

The Effects of Pushed Output Activity in Written Recall Task

Hiromi Martin

Bunkyo University

1. Background

“Listening and Speaking on CALL” is one of the compulsory EFL learning courses at Bunkyo University. The current trend in English Education requires output skills, for example, in CLIL, Content-and-Language-Learning-Integrated- Learning, the learners tend to notice production of the target language. In CLIL class, both content and language are included in learning and teaching (Dale & Tanner, 2015). Regarding the approach of CLIL, the students are exposed to a great deal of input from their teacher or classmates.

This present study investigates particularly how the learners produce recall protocols in writing after listening in the class. The aim is to see the effects of noticing in written recall protocols.

2. Output noticing hypothesis

In learning, learners become aware of their mistakes and modifications (Swain,1995). Therefore, learners pay attention to their production. Input alone is not sufficient for acquiring the target language. Learners notice the target language linguistic forms in input as a part of the input process (Schmidt,1995).

3. Previous Studies

Basterrechea and Leaser (2014) researched the role of output tasks in noticing tenses on receiving input; past and present forms in the CLIL classroom. The participants were divided into two groups; the individual group and the collaborative one. The results showed that pushed output affected noticing in subsequent input and provided learners the opportunity to notice formal aspects of language.

4. The purpose of this study

This study was conducted the first grade of International Understanding course students, whose CASEC average about 500pts / (= 405points TOEIC) . The research questions were below;

1. Does output in a written recall task affects learners’ noticing in producing recall protocols?
2. Does an “input-output-input” group write more recall protocols than an “input-only” group?

5. Procedure

All participants were required to do written recall tasks with listening to the passage. The Table 1 shows the procedure of this study.

Table 1. Sequence of activities in the experimental design

Input-Only Group ($N=10$)	Input-Output-Input Group ($N=10$)
(1) Listening to the passage once	(1) Listening to the passage once
(2) Vocabulary practice in ALC	(2) Vocabulary practice in ALC
(3) Listening to the passage again (twice)	(3) Listening to the passage again (once)
(4) Written recall task	(4) Written recall task 1
	(5) Listening to the passage again (once)
	Written recall task 2

6. Data Analysis

The written recall protocols were investigated through counting propositional representations. The spelling mistakes and grammatical mistakes were uncounted in the propositional units. There are 10 sentences to use to retell the story. A sentence or a unit of meaning was counted as one point for the recall protocols in the data analysis.

7. Results

In order to analyze the effects of noticing in written recall task, the number of the propositional representations in each group was displayed in Table 2 with the mean scores and the SD (standard deviation).

Table 2 Participants' mean scores on the written recall protocols

Group	N	M	SD
(1) Input-only	10	3.6	1.1
(2) Input-output-input	10	2.6	0.8
1st time			
Input-output-input	10	4.5	1.4
2nd time			

Then, in order to determine whether this increase was significant or not, the scores were analyzed by a paired sampled t-test with a nonparametric Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test due to the low number of participants and non-normally distributed data. The t-test revealed that the participants of the input-output-input group produced more recall protocols on the second time than the first time production, ($t(10) = -4.385$, $p = .002$), in addition, the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test, ($z = -2.539$, $p = .011$). Both the T-test and the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test showed the significant effect in the written recall protocols between the first task and the second one. The results indicated that the learners' noticing added more information in the written recall protocols.

The result showed that the learners' noticing affected the written recall task. On the second time, the learners improved their writing with correcting or adding the information compared to the first production and paid more attentions to the second written recall protocols.

8. Conclusion and Further study

The findings of the study can be used to support the two research questions; the first one, which suggested that the first recall protocols led the participants to notice the lack of information in a written recall task on the second time. In other words, the participants paid attention to the first output production during the second input (listening) task and added more information in their retelling the passage in writing. Then, the second research question indicated that the input-output-input group could write more protocols than the input-only group. The results supported some of the previous research related to the input and output tasks. Output did not always show a successive outcome to the target form. The learners also improved the structure when they received relevant input (Izumi & Bigelow, 2000).

In CLIL, the learners listen to English and reproduce what they learn from input activities in order to give opinions or presentation. Input-output-input activities are constantly occurring in CLIL classes. However, for further study, more linguistic features should be investigated such as grammatical outcomes and lexical richness, as well as examining more details of learners' development in learning the target language.

9. References

- Basterrechea, M & Leaser, M.J. (2014). "Pushed Output and Noticing in a Dictogloss: Task Implementation in the CLIL Classroom", in *PORTA LINGUARUM* 22.
- Dale, L.,&Tanner,R. (2015). *CLIL Activities*. Cambridge University Press.
- Izumi,S.&Bigelow,M. (2000). "Does output promote noticing and second languag acquisition?" in *TESOL Quaterly*,34:239-78.
- Schmidt,R.(1995). "Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awarenesss in learning", in R.Schmidt (ed.), *Attention an Awareness in Foreign Language Learning*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1-63.
- Swain,M. (1995). "There functions of output in second language learning", in G.Gook & B.Seidlhofer (eds.), *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 125-144