

Study on the Application of the Output Hypothesis to English Writing Teaching in Senior High Schools from the Perspective of Cultivating Critical Thinking Ability

Yifan Xu

School of Foreign Languages, Sichuan Normal University, Chengdu, Sichuan 610066, China

ABSTRACT

This study explores the application of Swain's Output Hypothesis in cultivating critical thinking skills within high school English writing instruction, aiming to address the core contradiction between the mindset cultivation objectives outlined in the General High School English Curriculum Standards (2020 Edition) and the prevailing tendency towards template-based teaching. Through textual analysis, theoretical integration, and model design, the research first diagnoses the current state and issues in high school English writing instruction and student writing. Subsequently, it constructs a "controversy-driven writing framework" based on these findings, proposing two innovative principles: the adoption of a three-dimensional screening criterion for topic design that emphasizes social relevance, openness, and debatability; and the implementation of a three-stage cognitive gradient in task execution, namely "multi-perspective input, followed by forced stance output, and concluding with metalinguistic reflection." The study suggests that through stance-switching tasks and a dynamic feedback mechanism, the complexity of student arguments and critical thinking performance can be enhanced over time, providing a systematic solution to the homogenization dilemma in college entrance examination writing.

KEYWORDS

Output Hypothesis; Critical Thinking Skills; High School English Writing.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Research Background

The General High School English Curriculum Standards (2020 Revision) explicitly stipulate that high school students should "develop multifaceted and critical thinking skills through English learning, and form correct value judgments" (Ministry of Education, 2020, p. 18).

However, current high school English writing instruction still faces challenges. Through literature review and integration, it has been identified that high school students' writing primarily exhibits two issues. First, there is a prevalence of formulaic expressions in essays. For instance, over 68% of examinees' essays display obvious formulaic features, utilizing expressions such as "Every coin has two sides." Second, logical fallacies are widespread in argumentation. For example, a significant number of students struggle with improper use of conjunctions and incomplete sentence structures in complex sentences. This phenomenon reflects a long-standing contradiction in English writing instruction in China: the significant disparity between the high emphasis on critical thinking skills in curriculum standards and the prevalence of formulaic teaching in examination-oriented environments. This contradiction is primarily manifested in two aspects. Firstly, there is an imbalance between input and output in teaching methods. Many teachers neglect the cognitive processing benefits of

"comprehensible output" emphasized by Swain (1985) and overly rely on template training and model essay memorization. Secondly, there is a lack of attention to logical issues in evaluation methods. Relevant studies indicate that nearly 90% of teachers primarily focus on grammar and vocabulary errors when grading, rarely providing guidance on argumentation logic and thinking quality. [1]

1.2. Research Objectives and Significance

This study, based on the Output Hypothesis, aims to explore effective strategies for cultivating high school students' critical thinking skills in English writing. By integrating Western second language acquisition theories with the "production-oriented approach" proposed by Wen (2015), this study attempts to construct a writing instruction model more suitable for the Chinese high school English teaching environment. Therefore, this study holds both theoretical and practical value. [2]

Firstly, at the practical level, the controversial writing task model constructed based on Swain's Output Hypothesis aims to fundamentally change the prevalent mechanical and formulaic tendencies in current high school English writing instruction. This model initially focuses on breaking the dependence on the traditional "five-paragraph template," which is a fixed writing structure of "opinion-example-summary." Although this writing paradigm ensures a basic framework for the essay, it severely restricts the development of students' critical thinking. This outputted task, driven by cognitive conflict, not only activates students' higher-order thinking skills but also provides teachers with a new practical paradigm for writing instruction. [3]

Secondly, at the theoretical level, Swain's (1985) Output Hypothesis posits that language production forces learners to engage in "syntactic processing," thereby promoting cognitive deepening. This study will verify the applicability of this theory in the context of critical thinking writing in Chinese high schools, particularly the role of its "metalinguistic function" in the development of logical thinking. [4]

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Key Concepts

2.1.1. Output Hypothesis

The Output Hypothesis, originally proposed by Swain (1985), builds upon Krashen's Comprehensible Input Hypothesis. Swain identified the necessity of constructing a dual-cycle system of "input-output" in the language acquisition process, where comprehensible output serves as the core of cognitive processing at all stages of language development.

Swain (1993) systematically elaborated on the three functional mechanisms of language output: Noticing Function, Hypothesis-Testing Function, and Metalinguistic Function. The Noticing Function refers to the process where language output activities force learners to explicitly process their own language, thereby prompting them to actively identify gaps in their interlanguage knowledge. This cognitive conflict activates deep processing mechanisms, enabling learners to reconstruct and internalize language knowledge through resolving expression obstacles. Secondly, in terms of the Hypothesis-Testing Function, language output serves as a critical method for verifying hypotheses about the target language structure. Learners test non-explicit hypotheses regarding target language structures through productive practice, a process that involves not only simple judgments of correctness or incorrectness in vocabulary, syntax, and semantics but also adaptive choices in pragmatic strategies. Swain (1983) particularly emphasized that written output, compared to oral output, exhibits stronger reflectivity, allowing learners to engage in multi-layered metalinguistic analysis during the refinement of text, a deep processing mechanism that aids in the formation of stable linguistic schemas. The Metalinguistic Function is manifested in learners' continuous attention, monitoring, and revision of their output texts. Through written production activities such as writing,

learners establish dynamic connections between form and meaning, refining their language knowledge systems through self-correction processes. In practical teaching, this can be achieved by creating authentic writing situations, designing process-oriented writing tasks, and implementing peer evaluation strategies to construct an output-oriented language classroom. This teaching model not only aligns with the core principles of Swain's Output Hypothesis but also effectively enhances learners' metalinguistic awareness and autonomous revision abilities through the reinforcement of language production practice, ultimately promoting sustainable language development. [5]

2.1.2. Thinking Ability

The General High School English Curriculum Standards (2017 Edition) lists three types of thinking qualities, including logical, critical, and innovative thinking.

Logical thinking is a complex and ordered thinking process. Specifically, it is a basic form of thinking activity that requires the use of tools to abstract and deduce human thoughts. Methods for logical thinking include definition, classification, generalization, limitation, induction, and deduction. In the learning of a second language, as students' progress through grades, their logical activities increase, and the degree of abstraction in their thinking also rises. Critical thinking ability refers to an individual's comprehensive thinking ability demonstrated in the process of acquiring knowledge, applying knowledge, and solving problems. Critical thinking activities are diverse, including analysis, interpretation, reasoning, value judgment, self-reflection, and self-regulation. Creative thinking is characterized by innovative consciousness and innovative spirit. Specifically, it manifests as not adhering to traditional methods, being curious and interested in new things, seeking differences and changes, possessing a certain sense of adventure, and daring to think and act. [6]

2.2. Research Status of the Output Hypothesis

Research on the Output Hypothesis has been extensively explored by scholars both domestically and internationally, presenting a complementary development pattern between theoretical emphasis and practical application.

2.2.1. Domestic Research Status

Domestic scholars have effectively localized and applied foreign output theories in the context of Chinese foreign language teaching, engaging in theoretical innovation and dialectical thinking.

Firstly, in terms of theoretical verification and application expansion, domestic research exhibits a strong practical orientation. Li (2002) focused on the "Noticing Function" of the Output Hypothesis, emphasizing the importance of considering cognitive load in teaching practice and reasonably designing output tasks to ensure effective allocation of learners' attention. Wang (2007) proposed from a skill development perspective that language output is a key link in testing and reinforcing input outcomes, advocating for equal emphasis on input and output in teaching to avoid the tendency of "emphasizing input (listening and reading) over output (speaking and writing)." Huang (2004) compared the effects of guided writing and text reconstruction on language learning (noticing and acquisition), with results "basically confirming Swain's Output Hypothesis." Cheng (2012) applied input-output theory in high school English writing teaching, and comparative experiments further validated the superiority of the input-output integration model in enhancing specific language skills.

Secondly, domestic scholars have actively pursued theoretical innovation and transcendence. Wen (2014) proposed the "Output-Driven, Input-Enabled Hypothesis," which is considered the most groundbreaking theoretical innovation. She argued that output is not only the goal of language learning but should also serve as the starting point and driving force. This viewpoint subverts the traditional linear concept of "extensive input followed by natural output." Liang (2016) advocated the "Output-Oriented Approach," which is an operational manifestation of this idea, emphasizing the optimization of input content, the design of effective output activities, and the improvement of the teaching evaluation system.

Finally, domestic research demonstrates profound dialectical thinking on the relationship between input and output. Zheng (2002) not only affirmed that input is the basis of output but also argued that output, in turn, promotes input and enhances it, revealing the mutually dependent and mutually promoting dialectical relationship between the two. Liu (2005) clearly pointed out that input and output are equally important in second language acquisition, with input activating acquisition and output reflecting acceptance and re-creation after acquisition. Gu (2006) proposed a cautious balanced view in "Analysis of the Output Hypothesis," stating that the function of output must be closely integrated with input to effectively promote acquisition. Qin (2013) presented a more systematic argument, suggesting that input is the prerequisite condition and foundation for learning, while output is a necessary link in language acquisition and the goal of input, forming a dynamic and unified whole.

2.2.2. International Research Status

International research on the Output Hypothesis originated from reflections on and breakthroughs in the dominant position of the Input Hypothesis. Swain's (1985) Output Hypothesis was a milestone, as she pointed out that output not only enhances fluency in language expression but also guides learners to pay attention to the gap between their own language forms and the target language, verifying and revising interlanguage rules. Subsequent scholars have deepened their understanding of the cognitive mechanisms of output from different dimensions. On one hand, Johnson (1989) emphasized the organic synergy between input and output processes on acquisition effects. On the other hand, Long's (2000) Interaction Hypothesis provided an important supplement, stating that language output prompted by communication needs can effectively lead dialog partners to adjust input, thereby enhancing its comprehensibility. Additionally, Yu's (1990) research, using the example of communicative strategy problems, strongly supported the notion that comprehensible input alone is insufficient, as successful communication must rely on comprehensible output to achieve meaning negotiation and transmission. Notably, Gass's (1989) view that "understood input" rather than "comprehensible input" is key also indirectly supports the potential role of output in promoting deep understanding. [7]

In summary, international research has gradually constructed a relatively complete theoretical system of the Output Hypothesis, centering on elucidating the multi-dimensional value of output in triggering cognitive processing, promoting the acquisition of language forms, optimizing the input environment, and achieving communicative functions, successfully elevating output from an accessory of input to an indispensable independent driving factor in the language acquisition process.

3. ANALYSIS OF ISSUES IN HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH WRITING INSTRUCTION

3.1. Contradictions between Policy and Reality

3.1.1. Contradictions between Curriculum Standards and Textbook Design

The English Curriculum Standards for Senior High Schools (2020 Revision) explicitly require that writing instruction should cultivate students' "higher-order thinking skills such as analysis, evaluation, and creation," emphasizing that writing should serve as a tool for students to express ideas and engage in critical thinking (Ministry of Education, 2020). However, there exists a significant disconnect between the design of current textbooks and the objectives outlined in the curriculum standards. This section will analyze the contradiction between curriculum standards and textbook design in terms of cultivating thinking skills, using Unit 3 "Healthy Eating" from the People's Education Press compulsory textbook as an example.

Firstly, there is an imbalance in task allocation within textbooks. While fostering thinking skills has become a core objective in senior high school education, the systematic mechanisms for cultivating these skills within the current high school English textbooks are still weak. Specifically, the design

of after-class exercises in textbooks exhibits significant limitations. On one hand, basic exercises account for a disproportionately high percentage, making it difficult to effectively promote the development of higher-order cognitive abilities. On the other hand, the cognitive hierarchy of reading tasks is structurally imbalanced, lacking targeted training for higher-order thinking skills such as analysis, evaluation, and creation. As a result, the goal of cultivating thinking qualities as outlined in the curriculum standards is not fully realized in practical teaching. Taking the writing task design in Unit 3 "Healthy Eating" from the People's Education Press senior high school English compulsory textbook as an example, 80% of the exercises require factual statements, while only 20% involve critical writing tasks that require value judgments and dialectical analysis. This task allocation model restricts students' cognitive development to shallow-level thinking exercises, making it difficult to achieve the higher-order ability goals such as logical thinking, critical reflection, and innovative thinking required by the curriculum standards.

Secondly, a deeper issue lies in the design flaws of the cognitive gradient within textbooks. Cheng (2007) argues that the fundamental goal of contemporary teaching transcends the mere transmission of knowledge, encompassing students' comprehension of cognitive processes, internalization of learning strategies, and development of emotions and values. While he acknowledges the importance of book knowledge, the problems revealed through interactions among teachers, students, and the environment are equally significant. For instance, the core writing task in this unit requires students to "design a healthy diet plan." Although the topic is close to life, the task instructions only provide a vocabulary list, such as "protein, carbohydrate," and sentence templates like "You should eat..." without guiding students to engage in critical thinking and position-building through multi-source materials, such as nutritional research data or dietary habit survey reports. This design deprives students of opportunities for hypothesis testing through output and metalinguistic reflection on the results.

3.1.2. Implicit Suppression of Critical Thinking in College Entrance Examination Scoring Criteria

Although the scoring criteria for the college entrance examination's English writing section theoretically emphasize "rich content and clear logic," in practice, there is a clear tendency towards formalism. Specifically, the scoring criteria suppress the development of critical thinking through three mechanisms:

Prevalence of Template-Based Writing Among Students: The root cause lies in the scoring detailed scoring rules) that quantify "grammatical structures and vocabulary richness" as advanced vocabulary and complex sentence structures, with weights as high as 30%-40%, explicitly listing "attributive clauses, inverted sentences," etc., as bonus points. This orientation leads students to direct their creativity towards "sentence structure replacement" rather than "viewpoint innovation." Students are more inclined to memorize universal sentence patterns rather than analyze the underlying logic. More seriously, template-based writing conceals the lack of critical thinking skills. Literature research has found that most high-scoring essays (≥ 22 points) exhibit repeated arguments or similar examples but are still favored due to their "linguistic richness." The essence of template-based incentives is to reduce language expression to technical operations, severing the symbiotic relationship between thinking and language.

Systematic Deduction of Points for Complex Viewpoints: When students attempt to express critical viewpoints, the scoring mechanism has an extremely low tolerance for errors. This is due to the dual limitations of the scoring rules. On one hand, the scoring criteria amplify the cumulative effect of errors. The rules stipulate that "each basic grammatical error results in a 1-point deduction," and complex viewpoints require the use of conditional clauses, abstract nouns, and other complex structures, increasing the probability of errors. For example, students need to use the subjunctive mood to express possibilities, such as "Were it not for ethical concerns...", which has a high error rate in timed writing. On the other hand, there is a lack of "corrective alternatives" in the scoring

dimensions. The scoring dimensions do not include "depth of thought" to offset "linguistic mistakes," whereas the B1-level writing standards of the Cambridge English CEFR explicitly allow "grammatical errors that do not affect understanding" and emphasize "communicative effectiveness priority." This penalty mechanism ultimately forces students to make utilitarian choices between ideological depth and score safety, leading them to abandon critical thinking viewpoints or sentence structures.

Lack of Logical Dimension in the Evaluation System: On one hand, there is an imbalance in teacher feedback. According to classroom observations in senior high schools, most teachers focus more on grammatical errors when correcting essays rather than logical loopholes. For example, in an essay discussing whether "artificial intelligence will cause unemployment in the future," most teacher annotations point to preposition misuse and tense errors but fail to identify the student's fallacy of equating "automation replacing assembly line workers" with "all occupations." On the other hand, the lack of critical thinking training in textbook design exacerbates this problem. Only 12.5% of exercises in senior high school English units involve "analyzing argumentative logic," whereas international assessments like the IELTS writing section explicitly require "addressing opposing viewpoints," accounting for 25% of the score.

3.2. Analysis of the Current Situation of High School English Writing

3.2.1. Prevalent Logical Fallacies in High School English Writing

According to literature research, logical fallacies in high school students' English writing can be summarized into two main categories: structural logical errors and argumentative logical errors.

Firstly, structural errors are manifested in a lack of semantic coherence between paragraphs, such as the mechanical use of transition words like "firstly, secondly" without establishing causal or progressive relationships between arguments, resulting in the essay becoming a mere piling up of viewpoints. For example, in argumentative essays, 62% of students fail to establish a "phenomenon-cause-solution" reasoning chain but instead list three isolated examples in parallel.

Secondly, argumentative errors are concentrated in three types of fallacies. First, equivocation, such as equating "gene editing technology needing ethical constraints" with "opposing scientific progress," which appears in 35% of essays discussing technology topics. Second, causal inversion, such as the typical statement "teenagers' addiction to the internet leads to estrangement in family relationships," ignoring that the lack of family communication is the cause of internet addiction, which accounts for 41% of causal argumentative essays. Third, invalid evidence, such as using personal experiences instead of authoritative data to support general conclusions, which occurs frequently in health-themed writing.

3.2.2. Typical Manifestations of the Lack of Critical Thinking in High School English Writing

According to literature research, the lack of critical thinking in high school students' writing is manifested in three dimensions: flattened arguments, superficial argumentation, and a lack of reflection.

Firstly, flattened arguments. Most students rely on binary opposition when generating arguments, lacking critical thinking skills. When faced with two seemingly conflicting viewpoints, students tend to view them as completely opposed. For example, approximately 78% of students adopt a simple stance of support or opposition in controversial topics like "whether to lose weight for beauty," failing to recognize the unity of contradictions, such as the intermediate stance of "healthy weight loss."

Secondly, superficial argumentation. Students tend to avoid critical examination during the argumentation process. Most students adopt a one-way argumentation style in their essays. In the topic of "the pros and cons of artificial intelligence," few essays proactively anticipate opposing

viewpoints, such as "AI replacing human labor may enhance efficiency," thus arguing from both perspectives. Most others adopt a one-way argumentation style.

Thirdly, weak metacognitive monitoring ability. Post-writing reflections focus on vocabulary and grammar, such as changing "important" to "vital," rather than the rationality of argumentative logic. This is actually directly related to the teaching mode. For example, traditional writing instruction typically includes tasks like summarizing, imitating, and writing based on reading, emphasizing language repetition and mechanical application of language structures and vocabulary learned in the unit, without involving a review of argumentative logic.

4. CONSTRUCTION OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL APPLICATION MODEL

4.1. Criteria for Selecting Controversial Topics

The instructional application model designed in this study necessitates the construction of controversial topics that meet three criteria: social relevance, openness, and conflict.

Firstly, the selection of controversial topics should adhere to the principle of social relevance. This means that topics should be related to real-world social contradictions or hot issues, enabling students to integrate language expression into authentic life contexts. For instance, setting up topics such as "Will artificial intelligence pose a risk of unemployment to humans?" in high school English classes not only aligns with the curriculum standards' requirements for "cultural awareness" and "thinking qualities" but also guides students to analyze the dual aspects of technological development from a sense of social responsibility, employing critical thinking.

Secondly, the construction of controversial topics should follow the principle of openness. Topics should avoid presupposing a single correct answer and should allow for multiple perspectives. This open structure provides students with a space for "hypothesis testing," pushing them to discern the rationality of different positions through output, which aligns with the cognitive requirements of Swain's Output Hypothesis concerning the "metalinguistic function."

Thirdly, the construction of controversial topics should meet the principle of conflict. The chosen topics should not only possess stable logical support but also exhibit a certain degree of logical conflict. Topics lacking debatability (e.g., "Is smoking harmful?") may lead to the issue of students' flattened arguments, whereas highly debatable topics can compel students into a state of "cognitive conflict," stimulating critical analysis.

4.2. Design Principles for the Cognitive Gradient of Output Tasks

Based on Swain's Output Hypothesis and the analysis of current issues, this study posits that output tasks should follow a progressive cognitive logic, gradually approaching the core of critical thinking, namely, from descriptive output to analytical output, and finally to evaluative output.

Firstly, descriptive output serves as the foundational level of cognitive logic. This type of output focuses on factual understanding, linguistic precision, and the simple conveyance of textual information. For example, in the initial stage of a "technology ethics" task, students are required to categorize and extract key technical principles of gene editing, application cases, and data from both pro and con perspectives (e.g., disease cure rates vs. ethical violations), identifying key terms (such as "bioethics") and information gaps through the "noticing function."

Secondly, analytical output represents an advancement from descriptive output. It emphasizes students' ability to deconstruct existing logical relationships using critical thinking skills. Teachers can design tasks such as causal analysis based on previous input, requiring students to compare the differences in regulatory policies on CRISPR technology between China and the United States, label causal chains (e.g., "religious beliefs → legislative stringency"), and identify common logical

fallacies. This stage links language understanding with thinking structures, adhering to the "logical element analysis" in Paul & Elder's critical thinking model.

Thirdly, evaluative output constitutes the highest level among the three logical approaches. This stage demands the highest level of critical thinking from students, requiring them to make value judgments and propose actionable innovative solutions. When writing, students must synthesize evidence from the previous two stages, weigh the pros and cons, and present their own viewpoints. This compels students to engage in "metalinguistic reflection," where they also need to label their argumentative logic chains, reflecting the "hypothesis testing" function in Swain's Output Hypothesis.

4.3. Reconstruction Pathway for the Dynamic Feedback Mechanism

The feedback mechanism constructed in this model addresses the major flaw of traditional feedback systems, which is the separation of language form and thinking quality in evaluation. This model achieves the integration of both through a three-dimensional dynamic evaluation system.

On one hand, considering the lack of logical weight in evaluation criteria, the quantitative scoring table needs to redistribute weights. "Evidence relevance" (30%) should be prioritized over "linguistic accuracy" (20%), with specific standards including the reliability of data sources, the timeliness of evidence, and its logical connection to the argument. This design also addresses the drawback in the college entrance examination scoring standards, which overly emphasizes language complexity at the expense of argument quality.

On the other hand, to counterbalance the imbalance in teacher feedback, the evaluation should establish a two-way cognitive dialogue system combining teacher evaluation and peer evaluation. Firstly, in actual high school English writing classes, teachers can adopt a "sandwich structure" for comments, focusing on revealing logical blind spots rather than linguistic errors. For example, when a student confuses "gene editing technology" with "eugenics," the teacher's comment should point out that "the two differ fundamentally in their application purposes and subject intentions; refer to Article 4 of the World Medical Association's Position Statement on Gene Editing for correction." Secondly, in peer evaluation, a "devil's advocate" system can be introduced, requiring evaluators to propose rebuttals against the weakest links in the argument chain. This design forces writers to engage in deeper metacognitive reflection.

5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

5.1. Research Summary

In summary, based on a comprehensive literature analysis, this study proposes three operationalizable paths:

Firstly, the integration of controversial topics aims to address the issue of student reliance on templates. Teachers are advised to select controversial issues based on criteria of social relevance, openness, and conflict. For instance, in the theme of "Technology Ethics," students can break free from simplistic binary positions such as "technology is omnipotent" or "science is dangerous" by comparing cases of CRISPR technology curing diseases (data from Nature journal) with details of ethical violations in the "He Jiankui incident," thus constructing conditional conclusions and dismantling template-based structures.

Secondly, the design of cognitive-gradient tasks serves as a prerequisite for the gradual progression of critical thinking skills. The literature analysis indicates that the implementation of tiered tasks ranging from descriptive output, through analytical output, to evaluative output adheres to the intrinsic logic of Bloom's Taxonomy of Cognitive Domains. During the analytical output phase,

students are required to annotate causal chains and identify common logical fallacies, thereby making their thinking processes explicit.

Thirdly, the reconstruction of a dynamic feedback mechanism represents a breakthrough in addressing the imbalance in evaluation standards. The quantitative scoring table designed in this study prioritizes "evidence relevance" (30%) over "linguistic accuracy" (20%), directing teacher feedback away from non-grammatical details and towards logical flaws. Additionally, the introduction of a "devil's advocate" system in peer evaluation, where students are required to challenge the weakest links in each other's arguments, forces writers to engage in deeper metacognitive reflection. This feedback mechanism compels students to confront the risks of critical thinking.

5.2. Research Limitations and Future Directions

Although the teaching model constructed in this study theoretically validates the effectiveness of the Output Hypothesis, it has not fully analyzed the impact of variations in teachers' critical thinking competencies on the model. Currently, high school English teachers exhibit varying levels of critical thinking teaching abilities, with some lacking relevant training, resulting in subpar critical thinking skills. Future research urgently needs to develop diagnostic tools for teachers' critical thinking abilities and construct teacher training systems by combining classroom examples, focusing on the operational training of core critical thinking skills such as "counterexample deduction" and "premise verification."

The current model validation has primarily focused on the high school stage. The writing teaching model designed in this study presupposes that students possess intermediate English pragmatic abilities, a presumption that poses significant challenges in terms of teaching continuity between primary and secondary schools. Specifically, junior high school learners face three primary dilemmas: Firstly, the asynchronous development of language ability and cognitive skills hinders their ability to complete high-order cognitive tasks. For example, in the "mandatory position expression" phase, when required to articulate in English that "intergenerational equity necessitates balancing ecological protection with economic development," over 60% of respondents revert to simplistic position statements (e.g., "nature should be protected") due to insufficient vocabulary reserves. Secondly, there exists a structural bias in teaching materials-junior high school topics predominantly revolve around personal life domains (e.g., vacation planning, campus life), lacking the controversial social issues required by this model. Implementing the model forcefully may lead to cognitive overload. Thirdly, there is a fundamental misalignment in the evaluation systems of different academic stages: the senior high school entrance examination writing scoring still prioritizes "content completeness" and "linguistic accuracy," with critical thinking dimensions excluded from the assessment framework, thereby diminishing teachers' motivation for reform.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ai, F. (2022). An exploration of Krashen's second language acquisition theory on English teaching in China. *Journal of Social Science and Humanities*.
- [2] Tan, T. Z. (2025). The impact of input and output hypothesis on learning a new language. *Journal of International Education and Science Studies*, 2(3).
- [3] Sun, W. (2020). The output hypothesis and its implications for language teaching. *Journal of Advances in Education Research*, 5(3).
- [4] Du, J. (2001). From students' English writing errors to writing teaching. *Foreign Language Education*, (2), 43–47.
- [5] Lan, R. (2021). Strategies for cultivating thinking quality in high school English classroom teaching. *Campus English*, (46), 116–117.
- [6] Xu, J., & Pang, Z. (2022). Analysis of high school English textbooks from the perspective of thinking quality based on English subject core competencies. *University*, (17), 59–62.

- [7] Li, N. (2007). The role of input and output hypotheses in foreign language teaching. *Chinese Adult Education*, (5), 189.