

Imagining Extensive Speaking for Korean EFL

Sarah Gu*

Seoul Women's University

Eric D. Reynolds

Woosong University

Gu, Sarah & Reynolds, Eric D. (2013). Imagining Extensive Speaking for Korean EFL. *Modern English Education*, 14(4), 81-108.

The divide between receptive and productive language skills is one of the fundamental conundra of language education in general and of TESOL in particular. The ongoing debate regarding the relative influence of input (e.g. Krashen, 1989) and output (e.g. Swain, 1993) in second language acquisition and proficiency is at the heart of our investigation. Our contention is that output is vitally important to proficiency, if not acquisition, and that the principles that Krashen (1989) and others outline for extensive reading can be used to imagine a design for extensive speaking activities to enhance students' oral production. In a six-week intensive immersion course we asked these mixed gender university students to record daily monologues on free topics with the teacher providing encouragement but no corrective feedback. At the beginning and end of the course we measured their fluency, proficiency and attitudes to judge the impact of the new pedagogy using both quantitative and qualitative measures. Even this minimal modification in the curriculum produced significantly better results in fluency, proficiency and attitude for the students in the extensive speaking group relative to the students receiving traditional instruction.

[extensive reading/output hypothesis/speaking fluency/speaking proficiency/
다독/출력가설/말하기유창성/말하기능력]

* First author: Sarah Gu, Corresponding author: Eric D. Reynolds

I. INTRODUCTION

Despite years of studying English inside the classroom setting, most Korean students still struggle when it comes to speaking English—at least that is the perception voiced by students and teachers alike (Li, 1998; J. K. Park, 2009; S. K. Shin, 2012). Admittedly, instruction on reading and grammar overwhelmingly dominates English language instructional time in Korea’s public middle and high schools, and this reality has been argued as the largest contributing factor to Korean student’s speaking difficulties (D. B. Jeong, 2001; W. J. Lee, 2011). In contrast, increasing students’ speaking skills is stated as a key goal of the Ministry of Education and further evidenced by the recent Ministry moves to adopt a speaking component for the national university entrance tests (KICE, 2013), as well as “teaching English through English” practices (S. K. Shin, 2012; Spolsky & Moon, 2012). However, determining best practices for speaking instruction, particularly given the limited amount of instructional time available, EFL instructors’ low speaking skills, and other institutional limitations in Korean public EFL education is highly problematic (S. K. Shin, 2012). This paper explores extensive speaking (ES) as an activity to enhance students’ spoken fluency. The old saying states that practice makes perfect; thus, this study seeks to test that adage and determine if sustained free speaking practice will aid students in becoming more fluent. We adopt several concepts including the term “extensive” from extensive reading, a widely accepted and well researched reading approach (Bell, 1998; Day, 2013; Day & Bamford, 2002; Judge, 2011; Krashen, 1989, 2011; Mason & Krashen, 1997), and seek to find out if methods from extensive reading can be transferred to speaking instruction in efficient and effective ways. The ultimate goal of ES is to help students become fluent, independent, and confident speakers and encourage students to take more responsibility for their fluency development both inside and outside of class.

As a result, this paper seeks to answer the following research questions:

- 1) Will ES activities improve students’ spoken fluency more than regular classroom activities?
- 2) Will ES activities improve students’ spoken proficiency more than regular classroom activities?
- 3) How will ES influence students’ attitudes to English speaking and ES practice?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Long before K-Pop and the Korean wave began sweeping the world, South Korean society caught an English fever (J. K. Park, 2009) that remains a powerful current in Korean education. English is not only a mandatory school subject, but is also “a class marker in South Korea: namely, knowledge of and comfort with English has been a sign of educational opportunity” (Park & Abelmann, 2004, p. 646). Of course, English fever is inextricably intertwined with the more general “education fever” noted across East Asia (Anderson & Kohler, 2012), and has been associated with a variety of maladies for example low fertility rates (Anderson & Kohler, 2012), and family “dis-integration” associated with the “*기러기*”, *kireogi*, or wild goose, syndrome (Y. H. Kang, 2012; J. H. Kim, 2010; H. Y. Lee, 2010; J. K. Park, 2009) as well as some benefits such as a creating a “citizenship-based participatory democracy” (Seth, 2012), and rebuilding the nation in the aftermath of the Korean War (S. Y. Ahn & H. J. Baek, 2013). Higher education, too, is not immune to pressures of English fever with Korean universities making fundamental changes in course delivery through increased English medium instruction (EMI) classes -- with extensive support from the national government: "Since the mid-2000s, ... the percentage of EMI (English medium instruction) classes being offered by Korean higher education institutions has risen sharply" (K. Y. Byun, et al. 2011, p. 432). Indeed, "EMI accounted for 9000 courses, or roughly 2.2%" of all classes in Korean higher education, and the government had earmarked funding for even more EMI courses "with the goal of raising the EMI ratio to 3.1% of all courses, by 2010" (p. 432). In this environment, marked by all of these instrumental motivations, one might well expect EFL instruction to flourish and succeed. In spite of these factors, however, the perception remains that contemporary Korean students struggle with oral production (Li, 1998; S. K. Shin, 2012). To make the case for this study, this literature review considers issues with EFL speaking instruction in Korea, the debate over input and output in the acquisition of FL speaking skills, measurement tools for evaluating speaking, and the principles of extensive reading as they might be applied to oral production.

1. Has English Fever Failed to Foster Better Speaking?

The authors are highly critical of the common perception and even outright statement that “Koreans are bad” at speaking English found in the press and blogosphere (S. W.

Kang, 2009; H. I. Shin, 2011; Unlikely Expat, 2012)¹. While the purpose of this article is not to refute that misperception, our presentation of the various factors restricting students' opportunities to practice speaking English and improve their fluency and proficiency (S. J. Kim, 2004) should aid readers in understanding the need for improved spoken English instruction in Korea.

One major factor restricting students' spoken English learning opportunities is the manner in which the Korean college entrance exam, or KSAT, dominates secondary education and has immense washback effects in the curriculum: "The most serious problem is that the KSAT does not include speaking and writing components, thus leading to very little, if any, teaching of speaking and writing at high school" (I. C. Choi, 2008, p. 41). As a result, English education in Korean public schools mainly focuses on grammar and reading comprehension (Li, 1998; J. K. Park, 2009). Indeed that washback effect is the cause of the "open secret that students as well as teachers do not bother to deal with productive skills [speaking and writing] in high school classrooms, especially in grade 12," (I. C. Choi, 2008, p. 41) to the extent that both teachers and students virtually ignore the writing and speaking of English.

A generation ago, both experts and laymen in South Korea attributed the failures of English education to the traditional grammar/translation method (K. E. Yoon, 2004). Consequently, the Korean national curriculum was revised. The sixth and quickly following seventh national curricula, from 1992 and 1997 respectively, added a functional-grammatical syllabus and communicative language teaching (CLT) methodology to the Korean national curriculum for English teaching (D. B. Jeong, 2001). While these changes were much needed and have produced several important and beneficial results, a growing consensus suggests that the changes have failed to produce the level of improvement in speaking skills that was anticipated. A variety of reasons have been suggested for this failure: cultural barriers, insufficient training of instructors, resistance to new methods and content from current instructors, difficulties in acculturating new instructors, and others (S. J. Kim, 2004; W. J. Lee, 2011; Li, 1998; S. K. Shin, 2012).

Indeed, the literature suggests a wide variety of specific causes for the failure of the Ministry of Education's newly introduced methodologies—particularly early primary school English classes, CLT, and teaching English through English (TETE)—to produce the anticipated improvement in students' spoken English proficiency. For example, S. J.

¹ These articles and blog posts are often based on faulty interpretation and the inappropriate application of statistical information, so much so that ETS recently held a press conference for the Korean press to ask journalists to cease such reports ("Koreans Need Not Be Disappointed With TOEFL Scores," 2009)

Kim (2004) argues that cultural barriers, which tend to center on Confucianism and the hierarchical character of Korean society, discourage students from speaking, such as the notion that while “eloquence may be silver, silence is gold” (para. 14). Male students in particular are affected by the ‘silence is golden’ maxim: “A talkative person is characterized by a ‘weightless’ person, especially if you are a male” (para. 14). Another cause that Korean EFL teachers themselves put forward is inadequate training in the new methods. Moreover, they place the blame for that lack of training on the administrative and ministry levels of the Korean education system. All of the participants in Li’s (1998) case study “named lack of training as one of the main obstacles” that block effective implementation of CLT. Indeed, the vast majority of those teachers felt that the “few in-service opportunities for retraining in CLT” additionally contributed to major “misconceptions about CLT,” that in turn created a situation where “teachers refused to accept CLT” (pp. 688-689).

While important, the lack of adequate teacher training is just one of many factors that result in “strong skepticism” (S. J. Kim, 2004, para. 2) and resistance from Korean EFL teachers to CLT and other new methodologies as is widely discussed throughout the literature (S. J. Kim, 2004; W. J. Lee, 2011; Li, 1998; S. K. Shin, 2012). Substantial evidence points to these issues representing an ongoing problem (W. J. Lee, 2011; S. K. Shin, 2012), which also mirrors the conclusions of research from a decade ago (S. J. Kim, 2004; Li, 1998). For instance, W. J. Lee (2011) investigated parental attitudes toward English instruction at the primary level concluding that “parents are not satisfied with the public primary English sector” (p. 23) because of the government’s failure to implement “the English curriculum with sufficient care” resulting in “lessons, as well as English textbooks, [that] are too easy and therefore not interesting” (p. 24). Likewise, S. K. Shin, (2012) notes similar patterns in implementing English-only instruction through the introduction of the TETE mandate. In particular he emphasizes the lack of change in school culture amongst both incoming and current teachers:

When asked to account for their difficulties in teaching in English, the biggest majority [of the new teachers] cited students’ poor understanding and lack of English proficiency and the subsequent inability of the teacher to progress through the coursework. The next highest reason was difficulty in classroom control. These findings largely concur with prior research.

Meanwhile, when asked why they were unable to continue teaching in English, analysis of the responses indicated that the key influences were institutional constraints, school culture, and students’ and teachers’ beliefs about English teaching and learning. Of course, these factors are closely interrelated, without clear boundaries (p. 561).

As a result, even after years studying English in the public school classrooms and in spite of added functional grammars, aural/oral content and CLT methodologies in earlier grades, current university English students are often tongue-tied when asked to respond to even the simplest questions.

2. Input versus Output

The goal of this research study is to determine if extensive speaking can improve students' speaking skills. In the literature this question is divided into a debate about what in fact improves students' *language* ability: input or output. Krashen's input hypothesis dates back to 1977, and as part of the Monitor Model, represents an attempt to create a comprehensive theory of Second Language Acquisition. The contention of the input hypothesis is that we acquire language by understanding messages—through “intake” (Krashen, 1981), which sets the foundation for acquiring phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics needed for language production. Krashen, however, did not argue that speaking and writing practice were unimportant. His position was that:

intake is fundamental to acquisition, and [I] have not mentioned what function *output* may play. It may be argued that *theoretically* speaking and writing are not essential to acquisition. One can acquire "competence" in a second language, or a first language, without ever producing it (pp. 107-108).

Izumi (2003) echoes Krashen's position with the succinct statement, “Production processing is not language learning” (p. 183). Ultimately, such views dominate SLA research to the end that Crookes (1991) concludes, “the role of output (i.e., production or use) in the development of SL proficiency has largely been ignored or denied” (p. 117). Our contention in developing this project is that, in *practical terms*, while production does not seem like the best method for language acquisition, production is nonetheless critical to improved communication and proficiency.

Other SLA theorists are less confident that Krashen in the absolute primacy of input and the near irrelevance of output. Swain (1985, 1993, 2005) proposes the “Output Hypothesis” and argues, “language production provides the opportunity for meaningful practice of one's linguistic resources permitting the development of automaticity in their use” (1993, p. 159). Clearly, McLaughlin's (1987) cognitive notions for language learning, particularly automaticity are in play here. Swain further specifies that output pushes learners to process language more deeply—with more mental effort—than does input. They need to create linguistic forms and meaning. In doing so, they discover what they can and cannot do. Interestingly, fluency is probably the primary element of Swain's hypothesis as Swain (2005) herself states when listing fluency as the first of the three functions of output, “One function of producing the target language, in the sense of

‘practicing,’ is that it enhances fluency” (p. 474). Liming’s (1990) autoethnographic study of her own use of comprehensible output echoes these themes concluding, “the learner’s output has an independent and indispensable role to play” (p. 9) in language learning. Clearly, substantial cognitive distance exists between *understanding* a language and being able to *produce* it with fluency, accuracy and complexity, and output is a critical tool for bridging that gap. Ultimately, we find Folse’s (2006) contention refreshingly reasonable: “Language educators believe that opportunities for both comprehensible input and output are important in language learning” (p. 42). Therefore, given that conventional EFL classrooms in Korea provide language learners substantial input, providing students additional opportunities for language output seems reasonable, and most importantly, investigating the impact of that production will be crucial in understanding language learning in this environment and designing instruction for Korean students.

3. How Might Extensive Reading Inform Extensive Speaking?

Establishing the existence of a special fever driving English education in Korea, while admitting a general weakness in the instruction of spoken English and considering the roles of both input and output in English instruction only goes part of the way to establishing the foundation for this research project. Which particular methodology for speaking instruction might be most useful in augmenting oral English instruction? Folse (2006) provides a starting point, “An obvious way to improve students’ speaking skills is through actual speaking” (p. 31). Brown (2003) expands on Folse’s notion, and he argues powerfully that when teaching speaking, particularly for improving spoken fluency, “we must be willing to let go of some of the control in our classrooms; we must be willing to let the students have some of the control and let them do some of the work” (p. 8). These positions led to the insight that perhaps a model might be found in another direction: The autonomous learning Brown describes seems remarkably akin to what occurs in extensive reading (ER). However, in our literature search, we could only find one peer reviewed article discussing “extensive speaking” (Y. C. Sun, 2012), and she only develops the teaching methodology in limited way. Thus, we were unable to find anyone who had thoroughly outlined methods for an extensive speaking approach, and the remainder of this section seeks to outline how ER might be imagined as a foundation for an extensive speaking approach to language learning with appropriate extensive speaking methods.

Kelly (1969) attributes the first use of the term *extensive reading* to Palmer (1917) who posits the juxtaposition of “intensive” against “extensive” in reading instruction:

Reading may be intensive and extensive. In the former case each sentence is subjected to a careful scrutiny, and the more interesting may be paraphrased, translated, or learnt by heart. In the latter case book after book will be read through without giving more than a superficial and passing attention to the lexicological units of which it is composed. (p. 2005)

Even though Palmer's distinction is nearly one hundred years old, he describes precisely the debate in foreign language reading instruction today when he asks, "Shall reading be intensive or extensive?" (1921, p. 165). Truth be told, in Korea at least, most EFL instruction *is intensive*. Our goal in designing the ES instructional methodology is to explore how others have made reading instruction *extensive*, and see how that might be modified to create extensive *speaking* instruction.

Beyond Palmer's (1917, 1921) and Kelly's (1969) historic descriptions of extensive reading, a more contemporary understanding of extensive reading has developed in the last couple of decades. Krashen is frequently credited with renewed interest in extensive reading based on his 1989 article "We Acquire Vocabulary and Spelling by Reading." Following that same line of research Mason and Krashen (1997) show extensive reading to be superior to traditional approaches on the measure of reading comprehension, as well as on measures of writing and reading speed, and according to teacher observation, much more popular with "reluctant" EFL students at university level. Bell (1998) claims that extensive reading can provide numerous benefits, from enhancing the students' general competence, to improving writing skills, to increasing motivation, to consolidating language learned previously.

The benefits of such self-directed extensive reading seemed to match well with our goals for extensive speaking, but in terms of designing the activities, we looked to Day and Bamford's (1998, 2002) frequently cited works for guidance. Table 1 outlines Day and Bamford's (2002) suggestions for implementing extensive reading, as well as offering our ideas for how they might be translated to extensive speaking instruction.

TABLE 1
Relating Day and Bamford's (2002) ER Principles to Extensive Speaking

Notion	Day and Bamford (2002)	How to accomplish in an extensive speaking design?
Skill level	Material is easy (<i>i-1</i>)	Since the student produces the language, it must, <i>definitionally</i> , be at or below the student's level. No pressure to incorporate new terms or structures.
Variety	Provide wide variety of materials and topics	Suggest lots of topics -- related to class themes, and not related to class themes.

Learner autonomy	Learners can choose what they read	Always allow “free topic” talks.
Consistency & regularity	Learners read as much as possible	Schedule daily time for extensive speaking work, allow additional talks via the Internet.
Purpose	Reading purpose is pleasure	Make activities required, but ungraded (and have instructor be enthusiastic in interacting with their extensive speaking reports).
Reward	Reading is its own reward (intrinsic, <i>not</i> graded)	Make activities ungraded.
Speed	Reading speed is faster rather intensive cases	Allow students to produce independently (in a different room than the rest of the class).
Interaction	Reading is individual and silent	Not silent, of course, but talks are individual (with post-talk feedback from teacher, but not other students).
Teacher roles	Teachers orient and guide	Teachers do not grade, but do provide positive feedback and encouragement.
Teacher roles	Teacher is a role model reader	Teachers also create talks on the scheduled class topics for the students to listen to and interact with.

Clearly, this rather long list of principles and notions is a good start at laying out the instructional methodology to support an extensive speaking approach. Our goal is to implement this approach and these methods in the EFL classrooms of our study.

III. METHOD

This study uses a mixed methods approach following some of the notions outlined by Creswell (2008). The study was conducted during a winter term full-immersion English camp at a Korean university with study participants divided into four matched ES and non-ES groups. The primary pedagogical intervention involved daily opportunities for individual speaking practice in an ES activity that translates many of the principles of extensive reading (Bell, 1998; Day, 2013; Day & Bamford, 1998, 2002; Krashen, 1989; Mason & Krashen, 1997). The primary quantitative data was pre-test and post-tests of the speaking of all students, while the qualitative data included the students’ self assessments of their English speaking skills and attitudes before and after the intervention, and focus group interviews of selected students.

1. Setting and Participants

This study was conducted during a winter intensive English course at a medium sized university in the capital city of South Korea, Seoul. Although the university is nominally a women's university, the participants in the English language intensive course were mixed men and women with 12 men and 25 women. The six-week intensive course was residential, and the students were required to use only English during the weekdays of the course including in the dormitory areas. This English only requirement included prohibitions on the students' use of their personal technology: cell phones, laptops, tablets, etc. Students were not, however, required to remain in residence in the "English language bubble" on the weekends and the vast majority of the students spent the weekends in a Korean language environment.

All three instructors were female. Two of the instructors are native speakers of English who hold TEFL certificates and have each taught in the US and Korea to ESL and EFL students for over five years. Both of them have taught in this immersion program for more than two years prior to the start of this research. The third instructor is one of the authors. Although she is not a native speaker of English, she is a trilingual whose English level is native-like equivalent to "superior" on the ACTFL-OPI scale. She holds an advanced degree in teaching English and is completing her Ph.D. in English Education at the time of this study. The researcher instructor has been teaching English for 15 years in countries where English is a foreign language.

The thirty-seven student participants in the study are all university students. Twelve are male and twenty-five are female. One male student's final audio recording was corrupted; therefore, his data is not included in the fluency and proficiency analysis. However, his survey and focus group responses are included. While the average age of the students is 23.5 years old², due to Korea's mandatory military service the men average nearly three years older than the women with the men's average at 24.8 years old and the women at 21.9 years old. A few of the student participants were freshmen, but there was a relatively even distribution in the other classes with three freshmen, nine sophomores, twelve juniors, and twelve seniors. The students were tested at the beginning of the program for their speaking level and assigned to class groups of 8-10 students. The students in the level one class performed roughly at ACTFL-OPI (Speaking - ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. n.d.) novice mid, and students in the level two class performed roughly at ACTFL-OPI novice high at the start of the program. A

² Koreans count "age" as the number of years in which one has been alive (i.e. a person is "one year old" at birth). Thus relative to the "birthday system" where years accrue after they have been lived, these students will have reported their age about one year more than one might expect.

class section each of level one and a class section of level two were assigned to the ES group and the “traditional” speaking class group.

2. Instructional Design

As with many educational research studies, understanding the pedagogical intervention in this study is critical to understanding the research results. The ES module was implemented as follows. First, all of the classes, the ES groups and the traditional groups, used the same main course book at the same level. Each course instructor taught the material in the course book following methodology developed in staff meetings. The ES activity was a daily recording of a monologue by each student in classes taught by the trilingual non-native instructor during class time. Students were instructed to record individually, in one by one pullout time, for one minute, although many went over that limit, up to nearly three minutes. Topic selection was up to the students; however, speaking prompts based on textbook material were available. The instructor listened to the recordings each day and on the following day provided general feedback, but was careful to be positive, non-specific, and non-judgmental.

3. Data Collection

Three main types of data were collected for this study. First, the daily monologues from throughout the course were retained. However, only the initial and final recordings were analyzed. Second, surveys were administered to the students before and after the course to evaluate their attitudes toward speaking, as well as their instructional experiences and preferences. The survey was written in both Korean and English. Closed questions were measured using even-number response Likert scales to create forced choice replies. The open-ended responses made in Korean and occasionally English and Korean responses were translated into English. This survey can be found in Appendix A. Finally, two post-course focus groups discussed the extensive speaking component of the course. These focus groups were conducted primarily in Korean and then translated into English for analysis. The semi-structured questions asked to the focus groups are in appendix B.

4. Data Analysis

To explore answers for the first two research questions, the initial and final audio recordings were analyzed in two different ways based on Kormos and Dénes (2004) “results [*that*] support earlier theoretical conceptualizations of fluency according to

which there exist two senses of fluency: low-order fluency (temporal aspects of fluency) and high-order fluency that can be equated with proficiency” (p. 158). For the first research question, on low-order fluency we wanted to measure the students’ fluency to look for improvement over time. According to Wood (2010), “perceived fluency has to do with increased speed of speech, and empirical studies generally tend to show that this is true. Measures of speech rate and articulation are relatively easy to link to fluency” (p. 18). Consequently, words per minute (WPM) was selected as the fluency measure based on Woods’ suggestion and the simplicity and convenience of administration. Two evaluators counted the number of words for both the initial and the final recording of each student. These scores were then averaged and divided by the length of the recording to provide words per minute. Then the difference in performance for each participant was used in a two-tailed student’s t-test that compared the amount of fluency improvement for the individuals in each group.

To answer the second research question regarding proficiency, Kormos and Dénes’ higher-order fluency, we needed a measure of proficiency to see if proficiency behaved differently than did low-order temporal fluency under these experimental conditions. According to Moeller (2013), “the ACTFL OPI [*American Council of Foreign Languages Oral Proficiency Interview*] and WPT [*Writing Proficiency Test*] are the most cited and preferred measures for scholarly inquiry in the area of language acquisition and assessment” (p. 549). Consequently, we turned to the ACFTL-OPI as our measure of oral proficiency to provide “higher order,” or more holistic, analysis than words per minute. Again two trained raters scored both the initial and the final recording of each student. These ratings were converted to numerical ratings to allow statistical analysis. Novice-low received a rating of “1” with the highest possible score being “11” for a distinguished rating. These scores were then averaged. Again as with the fluency ratings the difference in OPI scores for each participant was used in a two-tailed student’s t-test that compared the amount of proficiency improvement for the individuals in each group.

To address the third research question, we looked to the data collected in the pre and post surveys as well as the focus group interviews. The elements of the survey data were analyzed via descriptive statistics using Microsoft Excel, and the interview data was initially open coded and then axially coded following the principles associated with grounded theory research as outlined by Creswell (2012).

IV. DISCUSSION

This study explores how extensive speaking affects students’ temporal fluency and speaking proficiency, as well as their attitudes toward EFL speaking activities in general

and extensive speaking in particular. The results of this research support many of the researchers' intuitions about how ES might work in a Korean university. For example, the ES students' fluency improved significantly, and significantly more than the fluency of the traditional students. Moreover, the ES classes' speaking proficiency improved significantly relative to the traditional group as well. Similarly, the pre- and post-treatment surveys showed important changes in student attitude, while the post-treatment focus group interview revealed important subtle insights into students' attitudes and ideas about ES. In this discussion section, we review each of the research questions in order.

1. Effect of Extensive Speaking on Fluency

The students were recorded at the beginning and end of the six-week program. For this recording they were asked to speak for one minute on a topic of their own choosing. Again, the specific measure of fluency was words per minute, and the goal was to compare improvement in student fluency over the course of the program between the ES and traditional classes. Individually, of the thirty-six students, only four showed a decline in their WPM rate. One of these was in the ES group, and three were in the traditional group. Moreover, on average, both the ES group and the traditional group showed significant improvement in fluency measured in WPM. At the start of the language program, the average WPM for traditional group was 63.38 with a standard deviation of 13.01. After six weeks of traditional speaking activities without ES activity, the average WPM increased to 76.15 with a standard deviation of 17.81. On average, the traditional group improved 12.77 words per minute—a 19% increase. Similarly, before the ES treatment, the average WPM for ES group was 60.48 with a standard deviation of 15.59, very nearly identical to the traditional group. However, after the six weeks of ES activity, the average WPM increased to 82.84 with a standard deviation of 17.75. On average the ES group improved 22.36 words per minute—a 37% increase. As you can see, the ES group's performance actually leapfrogged over the traditional instruction groups', by a substantial nine point margin after starting three points lower than the traditional group. To determine if these differences are statistically significant, an independent samples two tailed t-test compared the improvement in fluency scores of the two groups over the course of the program. We found a statistically significant difference in the improvement scores for the ES group ($M=22.35$, $SD=14.17$) and the traditional group ($M=12.76$, $SD=12.55$); $t(34)=2.1374$, $p=0.0398$. We conclude that processes associated with output—the daily monologue ES activity—promoted this greater increase of WPM rate. While this conclusion appears to stand in opposition to Krashen's (1989) suggestion that, theoretically at least, "One can acquire 'competence'

in a second language, or a first language, without ever producing it” (p. 108), we would hesitate to draw such a black and white conclusion, because Krashen does not argue that output would not in any way facilitate the process. On the other hand, these results provide strong support for Swain’s (1985, 1993, 2005) Output Hypothesis, which argues that output has a critical role in developing second language skills, particularly productive skills like speaking.

2. Effect of Extensive Speaking on Proficiency

Based on Kormos and Dénes (2004) suggestion that fluency and proficiency are linked in an intimate fashion, we anticipated that proficiency would change in a way similar to fluency, and indeed this is exactly what the data reveals. Recall that the ACTFL-OPI speaking rubric was used to evaluate the initial and final recordings of all the participants to provide a more holistic evaluation of their speaking proficiency. In a near match of the fluency results, only five students showed a decline in their OPI score. One was from the ES group, while four were in the traditional group. Moreover, on average, both the ES group and the traditional group showed substantial improvement in proficiency measured on the OPI scale. At the start of the language program, the average OPI rating for traditional group was 2.486, which with a standard deviation of 0.996. This rating equates to midway between novice-mid and novice-high. After six weeks of traditional speaking activities without ES activity, the average OPI increased to 3.088 with a standard deviation of 1.011, just at the Novice-high level. On average, the traditional group improved 0.60 or about half a level on the OPI scale. Similarly, before the ES treatment, the average OPI for ES group was 2.513 with a standard deviation of 0.730. Again, this rating equates to midway between novice-mid and novice-high, and, as with the fluency scores, is very nearly identical to the traditional groups level. After six weeks of ES activity, the average OPI rating increased to 4.118 with a standard deviation of 1.718. On average, the ES group improved 1.60 ranks, or roughly a level and a half on the OPI scale which is almost three times the increase seen in the traditional group. To determine if these differences are statistically significant, an independent-samples two-tailed t-test was conducted to compare the improvement in fluency scores of the two groups over the course of the program. We found a statistically significant difference in the improvement scores for the ES group ($M=1.605$, $SD=1.276$) and the traditional group ($M=0.588$, $SD=0.873$; $t(34)=2.8378$, $p=0.0076$). As with fluency, we conclude that output processes via the daily monologue activity cause this greater increase in proficiency by the ES groups. Importantly, given that the proficiency data changes in a nearly identical manner as the fluency data does, this result provides

strong support for Kormos and Dénes (2004) suggestion that low-order temporal fluency factors are closely related to high-order proficiency factors.

3. Effect of Extensive Speaking on Attitudes

As stated in the methods section, we conducted a survey at the beginning and end of the study to measure the changes in students' attitudes toward and experiences with speaking practice activities in general and with this extensive speaking activity in particular (See Appendix A). We identified three important themes from survey. First, the students' reports regarding the relative difficulty of the four skills ran counter to conventional wisdom. Second, important differences were seen after the program in students' perceived frequency of instructional activities. Finally, the ES students' enthusiasm for different instructional activities, particularly higher order activities, increased substantially more than did the enthusiasm of the traditional group students.

1) Perceived incidence of instructional activities for speaking skills

Students were asked the frequency of various teaching activities they recalled from the speaking classes. The list consisted of choral repetition drill, pair speaking dialogue, free discussion, presentation, storytelling, debate, and extensive speaking. These activities were selected to represent a continuum from rote, memorized skills which are similar to what Scrivener (2005) calls "restricted output" to higher order synthetic and creative skills which align with skills that he calls "authentic output." In this set the perceived incidence of almost all of the activities was seen to rise, due in no small part to their participation in an intensive English program with several hours of instruction every day. Interestingly, the notable exception to this pattern was that the incidence of choral repetition shows a marked drop in the ES group while increasing in the traditional group. Certainly, choral repetition is perhaps the most rote of classroom speaking activities; thus, we consider it a positive indicator that the ES students perceived a reduction in choral repetition and a concerning marker that the traditional group reported an increase. The other area of reduction in frequency was found for the extensive speaking activity amongst the traditional group. Since ES was not done in that group, that it dropped is of little concern; however, the ES group's perceived incidence jumped three and a half ranks on the six rank scale.

Similarly, the higher orders activities of free discussion, presentation, storytelling, and debate, while increasing in both groups, increased substantially more in the ES group. Increasing a rank or less in the traditional group and jumping two to nearly three ranks in the ES group. After discovering this difference for the higher-order activities and as part

of our member checks, we decided to ask the ES instructor if there had been any particular effort to include such high-order activities—in deviation from the prescribed curriculum and textbook. Her reply was, “I don’t think we did anything particularly different. We were all following basically the same coursebook and the same curriculum.” Apparently, no such substantial differences in the frequency of high order instructional activities occurred between the ES and traditional classes: aside from the ES activities themselves. This mismatch of student perceptions and instructor perceptions is puzzling. We are left to assume that the students perceived the ES activity as incorporating and combining these higher-order skills as they were free to discuss their opinions, present their ideas, tell a story, or reflect on a debate. We have been unable to find any discussion of this effect in the literature, but given the emphasis on moving from low order skills to higher order skills in EFL education (e.g., Scrivener, 2002) and to authentic language (e.g., Peacock, 1997; Tomlinson, 2011), this emergent theme merits additional exploration and research.

2) Relative difficulty of productive and receptive skills.

An interesting emergent finding involved the students’ perception of macro skill difficulty. When they were asked to rank the difficulty of the four macro skills—reading, writing, listening, and speaking—the overall consensus was that the *receptive* skills were more difficult (See Table 2).

TABLE 2
Averages of Self Reports of Relative Macro-Skill Difficulty

Group & test	listening	speaking	reading	writing
Traditional-pre	2.94	1.35	3.35	1.94
Traditional-post	2.76	2.00	3.06	1.71
ES-pre	2.84	1.84	3.16	2
ES-post	2.73	1.91	3.09	1.95

Note. 4 is most difficult and 1 is least.

Specifically in the pre-treatment survey, speaking and writing were rated least difficult at roughly the same level, while listening and reading being the most difficult, although reading was rated slightly more difficult than listening. This runs counter to conventional ELT wisdom as well as prominent voices in the literature, including Celce-Murcia and

Olshtain (2000) who argue that productive skills are perceived as most difficult. Interestingly, while the scores did show some limited regression to the mean over the course of the intensive program, no marked differences were found between the scores of the ES group and the traditional instruction group with the single exception for the data point for speaking in the pre-treatment survey. The rating for speaking difficulty leaped up in the post-treatment survey by about 3/4 of a point on the 4-point scale.

3) Attitudinal change toward different speaking activities.

However, the difference in attitudes to these speaking activities shows great promise for motivational change. In the pre-treatment and post-treatment surveys, the students were asked to rate how much they enjoyed each of the typical EFL classroom speaking activities that they previously rated for frequency. The six rank scale ranged from “it’s my favorite” to “I hate it.” The results shown in Table 3 are intriguing. Across the board the ES class stated that they liked doing each of the speaking activities more after the program than they had before. On the other hand, the traditional classes’ attitudes toward these rather typical speaking activities were relatively unchanged, some becoming slightly more favored others becoming slightly more disfavored. All of the changes are about a half rank, or less, on average, with the exception of a full rank improvement in their favorability rating for debate. In contrast, the ES groups were generally on the order of a rank or more with the activities of exceptions of presentations and extensive speaking which both improved about a rank and a half, and pair dialogue which only increased a third of a rank. Indeed, while the average change for each of the seven activities types for the traditional group was positive, it was merely 18% of a rank, while the average change in favorability for the all of the different activities was almost exactly one full rank.

TABLE 3
Change in Reported Favorability of Each Activity
(based on ranks in a six rank scale)

	Choral repetition drill	Pair speaking dialogue	Free discuss- ion	Present- ation	Story- telling	Debate	Extensive speaking	Avg . Δ
Δ Trad. group	-0.41	-0.18	0.23	0.59	-0.12	1.12	0.00	0.18
Δ ES group	0.87	0.30	0.88	1.50	0.99	0.92	1.52	1.00
Difference	1.29	0.47	0.64	0.91	1.10	-0.20	1.52	

Clearly, the students in the ES group changed their attitudes for the better for the sorts of activities that they might meet in a speaking classroom. We should be somewhat cautious about attributing these results solely to the ES activity alone, in part because of Hawthorne effects that can occur in experimental groups, but also because as Day (2013) reports, all of the studies of extensive reading that have looked at attitudinal and motivational factors have shown attitudinal and motivational improvement after an extensive reading intervention: it would be fair to assume the same effect might occur in ES. However, two other factors support the conclusion that ES may have been a major factor in these attitudinal changes. One factor is the fact that the largest increase by far in attitudinal change was found in the presentation and extensive speaking activity types: the two Higher-order activity types inextricably linked to this extensive speaking activity. The second factor being that every attempt was made to control for confounding factors in the study including curriculum, instructional time, and other concerns.

4. Emergent Themes from Focus Group Interviews

As the final source of data for this study, one researcher conducted two focus group sessions of selected students at the end of the six-week program. The interview questions (see Appendix B) were designed to determine if the students' experiences and attitudes might provide additional insights that we could not garner through the other quantitative and survey methods. The first question asked was how effective the students themselves felt the extensive speaking activity was and why. Several students commented that the repetitive character of the activity was a key factor in why ES helped improve their speaking skills. For example, Jun [*all names are pseudonyms*], a lower level student, commented, "At the beginning it was very stressful. But then it got better, and I was used to it." Another more advanced student, Min, mentioned, "At the end, I harvested a lot. Clearly, I made progress. I was surprised I could talk in long sentences. That made me feel great about myself." Taeson echoed these opinions in stating, "I like it that we could do it everyday. I felt more comfortable speaking English as time went by." Clearly, regular speaking in general and practice associated with the specific monologue/presentation subskill helped reduce anxiety and improve the student's comfort level with speaking English as stressed by Krashen (1981) as well as Day and Bamford (1998, 2002). Jun's opinion additionally reflects the benefits of regular practice on improving confidence and fluency. As Swain (1993) argues "language production provides the opportunity for meaningful practice of one's linguistic resources permitting the development of automaticity in their use" (p. 159).

The focus groups were also asked which part of the ES activity they liked the most. Kate commented on her improvement saying, "For me, at the beginning, I thought of

grammar first before I began to say anything. At the end I feel I could talk continuously without worrying about grammar,” a thought that aligns well with Day’s (2013) contention regarding the primacy of fluency in extensive reading. Lee also discussed his increased fluency stating that in the beginning he was “talking in words only. Then I added more words, and made it into sentences. I felt great about myself.” Doomi expressed similar feelings, “I really enjoyed the recording activity, because I could talk without feeling anxious.” Lee and Doomi hint at a dropping of their affective filters and add the extra element of positive emotion, which implies increased motivation and matches the benefits argued for extensive reading by both Krashen (1981) and Day and Bamford (1998). Finally, when asked to explain the reasons why they liked the ES activity, Heojin stated that, “First of all, this activity gave us daily chances to talk. Secondly, the topics are to our own choices and, therefore, they are comparatively easier to talk about.” Here Heojin without being prompted raises two of the ten principles we adopted from Day and Bamford (2002) principles for extensive reading.

Several students raised an interesting emergent perspective that cannot be germane to extensive reading as it deals with the character of output and social interaction. Doomi expressed these feelings in a poetic way, “It was like sitting in a cafe and talking to my best friend.” Another student, Jinseon, felt it was like writing a letter to someone except that he was using his *voice*. Their comments point to two benefits of ES. One is that extensive *speaking* feels like a truly communicative activity due in part to the fact that it is a productive skill (Swain, 1985, 2005). Additionally, some elements of speaking are just inherent to speaking as Folse argues, “An obvious way to improve students’ speaking skills is through actual speaking” (2006, p. 31).

To summarize the students’ insights, when speaking in a foreign language becomes like talking to friends in the cafe or using their voice to compose a letter, the FL environment passes through a tremendous qualitative shift to become a positive environment in which skills in the language grow and speakers to experience the joy of talking. As a consequence students’ fluency jumps ahead, and they build confidence in their grammatical skills.

V. CONCLUSION

This study delves into the effectiveness of a simple in-class extensive speaking activity in increasing students’ fluency, raising their proficiency and improving their attitudes and confidence in EFL speaking. Indeed, all of the three areas showed significant and substantial improvement over the course of the program. Moreover, the qualitative data through pre and post survey responses and the focus group interviews

provided critical emergent insights into the processes and products of this extensive speaking activity. Ultimately pointing the curriculum toward more balance between input and output as suggested by Renandya (2013).

Additionally, we hoped to shed light on the disagreements surrounding the input and output hypotheses. Our contention has been that both input and output have important roles to play in SLA. Although we acknowledge that one's knowledge base of lexis, syntax, etc. acquired through receptive processes of listening and particularly reading, (Krashen, 1981) is vital to acquiring a second language, we argue that a comprehensive model of SLA cannot rely *exclusively* on evaluating one's language knowledge base. That comprehensive model ought to include some consideration of productive skills associated with the second language, because one cannot truly be said to have acquired a second language if they are unable to effectively communicate their own thoughts in that language. Our hope in this study was to focus on the second part of that proposition, the oral production of a second language. While we did *not* collect data on any increases in students' lexical or grammatical acquisition, we did explore their acquisition of a skill set associated with speaking in a foreign language. Moreover, the fact that the students improved significantly in these areas is a strong indicator that regular output increases the quality of learner's output.

Regarding our first research question, the temporal fluency, measured in words per minute, of the students in the ES group did improve significantly more than the fluency of the ones in the traditional group. Moreover, this improvement was achieved in spite of the substantial limitations of the study, which included the small sample size, and the limited curricular time available for the extensive speaking activity. Finally, we wish to emphasize that we compared the relative improvement in the two groups. Thus, while the control group in this intensive program also showed substantial improvement, the ES group made significantly *more improvement* than the regular students. These improvements are in line with the sorts of improvements reported in studies of extensive reading (Day, 2013; Krashen, 2011). Similarly, we posited that, based on Kormos and Dénes (2004), proficiency is a higher order component of the umbrella concept of general fluency, and consequently proficiency measures would change in a similar fashion to lower order temporal fluency measures. Indeed, this was precisely the behavior recorded regarding our second research question. As with temporal fluency, holistic measures based on the ACTFL-OPI improved for both groups; however, the proficiency of students in the ES group improved significantly more than the traditional group. This result echoes both Kormos and Dénes' (2004) results regarding the character of temporal fluency and proficiency, as well as the benefits of extensive practices over intensive practices found in the extensive reading literature (Day, 2013; Krashen, 2011).

The final research question regarding changes in attitudes is much more qualitative in character, and here too improvements were seen. Indeed, these results match well with the attitudinal changes seen in extensive reading research (Day, 2013). The ES students reported greater improvement in attitude to speaking activities in general and much greater improvement regarding higher skill activities of free discussion, presentation, storytelling, and, of course, extensive speaking. This result offers great promise for breaking through the barriers that have been identified for Korean students' development of speaking proficiency (Li, 1998; S. K. Shin, 2012). Ultimately, however, the best evidence for their change in attitude and the success of this extensive speaking activity is found in the participants' own voices as they describe with color and passion their ES journey moving from forcing out a few scattered words to speaking in sentences, from stammering along focusing first on grammar to speaking with fluidity lead by their own meanings, from awkwardness and anxiety to fluency and enjoyment.

REFERENCES

- Ahn, Sun-Young, & Baek, Hye-Jeong. (2013). Academic achievement-oriented society and its relationship to the psychological well-being of Korean adolescents. In C. C. Yi (Ed.), *The Psychological Well-being of East Asian Youth* (pp. 265–279). Springer Netherlands.
- Anderson, T., & Kohler, H. P. (2012). Education fever and the East Asian fertility puzzle: A case study of low fertility in South Korea. *PSC Working Paper Series*, 1-25.
- Bell, T. (1998). Extensive reading: Why? and how? *The Internet TESL Journal*, 4(12). Retrieved February 23, 2009, from the World Wide Web: <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Bell-reading.html>.
- Brown, J. D. (2003). Promoting fluency in EFL classrooms. *Proceedings of the 2nd Annual JALT Pan-SIG Conference*. Presented at the 2nd Annual JALT Pan-SIG Conference, Kyoto, Japan: Kyoto Institute of Technology. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://jalt.org/pansig/2003/HTML/Brown.htm>.
- Byun, Ki-Yong, Chu, Hui-Jung, Kim, Min-Jung, Park, InnWoo, Kim, Su-Hong, & Jung, Ju-Young. (2011). English-medium teaching in Korean higher education: Policy debates and reality. *Higher Education*, 62(4), 431–449.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and context in language teaching: A guide for language teachers*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Choi, Inn-Chull. (2008). The impact of EFL testing on EFL education in Korea. *Language Testing*, 25(1), 39–62.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Crookes, G. (1991). Second language speech production research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13(02), 113–131.
- Day, R. (2013, June). *Does the research support the promise of extensive reading?* Presented at the MEESO 2013 International Conference, Seoul, Korea.
- Day, R. R., & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive reading in the second language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Day, R., & Bamford, J. (2002). Top ten principles for teaching extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 14(2), 136-141.
- Folse, K. S. (2006). *The art of teaching speaking: Research and pedagogy for the ESL/EFL classroom* (4th ed.). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press/ELT.
- Izumi, S. (2003). Comprehension and production processes in Second Language Learning: In search of the psycholinguistic rationale of the Output Hypothesis. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(2), 168–196.
- Jeong, Dong-Bin. (2001). English education based on the 7th National English Curriculum. *Newsletter of Wonderland*, 7. Seoul: Wonderland.
- Judge, P. B. (2011). Driven to read: Enthusiastic readers in a Japanese high school's extensive reading program. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 23(2), 161–186.
- Kang, Shin-Who. (2009). Koreans ranked bottom in English proficiency test. *The Korea Times*. Retrieved April 1, 2009, from the World Wide Web: http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2009/04/117_42399.html.
- Kang, Yoon-Hee. (2012). Any one parent will do: Negotiations of fatherhood among South Korean “wild geese” fathers in Singapore. *Journal of Korean Studies*, 17(2), 269–297.
- Kelly, L. G. (1969). *25 centuries of language teaching*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Kim, Jee-Hun. (2010). “Downed” and stuck in Singapore: Lower/middle class South Korean wild geese (kirogi) children in Singapore. In E. Hannum, H. Park, Y. G. Butler (Eds.), *Globalization, changing demographics, and educational challenges in East Asia* (Vol. 17, pp. 271–311). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Kim, Sung-Jin. (2004). Coping with cultural obstacles to speaking English in the Korean secondary school context. *Asian EFL Journal*. September 2004. Retrieved April 9, 2013, from the World Wide Web: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/september_04_ksj.php.

- Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation. (2013). National English Assessment Test. Retrieved April 9, 2013, from the World Wide Web: <http://kice.re.kr/en/contents.do?contentsNo=150&menuNo=406>.
- Koreans Need Not Be Disappointed With TOEFL Scores. (2009). *The Korea Times*. Retrieved May 9, 2009, from the World Wide Web: http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2009/05/113_44622.html.
- Kormos, J., & Dénes, M. (2004). Exploring measures and perceptions of fluency in the speech of second language learners. *System*, 32(2), 145–164.
- Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (1989). We acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: Additional evidence for the input hypothesis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(4), 440–464.
- Krashen, S. (2011, October). *Seeking a justification for direct instruction*. Paper presented at the 19th Annual KOTESOL International Conference, Seoul, Korea.
- Lee, Hak-Yoon. (2010). “I am a Kirogi Mother, so this is my job, NOT Father’s!”: Education exodus and life transformation among Korean immigrant women. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 9(4). Retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://jlie.cal.org/ojs/index.php/jlie/article/view/101>.
- Lee, Woo-Joo. (2011). Views and experiences of English language education for young learners in South Korea: Has Korea government achieved its goal in introducing English language to public primary school? *Asian EFL Journal*, 5(6), 16-29
- Li, D. (1998). “It’s always more difficult than you plan and imagine”: Teachers’ perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 677–703.
- Liming, Y. (1990). The Comprehensible Output Hypothesis and self-directed learning: A learner’s perspective. *TESL Canada Journal*, 8(1), 9–26.
- Mason, B., & Krashen, S. (1997). Extensive reading in English as a foreign language. *System*, 25(1), 91–102.
- McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of second-language learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Moeller, A. J. (2013). Advanced Low Language Proficiency—An Achievable Goal? *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(2), 549–553.
- Palmer, H. E. (1917). *The scientific study and teaching of languages*. London: Harrap.
- Palmer, H. E. (1921). *The principles of language study*. London: Harrap.
- Park, Jin-Kyu. (2009). “English fever” in South Korea: Its history and symptoms. *English Today*, 25(1), 50-57.
- Park, Soo-Jin, & Abelmann, N. (2004). Class and cosmopolitan striving: Mothers’ management of English education in South Korea. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 77(4), 645–672.

- Peacock, M. (1997). The effect of authentic materials on the motivation of EFL learners. *ELT Journal*, 51(2), 144–156.
- Renandya, W. A. (2013). The role of input- and output-based practice in ELT. In A. Ahmed, M. Hanzala, F. Saleem & G. Cane (Eds.), *ELT in a changing world: Innovative approaches to new challenges* (pp. 41–52). Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Scrivener, J. (2005). *Learning teaching: A guidebook for English language teachers*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.
- Seth, M. (2012). Education zeal, state control and citizenship in South Korea. *Citizenship Studies*, 16(1), 13–28.
- Shin, Hae-In. (2011). Diplomats who don't speak good English? *The Korea Herald*. Retrieved September 14, 2011, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20110914000735>.
- Shin, Sang-Keun. (2012). "It cannot be done alone": The socialization of novice English teachers in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(3), 542–567.
- Speaking - ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. (n.d.). Retrieved June 5, 2013, from the World Wide Web: <http://actflproficiencyguidelines2012.org/speaking>.
- Spolsky, B., & Moon, Y. (2012). *Primary school English-language education in Asia: From policy to practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Sun, Yu-Chih. (2012). Examining the effectiveness of extensive speaking practice via voice blogs in a foreign language learning context. *CALICO Journal*, 29(3), 494–506.
- Swain, M. (1985) Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Gass, S. and Madden, C. (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, pp. 235-256. New York: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50(1), 158–164.
- Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook on research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471-83). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tomlinson, B. (2011). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Unlikely Expat. (2012, September 27). Why Korea can't speak English: Part II. Retrieved April 16, 2013, from the World Wide Web: <http://theunlikelyexpat.blogspot.kr/2012/09/why-korea-cant-speak-english-part-ii.html>.
- Wood, D. (2010). *Formulaic language and second language speech fluency: Background, evidence and classroom applications*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Yoon, Kyung-Eun. (2004). CLT theories and practices in EFL curricula. A case study of Korea. *Asian EFL Journal*. September 2004. Retrieved April 16, 2013, from the World Wide Web: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/september_04_yke.php.

APPENDIX A

Initial survey of students

Name: _____ (한글) _____ (English)

Attitudes toward and experiences with extensive speaking activities

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study. This study is to explore how speaking can be improved in the university foreign language classroom in Korea. Your responses to this survey will be anonymous in any research publish. By completing and turning in this survey you are agreeing to participate in my study. (THANK YOU!)

I Personal Info

Gender: Female/Male

Age:

Year in college: __ first __ second __ third __ fourth __ graduate

II English learning history and speaking proficiency

How many years have you studied English?

Do you like speaking English? (check the spot that matches your interest level)

1 ... 2 ... 3 ... 4 ... 5 ... 6 ... 7 ... 8 ... 9 ... 10

Not at all

Very much

How confident are you when speaking English? (check the spot that matches your level)

1 ... 2 ... 3 ... 4 ... 5 ... 6 ... 7 ... 8 ... 9 ... 10

Not confident (afraid)

Very confident

How would you rate your English speaking proficiency? How good are you at English conversation? (check the spot that matches your level)

1 ... 2 ... 3 ... 4 ... 5 ... 6 ... 7 ... 8 ... 9 ... 10

Low beginner Superior
 (1=only basic words) (4=simple topics, ok) (7=difficult topics, ok) (10=native speaker)

III Current English Speaking Practice

- Do you take speaking classes at university? Yes No
 Do you go to private academies to study speaking? Yes No
 Do you have foreign friends to speak English with? Yes No
 Do you speak English outside the classroom? Yes No
 How often do you speak English outside the classroom?
 every day 3-5 times a week once a week monthly yearly
 never
 Do you practice before you speak? Yes No
 Do you believe practice can make your speak better? Yes No

IV Learning English Speaking

What kinds of speaking exercises have you done in English class (and how often)?

	every class	every week	once a month	once a term	almost never	never
Choral repetition drill						
pair speaking dialogue						
free discussion						
presentation						
storytelling						
debate						
extensive speaking*						

* Extensive speaking is regular speaking practice on a self chosen topics without correction or interruption.

What kinds of speaking exercises do you like to do in English class?

	It is my favorite	I like it	It is ok	not so much	I dislike it	I hate it
Choral repetition drill						

pair speaking dialogue
free discussion
presentation
storytelling
debate
extensive speaking

Please list any other speaking activities you have done in English class:

Which English language skills is most difficult? Please rank in order (1 is hardest, 4 is easiest)

___ listening ___ speaking ___ reading ___ writing

V English speaking attitudes

How difficult is speaking English for you -- relative to other studies?

1 ... 2 ... 3 ... 4 ... 5 ... 6 ... 7 ... 8 ... 9 ... 10
 Not at all My most difficult subject

Why?

What is the best activity for improving your spoken English?

APPENDIX B

Focus group semi-structured interview questions

Please rate from 1-10 how much you liked our extensive speaking activity.

Why do you say that rating?

Do you feel your speaking is getting more fluent from the extensive speaking activity?

Why or why not?

When you were doing the extensive speaking activity, what was the most difficult part?

Tell us more about that.

Would you continue this extensive speaking activity after this intensive program?

Why do you say that?

Examples in: English

Applicable Languages: English

Applicable levels: Elementary/Secondary/Tertiary

Sarah Gu
Foreign Language Institute (SWELL)
Seoul Women's University
139-774, 621 Hwarangro, Nowon Gu, Seoul
Tel: 02-970-5114 H.P.: 010-9903-0534
Email: gyhsarah@gmail.com

Eric D. Reynolds
Woosong University
300-718, 509 Woosong Language Institute Building
196-5 Jayang-Dong, Dong-Gu, Daejeon
Tel: 82-42-630-9245 (office); 82-10-4039-4392 (mobile)
Email: ericreynolds@woosong.org

Received 15 September 2013

Revised 4 November 2013

Accepted 16 November 2013