**Input, Output & Interaction: Applied Linguistic (or Pedagogical) Approaches to SLA**

**A. General introduction**
1. Goals: understand SLA in classroom settings and investigate the relationship between instruction and SLA.
2. Research focus: Input, output, and interaction.
4. Important concepts: comprehensible input, premodified input, intake, comprehensible output, interaction, negotiation for meaning, noticing, input enhancement.

**B. The study of input and SLA**
1. Major research questions:
   a. Can input modification facilitate acquisition?
   b. In what ways can input be modified to facilitate acquisition?

2. **Input modification strategies and their effects on SLA**
   a. Input simplification Æ comprehension Æ acquisition
      -- simplify vocabularies and structures: omission, replacement
      -- change semantic and structural density: expansion, elaboration, add redundancy
   b. Input enhancement Æ noticing Æ acquisition
      -- increase frequency; -- increase salience (e.g., highlighting)
      -- provide additional information (e.g., margin glossing); -- slower speed (auditory input)

**C. The Comprehensible Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1985)**
1. The study (see data from test results on grammatical competence below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Immersion</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral production</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple choice</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written production</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **The Output Hypothesis:** “Receiving comprehensible input is effective but not sufficient for developing native-like grammatical competence….Producing the target language may be the trigger that forces the learner to pay attention to the means of expression needed in order to successfully convey his or her own intended meaning.” (Swain, 1985)


**E. Two sample studies**
1. Ellis & He (1999): Vocabulary

**F. Pedagogical Implications: Focus on Form (FonF)**