PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA

MINISTRY OF HIGER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

AbdElhafid Boussouf University Centre- Mila

Institute of Literature and Languages
Department of Foreign Languages
Branch: English

Relating Teachers' Use of Elicited vs. Pushed Output to EFL Learners' Oral Participation

The Case of Master One EFL Students at Mila University Centre

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment for the Requirement of the Master Degree in **Didactics of Foreign Languages**

Presented by:

1) Amin TRICHINE
2) Chahinez BOUBLAT

Supervisor:

Dr. Fouad BOULKROUN

Board of Examiners:

Chairman: **Dr. Fouzia BENNACER**

Supervisor: **Dr. Fouad BOULKROUN**

Examiner: **Dr. Rima HADEF**

Academic Year: 2023-2024

Relating Teachers' Use of Elicited vs. Pushed Output to EFL Learners' Oral Participation:

The Case of Master One EFL Students at Mila University Centre

Institute of Literature and Languages

Department of Foreign Languages

Branch: English

Presented by:

Amin TRICHINE

Chahinez BOUBLAT

Academic Year: 2023-2024

Dedication I

I dedicate this work to the memory of my deceased grandfather and aunt. To all of my family members without whom I could have never made it this far. Finally, to my friends, teachers and classmates who have helped and supported me throughout my journey, thank you.

Amin

Dedication II

I dedicate this modest work to myself,

To my parents and my brothers for their endless support through all the stages of my life.

To my best friend Farah for her unconditioned love and encouragement,

And to all those people who inspired me and believed in my success.

Chahinez

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, we would like to endlessly thank Allah, the Almighty, who helped and gave us patience to accomplish this work.

We would also like to sincerely express our deepest respect, gratitude, and appreciation to our supervisor, **Dr. Fouad BOULKROUN**, for his exceptional guidance, endless assistance, and valuable feedback throughout the stages of this study. It is truly an honor for us to have him as a supervisor.

We extend our deep appreciation to the board of examiners for accepting to critically evaluate this work and provide us with their invaluable feedback.

We would like to express our gratitude to Master One EFL students and teachers at Mila University Centre who kindly accepted to answer the administered questionnaires.

A big appreciation goes to all the teachers at Mila University Centre who taught us over the past five years.

Finally, we would like to thank everyone who participated in the success of this work in one way or another.

Abstract

In the field of education, the teacher's use of output strategies and learners oral participation are critical areas of investigation. Therefore, this research investigated teachers' use of elicited versus pushed output strategies and how they relate to student involvement and oral participation in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes. In the context of this study, four main research questions were raised: (1) Which output strategy (elicited vs. pushed) do teachers practise the most? (2)Which output type (elicited vs. pushed) do learners prefer? (3) Is there a discernible association between the type of output used and EFL learners' willingness to participate orally? (4) What are the potential challenges associated with each output strategy in terms of promoting oral participation among EFL learners? Data collection involved administering questionnaires to 41 Master one students and 17 teachers at Mila University Centre. They were administered in person using hard copies. After the analysis and the interpretation of the data, the results revealed that teachers tend to practise elicited output the most, and that there is a clear association between elicited output and increased oral participation. The findings also indicated that students preferred elicited output due to the supportive environment it created. Despite the potential anxiety associated with pushed output, it was also deemed valuable for pushing students beyond their comfort zones. However, both strategies posed challenges, with elicited output constrained by student anxieties and vocabulary limitations, and pushed output possibly leading to anxiety and performance pressure. The study concludes by suggesting avenues for future research, including longitudinal studies on the impact of output strategies on language development, and assessing the effectiveness of such strategies across different learner groups.

keywords: Elicited output, output strategies, pushed output, student involvement, willingness to participate.

List of Acronyms and Symbols

ALM: Audiolingual Method

CF: Corrective Feedback

CLL: Community Language Learning

CLT: Communicative Language Teaching

COH: Comprehensible Output Hypothesis

DM: Direct Method

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

etc.: etcetera

GTM: Grammar-Translation Method

i.e.: That is to say

IH: Interaction Hypothesis

IL: Interlanguage

L1: First Language

L2: Second Language

M1: First Year Masters

NSS: Nonnative Speakers

NTL: Non-target-like

PhD: Doctorate Degree

Q: Question

SCT: Sociocultural Theory

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

TEFL: Teaching English as a Foreign Language

TL: Target Language

TPR: Total Physical Response

ZPD: Zone of Proximal Development

%:Percentage

List of Tables

Table of Contents

1.2. EFL learners' Oral Participation

Chapter Two: Relating Elicited and Pushed Output to Learners' Oral Participation

General Introduction

1. Statement of the Problem

Teaching a foreign language is a multifaceted endeavour that involves imparting knowledge and various skills on the learner. Initially, it was believed that comprehensible input should be the emphasis of the teaching process, as it shapes that which the learners know and are able to do. Such views were later contested by other applied linguists, who proposed that comprehensible output is just as equally important. The comprehensible output hypothesis (COH) is a theory in second language acquisition that proposes that language learning is most effective when learners focus on producing understandable output. Swain (2005) states that language acquisition occurs when learners produce output that pushes them to pay better attention to their deficiencies, and to subsequently pursue new ways of expressing their ideas. This implies that the purpose of output is to help learners recognise their limitations and to work towards filling those gaps. In line with COH, there are several strategies that teachers employ to result in the production of output. It can either be elicited through the use of questions and prompts, or pushed by placing the learners in a situation in which they are stretched to perform. As learners produce output, they actively participate in the teaching learning process through a range of behaviours and actions. Participation involves engaging with the various activities and instructions, as well as responding to questions and solving tasks.

The intent of this research is to delve deeper into the specifics of how output and participation are associated. The problem around which the current study revolves lies in identifying a relationship between the use of elicited vs. pushed output strategies, and the learners' willingness to participate orally in English as a foreign language (EFL) classes. Understanding how these strategies relate to the degree of participation will allow educators to adapt their teaching to suit different types of learners in different situations.

2. Significance of the Study

The significance of this study stems from its potential to contribute insights to the field of language education, specifically EFL. Establishing an association between output strategies, elicited and pushed, with the degree of oral participation may allow for more informed teaching practices. Educators can better align their teaching methods with the diverse needs of learners, which will in turn result in an improved language acquisition experience.

3. Research Aims

As educators aim to create effective language learning environments and provide opportunities for learners to actively participate, this study seeks to identify which of the two output strategies (elicited vs. pushed) is most practised by teachers. Furthermore, it intends to discover learners' preferred output type, and to find a potential association between student oral engagement and teachers' utilisation of elicited and pushed output. Finally, the study seeks to identify the most prevalent challenges of each strategy in promoting learners' oral participation.

4. The Research Questions

This study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. Which output strategy (elicited vs. pushed) do teachers practise the most?

2. Which output type (elicited vs. pushed) do learners prefer?

3. Is there a discernible association between the type of output used and EFL learners' willingness to participate orally?

4. What are the potential challenges associated with each output strategy in terms of promoting oral participation among EFL learners?

5. Means of the Research

This study uses a students' questionnaire and a teachers' questionnaire in order to achieve the set aims and to answer the research questions. The students' questionnaire is administered to Master one students at the Department of Foreign Languages, Mila University Centre. The participants consist of a sample of 41students, representing a parent population of 115. It aims to identify the connection between the two variables, as well as the learners' preferred type of output. Likewise, a second questionnaire is administered to 17 teachers of mixed experience, with the intent of gathering similar information in addition to the challenges related to implementing elicited and pushed output strategies.

6. Structure of the Study

This study is divided into two chapters. The first chapter reviews the literature relevant to this research. The chapter is further divided into two sections, the first of which is concerned with output in language acquisition. It delves into the concept of output, examining its role in internalising linguistic knowledge (through noticing, hypothesis testing, and metalinguistic functions) and enhancing fluency (through automaticity). It then explores different types of output, including spoken vs. written, pushed vs. elicited, and modified output. Following that, the section connects output to theoretical frameworks like the Interaction Hypothesis, the Noticing Hypothesis, and Sociocultural Theory. It continues by exploring existing research on output and examining the place of output in various language teaching methods, including traditional methods and Communicative Language Teaching. The section concludes by reviewing various critiques of the Output Hypothesis. Shifting focus, Chapter One moves to the second section, which focuses on learners' oral participation. It commences by defining and exploring the role of learner participation in language learning. Following that, it categorises types of learner engagement, prior to reviewing the different modes of participation. The section then examines the causes of

student passivity in class, considering both internal and external barriers. Finally, it analyses strategies to cultivate active participation, including reticence coping mechanisms and contributions on the part of the teacher. The section concludes by summarising research findings on class participation, thereby bringing a close to the theoretical chapter.

Chapter Two opens by outlining the specific research aims and questions guiding the study. It details the participant selection process and the data collection tools employed, which include separate questionnaires for students and teachers. The chapter then dives into a detailed description of the students' questionnaire, its administration, and the analysis of the findings. This analysis covers general information, student preferences regarding elicited vs. pushed output, and the perceived connection of these strategies to oral participation. A similar breakdown is provided for the teachers' questionnaire, analysing teacher practices and perceptions regarding output strategies and their association with student participation in class discussions. The chapter moves to a general discussion that compares and contrasts the findings from both student and teacher questionnaires, before concluding with a delineation of the implications, limitations, and recommendations arising from the study.

Chapter One: Language Output and Learners' Oral Participation

Introduction

Language output is the dynamic expression of one's thoughts, emotions, and cultural identity. It encapsulates the essence of human experience, allowing individuals to navigate the intricate web of social interactions and convey their innermost thoughts with precision and nuance. From the early stages of language production in the form of babbling, to the eloquent rhetoric of fluent speakers, language output evolves alongside the individual, reflecting personal growth, societal influences, and cognitive development.

In the context of language teaching/learning, oral participation is the most common way through which language production manifests. Active participation in the classroom is a cornerstone of effective learning and development. It encompasses a diverse array of behaviours, from engaging in discussions and asking questions to collaborating with peers and sharing insights. It is a dynamic process through which students actively contribute to the construction of knowledge, nurturing their critical thinking and communication skills. Through involving themselves in classroom activities and tasks, learners ultimately produce language that they have previously acquired.

This chapter will cover language output and learners' oral participation, delving into the workings of the two interconnected variables. It composed of two sections, the first of which will deal with output in language acquisition. It starts by defining output, before moving to its functions and role in language acquisition. Following that, the section delves into various types of output, before discussing some of the theories from which the comprehensible output hypothesis draws its ideas. Next, the section explores some of the research conducted on language output. It then talks about the nature of output in the different language teaching methods and approaches, while concluding with critiquing the output

hypothesis. Going beyond output, the second section transitions to EFL learners' oral participation, defining participation, discussing its importance in language learning, and exploring the various types and modes of participation. It addresses factors contributing to student passivity in class and proposes strategies to promote active involvement, before bringing a close to the chapter by exploring some empirical studies conducted on learners' participation.

1.1. Output in Language Acquisition

1.1.1. Defining Output

Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2013) state that "language learning starts first with understanding and ends with production". (p.137). This succinctly captures the essence of language acquisition—the process of comprehending language and proficiently producing it. Language acquisition unfolds through various stages, beginning with receptive skills, and ending with productive skills. Ortega (2009) suggests that output is one of the fundamental components of second language acquisition (SLA). However, before delving deeper into this concept, it is prudent to present clear-cut definitions.

In the context of language learning, the Merriam Webster Dictionary defines the noun output as a "mental or artistic production". As a verb, the Oxford Dictionary states that output is "to supply or produce information". Regardless of form, what can be gleaned from these definitions is that output is synonymous with production. Swain and Luxin (2008) state that "there has been a shift in meaning from the 80's to now from output being understood as a noun, a thing, a product to output being understood as a verb, an action, a process" (p.4). In line with this, Gass et al. (2008) define output as the process of practising previously acquired knowledge. Del Pilar García Mayo and Soler (2012) point out that output can be a means of generating more input by allowing for opportunities for learners to interact. Of the four

language skills, output is associated with productive skills: speaking and writing (Brown, 2007; Tavakoli, 2013). Therefore, learners generate output when solving oral tasks such as group discussions, or written ones like writing essays and paragraphs.

When discussing the concept of output, certain scholars opt for using the term comprehensible output, which was coined by Swain in 1985. Tavakoli (2013) states that comprehensible output is "language produced by the learner that can be understood by other speakers of the language" (p.256). Swain and Luxin (2008) further clarify the notion of comprehensible output by explaining that it does not simply mean output that is understood. Instead, the term refers to output that is perpetually better than its previous forms in content, grammar, sociolinguistic, and discourse properties. This implies that valid output should not be merely an arbitrary amalgamation of words. While it is indeed possible to convey meaning through utterances that are grammatically irregular, Swain and Luxin (2008) insist that output ought to contain meaning "that is conveyed precisely, coherently, and appropriately" (p.18). While the aforementioned definitions put into perspective some degree of significance to output, its role in language acquisition and language teaching remains a controversy to the present day.

1.1.2. The Role of Output in Language Acquisition

The significance given to output originates from research conducted by Swain in Canada in the 1980s. At the time, the French language was taught using immersion programmes, which involve creating an environment where learners are surrounded by the target language, encouraging them to engage with and learn the language naturally through constant exposure and interaction. In a series of studies and observations conducted on French emersion students by Swain (1985), she identified a flaw in comprehension-based instruction. On tests of reading and listening, immersion students received scores similar to

students whose native language is French; however, their scores on tests where production of the language was required were significantly lower than those of their francophone counterparts. Based on the results of these studies, Swain (1995), proposed that the reason immersion learners performed poorly was due to a lack of practice in speaking and writing, while reading and listening were a major focus. She noted that while the students were fluent, they faced difficulties when it came to grammatical accuracy. In light of that, Gass et al. (2008) state that "input alone is not sufficient for acquisition, because when one hears language one can often interpret the meaning without the use of syntax" (p.324).

Swain's findings led her to propose what is known as the comprehensible output hypothesis(COH), with pushing for output being regarded as an important contributor in developing second language (L2) proficiency, especially that of syntax. This hypothesis introduces the idea that learners can develop their grammatical accuracy if they are made to produce the language. Swain and Lapkin (1995) state that "one function of output in second language learning might be to force the learner to move from the semantic processing prevalent in comprehension to the syntactic processing needed for production" (p.375). However, this only summarises the general function of output in language acquisition. There has been a multitude of functions put forth by various researchers. Shehadeh (2005) divides them into three categories: internalising linguistic knowledge, enhancing language fluency, and generating corrective feedback.

1.1.2.1. Internalising Linguistic Knowledge. Pushing L2 learners to formulate utterances , though incorrectly, enhances their language acquisition (Macaro, 2010). Through output, learners are bound to pay more attention to the various processes involved in language acquisition. To that end, there are three functions of output presented by swain (1995): These are the noticing function, the hypothesis testing function, and the metalinguistic function.

1.1.2.1.1. The noticing Function. It is a well-known fact that attention is vital for learning to occur (Izumi & Bigelow, 2000). In keeping with this notion, Swain (1995) proposed the noticing function of output. It is defined as "the process of learners becoming aware of their lack of linguistic knowledge in the course of producing output" (Kang, 2015, p.3). By producing output, learners can notice deficiencies in their interlanguage (IL). Recognising their weaknesses pushes them to restructure their output until it becomes comprehensible (Macaro, 2010; Shehadeh, 2005). Output triggers in an active manner the mental processes implicated in language acquisition. L2 learners may analyse more closely the syntax of incoming input, or they may analyse their preexisting linguistic knowledge in an effort to fill in the gaps they notice in their IL (Swain & Lapkin 1995). By developing their language through production, learners will become aware of what is and what is not appropriate to say in the target language (TL) (Izumi, 2002). Mitchell and Myles (2004) state that the noticing function of output has also been dubbed the consciousness-raising role. Indeed, this function represents the foundation block for all other functions of output, as learners have to be aware of a problem prior to attempting a solution.

1.1.2.1.2. The Hypothesis Testing Function. Humans approach every new problem with a preexisting set of cognitive structures and attempt to solve it by using insight, reasoning, and different types of hypothesis testing by draw upon their past experiences and cognitive structures (Brown, 2007). It is based on this idea that Swain's (1995) hypothesis testing function of output suggests that learners modify their output in accordance with the reactions of other interlocuters. Shehadeh (2005) states that "it is well established from interlanguage research that learner output (spoken or written) reveals hypotheses held by the learner about how the TL works" (p.8). As learners become aware of their deficiencies in the TL, they will proceed to search for ways to remedy such setbacks. One method of doing so is to test out new forms for the purpose of receiving feedback on whether or not they are

appropriate (Ortega, 2009); consequently, IL rules are regularly revised until a time when acquisition stops, either due to a lack of feedback or to the learner's satisfaction with the results (Tavakoli, 2013). Hypothesis testing is considered a collaborative process, as it requires other individuals to confirm or reject a hypothesis.

1.1.2.1.3. The Metalinguistic Function. Gass et al. (2008) define metalinguistic ability as the ability to reflect upon and manipulate language. It allows a learner to view language as a phenomenon to investigate rather than a means to an end. As such, the idea that students may be deliberately considering language and its structure, including its phonological, grammatical, and semantic rules, in order to direct them in producing utterances that are both linguistically and communicatively correct, is known as metalanguage (Tavakoli, 2013). This function of output goes hand in hand with the noticing and the hypothesis testing functions, since learners always reflect on their language learning. Brown (2007) adds that this function falls under the spectrum of social constructivism, meaning that knowledge is constructed through social interaction. He says that "speech (and writing) can offer a means to the learner to reflect (productively) on language itself in interaction with peers" (p.259).

1.1.2.2. Enhancing Language Fluency. The term fluency refers to the characteristics of natural and normal speech, such as the use of interjections and interruptions, rhythm, intonation, stress, and pauses that are similar to those of a native speaker (Tavakoli, 2013). It is largely agreed upon that through production, learners are able to enhance such characteristics, thereby becoming fluent in the L2 (Shehadeh, 2005). To achieve fluency, the learner has to move from controlled L2 processing to automatically and implicitly doing so. Gass et al. (2013) state that second language acquisition "takes place by the initial use of control processes. With time and with experience in specific linguistic situations, learners begin to use language more automatically, thus leaving more attentional resources for new

information that requires more control" (p.258), hence suggesting that the more learners produce in the target language, the more fluent they are. The notion of routinising language processes is known as automaticity, which is a function of comprehensible output.

Automaticity, or automatisation, is the idea of processing actions without having to consciously control or think about them. Segalowitz (2003) explains that "when we perform aspects of a task automatically, we perform them without experiencing the need to invest additional effort and attention (or at least with significantly less effort and attention)" (p.383). The difference between controlled and automatic processing has been used in language learning to explain why learners sometimes perform differently under different conditions. For instance, a learner may speak a foreign language in contexts where automatic processing is used (e.g., casual conversations among friends) with relatively few grammatical errors, while the same learner may speak less fluently and commit more grammatical errors in contexts where controlled processing is used (Richards & Schmidt, 2010). There are mainly two views regarding the meaning of automaticity. A quantitative view suggests that an important characteristic of automatic processing is time. Controlled actions require planning before execution, which is time consuming; conversely, automatised processes require significantly less time to enact (Brown, 2007). On the other hand, a qualitative perspective considers automatic processing to be a restructuring of the components implicated in the performance of language (DeKeyser, 2001).

The underlying mechanics of automatization are related to the function of memory. Automatic processing occurs when the learner subconsciously makes use of information stored in long-term memory (Richards & Schmidt, 2010). Galián-López (2018) explains that in order for knowledge to be automatically processed, it has to move from declarative to procedural memory. Declarative knowledge is typically explicit and capable of being expressed verbally (Tavakoli, (2013). It includes the kinds of grammar rules that a linguist

might formulate. It is what we know about the world and the events we recall; in contrast to that, procedural knowledge is implicit and includes the ability to process language without necessarily being able to put into words the rules being applied. In addition, it allows to perform many tasks that have become automatic. Ultimately, becoming fluent in the L2 is synonymous with developing automaticity. Fluency hinges on the ability to employ language with ease and speed, as learners endeavour to move beyond controlled utterances towards automatically constructed ones. Achieving such automatised processing requires regular practice to effortlessly connect components of speech, akin to mastering a skill like playing a musical instrument. While this principle applies to all aspects of speech, it may have a greater impact on certain elements, such as morphology, compared to others like word order; hence, the significance of practising speech, particularly in languages where morphology is more significant, cannot be overstated (Skehan, 1998). Gass et al. (2013) conclude that output plays a significant role in developing fluency, or more specifically automaticity, and states that "consistent and successful mapping (practice) of grammar to output results in automatic processing" (p.374).

1.1.2.3. Generating Corrective Feedback. Feedback refers to information provided to the learner regarding the outcome of their output (Richards & Schmidt, 2010). There are mainly two types of feedback, positive and negative. Positive feedback typically takes the form of praising a learner for a well-formed sentence, which may result in high motivation (Nunan, 1991, as cited in Ellis & Shintani, 2014). On the other hand, negative feedback, also known as corrective feedback (CF), is a reaction to learner errors so that he may modifies his output using the correct form (Tavakoli, 2013).

Generating opportunities for CF is one function of output that is largely supported, even by those who are opponents of the comprehensible output hypothesis. Ponniah and Krashen (2008) state that the role of output is to invite more input as a reaction, which in

itself can be considered feedback. Swain and Luxin (2008) point out that “research has shown that learners do modify their output in response to such conversational moves as clarification requests or confirmation checks” (p.40). CF is closely related to the three functions of output suggested by Swain (1995), the purpose of which is to internalise linguistic knowledge. During conversational interaction, learners can notice inconsistencies between their production and the target-like forms and modify their output based on feedback from their interlocutors (Del Pilar García Mayo & Soler, 2013). The relationship between output and CF can best be described as a give and take, meaning that feedback is both a source and a consequence of output. In this regard, the concept of "uptake," which is defined as a learner's oral response right after CF, is of importance. It is optional output on the learner's end and is thought to be connected to the noticing function and to subsequent learning. The chance for output provided by CF leads to a higher rate of uptake and may therefore maximise the learning potential (Sheen, 2011). In other words, output may result in feedback, which in turn may result in a more well-formed output. In case where learners test hypotheses about the language, CF may be referred to as negative evidence. While the SLA literature uses these terms interchangeably, they are slightly different: negative or corrective feedback implies external information provided by the feedback givers such as teachers; negative evidence implies a piece of information usable from the learner's perspective (Kim, 2004). There are mainly two types of corrective feedback: learner errors are corrected either explicitly or implicitly.

1.1.2.3.1. Explicit Feedback. When a teacher provides students with feedback, they can explicitly correct their ill-formed utterances by unequivocally giving them the proper form. This is known as explicit correction (Basiron et al., 2008). Explicit feedback is also known as direct negative evidence, and it mostly occurs in classroom environments (Tavakoli, 2013). In this type of feedback, the learner is made aware of having committed an

error; for example, a learner may say “he have my pen”, and the teacher may reply: “You should say he has my pen, not he have”. Sheen (2011) states that explicit feedback can occasionally be accompanied by metalinguistic comments on the language form. As Basiron et al. (2008) put it “Metalinguistic information can be given either as a grammatical description of the ill-formed utterance or a definition of a word if there is a lexical error” (p.2). An example of metalinguistic information is telling a learner to always use has with he she and it, following the provision of a correct form. The explicit type of feedback does not leave any room for misunderstandings or communication breakdowns on the learner’s part.

1.1.2.3.2. Implicit Feedback. Also known as indirect negative evidence, implicit feedback takes place when other interlocutors indicate in an indirect manner that something is wrong in the learner’s output. It is indirect because the main aim is not to correct, but to request confirmation or clarification (Tavakoli, 2013). In implicit feedback, there is no overt language signal or marker indicating the occurrence of an error. Instead, subtle hints are given to the learner that an error has been made (Sheen, 2011). Bakori (2021) clarifies that despite its indirect nature, implicit feedback is still used by learners to identify grammatical errors. This type of feedback encompasses several strategies that are used to implicitly bring the learner’s attention to an error; these include recasts, repetition, clarification checks, elicitation, and metalinguistic clues.

According to Sheen (2011), recasting is one of the most commonly used implicit feedback strategies in the classroom. It involves rephrasing an incorrect statement in full or in part using the proper syntax (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2021); for example, if a learner says: "He go store," the teacher might respond with a recast by saying, "Yes, he goes to the store." The correction is embedded within a natural conversational flow rather than explicitly pointing out the error, thus interrupting the continuousness of communication; however, Lyster (2004) claims that recasts may not be the most effective strategy of implicit feedback. He argues that

they are too vague “because they share discourse functions with a similar proportion of teacher repetitions of well-formed utterances” (p.6).

Repetition is a different yet similar strategy to recasts. To emphasise a mistake in the student's utterance, the teacher raises her or his voice and repeats the student's incorrect statement verbatim (Basiron et al., 2008). Unlike recasts, the teacher does not provide the correct form in the repeated utterance.

Another strategy of indirect feedback is clarification checks. Brown (2007) defines them as a request for repetition or reformulation of an utterance. Clarification checks are techniques in which one speaker asks another to clarify by using requests like "Please repeat", statements like "I do not understand", and WH questions (Mitchell & Myles, 2004).

Elicitation is yet another strategy of implicit feedback, in which the teacher prompts the learners to self-correct by way of repeating their ill-formed utterance up to the point where the error occurs (Sheen, 2011). For instance, a learner says while narrating a story: “Once upon a time, there is”. The teacher interjects by saying: “Once upon a time, there? How do we say that again?”. Usually, the interjection on the teacher’s part is in the form of a question to help the learners reach a conclusion on their own. Tavakoli (2013) makes mention of two more elicitation techniques. He states that teachers elicit completion of their own utterance by carefully pausing to allow students to "fill in the blank." These elicit completion moves may be preceded by a metalinguistic comment such as “no, not that” or by repeating the student’s error. In addition, teachers may use questions to elicit correct forms (e.g., How do we say X in French?). These questions do not use yes/no questions, as doing so would cross in to the territory of metalinguistic clues. Using elicitation techniques results in the production of elicited output on the learners’ part. Ortega (2009) argues that elicitations are

didactic, meaning that they are mostly employed by teachers, and are rarely used outside a classroom setting.

Finally, teachers can utilise metalinguistic clues as an implicit corrective strategy. This feedback is different from explicit correction in that the teacher offers a metalinguistic remark while omitting the correct form to encourage the student to correct the error on their own (Sheen, 2011). Going back to the example previously given in the segment discussing explicit feedback, a teacher may correct a learner who uses a grammatically inaccurate form of “to have” with “the third person” by reminding them of the grammatical rule without providing the correct form.

It is clear that output plays a significant role in language acquisition. Be it through helping learners internalise linguistic knowledge, enhancing their fluency, or providing opportunities for corrective feedback, all of its functions serve to improve the language learning experience. The discourse surrounding the role of output in SLA has engendered lively debates and extensive research. It cannot be denied that comprehensible output is important to language acquisition to a certain extent. Hence, it is crucial to understand its different types, which will be covered in the next subsection.

1.1.3. Types of Output

It has been made clear that producing output is a vital step of the language learning process. However, understanding the distinctions of various types of output is paramount. This subsection will explore the distinctions between spoken versus written output, pushed versus elicited output, and the intricacies of modified output. By dissecting these categories, a deeper insight into how output is produced can be gained.

1.1.3.1. Spoken vs. Written Output. Examining output through means of production reveals two types of output. Language production can occur either through speech or writing (Richards & Schmidt, 2010). Producing language through speaking involves retrieving words or morphemes that are appropriate for expressing an idea, arranging them in a given order so that the listener understands what the speaker is trying to say, and energising the arrangements into sound forms (Marzona, 2019). Speaking tasks require the learners to actively produce verbal output, either individually or in collaboration with others. Ellis and Shintani (2014) state that during collaborative tasks, "students can be asked to interact among themselves in small groups or pairs" (p.142). When it comes to feedback, oral feedback is usually immediate in comparison with written correction. Feedback strategies include recasts, explicit correction, repetition, clarification requests, as well as metalinguistic clues (Sheen, 2011).

In contrast to speaking, producing written language is a time-consuming process. It requires organising and transforming ideas into long-lasting representations of human language (Harris, 2000, as cited in Qizi, 2023). Nunan (2004) suggests several examples of written tasks. He states that informal tasks may include writing notes to teachers or the school, making shopping lists, and making postcards. Formal writing tasks include writing essays and reports, writing business letters, and taking notes during lectures. Unlike its spoken counterpart, written feedback is not immediate, as it takes time for teachers to provide. Sheen (2011) explains the various feedback strategies used in written production. Non-metalinguistic written correction involves simply providing the correct form without explanation, such as crossing out or inserting words or phrases. Direct metalinguistic written correction provides the correct form along with an explanation of the error type. Indirect written correction may or may not locate errors, leaving learners to find and correct them independently. In the located version, errors are pointed out but not corrected. Indirect written

correction using error codes provides explicit comments on error types via labels placed in the margin, requiring learners to correct the errors themselves.

1.1.3.2. Pushed vs. Elicited Output. In order to encourage learners to produce output, teachers may employ different strategies. These involve either eliciting learners to produce language, or forcing them to. Based on these two strategies, two types of output can be identified. the first type is known as pushed output. “What is meant by this concept is that learners are pushed or stretched in their production as a necessary part of making themselves understood. In so doing, they might modify a previous utterance, or they might try out forms that they had not used before” (Gass et al., 2013, p.356).

The idea behind pushed output is that learners are placed in situations where they have to produce the language, either through being forced by teachers, or in cases where they have to produce unelicited output to achieve a certain purpose. Indeed, this type of output forms the centre around which Comprehensible Output Hypothesis revolves, as it is the first type suggested by Swain (1995). Forced output production pushes students to switch from top-down semantic processing to bottom-up syntactic processing (Tavakoli, 2013), meaning that learners would focus more on the form of the language being produced. According to Nunan (2004), pushed output is produced by tasks requiring a lot of cognitive effort and more complex communication, such as those containing a high density of meaning negotiation.

Another type of output is known as elicited or prompted output. It is generated through elicitation techniques, which are intended to encourage someone to actively produce speech or writing; for example, the teacher may ask someone to describe a picture, tell a story, or complete a sentence. These techniques are used in second language teaching research to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of learners' abilities or interlanguage (Richards & Schmidt, 2010). Elicited output is used in tasks where the teacher guides the

learner, or through using elicitation as a means of generating corrective feedback; for instance, the teacher can ask students to reformulate their statement, to finish their own utterance, or to use a question to get the right form (Ellis & Shintani, 2014).

1.1.3.3. Modified Output. Unlike other types of output, modified output is never considered the first version of a particular utterance. Instead, it is a reformulation of previously generated output, which may follow feedback or result from self-monitoring, with the aim of repairing an initial error or making other changes. Modified output is thought to facilitate L2 development because it helps learners stretch their linguistic abilities, test hypotheses, and automate production (Tavakoli, 2013). Ellis and Shintani (2014) point out that the role of modified output is to help learners "analyse and break a message into its constituent parts and also to produce forms that may lie at the cutting edge of their linguistic ability" (p.208). Modified output can occur as a reaction to feedback, as well as a result of the learners' own hypothesis testing (Shehadeh, 2005). Based on the latter, it can be deduced that modified output is not only a result of negative evidence and corrective feedback. Learners may modify their output based on positive evidence as it is the basis for language hypothesis testing (Gass et al., 2013). Of note, positive evidence refers to fluent utterances in the language being learned.

Clearly, output is of several distinct types. While spoken and written output types are well known, it is crucial to keep pushed, elicited, and modified output in mind, and to understand which particular type should be produced in specific situations. The next subsection will delve into the theories that form the pillars of the comprehensible output hypothesis.

1.1.4. The Theoretical Framework of the Comprehensible Output Hypothesis

The comprehensible output hypothesis (COH) builds on the idea that language acquisition is driven by communication and social interaction. It expands on Krashen's ideas by arguing that the act of producing language itself, particularly when it pushes learners to notice and grapple with the gaps in their knowledge, can be a driver of acquisition. Based on these beliefs, COH incorporates some key concepts from related areas of language learning, specifically the interaction hypothesis, the noticing hypothesis, and the sociocultural theory.

1.1.4.1. The Interaction Hypothesis. Gass et al. (2013) argues that "conversational interaction in an L2 forms the basis for the development of language, rather than being only a forum for practice of specific language features" (p.378). This idea represents the basis on which Long (1981) formulated his interaction hypothesis (IH). Long suggests that understandable input and L2 development result from the conversational changes that take place when non-native speakers and native speakers attempt to overcome a communication barrier. While such interactional adjustments during negotiation of meaning are not the only way to achieve comprehension, they promote comprehensible input and subsequently, acquisition of the L2 (Mackey et al., 2013). In his initial version, Long agrees with Krashen in that comprehension is all that is required for acquisition.

Following the emergence of Swain's COH, Long revisited the interaction hypothesis in 1996. The revised version of the hypothesis proposed that the most comprehensible input that students can receive is that which has been modified during interaction. Modifications occur in response to a signal indicating that the other person requires additional assistance to fully comprehend the message (Ortega, 2009). Ellis (1999) clarifies that the overarching concern of the IH is that interpersonal oral interaction—i.e., situations in which communication breakdowns occur and get resolved—facilitates language acquisition by fostering the internal

mechanisms that underpin interlanguage development. In other words, learners may be unaware of their learning, as their primary focus as interlocutors is not to learn the language. Instead, the aim is to prevent communication disruptions from occurring. As such, the new version of the IH abandons the claim that comprehensible input is all that is required for acquisition. Long (1996, as cited in Mackey et al, 2013) states that "negotiation for meaning, and especially negotiation that triggers interactional adjustments by the native speaker or more competent interlocutor, facilitates acquisition because it connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways" (p.9). Swain's COH draws on the interaction hypothesis as can be seen in some of the functions suggested for output. For instance, metalinguistic awareness, the noticing function, as well as feedback all stem from interpersonal interaction and the negotiation of meaning.

1.1.4.2. The Noticing Hypothesis. The noticing hypothesis was proposed by Schmidt (1990), wherein he states that it is impossible to learn a language unconsciously. He explains that intake, i.e. input that is integrated into the learners' knowledge, is what learners consciously notice when they acquire a language. Schmidt extends the requirement of noticing to all aspects of language, including grammar, phonology, and pragmatics. According to this hypothesis, while it is possible to unconsciously perceive features of input, subliminal learning is unachievable (Schmidt, 2001). The noticing hypothesis stems from Schmidt's own experience, analysing his own acquisition of Portuguese. During a five-month stay in Brazil, Schmidt learned Portuguese through immersion, journaling, and recorded conversations. He found a strong correlation between what he noticed in native speakers' input and his own output. He concluded that conscious attention to linguistic features played a key role in L2 acquisition (Schmidt & Frota, 1986, as cited in Schmidt 1990). Swain (1995) extended the notion of noticing to her COA, suggesting that one function of output is that it

aids learners in noticing the gap in their L2, as was discussed in the subsection covering the role of output.

1.1.4.3. The Sociocultural Theory. The sociocultural theory (SCT) is a learning theory which resulted from Vygotsky's works. This theory views language learning as a consequence of the sociocultural activities in which the learner participates. It highlights the nature of language as a communicative activity, emphasizing the role that social interaction plays in learning (Richards & Schmidt, 2010). He and Ellis (1999) explain that acquisition takes place "when one interlocutor provides scaffolding that helps another to perform a new language function" (p.115). Scaffolding is an important SCT concept to the output hypothesis. It is the assistance given to learners to help them complete tasks that exceed their abilities through stimulating their interest in a task, guiding it toward suitable objectives, emphasising important aspects of a task, and demonstrating pertinent strategies (Tavakoli, 2013). Swain and Luxin (2008) state that students frequently produce output as a reaction to negotiation strategies such as clarification requests, which are a form of scaffolding. Another SCT concept of equal significance to the COH is the zone of proximal development (ZPD). It is "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, as cited in Gass et al., 2013, p.295). In other words, the ZPD suggests that learners benefit from tasks that challenge them slightly beyond their current abilities. Based on this idea, the COH proposes that pushing learners to produce comprehensible output benefits language acquisition through noticing the gaps in their current knowledge (Richards & Schmidt, 2010).

The COH is built on a solid foundation, drawing its concepts from various theories. However, its theoretical foundation is not to be solely credited for its soundness, as several

researchers have conducted studies to provide empirical data as support. Examples of such studies are reviewed in the coming subsection.

1.1.5. Reviewing Empirical Research on Output

Swain's COH has been influential in language teaching ever since its inception. Over the years, researchers have conducted numerous empirical studies to investigate the validity and implications of this hypothesis in real-world language learning contexts.

Swain and Lapkin (2002) led a study in an attempt to verify the soundness of the metalinguistic function of output. The purpose of this research was to investigate whether learners reflect upon and consequently improve their language through collaborative dialogue. The participants were two learners who were asked to write a story in French, and to compare their story to a reformulated version written by a native speaker. The findings showed that through the reformulated story and the accompanying discussion, the participants were able to notice the differences between their writing and that of the native speaker, while accepting or rejecting the corrected forms from the reformulation. Ultimately, a third of corrections were rejected by the participants; however, the researchers argue that rejection does not imply an absence of learning. In this study, metalinguistic reflection is apparent when the participants accepted or rejected the reformulation of their output as part of their collaborative dialogue. It indicates that they were consciously thinking about their metalinguistic knowledge, and making decisions to amend or keep previously learned rules of the language.

Another study was conducted by Shehadeh (2003) to understand how learners test out hypotheses about the L2. The study examined how often learners test hypotheses, the extent to which such hypotheses result in well-formed or ill-formed output, and the extent to which interlocutors challenge learners' non-target-like (NTL) output. The findings suggest that

learners tested out hypotheses about the target language every 1.8 minutes, on average. Of these hypotheses, 62% resulted in well-formed output, while 38% resulted in incorrect utterances. The study also reveal that over a third of NTL output go completely unchallenged by the interlocutors. The researcher argues that failing to provide feedback or counter evidence to the learners' output which contains NTL rules may inadvertently give a signal that the output was sufficiently appropriate. This may result in such rules being internalised as part of the learners' linguistic knowledge. Despite that, the study provides adequate evidence to support the claim of this particular function of output.

Donesch-Jezo (2011) investigated how output and feedback contribute to enhancing L2 acquisition. The research focused on the acquisition of grammatical structures necessary for academic writing among 45 third-year university medical students learning English as adults. The study compared three teaching methods for modal verbs, adjectives, and adverbs that convey uncertainty, crucial for expressing stance in academic texts. These methods included explicit instruction, input enhancement with implicit feedback, and forced output with feedback. The language learning tasks covered reading authentic medical research articles and completing exercises related to the targeted grammatical structures. The study spanned four weeks, comprising two-hour sessions per week. The group engaged in forced output with feedback, where students actively produced the target language and received corrective feedback, demonstrated the most significant improvement in grammatical accuracy. This outcome suggests that adult learners derive the greatest benefit from language production tasks coupled with feedback to develop grammatical competence in academic writing.

Another study was led by Beniss and Bazzaz (2014) who explored how pushed output affected the accuracy and fluency of speaking among Iranian EFL learners. The research involved 30 female upper-intermediate EFL learners, randomly selected from a pool of 50,

who were divided into experimental and control groups. The experimental group received pushed output treatment, engaging in tasks such as picture description, retelling, ask-and-answer, and storytelling, designed to stretch their language production beyond their current proficiency levels. Conversely, the control group receive instruction without such pressure to produce language beyond their comfort zones. The results indicate that the experimental group exhibited higher accuracy compared to the control group, suggesting that pushed output can enhance grammatical precision. However, no significant difference in fluency was observed between the two groups, indicating that pushed output may not notably impact fluency. Overall, the study suggests that pushed output can be a valuable tool for improving EFL learners' speaking accuracy, particularly when integrated after teaching grammar rules to reinforce learning.

Kang (2015) explored the impact of written output on the noticing of linguistic structures and the influence of note-taking in this process. The study assessed whether learners displayed heightened attention to linguistic form in subsequent input (model texts) following the completion of a written output task (picture description). Additionally, it investigated whether note-taking during the reading of model texts aided this process. The participants, who were advanced English as a Second Language learners, were randomly allocated to either a note-taking or a non-note-taking group. All participants engaged in a three-stage production task during a class session: composing a picture description, comparing it with a model text, and revising it. The study revealed that learners tended to prioritise lexical issues over grammatical ones during the initial writing task. Learners successfully identified and resolved the problems they observed in the model texts. Furthermore, learners who took notes were more inclined to integrate linguistic structures from the model texts into their revisions compared to those who did not take notes. Proficiency level also played a role, with higher proficiency learners noticing more linguistic

features than their lower proficiency counterparts. The study indicates that written output can aid learners in noticing areas requiring improvement, and note-taking can facilitate the assimilation of target language structures into their writing. The results of this study give credibility to the noticing function of the output hypothesis.

It is through these investigations that researchers have contributed to a deeper understanding of how learners produce language and the pivotal role comprehensible output plays in the language acquisition process. In line with this, the next subsection will cover the nature of output in the various language teaching methods and approaches.

1.1.6. Output in Language Teaching Methods and Approaches

Language teaching is an ever-evolving process. Throughout the last century, researchers have engaged in continuous debates, refining methodologies in pursuit of the most effective approach to language instruction. The idea of a methodical set of teaching techniques founded on specific beliefs in regard to language and language learning is a compelling one in education; as such, many educators and applied linguists spent much of the 20th century searching for more efficient methods and approaches (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

Although they reflect a variety of views on language instruction, it is clear that most methods are distinguished by placing an excessive amount of emphasis on one particular aspect as the main problem with teaching and learning languages (Liu & Jin-Fang, 2007). For instance, according to Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2013), one of the ways different methods and approaches are characterised is in how they teach the four language skills. Whereas some prioritise reading and writing, others favour listening and speaking. It has been previously established that output refers to the productive skills (speaking and writing); therefore, through exploring how each method and approach views language skills,

particularly the aforementioned productive skills, it is possible to gain an idea of how learner output is treated in any specific method. Richards and Rodgers (2001) divide language teaching methods into two eras: the traditional era and the communicative language teaching phase. While each method or approach focuses on different skills, there are common characteristics and beliefs about them, including output, that permeate each era, shared by all its methods.

1.1.6.1. The Traditional Methods Era. The traditional methods era is a phase of language teaching which consists of all the methods preceding communicative language teaching. It includes the Grammar-Translation Method, the Direct Method, the Audiolingual Method, the Silent Way, Total Physical Response, and Community Language Learning.

The Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) is one of the most traditional methods of language teaching. It originated in the 18th and 19th centuries and was commonly used in Europe for teaching classical languages such as Latin and Greek. However, it was later applied to modern languages as well. Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2013) state that GTM was first used in the 20th century to help students read and appreciate literature written in a foreign language. It was also intended that by studying the grammar of the target language, students would become more familiar with the grammar of their home language, which would improve their ability to speak and write it. What is learned is then practised through translating sentences to and from the target language. Richards and Rodgers (2014) state that in a typical Grammar-Translation text, the grammar rules are presented and illustrated; a list of vocabulary items is presented with their translation equivalents; and translation exercises are prescribed. The main focus is on reading and writing, with little to no systematic attention given to speaking or listening. Vocabulary selection is based only on the reading texts used. This implies that language teaching in the GTM is rigid and controlled, which leaves little to no opportunity for learner-initiated output. Moreover, written output is emphasised, whereas

speaking is completely dismissed. Adding to that, "student's native language is maintained as the reference system in the acquisition of the second language" (Liu & Jin-Fang, 2007, p.69). This indicates that this method allows the use of the mother tongue during learning, hence resulting in scarce L2 oral output when compared to that of the first language (L1).

Following the Grammar-Translation Method, the Direct Method (DM) was introduced as a reaction to its predecessor's dismissal of L2 oral output. This approach involves recreating the natural approach of the L1 acquisition approach in an effort to replicate the exposure that children have while they acquire language as they grow up (Ahamefula et al., 2014). Since this method follows the natural order of language learning, skills are taught in accordance with the manner in which the mother tongue is acquired, differing only in that all skills are simultaneously taught. While all four skills— listening, speaking, reading, and writing—are worked on from the outset, oral communication is considered a priority (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2013). The nature of language output resulting from this method can be inferred from the principles accounted for by Richards and Rodgers (2001). They state that oral communication skills are developed in a carefully graded progression centred around question-and-answer exchanges between teachers and students in small, intensive classes. New teaching points are introduced orally, and classroom instruction is conducted exclusively in the target language. Only everyday vocabulary and sentences are taught, and grammatical accuracy is emphasized. What can be gleaned from this account is that output in the DM is mainly spoken. It is elicited, meaning that it is produced through guidance provided by the teacher in the form of questions. Output was expected to be in the L2, as the use of the L1 is largely prohibited. Finally, output is expected to be grammatically accurate, for it to be used in natural communication.

The Audiolingual Method (ALM) is a similar yet different method to the DM. The entire lesson is conducted in the target language, and oral communication is a priority. The

ALM differs from the DM in that it places more emphasis on learning common everyday dialogue structures and patterns than on word comprehension (Alemi & Tavakoli, 2016). As put by Richards and Rodgers (2014), the ALM is based on behaviourism. The ALM believes that language learning occurs through habit formation, focusing on form and neglecting meaning. Among its characteristics is a preference for the oral skills over reading and writing. The ALM emphasises specific practice techniques, like pattern drills and mimicry, and it primarily presents the target language through dialogues (Liu & Jin-Fang, 2007). The nature of output in the ALM is best summed up by Ellis and Shintani (2014), who state that the ALM "is entirely output-based. That is, it assumes that learners learn through producing patterns correctly. However, the output they produce is very controlled; there is no opportunity for pushed output" (p.41). Production is mostly guided by the teacher, who elicits learners to produce output through exercises such as repetition and mimicry. Since the aural-oral skills are the focus of the ALM, written output is considered secondary; students only write what is covered in oral practice (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2013).

The Silent Way was introduced as a challenge to the core beliefs of the ALM. Whereas the ALM treats learners as passive recipients who only produce the language as part of mechanical drills, the Silent Way proposes that students should be able to use language for self-expression to communicate their ideas, opinions, and feelings. To do this, they must learn to be autonomous and establish their own standards for accuracy. As a result, teachers should only provide students with the minimal amount of knowledge necessary to support their learning (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2013). In the Silent Way, all language skills are equally important; however, the method follows the natural order of learning, prioritising speech and pronunciation over writing (Yüksel & Caner, 2020). Ultimately, the silent way is an entirely output -based method, wherein the teacher remains silent as much as possible while the learners autonomously produce in the target language (Richards & Rodgers,

2014). Therefore, the role of teachers in the Silent Way is to elicit learners into producing output, which is mostly spoken.

Total Physical Response (TPR) is a method that was introduced by Asher in the 1960s. A typical lesson starts with a focus on listening comprehension, mimicking the initial phases of learning a mother tongue, before advancing to speaking, reading, and writing (Ahamefula et al., 2014). While it is similar to the DM, it differs in that learners are meant to keep silent and observe at the beginning of a course. Astutik et al. (2019) indicates that in TPR, understanding the language comes before speaking, as learners are expected to produce output only when they are ready. TPR is based on the belief that the more frequently or intensely a memory connection is traced, the stronger the memory association and the greater the likelihood of recall. Retracing can be carried out orally (e.g., by repetition) or in conjunction with motor activity (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). In other words, as its name suggests, TPR proposes that learners can learn and refine their knowledge by associating verbal input and output with physical actions. Output is guided in TPR, as learners follow the example of their teacher or peers. It is mainly spoken, and it is delayed until learners obtain a basic grasp of the language.

Community Language Learning (CLL) is a method based on Curran's Counselling-Learning theory, which recognises that learners require support in order to learn. Teachers who use this method consider that understanding and accepting students' fears helps students feel secure and overcome their fears, which in turn helps them harness positive energy for learning. The materials used are learner-generated, meaning students choose what they want to learn. Teachers view students as whole persons, with intellect, feeling, instinct, physical response, and a desire to learn (Ahamefula et al., 2014). In a CLL class, both the teacher and learners are considered part of the learning process. Richards and Rodgers (2014) explain that "in CLL, learners become members of a community - their fellow learners and the teacher -

and learn through interacting within the community. Learning is not viewed as an individual accomplishment but as something that is achieved collaboratively" (p.309). When it comes to the language areas focused on, Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2013) state that based on the language students have generated, specific grammar points, pronunciation patterns, and vocabulary are worked on. The most crucial skills are understanding the language and speaking it first, with reinforcement of reading and writing. It is clear that in this method, spoken output is the basis on which a course is built. A CLL class completely revolves around the vocabulary and grammar produced by the learners, and instructional materials are selected based on what they orally produce. Finally, output is mostly elicited by teachers as well as other learners through collaborative interaction.

While the methods of the traditional era may be different from one another, they share some common characteristics. Every method focuses on one particular aspect of the language as being the most important. For instance, the GTM insists on prioritising written output, while the DM emphasises speaking. Moreover, most of these methods either emphasise output elicitation, or dismiss it all together. This leaves no opportunities for pushed output in such learning environments.

1.1.6.2. Communicative Language Teaching. Until the second half of the 20th century, the theoretical underpinnings of language education were firmly anchored in behavioural psychology and structuralism, which maintained that learning primarily takes place through a process of repetition and habit formation (Çelik, 2020). However, starting in the 1970s, it was believed that mastering a language should require more than simply learning its structure. As such, communicative language teaching (CLT) emerged. This era of language teaching saw the rise of several teaching approaches, all of which geared towards developing the learners' ability to use the target language accurately and fluently in social contexts. These approaches all shared one goal and roughly the same principles; however,

they achieve that goal using different paths. CLT was introduced in the 1970s based on Hymes' communicative competence theory, which suggests that proper language use involves "knowing how to use language for a range of different purposes and functions" (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p.90).

The era of CLT includes several similar yet varying approaches. The first approach to be introduced is known as the communicative approach. The foundation of this approach is the idea that language is a tool for communication; that is, speakers use language as a social tool to create meaning when they speak or write to someone about a particular topic for a specific purpose (Çelik, 2020). Richards and Rodgers (2014) explain that the communicative approach emphasises both form and function. Thus, it can be surmised that output in the communicative approach is considered a priority, focusing on both accuracy and fluency.

Another CLT approach is content based instruction. Its goal is for learners to master both the language and academic content through communication. (Kerestecioğlu, 2020). She adds that its principles align with those of the communicative approach. Output in this method focuses on the language and the content being taught. Task-based instruction is yet another approach of CLT. It denotes the use of tasks as the central component of lesson planning and delivery in language instruction (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2013) state that teaching occurs through two types of tasks: input providing tasks, which make use of the learners' receptive skills, as well as output prompting tasks, in which learners produce spoken and written output.

CLT approaches share several characteristics regarding L2 output. According to Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2013), all of them focus on teaching the four skills in equal measure, hence written and spoken output are produced equally. Use of the mother tongue is also prohibited, meaning that only L2 output is accepted. Finally, both elicited and pushed

output occur in CLT classes, either through the previously mentioned output prompting tasks, or tasks where the learners are required to produce language on their own (Páez, 2020).

Ultimately, it is clear that each method and approach of language teaching treats output differently, as with any other aspect of the language. Richards and Rodgers (2014) state that the CMT era was followed by the post methods phase, where "post-method is conceived as the development of a unique set of classroom practices by teachers themselves, tailored to their own identities, beliefs and teaching styles and, most importantly, designed to suit the specific contexts in which they teach" (Soto, 2014, p.29). This implies that teachers decide on what to teach, and how to teach it. Such decisions may involve deciding on which output tasks and strategies to employ, with different tasks and output types being used as the situation dictates. It is clear that comprehensible output is more prevalent in the post-methods era due to the importance of production in aiding language acquisition. However, despite its significance, COH has received criticism denouncing its role in this process. Such critiques are covered in the next subsection.

1.1.7. Critiquing the Output Hypothesis

The role of output in SLA has been a topic of contention for the last few decades, stirring debates and prompting extensive research in the field. At the heart of this discourse lie two contrasting perspectives: one which dismisses the need for output, and another which advocates its necessity, each offering compelling arguments and insights. On one side of the spectrum, proponents who argue for a major role for output contend that language learners develop proficiency through active engagement in language production (Swain, 1995). In contrast, those of a minimal or even non-existent role for output argue that language learning primarily occurs through input processing (Krashen, 1998). This subsection will explore the latter of the two perspectives, exploring the criticism directed at the output hypothesis.

Krashen is considered to be one of the leading opponents to output playing a major role in enhancing language acquisition. He states that more production does not result in an increased language competence (Krashen, 1994, as cited in Ponniah & Krashen, 2008). Krashen believes that productive skills such as speaking should not be taught to beginners (Brown, 2007). He proposes that with enough input, speech and writing will naturally develop. This places further emphasis on input being a priority, while output remains as an outcome of development rather than a direct cause. In an interview, he says that "more writing does not result in better writing, more speaking does not result in better speaking. But speaking is helpful, because it encourages input" (Krashen, as cited in Wang, 2013, p.2). Moreover, output plays a secondary role in SLA due to its insufficiency. There is a scarce amount of generated output when compared with input, and thus it is argued that it cannot be relied upon as a primary source for enhancing linguistic competence (Krashen, 1998). This argument was lent further credence through a study conducted by Pica (1998), where a native speaker and ten nonnative speakers (NSS) were placed in a situation where they had to interact. The aim of such an experiment was to judge whether comprehensible output played a role in developing the language proficiency of the NSS. The results proved that improvements were too infrequent in most cases.

Whereas Swain considers input to be complementary to output, Krashen and his followers dismiss the need for the latter. Krashen's comprehensible input hypothesis is in keeping with the natural approach to language learning, which focuses on acquisition through exposure to the language (Er, 2014). When advancing the input hypothesis, Krashen (1982) focused on two points: first, the hypothesis is related to acquisition instead of learning, implying that learners develop their language proficiency unconsciously as per the nature of acquisition. He adds that learners acquire language by comprehending input that is more complex than their current proficiency level (i+ 1), " i " being the learners' present level. This

is accomplished through the use of contextual or extralinguistic information. The input hypothesis claims that receptive skills are required for acquisition, dismissing the need to rely on production (Kavanagh, 2006). Krashen (1982) provides evidence to support the input hypothesis. One of his arguments is first language acquisition in children. It is heavily influenced by caretaker speech, which is modified input to aid comprehension rather than intentionally teach language. Caretakers simplify their speech to ensure the child understands, adjusting it as the child progresses (i+1). Caretaker speech also adheres to focusing on what the child can perceive in his immediate environment. The input hypothesis suggests that caretaker speech, and consequently modified input, is highly beneficial for children as it tends to be comprehensible and provides contextual support for understanding, aligning with the notion that comprehension precedes language acquisition.

While debates surrounding the role of output still persist, its practical implications in language pedagogy accentuate its enduring significance in shaping modern language education. Despite the criticism it has received, the output hypothesis still stands as one of the pivotal pillars of language acquisition. This is most apparent in that language teaching has moved from the old teacher centred-approach to a learner-centred one, putting learners' production in the forefront. In contemporary EFL contexts, learner participation and active engagement in language production are emphasised, reflecting a shift towards integrating output-focused activities into instructional practices, and prioritising learners' active involvement in language production. As such, the next section of this chapter will delve into the intricacies of EFL learners' participation.

1.2. EFL Learners' Oral Participation

1.2.1. Defining Oral Participation

Second language acquisition (SLA) refers to the process by which individuals learn languages in addition to their native tongue. Such learning can take place in educational institutions, inside classrooms. One of its main aspects is participation.

Defining participation precisely can be quite challenging due to the different forms it may take. According to the online Cambridge Dictionary, participation is generally defined as taking part or becoming involved in something. However, within an educational context, Burchfield and Sappington (1999, as cited in Rocca, 2010) define participation as "the number of unsolicited responses volunteered" (p.187). This definition sheds light on the spontaneous engagement of students without the teacher's prompts or him pushing them to output in the target language. Another perspective is given by Heyman and Sailors (2011), who state that participation is "a form of active learning in which students publicly discuss the course material" (p.605). This view suggests that when students participate orally in class, they experience an open exchange of ideas regarding the content covered in a particular course. Fassinger (1995) provides another outlook on oral participation, defining it as "any student comments offered or questions raised in class" (p.86). This means that participating in class encompasses the act of giving opinions and asking questions. Warayet (2011) defines participation as a "fundamental interactional and pedagogical task through which students display their involvement" (p.2). This perspective highlights participation as more than just speaking up in class and considers it a valuable element of students' engagement. Understanding the multifaceted nature of participation paves the way for exploring the role it plays in language acquisition and proficiency development.

1.2.2. The Role of Participation in Language Learning

The role of participation in language learning is vital. Abdullah et al. (2012) note that effective learning occurs when both students and teachers actively participate in class. This emphasises the crucial role of participation in enhancing the learning experience. According to Liu (2005), participation in class discussions helps students improve their English-speaking skills, which is a common motivation for students to engage in class. Similarly, Mustapha et al. (2010a) found that participation boosts students' confidence in English communication. By asking questions and sharing opinions, students get the chance to practise their speaking skills, eventually feeling more comfortable voicing their ideas. The study also revealed that participation opens students' minds to new perspectives through the exchange of ideas and information with their teachers and classmates. Furthermore, it enhances their academic achievements, as students learn more and gain a better understanding of the material being taught by participating in class. Akpur (2021) confirms this by saying that " participation is a significant variable in terms of promoting motivation, self-confidence and thus academic achievement" (p.156). Another benefit of participation is that it allows teachers to provide valuable feedback, correct pronunciation mistakes, and identify students' strengths and weaknesses. Lastly, Liu (2005, as cited in Abebe & Deneke 2015) mentions that "participation in verbal interactions offers language learners the opportunity to follow up on new words and structures to which they have been exposed during language lessons and to practice them in context" (p.75). This means that participating in class helps students acquire vocabulary and grammatical structures of the target language.

After shedding light on the importance of participation in the language learning process, it is also essential to address the different forms it may take. As such, the next subsection will deal with the types of class participation.

1.2.3. Types of Participation

Participation encompasses different forms of engagement, each offering unique opportunities for students to interact with course content, express themselves, and contribute to the learning community. Verbal, non-verbal, and written participation are three key modalities through which students can actively engage in classroom activities, each with its own characteristics and implications.

1.2.3.1. Verbal Participation. Verbal participation refers to students actively engaging in the classroom by asking questions, giving responses, presenting information, making comments, and expressing their thoughts and opinions. Overall, it involves using spoken language to participate in class activities. This type is the most observable behaviour of participation. It fosters real-time interaction and cultivates communication skills. However, it may also present barriers for shy or introverted students. In addition to a potential for misinterpretation, Robinson and Robinson (1982, as cited in Zahra & Nesrine 2021) state that "if speakers are to be consistently efficient at conveying verbally their intended meanings to listeners, they must understand that intended meaning may not be fully conveyed by a message" (p.16). This means that even when students express themselves clearly, their teachers or peers may misinterpret their meaning. Despite such possible barriers in verbal communication, students can cope with them and enhance their participation by using other ways to interact.

1.2.3.2. Non-verbal Participation. Non-verbal participation refers to any form of participation in which students interact in class without using words, by making eye contact, raising hands, nodding, smiling, using body language, and making gestures and facial expressions. Non-verbal participation allows all students, regardless of their verbal communication skills or confidence levels, to actively engage in classroom activities. This

inclusivity ensures that every student has the opportunity to contribute to discussions. According to García-Ramírez (2012, as cited in Wahyni 2018), “verbal and nonverbal communication is a unity that cannot be separated to convey a message” (p.80). This implies that these two types are complementary rather than distinct.

1.2.3.3. Written Participation. Written participation involves students engaging in classroom activities through written means rather than spoken words. Writing involves arranging concepts and converting them into lasting human language representations (Harris, 2000, as cited in Qizi, 2023). This can include writing essays, participating in collaborative writing projects, or submitting written assignment. Written participation allows students to express their thoughts, ideas, and understanding of the material through written communication, and helps them develop their writing skills.

By considering these three forms of class participation, educators can create dynamic and inclusive classroom environments that accommodate diverse communication styles and preferences. This ensures that all students can actively contribute to class discussions, thereby enhancing their learning experience. Exploring these types of participation reveals that there are several means through which learners can participate during class.

1.2.4. Modes of Participation

Student class participation, encompassing oral, non-oral, and written forms, is fundamentally crucial in language learning. There exist several modes through which students can actively engage with the language, thereby fostering their participation and enhancing comprehension and fluency. Bean and Peterson (1998) identified some structured modes for a participatory classroom like whole-class discussion and cold-calling, and there are still other modes such as presentations and online discussions which also contribute to effective language learning.

1.2.4.1. Whole-class Discussions. Whole-class discussions is a mode of interaction in which teachers involve the whole class in tasks and activities (Alexander, 2008). In this mode, educators pose questions to actively include all students in class discussions, facilitating the exchange of information and expression of ideas on a specific topic. The teacher assumes the role of a guide and facilitator, while students contribute to the discourse by engaging with each other, rather than merely providing answers to questions. To enhance whole-class discussion, different seating arrangements such as horseshoe or circle formations can be utilised. Whole class discussion can involve both pushed and elicited outputs, depending on the type of discussion. When the teacher invites students to willingly participate in the discussion, this is a form of elicited output. However, when he directs questions or provides prompts to engage them, it becomes a pushed output strategy. Teachers can combine both types to create balanced whole class discussions.

1.2.4.2. Cold-calling. Cold-calling refers to "any instance in which a teacher calls on a student whose hand is not raised" (Dallimore et al., 2012, p.5). In this mode, the teacher poses questions and randomly selects students by calling their names or choosing a number from the class list without prior warning. This technique is employed to actively involve students and stimulate their participation by encouraging readiness to engage with the material at any moment. This mode of participation can be considered as a pushed output strategy as teachers actively prompt students to contribute in activities rather than waiting for them to voluntarily involve in class.

1.2.4.3. Presentations. Presentations are a means of communication between the presenter and the audience. The purpose of academic presentations is primarily to provide information in a classroom lesson or in a conference research paper. In certain situations, academic presentations assist in persuading the audience to change practice and adopt new strategies. (Mohapatra & Zayapragassarazan, 2021). In this mode of class participation,

students actively engage in spoken communication through individual or group presentations on specific topics in the target language. These presentations serve as a platform for students to develop their speaking skills, receive constructive feedback from both their instructor and peers, and build confidence in using the language in real-world scenarios. Class presentations can be a combination of both types of output. When the teacher prompts students to give a presentation on a particular topic and controls aspects of their presentation, it is a form of pushed output strategy. However, during the presentation itself, students may spontaneously express their ideas and information, encouraged to engage with the audience. In this phase, elicited output strategy comes into play.

1.2.4.4. Online Discussions. Online discussions have emerged with the increasing spread of technology. The global COVID-19 pandemic has fuelled this growth by forcing educational institutions to shift to an online learning environment. Online learning allows for the anytime, anywhere, and everyone philosophy of education and provides students with a competitive alternative to the traditional face-to-face learning mode because it can transcend geographical, spatial, and temporal barriers (Vo & Ho, 2024). In contrast to the previous modes, this mode takes place through the use of virtual platforms. It involves students engaging in collaborative conversations, debates, or exchanges of ideas on the internet through video conferencing tools or social media platforms such as Zoom, Telegram, Google Meet, Facebook, etc. By adopting this mode of participation, students can express their ideas, perspectives, and questions, fostering a sense of community and collaboration in their learning. One of its main characteristics is flexibility, as it allows both teachers and students to participate at their own pace and convenience, regardless of their availability during face-to-face class time.Online discussions can involve both pushed and elicited output, depending on the context and how the students are structured. When students are involuntarily asked to post their thoughts, arguments, or reflections on a given topic, it is pushed output. Whereas,

when they voluntarily respond to questions or comments from their peers or the instructor, it becomes elicited output.

Active participation through these various modes cultivates a dynamic learning environment that encourages students to actively engage in class activities, thus developing their skills and enhancing comprehension. Despite the importance of interaction in language learning, many EFL students are often observed to lack active participation and instead assume passive roles in class, influenced by various factors.

1.2.5. Understanding the Causes of Students' Passivity

Participation involves the willingness to engage in class activities, while passivity or non-participation may indicate students' unwillingness or hesitance to actively participate in the classroom (Ahmad, 2021). Mustapha et al. (2010b) offer detailed insights into non-participation among students, defining it by traits such as inactivity, silence, and lack of interest. Passivity in class activities can stem from internal barriers within the learner and/or external barriers, which are factors beyond the learner's control.

1.2.5.1. Internal Barriers. Internal barriers to participation are those factors originating within the students themselves, including psychological and linguistic factors as well as lack of preparedness and the pursuit of perfection. Giantari et al. (2023) emphasise the prominence of psychological factors such as lack of confidence, shyness, and anxiety, which hinder students' willingness to speak English in class discussions. This reluctance is further underscored by Hernández et al. (2021), who state that “these emotional factors impact students' self-esteem and self-confidence. Students are often afraid to participate because they are nervous or because they think that their contributions to the lesson are not good enough, making them feel uncomfortable and inhibiting participation” (p.162). Qudoos and Samad (2022) note that students withhold participation despite knowing the answers due

to their lack of confidence. This reluctance extends to activities requiring public speaking, where students feel uncomfortable presenting in front of their peers. Hamouda (2012) and Abebe et al. (2015) corroborate the influential impact of shyness on EFL students' participation. Juhana (2012) states that “shyness is an emotional thing that many students suffer from at some time when they are required to speak in English class” (p.101). Moreover, students may experience anxiety when using the foreign language to answer questions or express themselves in class, which may hinder them from doing so. While some level of anxiety is natural before embarking on any task for any student, its impact becomes detrimental when it exceeds its limits.

When considering the psychological factors affecting class participation, students' personality traits play a significant role. Generally, learners are categorised according to their personalities as either extroverted or introverted individuals. According to Liu (2005), students with introverted personalities tend to be less engaged, especially in oral activities compared to extroverts, often preferring silence, isolation, and independent work. Moreover, those who struggle to focus, feel ashamed to ask questions, only speak when absolutely necessary, and possess limited knowledge are often associated with low self-efficacy, resulting in reduced engagement during class (Abdullah et al, 2012).

Besides psychological factors, linguistic skills such as vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar can also significantly influence students' class participation. According to Ahmed (2021), these linguistic skills are crucial for language learning as they enable students to accurately articulate their thoughts, opinions, and questions, thus communicating effectively in group discussions. However, when students encounter difficulties in these areas, their participation can be affected. He found that language students become “reluctant to participate in classroom discussions because of their faulty pronunciation and inadequate English vocabulary” (Ahmed, 2021, p.60). Giantari et al. (2023) also identified

mispronunciation and lack of vocabulary as significant contributors to student reticence in oral class. Their study revealed that students often remain passive if they fear they will mispronounce words and not be understood by others or if they lack vocabulary. Similarly, Qudoos and Samad (2022) found that students struggle to speak or write extensively in English due to their limited vocabulary. With regard to grammar, which is considered the basis of any language, it is an essential skill for students to produce correct sentences and effectively participate. However, if learners have difficulties with grammar, they may hesitate to do so. Giantari et al. (2023) add that language learners might refrain from actively participating in class due to their fear of making noticeable grammatical mistakes, such as using the wrong tenses.

In addition to psychological and linguistic factors, according to Liu (2005), the pursuit of perfection in the target language negatively influences classroom participation. He observed that many Asian students in language classrooms are passive. Therefore, he conducted a research study to find out the reasons behind their class passivity. The findings revealed that the pursuit of perfection was one of the significant factors contributing to their lack of participation in class. Some Chinese students refrain from speaking English to others because they aim for perfect English. They compare their English-speaking abilities to their native tongue, and when they find that they cannot speak English as perfectly as their native language (Chinese), they choose to remain silent because they believe it is shameful to speak English not as well as Chinese.

Furthermore, lack of preparation is an internal cause of students' reluctance to participate in class. When students are unprepared for their studies or when teachers pose questions for which they have not prepared in advance, they may be passive in class (Hamouda, 2013; Qudoos & Samad, 2022). Lastly, but still importantly, comparison with peers can also be a reason behind students' passivity in class. A study conducted by Hamouda

(2013) showed that many students remain passive in the EFL classroom when they feel that their classmates are better than them. They feel inferior to others because they are always comparing themselves to their classmates. Similarly, Aslan and Şahin (2020) consider the 'competitive atmosphere' as an inhibiting factor that makes students feel shy and disgraced in front of the whole class.

These internal barriers, including psychological and linguistic factors, are really serious and directly influence how learners respond to different output strategies used by EFL teachers. For example, if students are not prepared, feel anxious or suffer from the fear of making mistakes in front of others, they may be less responsive to pushed output techniques, where the teacher actively seeks responses, while other students might hesitate to participate in an elicited activity if they lack the necessary vocabulary to express their ideas.

1.2.5.2. External Barriers. External barriers to participation are factors that do not stem from the students themselves and are beyond their control, such as teachers' destructive criticism of mistakes which is identified as one of the main factors that demotivate students from actively speaking in class. Warsame (2018) holds that “if the students realize that his/her faults will be criticized, they will decide to keep silent” (p.9). The destructive criticism of students' errors can also directly impact the effectiveness of both elicited and pushed output strategies. Those students who fear being judged for their mistakes may not take part in class activities, whether involuntarily in response to the pushed output strategy or even voluntarily in response to elicited questions . Moreover, Ahmed (2021) found that harsh comments and negative gestures of the teacher lead students to be turned off in class and minimise their participation.

Another factor related to teachers is their styles and techniques of teaching. A study conducted by Aslan and Şahin (2020) reveal that teacher's authority in oral communication

courses negatively influences students' class participation, especially when the instructor continuously interrupts the speech of the learners. Such interruptions can cause students to feel lost, anxious, and find it difficult to concentrate again. Additionally, when the teacher dominates in selecting topics for presentations and does not give the students the freedom to control discussions or neglects their desires, they tend to become less active simply because they cannot talk about irrelevant issues that hold no interest for them. The teacher's authoritative teaching style influence the students' participation levels and may even affect the success of both elicited and pushed output strategies. When the teacher interrupts their students, this may make them feel less valued, leading them to remain passive whether they are forced to speak or invited to willingly participate.

Furthermore, instructional materials and teacher's questions that are complex or ambiguous, especially in reading sessions, can be a hindrance to students' class participation. Sanchez and Saranza (2023) state that:

> When teachers throw questions during reading exercises, many students become reluctant or give incorrect answers as they do not understand the question of their teachers or the article they have read. This has caused many students to remain passive in class, outnumbering those actively participating (p.1).

When students feel unable to comprehend the tasks or the teacher's questions, they decide to remain passive, whether they are encouraged to answer or pushed to do so. This suggests that complex instructional materials and questions may also affect the efficacy of both elicited and pushed output strategies

Apart from this, Abebe et al. (2015) discovered that the practice of teachers calling on students is also a significant cause of anxiety in the classroom, leading to student reluctance. According to Arafat (2012, as cited in Abebe et al., 2015), when students are compelled to

answer a teacher's question in an English class, they become more anxious compared to when they have the option to respond of their own accord. In line with this, Ahmed (2021) found that many students are sometimes hesitant to engage in classroom discussions due to the pressure they feel when forced by their teachers to answer questions, especially when they are not prepared or fear they would make mistakes and be despised by their classmates.These arguments suggest that the teacher's use of the pushed output strategy may have negative effects on participation levels. When educators force students to speak or answer questions involuntarily, it can impact them psychologically, causing feelings of anxiety, pressure, and fear, ultimately leading to reduced activity in class discussions and a greater tendency to remain silent. Consequently, this could negatively impact their overall learning experience.

In addition to the teacher's influence on learners' participation, students may face a disinclination to class discussion when their peers rudely react to their answers or laugh at their being wrong. Different researchers have found that fear of negative evaluation by peers also contributes to the passivity of students and significantly deters those who are actively engaged, leading to reduced participation. According to the study of Qudoos and Samad (2022), students remain silent because they feel afraid of being seen as unintelligent or incapable if they make blunders when they speak. Similarly, Hamouda (2013) states that learners avoid participating in class discussions because they think that committing mistakes will distort their image in front of their colleagues. According to Rohi and Muslim (2023), when a student belittles or laughs at another's idea, he discourages him from speaking in front of the class in the future. Such behaviour not only stifles that individual's voice but also discourages future interactions from other students, ultimately hindering the collective learning experience. In regard to the negative attitudes of peers in class, Ghalley and Rai (2019) showed that unnecessary noise made by some students disturbs the concentration of

others. Students who engage in disruptive behaviour, teasing, and disorganisation make it difficult for their peers to contribute effectively to class discussions.

Pushing further on the negative influence of peers and teachers on students' participation, a study conducted by Ghalley and Rai (2019) raise concerns about the discrepancy between high- and low-performing students. When classmates and teachers differentiate between high and low performers, it can hinder the participation of some students because they feel inferior and unable to contribute effectively in the class.

Qudoos and Samad mention in their 2022 study the issue of class size, finding that the classroom is a logistical factor that impacts student participation levels. Larger classes may not provide sufficient time for every learner to participate, particularly when students require more time for their contributions. They also make students more ashamed to ask questions, and instructors cannot focus on every single student. In addition, in a large classroom, students sitting at the back often struggle to see notes written on the board, leading to vague information and hindering their participation in class discussions. Moreover, a congested seating arrangement can cause students at the back to fall asleep or engage in distracting behaviours(Ghalley & Rai, 2019).

Benyo and Kumar (2023) identify similar barriers to student participation in class as previously mentioned. They highlight other issues such as lesson timing and lack of interest in the subject matter. Their research revealed that most students prefer morning classes as they feel more energetic and engaged, while they tend to become silent during afternoon or evening lessons due to exhaustion.

Participation is a fundamental aspect of language learning as it provides students with the opportunity to practise the language and have an effective learning experience. However, the existence of such influencing factors can impede students from doing so. Therefore, it is

important to find effective strategies that would help students overcome reluctance and become more willing to participate in class.

1.2.6. Strategies to Cultivate Active Oral Participation

There are various strategies that aim to address the challenges faced by EFL students and maximize their interaction levels in class. They can include reticence coping strategies for students, as well as significant contributions from teachers.

1.2.6.1. Reticence Coping Strategies. Students can employ a set of strategies to actively engage in their learning process. First and foremost, they should overcome the fear of speaking and practise the target language actively. Another effective strategy that can positively influence participation is prior preparation by students. When they prepare in advance for their upcoming lessons and exercises, they are more likely to be active and creative in class. They will find it easier to give their opinions, answer questions, and express their ideas simply because they have familiarised themselves with the content being taught (Ghalley & Rai, 2019; Benyo & Kumar, 2023). Sanchez and Saranza (2023) corroborate the idea of being ready and enthusiastic for class and emphasised the importance of using the target language to build high self-confidence. They state that:

> Students should come prepared and motivated in class. They should actively engage in participative activities to familiarize themselves with and refine their language skills. They should grow confident in using the English medium, which is achievable only when they constantly use and practice it (p.11).

When students are well-prepared and do not mind making mistakes, they will readily share their ideas or answer questions, whether they are asked to participate voluntarily or involuntarily. This means that overcoming the fear of making mistakes and being well-prepared not only enhances participation levels but also may promote the success of both elicited and pushed output strategies.

Overcoming the fear of making mistakes, practicing the target language, and engaging in advanced preparation will not only help students actively participate in class but also enable them to effectively respond to teacher's output strategies. These practices make students self-confident, improve their language skills, and familiarize them with the content, which are crucial factors in producing language, whether voluntarily or involuntarily.

A study conducted by Hamouda (2012) addresses some learning strategies that were used by language learners in Saudi Arabia which helped them to participate effectively in the class. According to its findings, students would carefully think and silently rehearse what they have in mind before speaking, as confirmed by Ahmed's 2012 study . Secondly, students wrote down notes and spoke from them, aligning with a study by Giantari et al. (2023), which emphasises the significance of this strategy in enhancing students' confidence as they express their thoughts through writing. Additionally, students would consult with nearby peers for advice on what to say before participating. These quick talks helped them verify the answers they wanted to share with the whole class and avoid feeling embarrassed. Lastly, they would listen to their classmates' responses before participating.

By employing these strategies, students can minimise their reluctance to actively participate and even promote the success of the teacher use of output strategies. However, enhancing participation is not solely the responsibility of students; there are still other contributions on the part of the teacher since he is a main component in the learning process.

1.2.6.2. The Teacher's Role in Enhancing Oral Participation. The most crucial role that teachers play in the classroom is to promote effective learning. Students' participation is integral to this process. Teachers can enhance classroom participation by considering several aspects, most importantly their positive traits and skills, which have been identified as one of the most influential factors in encouraging students to be more responsive in class by many researchers. The instructors' traits favoured by students include being enthusiastic, patient,

friendly, open-minded, approachable, supportive, knowing each student well, not minding mistakes, and being skilled. According to Abdullah et al. (2012), a skilled teacher is one who employs “the best method or style that will stimulate students to be responsive” (p.522). Besides, teachers' motivation is an important factor in fostering class engagement among students .Rohi and Muslim (2023) indicate that “if teachers motivate students for their performance and better activities, it will encourage them to come to class with preparation and participate enthusiastically for a better outcome” (p.102).

Appreciating students for their efforts instead of criticising their performance is also a very crucial aspect because they are more likely to participate and be engaged in class discussions if they are aware that their efforts will benefit the class and that their mistakes will not be pointed out (Warsame, 2018). Moreover, teachers should teach and train students to be supportive of one another rather than criticising each other. Zou (2004, as cited in Liu 2005), reminds that When students get along well, they usually feel comfortable participating fully in class. The conduct and attitudes of both students and teachers are crucial in shaping the learning environment. Therefore, it is essential to cultivate the importance of valuing each other's ideas and making students feel respected, accepted and their contributions acknowledged, consequently improving participation levels.

Participation of students varies also due to their differences in learning styles and personalities. Teachers can encourage their students' participation by providing a healthy and supportive environment that suits their individual differences. Aziz and Kazi (2018) state that “the goal of increasing participation is not to have every student participate in the same way or at the same rate. Instead, it is to create an environment in which all participants have the opportunity to learn” (p.10). Aziz et al. (2018) corroborate this in their study indicating that “a supportive, non-threatening and open learning environment provided by teachers would make students feel comfortable in expressing their thoughts” (p.216).

An important practice in language teaching is the assessment of learners needs. Analysing the needs of students and considering them before any teaching process can take place because instructional materials is crucial, including reading texts and class activities, should align with students' needs and level. Teachers should avoid including content beyond their students' level to enable learners to understand any questions asked and texts presented, consequently, actively involving them in the class.

In a study conducted by Rohi and Muslim (2023), additional teaching factors contributing to high participation were addressed, including think-time and course policies. It was found that students were more active when provided with sufficient time to think about teachers' questions. When teachers ask students to answer a question, it is better to allow some time for them to understand it and organise their ideas before giving an answer (Benyo & Kumar, 2023). Regarding the class content, language learners demonstrated increased engagement when presented with theory relevant to real-life situations. Consistent with the findings of Mustapha and Rahman (2011), students were highly responsive when teachers discussed topics that they found interesting. For instance, students responded well to topics such as organising events or product branding as they had prior knowledge about them.

A supportive and motivating teacher who provides his students with a healthy atmosphere in class, and gives them time to think about his questions, allowing them to answer when they are ready and willing instead of being pushed, all have been identified as features of teachers contributing to enhancing participation levels in class. These qualities align with the characteristics of teacher elicitation. This highlights the effectiveness of elicitation practices in engaging students and encouraging participation in class activities, thereby promoting an effective learning process.

Student participation is an important concept in language teaching/learning. As education moves on from teacher-centred classes to learner-centred ones, the significance given to learner involvement grows. As such, it is crucial that the concept of participation be understood, so that classes can be properly managed. In order to further this endeavour, several studies were conducted by various researchers. These studies will be explored in the next subsection.

1.2.7. Reviewing Empirical Studies on Students' Participation

Many researchers in the field of education conducted empirical studies on student participation. The results of their works have significantly contributed in filling in gaps in the teaching and learning domains.

A Research by Mustapha et al. (2010b) aimed to explore students' perceptions of classroom participation and how these perceptions influence their actual involvement. They collected data through interviews and observations from a sample of 85 students in Malaysian classes. The findings revealed various perspectives on class participation. Some students perceived participation as communication between the teacher and students, while other saw it as being physically and mentally present in class. The results also indicated that students' perceptions of participation coincided with their actual engagement in class. For example, students who considered participation as both mental and physical engagement were typically enthusiastic and engaged during class activities. Conversely, those who viewed participation solely as physical presence tended to be less involved, often choosing to observe rather than actively participate.

Another research conducted by wei and cao (2021) aimed to explore students' participation in English for Academic Purposes classrooms from both teachers' and students' perceptions. They collected data from class observations, semi-structured interviews with 12

teachers, and stimulated-recall interviews with 33 students. The answers obtained from the teachers' interviews indicated three types of learners' participation. The first type mentioned by the participating teachers was willing participation, which takes place when students voluntarily engage in class activities. They may do so due to their strong language skills, extroversion, or even as a reaction to the teacher's elicited output practice. The second type is silent participation; students belonging to this group are those who sit back and learn silently. Their silence does not necessarily imply weak language skills or lack of motivation, as when teachers checked their comprehension, some students seemed to be aware of what was going on in class and believed they contributed to learning despite being silent. The last type indicated was forced participation, where the teacher adopts a pushed output strategy by calling on students to answer questions involuntarily and without much freedom. The participating teachers in this study chose the pushed output strategy to help quieter students engage in class. While learners might feel pressured when forced to participate, it can be beneficial for them as they may come up with impressive answers. This suggests that while the pushed output strategy may make learners feel anxious and pressured, it is not necessarily a hindrance and can be effective for students who remain silent in class, especially those with high abilities

In a recent study conducted by Serajuddin (2023), the focus was on the effects of technology integration on student motivation and involvement in English language learning. Data was collected through classroom observation and questionnaires. The observation entailed physically examining students' responses to the effectiveness of multimedia-integrated English language teaching, while the questionnaire was administered to a total of 300 teachers and their students from randomly selected educational institutions. The results highlighted varying perspectives on the influence of technology in creating a better interactive learning atmosphere, with a notable proportion of students perceiving technology

as having a positive effect on their motivation and participation. Regarding the benefits of technology, it has the potential to make language learning more engaging and interactive. It allows students to engage with content through multiple sensory channels catering to different learning styles and preferences, and to provide them with access to a wide range of authentic English language resources.

Another recent study was led by Ibrahim and Alahmed (2023), in which they empirically investigated how the flipped classroom method affects EFL students' engagement. The researcher implemented a quasi-experimental design with a pre- and post-test to gather the necessary data. The study sample consisted of 100 participants, female students from Al-Zubaida Secondary School's second year, who were randomly divided into two groups. The experimental group followed the flipped classroom strategy, while the control group was taught using the traditional method. The researchers also used a questionnaire to measure students' engagement in the classroom. The findings revealed a significant difference between the pre- and post-test scores on class engagement for the experimental group, with the post-testing showing a clear positive effect of the flipped classroom on students' participation levels. Students taught using the flipped approach were actively attentive and supportive of one another compared to those who received traditional instruction, likely due to their prior exposure to educational materials related to forthcoming lessons. This allowed them to prepare questions to ask the teacher and their peers during class. Given the proven effectiveness of the flipped approach in enhancing participation compared to standard instruction, teachers may consider adopting it to encourage students to actively participate in class and enhance their learning experience.

These are just a few examples of the numerous empirical studies conducted on student participation. Such works have significant contributions in the field of teaching and learning as they aid in understanding perceptions of class participation, identifying factors influencing

students' willingness to engage in class, and providing educators with evidence-based strategies to enhance student engagement. This enhances pedagogical practices and fosters a more effective learning experience for students.

Conclusion

To conclude, language output serves as a conduit for the expression of thoughts, emotions, and cultural identity, giving shape to interactions and social experiences. It mirrors personal growth and societal influences, emphasising its pivotal role in human communication. In a classroom environment, learners' participation emerges as a primary avenue for the production of language output, as learners involve themselves in the learning process in hopes of refining their language proficiency. This chapter has explored the intricacies of both language output and learners' class participation. Whereas, the next chapter attempts to bridge the gap between the two concepts through field work.

Chapter Two: Relating Elicited and Pushed Output to Learners' Oral Participation

Introduction

The previous chapter explored the literature pertaining to the intricacies of language output and class participation. Whereas, so far, they have been explored separately, the purpose of this chapter is to bridge the gap between the two variables, namely output types and oral participation. The current chapter comprises the practical segment of this study, which attemptsto answer the research questions and achieve the research aims. It opens with an account of the various aspects of the on going study, restating its aims, research questions, the participants, and the means with which data is gathered. Following that, the chapter moves to describing, analysing, then discussing both the student and the teacher questionnaires, prior to providing a juxtaposition of the main finding from the two questionnaires. In addition, implications and limitations are explored. Ultimately, the chapter provides a range of recommendations and insights for educational practices and future research endeavours.

2.1. Research Aims

This research endeavours to ascertain which of the two output strategies (elicited vs. pushed) is predominantly utilised by teachers. In addition, it aims to discern learners' preferences regarding elicited and pushed output. Furthermore, it seeks to investigate the nature of a relationship between the teachers' implementation of elicited output and pushed output strategies with the learners' willingness to participate in oral activities. Finally, the research aims to uncover the common challenges associated with each strategy (eliciting vs. pushing) in fostering learner participation.

2.2. The Research Questions

In line with the aims set for the present study, the following research questions are put forth:

1. Which output strategy (elicited vs. pushed) do teachers practise the most?

2. Which output type (elicited vs. pushed) do learners prefer?

3. Is there an association between the type of output (elicited vs. pushed) and EFL learners' willingness to participate?

4. What are the potential challenges associated with each output strategy in terms of promoting participation among EFL learners?

2.3. The Participants

The present study was conducted at Mila University Centre, Institute of Letters and Languages, Department of Foreign Languages during the academic year of 2023/2024. The participants consist of Master 1 EFL learners and teachers. Regarding the learners, a sample of 41 participants was chosen, representing a parent population of 115 Master 1 students. These learners were chosen mainly due to their experience in didactic notions and, as such, they would be more familiar with the concepts presented in the study. Learners who are preparing to become future teachers are bound to be more aware of output and the intricacies of oral participation, finding thus less difficulties in answering the questionnaire. Conversely, a less experienced EFL learner may face challenges in comprehending some of the concepts, due to the specific nature of the study. The second group of participants includes 17 teachers (out of approximately 24 full-time teachers) employed at Mila University Centre. These are expected to provide insightful information which serve the purposes of this research.

2.4. Data Collection Tools

To achieve the stated aims, this research utilises two questionnaires as instruments for data collection. These questionnaires are administered to both students and teachers to procure the essential data required for this study.

2.5. The Students' Questionnaire

2.5.1. Description of the Students' Questionnaire

The students' questionnaire serves the purpose of collecting vital data regarding the participants' perceptions of the relationship between the teachers' use of output elicitation vs. output pushing strategies and their oral class participation. Additionally, the questionnaire seeks to uncover students' preferences concerning output tasks and the predominant teaching strategy adopted by instructors. Before delving into the specific questions, the questionnaire provides clear definitions of elicited and pushed output, ensuring that respondents have a comprehensive understanding of these terms. The questionnaire is divided into three sections: General information, Output strategies (elicited vs. pushed), and Elicited vs. pushed output and learner participation. Most of the questions are scale-based, with a few open-ended questions for the purpose of explanation or additional commentary.

The first section is aimed at gathering general information on the learners. It includes two questions: the first one asks the learners to specify their level of English proficiency, while the second enquires on whether or not they are motivated to learn the language.

The second section of the questionnaire focuses on output strategies, specifically the frequency of elicited and pushed output in the classroom, as well as students' comfort levels and preferences regarding these strategies. It begins by asking about the use frequency of elicited and pushed output by teachers, followed by questions assessing students' comfort

levels with each strategy. Participants are then prompted to indicate their preferences for elicited and pushed output tasks, as well as their beliefs about the importance of both strategies for language learning.

The last section of the questionnaire explores the relationship between output type and learner participation, while gathering additional insights into students' experiences with output strategies in EFL learning environments. Participants are asked about their comfort levels and preferences regarding oral participation when given the choice to contribute as opposed to. Additionally, the section probes students' perceptions of the benefits of elicited and pushed output tasks with regards to class discussions, their feelings about making mistakes in pushed output activities, and whether they perceive a connection between the teacher's output strategy and their own readiness for participation. The section concludes with an invitation for participants to provide further comments and share any additional thoughts or experiences related to output strategies in EFL learning environments.

2.5.2. Administration of the Students' Questionnaire

To collect the requisite data, the questionnaire was administered in a face-to-face setting. Learners received printed copies on which they were required to record their responses. This process took place within a single day. Eventually, a representative sample was reached, comprised of 41 participants.

2.5.3. Analysis of the Students' Questionnaire

2.5.3.1. General Information

Q1: Please specify your level of English proficiency:

Table 2.1. ***Students' Level of English Proficiency***

Option	Number	Percentage
Good	**19**	**46%**
Low	**20**	**49%**
Poor	**2**	**5%**
Total	**41**	**100%**

This item aims to discover the English proficiency of the students participating in the study. Forty-six percent of the participants consider themselves to have a "Good" level of English proficiency. Another significant portion, almost half (49%) the participants, rated their English as low. Only a small number of students (5%) said their English proficiency is poor. Overall, the results indicated a spread of English proficiency levels among the students. While auto-evaluation is not a reliable method of getting an accurate estimation of proficiency levels, it can still provide decent background information which might be interpretative of upcoming items.

Q2: Are you motivated to study English?

Table 2.2. ***Students' motivation to study English***

Option	Number	Percentage
Yes	**38**	**93%**
No	**3**	**7%**
Total	**41**	**100%**

This question asks the learners to indicate whether or not they are motivated to study English. The data shows a good proportion of learners who are motivated to learn English. This constitutes an overwhelming majority of 93% of the 41 participating students. Only a very small minority (7%) said that they are not motivated. It goes without saying that motivation is one of the many factors behind students' action and participation

.2.5.3.2. Elicited vs. Pushed Output

Q3: How frequently do your teachers elicit output from students in the classroom?

Table 2.3. ***Frequency of Teachers' Use of Elicited Output***

Option	Number	Percentage
Never	**0**	**0%**
Rarely	**3**	**7%**
Sometimes	**27**	**66%**
Often	**9**	**22%**
Always	**2**	**5%**
Total	**41**	**100%**

This question aims to find out the frequency of teachers' use of elicitation as a technique to invite learners to produce output. This includes prompting them to speak using hints to provide scaffolding. An important proportion of students (66%) reported that their teachers use elicited output strategies "sometimes" . Twenty-two percent of the participants indicated that their teachers often employ these strategies. A smaller number (7%) said it happens rarely, and a very small number (5%) said that their teachers always elicit output. Finally, no reports indicated that output is never elicited. This suggests that elicited output is a

common teaching practice used by the teachers, but Some teachers use it more frequently than others.

Q4: How comfortable do you feel when output is elicited instead of you being pushed to produce it?

Table 2.4. ***Students' Comfort with Elicited Output***

Option	Number	Percentage
Very comfortable	**13**	**31%**
Comfortable	**22**	**54%**
Neutral	**6**	**15%**
Uncomfortable	**0**	**0%**
Very Uncomfortable	**0**	**0%**
Total	**41**	**100%**

This question asks the participants to specify their level of comfort in situations when teachers use elicited output strategies, rather than pushing them to speak. Over half of the students (54%) reported feeling comfortable with output elicitation, while 31% reported feeling very comfortable. A small portion of the students (15%) are neutral and no student stated feeling uncomfortable or very uncomfortable. This suggests that elicited output is a method generally accepted by the students, as evidenced by the lack of discomfort among the participants

Q5: How frequently do your teachers push output in the classroom?

Table 2.5. ***Frequency of Teachers' Use of Pushed Output***

Option	Number	Percentage
Never	**2**	**5%**
Rarely	**12**	**29%**
Sometimes	**17**	**41%**
Often	**8**	**20%**
Always	**2**	**5%**
Total	**41**	**100%**

This question aims to determine how often teachers use pushed output as a strategy in the classroom, forcing students to speak without guidance. The most common response (41%) seems to be that teachers use pushed output "sometimes". A fair number of students (29%) said it happens "rarely", and a smaller number (20%) reported it to be used "often". Five percent claimed that teachers always push students for output production; conversely, the remaining 5% said teachers never use pushed output strategies. Overall, pushed output seems to be used less frequently than elicited output (see Table 2.3).

Q6: How comfortable do you feel when output is pushed instead of it being elicited ?

Table 2.6. ***Students' Comfort with Pushed Output***

Option	Number	Percentage
Very comfortable	**3**	**7%**
comfortable	**5**	**12%**
Neutral	**8**	**20%**
Uncomfortable	**19**	**46%**

Very Uncomfortable	**6**	**15%**
Total	**41**	**100%**

This question asks learners to indicate how comfortable they feel when teachers push output production, rather than prompting them to speak. A significant number of learners reported discomfort with pushed output, with nearly half (46%) of them indicating that they feel uncomfortable, while 15% stated being very uncomfortable. A smaller portion of students (20%) are neutral on the matter. Twelve percent stated they feel comfortable with being pushed to produce output, while the smallest number of students (7%) reported finding the strategy to be very comfortable. The data shows that most learners are less comfortable when placed in situations where producing output is involuntary, whereas only a small amount is acceptant of the strategy. Clearly, students generally feel more comfortable with elicited output than they do with pushed output.

Q7: I prefer when teachers prompt me to produce (elicited) output, such as by providing hints or questions that lead to the answer.

Table 2.7.*Learners' Preference for Elicited Output*

option	Number	Percentage
Strongly disagree	**2**	**5%**
disagree	**4**	**10%**
Neutral	**7**	**17%**
agree	**15**	**36%**
Strongly agree	**13**	**32%**
Total	**41**	**100%**

This item seeks to determine student preference for elicited output. Thirty-six percent agreed, and 32% strongly agreed that they prefer elicited output. Together, they make 68% of preference in favour of elicited output. A fair number of students (17%) chose to remain neutral. The remainder breaks down to (10%) disagreeing and (5%) strongly disagreeing with the statement. This suggests that most students prefer teachers to use prompts and questions when inviting them to speak instead of forcing them to do so without guidance. These results further confirm the findings in table 2.6, wherein most affirmed their discomfort with pushed output.

Q8: I prefer being pushed to produce output.

Table 2.8. ***Learners' Preference for Pushed Output***

option	Number	Percentage
Strongly disagree	**13**	**32%**
disagree	**21**	**51%**
Neutral	**3**	**7%**
agree	**4**	**10%**
Strongly agree	**0**	**0%**
Total	**41**	**100%**

This item aims to find out learners' preference for pushed output strategies. It is meant as a double check to the preceding item. The results show that students generally do not prefer being pushed to produce output, as 51% of the participants disagreed, added to 32%who strongly disagreed, with preferring pushed output. Only a small portion of the students (10%) agreed with preferring being pushed to produce language. The remaining students (7%) are neutral. This suggests that most students find being forced to speak without

guidance less favourable than being invited via prompts by the teacher. This is likely to be due to their personality or the issue of choice, where most individuals prefer volunteering instead of being forced to perform. At any rate, this cross-check seems to reiterate the preceding finding in question 7.

Q9: I believe that both elicited and pushed output tasks are equally important for language learning.

Table 2.9. ***Learners' Beliefs towards the Equal Importance of Output Types***

Option	Number	Percentage
Strongly disagree	**4**	**10%**
disagree	**9**	**22%**
Neutral	**10**	**24%**
Agree	**14**	**34%**
Strongly agree	**4**	**10%**
Total	**41**	**100%**

This item explores students' beliefs about the equal importance of both elicited and pushed output tasks in language learning. The data shows mixed opinions, as there was not a clear consensus among the students. A significant portion (34%) agreed, that they are equally important, and 10% strongly agreed. These add up to 44% who believed in their equal importance for language learning. Thirty-two percent indicated they disagree (actually, 22% disagreed and 10% strongly disagreed). A fair number of students (24%) remained neutral on the issue. This suggests that the value of both elicited and pushed output methods for language learning might be a topic of debate among these students. Some see the benefit of both types, while others might have a stronger preference for one over the other.

2.5.3.3. Elicited vs. Pushed Output and Learner Participation

Q10: I feel more comfortable speaking English when I am given choice to participate and not pushed to.

Table 2.10. ***Learners' Comfort in Speaking when Output is Elicited***

Option	Number	Percentage
Strongly disagree	**8**	**20%**
disagree	**0**	**0%**
Neutral	**3**	**7%**
Agree	**10**	**24%**
Strongly agree	**20**	**49%**
Total	**41**	**100%**

This item looks at the link between student comfort in speaking English and the teachers' use of elicited output strategies. The results show that learners are more comfortable participating in oral discussions when teachers use elicited output methods. Forty-nine percent of learners strongly agreed, and 24% agreed to speaking more comfortably when given a choice to participate through elicited output. Only a small portion (20%) strongly disagreed. A minor number of students (7%) were neutral on this topic. This suggests that giving students a choice to participate through elicitation techniques can increase their comfort level and potentially encourage participation. It is possible that learners with a low level of English (Table 2.1) may feel at ease when elicitation techniques are used, as they allow them to speak at their own pace rather than that of the teachers'.

Q11: I prefer elicited output tasks because they provide supportive classroom atmosphere which enables me to express my thoughts and ideas more freely.

Table 2.11. Learners' Preference for Elicited Output for Providing a Supportive Environment

Option	Number	Percentage
Strongly disagree	**3**	**7%**
disagree	**2**	**5%**
Neutral	**4**	**10%**
Agree	**15**	**37%**
Strongly agree	**17**	**41%**
Total	**41**	**100%**

This item seeks to check if elicited output tasks provide a supportive environment that encourages learners to participate. A considerable number of learners (41%) strongly agreed, and 37% just agreed that elicited output tasks create a more favourable environment where they can express themselves freely. Ten percent of the participants remained neutral on the issue. The data showsa strong disagreement of 7%, while the smallest minority (5%) just disagreed. This suggests that elicited output methods, where teachers prompt students to speak rather than forcing them to, are generally preferred by students because they create a more comfortable and supportive learning environment, which makes them feel more willing to speak and express themselves.

Q12: Elicited output tasks allow me to contribute to class discussions at my own pace rather than that of my teachers.

Table 2.12. ***Elicited Output and Learners' Pace of Learning***

option	Number	Percentage
Strongly disagree	**2**	**5%**
disagree	**2**	**5%**
Neutral	**9**	**22%**
agree	**16**	**39%**
Strongly agree	**12**	**29%**
Total	**41**	**100%**

This item explores whether or not elicited output tasks trigger students' participation by allowing them to control the pace at which they engage with class activities. The majority of students (68% i.e. 29% strongly agreeing and 39% simply agreeing) indicated that elicited output tasks allow them to contribute to class discussions at their own pace, instead of being forced to keep up with the teacher's pace. A fair number of students (22%) chose to remain impartial. A small number (10%i.e. 5% disagreeing and 5% strongly disagreeing) felt that output elicitation is of no help when it comes to controlling their own pace. This suggests that elicited output methods, where students are prompted to speak rather than forced to keep up with the teacher's pace, are generally preferred by students. This strategy allows them to participate in discussions at their comfortable speed.

Q13: Pushed output activities help me to develop my fluency in English.

Table 2.13. ***Pushed Output and English Fluency***

option	Number	Percentage
Strongly disagree	**6**	**15%**
disagree	**14**	**34%**
Neutral	**7**	**17%**
agree	**8**	**19%**
Strongly agree	**6**	**15%**
Total	**41**	**100%**

This item explores students' opinion on whether participating in pushed output activities helps develop fluency in English. Some students saw value in pushed output for fluency, with 19% agreeing and 15% strongly agreeing that pushed output tasks enhance fluency. A good proportion of students (34%) disagreed with the above statement, and 15% strongly disagreed. A fair number of students (17%) were neutral on the issue. The results show that the effectiveness of pushed output methods in developing fluency might be a debatable issue among these participants. Some students find it helpful, while others do not.

Q14: I prefer pushed output tasks because they require me to get out of my comfort zone and take risks to interact more with my classmates.

Table 2.14. ***Learners' Preference of Pushed Output for its Interactional Potential***

option	Number	Percentage
Strongly disagree	**5**	**12%**
disagree	**7**	**17%**

Neutral	**6**	**15%**
Agree	**17**	**41%**
Strongly agree	**6**	**15%**
Total	**41**	**100%**

This statement aims to find out whether pushed output tasks lead learners to interact with others by taking risks. A significant portion of learners (41%) agreed and 15% strongly agreed that forced output tasks push them to interact more. However, some responded in the negative with 17% disagreeing and 12% strongly disagreeing. The remaining 15% chose to be impartial. This suggests that pushed output tasks, while not the most preferred by all students, potentially foster interaction and participation. Some students, particularly those with a high level of English proficiency (Table 2.1) find value in the challenge, while others might find it uncomfortable or unproductive.

Q15: Making mistakes in pushed output tasks demotivates me from interacting with my classmates.

Table 2.15. ***Learners' Demotivation for Making Mistakes in Pushed Output Tasks***

Option	Number	Percentage
Strongly disagree	**1**	**2%**
Disagree	**9**	**22%**
Neutral	**6**	**15%**
Agree	**19**	**46%**
Strongly agree	**6**	**15%**
Total	**41**	**100%**

This item explores whether making mistakes in pushed output tasks hampers student motivation to interact with others. The majority of students (61%, i.e. 15% strongly agreeing and 46% agreeing) reported feeling demotivated from interacting with classmates due to making mistakes during pushed output tasks. A smaller portion (24%, i.e. 2% strongly disagreeing and 22% disagreeing)stated the reverse situation. Finally, a small number of students (15%) were neutral on this topic. This data implies that pushed output methods, while potentially useful for some reasons (Table 2.14) might be counterproductive for many students. The fear of making mistakes during these tasks seems to demotivate a significant portion of students from participating and interacting with classmates.

Q16: There is a relationship between the teacher's output strategy and my readiness to participate in class activities.

Table2.16. ***The Relation between Output Strategy and Learners' willingness to Participate***

option	Number	Percentage
Strongly disagree	**2**	**5%**
disagree	**1**	**2%**
Neutral	**8**	**20%**
agree	**23**	**56%**
Strongly agree	**7**	**17%**
Total	**41**	**100%**

This item explores the relationship teachers' method of getting students to speak and learner willingness to participate in class activities. The data shows that most learners hold a positive opinion, with 56% agreeing and 17% strongly agreeing to the existence of a relationship between the teacher's output strategy used and their willingness to participate.

The results also show that a very small number of students (2%) disagreed and 5% strongly disagreed with the given statement. The remaining 20% were neutral on the topic. This implies that most students believe the teacher's method of getting them to produce speech (either via pushed or elicited output) can influence their willingness to participate in class activities. Conversely, there is a minority who disagreed with this notion. This smaller portion may include those with poor levels of English (Table 2.1) or those who lack the motivation to study (Table 2.2) as teaching strategies rarely make a difference when met with a lack of comprehension or an unwillingness to participate.

A follow up question was asked, requesting that learners further explain their thoughts. Students overwhelmingly felt that elicited output creates a more comfortable and motivating environment that allows them to participate at their own pace. They argued that pushed output can be demotivating and lead to anxiety in speaking, especially for shy students. However, a small number of students saw pushed output as potentially useful in overcoming shyness or getting them involved, and one student mentioned a positive experience with pushed output resulting from being forced to orally recapitulate the content of previous lessons. This highlights the potential long-term benefits despite initial discomfort. There were also some neutral responses, with a couple of students suggesting that teacher skill or student's needs might be more important factors than the specific output strategy used. Over all, whereas some felt that output strategy has no relation to learners' participation, most learners agreed that output strategy, either elicited or pushed, can affect the learners' willingness to participate in future activities.

2.5.4. Discussion of the Main Findings of the Students' Questionnaire

After analysing the data gathered from the students' questionnaire, the findings revealed that teachers primarily relied on prompting students to speak (eliciting output),

rather than forcing them (pushing output). This strategy was overwhelmingly preferred by learners, as most of them favoured having the ability to produce language of their own volition. This preference is linked to a clear connection between being prompted and feeling comfortable and supported in class, ultimately leading to more participation in class discussions. However, forcing learners to speak is not without its own merit. While a number of learners dismissed the role of pushed output in developing their fluency, learners with high language proficiency have recognised its value in improving their learning by challenging them to do better. Despite that, one of the difficulties associated with pushed output tasks is that fear of making mistakes can be demotivating for many. Other students offer a different perspective by indicating the absence of a link between the output strategy used and the willingness to participate. This may be attributed to poor language proficiency or demotivation. Overall, the findings suggest a strong link between the type of strategy used (prompting vs. forcing) and students' willingness to participate in discussions. While output elicitation can foster a more positive and engaging learning environment, pushing output can challenge learners and encourage them to take risks and participate more in future interactions.

2.6. The Teachers' Questionnaire

2.6.1. Description of the Teachers' Questionnaire

This questionnaire was designed to investigate the relationship between teachers' use of different output strategies and student participation in EFL classrooms. The questionnaire starts with a preamble invitingthe teachers for their participation and assuring them of confidentiality. It then defines elicited and pushed output to give the participants an idea of the two concepts. The questionnaire is divided into three sections. Section one gathers general information about the teachers' experience and qualifications. Section two asks about

the frequency of teachers' use of elicited and pushed output strategies in their classrooms. Section three delves deeper into the relationship between these strategies and student participation. The questionnaire includes scale-based questions, yes/no questions, multiple choice questions as well as some open-ended ones.

The first section of the questionnaire aims to gather general information about the teachers participating in the study. It consists of two questions: The first question asks teachers to indicate their experience level, while the second requires them to fill in the blank with information about their professional degree.

The second section is titled "Output Strategies (Elicited vs. Pushed)". It contains two Likert scale-based questions that seek to determine the frequency of teachers'use of elicited and pushed output in their teaching.

The third section dives deeper into the connection between teachers' output strategies and student participation in the EFL classroom. It asks teachers if they have observed a connection between the type of output strategy used and students' willingness to participate in discussions. It also asks them to identify the most common challenges students face with elicited and pushed output tasks, and what strategies the teachers use to help students overcome these challenges. Finally, the questionnaire offers an open-ended question for teachers to share any additional insights or experiences they have regarding the use of output strategies in the EFL classroom.

2.6.2. Administration of the Teachers' Questionnaire

Similar to that of the students, this questionnaire was administered directly in-person. Data was gathered from teachers through the use of hard copies over the span of three days.Eventually, a satisfactory amount of data was collected from a representative sample.

2.6.3. Analysis of the Teachers' Questionnaire

2.6.3.1. General Information

Q 1: What is your teaching experience?

Table 2.17. ***Teachers' Experience***

Option	Number	Percentage
Less than 1 year	**0**	**0 %**
1-3 years	**6**	**36 %**
4-6 years	**4**	**23 %**
7-10 years	**4**	**23 %**
More than 10 years	**3**	**18 %**
Total	**17**	**100 %**

This question aims to find out the teaching experience of the participants. Thirty-six percent of them reported having between one and three years of experience. Twenty-three percent said that they have four to six years of experience, while another 23% indicated that it is between seven and ten years. There are a few teachers with more than ten years of experience (18%) and none with less than 1 year. Overall, this suggests a group of teachers with varying length of experience in the field, ranging from one to more than ten years.

Q2: What is your professional degree ?

Table 2.18. ***Teachers' Professional Degree***

Option	Number	Percentage
Doctorate Degree (PhD)	**9**	**53 %**

Master's Degree	**8**	**47 %**
Total	**17**	**100 %**

This question requires teachers to state their professional degree. Over half of the participating teachers (53%) reported holding a PhD, while the remaining teachers (47%) stated holding a Master's degree. This further reinforces the results of the previous item of information(Table 2.17) in that the participants range from veterans to those with comparatively less experience.

2.6.3.2. Output Strategies (Elicited vs. Pushed)

Q3: How frequently do you employ elicited output strategies in your classroom ?

Table 2.19. ***Frequency of Teachers' Use of Elicited Output Strategies***

Option	Number	Percentage
Never	**0**	**0 %**
Rarely	**1**	**7 %**
Sometimes	**7**	**41 %**
Often	**4**	**23 %**
Always	**5**	**29 %**
Total	**17**	**100 %**

This question asks teachers to indicate how often they use elicited output strategies in their classrooms. Most teachers (41%) reported that they sometimes elicit their learners to produce output. Twenty-nine percent indicated that they always rely on output elicitation, while 23% said that they do so often. Only a small portion of teachers (7%) rarely use elicited

output strategies. No teachers reported never using elicitation strategies in their classroom. Clearly, this shows that elicited output strategies are commonly used by most of the teachers participating in the study.

Q4: How often do you utilise pushed output strategies in your teaching?

Table 2.20. ***Frequency of Teachers' Utilisation of Pushed Output Strategies***

Option	Number	Percentage
Never	**0**	**0 %**
Rarely	**3**	**18 %**
Sometimes	**9**	**53 %**
Often	**3**	**18 %**
Always	**2**	**11 %**
Total	**17**	**100 %**

This question looks at how often teachers use pushed output strategies in their classrooms. While some teachers utilise them somewhat regularly (18% often and 11% always), over half of the teachers (53%) use them sometimes. A small proportion of teachers (18%) reported rarely using pushed output strategies. None reported never using them. These results show that pushed output is used by some teachers, but not as frequently as elicited output (Table 2.19). Compared to elicited output (Table 2.19), pushed output seems to be used less frequently by most teachers. This data also matches the findings from the students' questionnaire (Tables 2.3 and 2.5), where learners claimed that teachers tend to elicit output more than they force it.

2.6.3.3. Elicited vs. Pushed Output and Learner Oral Participation

Q 5: Have you observed any relation between the type of output strategy employed and students' willingness to participate actively in class discussions?

Table 2.21. ***The Relation between Output Type and Students' Readiness to Participate***

Option	Number	Percentage
Yes	**15**	**88 %**
No	**2**	**12 %**
Total	**17**	**100 %**

This question explores the teachers' observation on the relationship between the type of output strategy used (elicited or pushed) and student participation in class discussions. The overwhelming majority of teachers (88%, or 15 teachers out of 17) observed a connection between the type of output strategy used and student willingness to participate actively, while the remaining proportion (12%) indicated the opposite. This implies that most teachers believe the way they induce students to speak (either via pushed or elicited output) can influence how comfortable and motivated students feel to participate in class discussions.

A follow-up question was posed, asking those who answered “yes” to elaborate on their choice. The teachers' responses fall into two main categories regarding the relationship between output strategies and student participation. The majority of teachers agreed that elicited output, where students are prompted rather than forced to speak, leads to increased participation, motivation, and a more comfortable learning environment for students. Teachers indicated that elicited output helps students feel freer to express themselves and make mistakes without fear or pressure. This can lead to a more positive and engaging learning experience.

However, one teacher suggested that pushed output could result in participation becoming a habit, while also helping students overcome fear in the long run. Other teachers observed that pushed output, where students are forced to speak without guidance, can be useful for overcoming shyness or getting some quiet students involved. Despite its benefits, most teachers noted that pushed output can decrease participation, especially for less motivated students. It can lead to hesitation, anxiety, and a feeling of being forced to perform. Over all, most of these responses further emphasise the connection between output strategies and learners' willingness to participate in class discussions.

Q 6: According to you, what are the most common obstacles that prevent learners from participating willingly in response to prompts or questions when output activities are elicited?

Table 2.22. ***Obstacles Preventing Learners from Participating in Elicited Output Tasks***

Option	Number	Percentage
Limited Vocabulary	**14**	**82 %**
Lack of confidence in speaking	**14**	**82 %**
Difficulty in organising thoughts coherently	**8**	**47 %**
Fear of making mistakes	**13**	**76 %**

This question explores the teachers' perspectives on the obstacles that prevent students from willingly participating in response to prompts or questions during elicited output activities. The most common challenges contributed were the lack of confidence in speaking (82%), where learners hesitate due to underestimating their abilities. Limited vocabulary

(82%) was another major obstacle. Students might feel they do not have enough words to express themselves fully. The third most common challenge was fear of making mistakes (76%), as some learners worry about being wrong or looking bad in front of classmates. Difficulties in organising thoughts coherently (47%) was seemingly the least common obstacle according to the participants. This suggests that while some students might struggle to formulate their ideas before speaking, it is not the most glaring issue that leads to hesitation. Overall, these responses suggest that teachers believe student participation in elicited output activities can be hindered by a combination of affective factors, cognitive factors, as well as limited language skills.

The teachers' additional suggestions offer a more nuanced perspective on the obstacles to student participation in elicited output activities. Teachers acknowledged the factors mentioned on the list, but also highlighted the influence of personality and motivation. Another factor some teachers suggested was student passivity. Some students might lack motivation or wait for the teacher to take full responsibility for their learning. This can be independent of factors like language skills or confidence. Finally, some teachers stated that in some cases, students might simply not be interested in the topic, making participation difficult regardless of the output strategy used.

Q7: In your opinion, what are the most common challenges learners encounter when engaged in pushed output tasks that require them to produce language involuntarily?

Table 2.23. ***Obstacles Preventing Learners from Participating in Pushed Output Tasks***

Option	Number	Percentage
Anxiety about speaking in front of others	**15**	**88 %**
Pressure to perform under	**9**	**53 %**

time constraints		
Difficulty comprehending instructions	**9**	**53 %**
Lack of confidence in speaking	**9**	**53 %**
Fear of making mistakes	**12**	**70 %**
Introversion	**7**	**41 %**

This question aims to explore the teachers' observations on the challenges students face during pushed output tasks. The overwhelming majority of teachers (88%) observed that anxiety about speaking in front of others is the greatest challenge for students in pushed output tasks, followed by fear of making mistakes (70%). Over half of the participants (53%) identified the difficulty in comprehending instructions, lack of confidence in speaking, and feeling pressured to perform under time constraints as three equally common obstacles. Finally, introversion seems to be a relatively less prevalent issue, in that 41% teachers indicated it as a factor. Introverted students might find pushed output tasks particularly draining due to their preference for quieter environments. Overall, these responses suggest that pushed output tasks can be challenging for students due to a combination of social anxiety, performance pressure, and potential issues with understanding instructions.

Q8: How do you support learners in overcoming challenges associated with participating in elicited output tasks, such as fear of speaking or uncertainty about how to express themselves?

Table 2.24. ***Supportive Teaching Strategies to Overcome Elicited Output Challenges***

Option	Number	Percentage
Providing scaffolding or support materials	**11**	**64 %**
Using elicitation techniques, such as having learners finish your utterances to make them comfortable	**9**	**53 %**
Encouraging peer collaboration	**16**	**94 %**
Offering constructive feedback	**9**	**53 %**
Creating a supportive and non-judgmental classroom environment	**17**	**100 %**

This question aims to discover the strategies teachers use to support learners in overcoming challenges when participating in elicited output tasks. All of the participants (100%) emphasised the importance of creating a supportive and non-judgmental classroom environment. This is likely to involve setting expectations, fostering respect, and ensuring students feel safe to participate without fear of ridicule. An overwhelming majority of teachers (94%) reported encouraging on peer collaboration to boost participation in elicited output tasks. This might involve group discussion, pair work, or other activities that allow students to share ideas with classmates before speaking to the whole class. In addition, many

teachers (64%) indicated that they provide scaffolding or support materials to foster participation and help learners structure their ideas. Over half the teachers (53%) stated using elicitation techniques, such as having students finish sentences the teacher starts. This can help students feel more comfortable participating and provide a springboard for them to elaborate on their ideas. Finally, offering constructive feedback (53%) is another strategy used by many teachers. This feedback should focus on improvement and provide specific suggestions for how students can develop their speaking skills.

The teachers' comments provide additional insights into how they create a supportive environment for elicited output tasks. One teacher emphasises a learner-centred approach, giving students more speaking time than the teacher himself. This is an optimal general approach that can empower students and shift the focus to their participation. Another participant highlighted the importance of verbal encouragement, as reassurance acknowledging that mistakes are part of the learning process, a practice that can help reduce anxiety. Another suggested course of action was putting students at ease and creating a stress-free environment. This aligns with the idea of a supportive classroom and can help students feel more comfortable participating in elicited output tasks.

Q9: What strategies do you employ to help learners navigate the difficulties often associated with pushed output tasks, such as performance anxiety or feeling overwhelmed by the task?

Table 2.25. ***Supportive Teaching Strategies to Overcome Pushed Output Challenges***

Option	Number	Percentage
Gradually increasing the degree to which learners are pushed to participate	**5**	**29 %**

Providing opportunities for rehearsal and practice	**13**	**76 %**
Offering positive reinforcement and praise	**14**	**82 %**
Not correcting openly	**4**	**23 %**
Building a positive classroom atmosphere where errors are tolerated	**13**	**76 %**

This question aims to explore the strategies teachers use to help learners navigate the challenges associated with pushed output tasks. Offering positive reinforcement and praise was the most common strategy used by teachers (82%). This can help build student confidence and make pushed output tasks less daunting. Seventy-six percent of participants opted for building a positive classroom atmosphere where errors are tolerated, as ridiculing learners for their mistakes can crush their morale. Conversely, creating a safe space for mistakes can reduce anxiety associated with pushed output. In addition, 76% teachers opted for providing opportunities for rehearsal and practice, which allows students to prepare their thoughts and feel more comfortable speaking in front of the class. A fair number of teachers (29%) reported increasing gradually the degree to which learners are pushed to participate, starting with smaller challenges and building up to more demanding tasks to help learners get used to participating when pushed. Finally, 23% opted for not correcting openly. While some might see this as avoiding negative feedback, it is important to consider a balanced method to provide constructive feedback without discouraging participation. In general, these responses suggest that teachers who use pushed output tasks prioritise creating a positive and supportive

environment. They aim to reduce anxiety through praise, error tolerance, and opportunities for practice.

Q 10. Please share any additional insights or experiences you have regarding the use of elicited and pushed output strategies in the EFL classroom.

The teachers' final observations offer several views on using elicited and pushed output strategies effectively. Several teachers emphasised that elicited and pushed output are complementary and should be used in combination. This allows for a balanced approach that caters to different learning styles and goals. Elicited output can develop critical thinking and communication, while pushed output can improve accuracy and confidence (as suggested by one of the participating teachers). In addition, some teachers highlighted the importance of considering individual student needs. Some students thrive with elicited output, while others might benefit from a gentle push to participate. When it comes to solving difficulties with both strategies, multiple teachers stressed the importance of creating a supportive learning environment. This involves encouraging participation through competition and collaboration, fostering a positive atmosphere where mistakes are tolerated, and motivating students to overcome anxiety. Finally, one teacher underscores the value of pushed output, describing its successful use to help a student overcome shyness. These comments suggest that the most effective way to use elicited and pushed output strategies is to employ them situationally and with a focus on individual needs. It is about creating a supportive environment that uses a variety of techniques to encourage participation, improve communication skills, and foster a desire for learning in all students.

2.6.4. Discussion of the Main Findings of the Teachers' Questionnaire

Upon analysing the data gathered from the teachers' questionnaire, several key findings are revealed. When it comes to the output strategy most employed by teachers, the

study found that teachers primarily rely on elicited output strategies, where students are prompted rather than forced to speak. This strategy is seen as more effective in fostering participation and a positive learning environment. The results also show that there is a connection between the type of output strategy used and student oral participation. While elicited output encourages engagement, forcing learners to speak can be beneficial in giving shy learners enough push to take action and interact with peers.

However, the data also showed that pushed output can often be anxiety-provoking and lead to decreased participation, especially for less motivated students. According to the participants, each of the two strategies (elicited and pushed output) carry their own challenges. Participation in elicited output discussions can be hindered by students' limited vocabulary, fear of making mistakes, or difficulty organising thoughts. Teachers address these challenges by creating a supportive environment, using scaffolding techniques, and providing opportunities for peer collaboration. Similarly, pushed output tasks can be difficult for students struggling with performance anxiety, time constraints, or difficulty understanding instructions. Those who use pushed output strategies aim to mitigate these challenges by creating a positive environment tolerant of errors, offering opportunities for practice, and providing positive reinforcement.

Overall, the findings suggest that the most effective way to use output strategies seems to be a combination of elicited and pushed output, depending on the situation and individual student needs. It is advised that teachers carefully consider the use of elicited vs. pushed output strategies and weigh the potential benefits against the challenges they can create for students in various situations.

2.7. General Discussion

This study explored the use of elicited and pushed output strategies in EFL classrooms, and how these strategies relate to learners' oral participation in the classroom. The study investigated both teacher practices and student preferences. The analysis of the data gathered from the students' questionnaire revealed a clear preference for elicited output, where students are prompted rather than forced to speak. This aligns with the finding that teachers primarily rely on this strategy, emphasised by the results of the teachers' questionnaire. Students prefer to participate at their own pace, and this fosters a more positive and supportive learning environment. The study confirms a strong relation between elicited output and student participation in discussions. When students feel comfortable and supported, they are more likely to actively speak and engage with the material.

However, pushed output should not be entirely disregarded. While some students dismiss its role in developing fluency, others acknowledge its value as a challenge that pushes them to improve. A key concern with pushed output is its potential for student demotivation due to fear of making mistakes. The results of the teachers' questionnaire mirrored these findings. Teachers acknowledged the dominance of elicited output and its effectiveness in promoting participation and a positive learning environment. They also recognised the potential benefits of pushed output, particularly for overcoming shyness. However, they were aware that pushed output can be anxiety-provoking and a cause of decreased participation, especially for the unmotivated.

Both elicited and pushed output present challenges. For elicited output, these include limited vocabulary, fear of mistakes, and difficulty in organising thoughts. Teachers address these challenges by creating supportive environments, using scaffolding techniques, and providing opportunities for peer collaboration. Pushed output tasks can be difficult for

students struggling with performance anxiety, time constraints, or difficulty understanding instructions. Teachers who use pushed output strategies aim to mitigate these challenges by creating a positive and error-tolerant environment, offering opportunities for practise, and providing positive reinforcement. Overall, the study suggests that the most effective strategy is a combination of elicited and pushed output, depending on the situation and individual student needs. Teachers should carefully consider the potential benefits and drawbacks of each strategy to create a learning environment that encourages participation, mitigates anxiety, and fosters language development for all students.

Before moving on, the research questions set for this study need to be addressed. As for the question pertaining to which output strategy is more prevalent, teachers tend to practise elicited output most. The analysis of both teachers and students' questionnaires revealed a preference for elicited output, where students are prompted to speak rather than being forced. The second question sought to discover which output strategy is preferred by learners. It was found that learners prefer elicited output. Students appreciate the ability to participate on their own terms and the supportive environment it fosters, leading to increased participation.

Concerning the other questions, the third of which represents the primary aim of this study, as it sought to identify a relationship between the output strategy used and the degree to which learners participate in class discussions. According to both teachers and learners, there is a clear association between output type and learner participation. Elicited output is linked to a more positive learning environment and increased willingness to participate in discussions. On the other hand, pushed output can be beneficial for some learners but can also lead to anxiety and decreased participation, especially for unmotivated learners. The fourth and final question sought to identify the most prevalent challenges associated with each of the two output strategies. The findings show that both elicited and pushed output

strategies come with their own hurdles for EFL learners. Elicited output can be hindered by students' difficulties like vocabulary gaps or organising thoughts, leading to hesitation and reduced participation. Fear of making mistakes can also be a significant barrier. As for pushed output, it presents a different set of challenges. Students might grapple with anxiety about speaking in front of others or feel pressured to perform under time constraints. Introverts may find these tasks particularly draining. Additionally, unclear instructions can further impede participation in pushed output activities.

2.8. Implications, Limitations and Recommendations

2.8.1. Implications of the Study

The findings of this study hold significant implications for EFL classrooms. First, the study underscores the prioritisation of elicited output strategies. The reason for this is that elicitation acknowledges student anxiety and difficulties while still promoting speaking practice in a supportive environment. However, this does not imply that pushed output is to be completely abandoned, as it can be a valuable tool. Pushed output is most effective when used strategically, through considering individual student needs and creating a safe space that tolerates mistakes and offers opportunities for practice. Ultimately, the most effective approach seems to be a flexible one. Teachers should tailor the strategy (elicited or pushed) to the specific situation and students' individual needs. Some students might benefit from a more prompted strategy initially, while others might be ready for the challenge of pushed output. By using a combination of both elicited and pushed output strategies while addressing student challenges, teachers can create a balanced EFL classroom environment that caters to all learner needs.

2.8.2. Limitations of the Study

Every research is bound to encounter complications. The present study is no different in this regard. It would have been preferable to conduct an experimental study, with pre/post-tests for a control group and an experiment group. However, this proved to be an unrealistic endeavour due to various difficulties in gathering volunteering participants. Another limiting factor was the lack of time, resulting ina rushed process of data collection.Such a case was especially prevalent while administering the teachers' questionnaire. Originally, the questionnaire contained 16 questions, with a few of them being open ended. However, due to a lack of time, questions had to be removed or simplified so as not to be too imposing. The time shortage also forced a change of plans when it came to data analysis, as initially, statistical tests were to be used in order to give more weight to the study.

2.8.3. Recommendations for Pedagogy and Research

Based on the findings and the limitations, several suggestions that address pedagogy and future research can be formulated. This section will provide recommendations for students, teachers, as well as future studies.

2.8.3.1. Recommendations for Students. It is natural that when discussing different teaching strategies, one might only focus on the involvement of the teacher. Indeed, more often than not, a learner has no say in how teachers go about teaching or managing classes. However, this is not strictly true. There are several ways in which learners can involve themselves in teacher decision making. One of the points in this findings study's discussed the relevance of individual differences to the choice between elicited and pushed output. It was made clear that while some prefer output to be elicited, others would rather like to be pushed to produce language. As there is no way for a teacher to know a learner in and out, it

falls on the learners' shoulders to make their teachers aware of their preferences when it comes to which of the two strategies they would rather like to be used.

2.8.3.2. Recommendations for Teachers. This study offers valuable recommendations for EFL teachers. While prioritising elicited output, which fosters a positive and supportive environment for participation, teachers should not abandon pushed output entirely. The key is strategic use, considering individual student needs and creating a safe space tolerant of mistakes. The most effective approach is flexible, tailoring the strategy (elicited or pushed) used to the specific situation and student proficiency. Additionally, teachers should address student anxiety in both strategies, such as by being supportive and celebrating small wins. Furthermore, working on solutions for various challenges such as performance anxiety can bolster student confidence. In addition, it is necessary to learn to optimise output pushing and prompting strategies to encourage participation without driving learners away. Ultimately, the goal is to create a balanced classroom that fosters language development for all students through strategic use of both elicited and pushed output.

2.8.3.3. Recommendations for Further Research. This study paves the way for further research in EFL classrooms. Future studies could benefit from longitudinal designs, such as experimental studies tracking the long-term impact of elicited and pushed output on language development. Additionally, future research could examine the impact of elicited and pushed output on the development of specific language skills, such as speaking fluency, vocabulary acquisition, or grammatical accuracy. This would provide a more nuanced understanding of how each strategy contributes to different aspects of language learning. Finally, investigating the effectiveness of these strategies on different learner groups, such as those with varying learning styles, personalities, or proficiency levels, could provide valuable insights. By delving deeper into these areas, researchers can help educators develop more effective EFL classroom practices.

Conclusion

To conclude, this chapter attempts to shed light on teacher practises (pushed vs. elicited output) and student preferences in EFL classrooms. By analysing data from both student and teacher questionnaires, the study achieved its aims and answered the research questions. The findings revealed a clear connection between output strategy and participation, with elicited output fostering a more positive and supportive environment that encourages student engagement. This does not mean that the value of pushed output should be entirely disregarded, as it can challenge students and push them beyond their comfort zones. The study also identified practical implications for EFL classrooms, highlighting the importance of creating a safe and supportive environment that addresses student anxiety that is associated with both elicited and pushed output practices. Furthermore, recommendations for future research were outlined, including longitudinal studies, and the impact of output strategies on different learner groups. These areas of exploration hold promise for further understanding of how to optimise output strategies for effective language learning.

General Conclusion

This research delved into how various output strategies are related to student involvement in EFL classrooms. Drawing upon the Comprehensible Output Hypothesis which underscores the role of learners generating understandable output for language acquisition, the study aimed to discern the relationship between elicited and pushed output strategies and student engagement in oral activities.

The results affirmed a notable link between output strategy and oral participation. Elicited output, involving prompting students to speak, cultivates a positive atmosphere conducive to active involvement, aligning with student preferences for expressing themselves without feeling pressured. Nevertheless, pushed output, where students are urged to speak

without prompts, is not entirely dismissed. Although it may demotivate some students, it can serve as a means of challenging and pushing them out of their comfort zones.

The study also pinpointed challenges associated with each strategy. Elicited output may encounter obstacles such as vocabulary limitations or difficulty in organising thoughts, while pushed output can induce anxiety, particularly among introverted students, or performance pressure within time constraints.

These findings carry significant implications for EFL classrooms, suggesting that a balanced and adaptable approach tailored to specific situations and individual student needs is key. By understanding how output strategies influence oral participation, educators can better tailor their methods to cater to diverse learners in varied contexts, enhancing the language learning experience for all students. It is crucial to note that as this study is exploratory in nature, it was met with limitations; as such, further research is recommended so as to better understand the interaction between output strategies and student engagement. Future research avenues could delve into the long-term effects of different output strategies on language development through experimental studies. Continued exploration of output and participation complexities enables educators to create EFL classrooms that optimise language learning for all students.

List of References

Abdullah, M. Y., Bakar, N. R. A., & Mahbob, M. H. (2012). Student's participation in classroom: what motivates them to speak up? *Procedia: Social & Behavioral Sciences, 51*, 516–522. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.08.199

Abebe, D. T., Demis, G., & Deneke, T. (2015). Causes of students' limited participation in EFL classroom: Ethiopian public universities in focus. *Inter. J. Edu. Res. Technol, 6*(1), 74–89.

Ahamefula, N., Chinwe, U., & Okoye, C. L. (2014). *Language teaching methodology: historical development and contemporary issues.*

Ahmad, C. V. (2021). Causes of students' reluctance to participate in classroom discussions. *ASEAN Journal of Science and Engineering Education*, *1*(1), 47–62. https://doi.org/10.17509/ajsee.v1i1.32407

Akpur, U. (2021). Does class participation predict academic achievement? A mixed-method study. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, *4*(2), 148. https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v4i2.3551

Alemi, M., & Tavakoli, E. (2016). Audio lingual method. *ResearchGate*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/293731529_Audio_Lingual_Method

Alexander, R. (2008). Culture, dialogue and learning: notes on an emerging pedagogy. In *SAGE Publications Ltd eBooks* (pp. 91–114). https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446279526.n6

Aslan, R., & Şahin, M. (2020). 'I feel like I go blank': identifying the factors affecting classroom participation in an oral communication course. *Teflin Journal*, *31*(1), 19. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v31i1/19-43

Astutik, Y., Aulina, C. N., & Megawati, F. (2019). Total physical response (TPR): how is it used to teach EFL young learners? *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, *18*(1), 92–103. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.18.1.7

Aziz, F., & Kazi, A. S. (2018). Role of teachers in students classroom participation at university level. *International Journal of Educational Enquiry and Reflection*, *4*(1), 46–57.

Aziz, F., Quraishi, U., & Kazi, A. S. (2018). Factors behind classroom participation of secondary school students (agender basedanalysis). *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *6*(2), 211–217. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2018.060201

Bakori, H. (2021). Positive evidence and negative evidence in second language classroom. *مجلة العلوم الإنسانية*, *19*(2), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.51984/johs.v19i2.1223

Basiron, H., Knott, A., & Robins, A. (2008). *Corrective feedback in language learning*.

Bean, J. C., & Peterson, D. (1998). Grading classroom participation. *New directions for teaching and learning*, *1998*(74), 33–40. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.7403

Beniss, A. R. S., & Bazzaz, V. E. (2014). The impact of pushed output on accuracy and fluency of Iranian EFL learners' speaking. *DOAJ (DOAJ: Directory of Open Access Journals)*. https://doaj.org/article/6aba8fd95b744d69b924885992cb3ae3

Benyo, D. A., & Kumar, D. T. (2023). Exploring the factors ensuring student Participation in English classroom: an action research in saudi context. *Universidad De Granada*. https://doi.org/10.47750/jett.2023.14.02.008

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. LONGMAN.

Çelik, S. (2020). Communicative language teaching. In *approaches and principles in English as aforeign language (EFL) education*(3rd ed., pp. 183–200). VizetekYayincilik.

Dallimore, E. J., Hertenstein, J. H., & Platt, M. B. (2012). Impact of cold-calling on student voluntary participation. *Journal of Management Education*, *37*(3), 305–341. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562912446067

DeKeyser, R. (2001). Automaticity and automatization. In *Cambridge University Press eBooks* (pp. 125–151). https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139524780.007

Del Pilar García Mayo, M., & Soler, E. A. (2012). Negotiated input and output / interaction. In *Cambridge University Press eBooks* (pp. 209–229). https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139051729.014

Donesch-Jezo, E. (2011). The role of output and feedback in second language acquisition: a classroom-based study of grammar acquisition by adult English language learners. *Eesti Ja Soome-ugriKeeleteaduseAjakiri*, *2*(2), 9–28. https://doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2011.2.2.01

Ellis, R. (1999). Learning a second language through interaction. In *Studies in bilingualism*. https://doi.org/10.1075/sibil.17

Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2014). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*.

Er, G. (2014). The input hypothesis and second-language acquisition theory. *OndokuzMayis University Journal of Education Faculty*, *13*(1), 25–36.

Fassinger, P. A. (1995). Understanding classroom interaction: students' and professors' contributions to students' silence. *Journal of Higher Education/˜the œJournal of Higher Education*, *66*(1), 82. https://doi.org/10.2307/2943952.

Galián-López, G. (2018). *Automaticity in second language vocabulary learning*.

Gass, S. M., Behney, J., & Plonsky, L. (2013). Second language acquisition. In *Routledge eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203137093.

Gass, S. M., Behney, J., Plonsky, L., &Selinker, L. (2008). Second language acquisition. In *Routledge eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203932841

Ghalley, L. R., & Rai, B., M. (2019). Factors influencing classroom participation: a case study of Bhutanese higher secondary student. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2019/v4i330118

Giantari, K., Kurniawan, E., &Suherdi, D. (2023). Factors affecting students' reluctance to speak English in classroom interactions. *Tell-Us Journal : Teaching-English-Linguistics-Literature-Usage/Tell-us Journal*, *9*(2), 285–300. https://doi.org/10.22202/tus.2023.v9i2.6712

Hamouda, A. (2012). An exploration of causes of Saudi students' reluctance to participate in the English language classroom. *International Journal of English Language Education*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v1i1.2652

He, X., & Ellis, R. (1999). Modified output and the acquisition of word meanings. In *Studies in bilingualism* (p. 115). https://doi.org/10.1075/sibil.17.08he

Hernández, D. I. S., López, E. V., & García-Barrios, Y. (2021). Factors that de-motivate EFL students' class participation at a school of languages. *Gist : Education and Learning Research Journal/GIST Education and Learning Research Journal*, *22*, 147–172. https://doi.org/10.26817/16925777.860

Heyman, J., & Sailors, J. J. (2011). Peer assessment of class participation: applying peer nomination to overcome rating inflation. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education/Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *36*(5), 605–618. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602931003632365

Ibrahim, R. M., & Alahmed, K. I. (2023). Increasing EFL students' engagement in English lessons through flipped Classroom: an Experimental study. *Journal of College of Education for Women*, *22*(5), 220–242.

Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *24*(4), 541–577. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263102004023

Izumi, S., & Bigelow, M. (2000). Does output promote noticing and second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*(2), 239. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587952

Juhana, J. (2012). Psychological factors that hinder students from speaking in English class (A case study in a senior high school in South Tangerang, Banten, Indonesia). *Journal of Education and Practice*, *3*(12), 100–110.

Kang, E. Y. (2015). Effects of output and note-taking on noticing and interlanguage development. *DOAJ (DOAJ: Directory of Open Access Journals)*. https://doi.org/10.7916/d85b022r

Kavanagh, B. (2006). The input hypothesis (Krashen, 1982, 1985) an evaluation of its contributions to our understanding of second language acquisition phenomena. *Journal of Aomori University of Health and Welfare*, *7*(2), 241–248. https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/110006558134/

Kerestecioğlu, Y. (2020). Content-based instruction. In *Approaches and Principles in English as a Foreign Language (Efl) Education*(3rd ed., pp. 201–224). VizetekYayincilik.

Kim, J. H. (2004). Issues of corrective feedback in second language acquisition. *Studies in Applied Linguistics and TESOL*, *4*(2), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.7916/d844600x

Krashen, S. (1998). Comprehensible output? *System*, *26*(2), 175–182. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0346-251x(98)00002-5

Krashen, S., D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2013). *Techniques and principles in language teaching 3rd edition - Oxford Handbooks for Language Teachers*. Oxford University Press.

Liu, M. (2005). Reticence in oral English language classrooms: a case study in China. *TESL Reporter*, *38*(1), 1–16.

Liu, Q., & Jin-Fang, S. (2007). An analysis of language teaching approaches and methods-effectiveness and weakness. *US-China Education Review, 4*(1), 69–71. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED497389.pdf

Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *26*(03). https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263104263021

Macaro, E. (2010). *Continuum companion to second language acquisition*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Mackey, A., Abbuhl, R., & Gass, S., M. (2013). Interactionist approach. In *The Routledge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (1st ed., pp. 7–23). Routledge.

Marzona, Y. (2019). Spoken language production: apsycholinguistic approach. *Unespadang*. https://www.academia.edu/38679646/Spoken_Language_Production_A_Psycholinguistic_Approach

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Output. In *Merriam-Webster.com*. Retrieved March 17, 2024, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/output

Mitchell, R., & Myles, F. (2004). *Second language learning theories*. Hodder Education.

Mohapatra, D. P., & Zayapragassarazan, Z. (2021). Effective learner engagement strategies in visual presentations. *Journal of Education Technology in Health Sciences*, *8*(1), 2–11. https://doi.org/10.18231/j.jeths.2021.002

Mustapha, S. M., & Rahman, N. S. N. A. (2011). Classroom participation patterns: a casestudy of Malaysian undergraduate students. *EDUCARE, 3*(2). https://doi.org/10.2121/edu-ijes.v3i2.234.g233

Mustapha, S. M., Rahman, N. S. N. A., & Yunus, M. M. (2010a). Factors influencing classroom participation: a case study of Malaysian undergraduate students. *Procedia:*

Social &Behavioral Sciences, *9*, 1079–1084. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.12.289

Mustapha, S. M., Rahman, N. S. N. A., & Yunus, M. M. (2010b). Perceptions towards Classroom Participation: A Case Study of Malaysian Undergraduate Students. *Procedia: Social &Behavioral Sciences*, *7*, 113–121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.10.017

Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, E. (2021). The Cambridge handbook of corrective feedback in second language learning and teaching. In *Cambridge University Press eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108589789

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-Based language teaching*. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511667336

online Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d.). Participation. In *dictionary.cambridge.org*. Retrieved March 27, 2024, from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/participation

Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Routledge.

Oxford. (n.d.). Output verb. In *oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/*. Retrieved March 17, 2024, from https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/output_2

Páez, K. L. (2020). The impact of oral pushed output on intermediate students' L2 oral production. *Gist: Education and Learning Research Journal*. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1262696.pdf

Pica, T. (1988). Interlanguage adjustments as an outcome of NS-NNS negotiated interaction. *Language Learning*, *38*(1), 45–73. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1988.tb00401.x

Ponniah, J., & Krashen, S. (2008). The expanded output hypothesis. *The International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*.

Qizi, D. R. A. (2023). *The role of writing skill in foreign language fluency*. https://miastoprzyszlosci.com.pl/index.php/mp/article/view/1063

Qudoos, S., & Samad, A. (2022). Investigating the factors that hinder students' participation in English language classrooms at university level in Pakistan. *Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review*, *6*(II). https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2022(6-ii)15

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511667305

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Allyn & Bacon.

Rocca, K. A. (2010). Student participation in the college classroom: an extended multidisciplinary literature review. *Communication Education*, *59*(2), 185–213. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520903505936

Rohi, S., & Muslim, S. (2023). Factors influencing classroom participation: A case study of undergraduate students at Education Faculty, Paktia University. *Journal for Research in Applied Sciences and Biotechnology*, *2*(1), 99–104. https://doi.org/10.55544/jrasb.2.1.13

Sanchez, I. A., &Saranza, C. (2023). Class participation and proficiency in English subject: basis for English curriculum development. *European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements*, *4*(10), 1–13.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second Language learning1. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 129–158. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In *Cambridge University Press eBooks* (pp. 3–32). https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139524780.003

Segalowitz, N. (2003). Automaticity and second languages. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 382–408).

Serajuddin, M. (2023). Impact of using technology on English language teaching on students' motivation and engagement at. . . *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (JETIR)*, *10*(8). https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.15743.18089

Serrano, L. a. S. (2019). Designing speaking activities for a teacher-preparation course: An ESP approach. *Klausa*, *2*(02), 11–24. https://doi.org/10.33479/klausa.v2i02.152

Sheen, Y. (2011). Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning. In *Educational linguistics*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0548-7

Shehadeh, A. (2003). Learner output, hypothesis testing, and internalizing linguistic knowledge. *System*, *31*(2), 155–171. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0346-251x(03)00018-6

Shehadeh, A. (2005). Functions of learner output in language learning, language pedagogy, and classroom interaction. *Journal of King Saud University - Language and Translation*, *17*. https://www.academia.edu/5344721/Functions_of_Learner_Output_in_Language_Learning_Language_Pedagogy_and_Classroom_Interaction

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.

Soto, M. A. (2014). Post-method pedagogy: Towards enhanced context situated teaching methodologies. *ResearchGate*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309394906_Post-method_pedagogy_Towards_enhanced_context_situated_teaching_methodologies

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125–144). Oxford Applied Linguistics.

Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: theory and research. In *Routledge eBooks* (pp. 495–508). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410612700-38

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 16*(3), 371–391. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/16.3.371

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2002). Talking it through: two French immersion learners' response to reformulation. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *37*(3–4), 285–304. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0883-0355(03)00006-5

Swain, M., & Luxin, Y. (2008). Output hypothesis: its history and its future. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*.

Tavakoli, H. (2013). *A dictionary of language acquisition:a comprehensive overview of key terms in first and second language acquisition*. Rahnama Press.

Vo, H. T., & Ho, H. L. (2024). Online learning environment and student engagement: the mediating role of expectancy and task value beliefs. *Australian Educational Researcher*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-024-00689-1

Wang, M. (2013). Dr. Stephen Krashen answers questions on the comprehension hypothesis extended. *Language Teacher*, *37*(1), 25. https://doi.org/10.37546/jalttlt37.1-5

Warayet, A. M. (2011). *Participation as a complex phenomenon in the EFL classroom*. https://theses.ncl.ac.uk/jspui/bitstream/10443/1322/1/Warayet11.pdf

Warsame, A. A. (2018). Determinants of class participation case study. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, *6*(11), 1–18.

Wei, W., & Cao, Y. (2021). Willing, silent or forced participation? Insights from English for academic purposes classrooms. *RELC Journal*, *55*(1), 63–78. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882211066619.

Yüksel, İ., & Caner, M. (2020). The silent way. in *Approaches and Principles in English as a Foreign Language (Efl) Education* (pp. 39–54). VizetekYayincilik.

Appendices

Appendix A

The Students' Questionnaire

Dear first Master student,

The present questionnaire is a part of a Master two dissertation aimed at gathering necessary data regarding the nature of the relationship between the teacher's use of elicited vs. pushed output and students' oral participation. The questionnaire will also help identify learners' preferred output tasks, as well as the dominant type of output practiced by teachers. We would be grateful if you could sincerely answer the following questions by ticking the choice you wish to select. The collected responses will remain confidential and be used solely for academic purposes. Before answering this questionnaire, it is important to understand that, on the one hand, elicited output is when the teacher invites you to produce language in response to questions asked, where in you are given a choice to initiate interaction. On the other hand, pushed output involves being involuntarily compelled to produced that which you have learned.

Your collaboration and the time devoted to answering this questionnaire are greatly appreciated.

Section 1: General Information

1. Please specify your level of English proficiency:

1. good □
2. average □
3. poor □

2. Are you motivated to study English?

Yes□ No□

Section 2: Output Strategies (Elicited vs. Pushed)

3. How frequently do your teachers elicit output from students in the classroom?

1. Never□
2. Rarely□
3. Sometimes□
4. Often□
5. Always□

4. How comfortable do you feel when output is elicited instead of you being pushed to produce it?

1. Very comfortable □
2. Comfortable□
3. Neutral□
4. Uncomfortable □
5. Very Uncomfortable□

5. How frequently do your teachers push output in the classroom?

1. Never□
2. Rarely□
3. Sometimes□
4. Often□
5. Always□

6. How comfortable do you feel when output is pushed instead of it being elicited?

1. Very comfortable□
2. Comfortable□
3. Neutral□
4. Uncomfortable□

5. Very Uncomfortable□

7. I prefer when teachers prompt me to produce (elicited) output, such as by providing hints or questions that lead to the answer.

1. Strongly disagree□
2. Disagree□
3. Neutral□
4. Agree□
5. Strongly agree□

8. I prefer being pushed to produce output.

1. Strongly disagree□
2. Disagree□
3. Neutral□
4. Agree□
5. Strongly agree □

9. I believe that both elicited and pushed output tasks are equally important for language learning.

1. Strongly disagree□
2. Disagree□
3. Neutral□
4. Agree□
5. Strongly agree□

Section 3: Elicited vs. Pushed Output and Learner Participation

10. I feel more comfortable speaking English when I am given choice to participate and not pushed to.

1. Strongly disagree□

2. Disagree□
3. Neutral□
4. Agree□
5. Strongly agree□

11. I prefer elicited output tasks because they provide supportive classroom atmosphere which enables me to express my thoughts and ideas more freely.

1. Strongly disagree□
2. Disagree□
3. Neutral□
4. Agree□
5. Strongly agree□

12. Elicited output tasks allow me to contribute to class discussions at my own pace rather than that of my teachers.

1. Strongly disagree□
2. Disagree□
3. Neutral□
4. Agree□
5. Strongly agree□

13. Pushed output activities help me to develop my fluency in English.

1. Strongly disagree□
2. Disagree□
3. Neutral□
4. Agree□
5. Strongly agree□

14. I prefer pushed output tasks because they require me to get out of my comfort zone and take risks to interact more with my classmates.

1. Strongly disagree□
2. Disagree□
3. Neutral□
4. Agree□
5. Strongly agree□

15. Making mistakes in pushed output tasks demotivates me from interacting with my classmates.

1. Strongly disagree□
2. Disagree□
3. Neutral□
4. Agree□
5. Strongly agree□

16. There is a relationship between the teacher's output strategy and my readiness to participate in class activities.

1. Strongly disagree □
2. Disagree□
3. Neutral□
4. Agree□
5. Strongly agree□

Explain

……

…….....

17. Please share any additional thoughts or experiences you have regarding output strategies in EFL learning environments:

……

……

……

……

……

Thank you for your contribution.

Appendix B

The Teachers' Questionnaire

Dear teacher,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study, which seeks to investigate the relationship between teachers' use of elicited versus pushed output and students' oral participation in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom. Your responses will contribute significantly to this research endeavour, and all information provided will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Before answering the questionnaire, please keep in mind the following concepts: elicited output is output that is generated as a result of teachers' use of elicitation techniques. These may involve questions or prompts that encourage learners to voluntarily produce speech or writing. Conversely, pushed output is produced when teachers push learners to involuntarily speak or write, often forcing them to produce language that is at the limit of their proficiency. In other words, elicited output is optional, whereas pushed output is obligatory.

Please take a moment to respond to the following questions by ticking the most appropriate options or providing the necessary information.

Section 1: General Information

1. What is your teaching experience?

• Less than 1 year □ • 1-3 years □ • 4-6 years □ • 7-10 years □ • More than 10 years □

2. What is your professional degree?

……

……

Section 2: Output Strategies (Elicited vs. Pushed)

3. How frequently do you employ elicited output strategies in your classroom?

• Never □ • Rarely □ • Sometimes □ • Often □ • Always □

4. How often do you utilise pushed output strategies in your teaching?

• Never □ • Rarely □ • Sometimes □ • Often □ • Always □

Section 3: Elicited vs. Pushed Output and Learner Oral Participation

5. Have you observed any relation between the type of output strategy employed and students' willingness to participate actively in class discussions?

• Yes □ • No □

- If yes, how?

…….

6. According to you, what are the most common obstacles that prevent learners from participating willingly in response to prompts or questions when output activities are elicited? You may choose more than one option

• Limited vocabulary □

• Lack of confidence in speaking □

• Difficulty in organising thoughts coherently □

• Fear of making mistakes □

• Other (please specify):

……..

……..

7. In your opinion, what are the most common obstacles learners encounter when engaged in pushed output tasks that require them to produce language involuntarily? You may choose more than one option

• Anxiety about speaking in front of others □

• Pressure to perform under time constraints □

• Difficulty comprehending instructions □

• Lack of confidence in speaking □

• Fear of making mistakes □

• Introversion □

• Other (please specify): ……

8. How do you support learners in overcoming challenges associated with participating in elicited output tasks, such as fear of speaking or uncertainty about how to express themselves? You may choose more than one option

• Providing scaffolding or support materials □

•Using elicitation techniques, such as having learners finish your utterances to make them comfortable □

• Encouraging peer collaboration □

• Offering constructive feedback □

• Creating a supportive and non-judgmental classroom environment □

• Other (please specify):

……

9. What strategies do you employ to help learners navigate the difficulties often associated with pushed output tasks, such as performance anxiety or feeling overwhelmed by the task? You may select more than one option

• Gradually increasing the degree to which learners are pushed to participate □

• Providing opportunities for rehearsal and practice □

• Offering positive reinforcement and praise □

• Not correcting openly □

• Building a positive classroom atmosphere where errors are tolerated □

• Other (please specify):

……

10. Please share any additional insights or experiences you have regarding the use of elicited and pushed output strategies in the EFL classroom.

……

……

……

Your valuable contribution is greatly appreciated and will foster significantly our research.

Thank you

ملخص

في مجال التعليم، استخدام المعلمين لإستراتيجيات الإنتاج ومشاركة الطلاب شفهيًا هي مجالات حيوية للتحقيق. لذلك، قامت هذه الدراسة بالتحقيق في استخدام المعلمين لاستراتيجيات الإنتاج المحفزة و المفروضة وكيف ترتبط بمشاركة الطلاب في الفصول الدراسية للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية . في سياق هذه الدراسة، تم طرح أربعة أسئلة بحثية رئيسية: (1) أي استراتيجية إنتاجية (محفزة مقابل مفروضة) يمارس المعلمون أكثر؟ (2) أي نوع من الإنتاج (محفز مقابل مفروض) يفضله المتعلمون؟ (3) هل هناك ارتباط قابل للملاحظة بين نوع الإنتاج المستخدم واستعداد تعلم الإنجليزية للمشاركة شفهيًا؟ (4) ما هي التحديات المحتملة المرتبطة بكل استراتيجية إنتاجية في تعزيز المشاركة الشفهية بين تعلم الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية؟ تضمنت جمع البيانات تنفيذ استبيانات لـ 41 طالباً في السنة الأولى ماستر ولـ 17 معلماً في المركز الجامعي ميلة. تم توزيعها شخصيًا باستخدام نسخ ورقية. بعد تحليل البيانات وتفسيرها، كشفت النتائج عن أن المعلمين يميلون إلى ممارسة الإنتاج المحفز في الغالب، وأن هناك ارتباطًا واضحًا بين الإنتاج المحفز والمشاركة الشفهية المتزايدة. كما أشارت النتائج إلى أن الطلاب يفضلون الإنتاج المحفز بسبب البيئة الداعمة التي خلقها. على الرغم من القلق المحتمل المرتبط بالإنتاج المفروض، اعتبر أنه ثمين أيضًا لدفع الطلاب خارج مناطق راحتهم. ومع ذلك، واجهت كلتا الاستراتيجيتين تحديات، حيث تقيّد الإنتاج المحفز بقلق الطلاب وقيود المفردات، وربما يؤدي الإنتاج المفروض إلى القلق وضغط الأداء. تختتم الدراسة بتقديم مقترحات لأبواب البحث المستقبلي، بما في ذلك الدراسات طويلة الأجل حول تأثير استراتيجيات الإنتاج على تطوير اللغة، وتقييم فعالية مثل هذه الاستراتيجيات عبر مجموعات تعلم مختلفة.

الكلمات المفتاحية الانتاج المحفز- الانتاج المفروض- استراتيجيات الانتاج – مشاركة الطلاب- الرغبة في المشاركة

Résumé

Dans le domaine de l'éducation, l'utilisation par les enseignants des stratégies de production et la participation orale des apprenants sont des domaines critiques à investiguer. Par conséquent, cette recherche a examiné l'utilisation par les enseignants des stratégies de production élicitée versus poussée et leur relation avec l'implication des étudiants et la participation orale dans les classes d'anglais comme langue étrangère (EFL). Dans le contexte de cette étude, quatre principales questions de recherche ont été soulevées : (1) Quelle stratégie de production (élicitée vs. poussée) les enseignants pratiquent-ils le plus ? (2) Quel type de production (élicitée vs. poussée) les apprenants préfèrent-ils ? (3) Existe-t-il une association discernable entre le type de production utilisé et la volonté des apprenants d'EFL de participer oralement ? (4) Quels sont les défis potentiels associés à chaque stratégie de production en termes de promotion de la participation orale chez les apprenants en EFL ? la collecte de données a impliqué l'administration de questionnaires à 41 étudiants en première année de Master et 17 enseignants au Centre universitaire de Mila. Ils ont été administrés en personne à l'aide de copies papier. Après l'analyse et l'interprétation des données, les résultats ont révélé que les enseignants ont tendance à pratiquer principalement la production élicitée, et qu'il existe une association claire entre la production élicitée et une participation orale accrue. Les résultats ont également indiqué que les étudiants préféraient la production élicitée en raison de l'environnement de soutien qu'elle créait. Malgré l'anxiété potentielle associée à la production poussée, celle-ci était également jugée précieuse pour pousser les étudiants au-delà de leur zone de confort. Cependant, les deux stratégies ont posé des défis, la production élicitée étant limitée par les angoisses des étudiants et les limitations de vocabulaire, et la production poussée menant potentiellement à l'anxiété et à la pression de performance. L'étude se conclut en proposant des voies pour des recherches futures, notamment des études

longitudinales sur l'impact des stratégies de production sur le développement langagier et l'évaluation de l'efficacité de telles stratégies auprès de différents groupes d'apprenants.

Mots clés : Production élicitée, stratégies de production. Production poussée, implication des étudiants, volonté de participer.