The Influence of Input Enhancement and Input Flooding on Writing Performance Among Jordanian EFL Learners

Fatima Rasheed Al-Qeyam

Assistant Professor, English Language and Literature Department, Faculty of Arts

Isra University, Jordan

E-mail: fatima.al-qeyam@iu.edu.jo

Abstract

This research investigates the potential efficacy of input enhancement and input flooding as form-focused instruction (FFI) techniques in enhancing the acquisition of conjunctions by Jordanian English as a foreign language (EFL) learners and improving their writing performance. Seventy-two university students of English language literature and translation participated in the study. The participants were divided randomly into three groups, a control group of (24) which received traditional teaching of paragraph writing and conjunctions; and two experimental groups; the first experimental group of (24) which received instruction on conjunction using *input enhancement* (IE group), while the second experimental group of (24) received instruction on conjunctions using *input flooding* (IF group). Descriptive statistics, Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA), and Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) were used to analyze the data. The findings demonstrated that IE and IF enhanced students' writing abilities and positively impacted their learning of conjunctions, with a greater effect on IE due to the explicit instruction it involved. Thus, language instructors, curriculum designers, and researchers can utilize the pedagogical implications and recommendations from the current study.

Keywords: Form-focused instruction, Input enhancement (IE), Input flooding (IF), Conjunctions, Writing skills

1. Introduction and Background

Coherence and cohesion play significant roles in writing and are considered essential components in academic writing. Coherence refers to the logical and smooth flow of ideas

within a text, affecting readers' comprehension and interpretation of the written text (Witte and Faigley, 1981). Cohesion requires using lexical and grammatical tools to connect sentences and paragraphs (Halliday and Hasan, 1976. Nevertheless, achieving coherence and cohesion in writing presents a significant challenge for language learners. Thus, students and learners should employ, with the help of their teachers or instructors, certain strategies to enhance these aspects of written discourse and achieve good mastery of writing skills.

Although coherence and cohesion are different concepts, they are closely related and work together to form a well-structured and understandable text. Coherence and cohesion ensure the logical flow and connection of ideas within a text. A highly cohesive text may lack coherence if the ideas are not logically arranged. On the other hand, a coherent text may lack cohesion if it does not contain the appropriate cohesive devices to join sentences and paragraphs (McNamara et al., 1996). Teaching coherence and cohesion in writing instruction is very important due to the significance of these concepts in producing effective writing texts. As a result, students can produce logically organized and linguistically connected texts (Crossley et al., 2016).

Language learners, particularly learners of English as a foreign language (EFL), face many challenges in using cohesive devices in their writing, leading to redundancy or confusion in writing (Altenberg & Tapper, 1998). These challenges result from the differences in rhetorical and linguistic conventions between their mother language and English (Liu & Braine, 2005). Moreover, the incorrect use of cohesive devices results in an illogical flow of ideas (Conner & Johns, 1990). Therefore, the need to involve cohesive devices in teaching writing has evolved. Many strategies and techniques were proposed for teaching cohesive devices in the EFL classroom that help students maintain well-organized, coherent, and understandable texts (Oshema & Hogue, 2007; Wang, 2007).

Form-focused instruction (FFI) plays a vital role in developing language learning. Explicit instruction (such as input enhancement) is one of the most effective methods of teaching cohesive devices because it offers direct and effective teaching. In explicit instruction, teachers make students notice and retain linguistic features (Ellis, 2011). Teachers explain and illustrate the use of cohesive devices and their functions, giving students exercises and feedback (Brown, 2001; Norris & Ortega, 2001; Wang, 2007).

Input enhancement is one of the FFI techniques used to draw the students' attention to certain linguistic features. It is built on Schmidt's (1990) noticing hypothesis. Schmidt also argued that students should first notice the linguistic forms in the input. This will raise their conscious learning and make learning and retention of the forms more effective. Input enhancement makes non-salient forms noticeable in the input because it involves alerting the appearance of the linguistic features under focus in written texts by techniques such as bolding, underlining, italicizing, or coloring (Doughty & Williams, 1998).

Input enhancement also stems from Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis, which indicates the importance of providing students with comprehensible input in language acquisition. Krashen stated that successful language learning requires students to receive comprehensible input a little above their current level. Rutherford and Smith (1985) argued that the input students

receive, especially on grammatical structures, should be consciousness-raising, which refers to drawing the language learners' attention to formal aspects of the target language. This can be executed in several ways, such as highlighting the grammatical patterns in the text and asking students to pay attention to them, or exposing students to a large number of examples of particular structures under the assumption that exposure will attract students' attention to the target structure, which, as a result, fosters language learning.

IE can take various forms depending on the goal it is used for. Visual Input Enhancement (VIE) involves drawing learners' attention to the target forms by employing bolding, underlining, italicizing, or coloring (Doughty & Williams, 1998). Textual Input Enhancement (TIE) includes textual clues such as repetitions of the forms under focus or adding glosses and annotations to enhance the comprehensibility of the input (White, 1998). Auditory Input Enhancement (AIE) involves an emphasis on certain forms during spoken input. This helps learners focus on phonological aspects of the language.

Input flooding (IF) is another FFI technique that exposes students to a high frequency of specific linguistic features within the input they receive. IF is grounded on Krashen's Input Hypothesis and Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis. These hypotheses assume that high exposure to comprehensible input increases students' conscious noticing and acquisition of the forms under focus.

IF can be implemented in various ways in the EFL classroom. Lexical Flooding involves repeated exposure to vocabulary items within reading or listening classes (Ellis, 2002). Grammatical Flooding requires exposing students to certain grammatical structures in the input (Trahey & White, 1993). Phonological Flooding focuses on frequent exposure to phonological features to train students to pronounce specific sounds (Ellis & He, 1999).

IF has proved its effectiveness in facilitating language learning. Trahey and White (1993) found that IF is highly effective in learning English adverb placement structures. Hernan ández (2008) stressed IF's effectiveness on EFL learners' acquisition of vocabulary items in reading lessons. Many factors affected the role of IF in language learning, such as learners' proficiency level, the complexity of the target structure, and the mood of the input. Ellis & He (1999) observed that IF is more effective for intermediate and advanced learners rather than beginners.

However, combining IF with other FFI techniques elevates its value in language learning. Ellis (2002) stressed using IF with explicit instruction, which enhances learners' understanding and retention of the targeted forms. Willis and Willis (2007) suggested using IF with Task-Based learning (TBL). Exposing language learners to frequent occurrences of the form accompanied by authentic communication tasks allows learners to encounter the target forms while focusing on different language learning tasks.

2. Problem, Purpose, and Questions of the Study

Jordanian EFL students at all educational levels face many difficulties in mastering English (Al-Ghazo & Taamneh, 2018; Al-Qeyam et al.,2016; Al-Qeyam et al., 2024; Bataineh et al., 2017; Ta'amneh, 2013; Ta'amneh & Al-Ghazo, 2018). Writing is widely recognized as one of

the most challenging skills for EFL students (Brown,2001; Hyland, 2003). Learning cohesive devices also constitutes another challenge for EFL students because of the lack of sufficient instruction (Dastjerdi & Samian, 2011; Lestari et al., 2023). Furthermore, the researcher noticed from her experience in teaching writing to Jordanian EFL students that students struggle with writing coherent texts due to their ignorance of cohesive devices and their inadequate knowledge of their usage. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, FFI techniques are rarely used in the Jordanian context, despite their global use in language teaching.

Thus, the current study seeks to investigate the potential effectiveness of two FFI techniques, namely IE and IF, on developing Jordanian EFL university students' writing skills. Besides, it attempts to explore which one of the used techniques contributes to the better acquisition of conjunctions and the development of writing skills. The current study attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. Does input enhancement affect students' acquisition of conjunctions and writing skills?

2. Does input flooding affect students' acquisition of conjunctions and writing skills?

3. Which FFI technique has the greatest effect on students' acquisition of conjunctions and writing skills?

3. Significance of the Study

The significance of this study stems from the importance of teaching conjunctions in the language classroom. Jordanian EFL students must learn about conjunctions to help them improve their writing performance. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, this study is most likely to be one of the first studies to explore the effect of IE and IF in the Jordanian context. The conclusions and pedagogical implications of this study may provide new ways for language teachers to use in their classrooms to improve students' writing performance. Furthermore, it provides researchers with insights for further research in the field of teaching English as a foreign language. Further research may explore new FFI techniques with new students at different educational levels, since the current study is limited in scope and sample to using IE and IF for a convenient sample of 72 students from a university writing course. The study is also limited to teaching conjunctions; thus, further research may examine different linguistic features and other language skills.

4. Previous Studies

A plethora of empirical studies investigated the importance of teaching cohesive devices to EFL students and the effectiveness of IE and IF in language learning. Rashtchi and Etebari (2018) studied the difference between IE and IF in developing Iranian EFL students' passive voice. The researchers compared the results of the students who received instruction using IF and IE. The findings of the study indicated that both techniques significantly affected students' learning of passive voice. They also found that the two techniques closely affect the target form.

Kasgari (2018) compared the effects of IF and input elaboration on developing Iranian EFL intermediate learners' non-congruent collocations. The results revealed that the two techniques positively affected students' acquisition of non-congruent collocations.

Ramadan (2019) explored the impact of teaching cohesive devices within a contextual framework on improving the writing skills of Libyan EFL students. The study compared the effectiveness of teaching cohesive devices in context versus teaching them in isolation. The findings revealed that students' writing improved significantly, particularly when cohesive devices were taught in context.

Safdari (2019) conducted a study to examine the effect of IE and IF in teaching present simple and continuous tenses on developing students' writing performance. The study also investigated students' perceptions of the efficacy of using these techniques in improving writing. The results showed that the two techniques had significant effects on developing students' writing performance. Besides, students held positive views about using these techniques in the learning process.

Namaziandost et al. (2020) investigated the effect of visual input enhancement, semantic input enhancement, and input flooding on developing EFL learners' vocabulary. The results revealed the significant effects of the three techniques on improving students' comprehension and production of English vocabulary.

Behbahani and Khademi, A. (2022) studied the effect of IF, VIE, and consciousness-raising tasks on noticing and intake of the present perfect tense in EFL learners. The results showed that these techniques positively affected students' acquisition of the form under focus.

Majeed (2022) sought to investigate the effectiveness of IE in developing Iraqi EFL university students' learning of collocations. The results emphasized the effectiveness of using IE in improving students' acquisition of collocations.

Celik (2023) studied the effect of input flooding and input enhancement on teaching collocations to Iraqi university students attending an intensive language learning program. The results showed that IE and IF positively affected the students' writing performance. Moreover, the results indicate that IF is more effective than IE in developing students' writing.

Lestari et al. (2023) explored students' difficulties when using cohesive devices in their writing. The study involved twenty basic-level learners. The analysis of their written work revealed that the participants seldom used conjunctions, primarily due to their lack of understanding of how to use them correctly.

Al Qeyam et al. (2024) investigated the effect of input enhancement on Jordanian EFL students' development of writing skills. The study showed the great effect of teaching cohesive devices to EFL students on improving their writing skills.

Rezaee and Askari (2024) investigated the effect of auditory IE instruction on developing Iranian EFL students' speaking ability. Students who received instruction using auditory input enhancement significantly outperformed those taught conventionally.

The studies presented above on teaching cohesive devices and the effectiveness of input enhancement (IE) and input flooding (IF) in language teaching and learning have several similarities and differences. Some of the studies (e.g., Rashtchi and Etebari, 2018; Kasgari, 2018; Ramadan, 2019; Al Qeyam et al., 2024) present the significant impact of IE and IF on language acquisition and learning in many different aspects, such as their positive effect in improving the passive voice, non-congruent collocations, or cohesive devices in writing.

However, they differ in their focus areas; for example, Ramadan (2019) emphasizes the contextual teaching of cohesive devices, showing their particular effectiveness in writing, while Rashtchi and Etebari (2018) focus on grammar development, specifically the passive voice. Moreover, Namaziandost et al. (2020) expand on the range of IE and IF by including visual and semantic input enhancement for vocabulary acquisition.

Other studies, such as Celik (2023), compare the effectiveness of IF and IE, revealing that IF may be more effective than IE in developing students' writing. On the other hand, Lestari et al. (2023) concentrate on the difficulties students face with cohesive devices, pointing out that a lack of understanding impedes their usage, providing a contrast to the generally positive outcomes of IE and IF.

The above review of empirical research revealed the importance of teaching cohesive devices in the EFL classroom. This importance stems from the great role cohesive devices play in the understandability of the written text. Besides, the studies highlighted the great effectiveness of IE and IF in improving the acquisition of various linguistic features.

5. Methods and Procedures

5.1 Design and Sampling

The study adopts a quasi-experimental design. Three intact writing classes were conveniently chosen at Isra University in Jordan to participate in the study in the first semester of the academic year 2024/2025. The participants were randomly assigned to three groups: one control group of 24 and two experimental groups, with 24 participants in the IE group and 24 in the IF group.

5.2 Instrumentation and Data Collection

For data collection, two pre-posttests were designed by the researcher. The first is the Acquisition of Conjunctions Test, which includes 41 items to measure students' acquisition of the target conjunctions (for, and, nor, but, or, yet, and so).   The other one is the Writing Test, which requires students to write paragraphs about various topics. The validity of the tests was ensured by asking a jury of university professors of linguistics, applied linguistics, and TEFL to evaluate the tests for their appropriateness to the purpose of the study. All the comments and modifications were taken into consideration to improve the tests.

The reliability of the instruments was controlled as well. The pre-posttests were given twice, with a three-week interval, to 20 students from a previous semester's paragraph writing course. The reliability coefficient of the Acquisition of Conjunctions Test was 0.86. And for the Writing Test, it was 0.93, which was assessed through inter-rater consistency.

5.3 Instructing the Study Groups

Three intact paragraph writing classes were chosen to participate in the study. Two classes were assigned to be experimental groups, and one as the control group. The first experimental group (IE group) received modified instruction built on the coursebook but with extra exercises that use IE. IE instruction contained highlighting, italicizing, and bolding of the conjunctions under focus. The second experimental group (IF group) received instruction that supported the original material with input that included intensive occurrences of the targeted conjunction. On the other hand, the control group was taught conventionally per the guidelines of the course book "Effective Academic Writing 1" (Savage & Shafiei, 2007). The course book provides students with the fundamentals of paragraph writing with some rhetorical and grammar focus, yet it does not adequately illustrate cohesive devices.

Initially, the pre-tests were given to students to identify any potential differences among them. An independent sample t-test was conducted to ensure equivalence among the three groups. based on Levene's Test of Variance results as shown in Table 1:

Table 1. Independent Sample Test for the Acquisition of Conjunctions Test

Pre test		Levene's Test of Equality of Variance		t-test of Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)
Control & IE Group	Equal variance assumed	0.39	0.54	0.75	46	0.46
	Equal variance not assumed			0.75	45.2	0.46
Control & IF Group	Equal variance assumed	3.75	0.06	1.21	46	0.23
	Equal variance not assumed			1.21	41.4	0.23
IE Group & IF Group	Equal variance assumed	2.10	0.15	0.43	46	0.67
	Equal variance not assumed			0.43	44.1	0.67

It seems from Table 2 that the value of (sig) of Levene's Test Equality of Variance is greater than (α=0.05), so the first row of data will be attributed. The table shows the values of the Sig-2-tailed for the groups: (0.46, 0.23, and 0.67). These values are greater than 0.05, so there

is equality between the groups: control and IE Group, control and IF Group, and IE Group and IF Group. The researcher taught the experimental groups, while another instructor taught the control group. Both instructors hold Ph.D. degrees in TEFL and have similar teaching experiences.

To instruct the control group, the following steps were followed:

1. The lesson started with a warm-up exercise. In this exercise, students were shown a picture and asked to discuss what they saw and reflect on their expectations about the lesson topic.

2. A sample paragraph was introduced to students; they read it aloud and discussed its questions.

3. The instructor explained the structure of the paragraph, highlighting the topic sentence, the supporting sentences, and the concluding sentence.

4. The instructor highlighted the language focus and rhetorical focus for each type of paragraph, showcasing specific linguistic features that assist students in enhancing their writing skills.

5. The students answered the exercises concerning the language and rhetorical focus individually or in pairs.

6. After each unit, the instructor asked the students to write a paragraph about the type discussed, providing them with feedback.

The IE group was taught using instructional material that was designed by the researcher to support the original material with extra exercises using IE to teach students the targeted conjunctions. The instructions in this group followed the following steps:

1. The lesson started with a warm-up exercise. In this exercise, students were shown a picture and asked to discuss what they saw and reflect on their expectations about the lesson topic.

2. A sample paragraph was introduced to students, and they read it aloud and discussed its questions.

3. The instructor explained the structure of the paragraph highlighting the topic sentence, the supporting sentences, and the concluding sentence.

4. The instructor highlighted the language focus and rhetorical focus for each type of paragraph, showcasing specific linguistic features that assist students in enhancing their writing skill.

5. In each lesson, a conjunction and its usage were emphasized and explained. Examples included sentences with conjunctions that were highlighted for students using italics, bolding, enlargement, and underlining. This was done to draw the learners' attention to the conjunction in focus. The aim was to help students recognize each conjunction and understand its meaning through IE tasks (White, 1998).

6. Next, a paragraph containing the targeted conjunctions was presented using the IF technique to capture the participants' attention toward the conjunctions (Long & Robinson, 1998).

7. The students answered the exercises concerning the language and rhetorical focus individually or in pairs.

8. After each unit, the instructor asked the students to write a paragraph about a selected topic to use the targeted conjunctions. The instructor read the students' writings and provided them with feedback.

The IF group received instruction through materials specifically designed by the researcher to supplement the original content with additional exercises, utilizing IF to teach the targeted conjunctions. The instructional approach in this group followed these steps:

1. The lesson started with a warm-up exercise. In this exercise, students were shown a picture and asked to discuss what they saw and reflect on their expectations about the lesson topic.

2. A sample paragraph was introduced to students; they read it aloud and discussed its questions.

3. The instructor explained the structure of the paragraph, highlighting the topic sentence, the supporting sentences, and the concluding sentences.

4. The instructor highlighted the language focus and rhetorical focus for each type of paragraph, showcasing specific linguistic features that assist students in enhancing their writing skills.

5. In each lesson, an additional paragraph containing the targeted conjunctions in high-frequency occurrences because high exposure to comprehensible input increases students' conscious noticing and acquisition of the forms under focus (Krashen, 1985; Schmidt, 1990).

6. The students individually or in pairs answered the exercises concerning the language and rhetorical focus.

7. After each unit, the instructor asked the students to write a paragraph about a selected topic using the targeted conjunctions. The instructor then read the students' writings and provided them with feedback.

6. Findings and Discussion

To answer the first research question "**Does input enhancement affect students' acquisition of conjunctions and writing skills?",** the means and standard deviations of students' scores on the Acquisition of Conjunctions and Writing Skills pre-and post-tests of the control group and the (IE) group were calculated according to the teaching method (IE vs. course book), as shown in Table 2 and Table 3.

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations of the Participants' Scores on the Acquisition of Conjunctions Pre- and Post-tests of the Control Group and the IE Group

Group	N	PR		Post		Adjusted Mean	Std. Error
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation		
Control	24	19.45	5.93	23.08	6.06	23.51	0.61
IE Group	24	20.67	5.18	35.13	3.38	34.70	0.61

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations of the Participants' Scores on the Writing Pre- and Post-tests of the IE Group and the Control Group

G	Item	Pre		Post		Adjusted Mean	Std. Error
		Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.		
Control	Title	2.67	1.01	3.04	0.86	3.14	0.17
	Topic sentence	2.79	0.98	3.04	0.91	3.07	0.18
	Supporting sentences	2.08	0.83	2.42	0.83	2.37	0.21
	Spelling	2.42	0.93	2.79	1.18	2.90	0.21
	Word choice	2.25	0.99	2.83	1.01	2.80	0.23
	Verb tense and form	2.96	1.20	2.92	1.21	2.83	0.18
	Punctuation	2.17	0.92	2.29	0.95	2.34	0.20
	Capitalization	2.13	0.90	2.83	1.09	2.91	0.26
	Sentence structure	2.00	0.98	2.79	1.22	2.78	0.25
	background information	2.08	1.06	2.75	1.22	2.66	0.24
	Use of conjunctions	1.71	0.62	2.25	0.94	2.09	0.20
	Conclusion	1.79	0.88	2.33	1.13	2.33	0.22
	The number of	2.04	0.86	2.58	0.97	2.65	0.23

Variety of the	1.71	0.69	2.25	1.15	2.23	0.25
The correct use of	1.75	0.68	2.46	1.18	2.34	0.24
Unity and coherence	1.58	0.58	2.25	0.90	2.20	0.22
All	34.13	4.77	41.83	4.07	41.62	0.94
Title	2.75	1.11	3.79	0.66	3.70	0.17
Topic sentence	2.67	1.01	3.83	0.82	3.81	0.18
Supporting sentences	2.21	0.98	3.79	0.93	3.84	0.21
Spelling	2.29	1.00	3.71	1.04	3.60	0.21
Word choice	2.25	0.99	3.58	1.06	3.62	0.23
Verb tense and form	2.67	1.20	3.67	0.82	3.76	0.18
Punctuation	2.13	0.90	3.67	0.92	3.62	0.20
Capitalization	2.33	0.92	3.46	1.14	3.38	0.26
Sentence structure	2.17	0.87	3.71	0.86	3.72	0.25
background information	2.21	0.88	3.83	0.96	3.93	0.24
Use of conjunctions	1.92	0.83	3.92	0.93	4.08	0.20
Conclusion	2.08	0.88	3.63	1.01	3.63	0.22
The number of	2.25	1.03	3.71	0.95	3.65	0.23
Variety of conjunctions used in the paragraph.	1.88	0.85	3.50	0.88	3.52	0.25
The correct use of conjunctions	2.04	0.91	3.54	0.98	3.66	0.24
Unity and coherence	1.83	0.82	3.71	0.91	3.76	0.22
All	35.67	5.01	59.04	4.72	59.25	0.94

(Row label spanning rows from "Title" to "All": **IE Group**)

Table 3 displays a noticeable difference in the mean (and the adjusted mean) between the control and the IE groups, with close mean values on the pre-test and higher mean and adjusted mean scores of the IE group on the post-test. This suggests improving participants' understanding of conjunctions due to IE instruction. Thus, to determine the significance of these differences, ANCOVA was applied, as shown in Table 4 below. Table 3 shows observed differences in the mean and the adjusted mean scores of the two groups, which seem to suggest a development in the participants' writing skills in favor of the IE group. For further examination of the results, ANCOVA was used to analyze participants' test scores as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. ANCOVA of the IE group Participants' Scores on the Acquisition of Conjunctions Post-tests

Source	Sum of	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.	Partial
Pre	704.96	1	704.96	79.10	0.000*	0.64
Way	1485.03	1	1485.03	166.44	0.000*	0.79
Error	401.50	45	8.92			
Corrected Total	2846.48	47				

N=48 significant at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

Table 4 shows statistically significant differences in participants' scores on the acquisition of conjunctions post-test at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in favor of the IE group (F= 166.44, df=1 & 47, P= 0.000), which indicates that IE instruction developed participants' knowledge of conjunctions.

Table 5. ANCOVA of the Control Group and IE Group Scores on the Writing Skills Post-test

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
way	3305.97	1	3305.97	181.08	0.000*	0.80
Error	821.57	45	18.26			
Corrected Total	4447.81	47				

N=48 significant at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

Table 5 shows statistically significant differences in participants' scores on the writing skill post-test at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in favor of the IE group (F= 181.08, df=1 & 47, P= 0.000) which indicates that IE instruction developed participants' writing skills. To show which one of the writing skill criteria has been affected by using IE, MANCOVA was used as shown in Table 6.

Table 6. MANCOVA of the Control Group and IE Group Scores on the Writing Skill Post-test

Source	Source	Sum	df	Mean	F	Sig	Partial
Title	Way	2.79	1	2.79	5.00	0.033*	0.14
	Error	16.72	30	0.56			
	Corrected	33.67	47				
Topic sentence	Way	4.81	1	4.81	7.01	0.013*	0.19
	Error	20.57	30	0.69			
	Corrected	41.81	47				
Supporting sentences	Way	18.80	1	18.80	21.63	0.000*	0.42
	Error	26.07	30	0.87			
	Corrected	58.48	47				
Spelling	Way	4.25	1	4.25	4.57	0.041*	0.13
	Error	27.87	30	0.93			
	Corrected	67.00	47				
Word choice	Way	5.87	1	5.87	5.66	0.024*	0.16
	Error	31.08	30	1.04			
	Corrected	55.92	47				
Verb tense and form	Way	7.64	1	7.64	12.08	0.002*	0.29
	Error	18.97	30	0.63			
	Corrected	55.92	47				
Punctuation	Way	14.23	1	14.23	16.94	0.000*	0.36

	Error	25.20	30	0.84			
	Corrected	62.98	47				
Capitalization	Way	1.89	1	1.89	1.36	0.253	0.04
	Error	41.77	30	1.39			
	Corrected	61.98	47				
Sentence structure	Way	7.86	1	7.86	6.44	0.017*	0.18
	Error	36.63	30	1.22			
	Corrected	61.00	47				
background information	Way	14.10	1	14.10	12.11	0.002*	0.29
	Error	34.93	30	1.16			
	Corrected	69.92	47				
Use of conjunctions	Way	34.70	1	34.70	42.88	0.000*	0.59
	Error	24.28	30	0.81			
	Corrected	73.67	47				
Conclusion	Way	14.87	1	14.87	15.40	0.000*	0.34
	Error	28.98	30	0.97			
	Corrected	72.98	47				
The number of conjunctions used in the paragraph	Way	8.71	1	8.71	7.99	0.008*	0.21
	Error	32.69	30	1.09			
	Corrected	57.98	47				
Variety of the conjunctions used in the paragraph.	Way	14.61	1	14.61	11.34	0.002*	0.27
	Error	38.65	30	1.29			
	Corrected	67.25	47				
The correct use of	Way	15.12	1	15.12	12.99	0.001*	0.30

conjunctions	Error	34.93	30	1.16			
	Corrected	68.00	47				
Unity and coherence	Way	21.15	1	21.15	22.48	0.000*	0.43
	Error	28.22	30	0.94			
	Corrected	62.98	47				
All	Way	2720.48	1	2720.48	152.16	0.000*	0.84
	Error	536.37	30	17.88			
	Corrected	4447.81	47				

Table 6 shows that IE has affected participants' acquisition of most of the criteria used to examine the participants' acquisition of writing skills. According to the above data analysis, it is clear that the participants in the IE group outperformed those in the control group due to the IE instruction they received. The instruction in the IE group involved the presentation of conjunctions in many ways, such as bolding, italicizing, underlining, and coloring. These ways presented in authentic contexts helped attract students' attention to the conjunctions and helped them learn them easily as White (1998) demonstrated. IE instruction made students notice the conjunctions in the input and raised their awareness of them and their use, as Krashen (1985) and Schmidt (1990) hypothesized.

To answer the second question "**Does input flooding affect students' acquisition of conjunctions and writing skills?"**, the means and standard deviations of students' scores on the Acquisition of Conjunctions and the Writing Skills pre-and post-tests of the control group and the IF group were calculated according to the teaching method (IF vs. course book), as shown in Table 7 and Table 8.

Table 7. Means and Standard Deviations of the Participants' Scores on the Acquisition of Conjunctions Pre- and Post-tests of the Control Group and the IF Group

Group	N	Pre		Post		Adjusted Mean	Std. Error
		Mean	Std.	Mean	Std.		
Control	24	19.45	5.93	23.08	6.06	23.80	0.59
IF Group	24	21.25	4.19	32.83	3.64	32.12	0.59

Table 8. Means and Standard Deviations of the participants' Scores on the Writing Skills Pre- and Post-tests of the Control Group and the IF Group

G	Item	Pre		Post		Adjusted Mean	Std. Error
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation		
Control	Title	2.6	1.01	3.04	0.86	3.10	0.20
	Topic sentence	2.7	0.98	3.04	0.91	2.93	0.19
	Supporting sentences	2.0	0.83	2.42	0.83	2.34	0.24
	Spelling	2.4	0.93	2.79	1.18	2.97	0.22
	Word choice	2.2	0.99	2.83	1.01	2.92	0.25
	Verb tense and form	2.9	1.20	2.92	1.21	2.62	0.18
	Punctuation	2.1	0.92	2.29	0.95	2.34	0.24
	Capitalization	2.1	0.90	2.83	1.09	2.99	0.23
	Sentence structure	2.0	0.98	2.79	1.22	2.75	0.28
	background information	2.0	1.06	2.75	1.22	2.62	0.26
	Use of conjunctions	1.7	0.62	2.25	0.94	2.06	0.27
	Conclusion	1.7	0.88	2.33	1.13	2.34	0.25
	The number of conjunctions used in the paragraph	2.04	0.86	2.58	0.97	2.65	0.24
	Variety of the conjunctions used in the paragraph.	1.71	0.69	2.25	1.15	2.25	0.28
	The correct use of conjunctions	1.7	0.68	2.46	1.18	2.34	0.28
	Unity and coherence	1.5	0.58	2.25	0.90	2.37	0.26
	All	34.	4.77	41.83	4.07	41.57	1.05
	Title	2.6	1.01	3.25	1.15	3.19	0.20

Topic sentence	2.3	1.10	3.29	0.81	3.40	0.19
Supporting sentences	2.0	0.97	3.21	1.02	3.29	0.24
Spelling	2.2	1.06	3.04	0.86	2.86	0.22
Word choice	2.0	0.88	2.88	1.08	2.79	0.25
Verb tense and form	2.3	1.13	3.21	1.10	3.51	0.18
Punctuation	2.1	1.19	3.21	1.18	3.16	0.24
Capitalization	2.1	1.08	3.17	1.24	3.01	0.23
Sentence structure	2.2	0.88	2.88	1.12	2.92	0.28
background information	2.0	0.91	3.00	1.06	3.13	0.26
Use of conjunctions	1.6	0.64	3.00	1.25	3.20	0.27
Conclusion	2.0	0.93	3.42	1.02	3.41	0.25
The number of conjunctions used in the	2.1	1.08	2.83	1.17	2.77	0.24
Variety of the conjunctions used in the	1.7	0.88	3.00	1.14	3.01	0.28
The correct use of conjunctions	2.0	0.91	3.08	1.21	3.20	0.28
Unity and coherence	2.0	0.93	2.88	1.30	2.76	0.26
All	33.	4.99	49.33	5.35	49.59	1.05

(IF Group)

Table 7 reveals a noticeable difference in the mean (and the adjusted mean) between the control and the IF groups, with close mean values on the pre-test and higher mean and adjusted mean scores of the IF group on the post-test. This suggests an improvement in participants' knowledge of conjunctions due to IF instruction. Table 8 reflects an observed difference in the mean (and the adjusted mean) between the control group and the IF group on the Writing Skills pre-and post-tests in favor of the IF group. This also suggests a development in the participants' writing skills. To confirm the significance of these differences, ANCOVA was conducted, as shown in Table 9 and Table 10.

Table 9. ANCOVA of the IF Group Scores on the Acquisition of Conjunctions Post-test

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Pre	773.29	1	773.29	92.58	0.000*	0.67
Way	805.20	1	805.20	96.40	0.000*	0.68
Error	375.899	45	8.36			
Corrected Total	2289.92	47				

N=48 significant at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

Table 10. ANCOVA of the IF Group Scores on the Writing Skills Post-test

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
way	687.22	1	687.22	36.20	0.000*	0.45
Error	854.32	45	18.98			
Corrected Total	1715.67	47				

N=48 significant at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

Table 9 shows statistically significant differences in participants' scores on the acquisition of conjunctions post-test at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in favor of the IF group (F= 36.20, df=1 & 47, P= 0.000), which indicates that IF instruction developed participants' knowledge of conjunctions. Table 10 reflects statistically significant differences in participants' scores on the Writing Skills post-test at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in favor of the IF group (F= 36.20, df=1 & 47, P= 0.000), which suggests that IF instruction has developed students' writing skills. To show which one of the writing skill criteria has been affected by the use of IF, MANCOVA was used as shown in Table 11:

Table 11. MANCOVA of the Control Group and IF Group Scores on the Writing Skill Post-test

Source	Source	Sum Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig	Partial Eta Squared
	Way	0.06	1	0.06	0.07	0.788	0.00
Title	Error	23.88	30	0.80			
	Corrected total	47.98	47				
	Way	1.72	1	1.72	2.64	0.115	0.08
Topic sentence	Error	19.63	30	0.65			
	Corrected total	34.67	47				
	Way	7.09	1	7.09	6.68	0.015*	0.18
Supporting sentences	Error	31.87	30	1.06			
	Corrected total	47.31	47				
	Way	0.09	1	0.09	0.10	0.759	0.00
Spelling	Error	27.86	30	0.93			
	Corrected total	49.67	47				
	Way	0.12	1	0.12	0.09	0.762	0.00
Word choice	Error	37.06	30	1.24			
	Corrected total	49.98	47				
	Way	6.23	1	6.23	10.22	0.003*	0.25
Verb tense and form	Error	18.29	30	0.61			
	Corrected total	62.81	47				

Punctuation	Way	5.24	1	5.24	4.72	0.038*	0.14
	Error	33.36	30	1.11			
	Corrected total	63.00	47				
Capitalization	Way	0.00	1	0.00	0.00	0.963	0.00
	Error	30.68	30	1.02			
	Corrected total	64.00	47				
Sentence structure	Way	0.23	1	0.23	0.16	0.693	0.01
	Error	44.01	30	1.47			
	Corrected total	62.67	47				
background information	Way	2.04	1	2.04	1.60	0.215	0.05
	Error	38.22	30	1.27			
	Corrected total	61.25	47				
Use of conjunctions	Way	10.26	1	10.26	7.63	0.010*	0.20
	Error	40.33	30	1.34			
	Corrected total	63.25	47				
Conclusion	Way	8.94	1	8.94	7.72	0.009*	0.20
	Error	34.74	30	1.16			
	Corrected total	67.25	47				
The number of conjunctions used in the	Way	0.12	1	0.12	0.11	0.747	0.00
	Error	32.86	30	1.10			

paragraph	Corrected total	53.92	47				
Variety of the conjunctions used in the paragraph.	Way	4.57	1	4.57	2.98	0.095	0.09
	Error	46.01	30	1.53			
	Corrected total	67.25	47				
The correct use of conjunctions	Way	5.88	1	5.88	3.81	0.060	0.11
	Error	46.31	30	1.54			
	Corrected total	70.48	47				
Unity and coherence	Way	1.23	1	1.23	0.97	0.333	0.03
	Error	38.11	30	1.27			
	Corrected total	61.81	47				
All	Way	507.52	1	507.52	24.02	0.000*	0.44
	Error	633.82	30	21.13			
	Corrected total	1715.67	47				

IF instruction exposed students to a high frequency of the targeted conjunctions in the input they received. IF is also grounded on Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis and Schmidt's (1990) Noticing Hypothesis. These hypotheses assume high exposure to comprehensible input increases students' conscious noticing and acquisition of the forms under focus. This exposure raised students' conscious awareness of the conjunctions in the input (Long & Robinson, 1998) and as a result, improved their writing skills.

The third question is "**Which FFI technique has the greatest effect on students' acquisition of conjunctions and writing skills?"** To answer this question, the means and standard deviations of students' scores on the Acquisition of Conjunctions pre-and post-tests of the IE group and the IF group were calculated, as shown in Tables 12 and 13.

Table 12. Means and Standard Deviations of the Participants' Scores on the Acquisition of Conjunction Pre- and Post-tests of the IE Group and the IF Group

Group	N	Pre		Post		Adjusted Mean	Std.Error
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation		
IE Group	24	20.67	5.18	35.13	3.38	35.28	0.49
IF Group	24	21.25	4.19	32.83	3.64	32.67	0.49

Table 13. Means and Standard Deviations of the Participants' Scores on the Writing Skills Pre- and Post-tests of the IE Group and the IF Group

G	Item	Pre		Post		Adjusted Mean	Std. Error
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation		
IE Group	Title	2.75	1.11	3.79	0.66	3.70	0.18
	Topic sentence	2.67	1.01	3.83	0.82	3.79	0.16
	Supporting sentences	2.21	0.98	3.79	0.93	3.77	0.20
	Spelling	2.29	1.00	3.71	1.04	3.71	0.19
	Word choice	2.25	0.99	3.58	1.06	3.56	0.25
	Verb tense and form	2.67	1.20	3.67	0.82	3.62	0.20
	Punctuation	2.13	0.90	3.67	0.92	3.78	0.22
	Capitalization	2.33	0.92	3.46	1.14	3.46	0.27
	Sentence structure	2.17	0.87	3.71	0.86	3.70	0.20
	background information	2.21	0.88	3.83	0.96	3.68	0.17
	Use of conjunctions	1.92	0.83	3.92	0.93	3.96	0.21
	Conclusion	2.08	0.88	3.63	1.01	3.64	0.24
	The number of conjunctions used in the paragraph	2.25	1.03	3.71	0.95	3.74	0.24

Variety of the conjunctions used in the paragraph.	1.88	0.85	3.50	0.88	3.56	0.23
The correct use of conjunctions	2.04	0.91	3.54	0.98	3.40	0.25
Unity and coherence	1.83	0.82	3.71	0.91	3.71	0.25
All	35.67	5.01	59.04	4.72	58.77	1.16
Title	2.63	1.01	3.25	1.15	3.34	0.18
Topic sentence	2.38	1.10	3.29	0.81	3.34	0.16
Supporting sentences	2.08	0.97	3.21	1.02	3.23	0.20
Spelling	2.21	1.06	3.04	0.86	3.04	0.19
Word choice	2.08	0.88	2.88	1.08	2.90	0.25
Verb tense and form	2.38	1.13	3.21	1.10	3.26	0.20
Punctuation	2.13	1.19	3.21	1.18	3.10	0.22
Capitalization	2.13	1.08	3.17	1.24	3.16	0.27
Sentence structure	2.21	0.88	2.88	1.12	2.88	0.20
background information	2.04	0.91	3.00	1.06	3.15	0.17
Use of conjunctions	1.67	0.64	3.00	1.25	2.96	0.21
Conclusion	2.08	0.93	3.42	1.02	3.40	0.24
The number of conjunctions used in the paragraph	2.13	1.08	2.83	1.17	2.80	0.24
Variety of the conjunctions used in the paragraph.	1.79	0.88	3.00	1.14	2.94	0.23
The correct use of conjunctions	2.04	0.91	3.08	1.21	3.22	0.25
Unity and coherence	2.00	0.93	2.88	1.30	2.87	0.25
All	33.96	4.99	49.33	5.35	49.60	1.16

IF Group

Table 12 shows observed differences in the mean and the adjusted mean scores of the two experimental groups, which seem to suggest a gain in the participants' knowledge of conjunctions in favor of the IE group. Table 13 also reflects observed differences in the mean and adjusted mean scores of the students' scores in the two groups in favor of the IE group. The results suggest a gain in the participants' writing skills. For further examination of the results, ANCOVA was used to analyze participants' test scores, as shown in Tables 14 and 15.

Table 14. ANCOVA of the IE Group and IF Group Scores on the Acquisition of Conjunctions Post-test

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Pre	304.71	1	304.71	52.09	0.000*	0.54
Way	81.43	1	81.43	13.92	0.001*	0.24
Error	263.25	45	5.85			
Corrected Total	630.9	47				

N=48 significant at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

Table 14 shows statistically significant differences in participants' scores on the acquisition of conjunctions post-test at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in favor of the IE group (F= 13.92, df=1 & 47, P= 0.000) which indicates that IE instruction developed participants' knowledge of conjunctions better than IF.

Table 15. ANCOVA of the IE Group and IF Group Scores on the Writing Skills Post-test

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
way	1047.26	1	1047.26	40.90	0.000*	0.48
Error	1152.29	45	25.61			
Corrected Total	2303.31	47				

N=48 significant at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$)

Table 15 also shows statistically significant differences in participants' scores on the Writing Skills post-test at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in favor of the IE group (F= 40.90, df=1 & 51, P= 0.000), which indicates that IE instruction developed participants' writing skills better than IF.

Table 16. MANCOVA of the IE Group and IF Group Scores on the Writing Skill Post-test

Source	Source	Sum Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig	Partial Eta Squared
Title	Way	1.30	1	1.30	1.90	0.178	0.06
	Error	20.49	30	0.68			
	Corrected total	43.98	47				
Topic sentence	Way	2.06	1	2.06	3.73	0.063	0.11
	Error	16.61	30	0.55			
	Corrected total	33.81	47				
Supporting sentences	Way	2.92	1	2.92	3.32	0.079	0.10
	Error	26.41	30	0.88			
	Corrected total	48.00	47				
Spelling	Way	4.60	1	4.60	5.76	0.023*	0.16
	Error	23.97	30	0.80			
	Corrected total	47.25	47				
Word choice	Way	4.32	1	4.32	3.17	0.085	0.10
	Error	40.78	30	1.36			
	Corrected total	58.48	47				
Verb tense and form	Way	1.28	1	1.28	1.52	0.227	0.05
	Error	25.16	30	0.84			
	Corrected total	45.81	47				
Punctuation	Way	4.75	1	4.75	4.57	0.041*	0.13

	Error	31.20	30	1.04			
	Corrected total	53.81	47				
Capitalization	Way	0.91	1	0.91	0.55	0.464	0.02
	Error	49.40	30	1.65			
	Corrected total	66.31	47				
Sentence structure	Way	6.80	1	6.80	8.13	0.008*	0.21
	Error	25.10	30	0.84			
	Corrected total	53.92	47				
background information	Way	2.80	1	2.80	4.27	0.047*	0.12
	Error	19.62	30	0.65			
	Corrected total	55.67	47				
Use of conjunctions	Way	10.03	1	10.03	10.76	0.003*	0.26
	Error	27.95	30	0.93			
	Corrected total	65.92	47				
Conclusion	Way	0.61	1	0.61	0.50	0.485	0.02
	Error	36.81	30	1.23			
	Corrected total	47.98	47				
The number of conjunctions used in the paragraph	Way	9.07	1	9.07	7.13	0.012*	0.19
	Error	38.17	30	1.27			
	Corrected total	61.48	47				

Variety of the conjunctions used in the paragraph.	Way	3.86	1	3.86	3.42	0.074	0.10
	Error	33.80	30	1.13			
	Corrected total	51.00	47				
The correct use of conjunctions	Way	0.32	1	0.32	0.23	0.632	0.01
	Error	41.15	30	1.37			
	Corrected total	58.31	47				
Unity and coherence	Way	7.11	1	7.11	5.19	0.030*	0.15
	Error	41.11	30	1.37			
	Corrected total	65.92	47				
All	Way	853.07	1	853.07	28.71	0.000*	0.49
	Error	891.36	30	29.71			
	Corrected total	2303.31	47				

The above analysis suggests that Input Enhancement (IE) has a more substantial impact on students' acquisition of conjunctions and the development of their writing skills. IE requires explicit instruction and explanation of the linguistic features under focus (conjunctions in the current study) and presenting them in authentic examples with extra focus through bolding, italicizing, underlining, and coloring (Ellis, 2001). In explicit instruction, teachers make students notice and retain linguistic features (Ellis, 2011). Teachers explain and illustrate the use of cohesive devices and their functions, giving students exercises and feedback (Brown, 2001; Norris & Ortega, 2001; Wang, 2007).

On the other hand, IF involves implicit instruction by providing students with an input that contains high-frequency occurrences of the linguistic feature without explicit instruction (Long & Robinson, 1998). IF instruction requires students to notice the targeted forms through the repeated occurrences of the forms according to Krashen's Input Hypothesis and Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis.

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

The current study reflects many conclusions. First, teaching conjunctions using both IE and IF has a great effect on improving students' acquisition of conjunctions and writing skills. Second, students' writing performance has become more coherent because the two FFI techniques raised students' conscious awareness of conjunctions. Third, IE and IF provided students as well as teachers with insights for new strategies in language learning and teaching. Fourth, IE had a greater effect on students' acquisition of conjunctions and writing skills due to the explicit explanation of the targeted conjunctions, which engaged them in many cognitive processes, such as consciousness-raising. Fifth, IF has improved students' acquisition of conjunctions and improved their writing performance, but with less impact (compared to IE) due to the implicit nature of its presentation.

Students who received instruction using IE and IF were enthusiastic about the process of learning. They were engaged in many interesting and stress-free environments using authentic examples and continuous feedback. Consciousness-raising techniques equipped students with long-term learning and provided them with the means to highly develop their writing performance. IE and IF represent two exquisite teaching techniques that encourage students to learn English and improve their writing performance and language skills using focused instruction.

The results of this study are consistent with the results of previous studies, such as Namaziandost et al. (2020), Behbahani & Khademi. (2022), Majeed (2022), and Rezaee and Askari (2024) found significant effects of using IE in EFL classrooms in improving students' various linguistic features and language skills. The results of this study are also consistent with the results of Kasgari's (2018) and Celik's (2023), which showed the effectiveness of IF in language learning. On the other hand, the results of this study are different from the results of Rashtchi and Etebari's (2018), Safdari's (2019), and Celik (2023) which showed a similar effect of IE and IF on developing students' language skills while this study resulted in finding a greater effect of IE on students' acquisition of conjunctions and improving writing.

Further studies could investigate other FFI techniques with different students at different educational levels, as this study is limited in scope and sample to using IE and IF for a convenient sample of 72 students from a university writing course. Furthermore, this study is also limited to teaching conjunctions; thus, further research may examine different linguistic features and other language skills.

References

Al-Ghazo, A., & Taamneh, I. (2018). The Effect of Swain's Push Out Hypothesis on Promoting Jordanian Language Learners' Reading Performance. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 7*(1), 73-85. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.1p.73

Al-Qeyam, F., Ta'amneh, I., & Al-Ghazo, A. (2024). Does Input Enhancement Develop Writing skill? A Case Study of Jordanian EFL University Students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *14*(9), 2781-2790. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1409.14

Al-Qeyam, F. R., Bataineh, R. F., & Smadi, O. M. (2016). The Effect of Form-Focused Instruction on Learning and Retaining Pragmatic Knowledge among Jordanian EFL Tertiary-Level Learners. *Journal of International Doctoral Research*, *5*(1), 28-50.

Altenberg, B., & Tapper, M. (1998). The Use of Adverbial Connectors in Advanced Swedish Learners' Written English. In S. Granger (Ed.), *Learner English on Computer* (pp. 80-93). Addison Wesley Longman. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315841342-6

Bataineh, R. F., Al-Qeyam, F. R., & Smadi, O. M. (2017). Does Form-Focused Instruction Really Make a Difference? Potential Effectiveness in Jordanian EFL Learners' Linguistic and Pragmatic Knowledge Acquisition. *Asian- Pacific Journal of Second Language Acquisition*, *2*(1), 28-50. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-017-0040-0

Behbahani, H., & Khademi, A. (2022). The Concurrent Contribution of Input Flooding, Visual Input Enhancement, and Consciousness-Raising Tasks to Noticing and Intake of Present Perfect Tense. *MEXTESOL Journal*, *46*(4), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.61871/mj.v46n4-4

Brown, D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Longman.

Celik, B. (2024). The Effects of Input Flood and Input Enhancement Techniques in Teaching Collocations to EFL Learners. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, *6*(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.59400/fls.v6i1.2088

Connor, U., & Johns, A. M. (Eds.) (1990). *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives*. TESOL.

Crossley, S. A., Kyle, K., & McNamara, D. S. (2016). The Development and Use of Cohesive Devices in L2 Writing and their Relations to Judgments of Essay Quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *32*, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.01.003

Dastjerdi, H., & Samian, S. (2011). Quality of Iranian EFL Learners' Argumentation Essays: Cohesive Devices in Focus. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *2*(2), 65-76.

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.) (1998). *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, N. (2011). The Weak Interface, Consciousness and Form-Focused Instruction: Mind the Door. In S. Fotos, & H. Nassaji (Eds.), *Form-Focused Instruction and Teacher Education: Studies in Honour of Rod Ellis* (pp. 17-25). Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667190.023

Ellis, R. (2002). *Grammar Teaching – Practice or Consciousness-Raising?*. In J. C. Richards, & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice* (pp. 167-174). Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (Ed.) (2001). *Form-focused Instruction and Second Language Teaching*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Ellis, R., & He, X. (1999). The Roles of Modified Input and Output in the Incidental Acquisition of Word Meanings. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *21*(2), 285-301. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263199002077

Halliday, M., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hernández, T. (2008). The Effect of Input Flooding via Reading on Spanish L2 Learners' Lexical Acquisition. *Language Learning*, *58*(3), 539-580.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. London: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://books.google.jo/books?hl=en&lr=&id=6DCdDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR13&dq=Hyland,+K.+(2003).+Second+language+writing.+London:+Cambridge+University+Press.&ots=4mzoHjIE9S&sig=XW1eEjZC8q0L4tjgikI7cMdWN_0&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Hyland%2C%20K.%20(2003).%20Second%20language%20writing.%20London%3A%20Cambridge%20University%20Press.&f=false

Kasgari, Z. (2018). Elaborative Text Modification vs. Input Flooding: A Case Study on Non-Congruent Collocations. *Asian- Pacific Journal of Second Language Acquisition*, *3*(8), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-018-0049-z

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.

Lestari, A., & Werdining. (2023). An Analysis on Cohesive Devices of Students' Recount Paragraphs Writing. *JPBI: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, *1*(1), 3-16. https://doi.org/10.47134/jpbi.v1i1.14

Liu, M., & Braine, G. (2005). Cohesive Features in Argumentative Writing Produced by Chinese Undergraduates. *System*, *33*(4), 623-636. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.02.002

Majeed, N. (2022). The Effect of Using Input Enhancement Technique on Collocation Learning of Iraqi EFL Students. *ALUSTATH Journal for Human & Social Sciences*, *61*(3), 588-597. https://doi.org/10.36473/ujhss.v61i3.1707

McNamara, D. S., Kintsch, E., Songer, N. B., & Kintsch, W. (1996). Are Good Texts Always Better? Interactions of Text Coherence, Background Knowledge, and Levels of Understanding in Learning from Text. *Cognition and Instruction*, *14*(1), 1-43. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci1401_1

Namaziandost, E., Rezvani, E., & Polemikou, A. (2020) The Impacts of Visual Input Enhancement, Semantic Input Enhancement, and Input Flooding on L2 Vocabulary among Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners. *Cogent Education*, *7*, 1726606. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1726606

Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2001). Does Type of Instruction Make a Difference? Substantive Findings from a Metaphysical Review. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Form-Focused Instruction and Second Language Teaching* (pp. 157-213). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.2001.tb00017.x

Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2007). *Introduction to Academic Writing* (3rd ed.). Pearson Longman.

Ramadan, M. (2019). The Effectiveness of Teaching Grammar in Context: Teaching Conjunctions as an Example. *Journal of Social Sciences*, *18*, 706-754.

Rashtchi, M., & Etebari, F. (2018). Learning the English Passive Voice: a Comparative Study on Input Flooding and Input Enhancement Techniques. *International Linguistics Research*, *1*(1), 67-79. https://doi.org/10.30560/ilr.v1n1p67

Rezaee, M., & Askari, M. (2024). Developing Speaking Ability of Iranian EFL Learners via Auditory Input-Enhancement. *International Journal of Language and Translation Research*, *4*(2), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.12906/9783899664867_001

Rutherford, W., & Smith, M. (1985). Consciousness-Raising and Universal Grammar. *Applied Linguistics*, *6*(3), 274-282. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/6.3.274

Safdari, M. (2019). Input Flooding, Input Enhancement and Writing Performance: Effects and Percepts. *International Journal of Instruction*, *12*(4), 281-296. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12418a

Schmidt, R. (1990). The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 129-158. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129

Ta'amneh, E. (2013). The Effect of a Strategy-Based Classroom Interactional Instructional Program on Developing the Jordanian Basic Stage Students' Speaking Skill. *Unpublished Doctoral dissertation*, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.

Ta'amneh, I., & Al-Ghazo, A. (2018). The Effect of Episodic Texts on Developing Saudi EFL Students' Vocabulary and Grammatical Competence. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 9*(5), 158-169. https://doi.org/10.30845/ijbss.v9n5a13

Trahey, M., & White, L. (1993). Positive Evidence and Preemption in the Second Language Classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *15*(2), 181-204. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100011955

Wang, L. (2007). Theme and Rheme in the Thematic Organization of Text: Implications for Teaching Academic Writing. *Asian EFL Journal*, *9*(1), 164-176.

White, L. (1998). *Second Language Acquisition and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge University Press.

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Witte, S. P., & Faigley, L. (1981). Coherence, Cohesion, and Writing Quality. *College Composition and Communication*, *32*(2), 189-204. https://doi.org/10.58680/ccc198115912