

The Effect of L2 Exposure Environment on Nnests' Teaching Skills and Beliefs about EFL Learning Beyond the Class

Susilo Susilo

English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Mulawarman University, Samarinda, Indonesia

Bibit Suhatmady

English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,
Mulawarman University, Samarinda, Indonesia

Dyah Sunggingwati

English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Mulawarman University, Samarinda, Indonesia

Hany Farisa

English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Mulawarman University, Samarinda, Indonesia

Syaripa Nurul Ilmi

English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Mulawarman University, Samarinda, Indonesia

Abstract

The study aims at investigating the effect of second language (L2) exposure environment on NNESTs' teaching skills and beliefs about EFL learning beyond the classroom. This is a survey for non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs) of Indonesian Senior High Schools (or in Indonesian terms 'SMA') from different L2 environments, namely: 1) urban-region exposure environment schools (n=40), and 2) rural-region exposure environment schools (n=40). There were two instruments used in the present study, i.e. 1) observation scaling checklist, and 2) questionnaire. The observation scaling checklist was used for assessing the respondents' performance when they were teaching in class. Meanwhile, the questionnaire using a four-point Likert scale was used to elicit data. The researchers used a series of independent t-test to analyze the data. The result reveals that: 1) there is a significant difference between teaching skills of NNESTs from the urban region schools and those of NNESTs from rural region schools, $t(78) = 19.499$, $p=0.000$; and 2) there is a significant difference between beliefs about English as a foreign language (EFL) learning beyond the classroom of the NNESTs from urban region schools and those of NNESTs from rural region schools, $t(78) = -4.925$, $p=0.000$

Key Words: Beliefs about EFL learning beyond the classroom, NNEST, L2 exposure environment, and teaching skills

Cite as: Susilo, S., Suhatmady, B., Sunggingwati, D., Farisa, H., & Ilmi, S. N. (2017). The Effect of L2 Exposure Environment on Nnests' Teaching Skills and Beliefs about EFL Learning Beyond the Class. *Arab World English Journal*, 8 (3). DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no3.18>

Introduction

Second language acquisition's (SLA) variability has been partly dependent on a number of factors, such as modes of L2 acquisition - immersion vs. Classroom (e.g., Carroll, 1967), length of second language (L2) immersion (e.g., Flege, Frieda, & Nozawa, 1997), or extent of daily L2 vs first language (L1) usage (e.g., Jia et al., 2002). This indicates the importance of the relationship between L2 exposure and the attainment of L2 proficiency, which has been proved by many studies, for instance, the relationship between the age at which a learner is exposed to L2 and the ultimate L2 attainment level (e.g., Birdsong, 2005; Birdsong & Molis, 2001; Johnson & Newport, 1989); the benefits of the degree to which a learner is immersed in L2 (e.g., Carroll, 1967; Flege et al., 1999), the extent of L2 exposure (e.g., Birdsong, 2005; Genesee, 1985; Kohnert, Bates, & Hernandez, 1999; Weber-Fox & Neville, 1999), and extent of on-going L2 use (e.g., Flege, MacKay, & Piske, 2002; Jia et al., 2002) to L2 proficiency. L2 exposure has been assumed efficient for English as a second language learners to increase their L2 proficiency. In the context of inner circle or outer circle environment (Kachru's concept of world Englishes), L2 exposure has been easy to gain for improving the L2 learning; however, in the context of the expanding circle, getting enough L2 exposure is not that easy. It is due to the fact that in the expanding circle context, EFL learners are not mingling with real experience environment such as living in English-speaking community as their rich exposure in the target language; thus, the only way to get the target language exposure for them is to gain more access to authentic materials, such as newspapers, magazines, movies, films, or broadcasting programs which were provided in the target language.

The attainment of L2 proficiency in the context of inner circle or outer circle environment has been dependent to certain extent on learners' attitudes to the L2 which according to many research findings can also be constrained by socio-economic factors; for instance, students from rural regions or lower social classes have lower international orientation, thus show less favour in the attitude toward learning foreign language (see Dörnyei, Z., et al, 2006; Carr & Pauwels, 2006; Lamb, 2012). Moreover, failure and success of learning foreign language, thus level of L2 acquisition, is empirically influenced by learners' attitudes, speakers' cultures or context of foreign language learning (Gholami, 2012; Matsumoto, 2012). These researchers tell the importance of teacher's role and L2 environment. Teacher's role can represent how to create good atmosphere in class and generate a help to bridge out-class learning and in-class learning. The learning beyond the class in fact cannot be apart from L2 environment. In other words, it is teachers' teaching skills that can create a hub link between classroom learning and out-of-class learning, and how learners utilize learning beyond the classroom for learners' L2 exposure, which presumably plays a determining role. This study proposes two general research questions each of which entails three specific research questions, as follows.

- 1) Is any there effect of L2 exposure environments on NNESTs' teaching skills?
 - a. Is any there effect of L2 exposure environments on NNESTs' teaching preparation?
 - b. Is any there effect of L2 exposure environments on NNESTs' teaching action?
 - c. Is any there effect of L2 exposure environments on NNESTs' teaching action?

- 2) Is any there effect of L2 exposure environments on NNESTs' beliefs about EFL learning beyond the classroom?
 - a. Is there any there effect of L2 exposure environments on NNESTs' beliefs about the settings of L2 learning beyond the classroom?
 - b. Is there any effect of L2 exposure environments on NNESTs' beliefs about process of the out-class learning?
 - c. Is there any effect of L2 exposure environments on NNESTs' beliefs about atmosphere of the out-class learning?

Literature review

The definitions of teaching skill have been broadly explained by several L2 teaching experts or researchers. Some of them classified teaching skill into three different elements of teaching skills, i.e., knowledge, decision-making, and action (Kyriacou, 2007); knowledge how, which includes pedagogical knowledge (teaching itself—teaching methods, classroom management, and evaluation) and practical knowledge (to the one that is generated from L2 teachers who get more experiences in the real practices in L2 teaching and learning), in the terms of teachers education (Burns & Richards, 2009); teaching skill including: explaining and presenting new materials, providing practices, and testing (Ur, 1996); teaching skill including: 1) the nature of input, 2) the process of intake, and classroom interaction (Hedge, 2000); and three basic elements of the reflective decision-making model are to plan, to implement, and to evaluate Cooper (2011). In addition, various studies on teaching have been conducted, e.g. giving typical focus on how such skills are developed and displayed by beginning teachers and how beginning teachers differ from experienced teachers (Wragg, 2005) and what experienced teachers think about the skills they use in teaching (Day, 2004; Pollard et al., 2005).

The discussion on learning beyond the classroom includes the extended explanation of learner's autonomous use of any opportunities related to their self-directed learning outside the class. Obviously, learning beyond the classroom refers to the mode of learning which some experts mentioned in a number of alternative terms, such as: out-of-class learning, out-of-school learning, after-school learning, extracurricular and extramural learning, non-formal and informal learning, self-instructed learning, non-instructed and naturalistic learning, independent learning, or self-directed learning (Benson, 2011). In relation to L2 acquisition, this mode of learning is apparently beneficial as Ellis (2008) asserts that L2 acquisition can happen most rapidly via a combination of formal instruction and exposure to the target language. Since this mode of learning meets the learner's needs and preferences, it is believed very helpful to for learners to achieve better outcomes (Victori & Lockhart, 1995). There is a great amount of researches, supporting the effectiveness of out-class learning, i.e. some findings revealing that learners with better proficiency often admitt their success to out-of-class learning (Benson 2011; Lamb & Reinders 2008; Ushioda 2001, Yorozu 2001, Wenden 2001, Lamb 2002; Victori & Lockhart, 1995; Pickard 1995); others show the important role of teachers' advice on motivating students'

attempts to do out-of-class learning (Deepwell & Malik, 2008; Fagerlund, 2012; Inozu, Sahinkarakas, & Yumru, 2010). In terms of learners' outside-of-class activities, other researchers find that after joining their teachers to use technological resources in class, students tend to use them for any activities of learning beyond the class (Lai, 2014; Lai & Gu, 2011). However, sometimes because of a lack of technological resources or ability to use them, some learners do not feel confident in engaging out-of-class learning (Gamble et al., 2012; McKinney, Vacca, Medvedeva, & Malak, 2004); that is why, some teachers still need knowledge or skills to help their students design or use effective technological resources, which finally can drive them for the out-of-class use (Carson & Mynard, 2012; Kop & Fournier, 2011; Reinders, 2010).

In the context of improving outcomes of L2 learning, the role of learning beyond the classroom has been very significant since it is closely related to utilizing exposure of target language. Exposure to target language is helpful for learners to achieve language tasks (Bialystok (1981), as supported by many research findings such as Scarcella and Oxford (1992: 183) who shows that target language community provides information about on L2 registers and helps the development of proficiency for learners; and likewise, Rubin and Thompson (1994: 22) shows that target language discourse beyond the classroom offers learners appropriate use of language and the nature of conversation.

Non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs) are not as strong as Native English speaking teachers (NESTs) in terms of linguistic knowledge, proficiency as well as teaching competence (Stern, 1983; McNeill, 1993; Milambiling, 1999; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999). Besides, some researches show that NESTs are strong cultural resources, therefore they can efficiently teach L2 for learners of other language (e.g. Árvá & Medgyes, 2000; Carless, 2006; Tajino & Tajino, 2000). However, as English learners in the world now has been dominated by multilingual speakers of English (Alptekin, 2002; Jenkins, 2000; Kirkpatrick, 2006), the role of NNEST is getting very crucial in EFL teaching. Internet, technology and media have been widely creating different circumstances of English learning in anywhere regardless the countries where accessing authentic as well as meaningful exposure is difficult since English is used as a foreign language. Using English virtually in social media is now becoming a need for everybody across the state borders. This possibly gives changing faces of teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) in expanding circle contexts. What goes beyond the class really becomes potential opportunities for learners to enrich their learning environments as Richard (2015) predicts that nowadays there is a 'growing range of opportunities and resources available to support out-of-class learning'. Further he says that out-of-class activities are beneficial for teachers since it they enable teachers to create learning opportunities that are difficult in the classroom; this consequently generate challenges as well as opportunities for teachers and learners, which may bring about different class situation. This different situation of learning unavoidably intrigues teachers to treat their students differently in the classroom in order that

they can put more effort in maximizing beyond-the-class learning to help improve the in-class achievements.

For the last 20 years, interest in investigating teacher's cognition (teachers think, know, and believe) and its connection to classroom activities have been flourishing among the world of L2 teaching (Woods, 1996; Almarza, 1996; Borg, 2006). Those researches take the insights from the science of psychology arguing that understanding teacher's cognition is central to the process of understanding teaching. Teacher's belief which is latent has often been unconsciously used to make assumptions about learning activities (Farrell, 1999). Moreover, more researches on beliefs in relation to effective learning have been previously done. Those researches show significance of belief about learning for teachers in-class activities to the success of language learners both inside and outside class (see Feiman-Nemser & Floden 1986; Richards, et al. 1991; Freeman 1992; Johnson 1992; Yang, 1999; Farrell, Thomas S.C. & Bennis, K., 2013; Zare-ee, A & Salami, M. 2014; Lamb, 2008; Lai, Wang, & Lei, 2012).

Method

Participants

The participants were non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs) from Indonesian Senior High Schools (or in Indonesian terms '*SMA*') from different L2 environments, namely: 1) urban-region exposure environment schools (n=40), and 2) rural-region exposure environment schools (n=40). The consideration of labeling 'rural-region exposure' environment and 'urban-region exposure' environment was based on the availability of internet access in the surrounding schools, facilities and infrastructure in schools or the neighboring society, and human resources of the schools (i.e. teacher qualification). The sampling technique used in the current study was census sampling.

Instruments

There were two instruments used in the present study, i.e. 1) observation scaling checklist, and 2) questionnaire. The observation scaling checklist was used for assessing the respondents' performance when they were teaching in class. Each respondent was assessed by the researchers' team using the checklist in which four scales (1 - 4) were used as the options of performance in each aspect of teaching. It was designed by firstly developing concept of teaching skills (Cooper, 2011; Burns & Richards, 2009; Hedge, 2008; Ur, 1996); then divide the concept into three aspects, i.e. teaching preparation, teaching action and teaching evaluation (see table 1). Each aspect was translated into items which were the statements for assessing the respondents' teaching performance (see appendix 2). Meanwhile, the questionnaire was designed by developing concepts of EFL learning beyond the classroom (Benson & Reinders, 2011; Ellis, 2008; Victori & Lockhart, 1995; Nunan & Richards, 2015). The concept was then broken down into three aspects, i.e. the setting, process and atmosphere (see table 1). Based on the aspects, items of statements were constructed. The questionnaire was set up by using four-point Likert scales (strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree).

The questionnaire was piloted to other 20 pre-service teachers in the faculty of teacher

training and education, Mulawarman University. The purpose of the piloting was to have comments on the unclear or ambiguous items from the participants of the pilot groups. On the basis of the results of the piloting, the revisions were done for the betterment of the questionnaire before it was used in the real field.

In addition, internal consistency of each concept in the questionnaire and observation scaling checklist were examined by using Cronbach Alpha (see Cronbach Alpha indices per concept in table 1).

Table 1 *Concepts of variables of the study*

Teaching skills			EFL learning beyond the classroom		
Aspects	Cronbach Alpha for internal consistency	indicators	Aspects	Cronbach Alpha for internal consistency	indicators
Teaching preparation	0.761	<i>Having the lesson plans before teaching</i>	The settings of L2 learning beyond the classroom	0.932	<i>The learning is an out-of-class, or an after-school setting; or mingle with the extracurricular activity</i>
Teaching Action	0.964	<i>Applying a good classroom management Motivating learners in learning beyond the classroom Driving L2 acquisition in the classroom</i>	Process of the out-class learning	0.977	<i>The learning happens through a combination of form-focused instruction and exposure to the target language</i>
Evaluation	0.928	<i>Using product-oriented assessments Doing ongoing assessment while teaching</i>	Atmosphere of the out-class learning	0.855	<i>The learning has a diversity of opportunities and resources learners</i>

Data Collection

The data were collected by distributing questionnaires to the respondents. The process of fulfilling the questionnaire was tightly done under the supervision of enumerators to ensure the respondents' seriousness in answering the questions and to avoid misinterpretation.

Data Analysis

Quantitative analysis was used in this study. Descriptive statistical procedure (i.e. to know the minimum and maximum score and the mean of the items answered in the questionnaire and

observational scaling checklist) and a series of independent sample t-test was then used.

Results

Descriptive Data Analysis

Before running the t-test, the data were checked for the normality by defining their skewness. As shown in table 2 and 3, the skewness of the data for urban NNESTs’ teaching skills is 0.171, while the standard error of skewness is 0.374; thus the skewness ratio should be $0.171/0.374 = 0.457$ (the data were normal) ; in the mean time, the skewness of the data for rural one is -0.029, the standad error of skewness is 0.374; thus the skewness ratio should be $-0.029/0.374 = 0.077$ (the data were normal).

Table 2 *The skewness of urban NNESTs’ teaching skills*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std	variance	skewness	kurtosis		
	statistic	statistic	statistic	statistic	statistic	statistic	statistic	Std error	statistic	Std error
Teaching skills_Urban NNESTs	40	28.00	42.00	35.5500	4.24838	18.049	.171	.374	-1.437	.733
Valid N listwise	40									

Table 3 *The skewness of urban NNESTs’ teaching skills*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std	variance	skewness	kurtosis		
	statistic	statistic	statistic	statistic	statistic	statistic	statistic	Std error	statistic	Std error
Teaching skills_Rural NNESTs	40	20.00	30.00	24.9500	2.42794	5.895	-.029	.374	-.698	.733
Valid N listwise	40									

As seen in table 4 and 5, the skewness of the data for urban NNESTs’ beliefs about learning beyond the class is 0.272, while the standard error of skewness is 0.374; thus the skewness ratio should be $0.272/0.374 = 0.727$ (the data were normal) ; in the mean time, the skewness of the data for rural one is 0.159, the standad error of skewness is 0.374; thus the skewness ratio should be $0.159/0.374 = 0.425$ (the data were normal).

Table 4 *The skewness of urban NNESTs’ teaching skills*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std	variance	skewness	kurtosis	
--	---	---------	---------	------	-----	----------	----------	----------	--

	statistic	statistic	statistic	statistic	statistic	statistic	statistic	Std error	statistic	Std error
Belief about outclass learning _Urban NNESTs	40	30.00	45.00	36.9250	6.17434	38.122	.272	.374	-1.825	.733
Valid N listwise	40									

Table 5 *The skewness of urban NNESTs' teaching skills*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std	variance	skewness		kurtosis	
	statistic	statistic	statistic	statistic	statistic	statistic	statistic	Std error	statistic	Std error
Belief about outclass learning _Rural NNESTs	40	14.00	23.00	29.4250	4.56793	20.866	.159	.374	-1.500	.733
Valid N listwise	40									

Table 6 shows descriptive statistics for both NNESTs' teaching skills and beliefs about EFL learning beyond the class. According to the table, on average means of all aspects in teaching skills of NNESTs in urban region schools was higher than those in rural region schools. Similarly, NNESTs' beliefs about EFL learning beyond the class in urban region schools was higher than those in the rural region schools.

Table 6 *Results of descriptive statistics on both NNESTs' teaching skills and beliefs*

Teaching skills	Means		Std Deviation		N	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Preparation	4.15000	2.8500	0.76962	0.89299		
Action	22.3750	16.4250	3.97871	1.43021		
Evaluation	7.1750	5.6750	1.37538	1.85897		
Total	34.5500	24.9500	4.24838	2.42794	40	40

Beliefs about learners' out-class learning	Means		Std Deviation		N	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Urban	Urban	Rural
Setting	7.9750	5.1500	1.20868	1.45972		
Process	21.6500	19.3500	4.09221	3.75909		
Atmosphere	7.3000	4.9250	1.32433	1.20655		
Total	36.9250	29.4250	6.17434	4.56793	40	40

The effect of L2 exposure environment on NNESTs' teaching skills and beliefs about L2 learning beyond the class

Table 7 reveals the summary of independent t-test conducted to see whether teaching skills and beliefs about L2 learning beyond the class were influenced by the L2 exposure environment.

Table 7 Summary of independent t-test results

Dependent Variables: L2 exposure environment

Teaching skills	df	t	F	sig
Preparation	78	6.974	3.801	.000
Action	78	8.901	197.378	.000
Evaluation	78	4.102	2.029	.000
Beliefs about learners' out-class learning	df		F	sig
Setting	78	9.428	4.468	.000
Process	78	2.618	2.664	.001
Atmosphere	78	8.384	2.703	.000

Independent t-test was conducted to explore the effect of L2 exposure environment on each aspect of teaching skills performed by the NNESTs.

Table 8 Descriptive statistics of NNESTs' teaching preparation

Ex_En	N	Mean	Std Deviation	Std Error
				Mean

T_Pre	Urban School	40	4.1500	.76962	.12169
	Rural School	40	2.8500	.89299	.14119

The result shows as follows. As shown in figure 8 and 9, the urban school NNESTs' teaching preparation ($M = 4.15000$, $SD = .76962$) and the rural school NNESTs' teaching preparation ($M = 2.8500$, $SD = 0.89299$) differ significantly, $t(78) = 6.974$, $p = 0.000$

Table 9 The result of independent-samples t-test of the effect of L2 exposure environment on NNESTs' teaching preparation

		Levene's test for Equality of variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std Error Difference	95% Confidence interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper	
T_Pre	Equal variances assumed	3.801	.055	6.974	78	.000	1.30000	.18640	.92891	1.67109
	Equal variances not assumed			6.974	76.337	.000	1.30000	.18640	.92879	1.67121

As shown in figure 10 and 11, the urban school NNESTs' teaching action ($M = 22.3750$, $SD = 3.97871$) and the rural school NNESTs' teaching action ($M = 16.4250$, $SD = 1.43021$) differ significantly, $t(78) = 8.901$, $p = 0.000$

Table 10 Descriptive statistics of NNESTs' teaching action

Ex_En	N	Mean	Std Deviation	Std Error
				Mean

T_act	Urban School	40	22.3750	3.97871	.62909
	Rural School	40	16.4250	1.43021	.22614

Table 11 *The result of independent-samples t-test of the effect of L2 exposure environment on NNESTs' teaching action*

T_act	Levene's test for Equality of variances	t-test for Equality of Means								
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std Error Difference	95% Confidence interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
T_act	Equal variances assumed	197.378	.000	8.901	78	.000	5.95000	.66850	4.61912	7.28088
	Equal variances not assumed			8.901	48.913	.000	5.95000	.66850	4.60654	7.29346

As shown in figure 12 and 13, the urban school NNESTs' teaching evaluation ($M = 7.1750$, $SD = 1.37538$) and the rural school NNESTs' teaching evaluation ($M = 5.6750$, $SD = 01.85897$) differ significantly, $t(78) = 4.102$, $p = 0.000$

Table 8 *Descriptive statistics of NNESTs' teaching evaluation*

Ex_En	N	Mean	Std Deviation	Std Error Mean	
T_eva	Urban School	40	7.1750	1.37538	.21747

Rural School				
	40	5.6750	1.85897	.29393

Table 9 *The result of independent-samples t-test of the effect of L2 exposure environment on NNESTs' teaching evaluation*

		Levene's test for Equality of variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std Error Difference	95% Confidence interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
T_eva	Equal variances assumed	2.029	.158	4.102	78	.000	1.50000	.36563	.77208	2.22792
	Equal variances not assumed			4.102	71.853	.000	1.50000	.36563	.77110	2.22890

Similarly, independent t-test was conducted to explore the effect of L2 exposure environment on each aspect of beliefs about EFL learning beyond the classroom possessed by the NNESTs.

The result shows as follows. As shown in figure 14 and 15, the urban school NNESTs' beliefs on setting aspect ($M = 4.15000$, $SD = .76962$) and the rural school NNESTs' beliefs on setting aspect ($M = 2.8500$, $SD = 0.89299$) differ significantly, $t(78) = 9.428$, $p = 0.000$

Table 14 *Descriptive statistics of NNESTs' beliefs about setting of EFL Learning Beyond the classroom*

Ex_En	N	Mean	Std Deviation	Std Error
		Mean		
Be_set	Urban School	40	7.9750	1.20868
				.19111

Rural School	40	5.1500	1.45972	.23080
--------------	----	--------	---------	--------

Table 15 *The result of independent-samples t-test of the effect of L2 exposure environment on NNESTs' Beliefs about setting of EFL learning beyond the classroom*

		Levene's test for Equality of variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std Error Difference	95% Confidence interval of the Difference	
								Lower		Upper
Be_set	Equal variances assumed	4.468	.038	9.428	78	.000	2.82500	.29965	2.22844	3.42156
	Equal variances not assumed			9.428	75.378	.000	2.82500	.29965	2.22811	3.42189

As shown in figure 16 and 17, the urban school NNESTs' beliefs on process of EFL Learning Beyond the classroom ($M = 22.3750$, $SD = 3.97871$) and the rural school NNESTs' beliefs on process of EFL Learning Beyond the classroom ($M = 16.4250$, $SD = 1.43021$) differ significantly, $t(78) = 2.618$, $p = 0.000$

Table 15 *Descriptive statistics of NNESTs' beliefs about process of EFL Learning Beyond the classroom*

Ex_En	N	Mean	Std Deviation	Std Error Mean
Be_pro Urban School	40	21.6500	4.09221	.64703

Rural School	40	19.3500	3.75909	.59436
--------------	----	---------	---------	--------

Table 17 *The result of independent-samples t-test of the effect of L2 exposure environment on NNESTs' Beliefs about process of EFL learning beyond the classroom*

		Levene's test for Equality of variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std Error Difference	95% Confidence interval of the Difference	
								Lower		Upper
Be_Pro	Equal variances assumed	2.664	.107	2.618	78	.011	2.30000	.87859	.55086	4.04914
	Equal variances not assumed			2.618	77.444	.011	2.30000	.87859	.55066	4.04934

As shown in figure 18 and 19, the urban school NNESTs' beliefs on atmosphere of EFL Learning Beyond the classroom ($M = 7.1750$, $SD = 1.37538$) and the rural school NNESTs' beliefs on atmosphere of EFL Learning Beyond the classroom ($M = 5.6750$, $SD = 01.85897$) differ significantly, $t(78) = 8.384$, $p = 0.000$

Table 18 *Descriptive statistics of NNESTs' beliefs about atmosphere of EFL Learning*

Ex_En	N	Mean	Std Deviation	Std Error	
				Mean	
Be_at	Urban School	40	7.3000	1.32433	.20939
	Rural School	40	4.9250	1.20655	.19077

Table 19 *The result of independent-samples t-test of the effect of L2 exposure environment on NNESTs' beliefs about atmosphere of EFL Learning Beyond the classroom*

		Levene's test for Equality of variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std Error Difference	95% Confidence interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper	
Be_at	Equal variances assumed	2.703	104	8.384	78	.000	2.37500	.28327	1.81106	2.93894
	Equal variances not assumed			8.384	77.333	.000	2.37500	.28327	1.81098	2.93902

In terms of all aspect of teaching skills, the result of all aspect shows that there is a significant difference between all aspects of teaching skills of NNESTs from the urban region schools ($M = 34.55, SD = 4.24$) and those of NNESTs from rural region schools, ($M = 24.95, SD = 2.42$), $t(78) = 12.408, p=0.000$. In other words, there was a significant effect of L2 exposure environments on NNESTs' teaching skills (see figure 20 and 21).

Table 20 *Descriptive statistics of NNESTs' teaching skills*

Ex_En	N	Mean	Std Deviation	Std Error Mean
T_Skills Urban School	40	34.5500	4.24838	.67173
Rural School	40	24.9500	2.42794	.38389

Table 21 *The result of independent-samples t-test of the effect of L2 exposure environment on NNESTs' teaching preparation*

		Levene's test for Equality of variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std Error Difference	95% Confidence interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper	
T_skills	Equal variances assumed	30.833	.000	12.408	78	.000	9.60000	.77369	8.05971	11.14029
	Equal variances not assumed			12.408	62.020	.000	9.6000	.77360	8.05343	11.14657

In regard with all aspects of EFL learning beyond the classroom, the result reveals that there is a significant difference between beliefs about all aspects of EFL learning beyond the classroom of the NNESTs from urban region schools ($M = 36.92, SD = 6.17$), and those of NNESTs from rural region schools ($M = 29.42, SD = 4.56$), $t(78) = 6.176, p = 0.000$. The conclusion drawn was that there was a significant effect of L2 exposure environments on NNESTs' beliefs about EFL learning beyond the classroom (see figure 22 and 23).

Table 22 *Descriptive statistics of NNESTs' Beliefs about EFL learning beyond the classroom*

Ex_En		N	Mean	Std Deviation	Std Error
		Mean			
Belief	Urban School	40	36.9250	6.17434	.97625
	Rural School	40	29.4250	4.56793	.72225

Table 23 *The result of independent-samples t-test of the effect of L2 exposure environment on NNESTs' Beliefs about EFL learning beyond the classroom*

		Levene's test for Equality of variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Beliefs assumed	Equal variance	16.813	.000	6.176	78	.000	7.50000	1.21438	5.08236	9.91764
	Equal variance not assumed									
					71.851	.000	7.50000	1.21438		9.92090
				6.176					5.07910	

Discussion

The present study investigates the effect of L2 exposure environments, i.e. how easy the NNESTs can get access on authentic materials, English TV Channels, magazine or social media internet access in the regions where the NNESTs under study are teaching, on their teaching skills and beliefs about EFL learning beyond the classroom. The findings of this study can help us indicate NNESTs' all aspects of teaching, namely teaching preparation, teaching action and teaching evaluation, are affected by the regions where they are teaching, and so are their beliefs about all aspects of EFL learning beyond the classroom, i.e. the setting, process and atmosphere. In other words, there are significant effect of L2 exposure environment on NNESTs' teaching

skills and beliefs about EFL learning beyond the class. This finding implies the importance of out-class L2 exposure in helping L2 acquisition in teaching L2 for speakers of other language. This tenet has been in line with that argued by the results of some previous research studies (e.g. Flege, MacKay, & Piske, 2002; Jia et al., 2002; Benson 2011; Lamb & Reinders 2008; Ushioda 2001, Yorozu 2001, Wenden 2001, Lamb 2002; Victori & Lockhart, 1995; Pickard 1995; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992; Rubin and Thompson, 1994) which highlight the help of both beyond the classroom and classroom exposure in the process of achieving better target language task.

Conclusion

Such findings draw a conclusion that different L2 exposure environments in the expanding circle context of EFL bring about significant difference of NNESTs' teaching skills and beliefs about EFL learning beyond the classroom. This conclusion suggests critical information that being EFL teachers and learners in urban and rural schools in the era of globalization principally illustrates a different condition where the EFL exposure environment follows the consequence of the presence of technology and media which most rapidly happen in more developed regions. Making more developed regions then is becoming an urgent need for the rapid changing of the face of EFL teaching and learning in nowadays-schools. Learning beyond the class should get more spaces in the context of ELT in the expanding circle countries since using English in real life as it happens in the inner or outer circle countries is found limited or even not at all happens. Thus, it is not the face-to-face speaking but the virtual use of communication which can be done by nonnative English learners in everywhere of more developed region schools.

About the Authors:

Susilo Susilo is a professor at the English department, faculty of teacher training and education, Mulawarman University, Samarinda, Indonesia. His major academic interests are TEFL, L2 teacher education, and applied linguistics.

Bibit Suhatmady is a lecturer at the English department, faculty of teacher training and education, Mulawarman University, Samarinda, Indonesia. His major academic interests are TEFL, Discourse Analysis, and applied linguistics.

Dyah Sunggingwati is a lecturer at the English department, faculty of teacher training and education, Mulawarman University, Samarinda, Indonesia. Her major academic interests are TEFL, teaching reading, and tesol.

Hany Farisa is a postgraduate alumnus at the English department, faculty of teacher training and education, Mulawarman University, Samarinda, Indonesia.

Syaripa Nurul Ilmi is a postgraduate alumnus at the English department, faculty of teacher training and education, Mulawarman University, Samarinda, Indonesia.

References

- Almarza, G. G. (1996). Student foreign language knowledge growth. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.) *Teacher Learning and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence ELT. *ELT Journal*, 56(1), 57-64.
- Árva, V., & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System*, 28,

355–372

- Benson, P., (2011). Language Learning and Teaching beyond the classroom: An introduction to the field. In Benson, P., & Reinders, Hayo. (Eds.). *Beyond the language classroom*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Benson, P. & Reinders, H. (Eds.) (2011). *Beyond the language classroom*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bialystok, E. (1981). The role of conscious strategies in second language proficiency in *Modern Language Journal*, 65(2), 24-35
- Birdsong, D. (2005). "Interpreting age effects in second language acquisition" In J. Kroll & A. DeGroot (eds.), *Handbook of Bilingualism: Psycholinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 109-127). Oxford: Oxford U. Press.
- Birdsong, D., & Molis, M. (2001). "On the evidence for maturational effects in second language acquisition" *Journal of Memory and Language*, 44, 235-249.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. London: Continuum
- Burns, A. & Richards, J. 2009. *Second Language Teacher Education*. (eds). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carless, D. (2006). Collaborative EFL teaching in primary schools. *ELT Journal*, 60(4), 328-335.
- Carr, J., & Pauwells, A. (2006). *Boys and foreign language learning. Real boys don't do foreign languages*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Carroll, J. (1967). *The foreign language attainments of language majors in the senior year: A survey conducted in U.S. colleges and universities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Carson, L., & Mynard, J. (2012). Introduction. In J. Mynard, & L. Carson (Eds.), *Advising in language learning: Dialogue, tools and context* (pp. 3-25). Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Cooper, J. M. (2011). (9th. Ed). *Classroom Teaching Skills*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Day, C. (2004) *A Passion for Teaching*. London: RoutledgeFalmer
- Deepwell & Malik. (2008). On campus, but out of class: an investigation into students' experiences of learning technologies in their self-directed study. *ALT-J, Research in Learning Technology*, 16 (1): 5-14.
- Dörnyei, Z., Csizér, K., & Németh, N. (2006). *Motivational dynamics, language attitudes and language globalisation: A Hungarian perspective*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ellis, Rodd, (2008). A principled approach to incorporating second language acquisition research into a teacher education programme. *Reflections on English Language Teaching*, 9 (1), 1–17
- Fagerlund, T. (2012). *Learning and using English and Swedish beyond the classroom: Activity systems of six upper secondary school students*. Finland: University of Jyväskylä. Unpublished master's thesis.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (1999). The reflective assignment: unlocking pre-service teachers' beliefs on grammar teaching. *RELC Journal* 39 (2): 1-17.
- Farrell, T. S.C. & Bennis, K. (2013). Reflecting on ESL Teacher Beliefs and Classroom Practices: A Case Study. *RELC Journal* (44): 163-176.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. & Floden, R.E. (1986). The culture of teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (ed.), *Handbook of research in teaching*, 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan. Pp. 505 -26.
- Flege, J. E., Yeni-Komishian, G. H., & Liu, S. (1999). "Age constraints on secondlanguage

- acquisition". *Journal of Memory and Language*, 41, 78-104.
- Flege, J.E., Frieda, A. & Nozawa, T. (1997). "Amount of native-language (L1) use affects the pronunciation in an L2". *Journal of Phonetics*, 25, 169-186.
- Flege, J.E., MacKay, I.A., & Piske, T. (2002). "Assessing bilingual dominance." *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 23, 567-598.
- Freeman, D. (1992). Language teacher education, emerging discourse and change in class practice. In J Flowerdew, M. Brock, and S. Hsia (Eds.) *Perspective on second language teacher development*. Hong Kong: City Polytechnic of Hong Kong. Pp. 1-21.
- Gamble, C., Aliponga, J., Wilkins, M., Koshiyama, Y., Yoshida, K., & Ando, S. (2012). Examining learner autonomy dimensions: students' perceptions of their responsibility and ability. In A. Stewart, & N. Sonda (Eds.) *JALT 2011 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 263-272). Tokyo: JALT.
- Genesee, F. (1985). "Second language learning through immersion: A review of U.S. programs." *Review of Educational Research*, 55, 541-561.
- Gholami, R. (2012). Social Context as an Indirect Trigger in EFL Contexts: Issues and Solutions. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 5 (3).
- Hedge, Tricia. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: OUP
- Inozu, J., Sahinkarakas, S., & Yumru, H. (2010). The nature of language learning experiences beyond the classroom and its learning outcomes. *US-China Foreign Language*, 8,14-21.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: OUP.
- Jia, G., Aaronson, D., & Wu, Y. (2002). "Long-term language attainment of bilingual immigrants: Predictive variables and language group differences". *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 23, 599-621.
- Johnson, J. S., & Newport, E. L. (1989). "Critical period effects in second language learning: The influence of maturational state on the acquisition of English as a second language". *Cognitive Psychology*, 21, 60-99.
- Johnson, K. (1992). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English. *Journal of reading behavior* 24: 83-108.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2006). Which model of English: Native-speaker, nativized or lingua franca? In R. Rubdy & M. Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the world – Global rules, global roles* (pp. 71-83). London: Continuum.
- Kohnert, K., Bates, E., & Hernandez, A. (1999). "Balancing bilinguals: Lexical semantic production and cognitive processing in children learning Spanish and English." *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 42, 1400-1413.
- Kop, R., & Fournier, H. (2011). New dimensions to self-directed learning in an open networked learning environment. *International Journal of Self-Directed Learning*, 7(2), 2-20.
- Kyriacou, C. (2007). (3rd. Ed). *Essential Teaching Skills*. Bath Road Cheltenham, United Kingdom: Nelson Thornes Ltd.
- Lai, C. (2014). *Perceiving and traversing in-class and out-of-class learning: accounts from foreign language learners in Hong Kong*. Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching. Advance Online Publishing. (online: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2014.918982>., downloaded on 23 February, 2016).
- Lai, C., & Gu, M. Y. (2011). Self-regulated out-of-class language learning with technology. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 24(4), 317-335.
- Lai, C., Wang, Q., & Lei, J. (2012). What factors predict undergraduate students' use of technology for learning? A case from Hong Kong. *Computers & Education*, 59, 569-579.

- Lamb, M (2002). Explaining successful language learning in difficult circumstances. *Prospect*, 17(2), 35-52.
- Lamb, M. (2012). A self-system perspective on young adolescents' motivation to learn English in rural and urban settings. *Language Learning*, 62: 997-1023.
- Lamb, T. (2008). Learner autonomy and teacher autonomy: synthesizing an agenda. In T. Lamb, & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Learner and teacher autonomy: Concepts, realities, and responses* (pp. 269-284). Amsterdam, Netherland: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Matsumoto, M. (2012). *Motivational changes and their affecting factors among students from different cultural backgrounds*. CLaSIC 2012: The Fifth CLS International Conference. Singapore, Dec. 2012. Retrieved from: http://epublications.bond.edu.au/hss_pubs/675
- McKinney, K., Vacca, K., Medvedeva, M. A., & Malak, J. (2004). Beyond the classroom: an exploratory study of out-of-class learning in sociology. *Teaching Sociology*, 32, 43-60.
- McNeill, A. (1993). *Some characteristics of native or non-native speaker teachers of English*. Papers presented at Annual International Language in Education Conference, Hong Kong, China.
- Milambiling, J. (1999). *Native and non-native speakers: The view from teacher education*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the Midwest modern language association, St. Louis, MO.
- Nunan, D., & Richards, J (Eds.). (2015). *Language learning beyond the classroom*. New York: Routledge, Tailor & Francis Group.
- Pichard, N. (1995). Out-of-class language learning strategies: Three case studies. *Language Learning Journal*, 12: 35-7.
- Pollard, A. Anderson, J., Maddock, M., Swaffield, S., Warin, J. & Warwick, P. (2005) *Reflective Teaching*, 2nd ed. London: Continuum.
- Reinders, H. (2010). Towards a classroom pedagogy for learner autonomy: a framework of independent language learning skills. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35 40 -55.
- Richard, J. (2015). The Changing Face of Language Learning: Learning Beyond the Classroom. *RELC Journal* (46): 5-22.
- Richards, J.C., Tung, P. & Ng, P. (1991). *The culture of the English language teacher: a Hong Kong example*. Department of English research report no.6. City Polytechnic of Hong Kong.
- Rubin, J. & Thompson, I. (1994). *How to be a more successful language learner*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Samimy, K. K., & Brutt-Griffler, J. (1999). To be a native or non-native speaker: Perception of "non-native" students in a graduate TESOL program. In G. Braine (Ed.). *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 127-144). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Scarcella, R. C. & Oxford, R. L. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning: the individual in the communicative classroom*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tajino, A., & Tajino, Y. (2000). Native and non-native: What can they offer? *ELT Journal*, 54(1), 3-11.
- Ur, Penny. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theories*. New York: CUP
- Ushioda, E 2001. Language learning at university: exploring the role of motivational thinking. In Dornyei, Z and R Schmidt (Eds) *Motivation and second language acquisition* (Technical

Report-23) (pp. 93-125). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center

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

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

Weber-Fox, C., & Neville, H. J. (1999). “Functional neural subsystems are differentially affected by delays in 2nd language immersion”. In D. Birdsong (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and the critical period hypothesis* (pp. 23-38). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Wenden, A 2001. Metacognitive knowledge in SLA: the neglected variable. In Breen, M (Ed) *Learner contributions to language learning* (44-64). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wragg, E. C. (2005) *The Art and Science of Teaching and Learning: The Selected Works of Ted Wragg*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Yang, N.D. (1999). *Beliefs about language learning and learning strategy use: A study of college students of English in Taiwan*. In papers from the tenth conference on English teaching and learning in the Republic of China, Taipei, Crane, pp.193-219.

Yorozu, M. (2001). Interaction with native speakers of Japanese: what learners say in Japanese. *Studies*, 21(2), 199-213.

Zare-ee, A & Salami, M. (2014). A Close Study of the Effect of ESP learners’ beliefs on the Choice of Language Learning Strategies. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*. 7 (1): 119-130.

APPENDIX A

THE QUESTIONNAIRE OF NNESTs’ BELIEFS ABOUT EFL LEARNING BEYOND THE CLASSROOM

* Check (v) one of the columns after the statements under provided options (strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree) as describing your real agreements!

No.	STATEMENT	Options			
		Strongly agree	agree	disagree	Strongly disagree
Beliefs about the settings of EFL learning beyond the classroom					
1	My students should get more informal English lessons after school, e.g. extra-curricular activities, , etc.				
2	My students should get an easy access of English informal lessons, e.g. English course, private course, etc.				
3	My students should be familiar with any social media				
Beliefs about <i>Process of out-class learning</i>					
4	The students should be optimistic in adapting their feelings to speak English outside the class				
5	The students should dare to prefer speaking English rather than speaking local language				

6	Speaking English outside the class gives my students opportunities to increase the achievements in class				
7	Speaking English outside the class gives my students habits so that it can stimulate their class participation in L2 speaking				
8	Having more access to speaking English outside the class gives my students' modeling for L2 practices				
9	Students' personal factors such as introversion, nervousness, etc., are factors which hinders them to be active in out-of-class L2 practices				
10	Uninteresting condition or situation are factors which hinders them to be active in out-of-class L2 practices				
11	Surrounding people's negative perception about English are factor which hinders learners to start learning L2 outside the class				
12	Lack of media access to do English practices in class are factor which hinders learners to start learning L2 outside the class				
<i>Beliefs about atmosphere of the out-class learning</i>					
13	Conversation club is the most possible alternative for out-of-class activities				
14	Additional class meeting hours is the most possible alternative for out-of-class activities				
15	Utilizing English social media is the most possible alternative for out-of-class activities				

APPENDIX B

OBSERVATION SCALING CHECKLIST FOR NNESTs' TEACHING SKILLS

* Check (v) one of the columns after the statements under provided options (1 -2 - 3 - 4) as describing your real assessment!

STATEMENT		Options			
		1	2	3	4
<i>Teaching preparation</i>					
1	Before teaching, the teacher designs a lesson plan				
2	Before teaching, the teacher prepares teaching media, such as interactive media, internet, or real objects				
<i>Teaching actions</i>					
Applying a good classroom management					
3	When the teacher teaches, she/he usually arrange the class chairs as: <i>U-shaped</i> arrangement or <i>In-group</i> arrangement				
4	To enhance students' social skills in their				

	classroom learning activities, the way the teacher usually takes are: by giving collective-answered questions, making a group discussion, and making a pair discussion				
<i>The way the teacher motivated his/her students to make out-of-class English-speaking practices is by:</i>					
5	giving the students English reading materials to read at home				
6	giving the students assignments to do practice speaking with peers at home				
7	establishing conversation clubs with peers				
8	giving the students assignments to do practice speaking with expatriates who are native English speakers at home				
<i>The teacher attempted to make in-class L2 acquisition happens is by:</i>					
9	using English all the time as the medium of instruction in class				
10	obligating the students to speak English when they interact with their peers or ask questions to the teacher in the classroom during the teaching and learning process				
11	giving simple commands in English during the teaching and learning process				
<i>Teaching Evaluation</i>					
12	For evaluation the teacher asked my student to work with open-ended problems				
13	For evaluation the teacher used portfolio of student's work				
14	For evaluation the teacher used group projects				