

Effects of Input Enhancement Cues on EFL Learners' Intake of English Grammar: The Case of Connectors

Sara Kian

Department of ELT, Khuzestan Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran. Department of ELT, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran.
Email: Kian@yahoo.com

*Bahman Gorjian **

Department of ELT, Abadan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Abadan, Iran
Email: b.gorjian@iauabadan.ac.ir

Abstract

The present study investigated the effect of two types of attention drawing techniques (i.e., choice and underlining) on the learners' intake of English connectors. The design of the study was a quasi-experimental research. Participants took a homogeneity test and were assigned to two experimental and a control group in Kalam Language Institute of Shoush. Then, sixty-nine learners were divided into three groups. The two experimental groups used attention drawing techniques to choose or underline the correct connectors in the texts. The control group, however, was simply exposed to read the text and exercise the drills of grammar in their text. Results indicated that both attention drawing techniques had a significant effect on the intake of the targeted forms of connectors. Implications of the study for practical teaching suggest that the attention drawing techniques can enhance learning connectors and they may be effective in teaching grammar to the pre- intermediate learners.

Keywords: Input enhancement, Intake, Underlining, Choice, Connectors

1. Introduction

Taking the crucial role of noticing and attention in language acquisition as a starting point of research, recent second language acquisition (SLA) investigation has begun to explore whether and how the learners' attention processes may influence second language (L2) learners' inter-language development. During the last two decades or so, specific pedagogical approaches have proposed that drawing the learners' attention to grammatical forms can provide L2 learners with the input which is a necessary but insufficient condition for SLA (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). It is generally believed that not all of the input that learners are exposed to be utilized as intake for L2 acquisition. For this, recent research in SLA has examined the role of attention (i.e., noticing) in mediating input and acquisition. A general finding of such research indicates that attention to language forms is necessary for learning a language (Erturk, 2013).

Schmidt (1990) claims that intake is that part of the input which the learner notices. He went on further to argue that SLA is mainly driven by what learners pay attention to and notice in the target language input. For Schmidt (2001), the more attention given, the greater the intake and learning would be. Therefore, using a language is, to a large extent, a psychological activity in which a language learner's responses depend not only upon knowledge of structures but also upon the knowledge of the events of a situation and the learner's feelings toward those events. He further believes that students (at every level) must be expected to give semantically and contextually correct responses as well as grammatically correct ones. Thus, stimulus means everything that raises one's attention. In order to make a structural feature salient and induce attention on the part of learners', textual (input) enhancement has recently been introduced as an asset. Moreover, we can add the impact of output. This is in line with the consensus among applied linguists who note paying attention to form is necessary for the acquisition a language (e.g., Nassaji, 1999).

Textual Enhancement (TE) is one way to modify the input to arise noticing and to draw learners' attention to linguistic forms by modifying the typographical or physical appearance of the target structures. The main typographical cues introduced in the literature are bolding, underlining, choice, background, CAPITALIZATION, font size, *italics*, etc. All these techniques are used to enhance the saliency of certain linguistic features in written texts (Simard, 2009). Input enhancement and output production are used to make a particular linguistic feature more salient in the written text in order to make the readers notice this feature.

The important point to mention here according to Farahani (2012) is that intake of a particular linguistic feature is the result of the learner's paying attention to that feature. This idea is in line with that of Schmidt (2001) who believes that linguistic features which are made salient or enhanced are more likely to be paid attention to. Many experts (e.g., Leow, 1997; Robinson, 1996; Rosa & O'Neill, 1999) have conducted numerous empirical studies endorsing the view that when higher amount of attention is paid to form, more learning takes place in this field. This can be accomplished via either input enhancement or output production or both. Since it is obviously evident in the recent related literature of SLA, great importance has been given to the role of input enhancement in the intake/acquisition of linguistic features including grammatical forms. However, this field still faces many controversies. Accordingly, the aim of this study is to further explore the influence of input enhancement on intake of English connectives as discourse markers. The previous investigations show that the use of discourse markers can be problematic for EFL learners (Fraser, 1999). It is also hope the results of this research can help teachers and learners in facilitating teaching and learning grammar.

According to the literature of this study, some experimental studies have shown that learning English connectors is a problematic area for both EFL and ESL students with different backgrounds. It also revealed that the students at different level of proficiency have found it difficult to English conjunctive adverb in general and English coordinate conjunction in specific. This problem may be related to the weaknesses of text books, teachers' teaching methods or learners' paying attention to grammatical patterns. Perhaps the books cannot attract the learners' attention to the grammatical points. Furthermore, teachers, who convey the matter, may ignore to guide the learners to notice on the texts. Therefore, the researchers of the current study selected this set of English discourse markers, as the target structures of the treatment sessions.

2. Literature Review

2.1. The Role of Input, Noticing and SLA

In the field of SLA, the nature of linguistic input in L2 acquisition has always been a significant issue. This controversial issue is that either the direct (explicit) or indirect (implicit) instruction of language forms has always been challenged. The role of grammar instruction has undergone lots of changes both in theory and in practice. Long (1991) claims

that grammar instruction can be of two types: focus on form and focus on forms. According to him, focus on form refers to drawing learners' attention to the form as they arise incidentally in classroom. However, focus on forms refers to teaching of discrete points of grammar in separate lessons. But for Krashen (1985), the story of acquiring a language is different from that of Long (1991). In his input hypothesis, he proposes that second languages are acquired "by understanding messages or by receiving comprehensible input" (Krashen, 1985, p.2).

Krashen (1985) defines comprehensible input in a particular way. Essentially, comprehensible input is that bit of language that is heard/ read and that is slightly ahead of a learners' current state of grammatical knowledge. He assumes a Language Acquisition Device (LAD), that is, an innate mental structure capable of handling both first and second language acquisition. The input activates this innate structure. But only input of a very specific kind ($i+1$) will be useful in altering a learner's grammar. In his view, the input hypothesis is central to all of language acquisition and also has implications for the classroom. For him, mere exposure to optimal input ($i+1$) is both necessary and sufficient for language acquisition. However, despite its attractiveness, that no one would deny the importance and significance of input, there are numerous difficulties with this concept. One of the main drawbacks of his input hypothesis is that the way input is turned into intake is not specified.

2.2. Input-Based Instruction and Enriched Input

Input-based instruction is directed at enabling learners to (1) notice the presence of a specific feature in the input, (2) comprehend the meaning of the feature, and (3) rehearse the feature in short-term memory. One of the assumptions of input-based is that it is psycholinguistically easier to manipulate the processes involved in intake than it is to induce learners to restructure their inter-language systems. Studies that have examined enriched input options have shown on Schmidt's (1990) Noticing Hypothesis and the Frequency Hypothesis. Enriched input could be in oral or written forms that the learners simply listen to or read (i.e. input-flooding) or target structure has been highlighted in some way in texts; for example, through the use of underlining or bold print. Three types of studies are presented to identify the related literature based on the enriched input studies: (1) studies designed to examine whether the target forms in the enriched input are noticed by the learners, (2) studies developed to consider whether enriched input advocated acquisition and (3) studies comparing the effects of enriched input with some other instructional option (Ellis, 2009)

The aim of textual enhancement is to increase the chance of being noticed of the target structure by the learners. Input flood is one technique that has been used by a great number of researchers (e.g., Ellis, 2009) who notice the provision of numerous instances of target linguistic forms in the input. Based on the focus on form in the texts, the input is typographically increased through a range of enhancement techniques such as bold facing, color-coding, underlining, italicizing, capitalizing, and using different font types and sizes which try to attract more attention from learners (Doughty & Williams, 1998; Long & Robinson, 1998; Wong, 2005).

2.3. Connectors

Writing is generally regarded as a difficult and challenging skill. This is a reflective activity that needs enough time to think about the topic and to analyzing and classifying the background knowledge. Wall (1981) assert that “it ranges from mechanical control to creativity, with good grammar, knowledge of subject matter, awareness of stylistic convention and various mysterious factors in between whichever all add to its compound characteristic” (p.53).

Writing is one of the complex processes even in the first language. The EFL/ESL learners face greater problems in learning this skill. Many teachers of English have acclaimed that learning writing skill seems to be more demanding than any other language skills. A lot of research (e.g., Congjun, 2005, Lee, 2002, Liu & Brain, 2005) has been done to propose several factors that affect writing skill and remove the texting problems of language learners. The most problematic area for EFL learners seems to be some factors that influencing writing tasks are cohesion and coherence (Shokrpour & Fallahzadeh, 2007).

Cohesion is believed as one of the essential factors that have to be deliberate in writing because it links different parts of the text together. Text stands as a text by the use of cohesion and the text without cohesive sentences would be fragmented and at the end we have a number of unrelated sentences. Halliday and Hasan (1976) explain that cohesion is the factor that can distinguish a text and a non-text.

Conjunctions have been studied by various names and labels in the field of linguistics. They are called as discourse markers by Schiffrin (1987) and treated as pragmatic class of lexical items by Fraser (1999). Warner (1985) named them pragmatic framework and other researchers such as Rouchota (1998) who worked within the Relevance Theory structure used “a type of Gricean conventional implicature” (Fraser, 1999, p. 936) or “pragmatic markers”.

This research studied the effects of two attention drawing techniques, namely choice and underlining used in teaching grammar with a focus on form. The aim was to discover the most effective and durable technique for a second language grammar class. The study addressed the following research questions:

1. Does choice as an externally driven input enhancement technique have any facilitative effect on the intake of English connectors as discourse markers?
2. Does underlining as an externally driven input enhancement techniques have any facilitative effect on the intake of the English connectors as discourse markers?
3. Are the two techniques of underlining and choice different in the intake of English connectors as discourse markers?

3. Methodology

3.1. Design and Context of the Study

This study was conducted in Kalam Language Institute of Shoush, Iran. The design of the study was a quasi-experimental research which dealt with pre, post and delayed post-test. Two groups of experimental and control participated in this study.

3.2. Participants

This study was conducted in Kalam Language Institute of Shoush. The first step was to make sure of the students' homogeneity by giving OQPT to 88 learners. Sixty nine learners whose band score fell between 18 and 39 were selected as the pre-intermediate participants. Then they were non-randomly divided into three groups based on non-random convenient sampling method as a control and two experimental groups (i.e., choice and underlining). Each groups comprised of 23 participants. The age of them ranged from 16 to 32.

3.3. Instruments

In order to accomplish the objectives of the present study, the following instruments were employed. First of all, OQPT was administrated to determine the participant's language homogeneity. This test included 60 items and the participants were given 30 minutes to answer them. Then, the pre-test that consisted three different types of items were used in the formats of multiple-choice (MC), grammaticality judgment (GJ) and constrained structured response (CSR). The participants used the target forms within a highly controlled linguistic

context-fill in the gaps. The next instrument was the immediate post-test which was like the pre-test but the researchers modified its items to avoid the possibility of reminding by the learners. The final test was the delayed post-test that was similar to the post-test.

The reason to employ these kinds of tests was based on Ellis (2009) who proposed such types of activities as to be appropriate means to measure intake of the linguistic features. There were 30 items in each test (i.e., 10 MC, 10 GJ and 10 CSR).

In order to check the participants' intake of the targeted connectors, three parallel tests were developed. Each test consisted of the raw scores for each test. It was calculated through assigning half a point for each correct response (with maximum score of 15). The tests had been piloted on the similar group of the students other than the participants of the study. The reliability of the tests was calculated to make sure if they measured the participants' intake of the target forms.

The reliability of the tests was calculated through a pilot study on 10 students other than the participants. Based on Cronbach Alpha as ($\alpha=.856$) in the pre-test and ($\alpha=.682$) in the immediate post-test and delayed-post-test. The content validity of the tests was checked and confirmed by two experts.

This study investigated the way of effective grammar leaning through input enhancement. Thus, it has been tried to show the benefits of new techniques to attract the learners' attention and try to make teaching easier. The data for this study comprised of two text books. The first one was "concepts and comment" by Acer and Lee (2005) and the second one was "communicate what do you mean" by Carroll (1998). Then five passages were selected from the first one that includes conjunction in the passages and the second book was used for the exercise parts to help to understand better of the matter.

The first book was selected because of its popularity and availability of conjunction in the text. The aim of this study is to increase the attention of learners by using input enhancement techniques. The second book was selected to complete the process of learning conjunctions and help student to do exercise. These two text books were tended for intermediate students of English or foreign language.

3.4. Data Collection Procedure

The first step was to make sure of the students' homogeneity by giving OQPT to 88 learners. Then sixty nine learners whose scores fell between 18 and 39 were selected as

homogeneous participants. Then they were divided into three equal groups based on non-random sampling method as a control and two experimental groups.

During the treatment period of four weeks, they met for three sessions a week, each session contains 60 minutes. All three groups including the control and the experimental groups were exposed to appropriate reading passages in which the target forms of the study had been embedded.

The participants in the experimental groups received teaching by changed texts based on their Input Enhancement. It means that for the first group, they studied the texts through underlining the target connectors. For the second group, the texts were changed based on their input enhancement and the connectors were underlined in order to attract learners' attention. In order to teach input enhanced target point in the experimental classes, the following phases were carried out:

Phase 1: In the first session, the target connectors (that is points) were presented and described explicitly and the teacher divided connectors for each section. Then, it was explained to language learners why, when, how this discourse marker was used.

Phase 2: In each session, before reading the passage, the teacher presented the students with the challenging new connector and extracted it from the reading passage. Then they read the enhanced text and talked about it.

Phase 3: The students were gathered in groups of two or three around a table, and try to answer the exercise of second book 'communicate what you mean'.

Phase 4: The students and teacher checked the answers and worked on new target point.

In control group, first, each section was reviewed, and then the text was read by the students through scanning technique. Then, the text was read by teacher and it was taught to clarify the target point implicitly and explicitly. Second activity was to answer the exercise in 'communicate what do you mean', but the text was not enhanced.

That is, they were simply provided with opportunities to read the same texts to which the experimental groups were exposed. For the experimental group one (E1), the same texts were utilized. However, the target forms had been highlighted using underlining technique. Put another way, they receive pre-modified texts in which the connectors had already been enhanced.

The second experimental group, however, was exposed to the target forms embedded in an enriched text by the focused structures which included connectors marked (that is, *) by

the teacher to be noticed by the learners. In the enriched texts, the target connectors were used both the correct form and an incorrect form of the forms were parenthesized. In the exercises, the incorrect forms had been asterisk marked (*), so the students might notice and compare the correct and the incorrect forms of the connectors.

After treatment period a pretest was administered to measure the levels of students' connector knowledge. At the end, the delayed-posttest was administrated to measure the retention of the target points from each group.

3.5. Data Analysis Procedure

To compare their between and within group probable differences both before and after the instruction, One-way ANOVA, Post-hoc Scheffe test were used on the data obtained from the pre-test, the immediate post-test and the delayed post-test. All analysis of the obtained data was done through using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 22.

4. Results

To examine the difference between the experimental and control groups' pre-tests, the descriptive statistics were firstly calculated.

4.1. Results of the Pre-test

Table 1 shows the means of these three groups in the pre-test.

Table 1.

Descriptive Statistics (Pre-test)

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Control	23	7.78	1.782	.37171	7.0117	8.5535	5.00	11.00
Choice	23	7.69	1.964	.40954	6.8463	8.5450	3.00	11.00
Underlining	23	8.30	1.869	.38976	7.4960	9.1127	4.00	12.00
Total	69	7.92	1.865	.22458	7.4794	8.3757	3.00	12.00

Table 1 shows that the number of the students in the four groups is 23. Initially, each student's pre-test score was obtained. Then descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviation of each group were calculated. Based on the descriptive statistics, the pre-test mean of the underlining experimental group were greater than the pre-test mean of the choice and control groups. While the mean of the underlining group was 8.30, choice group was 7.69 and the mean of the control group was 7.78.

Table 2.

One-way ANOVA (Pre-test)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4.986	2	2.493	.710	.495
Within Groups	231.652	66	3.510		
Total	236.638	68			

Table 2 presents the results. With a significant level which turned out to be $p > 0.05$ ($p = .495$, $f = .710$, $df = 2/66$), it can safely be said that there were neither between nor within group significant variation among the groups prior to instruction.

4.2. Results of Immediate and Delayed Post-tests

In order to examine the difference between the experimental and control groups' post-tests, first, the descriptive statistics was calculated. The means of the experimental and control groups' immediate post-test are presented in Table 3.

Table 3.

Descriptive Statistics (Immediate Post-test)

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Control	23	8.0	1.92	.40	7.2530	8.9209	4.00	12.00
Choice	23	10.1	2.92	.61	8.8643	11.3966	2.00	14.00
Underlining	23	11.7	2.19	.45	10.8338	12.7314	7.00	15.00
Total	69	10.0	2.80	.33	9.3268	10.6732	2.00	15.00

Table 3 reveals that the immediate post-test means are (10.1) in the choice group and (11.7) in the underlining group. These two groups' means show different value comparing to the control group (8.0). On the other hand, the post-test mean for the underlining group shows greater difference from the control one.

After assigning the groups to different treatments, an immediate post-test was run on the results obtained from the test.

Table 4.
One-way ANOVA (Immediate Post-test)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	157.652	2	78.826	13.824	.000
Within Groups	376.348	66	5.702		
Total	534.000	68			

Table 4 demonstrates the results with df and F values which turned out to be 2/66 and 13.824. The p-value ($p = .000$) is less than ($p < 0.05$). Thus we conclude that the groups' performances on immediate post-test were significantly different in comparison with their performances on the pre-test. This means that the type of instruction provided for the experimental groups was effective leading to their better performance on the immediate post-test.

Table 5.
Post-hoc Scheffe Test (Immediate Post-test)

(I)	(J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
VAR00010	VAR00010				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Control	Choice	-2.043*	.70416	.019	-3.8070	-.2800
	Underline	-3.695*	.70416	.000	-5.4591	-1.9322
Choice	Control	2.043*	.70416	.019	.2800	3.8070
	Underline	-1.652	.70416	.071	-3.4157	.1113
Underline	Control	3.695*	.70416	.000	1.9322	5.4591
	Choice	1.652	.70416	.071	-.1113	3.4157

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 5 present the result of immediate post-test conducted by post hoc-Scheffe test based on the scores of three groups. The difference between the control group and choice group is significant ($.019 < 0.05$). The difference between the control group and underlining group is significant ($.000 < 0.05$) too, but the difference between choice and underlining group is not significant ($.071 > 0.05$).

Table 6.

Descriptive Statistics (Delayed Post-test)

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Control	23	8.17	1.58	.33	7.48	8.85	5.00	11.00
Choice	23	9.56	2.60	.54	8.43	10.69	1.00	13.00
Underlining	23	10.17	2.55	.53	9.07	11.27	5.00	14.00
Total	69	9.30	2.41	.29	8.72	9.88	1.00	14.00

Table 6 indicates that the mean of all groups based on the delayed post-test's scores. This table reveals that the mean in all groups: control group (8.17) choice group (9.56) and underlining group (10.17). The underlining group mean is different from another two groups.

Table 7.

One-way ANOVA (Delayed Post-test)

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	48.348	2	24.174	4.581	.014
Within Groups	348.261	66	5.277		
Total	396.609	68			

Table 7 shows that the students could keep their gain of knowledge of the targeted forms after the two-week time interval ($df = 2/66$, $f = 4.518$ and $p = .014$). Moreover, the table displays that there are both between group and within group variation among the groups

which means that the treatment groups could retain their gain of inter-language knowledge of the forms, the rate of their retention are not at the same rate.

Table 8.

Post-hoc Scheffe Test (Delayed Post-test)

(I)	(J)	Mean	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
VAR00010	VAR00010	Difference (I-J)				
Control	Choice	-1.391	.677	.129	-3.0877	.3051
	Underline	-2.000*	.677	.017	-3.6964	-.3036
Choice	Control	1.391	.677	.129	-.3051	3.0877
	Underline	-.608	.677	.669	-2.3051	1.0877
Underline	Control	2.000*	.677	.017	.3036	3.6964
	Choice	.608	.677	.669	-1.0877	2.3051

Table 8 presents the difference between the three groups, difference between the control and choice groups is not significant (.129), difference between the choice and underlining group is not significant too, (.669). On the other hand, the difference between the control and underlining group is significant (.017).

5. Discussion

In this section, the results will be discussed concerned with the three research questions.

1. Does choice as an externally driven input enhancement techniques have any facilitative effects on the intake of English connectives as discourse markers?

After analyzing data, the results showed that there was not significance difference among students' performance in the pre-test; however, there was a significant difference among the performances of the two experimental groups in the post-test and delayed post-test. Moreover, it could be observed that students who received the choice as input enhancement got better marks and their performance was better than the control group who received the traditional instruction without any input enhancement.

The result of this study does not match with Sarboland (2012) who emphasizes that Choice did not have any impact on the pre-intermediate EFL learners' intake. Findings of this

research revealed that Choice as an input enhancement had some effect on the learners' attention on learning the connectors. The reason of Choice as TE format did also effective in the results of the immediate post-test. It seems in this format the students noticed each enhanced point and compared the incorrect one which was marked by an asterisk. So this technique helps the learners to have better function in compare to control group.

2. Does underlining as an externally driven input enhancement technique have any facilitative effects on the intake of the English connectives as discourse markers?

Analyzing data showed that students' scores in pre-test was not significance difference between three groups. On the other hand, there was a significant difference among the performances of the underlining group in the immediate post-test and delayed post-test. Furthermore it could be observed that the students who received the underlining activities as input enhancement had better scores and their performance was better than the control group and choice group.

The results showed that underlining the target forms was found to be an effective textual enhancement format in inducing the noticing and intake of the focused features in the present study. This is in line with the findings of Doughty and Williams (1998) who contemplate the possible reasons for finding underlining group to outperform other groups with a greater mean difference in their studies. Since we add something to the text in underlining, the target underlined feature is more salient. For them underlining is an additive TE format.

3. Which technique would have more durable impact on the retention of the target forms over time?

When a language teaching technique is utilized by language instructors, they should make sure about the durability of its effect. Accordingly, the last but by no means the least question of the present investigation was asked to verify if the effect of the two input enhancement techniques could be durable over time. To verify this, a delayed post-test was run. Results displayed that the learners' gained knowledge of the target forms was stable over time. Based on these results the students of the underlining group could keep their gained knowledge of the target forms after the two week-time interval. On the other hand, the choice group did not have a significant performance in comparison to underlining. Regarding the third research question which asked the impact of the techniques on intake, the underlining technique significantly affected learning of the connectors in the post-test. The results of the

delayed post-test demonstrated that the two input enhancement techniques were effective in helping the learners preserving their gained inter-language knowledge over time. However, the delayed post-test further displayed that the two groups could not keep their knowledge gain of the targeted features at the same rate. That is to say, the underlining group had better performance on the delayed post-test. Accordingly, we suggest that underlining can an effective technique in promoting the intake, noticing and subsequent learning of the English connectors in longer time and it might be effective in helping EFL learners to focus their attention on other various linguistic elements in written input to which they are exposed.

6. Conclusion

To sum up, the results of the current quasi-experimental study demonstrated that the answers to all the research questions which motivated the current investigation were positive. In other words, both externally input enhancement techniques, operationalized through the underlining and choice noticing techniques were effective in inducing and promoting the participants' noticing and subsequent intake of the grammatical points. As for the second research question of the study, our data revealed that although both techniques did have facilitative effect on the intake of the target forms, this effect was not at the same rate. It means that the learners, who were assigned to the underlining procedure, performed those assigned to the choice condition. These conclusions were derived from the results of the immediate post-test performed after the treatment provided for the learners in our study. These factors involve learner-related variables like proficiency level, prior knowledge of the target form, the developmental stage and the degree of readiness of the learner. Therefore, we believe that because of the contradictory results, more research in this area, especially in EFL contexts, seems necessary.

The findings of this investigation may help EFL teachers to make a comparison between the long-term impacts of input modification and the traditional explicit rule presentation in teaching linguistic features on their EFL students' inter-language system development. Another motivation of the researchers to carry out this inquiry was also likely to be its benefit for theoreticians and scholars in the field of SLA. Further research can be conducted to take gender as an intervening variable to examine its effect on the use of input enhancement procedures and their efficacy in developing inter-language knowledge of various linguistic forms to which learners are exposed in written input.

References

- Acer, P. & Lee, L. (2005). *Cause & effect*. United State of America: James W. Brown.
- Carroll, W. P. (1998). *Communicate what you mean: A concise advanced grammar*. (2nd Edition). London: Longman.
- Congjun, M. U. (2005). *A taxonomy of ESL writing strategies*. In Proceedings Redesigning Pedagogy: Research, Policy, Practice.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.) (1998). *Focus and form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). The differential effects of three types of planning on fluency, complexity and accuracy in L2 oral production. *Applied Linguistics* 30, 474-509.
- Erturk, E. (2013). The impact of intellectual property policies on ethical attitudes toward internet piracy. *Knowledge Management: An International Journal*, 12(1), 101-109.
- Farahani, A. K, & Sarkhosh, M. (2012). Do different textual enhancement formats have differential effects on the intake of English subjunctive mood? *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2, 687-697.
- Fraser, B., (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 931-952.
- Halliday, M. & R. Hasan. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Oxford: Pregamon Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition Research*. New York: Longman.
- Lee, I. (2002). Teaching coherence to ESL students: a classroom inquiry. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11, 135-159.
- Leow, R. (1997). The effects of input enhancement and text length on adult L2 readers' comprehension and intake in second language acquisition. *Applied Language Learning*, 8, 151-182.
- Liu, M., & Braine, G. (2005). Cohesive features in argumentative writing produced by Chinese undergraduates. *System*, 33(4), 623-636.
- Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot Ginsberg, and C. Kramersch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amesterdam: John Benjamins.
- Long, M., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: theory, research and practice. In: Doughty, C., Williams. J. (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Nassaji, H. (1999). Toward integrating form focused instruction and communicative interaction in the second language classroom: Some pedagogical possibilities. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 55, 385-402.
- Robinson, P. (1996). Learning simple and complex second language rules under implicit, incidental, rule search, and instructed conditions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 27-67.
- Rosa, E., O'Neill, M. (1999). Explicitness, intake and the issue of awareness: Another piece to the puzzle. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21, 511-556.
- Rouchota, V. (1998). *Connectives, coherence and relevance: Current Issues in Relevance Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sarboland, E. (2012). Different textual enhancement formats and the intake of English past simple tense. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4, 459-474.
- Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-158.
- Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In Robinson, P. (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 5-11). Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Simard, D. (2009). Differential effects of textual enhancement formats on intake. *System*, 37, 124-135.
- Shokrpour, N., & Fallahzadeh, M. (2007). A survey of the students and Interns' EFL writing problems in Shiraz University of Medical Sciences. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9(1), 1-15.
- Wall, D. (1981). A pre-sessional academic writing course for postgraduate students in economics. *Practical Papers in English Language Education*, 4, 34-105.
- Warner, R. G. (1985). *Discourse connectives in English*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Wong, W. (2005). *Input enhancement: From theory and research to the classroom*. New York: McGraw-Hill.