IQRO JURNALI , IQRO JOURNAL, ИКРО ЖУРНАЛИ
ISSN:2181-4341| wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/iqro
Volume 23 Issue 01 AVGUST 2026

THE INFLUENCE OF PASSIVE ENGLISH EXPOSURE ON ACTIVE SPEAKING SKILLS AMONG EFL LEARNERS

Abdusaitova Sevinch Sadridin qizi
Student of Samarkand State
Institute of Foreign Languages
sevinchabdusaidova185@gmail.com
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22254687

Abstract: This article examines the influence of passive English exposure on the development of active speaking skills among learners of English as a foreign language (EFL). Passive exposure is considered as the regular reception of English through audio and video materials, films, podcasts, social media content, and other authentic language sources. Such exposure can contribute to the development of learners' vocabulary, understanding of grammatical structures, pronunciation awareness, and ability to recognize commonly used language patterns. However, increased comprehension of English does not necessarily lead to fluent and accurate oral production. Therefore, this study analyzes the relationship between passive language experience and active speaking development, with particular attention to the role of regular conversation, repeated language production, interactive tasks, and communicative activities in transforming passive knowledge into active speaking competence. The study emphasizes that passive English exposure should not be treated as an independent method of language development but rather as a complementary component that should be integrated with systematic speaking practice.

Keywords: passive English exposure, active speaking skills, EFL learners, English language learning, oral communication, language input, speaking proficiency, vocabulary acquisition

Introduction

English has become one of the most widely learned foreign languages worldwide, increasing the importance of effective approaches to developing learners' communicative competence. Within English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, learners often receive substantial amounts of English input through films, podcasts, music, social media, online lectures, video platforms, and other digital resources outside the formal classroom. This phenomenon can be described as passive English exposure, in which learners primarily receive and process linguistic input without necessarily producing language themselves. Although such exposure does not directly require oral interaction, it may provide learners with frequent contact with vocabulary, grammatical structures, pronunciation patterns, discourse features, and naturally occurring expressions.

The role of language input in second language acquisition has been widely discussed in theoretical and empirical research. Krashen's Input Hypothesis emphasizes the importance of comprehensible input in language development, arguing that exposure to language that is understandable but slightly beyond the learner's current level can contribute to acquisition.

Similarly, research on incidental vocabulary learning suggests that repeated encounters with words in meaningful contexts can support vocabulary development and improve learners' recognition of lexical items. These processes are particularly relevant to EFL learners because limited opportunities for authentic English communication may restrict the amount of linguistic input available in their everyday environment.

However, exposure to English and the ability to use English actively are not identical constructs. Learners may understand a considerable amount of vocabulary and grammatical information while experiencing difficulty retrieving and producing this knowledge during spontaneous communication. Speaking requires more than knowledge of linguistic forms; it involves rapid lexical retrieval, grammatical processing, pronunciation control, fluency, and the ability to construct meaning under real-time communicative conditions. From this perspective, passive exposure may create an important linguistic foundation, but it cannot necessarily substitute for opportunities to produce language and interact with other speakers.

The distinction between receptive and productive language knowledge is therefore central to understanding the relationship between English exposure and speaking development. Receptive knowledge enables learners to recognize and understand linguistic forms, whereas productive knowledge involves retrieving and using those forms appropriately in communication. The development of productive competence generally requires repeated retrieval and meaningful use of language. Swain's Output Hypothesis, for example, emphasizes that language production can encourage learners to notice gaps in their linguistic knowledge and process language more deeply. Interaction-based perspectives similarly highlight the importance of negotiation of meaning and communicative interaction in second language development.

The rapid expansion of digital media has made passive English exposure increasingly accessible to EFL learners. Unlike traditional classroom-based input, digital content can provide learners with frequent and potentially authentic exposure to different accents, registers, vocabulary items, and communicative situations. Nevertheless, the educational value of such exposure depends on how learners engage with the input and whether it is subsequently connected with active language production. Passive listening or viewing may increase familiarity with English, but structured speaking activities, conversation, shadowing, discussion, role-play, and other forms of productive practice may be necessary to transform receptive knowledge into usable speaking competence.

Therefore, the present study focuses on the influence of passive English exposure on active speaking skills among EFL learners. The study considers passive exposure not as a replacement for communicative practice but as a potentially significant component of a broader language-learning process. Particular attention is given to the relationship between the amount and nature of English input and learners' ability to retrieve vocabulary, construct sentences, maintain fluency, and communicate ideas orally. Examining this relationship is important for EFL pedagogy because it may help educators design learning environments in which extensive English exposure is systematically combined with opportunities for meaningful language production. In this way, passive input can function as a foundation for developing active and communicatively effective speaking skills.

Passive English exposure represents an important source of linguistic input for learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), particularly in contexts where opportunities for direct

communication with proficient English speakers are limited. In contemporary learning environments, EFL learners can encounter English through films, television programs, podcasts, songs, online courses, social media, video-sharing platforms, digital games, websites, and other forms of authentic content. Unlike formal classroom instruction, these sources often expose learners to naturally occurring language, including different accents, speech rates, colloquial expressions, discourse markers, and context-dependent vocabulary. From a second language acquisition perspective, repeated exposure provides learners with opportunities to notice linguistic patterns and gradually develop stronger receptive knowledge.

One of the most influential theoretical perspectives concerning the importance of exposure is Krashen's Input Hypothesis. According to this perspective, language acquisition is facilitated when learners receive comprehensible input that contains linguistic features slightly beyond their current level of competence. The importance of comprehensible input lies not simply in the quantity of English encountered but also in the learner's ability to understand the meaning of the message. Consequently, passive exposure is likely to be more beneficial when learners can understand a substantial proportion of the material and use contextual information, visual information, subtitles, or prior knowledge to interpret unfamiliar language. Exposure that is consistently far beyond the learner's proficiency level may provide less accessible input and may therefore have a weaker direct effect on language development.

Passive exposure is particularly relevant to vocabulary acquisition. During repeated encounters with English words in meaningful contexts, learners may gradually strengthen their recognition of lexical forms and their associations with meanings and grammatical patterns. Research on incidental vocabulary learning has demonstrated that repeated exposure to words through reading and listening can contribute to vocabulary growth, although the amount learned from a single encounter is generally limited. This means that frequency of exposure is an important factor. When a learner repeatedly encounters the same lexical item across different contexts, the word may become increasingly familiar, making subsequent retrieval and understanding easier. Nevertheless, receptive recognition of a word does not automatically mean that the learner can actively retrieve and use that word accurately during spontaneous speaking.

The distinction between receptive and productive vocabulary provides an important explanation for this phenomenon. Receptive vocabulary refers broadly to words that learners can recognize and understand when they encounter them, whereas productive vocabulary concerns words that learners can retrieve and use appropriately in speech or writing. Passive exposure primarily strengthens receptive knowledge because learners are receiving language rather than producing it. For example, an EFL learner may understand the expression "take responsibility" immediately when hearing it in a film but may fail to retrieve the same expression when attempting to express an idea during a conversation. The gap between recognition and production demonstrates why passive exposure should be connected with opportunities for active retrieval and communicative use.

The influence of passive exposure can also be observed in pronunciation and listening-related aspects of speaking. Regular exposure to authentic spoken English allows learners to hear differences in stress, rhythm, intonation, connected speech, reductions, and pronunciation patterns. Such exposure can improve learners' ability to distinguish sounds and recognize frequently occurring pronunciation patterns. It may also contribute to the development of a more

accurate internal representation of spoken English. However, hearing pronunciation repeatedly is different from physically producing it. Speaking requires coordinated motor control of the articulatory system, timing, prosody, and the ability to produce sounds rapidly within connected speech. Therefore, passive listening may establish useful phonological awareness, while explicit pronunciation practice and repeated oral production are needed to develop stable productive pronunciation skills.

Another important dimension is speaking fluency. Fluency requires learners to formulate and express ideas with relatively limited hesitation and excessive pauses. Passive exposure can indirectly support fluency by increasing familiarity with frequently occurring lexical combinations, sentence patterns, discourse markers, and conversational routines. Through repeated listening, learners may become familiar with expressions such as “I think that…,” “in my opinion,” “the main reason is…,” or “on the other hand.” These ready-made sequences can reduce the processing demands involved in constructing speech. Nevertheless, fluent speaking depends heavily on the ability to retrieve linguistic material under real-time conditions. Consequently, exposure must be accompanied by repeated speaking opportunities in which learners are required to retrieve and manipulate language themselves.

The Output Hypothesis provides an important theoretical explanation for why passive exposure alone may not be sufficient. Swain argued that producing language can encourage learners to notice gaps between what they want to say and what they are able to say. When learners attempt to communicate a complex idea, they may discover that they do not possess the necessary vocabulary, grammatical structure, or pronunciation pattern. This “noticing” process can stimulate further learning and modification of linguistic knowledge. In this sense, speaking is not merely the final product of language acquisition; it can also function as a mechanism through which learners develop greater control over the language. Passive exposure therefore becomes more pedagogically effective when learners subsequently use the language they have encountered.

Interaction provides an additional mechanism through which passive knowledge can become active competence. In communicative interaction, learners must interpret another speaker’s message, formulate a response, select appropriate vocabulary and grammatical structures, and monitor whether their intended meaning has been understood. These processes place greater cognitive demands on learners than simply recognizing language while watching a video or listening to a podcast. Interaction may also provide immediate feedback, clarification, reformulation, and opportunities for negotiation of meaning. Such experiences can help learners identify linguistic problems and develop more efficient strategies for communication.

The increasing availability of digital media has significantly expanded the amount of English that EFL learners can encounter outside the classroom. Digital platforms provide access to authentic content produced for native and proficient English-speaking audiences rather than exclusively for language learners. This can expose learners to a broader range of vocabulary, speech styles, cultural references, and communicative situations. At the same time, digital exposure varies considerably in quality. Watching English content passively in the background may involve limited attention to linguistic form, whereas attentive viewing with comprehension tasks, repetition, note-taking, subtitles, shadowing, or subsequent discussion may create deeper

engagement with the language. Thus, the educational effect of exposure depends not only on the duration of contact with English but also on the quality and intensity of learner engagement.

Subtitles represent another factor that can influence the effectiveness of passive exposure. When learners watch English audiovisual content with English subtitles, they simultaneously receive auditory and written representations of the language. This may facilitate the recognition of unfamiliar words and help learners connect pronunciation with orthographic forms. However, subtitles in the learners' first language may primarily support comprehension of content without necessarily directing attention toward English linguistic forms. Therefore, the type of subtitle and the learner's proficiency level can influence how effectively audiovisual exposure contributes to language development. For speaking development, exposure becomes particularly valuable when learners subsequently imitate, repeat, or actively use expressions encountered in the audiovisual material.

The relationship between exposure and speaking is also influenced by individual learner characteristics. Learners differ in proficiency, motivation, attention, vocabulary size, working-memory capacity, learning strategies, and willingness to communicate. A highly motivated learner who actively notices and records new expressions may benefit more from the same amount of English exposure than a learner who consumes identical content without deliberate attention to language. Similarly, learners with stronger foundational knowledge may be able to extract more linguistic information from authentic materials because they can understand a greater proportion of the input. Therefore, the amount of exposure alone should not be regarded as a sufficient indicator of its potential effect on speaking performance.

An important pedagogical implication is that passive exposure should be integrated into a balanced input-output cycle. Learners can first encounter authentic English through listening or audiovisual materials and then transform selected linguistic material into active practice. For example, after listening to a short podcast, learners can summarize its content orally, answer comprehension questions, retell the main ideas, discuss their opinions, or use newly encountered vocabulary in original sentences. Similarly, after watching a short video, learners can imitate selected phrases, practice pronunciation through shadowing, participate in role-play, and discuss the topic with peers. Such activities connect receptive processing with productive use and increase the probability that linguistic knowledge will become accessible during spontaneous communication.

The frequency and distribution of practice are also important. Occasional exposure to a large amount of English may increase general familiarity with the language, but systematic and repeated encounters are more likely to strengthen specific linguistic forms. A learner who listens to English for a short period every day and repeatedly retrieves newly encountered vocabulary may have more opportunities for consolidation than a learner who watches English content intensively but irregularly. From a pedagogical perspective, therefore, consistency may be more useful than exposure that occurs only sporadically. Regular exposure combined with deliberate speaking practice can create repeated opportunities for learners to encounter, recognize, retrieve, and use the same linguistic resources.

It is also necessary to distinguish between exposure and acquisition when evaluating the effectiveness of passive English contact. Exposure creates opportunities for learning, but it does not guarantee acquisition of every linguistic feature encountered. Learners may understand the

general meaning of a message while failing to notice individual grammatical or lexical forms. This is especially likely when attention is focused primarily on the content rather than on language. Consequently, the relationship between exposure and speaking development should not be understood as a simple linear process in which more hours of listening automatically produce proportionally higher speaking proficiency. The effectiveness of exposure depends on comprehensibility, repetition, attention, learner engagement, prior knowledge, and opportunities for subsequent production.

Overall, the evidence and theoretical perspectives surrounding second language acquisition suggest that passive English exposure can provide a valuable linguistic foundation for active speaking development, particularly by increasing access to vocabulary, pronunciation patterns, grammatical structures, formulaic expressions, and authentic discourse. However, passive exposure should not be interpreted as a sufficient substitute for speaking practice. The development of active oral competence requires learners to retrieve and produce language, interact with others, receive feedback, and repeatedly use linguistic resources in meaningful communicative situations. The most productive approach is therefore an integrated model in which extensive and comprehensible English input is systematically followed by structured opportunities for output and interaction. Such integration can help bridge the gap between what EFL learners understand and what they are able to communicate actively and fluently.

Conclusion

The analysis demonstrates that passive English exposure can play a significant supporting role in the development of active speaking skills among EFL learners. Regular contact with English through listening, films, podcasts, audiovisual materials, online content, and other authentic sources provides learners with meaningful linguistic input and opportunities to encounter vocabulary, grammatical structures, pronunciation patterns, collocations, and discourse expressions in context. Empirical research has confirmed that incidental vocabulary learning can occur through different forms of input, including reading, listening, and viewing. For example, Feng and Webb's experimental study involving 76 university EFL learners in China demonstrated that incidental vocabulary learning occurred through reading, listening, and audiovisual viewing, with learning gains retained one week after exposure.

At the same time, the evidence indicates that passive exposure alone cannot be regarded as a sufficient condition for developing fluent and accurate speaking. Receptive knowledge and productive language ability represent related but distinct dimensions of second language competence. A learner may recognize and understand a word, grammatical structure, or expression during listening but still experience difficulty retrieving and using it during spontaneous communication. This distinction explains why increased exposure does not automatically result in proportional improvements in speaking performance.

The role of repeated exposure is particularly important. Research on incidental vocabulary learning indicates that the frequency with which learners encounter linguistic items influences the likelihood of learning them, although there is no universal number of encounters that guarantees acquisition. Repeated encounters across meaningful contexts can therefore strengthen learners' familiarity with vocabulary and linguistic patterns. However, for receptive knowledge

to become productive knowledge, learners need opportunities to retrieve and actively use the language.

The findings also support the importance of combining input with output and interaction. Swain's Output Hypothesis argues that language production can contribute to second language development by encouraging learners to notice gaps in their linguistic knowledge and attempt to modify their production. Research on learner output similarly emphasizes that opportunities to produce language are important because comprehension of input alone may not guarantee accurate control of vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. Therefore, passive English exposure should be incorporated into a broader input–interaction–output cycle rather than used as an isolated learning strategy.

From a pedagogical perspective, EFL teachers should encourage learners to combine extensive English exposure with systematic speaking activities. Listening to podcasts or watching English-language videos can be followed by oral summaries, discussions, retelling activities, role-plays, question-and-answer tasks, shadowing, and vocabulary recycling. Such activities create a transition from recognition to retrieval and from receptive knowledge to productive competence. The effectiveness of exposure is therefore determined not only by the amount of English learners encounter but also by the comprehensibility, repetition, attention, interaction, and subsequent productive use associated with that exposure.

In conclusion, passive English exposure should be considered a valuable foundation rather than a substitute for active speaking practice. Its greatest pedagogical potential emerges when learners are provided with frequent and comprehensible English input and subsequently required to retrieve, manipulate, and use that input in meaningful communication. An integrated approach combining passive exposure, deliberate practice, interaction, and language production is consequently more appropriate for developing sustainable speaking proficiency among EFL learners.

References

1. Feng, Y., & Webb, S. (2020). Learning vocabulary through reading, listening, and viewing: Which mode of input is most effective? Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 42(3), 499–523. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263119000494
2. Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
3. Nation, I. S. P. (2001). Learning Vocabulary in Another Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), Input in Second Language Acquisition (pp. 235–253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
5. Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics: Studies in Honour of H. G. Widdowson (pp. 125–144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning (pp. 471–484). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

7. Webb, S. (2007). The effects of repetition on vocabulary knowledge. Applied Linguistics, 28(1), 46–65. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml048
8. Webb, S. (2010). A corpus driven study of the potential for vocabulary learning through watching movies. International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 15(4), 497–519.
9. Webb, S., & Rodgers, M. P. H. (2009). The vocabulary demands of television programs. Language Learning, 59(2), 335–366.
10. Webb, S., & Chang, A. C.-S. (2015). Second language vocabulary learning through extensive reading with audio support: How do frequency and distribution of occurrence affect learning? Language Teaching Research, 19(6), 667–686. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814559800
11. Webb, S., Newton, J., & Chang, A. C.-S. (2013). Incidental learning of collocation. Language Learning, 63(1), 91–120.
12. Webb, S., Uchihara, T., & Yanagisawa, A. (2023). How effective is second language incidental vocabulary learning? A meta-analysis. Language Teaching, 56(2), 161–180. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444822000507
13. Webb, S., Yanagisawa, A., & Uchihara, T. (2020). How effective are intentional vocabulary-learning activities? A meta-analysis. The Modern Language Journal. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12671
14. Zahar, R., Cobb, T., & Spada, N. (2001). Acquiring vocabulary through reading: Effects of frequency and contextual richness. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 57(4), 541–572.