Impact of Textual Enhancement on Bangladeshi Tertiary Learner's Noticing and Grammatical Development of Present Perfect and Past Simple Tenses

Akhter Jahan
International Islamic University Malaysia

Textual Enhancement (TE) can be distinguished as the focus on form procedure that intends to increase input saliency in any kind of texts so that learners can notice target forms in a meaning oriented context and thereby acquiring the form-function mapping of those items (Schmidt, 1995, 2001; Smith, 1991, 1993). Lee (2007) and White (1998) suggested that this implicit procedure would be able to assist the language acquisition process of those learners who have pre-knowledge regarding target forms. In spite of having long term pre-exposure to English, most of the Bangladeshi tertiary learners encounter problems in using present perfect and past simple tenses accurately. Therefore, this experimental study investigated whether or not TE could facilitate those learners' noticing, intake and acquisition of those forms. With this aim, the study was conducted with pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test research design. 100 Bangladeshi undergraduate participants were divided into enhanced, non-enhanced and control groups. Data were elicited by a note taking, a reading comprehension, two grammar and a metalinguistic awareness tasks along with four noticing questions. The findings of the study exposed that multiple exposure to TE was able to facilitate only the noticing and the intake of the targeted forms.

Key words: Focus on form, textual enhancement, noticing, intake, acquisition.

1. INTRODUCTION

Textual Enhancement (TE) of input is one of those Focus on Form (FonF) procedures that tends to increase input saliency in any kind of texts (either written or oral) so that Second Language (L2) learners can notice targeted form in a meaning oriented context and thereby acquiring the item's form-function mapping easily (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011; Schmidt, 1995, 2001; Smith, 1991, 1993). However, after TE's emergence in the nineteen-nineties, different researchers have treated it in such diversified ways during their empirical investigations that their individualistic research designs and various data elicitation techniques have resulted in a set of divergent and conflicting findings (Han, Park, & Combs, 2008). Researchers find it difficult to draw any generalization regarding the impact of input enhancement in any teaching contexts. Taking all the distinctive features of the previous TE studies, this study was planned. Bangladeshi tertiary level learners were included in this study as participants due to their 12 years formal pre-exposure to English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Owing to this fact, it has been assumed that an implicit way of focusing on form such as TE would be able to assist them in acquiring the Target Language (TL) grammar in meaningful contexts (Lee, 2007; White, 1998). The uses of present perfect and past simple tenses for expressing higher and lower immediacy of any event taking place are two of the weakest areas where these learners need the most support for developing their grammatical accuracy (Azad & Shanta, 2012). Similar findings have been reported by the researchers in the case of Malaysia, Indonesia, China and Korea (Isa, Risdaneva & Alfayed, 2017; Singh, Singh, Razak & Ravinthar, 2017; Zheng & Park, 2013). Therefore, the uses of these tense forms were targeted in this study with the aim to measure the impact of TE of input on Bangladeshi tertiary learner's noticing, intake and thereby acquisition of the form to function mappings of the targeted grammatical items.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

TE has been distinguished as a Focus on Form (FonF) technique (Long, 1991; Schmidt, 1995, 2001; Smith, 1991, 1993). FonF procedures were proposed by Long (1991) to reveal the techniques

through which language users attention can best be drawn to the formal features of a TL in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Therefore, it emphasizes the importance of drawing learners' attention to both form and function of any targeted linguistic items in meaning based contexts in L2 classrooms (Doughty & Williams, 1998).Input enhancement is considered a FonF technique which includes the application of various teaching procedures to increase the perceptual saliency of the targeted items in any TL input (Doughty & Williams, ibid.). TE is considered as the positive input enhancement procedure whereby typographical manipulations are performed by bolding, italicizing, underlining so that learners' attention can be directed towards certain aspects of the TL (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). Input enhancement was put forwarded by Smith (1991, 1993) in oppose to Krashen's (1985) input hypothesis. Smith (1991) argued that only exposure to comprehensible input would not be able to facilitate language acquisition. For assisting the SL learner's acquisition process, planned interventions might be required to direct their attention to the formal properties of a L2. These deliberate interventions may increase the learners' awareness about certain formal features of any L2 and thereby supporting them in noticing the targeted aspect of a language and turning the input into intake (Smith, 1991).

Input enhancement can be carried out both externally and internally (Smith, 1993). External manipulation of input is carried out as learners might miss noticing the TL formal features even if they are given exposure to it. They might not notice any targeted features since human's attentional span and language processing abilities are limited, and they tend to process the input primarily for interpreting meaning rather than for understanding forms (VanPatten, 2007). However, external manipulation of input might not result in learners' language acquisition since their internal factors can play a major role in directing their noticing towards targeted forms in the input. In addition, any target form's formal complexities, and learner's readiness, L1 and motivation can cause variations in the effects of input enhancement (Han et al., 2008). Therefore, whether or not, external manipulation like TE of input could trigger learners' noticing, then intake, and thereby acquisition of target forms is a query that requires empirical investigation. Input enhancement is different from input flood or input enrichment in that in the later enhancement technique only the frequency of specific linguistic features is increased in a text in a meaning oriented context so that learners can notice those particular linguistic features while interpreting the input for meaning (Ellis, 2001).

According to Smith (1991) noticing input is the initial step towards processing it further. Therefore, any FonF technique requires L2 learners' noticing of form, meaning and function simultaneously during any cognitive event (Doughty, 2001). Input enhancement also conforms to this criteria. It has drawn support from Schmidt's (1995) noticing hypothesis. According to Schmidt (1990) noticing is a pre-requisite for language acquisition to take place and learners should pay attention to or notice the TL formal features in the input to acquire those particular aspects of the TL. Noticing is not merely the acknowledgement that any targeted forms are present in the input. It involves a lower level of awareness about the target forms in the input (Truscott & Smith, 2011). Schmidt (2010) pointed out further that the level of awareness involved in noticing the input is different from the level of awareness engaged in understanding any form-function mapping in the input. Awareness at the level of noticing is a surface level phenomena in that it requires only the conscious registration of certain event whereas awareness at the level of understanding involves the recognition of rules as well as patterns in the input. SLA researchers mainly aims to investigate what learners attend to and notice in the TL input, and how learners interpret the noticed forms by understanding the role of those items in the input (Schmidt, 2001). However, Smith (1993) acknowledged the fact that noticing cannot guarantee that input will be processed further as intake since it can only increase the possibilities of acquiring any L2 forms.

By reviewing the previous studies on TE, it can be ascertained that those research works had distinctive features. Those research projects varied greatly in the number and choice of target forms; enhancement techniques, data collection instruments and data analysis methods; inclusion of a control group in their research design; the background, number and level of participants; and

providing multiple exposure to TE. In addition, eye tracking mechanism has been introduced recently to measure learners' noticing more accurately in the studies related to TE of input (Indrarathne & Kormos, 2017; Indrarathne, Ratajczak, & Kormos, 2018). As a result, the published studies greatly differed in their findings. For example, Lee (2007) discerned the positive impact of TE on recall. Jahan and Kormos (2015), and Loewen and Inceoglu (2016) revealed the facilitating effect of TE on noticing whereas White (1998) showed that same kind of positive impact of TE on production; and LaBrozzi (2016), Lee (2007) and White (1998) deemed that there is positive influence of TE on learning. In contrast, Lee (2007) and Overstreet (1998) discovered the negative impact that TE had on learner's comprehension of texts, and Putta (2016) found differential effects of TE on the old and the new grammatical features that his participants were exposed to. Taking these issues into account, this study was conducted to examine two research questions: 'to what extent does multiple exposure to enhanced texts facilitate participant's noticing of present perfect and past simple tense verb forms?' and 'to what extent does multiple exposure to TE develop participant's grammatical ability to express higher and lower immediacy of any event taking place by using present perfect and past simple tense verb forms?'

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Participants

Fist year first semester students of a renowned private university of Bangladesh participated in the study. Though 113 students took the pre-test, only 100 of them, who scored 40% of the total marks (20), were included in the study. The mean score for their age was 18.5 (SD= 0.57, range 18-20). Four groups of first semester students from Bangla (First Language or L1) medium background participated in the study. All of them had 12 years prior exposure to EFL.

3.2 The target forms

The following forms, meanings and functions were targeted in this study from present perfect and past tense verb form constructions. The 'have + V –en' verb phrase construction of present perfect tense conveys the message that an event has started in the past but is completed at the moment of speaking and some goal has been achieved. Therefore, it refers to 'non-remote + factual' events with a retrospective view from outside the event (Yule, 2003).This verb form is used to refer to events which have 'non-past before' time reference in terms of immediacy thereby expressing higher immediacy of events taking place than the past form, that is, higher level of relevance of events to the moment of speaking (Hashim & Govindasamy, 2009). For example, 'They **have eaten** lunch'. On the other hand, the 'V-ed' verb phrase construction of past tense indicates that an event has already taken place in the past context. Therefore, it refers to 'remote + factual' events (Yule, 2003, p. 59). This verb form is used while denoting a completed action in the past (Yule, 2003) thereby expressing lower immediacy of the event than the non-past before form. In other words, this form refers to the lower level of relevance to the moment of speaking. (Hashim & Govindasamy, 2009). For example, 'They **killed** the tiger yesterday'.

3.3 Materials

Two reading texts having two versions were used as materials. The enhanced version had emboldened target forms whereas the non-enhanced one included those forms without any kind of manipulation of the font. The reading texts: *Genealogy* (Text A, 225 words; Elbaum, 2001, p. 246) and *A Look at the History of Snowboarding* (Text B, 232 words; Kingston, n.d. in English Grammar 4U Online) were selected and modified for the study(see Appendix I).

3.4 The Research design

This study had an experimental design with a pre-test, an immediate post-test and a delayed post-test. All these tests were conducted over fourteen weeks. The study included two experimental groups – enhanced (N=40) and non-enhanced (N=40), and a control group (N=20). The experimental groups were exposed to different versions of the input but the control group was not provided with any textually enhanced or non-enhanced input. The participants were divided into these groups randomly. To provide multiple exposure to the target forms, two reading texts were used in a week during the exposure sessions in different orders – text A first and text B first to examine the task order effect. Therefore, the enhanced and non-enhanced groups were further divided into two more groups respectively, as text A first and text B first, each having equal numbers of participants (N=20) Thus, the participants of these two groups were given exposure to total two texts (text A + text B) during two treatment sessions over a week. In week 1, pre-test was administered. This test included choosing the correct form task, that is, a form recognition task with judging the certainty of the answers task and a fill-in-the blanks task, that is, a form production task. The immediate post-test was conducted in the fourth week and the delayed post-test was conducted in the fourteenth week using the pre-test materials. After taking the pre-test, the participants were exposed to the texts twice during the fourth week with one day apart. The second exposure was followed by the immediate post-test. The control group attended only the tests. This group provided a means to examine whether the tests had any practice effects and to assess the participant's current level of knowledge regarding the form to function mappings of the target forms. The multiple choice reading comprehension task and the note taking task were given to the participants during the two exposure sessions. Four noticing questions and the metalinguistic awareness task were given to the participants after the second exposure.

3.5 Instruments

A note taking task (15min), a reading comprehension based MC comprehension task (5 min), four noticing measurement questions (10 min), a controlled production grammar task (fill-in-the-blanks with clues) (10 min), a form recognition task (choosing the correct form) with judgement of certainty of the answers (10 min), and a meta-linguistic awareness task (10 min) were used in this study to elicit data (see Appendix I). The instruments and materials used in the study had been piloted prior to the study. Besides, in both fill-in-the-blanks and choosing the correct form tasks, equal numbers of correct answers (5+5= 10 items) were included for both targeted forms.

3.6 Data analysis

3.6.1 Scoring of the quantitative data

The correct and incorrect answers among the quantitative data gathered from the MC comprehension task, fill-in-the-blanks task and choosing the correct form task were scored '1' and '0', respectively. In addition, the answers to the participants' assumptions regarding the certainty of answers in the choosing the correct form task were also scored as '1' if the participants had ticked that they were certain about the answer, and '0' if they were not certain. In addition, there were four noticing questions in the study. Both the first noticing question, 'Did you notice anything particular while reading the texts?' and the third question, 'Were you thinking about any grammatical rules while reading the texts?' had two options in the answer- 'Yes/No'. If the participants ticked the answer 'Yes', that answer was scored as '1' whereas if they chose the opposite, then it was scored as '0'.

3.6.2 Scoring of the qualitative data

The qualitative data were collected through noticing questions and metalinguistic awareness task. Those data were scored in the following way. Of the four noticing questions of the study, the second and the fourth ones were open ended. For scoring the answers of the second question, 'If your answer to question no. 1 is 'yes', then what did you notice?' the following criteria were used. Responses which expressed that the participants had noticed the target forms saying they had seen 'lots of examples of the use of the targeted forms in the texts', 'some words were bolded in the texts' or 'some bolded words' related to the targeted forms specifically were considered as instances of 'noticed', and therefore were scored as '1'. In contrast, any answers other than those responses mentioned before which reflected that the participant had not noticed the targeted forms having the TE were considered as examples of 'not noticed', and therefore, were scored as '0'. On the other hand, the scoring of the fourth noticing question, 'If your answer to question no. 3 is 'yes', then what grammatical rules were you thinking about?' was done in the following way. Responses which expressed that the participants were thinking about the grammatical rules related to the target forms were marked as showing awareness of the targeted forms and were scored as '1'. In contrast, any answers other than those responses mentioned earlier which reflected that the participants were not considering the rules related to the targeted forms were determined as showing 'no awareness' of the target forms, and were scored as '0'.

For scoring the answers to the metalinguistic awareness task, replies which expressed that **'have + V-en** could be used for referring to the events which started in the past but is completed at the moment of speaking and this event has a higher level of relevance to the moment of speaking' or 'V-ed could be used for referring to actions that have been completed in the past and expresses lower level of relevance to the moment of speaking' were considered as showing 'full understanding' of the targeted forms. In contrast, responses which stated that only '**have + V-en** could be used for referring to the events which started in the past but is completed at the moment of speaking' or **'V-ed'** could be used for referring to the actions that have been completed in the past' were considered as reflecting 'partial understanding' of the targeted forms. Any other responses considered as showing 'no understanding' of those forms.

3.6.3 Scoring of the note taking data

The participants of both enhanced and non-enhanced groups were asked to take notes of the words that they had noticed at both individual word and phrase levels in the note taking task. Therefore, while scoring the note taking data, the scores were counted separately for each of the items of the targeted forms, and '1' score was given to the noticing of each of the targeted items in the targeted forms. In addition, the participants received '0' score if they did not notice any of the targeted items during the exposure. Interrater reliability was tested for 20% of the qualitative data using Kappa statistic.

3.6.4 Procedure of data analysis

All the tests of this study were conducted in classroom setting. The raw test scores which were obtained from the three tests were transferred to the statistical software SPSS version 23 where the significance level was set at .05.The pre-test scores for each of the target forms were deducted from their respective post-test scores to measure how far the participants of each of the treatment groups developed with respect to overall test scores, grammar task wise test scores, and certainty scores for each of the target forms distinctively. These gains scores were calculated based on the test scores of the grammar tasks. The deduction of scores was made before conducting any kind of statistical tests

on the raw data. Next, a repeated measure analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted considering the immediate and the delayed post-tests' total gain scores for the target forms as within subject factors and treatment (i.e. enhanced, non-enhanced and control) and text order (A-first and B-First) as between subject factors. It was discovered that text order had no statistically significant task order effect on the gain scores of the treatment groups since the ANOVA results for the gain scores were $F= .103$ and $p= .748$. Afterwards, the normality of distribution of all the gain scores was checked by measuring those scores' descriptive statistics along with the skewness and the kurtosis of the distribution of those data. All the gain scores were found to be normally distributed.

4. RESULTS

The descriptive statistics for all the treatment groups' total scores in the pre-test for the target forms revealed that all the treatment groups had almost similar level of prior knowledge regarding the target forms. One-way ANOVA results for the pre-test mean scores (see Table 1) revealed that these groups

Table 1 Pre-test Scores According to Treatment Groups

Target forms	Control (N=20)		Non-enhanced (N = 40)		Enhanced (N=40)		Total (N=100)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Present per. & past simple tense	6.10	1.17	6.42	1.24	6.37	1.17	6.34	1.19

did not vary from each other significantly in their pre-knowledge of the forms *(M=6.34 & SD= 1.19, F(2,97)= .520, p=.596)*. All the participants acquired more scores for the past tense form *(M=3.67, SD= .82)* than the present perfect tense form *(M=2.70, SD=.89)*.

4.1 Note taking task results

An independent samples t-test was conducted on these note taking scores which were drawn from the data of the first and second exposure to the input. The aim of this investigation was to examine whether the enhanced and the non-enhanced groups differed from each other in their note taking mean scores according to the days of exposure and the items in the targeted forms. It was discerned from

Table 2 Independent Samples t Test Results for the Note Taking Mean Scores

Exposure	Target forms	Paired samples	Enhanced		Non-enhanced		t	df	Sig-2 tailed
			M	SD	M	SD			
Day 1	**Present perfect tense**	**Have**	1.58	1.55	.28	.64	-4.90	78	.000
		V-en	1.75	1.51	.53	.68	-4.67	78	.000
	Past Sim. tense	**V-ed**	2.18	1.26	.58	.78	-6.83	78	.000
Day 2	**Present**	**Have**	3.13	1.68	.65	1.21	-7.55	78	.000

perfect tense	**V-en**	3.13	1.68	1.13	1.24	-6.05	78	.000
Past Sim. tense	**V-ed**	3.48	1.57	1.58	1.15	-6.17	78	.000

the t test results (see Table 2) that the enhanced group's mean scores for each of the forms were higher than that of the non-enhanced group and both groups' participants took more notes of the targeted items on day-2 than on day-1 exposure. This variation was statistically significant. All the participants of both groups also took more notes of the content words such as verbs than the auxiliary verb 'have'.

4.2 Multiple choice comprehension task results

The descriptive statistics for these comprehension scores according to treatment groups and target forms revealed that both enhanced and non-enhanced groups gained very high scores in this comprehension task where the maximum possible score for each of these comprehension task was '5' (see Table 3). It could also be ascertained from the SD scores that the participants did not vary from

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics for Text Comprehension Scores

Target forms	Text A				Text B			
	Enhanced (N=40)		Non-enhanced (N=40)		Enhanced (N=40)		Non-enhanced (N=40)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Present Perfect & Past simple tense	4.40	.55	4.40	.67	4.68	.53	4.5	.60

each other significantly in comprehending the texts within the treatment groups. Independent samples t-test results of these mean scores also indicated that the treatment groups did not differ from each other significantly in terms of comprehending the enhanced or the non-enhanced version of the texts (for text A $t(78)= .18, p=.861$ and for text B $t(78)=1.39, p=.169$).

4.3 Noticing question results

It was revealed from a Pearson's chi-square test of the first $(\chi^2 (1,N=80)=7.22, p=.007)$ and the second $(\chi^2 (1, N=80) =7.5, p=.006)$ noticing question scores that the enhanced and the non-enhanced groups varied significantly in noticing something particularly while reading the texts. On the other

Table 4 Cross -tabulation of Treatment and Noticing Question Scores

Treatment	N & %	Noticing Q 1		Noticing Q 2		Noticing Q 3		Noticing Q 4	
		Yes	No	Noticed	Not Noticed	Yes	No	Aware	Not Aware
Non-enhanced	40 100%	15 37.5%	25 62.5%	10 25%	30 75%	9 22.5%	31 77.5%	7 17.5%	33 82.5%

	40 100%	27 67.5%	13 32.5%	22 55%	18 45%	13 32.5%	27 67.5%	12 30%	28 70%
Enhanc ed									

hand, a Pearson's chi-square test of the third (χ^2 (1,N=80)=1.00, p=.317) and the fourth (χ^2 (1,N=80)=1.73, p=.189) noticing question scores revealed that both groups did not vary from each other significantly in considering the grammar rules. The cross-tabulation of the noticing questions' scores and the treatment (see Table 4) showed how the two groups varied from each other.

4.4 Fill-in-the-blanks task results

One-way ANOVA and the partial eta squared results of the gain scores for the fill-in-the-blanks task revealed that though there was a large effect of treatment on these form's gain scores in the immediate post-test (M= .92&SD=.80, F (2,97)= 26.80, p=.000, $\eta\rho^2$ = .356), in the delayed post-test that effect size turned into a moderate one (M=.62&SD=.8, F (2,97)= 4.26, p= .017, $\eta\rho^2$ = .081) (see Table 5). The post hoc Scheffe test of these gain scores further exposed that though all the treatment groups

Table 5 Descriptive Statistics for Gain Scores for the Fill-in-the-blanks Task

Name of the target forms	Immediate post-test						Delayed post-test					
	Control (N=20)		Non-enhanced (N=40)		Enhanced (N=40)		Control (N=20)		Non-enhanced (N=40)		Enhanced (N=40)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Present Per. & Past sim. tense	.15	.55	.78	.58	1.40	.78	.10	.71	.70	.85	.68	.80

varied from each other statistically significantly in their gains scores of this task in the immediate post-test, they did not vary that much in terms of their scores in the delayed post-test. Actually, there were no significant difference between the enhanced and the non-enhanced groups' gain scores in the delayed post-test. Therefore, there was only a weak effect of treatment on these form's production abilities of the participants in the delayed post-test than in the immediate one.

4.5 Choosing the correct form task results

With regards to choosing the correct form task, the participants had to choose the correct form from the options that were provided to them. The results of the one-way ANOVA and partial eta squared test of the gain scores of this task also exposed that the treatment had large effects on the performance of the participants in both immediate (M= 1.94, SD= .98, F(2,97)= 28.28, p= .000, $\eta\rho^2$ = .368) and delayed (M= .74, SD= .81, F(2,97)= 31.02, p= .000, $\eta\rho^2$ = .390) post-tests (see Table 6). The post

Table 6 Descriptive Statistics for Gain Scores for Choosing the Correct Form Task

Target forms	Immediate post-test			Delayed post-test		
	Control	Non-	Enhanced	Control	Non-	Enhanced

	(N=20)		enhanced (N=40)		(N=40)		(N=20)		enhanced (N=40)		(N=40)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Present Perfect & Past simple tense	.20	.61	.90	.81	1.77	.86	.30	.57	.35	.57	1.35	.74

hoc Scheffe test of these gain scores demonstrated that though the three treatment groups differed significantly in their gain scores in the immediate post-test; only the enhanced group's gain scores differed from the non-enhanced and the control group's gain scores in the delayed post-test.

4.6 Certainty judgment task results

The large effect of treatment was found from the one-way ANOVA of the certainty gain scores for the target forms (immediate $M= 1.33$, $SD= 1.02$, $F_{(2,97)}= 39.86$, $p= .000$, $\eta\rho^2 = .451$ and delayed $M= .73$, $SD= 1.21$, $F_{(2,97)}= 9.38$, $p= .000$, $\eta\rho^2 = .044$). The descriptive statistics for the treatment groups were as follows in the immediate (Control $M=.35$ & $SD = .81$, Non-enhanced $M=1.05$ & $SD = .81$ and Enhanced $M=2.10$ & $SD =.67$) and the delayed (Control $M=.35$ & $SD = 1.27$, Non-enhanced $M=.33$ & $SD = 1.16$ and Enhanced $M=1.33$ & $SD =1.00$) posttests. The post hoc Scheffe test of these gain scores further revealed that the three treatment groups varied significantly in their mean scores of this task in the immediate post-test but only the enhanced group varied significantly from the non-enhanced and the control groups in their mean scores of this task in the delayed post-test.

4.7 Metalinguistic awareness task results

A Pearson's Chi-square test was performed on the metalinguistic awareness task's scores demonstrated that all the treatment groups varied from each other statistically significantly in gaining understanding about the uses of the past simple tense form ($\chi^2_{(4,N=100)}=11.19$, $p=.025$) but their performance did not vary similarly for the present perfect tense form ($\chi^2_{(4,N=100)}=4.06$, $p=.398$). Cross-tabulation of this task scores along with the treatment (See Table 7) revealed the way different

Table 7 Cross -tabulation of treatment and Meta-linguistic Awareness Task Scores

Targeted tense forms	Treatment	N	No Understanding		Partial Understanding		Full Understanding	
			Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Present Perfect	Control	20	17	85%	3	15%	0	0
	Non-enhanced	40	34	85%	6	15%	0	0
	Enhanced	40	28	70%	11	27.5%	1	2.5%
Past Simple	Control	20	17	85%	3	15%	0	0
	Non-enhanced	40	29	72.5%	10	25%	1	2.5%
	Enhanced	40	20	50%	14	35%	6	15%

types of understanding achieved by the treatment groups regarding each of the target forms individually. These results revealed that though the enhanced group gained more understanding about the past forms ('full understanding' 15%, 'partial understanding' 35%) rather than the present forms ('full understanding' 2.5%, 'partial understanding' 27.5%), still half of the participants of the group could not achieve any explicit understanding regarding either of the forms.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The first research question was set to examine the extent to which multiple exposure to enhanced texts can promote participants' noticing of the target forms. Therefore it was hypothesized that the participants who received multiple exposure to the textually enhanced input (the enhanced group) would notice the targeted forms more than would the participants who did not get that enhanced input (the non-enhanced group). This hypothesis was drawn based on Smith's (1993) argument that multiple exposure to the enhanced input will raise the possibility of noticing the target forms. The difference in noticing could occur because it was assumed that the increased saliency of input would facilitate the enhanced group's noticing process and thereby enabling them to notice the targeted forms at a higher level than the non-enhanced group (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011).

The descriptive statistics and the t test results of the note taking task for the target forms revealed that the participants of both enhanced and non-enhanced groups varied significantly in taking notes on the first and second exposure (Day 1 and 2). These findings demonstrated that the multiple exposure to the enhanced (for the enhanced group) and to the enriched (for the non-enhanced group) texts were able to increase both groups' chances of noticing the targeted tense forms (Smith 1993). Another notable finding of the study was that a large number of participants replied in the affirmative in response to the first noticing question that they had noticed something particularly while reading the texts for both target forms but a less number of participants than that was actually able to identify the targeted forms as the noticed items in their answer to the second noticing question. This discrepancy might have occurred due to the fact that some of the participants of both groups might have considered new or meaningful information in the texts as instances of noticing but according to Truscott and Smith (2011) noticing is more than 'just the awareness of input' and involves the awareness about a specific form in the input (p.501). Therefore, the percentage of the participants responding positively to the first noticing question was higher than the second one which was regarding specifying the forms that the participants had noticed particularly in the texts.

It was further ascertained from the note taking task results that the participants of both enhanced and non-enhanced groups took more notes of the content words (such as verbs) than that of the function words such as auxiliary verb 'have'. This kind of variation in noticing the items in the targeted forms might have occurred due to the fact that the participants might have processed those forms first which seemed more meaningful to them while interpreting the reading texts. This claim can be made based on VanPatten's (2007) 'the primacy of content word principle' drawn from the input processing model (p.117). According to this principle, content words are the first items that learners tend to process when they get exposure to the input due to the fact that the content words have higher semantic and communicative value than the grammatical items (VanPatten, 2007). As a result, these participants might have taken more notes of the content words than the function words. All these findings from the note taking task, and the first and the second noticing questions made it evident that the participants of not only the enhanced group but also the non-enhanced groups noticed the target forms in the input. In spite of that fact, these two groups' performances varied significantly in noticing the target forms of the study. These findings coincided with the results of the previous studies conducted on TE and grammar learning by Izumi (2002), Jahan and Kormos (2015), Leow (2001), and Loewen and Inceoglu (2016) but remained in contrast to that of Overstreet (1998) who had demonstrated the TE was not that effective with respect to directing learner's attention to noticing the target forms in the input.

The second research question was formulated to examine the extent to which multiple exposure to TE can develop participants' grammatical ability to express the targeted meanings, higher and lower immediacy of events taking place, by using the target forms. Accordingly, it was hypothesized that the participants who received multiple exposure to the enhanced input would progress further in expressing the targeted meanings by using the target forms more than would participants who did not get that enhanced input. The assumption was made based on Schmidt's (1995) argument that noticing the target form can initiate a range of cognitive processes which may

turn the input into intake and on Robinson's (1995) assertion that rehearsal as well as elaboration of input can increase the activation of information in the short term memory. Since there were two experimental groups (enhanced and non-enhanced) who received multiple exposure to the enhanced or the non-enhanced versions of the input (texts) and one control group who did not get any exposure to the input in this study, it was expected that the enhanced group would outperform the non-enhanced and the control group in expressing the targeted meanings by using the targeted forms after receiving the exposure.

It was evident from the form recognition task (choosing the correct form task) gain scores that there was large effect of treatment on the participants' scores in both the posttests and the enhanced group varied significantly from the other groups in both the posttests. On the other hand, from the form production task (fill-in-the blanks task) gain scores it was ascertained that there were large and moderate effect of treatment on the participants' scores in the immediate and the delayed posttests respectively, and the enhanced group varied significantly from the non-enhanced and the control groups only in the immediate posttest. These evidence suggested that TE was more helpful to the participants for only the intake of the targeted tense forms during the immediate post-test but not in the case of the acquisition of these forms afterwards. This finding is similar to what Jahan and Kormos (2015), and White (1998) reported in their studies.

It was determined from the reading comprehension task scores that both the enhanced and the non-enhanced groups acquired quite higher level comprehension about the meaning of the texts. It was also ascertained by comparing the scores of the noticing question 2 and 4 that actually a less number of participants had considered the grammar rules regarding the target forms even after noticing those forms. Additionally, though the enhanced group's amount of noticing varied significantly from the non-enhanced group, their awareness about the rules regarding the targeted tense forms did not vary in the similar manner. These findings suggested that though there was significant difference between the enhanced and the non-enhanced groups' noticing of the targeted forms, that inequality was minimized at this rule recognition phase due to the less processing of the noticed data for the targeted forms. This less processing of forms suggested that there were no guarantee that all the noticed items will be processed further (Smith, 1991, 1993).

The metalinguistic awareness task data also revealed that the enhanced group's achievement of understanding of the past tense varied from the non-enhanced group, and that variation was statistically significantly. However, these two groups' performances did not vary from each other significantly in terms of obtaining understanding concerning the function and meaning of the present perfect tense form of verb. As the participants had better pre-knowledge about the past tense form rather than the present perfect tense form, TE might have been able to facilitate them in achieving better understanding regarding the first target form from the exposure to some extent.

In conclusion, based on the evidence drawn from the increased noticing of the target forms by the enhanced group as opposed to the non-enhanced group, and the significantly better performance of the enhanced group rather than the non-enhanced and the control groups only in the immediate posttest, it could be claimed that TE was more effective in increasing the saliency of input than the input enrichment. Therefore, multiple exposure to TE had a more significant impact on learners' noticing and intake of the targeted tense forms than on the acquisition of the functions and meanings of those grammatical items. English language teaching practitioners in Malaysia, Indonesia, China and Korea can also apply this implicit instructional strategy to draw their learners' attention to the targeted tense forms in the written texts as their tertiary learners are also facing great difficulties in using these tense forms in writing (Isa, et al., 2017; Singh, et al., 2017; Zheng & Park, 2013). However for facilitating learner's acquisition of the targeted forms, the application of more explicit teaching techniques than TE would be recommended in EFL contexts since half of the participants of the enhanced group were unable to demonstrate any explicit understanding about

these forms in this study. Future researchers can explore how effective TE will be if it is applied in coordination with explicit teaching techniques.

REFERENCES

Azad, M. A. K., & Shanta, S. A. (2012).Teaching Grammar to the Undergraduate Bangladeshi EFL Learners: A Rethinking. *ASA University Review*, 6(2), 117-128.

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114- 138). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C. (2001). The cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 206-257). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elbaum, S.N. (2001). *Grammar in Context 2*. Third edition. Weymouth, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Ellis, R. (2001). Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Form-Focused Instruction and Second Language Learning* (pp. 1-46). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Han, Z., Park, E. S. & Combs, C. (2008). Textual enhancement of input: Issues and possibilities. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(4), 597–618. doi:10.1093/applin/amn010.

Hashim, S. A., & Govindasamy, S. (2009). The English verb: factual and non-factual Message. In N. Othman & S. Govindasamy (Eds.) *English and Asia* (pp. 347-358). IIUM Press: Kuala Lumpur.

Indrarathne, B., & Kormos, J. (2017). Attentional processing of input in explicit and implicit learning conditions: an eye-tracking study. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 39(3), 401-430. doi: 10.1017/S027226311600019X

Indrarathne, H. D. B. N., Ratajczak, M. P., & Kormos, J. (2018). Modelling Changes in the Cognitive Processing of Grammar in Implicit and Explicit Learning Conditions: Insights from an Eye-Tracking Study. Language Learning. doi: 10.1111/lang.12290

Isa, Q. N. M., Risdaneva, & Alfayed, A. (2017). An Analysis of Acehnese EFL Students' Grammatical Errors in Writing Recount Texts. *Englisia*. 5 (1), 41-50.

Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis: An experimental study on ESL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 24, 541-545.

Jahan, A.,& Kormos, J. (2015). The impact of textual enhancement on EFL learners grammatical awareness of future plans and intentions. International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 25, 46 – 66.

Kingston, K. (n.d.) A Look at the Intriguing History of Snowboarding. In *English Grammar 4U Online*. Retrieved April 27, 2014 from http://www.ego4u.com/en/read-on/animals/snowboarding

Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.

LaBrozzi, R. M. (2016). The Effects of Textual Enhancement Type on L2 Form Recognition and Reading Comprehension in Spanish. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(1), 75-91.

Lee, S.-K. (2007). Effects of textual enhancement and topic familiarity on Korean EFL students' reading comprehension and learning of passive form. *Language Learning*, 57, 87 – 118.

Loewen, S., & Inceoglu, S. (2016). The effectiveness of visual input enhancement on the noticing and L2 development of the Spanish past tense. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching.* 6 (1), 89-110. doi: 10.14746/ssllt.2016.6.1.5

Long, M. H., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice'. In C. Doughty,

& J. Williams (Eds). *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 16-41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2011). *Teaching grammar in second language classrooms*. New York: Routledge.

Overstreet, M. H. (1998). Text enhancement and content familiarity: The focus of learner attention. *Spanish Applied Linguistics*, 2, 229 – 258.

Putta, P. D. (2016). The effects of textual enhancement on the acquisition of two nonparallel grammatical features by Spanish speaking learners of Italian. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 38, 217– 238.doi:10.1017/S0272263116000073

Robinson, P. (1995). Attention, memory and the "noticing" hypothesis. *Language Learning,* 45, 283-
331.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics,* 11, 129-158.

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (pp. 1-63). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Schmidt, R . (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.). *Cognition and Second Language Instruction* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt , R . (2010). Attention, awareness, and individual differences in language learning. In W. M. Chan, S. Chi , K. N. Cin , J. Istanto , M. Nagami , J. W. Sew , T. Suthiwan, & I. Walker (Eds.), Proceedings of CLaSIC 2010, Singapore, December 2–4 (pp. 721 – 737). Singapore: National University of Singapore, Centre for Language Studies.

Singh, C. K. S., Singh, A. K. J., Razak, N. O. A., & Ravinthar, T. (2017). Grammar Errors Made by ESL Tertiary Students in Writing. *English Language Teaching*. 10(5), 16-27.

Smith, M. S. (1991). Speaking to many minds: On the relevance of different types of language information for the L2 learner. *Second Language Research,* 72, 118-32.

Smith, M. S. (1993). Input enhancement in instructed SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 15, 165-79.

Truscott, J., & Smith, M. S. (2011).Input, intake, and consciousness: The quest for a theoretical foundation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *33*, 497– 528.

VanPatten, B. (2007). Input processing in adult second language acquisition. In B. VanPatten, & J. Williams (Eds.). *Theories of second language acquisition: an introduction* (pp. 115-135). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Yule, G. (2003). *Explaining English grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zheng, C., & Park, T. (2013). An analysis of errors in English writing made by Chinese and Korean university students. *Theory and Practise in Language Studies, 3*(2), 1342-1360.
doi: 10.5539/elt.v10n5p16

APPENDIX I: Texts and Instruments for the Present Perfect and the Past Simple Tense Forms of Verb

Genealogy (Text A Enhanced)

Would you like to know about the history of your family? Many people are curious about it. *Roots,* a 1977 TV series, **showed** one man's search to find the history of his family. He **learned** that his family **moved** from Africa to America as slaves. Ever since the TV series **appeared**, genealogy **has become** one of the most popular hobbies of western people. People **have started** to ask themselves several questions about their own family origin.

Until recently, finding a family history **was** a difficult task. But the increasing popularity of internet since the 1990s **has made** this search for one's past a lot easier task. Even after that, most people need to go to libraries and courthouses to search for family records as using only internet is not enough to get the exact information. They look at census reports, old newspapers (document like marriage and death certificates), tax records, and land deeds. Early census records are not complete, but since the mid-1800s, many countries in the west **have kept** comprehensive records of family members, their ages, occupations, and place of birth.

How far back can you go in searching for relatives? One genealogist **has collected** information about 88,000 relatives. But finding this information takes a lot of time. Some people spend all their free time searching for clues that connect them to their past.

(Elbaum, 2001b, p. 246)

Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension Task

Circle the correct answers for the multiple choice questions:
a. *Roots* is a _____ .
i) movie   ii) novel
iii) television series   iv) drama
b. *Appeared* in line 3 means _____.
i) become popular   ii) publicized
iii) broadcasted   iv) seen
c. Finding a family history has become less time consuming due to the advancement of ____ .
i) technology   **ii) internet**
iii) communication system   iv) science
d. People will not be able to find information about their family members in_____.
i) the libraries   ii) the court
iii) census reports   **iv) bank records**
e. A genealogist is a person _____.
i) who looks for the origin of his/her gene.   ii) who search for his/her family stories.
iii) who look for his/her family members.   iv) who is interested in exploring his/her family history.

A Look at the History of Snowboarding (Text B Enhanced)

Tracing the history of the sport, snowboarding, would be impossible because people **have** always **loved** to slide down a snow-clad hill. Soaring through the snow on some kind of seat or board is nothing new. The ways to enjoy the snow are numerous, and people **have devised** ways to turn garbage can lids and cardboard into 'snowboards' to enjoy a thrilling afternoon outdoors. The various ways to glide through snow **have become** a more challenging task with the advancement of

technology. A snowboarder **has started** using smooth boards or skis in much the same manner as a surfboarder would ride a wave.

There **have been** many attempts at developing a modern snowboard. In 1965, researchers **developed** the 'Snurfer' (a word play on 'snow' and 'surfer') as a child's toy. The year 1969 **brought** a slightly more exclusive snowboard combining the principles of skiing with surfboard styling.

In 1977, the 'Flying Yellow Banana', **looked** more like a plastic shell with a top surface, similar to that of a skateboard. At that time, people might consider it as a major advancement in the little known sport of snowboarding. The first national snowboard race, 'The Suicide Six' must be a milestone in the history of snowboarding. The race **consisted** of a steep downhill run, *The Face.* In this race, the participant's main goal **seemed** to be mere survival.

(Kingston, n.d. in English Grammar 4U Online)

Multiple Choice Reading Comprehension Task

Circle the correct answers for the multiple choice questions:

a. Anyone would find it difficult to explore the history of snowboarding because_____
i) people have been skiing on the ice since time immemorial.
ii) nobody kept any record of it.
iii) people did not take interest in it initially.
iv) people treated it casually at the beginning.
b. *Soaring* in line 2 means _____.
i) descending.   ii) following.
iii) climbing.   iv) raising.
c. Surfboards are used for riding _____.
i) in water.   ii) in snow
iii) waves   iv) mountains
d. The snowboard was initially a _____.
i) can lid made board   ii) hardboard made board
iii) child's toy   iv) surfboard
e. The aim of the first national snowboard race was _____.
i) only winning the trophy.   ii) only enjoyment.
iii) only drawing people's attention.   **iv) only endurance.**
Grammar Task 1
Fill in the blanks with the correct form of verbs using the forms *have + V-en* **or** *V-ed.*
1. I **called** (call) Sharmin last month.
2. We **have promised** (promise) to help them already.
3. She **decided** (decide) to go on holiday three weeks ago.
4. She **has been** (be) here for three weeks.
5. They **killed** (kill) a tiger last summer.
6. I **have had** (have) breakfast this morning.
7. She **dropped** (drop) in to see me yesterday.
8. She **has watched** (see) the film three times.
9. We **talked** (talk) on the phone for thirty minutes.
10. I **have lost** (lose) my ID card - can you help me look for it?

Grammar Task 2

Put a circle around the correct answer. For this task please also let us know how certain you are that you gave the right answer. Please tick the box for the statement that refers to you.

1. They has just visited/ **have just visited**/ just visited the castle in Bharatpur.
☐I am certain I gave the right answer. ☐I am not certain that I gave the right answer.
2. While I have spoken/ has spoken/**spoke** to you, he came home.
☐I am certain I gave the right answer. ☐I am not certain that I gave the right answer.
3. I have lived/ has lived/ **lived** in South Africa for two years.
☐I am certain I gave the right answer. ☐I am not certain that I gave the right answer.
4. She **has washed**/ have washed/ washed her bike. Look, now it is really clean and looks like new!
☐I am certain I gave the right answer. ☐I am not certain that I gave the right answer.
5. I have got/ has got/ **got** my bike in November. So I have had it for five months.
☐I am certain I gave the right answer. ☐I am not certain that I gave the right answer.
6. She **has taught**/ have taught/taught many children since she finished school herself.
☐I am certain I gave the right answer. ☐I am not certain that I gave the right answer.
7. Its 11 o'clock. We are still enjoying the party. She has brought/ have brought/ **brought** pizza at 9 o'clock.
☐I am certain I gave the right answer. ☐I am not certain that I gave the right answer.
8. His grandfather is dead. He has painted/ have painted/ **painted** the bench.
☐I am certain I gave the right answer. ☐I am not certain that I gave the right answer.
9. They **have been**/ has been/ was/were married since 2003.
☐I am certain I gave the right answer. ☐I am not certain that I gave the right answer.
10. My family have adopted/ has adopted/**adopted** a dog when I was a baby.
☐I am certain I gave the right answer. ☐I am not certain that I gave the right answer.

Metalinguistic Awareness Task (For the experimental groups)
Please explain what you have understood about the functions of *have + V-en* **and** *V-ed* **from reading the text. You can use Bangla (first language) if you want.**

Metalinguistic Awareness Task (For the control group)
Please explain your understanding of the functions of the forms *have + V-en* **and** *V-ed* **in English. You can use Bangla (first language) if you want.**