



## Impact of Consciousness-Raising via Input Flooding vs. Vocabulary Input Enhancement on EFL Learners' Reading Fluency

Saeideh Sadat Fatahzadeh<sup>1</sup>, Sajad Shafiee<sup>2\*</sup>, Fariba Rahimi Esfahani<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ph.D. Candidate, English Department, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, English Department, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

<sup>3</sup> Assistant Professor, English Department, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran

Received: January 06, 2022

Accepted: March 04, 2022

### ABSTRACT

The current study was set to examine whether input flooding and input enhancement of vocabulary affected the reading fluency of Iranian EFL learners. It also evaluated whether there was any substantial difference between the impacts of input flooding and input enhancement of vocabulary on the reading of Iranian EFL learners. To this end, 120 out of 150 Iranian EFL intermediate learners at three language schools in Iran were randomly selected and divided into three groups, each consisting of 40 learners. The first experimental group received input flooding as treatment. To this aim, the frequency of the vocabulary items in the reading texts used during the course was increased. In other words, learners were flooded with the vocabulary items via different examples and using the words several times in the reading texts. The participants in the Input Enhancement (IE) group received IE through underlining, boldfacing, italicization, capitalization, and other strategies such as color coding, using different fonts, and diverse forms of vocabulary. To this end, in this experimental group, the vocabulary items appeared in the texts by using underlining, boldfacing, italicization, and capitalization. In order to do so, the researcher retyped the selected materials and carried out the required modifications on them. In contrast, the control group received the traditional method for teaching reading. The results were analyzed via ANCOVA. The findings revealed that both input flooding and input enhancement of vocabulary had positively significant impacts on Iranian EFL learners' reading fluency. Input flooding of vocabulary was more effective than input enhancement of vocabulary regarding their impacts on Iranian EFL learners' reading fluency. Some pedagogical and theoretical implications are also presented.

**Keywords:** Consciousness-raising; Input Enhancement; Input Flooding; Reading Fluency; Vocabulary

### INTRODUCTION

The importance of the role of conscious and unconscious procedures as well as the concept of input flooding and input development (IE) in the second language (L2) development have been the subject of much debate in the wide-ranging field of psychology. Different theories (Bialystok, 1979; Krashen, 1982, 1985;

McLaughlin, 1990) has led to much research. Both Long (1983, 1988) and Ellis (1995), by studying a large number of such empirical studies, concluded that, in general, conscious learning seems to contribute to the positive improvement of L2. This conclusion, according to Fotos (1993), implies that there is a connection between what has been "learned" and what has been acquired. If it is accepted that a virtual connector (interface) actually exists,

\*Corresponding Author's Email:  
s.shafiee@iaushk.ac.ir



what would be the type of such a virtual connector? Another suggestion is the one proposed by Schmidt (1993, 1994, Schmidt and Frota, 1986), which presents a concept related to conscious learning that focuses on what Skehan opposes as a "critical concept of consciousness" (Skehan, 1998, p. 48).

Describing IE by Gass & Toress (2005) as the "sin qua none of the education", places more emphasis on an integral part of input in the process of learning a new language. It is argued that IE allows L2 learners to be aware of the target form which will lead them to notice the structure in question (Jailani, Mohamad, Razali, Yatim, & Yusuf, 2016). IE allows learners to focus on any linguistic skill they hope to acquire (syntax, morphology, vocabulary etc.) by highlighting that particular form. IE tasks are believed to be beneficial for SLA as they trigger noticing that is essential in the learning process of an L2. In fact, noticing is the first step to developing learners' awareness in order to acquire a new language.

There are no theories or approaches to language acquisition that ignore the significance of input, although theories differ as to its importance. Stated by Cook (2001), the main purpose of language teaching is to provide the most appropriate samples of language for the learner to benefit from the best input in the process of language learning. It should be mentioned that a teacher provides the language learner with all activities and opportunities to face the language. In many studies about the importance of input in language acquisition, it has been asserted, however, that input is a necessary but insufficient condition for language learning (Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991). It is, in fact, believed that not all the exposed input is used as the intake for language learning. Therefore, current studies in the realm of language learning and teaching have been in the direction of investigating the role of attention in mediating input and learning. A general finding of such studies reveals that attention is an essential element for learning to come to pass.

Due to the limitations in conventional classes, especially in Iranian EFL contexts, using new methods such as input flooding and

IE is definitely impossible for EFL instructors. Thus, the current study was an attempt to examine the effect of consciousness-raising via input flooding and input enhancement of vocabulary instructions on the reading fluency of Iranian EFL learners, and the following questions and hypotheses were formulated:

### Research Questions

*RQ1. Does input flooding of vocabulary significantly affect the reading fluency of Iranian EFL learners?*

*RQ2: Does input enhancement of vocabulary significantly influence the reading fluency of Iranian EFL learners?*

*RQ3. Is there any significant difference between the effects of input flooding and input enhancement of vocabulary on the reading fluency of Iranian EFL learners?*

### Research Hypotheses

*Ho1: Input flooding of vocabulary does not affect the reading fluency of Iranian EFL learners.*

*Ho2: Input enhancement of vocabulary does not influence the reading fluency of Iranian EFL learners.*

*Ho3: There is no significant difference between the effects of input flooding and input enhancement of vocabulary on the reading fluency of Iranian EFL learners.*

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The growth of input enhancement (IE) research mirrors the acknowledgment of its highly important role in the SLA. It is clear that, according to a number of researchers (e.g., Tomlin & Villa, 1994), students do not use all the inputs they are exposed to. However, it has been broadly argued that attention is needed to the study of L2 (Leow, 1997, 1999, 2001; Robinson, 1995; Schmidt, 1990, 1993, 1994, 1995; Tomlin & Villa, 1994) or, at least, as Schmidt (2001) emphasizes, there is no doubt that the reading approach is very important, and for all practical purposes, attention is required on all facets of L2 learning. As attention can be applied externally (Schmidt, 1990), many studies have explored ways to attract students' attention to systematic facets of mind-focused

activities, a process called the focus on form. In this respect, the concept of consciousness-raising has created a current debate in pedagogy. Consciousness-raising refers to drawing learners' attention to the features of the target language.

Attention is assigned a crucial role in learning because it is regarded as a helping factor that leads to better acquisition as it contributes to converting input into intake. Thus, focusing seriously our attention on the target structures of the language helps learners to understand the input and acquire the language. Schmidt (2001) notes that attention appears necessary for understanding nearly every aspect of second and foreign language learning". However, it is evident that learners cannot pay attention to every aspect of language because of the nature of the human brain. This fact leads to suggest that attention should be selective. Regarding the notion of selective attention, Osborne and Wittrock (1983) note that the pathway to the construction of meaning from any experience does not begin with that experience. Rather it begins with selective attention to that experience, where selective attention is influenced by a variety of aspects long term memory and cognitive processes.

Among the different models that treat attention is the model of Tomlin and Villa (1994). They provide three components of attention which consist of alertness (readiness to deal with incoming stimuli), orientation (the direction of attentional resources to a certain type of stimuli), and detection (the cognitive registration of stimuli). However, detection is considered as the most important component above the other components). In the conversion of input to intake, it is also believed that conscious noticing is an essential and sufficient factor stressed in improving learners' awareness of the target language.

Schmidt (2001) develops a hypothesis called 'the noticing hypothesis' which holds that noticing particular forms in the input leads to successful learning.

Schmidt announces that SLA is largely driven by what learners pay attention to and notice in the target language input and what they understand the significance of noticed

input to be. This aspect that plays an important role in the learning process is defined by Bastone (1996) as "the intake of grammar as a result of learners paying attention to the input where intake refers to input which becomes part of the learning process". The role of noticing has been also investigated by Gass (1997) who presents different stages for converting input to output: Apperceived input comprehended input, intake, integration, and output. The first stage helps learners to know the gap that exists between the knowledge they have or what they produce with what others produce. Gass (1997) defines apperceived input as a bit of language that is noticed by the learner due to some particular recognizable features. The learners recognize a particular form as apperceived 68 input by some factors including frequency and saliency in the input, prior knowledge, and the affective side of the learner.

Consciousness-raising equips learners with an understanding of specific language features. A consciousness-raising task, as a concept-forming technique, for explicit learning assists learners to develop declarative and explicit rather than procedural and implicit knowledge. Consciousness-raising tasks engage learners' minds in the procedures of noticing and comparing so that they can integrate new language features into their mental competence. According to Shaby & Love Joy (2020), consciousness-raising activities are designed to cater to explicit learning. They are designed to improve awareness at the level of understanding and not just noticing. Students need to speak about language. They are asked to make their own grammar rules. Non-focus activities are based on the theory that learning is a transparent process that cannot be directly influenced by teaching. According to explicit reading theory, the practice should involve students in real communicative activity and is based on a robust version of communicative language teaching (Howatt, 1984 as cited in Ellis 2009). Systematic activities and activities based on general knowledge often produce high accuracy and activities that force students to reach a fair conclusion often produce more advanced language. In fact, if planning time is given to students before they participate in the

task, it leads to more complexity and gives students post-task work after an interactive task. For instance, asking the learners to write about their work leads to greater accuracy (Skehan, 2002). Finally, the use of activities or tasks will provide a clear and meaningful context for teaching and learning all different features of language as well as skills.

A form of input enhancement is textual enhancement. Simard (2009) investigated the effects of diverse textual enhancement (TE) formats (number and choice of different symbol types) on the plurality markers in English. He edited eight varieties of the same text to allow comparisons of different TE formats to the benefit of the students, making the intended feature (English plural) highlighted with 1) italics, 2) underline, 3) bold typing, 4) varied color, 5) capitalized, 6) improved plural with five symbols used simultaneously, 7) improved plural with the use of three, bright, capitalized and underlined punctuation marks, and 8) advanced plural features (control group). His findings recommended that diverse TE formats had different impacts on the intake of the participants. Another type of input enhancement is 'input flooding'.

In this type, the students are given many examples of a specific target form (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). Increasing the frequency of visibility of an assumed feature in the input makes such features more outstanding in the L2 grammatical input series, and this is known as input flooding. Exposing L2 students to multiple forms or "flooding" has been introduced as a way to attract student attention, and later, to incorporate, and use the target form within a set of classroom instructions (Nemati & Motallebzadeh, 2013).

Input flooding is an obvious way to focus on form that tries to attract the attention of students. In the process of flooding, students' exposure to full-featured applications filled with multiple examples facilitates their learning. According to Gas (1997), repeated exposure to targeted forms has a significant impact on their learning. This type of input enhancement is ideal for meaning-based classes that focus on meaningful communication and promote incidental learning. Input flooding is a

method that does not require the teacher to pause the task in order to say something, but can provide independence for students to relate form to the meaning. Wong (2005) argues that flooding may seem obvious because students may not be able to recognize new forms of targeting. Numerous studies on input flooding have shown its role in learning different language features. Lee (2002) demonstrated the effectiveness of flooding in the acquisition of Spanish future tense. Trahey & White (1993) demonstrated its effectiveness in learning the meanings and additions of English adjectives, while White (2015) showed its excellent role in learning Spanish accusative clitics.

Similarly, Rikhtegar & Gholami (2015) have shown that flooding can improve the acquisition of English simple tense. Tabatabaei and Yakhabi (2009) found that although the production of language by students can improve language use effectively, input flooding plays an important role in speech complexity. However, Reinder & Ellis (2009) did not find a positive effect of input flooding on the acquisition of negative English pronouns that raise the need for explicit command in other aspects of language. Hernandez (2008) also showed that clear instructions combined with input flooding were more effective than flooding alone in improving students' use of speech markers

## **METHOD**

### **Participants**

The current study was conducted on Iranian EFL learners from three language institutes (i.e. Kanoon Zabane Iran (ILI), Zaban Sara, and Gooyesh) in Tehran, Iran, during the 2020 academic year. The participants were randomly drawn from 150 learners who took the language proficiency test, assigned to the intermediate learners, and were randomly divided into three groups as two experimental groups and one control group, ranging from 18 to 35 years old. All of them were Persian native speakers. The participants included 87 female and 33 male EFL learners.

### **Instruments**

The following instruments were exploited in the current study.

### Placement Test

To assess the extent of the participants' language knowledge at the beginning of the study and to obtain a homogenous sample, a sample TOEFL OPT test, without its writing section, was used. OPT exam materials were taken from the 'Longman Complete Course for TOEFL Test' by Philips (2018). It had three parts: listening comprehension, reading comprehension, and grammatical structures. The test had 100 items and the highest score was 100. Based on the test standards, the allotted time was 100 minutes.

### Reading Fluency Pre-test and Post-test

To have a standard test to evaluate reading fluency, the reading section of Cambridge English Preliminary exam was used in this study as the reading pre-test and post-test. The reading section had five passages, and the students were expected to read each passage after the raters' permission. The only difference between the pre-test and the post-test was that the sequence of the topics was changed in order to avoid the "practice effect" (Bachman, 1990) on the part of the participants, and there was an attempt to keep the content of the two tests the same. To check the validity and reliability, the test was piloted. Consequently, the reliability coefficient was calculated through Cronbach's alpha (.82 for the pre-test and .86 for the post-test), and the content and face validity of the tests were confirmed.

### Procedure

#### Data Collection Procedure

The participants of the current study were selected from 150 EFL learners at the intermediate level of language proficiency. The initial 150 learners were given a proficiency test (OPT), and based on the results, 120 intermediate-level learners were selected and divided into two experimental groups and one control group, each consisting of 40 learners. One of the experimental groups received input flooding of vocabulary, while the other was taught via input enhancement of vocabulary. In contrast, the control group received the traditional method for teaching reading. Prior to starting the experiment, the learners in the three

groups were given a reading pre-test. The reading fluency of the participants in the three groups was calculated by the reading rate measure. Reading rate is a measure of word count per minute (WCPM) (Hasbrouck and Tindal, 2006)

Following that, the participants in the first experimental group received input flooding as treatment in line with Schmidt's (2000) noticing hypothesis and the proposed definition of Schmitt (2002) for input flooding. To this aim, the frequency of the vocabulary items in the reading texts used during the course was increased. In other words, learners were flooded with the vocabulary items via different examples and using the words several times in the reading texts. The participants in the IE group received IE in line with Schmidt's (1994) noticing hypothesis and proposed by Norris & Ortega (2000) by underlining, boldfacing, italicization, capitalization, and other strategies such as color coding or using different font sizes or types of the vocabulary. To this end, in this experimental group, the vocabulary items appeared in the texts by using underlining, boldfacing, italicization, and capitalization. In order to do so, the researcher retyped the selected materials and carried out the required modifications on them. As in the control group, the learners followed the traditional syllabus and teaching procedures and received a placebo instruction. To this end, the teacher, first, taught the main words of each reading passage. Then, the teacher asked the learners to read the passage loudly. Finally, the learners were supposed to answer the reading comprehension questions. After 15 sessions of treatment, the learners in the three groups were given the reading comprehension post-test to gauge their reading fluency.

### RESULTS

To choose a homogeneous sample of learners in this study, an OPT was administered among the 150 learners available to the researcher, the results of which are illustrated in Table 1 below. According to Table 1, the mean and standard deviation of the OPT scores were 62.66 and 12.13, respectively. Based on the OPT results, 120 out of 150 Iranian intermediate EFL

learners whose scores were within one standard deviation above and below the mean were selected. Then, the selected participants were

divided into three equal groups, i.e., two experimental groups and one control group, each including 40 learners.

**Table 1**  
*Descriptive Statistics of the OPT Test*

OPT	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
	150	45.00	85.00	62.66	12.133
Valid N (listwise)	150				

Moreover, prior to conducting the parametric tests, the assumptions underlying these tests (such as the normality assumption) had to be checked.

Thus, the skewness and kurtosis values for all the tests used in this study were presented and examined in Table 2 below, which shows the descriptive statistics of the employed tests.

**Table 2**  
*Descriptive Statistics of Reading Fluency Pre-tests and Post-tests for the Three Groups*

Tests	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
EG1 Pre-test	40	18.95	2.65	-.09	.37	-1.39	.73
EG1 Post-test	40	20.10	2.70	-.30	.37	-1.25	.73
EG2 Pre-test	40	18.65	2.47	-.58	.37	-.64	.73
EG2 Post-test	40	19.00	2.12	-.47	.37	-.87	.73
CG Pre-test	40	19.80	2.44	-.74	.37	.40	.73
CG Post-test	40	18.97	2.55	-.40	.37	-.97	.73

The skewness and kurtosis values lower than  $\pm 2.00$  indicate that a given distribution is normal, while values greater than  $\pm 2.00$  show that the distribution has been skewed and/or peaked. Because all the skewness and kurtosis values lined up under the skewness statistic and kurtosis statistic columns of Table 2 represent values lower than  $\pm 2.00$ , it could be concluded that the distributions for all the pre-tests and post-tests of the three groups used in this study met the assumption of normality.

In addition to the assumption of normality, the assumptions of linearity, homogeneity of variances, and homogeneity of the regression

slopes were checked for the ANCOVA tests conducted in the current study, and no violations of these assumptions were ensured as well. The first research question of the study sought to find out whether input flooding of vocabulary could significantly affect the reading fluency of Iranian EFL learners. To answer this research question, the reading fluency pre-test and post-test scores of the learners in the two groups of EG1 and CG were used to conduct a one-way ANCOVA, the results of which are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

**Table 3**  
*Descriptive Statistics for Reading Fluency Post-test Scores of EG1 and CG Learners*

Groups	Mean	SD	N
EG1	20.10	2.70	40
CG	18.97	2.55	40
Total	19.53	2.67	80

Table 3 shows that the tee reading fluency post-test mean score of the EG1 learners ( $M = 20.10$ ) was greater than the reading fluency post-test mean score of the CG learners ( $M = 18.97$ ). In order to find out whether the EG1

learners obtained significantly higher scores than the CG learners regarding their reading fluency, the results of the one-way ANCOVA in Table 4 had to be checked:

**Table 4**

***One-Way ANCOVA for the Reading Fluency Post-test Scores of EG1 and CG Learners***

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	56.17	2	28.08	4.24	.01	.099
Intercept	288.72	1	288.72	43.61	.00	.362
Pre-test	30.86	1	30.86	4.66	.03	.057
Groups	34.64	1	34.64	5.23	.02	.064
Error	509.71	77	6.62			
Total	31103.00	80				
Corrected Total	565.88	79				

It could be seen in Table 4 that the relevant *p-value* (i.e., the one in the row labeled Groups) was smaller than the alpha level of significance ( $.02 < .05$ ), which means that the difference between the learners in EG1 ( $M = 20.10$ ) and CG ( $M = 18.97$ ) on the reading fluency post-test reached statistical significance. In other words, input flooding of vocabulary was shown to be more effective than conventional instruction with regard to the reading fluency development

of Iranian EFL learners. The effect size for this analysis was shown to be large (.064).

In the second research question, the impact of input enhancement of vocabulary on the reading fluency of Iranian EFL learners was examined. To find an answer to this research question, the reading fluency post-test scores of the EFL learners in EG2 and CG were compared by means of a one-way ANCOVA.

**Table 5**

***Descriptive Statistics for Reading Fluency Post-test Scores of EG2 and CG Learners***

Groups	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
EG2	19.00	2.12	40
CG	18.97	2.55	40
Total	18.98	2.33	80

It could be found in Table 5 that on the reading fluency post-test, the EG2 learners ( $M = 19.00$ ) obtained a slightly higher mean score than the CG learners ( $M = 18.97$ ). In order to find out whether this difference between the reading fluency post-test mean scores of the two groups of learners were statistically significant or not, the researcher had to examine the *p-value* under the Sig. column in front of the Groups row in Table 6. The results presented in Table 6 show that the *p-value* corresponding to

the Groups row was larger than the alpha level of significance (i.e.,  $.57 > .05$ ), which implies that the difference between the reading fluency post-test mean scores of the EG2 ( $M = 19.00$ ) and CG ( $M = 18.97$ ) learners was not statistically significant. It could, hence, be construed that input enhancement of vocabulary was approximately as effective as conventional instruction as far as the reading fluency of EFL learners was concerned. Finally, the current study evaluated whether

there was any significant difference between the effects of input flooding and input enhancement of vocabulary on reading fluency. To answer this question, another one-way

ANCOVA was employed to compare the reading fluency post-tests of the EG1 and EG2 learners, the results of which are reproduced in the following tables:

**Table 6**  
*One-Way ANCOVA for Reading Fluency Post-test Scores of EG2 and CG Learners*

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	26.52	2	13.26	2.52	.08	.062
Intercept	261.42	1	261.42	49.76	.00	.393
Pre-test	26.51	1	26.51	5.04	.02	.062
Groups	1.67	1	1.67	.31	.57	.004
Error	404.46	77	5.25			
Total	29273.00	80				
Corrected Total	430.98	79				

**Table 7**  
*Descriptive Statistics for Reading Fluency Post-test Scores of EG1 and EG2 Learners*

Groups	Mean	SD	N
EG1	20.10	2.70	40
EG2	19.00	2.12	40
Total	19.55	2.47	80

It is evident in Table 7 that on the reading fluency post-test, the EG1 learners ( $M = 20.10$ ) received a higher mean score than the EG2 learners ( $M = 19.00$ ). To figure out whether this difference between the reading fluency post-test mean scores of the two

groups of learners reached statistical significance or not, the researchers needed to check the *p-value* under the Sig. column in front of the Groups row in the ANCOV table below:

**Table 8**  
*One-Way ANCOVA for Reading Fluency Post-test Scores of EG1 and EG2 Learners*

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	60.89	2	30.44	5.51	.006	.12
Intercept	300.64	1	300.64	54.48	.000	.41
Pre-test	36.69	1	36.69	6.64	.012	.07
Groups	20.72	1	20.72	3.75	.056	.04
Error	424.90	77	5.51			
Total	31062.00	80				
Corrected Total	485.80	79				

Based on the results presented in Table 8, it could be inferred that there was no sign of the difference between the reading fluency post-test mean scores of the EG1 ( $M = 20.10$ ) and

EG2 ( $M = 19.00$ ) learners as the *p-value* corresponding to the Groups row was larger than the alpha level of significance (i.e.,  $.056 > .05$ ); this indicates that the difference between



the effects of input flooding and input enhancement was not large enough to be of statistical significance.

## DISCUSSION

The findings revealed that both input flooding of vocabulary had a positively significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' reading fluency. In addition, a significant difference was found between the two instructions regarding their effects on reading fluency scores. That is, input flooding of vocabulary was more effective than input enhancement of vocabulary in terms of their effects on Iranian EFL learners' reading fluency. The main justification for such results can be related to the theory of input hypothesis. As mentioned by Krashen (1985), the input should be comprehensible and L2 learners must be ready to acquire it.

The findings of the current research are also in line with this recent argumentation of Leow (1997) in that instructional assistance provided for the learners to draw their attention to the target vocabulary can contribute to the impact of input enhancement. The determining role of instructional assistance was also emphasized by Izumi (2002). He inspected whether output and input enhancement alone or together enhance noticing and learning English by the learners. His obtained results favored output while learners in the input enhancement group did not receive any instructional assistance. Izumi (2002) came to the conclusion that no teaching support and cognitive handing in input enhancement and cognitive contrast between L1 and L2 language vocabulary can lead to greater knowledge of the output group.

A number of researchers (Krashen 1985; Nemati & Motallebzadeh 2013) address the potential flood input and contribution to L2 learning. According to Rikhtegar & Golamami (2015), the practice of flooding has influenced the language proficiency of Iranian ESL students. Similarly, Balcom & Bouffard (2015) argue that input flooding and form-based teaching have had a significant impact on grammar learning with regard to the position of adverbs. Their results showed that exposing students to flooded practices and giving them opportunities to become proficient in

communication leaves a significant impression on the learning of discourse markers.

## CONCLUSION

The present study suggested that developing texts for instruction with input enhancement and input flooding techniques is more effective for the immediate recall of second or foreign language learning than instructive texts without enhancement techniques. However, depending on whether the pedagogical materials require a form or meaningful information about the target language, the effectiveness of input enhancement techniques will vary. Input enhancement and input flooding instructions techniques facilitate recall of the form of target structures and words.

More importantly, the considerable immediate gains demonstrated by this study should be maintained and stored in the long-term memory of learners. In a cognitive sense, any stored information should be regularly repeated or rehearsed through articulation or mental stimulation. To apply this rule of thumb, teachers are suggested to provide opportunities for students to review periodically newly acquired structures and words on an ongoing basis. More specific follow-up pedagogical procedures should be studied and explored. More immediately, as rote memorization or decontextualized learning does not conform to current communicative teaching methods, teachers need to provide deliberate tasks in which students can repeatedly review words in meaningful and natural settings.

The findings of the current study appear to have a number of significant instructional implications for language teachers. As the role of inclusion in EFL / ESL student performance has proved to be very effective, student awareness of input is critical. In other words, teachers should use high-level awareness procedures to help students recognize the input, keep them in their working memory in an orderly fashion, and promote students' independence due to the fact that language development is a lengthy process. More research is needed to evaluate the efficacy of these teaching methods (input enhancement compared to input flooding) in the language

skills of EFL / ESL students with varying levels of language proficiency and learning methods. In addition, making some changes in input-based practices in future research could result in to more valuable findings. For example, the efficacy of combining input enhancement with input flooding can be explored in future studies in order to discover the most effective method for teaching reading fluency.

## REFERENCES

- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Balcom, P., & Bouffard, P. (2015). The effect of input flooding and explicit instruction on learning adverb placement in L3 French. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 18(2), 1-27.
- Bastone, R. (1996). Key Concepts in ELT: Noticing. *ELT Journal*, 50 (3), 273.
- Bialystok, E. (1993). Symbolic representation and attentional control in pragmatic competence. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.) *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 43- 57). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blevins, R. (2005). The effects of focus on form in the teaching of Spanish- English false friends. *RESLA*, 17-18, 65-79.
- Cook, N. (2001). Fostering creativity and innovation without encouraging unethical behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81, 97-115.
- Ellis, R. (1995). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3-18.
- Fotos, T. (1993). *Attention and effort*. Prentice Hall Publishing.
- Gass, S. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gass, S. & Toress, W. (2005). Introduction: The universalization of creativity. In A. Craft, B. Jefferey, & M. Leibling (Eds.), *Creativity in Education* (pp. 1-16). London, England: Continuum.
- Hasbrouck, S. & Tindal, S. (2006). The importance of input in second language acquisition studies. *Language Learning Journal*, 25(2), 297-308.
- Hernandez, T.A. (2008). The effect of explicit instruction and input flood on students' use of discourse markers on a simulated oral proficiency interview. *Hispania*, 91, 665-75.
- Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Ideka, S. & Fong, L. (2015). The use of consciousness-raising techniques in teaching the verb 'be' to students of vocational colleges. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(8), 110–121.
- Izumi, S. (2002). Output, Input Enhancement, and the Noticing Hypothesis: An Experimental Study on ESL Relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 541-577.
- Jailani, A, I., Mohamad, N, A., Rzali, N, A., Yatim, A, I, A. &, Yusuf, A, H, S, M., (2016). Input enhancement on teaching parts of speech: Action research using #SLIPPAWORD; a part of speech game. National Conference of Research on Language Education.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. (1991). The emergence of complexity, fluency, and accuracy in the oral and written production of five Chinese learners of English. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(4), 590-619.
- Lee, J.F. (2002). The incidental acquisition of Spanish future morphology through reading in a second language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24(1), 55-80.
- Leow, R. P. (1997). Attention, awareness, and foreign language behavior. *Language Learning*, 51(1), 113-155.
- Long, M. (1983). Mothers' and fathers' speech to their young children: Similar or different? *Journal of Child Language*, 10(1), 245-252.

- Long, M. (1988). Long-term effects of noticing on oral output. *Language Teaching Research*, 11(3), 265-280.
- Martinez, D. Roser, E. & Strecker, R. (1999). The generality–specificity of creativity: A multivariate approach. In R. J. Sternberg, E. L. Grigorenko, & J. L. Singer (Eds.), *Creativity: From potential to realization* (pp. 43-56). Washington, DC: *American Psychological Association*.
- McLaughlin, B., White, D., McDevitt, T., & Raskin, R. (1983). Mothers' and fathers' speech to their young children: Similar or different? *Journal of Child Language*, 10(1), 245 – 252.
- Nassaji, A. & Fotos, S. (2011). *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Nemati, W. & Motallebzadeh, Kh., (2013). The Effect of Short Message Service on the Retention of Collocations among Iranian Lower Intermediate EFL Learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(11), 1514-1520.
- Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2000) Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50, 417–528.
- Osborne, R. J. and Wittrock, M. C. (1983). Learning Science: A Generative Process. *Science Education*, 67/4: 489-508.
- Rasinski, F. (2004). Vocabulary and Comprehension: Two Portraits. In Coady, J. and Huckin (eds.) *Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition: A Rationale for Pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reinders, H., & Ellis, R. (2009). The effects of two types of input to intake and the acquisition of implicit and explicit knowledge. In R. Ellis, S. Loewen, C. Elder, R. Erlam, J. Phlip, & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching* (pp.281-302). Bristol: *Multilingual Matters*.
- Reutzel, S. (2006). Classroom Instruction and Second Language Acquisition: The effect of explicit form-focused instruction on L2 learners' linguistic competence. A doctoral dissertation presented to the University of Mississippi, Oxford, Mississippi.
- Rikhtegar, O., & Gholami, J. (2015). The effect of preverses post -presentation input flooding via reading on the young EFL learners' acquisition of simple past tense. *English Language Teaching*, 8(3), 80-88.
- Robinson, P. (1995). Attention, memory and noticing hypothesis. *Language Learning*, 45(2), 283-331.
- Samuels, D. (2006). A new measure of an individual's tolerance for ambiguity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53, 183-189.
- Skehan, P. (1998). Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction. In J. Willis, & D. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching* (pp. 17-30). Oxford: Heinemann. *English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 97-115.
- Skehan, P. 2002. Theorizing and updating aptitude in P. Robinson (ed.). *Individual Differences and Instructed Language Learning*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129 –158.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1992). Psychological mechanisms underlying second language fluency. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 423-41.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1993). Awareness and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 206 – 226.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1994). Implicit learning and the cognitive unconscious: Of artificial grammars and SLA. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 165-209). London: Academic Press.
- Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.) *Cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge, UK; Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. N. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second

- language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Shaby, D. & Joy, L. (2020). The Effectiveness of Speaking Instruction through Task-Based Language Teaching, *PJAE*, 17(12), 1621-1625.
- Simard, Daphnée. (2009). Differential effects of textual enhancement formats on intake. *System*, 37, 124-135.
- Tabatabaei, O., & Yakhabi, M. (2009). The effect of comprehensible input and comprehensible output on the accuracy and complexity of Iranian EFL learner's oral speech. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2, 218-248.
- Tomlin, R., & Villa, U. (1994). Attention in cognitive science and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 183 - 203.
- Trahey, M., & White, L. (1993). Positive evidence and preemption in the second language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 181-204.
- White, P. (2015). The effects of input-based instructions on the acquisition of Spanish accusative clitics. *Hispania*, 98(2), 264-284
- Wong, W. (2005). *Input enhancement: From theory and research to the classroom*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

### **Biodata**

**Saeideh Sadat Fatahzadeh** is a Ph.D. Candidate of TEFL at Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord. She is interested in research on language teaching and learning skills.

Email: [sfatahzadeh@yahoo.com](mailto:sfatahzadeh@yahoo.com)

**Dr. Sajad Shafiee** is an assistant professor at Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord. He has published papers on testing and research issues in local and international journals. His research interests include testing, research, and materials development.

Email: [s.shafiee@iaushk.ac.ir](mailto:s.shafiee@iaushk.ac.ir)

**Dr. Fariba Rahimi Esfahani** is Assistant Professor, Department of English, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran. She has published a good number of articles on discourse, pragmatics, and in local and international journals.

Email: [rahimi\\_fariba@yahoo.com](mailto:rahimi_fariba@yahoo.com)