Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies (IJALS)
ISSN: 2008-5494 -E-ISSN: 2322-3650 -http://ijals.usb.ac.ir
Published by University of Sistan and Baluchestan

Research Paper, Doi: 10.22111/IJALS.2020.5828 - Vol 12, No, 1, 2020, pp. 65-88
Received: December 2018 Accepted: December 2019

# Is the Pushed Output-Based Instruction Effective in Promoting Iranian EFL Learners Grammatical Accuracy in Writing?

**Simin Anbarshahi[1], Lida Sharafati[2]**

[1] Corresponding author, Assistant Professor, English Language Department, Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University, Tabriz, Iran,
Email: anbarshahi@azaruniv.ac.ir

[2] M.A., English Language Department, Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Tabriz Branch, Payame Noor University, Tabriz, Iran, Email: sharafati@rocketmail.com

## Abstract

In an attempt to contribute to the ongoing debate about how output tasks affect noticing of linguistic forms, the present study set out to investigate the effect of pushed output tasks on grammatical accuracy in sentence writing of Iranian EFL learners. Fifty homogenous Iranian EFL learners were randomly assigned to two experimental and control groups. Then, every group underwent ten different treatment sessions. The control group received writing instruction through conventional methods, while the experimental group received instruction through two pushed output tasks. In the case of the experimental group, in the first five treatment sessions, four grammatical structures were presented through picture cued tasks. The next five treatment sessions directed at other structures took place via reconstruction tasks. Two different versions of the writing section of the Preliminary English Test (PET) were used as pre/post-test. The results indicated that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group. Therefore, it might be argued that pushed output-based tasks had a positive effect on the Iranian EFL learner's grammatical accuracy in sentence writing. These findings provide empirical support for the output hypothesis and have pedagogical implications for the choice of output-oriented grammar tasks.

***Keywords:*** output hypothesis, grammatical accuracy, text reconstruction, picture cued tasks, output tasks

# 1. Introduction

The advent of communicative methodologies for teaching a foreign language in 1970 was an attempt to improve the teaching practices. However, these fluency-based methodologies not only weakened the status of grammar teaching but also led to negative reactions to grammar (Swain, 1988; Lyster, 1998; Spada & Lightbown, 1999). In other words, although learners have been able to comprehend what they listen and read in communicative methodologies, most of them fail to produce the written or oral message they want to convey (Gass, 2003).

Accordingly, these problems led to a debate between the form-focused approach and meaning-focused approach, as a result of which perspectives on language teaching and learning changed dramatically. According to Long (1991) and Long and Robinson (1998), both Focus on Forms and Focus on Meaning instructions are valuable and should complement rather than exclude each other. The new approach that emerged from this notion, was called the focus on form (FonF). Long (1991, pp.45-46) proposed that focus on form " overtly draws students' attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication".

In this light, recent empirical studies operationalized and tested some pedagogical means which deliberately drawn the learners' attention to the targeted elements during meaning-oriented communication. For example, some studies utilized form-focused instruction (Ellis, 2001, 2008; Williams, 2005; Spada & Lightbown, 2008; Tomita, & Spada, 2013), grammar-based tasks (Fotos, 1993; Reinders, 2009), pushed output instruction (Bigelow, Fujiwara, & Fearnow, 1999; Izumi & Bigelow, 2000; Izumi, 2002; Leeser, 2008; Song & Suh, 2008; Uggen, 2012; Basterrechea, García Mayo & Leeser, 2014). Other studies employed more implicit techniques, such as textual input enhancement

techniques (Izumi, 2000; Lee, & Huang, 2008; Kim, 2010) recasts (Lyster, 2004; Sheen, 2006), text reconstruction tasks (Uggen, 2012; Sitthitikul, 2017; 1998; Pawlak, 2011; Zoghi & Hasannejad, 2015), task-based instruction and task complexity in L2 writing (Birjandi & Malmir, 2009; Malmir & Khosravi, 2018) and picture description tasks (Izumi & Izumi, 2004; Shehadeh, 1999, Song & Suh, 2008).

A specific strength of all the studies was that learners whose attention is deliberately drawn to the targeted elements via external input or task manipulation tend to demonstrate the more accurate use of language forms than learners who are exposed to non-manipulated input (Izumi & Bigelow, 2000). Among pedagogical means that aim to facilitate the development of the learner's L2 grammar, the present study focuses on the role of pushed output via picture cued and reconstruction tasks.

The role of output in the construction of an L2 grammar is perhaps best attributed to Swain's (1985) seminal paper. In reviewing the ability of L2 learners whose context of learning is a French immersion program in Canada, her observation showed that immersion learners did not gain the ability for accurate production while they were fluent. Swain (1985, p.249) has concluded that "immersion students did not demonstrate native-speaker productive competence, not because their comprehensible input was limited but because their comprehensible output was limited.

In this light, Swain (1985, p. 249) claims that "producing the target language may be the trigger that forces the learner to pay attention to the means of expression needed in order to successfully convey his or her own intended meaning". In other words, production then "may force the learner to move from semantic processing to syntactic processing" (Swain, 1985, p. 249). In her pushed out hypotheses (POH), Swain (1985) claims that output

production helps learners focus on language forms, and this can make the acquisition process easier. In this regard, Swain (1995) proposed three potential functions that output plays in in the process of acquiring a second language (L2): Noticing/triggering of specific aspects of the target language: producing the target language may lead learners to notice a hole in their interlanguage; (b) hypothesis testing: learners may receive feedback by trying out new forms and structures; (c) conscious reflection on output upon production: learners can explicitly hypothesize about language itself by consciously reflecting on it.

Among the potential functions of PO, noticing function of output has been increasingly researched by a number of applied linguists. One relevant theory to the noticing function of Swain, noticing hypothesis proposed by Schmidt (2001, p.26) states that "noticing requires of the learner a conscious apprehension and awareness of input" and "while there is subliminal perception, there is no subliminal learning". In fact, from Schmidt's (1994, p.17) point of view, noticing is argued to be "the necessary and sufficient condition for the conversion of input into intake", and is a process by which linguistic rules, forms, and knowledge are *consciously* recognized within the input and subsequently utilized by learners to inform or reinforce their current knowledge of the target language.

For Gass & Selinker (2001) noticing of linguistic forms and structures by a learner can take place in three different ways and can occur over a long period of time or in a brief "on-the-spot reassessment" of language. In terms of in-class activities that promote the noticing of input, Gass & Selinker (1994, p.388) introduce the notion of "input enhancement" in which a specific form contained within the input is emphasized. The second instance of noticing occurs during language production when a student becomes aware of

something that they wish to say in the target language but finds that they are unable to do so due to a lack of knowledge in their interlanguage. This type of noticing was defined as "noticing a hole" (Doughty & Williams, 1998 cited by Swain, 1998, p. 66).

Third type of noticing demonstrates a gap between the learner's interlanguage and that of the L2 and "can prompt the learners to attend to the relevant information in the input (in order to fill the gap), which will trigger their IL development" (Izumi, 2003, p. 171). It is also Swain's (1998) argument that the discovery of a 'hole' in a learner's interlanguage can provide the impetus needed for them to employ cognitive processes when comprehending input which will ultimately result in them filling a 'gap' in their IL.

Following such tradition, pedagogically, a fair amount of research has taken into account and tested student output and its noticing function, However, ongoing debate about how PO tasks affect noticing of linguistic forms is whether output tasks leads to the better noticing of a targeted linguistic than tasks where production is not required.

## 2. Review of Literature

### *2.1. The Noticing Function of Output in Tasks*

Recently, several researchers (Izumi & Bigelow, 2000; Izumi, 2000, 2002; Izumi & Izumi, 2004; Yoshimura, 2006; Suzuki & Itagaki, 2007; Leeser, 2008; Song & Suh, 2008; Rezvani, 2011; Uggen, 2012; Basterrechea et al., 2014; Birjandi & Jafarpour, 2014; Zoghi & Hasannejad, 2015; Basterrechea, 2015; Sitthitikul, 2017) have investigated how PO (written or oral) affects noticing by employing carefully planned tasks. For example, Izumi et al. (1999) and Izumi and Bigelow (2000) operationalized noticing as notes taken in the input turn,

i.e., when receiving the aural stimulus, or as underlines in a written text. In doing so, Izumi et al. (1999) compared two groups of ESL (English as Second Language) students concerning their learning of past hypothetical conditional in English. The findings showed that the experimental group did not notice the target form greater than the control group. In a follow-up study, Izumi and Bigelow (2000) found the same findings as Izumi et al. (1999): no unique effects of output.

In another study, Shehadeh (2001) examined the role of self-and other-initiations play in providing opportunities for modified output. Thirty-five adult participants performed three tasks (picture description, opinion exchange, and decision making). The author found that picture description tasks gave more chances for using pushed output than opinion exchange. In a similar study, Izumi and Izumi (2004) used picture description and picture sequencing tasks to examine the effect of oral output on the L2 learners' acquisition of a grammatical form. The authors found that the picture description task was the best task to provide a situation for students to be pushed in oral output.

Suzuki and Itagaki (2007) examined the type of metatalk learners engaged in after performing writing output-oriented tasks. Results revealed that learners' metalinguistic reflections enabled them to internalize linguistic competence and allowed them to engage in syntactic processing, essential in SLA. In an ESL context, Lesser (2008) examined the effects of learners' production during a multi-stage reconstruction task on learners' noticing of Spanish linguistic forms. Their findings showed that the output group reported more noticing of words overall, but not of past tense forms.

In an English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL) context, Song and Suh (2008) investigated the role of output and the relative efficacy of two different types of output tasks in learning of the English past counterfactual conditional.

Based on findings, no difference was found between the production and the control group on receptive knowledge of the target structure. In a similar study, in Rezvani's (2011) study, participants were engaged in an output task struggling to produce grammatical English. Based on the finding, the author concluded that output tasks do not have any superiority over input enhancement tasks.

A conceptual replication of Izumi and Bigelow's research, Uggen (2012) examined whether producing the target language impacts learners' attention to L2 structures in subsequent input. The author found that stimulated- recall, which is a qualitative measure of noticing, revealed how the output was related to noticing, although underlining, a quantitative measure, did not identify the positive effects of output on noticing. In another study, Basterrechea et al. (2014) investigated the role of output tasks in noticing a certain target form upon receiving subsequent input via a multi-stage dictogloss task. Their study revealed that PO draws learners' attention to the formal aspects of language.

In an Iranian context, Birjandi and Mamaghani (2014) investigated the impact of oral pushed output on the learning and retention of English perfect tenses via picture description and translation tasks. The findings supported the facilitative effects of oral pushed output on the learning and retention of English perfect tenses. In a similar context, Zoghi and Hasannejad (2015) investigated the role of output and the relative efficacy of two different kinds of output tasks in comprehending two English target forms. According to the findings, the reconstruction group outperformed the picture-cued writing group in comprehension.

Basterrechea (2015) examined how learners' written production would affect their noticing and production of a specific language form via multi-stage dictogloss tasks. Results indicated no significant differences between the

experimental and the control. Finally, in the small-scale investigation, Sitthitikul (2017) examined the potentially facilitative effects of output on the acquisition of the English passive form in reconstruction tasks by Thai English language learners. The results also suggested that pushed output did not have any significant effect on learners' grammatical acquisition.

One conclusion that may be drawn from the above studies is that although some of these studies support the facilitative role of pushed output tasks in the acquisition process, nevertheless, some others have produced mixed results (Izumi, 2002; Izumi & Bigelow, 2000; Izumi et al., 1999; Izumi & Izumi, 2004; Song & Suh, 2008). Therefore, regarding the necessity of more research on the role of pushed output tasks in L2 learning and the scarcity of empirical studies that support or rebut the role of text picture cued and reconstruction tasks in learning of a targeted linguistic form; specifically, this study aims at examining the effect of PO on grammatical accuracy in sentence writing of Iranian EFL learners through following research question:

1) Does PO in text picture cued and reconstruction tasks affect grammatical accuracy in sentence writing of Iranian EFL learners?

# 3. Methodology

## *3.1. Participants*

The participants were 50 Iranian female EFL learners whose ages ranged from 16 to 18 in tenth grade from Fatemiye high school located in Bostan Abad, East Azerbaijan. To make sure that these learners were truly homogenous about their English proficiency level, a Standard English language proficiency test, Oxford Quick pre-intermediate Placement Test (OQPT), containing 60 multiple-choice items was given to 80 learners (see a sample of OQPT in appendix A). Having obtained the proficiency test results as shown in

Table 1, the researcher decided to choose those participants whose score range fell on the mean of 18.91 plus and minus one standard deviation of 5.10. Eighty students on the basis of their pretest performance were included in the study and randomly assigned to the two (experimental and control) groups.

**Table 3.1**

*The Result of Oxford Quick pre-intermediate Placement Test*

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Placement | 80 | 18.91 | 5.102 | 26.030 |
| KR-21 | .76 | | | |

## *3.2. Instruments*

The instruments of the study consisted of the Oxford Quick pre-intermediate Placement Test (OQPT), the writing section of the Preliminary English Test (PET), and some technological instruments such as laptops and electronic notebooks.

## *3.3. Materials*

Text reconstruction: it is similar to a dictogloss (Wajnryb, 1990) and Rutherford's (1987) prepositional cluster. It involves several stages of production and revision, including an initial individual listening task, a pair or group reconstruction of the text from the learners' shared resources, and teacher feedback on their co-constructed work (Shin et al., 2016).

Picture-cued tasks: they are one of the ways to assess students' writing ability that use the picture as a medium. These tasks separate reading and writing connections and proposing a nonverbal means as a substitute to stimulate written responses (Brown, 2004).

### *3.4. Procedures*

The experiment followed a pretest- treatment-posttest design. At first, one week prior to the first treatment session, all the participants took the pre-test (PET test) which consisted of 20 sentence writing items designed to assess the learners' prior knowledge of writing (see a sample of pre-test PET in appendix B). The performance of each participant on the pretest was analyzed and scored based on the definite answers of the standard answer sheet of the original PET test. Then, every group underwent ten different treatment sessions as follows.

As for the students in the experimental group, they were exposed to pushed out-put tasks: picture cued and text reconstruction. In doing so, during the first five sessions, the teacher focused on the use of four different structures (simple past, conditional sentences, comparative adjective, and as... as) via picture cued tasks. In every session, she talked about something which was related to the topic and engaged the students' mind to the topic then she showed some related pictures to the topic on the screen. Then, the learners were asked to do some pushed output-tasks and writing activities relating to the above-mentioned structures. The teacher checked their responses and corrected their errors emphasizing that the students have to be more aware of the errors and helped students to correct their mistakes. For example, in the fourth session, the teacher talked about her childhood and students listened carefully to the form of verbs that the teacher used when she was talking about past time. Then she gave them a text about Jasmine's vacation and asked them to circle the simple past verbs. Next, she showed them a picture of Felipe's last summer and told them that Felipe went on vacation then asked them to look at the picture and complete Felipe's diary. They wrote their sentences in their

books and whiteboard then the teacher corrected their mistakes and tried to learn and memorize the past form of some irregular verbs.

In the second five sessions, the teacher continued by using through text reconstruction task to teach four other structures (adjective clauses, direct speech, simple past passive, and infinitives). In doing so, every session the teacher read some short texts aloud while students just listened. Then, the students found keywords and new grammatical forms. Next, the students listened to the text for the third time and took notes and after that, they discussed their notes with a partner and worked together to reconstruct the text. And finally, the students got the original text and discussed differences or similarities between the original and their texts. For example, in the sixth session, following this procedure, the teacher used below bold text to teach direct speech.

*"You'll never guess what I've just seen!" said Sam, excitedly.*

*"What's that?" asked Louise.*

*"Our teacher has a broomstick and a black pointy hat in the back of her car. Maybe she's a witch"!*

Students in the control group received writing instruction through conventional methods. In doing so, the teacher presented the formula of structures and the participants repeated and did some drills to memorize to use them in sentences. Finally, another version of the writing section of PET as post-test followed the last teaching session a week later (see a sample of post-test PET in appendix C). It should be noted that, based on the results of Pearson correlation as shown in Table 2, there was a significant agreement between the two raters who rated the participants' performance on the pretest and posttest of writing. The data collected in this study were analyzed through

an independent-samples t-test which assumes normality of the data and homogeneity of variances of the groups.

**Table 3.2**

*Inter-Rater Reliability Indices of Pretest and Posttest*

| | | PreR2 | PostR2 |
|---|---|---|---|
| PreR1 | Pearson Correlation | .687** | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | |
| | N | 50 | |
| PostR1 | Pearson Correlation | | .734** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 |
| | N | | 50 |

# 4. Results

In this section, at first, the results of the experimental and control groups' mean on the pre-test of grammatical accuracy in writing were presented. Then, the experimental and control groups' mean on the post-test of grammatical accuracy in writing were provided accompanying their contingency tables.

## *4.1. Pre-test of the Study*

In order to ensure that the participants represented the same population, an independent t-test was run to compare the experimental and control groups' means on the pretest of grammatical accuracy. Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics of the experimental and control groups' scores on the Pre-test. As the table indicates the mean scores for the two groups are statistically very close (11.80≈11.48).

**Table 4.1**

*Descriptive Statistics of the Experimental and Control Groups' Scores on the Pre- Test*

| | Group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pretest of writing | Experimental | 25 | 11.80 | 1.514 | .303 |
| | Control | 25 | 11.48 | 1.759 | .352 |

Moreover, the results of the independent-samples t-test, as displayed in Table 4, ($t(48) = .689$, $p=.794$) also indicated that there was not any significant difference between the two groups' means on the pretest of writing. Thus, it can be claimed that the experimental and control groups were homogenous in terms of their grammatical accuracy in sentence writing prior to the main study.

**Table 4.2**

*Independent-Samples t-test; Pre-test of Writing by Groups*

| | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | F | Sig. | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Equal variances assumed | .562 | .457 | .689 | 48 | .494 | .320 | .464 | -.613 | 1.253 |
| Equal variances not assumed | | | .689 | 46.959 | .494 | .320 | .464 | -.614 | 1.254 |

## *4.2. Post-test of the Study*

To investigate the effect of PO on grammatical accuracy in sentence writing of Iranian EFL learners an independent t-test was run. The t-test was intended to compare the experimental and control groups' means on the post-test of grammatical accuracy in writing to indicate the effectiveness of the treatment. The descriptive statistics, along with the results of the t-test are presented in Tables 5 and 6, respectively. As displayed in Table 5, the experimental group ($M$=16.40) had a higher mean than the control group ($M$ =12.88) on the post-test of writing.

**Table 4.3.**

*Descriptive Statistics of the Experimental and Control Groups' Scores on the Post-test*

| | Group | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Posttest of writing | Experimental | 25 | 16.40 | 2.566 | .513 |
| | Control | 25 | 12.88 | 1.827 | .365 |

Moreover, the results of the independent-samples t-test, as displayed in Table 6, ($t$ (48) =5.58, $p$=.000) also indicated that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group on the posttest of grammatical accuracy in sentence writing. Thus, it might be argued that pushed output-based instruction has a positive effect on grammatical accuracy in sentence writing of Iranian EFL learners.

**Table 4.4**

*Independent-Samples t-test; Post-test of Writing by Groups*

| | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | F | Sig. | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Equal variances assumed | 3.811 | .057 | 5.587 | 48 | .000 | 3.520 | .630 | 2.253 | 4.787 |
| Equal variances not assumed | | | 5.587 | 43.364 | .000 | 3.520 | .630 | 2.250 | 4.790 |

## 5. Discussion

This study aimed to investigate whether the PO in text picture cued and reconstruction tasks affect grammatical accuracy in sentence writing of Iranian EFL learners. It was found that pushed output-based instruction had a positive effect on the Iranian EFL learner's grammatical accuracy in sentence writing skill. This was proved through the results of the independent sample t-test which indicated that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group on the posttest of grammatical accuracy in sentence writing. Overall, the findings of the study lend support to Swain's (1995) Output Hypothesis: our results indicate that the pushed output-based instruction promotes writing and improves grammar accuracy.

One plausible explanation for the results of the present study may be found in the kinds of tasks implemented in this study. It has been believed that establishing form–meaning connections in developing L2 learners' IL

competence is crucial in SLA research (e.g., Doughty & Williams, 1998; VanPatten, 1996, 2002). The output tasks manipulated in this study (pictured cued and reconstruction tasks) were intended to promote this form-meaning mapping process (Izumi, 2004). Nobuyoshi and Ellis (1993, p. 203) argue that tasks "contribute to accuracy (i.e. linguistic competence) by enabling learners to discover new linguistic forms during the course of communicating, and also by increasing their control over already-acquired forms". In the same vein, Swain (1995) also argues that tasks that encourage reflection on language and are oriented to getting meaning across can help us to investigate how learners' explicit hypothesizing contributes to language development. In similar logic, Campillo (2006) states that these kinds of tasks will provide a context for learners to use preselected target forms which will be used during the tasks many times. Thus, it might be argued that the result of this study gives support to the view that "not all circumstances of production may provide language learners with ideal grounds in which to encourage syntacticization and sensitization to language forms" (Izumi, 2003, p.22).

In terms of reconstruction tasks, the findings in this study support the effectiveness of these tasks in drawing attention to language form. In this light, Thornbury (1997, p.334) truly argues that" by the manipulation of task design or the choice of text, reconstruction tasks can be harnessed to the needs of an essentially grammar-driven programme". Following a similar logic, Mayo (2013) states that text-reconstruction tasks require learners to insert the necessary function words or change word forms in order to increase grammatical accuracy. In addition, Kowal and Swain (1994) suggested the use of text reconstruction tasks as advantageous considering grammatical accuracy within a communicative context. The results of the present study have been in line with the study of Storch, (1998), Pawlak (2011), Esmaieelzade (2014), and

Zoghi and Hasannejad (2015). For example, Storch (1998) has shown that a text reconstruction task makes learners attend to a range of grammatical issues and resort to a number of knowledge sources while they are attempting to reach grammatical when performing such tasks. Pawlak (2011, p.33) also suggests that "by providing learners with opportunities to engage in interactions about the formal aspects of language they have to use to reconstruct, reformulate or create a piece of writing, they trigger noticing, hypothesis testing and metatalk".

However, the result of this study contradicts with those studies indicating no significant differences between the learners who received subsequent input upon production and those who acted as a control group. (Izumi et al., 1999; Izumi & Bigelow, 2000; Leeser, 2008; Song & Suh, 2008; Uggen, 2012; Sitthitikul, 2017). It is interesting to note that, the negative results in some of these studies may be attributable to the way in which noticing was operationalized. For example, Uggen (2012) has pointed at the difficulty in operationalizing noticing. Moreover, in some other studies, the researchers acknowledge design problems. For instance, in the studies by Izumi and Bigelow (2000) and Song and Suh (2008), the learners' attention was drawn and consequently biased due to the fact that they "foreknowledged the tasks". Their findings evoke the findings of a study by Yoshimura (2006), in which foreknowledge of distinct output tasks resulted in differences in learners' reading behavior and noticing of a form.

In terms of picture cued tasks, the findings in this study also support the effectiveness of these tasks on learning an L2 grammatical form. In this regard, Song and Suh (2008) argue that manipulating these tasks in the classroom would make learners notice, take in, acquire, and/or produce a syntactic form in a meaningful context. For Fortune (2005), the employment of contextualized

pedagogic tasks such as dictogloss or picture description is more likely to be necessary for the co-construction of knowledge about linguistic forms. These findings are consistent with the general trends observed in the study of Shahadeh (2001), Izumi and Izumi, (2004), Birjandi and Mamaghani (2014), and Zoghi and Hasannejad (2015). According to Shahadeh (2001), picture description tasks gave more chances for using pushed output than opinion exchange. However, these findings contradict with previous studies reporting that the output conditions did not result in greater noticing in linguistic forms via picture cued tasks (Song & Suh, 2008).

## 6. Conclusion

It can be concluded that the result of this study provided theoretical and pedagogical implications. From a theoretical point of view, this study presented pushed output-based instruction as one of the creative techniques for improving Iranian EFL learners' grammatical accuracy in sentence writing. From the pedagogical aspect, this study suggests an alternative presentation to account for the learning of a chosen linguistic item. In fact, foreign language courses might profit from including lessons with a FonF focus. As an alternative to conventional methods in which the structures students need to learn are predicted and prepared, syllabi could be amended to include lessons in which grammar is taught in response to learner output. By doing this, not only might processing of language occur, but also motivation could be heightened since instruction would be tailored to suit the specific group of students. Besides, the findings of this study suggest that asking students to reconstruct texts that are flooded with the targeted form appears and using visual media in the teaching-learning process to be highly effective for

encouraging pushed output. Additionally, it is recommended that L2 curriculum designers and material developers make changes in the way of constructing curricula, syllabi, and English textbooks based on a vast presentation of input. Pushed output (tasks) should be included in them so as to provide students more opportunities to produce L2 output in the ESL and EFL classroom.

# References

Birjandi, P., & Malmir, A. (2009). The effect of task-based approach on the Iranian advanced EFL learners' narrative vs. expository writing. *The Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies (IJALS), 1*(1), 1-23.

Birjandi, P., & Mamaghani, H. J. (2014). The impact of immediate and delayed written pushed output produced by pre-intermediate EFL learners in Iran on their acquisition of English verb tenses. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *5*(6), 13-40.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices.*: Pearson Education.

Campillo, P. (2006). Focus on form tasks and the provision of corrective feedback. *IBERICA*, *2,* 123-138.

Ellis, R. (2001). Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning*, *51*(1), 1-46.

Ellis, R. (2008). Explicit form-focused instruction and second language acquisition. In B. Spolsky, & F. Hult (Ed.), *The handbook of educational linguistics*, (pp. 437-455). Wiley Blackwell Publications.

Esmaieelzade, V. (2014). The effect of text reconstruction on grammar ability of Iranian EFL learners. *Advances in Environmental Biology, 8*(2), 153-157.

Fotos, S. S. (1993). Consciousness raising and noticing through focus on form: Grammar task performance versus formal instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, *14*(4), 385-407.

Fortune, A. (2005). Learners' use of metalanguage in collaborative form-focused L2 output tasks. *Language Awareness*, *14*(1), 21-38.

Gass, S. M. (2003). Input and interaction. In C. J. Doughty, & M. K. Long, M. K. *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 224-254). Blackwell.

Gass, S. M. & Selinker, L. (1994). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2001) *Second edition second language acquisition: An introductory course.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Hawkes, M. L. (2012). Using task repetition to direct learner attention and focus on form. *ELT journal*, *66*(3), 327-336.

Izumi, S., & Lakshmanan, U. (1998). Learnability, negative evidence and the L2 acquisition of the English passive. *Second Language Research*, *14*(1), 62-101.

Izumi, S., Bigelow, M., Fujiwara, M., & Fearnow, S. (1999). Testing the output hypothesis: Effects of output on noticing and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 421-452.

Izumi, S., & Bigelow, M. (2000). Does output promote noticing and second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*(2), 239-278.

Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis: An experimental study on ESL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *24*(4), 541-577.

Izumi, S. (2003). Comprehension and production processes in second language learning: In search of the psycholinguistic rationale of the output hypothesis. *Applied Linguistics*, *24*(2), 168-196.

Izumi, Y., & Izumi, S. (2004). Investigating the effects of oral output on the learning of relative clauses in English: Issues in the psycholinguistic requirements for effective output tasks. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 60* (5), 587-609.

Kim, E. C. (2010). Textual input enhancement: Applications in teaching. *ORTESOL Journal*, *28*, 22.

Kowal, M., & Swain, M. (1994). Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness. *Language Awareness*, *3*(2), 73-93.

Kim, Y., Choi, B., Yun, H., Kim, B., & Choi, S. (2020). Task repetition, synchronous written corrective feedback and the learning of Korean grammar: A classroom-based study. *Language Teaching Research, 24*(4), 4342-561.

Long, M. (1991). Focus on Form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). John Benjamins.

Long, M., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research and practice. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams, *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 15-41). Cambridge University Press.

Leeser, M. J. (2008). Pushed output, noticing, and development of past tense morphology in content-based instruction. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *65*(2), 195-220.

Lee, S. K., & Huang, H. T. (2008). Visual input enhancement and grammar learning: A meta-analytic review. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *30*(3), 307-331.

Lozano, M. B., Mayo, M. D. P. G., & Leeser, M. J. (2014). Pushed output and noticing in a dictogloss: Task implementation in the CLIL classroom. *Porta Linguarum: Revista internacional de didáctica de las lenguas extranjeras*, *22*, 7-22.

Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning, 48*(2), 183–218.

Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *26*(3), 399-432.

Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction, and second language development: An empirical study of question formation in ESL. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *21*(4), 557-587.

Malmir, A., Khosravi, F. (2018). The effect of argument mapping instruction on L2 writing achievement across writing tasks and writing components: A case of Iranian EFL learners. *Applied Research on English Language, 7*(4), 515-540.

Mayo, M. G. (2013). Collaborative tasks and their potential for grammar instruction in second/foreign language contexts. In M. G. Mayo (E.d), *The Grammar dimension in instructed second language learning* (pp. 82-102). Wiley-Blackwell.

Nahavandi, N., & Mukundan, J. (2013). The impact of textual input enhancement and explicit rule presentation on Iranian elementary EFL learners' intake of simple past tense. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(1), 92-102.

Nobuyoshi, J., & Ellis, R. (1993). Focused communication tasks and second language acquisition. *ELT Journal*, *47*(3), 203-210.

Pawlak, M. (2011). Text reconstruction activities and teaching language forms. In J. Majer, & Ł. Salski (Eds.), *FLOW*: *Foreign language opportunities* in *writing* (pp. 8-21). Łódz University Press.

Reinders, H. (2009). Learner uptake and acquisition in three grammar-oriented production activities. *Language Teaching Research, 13*(2), 201-222.

Rezvani, E. (2011). *The effect of output requirement on the acquisition of grammatical collocations by Iranian EFL learners. Journal of Language Teaching & Research, 2(3), 674-682.*

Rutherford, W. (1987). *Second language grammar: Learning and teaching*. Longman.

Schmidt, R. (1994). Implicit learning and the cognitive unconscious: Of artificial grammars and SLA. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 165–209). Academic Press.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge University Press.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *10*(1-4), 209-232.

Shehadeh, A. (2001). Self- and other-initiated modified output during task-based interaction. *TESOL Quarterly, 35,* 433–457.

Shin, S. Y., Lidster, R., Sabraw, S., & Yeager, R. (2016). The effects of L2 proficiency differences in pairs on idea units in a collaborative text reconstruction task. *Language Teaching Research*, *20*(3), 366-386.

Skehan, P. (2003). Task-based instruction. *Language Teaching, 36*, 1-14.

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (1999). Instruction, first language influence, and developmental readiness in second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, *83*(1), 1-22.

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (2008). Form-focused instruction: Isolated or integrated?. *TESOL Quarterly*, *42*(2), 181-207.

Sheen, Y. (2008). Recasts, language anxiety, modified output, and L2 learning. *Language Learning*, *58*(4), 835–874.

Song, M. J., & Suh, B. R. (2008). The effects of output task types on noticing and learning of the English past counterfactual conditional. *System*, *36*(2), 295-312.

Sitthitikul, P. (2017). The roles of output in second language acquisition. *Human Behavior, Development and Society, 15*(1), 63-76.

Storch, N. (1998). A classroom-based study: Insights from a collaborative text reconstruction task. *ELT Journal*, *52* (4), 291–300.

Suzuki, W., & Itagaki, N. (2007). Learner metalinguistic reflections following output-oriented and reflective activities. *Language Awareness*, *16*(2), 131-146.

Swain, M. (1985). *Communicative competence, some roles of comprehensible input and* comprehensible *output in its development*. In S. Gadd, & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input SLA* (pp. 235-253). Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook, & B. Seidelhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom SLA* (pp. 64-81). Cambridge University Press.

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.

Tomita, Y., & Spada, N. (2013). Form-focused instruction and learner investment in L2 communication. *The Modern Language Journal*, *97*(3), 591-610.

Thornbury, S. (1997). *About language: Tasks for teachers of English*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Uggen, M. S. (2012). Reinvestigating the noticing function of output. *Language Learning*, *62*(2), 506-540.

VanPatten, B. (1996). *Input processing and grammar instruction in second language acquisition*. Greenwood Publishing Group.

VanPatten, B. (2002). Processing instruction: An update. *Language Learning*, *52*(4), 755-803.

Williams, J. (2005). Form-focused instruction. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), Handbook *of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 695-716). Routledge.

Zoghi, M., & Hasannejad, M. R. (2015). A comparative study of output task types on EFL learners' comprehension of target forms. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *5*(3), 498-503.

Yoshimura, F. (2006). Does manipulating foreknowledge of output tasks lead to differences in reading behavior, text comprehension and noticing of language form?. *Language Teaching Research, 10*(4), 419-434.