

## Revisiting Input and Output Mechanisms in Writing Development: A Comparative Review of Contemporary Research

Daffa Anugrah Pratama<sup>1</sup>, Nanik Retnowati<sup>2</sup>

English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,  
Universitas Ibn Khaldun Bogor

Email: [Daffaanugrah1508@gmail.com](mailto:Daffaanugrah1508@gmail.com)

### ABSTRAK

Penelitian tentang Akuisisi Bahasa Kedua (SLA) telah lama mendiskusikan peran relatif antara masukan yang dapat dipahami dan keluaran bahasa dalam perkembangan bahasa. Dalam diskusi ini, posisi penulisan bahasa kedua (L2) tetap kompleks, karena penulisan sering dianggap sebagai hasil dari akuisisi atau keterampilan pedagogis daripada mekanisme perkembangan. Studi ini bertujuan untuk meninjau kembali peran mekanisme berbasis masukan dan berbasis keluaran dalam perkembangan penulisan bahasa kedua melalui tinjauan literatur kualitatif yang didasarkan pada teori SLA. Mengacu pada dua belas studi teoretis dan empiris terbaru yang diterbitkan antara tahun 2015 dan 2025, tinjauan ini mensintesis penelitian yang membahas instruksi menulis, pembelajaran berbasis tugas, menulis kolaboratif, umpan balik, dan praktik menulis yang dimediasi teknologi. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa meskipun masukan yang dapat dipahami seperti teks model, reformulasi, dan umpan balik menyediakan sumber daya linguistik yang esensial, output yang dihasilkan melalui menulis memainkan peran sentral dalam mempromosikan perkembangan dengan memicu pengamatan, pengujian hipotesis, dan refleksi metalinguistik. Selain itu, interaksi dan umpan balik terbukti memediasi hubungan antara masukan dan output, meningkatkan kemampuan pembelajar untuk mengubah masukan menjadi kompetensi produktif. Secara keseluruhan, tinjauan ini mendukung perspektif SLA terintegrasi di mana penulisan bahasa kedua (L2) tidak hanya berfungsi sebagai hasil dari akuisisi, tetapi sebagai mekanisme perkembangan melalui mana pembelajaran bahasa terjadi. Studi ini menyoroti implikasi pedagogis yang penting.

**Kata Kunci:** Input, Output, L2 Writing

### ABSTRACT

Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research has long debated the relative roles of comprehensible input and language output in language development. Within this debate, the position of L2 writing remains complex, as writing has often been treated as either a product of acquisition or a pedagogical skill rather than a developmental mechanism. This study aims to revisit the roles of input-based and output-based mechanisms in L2 writing development through a qualitative literature review grounded in SLA theory. Drawing on twelve recent theoretical and empirical studies published between 2015 and 2025, the review synthesizes research addressing writing instruction, task-based learning, collaborative writing, feedback, and technology mediated writing practices. The findings indicate that while comprehensible input such as model texts, reformulations, and feedback provides essential linguistic resources, it is pushed output through writing that plays a central role in promoting development by triggering noticing, hypothesis testing, and metalinguistic reflection. Furthermore, interaction and feedback are shown to mediate the relationship between input and output, enhancing learners' ability to transform input into productive competence. Overall, the review supports an integrated SLA perspective in which L2 writing functions not merely as an outcome of acquisition but as a developmental mechanism through which language learning occurs. The study highlights important pedagogical implications for designing writing instruction that combines rich input with meaningful, cognitively demanding output tasks supported by interaction and feedback.

**Keyword:** Input, Output, L2 Writing

### INTRODUCTION

In the context of globalization and internalization. Second Language Acquisition (SLA) has become a significant topic and important aspect in education.

Learning a language is not only crucial for career development and for long prospect but it is also for cross-cultural communication and understanding. Second Language (L2) Writing development has long occupied a complex position within second

language acquisition (Li, 2024). English Courses are often approached to traditional subject. However, mastering English requires a lot of efforts and a different method than textbook study alone (Wang, 2024). It follows a natural process to acquire native language rather than second language.

Acquiring L2 language is fundamental for communicative competence and achieving language mastery. Within SLA theory, this tension is closely associated with the long-standing debate between input-based and output-based perspectives. Krashen's input hypothesis positions comprehensible input as the primary driver of language acquisition, arguing that exposure to language slightly above learners' current proficiency is sufficient for development. While this view has been influential in shaping communicative language teaching, subsequent research has questioned whether input alone can account for learners' ability to produce accurate and complex written language (Gillespie, 2005).

In language acquisition research, communicative language teaching always goes along with interaction modes that refer to the ways and forms of communication between educators and learners (Jaelani, A., Rafli, Z., & Murtadho, F., 2025). This includes how learners engage in language communication, interaction, and collaboration in the other classroom learning environments (Li, 2024). Different interactions modes not only provide various types of languages input but also influences on how learners offering more information and immediate correction, which aids in language acquisition and fluency improvement (Q. N. Nguyen et al., 2025).

Despite growing interest in the interaction between input and output mechanisms, existing research remains fragmented across theoretical orientations and instructional contexts. Some studies prioritize input-rich environments and genre exposure, while others emphasize the benefits of pushed output, collaborative writing, and feedback-driven revision. A systematic synthesis of these perspectives, particularly with attention to writing development outcomes such as accuracy, complexity, and lexical growth is still needed (Alsulami, 2016).

Therefore, this study aims to revisit the roles of comprehensible input and pushed output in L2 writing development through a qualitative review of empirical and theoretical studies. By examining how input, output, and interactional mechanisms jointly contribute to writing development (Loetter, 2024.). This review seeks to clarify the complementary functions and to offer pedagogical insights for designing writing instructions that treats writing as both a learning process and a developmental mechanism within SLA (Albaqami, 2024). The question focused on this study are:

1. What do recent studies suggest about integrating input-output in writing pedagogy?
2. How does input-based and output-based contribute to L2 writing development?

#### **METHOD**

This study employed a descriptive qualitative literature review to examine how comprehensible input and pushed output contribute to second language (L2) writing development. This design allows for an in-depth comparison of how input, output, interaction, and feedback are conceptualized and operationalized across studies within the field of SLA (Nassaji, 2015).

Relevant literature was identified through systematic searches of peer reviewed journals and academic databases commonly used in SLA and applied linguistics research, including journals focusing on second language writing, language pedagogy, and language acquisition. Studies were excluded if they focused exclusively on spoken language learning outside instructional contexts, or lacked a clear connection to SLA theory.

The collected data were analyzed using thematic analysis. Each article was examined to identify key themes related to the roles of input, output, and improvement in writing development. Findings from the collected studies were then compared and synthesized to identify converging patterns, points of divergence, and gaps in the literature. The analysis emphasized how different theoretical perspectives collectively contribute to understanding L2 writing as a developmental process.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Input-Based Mechanisms in L2 Writing Development

Across the reviewed studies, Input based mechanisms play an essential but non-sufficient role in L2 writing development. Input is most commonly operationalized through modal texts, reformulations, written corrective feedback, instructional explanations, and technology or AI mediated feedback. Studies consistently show that such input enhances learners' awareness of target like lexical, grammatical, and discourse features, particularly when input is contextualized.

However, the findings indicate that exposure to input alone rarely leads to sustained writing development. Instead, input spoken output indicates that writing activates core SLA mechanisms such as inhibition, lexical selection, and phonological mediation. From an SLA perspective, the study strongly supports treating writing as a central output modality through which input is processed, controlled, and transformed into linguistic competence, reinforcing integrated input–output models of L2 development. Functions primarily as a resource that prepares learners for subsequent production. Research on model essays, positive evidence feedback, and AI-generated input demonstrates that learners benefit most when input draws attention to form and meaning in ways that invite comparison with their own writing. Thus, input contributes to writing development by shaping learners' linguistic readiness, but its pedagogical effectiveness depends on how learners are required to engage with it during writing tasks.

### 4.2 Output-Based Mechanisms and Writing as Pushed Output

A dominant finding across the literature is the central role of pushed output in driving L2 writing development. Writing tasks that require learners to articulate precise meanings such as narrative writing, translation, laboratory report writing, sentence construction, and task-based essay writing consistently lead to improvements in accuracy, lexical development, and syntactic control. Studies focusing on repeated writing practice, task design, and planning conditions show that output pushes learners to notice gaps between intended meaning and available linguistic resources, thereby triggering hypothesis testing and metalinguistic reflection. Empirical evidence from error analysis, task-based interventions, and

experimental studies demonstrates that learners who engage in sustained writing output outperform those who receive comparable instructional input without equivalent production demands. These findings strongly support SLA perspectives that view writing not merely as a demonstration of acquired knowledge, but as a developmental mechanism through which acquisition occurs.

A central finding of this synthesis is the decisive role of pushed output in driving L2 writing development. Writing tasks that require learners to articulate precise meanings such as task-based writing, translation, collaborative text construction, and repeated writing practice consistently promote noticing, hypothesis testing, and metalinguistic reflection. Empirical evidence shows that learners who engage in sustained writing output demonstrate greater gains in accuracy, lexical development, and syntactic control than those exposed to comparable input without equivalent production demands. These results strongly support Swain's Output Hypothesis and position writing not merely as evidence of acquisition, but as a site of acquisition where learning is triggered by the cognitive demands of production.

### 4.3 Interaction and Feedback as Mediating Factors between Input and Output

The findings further reveal that interaction and feedback play a critical mediating role in transforming input into productive writing ability. Collaborative writing studies show that peer interaction creates opportunities for negotiation of meaning and language-related episodes, which enhance learners' attention to form during output. Similarly, written corrective feedback, reformulations, and model-based feedback become effective when learners actively process them through revision and rewriting. Technology-mediated environments—including email-based writing tasks and AI-assisted feedback—extend these interactional opportunities by allowing delayed reflection, iterative revision, and personalized scaffolding. Across contexts, interaction serves to increase the salience of input during output and supports learners in resolving linguistic problems, suggesting that writing development emerges most robustly when output is interactional mediated rather than individually produced in isolation.

## CONCLUSION

This review set out to examine the roles of input-based and output-based mechanisms in L2 writing development within the framework of Second Language Acquisition. Drawing on recent theoretical and empirical studies, the findings demonstrate that while comprehensible input provides essential linguistic resources, it is pushed output through writing that plays a central role in driving development. Writing tasks that require learners to articulate meaning, revise drafts, and reflect on language use consistently promote noticing, hypothesis testing, and metalinguistic awareness, which are key mechanisms of language acquisition.

The synthesis further shows that interaction and feedback serve as crucial mediators between input and output in L2 writing development. Collaborative writing, corrective feedback, model texts, and technology-mediated support enhance the effectiveness of input by encouraging learners to actively engage with language during production. These processes support the transformation of input into intake and facilitate the gradual restructuring of learners' interlanguage. Despite the strengths of the reviewed literature, further research is needed to explore longitudinal writing development, learner individual differences, and the pedagogical use of emerging technologies such as AI-assisted writing tools. Future studies that integrate SLA theory with process-oriented writing research will contribute to a deeper understanding of how writing supports second language development over time.

## REFERENCES

- Albaqami, S. E. (2024). *The impact of technology-based and non-technologybased vocabulary learning activities on the pushed output vocabulary learning of Saudi EFL learners*. August, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.139> 2383
- Alsulami, S. Q. (2016). *Testing the Noticing Function of the Output Hypothesis*. 9(2), 136–141. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n2p136>
- Cao, Z. (2024). *Studies on Positive Evidence Feedback in Second Language Writing : Status Quo and Implications*. 55(1), 209–218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882211072905>
- Crosthwaite, P. (2025). *Research methods in L2 writing Interdisciplinary approaches*.
- Gillespie, M. (2005). Student-teacher connection: A place of possibility. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 52(2), 211–219. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2005.03581.x>
- Hu, N., & Xu, X. (2015). *Implications of Output Hypothesis in College English Translation Course*. *Emim*, 669–673.
- Jaelani, A., Rafli, Z., & Murtadho, F. (2025). Parental Strategies in Managing L1 Interference in Early Second Language Acquisition: An Intrinsic Case Study. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 13(2), 616–631. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v13i2.13704>
- Khan, A., & Khajavi, Y. (2022). The effect of writing exercises in classroom on the production of written sentences at undergraduate level by Saudi EFL learners : A case study of error analysis the production of written sentences at undergraduate level by Saudi EFL learners : A case study of error analysis. *Cogent Education*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2122259>
- Khan, R., Qamar, T., Ansari, M. S., & Yasmeen, J. (2025). Enhancing or impairing? Exploring Indian EFL learners' academic writing narratives with ChatGPT. *Cogent Education*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2514329>
- Lázaro-ibarrola, A., & Hidalgo, M. Á. (2024). Collaborative writing among young EFL learners in a school context: product and process. *The Language Learning Journal*, 52(3), 285–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2022.2141828>
- Li, C. (2024). *Study on the Impact of Interaction Modes on Second Language Acquisition*. 7, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.23977/langl.2024.070701>
- Liu, X. (2022). *The Relation of Input , Interaction , and Output in SLA*. 215(Icssed), 474–479.
- Loetter, G. (n.d.). *Exploring the Approach of Eliminating Pushed Output in EFL Classes*. 19(2), 3–27.
- Mohammad, B. (2024). The effects of task design variables and corrective feedback on EFL learners' writing complexity and accuracy. *Cogent Education*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2310433>
- Nassaji, H. (2015). *Qualitative and descriptive research : Data type versus data analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815572747>
- Nguyen, L. Q., & Le, H. Van. (2022). Improving L2 learners' IELTS task 2 writing : the role of model essays and noticing hypothesis. *Language Testing in Asia*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00206-0>

- Nguyen, Q. N., Thi, D., & Doan, H. (2025). *Beyond comprehensible input: a neuro-ecological critique of Krashen 's hypothesis in language education*. *October*.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1636777>
- Singtong, S., Khemanuwong, T., Phairot, E., & Jitpanich, T. (2025). From general English to scientific literacy : a TBLT intervention for laboratory report writing among Thai EFL students. *Cogent Education*, *12*(1).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2588056>
- Wai Leung Wong, & Maurer, U. (2021). *The effects of input and output modalities on language switching between Chinese and English*.
- Wang, S. (2024). *Application of Krashen 's Input Hypothesis in College English: Empirical Findings and Curriculum Implications*. *6*(8), 116–119.  
<https://doi.org/10.12238/rerr.v6i8.2504>