

**Research Article**

## **COMPARING THE EFFECT OF ENHANCED VERUS UNENHANCED LEXICAL INPUT ON IRANIAN INTERMEDIATE EFL LEARNERS' VOCABULARY LEARNING**

**Ramin Rahimi<sup>1</sup> and \*Gholamhossein Shabani<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Department of English, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of English, Roudsar and Amlash Branch, Islamic Azad University, Roudsar, Iran*

*\*Author for Correspondence*

### **ABSTRACT**

The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of Enhanced and unenhanced lexical input, as two various techniques for teaching vocabulary, on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' vocabulary learning. To this end, sixty students were selected out of ninety via the administration of a Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT). They were intermediate students with the age range between 19 and 28 majoring in English language teaching. They were then divided into two equal comparison groups: Enhanced Input (EI) and Unenhanced Input (UI) groups. A pretest of vocabulary was administered to both groups. Then both groups were offered a five-session treatment. One group was taught vocabulary through enhanced lexical input, and the other group was taught vocabulary via unenhanced lexical input. After the treatment period, the same version of vocabulary test was administered to both groups as posttest to examine the effectiveness of the treatments. The results of paired-samples and independent samples t-tests indicated that both groups had vocabulary gains but the effect of enhanced lexical input on learners' vocabulary learning was more than that of the unenhanced lexical input. The implications and recommendations will also be presented.

**Keywords:** *CELT, Enhanced Lexical Input, Intermediate, Unenhanced Lexical Input*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Vocabulary is recognized as a crucial underlying construct for EFL learners both in reading and listening comprehension as two major receptive skills. Flowerdew (1994) and Rost (1994) contend that language learners need to process receptive skills input quickly and efficiently, and focus on linguistic forms and lexical meanings in order that they will be able to comprehend the input accurately. Buck (2001), Goh (2000), and Rost (2005) maintained that Individuals' vocabulary knowledge and ability are identified as two of the most powerful indications of EFL learners' skills of listening and reading comprehension. Lin and Chiu (2009), based on EFL learners' self-reports, reported that learners' lack of vocabulary in both listening and reading contexts is assumed as a critical problem in EFL efficient listening and reading comprehension, triggering their comprehension to be severely broken down. Krashen's (1981) model of Comprehensible Input Hypothesis, which proposed that language is just acquired through comprehensible input and not by the virtue of explicit instruction, was not left unopposed. Krashen believed that acquiring language just requires understanding the language. Poole and Sheorey (2002) were of the position that the EFL learners who do not undergo instruction develop wild vocabulary and produce non target-like output. As the criticism to Krashen's comprehensible input hypothesis, which negated the underlying function and role of instruction, Schmidt (1990) devised the concept of 'noticing, which was language learners' conscious awareness of vocabulary forms, and was considered as the impeding and determining condition for language acquisition to take place. Some investigators such as Dekeyser (1998), Ellis (2002), Ellis *et al.*, (2001a, 2001b), Fotos (1993), and Nassaji (2000) followed Schmit's (1990) noticing hypothesis, and through their general findings maintained that for language learning to take place, language learners need to notice the target language form in input so that they can process and acquire them. Accordingly, these SLA investigators viewed that EFL learners learn about the things that they attend to and don't learn about things that they do not attend to. Farrokhi (2007) stipulated that EFL learners are required to attend to form instead of being solely involved in communicative language use.

### **Research Article**

In this regard, the main purpose and primary focus of the present study was to find out the effect of two models (i.e., enhanced versus unenhanced lexical items) on learners' vocabulary knowledge as they encounter various contexts. These two variables and their potential interaction on each other have not been investigated thoroughly in the Iranian context yet. So the present study was going to fill this gap and shed more light on this by finding any possible effect of enhanced and unenhanced lexical input on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' vocabulary knowledge development. Therefore, the following null hypotheses were formulated in this study:

H01: Enhanced lexical input does not affect Iranian intermediate EFL Learners' vocabulary learning.

H02: Unenhanced lexical input does not affect Iranian intermediate EFL Learners' vocabulary learning.

H03: There is no significant difference in the vocabulary learning of enhanced lexical input group and unenhanced lexical input group.

### **Review of the Literature**

#### *Input Enhancement and Vocabulary Learning*

Schmidt (1993) and Sharwood-Smith (1993) pointed to growing interest in the areas of EFL and second language acquisition as to drawing learners' attention to the formal features and components of second language input, which is beneficial and necessary for optimizing L2 learners' development. The pedagogic technique which is addressed to be the idea of input enhancement which enhances input. According to Schmidt (1993) and Sharwood-Smith (1993), the idea supported by input enhancement or conscious raising is that some formal aspects of L2 input are shown more saliently, and it helps learners notice targeted forms further, and provide them with more chance for L2 intake; likewise, the subset of the formal aspects of the input data are taken into account for further language processing. Birjandi and Najafi (2015) contented that having L2 learners focus on certain aspects of target language forms enables them to pay attention to the gap existing between their present L2 knowledge and the target language they are exposed to. Swain (1993) pointed to the term 'notice the gap' which draws learners' attention to make a connection between their current knowledge of L2 language and the target language formal aspects. Schmidt (1994) proposed the idea of Noticing Hypothesis, as a reaction to Krashen's (1981) Comprehensible Input Hypothesis, stressing that for language learning to take place, learners need to notice L2 formal features they are exposed to, whether in spoken or written input. In this notion, Noticing Hypothesis, as used by Schmidt (1994), involves learners' noticing or drawing their attention to the features of the language they are encountered, and it is a necessary condition for learning L2 features and further processing of some sub-set of language.

White (1998) argued for the importance of input enhancement, showing that it influences learners' knowledge and performance in the target language. He reiterated that input enhancement helps L2 features improvement via two main ways of having learners focus their attention to particular aspects of the target language and getting them to leave their inaccurate analysis of L2 unlearned.

#### *Input Enhancement Techniques*

Two notable techniques of input enhancement in SLA literature are known as 'textual input enhancement' and 'visual input enhancement'. The former, as Wong (2005) explained, is basically manifested through some typographical cues, the most popular of which are underlining, italicizing, coloring, boldfacing, enlarging the font size, and changing the font type. These are to make particular part or parts of the incoming data more salient and noticeable to learners and draw their attention to certain aspects or forms in a text to which they are exposed. Furthermore, this technique improves L2 learners' potentials to establish form-meaning connections for the target language. Some studies have shown the merits and effectiveness of typographical input enhancement. Shook (1994), for example, reported that this technique of enhancement brought about more noticing of the enhanced data, and facilitated learning of those target features. The latter, according to Doughty and Williams (1998), is an implicit method applicable to raise L2 learners' attention to particular forms of the incoming written input. Izumi (2000) addressed 'perceptual salience' as the most popular norm of input enhancement applicable to target forms manifested by modifying the format of a text, the most known of which are capitalizing, underlining, and bolding.

### **Research Article**

Smith (1993) provided a classification of input enhancement by placing it into two types of positive and negative. Positive input enhancement, as he clarified, makes the accurate forms of the incoming input salient and noticeable, the typical sample of which is the visual input enhancement of a piece of reading text as incoming input in which particular forms are highlighted via bold, underlined, capitalized or italicized forms. Negative input enhancement is contrasted in that it makes error forms as salient. In addition, Lim (2007) pointed to increasing the visual salience of the L2 particular features which can be achieved through a combination of different formatting techniques such as bolding, capitalizing, and underlining.

#### *Empirical Studies on Input Enhancement*

The Previous studies on the effects of visual/textual input enhancement varied in their findings. Investigators such as Alanen (1995), Leow (1993), Robinson (1996), and Williams (1999) tested the effectiveness of input enhancement by getting learners to limited exposure to input enhancement. Investigators such as Doughty, (1991), Shook (1994), and Williams (1999) reported the positive findings and effects of input enhancement. The studies carried out by Alanen (1995), Robinson (1997), and White (1998) revealed just limited and impartial effects of input enhancement. Doughty (1988) and Leow (1993) did not report significant effects of input enhancement.

In a recent study, Wong's (2003) concern was to examine the relative effectiveness of typographical enhancement and simplified input on learners' effort to learn the past participle agreement in relative clauses. The findings of his study showed that text enhancement did not have a positive effect on the knowledge and acquisition of the target forms.

Birjandi and Najafi (2015) investigated the effects of three independent variables of unenhanced, enhanced, and elaborated input on EFL Learners' English phrasal verbs. Their findings of the study revealed that typographical input enhancement, as one of the independent variable, had better effect on L2 learners' ability to learn English phrasal verbs than the unenhanced input, and lexical input elaboration facilitated the learning of English phrasal verbs compared with unenhanced input.

Karbalaeei *et al.*, (2013) examined the effect of focus on form instruction on second language vocabulary and grammar learning. Through their study, they reported the positive effects of visual enhancement of forms on learning vocabulary and grammar.

Goudarzi's and Moini's (2012) study was an attempt to examine the effect of applying three different kinds of collocations on collocation learning and retention of Iranian EFL university students. In this study, the collocations were presented in highlighted (bold), non-highlighted and L1 glossed forms. The findings of this study represented that the students in L1 glossed group outperformed the students in the other two groups and participants in highlighted group outperformed non-highlighted (text only) group.

Nacis (2011) dealt with finding out the impact of enhanced input through multimedia presentation on learners' retention of collocations. The results obtained of the study revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between the enhanced and non-enhanced input in the impact on the retention of the collocations. Both groups showed gains in terms of retention of the collocations at the end of the experiment.

Lee and Lee (2012) examined the effects of three types of input enhancement techniques on the immediate and delayed vocabulary recall of young Korean EFL learners. To do this study, the investigators choose reading classes, and each of three classes was instructed based on one of the input enhancement techniques, including visual enhancement, semantic enhancement, and input flooding. The fourth class, however, was instructed using regular texts without the involvement of input enhancement. In the immediate meaning-recognition post-test, the semantic enhancement group outperformed the visual input enhancement and control groups, whereas in the form-recognition post-test the input flooding and visual input groups significantly outperformed the semantic input group. Likewise, in the delayed meaning-recognition post-test, there were no significant differences between the groups. These particular patterns were consistent regardless of varying language levels of the learners.

Karbalaeei *et al.*, (2013) designed a study which aimed to examine the effect of one independent variable on two dependent variables. They investigated the effect of focus on form instruction on vocabulary

## **Research Article**

learning using visually enhanced reading texts. Sixty four Intermediate EFL learners were assigned into two experimental groups – a vocabulary and grammar group. The findings of this indicated the positive effects of visual enhancement of forms on learning vocabulary and grammar. This research showed the effectiveness of visual input enhancement as a technique for vocabulary and grammar learning.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### **Methodology**

#### *Participants*

The participants in this study were 60 intermediate EFL university students, majoring in English Teaching at the Islamic Azad University of Tonekabon, Iran. They were both male and female. Twenty of them were male and forty were female with an age range of 19 to 28 years old. All the participants' first language was Persian. In order to obtain a homogenized group, the participants were given the Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT). The CELT test was given to ninety students out of whom sixty were selected based on the results of the test. Those students whose scores were one standard deviation above and below the mean (i.e.,  $\text{mean} \pm 1$ ) were selected as participants of this study. Then, they were randomly assigned into two equal comparison groups, including Enhanced Input (EI) and Unenhanced Input (UI) groups.

#### *Materials and Instruments*

The materials and instruments applied in this study were of four types as follows:

##### *3.2.1. The Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT)*

In order to keep the homogeneity of the participants under study, a multiple-choice-item CELT was administered to 90 students. Based on the CELT results, the participants whose score range was one standard deviation above and below the mean (i.e.,  $\text{mean} \pm 1$ ) were assigned for the sake of this study to serve the purpose of the researcher.

*3.2.2. Vocabulary pretest and posttest:* The pretest given to the participants was a vocabulary test that comprised twenty multiple-choice items (recognition type). The vocabulary test was determined and constructed based on the original vocabulary book titled "504 Absolutely Essential Words, Fifth Edition" (Bromberg *et al.*, 2013). It was a course-book on morphology that the students in the university had already passed during their course of study. The same version of vocabulary multiple-choice-item test was administered as posttest to the both groups. In the posttest, some items of the test were rearranged.

*3.2.3. Pilot study:* The test constructed as the pretest and posttest of this study underwent a pilot study. To this end, a 40-multiple-choice-item vocabulary test which was constructed from "504 Absolutely Essential Words, Fifth Edition" (Bromberg *et al.*, 2013) was given to 40 subjects with similar characteristics as those of the target groups. Based on the psychometric characteristics of the items (item facility, item discrimination, and choice distribution), the poor items were discarded from the final version, and a 20-multiple-choice-item vocabulary test was determined for the pre-test and post-test.

*3.2.4. The material for the treatment:* The material selected in the treatment for both groups included eight reading passages, each of which was within 190 to 210 word limit. The readability of the selected passages was determined based on Fog's readability formula, and finally, eight passages which had almost the same readability indices (about 19.80) and were of the average same length-210 words- were chosen to be used for reading materials. The passages did not need culture-specific or discipline-specific background knowledge. They were authentic passages and extracted from language teaching materials designed for intermediate EFL learners. 14 to 16 new words and expressions of each reading passage were enhanced through the medium of typographical features (underlining, italicizing, coloring, boldfacing, enlarging the font size, and changing the font type) as treatment material for the Enhanced Input group (experimental group). The same text was given to the Unenhanced Input group (Comparison group) without enhancing the new words and expressions.

#### *Procedure*

In order to keep the homogeneity of the participants in this study, the multiple-choice CELT test was administered to 90 subjects, out of whom 60 were selected as the target group participants. After the



**Research Article**

administration of the CELT test, and pretest in both groups, the participants were offered their treatments (enhanced lexical input in one group and unenhanced lexical input in the other group) for the same period of time through the same material and based on the same methodology. To serve the purpose of this study, the treatment material selected, comprised five authentic reading passages, each of which was within 190- 200 word limit and taught during one session. In general, the five reading passages were taught during five sessions of treatment. The participants of the two groups were supposed to work on the material based on the instructions given to them.

The participants in the two groups separately underwent five sessions of instruction. They were all given the same reading passages. Both the experimental groups and the control group were taught by the same person using different instructional ways constructed for each group. As for the participants in **EI** group, the new lexical items, as new incoming input, in the reading passages were made salient and enhanced through three different typographical cues of bolding, capitalizing, and underlying. The participants of this group were supposed to learn and clarify the meaning of the new words, enhanced in each reading passage, through definition, synonym, antonym, and exemplification, supplemented merely through the medium of monolingual dictionary wherever necessary. Then each reading passage, into which new words were enhanced, was followed by vocabulary exercises, according to which the participants were asked to work on during each session.

The UI group was instructed the same material but through different instructional way. The participants in this group passed the same period of instruction like the EI group. To meet the requirements of this group, the participants of this group were offered the same reading passages. The new words and expressions of the reading passages were presented to the without textual/visual enhancement. In other words, the new words and expressions inserted in these reading texts were lacking in textual or visual salience. Like the EI group, the participants were asked to refer to a monolingual dictionary to extract, practice and learn the meaning of the new words and expressions they were introduced during each session. Furthermore, they were supposed to practice and learn the meaning of the words by providing antonym or synonym for the words, as required. The participants of this group were given a sample vocabulary exercise to work on at the end of each treatment session. After the fulfillment of treatment for the both groups within five sessions, they were given the post-test, which was the same version of test on vocabulary administered as pretest, with a rearrangement of some items in the posttest.

*Design*

All requirements of a quasi-experimental study, including pretest, posttest, randomization, treatment for the experimental group and placebo for the control group were met in this study. The independent variables of the study were enhanced lexical input and unenhanced lexical input, and the dependent variable was vocabulary learning.

*Data Analysis*

The collected data were entered into the SPSS 16.0 for further analysis. Two Paired- Samples t-tests and an Independent-Samples t-test were used to test the null hypotheses of the study and the alpha level for significance testing was set at .05.

**Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of the Paired-Samples t-test for the Experimental Group (EI Group)**

		<b>Mean</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Std. Error Mean</b>
Pair 1	PreEX	12.00	30	3.99	.72
	posEX	15.35	30	2.48	.45

*Results*

The description of the statistical analyses pertaining to the test and the null hypotheses of this research were represented as follows:

*First Null Hypothesis*

The first null hypothesis of this study proposed that Enhanced lexical input does not affect Iranian intermediate EFL Learners’ vocabulary learning.

**Research Article**

To examine this hypothesis, a Paired-Samples t-test was conducted. The descriptive statistics are represented in Table 1.

Table 1 shows that the posttest means score (15.35) of the EI group was more than the pretest mean score (12.00). The standard deviation for the posttest was less than the pretest. This may give an image of less variability among EI group's posttest scores compared to the pretest scores.

In order to find out whether there was a significant difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores of the EI group, the results of Paired-Samples t-test are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Paired Differences (EI group)**

		Paired Differences			t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean			
Pair 1	PreEX - posEX	3.35	1.76	.32	10.41	29	.000

As illustrated in Table 2, there is a significant difference,  $t(29)=10.41$ ,  $p= .000$ ), between the pretest-posttest mean scores of the EI group. Therefore, the first null hypothesis of the study is rejected.

*Second Null Hypothesis*

The second hypothesis of the study proposed that unenhanced lexical input does not affect Iranian intermediate EFL Learners' vocabulary learning. To investigate this hypothesis, a Paired-Samples t-test was run for the UI group.

**Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Paired-Samples t-test for the Comparison Group (BD Group)**

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	PreCON	12.03	30	3.97	.72
	PostCON	13.20	30	2.80	.51

As the results in Table 3 show, the mean score of UI Group in pretest was 12.03 but in the posttest was 13.20. So the participants' vocabulary learning after treatment was notable and something to be taken into consideration. This clue indicated the rejection of the second null hypothesis. Furthermore, standard deviation (Std. Deviation) for the posttest in this group was less than that of the pretest. This may be indicative of less variability among UI group's posttest scores than that of the pretest. Furthermore, the Table 4 provides further clue concerning the rejection of the second null hypothesis.

**Table 4: Paired –Samples t-test for the UI Group**

		Paired Differences			t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean			
Pair 1	PreCON - PostCON	1.16	1.62	.29	3.94	29	.000

According to Table 4, there is a significant difference,  $t(29)= 3.94$ ,  $p= .001$ ), between the pretest-posttest mean scores of the UI Group. Therefore, the second null hypothesis of the study, which proposed that unenhanced lexical input do not affect Iranian intermediate EFL learners' vocabulary learning, is rejected. Therefore, the second hypothesis is rejected.

*Third Null Hypothesis*

The third null hypothesis constructed for this study expressed that there was no significant difference in the vocabulary learning of enhanced lexical input group and unenhanced lexical input group. To examine

**Research Article**

this hypothesis, an Independent-Samples t-test was run. The descriptive statistics of the results are represented in Table 5.

**Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for the EI and UI Groups in the Posttest**

nInput enhancement		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Vocabulary	Enhanced Input	30	15.35	2.48	.45
	Unenhanced Input	30	13.20	2.80	.51

According to Table 5, the mean of the EI Group in the posttest was 15.35, and that of the UI Group was 13.20. The results indicated that the EI Group outperformed the UI Group. Therefore, it was concluded that the using enhanced lexical input as an independent variable in this study was more effective than that of unenhanced lexical input as the second independent variable. In addition, the standard deviation value for the MD group, according to the table, is less than the other group, meaning that there was less variability in the scores of the EI's participants compared with those of the UI group's participants. However, so as to determine whether there was a significant difference between the two groups' mean scores in the posttest, the results of the Independent-Samples t-test are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6: Independent-Samples t-test for the EI and UI Groups in the Posttest**

		t-test for Equality of Means			95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Lower	Upper
Vocabulary	Equal variances assumed	3.13	58	.003	.77	3.52
	Equal variances not assumed	3.13	57.16	.003	.77	3.52

Table 6 demonstrates that there is a significant difference,  $t(58) = 3.13, p = .003$ , between the EI and UI groups. Therefore, the third null hypothesis of the study was rejected.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Discussion**

This study aimed at examining the effect of enhanced lexical input and unenhanced lexical input as two vocabulary learning techniques in EFL contexts on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' vocabulary learning. The results of this study indicated that the enhanced lexical input and unenhanced lexical input were both effective on EFL Learners' vocabulary learning, but the application of enhanced lexical input had a significant effect on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' vocabulary learning compared to the application of unenhanced lexical input. It appeared that the presentation of enhanced exercises to the participants led to their overall improvement in vocabulary. It was, therefore, showed that learners' vocabulary learning effort and task can be facilitated as they get involved or come to encounter texts in which new lexical input are enhanced through either textual or visually-based enhancement practice because the technique of enhancement of vocabulary fostered their learning activity.

The results of this study indicated that the students in the enhanced targeted words group noticed the targeted vocabulary and showed significant gains in vocabulary. In this regard, the findings of the study accord with Schmidt (1994) and Al-Hejin (2004), who emphasized that only input that is noticed becomes intake.

### **Research Article**

Lee and Lee (2012) argued for the supportive role of both visual input enhancement and input flooding techniques and semantic input enhancement in that they maintained that these two categories of techniques facilitate the recall of the form of target words, and the recognition of target word meaning, respectively. They reported that teachers can enhance instructional reading materials textually in such a way that they can be compatible with the specific aims of learners' vocabulary learning. According to these researchers, effectively acquiring the form and meaning of words will require a method which can supply learners with visually enhanced texts for reading, along with activities and practices that demand semantic mapping.

The findings of this study are compatible with what was obtained by Birjandi and Najafi (2015) in the study carried out through the participation of EFL learners. They examined the effects of three independent variables of unenhanced, enhanced, and elaborated input on EFL Learners' English phrasal verbs, and, through the experiment, they indicated that typographically enhanced input enhancement, as one of the independent variable, was more effective effect on L2 learners' ability to learn English phrasal verbs than the unenhanced input. By the same token, they concluded that lexical input elaboration facilitated the learning of English phrasal verbs compared with unenhanced input material.

Karbalaei *et al.*, (2013) examined the effect of focus on form instruction on second language vocabulary and grammar learning. Through their study, they reported the positive effects of visual enhancement of forms on learning vocabulary and grammar.

The results of the study are also in accordance with what has already been achieved by Karbalaei *et al.*, (2013), who examined the effect of visual enhancement on second language vocabulary and grammar learning. Based on what they obtained, they reported the positive effects of visual enhancement of forms on learning vocabulary and grammar.

The findings of this study appear to be in line with Lee's and Lee (2012) experiment, via which they investigated the effects of three types of input enhancement techniques, including visual enhancement, semantic enhancement, and input flooding on the immediate and delayed vocabulary recall of young Korean EFL learners. The investigators reported the positive effects of the three types of enhancement on L2 target features learning, at the immediate meaning-recognition level, the semantic enhancement group outperformed the visual input enhancement and other groups; at the form-recognition stage, however, the input flooding and visual input groups outperformed the semantic input group.

The findings of this study do not seem to be in line with what Nacis's (2011) concluded through the findings of his investigation. He investigated the effectiveness of enhanced input versus non-enhanced input through multimedia presentation on learners' retention of collocations. The results revealed no statistically significant difference between the enhanced and non-enhanced input in respect with their impact on the retention of the collocations because the two groups represented gains in the retention of the collocations. Therefore, the findings of this study, being in line with those of some other studies mentioned above, can supply a good justification for placing more emphasis on applying enhanced input more frequently than unenhanced input in EFL vocabulary learning classes. According to the findings of this study, benefiting from enhanced input, as the conventional technique of instructing vocabulary in both first and second language learning, can be more effective than unenhanced input technique in learning vocabulary in EFL classes.

### **Conclusion**

The findings of this study revealed that enhanced lexical input was more effective than unenhanced lexical input, as an educational technique, in Iranian EFL classes and vocabulary learning contexts. Being integrated into reading passages, which involve lexical input enhancement, leads to improved learning of vocabulary. This technique culminates in learners' better performance in vocabulary learning, and can attribute to the fact that input enhancement provides eye-catching contexts in which targeted vocabulary learning is more facilitated than when the targeted words are represented with no enhancement. Providing second/ foreign learners with a list of enhanced words represented evenly all across reading texts helps them make practical word map in their mind, culminating in long retention of information about a word in their mind.



### Research Article

The findings of the current study will be helpful to English teachers and language learners in EFL classes. Teachers can assist EFL learners to maximize and enrich their knowledge of lexical competence by exposing them to texts given with enhanced input manifestation, the advantage of which is creating a facilitating mode of vocabulary learning strategy for intermediate learners. Instructors need to deliberately supply tasks in which learners will be able to learn and review newly offered words in meaningful and effective settings. EFL learners, as the consumers of language, can benefit from this method of language instruction in that it can optimize their efficiency and durability of vocabulary learning, and improve their effectiveness of new information gains.

This study was applied and addressed to Iranian intermediate EFL learners. It is suggested that the future studies of similar nature address other proficiency levels of the EFL learners such as high school students or junior high school learners. In this study, the effectiveness of enhanced versus unenhanced lexical input were tested on EFL learners' vocabulary learning. The future experiments can address the effectiveness of these techniques on sub-types of EFL vocabulary learning, in particular, phrasal verbs, two-word verbs, active, and passive verbs.

### REFERENCES

- Al-hejin B (2005).** Attention and Awareness: Evidence from Cognitive and Second Language Acquisition Research. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics* 4(1) 2004.
- Birjandi P, Alavi SM and Najafi Karimi S (2015).** Effects of unenhanced, enhanced, and elaborated input on learning English phrasal verbs. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning* 4(1) 43-59.
- Bromberg M, Liebb J and Traiger A (2013).** *504 Absolutely Essential Words*, fifth edition (Tehran: Zaban Mehr).
- Buck G (2001).** *Assessing Listening* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Chang ACS and Read J (2006).** The effects of listening support on the listening performance of EFL learners. *TESOL Quarterly* 40(2) 375–397.
- Dekeyser R (1998).** *Beyond Focus on Form: Cognitive Perspectives on Learning and Practicing Second Language Grammar*. In: *Focus on Form in Classroom L2 Acquisition*, edited by Doughty C and Williams J (New York: Cambridge).
- Ellis R (2002).** Does form-focused instruction affect the acquisition of implicit knowledge? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24 223-236.
- Ellis R, Basturkmen H and Loewen Sh (2001a).** Learner Uptake in Communicative ESL Lessons. *Language Learning* 51(2) 281-318.
- Ellis R, Basturkmen H and Loewen Sh (2001b).** Preemptive focus on Form in the ESL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly* 35(3) 407-432.
- Farrokhi F (2005).** A practical step towards combining focus on form and focus on meaning. *Journal of Faculty of Letters and Humanities* 49(198) 99-148.
- Farrokhi F (2007).** Teacher's stated beliefs about corrective feedback in relation to their practices in EFL classes. Research on Foreign Languages. *Journal of Faculty of Letters and Humanities* 49(200) 91-131.
- Flowerdew J (1994).** Research of relevance to second language lecture comprehension: An overview. In: *Academic Listening: Research Perspectives*, edited by Flowerdew J (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 7–29.
- Fotos S (1993).** Consciousness raising and noticing through focus on form: Grammar task performance versus formal instruction. *Applied Linguistics* 14(4) 385-407.
- Goh CCM (2000).** A cognitive perspective on language learners' listening comprehension problems. *System* 28 55–57.
- Izumi S (2000).** *Promoting noticing and SLA: An empirical study of the effects of output and input enhancement on ESL relativization*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University, Washington DC.

**Research Article**

**Karbalaei A, Pourzargham A and Kazemi M (2013).**The impact of focus on form instruction on second language vocabulary and grammar learning. *Journal of Advances in English Language Teaching* **1**(1) 31-38.

**Krashen S (1981).** *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

**Lee Y and Lee H (2012).** Effects of input enhancement techniques on word learning of Korean elementary learners. *Primary English Education* **18**(3) 381-398.

**Lim J (2007).** Input Enhancement in the EFL Learning of Present Perfect and the Lexical Aspect. *Modern English Education* **8**(3) 38-60.

**Lin MC and Chiu T (2009).** The Impact of an Online Explicit Lexical Program on EFL Vocabulary Gains and Listening Comprehension. *Jalt Call Journal* **5**(2) 3-14.

**Nassaji H (2000).** Toward Integrating Form-Focused Instruction and Communicative Interaction in the Second Language Classroom: Some Pedagogical Possibilities. *The Modern Language Journal* **84**(2) 250-241.

**Poole AB and Sheorey R (2002).** Sophisticated noticing: Examination of an Indian professional's use of English. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics* **28**(2) 121- 136.

**Rost M (1994).** On-line summaries as representations of lecture understanding. In: *Academic Listening: Research Perspectives*, edited by Flowerdew J (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 93–129.

**Rost M (2005).** L2 listening. In: *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, edited by Hinkel E (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum) 503–528.

**Schmidt R (1994).** Deconstructing consciousness in search for useful definitions for applied linguistics. *AILA Review* **11** 11-26.

**Schmidt RW (1990).** The role of consciousness in second learning. *Applied Linguistics* **11**(2) 129-158.

**Schmitt N (1998).** Measuring Collocation knowledge: key issues and experimental assessment procedure 27-47.

**Sharwood Smith M (1993).** Input enhancement in instructed SLA: Theoretical bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* **15** 165-179.

**Swain M (1993).** The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing are not enough. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* **50**(2) 158-164.

**White J (1998).** Getting the learners' attention: A typographical enhanced study. In: *Focus-on- form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Doughty C and Williams J (New York: Cambridge University Press).

**Wong W (2005).** *Input Enhancement: From Theory and Research to the Classroom* (Boston: McGraw-Hill).