brochures* and *reading books* fall to *once a month* in the frequency section of the reading skill, $x =$ between 1.84 and 2.67. The total mean of the participants shows that *reading short stories* was chosen as extremely effective activity for vocabulary building, skimming and scanning, text summarizing and reading for details, $x =$ between 3.21 and 4, but very effective for note-taking, $x =$

between 2.41 and 3.20, *reading film subtitles* was chosen as an extremely effective activity for vocabulary building, and skimming & scanning, $x =$ between 3.21 and 4, but very effective for text summarizing, reading for main idea, reading for details and note-taking, $x =$ 2.41 and 3.20, *reading favourite topics* was chosen as extremely effective activity for vocabulary building, $x =$ between 3.21 and 4, but very effective for the rest of the sub-skills in the table, $x =$ between 2.41 and 3.20, *newspaper reading* was selected as very effective activity for vocabulary building, skimming and scanning, reading for main idea and details, $x =$ between 2.41 and 3.20, but effective for text summarizing and note-taking, $x =$ between 1.61 and 4.40, *joining reading groups* was reported effective for all the skills, $x =$ between 1.61 and 2.40, *reading jokes* was reported very effective for vocabulary building, and effective for other skill, *reading ads and brochures* was reported effective for improving all skills and *reading books* was reported as a very effective activity for all the skills, $x =$ between 2.41 and 3.20.

In comparison to sub-skills, *vocabulary building, skimming and scanning, text summarizing, reading for details and note-taking*, the report shows that the participants have different viewpoints from each other regarding the effects of the activities on the mentioned skills, $v > 25$.

4.5 HOMOGENEITY AND HETEROGENEITY OF DISTRIBUTION AND CONTRIBUTION OF ACTIVITIES IN SPEAKING SECTION

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics in Speaking Section

Speaking Activities	Descriptive			Contribution											
				Fluency			Speaking with Expand Description			Pronunciation and Intonation			Grammatical Structure in Speaking		
	X	SD	V	X	SD	V	X	SD	V	X	SD	V	X	SD	V
Speaking with native speaker	3.1	1.7	56.3	3.1	1.6	50.2	3.0	1.5	50.4	3.1	1.6	50.5	2.8	1.4	51.4
Recording yourself	2.6	1.5	57.4	2.6	1.4	56.2	2.7	1.5	56.4	2.5	1.4	57.1	2.5	1.4	56.1
Memorizing songs	3.7	1.8	48.9	3.3	1.5	45.9	2.8	1.4	51.3	3.2	1.5	47.4	2.7	1.4	51.8
Joining speaking groups	2.2	1.5	67.0	2.4	1.6	66.8	2.4	1.5	65.5	2.3	1.5	64.6	2.3	1.6	66.7
Memorizing vocabulary	3.1	1.8	56.9	2.8	1.5	52.8	2.8	1.5	52.0	2.4	1.3	56.4	2.6	1.4	55.8
Participating debates and conferences	2.0	1.2	60.5	2.4	1.6	65.2	2.5	1.6	64.8	2.4	1.6	66.5	2.4	1.6	65.7
Imitating actors discourse	2.5	1.6	62.7	2.7	1.6	60.0	2.3	1.4	59.1	2.7	1.7	61.3	2.4	1.4	58.3
Video chatting	2.4	1.5	64.4	2.6	1.7	64.4	2.4	1.5	64.2	2.5	1.6	62.8	2.3	1.5	66.3
Other	1.1	0.5	50.3	1.1	0.5	45.3	1.1	0.4	40.9	1.1	0.4	40.9	1.1	0.4	39.0

N=153

According to table 5, the results in frequency descriptive shows that the total mean of the participants in *memorizing songs* are involved practicing *twice a week*, $x =$ between 3.52 and 4.35. The level of participation declines to *once a week* in *speaking with native speakers* and *memorizing vocabulary*, $x =$ between 2.68 and 3.51. furthermore, the total mean of participation in *recording yourself*, *joining speaking groups*, *participation in debates and conferences*, *imitating actors discourse* and video chatting fall to *once a month* in the frequency section of the speaking skill, $x =$ between 1.84 and 2.67. At the same time, *speaking with native speakers* was reported as very effective for the sub-skills, fluency, speaking with expand description, pronunciation and intonation, and grammatical structure in speaking, $x =$ between 2.41 and 3.20, *recording yourself* was also reported as very effective for the mentioned skills, $x =$ between 2.41 and 3.20, *memorizing songs* was reported extremely effective for fluency and very effective for other activities, $x =$ between 3.21 and 4 and $x =$ between 2.41 and 3.20, *joining speaking groups* was reported effective for all the activities, $x =$ between 1.61 and 2.40, *memorizing vocabulary*

was reported very effective for improving all skills, $x =$ between 2.41 and 3.20, *Participating debates and conferences* was reported as very effective for speaking with expand description and effective for the rest of the skills, *Imitating actors discourse* was reported very effective for fluency and pronunciation and intonation, but effective for speaking with expand description and grammatical structure in speaking, *video chatting* was reported as very effective for fluency and pronunciation and intonation, but effective for speaking with expand description and grammatical structure in speaking, $x =$ between 2.41 and 3.20 and $x =$ between 1.61 and 2.40.

In comparison to sub-skills, *understanding main idea, understanding details, accent familiarization* and *predicting discussion direction*, the report shows that the participants have different viewpoints from each other regarding the effects of the activities on the mentioned skills, $v > 25$.

4.6 HOMOGENEITY AND HETEROGENEITY OF DISTRIBUTION AND CONTRIBUTION OF ACTIVITIES IN WRITING SECTION

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics in Writing Section

Writing Activities	Descriptive			Contribution														
				Timed-writing			Using signal words			Outlining			Variety in Writing			Identifying Relevant Ideas		
	X	SD	V	X	SD	V	X	SD	V	X	SD	V	X	SD	V	X	SD	V
Chatting online	3.4	1.9	54.5	2.8	1.5	53.0	2.8	1.5	52.1	2.3	1.3	56.1	2.7	1.4	51.8	2.6	1.4	51.9
Story writing	2.5	1.6	61.2	2.7	1.5	55.6	2.8	1.6	57.9	2.5	1.4	56.6	2.7	1.6	57.5	2.4	1.4	59.3
Writing diary	2.3	1.7	76.9	1.9	1.2	65.4	2.0	1.4	69.6	1.9	1.3	69.0	1.9	1.3	67.6	1.7	1.2	71.0
Joining seminars, events etc	1.7	1.2	66.9	1.7	1.2	69.4	1.8	1.2	65.2	1.6	1.1	65.4	1.8	1.2	67.8	1.7	1.2	69.5
Editing by others	2.7	1.4	53.4	2.4	1.4	56.0	2.8	1.4	51.8	2.5	1.4	57.8	2.8	1.5	55.2	2.8	1.6	55.3
Using internet forum	2.3	1.6	69.5	2.2	1.4	66.4	2.2	1.5	66.2	1.9	1.2	62.8	2.1	1.4	66.5	2.1	1.4	65.9
Participating writing clubs	1.8	1.2	67.8	1.9	1.3	69.5	1.8	1.3	71.7	1.7	1.2	67.9	1.7	1.2	68.5	1.7	1.2	71.0
Other	1.1	0.5	50.3	1.0	0.4	38.5	1.1	0.4	39.0	1.0	0.3	28.1	1.1	0.4	39.0	1.0	0.3	29.0

N=153

According to table 6, the results in frequency descriptive shows that the total mean of the participants in *chatting online* are involved practicing *twice a week*, $x =$ between 3.52 and 4.35. The level of participation declines to *once a week* in *editing by others*, $x =$ between 2.68 and 3.51. furthermore, the total mean of participation in *story writing*, *writing diary*, and *using internet forum* fall to *once a month* in the frequency section of the speaking skill, $x =$ between 1.84 and 2.67. Besides, *chatting online* was reported as a very effective activity for timed-writing, using signal words, variety in writing, and identifying relevant ideas, $x =$ between 2.41 and 3.20 and effective for outlining, $x = 2.3$, *story writing* was reported very effective for timed writing, using signal words, outlining and variety in writing, $x =$ between 2.41 and 3.20 and effective for identifying relevant ideas, $x =$ between 1.61 and 2.40, *writing diary* was reported as effective for all skills, *joining seminars and events* was reported eff not very effective for outlining, $x =$ between 0.81 and 1.60, and effective for the rest of the skills, $x =$ between 1.61 and 2.40, *editing by others* was reported as very effective for all activities except timed-writing, $x =$ between 2.41 and 3.20, but effective for timed writing, finally, *using internet forum* and *participating writing clubs* were reported as effective activities for all skills, $x =$ between 1.61 and 2.40.

In comparison to sub-skills, *timed-writing*, *using signal words*, *outlining*, *variety in writing* and *identifying relevant ideas*, the report shows that the participants have different viewpoints from each other regarding the effects of the activities on the mentioned skills, $v > 25$.

4.7 T-TEST RESULTS OF THE LISTENING SECTION

4.7.1 T-test Result of Listening Frequency According to Departments

Table 7. T-Test Result Of Listening Frequency According To Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	T	Df	P
Listening to audio books	Eng. teacher	75	2.3333	1.36890	.15807	17.346	-3.357	151	.001
	other	78	3.2308	1.88585	.21353		-3.378	140.58	.001
Listening to songs	Eng. teacher	75	5.0533	1.40360	.16207		.599	149.926	.550
	other	78	3.6154	1.94222	.21991	22.619	5.231	151	.000
Listening to podcasts	Eng. teacher	75	2.8933	1.59876	.18461		1.491	149.772	.138
	other	78	3.1538	1.57147	.17793	.000	-1.016	151	.311
Listening to radio	Eng. teacher	75	2.2000	1.37546	.15882		-.410	150.265	.683
	other	78	2.3205	1.44594	.16372	.900	-.528	151	.598
Watching favourite TV programs	Eng. teacher	75	3.5067	1.59707	.18441		-.932	150.929	.353
	other	78	3.3846	1.84624	.20905	2.239	.437	151	.663
Using websites	Eng. teacher	75	3.7200	1.75191	.20229		2.602	150.451	.010
	other	78	2.8205	1.66510	.18854	1.305	3.256	151	.001
Joining group activities	Eng. teacher	75	2.0400	1.44671	.16705		2.697	150.606	.008
	other	78	2.2692	1.39268	.15769	.096	-.999	151	.320
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.3067	1.11468	.12871		-1.156	150.931	.249
	other	78	1.0641	.56614	.06410	12.089	1.707	151	.090

According to department engagement frequency in co-curricular activities, there was significant difference in the activities: *listening to audio books*, *using websites*, and *joining group activities*, $t_{(151)} = -3.357, p < .05$ and $t_{(150.451)} = 2.602, p < .05$ and $t_{(150.606)} = 2.697, p < .05$. There was no significant difference in the reported other activities. Students from other departments practiced listening to audio books more than English Language Teachers department. In using websites English Teachers department practiced more than other departments' students. In joining group activities other departments' student practiced more than English language teachers department. Meanwhile there is another significant difference in *listening to songs* because p value differs between (.000) and (.550).

4.7.2 T-test Result of Effect on Understanding the Main Idea according to Departments

Table 8. T-Test Result of Effect on Understanding the Main Idea According To Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	T	Df	P
Listening to audio books	Eng. teacher	75	2.6267	1.59198	.18383		-3.378	140.584	.001
	other	78	3.0641	1.65412	.18729	.022	-1.666	151	.098
Listening to songs	Eng. teacher	75	3.4267	1.43483	.16568		5.264	140.295	.000
	other	78	2.5385	1.23470	.13980	2.559	4.109	151	.000
Listening to podcasts	Eng. teacher	75	2.9067	1.58688	.18324		-1.016	150.516	.311
	other	78	3.2051	1.61454	.18281	.528	-1.153	151	.251
Listening to radio	Eng. teacher	75	2.4400	1.49087	.17215		-.528	150.983	.598
	other	78	2.4103	1.48093	.16768	.009	.124	151	.902
Watching favourite TV programs	Eng. teacher	75	3.5200	1.41765	.16370		.438	149.357	.662
	other	78	3.1538	1.65989	.18795	6.718	1.465	151	.145
Using websites	Eng. teacher	75	3.4533	1.54477	.17837		3.253	149.781	.001
	other	78	2.4615	1.34543	.15234	2.306	4.240	151	.000
Joining group activities	Eng. teacher	75	2.2400	1.49630	.17278		-.998	150.099	.320
	other	78	2.3718	1.42436	.16128	.663	-.558	151	.578
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.2267	.81495	.09410		1.687	108.827	.094
	Other	78	1.0513	.45291	.05128	11.270	1.654	151	.100

According to department types, respectively, the effect on understanding the main idea in listening section, there was significant difference in the activities: *listening to audio books*, *listening to songs*, and *using websites*, $t_{(140.584)} = -3.378$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(140.295)} = 5.264$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(149.781)} = 3.253$, $p < .05$. Other department student declared that listening to audio books had been more effective understanding the main idea in listening skill. English department students supported listening to songs to be more effective than other departments' students. There was no significant difference in the reported other activities.

4.7.3 T-test Result of Effect on Understanding Details According to Department

Table 9. T-Test Result of Effect on Understanding Details According to Department

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Listening to audio books	Eng. teacher	75	2.3067	1.38499	.15992	3.158	-1.667	151.000	.098
	other	78	2.9231	1.60979	.18227		-2.535	151	.012
Listening to songs	Eng. teacher	75	3.0933	1.17604	.13580	1.531	4.097	145.839	.000
	other	78	2.4872	1.27660	.14455		3.051	151	.003
Listening to podcasts	Eng. teacher	75	2.7067	1.43106	.16524	4.599	-1.153	150.926	.251
	Other	78	3.0769	1.63381	.18499		-1.489	151	.139
Listening to radio	Eng.. teacher	75	2.2400	1.28231	.14807	7.293	.124	150.679	.902
	Other	78	2.3974	1.54869	.17535		-.683	151	.495
Watching favourite TV programs	Eng. teacher	75	3.1733	1.28792	.14872	3.848	1.469	148.946	.144
	Other	78	2.8077	1.45100	.16429		1.646	151	.102
Using websites	Eng. teacher	75	3.2267	1.40051	.16172	.058	4.228	146.444	.000
	Other	78	2.4231	1.32429	.14995		3.648	151	.000
Joining group activities	Eng. teacher	75	2.0933	1.41587	.16349	.950	-.558	149.822	.578
	Other	78	2.2692	1.33556	.15122		-.791	151	.430
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.2533	.90185	.10414	13.054	1.637	114.753	.104
	Other	78	1.0513	.45291	.05128		1.761	151	.080

According to department types, respectively, the effect on understanding details in listening section, there was significant difference in the activities: *listening to songs* and *using websites*, $t_{(145.839)} = 4.097$, $p < .05$ and $t_{(146.444)} = 4.228$, $p < .05$. English department supported the mentioned two activities to be more effective for developing understanding details in listening skill than other departments' students. There was no significant difference in the reported other activities.

4.7.4 T-test Result of Effect on Accent Familiarization According to Departments

Table 10. T-test Result of Effect on Accent Familiarization According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Listening to audio books	Eng. teacher	75	2.4533	1.45466	.16797		-2.542	149.188	.012
	Other	78	2.8846	1.60341	.18155	1.646	-1.740	151	.084
Listening to songs	Eng. teacher	75	3.7200	1.23639	.14277		3.056	150.728	.003
	Other	78	2.9103	1.59696	.18082	14.338	3.497	151	.001
Listening to podcasts	Eng. teacher	75	2.920	1.5224	.1758		-1.493	149.717	.138
	Other	78	2.962	1.6232	.1838	1.953	-.163	151	.871
Listening to radio	Eng. teacher	75	2.5867	1.67730	.19368		-.686	147.776	.494
	Other	78	2.6795	1.68641	.19095	.010	-.341	151	.733
Watching favourite TV programs	Eng. teacher	75	3.6000	1.40463	.16219		1.650	150.053	.101
	Other	78	3.0256	1.63544	.18518	7.419	2.326	151	.021
Using websites	Eng. teacher	75	3.0533	1.41319	.16318		3.644	149.640	.000
	Other	78	2.5000	1.43925	.16296	1.461	2.398	151	.018
Joining group activities	Eng. teacher	75	2.0800	1.35327	.15626		-.790	149.571	.431
	Other	78	2.2436	1.33081	.15068	.194	-.754	151	.452
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.2000	.80539	.09300		1.741	108.131	.085
	Other	78	1.0513	.45291	.05128	8.135	1.415	151	.159

According to department types, respectively, the effect on accent familiarization in listening section, there was significant difference in the activities: *listening to songs*, and *using websites*, $t_{(150.728)} = 3.056$, $p < .05$ and $t_{(149.640)} = 3.644$, $p < .05$. English department students supported the mentioned activities to be more effective for accent familiarization than other departments' students. There was no significant difference in the reported other activities.

4.7.5 T-test Result of Effect on Predicting Discussion Direction According to Departments

Table 11. T-test Result of Effect on Predicting Discussion Direction According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Listening to audio books	Eng. teacher	75	2.3867	1.37441	.15870		-1.744	150.498	.083
	Other	78	2.2564	1.31362	.14874	.977	.599	151	.550
Listening to songs	Eng. teacher	75	2.7200	1.37113	.15832		3.515	144.495	.001
	Other	78	2.3974	1.30274	.14751	.187	1.492	151	.138
Listening to podcasts	Eng. teacher	75	2.5600	1.33801	.15450		-.163	150.909	.870
	Other	78	2.6538	1.49307	.16906	1.402	-.409	151	.683
Listening to radio	Eng. teacher	75	2.0933	1.29629	.14968		-.341	150.825	.733
	Other	78	2.2949	1.37802	.15603	1.507	-.931	151	.353
Watching favourite TV programs	Eng. teacher	75	3.1733	1.33936	.15466		2.333	149.132	.021
	Other	78	2.6154	1.31159	.14851	.066	2.603	151	.010
Using websites	Eng. teacher	75	2.9200	1.32298	.15276		2.399	150.932	.018
	Other	78	2.3462	1.30759	.14806	.257	2.698	151	.008
Joining group activities	Eng. teacher	75	1.9600	1.29906	.15000		-.754	150.524	.452
	Other	78	2.2051	1.32272	.14977	.193	-1.156	151	.250
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.2000	.75337	.08699		1.400	115.575	.164
	Other	78	1.0513	.45291	.05128	8.771	1.486	151	.139

According to department types, the effect on predicting discussion direction in listening section, there was significant difference in the activity: *watching favourite TV programs*, $t_{(150.932)} = 2.399$, $p < .05$. English department student supported the activity to be more effective for predicting discussion direction than other departments' students. There was no significant difference in the reported other activities.

4.8 T-TEST RESULTS OF THE READING SECTION

4.8.1 T-test Result of Reading Frequency according to Departments

Table 12. T-Test Result of Reading Frequency According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Reading short stories	Eng. teacher	75	3.3867	1.63487	.18878	7.982	1.585	74.000	.117
	Other	78	3.7308	2.01083	.22768		-1.159	151	.248
Reading film subtitles	Eng. teacher	75	3.5600	1.62114	.18719	9.109	1.446	147.035	.150
	Other	78	3.6795	1.98366	.22461		-.407	151	.685
Reading favourite topics	Eng. teacher	75	3.6667	1.74242	.20120	.008	.395	150.998	.693
	other	78	3.1026	1.76245	.19956		1.990	151	.048
Newspaper reading	Eng. teacher	75	2.4133	1.41511	.16340	.115	-.130	150.311	.897
	other	78	2.5256	1.44801	.16395		-.485	151	.628
Joining reading groups	Eng. teacher	75	1.8133	1.34258	.15503	2.362	-.669	150.894	.504
	other	78	2.1410	1.43901	.16294		-1.455	151	.148
Reading jokes	Eng. teacher	75	2.7867	1.71080	.19755	3.742	-1.184	150.996	.238
	other	78	3.2564	1.86865	.21158		-1.620	151	.107
Reading ads and brochures	Eng. teacher	75	2.7333	1.63850	.18920	5.590	1.716	143.186	.088
	other	78	2.1667	1.37148	.15529		2.323	151	.022
Reading books	Eng. teacher	75	2.5867	1.49859	.17304	1.168	.538	149.871	.591
	other	78	2.5128	1.52676	.17287		.302	151	.763
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.0533	.46188	.05333	4.276	.207	150.713	.836
	other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000		1.020	151	.309

According to department engagement frequency of the co-curricular activities in reading section of the survey, respectively, there were significant differences in the activities: *reading favourite topics* and *reading ads and brochures*, $t_{(151)} = 1.990$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(151)} = 2.323$, $p < .05$ It suggests that English departments students engaged in the mentioned activities more than other departments' students. There was no significant difference in the reported other activities. X values are close to each other.

4.8.2 T-test Result of Effect on Vocabulary Building According to Departments

Table 13. T-test Result of Effect on Vocabulary Building According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Reading short stories	Eng. teacher	75	3.7867	1.39781	.16141	8.738	-1.163	146.980	.247
	Other	78	3.3846	1.63747	.18541		1.630	151	.105
Reading film subtitles	Eng. teacher	75	3.5333	1.33895	.15461	1.455	-.409	147.214	.683
	Other	78	3.1410	1.48345	.16797		1.715	151	.088
Reading favourite topics	Eng. teacher	75	3.4400	1.49991	.17319	2.001	1.991	150.881	.048
	Other	78	3.0128	1.64746	.18654		1.675	151	.096
Newspaper reading	Eng. teacher	75	2.6933	1.61055	.18597	4.358	-.485	150.959	.628
	Other	78	2.3974	1.38957	.15734		1.218	151	.225
Joining reading groups	Eng. teacher	75	2.0267	1.54197	.17805	2.890	-1.457	150.866	.147
	Other	78	2.3846	1.62153	.18360		-1.398	151	.164
Reading jokes	Eng. teacher	75	2.7733	1.48482	.17145	1.290	-1.623	150.643	.107
	Other	78	2.7821	1.56792	.17753		-.035	151	.972
Reading ads and brochures	Eng. teacher	75	2.7867	1.58790	.18336	16.606	2.315	144.335	.022
	Other	78	1.9615	1.16711	.13215		3.672	151	.000
Reading books	Eng. teacher	75	3.3600	1.58233	.18271	3.572	.302	150.934	.763
	Other	78	2.8333	1.69351	.19175		1.986	151	.049
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.0400	.34641	.04000	4.276	1.000	74.000	.321
	Other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000		1.020	151	.309

According to department types, the effect on vocabulary building skill, respectively, there were differences in *reading favourite topics*, *reading ads and brochures* and *reading books*, $t_{(150.881)} = 1.991$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(144.335)} = 2.315$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(150.934)} = .302$, $p < .05$. It suggests that English department students reported that the mentioned activities had been more effective for improving their vocabulary building in reading skill than other departments' students. There was no significant difference in the other reported activities.

4.8.3 T-test Result of Effect on Skimming and Scanning According to Departments

Table 14. T-test Result of Effect on Skimming and Scanning According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Reading short stories	Eng. teacher	75	3.5867	1.34660	.15549	.207	1.636	148.929	.104
	Other	78	2.9231	1.38423	.15673		3.004	151	.003
Reading film subtitles	Eng. teacher	75	3.2800	1.33112	.15370	3.306	1.718	150.406	.088
	Other	78	3.1154	1.51169	.17117		.714	151	.476
Reading favourite topics	Eng. teacher	75	3.2000	1.44260	.16658	1.391	1.678	150.557	.095
	Other	78	2.8333	1.50684	.17062		1.536	151	.127
Newspaper reading	Eng. teacher	75	2.6800	1.57823	.18224	.313	1.215	145.974	.226
	Other	78	2.6923	1.54001	.17437		-.049	151	.961
Joining reading groups	Eng. teacher	75	1.8133	1.33248	.15386	.928	-1.400	150.982	.164
	Other	78	1.9231	1.22495	.13870		-.531	151	.596
Reading jokes	Eng. teacher	75	2.5733	1.36731	.15788	1.598	-.035	150.966	.972
	Other	78	2.0769	1.27686	.14458		2.322	151	.022
Reading ads and brochures	Eng. teacher	75	2.6267	1.49570	.17271	16.834	3.651	135.665	.000
	Other	78	1.8718	1.08543	.12290		3.583	151	.000
Reading books	Eng. teacher	75	3.2667	1.58825	.18339	1.271	1.988	150.878	.049
	Other	78	2.7436	1.63910	.18559		2.004	151	.047
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.0400	.34641	.04000	4.276	1.000	74.000	.321
	Other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000		1.020	151	.309

According to department types, the effect on skimming and scanning skill, respectively, there were differences in *reading short stories*, *reading jokes*, *reading ads and brochures* and *reading books*, $t_{(151)} = 3.004$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(151)} = 2.322$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(135.665)} = 3.651$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(150.878)} = 1.988$, $p < .05$ It suggests that English department students reported that the first three mentioned activities had been more effective for improving their skimming and scanning in reading skill than other departments' students, but other departments' student supported reading books more than English students for developing this skill. There was no significant difference in the other reported activities.

4.8.4 T-test Result of Effect on Text Summarizing According to Departments

Table 15. T-test Result of Effect on Text Summarizing According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Reading short stories	Eng. teacher	75	3.3333	1.38850	.16033	2.406	3.006	150.979	.003
	Other	78	3.1410	1.52660	.17285		.814	151	.417
Reading film subtitles	Eng. teacher	75	2.9333	1.34901	.15577	.485	.716	149.857	.475
	Other	78	2.2949	1.28031	.14497		3.004	151	.003
Reading favourite topics	Eng. teacher	75	3.0800	1.41192	.16303	.601	1.538	150.997	.126
	Other	78	2.4231	1.32429	.14995		2.969	151	.003
Newspaper reading	Eng. teacher	75	2.4667	1.52753	.17638	10.739	-.049	150.384	.961
	other	78	2.3077	1.23064	.13934		.710	151	.479
Joining reading groups	Eng. teacher	75	1.8133	1.27017	.14667	1.031	-.530	148.740	.597
	other	78	1.8333	1.10978	.12566		-.104	151	.917
Reading jokes	Eng. teacher	75	2.4000	1.42374	.16440	23.041	2.319	149.268	.022
	other	78	1.8718	1.06123	.12016		2.609	151	.010
Reading ads and brochures	Eng. teacher	75	2.4667	1.47349	.17014	30.823	3.561	134.721	.001
	other	78	1.8718	1.01109	.11448		2.921	151	.004
Reading books	Eng. teacher	75	2.9600	1.58063	.18251	2.437	2.005	150.990	.047
	other	78	2.7821	1.65653	.18757		.679	151	.498
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.0400	.34641	.04000	4.276	1.000	74.000	.321
	other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000		1.020	151	.309

According to department types, the effect on text summarizing, respectively, there were significant differences in *reading short stories*, *reading film subtitles*, *reading favourite topics*, *reading jokes*, *reading ads and brochures* and *reading books*, $t_{(150.979)} = 3.006$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(151)} = 3.004$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(151)} = 2.969$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(149.268)} = 2.319$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(134.721)} = 3.561$, $p < .05$ and $t_{(150.990)} = 2.005$, $p < .05$. It suggests that English department students supported the mentioned activities more than other departments' students for developing text summarizing in reading skill. There was no significant difference in the other reported activities.

4.8.5 T-test Result of Effect on Reading for Main Idea According to Departments

Table 16. T-test Result of Effect on Reading for Main Idea According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Reading short stories	Eng. teacher	75	3.5333	1.45503	.16801	.070	.816	150.541	.416
	Other	78	3.0000	1.48586	.16824		2.242	151	.026
Reading film subtitles	Eng. teacher	75	3.3067	1.38499	.15992	.983	3.000	149.743	.003
	Other	78	2.4231	1.25377	.14196		4.140	151	.000
Reading favourite topics	Eng. teacher	75	3.2400	1.42222	.16422	1.823	2.966	149.403	.004
	Other	78	2.6795	1.52463	.17263		2.349	151	.020
Newspaper reading	Eng. teacher	75	2.5200	1.54535	.17844	.424	.707	142.026	.481
	Other	78	2.8846	1.64341	.18608		-1.413	151	.160
Joining reading groups	Eng. teacher	75	1.8933	1.41013	.16283	5.457	-.104	146.598	.918
	Other	78	1.8333	1.10978	.12566		.293	151	.770
Reading jokes	Eng. teacher	75	2.4933	1.33936	.15466	2.734	2.594	136.693	.011
	Other	78	1.9487	1.24731	.14123		2.604	151	.010
Reading ads and brochures	Eng. teacher	75	2.5867	1.47129	.16989	16.302	2.901	130.473	.004
	Other	78	1.9744	1.08082	.12238		2.942	151	.004
Reading books	Eng. teacher	75	3.1200	1.58507	.18303	2.498	.680	150.992	.498
	Other	78	2.7436	1.70892	.19350		1.411	151	.160
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.0267	.23094	.02667	4.276	1.000	74.000	.321
	Other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000		1.020	151	.309

According to department types, the effect on reading for main idea, respectively, there were significant differences in *reading short stories*, *reading film subtitles*, *reading favourite topics*, *reading jokes*, and *reading ads and brochures*, $t_{(151)} = 2.242$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(149.743)} = 3.000$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(149.403)} = 2.966$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(136.693)} = 2.594$, $p < .05$ and $t_{(130.473)} = 2.901$, $p < .05$. It suggests that English department students supported the mentioned activities more than other departments' students for developing reading for main ideas reading skill. There was no significant difference in the other reported activities.

4.8.6 T-test Result of Effect on Reading for Details According to Departments

Table 17. T-test Result of Effect on Reading for Details According to Departments

Activity	department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Reading short stories	Eng. teacher	75	3.3867	1.46022	.16861	1.731	2.243	150.948	.026
	other	78	3.0769	1.57718	.17858		1.259	151	.210
Reading film subtitles	Eng. teacher	75	3.0667	1.40783	.16256	.116	4.132	148.159	.000
	other	78	2.2436	1.42506	.16136		3.593	151	.000
Reading favourite topics	Eng. teacher	75	3.2667	1.48263	.17120	4.233	2.352	150.864	.020
	other	78	2.8333	1.64685	.18647		1.708	151	.090
Newspaper reading	Eng. teacher	75	2.4933	1.45540	.16806	.088	-1.414	150.927	.159
	other	78	2.4744	1.42996	.16191		.081	151	.935
Joining reading groups	Eng. teacher	75	1.8400	1.36600	.15773	.289	.292	140.498	.771
	other	78	1.9615	1.25297	.14187		-.574	151	.567
Reading jokes	Eng. teacher	75	2.3333	1.38850	.16033	10.341	2.600	149.180	.010
	other	78	1.9615	1.14464	.12960		1.810	151	.072
Reading ads and brochures	Eng. teacher	75	2.5200	1.44596	.16697	10.118	2.924	135.626	.004
	other	78	1.9359	1.19891	.13575		2.724	151	.007
Reading books	Eng. teacher	75	3.0933	1.54372	.17825	4.692	1.413	150.808	.160
	other	78	2.6923	1.69267	.19166		1.529	151	.128
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.0400	.34641	.04000	4.276	1.000	74.000	.321
	other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000		1.020	151	.309

According to department types, the effect on reading for details, respectively, there were significant differences in *reading short stories*, *reading film subtitles*, *reading favourite topics*, *reading jokes*, and *reading ads and brochures*, $t_{(150.948)} = 2.243$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(148.159)} = 4.132$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(150.864)} = 2.352$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(149.180)} = 2.600$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(135.626)} = 2.924$, $p < .05$. It suggests that English department students supported the mentioned activities more than other departments' students for developing reading for details in reading skill. There was no significant difference in the other reported activities.

4.8.7 T-test Result of Effect on Note-Taking According to Departments

Table 18. T-test Result of Effect On Note-Taking According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Reading short stories	Eng. teacher	75	2.8400	1.42412	.16444	1.222	1.261	150.788	.209
	other	78	2.5256	1.25589	.14220		1.450	151	.149
Reading film subtitles	Eng. teacher	75	2.4933	1.27738	.14750	.077	3.593	150.887	.000
	other	78	2.4103	1.32347	.14985		.395	151	.694
Reading favourite topics	Eng. teacher	75	2.5600	1.33801	.15450	2.862	1.712	150.357	.089
	other	78	2.5897	1.48967	.16867		-1.130	151	.897
Newspaper reading	Eng. teacher	75	2.2667	1.43634	.16585	.011	.081	150.509	.935
	other	78	2.4231	1.45512	.16476		-.669	151	.505
Joining reading groups	Eng. teacher	75	1.6800	1.17588	.13578	1.009	-.573	148.659	.568
	other	78	1.9103	1.22936	.13920		-1.183	151	.239
Reading jokes	Eng. teacher	75	2.1467	1.33248	.15386	8.145	1.803	143.444	.073
	other	78	1.8077	1.09376	.12384		1.723	151	.087
Reading ads and brochures	Eng. teacher	75	2.0533	1.22908	.14192	.232	2.714	143.787	.007
	other	78	1.9487	1.17216	.13272		.539	151	.591
Reading books	Eng. teacher	75	2.6933	1.49751	.17292	3.919	1.532	150.585	.128
	other	78	2.6410	1.62748	.18428		.207	151	.837
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.0533	.46188	.05333	4.276	1.000	74.000	.321
	Other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000		1.020	151	.309

According to department types, the effect on note-taking, respectively, there were significant differences in *reading film subtitles* and *reading ads and brochures*, $t_{(150.887)} = 3.593$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(143.787)} = 2.714$, $p < .05$. It means that English department students supported the mentioned activities more than other departments' students for improving note-taking in reading skill. There was no significant difference in the other reported activities.

4.9 T-TEST RESULTS OF THE SPEAKING SECTION

4.9.1 T-test Result of Speaking Frequency According to Departments

Table 19. T-test Result of Speaking Frequency According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Speaking with native speaker	Eng. teacher	75	3.1867	1.74521	.20152	.228	1.621	74.000	.109
	other	78	3.0256	1.75791	.19904		.568	151	.571
Recording yourself	Eng. teacher	75	2.4800	1.52776	.17641	.029	1.335	149.824	.184
	other	78	2.7692	1.48519	.16816		-1.187	151	.237
Memorizing songs	Eng. teacher	75	3.8267	1.89147	.21841	3.549	2.150	137.250	.033
	other	78	3.5385	1.70326	.19286		.991	151	.323
Joining speaking groups	Eng. teacher	75	2.1333	1.54512	.17841	.384	2.017	149.358	.045
	other	78	2.2821	1.42243	.16106		-.620	151	.536
Memorizing vocabulary	Eng. teacher	75	3.1333	1.60517	.18535	7.460	-1.952	150.282	.053
	other	78	3.0641	1.90924	.21618		.242	151	.809
Participating debates and conferences	Eng. teacher	75	2.0133	1.25734	.14518	.486	3.481	149.701	.001
	other	78	1.9615	1.15593	.13088		.265	151	.791
Imitating actors discourse	Eng. teacher	75	2.7600	1.61781	.18681	.260	.316	150.819	.752
	other	78	2.3333	1.55143	.17566		1.665	151	.098
Video chatting	Eng. teacher	75	2.1600	1.54255	.17812	.029	1.591	150.600	.114
	other	78	2.6154	1.51384	.17141		-1.843	151	.067
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.1467	.76571	.08842	12.229	-2.071	150.622	.040
	other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000		1.692	151	.093

According to department engagement frequency of the co-curricular activities in speaking section of the survey, respectively, there were significant differences in the activities: *memorizing songs*, *joining speaking groups*, *participating debates and conferences*, and *other activities*, $t_{(137.250)} = 2.150$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(149.358)} = 2.017$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(149.701)} = 3.481$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(150.622)} = -2.071$, $p < .05$. It suggests that English departments students engaged more with memorizing songs, participating debates and conferences and performed more extra activities than other departments' students. Other department students were involved with joining speaking groups more than English department students. There was no significant difference in the reported other activities. X values are close to each other.

4.9.2 T-test Result of Effect on Fluency According to Departments

Table 20. T-test Result of Effect on Fluency According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Speaking with native speaker	Eng. teacher	75	3.2133	1.50039	.17325	1.409	.568	150.843	.571
	other	78	3.0256	1.62748	.18428		.741	151	.460
Recording yourself	Eng. teacher	75	2.8000	1.60236	.18502	18.016	-1.187	150.311	.237
	other	78	2.3333	1.23443	.13977		2.023	151	.045
Memorizing songs	Eng. teacher	75	3.5067	1.50111	.17333	.071	.989	147.946	.324
	other	78	3.1282	1.52349	.17250		1.547	151	.124
Joining speaking groups	Eng. teacher	75	2.1867	1.55697	.17978	.702	-.619	148.790	.537
	other	78	2.5897	1.62318	.18379		-1.566	151	.119
Memorizing vocabulary	Eng. teacher	75	3.0133	1.40936	.16274	5.380	.243	148.382	.808
	other	78	2.6795	1.57491	.17832		1.380	151	.170
Participating debates and conferences	Eng. teacher	75	2.5467	1.65459	.19106	5.314	.265	148.741	.791
	other	78	2.2308	1.44979	.16416		1.257	151	.211
Imitating actors discourse	Eng. teacher	75	2.9867	1.58961	.18355	.066	1.664	150.008	.098
	other	78	2.3718	1.57174	.17796		2.406	151	.017
Video chatting	Eng. teacher	75	2.2933	1.61725	.18674	.397	-1.842	150.489	.067
	other	78	2.9103	1.69174	.19155		-2.304	151	.023
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.1333	.68445	.07903	12.718	1.659	74.000	.101
	other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000		1.721	151	.087

According to department types, the effect on fluency of speaking section, respectively, there were differences in *recording yourself*, *imitating actors discourse* and *video chatting*, $t_{(150.311)} = -1.187$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(150.008)} = 1.664$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(150.489)} = -1.842$, $p < .05$. It means that English department students reported that the first two of the mentioned activities had been more effective for their fluency than other departments' students but other departments' students supported video chatting more for fluency improvement than English students. There was no significant difference in the other reported activities.

4.9.3 T-test Result of Effect on Speaking with Expand Description According to Departments

Table 21. T-test Result of Effect on Speaking with Expand Description According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Speaking with native speaker	Eng. teacher	75	3.1333	1.39820	.16145	5.374	.742	150.737	.459
	other	78	2.8462	1.59607	.18072		1.182	151	.239
Recording yourself	Eng. teacher	75	2.7333	1.56251	.18042	.403	2.012	139.041	.046
	other	78	2.6795	1.49886	.16971		.218	151	.828
Memorizing songs	Eng. teacher	75	3.1200	1.43282	.16545	.000	1.548	150.908	.124
	other	78	2.4744	1.36491	.15455		2.854	151	.005
Joining speaking groups	Eng. teacher	75	2.1200	1.47006	.16975	2.226	-1.568	150.999	.119
	other	78	2.5769	1.58335	.17928		-1.848	151	.067
Memorizing vocabulary	Eng. teacher	75	3.1067	1.41968	.16393	1.548	1.383	150.235	.169
	other	78	2.5513	1.47399	.16690		2.372	151	.019
Participating debates and conferences	Eng. teacher	75	2.6933	1.69238	.19542	.922	1.254	146.735	.212
	other	78	2.3974	1.59821	.18096		1.112	151	.268
Imitating actors discourse	Eng. teacher	75	2.7333	1.45503	.16801	7.622	2.405	150.612	.017
	other	78	1.9615	1.20002	.13588		3.585	151	.000
Video chatting	Eng. teacher	75	2.1467	1.54826	.17878	.083	-2.306	150.995	.022
	other	78	2.6282	1.49553	.16933		-1.957	151	.052
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.1200	.61425	.07093	12.803	1.687	74.000	.096
	other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000		1.726	151	.086

According to department types, the effect on speaking with expand description, respectively, there were differences in *recording yourself*, *memorizing songs*, *memorizing vocabulary*, *imitating actors discourse* and *video chatting*, $t_{(150.908)} = 1.548$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(150.235)} = 1.383$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(150.612)} = 2.405$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(150.995)} = -2.306$, $p < .05$. It means that English department students reported that the first three of the mentioned activities had been more effective for their skill of speaking with expand description than other departments' students but other departments' students supported video chatting more for fluency improvement than English students. There was no significant difference in the other reported activities.

4.9.4. T-test Result of Effect on Pronunciation and Intonation According to Departments

Table 22. T-test Result of Effect on Pronunciation and Intonation According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Speaking with native speaker	Eng. teacher	75	3.2800	1.47557	.17038	4.443	1.185	149.721	.238
	other	78	2.9359	1.64625	.18640		1.360	151	.176
Recording yourself	Eng. teacher	75	2.7733	1.61558	.18655	27.129	.217	150.016	.828
	other	78	2.1795	1.11359	.12609		2.656	151	.009
Memorizing songs	Eng. teacher	75	3.3200	1.52599	.17621	.634	2.852	149.841	.005
	other	78	3.0000	1.45941	.16525		1.326	151	.187
Joining speaking groups	Eng. teacher	75	2.1333	1.48263	.17120	.007	-1.851	150.818	.066
	other	78	2.3974	1.44456	.16356		-1.116	151	.266
Memorizing vocabulary	Eng. teacher	75	2.8533	1.35261	.15619	3.163	2.374	150.999	.019
	other	78	1.9487	1.19411	.13521		4.390	151	.000
Participating debates and conferences	Eng. teacher	75	2.6533	1.70447	.19682	9.344	1.111	149.604	.268
	other	78	2.1410	1.43901	.16294		2.012	151	.046
Imitating actors discourse	Eng. teacher	75	2.9733	1.64377	.18981	.087	3.572	143.471	.000
	other	78	2.4359	1.63238	.18483		2.029	151	.044
Video chatting	Eng. teacher	75	2.1600	1.46158	.16877	2.356	-1.956	150.176	.052
	other	78	2.8333	1.61500	.18286		-2.701	151	.008
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.1200	.61425	.07093	12.803	1.692	74.000	.095
	other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000		1.726	151	.086

According to department types, the effect on pronunciation and intonation, respectively, there were differences in *recording yourself*, *memorizing songs*, *memorizing vocabulary*, *participating debates and conferences* and *imitating actors discourse*, $t_{(150.016)} = .217$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(149.841)} = 2.852$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(150.999)} = 2.374$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(149.604)} = 1.111$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(143.471)} = 3.572$, $p < .05$. It means that English department students reported that the mentioned activities had been more effective for their pronunciation and intonation skills than other departments' students. There was no significant difference in the other reported activities.

4.9.5 T-test Result of Effect on Grammatical Structure in Speaking According to Departments

Table 23. T-test Result of Effect on Grammatical Structure in Speaking According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Speaking with native speaker	Eng. teacher	75	2.9067	1.31697	.15207	9.390	1.363	150.269	.175
	other	78	2.6026	1.49753	.16956		1.332	151	.185
Recording yourself	Eng. teacher	75	2.6933	1.54197	.17805	14.691	2.637	130.818	.009
	other	78	2.2179	1.15823	.13114		2.162	151	.032
Memorizing songs	Eng. teacher	75	2.8800	1.40424	.16215	.789	1.325	149.942	.187
	other	78	2.4359	1.31514	.14891		2.020	151	.045
Joining speaking groups	Eng. teacher	75	2.0800	1.44970	.16740	3.633	-1.115	150.355	.266
	other	78	2.5641	1.61639	.18302		-1.948	151	.053
Memorizing vocabulary	Eng. teacher	75	2.9733	1.42348	.16437	.779	4.379	147.085	.000
	other	78	2.1923	1.34896	.15274		3.485	151	.001
Participating debates and conferences	Eng. teacher	75	2.4133	1.56043	.18018	.002	2.005	144.819	.047
	other	78	2.3333	1.56808	.17755		.316	151	.752
Imitating actors discourse	Eng. teacher	75	2.5600	1.38759	.16023	.209	2.029	150.675	.044
	other	78	2.2051	1.37093	.15523		1.591	151	.114
Video chatting	Eng. teacher	75	2.0667	1.45503	.16801	4.194	-2.706	150.455	.008
	other	78	2.5769	1.59153	.18021		-2.067	151	.040
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.1067	.58294	.06731	11.007	1.692	74.000	.095
	other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000		1.616	151	.108

According to department types, the effect on grammatical structure in speaking, respectively, there were differences in *recording yourself*, *memorizing songs*, *memorizing vocabulary*, *participating debates and conferences*, *imitating actors discourse*, and *video chatting* $t_{(130.818)} = 2.637, p < .05$ and, $t_{(149.942)} = 1.325, p < .05$ and, $t_{(147.085)} = 4.379, p < .05$ and, $t_{(144.819)} = 2.005, p < .05$ and, $t_{(150.675)} = 2.029, p < .05$ and, $t_{(150.455)} = -2.706, p < .05$. It suggests that English department students reported that the first five mentioned activities had been more effective for improving their grammatical structure in speaking skill than other departments' students, but other departments' students preferred video chatting than English

students for improving this skill. There was no significant difference in the other reported activities.

4.10 T-TEST RESULTS OF THE WRITING SECTION

4.10.1 T-test Result of Writing Frequency According to Departments

Table 24. T-test Result of Writing Frequency According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Chatting online	Eng. teacher	75	3.3600	1.86461	.21531		1.473	120.396	.143
	Other	78	3.4487	1.85618	.21017	.159	-.295	151	.768
Story writing	Eng. teacher	75	2.7067	1.61725	.18674		2.390	149.643	.018
	Other	78	2.3718	1.47806	.16736	2.103	1.338	151	.183
Writing diary	Eng. teacher	75	1.8267	1.34941	.15582		Eng..	147.225	.069
	Other	78	2.6795	1.96392	.22237	29.214	-3.119	151	.002
Joining seminars, events etc	Eng. teacher	75	1.6400	1.12274	.12964		-.118	150.721	.906
	Other	78	1.8462	1.20687	.13665	.988	-1.093	151	.276
Editing by others	Eng. teacher	75	2.8267	1.46466	.16912		.414	137.502	.680
	Other	78	2.4872	1.35554	.15348	.526	1.489	151	.139
Using internet forum	Eng. teacher	75	2.2000	1.55094	.17909		1.011	150.906	.314
	Other	78	2.3077	1.58980	.18001	.132	-.424	151	.672
Participating writing clubs	Eng. teacher	75	1.8000	1.23025	.14206		.835	147.495	.405
	Other	78	1.8462	1.24918	.14144	.049	-.230	151	.818
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.1467	.76571	.08842		.728	130.068	.468
	Other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000	12.229	1.692	151	.093

According to department engagement frequency in co-curricular activities, there was significant difference in the activity: *writing diary*, $t_{(147.225)} = 1.832$, $p < .05$. Other departments' students practiced the activity more often than English department students. There was no significant difference in the reported other activities. X values are close to each other.

4.10.2 T-test Result of Effect on Timed-Writing According to Departments

Table 25. T-test Result of Effect on Timed-Writing According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Chatting online	Eng. teacher	75	2.8800	1.47923	.17081	.163	-.295	150.708	.769
	other	78	2.7821	1.52594	.17278		.403	151	.688
Story writing	Eng. teacher	75	2.6933	1.47018	.16976	.733	1.335	148.526	.184
	other	78	2.7564	1.56409	.17710		-.257	151	.798
Writing diary	Eng. teacher	75	1.7333	1.17787	.13601	.467	-3.141	136.848	.002
	other	78	2.0000	1.25874	.14252		-1.352	151	.178
Joining seminars, events etc	Eng. teacher	75	1.8000	1.28400	.14826	2.331	-1.094	150.838	.276
	other	78	1.6923	1.14311	.12943		.548	151	.584
Editing by others	Eng. teacher	75	2.9333	1.37873	.15920	2.025	1.486	148.974	.139
	other	78	1.9615	1.17818	.13340		4.693	151	.000
Using internet forum	Eng. teacher	75	2.1333	1.38850	.16033	.130	-.424	150.967	.672
	other	78	2.1667	1.47196	.16667		-.144	151	.886
Participating writing clubs	Eng. teacher	75	1.8800	1.38486	.15991	.863	-.230	150.912	.818
	other	78	1.8846	1.23773	.14014		-.022	151	.983
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.0933	.57359	.06623	8.714	1.659	74.000	.101
	other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000		1.437	151	.153

According to department types, the effect on timed-writing of the writing section, there was significant difference in the activities: *writing diary* and *editing writing by others*, $t_{(136.848)} = -3.141$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(148.974)} = 1.486$, $p < .05$. English department student supported these activities to be more effective for timed-writing skill than other departments' students. There was no significant difference in the reported other activities.

4.10.3 T-test Result of Effect on Using Signal Words According to Departments

Table 26. T-test Result of Effect on Using Signal Words According to Departments

Activity	Depart	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Chatting online	Eng. teacher	75	2.8933	1.44796	.16720	.234	.403	150.989	.687
	Other	78	2.7051	1.46924	.16636		.798	151	.426
Story writing	Eng. teacher	75	2.8000	1.56827	.18109	4.372	-.257	150.924	.797
	Other	78	2.8590	1.71111	.19375		-.222	151	.825
Writing diary	Eng. teacher	75	1.8267	1.30874	.15112	3.842	-1.354	150.891	.178
	Other	78	2.1923	1.46879	.16631		-1.623	151	.107
Joining seminars, events etc	Eng. teacher	75	1.6800	1.12898	.13036	.416	.547	147.461	.585
	Other	78	1.8590	1.18129	.13375		-.957	151	.340
Editing by others	Eng. teacher	75	2.9733	1.39471	.16105	1.179	4.679	145.475	.000
	Other	78	2.5769	1.45512	.16476		1.719	151	.088
Using internet forum	Eng. teacher	75	2.3067	1.50650	.17396	1.834	-.144	150.946	.886
	Other	78	2.1026	1.41044	.15970		.865	151	.388
Participating writing clubs	Eng. teacher	75	1.9467	1.44160	.16646	9.588	-.022	147.631	.983
	Other	78	1.6538	1.11457	.12620		1.409	151	.161
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.1067	.58294	.06731	11.007	1.409	74.000	.163
	Other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000		1.616	151	.108

According to department types, the effect on using signal words of the writing section, there was not any significant difference between the variables. Meanwhile, X value does not show any significant difference in the table above and.

4.10.4 T-test Result of Effect on Outlining According to Departments

Table 27. T-test Result of Effect on Outlining According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Chatting online	Eng. Teacher	75	2.4133	1.28498	.14838	.867	.798	150.907	.426
	Other	78	2.1795	1.28673	.14569		1.125	151	.263
Story writing	Eng. Teacher	75	2.4933	1.42728	.16481	.006	-.222	150.659	.824
	Other	78	2.5385	1.42967	.16188		-.195	151	.845
Writing diary	Eng. Teacher	75	1.6933	1.12674	.13011	10.759	-1.627	150.141	.106
	Other	78	2.1410	1.46584	.16597		-2.112	151	.036
Joining seminars, events etc	Eng. Teacher	75	1.6133	1.10151	.12719	.079	-.958	150.995	.339
	Other	78	1.6538	1.04231	.11802		-.234	151	.816
Editing by others	Eng. Teacher	75	2.9600	1.41841	.16378	2.244	1.721	150.999	.087
	Other	78	2.0513	1.32799	.15037		4.092	151	.000
Using internet forum	Eng. Teacher	75	2.0000	1.26277	.14581	2.304	.864	149.348	.389
	Other	78	1.8462	1.15181	.13042		.788	151	.432
Participating writing clubs	Eng. Teacher	75	1.7733	1.24741	.14404	1.051	1.402	139.289	.163
	Other	78	1.7051	1.11785	.12657		.356	151	.722
Other	Eng. Teacher	75	1.0667	.41373	.04777	8.527	1.585	74.000	.117
	Other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000		1.423	151	.157

According to department types, the effect on outlining of the writing section, there was significant difference in *writing diary* between the departments, $t_{(150.141)} = -1.627$, $p < .05$. Students from other departments supported this activity to be more effective for outlining skill than English department students. There was no significant difference in the reported other activities.

4.10.5 T-test Result of Effect on Sentence & Word Variety in Writing According to Departments

Table 28. T-test Result of Effect on Sentence & Word Variety in Writing According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Chatting online	Eng. Teacher	75	2.9333	1.39820	.16145	.061	1.125	150.781	.263
	other	78	2.3846	1.30165	.14738		2.514	151	.013
Story writing	Eng. teacher	75	2.6933	1.47935	.17082	4.747	-.195	150.784	.845
	other	78	2.7179	1.63483	.18511		-.098	151	.922
Writing diary	Eng. teacher	75	1.8267	1.32923	.15349	.311	-2.123	144.092	.035
	other	78	1.9231	1.21430	.13749		-.469	151	.640
Joining seminars, events etc	Eng. teacher	75	1.8400	1.36600	.15773	8.637	-.233	149.661	.816
	other	78	1.6795	.99992	.11322		.832	151	.407
Editing by others	Eng. teacher	75	2.9333	1.51865	.17536	.813	4.087	149.348	.000
	other	78	2.6538	1.56111	.17676		1.122	151	.264
Using internet forum	Eng. teacher	75	2.1600	1.41460	.16334	2.404	.786	148.452	.433
	Other	78	1.9872	1.34351	.15212		.775	151	.440
Participating writing clubs	Eng. teacher	75	1.8533	1.34258	.15503	8.746	.356	147.744	.723
	Other	78	1.5897	.98608	.11165		1.388	151	.167
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.1067	.58294	.06731	11.007	1.395	74.000	.167
	Other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000		1.616	151	.108

According to department types, the effect on sentence and word variety of the writing section, there was difference, respectively, in *chatting online*, *writing diary* and *editing by others*, $t_{(150.781)} = 1.125$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(144.092)} = -2.123$, $p < .05$ and, $t_{(149.348)} = 4.087$, $p < .05$. There was no significant difference in mean values ($X =$ close values) of the other reported activities.

4.10.6 T-test Result of Effect on Identifying Relevant Ideas According to Departments

Table 29. T-test Result of Effect on Identifying Relevant Ideas According to Departments

Activity	Department	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	t	Df	P
Chatting online	Eng. teacher	75	2.9067	1.38694	.16015		2.510	149.169	.013
	Other	78	2.3846	1.31159	.14851	.016	2.393	151	.018
Story writing	Eng. teacher	75	2.6267	1.50471	.17375		-.098	150.453	.922
	Other	78	2.2051	1.33250	.15088	3.992	1.836	151	.068
Writing diary	Eng. teacher	75	1.7200	1.23639	.14277		-.468	148.510	.641
	Other	78	1.7436	1.23200	.13950	.048	-.118	151	.906
Joining seminars, events etc	Eng. teacher	75	1.7467	1.34660	.15549		.827	135.364	.410
	Other	78	1.6667	1.01504	.11493	4.521	.416	151	.678
Editing by others	Eng. teacher	75	2.9467	1.50578	.17387		1.122	150.979	.263
	Other	78	2.6923	1.60606	.18185	1.240	1.010	151	.314
Using internet forum	Eng. teacher	75	2.1867	1.45837	.16840		.774	149.762	.440
	other	78	2.0000	1.29935	.14712	5.557	.837	151	.404
Participating writing clubs	Eng. teacher	75	1.8133	1.44908	.16732		1.380	135.612	.170
	other	78	1.6667	.98912	.11200	9.426	.734	151	.464
Other	Eng. teacher	75	1.0800	.42744	.04936		1.585	74.000	.117
	other	78	1.0000	.00000	.00000	11.592	1.653	151	.100

According to department types, the effect on identifying relevant ideas of the writing section, there was significant difference in *chatting online*, $t_{(149,169)} = 2.510$, $p < .05$. There was no significant difference in the other reported activities.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 DISCUSSION

In this part of the study, the results are discussed associated with each of research questions.

Research Question 1: How do co-curricular activities affect second language learners' listening skill?

Based on the survey outcome and in the listening section of the questionnaire, around one sixth of the participants declare that co-curricular activities *somehow affect* positively their listening skill, more than a quarter of the participants call these activities as *effective* activities for the listening skill, almost one third of the participants mark co-curricular activities as *very effective*, and one fifth of them accept the outside-classroom activities as *extremely effective* activities to improve second language learners' listening skill. As stated above the majority of the participants found the co-curricular activities beneficial to enhance their listening skill while learning a second language.

Research Question 2: How is reading skill of the second language learners influenced by co-curricular activities?

In the reading section of the survey, the participants who have been involved with outside-class activities, approximately one tenth of the participants accept co-curricular activities as activities that have *no positive effect* on reading skill of the second language learners, less than one fifth declare that co-curricular activities

somehow affect positively their reading skill, more than one fifth call these activities as *effective* activities for the reading skill, almost one third mark co-curricular activities as *very effective*, and on fifth realize the outside-classroom activities as *extremely effective* activities to improve second language learners' reading skill. As the mentioned data reveal, co-curricular activities can improve the reading skill of the second language learners.

Research Question 3: Does speaking skill of the second language learners change by participating in co-curricular activities?

In the speaking section of the survey, the participants who have been involved with outside-class activities in this section, almost one fourteenth of the participants vote for co-curricular activities as activities that have *no positive effect* on speaking skill of the second language learners, over one seventh declare that co-curricular activities *somehow affect* positively their speaking skill, approximately a quarter call these activities as *effective* activities for the speaking skill, nearly one seventh mark co-curricular activities as *very effective*, and a quarter of them accept the outside-classroom activities as *extremely effective* activities to improve second language learners' speaking skill. The results obtained from the survey imply that co-curricular activities are effective experience for students to develop their speaking skill while learning a second language.

Research Question 4: How is writing skill of the second language learners affected by co-curricular activities?

In the writing part of the questionnaire and according to the participants' responses, showing the influence of the activities which the participants were involved with, around on tenth mark *no positive effect*, nearly one fifth say *somehow positively affective*, respectively less than one third accept the activities as *effective* and *very effective*, and almost one sixth mark the activities as *extremely effective* to improve second language learners' writing skill. As mentioned above, co-curricular activities can develop the students' writing skill in the second language learning faculties.

In addition, Regarding the second language learning, the improvement of techniques to develop the four main language skills (listening, reading, speaking, and writing) is necessary as the four skills build the basis of the interdependence of language and

communication (Richards, Rodgers 1986: 64-66). The following opinions support the student engagement in second language learning as Littlewood states, a very important feature of communicative language teaching is systematic attention to functional features as well as structural features of the language (Littlewood, 1981: 1). Another important aspect is group and pair work. By this approach learners will be able to work in pairs or groups and attempt to answer difficult tasks with their current available language knowledge (Altenaichinger, 2003). Furthermore, he adds that there is proof that a powerful type of the interaction hypothesis, one which defend that interaction is essential for language learning, is not correct. That type of hypothesis rejects that learning or acquisition can happen from listening and reading. Moreover, to the huge data viewing that reading can develop language improvement, the outcomes of Ellis et. al. (1994), approve that learning is possible without participation in the interaction in fact. The weaker version of this hypothesis is that interaction may happen to be a good source of (CO) or comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982).

Also, growing research from theorists of university student development supports the usage of co-curricular events to improve the learners' learning. Opinions from Astin (1987, Theory of Involvement), Vincent Tinto (1994, Interactionalist Theory), and Arthur Chickering (1993, Theory of Identity Development) all encourage this study however Chickering's ideas were used most definitely to support the theory basis of current research. These theories and other student development in higher education theories can connect the level to which co-curricular activities happen to improve student learning in all departments as well as second language learning faculties.

As Stefánsson describes that by being actively engaged in the educational environment, the student is continuously connected with the second language through normal day by day routines and it is really important in second language learning to pay attention to the learning environment, co-curricular activities must increase the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) in the second language learning. The ways to meet the demands of the different needs of the students are to firstly recognize what those needs contain, then to plan flexible and creative activities that address these requirements, and finally to evaluate the effectiveness of those activities (Williams, 2002).

Since student participation in co-curricular activities is voluntary, fewer students decide to attend, specifically those students who may benefit more from the events. Therefore, support from the institution professionals helps to enhance engagement in co-curricular events:

By focusing on improving student learning and success, diverse stakeholders can be brought together to co-create seamless learning experiences that integrate, in a comprehensive and coherent fashion, activities that foster educational attainment for first-year students and ensure the vitality of their institutions (Schroeder, 2005).

If more students practice co-curricular activities and more higher education officials identify the value of co-curricular events, organizations and clubs in improving classroom learning, more opportunities can be generated to increase the second language learning skills and support a flourishing student learning experience in the institution.

5.2 CONCLUSIONS

According to the questionnaire survey, respectively the following activities are rated as most effective and least effective for developing the listening skill of the learners: watching TV programs, listening to podcasts, listening to songs, listening to audio books, using websites, listening to radio program, and joining group activities. In addition, starting with the most effective and ending with the least effective activities, the following activities are rated for improving the reading skill of the second language learners: reading books, reading short stories, reading favourite topics, watching films, reading newspapers, reading advertisements and brochures, reading jokes and joining reading groups. Furthermore, in the speaking section the below activities are ranked the most effective starting in the beginning and rated the least effective coming in the end: speaking with native speakers, memorizing songs, participating debates and conferences, video chatting in the target language, imitating actors' discourse, joining conversation groups, memorizing specific list of vocabulary, recording oneself in the target language. In the writing section of the survey, the participants vote for the most effective and the least effective activities as they follow: writing stories in the target language, getting help from others to edit

writing, chatting online, writing in the target language on web forums, participating writing clubs, writing diary in the target language.

The effects of co-curricular activities are identified positive for development of second language learning in higher education. Moreover all four language skills are enhanced by engagement with co-curricular activities, so the higher education institution leaders are recommended to provide student development departments for their language learning faculties. This study is not only useful for higher education institution leaders but also it is beneficial for any second language learning institutions.

Finally, second language learning requires involvement with the target language or the process of learning slows down or even stops provided the interaction between the learner and the target language is lost. The findings of the study show that the much time the second language learners spent for their skills - listening, reading, speaking, and writing – the more they improve these skills.

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

This study presents three recommendations to improve and make co-curricular activities more effective for second language learners in university level especially for Sakarya University students.

The first recommendation is to establish a student development department for each second language learning faculty. This department supports and creates flexible and helpful outside-classroom activities led and directed by students themselves so students can develop their listening, reading, speaking and writing skills through those programs. The programs or activities formed in groups not only enhance their academic skills but also they occur to improve the students' leadership, social experience and management skills.

Because a huge number of the participants, according to the survey, have chosen to *never* practice co-curricular activities, the second recommendation is addressing faculty professionals to provide prizing approaches towards co-curricular participants

so students are encouraged to attend more co-curricular events like student clubs, organizations etc. In addition, researchers in this area are recommended to investigate the reasons for active and passive participation in co-curricular activities.

Finally, language learning including second language acquisition requires practicing the target language as more as often and universities like Sakarya University with numerous international students can provide the interaction opportunity for the second language learners with the native speakers. By this approach, students can improve their skills especially their speaking skill through communication with the native speakers. Therefore, the last recommendation again addresses the university leaders in general but particularly the faculty organizers to establish a link between the native speakers and the second language learners.

REFERENCES

- Agrawal, S. Szatmari, P. Hanson, M. (2008). Teaching Evidence-Based Psychiatry: *Integrating and Aligning the Formal and Hidden Curricula Academic Psychiatry*. Retrieved 08/2/2016 from: <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1176%2Fappi.ap.32.6.470>
- Alptekin C. (2007). Strategy Choice: *Naturalistic Versus Instructed Language Acquisition*. Retrieved 03/03/2016 from: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.128.8966&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Altenaichinger, A. (2003). *Theories of Second Language Acquisition*. Austria: University of Graz.
- American College Personnel Association. (2008). *Student Personnel Point of View*. Retrieved 14/11/2008 from: <http://www.myacpa.org/pub/documents/1937.pdf>
- ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report. (2004). *Tinto's Interactionalist Theory*., 30, 7-20.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What Matters in College: Four Critical Years Revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Astin, A. W. (1999). Student Involvement: A Developmental Theory for Higher Education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40, 518-529.
- Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barnett, R and Coate, K. (2005). *Engaging the Curriculum in Higher Education*. Berkshire: The Society for Research in Higher Education, Open University Press.
- Bates, E., and Macwhinney, B. (1982). Functionalist Approaches to Grammar. In E. Wanner And L. Gleitman (Eds.), *Language Acquisition: The State Of the Art* (Pp. 173-218). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Biggs, J. (1999). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. Buckingham: Society for Research in Higher Education, Open University Press.
- Bloland, P. A. (1987). *Leisure as a Resource for Fostering Student Development*. *Journal of Counselling & Development*. 65, 291-295.
- Bogo, M. and Wayne, J. (2013). The Implicit Curriculum in Social Work Education: *The Culture of Human Interchange*. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 33:2–14.
- Brandl, K. (2007). *Communicative Language Teaching in Action: Putting Principles to Work*. London: Pearson.
- Braslavsky, C. (22-23 June 2003). *Challenges of Curriculum Development in the XXI Century Perspectives from Belarus, Moldova, Russia and Ukraine, Minsk*. Retrieved 04/05/2016 from:
http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/archive/curriculum/USSR/pdf/report_minsk03_en.pdf
- Brown, Henry D. (2002). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Bruner, J. (1960). *The Process of Education*. Cambridge Ma: Harvard University Press
- Canale, M. (1983). From Communicative Competence to Communicative Language Pedagogy. In Richards, J. C., and Schmidt, R. W. (Eds.), *Language and Communication*, 2-27. London: Longman.
- Canale, M.; Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics* (1): 1–47.
[Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1093/Applin/I.1.1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1)
- Chicago Metropolitan Area Community College. (2009). 2009-2010 College Catalog.
- Chickering, A. W. and Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and Identity (2nd Ed.)*. San Francisco, Ca: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Davis, B.W. (2011). A Conceptual Model to Support Curriculum Review, Revision, and Design in an Associate Degree Nursing Program. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, Vol 32, No 6
- Day, R., and Omura, C., and Hiramatsu, M. (1991). Incidental Vocabulary Learning and Reading. *Reading In a Foreign Language*, 7, 541-551.
- De Avila, E. (1990). *Assessment of Language Minority Students: Political, Technical, Practical and More Imperatives. Proceedings of the First Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues*. Obemla.
- Desmet, T., and Declercq, M. (2006). Cross-Linguistic Priming of Syntactic Hierarchical Configuration Information. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 54(4), 610-632.
- Dulay, Heidi, Marina Burt and Stephen Krashen. (1982). *Language Two*. New York: Oup.
- Dupuy, B. and Krashen, S. (1993) Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition in French as a Foreign Language. *Applied Language Learning* 4, 55-63.
- Dussias, P. E. (2003). Syntactic Ambiguity Resolution in L2 Learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25(04), 529-557.
- Eisner, E. W. (2002). *The Educational Imagination: On the Design and Evaluation of School Programs (3rd Ed.)*. New York, Ny: Prentice Hall.
- Elen, J. (2002). *Reality of Excellence in Higher Education: The Case of Guided Independent Learning at the Ku Leuven*. Excellence in Higher Education, Pp 109-126. London: Portland Press.
- Ellis, R., Tanaka, Y. And Yamazaki, A. (1994). Classroom Interaction, Comprehension, and L2 Vocabulary Acquisition. *Language Learning* 44, 449- 91.
- Engstrom, C. M. And Tinto, V. (2000). Developing Partnerships with Academic Affairs to Enhance Student Learning. In Barr, M. J., Desler, M. K., and Associates, *The Handbook of Student Affairs Administration (2nd Ed.)* (Pp. 425-452). San Francisco, Ca: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., and Guido-Dibrito, F. (1998). *Student Development in College: Theory, Research and Practice*. San Francisco, Ca: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Farhady, H. (1983). New Directions for Esl Proficiency Testing in J.W. Oller (Ed.), *Issues in Language Testing Research*. (Pp.253-268). U.S.A: Newbury House.
- Fink, D. (2003). *Creating Significant Learning Experiences: An Integrated Approach to Designing College Courses*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Flynn, S. (1989). Spanish, Japanese and Chinese Speakers' Acquisition of English Relative Clauses: New Evidence for the Head Direction Parameter. In K. Hyltenstam and L. K. Obler (Eds.) *Bilingualism across the Lifespan. Aspects of Acquisition, Maturity, and Loss*. Cambridge, Uk: Cambridge University Press.
- Flynn, S., and Espinal, I. (1985). Head/Initial Head/Final Parameter in Adult Chinese L2 Acquisition of English. *Second Language Research*, 1(2), 93-117.
- Frenck-Mestre, C., and Pynte, J. (1997). Syntactic Ambiguity Resolution While Reading in Second and Native Languages. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 50a(1), 119-148.
- Garcia, J. (1993). Misrepresentation of My Criticisms of Skinner. *American Psychologist*, 48, 1158.
- Gardner, H. (1998). A Multiplicity of Intelligences. *Scientific American Presents*, 1998, 18-23.
- Gass, S. M. (1987). The Resolution of Conflicts among Competing Systems: A Bidirectional Perspective. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 8, 329-350.
- Greenberg, M. (2004). How The Gi Bill Changed Higher Education. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50, 9-11.
- Hakuta K., Goto Y. and Witt D. (2000). How Long Does It Take English Learners to Attain Proficiency? *Stanford Univrsity*. Retrieved 06/02/2016 From: <http://web.stanford.edu/~hakuta/publications/%282000%29%20%20how%2>

0long% 20does% 20it% 20take% 20english% 20learners% 20to% 20attain% 20pr
.pdf

Halpern, D. F. (1987). Student Outcomes Assessment: Introduction and Overview. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 59, 5-8.

Hartsuiker, R. J., Pickering, M. J., and Veltkamp, E. (2004). Is Syntax Separate or Shared Between Languages? Cross-Linguistic Syntactic Priming in Spanish-English Bilinguals. *Psychological Science*, 15(6), 409-414.

Hernandez, K. R. (1989). Are New Student Development Models Needed? Online Submission, (*Eric Document Reproduction Service* No. Ed321791).

Hernandez-Chavez, E., M. Burt, and H. Dulay. (1978). Language Dominance and Proficiency Testing: Some General Considerations. *Nabe Journal* 3:41-54.

Holloway, S., Black, P., Hoffman, K., and Pierce, D. (2009). *Some Considerations of The Import of The 2008 Epas for Curriculum Design*. Washington, Dc: Council on Social Work Education.

Holloway S. (2008). *Council on Social Work Education, Commission on Accreditation: Some Suggestions on Educational Program Assessment and Continuous Improvement*. Washington, Dc: Council on Social Work Education.

Hopp, H. (2006). Syntactic Features and Reanalysis in Near-Native Processing. *Second Language Research*, 22(3), 369-397.

Jackson, Philip (1986). *Life in Classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. Pp. 33–35. Isbn 0-8077-3034-3.

Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in Classrooms*. New York, Ny: Holt, Reinhart And Winston.

Kelly, Av (2009). *The Curriculum: Theory and Practice (6th Ed)*. London: Sage Publications.

Kelly, A.V. (2004). *The Curriculum: Theory and Practice Fifth Edition*. Retrieved 18/1/2016 from: http://aglow.edu.pk/documents/the-curriculum_theory-practice-5th-edition_20042.pdf

- Kilborn, K., and Cooreman, A. (1987). Sentence Interpretation Strategies in Adult Dutch-English Bilinguals. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 8, 415-431.
- King, D. B., Wertheimer, M., Keller, H., and Crochietiere, K. (1994). The Legacy of Max Wertheimer and Gestalt Psychology. *Social Research*, 61, 907-935.
- Knight, P. (2001). Complexity and Curriculum: A Process Approach to Curriculum-Making. *Teaching In Higher Education*, Vol 6, No 3, Pp 369-381.
- Knowles, M. S., Holton Iii, E. F., and Swanson, R. A. (2005). *The Adult Learner (6th Ed.)*. Burlington, Ma: Elsevier.
- Knowles, M. S. (1975). Adult Education: New Dimensions. *Educational Leadership*, 33, 85-89.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Upper Saddle River, Nj: Prentice Hall.
- Krashen S. and Lee B. C. (2007). *What Is Academic Language Proficiency?*
Retrieved 01/04/2016 from:
http://www.sdkrashen.com/content/articles/krashen_brown_alp.pdf
- Krashen, S. (1998). Comperhensible Output. *System* 26:175-182. Retrieved 15/04/2016 from:
http://www.sdkrashen.com/content/articles/comprehensible_output.pdf
- Krashen, S. (1994). The Input Hypothesis and Its Rivals. In Ellis, N. (Ed.) *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages*, Pp. 45-77. London: Academic Press.
- Krashen, S. (1993). *The Power of Reading*. Englewood, Co: Libraries Unlimited.
- Krashen, S. (1989). We Acquire Vocabulary and Spelling by Reading: Additional Evidence for the Input Hypothesis. *Modern Language Journal* 73, 440-464.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. Beverly Hills, Ca: Laredo Publishing Company.
- Krashen, Stephen D. and Tracy D. Terrell. (1983). *The Natural Approach. Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Englewood Cliffs, Nj: Prentice Hall.

- Kuh, G. D. (2000). Understanding Campus Environments. *In Barr, M. J., Desler, M. K., and Associates, the Handbook of Student Affairs Administration (2nd Ed.)* (Pp. 50-72). San Francisco, Ca: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J., Andreas, R. E., Lyons, J. W., Strange, C. C., Krehbiel, L. E., and Mackay, K. A. (1991). *Involving Colleges: Successful Approaches to Fostering Student Learning and Development in Outside the Classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Leach, E. R. (1989). Student Development and College Services: A Focus on Consumers. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 67, 45-59.
- Letschert, Jfm (2004). *The Art of Curriculum Development*. Enschede: University of Twente.
- Lightbown, Patsy M. and Nina S. (1995). *How Languages Are Learned*. Oxford: Oup.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cup.
- Litzinger, T., Lattuca L., Hadgraft R., and Newstetter W. (2011). Engineering Education and the Development of Expertise. *Journal of Engineering Education*, Vol 100, No 1
- Macwhinney, B. (2004). A Unified Model of Language Acquisition. In J. F. Kroll and A. D. Groot (Eds.), *Handbook of Bilingualism: Psycholinguistic Approaches*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mcdonald, J. L. (1987). Sentence Interpretation in Bilingual Speakers of English and Dutch. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 8, 379-413.
- Marks, A. (1998). Towards a Gestalt Adult Learning Practice. *Adults Learning*, 10.
- Nagy, W., Herman, P., and Anderson, R. (1985). Learning Words from Context. *Reading Research Quarterly* 20, 233-253.
- National Academy of Higher Education. Model III: Curriculum Development, Assessment and Evaluation. *National Academy of Higher Education, Learning Innovation Division*. Retrieved 11/03/2016 from:

<http://www.hec.gov.pk/insidehec/divisions/learninginnovation/documents/curriculum%20development,%20assessment%20and%20evaluation.pdf>

- Nitschke, S., Kidd, E., and Serratrice, L. (2010). *First Language Transfer and Long-Term Structural Priming in Comprehension*. Language and Cognitive Processes. Psychology Press Tay and Francis Group. 25(1):94-114
- Oliver, R, Kersten, H, Vinkka-Puhakka, H, Alpasan, G, Bearn, D, Cema, I, Delap, E, Dummer, P, Goulet, Jp, Gugushe, T, Jeniati, E, Jerolimov, V, Kotsanos, N, Krifka, S, Levy, G, Neway, M, Ogawa, T, Saag, M, Sidlauskas, A, Skaleric, U, Vervoorn, M, White, D. (2008). Curriculum Structure: Principles and Strategy. *European Journal of Dental Education*, Vol 12, No 1.
- Oller, J . W. (1978). The Language Factor in the Evaluation of Bilingual Education. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.) *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*. Washington D. C.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. New York, Usa: Newbury House.
- Pascarella, E. T. and Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How College Affects Students?* San Francisco, Ca: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods (3rd Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications.
- Pepper, S. C. (1934). The Conceptual Framework of Tolman's Purposive Behaviorism. *Psychological Review*, 41, 108-133.
- Petracchi, H. E. and Zastrow, C. (2010). *Suggestions For Utilizing The 2008 Epas in Cswc-Accredited Baccalaureate and Masters Curriculum—Reflections From The Field, Part 1: The Explicit Curriculum*. Retrieved 12/04/2016 from:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/08841231003704761#ahr0cdovl3d3dy50yw5kzm9ubgluzs5jb20vzg9pl3bkzi8xmc4xmdgwlza4odqxmjmxmdaznza0nzyxqebama==>
- Pitts, M., White, H., and Krashen, S. (1989). Acquiring Second Language Vocabulary through Reading: A Replication of the Clockwork Orange Study

- Using Second Language Acquirers. *Reading In a Foreign Language* 5, 271-275.
- Richards, J.C. and T.S. Rodgers (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cup.
- Savignon, S. J. (1997). *Communicative Competence: Theory and Practice*. (2nd Ed.). New York: Mcgraw Hill.
- Savignon, S. J. (1983). *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- Schleppegrell M. And Christian D. (1986). Academic Language Proficiency. *Center for Applied Linguistics*. Washington D.C. Retrieved November 11/04/2008 from: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ed278266.pdf>
- Schoonbaert, S., Hartsuiker, R. J., and Pickering, M. J. (2007). The Representation of Lexical and Syntactic Information in Bilinguals: Evidence from Syntactic Priming. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 56(2), 153171.
- Schroeder, C. C. (2005). Collaborative Partnerships between Academic and Student Affairs. In Upcraft, M. L., Gardner, J. M., Barefoot, B. O., And Associates, *Challenging and Supporting the First-Year Student: A Handbook for Improving the First Year of College (Pp. 204-220)*. San Francisco, Ca: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Skinner, B. F. (1985). Cognitive Science and Behaviourism. *British Journal of Psychology*, 76, 291-302.
- Stark, J and Lattuca, L. (1997). *Shaping the College Curriculum: Academic Plans in Action*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon
- Stefánsson, E. G. (2013). *Second Language Acquisition: The Effect of Age and Motivation*. Háskóli Íslands, Hugvísindasvið, Enska. Retrieved 16/04/2016 from: http://skemman.is/stream/get/1946/15018/35741/1/ba_einarg.pdf
- Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*. London: Heineman

- Stephen, H., Phyllis, B., Kay, H., Dean, P. (2009). *Some Considerations of the Import of the 2008 Epas for Curriculum Design*.
<http://www.cswe.org/File.aspx?id=64764>
- Stern, H.H. (1983). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Steve G. and Karen R. H. (2000). The Role of Self-Regulation and Transcription Skills in Writing and Writing Development. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(1), 3–12.
- Storey K. L. (2010). *Bridging the Gap: Linking Co-Curricular Activities to Student Learning Outcomes in Community College Students*. National-Louis University. Doctorate Thesis. Retrieved November 20/03/2016 from: <http://digitalcommons.nl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1030&context=dis>
s
- Swain, M. and Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in Output and the Cognitive Processes They Generate: A Step Towards Second Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics* 16, 371-391.
- Tchibozo, G. and Pasteur, L. (2007). Extra-Curricular Activity and the Transition from Higher Education to Work: A Survey of Graduates In The United Kingdom. *Higher Education Quarterly*, Vol. 61, No. 1 Pp37-56.
- The Glossary of Education Reform. (2013). *Co-Curricular*. Retrieved 13/04/16 from: <http://edglossary.org/co-curricular/>
- Thorndike, E. L. (1932). The Significance of Responses in the Free Association Test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 16, 241-253.
- Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes of Student Attrition*. (2nd Ed.). Chicago: The University Of Chicago Press.
- Toefl Ibt Scores. (2005). Better Information about the Ability to Communicate an Academic Setting. *Educational Testing Service*. Retrieved 08/5/2016 from: [http://www.hhl.de/fileadmin/texte/_relaunch/conversion_table_toefl_\(pbt,cbt,ibt\).pdf](http://www.hhl.de/fileadmin/texte/_relaunch/conversion_table_toefl_(pbt,cbt,ibt).pdf)

- Tolman, E. C. (1925). Purpose and Cognition: The Determiners of Animal Learning. *Psychological Review*, 32, 285-297.
- Totté N., Huyghe S. and Vergageb A. Building the Curriculum in Higher Education: A Conceptual Framework. *Academic Development Unit*, Ku Leuven, Belgium. Retrieved 17/04/2016 from: <http://www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/docs/paper/building-the-curriculum-in-higher-education---a-conceptual-framework.pdf?sfvrsn=10>
- Trowler, V. (2010). Student Engagement Literature Review. *The Higher Education Academy*. York, Uk. https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/studentengagementliteraturereview_1.pdf
- Tyler, R. (1949). *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press
- Walker, S. F. (2008). *A Brief History of Connectionism and Its Psychological Implications*. Retrieved 11/10/08 from: http://www.psyc.bbk.ac.uk/people/academic/walker_s/pubs/histconnectforweb.pdf
- Waterhouse, L. (2006). Inadequate Evidence for Multiple Intelligences, Mozart Effect, and Emotional Intelligences Theory. *Educational Psychologist*, 41, 247-255.
- Weisberg, R. W. and Alba, J. W. (1981). Gestalt Theory, Insight, and Past Experience: Reply to Dominowski. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 110, 193-198.
- WEB1. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/curriculum>
- WEB2. <http://www.wikihow.com/improve-your-writing-skills>
- WEB3. <http://www.wikihow.com/improve-english-communication-skills>
- WEB4. <http://englishlive.ef.com/blog/10-top-tips-improving-spoken-english/>
- WEB5. <http://www.ets.org/toefl/ibt/scores/understand>

WEB6.<http://www.phrasemix.com/blog/how-to-improve-your-english-listening-comprehension>

Williams, T. E. (2002). Challenges in supporting student learning and success through student services. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 117, 67-76.

Xiao, L., and Luo, M. (2009). English Co-Curricular Activities: A Gateway to Developing Autonomous Learners. *Camtesol Selected Papers*, 5, 239-251.

Yeganeh, B. and Kolb, D. (2009). Mindfulness and Experiential Learning. *Od Practitioner*, 41, 13-18.

Yorke, M. (2006). Employability in Higher Education: What It Is – What It Is Not. *The Higher Education Academy*, York, UK. Information Available at: <http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/detail/employability/employability336> [accessed on 19th march 2016]

APPENDICES

APPENDIX-1. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data on effects of co-curricular activities on second language learners in higher education. Collected data is used only for academic and educational research. Thank you for responding the questionnaire.

Mohammad Kazem

Native Language:

Department:

Please read the activities on the left column and tick (✓) the appropriate circles in the middle columns. Then score (1-5) the efficiency of those activities on the right columns.

Example

Out of Lesson Activities

Frequency

1 = the lowest score & 5 = the highest score

Contribution to Skills

No	I do the following outside-classroom activities to improve my READING skill in English language:	Every day	Every other days	Twice a week	Once a week	Once a month	Never	Vocabulary	Building	Skimming & Scanning	Text	Summarizing	Understanding	Main Idea	Understanding	Details	Note-Taking
		<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	5	5	2	2	3	1	5	1	
I	I read a short story.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>										
II	I read poems.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>										
No	I do the following outside-classroom activities to improve my LISTENING skill in English language:	Every day	Every other days	Twice a week	Once a week	Once a month	Never	Understanding the Main Idea	Understanding Details	Accent	Familiarization	Predicting Discussion	Direction				
1	I listen to English audio books.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>										
2	I listen to English songs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>										
3	I listen to English podcasts.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>										
4	I listen to English radio programs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>										
5	I watch my favorite English TV programs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>										
6	I use websites to improve my listening skill.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>										
7	I join group activities for my listening.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>										
8	Other (Please write here if you perform or participate any other activities):	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>										

1 of 4

Out of Lesson Activities

Frequency

Contribution to Skills

1 = the lowest score & 5 = the highest score

	I do the following outside-classroom activities to improve my WRITING skill in English language:	Every day	Every other days	Twice a week	Once a week	Once a month	Never					
								Timed-Writing	Using Signal Words	Outlining	Sentence & Word Variety in Writing	Identifying Relevant Ideas
9	I chat in English online.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>					
10	I practice writing stories in English language.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>					
11	I write diary in English language.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>					
12	I join writing seminars, events etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>					
13	I get help from others to edit my writing.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>					
14	I write in English on internet forums.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>					
15	I participate students' writing clubs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>					
16	Other (Please write here if you perform or participate any other activities): _____ _____ _____ _____	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>					
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>					
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>					
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>					
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>					

Out of Lesson Activities

Frequency

Contribution to Skills

1 = the lowest score & 5 = the highest score

No	I do the following outside-classroom activities to improve my SPEAKING skill in English language:	Every day	Every other days	Twice a week	Once a week	Once a month	Never	Fluency	Speaking with Expand Description	Pronunciation & Intonation	Grammatical Structure in Speaking
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
17	I speak with a native or like native English speaker.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
18	I record myself in English and listen to it later.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
19	I memorize and sing English songs to myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
20	I join free English conversation groups.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
21	I memorize a specific list of English vocabulary.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
22	I participate English debates and conferences.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
23	I imitate movie actors' speaking.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
24	I video chat with people who know English.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
25	Other (Please write here if you perform or participate any other activities):	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
26		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				

1 = the lowest score & 5 = the highest score

<i>Out of Lesson Activities</i>		<i>Frequency</i>					<i>Contribution to Skills</i>												
		Every day	Every other days	Twice a week	Once a week	Once a month	Never	Vocabulary Building	Skimming & Scanning	Text Summarizing	Reading for Main Idea	Reading for Details	Note-Taking						
No	I do the following outside-classroom activities to improve my READING skill in English language:																		
27	I read short stories in English.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>													
28	I watch films with English subtitle.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>													
29	I read my favorite topics in English on the web.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>													
30	I read newspapers in English.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>													
31	I join English reading groups.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>													
32	I read jokes in English.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>													
32	I read jokes in English.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>													
33	I read advertisements and brochures in English.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>													
34	I read different books in English.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>													
	Other (Please write here if you perform or participate any other activities):																		
35		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>													

APPENDIX-2. SURVEY PERMISSION LETTER

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 29/03/2016-E.4383



T.C.
SAKARYA ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü

Sayı : 81179084/044/
Konu : Anket Uygulama (Mohammad
KAZEM)

İLGİLİ MAKAMA

İlgi : Muhammad KAZEM 23/03/2016 tarihli ve - sayılı yazı

Eğitim Bilimleri Ana Bilim Dalı Yükseköğretim Bilim Dalı 1370Y51008 numaralı yüksek lisans öğrencisi Mohammad KAZEM; "Ders Dışı Etkinliklerin Yabancı Dil Öğrenmeye Etkisi" ile ilgili anket formları hazırlamıştır.

Anket formları Enstitümüzde incelenmiş olup, yasal gerekliliğin ilgili kuruma ait olması kaydı ile yapılması uygun görülmüştür.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımla arz/rica ederim.

Yrd.Doç.Dr. Özlem CANAN GÜNGÖREN
Müdür Yardımcısı

24/03/2016 V.H.K.İ
24/03/2016 Enst.Sek. Vekili

E.ÇORAPÇIĞIL
H.F.TATAROĞLU

Evrak Doğrulama için : <http://193.140.253.232/envision/Sorgula/BegeDogrulama.aspx?V=BENN3L3KF>

Öğrenci İşleri Birimi Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü 34300
Hendek/Sakarya
Tel:0264 214 2434 Faks:0264 295 7492
E-Posta : egitim@sakarya.edu.tr Elektronik Ağ : www.egitim.sakarya.edu.tr



Bu belge 5070 sayılı Elektronik İmza Kanununun 5. Maddesi gereğince güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

BACKGROUND AND CONTACT INFORMATION

Mohammad Kazem was born in Taloqan, Takhar, Afghanistan in 1988. He completed his primary and elementary education in Dr Sayed Husain Shaheed Elementary School in 2002. Kazem successfully graduated from Abo Osman-e-Taloqani High school in 2005 and in 2006 he began his higher education studies in English Department, of Faryab Institute of Higher Education. After one year, he transferred to English Department, Language and Literature Faculty of Takhar University where he graduated with a BA in 2010. In 2011, after passing a competitive exam and interview, he was appointed as an English lecturer in English Department, Language and Literature Faculty of Takhar University and worked in the mentioned faculty for more than two years. In 2013, Kazem succeeded to win the *Turkish Scholarships* and began his Master's Study in the program of Research in Higher Education, Faculty of Education at Sakarya University. Beside his successful education background, Mohammad Kazem is multilingual and skilful with computer programs. He has worked as a computer teacher in different educational centres in Takhar province and speaks Uzbek, Dari, English, and Turkish fluently and knows Pashto too.

E-mail: kazim_timor@yahoo.com