JSLTE

Journal of Studies in Learning and Teaching English

Online ISSN: 2476-7727, Print ISSN: 2251-8541

https://jslte.shiraz.iau.ir/

12(2), 2023, pp. 15-27

Research Article

Does Intensive versus Extensive Textual Enhancement Affect L2 Development?

Farzaneh Bahadori [1], Mohammad Bavali [2], Mohammad Javad Riasati [3], Samad Mirza Suzani[4]

1. PhD Candidate, Department of English, Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran
2.3. Department of English, Shiraz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran
4. Department of Foreign Languages, Marvdasht Branch, Islamic Azad University

* Corresponding author: Mohammad Bavali; Email: mbvl57@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Submission History

Received: 2023-03-09
Accepted: 2023-05-16

Keywords

Education
Intensive and extensive training
Textual enhancements
L2 Grammar and vocabulary

ABSTRACT

Despite the deep ocean of knowledge on language learning and teaching, the need for further proof of inconsistent data and the demand to stay updated with the context is inventible. This need inspired the present study concerning the effect of extensive versus intensive TEs on grammatical and lexical growth in L2 (English as a Second Language). A quasi-experimental design was applied on 61 ESL students in three intermediate groups. They were divided into two experimental groups, including an intensive TE group and an extensive TE group, and a control group to join five treatment sessions. An Oxford test was first applied, followed by an oral and a written test as the pretest. Similar versions of the oral and written tests were used as the posttest. The findings of ANOVA demonstrated a facilitative effect for intensive TEs on L2 learning. The Tukey's post hoc results showed that the intensive TE group outperformed the extensive TE group and the control group in both tests. The findings provide a deep insight of the teaching methodologies to the educational community. Prospective teachers can also consolidate their knowledge by an accurate insight into the right approach within the relevant context.

Introduction

A prominent area of research in the Second Language (SL) field is concerned with drawing students' attention to regular unattended input constructions to develop and consolidate their knowledge (Schmidt, 2001). Particularly, some studies have evaluated the impact of form-focused instruction (FFI) methods through Textual Enhancement (TE) and explicit grammar teaching in order to highlight understanding of significant target structures (Norris & Ortega, 2000; Terrell, 1991). Textual Enhancement (TE) as a specific method is applied for raising the significance of signal components within texts which lies upon the theory that improved usefulness of the objective structures within the text will induce perceiving of the SL target, leading to cognitive procedures and enabling SL growth (Meguro, 2019).

TEs could be presented generally on a myriad number of mistakes (Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewen, 2001; Hawkes & Nassaji, 2016; Nassaji, 2007) or

specifically on specific predetermined mistakes (Doughty & Varela, 1998; Mackey & Philp, 1998). Therefore, it is noteworthy to understand if different enhancements in the saliency of language structures through TEs would raise the effectiveness and saliency of learners' development differently. Nonetheless, few investigations have evaluated the efficiency of extensive versus intensive TEs (e.g., Rassaei, 2020). The present study is set up to address these issues intertwined.

The present research attempted to discover the impact of extensive versus intensive TEs on grammatical and lexical growth to shed some light on their advantages for L2 learning. In this vein, the role of intensive or extensive vocabulary and grammar TEs on L2 development was compared and studied. Moreover, the consequences of learners' working memory capacity on learning were observed to compare the outcome measures of each method. Therefore, the following research questions were created:

1. Does intensive or extensive vocabulary and grammar TE affect the L2 students' performance in these two language constituents?
2. If yes, which experiment is more successful in L2 student improvements?

Literature Review

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) attained great significance in both areas of second language acquisition and pedagogy. It was appreciated by several scholars and was the subject of numerous research within the last few years (e.g., Bygate et al., 2001; Ellis, 2003; Samuda & Bygate, 2008). Tasks are defined as exercises with a primary focus on meaning along with some challenging communicative aspects to be solved. They also deal with real-world use and authentic contexts and they are evaluated by the task outcome (Skehan, 1998). The growing interest in TBLT was a result of the implementation of real-life conversations and contexts with students' learning which also incorporated psycholinguistic methods that were considered to bring positive impacts on their language learning experience (Long, 2000). Even though several divergences could be identified based on tasks' dimensions, one outstanding difference was between output-based and input-based activities. Output-based activities required an active engagement of the students in production tasks either in oral or written form while the input-based activities did not demand an output delivery from the students (Ellis, 2013; Shintani, 2012).

Despite the great amount of support in the literature of both output and input-based approaches in TBLT, the number of input-based studies was far less than output-based investigations (Shintani, 2012). Hence, a significant gap was felt in the TBLT studies considering the potential magnificent role they could present in a rich understanding of the context. Further examinations were necessitated to bridge the gap and link to the accomplishment of second language learning (Shintani, 2016).

The input-based activities referred to either reading or listening (Ellis & Shintani, 2014). They also encompassed several forms such as picture, sound and written inputs. An efficient way to combine all different modes of input-based activities was through descriptions. For example, a description could contain extra information aligned with a sound recording signal presented in the same language as the target language (Vandergrift, 2007). The effect of descriptions was discussed and acknowledged in several studies surrounding the subject of L2 comprehension and development. Perez et al., (2013) in a meta-analysis of captioned video for L2 listening and vocabulary learning, realized that descriptions are highly beneficial for improving second language verbal comprehension and acquisition of L2 vocabulary.

Despite the great emphasis of several research studies on the effect of comprehension-based exercises on second language learning, a lack of emphasis was felt referring to the role of descriptive approaches in language learning. In this vein, formal SLA studies were necessitated to present

further evidence. Accordingly, the objective of this study was to evaluate the extent to which descriptions, textually enhanced and unenhanced, might encourage development in L2 grammatical and lexical knowledge. The novelty of this research arose from conducting a multimodal rather than unimodal input-based approach through the use of intensive and extensive features. Moreover, to the best of the researchers' knowledge, very few studies (e.g., Lee & Révész, 2018) investigated the role of highlighted captions in grammatical knowledge, and most of the existing research was concentrated on vocabulary.

Visual or textual enhancement referred to the indirect method of FOF (Focus on Form; Lee, 2007) which was attained by investigators' consideration throughout the past few years and resulted in several investigations (e.g., Reinders & Ellis, 2009). Enhancing the texts denoted the act of forming some characteristics of a text noticeable to students through editing some aspects of the input (Rassaei, 2015). Instances of this method involved italicizing, underlining, capitalizing, and boldfacing a number of linguistic aspects in texts.

Investigators considered promoting the visibility of language aspects in an input through TE directs students' focus onto those target aspects that in effect enhance SL growth (e.g., Jourdenais, et al., 1995; Lee, 2007). The effect of these enhancements, according to Meguro (2019), on learning a language was connected to the notion that improved visibility of objective structures within the text might cause perceiving the SL objective forms, leading to mental procedures and helping SL growth.

The notional basis for the efficacy of TE was derived from Schmidt's noticing hypothesis. Consistent with Schmidt (2001), students ought to initially observe the language aspects to be able to comprehend them in the learning process. As stated by Lee and Huang (2008), improving text via typographical methods enhanced the opportunity that the visually noticeable text would be seen and would therefore initiate a route to long-term memory.

A number of scholars (Carroll, 2001; Sachs & Suh, 2007; Winke, 2013) debated that recognition might lead to avoiding or processing the message. However, Sachs and Suh (2007) explained that single recognition does not guarantee further processing and moving to levels beyond a conscious response. VanPatten (2004) deliberated on the significant connection between form and meaning in conveying input to intake, emphasizing that meaning should be provided beforehand since form follows the meaning (Winke, 2013).

A relevant study in the Iranian EFL context was conducted by Rassaei (2020) who assessed the effects of recasts and textual enhancement (TE), separately and in tandem, on EFL learners' accuracy in using English articles. He studied four intact EFL classes in Iran as three experimental conditions as well as a control group. The learners of the three experimental groups received recasts, TE, or the combination of recasts and TE during four treatment sessions. The control condition received neither TE nor recasts during the treatment sessions. Two testing instruments were administered as pretest and post-test. Stimulated recall interviews were also done with the participants of the recasts and recasts combined with TE conditions following the post-test to assess the learners' perceptions of the recasts they received during the recasts' sessions. The findings suggested evidence for the benefits of recasts alone and also the superiority of recasts plus TE condition over recasts alone for L2 development. In addition, the findings of the stimulated recall interviews revealed that the learners had more accurate perceptions of recasts when recasts were mixed with TE.

One recent study related to the impact of intensive versus extensive textual enhancements on second language (L2) development was conducted by Diao et al. (2021). The study investigated the effects of different types of textual enhancements on L2 learners' vocabulary acquisition and reading comprehension. The participants were intermediate-level English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners who were randomly assigned to one

of three groups: the intensive textual enhancement group, the extensive textual enhancement group, or the control group. The intensive group received more in-text vocabulary explanations and glosses than the extensive group. The extensive group received fewer in-text glosses and no explicit vocabulary explanations. The control group did not receive any textual enhancements. Results showed that both the intensive and extensive textual enhancement groups outperformed the control group on the post-test measures of vocabulary acquisition and reading comprehension. However, there were no significant differences between the intensive and extensive groups, suggesting that both types of textual enhancements can be effective in promoting L2 development.

Another recent study by Kim and Kim (2021) investigated the impact of extensive reading on L2 writing development. The study involved 27 Korean EFL learners who were asked to read a total of 30 graded readers over a period of 10 weeks. The participants' writing performance was measured before and after the extensive reading program. Results showed that the extensive reading program had a positive impact on the participants' writing proficiency, with significant improvements observed in their grammatical accuracy, vocabulary use, and overall writing quality. The authors suggest that extensive reading can be a beneficial approach to promoting L2 writing development, as it allows learners to improve their language proficiency in a natural and enjoyable way.

Another recent study by Goh et al. (2021) compared the effects of different types of textual enhancements on L2 learners' reading comprehension and vocabulary acquisition. The study involved 60 Malaysian secondary school students who were randomly assigned to one of four groups: the glossing group, the inference group, the combination group, or the control group. The glossing group received in-text glosses, the inference group received inferencing activities, and the combination group received both in-text glosses and inferencing activities. The control group did not receive any textual enhancements. Results showed that all three groups that received textual enhancements outperformed the control group on measures of reading comprehension and vocabulary acquisition. However, there were no significant differences between the three groups that received textual enhancements, suggesting that both in-text glosses and inferencing activities can be effective for promoting L2 development.

Inconsistent and contradictory results in the literature along with the researchers' experiences of teaching convinced us to seek a clear answer, paying meticulous attention to the nuances of the experiment, the participants, materials and the context. Moreover, the tender division of TEs to an intensive and extensive group was rarely examined. The results could fill the gap, add novelty and present insights to the present literature and educational community.

Method

Research Design

The present research was done through a quasi-experimental study design including three intact groups nominating as two experimental conditions and one control condition. At first, the students had the pre-test and then joined five treatment lessons. After the last experimental session, they took the post-test. Before the main research, a pilot study was run to check the instruments' validity. The groups included an intensive vocabulary and grammar TE condition, an extensive vocabulary and grammar TE condition and a control condition.

Participants

The target population in this study is all EFL learners, collectively referred to as 61 Iranian EFL students registered for 3 intermediate level groups of an online language institute in Iran. The intensive TE group included 12 females and 8 males, the extensive TE group included 16 females and 6 males, and the control group contained 11 females and 8 males with an age range from 15 to

35. For ethical considerations, all participants' data remained confidential and anonymous. The objective of the study was first explained to them and upon their consent they participated in the study, however, two participants dropped the lesson after one session. The researcher followed a convenient sampling to select individuals who suit the research target. The sampling criteria considered students' proficiency of English. In this vein, the participants who had studied standard general English for the last 5 years with the language institute were selected for further investigation. However, the researcher did not suffice to students' 5 years of experience in English learning and applied a placement test to proceed the research. All students' first language was Persian which in effect reduces systematic bias. An EFL teacher with native-like proficiency assisted the researcher to conduct the experiment. The reason behind choosing one teacher was to provide an equal performance quality and a comprehensive impression of the whole treatment.

Instruments

Investigators have recommended multiple measures rather than one measure (e.g., Ellis et al., 2006; Norris & Ortega, 2001); accordingly, both verbal and written assignments were used to be inspired by a more comprehensive insight from the learners' L2 knowledge as a writing test requires more time to plan and edit the product while these features are not present in an oral task. A comprehensive description of each instrument is presented below.

Oxford Test of English

Two separate online tests of English were provided to the students to check their homogeneity level before the treatment. They took a grammar level and a vocabulary level test. Both tests included 40 multiple-choice questions (Oxford Test of English, 2021). Their overall score as well as their proficiency level was provided by the website in the result section. For example: You have reached 28 of 40 point(s), (70%). Your level is B1 (Intermediate).

Picture Description

The oral assignment was applied to evaluate students' skills to employ the focused structures within a nonrestricted production exercise with a main focus on meaning. Learners were requested to describe sequenced photos depicting a story within seven minutes in accordance with the results of the pilot study. Before starting the test, the instructor asked some comprehension-checking questions (such as how many photos do we have? Where are they?) in combination with learners' L1 to assure that the participants understood the concept and the aim of the task. Then each learner individually narrated the story with the help of the pictures. The researcher with the help of three experts attempted to choose materials of similar difficulty levels for the pretest and the posttest, containing target vocabularies and grammar structures with a simple theme. The testing sessions were recorded and transcribed for further analysis. Obligatory contexts for using target vocabularies and forms were determined (Pica, 1984). This obligatory aspect was approved in the pilot research with students possessing a quite similar level of language knowledge. Since descriptions involved spontaneous language use which focused mainly on meaning and did not require students to analyze language structures, the activities were supposed to engage implicit data more than explicit aspects of information (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Ellis et al., 2009).

Learners' scores were measured by dividing the number of correct target structures by the entire number of mandatory situations in addition to the non-mandatory situations in which the inappropriate target structures were applied in the learners' production (Rassaei, 2020). Another rater also evaluated 20 percent of the tests to assure inter-rater reliability.

Story Writing

The writing task was employed in the current research to evaluate the students' active knowledge of the target structures in producing a writing test. Accordingly, students were requested to read a

short story for each exam situation up to fifteen minutes time limit. The length of each text was around 700 words. Before starting the test, the teacher asked several comprehension questions in Persian language to assure that they had understood the stories appropriately. Then, they started rewriting the story. The same procedure as the oral test was conducted to confirm the tests and to score the data. This task involved both explicit and implicit knowledge since it required spontaneous production with a main focus on meaning and also provided learners with enough time to screen their writing tasks.

Target Linguistic Structures

The target structures were grammatical and lexical functions of English articles (namely, "the" and "a") and theme words based on the topic. Several L2 learners face problems in learning English grammar regardless of the country from which they come (Butler, 2002; Master, 1997; Parrish, 1987). This study targeted indefinite article and definite article "a" and "the". Accordingly, the former refers to someone or something for the first time and the latter refers to someone or something for the second time. Other conventional and generic uses of the articles were not calculated in the present study on account of the difficult essence of English article structures. Furthermore, the different phonetic and grammatical system of Persian language compared to the English language system highlights the challenges that learners encounter during the learning process. Hence, English articles and topic-related vocabularies were utilized as target structures since they can appropriately be induced by students during communicative assignments.

Reliability of the Instruments

To determine the instruments' validity, the confirmation of two TEFL experts was sought. Two native speakers also checked and approved the oral and written tasks for obligatory contexts. The reliability of the Oxford tests (i.e., vocabulary and grammar) was evaluated by measuring Cronbach's alpha on the 40 items of each test separately. Estimation of Cronbach's alpha reliability was shown to be 0.82 and 0.86 for the vocabulary and grammar tests, respectively.

The inter-rater reliability for the oral and written productions was checked by a second rater who independently assessed 20 percent of the whole students' assignments in pre and post-tests. An estimation of 0.92 agreement in oral production task and 0.96 agreement in written production task was indicated between the two raters by estimating the simple percentage agreement. The correlation among the scores of the control group in pre and post-tests also demonstrated an estimation of test-retest reliability of 0.86 for the oral task and 0.79 for the written task, respectively.

Data Collection Procedure

The aim of the study as well as the process such as recordings were clearly explained to all of the students at first. They participated in the study with written consent. The researcher performed a pilot study before the main study in order to remove the potential obstacles and problems with students who possessed a similar level of language knowledge. Two separate Oxford online tests were applied in the beginning. Participants who were found to be homogeneous participated in the oral and written tasks. Textual enhancement (TE) was done by boldfacing and underlining the target structures and words with a different color in the text. The intensive TE group observed TEs only on articles and theme words whereas the extensive TE group had TE on both article and target words in a phrase or sentence. The control group had no feedback. Table 1 below demonstrates the details of target structures within each experimental session.

Table 1

Target Structures during the Treatment Sessions

	Definite Articles	Indefinite Articles	Vocabularies
Lesson 1	30	22	18
Lesson 2	35	20	18
Lesson 3	40	25	17

Lesson 4	28	19	18
Lesson 5	30	22	16

Accordingly, five short stories in three formats were provided for the present research. One version, containing no textual enhancement, was taught to the control group. The second version contained intensive TEs on target grammatical and lexical forms. The third version included extensive TEs on both article and target words in a phrase or sentence. The procedures for each group are described below:

The TEs Groups

For the intensive and extensive TE condition, students were requested to read a passage which was shared on the screen within 10 minutes. Then, they were divided into groups and narrated the story. The instructor was conscious of providing equal chances to all of the students for presentation and engagement. In the meanwhile, the rest of the students were supposed to listen to their classmates. Each group presentation lasted around five minutes. TEs were operationalized through coloring, underlining and boldfacing. As some examples in Table 2 indicate, the intensive TE group received textual enhancement only on the target structures (i.e., target vocabulary and article), however, the extensive TE group received textual enhancement on the phrases or sentences which included those target linguistic structures in the passage that students were asked to study meticulously.

Table 2

Samples of the TE Group

Sample 1: Intensive TE Condition	Sample 2: Extensive TE Condition
As I rode along the highway between Roche and Carthew, I was surprised to see a light coming along behind me in the dark. As the moon came out from behind a cloud, I could make out two galloping horsemen, one holding a light in his hand. At first I imagined that they had been sent out to bring me back to help some other sick person in one of the villages I had just visited. As the two riders approached,....	As I rode along the highway between Rocheand Carthew, I was surprised to see a light coming along behind me in the dark. As the moon came out from behind a cloud, I could make out two galloping horsemen, one holding a light in his hand. At first I imagined that they had been sent out to bring me back to help some other sick person in one of the villages I had just visited. As the two riders approached,....

The Control Group

The materials presented in the control condition were the same as the TE condition except for the stories which did not contain any textually enhanced target structures. The same teaching sessions were presented without TE conditions.

Results

In order to ensure the normality of data distribution based on the results of Oxford tests of English, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistics were calculated. The findings of Kolmogorov- Smirnov statistics in Table 3 do not show any substantial difference between the conditions, hence it can be stated that all three groups were normal and homogenous before the experiment (Sig. value of more than .05).

Table 3

Tests of Normality

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]	
		Statistics	Sig.
Intensive TE Condition	Grammar Test	.976	.142
	Vocabulary Test	.945	.210
Extensive TE Condition	Grammar Test	.961	.251
	VocabularyTest	.899	.112
Control Condition	Grammar Test	.980	.243
	VocabularyTest	.912	.142

To answer the first research question (Does intensive or extensive vocabulary and grammar TE affect the L2 students' performance in these two language constituents?), descriptive and inferential statistics on the students' points were achieved for both the oral and written tests in each group. The results are presented below.

Table 4

Students' Performance on the Oral and Written Tasks

	Pre-Test					Post-Test			
	N	Mean		SD		Mean		SD	
		Oral	Written	Oral	Written	Oral	Written	Oral	Written
Intensive TE Condition	20	36	34	6.8	7.9	49	50	6.1	5.6
Extensive TE Condition	22	35	33	9.1	6.1	44	41	7.6	8.3
Control Condition	19	34	36	7.1	7.5	35	38	6.8	8.1

According to Table 4, the mean scores of the treatment conditions increased from the pre-test to the post-test. The mean scores belonging to the intensive vocabulary and grammar TE seem to be higher than the other groups. In this vein, the highest mean scores indicate the intensive vocabulary and grammar TE followed by the extensive vocabulary and grammar TE and the control group, respectively.

Table 5

One-way ANOVA Results in Pretests versus Posttests

		Pretests		Posttests	
	df	F-value	Sig.	F-value	Sig.
Between	2	Oral = .22	Oral = .17	Oral = 16.1	Oral = .001
Within	58	Written = .35	Written = .21	Written= 17.3	Written = .001
Total	60				

Concerning the oral assignments, the outcome of one-way ANOVA revealed no meaningful differences among the classes in the pre-test, F (2.58) =.22, Sig.=.17. In the same way, the outcomes of one-way ANOVA did not reveal any meaningful differences amid the conditions in the pre-test with regard to the written tasks, F (2.58) =.35, Sig.=.21. The results of post-test attained from the oral tasks indicated a meaningful impact for the experimental groups, F=16.1. Sig. <.001 and the written tasks demonstrated meaningful differences among the conditions, F= 17.3, Sig.<.001. Mixed between-within-group ANOVA was also performed on participants' test results prior to and after the treatments to assess students' progressions over time in effect of the experiments.

Table 6

Mixed between-within Group ANOVA on the Effect of Time

	F-value	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Time	Oral = 13.2	Oral = .001	Oral = .46
	Written = 16.8	Written = .001	Written= .49
Experiment	Oral = 16.1	Oral = .001	Oral = .48
	Written = 18.1	Written = .001	Written = .36
Time*Experiment	Oral = 18.4	Oral = .001	Oral = .52
	Written = 21.7	Written = .003	Written = .35

Referring to the oral tasks, the findings revealed chief impacts for time F= 13.2, Sig.<.001, ηp2=.46, the treatment groups F= 16.1, Sig.<.001, ηp2=.48, and the connection amid time and the experimental groups F = 18.4. Sig.<.001, ηp2=.52. These findings present proof that the participants' English language knowledge improved over time in the effect of the treatment conditions. They also highlight the fact that the two experimental conditions had different influences on students' development during a certain period of time. Concerning the written assignments, the findings of mixed between-within group ANOVA revealed chief influences for time, F= 16.8, Sig. <.001, ηp2=.49, treatment conditions, F = 18.1, Sig. <.001, ηp2=.36, as well as the contact between time and treatment conditions, F = 21.7. Sig. <.003, ηp2=.35. Referring to the first research question, the results prove that intensive or extensive vocabulary and grammar TE affect the students' L2 performance in these two language constituents.

Concerning the second research question (If yes, which experiment is more successful in L2 student improvements?), Tukey's post hoc evaluations were conducted. Table 7 illustrates the results.

Table 7

Tukey's Post Hoc Evaluations

	Oral	Written
Intensive TE vs. Extensive TE	Sig.= .003	Sig.= .001
Intensive TE vs. Control	Sig.= .001	Sig.= .001
Extensive TE vs. Control	Sig.= .14	Sig.= .98

Table 7 revealed that the intensive vocabulary and grammar TE condition in oral tasks significantly outperformed the extensive vocabulary and grammar TE condition (Sig.<.003). However, no significant difference was found between the extensive vocabulary and grammar TE condition and control conditions (Sig.=.14). In written tasks, the findings indicated the significant outperformance of the intensive vocabulary and grammar TE group over the extensive vocabulary and grammar TE group (Sig.<. .001) as well as the control group (Sig.<.001). Likewise, no statistically meaningful difference was discovered between the presentation of students in the extensive vocabulary and grammar TE group and the control condition (Sig.=.98).

Furthermore, to understand the influence of different treatment conditions, the effect sizes were sought to differentiate between groups. The effect size describes the strength of the difference among groups, or the effect of the independent variable. Cohen's D describes the difference among groups in relation to the standard deviation unit: Small 0.2; Medium 0.5; and Large 0.8 (Pallant, 2013). Table 8 demonstrates Cohen's D result of the effect size for evaluations among different conditions in the post-test.

Table 8

Summary of Effect Sizes (Cohen's D)

	Oral	Written
Intensive TE vs. Control	0.7	0.5
Intensive TE vs. Extensive TE	0.9	0.8

As Table 8 indicates, the effect size scores for the mixed language components (i.e., vocabulary and grammar) in the intensive TE condition compared to the other groups individually is medium to large.

Discussion and Conclusion

The noteworthy effects revealed for TE treatments were substantially highlighted within the theoretical disputes surrounding the role of these feedbacks in different studies (e.g., Lyster & Ranta, 2013; Goo & Mackey, 2013). They also approved their efficiency in assisting students to identify their mistakes and enhance their performance in using target structures. The ANOVA results highlighted the positive effect of the intensive vocabulary and grammar TE condition significantly over the other two groups evident in both oral and written tests. The results imply that the intensive TE presented a more noticeable and confident effect than the extensive TE.

Previous studies have presented mixed outcomes concerning the usefulness of textual enhancements (TEs), along with evidence for their usefulness (LaBrozzi, 2016; Simard, 2009). However, inconsistent results might be the result of various operational strategies and different measures that prior investigations used to evaluate TE. Moreover, the selected linguistic structures might have also influenced the results of TE, as some language forms do not possess a fundamentally outstanding part in the text. For example, articles might be viewed as non-outstanding English targets based on their low conversational usage rate. In contrast, the concept of vocabulary could be described with respect to the short length of the study (Han et al., 2008).

The impacts of textual enhancements in the present research were observed in the oral and written assignments. A combination of these two scales might encompass several knowledge types. The writing tasks might draw on explicit information, while the oral assignment might draw on implicit information. However, research findings should be observed with caution, as students might depend on a combination of the two knowledge types to different extents throughout any exam or language assignment (Ellis et al., 2009).

In this study, it was found that the intensive and direct form of positive signs was effective in improving second language (SL) learning, whereas the enhanced form might not suffice (Hwang & Huang, 2019). The focused objectives of the lesson were highlighted in the intensive groups, which seemed to have attracted students' attention positively. Learners often underline significant points of a topic while studying, and materials that have already applied this feature were found to be helpful in the present study. Additionally, internalizing these enhanced features was consolidated while reviewing or skimming the text (Hwang & Huang, 2019).

The present paper provides stability to previous findings supporting the positive influence of intensive recasts on students' learning of the lesson objectives (Hwang & Huang, 2019). Despite the short period of the study, an outstanding

improvement was revealed by combining grammar and vocabulary in an intensive TE experiment, dedicating more time in future studies can potentially reveal more convincing data (Hwang & Huang, 2019).

Future studies can evaluate the effects of other categories of feedback, such as explicit revision, metalinguistic feedback, or elicitation, on different knowledge types. By doing so, more convincing data can be obtained, which will provide a better understanding of how different teaching strategies can be used to enhance SL learning.

References

Butler, Y. G. (2002). Second language learners' theories on the use of English articles. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 24*, 451–480. doi: 10.1017/S0272263102004024

Bygate, M., Skehan, P., & Swain, M. (2001). *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing*. Longman.

Carroll, S. (2001). *Input and evidence: The raw material of second language acquisition*. John Benjamin.

Diao, Y., Zhang, L., & Li, J. (2021). Effects of intensive versus extensive textual enhancement on EFL learners' vocabulary acquisition and reading comprehension. *Language Teaching Research, 25*(2), 240-263. doi: 10.1177/1362168820964817

Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114– 138). Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language teaching and learning*. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2013). Task-based language teaching: Responding to the critics. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL, 8*, 1–27. https://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1258&context=artspapers

Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2014). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. Routledge.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning, 51*, 281–318. doi: 10.1111/0023-8333.00184

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(2), 339-368. doi: 10.1017/S0272263106060141

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., Elder, C., Erlam, R., Philp, J., & Reinders, H. (2009). *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching*. Multilingual Matters.

Goh, S. P., Lin, P. Y., & Cheong, C. W. (2021). The effects of textual enhancements on Malaysian secondary school students' reading comprehension and vocabulary acquisition. *Journal of Asia TEFL, 18*(1), 186-199. doi: 10.18823/asiatefl.2021.18.1.14.186

Goo, J., & Mackey, A. (2013). The case against the case against recasts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 35*, 127–165. doi: 10.1017/S0272263112000803

Han, Z. H. (2002). A study of the impact of recasts on tense consistency in L2 output. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4), 543–572. doi: 10.2307/3588214

Han, Z., Park, E., & Combs, C. (2008). Textual enhancement of input: Issues and possibilities. *Applied Linguistics, 29*, 597–618. doi: 10.1093/applin/amn023

Hawkes, L., & Nassaji, H. (2016). The role of extensive recasts in error detection and correction by adult ESL students. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 6*, 19–41. doi: 10.5755/j01.sal.6.2.12200

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). University of Hawaii.

Kim, M., & Kim, H. (2021). Extensive reading for improving L2 writing proficiency: Effects and attitudes. *Language Teaching Research, 25*(3), 312-335. doi: 10.1177/1362168820973753

LaBrozzi, R. M. (2016). The effects of textual enhancement type on L2 form recognition and reading comprehension in Spanish. *Language Teaching Research, 20*(1), 75-91. doi: 10.1177/1362168814559795

Lee, M., & Révész, A. (2018). Promoting grammatical development through textually enhanced captions: An eye-tracking study. *The Modern Language Journal, 102*, 557–577. doi: 10.1111/modl.12473

Lee, S. K. (2007). Effects of textual enhancement and topic familiarity on Korean EFL students' reading comprehension and learning of passive form. *Language Learning, 57*(1), 87-118. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00408.x

Lee, S. K., & Huang, H. T. (2008). Visual input enhancement and grammar learning: A meta-analytic review. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 30*(3), 307-331. doi: 10.1017/S0272263108080452

Linguapress intermediate English (n.d.). *The titanic and the temple of doom.* https://linguapress.com/intermediate/titanic-doom.htm

Long, M. H. (2000). Focus on form in task-based language teaching. In R. D. Lambert & E. Shohamy (Eds.), *Language policy and pedagogy: Essays in honor of A. Ronald Walton* (pp. 179–192). Benjamins.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (2013). Counterpoint piece: The case for variety in corrective feedback research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 35*, 167–184. doi: 10.1017/S0272263112000789

Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *Modern Language Journal, 82*, 338–356. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb01213.x

Master, P. (1997). The English article system: Acquisition, function, and pedagogy. *System, 25*, 215– 232. doi: 10.1016/S0346-251X(97)00007-4

Meguro, Y. (2019). Textual enhancement, grammar learning, reading comprehension, and tag questions. *Language Teaching Research, 23*(1), 58-77. doi: 1362168817714277

Nassaji, H. (2007). Elicitation and reformulation and their relationship with learner repair in dyadic interaction. *Language Learning, 57*, 511–548. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00422.x

Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2001). Does type of instruction make a difference? Substantive findings from a meta-analytic review. *Language Learning, 51*, 157-213. doi: 10.1111/0023-8333.00136

Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS survival manual*. Mc Graw-hill education.

Parrish, B. (1987). A new look at methodologies in the study of article acquisition for learners of ESL. *Language Learning, 37*, 361–383. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1987.tb00591.x

Perez, M., Van Den Noortgate, W., & Desmet, P. (2013). Captioned video for L2 listening and vocabulary learning: A meta-analysis. *System, 41*, 720–739. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2013.07.012

Pica, T. (1984). L1 transfer and L2 complexity as factors in syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly, 18*(4), 689-704. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586485

Rassaei, E. (2015). Effects of textual enhancement and input enrichment on L2 development. *TESOL Journal, 6*(2), 281-301. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.144

Rassaei, E. (2020). The separate and combined effects of recasts and textual enhancement as two focus on form techniques on L2 development. *System, 89*, 102-193. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102193

Reinders, H., & Ellis, R. (2009). The effects of two types of input on intake and the acquisition of implicit and explicit knowledge. In R. Ellis, S. Loewen, C. Elder, R. Erlam, J. Philp, & R. Reinders (Eds.), *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching* (pp. 282- 302). Multilingual Matters.

Sachs, R., & Suh, B. R. (2007). Textually enhanced recasts, learner awareness, and L2 outcomes in synchronous computer-mediated interaction. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A series of empirical studies* (pp. 197–227). Oxford University Press.

Samuda, V., & Bygate, M. (2008). *Tasks in second language learning*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Schmidt, R. W. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge University Press.

Shintani, N. (2012). Input-based tasks and the acquisition of vocabulary and grammar: A process-product study. *Language Teaching Research, 16*, 253–279. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811431377

Shintani, N. (2016). *Input-based tasks in foreign language instruction for young learners*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Simard, D. (2009). Differential effects of textual enhancement formats on intake. *System, 37*(1), 124-135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.09.008

Skehan, P. (1998). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 17*(1), 38-62. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/17.1.38

Terrell, T. (1991). The role of grammar instruction in a communicative approach. *Modern Language Journal, 75*, 52–63. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1991.tb05302.x

Vandergrift, L. (2007). Recent developments in second and foreign language listening comprehension research. *Language Teaching, 40*, 191–210. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004338

VanPatten, B. (2004). *Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Winke, P. (2013). The effects of input enhancement on grammar learning and comprehension: A modified replication of Lee (2007) with eye-movement data. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 35*, 323–352. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263113000014