A Review of Input Processing Theory in Second Language Acquisition Research

Chunyi Yan
School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Xi'an Polytechnic University, Xi'an, Shaanxi, China

Abstract: Since Van Patten introduced input processing theory in the 1990s, it has become essential for understanding language teaching by emphasizing learners' limitations in processing input and the significance of processing strategies. This paper reviews key concepts, empirical developments, and teaching applications from 1990 to 2023, highlighting the practical effects of processing instruction across various contexts and the evolution of research methodologies. It also outlines future research directions, including the influence of individual learner differences, innovative research methods for understanding processing mechanisms, and long-term effects at the discourse level. These insights aim to help foreign language teachers optimize instruction and deepen researchers' understanding of language processing.

Keywords: Second Language Acquisition; Input Processing Theory; Processing Teaching

1. Introduction

William and VanPatten[1] introduced the Input Processing Theory in the 1990s, which examines how language learners extract and process linguistic data from extensive input. He noted that due to cognitive processing limitations, learners can only handle a portion of the input, transforming it into intake, a critical component of language acquisition that influences the development of linguistic knowledge. Building on this theory, VanPatten [2] developed the Processing Instruction model, which guides learners to identify and avoid ineffective processing strategies, promoting more effective methods through carefully designed activities that enhance the mapping between language forms and meanings. Empirical research has consistently shown the effectiveness of Processing Instruction across various teaching environments, as supported by studies from Henry [3], VanPatten et al.[4]. Lourdes Ortega, in her review of contemporary second language acquisition theories, emphasized the practical value of Input Processing Theory in bridging theory and practice in language teaching. This article comprehensively reviews the key aspects of the theory, empirical research foundations, and future research directions, aiming to provide domestic teachers with insights for classroom strategy implementation and offering references for researchers to explore the mechanisms and applications of Processing Instruction further. We anticipate that ongoing research and practice will continue to yield new insights and innovations in second language teaching.

2. Input Processing Theory

Input Processing Theory and Processing Instruction provide a cognitively informed approach to second language acquisition, focusing on the optimization of input processing to enhance grammatical intake and understanding, with structured input tasks proving more effective than explicit information alone, and the benefits of PI extending to discourse-level language use and showing potential for long-term and transferable effects across diverse learner profiles.

2.1 Main Points

The Input Processing Theory, articulated by VanPatten [2], aims to clarify how second language learners assimilate linguistic knowledge and comprehend sentences from the input they receive. Central to this framework are two principles: the Meaning Priority Principle and the First Noun Principle. The Meaning Priority Principle suggests that learners prioritize meaning over form when processing input, resulting in several outcomes: learners first process lexical items to grasp meaning; when both lexical items and grammatical structures convey the same semantic load, lexical items take precedence (e.g., in "I called him last night," "last night" is processed before the past tense marker "-ed"); non-redundant markers like

"-ing" in "I am writing" are prioritized over redundant ones; and semantic markers, such as plural "-s" and progressive "-ing," are processed before non-semantic markers, like the conjunction "that". In addition, the First Noun Principle posits that learners tend to interpret the first noun or pronoun in a sentence as the subject or agent, although this principle can be moderated by three factors: the principle may not apply if learners can derive meaning through lexical semantics (e.g., "The wall was painted by John"), when real-life probabilities inform their understanding (e.g., in "The child was scolded by his mother," learners correctly identify the mother as the agent), and when contextual clues diminish its efficacy (e.g., in "John is arrested because Mary is killed by him," context helps learners recognize Mary as the agent). These principles highlight the complex relationship between cognitive processes and linguistic structures in language acquisition, offering insights for educators and researchers to develop pedagogical approaches that align with learners' natural processing tendencies.

VanPatten[2] highlights a significant issue in second language instruction: the tendency to overemphasize language output and rule internalization at the expense of understanding processing mechanisms. He argues that effective language teaching often falters because it fails to address how learners can process input effectively to facilitate intake, which is crucial for language acquisition. In response, researchers, including VanPatten[2], Benati[5], and VanPatten and Cadierno [6], have developed Processing Instruction (PI), a pedagogical intervention designed to improve learners' input processing behaviors and grammatical intake.

Processing Instruction diverges from traditional methods by manipulating input to counteract default processing strategies, guiding learners toward accurate form-meaning mappings essential for language acquisition. PI activities prompt learners to notice linguistic forms typically overlooked due to cognitive biases like the Meaning Priority Principle and the First Noun Principle. By integrating PI into curricula, educators shift focus from rote memorization to deeper engagement with language structures, potentially improving learners' proficiency.

Moreover, PI fosters empirical research opportunities, allowing scholars to explore language processing nuances and instructional efficacy. Within the framework of Focus on Form, PI emphasizes structured input—activities crafted to draw attention to specific grammatical structures. These structured input tasks consist of two complementary components: referential activities/tasks that require learners to discern meaning through correct grammatical use, and affective activities/tasks that encourage personal expression using the target structures.

Referential tasks compel learners to make choices based on their understanding of grammar, helping them overcome biases like the meaning priority principle. Affective tasks consolidate learning by allowing students to express opinions and experiences, reinforcing newly acquired structures. This dual approach enhances interpretive skills and production accuracy, moving beyond mere grammatical knowledge to engaging learners meaningfully with the language.

Overall, PI's structured input tasks provide insights into the cognitive processes of language learning, offering effective strategies for grammatical acquisition and improved communicative competence in second language teaching.

Table 1. A Summary of Related Concepts

Concept	Core Idea	Application
Input Processing Theory	Learners assimilate linguistic knowledge from input	Meaning Priority and First Noun Principles
Meaning Priority Principle	Prioritize meaning over form	Lexical items > Grammatical structures
First Noun Principle	Initial noun often considered as subject	Modulated by lexical semantics, event probability, context
Processing Instruction (PI)	Enhance input processing skills	Manipulate input to counteract default strategies
Structured Input Tasks	Foster grammatical structure acquisition	Referential tasks + Affective tasks

Table 1 succinctly captures the key ideas and applications of the concepts discussed.

2.2 Empirical Basis

Processing Instruction (PI) has emerged as an innovative intervention in grammatical teaching, demonstrating significant effectiveness in facilitating second language acquisition. Initial studies by VanPatten and his team established PI's ability to move learners away from entrenched processing strategies like the "First

Noun Principle" and the "Meaning Priority Principle"[6][7]. Subsequent research has consistently affirmed PI's superiority over traditional instructional methods, such as the 3P approach (Presentation, Practice, Production), meaning-based output instruction, dictogloss, and drill-based practices. These studies highlight PI's capacity to enhance grammatical processing speed and accuracy while promoting deeper engagement with grammatical structures through carefully designed activities that draw attention to specific forms.

The positive outcomes associated with PI extend beyond immediate classroom effects, suggesting that appropriate instructional approaches can enhance learners' sensitivity to grammatical structures, leading to more fluent and accurate language use. Research indicates that the benefits of PI are enduring; studies show lasting impacts, such as improved proficiency in the Spanish object-verb-subject structure and the English causative form in passive voice, even months after intervention[2][8]. Additionally, investigations into transfer-of-training effects demonstrate that PI influences not only the targeted grammatical forms but also broader linguistic competencies, with empirical evidence supporting both secondary and cumulative effects[7][8]. Ultimately, PI represents a paradigm shift in grammar teaching, advocating for a cognitively informed, learner-centered methodology to enhance language acquisition.

Research has increasingly focused on the long-term efficacy of Processing Instruction (PI), its potential for transfer-of-training effects, and its impact at the discourse level. Studies indicate that the effects of PI are both immediate and enduring. For instance, VanPatten and Fernández demonstrated that PI significantly improves learners' acquisition of the Spanish object-verb-subject structure, maintaining higher proficiency levels even eight months post-intervention. Similarly, Benati and Batziou[3] found that the positive effects of PI on the English causative form in passive voice persisted over time, regardless of whether assessments occurred three weeks or six months later.

Additionally, research has explored PI's transfer-of-training effects, which include secondary and cumulative influences on grammatical processing. The secondary effect refers to how learning one grammatical form can enhance the processing of another form under the same principle, while the cumulative effect involves the impact of one form on another influenced by different principles. Empirical evidence from Benati[5] supports these effects, further corroborated by another study[9]. These findings highlight that PI is not just a temporary instructional method; it has the potential to create a lasting impact on learners' language processing and production abilities, reshaping the educational landscape and enhancing grammatical competence.

The insights gained from Processing Instruction (PI) emphasize the importance of recognizing the enduring and transferable nature of the skills fostered through this approach. As educators and researchers delve deeper into language acquisition, PI emerges as a valuable strategy for cultivating a more integrated understanding of grammatical structures that transcends classroom boundaries and enhances real-world language use. While traditional PI interventions focus on sentence-level processing, research led by Benati and colleagues demonstrates that the positive effects of PI extend to discourse-level tasks, revealing its broad impact on learners' overall language capabilities. Further research by Benati and Batziou[8] confirmed these findings, showcasing that learners not only improved in discourse comprehension but also in producing coherent discourse using complex structures like the passive voice. This suggests that PI enhances both interpretive and productive language skills, highlighting its role in developing proficiency in conveying meaning across sentences within cohesive discourse. The implications for language pedagogy are significant, indicating that PI can be an effective tool for teaching complex linguistic structures beyond isolated sentences.

The expansion of Processing Instruction (PI) to discourse-level tasks highlights the necessity for language curricula to embrace the interconnectedness of linguistic units and enhance learners' abilities to process and produce language reflective of real-world communication. Incorporating PI strategies that focus on sentence-level structures while preparing students for discourse challenges can help develop a comprehensive command of the language. Research has shown that PI consists of two key elements—explicit information and structured input tasks—and studies, such as those by VanPatten and Oikkenon[10], have revealed that the effectiveness of PI is primarily

driven by the structured input tasks rather than the explicit information provided. Subsequent research supports this conclusion, demonstrating that engaging learners in activities designed to draw attention to form within meaningful contexts significantly enhances grammatical acquisition.

Furthermore, investigations into individual differences—such as age, linguistic background, language aptitude, and motivation—reveal varied effects on the efficacy of PI. For instance, studies by Cox and Sanz [11] found that PI positively impacts both younger and older learners equally, while Benati [5] indicated that linguistic background does not significantly influence PI's effectiveness. Research by VanPatten et al.[4] suggested that grammatical sensitivity may not be a primary factor in PI's success across various language groups, with exceptions noted among German learners. Additionally, findings by Zhang [9] highlighted an interaction between explicit information and motivation, while Farhat and Benati [12] found motivation did not affect PI outcomes in Arabic gender agreement acquisition. These studies underscore the importance of further research to understand how individual differences interact with PI, enabling educators to tailor instructional approaches to diverse learner needs and optimize the potential of PI for facilitating grammatical acquisition across various contexts.

Table 2. Summary of Empirical Basis

Aspect	Description	Key Findings
PI Efficacy	PI's effectiveness in facilitating second language acquisition	Superior to traditional methods; enhances processing speed and accuracy
Initial Studies	Demonstrated PI's potential to alter entrenched processing strategies	Laid groundwork for further research affirming PI's positive impact
Superiority	Comparisons with other instructional methods	PI fosters more nuanced and accurate grammatical processing
Unique Approach	PI's method of grammar instruction	Guides learners to process language attuned to grammatical structures
Long-term Efficacy	Enduring effects of PI on language acquisition	Lasting impact on learners' processing and production abilities
Transfer-of-Training	Influence of PI on other grammatical forms	Evidence of secondary and cumulative effects
Discourse Level	PI's impact beyond sentence-level tasks	Enhances discourse comprehension and production
Explicit Information vs. Structured Input	Role of each element in PI's efficacy	Structured input tasks are main drivers of effectiveness
Individual Differences	Factors like age, linguistic background, and motivation	Interactions with PI effectiveness; need for tailored approaches

Table 2 provides a streamlined overview of the effectiveness of Processing Instruction, its superiority over traditional methods, the unique approach it offers, long-term efficacy, transfer-of-training effects, discourse level impact, the role of explicit information versus structured input, and considerations of individual differences.

3. Theoretical Research Methods of Input Processing

Empirical research in the field of Input Processing Theory and Processing Instruction utilizes rigorous (quasi-)experimental designs to investigate the impact of various instructional methods and individual difference factors on language learning outcomes, with a focus on input processing and form-meaning mappings, employing both structured tasks and innovative methodologies like eye-tracking and self-paced reading to capture comprehensive and real-time data on linguistic abilities. The following is an overview through research design and data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

Empirical research from the perspective of Input Processing Theory often employs quantitative research paradigms that are (quasi-)experimental in design. This approach systematically investigates the effects of various independent variables on language learning outcomes. These independent variables include instructional methods such as the 3P approach (Presentation-Practice-Production), Processing Instruction, grammar dictation, explicit

information, and individual difference factors like age and motivation. Some studies also incorporate individual difference factors as covariates in statistical analyses to control for their potential influence on the dependent variables [12]. The dependent variables in these studies typically measure aspects of learners' language processing and production, such as the time taken to achieve correct processing, the number of correct items in sentence interpretation tasks, and scores on language production tasks. These metrics provide a comprehensive assessment of learners' linguistic abilities and the effectiveness of different instructional approaches.

In terms of experimental group design, research guided by Input Processing Theory often utilizes a multifaceted approach to examine the impact of multiple variables on instruction. For instance, Benati [5] employed both between-subjects design (varying teaching interventions) and within-subjects design (test × instruction) to explore the effects of different teaching methods on learners' interpretation of future tense sentences. This dual approach allows for a more nuanced understanding of how different instructional strategies influence language learning outcomes. Similarly, VanPatten, Borst & Collopy, et al. [3] conducted a study using explicit information (with or without explicit information) as a between-subjects variable and test timing (pre-test/post-test) as a within-subjects variable to investigate whether explicit information affects the efficacy of Processing Instruction. This kind of experimental design helps to disentangle the specific contributions of various instructional components and individual differences to language learning.

By adopting such rigorous research methodologies, Input Processing Theory-based studies contribute to a robust evidence base for informed language teaching practices. They offer insights into the complex interplay between instructional methods, explicit information, and individual learner characteristics, and how these factors collectively shape language acquisition. As our empirical knowledge in this area grows, so does our capacity to refine instructional strategies that are tailored to the needs of diverse learners, enhancing the overall effectiveness of language education.

3.2 Data Analysis

Under the guidance of Input Processing Theory, research on PI focuses less on the internalization of grammatical rules and the learning skills, and more on the process of input processing itself—specifically, the construction of accurate form-meaning mappings [12]. Consequently, PI research often employs structured practice tasks to collect data, such as asking learners to select pictures after listening to sentences or discourses, or to read sentences or discourses and determine the tense of the sentence. These tasks, which are sentence or discourse comprehension tasks, are designed to ascertain the accuracy with which learners process specific grammatical forms [4,9].

However, this does not imply that all PI research is limited to structured practice tasks. In studies with experimental and control group designs, researchers typically incorporate additional tasks, such as grammaticality judgment [7] and language production tasks[5,8], to prevent the research design from being skewed towards PI. These tasks serve to provide a more comprehensive assessment of learners' linguistic abilities and to ensure that the findings are not solely attributed to the PI methodology.

Traditionally, research has assessed learners' sentence comprehension abilities after listening or reading tasks, thereby obtaining offline data. However, in recent years, some studies have adopted eye-tracking technology to measure the duration of learners' eye movements when they focus on specific parts of a sentence or particular images. Other studies have utilized self-paced reading techniques to examine the reading speed of learners when they encounter sentences that are anomalous, which tends to slow down as they process the unusual sentence structure [13]. By obtaining online data, these studies have been able to demonstrate the intrinsic differences between PI and other instructional interventions in the processing of sentences and discourses.

The incorporation of such innovative methodologies not only enriches our understanding of the dynamics of language processing but also provides a more nuanced perspective on the effectiveness of PI. It allows researchers to capture the immediate cognitive processes involved in language comprehension and production, offering insights into the very moment when learners encounter, process, and interpret linguistic information. This real-time data is invaluable in discerning the precise mechanisms through which PI facilitates

language learning, ultimately contributing to a more profound appreciation of the complex interplay between instruction, cognition, and linguistic competence.

4. The Direction of Future Development

While many studies suggest that individual differences do not significantly affect the effectiveness of Processing Instruction (PI), this does not mean that all individual differences are irrelevant to input processing [4]. A closer examination of standard deviations in data can reveal significant individual variability, indicating that other factors influence intervention effectiveness. For instance, VanPatten et al. found that standard deviations in sentence interpretation outcomes exceeded 10, suggesting variability beyond grammatical sensitivity. These mixed findings highlight the need for further exploration of how individual differences relate to PI [8,14].

Current research on PI primarily uses offline tasks like sentence interpretation and production, which may not accurately reflect learners' implicit language processing [15]. Future studies should incorporate online methods, such as eye-tracking, to examine immediate processing during tasks. Although some research has addressed PI at the discourse level, it remains limited. Future work should compare structured input practice with other instructional methods at the discourse level, focusing on the durability of effects and optimal configurations of explicit information, structured input, and output practice [16]. This approach could enhance our understanding of PI's impact on language learning beyond the sentence level, leading to more effective instructional strategies.

5. Conclusion

This research begins with a comprehensive retrospective of Input Processing Theory in second language acquisition, examining its fundamental concepts and empirical support. It integrates key components of the theory with evidence from scholarly investigations, laying a solid foundation for further exploration. The paper then reviews common methodological approaches used in research on Input Processing Theory, discussing strategies to assess its practical applications in language learning and teaching. It identifies three critical areas for future investigation: the impact of individual differences—such as age, prior linguistic experience, language aptitude, and motivation—on learners' responses to Processing Instruction; the adoption of innovative research methodologies like eye-tracking and self-paced reading to reveal the intricacies of language processing; and the importance of examining Processing Instruction at the discourse level to evaluate its broader implications for language competencies. By highlighting these areas, the study aims to enhance the application of Input Processing Theory and refine instructional strategies that align with the complexities of language learning, ultimately promoting a deeper understanding of second language acquisition informed by empirical research.

Reference

[1] VanPatten B, Williams J. Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction. New York: Routledge, 2015: 245-272.

[2] VanPatten B. Processing instruction: Theory, research and commentary. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004: 5-31.

[3] Henry N. The effects of processing instruction on the acquisition and processing of grammatical gender in German. Language Teaching Research, 2022, in press.

[4] VanPatten B, Borst S, Collopy E, et al. Explicit information, grammatical sensitivity, and the first-noun strategy: A cross-linguistic study in processing instruction. The Modern Language Journal, 2013, 97(2): 506-527.

[5] Benati A. Classroom-oriented research: Processing instruction (findings and implications). Language Teaching, 2019, 52(3): 343-359.

[6] VanPatten B, Cadierno T. Explicit instruction and input processing. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 1993, 15(2): 225-243.

[7] Cox J G, Sanz C. Deconstructing PI for the ages: Explicit instruction vs. practice in young and older adult bilinguals. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 2015, 53(2): 225-248.

[8] Benati A, Batziou M. Discourse and long-term effects of isolated and combined structured input and structured output on the acquisition of the English causative form. Language Awareness, 2019, 28(2): 77-96.

[9] Zhang S M. A comparative study of processing instruction and 3P grammar teaching from the perspective of foreign

language learning motivation. Journal of PLA University of Foreign Languages, 2014, (6): 74-82.
[10]VanPatten B, Oikkenon S. Explanation versus structured input in processing instruction. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 1996, 18(4): 495-510.
[11]Sanz C, Morgan-Short K. Positive evidence vs. explicit rule presentation and explicit negative feedback: A computer-assisted study. Language Learning, 2004, 54(1): 35-78.
[12]Farhat A, Benati A. The effects of motivation on processing instruction in the acquisition of Modern Standard Arabic gender agreement. Instructed Second Language Acquisition, 2018, 2(1): 61-82.
[13]Dracos M. The effects of form-focused training and working memory on the L2 processing and learning of morphological cues. Pennsylvania State University, 2013.
[14]VanPatten B, Smith M. Word-order typology and the acquisition of case marking: A self-paced reading study in Latin as a second language. Second Language Research, 2019, 35(3): 397-420.
[15]Benati A. A comparative study of the effects of processing instruction and output-based instruction on the acquisition of the Italian future tense. Language Teaching Research, 2001, 5(2): 95-127.
[16]Sanz C, Morgan-Short K. Positive evidence vs. explicit rule presentation and explicit negative feedback: A computer-assisted study. Language Learning, 2004, 54(1): 35-78.

