

An Exploration on the Impact of Textual Input Enhancement and Explicit Rule Presentation on Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners' Intake of Noun Making Suffixes

Elmira Pouryousef^{1&2} and Mehran Davaribina^{1&2*}

1. Department of English, Ardabil Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran

2. Department of English, Ardabil Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran

* Corresponding Author email: m.davaribina@iauardabil.ac.ir

Abstract: The present study investigated the impact of textual input enhancement and explicit rule presentation on 93 Iranian intermediate EFL learners' intake of noun making suffixes. Three general English classes in Anzali Islamic Azad University were randomly assigned to: 1) a Textual Input Enhancement (TIE) group, 2) a TIE plus explicit rule presentation (RP) group and 3) a control group. All participants were given 10 reading texts and comprehension questions to complete. For participants in groups 1 and 3 the input was textually enhanced through bold facing and underlining. Participants in group two in addition had explicit rule presentation of noun making suffixes. Intake of noun making suffixes was measured through performance on a Multiple-choice Recognition Test. The results of a one-way ANOVA indicated that there was a significant gain from pretest to posttest. Furthermore, TIE + RP group significantly outperformed the control group in posttest. The study concluded with some pedagogical implications.

Keywords: Bold facing; Consciousness-raising; Corrective feedback; Grammar instruction; Intake; Underlining

Introduction

The role of grammar and grammar learning as well as teaching has been a central issue in the history of language teaching and learning. From this stand point Tran-Hoang-Thu (2009) stated that although grammar may not be the magical thing that enables one to use a foreign or second language, it does significantly make it easier for learners to express themselves clearly and accurately. Approaches to teaching grammar vary according to the methods and activities or task employed by the teachers in the classroom.

Grammar is the system of a language. People sometimes describe grammar as the "rules" of a language; but in fact no language has rules. If we use the word "rules", we suggest that somebody created the rules first and then spoke the language, like a new game. But languages did not start like that. Languages started by people making sounds which evolved into words, phrases and sentences. No commonly-spoken language is fixed and all languages change over time. What we call "grammar" is simply a reflection of a language at a particular time.

That input matters comes as no surprise to second language practitioners, but the issue of exactly how input affects second language acquisition (SLA) is another matter. Second language acquisition researchers who see the second language learner as capable of unconsciously converting what is heard into a linguistic system take it for granted that as long as there is input, acquisition will occur (Piske & Young-Scholten, 2009).

While the term input invokes various conceptions, Chaudron's definition is helpful. He states that, "[t]he input available to second language learners is the raw data from which they derive both meaning and awareness of the rules and structures of the target language" (Chaudron, 1985, p.3). Carroll (1999) notes that conceiving of input as raw data as compared with analyzed data is popular in SLA research. Saleemi (1989) further explains that the concept of input depends on the researcher's resources and interests, and more importantly, his/her view of language.

Literature Review

Textual Input Enhancement and Consciousness-Raising

Textual input enhancement (TIE), according to Simard (2009), is the typographical manipulation of language forms in order to make them more salient so that language forms are more easily noticed by language learners. Its main objective is to draw learner's attention to language forms by enhancing the saliency of these forms. There have been different ways of increasing the saliency of target forms, such as underlining, capital, bold, different color, etc. Sharwood Smith (1981) proposed the term 'consciousness raising' (C-R), which refers to increasing or raising learners' conscious awareness of particular linguistic structures, altered by input.

Input Enhancement as Focus on Form

Considering the fact that attention plays a crucial role in language learning, many SLA researchers have tried different methods of focusing learners' attention on linguistic forms during meaning-focused activities. Some of these studies employed input enhancement as an implicit way to draw learners' attention to form (DeSantis, 2008; Izumi, 2002; Jourdenais et al., 1995; Lee, 2007; Leow et al., 2003; Radwan, 2005; Robinson, 1997; White, 1998; Wong, 2003).

In another experiment, Leeman et al. (1995) also examined the effects of focus on form on the learning of preterit and imperfect tenses in Spanish on two types of content-based instruction. One was a communicative class that focused solely on meaning, and the other was a content-based FonF class, which incorporated a number of input enhancement techniques which varied in degrees of explicitness and elaboration (via highlighting, underlining, and/or color-coding) as well as corrective feedback on the target forms. Their results also showed that participants in the FonF Group significantly improved accuracy and suppliance of the target forms, suggesting that content-based classes with FonF instruction, which incorporates input enhancement and corrective feedback are more effective than a content-based class, which is purely communicative in nature. In their conclusions, Leeman and colleagues openly attributed the gains for instruction to enhanced learner noticing.

Explicit Rule Presentation (RP)

One central issue in SLA theory-building is determining what types of linguistic input are most beneficial for second language (L2) learners. On the one hand, some researchers argue that negative evidence, information regarding the impossibility of certain linguistic structures in the language being acquired, is not necessary (and perhaps not consistently available) for first language (L1) acquisition. They maintain that Universal Grammar (UG) drives L1 acquisition solely on the basis of exposure to positive evidence, or exemplars of possible utterances in the language, which are present in all grammatical speech. However, research on L2 acquisition (especially in immersion contexts) has suggested that positive evidence alone may not be sufficient for the acquisition of certain L1-L2 contrasts or structures that are not present in the L1 (Trahey & White, 1993; White, 1989, 1991). That is, learners may benefit from some type of form-focused instruction. Following Sanz and Morgan-Short (2004), form-focused instruction can involve providing learners with explicit information before or during exposure to L2 input, by means of either grammatical explanation or negative evidence in the form of corrective feedback (CF). Much research has investigated the role of explicit grammatical

explanation or rule presentation in SLA, generally finding it beneficial (e.g., Alanen, 1995; Carroll & Swain, 1993; de Graaf, 1997; DeKeyser, 1995; Nagata, 1993; Nagata & Swisher, 1995; Robinson, 1996, 1997; Rosa & Leow, 2004).

Word formation

The relationship between grammar and vocabulary is one of partners working together to create meaningful communication. Words in a language are known as vocabulary, while grammar gives the methods and rules for combining those words into sentences. Ideas are communicated when both grammar and vocabulary work in tandem. What is more, as one of the hotly debated issues in vocabulary learning, suffixes display all kinds of relationships between form, meaning, and function. Some are rare and have only vague meanings. Some have just enough uses to suggest a meaning, (TomMcArthur,1992) .The number of suffixes in Modern English is so great, and the forms of several, especially in words derived through the French from Latin, are so variable that an attempt to exhibit them all would lead to confusion (Walter, 1882).

Considering the above mentioned issues, the following research question was posed to fulfill the purpose of the study:

Does type of instruction (TIE, TIE+RP and Traditional method) have any effect on Iranian EFL learners' intake of noun making suffixes?

Methodology

Design of the study

The present study employed an experimental design with pretest, treatment, and posttest design.

Participants

The original pool of the participants was 165 intermediate learners from Islamic Azad University in Anzali, registered in General English Course. These participants were in mixed classes including male and female students with the age range of 19 to 40. It was expected that participants were at the level where they could learn English noun making suffixes, but had not yet developed full mastery of the form and meaning. In order to make sure that the participants were all at the same level of proficiency, Oxford Placement Test (OPT) was administered. Out of 165 participants, 90 students at intermediate level were selected to take part in the main phase of the research. These participants were divided into three groups of 30 each. Participants in class 1 were assigned as TIE only group, participants in class 2 to TIE plus rule presentation (TIE/RP) group and participants in class 3 were assigned as the control group.

Instrumentation
Proficiency test

Oxford Placement Test (OPT) was used to ensure the initial homogeneity of the participants. The test includes 50 multiple-choice questions, which determine students' knowledge of key grammar and vocabulary from elementary to intermediate levels, a reading text with 10 graded comprehension questions and an optional writing task that estimates students' ability to produce the language.

Reading texts

Ten reading comprehension passages from Reading Skillfully 2 (Mirhasani & Rahmani 2005) were selected. The participants in the experimental groups read the text including noun making suffixes highlighted via bold facing and underlining.

Multiple-choice recognition tests

To check the students' intake of the noun making suffixes in both pre and posttests multiple-choice recognition tests were used. The reason for using these tests was that studies such as Leow (1997) and Overstreet (1998) have confirmed that this kind of test is effective in exploring the impact of TIE on intake. Two sets of multiple-choice recognition tests were developed, one for the pretest and one for the posttest; each version included 30 questions. Each correct answer was awarded 1, therefore the total mark was 30; thirty minutes was allocated to this test. The content validity of the tests was confirmed by two experts in the field of TEFL and based on the received feedback, some questions were revised and ambiguities were removed.

Procedure

This study was conducted in 10 sessions during the fall semester of 2014. In order to achieve the purpose of the study and to collect requisite data, several stages were followed.

To begin with, Oxford Placement Test (OPT) was administered to determine the language

proficiency level of 165 participants. Consequently, 90 homogenous learners at intermediate level were selected to take part in the main phase of the study. Then the subjects were randomly assigned to two treatment groups (TIE and TIE+RP) and a control group.

In the first session, the researcher administered the pretest to make sure the three participating groups were homogeneous in terms of knowledge of noun making suffixes. They worked on the book "Reading Skillfully 2" for ten sessions, one lesson each session. In group 1 they received textual input enhancement including **bolding** and underlining of noun making suffixes and in group 2 they received more explanation about suffixes especially noun making suffixes beside bolding and underlining. In group 3, traditional teaching of reading was followed, where the passages were read by the learners. This was followed by some class discussion about both the form and content of the passage including some focus on forms. Then the reading questions were answered individually and the correct answers were provided by the teacher to be discussed. What is more, in the process of reading, in groups 1 and 2, the students were exposed to ideas of others about noun making suffixes, which could have supposedly helped them express their own and, above all, make them believe that knowledge of these suffixes can help them get more out of reading. The posttest of the study was administered one day after the last treatment session.

Results

Descriptive Statistics for the Pre - Test Scores of L2 Grammar test

As elaborated above, a pre-test of L2 grammar was administered to make sure that there was no difference among three participating groups in terms of knowledge of noun making suffixes at the beginning of the study. Table 4.2 depicts the descriptive statistics for the participants' performance in this test.

Table 4.2. *Descriptive Statistics for the Pre-Test Scores*

| Groups | Mean | Std. Deviation | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|---------------|-------|----------------|----------|----------|
| TIE | 14.73 | 1.982 | -.059 | .047 |
| TIE + RP | 15.83 | 2.679 | .237 | .984 |
| control group | 15.20 | 1.186 | -.414 | 1.273 |

To check any possible difference between these groups, the pre-test scores were submitted to a one-way ANOVA, which indicated no significant difference in pre-test scores among the participating

groups ($F(2, 87) = 2.193, p = .118 > .05$) (See Table 4.3). Thus, the groups could safely be considered equal at the beginning of the study with respect to their use of noun making suffixes in L2 grammar.

Table 4.3. One-Way ANOVA for the Pre-Test Scores

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|------|
| Between Groups | 18.289 | 2 | 9.144 | 2.193 | .118 |
| Within Groups | 362.833 | 87 | 4.170 | | |
| Total | 381.122 | 89 | | | |

Descriptive Statistics for the Post-Test Scores of Grammar test (noun making suffixes)

As mentioned above, after the treatment session a post-test was run to gauge the likely

improvement in the grammar knowledge of the participants. Table 4.4 shows the descriptive statistics for the three participating groups' scores on this test.

Table 4.4. Descriptive Statistics for L2 Grammar Scores (Post-Test)

| Groups | Mean | Std. Deviation | Minimum | Maximum |
|---------------|-------|----------------|---------|---------|
| TIE | 17.40 | 1.773 | 14 | 21 |
| TIE + RP | 19.20 | 2.833 | 15 | 26 |
| control group | 15.73 | 1.172 | 13 | 18 |

To see if the implementation of different treatments has given rise to any difference in the improvement of the participants' knowledge

concerning noun making suffixes a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run on the post-test scores. Table 4.5 below shows the result.

Table 4.5. One- Way ANOVA for the Scores on Post-Test

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|------|
| Between Groups | 180.356 | 2 | 90.178 | 21.561 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 363.867 | 87 | 4.182 | | |
| Total | 544.222 | 89 | | | |

As it can be seen from table 4.5 there is a significant difference between the three participating groups' post-test scores ($F(2, 87) = 21.56, p=.00$

$<.05$). To see where this difference exactly lies, a Post- Hoc Scheffe Test was run. Table 4.6 shows the result.

Table 4.6 .Post- Hoc Scheffe Test for L2 Grammar Scores on Post-Test

| (I) Groups | (J) Groups | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| TIE | TIE+RP | -1.800* | .528 | .004 | -3.12 | -.48 |
| | control group | 1.667* | .528 | .009 | .35 | 2.98 |
| TIE+RP | TIE | 1.800* | .528 | .004 | .48 | 3.12 |
| | control group | 3.467* | .528 | .000 | 2.15 | 4.78 |
| control group | TIE | -1.667* | .528 | .009 | -2.98 | -.35 |
| | TIE+RP | -3.467* | .528 | .000 | -4.78 | -2.15 |

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

It can clearly be seen that the difference between the performance of experimental groups and control group is significant. What is more, the is

also a statistically significant difference between the performance of TIE and TIE+RP group.

Discussion And Conclusion

The present study investigated the effect of TIE and TIE/RP intervention on intake of English noun making suffixes.

Based on the statistical results of the study, textual input enhancement per se as well as its mixture with explicit rule presentation affected Iranian EFL learners' L2 grammar. However, the extent of improvement that occurred was not the same for both experimental groups, that is, the

combination of explicit rule presentation along with textual input enhancement would make more contribution to the learners' knowledge concerning the use of noun making suffixes.

The results of the study also showed that TIE is helpful in drawing learners' attention to the target form, subsequently leading to their intake of the form. Therefore, it can be inferred that textual enhancement helped the learners in attending to the target form. However, the results of the present study

was in contrast to some studies, which reported no facilitative effects for TIE (e.g., Izumi, 2000; 2002; Leow et al., 2003; Overstreet, 2002; Wong, 2003). Some researchers such as Alanen (1995) and Leow (1997, 2001) reject the positive effect of TIE on the intake of target forms, however, a set of other studies (e.g., Jourdenaise, Stauffer, Boyson & Doughty, 1995; Shook, 1994) report the positive role of TIE on triggering the noticing and intake of language forms. Another finding of the study, as mentioned above, was that TIE is more effective when it is combined with explicit rule presentation. Thus, the present study supports the claims that focus-on-form draws learners' attention to form, in a generally meaning-oriented activity. Therefore the results of the present study confirm the claim made by some researchers (e.g., Harley & Swain, 1998; Schmidt, 1993) that learners often don't notice forms in the input in spite of repeated exposure, claiming that explicit instruction can benefit learners in acquiring moderately difficult grammatical rules. For DeKeyser (2003) benefit of explicit instruction can be its ability in triggering the incidental noticing of form-meaning connections within subsequent input.

Based on the results of the present study some pedagogical implications can be made. First, if effects of TIE+RP are found to be confirmed in future research, language instructors might feel more justified while using TIE+ explicit instruction to target moderately difficult linguistic patterns when the instruction per se does not lead to immediate acquisition. Taking into consideration the grammar pedagogy, the present study may offer some evidence that TIE can be an effective focus-on-form technique, at least for the English noun making suffixes and the EFL population investigated. The results can provide further insight into how learners utilize attentional resources when they are faced with textual input enhancement as a type of focus-on-form instructional intervention. At the same time, the study also shows that additional or alternative instruction TIE+ rule presentation is more beneficial in triggering learners' intake of the target form and thus the findings bolster a recommendation for some combination of explicit instruction plus textual enhancement.

References

- Alanen R, 1995. Input enhancement and rule presentation in second language acquisition. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (pp. 259-302). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii.
- Barker C, Pistrang N, Elliot R, 1994. *Research methods in clinical and counselling psychology*. Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Basturkmen H, Loewen S, Ellis R, 2004. Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 243, England: John Wiley.
- Carroll S, 1999. Putting 'input' in its proper place. *Second Language Research*, 15(4), 337.
- Carroll S, Swain M, 1993. Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15(3), 357_86.
- Chaudron C, 1985. Intake: On models and methods for discovering learners' processing input *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 34_45.
- De Graaf R, 1997. The eXperanto experiment: Effects of explicit instruction on second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 249_297.
- DeKeyser R, 1995. Learning second language grammar rules: An experiment with a miniature linguistics system. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 17(3), 379_410.
- DeKeyser R, 2003. Implicit and explicit learning. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 313_348). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- DeSantis P, 2008. Text Enhancement and the Acquisition of English Verbal Inflection -s by L1 Haitian Creole Speakers. *Applied Language Learning*, 18(1&2), 27-50.
- Doughty C, 2001. Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*, 206_257.
- Doughty C, Williams J, 1998. *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. USA, Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards L, 2009. *Solution placement test*. Oxford: USA, Oxford University Press.
- Ellis R, 2003. *Task-based language learning*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis R, Loewen S, Erlam R, 2006. Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 339_368.
- Harley B, 1998. The role of focus-on-form tasks in prompting child L2 acquisition. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in second language acquisition* (pp.11_74) .Cambridge, England: Cambridge University press.
- Izumi S, 2000. Promoting noticing and SLA: An empirical study of the effects of output and input enhancement on ESL relativization (Doctoral dissertation).
- Izumi S, 2002. Output, input enhancement and the noticing hypothesis: An experimental study of ESL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24(4), 541_577.
- Jourdenais R, Ota M, Stauffer S, Boyson B, Doughty C, 1995. Does textual enhancement promote noticing? A think-aloud protocol analysis. In R. Schmidt (Ed), *Attention and awareness in*

- foreign language learning (pp. 183-216). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii.
- Lee S, K, 2007. Effects of textual enhancement and topic familiarity on Korean EF students' reading comprehension and learning of passive form. *Language Learning Journal*, 57(1), 87-118.
- Leeman J, Arteagoitia I, Fridman B, Doughty C, 1995. Integrating attention to form with meaning: Focus on form in content-based Spanish instruction. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (pp. 217-258). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Leow R, Egi T, Nuevo A, Tsai Y, 2003. The roles of textual enhancement and type of linguistic item in adult L2 learners' comprehension and intake. *Applied Language Learning*, 13(2), 1-16.
- Leow R, P, 1997. The effects of input enhancement and text length on adult L2 readers' comprehension and intake in second language acquisition. *Applied Language Learning*, 8(2), 151-182.
- Leow R, P, 2001. Do learners notice enhanced forms while interacting with the L2? An online and offline study of the role of written input enhancement in L2 reading. *Hispania*, 84(3), 496-509.
- Lightbown P, 1998. The importance of timing in focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 177-196). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Long M, H, 1991. Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. De Bot, R. B.
- Long Michael, 1996. The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- McArthur T, 1992 *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford University Press
- Mirhassani A, Rahmani N, 2005. *Reading Skillfully 2*. (13th ed) a general textbook for university student. Iran: Diba press.
- Mitchell R, 2000. Anniversary article. *Applied linguistics and evidence-based classroom practice: the case of foreign language grammar pedagogy*. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(3), 281.
- Muranoi H, 2000. Focus on form through interaction enhancement: Integrating formal instruction into a communicative task in EFL classrooms. *Language Learning*,
- Nagata N, Swisher M, Virginia, 1995. A study of consciousness-raising by computer: The effect of metalinguistic feedback on SLA. *Foreign Language Annals*, 28, 336-347.
- Norris J, M, Ortega L, 2000. Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50(3), 417-528.
- Overstreet M, 1998. Text enhancement and content familiarity: The focus of learner attention. *Spanish Applied Linguistics*, 2, 229-258.
- Overstreet M, 2002. The effects of textual enhancement on second language learner reading comprehension and form recognition (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses databases. (UMI No. 3070405)
- Piske T, Young S, 2009. *Input Matters in SLA*. (2nd ed) David Singleton, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland.
- Radwan A, 2005. The effectiveness of explicit attention to form in language learning. *System*, 33, 69-87.
- Richard J, Radgers Th, 2001. *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. (2nd ed) United Kingdom, Cambridge: Cambridge university press
- Robinson P, 1996. Learning simple and complex second language rules under implicit, incidental, rule-search, and instructed conditions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(1), 27-67.
- Robinson P, 1997. Individual differences and the fundamental similarity of implicit and explicit adult second language learning. *Language Learning*, 47(1), 45-99.
- Robinson P, 1997. Individual differences and the fundamental similarity of implicit and explicit adult second language learning. *Language Learning*, 47(1), 45-99.
- Rosa E, Leow R, 2004a. Awareness, different learning conditions, and L2 development. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 25(2), 269-292.
- Rosa E, Leow R, 2004b. Computerized task-based exposure, explicitness, type of feedback, and Spanish L2 development. *Modern Language Journal*, 88(2), 192-216.
- Saleemi A, P, 1989. Inputs for L2 acquisition. *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 27(3), 173-191.
- Sanz C, Morgan-Short K, 2004. Positive evidence vs. explicit rule presentation and explicit negative feedback: A computer-assisted study. *Language Learning*, 54(1), 35-78.
- Schmidt R, 1993. Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. *Interlanguage pragmatics*, 21, 42.
- Shook D, J, 1994. FL/L2 reading, grammatical information, and the input-to-intake phenomenon. *Applied Language Learning*, 5, 57-93.

- Smith S, M, 1981. Consciousness-raising and second language acquisition theory. *Applied Linguistics*, 2, 159-168.
- Trahey M, White L, 1993. Positive evidence and preemption in the second language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15(02), 181-204.
- Tran H,
2009. Density of visual input enhancement and grammar learning.
- VanPatten B, 1996. *Input processing and grammar instruction: Theory and research*. Norwood, NH: Ablex.
- Walter W, 1882. *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*
- White J, 1998. Getting the learners' attention: A typographical input enhancement study. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp.85-113). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White L, 1989. The principle of adjacency in second language acquisition: Do learners observe the subset principle? In S. Gass & J. Schachter (Eds.), *Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 134-158). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- White L, 1991. Adverb placement in second language acquisition: Some positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Second Language Research*, 7(2), 133-161.
- Williams J, 2005. Form-focused instruction. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 671-692). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wong W, 2003. Textual enhancement and simplified input: Effects on L2 comprehension and acquisition of non-meaningful grammatical form. *Applied Language Learning*, 13(2), 17-45.