

# Effects of Lexical Simplification and Elaboration on Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners' Learning and Retention of Phrasal Verbs

Melika Ghorbanian

Faculty of Persian and Foreign Language, Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran

Shadab Jabbarpoor

Department of English Language, Yadegar-e-Imam Khomeini RAH Shahre-Rey Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

**Abstract**—This study aimed at investigating the effect of lexical simplification and elaboration on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' learning and retention of phrasal verbs. In order to achieve this goal, a PET test was run into 130 learners. When target participants were chosen, they were assigned into three groups including two treatment groups and one control group. Through a multiple choice test, 40 out of 60 phrasal verbs were selected as target phrasal verbs. Through 8 sessions of treatment, each group received a reading comprehension text that contained 5 phrasal verbs. But the way the phrasal verbs in two experimental groups were modified was different. One of them received elaborated input and the other group received simplified input; meanwhile, the control group received unmodified input. After eight sessions of treatment, an immediate multiple choice test was administered to find out which techniques had stronger effect on participant's learning and retention of phrasal verbs. After one month, the same test, with a different order of items, was administered as delayed posttest to check the participants' level of retention. According to the results of the study simplified input group significantly outperformed the control and elaborated group on both learning and retention of phrasal verbs.

**Index Terms**—lexical elaboration, lexical simplification, phrasal verbs

## I. INTRODUCTION

In learning a second language, we should take into consideration that language input is a necessary and key factor in learning a second language, but more important than that is being exposed to comprehensible input which means that learners should be able to understand the essence of what is being said or presented to them. What seems essential in here is not only the presence of target language input, but also that the learner understanding of target language. As Corder (1967) originally pointed out and it has also been underlined by Krashen's input hypothesis (1980), any input must be comprehended if it is meant to assist the acquisition process. Different studies have been done in the area of input comprehension (Carroll 1999, Ellis 1991, block 2003, Gass and Mackey 2007), most of these studies have developed from two important hypotheses first, Krashen's Input Hypothesis (1982) which emphasized the importance of comprehensible input in second language acquisition and second, long's interaction hypothesis (1996) which is related to the role of interaction in second language criteria.

There are various strategies and methods in second language acquisition that have a contributor role in making input more easily understood and comprehensible, among them, input modification can be referred. To be more specific, input modification has its own subdivisions including input simplification, input elaboration, input enhancement, etc. Input modification is based on premise that "input must be comprehensible to become intake" (Watanabe, 1997, p, 287).

The input modification is motivated by Krashen's input hypothesis (1981, 1985 and 1987) and Long's interaction hypothesis (1983a, 1983b, 1996). "The input hypothesis states that an important condition for language acquisition to occur is the acquirer understand input language that contains structure a bit beyond his or her current level of competence, for instance if an acquirer is at stage or level I, the input he or she understands should contain  $i+1$ " (Krashen, 1981, p.100). In parallel to Krashen's input hypothesis, the interaction hypothesis argued that comprehensible input is essential for language learning. Moreover, interaction hypothesis states that the effectiveness of comprehensible input is considerably enhance when learners have to negotiate for meaning.

Even though there are several studies that relate interaction with language acquisition, not all researchers advocate for the idea that interaction is the main means by which language proficiency develops. Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991), believe that interaction is not necessary for language acquisition and it only aids in certain conditions. Furthermore, Ellis, (1997) notes that interaction is not always positive. He stated that sometimes it can make the input more sophisticated and therefore learners might confuse. In accordance with Ellis (1997), long paraphrases and complex, confusing definitions of a word which is not understood should be avoided; otherwise, learners may come to the

conclusion that the role of interaction in language acquisition is hard for them. In the similar path, this study endeavored to examine two types of input modification (simplification and elaboration) on learning and retention of phrasal verbs by Iranian EFL intermediate level students. To be more specific, the researcher of this study investigated the best way to modify or manipulate the input in a way which is best for learning and retention. The input for the current study is Phrasal verbs. Phrasal verbs are two-word or three word idiomatic expressions, consisting of a verb and a particle or combination of a particle and a preposition (Lewis, 1993). Recently, there has been much attention paid to avoidance of phrasal verbs by EFL learners. (Chen, 2007; Liao, 2004). Having magnified the importance of phrasal verbs in many curriculums, some learners still have considerable problems applying them. Many EFL teachers wonder why their students do not show comprehensive improvement in using phrasal verbs. Although English learners including Iranian EFL learners, encounter some of the phrasal verbs such as go on, get out, point out, wake up etc. from very early stage, they still have considerable problems in applying them. Native speakers tend to use phrasal verbs in their speech a lot. On the contrary, non-native speakers of English tend to avoid phrasal verbs when communicating in the foreign language (Liao & Fukuya, 2004). Although most of English learners have desired to use language as native speakers, they don't use phrasal verbs as much as native speakers. This shortcoming may come from the complexity of phrasal verbs or maybe because of learners' needs for more illustration to get the meaning of that specific phrasal verb.

#### **Input Simplification and input Elaboration**

One of the major types of modifications that have been used to make incoming input more understandable for learners is input simplification. Simplification refers to those changes that make input to have less lexical and syntactical complexity. In lexical simplification, a word with a low frequency is substituted with higher frequency equivalent word; and in case of no synonymous word is found a low frequency word with a short phrase including higher frequency word will be use (brewer, 2008). Similar definition for input simplification is suggested by Urano (2000, p. 4) as controlling the text which is targeted for second language learners by removing unfamiliar linguistic items, in order to increase their comprehension level.

Another major type of modifications that has a great effect on comprehensible input is elaborative modification. In the process of input elaboration, extra information is added to the text in order to make it less difficult in terms of lexical or syntactic complexity. Yet on the input simplification mechanism, syntactic or lexical complexity is omitted from the text. Different researchers presented different definition as Brewer (2008) defined lexical elaboration as "adding a short parenthetical definition (composed of high frequency words) after a low frequency word" (p.4). On the other hand in some other studies lexical elaboration is defined as adding definitions or synonyms instead of difficult lexical items (Kim, 2006).

Elaboration is defined in a bit different way by Parker and Chaudron (1987). They suggested another definition for elaboration as "the addition of redundancy, and the explicit realization of underlying thematic relations" (p.110). It is believed that elaboration is created to facilitate language learning by means of restatement, paraphrases, and synonyms (Chaudron& Parker, 1987, p.110).

A number of researches in the area of text modification have been done. A study conducted by Shirinzarii and Mardani (2011) investigated the effect of two different text modification including simplification and elaboration, on Iranian EFL learners' incidental vocabulary acquisition. The result indicates that, the learners who read the simplified text, gained higher score in comparison with those who received elaborated and baseline texts.

Mousapour Negari (2012) attempted to investigate the effects of lexical modification on incidental vocabulary acquisition of Iranian EFL students. In Mousapours' study four versions of experimental text containing 20 target words were created including baseline and simplified versions, as well as elaborated version with two types of parenthetical elaborated and non-parenthetical elaborated version. The result revealed the superiority of elaboration over simplification and also the superiority of parenthetical elaboration over non-parenthetical elaboration. They also assumed that supplying synonyms or short definition exactly next to the lexical items can help the learners acquire the second stage of vocabulary learning considerably easier.

Blae (1982) presents ineffectiveness of simplification as he believes that input simplification leads to comprehension, but clearly not consistently, he also state that input simplification omits the input linguistic items from baseline text that students need to acquire.

Chung (1995) investigated the effect of input simplification and input elaboration on reading comprehension of second language learners and came to conclusion that both input simplification and input elaboration would facilitate the process of reading comprehension in second language learners. In Chung (1995) study five different version of reading passage were presented as unmodified version, simplified version, structurally elaborated version, lexically elaborated version and structurally and lexically elaborated version. In simplified version, some changes may occur to simplify the text as an example, a compound sentence substituted with several simple declarative sentences and each of them represent only a single main idea, in this version a low-frequency word substituted with high-frequency word also active voice sentences are more preferable in simplified version. Lexical elaboration was achieved by definition of unknown elements. The aim of structural elaboration is to increase redundancy of the text in order to make it clarify. The combination of lexically elaborated and structurally elaborated made the last version which is lexically & structurally version. Data obtained from this study indicated that a significant difference between the simplified and

baseline version of the text also No significant differences were appeared between the elaborated conditions and the baseline form.

Pica (1987) investigates the effects of modified interaction on Comprehension and the acquisition of word meaning. He found that internationally modified input resulted in better comprehension, furthermore new words acquired better in compare to pre-modified group in his study.

Various researches in the area of text modification have been examined the effects of input elaboration on second language learners' comprehension. Moradian and Adel (2011), attempt to investigate the effect of elaborated text and unelaborated text on vocabulary learning of Iranian EFL learners in Lorestan University. They tried to find out whether explicit elaboration or implicit elaboration have any effects on vocabulary acquisition of learners, and can they be used as an independent tool for increasing learners in recognizing the meaning of new vocabularies in a text. Moradian and Adel (2011), choose three groups of EFL learners that each group contains 45 students and they were exposed to 30 low-frequency words by reading one of the three versions of an experimental text which contains those verbs. The outcome indicate that explicit lexical elaboration, compared to implicit lexical elaboration, was the most effective kind of lexical elaboration in vocabulary learning of Iranian EFL learners. Urano (2000) examined the effect of lexical simplification and lexical elaboration on second language sentence comprehension and incidental vocabulary acquisition. Forty sentences were presented in a way which one target word was included in three version of simplified, elaborated, and distracted then the test distributed to forty native speakers of Japanese. After reading the sentences, two vocabulary tests were administered and showed that the mean score in the baseline version and elaborated version were higher than in the simplified version. On the other hand, some studied came to this conclusion that none of the techniques have positive effects on learners' learning. In this regard, Nemat tabrizi (2016), attempt to investigate the effect of input-based instruction on the speaking ability of Iranian EFL learners. The results reveal that the students who received input -based instruction outperformed the other students in the control group. This led to the conclusion that input-based instruction influences total speaking ability of EFL learners.

Modifying input with the aim of making it more comprehensible for language learners is one of the most common phenomena in the second language area. Input modification is based on premise that that "input must be comprehensible to become intake" (Watanabe, 1997, p, 287). Guided by theoretical perspective of modifying input with the aim of making it more comprehensible for language learners, much current second language research has focused on identifying what makes input more comprehensible to the learner (e.g., Blau 1980, Chaudron 1983, 1985, Johnson 1981, Krashen 1980, Long 1985). Rubin (1987) believes that educators need to be aware of a number of techniques and strategies which can be set into students existing criteria. Use of input simplification and input elaboration as techniques of input modification, to enhance comprehension has gained attention of SLA researchers.

It is commonly believed that simplifying input will enhance L2 comprehension; however, several researchers have presented against its use as a result of simplifying input does not necessarily help Comprehension (e.g., Blau, 1982), also it removes from the input linguistic items that L2 learners need to learn (e.g., Yano, Long, & Ross, 1994).

Input elaboration as well as input simplification improves comprehension by adding extra information to the text and make it less complicated. In the following section, this study is going to illustrate each technique.

Long believes that, input in second language area can be modified in its linguistic form such as morphemes deletion, also input modification can take place during interaction which a proper example of it would be confirmation checks and self-repetition. Moreover, it is likely that modification occur in both linguistic form and interaction or neither of them.

Long's study (1981, 1983) indicates that in the interaction of native speaker and non-native speaker, native speakers tend to modify their interaction more often than they did the input.

A few researchers (Long, 1982; Ellis & He, 1999; Gass & Varonis, 1994) have supported the input hypothesis by suggesting modified input, internationally modified input and modified output as three rich sources of comprehensible input for SLA. On that account, modified input refers to those input that has been altered in order to make them more simplified before the language learners confront them, internationally modified input, on the other hand, originates from input modification that occurs when language learners experience difficulty comprehending a message in their communication with interlocutors, and modified output refers to language learners' efforts to modify their output to make it more comprehensible to the interlocutor (Long, 1996).

Similarly, in this area, long (1983), however, has propose the interaction hypothesis according to which it is the modifications that make input comprehensible through the process of negotiating a communication problem that are especially beneficial for second language acquisition. Long refers a number of these modifications such as self-repetition, confirmation checks, clarification requests, clarification request and other repetitions; he claims that he assists to make unfamiliar linguistic input, more comprehensible and consequently more acquirable by the learner.

## II. METHODOLOGY

As already elaborated in the first chapter, the current study investigated which type of input modification; either input elaboration or input simplification had a better effect on learning and retention of phrasal verbs. To move forward this study the researcher needed to determine who the participants were and what kind of materials were going to be used and more importantly what method was going to be applied. In addition, a control group needed to be selected to

contribute to the validity of the research. This approach was possible by implementing pretest posttest control group design.

A quantitative method was used in this study to analyze the problem by generating numerical data that could lead to usable statistics. By the end of chapter three, the design section will represent how the general plan of this research was retained.

### Participants

It is said that, selection of participants has always been a crucial factor since it has strong effect on external validity of research (Hatch and Farhady, 1981). Therefore, considerable care is devoted in the process of drawing them out of population; however, in order to heel the external validity of the research and have better random sampling, the participants that were taking part in this study were those who studied English as a Foreign Language at two English institutes in different parts of Tehran. The participants of this study were intermediate level students who were chosen from 130 Iranian EFL learners of English by means of proficiency test of PET. Those learners whose scores on the language proficiency test fell within 1 standard deviation above or below the mean score were selected as the target participants of the study. The participants' age ranges were between 13 and 16 years old. Both genders were included in the study.

### Procedure

Before the treatment sessions started, all the participants needed to be homogeneous in terms of their proficiency level; this is the first and foremost matter that should be taken into consideration. To accomplish this goal, the researcher administered a preliminary English Test to 130 learners, on the basis of the results of language proficiency test, those participants whose scores on the test fell within one standard deviation above and below the mean score were selected as target participants for this study and they were randomly assigned to three groups including two treatment groups and one control group. After the pretest, 40 phrasal verbs out of 60 phrasal verbs which gained the lowest scores were selected as target phrasal verbs of the study. Through 8 sessions of treatment, each group received a reading comprehension text on every session; every reading comprehension text contained 5 phrasal verbs. But the way the phrasal verbs in two experimental groups were modified was different. One of the experimental groups received elaborated input (a brief elaboration or definition of the term comes into parentheses) and the other group received simplified input (replacing an input with synonymous word) meanwhile, the control group received unmodified input in the exactly the same circumstances as the other two experimental groups. The samples of both elaborated and simplified texts are brought in the Appendices. After eight sessions of treatment, an immediate multiple choices test was administered to find out which techniques of modification had stronger effect on participants' learning of phrasal verbs.

As one line of the study linked to the retention of the phrasal verbs, after one month of no treatment the same test with the same amount of time and condition was administered as delayed posttest to check out the participants' level of retention. One month duration had been chosen based on what Mackey and Gass (2005) knew best for retention of acquired knowledge.

## III. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Based on the results displayed in Table 1, it can be claimed that the simplified ( $M = 23.23$ ,  $SD = 7$ ), elaborated ( $M = 21.53$ ,  $SD = 6.31$ ) and the control ( $M = 20.97$ ,  $SD = 4.85$ ) groups had close means on the PET test.

TABLE 1  
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS; PET GENERAL LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TEST BY GROUPS

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Simplified	30	23.23	7.001	1.278	20.62	25.85	10	36
Elaborated	30	21.53	6.312	1.152	19.18	23.89	7	38
Control	30	20.97	4.853	.886	19.15	22.78	11	32
Total	90	21.91	6.129	.646	20.63	23.19	7	38

The non-significant results of one-way ANOVA ( $F(2, 87) = 1.11$ ,  $p = .333$ ,  $\omega^2 = .003$  representing a weak effect size) (Table 2) indicated that there were not any significant differences between the three groups' means on the PET test. Thus, it can be claimed that they were homogenous in terms of their general language proficiency prior to the main study.

TABLE 2  
ONE-WAY ANOVA; PET GENERAL LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TEST BY GROUPS

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	83.489	2	41.744	1.114	.333
Within Groups	3259.800	87	37.469		
Total	3343.289	89			

Note. Eta-square = .02 and Partial eta-squared = .02 both represented weak effect sizes

A t test was run to compare the means on pretest/posttest and delayed posttest (simplified input) in order to probe the first and second null-hypotheses.

Paired-samples t test was conducted to determine whether the performance of simplified group significantly changed from pretest to posttest and also from posttest to delayed posttest. Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics.

TABLE 3  
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: PRETEST, IMMEDIATE AND DELAYED POSTTEST (SIMPLIFIED INPUT GROUP)

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pretest	22.9	30	6.565	1.199
Immediate posttest	32.50	30	5.740	1.048
Delayed posttest	28.67	30	6.619	1.209

Table 3 shows that there was an improvement in the performance of the learners from the pretest to the posttest. However, the mean on delayed posttest decreased; Paired sample test (table 4) was conducted to find out whether these changes were significant or not.

TABLE 4  
PAIRED SAMPLES TEST: PRETEST/POSTTEST; POSTTEST/DELAYED POSTTEST (SIMPLIFIED INPUT GROUP)

		Paired Differences		Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation		Lower	Upper			
Pair	Comparison								
Pair 1	Posttest – Pretest	9.567	2.029	.370	8.809	10.32	25.8	29	.000
Pair 2	Posttest – Delayed	3.833	1.663	.304	3.212	4.45	12.6	29	.000

a. Group = Simplified

Table 4 shows that there is a significant difference between the performance of the learners in pretest/posttest and posttest/delayed posttest of phrasal verbs therefore the first and second null hypotheses were **rejected**.

In order to probe the third and fourth null-hypotheses a t-test was run to compare the means on pretest/ posttest in elaborated input group and posttest/ delayed posttest of phrasal verbs in order to probe the third and fourth null-hypotheses; the t test also determines whether the performance of elaborated group has significantly changed from pretest to posttest and also from posttest to delayed posttest. Table 5 indicates the descriptive statistics.

TABLE 5  
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: PRETEST, IMMEDIATE AND DELAYED POSTTEST (ELABORATED INPUT GROUP)

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pretest	22.47	30	6.2906	1.148
Posttest	28.83	30	6.773	1.236
Delayed	27.33	30	6.370	1.163

Table 5 shows that there is an improvement in the performance of the learners from the pretest to the posttest in elaborated input group. However, the mean on delayed test has decreased; Paired samples test (table 6) was conducted to find out whether these changes were significant or not.

TABLE 6  
PAIRED SAMPLES TEST: PRETEST/POSTTEST; POSTTEST/DELAYED POSTTEST (ELABORATED INPUT GROUP)

		Paired Differences		Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation		Lower	Upper			
Pair	Comparison								
Pair 1	Posttest Pretest	6.36	7.57	1.383	3.539	9.194	4.60	29	.000
Pair 2	Posttest Delayed	1.50	8.60	1.570	-1.712	4.712	.955	29	.347

a. Group = Elaborated

Table 6 shows that there is a significant change in the mean score from pretest and posttest therefore the third null hypothesis was **rejected**. Results also showed that there is a no significant change from posttest to delayed posttest which means the learners retained their knowledge of the phrasal verbs from immediate posttest to the delayed posttest and the null hypothesis related to this research question was therefore **retained**.

The following table indicated that there were not any significant differences between the three groups' means on the pretest of phrasal verbs. Thus, it can be claimed that they were homogenous in terms of their knowledge on English phrasal verbs prior to the main study.

TABLE 7  
ONE-WAY ANOVA; PRETEST OF PHRASAL VERBS BY GROUPS

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	8.267	2	4.133	.103	.903
Within Groups	3506.133	87	40.300		
Total	3514.400	89			

Note. Eta-square = .269 and Partial eta-squared = .269 both represented large effect sizes

Table 8 indicated that there were significant differences between the three groups' means on the posttest of phrasal verbs. The fifth null-hypothesis as there is no significant difference between students' learning in lexical simplification and lexical elaboration **was rejected**.

TABLE 8  
ONE-WAY ANOVA; POSTTEST OF PHRASAL VERBS BY GROUPS

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1267.467	2	633.733	15.987	.000
Within Groups	3448.633	87	39.639		
Total	4716.100	89			

Note. Eta-square = .269 and Partial eta-squared = .269 both represented large effect sizes

Table 9 indicated that there were significant differences between the three groups' means on the delayed posttest of phrasal verbs.

TABLE 9  
ONE-WAY ANOVA; DELAYED POSTTEST OF PHRASAL VERBS BY GROUPS

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	820.467	2	410.233	10.504	.000
Within Groups	3397.633	87	39.053		
Total	4218.100	89			

Note. Eta-square = .195 and Partial eta-squared = .195 both represented large effect sizes

#### IV. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Based on the result of the study, students who received simplified input significantly outperformed the elaborated group as well as control group on the posttest and delayed posttest of phrasal verbs. It is worth mentioning that elaborated group showed better performance in comparison to the control group. The results also indicated that there was not any significant difference between the simplified and elaborated groups' means score on the delayed posttest of phrasal verbs as well as posttest of phrasal verbs.

Many similar studies have been done in the area of input modification; some of them were in favor of input simplification while many others came to the conclusion that input elaboration outperformed the input simplification. One of the studies that came to similar results with the current study is Shirinzarii and Mardani's (2011). They investigated the effect of two different text modification methods including simplification and elaboration, on Iranian EFL learners' incidental vocabulary acquisition. The results indicated that the learners who read the simplified text, gained higher scores in comparison to those who received elaborated and baseline texts. Another study by Birjandi, Alavi and Najafi Karimi (2015) indicated rather similar results as simplification may increase the comprehensibility of the text, but it removes low frequency item and structure that the learners need to acquire.

Another study that shows similar results as both input simplification and input elaboration have facilitating role in the process of language learning is Chung (1995), who investigated the effect of input simplification and input elaboration on reading comprehension of second language learners. Data obtained from this study indicated a significant difference between the simplified and baseline version of the text.

In contrast to the above mentioned results, Moradian and Adel's (2011) study indicated that explicit lexical elaboration, compared to implicit lexical elaboration, was more effective in vocabulary learning among Iranian EFL learners.

Previous studies of input modification methods on EFL learners indicated different results. Some of them were not in favor of modifications and they believed that input modification omits the input linguistic items from baseline text that students need to acquire Blae (1982). Many others concluded that input modification could facilitate the process of reading comprehension in second language learners; however, based on the results of the study, one can argue that both modifications' methods were significantly effective in learning of phrasal verbs. Although input simplification method showed better result, the elaborated method was effective in comparison to the control group.

Since, the other line of the study was concern with retention of phrasal verbs among learners; the result revealed that simplification method outperformed the elaborated method. It is worth mentioning that elaborated group showed better result in compare to the control group.

Consequently, it can be concluded that input modification methods can be helpful in both learning and retention of phrasal verbs.

#### APPENDIX A

##### Meeting a Dentist

Little Johnny hated going to see the dentist. It wasn't that his dentist was nasty. It was Johnny was too fond of sweets. His dentist had told him that his teeth would **fall out**, (drop) if he continue eating candy.

Time and time again, the dentist had told him to stop eating sweet food or at least **cut down on** (reduce) the amount he ate as he lay in the dentist's chair, all the horrible memories from his last visit **came back** (recall) to him. On that occasion, the dentist had to pull one of his teeth! The pain was terrible, even with the painkiller the dentist had given him. When the medicine **wore off** (disappear) it was difficult for him to eat or chew almost anything.

Fortunately this time the **checkup** (examination) was much better because the dentist made Johnny to wash his mouth with pink liquid. This time Johnny was delighted and so his dentist.

#### APPENDIX B

##### Meeting a Dentist

Little Johnny hated going to see the dentist. It wasn't that his dentist was nasty. It was Johnny was too fond of sweets. His dentist had told him that his teeth would **fall out**, (when a thing separate from another thing) if he continue eating candy.

Time and time again, the dentist had told him to stop eating sweet food or at least **cut down on** (to consume or use something less) the amount he ate as he lay in the dentist's chair, all the horrible memories from his last visit **came back** (when someone remembered something again) to him. On that occasion, the dentist had to pull one of his teeth! The pain was terrible, even with the painkiller the dentist had given him. When the medicine **wore off** (when the effect of something like drug or medicine gradually stop) it was difficult for him to eat or chew almost anything.

Fortunately this time the **checkup** (when someone wants to inspect something) was much better because the dentist made Johnny to wash his mouth with pink liquid. This time Johnny was delighted and so his dentist.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Birjandi, P., Alavi, S. M., & Najafi karimi, S (2015). Effect of unenhanced, enhanced and elaborated input on learning English phrasal verbs. *International journal of research studies in language learning*, 4(1), pp.43-59.
- [2] Blau, E.K. (1982). The effect of syntax on readability for ESL students in Puerto Rico. *TESOL Quarterly* 16 (4), 517-528.
- [3] Block, D. (2003). The social turn in second language acquisition. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
- [4] Brewer, B. (2008). Effect of lexical simplification and elaboration on ESL readers' local-level perceived comprehension (master's thesis). Available from proQuest Dissertation and theses Databased.
- [5] Carroll, S. (1999). Putting "input" in its proper place. *Second Language Research*, 15, 337-388.
- [6] Chaudron, C. (1983). Simplification of input: topic reinstatements and their effects on L2 learners' recognition and recall. *TESOL quarterly* 17 (3), 437-458.
- [7] Chaudron, C. (1985). Intake: On models and methods for discovering learners' processing input. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7, 1-14.
- [8] Chen, J. (2007). On How to Solve the Problem of the Avoidance of Phrasal Verbs in the Chinese Context. Adelaide: *International Education Journal*.
- [9] Chung, H. (1995). Effects of elaborative modification on second language reading comprehension and incidental vocabulary learning. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Honolulu.
- [10] Corder, S.P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *IRAL*, 5, 161-170.
- [11] Ellis, R. (1991). The interaction hypothesis: A critical evaluation. Paper presented at the Regional Language Center Seminar, Singapore, April 22-28, 1991. (ERIC document no.ED338037).
- [12] Ellis, R. (1997). Second language acquisition. In Oxford Introduction to Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [13] Ellis, R., & He, X. (1999). The roles of modified input and output in the incidental acquisition of word meanings. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21, 285-301.
- [14] Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2007). Input, interaction, and output in second language acquisition. In B. Van Patten and J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (pp. 175-199). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [15] Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1994). Input, Interaction, and Second Language Production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 283-302.
- [16] Hatch, E., & Farhady, H. (1981). Research design and statistics for applied linguistics. Tehran: Rahnama publications.
- [17] Johnson, P. (1981). Effects of reading comprehension on language complexity and cultural background of a text. *TESOL Quarterly* 15 (2):169-181.
- [18] Kim, Y. (2006). Effects of input elaboration on vocabulary acquisition through reading by Korean learners of English as a foreign language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(2), 431-373.
- [19] Krashen, S. (1980). The input hypothesis. In J. Alatis, (Eds.), current issues in bilingual education. Washington, D.C: George Town university press.
- [20] Krashen, S. (1981). Second language acquisition and second language learning. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- [21] Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon.
- [22] Krashen, S. (1985). The input hypothesis: issues and implications. London: Longman.
- [23] Krashen, S. (1987). Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. UK: Prentice-Hall International.
- [24] Larsen-Freeman, Diane and Michael H. Long. (1991). An introduction to second language acquisition research. New York: Longman. 333pp.
- [25] Lewis, M. (1993). The lexical approach. Hove: Teacher Training Publications.
- [26] Liao, Y., & Fukuya Y.J. (2004). "Avoidance of phrasal verbs: the case of Chinese learners of English." *Language Learning* 54 (2), 193-226.
- [27] Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction, second-language acquisition. In H. Winitz (Ed.), *Native language and foreign language acquisition* (pp.259-278). New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

- [28] Long, M. H. (1983b). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation in the second language classroom. In M. Clarke & J. Hanscombe (Eds.), *On TESOL 82*. Washington, D. C.: TESOL.
- [29] Long, M. H. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass and C. Madden (eds.), *Input and second language acquisition* (pp. 377-93). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- [30] Long, M. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds), *Hand book of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press.
- [31] Macky, A., M. Gass. S (2005). *Second language research. Methodology and Design*. Georgetown and Michigan State University
- [32] Mousapour Negari, G. (2012). Effects of lexical modification on incidental Vocabulary Acquisition of Iranian EFL students. *English Language Teaching*, 5(6), 44-55.
- [33] Moradian, M.R. & Adel, M. R. (2011). Explicit lexical elaboration as an autonomy enhancing tool for acquisition of L2 vocabulary from reading. *Journal of Studies in literature and language*, 3(3), 153-159.
- [34] Nemati Tabrizi, A. (2016). The Effect of Input-based Instruction on the Speaking Ability of Iranian EFL Learners. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research Volume 3, Issue 4, 2016*, 253-265.
- [35] Parker, K. & Chaudron, C. (1987). The effects of linguistic simplifications and elaborative modifications on L2 comprehension. *University of Hawaii working papers in ESL*, 6, 107- 133. Retrieved October, 15, 2010.
- [36] Pica, T. (1987). The impact of interaction on comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21 (4), 737-758.
- [37] Rubin, J. (1987). Learner strategies: theoretical assumptions, research History and Typology. In A.L.Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning*, (pp.15-30). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [38] Shirin Zarii, M., & Mardani, M. (2011). Two types of text modification and incidental Vocabulary Acquisition: Simplification vs. Elaboration. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, 7 (1), 127-156.
- [39] Urano, K. (2000). Lexical simplification and elaboration: sentence comprehension and incidental vocabulary acquisition (Unpublished Master's thesis). University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Honolulu.
- [40] Watanabe, Y. (1997). Input, intake, and retention: Effects of increased processing on incidental learning of foreign language vocabulary. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 19, 287-307.
- [41] Yano, Y., Long, M. H., & Ross, S. (1994). The effects of simplified and elaborated texts on foreign language reading comprehension. *Language Learning*, 44, 189 -219.



**Melika Ghorbanian** was born in Tehran, Iran, in 1989. She received her BA degree in English translation from the Islamic Azad University, Tehran Shomal branch, Iran; then she received her MA degree in TEFL from Islamic Azad University, Tehran South branch and she currently teaches English at a private English institute in Tehran.



**Shadab Jabbarpoor** received her PhD in applied linguistics from the Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch, Tehran, Iran and is currently assistant professor in the Islamic Azad University. She has taught courses like language teaching methodology and language skills at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Her research interests include form-focused instruction and learning strategies. She has published articles in ISI-indexed journals and presented nationally and internationally.