The Output Hypothesis: From Theory to Practice

Justin Pannell*
Hawaii Pacific University

Friederike Partsch
Richard-Hallmann Gemeinschaftsschule Trappenkamp, Germany

Nicholas Fuller
Hawaii Pacific University

Abstract
While the Output Hypothesis is embraced by many, there is still a relative disconnect between the theoretical concepts and its pedagogical use, as there is a relative lack of literature which offers on-the-ground suggestions for its application. In this paper, we review the literature on the Output Hypothesis with the explicit aim of generating both readily teachable materials for language teaching experts and a model for how this can be accomplished. We discuss the three functions of output, the notion of pushed output, and the practice of negotiation for meaning, and we provide two illustrative teaching units to show how insights taken from literature on these concepts can be adapted to teaching practice. The teaching units are constructed in a step-wise fashion so that students are guided towards producing pushed output in the apex of each teaching unit, which serves as the object of formal assessment. We conclude by reflecting on the pedagogical upshot of the Output Hypothesis.

Introduction

Language learning is a complex and multidimensional undertaking. While some research trends materialize on the horizon only to fade into the distance, other principles of language learning have become firmly established. Among this reservoir of foundational principles is the notion that producing output is necessary to become a proficient language learner. *Prima facie*, this principle can be supported with the supposition that one gets better at something with more practice. Behind this superficial analysis, however, lay more powerful reasons for believing that output is a central feature of language learning. In the following, we review the literature on the Output Hypothesis, the notion of pushed output, and the closely related concept of negotiation for meaning. These theoretical underpinnings will serve to buttress two illustrative teaching units, which draw from the insights gleaned in the literature. Our aim is to present both the theoretical and practical aspects of the Output Hypothesis.

The Output Hypothesis

In this section, we will outline the role that output plays in second language acquisition. In particular, we will focus on the features of output, pushed output, and the mechanisms involved in negotiation for meaning which facilitate second language learning.

Swain (1985, 1995, 2000, 2005) posited three major functions of output, namely noticing (or triggering), hypothesis testing, and metalinguistic reflection. Swain's claims regarding the functions of output followed her empirical studies of French immersion students, who had language comprehension proficiencies on par with those of native speakers but lagged far behind their native speaker peers in their ability to verbalize in French (Swain 1998). This was the case in spite of the fact that the French immersion students were routinely exposed to ample compressible input, which turns out to be a necessary but insufficient condition for second language learning. These observations led Swain to formulate the Output Hypothesis, which asserts that "the act of producing language (speaking or writing) constitutes, under certain circumstances, part of the process of second language learning" (Swain 2005, p. 471).

The first function of output is noticing, which refers to events in which a second language learner, through an attempt at verbalizing an intended meaning, becomes aware that she lacks the resources to linguistically encode and express an intended meaning. As Swain (1985) noted, "producing the target language may be the trigger that forces the learner to pay attention to themes of expression needed in order to successfully convey his or her own intended meaning" (p. 249). Noticing is a prerequisite for language learning in that once the attention of a speaker is directed towards the hole in her interlanguage, she may draw on further resources to mend that hole. Noticing involves two auxiliary aspects beyond recognizing the gaps in one's interlanguage. The first auxiliary aspect is that learners might recognize the differences of target language forms and the forms in their L2 usage (Schmidt & Frota, 1986). Gass (1997) mentioned a second auxiliary aspect of the noticing function, namely the identification of frequently used linguistic forms.

Izumi (2002) expanded on the necessary conditions necessary for the noticing function to benefit language learning. Izumi contended that the depth of analysis associated with output is linked with stronger and longer lasting memory traces of the grammatical forms to which learners attend. Izumi's study compared the degree to which output and modified input correlate with noticing. His study found only a marginal increase in noticing with the inclusion of modified input; however, he found a significant correlation between making learners produce output including the target forms and noticing. Izumi claimed that grammatical encoding in the production of output tends to engage cognitive processes in which a given grammatical structure is processed as an unitized structure. This is conducive to language learning. Thus, noticing, in the shallow sense of attending to a grammatical form, is not enough to substantially encourage language learning. Rather, to notice a grammatical form in a robust sense, learners must engage in deeper, integrative cognitive processes which are characteristic of attempts to verbalize.

Swain and Lapkin (1994) also found results supporting the benefit of producing output to language learning in relation to the noticing function. In their study, eighth-grade immersion students were confronted with a think-aloud procedure while writing an article. Dictionaries or other sources were not allowed in order to observe the students' handling of difficulties in their

language production. After evaluating the protocols, Swain and Lapkin concluded that L2 learners are in fact capable of noticing language gaps, which generated opportunities to engage in cognitive processes conducive to second language learning. In the same vein, Leeser's (2008) study showed that the experiment group, who produced output during a multi-phase reproduction task, outperformed the control group, who merely completed post-test comprehension test items, on the post-test with respect to the target forms.

A key feature of output is the movement from semantic to syntactic processing. Comparing the processing of input with the cognitive functions associated with producing output illustrates this feature. Swain noted that "it is possible to comprehend input—to get the message—without a syntactic analysis of that input" (Swain, 1985, p. 249). For instance, strategies employed by listeners, such as anticipating the course of a conversation, may allow listeners to comprehend input without moving to syntactic analysis. Further, without being pushed to produce comprehensible output, learners may get by without advancing their interlanguage in key areas. For instance, a learner might encode information using time markers e.g. "yesterday," "last Tuesday," "at three o'clock" while using the present tense. This may be the case even though the learner comprehends input that includes past tense structures. A learner who is not pushed to produce comprehensible output may not develop her interlanguage because she is not forced to move from the semantic processing of input to syntactic processing, and thereby benefit from related processes such as noticing interlanguage gaps.

Another important function of output is hypothesis testing. During hypothesis testing, language learners verbalize linguistic hypotheses. The hypotheses that learners maintain regard how an intended meaning should be linguistically encoded. Swain (2005) claimed that "output may sometimes be, from the learner's perspective, a 'trial run' reflecting their hypothesis of how to say (or write) their intent" (p. 476). The opportunity to test a hypothesis establishes the opportunity for a potential confirmation that the intended message has properly been linguistically encoded or, perhaps more importantly, the opportunity to be exposed to negative feedback. Negative feedback is instantiated in a variety of forms. For example, its forms include clarification requests, recasts, implicit feedback, and others (Gass & Mackey, 2006). The main characteristic of negative feedback with regard to linguistic form is that the grammaticality of a verbalization is challenged by an interlocutor. Once a speaker testing a hypothesis recognizes that his hypothesis is wrong, a speaker then has the further opportunity to amend his hypothesis and engage in another trial.

Producing output also leads to metalinguistic reflection. Swain (1995) maintained that "under certain task conditions, learners will not only reveal their hypotheses, but reflect on them, using language to do so" (p. 135). Task conditions in these cases typically pertain to special cases of negotiation for meaning, namely negotiation about linguistic form. The type of negotiation which Swain had in mind is one that "incorporate[s] the notion of being pushed toward the delivery of a message that is not only conveyed, but that is conveyed precisely, coherently, and appropriately" (Swain, 1985, p. 249). If circumstances establish the need to reflect on language during an episode of negotiation where aspects of the target language are relevant, then the conditions for negotiating about linguistic form obtain. Metalinguistic reflection necessarily relates to output because episodes of negotiation require two-way verbalizations by interlocutors.

Metalinguistic reflection relates to language acquisition because grammatical properties of a target language are taken as objects of discourse. According to Vygotsky (1986), intermental knowledge will merge into intramental knowledge through conversation. Drawing on Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of mind, Swain (2005) claimed that "Speaking is initially a source of physical and mental regulation for an individual—an individual's physical and cognitive behavior is initially regulated by others. Over time, however, the individual internalizes these regulatory actions" (p. 478). The general claim, then, is that dialog is particularly crucial for language learning in that the cognitive processes which are activated in an interaction are later internalized and activated in individual cognitions. The specific claim is that when the target language is discussed during an episode of negotiation, in the sense that Swain uses the term, the cognitions involved in discussing the target language are later internalized. Importantly, the specific claim asserts that metalinguistic reflection in particular becomes a part of the cognitive repertoire of learners. That is, learners may verbalize and reformulate hypotheses about a target language within a dialog, and if learners determine a correct linguistic hypothesis after such an episode, then that new, correct hypothesis will become internalized as linguistic knowledge for the individual along with the attendant cognitive processes that produced the new hypothesis. LaPierre's (1994) study supported the claim that metalinguistic reflection leads to language learning. LaPierre found evidence for language learning in 80% out of 140 cases of metalinguistic episodes embedded in meaning-focused tasks.

In producing output, learners not only engage in metalinguistic reflection but also negotiation for meaning, a key impetus for language learning (Long 1983, 1985, 1996). Along with Long (1985), we can posit an indirect causal link between negotiation of meaning and language learning by arguing in the following manner. Learners' negotiation of meaning in interaction results in input that is comprehensible for them. Comprehensible input promotes second language acquisition. Therefore, negotiation promotes second language acquisition (Long, 1985, p. 378). Negotiation for meaning is an integral component of the Interaction Hypothesis, which maintains that "environmental contributions to acquisition are mediated by selective attention and the learner's developing L2 processing capacity and that these resources are brought together most usefully, although not exclusively, during negotiation" (Long, 1996, p. 414). Pica (1994) championed the view that the whole of the benefits of negotiation go deeper than merely promoting comprehensible input. Firstly, grammatical segmentation during negotiation draws the attention of learners to linguistic form. Secondly, feedback on learners' production of messages during negotiation allows learners to focus on form in their interlanguage.

Mackey (1999) found empirical evidence for a positive effect of meaning negotiation in language learning in an experiment concerning question formation wherein participants with opportunities to negotiate for meaning improved their question forming capacities in comparison with a control group. Participants in the interaction group were able to produce questions of a more advanced stage after producing output and negotiating, while participants in the non-interaction groups were not able to produce more advanced question forms. Mackey attributes the improvements to the negotiation for comprehensible input, pushed output, and noticing gaps in one's interlanguage during negotiation.

Long (1996) also emphasized the role that negative evidence can play for language acquisition during negotiation. The juxtaposition of negotiated grammatical forms of a competent speaker with ungrammatical forms in a learner's interlanguage which have received negative feedback may elicit the formulation of new linguistic hypotheses regarding grammatical structures. Accordingly, after such an episode, older, incorrect hypotheses may be held more weakly or jettisoned altogether. The upshot is that incorrect linguistic hypotheses about the grammaticality of an utterance which are tested can be abandoned in favor of correct, new linguistic hypotheses in episodes of negotiation for meaning, echoing the hypothesis testing function of output discussed earlier. Since focus on form pertains to episodes in which an individual focuses both on grammatical structure and meaning, the comparison of syntactic structures during negotiation presents the conditions for focus on form. Thus, the argument goes as follows. Producing output during negotiation introduces conditions whereby learners can compare their own ungrammatical utterances with the grammatical utterances produced by their interactants. This noticing of the gap leads to focus on form in meaningful contexts. Focus on form in contexts of use leads to language learning. Therefore, producing output involving negotiation leads to language learning. Besides the juxtaposition of ungrammatical forms in a learner's interlanguage and the target form by others, researchers have argued that simply struggling to communicate during episodes of negotiation can induce language learners to focus on form (Gass and Varnis, 1994; Pica, 1994).

It should be noted, however, that episodes of meaning negotiation are facilitative of language learning not just through negotiation. Varonis and Gass found that episodes of negotiation "allows them [learners] a non-threatening forum within which to practice developing language skills" (Varonis and Gass, 1985, p. 87). It is important to note that cases of negotiation need not involve native speakers and non-native speakers of the target language. Negotiation episodes between non-native users of the target language can afford opportunities for exposure to comprehensible input and for practicing output.

The notion of being pushed into the delivery of a message mentioned earlier in the discussion on metalinguistic reflection has led to extensive research into the notion of pushed output. Pushed output drives students "to produce spoken language in unfamiliar areas" (Nation & Newton, 2009, p. 115) and therefore leads students to focus on grammar (Swain, 1985). Nation and Newton stated that encouragement or necessity is the requirement for students to be pushed to produce language. In order to be useful in the language acquisition process, pushed output has three preliminaries mentioned by Nation and Newton. They need to be taken into account in order to obtain the best possible learning gains.

The first preliminary is the aspect of topic. L2 learners should be confronted with many different topics in order to facilitate learning of a large range of vocabulary. Furthermore, students should be confronted with various types of text. Nation and Newton listed five pairs: (1) Involved interaction vs. monologue, (2) colloquial vs. formal speech, (3) short vs. long turns, (4) interactional vs. transactional speech, and (5) narrative vs. non-narrative. Implementing as many of these written or spoken text types in the classroom will help learners speak and write in different genres.

The second preliminary Nation and Newton listed are performance conditions. Planning, time pressure, amount of support, and standard of performance are the four possible conditions they mention. Planning will help the students to organize their thoughts beforehand, which has positive effects on fluency and grammatical accuracy. However, Nation and Newton stated that several studies have shown that planning does not necessarily have positive effects on accuracy. Batstone (2002) criticized the planning phase, because it gives the learners too much time to think about the possible mistakes they could make during their speech act. This results in the use of simplified language in order to avoid errors. The task might still have a positive influence on accuracy, but the growth of grammatical knowledge and fluency may be minimized through an extensive planning phase. The aspect of time pressure calls upon Batstone's criticism of the planning phase. It suggests that preparing for a speech event will result in the organization of as many ideas as possible. However, if the students are afforded sufficient time during the speech event rather than before, they might utilize their range of grammatical knowledge. The amount of support refers most likely to conversations between partners. The listener may support the speaker by giving him or her time to think and produce language, by summarizing her output, asking questions, or helping with phrases or words.

The third preliminary elucidated by Nation and Newton which influences pushed output is the standard of performance. Performing in front of a group adds more pressure on the speaker than talking to one conversation partner. This aspect of pushed output was also criticized by Batstone. Being pushed to produce language, whether in pairs or in front of the class, is intimidating for learners. They are "reluctant to take too many linguistic chances" (Batstone, 2002, p. 10) and therefore produce only language they feel confident with. While learners pressured to produce a higher standard of output may reduce the grammatical complexity of their output initially, enough support from the teacher and other learners through a with a warm, supportive environment and plenty of practice may obviate Batstone's concerns. Furthermore, learners are likely to find themselves in high-pressure situations outside of the classroom. To avoid retreating to basic stock phrases and expressions, repeated exposure to expectations of high standards of performance may fortify them to produce higher standards of performance under these conditions, where the quality of the output they produce may determine significant, real-life consequences.

In summary, episodes in which interlocutors attempt to syntactically encode an intended message lead learners to notice the gaps in their interlanguage. Learners can work to mend the holes in their interlanguage once they notice them. Learners are also given the opportunity to test, confirm, and reject linguistic hypotheses in their attempts to verbalize messages. If the content of such verbalizations is language taken as an object, then the conditions are established for metalinguistic reflection. Further, the causal link between negotiation and language learning is established indirectly because negotiation produces comprehensible input, which is essential for language learning. The juxtaposition of ungrammatical structures with the target language within negotiation also allows for learners to focus on form. Moreover, simply struggling to produce output during negotiation can encourage focus on form. Finally, being pushed to produce output in terms of the breadth of range of topics, variations of performance conditions, and a high standard of performance can compel learners to produce pushed output

Taking the Output Hypothesis into Language Lessons

In the teaching units below, we implement the insights taken from the literature on the Output Hypothesis and negotiation for meaning. We include two units: the first, on jobs and work, is directed toward intermediate to low advanced learners, and the second, on food, is directed toward high beginner to low intermediate learners. We chose two very different topics in these teaching units in order to show that output, negotiation for meaning, and pushed output can be implemented in a variety of contexts, from beginner to advanced. A common premise that runs through the teaching units is that speakers who regularly produce output will have a greater opportunity to succeed than passive learners who are merely exposed to comprehensible input. Students have the opportunity to engage in discussions in a variety of activities. In the first unit, the learners discuss the topics in a stepwise fashion which ultimately culminates in a mock job interview, the apex of pushed output and the object of formal assessment in the teaching unit. In the second unit, students use much of their background cultural information they maintain to engage their schemata and scaffold them for greater language production throughout the teaching unit.

These teaching units implement a variety of activities which foster pushed output and negotiation for meaning. For example, "Ranking," "Finding Agreements," "Modify the Statement," and "Giving Feedback" promote communication in small groups or pairs. These and a variety of other activities, including "Pyramid Procedure," "Prepared Talk," "Split Information," "Strip-story," "Padded Questions," "Same or Different," "Pass and Talk," and "Agony Column," are taken or adapted from Nation & Newton (2009). In these activities, opinions have to be expressed, agreements need to be reached, or information must be exchanged to complete each task. Accordingly, each lesson focuses on interactive communication. These activities take Batstone's criticism of prepared talk into account and implement spontaneous communication. Lesson three in the first teaching unit and lesson three in the second teaching unit on the other hand, push the learners to produce a monologue. Here the learners have to focus on a coherent and cohesive spoken text, without negotiation for meaning or interruptive feedback. The "Pyramid Procedure" and "Recording" activities in Lesson One in the first teaching unit incorporate both short prepared monologues as well as a communicative feedback phase. Iterations of feedback and production are also present in Lesson three of the second teaching unit, where the pyramid procedure elicits pushed output for English language learners of a lower level. These activities give the students time to prepare and focus on fluency and accuracy as well as they incorporate a considerable amount of support through constructive feedback from other learners. While lessons one through three of the first teaching unit take into account the pressure on the students and focus on pair work or small groups, lesson four and five of the same unit increases the level of pressure drastically. "Role Plays" and "Mock Interviews" in front of the whole class push the students to produce fluently, accurately, and comprehensibly under enormous time pressure.

These teaching units take the three preliminaries of pushed output into account. The topics of life goals, job announcements, application letters, job interviews, dietary preferences, healthy eating habits, and the relation of food and culture introduce opportunities to instruct students on a broad range of vocabulary and grammar points. Furthermore, various text types

are incorporated. Listening materials with both spontaneous as well as planned talk, covering job announcements, application letters, and job interviews, confront the students with different genres. Finally, the teaching units vary the performance conditions as mentioned above. They implement activities that give time for preparation as well as spontaneous talk. The amount of time pressure and the levels of support given by partners or group members vary accordingly. Ultimately, the amount of pressure to produce output increases drastically at the end of each teaching unit. Taken together, these interactive activities compel students to produce pushed output in order to learn the target language.

Sample Teaching Unit: The World of Work
Student level: intermediate to advanced

Lesson 1: Life Goals
Before class begins: Record three people discussing their future goals, including the following interview prompts: please introduce yourself; what are your three main goals in life?; which is the most important to you?; what do you have to do to accomplish your main goal?

Activity 1: Warm-up
1.   Write the word *goal* on the board
2.   Ask students what a goal is and about their personal goals
3.   Talk about teacher's personal goals and goals of students

Activity 2: Ranking
1.   Pass out *Worksheet: Ranking Activity* (Appendix A)
2.   Students complete a ranking activity on their worksheet
3.   Pairs: students compare and discuss their choices and compromise on the top three

Activity 3: Filling out template
1.   Explain task and hand out *Template: Personal Goals* (Appendix B)
2.   Students fill out the *Template: Personal Goals*.

Activity 4: Pyramid Procedure
1.   Pairs: students present their life goals to their partner.
2.   Partners give feedback on language, coherence, and cohesion based on the *Template: Feedback on Interview* (Appendix C)
3.   Students revise their Template: Personal Goals and prepare
4.   Group (4): students present their talk, get feedback, and adjust their notes.

Activity 5: Record talk/prepared talk
1.   To motivate the students, their recordings will be used as future teaching material and will be shared on Dropbox with the class
2.   Pairs: students go back to their first pair and record each other's talk

Activity 6: Discussion about recorded materials
1. Play prepared recording of peoples' life goals.
2. Ask what goals introduced in the recordings? (collecting goals on board)

3. Compare those goals to one another. Ask students the following questions: in what ways are they similar?; in what ways are they different?

Lesson 2: Finding a Job

Activity 1: Warm-up
1. Recapitulate last lessons final ranking and make transition to today's topic

Activity 2: Listening & Discussion
1. Students listen to three people talk about their job
2. Students answer the questions on the *Worksheet: The World of Work* (Appendix D)
3. Discussion: What kind of job would you like to do and how can you find job announcements?

Activity 3: Learning how to read job announcements
1. Hand out *Worksheet: Job Announcements* (Appendix E)
2. Discuss the outline of the announcements
3. One student reads the first announcement aloud as an example for the class
4. Ask students, "What information do we get from the announcement?"

Activity 4: Split Information
1. Hand out worksheet *Template: Job Announcements* (Appendix F)
2. Students have different job announcements and fill out one template
3. Group (3): students ask each other questions about the other students' job announcements and fill out the templates

Activity 5: Closing Discussion
1. Ask students:
   a. What kind of information do we get from the announcements?
   b. What do you think about the jobs?
   c. What are the next steps in the process of finding a job?

Lesson 3: Applying for a Job

Activity 1: Warm-up
1. Collect words and phrases to describe students' personal qualities.
2. Take notes about their strengths.

Activity 2: Talking about Personal Qualities
1. Group (3): students take turns in presenting themselves. They should tell the truth but stress their good qualities. Students give helpful feedback.

Activity 3: Strip Story: Application Letter I
1. Pairs: students get *Application Letter I* (Appendix G), which is stripped apart into its main features.
2. They will try to find out in which order to put the pieces to create a coherent application letter
3. Discuss the solution in class
4. Ask students to identify characteristics of the application letter

Activity 4: Application Letter Sample
1. Give students sample *Application Letter II* (<u>Appendix H</u>)
2. Compare the characteristics of the first and second application letter. Create a scaffold of helpful phrases for writing an application letter

Activity 5: Discussion
1. Show a third sample on a transparency or ppt. of *Application Letter III* (<u>Appendix I</u>).
2. Give the students time to analyze the letter.
3. Students apply the already learned features to the new sample.

Activity 6: Closing Discussion
1. Tell students: "Think about what kind of company you would enjoy a placement for a work experience with."
2. Homework: Start writing your application letter for a work experience placement.

Lesson 4: Preparing for an Interview

Activity 1: Warm-up
1. Recapitulate the scaffold for writing an application letter

Activity 2: Giving Feedback
1. Pairs: students exchange application letters and give feedback.
2. Show one student's (volunteer) example on the projector. In a class discussion, give feedback on parts that he/she did well and on parts that need improvement
2. Give students more time to correct their work accordingly.

Activity 3: Finding Agreement
1. Students make a list of important things to do in preparation for a job interview.
2. Groups (4): students compare lists and agree on five important ways to be prepared
3. Students explain their list to the class

Activity 4: Listening
1. Give students the *Chart: Things He Does Well and Mistakes He Makes* (<u>Appendix J</u>)
2. Students listen to the job interview and fill out the chart
3. Collect the students' ideas in a chart on the board
4. Students listen to the interview again and compare chart on the board
5. Students adjust chart if needed

Activity 5: Role Play
1. Groups (4): students decide on a job and prepare questions for the interviewer
2. First pair role plays the job interview and the second pair listens carefully and gives feedback
3. Change roles, pair two role plays the job interview and pair one gives feedback
4. Students practice the role play again and pay attention to the feedback they got from the other pair

Activity 6: Closing Homework
1. Give the students a role card—company, job, job description, name of the interviewer
2. Students prepare and will be ready for a mock interview

3. Students listen to the following audio files to prepare their interview and get ideas about useful phrases:
    a. <u>Audio 1</u>
    b. <u>Audio 2</u>
    c. <u>Audio 3</u>

Lesson 5: The Interview
Activity 1: Warm-up
1. Recapitulate important aspects of a job interview
2. Set up interview

Activity 2: Mock Interview 1
1. First find a volunteer to role play a mock interview with teacher
2. Other students listen and fill out feedback, answering the following questions: what did the student do well?; what should the student work on?; what further comments do you have?
3. Students hand over feedback to the first volunteer
4. Students guess the job their peer applied for

Activity 3+: Mock Interview 2
1. Continue as in activity 2 until all students have completed a mock interview

Activity 4: Closing
1. Summarize important information
2. Discuss topic of teaching unit and relevance for students

Sample Teaching Unit: I Love to Eat
Student level: High beginner to intermediate

Lesson 1: A Balanced Diet
Activity 1: Warm-up: Guess and Tell
1. Draw the food pyramid and explains its format.
2. Ask students to copy the food pyramid in their notebooks and fill in food pyramid with their guesses for each tier.
3. Fill in food pyramid with correct answers. Class discusses their guesses in relation to answers.

Activity 2: Last one standing
1. Students study the food pyramid.
2. Break students off into groups of 2-3. Each group is assigned a food category.
3. Students brainstorm food items according to category, focusing on ones from their home country.
4. Students compare the Western food pyramid with eating habits in their home countries.
5. Students present their food lists and food comparisons by country.

Activity 3: Survey
1. Give students the *Handout: Favorite Food Survey* (<u>Appendix </u>K).
2. Discuss question formation and negotiation strategies with students, e.g., clarification request.
3. Encourage students to ask other teachers, administrators, and students to complete the survey.
4. Students sit in groups and explain the results of their survey to classmates.
5. Students tally results of the most popular food items and make a short presentation to the class.

Activity 4: Best and Worst
1. Students are given the *Worksheet: Popular Diets* (<u>Appendix </u>L).
2. Discuss any unknown vocabulary or sentence structures.
3. Each student chooses two diets she would never use and one diet she would use.
4. Discuss words used to convince.
5. Students work in pairs and try come to a consensus about the best and worst diets.
6. Give students time to prepare for a presentation of results
7. Students present their results to the rest of the class.

Activity 5: Modify the Statements
1. Explain that students will work in pairs to modify given statements so that they both agree on the statement.
2. Give students the *Worksheet: Modify the Statements* (<u>Appendix </u>M). Students complete the activity with a partner.
3. Each set of partners discusses the modifications they made with the rest of the class.

Activity 6: Closing
1. Bring attention back to the class.
2. Ask for feedback about today's activates and the usefulness of the grammar/vocabulary learned.
3. Discuss feedback with class.

Lesson 2: My Favorite Food

Activity 1: Warm-up
1. Break the students up in pairs to discuss what they've eaten since the last session.
2. The class playfully categorizes and critiques each classmate's food intake.

Activity 2: Padded questions
1. Ask the students padded questions. For example, *When I'm in a bad mood, I always really want pizza. I crave it. What foods do you usually crave?*
2. Note relevant vocabulary and sentence frames on the board.

Activity 3: Same or different
1. Give pairs of students *Worksheet: Same or Different* (<u>Appendix N</u>). Students do not show their sheets to each other.

2. Each reads sentences in turn. Together, the learners judge if the sentences have the same or different meaning.
3. Discuss answers with the class.

Activity 4: Pass and talk
1. Put students into groups. Each group is given several cards with questions on them *Worksheet: Pass and Talk* (Appendix O)
2. Students lay the cards face down and take turns picking up the cards, reading the question aloud, answering each question, and leading a discussion on the topic.
3. Students are given time to reach a consensus about each issue.
4. When all groups are finished, each group presents their answers.

Activity 5: Food survey
1. Students are given the worksheet: *Humorous Food Survey* (Appendix P).
2. Review how to formulate any unknown question forms on the board.
3. Students are given time to complete the survey.
4. Student groups are told to use all knowledge about each other's eating habits to collectively prepare a dinner party. They can only bring 4 items so they have to negotiate. Groups must present to the class when finished.

Activity 6: Closing
1. Bring attention back to the class.
2. Ask for feedback about today's activates.
4. Engage in small talk with the students about their plans for lunch and dinner.

Lesson 3: Let's Talk about Food

Activity 1: Warm-up
1. Ask students some padded questions related to the unit, e.g., *Did you drink coffee this morning? I'm a big coffee drinker, what about you?*

Activity 2: Agony Column
1. Students are given *Worksheet: Agony Column* (Appendix Q)
2. Students are put in groups of three, where the first person reads the column, the second gives advice with respect to the problem in the agony column, and the third writes the advice.
3. Students rotate agony columns between groups and students switch roles.
4. Continue until each student has had a turn to read, speak, and write.

Activity 3: Information Gap
1. Pass out *Worksheets: Information Gap I & Information Gap II* (Appendix R) to students, ensuring that each student in pairs are given different worksheets
2. Use an information gap using student's eating habits generated from information gathered from the past two lessons.
3. Put students in pairs, and give them time to complete information gap activity.
4. As a class, students' habits and needs are discussed, and students categorize what foods they should avoid, detailing why.

Activity 4: Realia
  1. Present to students real food items ranging in taste and texture.
  2. Elicit target vocabulary from students regarding food items
  3. Give groups of students different food items and ask them to describe the items to their partners.
  4. Write some errors on the board and attempts to encourage self correction.
Activity 5: Prepared Talk
  1. Students are given model of a talk prepared by the teacher: *Worksheet: Talk Model* (Appendix S)
  2. Students are asked to prepare their own talk using only brief notes. Students are not given enough time to construct a verbatim version.
  3. Students deliver their talk to their partners and are given feedback.
  4. Students deliver their talk in groups of three or four and are given feedback.
  5. Students deliver their talk to the entire class.
Activity 6: Closing
  1. Bring attention back to the class.
  2. Ask for feedback about today's activities and the usefulness of the grammar/vocabulary learned.
  3. Engage in small talk with the students about their plans for this afternoon and this evening.

Conclusion

We hope to have shown that the theoretical principles of the Output Hypothesis are not only compelling in their own right, they can also have direct classroom application. Recognizing that comprehensible input is a necessary condition for language learning should prompt educators to provide plenty of opportunities to be exposed to it. However, comprehensible input alone is insufficient for reaching a learning outcome in which students are able to fluently and accurately verbalize their intended messages and meanings. The pedagogical upshot of this consideration is that educators can act as a guide in creating opportunities for interaction. This serves the twofold impetus to craft scenarios in which students are both exposed to comprehensible input and to craft scenarios where learners have plenty of chances to produce output. Further, when students are pushed to provide output, they tend to focus-on-form, since they must concentrate on both the meaning of their utterance and the grammatical structure in which they encode it. Thus, creating task conditions for pushed output can facilitate precisely the sort of output which is most effective in developing the interlanguage of learners. Further, producing output in communicative contexts allows students to benefit from the three functions of output (Swain, 1995; 2000; 2005). Establishing interactive, task-based contexts for learners further encourages negotiation for meaning by giving students a common goal for which they must interact to reach. Thus, the general strategy being advocated here for implementing the theoretical principles just examined is to create interactive, task-based activities which will allow students to enjoy the benefits of comprehensible input, output, and negotiation for meaning.

References

Gass, S. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gass, S. & Mackey, A. (2006). Input, interaction and output: An overview. *AILA Review 19*(15), 3-17.

Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis: an experimental study on ESL relativization. *SSLA 24,* 541-577.

LaPierre, D. (1994). *Language output in a cooperative learning setting: Determining its effects on second language learning.* National Library of Canada.

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

Long, M.H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics 4*(2), 126-141.

Long, M. H. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass and C. Madden (eds.) *Input in second language acquisition*. (pp. 377-393). Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W.C. Ritchie and T.K. Bhatia (eds.) *Handbook of language acquisition Vol. 2: Second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press.

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.

Nation, I. S. P & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking*. New York: Routledge.

Schmidt, R., Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.) *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newburry House.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Gass S. and Madden C. (eds.) *Input in second language acquisition* (pp.235-253). Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

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

Swain, M. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal 82*, 320-337.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. Lantolf (Eds.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97-119). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471-483). Yahweh, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Swain, M., Lapkin, S., (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: a step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 16*, 371-391.

Varonis, E. M. and Gass, S. (1985). Non-native/non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics 6*(1), 71-90.

Vygotzky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Appendix A
Teaching Unit on The World of Work

Lesson 1 Activity 2

Ranking Activity

Rank what is most important to you. Number the items from 1 to 8. Number 1 is the most important to you.

_____ love _____ employment   _____ money   _____ friends

_____ family _____ entertainment _____ education _____ housing

Back to The World of Work Lesson 1 Activity 2

Appendix B
Teaching Unit on The World of Work

Lesson 1 Activity 3
<u>Template: Personal Goals</u>

Name	
Age	
Country	
Three Lifelong Goals	1) 2) 3)
Most Important Goal	
Explanation for Most Important Goal	
Requirements to Achieve Goals	
Predict Factors that Influence Your Success	
State and Explain Your Role Models	

<u>Back to The World of Work Lesson 1 Activity 3</u>

Appendix C
Teaching Unit on The World of Work

Lesson 1 Activity 4
Template: Feedback on interview

Did your partner use the terms *want to, plan to, be going to*?	
Correct grammar use	
Appropriate vocabulary	
Information are clear: 1. Did the interviewee explain why his/her most important goal is more important than the others? 2. Does the listener understand how the goals can be achieved, do the requirements actually lead to the goal? 3. Did the interviewee elaborate on the obstacles that might occur along the way? 4. Did the interviewee give specific examples why his/her role models are so important?	
Interesting information that needs more details: 1. Elaborate on goal 2. Elaborate on requirements 3. Elaborate on obstacles 4. Elaborate on role models 5. Elaborate on ...	

Appendix D
Teaching Unit on The World of Work

Lesson 2 Activity 2
The World of Work

What information do the speakers give about the world of work?

What is important when you choose a career?

What can you learn from the speakers?

What Questions remain?
Back to The World of Work Lesson 2 Activity 2

Appendix E
Teaching Unit on The World of Work

Lesson 2 Activity 3
Job Announcements

Back to The World of Work Lesson 2 Activity 3

Appendix F
Teaching Unit on The World of Work

Lesson 2 Activity 4
Template: Job Announcements

Employer	
Position	
Hours	Part-Time Full-Time
Responsibilities	
Salary	
Location	
Application Process	

Back to The World of Work Lesson 2 Activity 4

Appendix G
Teaching Unit on The World of Work

Lesson 3 Activity 3
<u>Application Letter I</u>

Philipp Burns Eichkoppelweg 55 24119 Kronshagen Germany philippb@....de	Barnes and Noble 325 Keawe #101 Lahaina, HI 96761 808-662-1300

Application for an internship in customer service in Summer 2017
Sincerely yours, Philipp Burns
Dear Sir or Madam,
I am always eager to seek new responsibilities and learn new skills in the workplace. I am self-motivated and enjoy taking initiative to achieve better results. I also enjoy a challenge, and am keen to use my skills and experience at Barnes and Noble.
I would like to apply for an internship in customer service at your Barnes and Noble Bookstore in Lahaina.
Encl. CV
I would love the opportunity to discuss my application with you in further detail, and look forward to hearing from you.
I am a high school student with experience as an assistant librarian. I am eager to continue delivering excellent service and developing my skills at Barnes and Noble, particularly due to my love for travel literature.

<u>Back to The World of Work Lesson 3 Activity 3</u>

Appendix H
Teaching Unit on The World of Work

Lesson 3 Activity 4
Application Letter II

Maximilian Schneider¶
Gerstäckerstr. 20¶
23814 Hamburg¶
Germany¶

> Friederike
> Write your full name and address on the right top corner of the page¶

Webb Miller Architects¶
16-18 Rutland Way¶
Peterborough PE1 5JN¶

UK¶

> Friederike
> Write the company's name and address on the left side¶

10.11.2016¶
¶
¶
¶

> Friederike
> write the date ¶

Application for a work experience placement in Summer 2016¶
¶
¶
¶

> Friederike
> write a short statement of your letters purpose, in bold¶

Dear Mr. Webb ¶
¶
I am writing to apply for a work experience placement with your company this summer. Your name was given to me by friends in Peterborough. ¶
¶

> Friederike
> write „Dear Mr./Mrs.…" if you have a specific name. Write "Dear Sir or Madam" if not¶

> Friederike
> Say why you are writing this letter in the first paragraph¶

After graduating from school in two years, I plan to study architecture. As you will see from my enclosed CV, I spent one month with an architecture company in Hamburg last summer. A placement in your company would be a great chance to enlarge my knowledge and experience in this field. I like to work in a team and am very eager to learn and contribute to your projects. ¶
¶
¶

> Friederike
> Add useful information about your experiences and strength in the second paragraph¶

I look forward hearing from you ¶
¶
¶
¶

> Friederike
> Be friendly but certain at the same time¶

Maximilian Schneider¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶

> Friederike
> Print your name under your signature ¶

> Friederike Vor wenigen Sek
> Show what you are enclosing¶
> 📣 Antworten   📣 Auflösa

Encl. CV¶

Back to The World of Work Lesson 3 Activity 4

Appendix I
Teaching Unit on The World of Work

Lesson 3 Activity 5
Application Letter III

Anna Bauer
Weidenkamp 23
24107 Kiel
Germany
Abauer@....de

Elisabeth Ruffer
Bright Horizons Ladbroke Grove Day Nursery and Preschool
34 Ladbroke Grove
London W11 3BQ
10.01.2017

Application for an internship as Daycare Assistant

Dear Sir or Madam,
I am writing to apply for the internship as a Daycare Assistant that was advertised in your local newspaper. Having worked with children for over five years, I think I would be a good addition to your daycare facility.
I have been a childcare provider for over five years now, having cared for children age ½ through 10 years. I have babysat day and evening, whole weekends and attended swimming classes with the children. Usually, I cared for one up to four children at a time. During daytime hours I not only supervised them, but also went on field trips, did sports and provided various educational opportunities.
I look forward to hearing from you and discuss my experience and how I can be a good addition to Bright Horizon Daycare.

Sincerely yours,

Anna Bauer

Encl. CV
Back to The World of Work Lesson 3 Activity 5

Appendix J
Teaching Unit on The World of Work

Lesson 4 Activity 4

<u>Things He Does Well and Mistakes He Makes</u>
Things he does well   Mistakes he makes

Back to <u>The World of Work </u>Lesson 4 Activity 4

Appendix K
Teaching Unit on I Love to Eat

Lesson 1 Activity 3
<u>Favorite Food Survey</u>

Name	Favorite Fruit	Favorite Vegetable	Favorite Sweets	Favorite type of carb	Favorite type of protein	Favorite type of dairy	Favorite Restaurant

<u>Back to I Love to Eat Lesson 1 Activity 3</u>

Appendix L
Teaching Unit on I Love to Eat

Lesson 1 Activity 4
Popular Diets
Pick the top diet you would like to try. Label it #1 . Pick the top two diets you would never want to try and put a big X next to them.

Raw food diet: Uncooked and unprocessed food. Mostly raw fruits and vegetables, nuts, and seeds. Some people eat raw meat, fish and eggs.
Vegan diet: No animal products including dairy and eggs. Mostly beans, vegetables, and fruits.
The Atkins diet: High protein foods such as meat, eggs, and cheese. Avoid foods that are high in carbs.
Baby Food diet: Only eat baby food for breakfast and lunch for two weeks.
Tapeworm diet: Eat a tapeworm and wait for it to leave your body
The Mushroom diet: Replace lunch or dinner every day for two weeks with a mushroom dish.
The Juice Fast: Instead of food, drink four to six glasses of fresh vegetable and fruit juices for one week. Avoid exercise.
The Mediterranean diet: Mostly fruits and vegetables. Eat very little red meat. Use herbs and spices instead of salt. Drink red wine.

Back to I Love to Eat Lesson 1 Activity 4

Appendix M
Teaching Unit on I Love to Eat

Lesson 1 Activity 5
<u>Modify the Statement</u>
Change the sentences with your partner so that you both agree
Eating carbs will make you fat.
Red meat will give you heart disease.
Eating raw food is the only way to lose weight.
Vegans are the healthiest people in the world.

<u>Back to I Love to Eat Lesson 1 Activity 5</u>

Appendix N
Teaching Unit on I Love to Eat

Lesson 2: Activity 3
<u>Same or Different</u>
Partner A's sentences
- This class is so weird!
- I have a craving for Ms. Lee's homemade pizza!
- I have no idea how to speak Korean!
- I don't like Brittney's spaghetti!
- I saw Sachiko at Ala Moana mall yesterday. I avoided her.
- I can never turn down good Ahi!
- I'm watching my weight, I'm getting married soon.
- Last night I ate hot pot and now I can't poop!!!!

Partner B's sentences
- This class is so much fun!
- I really want the pizza Ms. Lee's makes at home!
- I don't know how to speak Korean!
- I don't care for Brittney's spaghetti!
- I saw Sachiko at Ala Moana mall yesterday. I stayed stayed away from her.
- I can't say no to good Ahi!
- I can't stop looking in the mirror. My girlfriend wants to marry me.
- Last night I ate hot pot and I've had such bad diarrhea!!!!

<u>Back to I Love to Eat Lesson 2 Activity 3</u>

Appendix O
Teaching Unit on I Love to Eat

Lesson 2 Activity 4
<u>Pass and Talk</u>
What's the weirdest thing you've ever eaten? How did it look/smell/taste? What did it look/smell/taste like?

What's the grossest thing you've ever eaten? How did it look/smell/taste? What did it look/smell/taste like?

What's the most delicious thing you've ever eaten? How did it look/smell/taste? What did it look/smell/taste like?

What's your favorite dish to cook? How does it look/smell/taste? What does it look/smell/taste like?

<u>Back to I Love to Eat Lesson 2 Activity 4</u>

Appendix P
Teaching Unit on I Love to Eat

Lesson 2 Activity 5
Humorous Food Survey

Name	Are there any foods you're avoiding?	Are there any foods you're allergic to?	Can you eat spicy food?	What's your favorite meat dish?	What's your favorite vegetable dish?	What's your favorite carb?	Do you drink? What's your favorite alcoholic drink?
A							
B							
C							

Back to I Love to Eat Lesson 2 Activity 5

Appendix Q
Teaching Unit on I Love to Eat

Lesson 3 Activity 2
<u>Agony Column</u>

Dear Agony,
My husband and I have been married for 10 years. We have a happy marriage, and I love him very much. However, he has gained a lot of weight. He loves eating fast food and sweets, and he never exercises. I don't want to hurt his feelings, but I'm not feeling attracted to him anymore. Should I say something? I don't know what to do!

Dear Agony,
My husband loves to cook. He makes me dinner every night, and he really enjoys doing it. The problem is, his cooking is terrible! His spaghetti is too salty, his soup it too bland, the meat he cooks is almost always overdone, and whenever he makes desert it's way too sweet! I've told him about the problems with his food, but he isn't getting any better! What should I do?

Dear Agony,
My girlfriend is a vegetarian and I'm not. At first, this wasn't a problem, but now it is. We can never agree about where to eat out, and we usually get in fights about it. Now, she won't even allow me to have any meat in our house! I'm a big meat eater, and I feel really annoyed! I told her, but she won't compromise. What should I do?!

<u>Back to I Love to Eat Lesson 3 Activity 2</u>

Appendix R
Teaching Unit on I Love to Eat

Lesson 3 Activity 3
<u>Information Gap I</u>

Name	What food(s) are they allergic to?	What food(s) don't agree with them?	What food(s) do they not care for?	What food(s) are they avoiding?	What kind of alcohol gives them a hangover?	What foods are they crazy about?	What foods can they not stand?
A	Uncooked Crab		Chinese Food		Soju		Carrots
B	Beer		Vietnamese Food		Soju		Broccoli
C	None		None		Oily Food		Cabbage
D	None		Malasada		Korean Soju		Eggplant
E	Cheese		Cilantro		Whisky & Tequila		Onion
F	None		Curry		Whisky		Celery

<u>Information Gap II</u>

Name	What food(s) are they allergic to?	What food(s) don't agree with them?	What food(s) do they not care for?	What food(s) are they avoiding?	What kind of alcohol gives them a hangover?	What foods are they crazy about?	What foods can they not stand?
A		Spicy Food		Chinese Food			
B		Spicy Food		Vietnamese Food			
C		None		None			
D		Milk		Spicy Food			
E		Bulgolgi		Hamburgers			
F		French Fries		Pizza			

<u>Back to I Love to Eat Lesson 3 Activity 3</u>

Appendix S
Teaching Unit on I Love to Eat

Lesson 3 Activity 5

Talk Model
My food tastes have really changed since I was a kid! My parents always used to take me to eat fast food, and I used to really love it. Now I can't stand it because it tastes so salty. I also used to really love chocolate cake, but now I think it's too sweet. It hurts my teeth, so I never eat chocolate cake anymore. Now, I'm a big sushi eater, but I hated it when I was a kid. I thought raw fish was so disgusting. It smelled so gross and the texture was really weird, but now I eat it twice a week. It's so good! When I was younger, I hated spicy food. I could never eat it. It burnt my tongue and gave me diarrhea. Now I love spicy food. It doesn't burn my mouth anymore, but it still gives me diarrhea. But I don't care. It tastes so good!

Back to I Love to Eat Lesson 3 Activity 5

About the Authors:
Justin Pannell holds a master's degree in Philosophy and is currently a MA TESOL candidate at Hawaii Pacific University. He has taught formal logic and philosophy at Syracuse University, and has taught ESL/EFL at a language school in Honolulu. His research interests include critical pedagogy, critical ethnography, and problem-posing education.

Friederike Partsch holds an MA in TESOL from Hawaii Pacific University as well as an MA in Education from Christian-Albrechts-University of Kiel, Germany. She is currently a high-school English and History teacher in Germany.

Nicholas Fuller holds a bachelor's degree in Sociology and is currently a MA TESOL candidate at Hawaii Pacific University. He has taught EFL in China and ESL at a language school in Honolulu. His research interests include the use of authentic materials in the classroom, conversation analysis, and the effect of trauma on language learning.