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The purpose of this study is to compare the efficacy between input-based instruction and output-based instruction for acquisition of the English past perfect continuous tense. Seventy second-year university EFL students were divided into two groups based on the results of a reading proficiency test. The superior effects of output-based instructions in previous studies seemed to be due to its elaborateness in feedback and cognitive demand. Thus, the comprehension group conducted more elaborate comprehension task with textually enhanced material, while the production group performed a dictogloss which was modified to unify the modality of input for both groups. Pre- and post-test data were analyzed by using the T-test. Results showed that input-based instruction was as effective as output-based instruction in both the comprehension and production of the target form. It also revealed that output-based instruction contributed to the learners’ accurate use of the target form. Over-crowded classrooms and teachers with inappropriate English speaking abilities are the norms in an EFL context. This study shows that input-based instructions may be good alternatives in such a context.

I. INTRODUCTION

The importance of input and output is undeniable for second language acquisition (SLA). The view that the process of SLA is very similar to that of first language acquisition puts an emphasis on the role of input. Krashen (1985) claims, in his ‘Comprehensible Input Hypothesis’, that even adults typically learn rules implicitly, and that learners acquire second language (L2) implicitly via exposure to sufficient amounts of comprehensible input. However, the failure of native-like accuracy and fluency in French immersion programs has provided the view that input alone is not sufficient for SLA and what is required is not only comprehensible input, but
also comprehensible output for automatization and accuracy of L2 (Swain, 1985).

Since Schmidt (1990, 1993) proposes in his 'Noticing Hypothesis' that "noticing" is a necessary and sufficient condition for the conversion process of input into intake, many researchers have investigated the process in which learners' noticing and attention have been given to the input or the output and tried to figure out what actually makes learning possible. Thus, many focus on form instructions have been developed along the lines of how to draw learners' attention to the linguistic features of L2.

Input manipulation by increasing its saliency in order to draw learners' attention to a certain aspect of the target language is a key in input-based instruction in focus on form. "Input enhancement" coined by Sharwood Smith (1991) has proven to be effective in getting the input noticed in many studies. However, Gass (1988) argues in her L2 acquisition model that not all noticed input may always be fed into the further acquisition process that is to be converted into comprehended input or intake. Her claim implies that noticing by input enhancement alone is not sufficient for learning to take place. Thus, what actually makes learning possible would be not only input enhancement, but also the accompanying subsequent tasks. Subsequent meaning-based tasks such as comprehension tasks, along with "input enhancement", trigger form-meaning mapping which refers to how learners map referential real-world meaning onto form, so that the noticed input can be converted into intake.

However, the view that emphasizes the importance of learners' output is based on Swain's 'Output Hypothesis' (1985). Swain argues that "pushed output" prompts learners to notice the gap between their interlanguage (IL) and the target language. In other words, when learners experience communication difficulties, they will be "pushed" into making their output more precise, coherent, and appropriate, thus contributing to language learning. A number of studies based on the Output Hypothesis have shown the effects of output-based instruction (Izumi et. al., 1999; Haemoon Lee, 2002; Swain, 1995; 1998; Swain & Lapkin, 1995; Kyunghee Yeo, 2002).

These two different instructions based on two different views in SLA have been compared in some empirical studies. Most of them revealed the superior effects of output-based instruction, although there are some studies revealing the contradictory results (Cadierno, 1995; VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993a; 1993b; VanPatten & Oikkenon, 1996; VanPatten & Sanz, 1995). One possible cause for these results might be the fact that the tasks in the output-based instructions are much more elaborate and motivating than the ones in the input-based instructions. The tasks in input-based instructions are usually neither provided with feedback nor cognitively demanding. Without controlling these factors in the experiment, the superiority of output-based instruction is predictable. There is another potential intervening variable in those studies. It is learners' language proficiency and it affects the amount of learners' attention paid to the enhanced forms during the tasks. It should be controlled particularly in the studies which
compare the efficacy of instructions in focus in form.

The purpose of the present study is, therefore, to compare the efficacy between the input-based and the output-based instruction for acquisition of the English present perfect continuous tense with more elaborate input-based instruction in terms of feedback and its cognitive demands. The level of the subjects' language proficiency and the difficulty of the tasks for both groups were also controlled by utilizing a simulated TOEIC test and unifying modality of input, because learners' variations in the amount of attention given to the target form are likely to be affected by those factors due to the limited human attentional system (Doughty, 2001; Van Patten, 1990).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

As Sharwood Smith (1993) states that "input enhancement implies only that we can manipulate aspects of the input but makes no further assumptions about the consequences of that input on the learner" (p. 176), it is still unclear how noticing the input leads learners to the completion of acquisition. It is well known that noticed input is not always fed into further language processing. According to the acquisition model by Gass (1988), there are five stages to the SLA process: (1) apperceived input, (2) comprehended input, (3) intake, (4) integration, and (5) output. Noticed input may be apperceived input which is available for the comprehended input, but apperceived input through noticing is not naturally fed into the comprehended input or intake which actually makes learning possible (p. 200).

Textual enhancement (i.e., larger fonts, bolding, underlining, color coding, upper case) is an effective way to increase the perceptual salience of certain elements of the text in order for them to get noticed. However, the noticed input is not always converted into intake. What makes the conversion possible would be the tasks accompanied by input enhancement, and not just by input manipulation alone. Especially, the efficacy of textual input enhancement techniques seems to depend even more on the subsequent comprehension tasks. The role of the comprehension tasks with textual input enhancement is not only to promote learners' comprehension of the forms by semantic or grammatical processing, but also to convert comprehended input into intake through form-meaning mapping. Form-meaning mapping is the process of connecting by mapping referential real-world meaning onto form. Form-meaning mapping is the result of active on-line processing of comprehension and is necessary for learners to build a linguistic system of their IL (Van Patten, 1990; 1996).

The positive effects of textual enhancement have been shown in a number of studies (Alanen, 1995; Doughty, 1991; Leeman et al., 1995; Shook, 1994; White, 1998). But, when
textual enhancement is combined with additional techniques which make the subsequent comprehension tasks more elaborate, a greater effectiveness is demonstrated. In other words, textual enhancement with a typical comprehension task alone does not seem to be effective. Table 1 shows that the textual enhancement techniques need more cognitively elaborate techniques such as explicit rule explanations, feedback, or semantic support in order to obtain the positive effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Target forms and subjects</th>
<th>Additional techniques to textual enhancement</th>
<th>Results in rule acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doughty (1991)</td>
<td>20 ESL adults</td>
<td>Semantic support with paraphrases and vocabulary clarification</td>
<td>Enhancement group with semantic support performed as well as Rule-only group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative clause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shook (1994)</td>
<td>125 college students</td>
<td>Direction to pay attention to highlighted part of the input</td>
<td>No better than textual enhancement only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish present perfect tense and relative pronouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alonen (1995)</td>
<td>36 adults</td>
<td>Explicit rule explanation and dictionary help</td>
<td>Rule-only group and textual enhancement group with explicit explanation show superior effects to enhance only group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-artificial Finnish locative suffixes and consonant gradation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeman et. al. (1995)</td>
<td>22 native English learners</td>
<td>Teacher feedback</td>
<td>Textual enhancement with teacher feedback was more effective without such feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish imperfect and preterit verb forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (1998)</td>
<td>86 6th graders</td>
<td>Input flood, extensive reading, and listening</td>
<td>The group with the additional treatments outperformed non-enhance group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English possessive determiners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other studies which show the effectiveness of input-based instruction utilizing elaborate comprehension tasks are the ones with Input Processing Instruction (Cadierno, 1995; VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993a; 1993b; VanPatten & Oikkenon, 1996; VanPatten & Sanz, 1995). Input Processing Instruction provides more structured input to learners in order for them to alter the processing strategies that they have normally been using for comprehending input, so that it encourages the learners to make better form-meaning connections.

VanPatten and Cadierno (1993b) compared Input Processing Instruction with output-based instruction. The results showed that the Processing Instruction group outperformed the
output-based instruction group in comprehension of the target forms, and performed as well as the output-based instruction group in the production of them. Interestingly, however, Dongho Kang’s study (2003) dealing with the same experimental design revealed contradictory results and he attributed the discrepancy to the learners' preferences for output-based instruction, as revealed in his post-instructional preference survey.

It seems to be true that Korean university students have a tendency to get bored during comprehension activities due to lack of prior motivating experiences in their long exposure to the same kind of activities since their middle school years. Dongho Kang’s study shows that the efficacy issue is easily influenced by internal factors of the learner, such as one’s preference as well as the external manipulation of the input. Thus, well-designed experiments to control learner-internal factors can be critical in comparing the effectiveness of instructions.

On the other hand, Swain’s ‘Output Hypothesis’ (1985) was proposed after her exhaustive observations of French immersion programs in Canada. She found out that, despite the rich comprehensible input of the immersion context, the students still failed to achieve native-like accuracy of L2. She concluded that the lack of opportunities for output, especially “pushed output” might be the reason for the failure. In other words, “pushed output” for accurate use of the target language, not just getting their meaning across without considering grammatical accuracy, was insufficient in the immersion context.

Swain (1995) suggests the following three positive effects of “pushed output” as a facilitator in SLA: First, “pushed output” has a hypothesis-testing function. Producing output is one way of testing one’s hypotheses about the target language. Second, it enables learners to notice the gap between their IL and the target language. Recognition of problematic aspects of L2 through output may prompt learners to seek out relevant input with more focused attention (Swain & Lapkin, 1995). Third, it has a metalinguistic function. While comprehending processes prompt learners to focus on the parts containing more communicative information, output processes enable learners to reflect on their target language use and to engage in more syntactic processing.

Output Hypothesis has been tested in many studies (Izumi et. al., 1999; Izumi & Bigelow, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 1995; Kyunghee Yeo, 2002). Izumi et. al. (1999) investigated whether “pushed output” promoted ‘noticing’ of linguistic forms and whether it resulted in improving learners’ production of the target forms. The results partly supported the Output Hypothesis. That is, output promotes noticing, but noticing may not always enable learning to take place. Kyunghee Yeo (2002) examined the effect of output-based focus on form instruction; i.e., dictogloss. Dictogloss task is an output-based technique which requires learners to reconstruct the passage they have heard. Ninety college students were taught English participial adjectives, -ed and -ing. The results showed that output-focused practice was more effective than input
focused practice. In her study, the input-focused group carried out a reading task with textually enhanced material, while the output-focused group did a listening task. The difference of modality in presenting the input might have affected learners' perception about the task difficulty. Consequently, it would have influenced the amount of learners' attention given to the target forms differently in each group.

In addition, there were no studies in which a proficiency test was conducted in order to control the level of experimental groups. The subjects were assigned to each group either by pre-tests that measured the learners' knowledge limited to the target structure or by random stratification. The performance in comprehensions tasks is influenced not only by the knowledge of the target structure, but also by reading proficiency of the target language. The difficulty of the tasks may be perceived differently by learners depending on their language proficiency, thus affecting the results.

**FIGURE 1**

The process of input-based instruction and output-based instruction, using Gass's (1988) SLA model

Figure 1 shows that how input-based instruction and output-based instruction facilitate learners' SLA. Gass's model is in the middle of the figure showing each step of SLA. The top is the process in textual input enhancement technique and the bottom is the one in output-based instruction. Although output in SLA is often assumed to be the final product which has completed each stage of SLA, the “pushed output” in output-based instruction may not be the same kind of output. When learners are required to produce the output by a task, it may not be assumed that they readily go through each necessary stage of SLA to produce that output. Therefore, the output in this figure should be considered to be one of the facilitators in SLA, not the final product of acquisition. A feedback stage in output-based instruction prompts learners to notice the gap between what they know and what they do not know about the use of the target language. Swain (1998) also pointed out in a study using dictogloss that a feedback stage was valuable in order for learners to notice the incorrect parts of their production. Any kind of
production tasks are inherently provided with communication breakdown and it can serve as feedback.

On the contrary, the comprehension tasks in textual input enhancement are somewhat plain and even tedious in most studies and it should be changed to compete with the production tasks on the efficacy matter. Most studies on the efficacy between input-based instruction and output-based instruction focusing on form have revealed the superior effects of output-based instruction. Contradictory results have been only for Input-Processing Instruction. However, in most studies, output-based instructions were much more elaborately designed, while input-based instructions contained only typical, plain comprehension activities. Only Input Processing Instruction by VanPatten provided learners with more elaborately structured input. In other words, when the method of conducting comprehension activities in input-based instruction is more elaborate in terms of feedback and cognitive demands, input-based instruction can be as effective as output-based instruction.

Korean classrooms are usually so over-crowded that the opportunity for output by learners is very limited. In such conditions, input-based instructions would be desirable if they prove to be as effective as output-based instructions.

III. METHOD

1. Subjects

The subjects of this study were 70 second-year Korean university students attending English conversation courses (60 percent comprehension and 40 percent conversation) for two hours each week. Two classes were selected based on the results of a TOEIC-simulated reading proficiency test. There were fifty items on the test and each item was worth two points. The test results of the two groups did not show a significant difference by an independent T-test (SAS 8.2). The mean scores were very close, 43.9 for the comprehension group, and 42.4 for the production group. The P-value was 0.5778 (p<.05) and it indicated that both groups were considered to be of the same proficiency level in reading ability.

After the pre-test, two students were excluded because one showed considerable amount of knowledge of the target form and the other handed in a blank answer sheet. The Comprehension group consisted of fifteen male and eighteen female students majoring in Business, while the Production group consisted of six male and twenty-nine female students majoring in Chinese.
2. Design of the Experiment

Each group received a two-hour class. They were taught the English present perfect continuous tense (have/has been + -ing) by the researcher. The rationale for selecting the present perfect continuous tense was that Korean students are often confused with the different use between the present perfect tense and the present perfect continuous tense. Since the present perfect continuous tense in English has simpler form-meaning connection than the present perfect tense, it is considered to be an appropriate form to be taught for low-intermediate students. Doughty (2001) suggests that the difficulty level of the target items in focus on form should be targeted such that the subjects have little problem in understanding the meaning but probable difficulty in producing the form accurately. The target form selected for the present study appears to belong to this category.

In most of textual input enhancement studies, the subjects have been assigned to each group based on their pre-test scores which show the knowledge of the target form only. Leow (1997) points out in his study that learner variations caused by the relationship between the learners’ language proficiency and the amount of attention paid to the enhanced forms exist as the potential intervening variables of the experiments in focus on form studies. He suggested that more robust designs in which participants focus on the enhanced forms, without being affected by their variations, be needed in the studies which try to manipulate learners’ attention.

Therefore, the present study used the reading parts of a simulated TOEIC test for evaluating the students’ general reading ability in order to make sure that both experimental groups were the same level. It was particularly important because the present study dealt with reading material for both groups.

In terms of learnability, there has been no valid instrument to evaluate the learnability for the target structure. The present study was made under the assumption that the same level of learners’ reading ability implied the same degree of readiness for learning the target form. A pre-test was conducted for each group before class and a post-test was given after the class. Both pre- and post- tests consisted of two parts: a grammaticality judgment test and an open-ended production test in written mode.

3. Materials

For selecting two experimental groups that had the same level of reading proficiency, a simulated TOEIC reading test was used for ensuring test reliability. The test utilized Parts Five, Six, and Seven of the TOEIC test.

The class material used for the present study was a 180 word-length short story about a male
model, which the young readers would find interesting. The reading text was controlled in vocabulary and structure to be appropriate for the level of students in the present study. VanPatten (1990) argues that it is very hard for beginning L2 learners to process both meaning and form when their primary task is to understand the meaning of the input, and that only after meaning is easy to understand (which requires little or no attention) can learners notice form. Thus, the structures and words used in the text were graded to the level of the students in the study. The reading material for the Comprehension group was textually enhanced with bolding and underlining, while the one for the Production group was not.

4. Procedure

The experiment was conducted on two separate groups, a Comprehension group and a Production group, after their reading proficiency was assessed by a simulated TOEIC. One week before class, a pre-test was given. The pre-test consisted of two parts: a grammaticality judgment test for ten minutes and a production test for ten minutes. The grammaticality judgment test was for assessing learners’ comprehension of the target form, while the production test was for assessing learners’ production ability of it. In the former test, students were instructed to underline and correct erroneous segments of the sentences. There were 15 sentences with five distracters added. The latter test was to translate six sentences written in Korean, in order not to give the students any clues to the target form. Only one out of the six sentences was a distracter.

Before the given class, students were given three example sentences with the target form and their meanings without any metalinguistic explanations. This type of input enhancement is effective in directing the learners’ attention to the target form in the reading material, especially when the target form is not visually enhanced.

During class, the production group completed a modified dictogloss. The students in the group read the material, instead of listening to it. The purpose of modifying the dictogloss was to unify the modality of presenting input for both the Comprehension and the Production groups. Different modalities in presenting input might cause different degrees of perceived difficulty of the task by learners and it may affect the results. According to Wong’s (2001) study, learners who processed aural input had more difficulty than the ones who did written input.

The procedure of the modified dictogloss in the present study was: (1) skimming, (2) intensive reading for note-taking, (3) reconstructing, and (4) feedback. In the note-taking phase, students read the text from an overhead projector (OHP) for three minutes and were given two minutes after the reading to take notes. During the note-taking phase, the text on the OHP was removed. The students repeated the procedure one more time and they tried to reconstruct the reading text based on their notes as accurately as possible in groups of four. The time limit for
the reconstruction phase was thirty minutes. The purpose of the time limit was two fold: to get them more actively involved in the activity and to increase learners' anticipation of the feedback phase. Right before the reconstruction period, the students were provided with picture cues about the reading text in order for them to remember the rough content. However, the picture cues did not have any information on the vocabulary or the structure. During the reconstruction phase, students engaged in "metatalk". According to Swain (1998), this "metatalk" promotes noticing. Finally, the reading text was shown to the students for comparing it with their own output. The purpose of the feedback was to correct the problematic features of the target language that they had noticed during the reconstruction phase. Thus, the emphasis on the feedback phase is critical for learners to notice the gap between what they know and what they do not know.

The Comprehension group carried out the comprehension task which consisted of four steps: (1) skimming, (2) in-depth reading, (3) comprehension questions, and (4) feedback. Before the in-depth reading, the students were informed that they would work on comprehension questions without referring to the reading text. The purpose of this was to make the comprehension task more cognitively demanding. Working on the comprehension task in this way pushed the learners into the situation where they had to get more actively engaged in the in-depth reading phase. In the feedback phase, the reading text was given back to the learners and they had the opportunity to review what they did not understand about the text. The comprehension questions included multiple choice, true/false, and short-answer questions. In order to avoid the priming effect, the questions were carefully made to check students' general understanding of the text and not for understanding the target form directly.

After the given class, post-tests were conducted for each group. The grammaticality judgment test was ten minutes long and it consisted of 15 sentences. Five out of the 15 were distracters. The production test was fifteen minutes long. There were five items with each item consisting of three questions. All questions were written in Korean in order not to give the students a clue to the target form. Among the three questions, only one question in each item was the target question. In this way, the target sentences could be elicited more naturally in the given context.

In scoring the pre- and post-test items, the students who used inaccurate forms, but very close target forms, were given a half point per item because those forms were regarded as developing forms in their IL. The various developing forms shown in the tests provided valuable information about the learners' IL system, such as the learner's readiness of learning the target forms or the degree of learning them.
IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The grammaticality judgment test scores in the pre-test showed no significant statistical difference using an independent T-test in Table 2 (p<.05). The mean scores in the Comprehension group and in the Production group were 0.33 and 0.47, respectively. The pre-test scores of the two groups indicated that the students in the study had almost no knowledge about the target form. Twenty two out of thirty three students in the Comprehension group scored nothing and the rest of the students in the group scored from 0.5 to 3 (Maximum: 10). In the Production group, 24 out of 35 scored nothing and the score for the rest of the students ranged from 0.5 to 3.

Table 3 shows that neither the two groups were significantly different in the production tests score in the pre-test (p<.05). The production test showed a similar score range, zero to three (Maximum: 5). Twenty three out of thirty three students in the Comprehension group and 22 out of 35 students in the Production group scored zero. In sum, the pre-test results indicated that both groups had little knowledge about the target form, although a few students showed some readiness of learning the target form.

According to Figure 2 and 3, both the Production and the Comprehension groups made big progress on the post-tests. Since the pre-tests of both groups started out at almost zero, gains in their scores on the post-tests were mostly due to the instructions given to both groups. This means that both instructions, the input-based and the output-based, were very effective on both the comprehension of the target rule and its production. The increase from the pre-test to the post-test of the grammaticality judgment test in the Comprehension group was 5.51, and that of the Production group was 5.18. The Comprehension group slightly outperformed the Production group in the grammaticality judgment test. However, the difference between the two groups did not reach a level of statistical significance (p<.05) according to Table 4. The results show that the comprehension of the target form was a little higher in the Comprehension group than in the Production group. That is, the input-based instruction was slightly more effective than the output-based instruction in learners’ comprehension of the target rule, although not great enough to be statistically significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
<th>The Grammaticality Judgment Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Comp. G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prod. G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Maximum score was 10
TABLE 3
The Production Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. G</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>0.4292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prod. G</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Maximum score was 5.

FIGURE 2
The comprehension group

FIGURE 3
The Production group

TABLE 4
The Grammaticality Judgment Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comp. Group</th>
<th>Prod. Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post test</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The maximum score was 10.

Table 5 shows that the increase from the pre-test to the post-test in the production tests for both groups was quite similar. They were 3.28 for the Comprehension group and 3.25 for the Production group and this difference was not statistically significant. Interestingly, the Comprehension group performed as well as the Production group did. This result partly supports DeKeyser and Sokalski's study (1996) and Dongho Kang's study (2003) which support the acquisition theory, whereby a comprehension task is effective for comprehension skills, while a
production task is effective for production skills. The results of the present study showed that the Comprehension group outperformed the Production group on the comprehension test, even though it did not reach the level of statistical significance. However, in the production tests, the two groups showed no significant difference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comp. Group</th>
<th>Prod. Group</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  Mean  SD</td>
<td>N  Mean  SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>33  0.40  0.73</td>
<td>35  0.55  0.79</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.7233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post test</td>
<td>33  3.68  1.26</td>
<td>35  3.70  1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The maximum score was 5.

In sum, the Comprehension group did as well as the Production group on both comprehension and production of the target form. This indicates that input-based instruction was as effective as output-based instruction in focus on form, unlike the growing body of research which seems to reveal the superiority of output-based instruction.

There were other interesting facts found by doing more detailed analysis. The pattern of the learners' output on the production test showed that more students in the Comprehension group than the Production group used developing forms of the target structure. Eight out of thirty-three students were considered to be in the process of developing their IL system on the target form. Four students used the “have + been + infinitive” form and three students used the “have + been + past” form. One student used “have + been + no verb”. To the contrary, in the Production group, only two students showed this kind of interlanguage pattern and they used the “have + been + past” form. This result indicates that the output-based instruction certainly played a role in facilitating the accuracy of learners' L2 use, although in the effectiveness of rule acquisition, there was no significant difference between these two instructions. These results support Swain and Lapkin's (1995) claim that production practice forces learners to do more syntactic processing so that they notice the problematic elements for accurate use of the target language. However, this seems to be limited to the accuracy of L2 use by learners, and not to the degree of effectiveness of learners' rule acquisition.

On the contrary, the Comprehension group showed more developing forms of the IL. According to Gass (1988), not all intake is integrated into their IL system and the part which fails to do so may be stored until subsequent input is available. If there had been a delayed test, it would probably have revealed whether those learners in the Comprehension group had finally acquired the target form.
In the present study, the methods of conducting the task for each group were different. The Comprehension group conducted the task individually, while the Production group did the task collaboratively. The benefit of collaborative work in dictogloss was to exploit the principle that two heads are better than one. Students were able to pool their resources, and even low-level learners are able, through collaborative action, to “outperform their competence” (Nunan, 1998). However, the present study showed that the Production group failed to outperform the Comprehension group, despite the fact that the students in the Production group carried out the task collaboratively.

V. CONCLUSION

The present study investigated the efficacy between input-based instruction and output-based instruction in focus on form. In order to obtain validity of the results, the experiment of the present study was carefully designed to control the learners’ level of reading proficiency and the modality of input for both groups. The comprehension task used in the input-based instruction was designed to be more elaborate than the typical comprehension tasks in terms of feedback and cognitive demands.

The results showed that both instructions were significantly effective on comprehension and production of the English present perfect continuous tense. However, the differences of the effectiveness between the two instructions were not statistically significant. In sum, the present study showed that input-based instruction was as effective as output-based instruction in focus on form, if the input-based instruction is well designed to promote the elaborateness of the accompanied task.

There are some limitations of the present study. First, a delayed test would have revealed more valuable information about the learners who showed the developing forms of the target structure. Second, the target form in the study had a high communicative value. The forms with high communicative value may be less sensitive to the types of instruction, because they are the units processed primarily anyway in comprehension process. Therefore, the results of the present study should not be generalized to other forms with low communicative value, such as morphological endings. Third, the task demands of the Production group may have been heavier and it may have affected the results. Task demands are considered to deplete the learners’ attentional resources (Skehan, 1998; VanPatten, 1990).

There are a few considerations for future studies. First, how a particular target form or task difficulty may influence the results should be considered. Second, the learning style preferences of learners should be taken into consideration in task-based learning. A learner’s preference in
receiving and internalizing information will shape the conditions that support his/her active engagement and achievement in various forms of task-based learning. The beneficial effects of collaborative work were not shown in the present study, although a number of studies claimed its positive effects. According to Reid’s study (1987), the students from different language/cultural backgrounds often differed significantly in their learning style preferences. Nearly 1,300 ESL students across the United States participated in her study and, interestingly enough, 118 Korean students preferred individual learning to group learning. Goodson (1991) also found that most of the East Asian students did not choose group learning for their learning style preference. Third, efficacy of the grammaticality judgment test should be thoroughly investigated for Korean learners. The learners in the experiment seemed to be extremely overwhelmed during the test. This may have been due to the recent change of educational policy in teaching reading in Korea. Skimming and scanning strategies are becoming more important part than intensive reading in the curriculum of English reading. The fact that learners had little experience in reading a text, paying close attention to the grammatical aspects of the text, seemed to give them tremendous difficulty and confusion during the test. Thus, how much information the grammaticality judgment test can show about learners should be examined in future studies.

Various techniques in focus on form have been introduced and utilized in ESL/EFL language classrooms and their effectiveness has been tested in many studies. The superiority of output-based instruction is prevalent in language classrooms. However, over-crowded classrooms and low English-speaking proficient teachers are common in foreign language learning contexts and these limitations keep the classroom teachers from utilizing various output-based instructions successfully. Thus, if the elaborateness of input-based instructions is promoted in the aspects of feedback, motivation, and cognitive demands along with the consideration of learners’ instructional preference, input-based instructions will be no longer considered as boring or tedious ones in the field of focus on form.
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APPENDIX A
Pre-test

다음의 문장을 읽고 어법/문법이 옳으면 O, 틀리면 X를 표시하고, 틀린 부분에 밑줄을 치고 고치시오.

1. I got interested when he mentioned the project. (   )
2. We are waiting for an hour. Has he come yet? (   )
3. In class yesterday, I was confused. I didn’t understand the lesson. (   )
4. He is taking shower for 2 hours. (   )
5. I studied in the library since 10 o’clock this morning. (   )
6. We have to turn in our homework by tomorrow. (   )
7. It’s raining since last week. (   )
8. The weather has been so nice lately. (   )
9. I live here for 2 months. (   )
10. He has talking on the phone since he got home. (   )
11. The movie was so boring that we all fell asleep. (   )
12. They are playing tennis together since early this morning. (   )
13. He have been exercising all day. (   )
14. How long did he been drinking? (   )
15. I’ve been working here for a couple of years. (   )

다음의 문장을 영어로 쓰시오.

1. 지난주부터 내내 비가 오고 있습니다.
2. 그것은 너무나 충격적인 소식이었습니다.
3. 나는 피아노를 친지가 5년이여 되었습니다.
4. 우리는 영어공부를 중학교 때부터 해 왔습니다.
5. 우리는 벌써 7시간이나 계속 운전을 하고 있습니다.
6. 여기서 그를 한 시간에 그를 가다리고 있습니다.

APPENDIX B
Post test

다음의 문장을 읽고, 어법/문법이 옳으면 O, 틀리면 X를 표시하고, 틀린 부분에 밑줄을 치고 고치시오.

1. I should go to school in time. (   )
2. It is snowing since early this morning. ( )
3. Mark is still taking a shower. He took a shower for a couple of hours.( )
4. I have been living in Seoul for six years, but I hate this city. ( )
5. His explanation is so confused that I’m completely lost. ( )
6. I think I have been working too much. I feel bad since last weekend. ( )
7. Claudia Schiffer is born on August 25 in Dusseldorf, Germany. ( )
8. I went shopping today and bought a pair of shoes. ( )
9. My baby is sick. She is crying for a few hours. ( )
10. Since moving to this house, they were growing many interesting plants ( )
11. Ann and Jerry are from different dancing school, but they are dancing together in this theater for six months ( )
12. I’m going to stay here until next week. ( )
13. She was dreaming about getting a job in KAL since she was a little girl. ( )
14. My parents have been traveling since my dad retired. ( )
15. It’s almost noon. My next door neighbors would argue all morning. ( )

다음 질문에 대한 대답을 영어로 쓰시오. 한 줄에 한 문장씩 쓰십시오. 단답식이 아닌 주어와 동사 등을 갖춘 완전한 문장으로 쓰시오.

1. 당신이 사는 곳은 어디입니까? 언제 그 곳으로 이사를 갔습니까? 당신이 그곳에 산 지는 얼마나 되었습니까?
   *이사가다: move

2. 당신은 영화를 공부하시나요? 당신이 영화 공부를 한 지가 얼마나 되었습니까? 당신은 영화의 읽기, 듣기, 말하기, 쓰기 중에 어느 것이 가장 어렵습니까?

3. 당신은 휴대폰을 갖고 있습니까? 지금의 휴대폰을 사용한 지가 얼마나 되었습니까? 당신은 그 휴대폰을 사는데 얼마나 지불하였습니다 ли?
   *휴대폰: cell phone

4. 당신의 과목과 과목표는 누구입니까? 그 과목표로 일한 지가 얼마나 되었습니까?
   *과목표: the captain of the department

5. 당신 집에서는 어떤 신문을 구독합니까? 그 신문을 구독한 지가 얼마나 되었습니까?
   *구독하다: subscribe

**APPENDIX C**

Reading passage

Modeling can be a very exciting job. Famous models can earn a lot of money. They can travel to many interesting places. Successful models are mostly women. There are a few successful male models. Travis Fimmel is one of them. He was discovered by a model agent in Melbourne. He has been modeling since 1998. He worked in Melbourne and London for a while. Now, he is living in L.A. He has been living in L.A for 3 years. He does many things to be a better model. Since moving to L.A., he has been exercising, getting skin care. He has also been learning how to walk down the runway.
He meets fashion designers all over the world. He has been working with many fashion magazines. He appears in TV commercials. The music video with Jennifer Lopez was very successful and he has been attending an acting school since then. Popular female models can earn about $35,000 for one day. But, male models earn only about $7,000. They have much shorter careers, too. But, he loves his job and he is having a lot of fun.

*runway: 패션쇼의 무대
*Melbourne: 호주의 도시 이름

Applicable levels: tertiary education
Key words: input-based instruction, input enhancement, output-based instruction, output hypothesis
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