Journal of Human Studies and Social (دراسات إنسانية واجتماعية)/ University Oran2. Volume 09 N03 /16/06/2020
ISNN : 2253-0592 EISSN : 2588-199X / Prefix: 10.46315

The Effects of Visual Input Enhancement and Input Flood on The Acquisition of The English Passive Form.

آثار استخدام التأثيرات البصرية المُحسنة للنص وسيل المعلومة على تعلم صيغة المبني للمجهول في اللغة الإنجليزية

Doc: Youcef REMACHE ط: يوسف رماش xclumail@gmail.com	Didactiques des Langues Etrangères	Faculté des Lettres et des Langues Université des Frères Mentouri Constantine1, Algerie.
Framing: Pr. Sarah MERROUCHE أد. سارة مروش	Langues Etrangères	Faculté des Lettres et des Langues Université Oum el Bouaghi, Algerie.

DOI: 10.46315/1714-009-003-037

Received: 24/10/ 2018 Accepted: 08/05/ 2020 Published :16/06/ 2020

Abstract: This study was set up to investigate the potentially facilitative effects of using visually/textually enhanced materials and input flood techniques on the acquisition of the English passive form. Sixty students majoring in Economics at Larbi Ben M'hidi University, O.E.B were randomly assigned to three groups: a control group, experimental group 1 and experimental group 2. The research questions formulated to investigate the effects of the two input enhancement techniques are as follows: Can providing learners with visually enhanced materials facilitate the noticing and subsequently the acquisition of the English passive form?

Can providing learners with sufficient input facilitate the noticing and subsequently the acquisition of the English passive form? In an attempt to answer the previous research questions two hypotheses were formulated:

Hypothesis A: Learners receiving input flood will outperform learners of the control group

Hypothesis B: Learners receiving visual input enhancement will outperform learners of the control group. While participants of experimental group1 performed significantly better in both post-tests, no such improvement was recorded in the performances of the participants of experimental group2.

Keywords: Input; Input Enhancement; Intake; Noticing Hypothesis; Textual Input Enhancement.

تم إعداد هذه الدراسة للتحقيق في التأثيرات التيسيرية المحتملة لاستخدام التأثيرات البصرية المحسنة للنص وسيل المعلومة على تعلم صيغة المبني للمجهول في اللغة الانجليزية على ثلاث مجموعات :مجموعة مراقبة، مجموعة تجريبية 1 ومجموعة تجريبية 2 .أسئلة البحث التي تم وضعها للتحقيق في آثار تقنيات تحسين المدخلات هي كما يلي :هل يمكن لتزويد المتعلمين بمواد محسّنة بصريًا أن يسهل عملية ملاحظة صيغة المبني للمجهول للغة الإنجليزية وبالتالي اكتسابها ؟

ISNN : 2253-0592 EISSN : 2588-199X / Prefix: 10.46315

هل يمكن لتزويد المتعلمين سيل المعلومة تسهل عملية ملاحظة صيغة المبني للمجهول للغة الإنجليزية وبالتالي اكتسابها؟ بينما كان أداء المشاركين في المجموعة التجريبية 1 أفضل بكثير في كلا الاختبارين اللاحقين، لم يتم تسجيل أي تحسن في أداء المشاركين في المجموعة التجريبية2 . في محاولة للاجابةعنالأسئلة السابقة تمت صياغة فرضيتين فرضية أ :المتعلمين الذين تلقوا سيل المعلومة سيؤدون بشكل أفضل من متعلمي المجموعة المراقبة فرضية ب :المتعلمين الذين تلقوا المدخلات المحسنة شكليا سيؤدون بشكل أفضل من متعلمي المجموعة المراقبة
كلمات مفتاحية :المعلومة اللغوية؛ التاثيرات البصرية المحسنة للنص؛ الاستيعاب ؛ محسنات النص؛ نظرية الملاحظة.

1 Introduction

In the field of SLA, the role and type of grammatical instruction have always been a controversial issue. Over the past two decades, most L2 studies on grammar teaching have yielded different, sometimes even conflicting, results supporting either an explicit or an implicit approach to grammar instruction. The explicit approach to grammatical instruction is based on the assumption that an explicit focus on language form is necessary for SLA to take place; however, this approach has been questioned by a number of researchers who see the L2 acquisition as an essentially implicit process similar to first language (L1) acquisition through the sufficient exposure to a rich linguistic input which is provided in highly contextualized social interaction (Dulay & Burt, 1973; Krashen, 1981). Krashen suggests that the formal instruction may only result in an increase in consciously-learned competence which he considers can serve only as a monitor to what the L2 learners produce.

Other researchers (Smith, 1993; Long, 1996; Van Patten, 1996) on the other hand, argue that input alone is not enough and it has to be enhanced so that the language learners can notice it, and eventually convert it into intake. Schmidt (1990) states that features of the target language cannot be learned unless they have been noticed. Schmidt considers noticing, which he defines as paying attention to the input received, is a necessary condition for converting input into intake. Emphasizing the indispensability of attending to input, Smith (1990) argues that not all grammatical forms are easily noticed and input has to be manipulated in a way that makes the less salient grammatical forms more noticeable for L2 learners. The process by which language input becomes salient to the learners is called input enhancement. The major aim of input enhancement is to either draw or direct learners' attention to the problematic language features. This unobtrusive pedagogical intervention employs different techniques to promote the perceptual salience of the target forms such as: the use of italics, boldface, capitalization, underlining....

ISNN : 2253-0592 EISSN : 2588-199X / Prefix: 10.46315

2 Review of the literature

2.1 Definition of input

Many researchers in the field of SLA have defined 'input' in approximately the same way. Sharwood Smith (1993, p.167) defines input as the: 'potentially processable language data which are made available, by chance or by design, to the language learner'. Lee & VanPatten (2003, p.25) explained that: 'input is the language that a learner hears (or reads) that has some kind of communicative intent'. In simple words, input is language data that the learner is exposed to, that is, the learner's experience of the target language in all its various manifestations. It is an essential component of SLA, simply because learners use it 'in order to construct a mental representation of the grammar that they are acquiring' (VanPatten, 1996, p. 13).

2.2 Definition of intake

While there is some kind of consensus about the definition of input, Intake 'has taken on a number of different meanings, and it is not always clear what a particular investigator means in using it' (McLaughlin, 1987, p. 13). The reason behind this dissension is the different views towards the nature of intake itself. Corder (1967, p. 165), who considers intake as a product defines it as 'a mental representation of a physical stimulus', in other words for Corder intake is that part of input that has been perceived but hasn't yet been integrated in the learner's language system as it is still dependent on an external physical stimulus. Sharwood Smith (1994, p.8) who also sees intake as a product defines it as 'that part of input which has actually been processed by the learner and turned into knowledge of some kind'. Then proceeds to say that if 'input is, as it were, the goods that are presented to the customer, including the articles that the customer picks up to look at. Intake is what is actually bought and taken away from the shop, i.e. what passes into the ownership of the customer' (1994, p. 9) in other words, intake is not all the input the learners are exposed to, but only what the learners actually comprehend in terms of form, function and meaning. On the other hand, many researchers have approached intake as a process rather than as a product. Among which, Chaudron (1985, p.1) who defines intake as 'the mediating process between the target language available to learners as input and the learners' internalized set of L2 rules and strategies for second language development'. Then he carries on, 'in speaking of intake we are, in effect, referring not to a single event or product, but to a complex phenomenon of information processing that involves several stages, roughly characterized as (1) the initial stages of perception of input, (2) the subsequent stages of recoding and encoding of the semantic (communicated) information into long term memory, and (3) the series of stages by which learners fully integrate and incorporate the linguistic information in input into their developing grammars' (1985, p. 2). In contrast, some other

researchers assert that viewing intake as exclusively a product, or exclusively as a process has in fact some limitations. Alcon (1998), for example, suggests that if intake is to be viewed as a product, then there will be no explanation left for how that product is created or processed from input. And if intake is to be viewed as a process, then the fact that 'a small proportion of the learners' intake can go beyond the boundaries of the input they are exposed to' (p. 345) is overlooked. Alcon argues that intake is both that part of input the learners perceive and process as well as the end-product after the processing is complete. In other words, for Alcon intake is a product of a process.

2.3 Input enhancement

Input enhancement theory is based on the premise that the mere exposure to the less salient features of L2 structures is not sufficient for language acquisition to take place, and learners will fail to perceive them in naturalistic input (Rutherford & Sharewood Smith, 1985). In other words, not all language features are perceived in the same way and in order for the learners to notice the less salient features, input has to be modified in a way so to promote their (less salient features) salience. Sharewood Smith (1991) defines input enhancement as: 'Input enhancement is the process by which language input becomes salient to the learner. This process can come about as a result of deliberate manipulation, or it can be the natural outcomes of some internal learning strategy' (p. 118). Smith, clearly distinguishes between the deliberately created input enhancement through the application of specific techniques such as: input flood, input enhancement, output enhancement, error correction...etc. and the internal learning processes by which certain formal properties become salient because the learner is ready for growth in knowledge (Natural development). A more recent definition of input enhancement was provided by Kim (2006), 'Pedagogical techniques designed to draw L2 learners' attention to formal features in L2 input.' (p. 345). Kim, suggests that altering the quality of the available input can result in stimulating the learners' processing of linguistic materials.

2.4 Textual input enhancement

Textual input enhancement, sometimes also referred to as visual enhancement, is an implicit and unobtrusive means to draw the learners' attention to form contained in the written input (Doughty & Williams, 1998); In other words, it is the process by which the perceptual salience of certain target structures is increased by the use of some text-editing techniques such as using **Boldface**, *Italics*, capitalization, and Underlining or a combination of these cues. The application of such techniques on the input available for the L2 learner increases the chances of the enhanced structures being noticed while the main focus is always on meaning. Textual input enhancement is used either to attract or to direct learners' attention to the target structures; in the former the learners are provided with textually enhanced materials without being told what the purpose of the enhancement is, while

ISNN : 2253-0592 EISSN : 2588-199X / Prefix: 10.46315

in the latter the learners are asked (without excessive guidelines) to pay attention to the enhanced structures.

2.5 Noticing hypothesis

In an attempt to better understand the obscure relationship between input and intake, both second language and cognitive psychology researchers have examined the role of attention and the perceptual consciousness in processing input and the learning process in general (Robinson, 1995; Schmidt, 1990, 1995, 2001; Tomlin & Villa, 1994). The most influential attempt to explore the input-intake relationship was Schmidt's (1990) noticing hypothesis in which he claims 'what learners notice in input is what becomes intake for learning' (p. 20). Schmidt argues that a linguistic feature embodied in the input is learnt only if the learner becomes consciously aware of it. In this regard Schmidt distinguishes between two levels of awareness:

- Awareness at the level of noticing: When reading, for example, we are normally aware of the content of what we are reading, rather than the syntactic peculiarities of the writer's style, the style of type in which the text is set, music playing on a radio in the next room, or background noise outside a window. However, we still perceive these competing stimuli and may pay attention to them if we choose (Schmidt, 1990, p.132).
- Awareness at the level of understanding: Understanding is regarded as a higher-level activity than noticing and involves a deeper level of processing information, such as pattern recognition or recognition of rules of a grammar (Schmidt, 1990, p.133).

Finally, Schmidt determines six factors that may influence noticing;

- Frequency: the more frequently a form occurs, the more likely it will be noticed.
- Perceptual salience if all other conditions are the same, the more the input stands out the more probable that it will be noticed.
- Instruction: instruction must channel learners' attention to parts of input that they would overlook or ignore otherwise.
- Processing ability: there are likely to be individual learner differences in input processing. Good, quick processors tend to notice new forms more easily due to their better working memory qualities including attentional capacity or quicker analytic processes.
- Readiness to notice: it means if the learner has reached the necessary level in interlanguage development, and thereby they are ready or not to perceive the new information and integrate it into their knowledge system.
- Task demands: if the right kind of task is set at the right level this will promote noticing. Schmidt continued to argue that sometimes noticing alone could not be sufficient and

ISNN : 2253-0592 EISSN : 2588-199X / Prefix: 10.46315

learners must 'notice the gap' in order to convert the linguistic features in the input they are exposed to into intake.

3 Methodology

3.1 Participants

The participants involved in the pilot study were sixty (60) third-year students majoring in Economics at Larbi Ben M'hidi University, Oum el Bouaghi for the academic year 2016/2017, divided into three groups. Although there were initially 67 students, seven of them were excluded for different reasons (some skipped either the pre-test or one of the post-tests, some skipped some of the treatment sessions). The participants were randomly assigned to a control group, experimental group 1 and experimental group 2. Each group consisted of twenty (20) students who went through the same curriculum for the past three years.

3.2 Design of the study

The present study employed a quasi-experiment design with pre-test, treatment period an immediate post-test and a delayed post-test. All three groups were subject to a pre-test during the first week of the study. The pre-test consisted of three different activities; a multiple-choice test covering all the aspect of the English passive form structure (tense, aspect, subject-verb agreement and agent). The second activity was a gap-fill production activity where the learners were supposed to fill in the gaps using a provided list of words (All the words in that list were familiar to the students), and finally a grammaticality judgement activity. Each group had five treatment sessions of ninety minutes, and each of those session was administered with one-week time interval.

The experimental group 1 received five visually enhanced texts upon which different typographical input enhancement techniques were applied. After reading the texts the learners were asked to answer some comprehension questions, to write a short paragraph; either to elaborate on one of the major points in the texts, or to simply summarize the text. (Reading texts and answering comprehension questions were common in their ordinary classes). Experimental group 2 received the same texts without any typographical alteration, and as with the experimental group 1 they were asked to answer comprehension questions after reading the texts. During the seventh week, all three groups took the immediate post-test which was identically structured to the pre-test, but not the same questions. "... Administrators should not post-test a student with the same questions they encountered in the pre-test. Doing so can produce invalid data because a student's progress cannot necessarily be attributed to the skills they have developed if they are already familiar with the test questions" Cronbach. (1990).

ISNN : 2253-0592 EISSN : 2588-199X / Prefix: 10.46315

4 Data Analysis

To assess the possible effects using visually/textually enhanced materials, and input flood on the acquisition of the English passive voice a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with repeated measures design was used to investigate changes in mean scores in the pre-test, immediate post-test and the delayed post-test. Accordingly, the null hypothesis which will be tested is: u_0 there will be no significant difference in the scores of the subjects of the two groups in the pre-test, immediate post-test and the delayed post-test.

Since the ANOVA test is a parametric test, it requires that the obtained data must follow a normal distribution so the results can be considered significant. One way to test the normality of data is by conducting a Shapiro–Wilk test:

	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Control	.928	20	.142
V.E	.934	20	.184
I.F	.937	20	.213

We can see from the above table that for the three groups (Control, V.E., I.F.) the Sig. value of the Shapiro-Wilk test is greater than .05 which means that the data are to be considered normally distributed.

Now we have confirmed that our data follow a normal distribution we proceed with the analysis of variance (ANOVA) both within the groups (compare the means of each group in the pre-test, immediate post-test and the delayed post-test) and between groups (compare the means of each test between the three groups). If the ANOVA results reveal any significant differences pot hoc tests will be carried out to understand where the source of these differences lies.

The repeated measures ANOVA performed on the scores of the control group in the pre-test, immediate post-test and the delayed post-test revealed no significant differences between the three tests: $(F_{2,38} = 0.075, p = .928)$. Since the p-value is greater than the alpha level which was set at (.05), we can conclude that subjects of the control group showed no significant difference in their performances neither in the immediate post-test nor in the delayed post-test.

ISNN : 2253-0592 EISSN : 2588-199X / Prefix: 10.46315

Tests of Within-Subjects Effects

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Control	Sphericity Assumed	.100	2	.050	.075	.928	.
	Greenhouse-Geisser	.100	1.680	.060	.075	.899	.
	Huynh-Feldt	.100	1.824	.055	.075	.913	.
	Lower-bound	.100	1.000	.100	.075	.787	.
Error(Control)	Sphericity Assumed	25.233	38	.664			
	Greenhouse-Geisser	25.233	31.915	.791			
	Huynh-Feldt	25.233	34.659	.728			
	Lower-bound	25.233	19.000	1.328			

Repeated measures ANOVA demonstrated statistically significant differences among the means of the pre-test, immediate post-test, and delayed post-test of experimental group 1 (the subjects received visually enhanced materials; VE): $(F_{2,38} = 86.777, p = .000)$. Since the p-value is inferior than the alpha level which was set at $(.05)$, we can conclude that differences among the means of experimental group1 are statistically significant.

Tests of Within-Subjects Effects

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
V.E	Sphericity Assumed	304.633	2	152.317	86.777	.000
	Greenhouse-Geisser	304.633	1.567	194.395	86.777	.000
	Huynh-Feldt	304.633	1.683	180.993	86.777	.000
	Lower-bound	304.633	1.000	304.633	86.777	.000
Error(V.E)	Sphericity Assumed	66.700	38	1.755		
	Greenhouse-Geisser	66.700	29.775	2.240		
	Huynh-Feldt	66.700	31.979	2.086		
	Lower-bound	66.700	19.000	3.511		

In order to better understand where the difference lies; that is, which test results differed, a post-hoc Bonferroni test was carried out, and it showed significant differences between the pre-test and the immediate post-test$p < .05$, and between the pre-test and the delayed post-test$p < .05$, but no significant difference between the immediate post-test and the delayed post-test $p > .05$

ISNN : 2253-0592 EISSN : 2588-199X / Prefix: 10.46315

Bonferroni Post-hoc test

(I) factor1	(J) factor1	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.[b]	95% Confidence Interval for Difference[b] Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	-4.900*	.464	.000	-6.118	-3.682
	3	-4.650*	.477	.000	-5.903	-3.397
2	1	4.900*	.464	.000	3.682	6.118
	3	.250	.289	1.000	-.509	1.009
3	1	4.650*	.477	.000	3.397	5.903
	2	-.250	.289	1.000	-1.009	.509

Unlike experimental group 1, the repeated measures ANOVA demonstrated no statistically significant differences among the means of the pre-test, immediate post-test, and delayed post-test of experimental group 2 (the subjects received input flood; IF): $(F_{2,38} = .099, p = .906)$. with a p-value $(.906)$ greater than the alpha level which was set at $(.05)$, we can conclude that subjects of experimental group 2 showed no significant differences in their performances neither in the immediate post-test nor in the delayed post-test.

Tests of Within-Subjects Effects

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
factor1	Sphericity Assumed	.100	2	.050	.099	.
	Greenhouse-Geisser	.100	1.798	.056	.099	.
	Huynh-Feldt	.100	1.974	.051	.099	.
	Lower-bound	.100	1.000	.100	.099	.
Error(factor1)	Sphericity Assumed	19.233	38	.506		
	Greenhouse-Geisser	19.233	34.165	.563		
	Huynh-Feldt	19.233	37.514	.513		
	Lower-bound	19.233	19.000	1.012		

To understand how the three groups compare to each other in every test, a one-way ANOVA was carried out on scores of the pre-test, immediate post-test and the delayed post-test. If ever the ANOVA test reveals a statistically significant difference between any of the three groups, a post-hoc Tukey's HSD test was carried out to locate where the differences actually lies.

The one-way ANOVA performed on the pre-test scores revealed no statistically significant differences between the three groups: $(F_{2,57} = .147, p = .864)$.

ISNN : 2253-0592 EISSN : 2588-199X / Prefix: 10.46315

ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.633	2	.317	.147	.864
Within Groups	123.100	57	2.160		
Total	123.733	59			

Consequently, we can say that all three groups showed equal knowledge of the target form before the introduction of the treatment procedures, and that any post-test statistically significant differences recorded, is due to the experimental treatment the students went through.

Similarly, another one-way ANOVA was carried out on the scores of the immediate post-test of all three groups. The results showed a statistically significant differences between the scores of the three groups: $(F_{2,57} = 55.638, p = .000)$.

ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	301.142	2	150.571	55.638	.000
Within Groups	154.258	57	2.706		
Total	455.400	59			

So far, we understand that there are statistically significant differences between the scores of the three tests. In order to show which test scores differed from each other, a post-hoc Tukey test was carried out and the results showed statistically significant differences between the scores of the control group and the visual enhancement group: $(p = .000)$, but there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of the control group and the input flood group: (p=.974). A statistically significant difference was also recorded between the scores of the two experimental groups: $(p = .000)$.

		Mean			95% Confidence Interval	
(I) Group	(J) Group	Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Control Group	Visual Enhancement	-4.637*	.521	.000	-5.89	-3.38
	Input Flood	.116	.527	.974	-1.15	1.38
Visual Enhancement	Control Group	4.637*	.521	.000	3.38	5.89
	Input Flood	4.752*	.514	.000	3.52	5.99
Input Flood	Control Group	-.116	.527	.974	-1.38	1.15
	Visual Enhancement	-4.752*	.514	.000	-5.99	-3.52

ISNN : 2253-0592 EISSN : 2588-199X / Prefix: 10.46315

Finally, a one-way ANOVA was also carried out on the scores of the delayed post-test of the three groups. The results showed a statistically significant differences between the scores of the three groups: $(F_{2,57} = 55.652, p = .000)$.

ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	294.933	2	147.467	57.652	.000
Within Groups	145.800	57	2.558		
Total	440.733	59			

To understand exactly how the test scores differed from each other, a post-hoc Tukey test was carried out and the results showed statistically significant differences between the scores of the control group and the visual enhancement group: $(p = .000)$, but no statistically significant difference between the scores of the control group and the input flood group: $(p = .918)$. A statistically significant difference was also recorded between the scores of the two experimental groups: $(p = .000)$.

		Mean Difference			95% Confidence Interval	
(I) Group	(J) Group	(I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Control Group	Visual Enhancement	-4.600*	.506	.000	-5.82	-3.38
	Input Flood	.200	.506	.918	-1.02	1.42
Visual Enhancement	Control Group	4.600*	.506	.000	3.38	5.82
	Input Flood	4.800*	.506	.000	3.58	6.02
Input Flood	Control Group	-.200	.506	.918	-1.42	1.02
	Visual Enhancement	-4.800*	.506	.000	-6.02	-3.58

5 Discussion

The present study was carried out to investigate the potentially facilitative effects of visual input enhancement and input flood on the acquisition of the English passive form by Algerian students. The results of previous research (Jourdanais et al., 1995; Shook, 1994) and Van Patten's model of input processing (1996,2004) suggested the need to visually enhance some linguistic features so as to promote their salience and to increase the likelihood of these features being noticed and eventually assimilated into the learners' developing linguistic system. While the data obtained from the results of experimental group2 revealed no evidence to suggest that input flood allowed the learners to perform better neither in the immediate post-test nor the delayed post-test, the data

ISNN : 2253-0592 EISSN : 2588-199X / Prefix: 10.46315

obtained from the results of experimental group1 revealed statistically significant evidence to suggest that textual enhancement did indeed help the learners perform better in both post-tests.

These results comply with the previous studies (Sharewood Smith, 1991; VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993; Shook, 1994; Gass & Selinker, 1994; Jourdenais et al., 1995; White, 1998) which suggest that in addition to attending to meaning, learners have to attend also to the target forms particularly the less salient ones to increase the likelihood that learners would pay attention to them, and eventually assimilate these features into their developing linguistic system. Sharewood Smith (1994) also argues 'The most obvious way to try to affect the subconscious processes beneficially is by making relevant evidence in the input salient' (p.178). Shook, (1994) also reports that visual input enhancement has a positive effect on the acquisition of relative pronouns; where learners who received visually enhanced materials outperformed the control group. The results also adhere to the findings of (Gass, 1997) who insists on the importance of promoting the salience of target forms in the language development. Lee (2007) who studied the effects of textual enhancement and topic familiarity on Korean EFL students' reading comprehension and learning of passive form, comes to the conclusion that textual input enhancement leads to the acquisition of the targeted form, but warned that it also negatively affected comprehension (The typographical intervention directed the learners' attention towards the formal aspect of the language). Finally, it's also worth mentioning that there have been some studies (Alanen, 1995; Robinson, 1997; White, 1998) who found no positive, or at least limited effect of using textual enhancement on the acquisition of certain grammatical features in a meaning focused context.

These mixed results might be explained by inconsistencies in the research designs of some studies and by other different factors. For example, while Jourdenais (1995) and Shook (1994) have successfully isolated textual enhancement as an independent variable, Alanen (1995) and White (1998) have not. Consequently, it is difficult to determine the contribution of this technique to the acquisition of targeted grammatical features. The level of text difficulty can also be considered as a cause of inconclusive findings. Overstreet (1998), for example, suggests that text simplification would reduce the amount of attentional resources needed for text comprehension and would allow learners to better attend to form. In addition, the different types of textual enhancement employed can differently affect the degree of perceptual saliency of the enhanced forms. The effect of textual enhancement may be negatively affected when a combination of several types of text enhancement (for example, underlining, changing the font, and highlighting) are employed in the same treatment. Thus, too many differently enhanced forms could have been too cognitively demanding for the beginner learners in Overstreet's study and could thus explain the negative results of his experiment.

ISNN : 2253-0592 EISSN : 2588-199X / Prefix: 10.46315

6 Conclusion

This study was an attempt to investigate the possible facilitative effects of using visually enhanced materials and input flood on the learning of the English passive form. The results obtained demonstrate that while the learners who received input flood failed to record any improvements in their knowledge of the target form, the subjects who received textually enhanced materials performed better than those who received traditional materials. These results suggest that the typographical modification of input can be an effective technique in promoting the salience of certain linguistic features that have been proven to be problematic for L2 learners while the main focus is always on meaning. Finally, although this study has yielded some promising results regarding the use of textual input enhancement and its effects on the noticing and learning of the English passive form, we should mention that the effects of the instruction in question were not tested beyond the period of three months, thus any claims about long-term effect of instruction must be considered with caution. It is also worth mentioning that the absence of any improvement in the scores of experimental group1 might be due to brief classroom exposure to the target form considering that SLA is a very slow and laborious process.

Appendix I (Pre-test)

Tick the correct answer (only one of three alternatives is correct):

Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire.....by J.K. Rowling.

- Wrote
- Were written
- Was written

The judge .....Smith to five years in prison.

- Sentenced
- Was sentenced
- Were sentenced

Over two millions dollars in cash.....from the Bank of East Asia.

- Have stolen
- Stole
- Have been stolen

The gold.....in a cave near the top of the mountain.

- Discovered
- Was discovered
- Were discovered

The meeting.....until the end of the month.

- have been postponed

ISNN : 2253-0592 EISSN : 2588-199X / Prefix: 10.46315

- Has been postponed
- Has postponed

The Picasso paintings..... by John.

- Is bought
- Were bought
- Have bought

Complete the following paragraph with the appropriate form of the verbs:

The Statue of Liberty (give).....to the United States by France. It (be) .....a present on the 100th anniversary of the United States. The Statue of Liberty (design) .....by Frederic Auguste Bartholdi. It (complete) .....in France in July 1884. In 350 pieces, the statue then (ship) .....to New York, where it (arrive) .....on 17 June 1885. The pieces (put) .....together and the opening ceremony (take) .....place on 28 October 1886. The Statue of Liberty is 46 m high (93 m including the base). The statue (represent) .....the goddess of liberty. She (hold) .....a torch in her right hand and a tablet in her left hand. On the tablet you (see / can) .....the date of the Declaration of Independence (July 4, 1776). Every year, the Statue of Liberty (visit) .....by many people from all over the world.

Decide whether the sentences below are GRAMMATICALLY correct or incorrect. (correct the wrong ones)

Letters is delivered by the postman at 8 a.m. every day.

.....

The report will not finish in time if you don't help me.

.....

The stories was misunderstood by most students.

.....

The White House and the Capitol are connect by Pennsylvania Avenue.

.....

Tom were told many times to stop talking in class.

.....

The present given to her by a co-worker.

.....

A new shopping center will be opened in the city.

.....

The meeting hold in the conference room.

.....

Millions of books is bought for students each year.

.....

The White House was build by James Hoban.

ISNN : 2253-0592 EISSN : 2588-199X / Prefix: 10.46315

.....

Appendix II (Post-test)

Tick the correct answer (only one of three alternatives is correct):

This building..... in the 1930's.

- Built
- Was built
- Were built

The plan ..... two days ago.

- Announced
- Was announced
- Were announced

No prizes.....by the contest organizers.

- Is actually given
- Actually give
- Were actually given

Paula..... an award-winning essay.

- Has written
- Was written
- Were written

This issue..... by the employees during the meeting.

- Were discussed
- discussed
- was discussed

Thieves ..... over a million dollars in cash from the Bank of East Asia.

- was stolen
- Were stolen
- Have stolen

Complete the following paragraph with the appropriate form of the verbs:

The police (announce) .....that the National Bank (rob) .....yesterday. Three men (enter) .....the bank at 4:30 a.m. with guns in their hands. Customers and bank clerks (ask) .....to lie down on the floor. Later, one of the bank clerks (order) .....to fill the robbers' bags with money. After that, the three men (leave) ..... the bank quickly. The police officer Jason Gregson (say) ..... that more than 20,000,000 pounds (steal) .....yesterday, but nobody (injure) ..... Jason Gregson believes that the robbers (find) .....soon. The bank (close) .....since then.

Decide whether the sentences below are GRAMMATICALLY correct or incorrect. (correct the wrong ones)

ISNN : 2253-0592 EISSN : 2588-199X / Prefix: 10.46315

Volkswagen cars is made in Germany and the Czech Republic .

.....

A number of people have arrested following a demonstration in the Serbian capital, Belgrade.

.....

Two men are being questioned following a robbery this afternoon.

.....

Police are being questioned two men following a robbery this afternoon.

.....

A visitor's center are being built in the Capitol building.

.....

Thousands of airplanes produced by American companies, each year.

.....

Penicillin was discovered by A. Fleming in 1928.

.....

A new school are being built by the local council just now.

.....

The new computer chip will be produce next year.

.....

The energy of steam were discovered by James Watt in 1712.

.....

*- References

1. Alanen, R. (1995). Input enhancement and rule presentation in second language acquisition. In R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.
2. Alcon, E. (1998). Input and input processing in second language acquisition. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *36*(4).
3. Benati, A. (2004). The Effects of Structured Input Activities and Explicit Information on the Acquisition of the Italian Future Tense. In VanPatten, B. (Eds.), *Processing Instruction: Theory, research, and commentary*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
4. Chaudron, C. (1985). Intake: On Models and Methods for Discovering Learners' Processing of Input. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*.
5. Corder, S. (1967). THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LEARNER'S ERRORS. *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(1-4). doi: 10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161
6. Cronbach, L. J. (1990). *Essentials of Psychological Testing* (5th ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

ISNN : 2253-0592 EISSN : 2588-199X / Prefix: 10.46315

7. Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
8. Doughty, C. (2001). *Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form*. In Robinson, P. (Ed.). *Cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
9. Dulay, H. C., & Burt, M. K. (1973). Should we teach children syntax? Language Learning.
10. Gass, S. (1997). *Input, Interaction, and the second Language Learner*. Mahwa, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
11. Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (1994). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. Hillsdale, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
12. Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input enhancement and the noticing hypothesis: An experimental study on ESL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*.
13. Jourdenais, R., Ota, M., Stauffer, S., Boyson, B., & Doughty, C. (1995). Does textual enhancement promote noticing? A think-aloud protocol analysis. In R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.
14. Kim, Y. (2006). Effects of input elaboration on vocabulary acquisition through reading by Korean learners of English as a foreign language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(2).
15. Krashen, S. (1981) Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
16. Lee, S. (2007). Effects of textual enhancement and topic familiarity on Korean EFL students' reading comprehension and learning of passive form. *Language Learning*.
17. Lee, J., & VanPatten, B. (2003). Making communicative language teaching happen. New York: McGraw-Hill.
18. 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*.
19. Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie, & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition*. New York: Academic Press.
20. Long, M. H., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research and practice. In C. J. Dougthy, & J. Williams (Eds.). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
21. McLaughlin, B. (1987). Theories of second-language learning. London: Edward Arnold.
22. Overstreet, M. H. (1998). Text enhancement and content familiarity: The focus of learner attention. *Spanish Applied Linguisitics*, 2.
23. Robinson, P. (1995b). Aptitude, awareness, and the fundamental similarity of implicit and explicit second language learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.*), Attention and awareness in foreign*

language learning. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

24. Robinson, P. (1997). Learning Simple and Complex Second Language Rules Under Implicit, Incidental, Rule-search, and Instructed Conditions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*.
25. Rutherford, W., & Sharwood Smith, M. (1985). Consciousness-Raising and Universal Grammar. *Applied Linguistics*.
26. Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 129–158.
27. Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). New York: Cambridge University Press.
28. Sharwood Smith, M. (1981). Consciousness raising and second language learner. *Applied Linguistics, 2*.
29. Sharwood Smith, M. (1993). Input enhancement in instructed SLA: Theoretical bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*.
30. Shook, D.J., 1994. FL/L2 reading, grammatical information, and the input to intake phenomenon. *Applied Language Learning*.
31. Tomlin, R. S., & Villa, V. (1994). Attention in Cognitive Science and Second Language Acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*.
32. VanPatten, B., & Oikkenon, S. (1996). Explanation vs. structured input in processing instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*.
33. VanPatten, B., Williams, J., & Rott, S. (2004). Form-meaning connections in second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten, J. Wlliams, S. Rott and M. Overstreet (eds.), Form-meaning connections in second language acquisition. Mawah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
34. White, J. (1998). Getting the learners' attention. In C. Doughty & J.Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
35. Wong, W. (2003). Textual Enhancement and simplified input: Effects on L2 comprehension and acquisition of non-meaningful grammatical form. *Applied Language Learning*.