

# Does Input Enhancement Develop Writing Skill? A Case Study of Jordanian EFL University Students

Fatima R. Al-Qeyam

English Language and Literature Department, Isra University, Jordan

Issam M. Ta'amneh\*

English Language & Translation Department, Isra University, Jordan

Abeer Mahmoud Al-Ghazo

Department of English Language and Literature, Ajloun National University, Jordan

**Abstract**—This research investigates the possible efficacy of input enhancement as one of the form-focused instruction (FFI) techniques for developing Jordanian English as a foreign language learners' (EFL) writing. Fifty university students of English language literature and translation participated in the study. The participants were divided randomly into two groups, a control group of (24) which received traditional teaching of paragraph writing and conjunctions; and an experimental group of (26) which received instruction on conjunction using input enhancement. Descriptive statistics, Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA), and Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) were used to examine the data. The findings demonstrated that input enhancement developed students' writing abilities and had a favorable impact on their learning of conjunctions. Thus, many pedagogical implications and recommendations which emerged from the current study can be used by language instructors, curriculum designers, and researchers.

**Index Terms**—form-focused instruction, input enhancement, conjunctions, writing skill

## I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Teaching writing to second or foreign language learners (henceforth, EFL) has been the focus of many language teachers and educators for a long time. Writing is a way to contact others such as family and friends and to express feelings and share knowledge. Writing is a powerful tool to influence the thoughts of people and change others' attitudes and beliefs. It is also a tool for learning, gathering, preserving, and transmitting information. It also has a significant effect on learning other language skills, especially reading (Graham et al., 2013). Writing has many purposes in our lives; it is a means of communication, a tool for expressing feelings, a facilitator of business work as well as its academic role (Dastjerdi & Samian, 2011).

There are two categories of language skills: receptive and productive. The ability to take in language created by others is known as receptive abilities. They consist of listening and reading. Conversely, writing and speaking are productive skills. These are two essential abilities that are fundamental to the intricate process of communication (Hyland, 2003, p. 4). To write well, students must have a high level of precision in writing different tasks. Writing is, by far, the hardest language talent to acquire when compared to other language abilities, according to many language teachers (Hyland, 2003).

Interest in teaching writing has increased due to its importance in our lives. Graham et al. (2013) stated that the interest in teaching writing is shown at all students' levels. Writing is not only taught to improve the writing skill, but also to facilitate students' learning in general. Students write for various purposes so schools must pay considerable attention to teaching students how to write. Schools must also focus on incorporating technology in teaching writing. However, it was noted that some of the teachers teach writing inappropriately because they do not have the experience or the suitable technique to teach writing as a productive skill.

Writing has been considered the most difficult skill in the field of language teaching and learning. Brown (2001) stated that writing is a complicated skill that is not acquired naturally; it should be taught through practice and training to acquire and master it acceptably. Thus, teaching writing should direct the students' attention to the form of the written text which is coherently organized using cohesive devices and discourse markers paying attention to grammar, spelling, and punctuation.

Teachers, when they teach writing, should know that there are many differences between writing in L1 and L2 as stated in Silva (cited in Brown, 2001). Silva surveyed L2 writing and demonstrated that L2 writers lack a lot of L2

---

\* Corresponding Author

writing skills and commit a lot of errors due to the difference between grammar and lexicon, and differences between cohesive devices, and their meanings in both languages. Therefore, language teachers should be aware of these differences to choose the best way of teaching writing to their students.

In the process of teaching writing to EFL learners, teachers should explicitly and implicitly provide their students with instruction related to all aspects concerning writing. Omaggio (2001) emphasized that teachers of writing should use contextualized and meaningful activities even when focusing on forms and combine different writing processes that are taught in the language classroom such as grammar, vocabulary, and discourse features. In this context, Al-Ghazo and Ta'amneh (2021) stressed the importance of positive enhancement as well as suitable feedback in writing, as this will help students improve and monitor their progress effectively and efficiently.

The ultimate goal of teaching writing is to teach students how to write down their ideas and thoughts in a coherent text. But students have cohesion problems in their writing as Dastjerdi and Samian (2011) hypothesized. These problems refer to the lack of knowledge of the appropriate cohesive devices in the L2. So, they produce missing or misleading sentence connections.

Through writing, individuals may acquire and comprehend the ideas and opinions of others who live in different times and places or the same periods as them, as well as about science, politics, history, and other subjects. Warschauer (2010) emphasized the importance of teaching writing to L2 learners because writing is a skill that is needed for learning and having a good job. Writing can also work as an effective tool for language skills development as well as the development of different subject matter.

Cohesion helps to combine the elements of the text. Students write effectively if they can use cohesive devices properly. There are many aspects of cohesion, such as the use of some devices that guide readers and show them how the ideas of a written text relate to one another. There are various kinds of cohesive relations such as reference, ellipsis, substitution, conjunctions, and lexical cohesion (Emah & Omachonn, 2018).

Writing serves as a communicative function, so it is recommended to be learned in a communicative context or by using communicative language teaching methods but without ignoring to emphasize and focus on the formal aspects of the language especially those that help students compose meaningful well-organized, and grammatically correct writings. These aspects include using cohesive devices that connect ideas in the written text. According to Long (1991), Nassaji (1999), and Spada (1997) form-focused instruction (henceforth, FFI) techniques provide language learners with formal instruction in a communicative language learning context that makes students master language fluency and accuracy at the same time. For better language learning, it is recommended that these FFI techniques should be planned by the language teacher in advance such as completion tasks (Nassaji, 1999) (this is obviously represented in input enhancement, the technique chosen in this paper). FFI refers to any explicit or implicit instructional strategy that is prepared ahead of time and involves bringing the language learners' attention to language forms (Long, 2000).

Focused L2 instruction results in better language learning. The teaching method that incorporates form and meaning results in much more durable learning than the other methods. Explicit instruction is direct and practical. Moreover, FFI activities develop accuracy as well as fluency and provide an interesting and motivating learning context (Brown, 2001; Norris & Ortega, 2001).

FFI provides several pedagogical practices that make students notice forms in a flexible meaningful way. Instructors must choose when and how to apply FFI techniques in their classrooms based on the needs of their students (Haley & Retz, 2002). The importance of FFI arises from its role in making the non-salient form noticeable and easy to understand (Ellis, 2011).

FFI provides several pedagogical practices that make students notice forms in flexible meaningful ways (Haley & Retz, 2002). Ellis (2011) stressed the importance of explicit teaching (such as input enhancement) because of its importance in making non-salient forms noticeable and easy to understand. However, Fotos and Nassaji (2011) stated that students can be subjected to repeated exposure to the intended forms (such as input flooding practices) during language learning.

FFI makes students notice the target forms and helps them to store these forms in the long-term memory, this is what Schmidt (1990) called consciousness-raising by noticing. Input enhancement exercises involve the use of italics, bolding, enlargement, and underlining, which direct the learners' attention to forms more than input flooding which involves exposing learners to input with an exceptionally large amount of the form under focus (White, 1998).

## II. PROBLEM, PURPOSE, AND QUESTIONS OF THE STUDY

Jordanian EFL students, like other learners of English as a foreign language, are reported to face many challenges in mastering the language (e.g., Al-Damiree & Bataineh, 2016; Al-Qeyam et al., 2016; Bataineh & Mayyas, 2017). Thus, students struggle with writing as it is considered one of the productive skills in the language (Brown, 2001; Hyland, 2003). The usage of cohesive devices is one of the numerous challenges and difficulties that EFL students encounter while learning English as a foreign language. (Dastjerdi & Samian, 2011). Moreover, from the researchers' own experiences as university professors of TEFL, they observed that students face difficulties in writing, especially in using cohesive devices. This difficulty could be attributed to students' lack of understanding and using cohesive devices as well as the lack of vocabulary. Therefore, this study aims to investigate the effect of using input enhancement to teach

cohesive devices as an attempt to develop EFL university students' knowledge of cohesive devices and improve their writing skill. The current study attempts to answer the following research questions:

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

### III. SIGNIFICANCE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study is most likely one of the first to look into input enhancement's possible efficacy in the setting of Jordanian EFL. Its conclusions could provide educators and learners with fresh approaches to teaching writing in English language classes. Since this study is among the first to use a particular approach to examine certain components of language competency, it is hoped that the findings may open up new avenues for future research in the field of EFL. Further research may look at different techniques with different student levels, as this study's scope and sample are restricted to evaluating the impact of one (input enhancement) out of eleven FFI techniques on cohesive devices and writing development of a convenient sample of fifty students from an EFL writing course. The presentation of this study is further constrained since it only addresses cohesive devices that embody a single category of knowledge.

### IV. PREVIOUS STUDIES

The review of the empirical studies shows the effectiveness of using different techniques of FFI in developing various language learners' skills. It reflects also the importance of teaching cohesive devices to improve L2 learners' writing skills. To the best of the researchers' knowledge, this is the first study that uses input enhancement to teach conjunctions in the Jordanian context.

Bataineh and Bani Younis (2016) studied the effect of dictogloss as one of the FFI techniques on Jordanian teachers' instructional practices and students' writing performance. The results of the study reflected the effectiveness of dictogloss in improving students' writing.

Ramadan (2019) investigated the effect of teaching cohesive devices in context in improving Libyan EFL students' writing. The researcher contrasted teaching cohesive devices within context against teaching them separately. The results showed that teaching cohesive devices develop students writing especially when taught in context.

Safdari (2019) conducted a study to find out how Iranian EFL learners' writing is affected by input flooding and input enhancement. To conduct the study, Sixty EFL students were divided into three groups of twenty. Two experimental groups and one control group made up the study's sample. A pre-post exam was given to each group. The results pointed out that the two strategies had a great effect on the participants' writing.

The effectiveness of improving the reading-based input data in EFL students' written restatements was examined by Fakhzadeh and Yazdanjoo (2020). The study's sample consisted of sixty intermediate EFL students, both male and female, enrolled in Tehran's Attar Language Institute. They were arbitrarily split into 30 individuals for the experimental and control groups. Under augmented input, instruction was supplied to the experimental group. On the other hand, the control group was trained conventionally. The results showed that when students in the experimental group were given enriched texts to read, their scores were much higher than those of the control group.

Salehi et al. (2020) studied the impact of different input approaches on conjunction output. To conduct the study, 40 Iranian students participated in the study. The participants were divided into two groups: an experimental and a control one. The results indicated the importance of input strategy in developing the learners' conjunctions.

Lestari et al. (2023) examined the challenges that students faced in the use of cohesive devices in writing. Twenty learners, in the basic stage, participated in the study. The participants' writings were analyzed and it was found that the participants used conjunctions rarely because they did not know the use of them in a proper way.

Reyes (2023) studied the effect of contrastive FFI on developing 11<sup>th</sup>-grade L2 vocabulary skills. The study focused on developing students' synonyms, antonyms, multiple meanings of words, prefixes, and lexical chunks. An 11<sup>th</sup>- grade class from a public school was conveniently chosen to participate in the study. The results indicated that contrastive FFI improved students' vocabulary skills.

Meng and Yin (2023) sought to determine how input enhancement affected the linguistic performance of Chinese EFL learners as indicated by complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) in continuation writing tasks. The sample of the study consisted of 80 Chinese high school students. The findings showed that while input enhancement had a little effect on accuracy, it had a large influence on complexity and fluency, which helped the participants write more proficiently overall.

Woyimo et al. (2024) studied the effect of integrating FFI in communicative language teaching. The researchers used FFI to teach pronunciation and grammar to improve Ethiopian 11<sup>th</sup>-grade students. The results of the study emphasized the effectiveness of FFI in developing the grammar and pronunciation of the students.

## V. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

### A. Design and Sampling

The current study has a quasi-experimental design. Two intact paragraph writing classes were chosen conveniently at Isra' University, Jordan for the purpose of the study. The classes took place in the first semester of the academic year 2023/2024. Then, the classes were divided randomly into a control group of 24 students and an experimental group of 26 students.

### B. Instrumentation and Data Collection

Two pre-posttests were designed by the researchers for data collection purposes. The first one is the acquisition of conjunctions test which comprised 41 items about the conjunctions under focus (for, and, nor, but, or, yet, and so). The other test is a writing test in which students are asked to write two meaningful, well-organized, and coherent paragraphs. The validity of the instruments (the pre-posttests and the instructional material) was ensured by asking a jury of university professors of applied linguistics, linguistics, TEFL, and measurement and evaluation. The jury evaluated the instruments in terms of their appropriateness for the purpose of the study. The comments of the jury were used to improve the quality of the instruments.

The reliability of the instruments was also established. The pre-posttests were administered twice to 13 students of a paragraph writing course in a preceding semester with a time-lapse of three weeks. The reliability coefficient of the conjunctions test was 0.78 and for the writing test 0.83.

### C. Instructing the Two Groups

Two groups were used for the purpose of this study. The experimental group was taught using instructional material that was designed to support the original material with input enhancement instruction and exercises to teach students conjunctions. On the other hand, the control group was taught conventionally per the guidelines of the coursebook "Effective Academic Writing 1" (Savage & Shafiei, 2007). According to the course description, it aims at teaching university students paragraph writing. The course provides students with the basics of writing a paragraph and shows them the diverse types of academic writing. However, it does not provide them with an adequate illustration of cohesive devices.

At first, the pre-tests were administered to the participants to find any potential differences among them. To ensure equivalence between the two groups, an independent sample t-test was used. According to the values of Levene's Test of Variance, the groups are considered equivalent because the values were greater than  $\alpha=0.05$  (0.45 for the acquisition of conjunctions test and 0.86 for the writing test). The experimental group received instruction from the first researcher while the control group received instruction from the original course instructor. The two instructors have a Ph.D degree in TEFL and have similar teaching experience. The instruction of the control group followed these steps:

1. A warm-up exercise was introduced to the students. This exercise included asking a question or presenting a picture related to the topic of the lesson.
2. The students discussed and shared opinions about the topic of the lesson and the instructor organized the discussion.
3. The students read the example paragraph aloud and answered the questions related to it.
4. The instructor highlighted the structure of the paragraph by identifying the topic sentence, the supporting sentences, and the concluding sentence.
5. The instructor explained the language focus on each type of paragraph which illustrated some linguistic features that help students in improving their writing.
6. At the end of the lesson, the instructor asked the students to write a paragraph about the type and topic of the paragraph discussed. The instructor read the writings of the students and provided them with feedback.

On the other hand, the experimental group was taught the conjunctions through an eight-week, researcher-designed, input enhancement-based instructional treatment. The content of the treatment was based on the course book, "Effective Academic Writing 1". The lessons proceeded as follows:

1. A warm-up exercise was introduced to the students. This exercise included asking a question or presenting a picture related to the topic of the lesson.
2. The students discussed and shared opinions about the topic of the lesson and the instructor organized the discussion.
3. A conjunction and its use were highlighted and explained in each lesson. The examples included conjunctions used in sentences and highlighted to students using italics, bolding, enlargement, and underlining; which directed the learners' attention to the conjunction under focus. The goal was to enable students to notice each conjunction and its meaning through input enhancement tasks (White, 1998).
4. Then, a paragraph that included the conjunctions under focus, was presented per the input enhancement technique to draw the participants' attention to the conjunction (Long & Robinson, 1998).
5. The participants were then asked to write their paragraphs on a selected topic to use the conjunctions under focus. The instructor read the writings of the students and provided them with feedback.

## VI. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

To answer the first research question “Does input enhancement affect students’ acquisition of conjunctions?”, the means and standard deviations of students’ scores on the acquisition of conjunctions pre-and post-tests of the control group and the input enhancement (IE) group were calculated according to the teaching method (IE vs. course book), as shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1  
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	Pre		Post		Adjusted Mean	St. Error
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation		
Control	24	19.08	6.48	21.21	6.23	21.66	0.61
IE group	26	20.34	5.09	34.73	3.47	34.31	0.59

Table 1 shows an observed difference in the mean (and the adjusted mean) of the control and the IE groups, with close values of means on the pre-test and higher mean and adjusted mean scores of the IE group on the post-test. It indicates a development in participants’ knowledge of conjunctions due to IE instruction. Thus, to ascertain the potential significance of these differences, ANCOVA was used, as shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2  
ANCOVA OF THE IE GROUP PARTICIPANTS’ SCORES ON THE ACQUISITION OF CONJUNCTIONS POST-TESTS

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Pre	773.18	1	773.18	86.13	0.000*	0.64
Way	1972.22	1	1972.22	219.71	0.000*	0.82
Error	421.88	47	8.98			
Corrected Total	3477.12	49				

N=50 significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

Table 2 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 ( $F= 219.71$ ,  $df=1$  and  $49$ ,  $P= 0.000$ ) which seems to indicate that IE instruction developed participants’ knowledge of conjunctions. The analysis of the data shows that the participants in the experimental group outperformed the participants in the control group. The experimental group received instruction on the conjunctions under focus using input enhancement in which the conjunctions are highlighted in many different ways using authentic contexts. This FFI technique has drawn the participants’ attention to these conjunctions and their use since input enhancement exercises involve the use of italics, bolding, enlargement, and underlining, which direct the learners’ attention to forms as White (1998) demonstrated.

To answer the second question “Does input enhancement affect students’ writing skills?”, the means and standard deviations of students’ scores on the writing pre-and post-tests of the IE group were calculated, as shown in Table 3.

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. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation		
Control	Title	2.50	1.14	2.83	1.09	2.95	0.19
	Topic sentence	2.46	1.06	2.92	1.02	3.02	0.20
	Supporting sentences	1.88	0.85	2.29	0.91	2.37	0.20
	Spelling	2.29	1.00	2.79	1.06	2.80	0.19
	Word choice	2.04	0.95	2.75	1.19	2.82	0.26
	Verb tense and form	2.67	1.34	2.67	1.34	2.72	0.19
	Punctuation	1.96	1.00	2.17	0.92	2.20	0.26
	Capitalization	2.08	0.97	2.67	1.20	2.78	0.23
	Sentence structure	1.96	1.00	2.63	1.28	2.63	0.25
	background information	2.04	0.95	2.50	1.06	2.44	0.23
	Use of conjunctions	1.58	0.65	2.08	0.97	2.01	0.24
	Conclusion	1.79	0.93	2.13	1.08	2.10	0.22
	The number of conjunctions used in the paragraph	1.88	0.90	2.21	1.02	2.24	0.23
	Variety of the conjunctions used in the paragraph.	1.58	0.65	2.04	1.12	2.04	0.23
	The correct use of conjunctions	1.50	0.59	2.17	1.24	2.29	0.24
	Unity and coherence	1.50	0.59	2.17	1.01	2.15	0.24
	All	31.71	5.25	39.00	4.29	39.54	0.88
IE group	Title	2.46	1.17	3.65	0.85	3.55	0.18
	Topic sentence	2.27	1.12	3.73	0.87	3.64	0.20
	Supporting sentences	1.85	0.83	3.69	0.88	3.62	0.19
	Spelling	2.08	1.06	3.38	1.02	3.38	0.18
	Word choice	2.08	0.93	3.35	1.13	3.28	0.25
	Verb tense and form	2.42	1.30	3.46	1.07	3.42	0.18
	Punctuation	1.96	0.92	3.35	1.23	3.32	0.24
	Capitalization	2.08	0.93	3.46	1.21	3.36	0.22
	Sentence structure	1.92	0.89	3.50	1.10	3.50	0.24
	background information	2.00	0.94	3.58	1.06	3.63	0.22
	Use of conjunctions	1.73	0.72	3.62	1.10	3.69	0.23
	Conclusion	2.00	1.02	3.38	1.20	3.41	0.21
	The number of conjunctions used in the paragraph	2.04	1.04	3.46	1.21	3.43	0.22
	Variety of the conjunctions used in the paragraph.	1.69	0.79	3.19	1.17	3.20	0.22
	The correct use of conjunctions	1.69	0.79	3.35	1.13	3.23	0.23
	Unity and coherence	1.69	0.79	3.46	1.03	3.48	0.23
	All	31.96	5.16	55.62	6.39	55.12	0.84

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 skill in favor of the IE group. For further examination of the results, ANCOVA was used to analyze participants' scores in the tests as shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4  
ANCOVA OF THE CONTROL GROUP AND IE GROUP SCORES ON THE WRITING SKILL POST-TEST

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
way	3399.90	1	3399.90	130.66	0.000*	0.73
Error	1222.98	47	26.02			
Corrected Total	4891.52	49				

Source	Source	Sum Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig	Partial Eta Squared
Title	Way	3.72	1	3.72	4.94	0.03*	0.13
	Error	24.11	32	0.75			
	Corrected total	53.62	49				
Topic sentence	Way	4.00	1	4.00	4.39	0.04*	0.12
	Error	29.16	32	0.91			
	Corrected total	51.22	49				
Supporting sentences	Way	16.34	1	16.34	19.31	0.000*	0.38
	Error	27.09	32	0.85			
	Corrected total	62.98	49				
Spelling	Way	3.52	1	3.52	4.61	0.04*	0.13
	Error	24.43	32	0.76			
	Corrected total	56.50	49				
Word choice	Way	2.25	1	2.25	1.57	0.22	0.05
	Error	46.10	32	1.44			
	Corrected total	68.82	49				
Verb tense and form	Way	5.12	1	5.12	6.54	0.02*	0.17
	Error	25.06	32	0.78			
	Corrected total	77.68	49				
Punctuation	Way	13.04	1	13.04	9.18	0.01*	0.22
	Error	45.43	32	1.42			
	Corrected total	74.58	49				
Capitalization	Way	3.50	1	3.50	3.17	0.08	0.09
	Error	35.30	32	1.10			
	Corrected total	77.68	49				
Sentence structure	Way	7.79	1	7.79	5.65	0.02*	0.15
	Error	44.10	32	1.38			
	Corrected total	77.68	49				
background information	Way	14.72	1	14.72	13.09	0.001*	0.29
	Error	35.99	32	1.13			
	Corrected total	68.82	49				
Use of conjunctions	Way	29.29	1	29.29	22.80	0.000*	0.42
	Error	41.10	32	1.28			
	Corrected total	81.28	49				
Conclusion	Way	17.71	1	17.71	16.31	0.000*	0.34
	Error	34.74	32	1.09			
	Corrected total	82.58	49				
The number of conjunctions used in the paragraph	Way	14.80	1	14.80	12.88	0.001*	0.29
	Error	36.77	32	1.15			
	Corrected total	80.02	49				
Variety of the conjunctions used in the paragraph.	Way	13.89	1	13.89	12.18	0.000*	0.28
	Error	36.49	32	1.14			
	Corrected total	79.52	49				
The correct use of conjunctions	Way	9.25	1	9.25	7.13	0.01*	0.18
	Error	41.50	32	1.30			
	Corrected total	84.58	49				
Unity and coherence	Way	18.24	1	18.24	14.27	0.001*	0.31
	Error	40.92	32	1.28			
	Corrected total	70.72	49				
All	Way	2522.65	1	2522.65	149.84	0.000*	0.82
	Error	538.74	32	16.84			
	Corrected total	4891.52	49				

N=50 significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

Table 4 shows statistically significant differences in participants' scores on the writing skill post-test at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in favor of the IE group ( $F= 130.66$ ,  $df=1$  &  $49$ ,  $P= 0.000$ ) which indicates that IE instruction developed participants' writing skill. To show which one of the writing skill criteria has been affected by the using IE, MANCOVA was used as shown in Table 5:

TABLE 5  
MANCOVA OF THE CONTROL GROUP AND IE GROUP SCORES ON THE WRITING SKILL POST-TEST

Source	Source	Sum Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig	Partial Eta Squared
Title	Way	3.72	1	3.72	4.94	0.03*	0.13
	Error	24.11	32	0.75			
	Corrected total	53.62	49				
Topic sentence	Way	4.00	1	4.00	4.39	0.04*	0.12
	Error	29.16	32	0.91			
	Corrected total	51.22	49				
Supporting sentences	Way	16.34	1	16.34	19.31	0.000*	0.38
	Error	27.09	32	0.85			
	Corrected total	62.98	49				
Spelling	Way	3.52	1	3.52	4.61	0.04*	0.13
	Error	24.43	32	0.76			
	Corrected total	56.50	49				
Word choice	Way	2.25	1	2.25	1.57	0.22	0.05
	Error	46.10	32	1.44			
	Corrected total	68.82	49				
Verb tense and form	Way	5.12	1	5.12	6.54	0.02*	0.17
	Error	25.06	32	0.78			
	Corrected total	77.68	49				
Punctuation	Way	13.04	1	13.04	9.18	0.01*	0.22
	Error	45.43	32	1.42			
	Corrected total	74.58	49				
Capitalization	Way	3.50	1	3.50	3.17	0.08	0.09
	Error	35.30	32	1.10			
	Corrected total	77.68	49				
Sentence structure	Way	7.79	1	7.79	5.65	0.02*	0.15
	Error	44.10	32	1.38			
	Corrected total	77.68	49				
background information	Way	14.72	1	14.72	13.09	0.001*	0.29
	Error	35.99	32	1.13			
	Corrected total	68.82	49				
Use of conjunctions	Way	29.29	1	29.29	22.80	0.000*	0.42
	Error	41.10	32	1.28			
	Corrected total	81.28	49				
Conclusion	Way	17.71	1	17.71	16.31	0.000*	0.34
	Error	34.74	32	1.09			
	Corrected total	82.58	49				
The number of conjunctions used in the paragraph	Way	14.80	1	14.80	12.88	0.001*	0.29
	Error	36.77	32	1.15			
	Corrected total	80.02	49				
Variety of the conjunctions used in the paragraph.	Way	13.89	1	13.89	12.18	0.000*	0.28
	Error	36.49	32	1.14			
	Corrected total	79.52	49				
The correct use of conjunctions	Way	9.25	1	9.25	7.13	0.01*	0.18
	Error	41.50	32	1.30			
	Corrected total	84.58	49				
Unity and coherence	Way	18.24	1	18.24	14.27	0.001*	0.31
	Error	40.92	32	1.28			
	Corrected total	70.72	49				
All	Way	2522.65	1	2522.65	149.84	0.000*	0.82
	Error	538.74	32	16.84			
	Corrected total	4891.52	49				

Table 5 shows that IE has affected participants' acquisition of most of the criteria used to examine the participants' acquisition of writing skill. This positive effect of IE can be attributed to Schmidt's (1990) consciousness-raising by noticing which states that students' awareness of a certain form can be improved by providing them with the forms under focus in an explicit way. So, students can learn and retain the forms and then use them appropriately.

## VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following conclusions are drawn from the current study. First, teaching conjunctions using input enhancement raised the participants' awareness of them and their importance in maintaining paragraph coherence. Second, instruction of conjunctions has potentially provided the participants with new options that helped them join the ideas within the paragraph. Third, input enhancement worked on improving the participants' overall writing skill by engaging them in many cognitive processes such as consciousness-raising.

Students are more likely to feel inspired and involved in the writing process when they get feedback and direction using input enhancement strategies. Students' confidence may be increased and they can be inspired to keep improving their writing abilities by providing them with focused help and positive reinforcement.

As shown in the previous section, the results of this study are completely consistent with the studies mentioned previously, such as Ramadan (2019), Safdari (2019), Fakhrazadeh and Yazdanjoo (2020), Reyes (2023), Meng and Yin (2023), and Woymo et al. (2024) which pointed out that applying the input enhancement technique had a positive effect in improving students' writing skill. The results of other studies - that were conducted by Salehi et al. (2020), and Lestari et al. (2023) - were in complete harmony with the results of this paper, as it proved that using the technique of input enhancement had a great and positive effect to acquire and master learning the conjunctions.

Based on the findings of this study, many recommendations can be presented. First, instructors need to teach conjunctions in their writing courses because of the positive impact of teaching them on students' writing skill. Second, EFL instructors are recommended to utilize input enhancement in their teaching practices due to its proven effectiveness in this study.

Third, Further research on FFI techniques on other language skills and other cohesive devices is also recommended. Fourth, other samples and longer instruction are recommended for better generalization of results.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Al-Damiree, R., & Bataineh, R. F. (2016). Vocabulary knowledge and syntactic awareness as potential catalysts for reading comprehension among young Jordanian EFL students. *Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education* (University of Bahrain), 4(1), 53-59. Retrieved February 27, 2024 <http://journals.uob.edu.bh/JTTE/contents/volume-1073/articles/article-2397>.
- [2] Al-Ghazo, A. & Ta'amneh, I. (2021). Evaluation and Grading of Students' Writing: Holistic and Analytic Scoring Rubrics. *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics*, 9(1), 777-93. Retrieved February 23, 2024 <https://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/jsel/article/view/19060>
- [3] 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.
- [4] Bataineh, R. & Bani Younis, R. (2016). The Effect of Dictogloss on Jordanian EFL Teachers' Instructional Practices and Students' Writing Performance. *International Journal of Education and Training*, 2(1), 1-11.
- [5] Bataineh, R. F., & Mayyas, M. B. (2017). The utility of blended learning in EFL reading and grammar: A case for Moodle. *Teaching English with Technology*, 7(3), 35-49. Retrieved March 15, 2024 <http://www.tewtjournal.org/?wpdmact=process&did=NTAwLmhvdGxpbms>.
- [6] Brown, D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Longman.
- [7] 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.
- [8] Debot, K., Ginsberg, R., & Kramsch, C. (Eds). (1991). *Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- [9] Ellis, R. (Ed.). (2001). *Form-focused Instruction and Second Language Teaching*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- [10] Emah, S. & Omachonn, C. (2018). Functions of Cohesive Devices in Text Comprehension and Writing. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development*, 3(1), 79-85.
- [11] Fakhrazadeh, S., & Yazdanjoo, S. (2020). The Impact of Using Input Enhancement Techniques in the Use of Frequent Collocations via Reading on Restatement in Writing of Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners. *MEXTESOL Journal*. Retrieved February 10, 2024 from [https://www.mextesol.net/journal/index.php/index.php?page=journal&id\\_article=21238](https://www.mextesol.net/journal/index.php/index.php?page=journal&id_article=21238)
- [12] Fotos, S., & Nassaji, H. (Eds.). (2011). *Form-Focused Instruction and Teacher Education: Studies in Honour of Rod Ellis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [13] Graham, S., Gillespie, A. & Mckeown, D. (2013). Writing: Importance, development, and instruction. *Reading and Writing*, 26(1), 1-15.
- [14] Haley, M. & Rentz, P. (2002). Applying SLS Research and Theory to Practice: What Can a Teacher Do?. *TESL-EJ*, 5(4), 13-27.
- [15] Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. London: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved December 25, 2023 [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=XW1eEjZC8q0L4tjikI7cMdWN\\_0&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Hyland%2C%20K.%20\(2003\).%20Second%20language%20writing.%20London%3A%20Cambridge%20University%20Press.&f=false](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=XW1eEjZC8q0L4tjikI7cMdWN_0&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Hyland%2C%20K.%20(2003).%20Second%20language%20writing.%20London%3A%20Cambridge%20University%20Press.&f=false)
- [16] Lestari, Astutik., & Werdining. (2023). An Analysis on Cohesive Devices of Students' Recount Paragraphs Writing. *JPBI: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, 1(1), 3-16.
- [17] Long, M. (1991). Focus on Form: A Design Feature in Language Methodology. In K. Debot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch, (Eds), *Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspective*, (39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- [18] Long, M. (2000). Focus on Form in Task-Based Language Teaching. In R. Lambert & E. Shohamy (Eds.), *Language Policy and Pedagogy: Essays in Honour of A. Ronald Walton (172-192)*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin.
- [19] Long, M., and Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on Form: Theory, Research, and Practice. In Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, 15-41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [20] Meng, L., & Yin, H. (2023). Effects of input enhancement and genre on L2 learners' performance in the continuation writing task. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*. Retrieved January 20, 2024 from <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02488-y>
- [21] Nassaji, H. (1999). Towards Integrating Form-Focused Instruction and Communicative Interaction in Second Language Classroom: Some Pedagogical Possibilities. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 55(3), 385-402.

- [22] 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*, (157-213). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- [23] Omaggio-Hadley, A. (2001). *Teaching Language in Context*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- [24] Ramadan, M. (2019). The Effectiveness of Teaching Grammar in Context: Teaching Conjunctions as an Example. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 18, 706-754.
- [25] Reyes, D. (2023). Contrastive Form-Focused Instruction in Improving Vocabulary. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, 4(4), 1-27.
- [26] Safdari, M. (2019). Input Flooding, Input Enhancement and Writing Performance: Effects and Percepts. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(4), 281-296. Retrieved January 11, 2024 from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1230054>
- [27] Salehi, H., Shahpari, A., & Ahmadishokouh, A. (2020). The Effects of Input Enhancement Techniques on ESP Learners' Microgenetic Development of Conjunction Production. *Journal of Practical Studies in Education*, 1(1), 6-14. Retrieved January 17, 2024 from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1320617.pdf>
- [28] Schmidt, R. (1990). The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129-158. Retrieved March 20, 2024 from <http://applied.oxfordjournals.org/at>.
- [29] Spada, N. (1997). Form-Focused Instruction and Second Language Acquisition: A Review of Classroom and Laboratory Research. *Language Teaching*, 30(2), 73-87.
- [30] Warschauer, M. (2010). Invited Commentary: New Tools for Teaching Writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 14(1), 3-8.
- [31] White, J. (1998). Getting the learner's attention: a typographical input enhancement study In C. Doughty and J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 85-113). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [32] Woyomo, T. Bachore, M. & Jobo, M. (2024). The Effects of Form-Focused Communicative Grammar Instruction on Students' Pronunciation and Grammar in Speaking. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, 13(1), 61-70.

**Fatima Al- Qeyam** is an Assistant Professor in English Language and Linguistics at Isra University, Jordan. She was awarded her PhD in TEFL from Yarmouk University, Jordan in 2017. Her current research interests include Second Language Acquisition, Pragmatics, Teacher Education, Curriculum Development & Computer Assisted Language Learning.

**Issam Ta'amneh** is an associate professor of curriculum and methods of teaching English at Isra University, Jordan. Master of Translation at Yarmouk University, Jordan. He is a member of the Jordanian Translators Association (JTA). His areas of interest are Content Analysis, Translation, Applied Linguistics, Contrastive Analysis, Language Acquisition, and TEFL.

**Abeer Al-Ghazo** is an associate professor of curriculum and methods of teaching English at Ajloun National University, Jordan. Her areas of interest are Content Analysis, Applied Linguistics, Contrastive Analysis, Language Acquisition, and TEFL.