# THE EFFECTS OF FORM-FOCUSED INSTRUCTION ON LOWER-INTERMEDIATE EFL IRANIAN LEARNERS' GRAMMAR LEARNING

Somaye Ranjbar
M.A, Department of Foreign Languages, Fars Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht, Iran
M.A, Department of Foreign Languages, Marvdasht Branch, Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht, Iran
somaye.ranjbar.m@gmail.com

Ehya Amalsaleh
Associate prof., Paramedical School, Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran
asalehe@yahoo.com

Zahra Rastegar Haghighi Shirazi
Assistant prof., Department of Foreign Languages, Marvdasht Branch , Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht , Iran
zrastegar@gmail.com

**Somaye Ranjbar** has got her MA degree in TEFL in 2014 from the Department of Foreign Languages, Fars Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht, Iran.

**Ehya Amalsaleh** is an associate professor of TEFL at English Department, Paramedical School, Shiraz University of Medical Sciences. She has published seven ESP textbooks for Iranian students. Her research interest lies in Critical Discourse Analysis and methods of teaching writing.

**Zahra Rastegar Haghighi Shirazi** is an Assistant Professor in Islamic Azad University, Marvdasht Branch. Her professional interests are teacher education, psychology of language education, and research methods.

# THE EFFECTS OF FORM-FOCUSED INSTRUCTION ON LOWER-INTERMEDIATE EFL IRANIAN LEARNERS' GRAMMAR LEARNING

Somaye Ranjbar
somaye.ranjbar.m@gmail.com

Ehya Amalsaleh
asalehe@yahoo.com

Zahra Rastegar Haghighi Shirazi
zrastegar@gmail.com

## Abstract

One of the most controversial questions raised by classroom second language acquisition (SLA) researchers is whether and how to include grammar in second language ($L_2$) classrooms.  This study tried to investigate how the form-focused instruction affects lower-intermediate EFL Iranian learners' grammar learning. Based on an experimental data collection and analysis, the study followed the pre-test and post-test design performed on 45 female participants at the pre-intermediate level. The pre-test was administered at the beginning of the course; then, the researcher divided the participants into two groups: experimental (FFI) and control group (traditional method). The researcher also used an observation checklist to ascertain if the teacher used the related items in classes. Afterwards, the researcher provided the frequency of observation of teachers' operations which showed differences between the FFI and the traditional instruction. After observing the teaching sessions, the researchers administered the same test as a post-test to both groups. . The data were analyzed using independent t-test and paired t-test.

*Keywords***:** form-focused Instruction (FFI); traditional Grammar Instruction.

## 1. Introduction

Researchers in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) usually confront the controversial issue if it is beneficial to learners to include grammar into SLA syllabus. Diller (1978) stated that in1960s up to early 1970s, educational experts introduced form-focused instruction (FFI). Scholars discovered that second language learning resembles the first language acquisition in the sense that both appear to be a gradual process through which the learner perpetually learns to match form and meaning, to meet the communication needs. Similarly, Pawlak (2006) maintains that second language learning, like first language acquisition, is a sort of developmental process, following a pre-defined order.

Some researchers (e.g., Doughty, 1991) referred to the beneficial influences of FFI on second language instruction compared to other types of approaches to instruction.  FFI in second language teaching was defined by Long (1991) as an attempt to shift attention towards linguistic units that are at the service of various meaning and functions in different contexts. Focus on forms instruction, however, as Long (ibid) maintains, instructs grammatical patterns separately without relating them to their meanings. This, unlike more recent educational methods which take meaning and function into account, is in close association with traditional methods of instruction, devoid of communicative functions.

As stated by Norris and Ortega (2000: 438), an L2 instructional approach is known as FFI when form and meaning are integrated for the following reasons: "designing tasks to promote learner engagement with meaning prior to form; seeking to attain and document task essentialness or naturalness of the L2 forms; attempting to ensure that instruction is unobtrusive; and documenting learner mental processes (i.e., noticing)".

Furthermore, a number of studies carried out on FFI adding some criteria to the aforementioned ones, as follows: "selecting target form(s) by analysis of learners' needs; or considering inter-language constraints when choosing the targets of instruction and when interpreting the outcomes of instruction" Norris and Ortega (ibid).

## 2. Review of the Related Literature

### 2.1. Focus on Form Background

Long and Robinson (1998) present a historical overview of FFI and refer to creating a pedagogical grammar through the analysis of the target language as the primary task in the syllabus design. This approach is termed the synthetic approach in materials development and syllabus design procedures by Wilkins (1976). As suggested by Long and Robinson (1998), FFI is defined as every task to direct learners' attention towards available facilities for practicing different aspects of the linguistic syllabus and helping learners develop their interlanguage systems. This is believed to help learners to draw the system and conceptual grammar through the input they are exposed to ( Ellis, 1995) and hence to use grammar appropriately to communicate ideas in the target language.

There are various definitions for the focus on form, some of which are presented below: Schmidt (2001), for instance, maintains that focus on form is known as the approach in which the learner's attention is directed towards the formal aspects of language. Ellis (2001), on the other hand, disagrees with the term "global attention hypothesis" and argues that the learner's attention should be paid to formal linguistic features. As defined by Long and Robinson (1998), FFI consists of a balanced integration of focus on form and meaning in teaching language. Or as Poole (2005) contended, FFI is an educational method in which whereas the importance of communicative principles is appreciated, learners are directed to occasionally shift their attention towards linguistic feature. It should be noted, however, that some scholars (e.g., Schmidt, 2001) do not refer to this second definition and postulate that focus on form corresponds to mapping functions and meanings into their related forms. In this regard, Schmidt (2001), holds that focus on form refers to attaining knowledge of the abstract linguistic representations. It is worth mentioning that this definition has been implies that one could make sense of focus on form not as knowledge of grammatical rules, but rather as gaining awareness of particular linguistic signals provided by the input (Schmidt, 2001).

So far, a number of scholars have addressed the significance of instructing grammar for the purposes of language learning. According to Richards and Renandya (2002), teaching grammar plays an important role in language teaching systems. In the same vein, Saeidi (2009) maintains that there is a consensus among people that language learning may not be possible without grammar instruction. Furthermore, unless learners are equipped with grammatical knowledge, they face challenges effectively using that language (Saeidi, 2009).

Various categorizations have been proposed for the notion of FFI. Some studies (e.g., Schmidt, 1994; Sharwood Smith, 1993) have concentrated their attention on the possible functions of noticing. As such, the existing relations between implicit and explicit language knowledge types have been the main concerns of numerous studies (Dekeyser, 1998; Ellis,

2003). Accordingly, a series of grammar learning methods including metalinguistic awareness and implicit input improvement have been suggested by scholars (Doughty &Varela, 1998).

Doughty and Williams (1998) emphasize that focus on form differs from focus on forms instruction. That is to say, they consider focus on form a more beneficial approach activating the cognitive resources by directing learners' attention to meaning and communicative functions of language. They further state that this advantage of focus on form instruction helps learners to find the linguistic items and forms that are at the service of different communicative functions of language (Doughty & Williams, 1998).

## 2.2. Form-Focused Instruction versus Traditional Method

As suggested by Spada (2008), focus on form instruction answers the demands of the learners for grammar learning; this type of instruction differs from communicative approaches to language instruction in the way that FFI does not merely revolve around functions and notions of language. That is, in FFI, learners attend to the instructions of their teachers and try to attend to the linguistic rules of language to be able to perform grammar learning activities appropriately. It should be noted, however, that learners attain knowledge of language grammar by paying close attention to the grammatical forms and their functions. Ellis ( 2006) more specifically defines FFI as followed: FFI "entails a focus on meaning with attention to form arising out of the communicative activity" (p. 100)

As Long (1991) maintains, the difference between the FFI and the traditional or focus on forms instruction is that unlike FFI, in traditional approach, focus revolves around forms in isolation. A number of scholars, namely Elgün-Gündüz et al, 2012, Spada, N., & Lightbown, 2008, Long, 1991, call the former approach, 'integrated form-focused instruction' and the latter, 'isolated form-focused instruction'. Or, in line with these scholars, Laufer and Girsai (2008) consider the focus on forms instruction equal to the traditional grammar teaching approaches and pinpoint that in such types of instruction, linguistic units are presented in isolation and , following a pre-specified order, are learned in a rote manner. This may be the reason underlying Richards and Rogers' (2001) argument concerning the gradual decrease in popularity of the traditional approaches such as grammar translation method and audio-lingual approach.

One main benefit of FFI, in contrast with focus on forms or traditional methods, is its focus on meaning and communicative functions of language that has led to the suggestion of the strong version of communicative approach to the teaching of language (Howatt 1984 cited in Baleghizadeh, 2010). Among the scholars who favored such strong version of communicative approach, Krashen and Terrell (1983) made use of the meaning focused FFI approach to develop their Natural Approach with its focus on the comprehensible input as the prerequisite for natural use and learning of communication in a relaxed context. Further, Prabhu (1987 cited in Baleghizadeh 2010) developed his task-based language teaching approach on the basis of Bangalore Project and with special attention to meaning-based focus on form instruction.

Some researchers (e.g. Doughty, 2001; Long, 1991) prefer the focus on form approach as a more beneficial instruction compared to focus on forms instruction. They hold that, owing to the following four reasons, FFI is to the advantage of the learner: firstly, the learner should learn the communicative functions of the language through meaning-based instruction to be able to grasp the communicative dimensions of the language; secondly, to be exposed to the meaning alone may not help learners to use the language appropriately.

(Long, 1991); thirdly, as learners might find it challenging to focus on both meaning and form simultaneously, meaning overtakes form (Van Patten, 1990); and last, but not least, some activities should be designed to expose the learners to different forms in different context of situation. One proposed argument by (Doughty 2001 cited in Ellis, 2002) is that what makes FFI different from any other teaching approaches is its simultaneous attention to form, meaning and use in cognitive learning processes.

## 3. Research Questions

Two research questions were addressed in this study:

1. How does the FFI affect Iranian lower-intermediate EFL learners' grammar learning?

2. Are there any meaningful differences between FFI and traditional grammar instruction in teaching English grammar to Iranian lower-intermediate EFL learners?

## 4. Methodology

### 4.1. Participants

The participants were 45 female students of a Language Institute. They were given a homogeneity test at lower intermediate Iranian learners. Their ages ranged between 12 and 17.

They were first randomly divided into two groups: 23 participants in the experimental group (FFI group) and 22 participants in the control group; then, each group was further divided into two classes. All groups were taught by only one teacher twice a week during the project.

### 4.2. Materials

For this study, the textbook entitled, "Summit 1A" by Joan Saslow and Allen Ascher (2007) was selected. The book was designed for students at the lower-intermediate level; the book comprised different passages with related grammatical points. The structural patterns in passages were taught through FFI and traditional methods.

### 4.3. Instrumentation

To have a homogeneous research sample, the researcher employed a validated teacher-made achievement test, including grammar items. It included 30 multiple-choice items on grammatical patterns suitable for the lower intermediate level. Its reliability index was calculated through Cronbach's alpha formula as ($r= 0.624$).

Tests constituted the main instruments for this study. The pre-test (Appendix A) was administered at the beginning of the course. In order to have a more reliable test, it was administered to the similar group of students (who has passed level 8 of Real course) before the beginning of the study. The post-test was another instrument with the same format and form. The researchers' observation of the classes made another instrument to ensure that the teacher was following the method he aimed at; that is to say, the researcher wanted to make sure that the teacher was using the FFI and traditional method in related classes.

## 4.4. Procedures

Initially, the pre-test was administered at the beginning of the course. Two classes had the same syllabus and course book. These classes were held two days a week for two hours.

The study lasted for 12 sessions. Each session comprised one grammar lesson including ''gerunds and infinitives'', ''the present perfect and the present perfect continuous'', ''future plans and finished future actions'' and so on. At the end of the semester, the same test was administered as the post-test to both groups: the experimental and the control groups.

The main purpose of this study was to find out whether FFI and focus on forms had any effects on the grammar proficiency of EFL learners and if yes, which one was more effective. Hence, the initial procedure is as follows:

| Pre-test Experimental Group 1 ( FFI) -Post-test |
| Pre-test Control Group 2 ( focus on forms)-Post-test |

In FFI class, the teacher and learners first discussed the main theme and the content of each unit; then they went through the formal structures and grammatical rules. In this class, the teacher attempted to raise learners' attention towards grammatical patterns used in passages indirectly; the teacher's initiatives aimed at making the students active. During this procedure, the teacher did not correct the learners' errors.

The  Post-test (with the same format and form of the pre-test) was administered after six weeks of instructions. Mean scores of the pre-test and post-test were calculated separately. Having reported the scores of two sets of tests (pre/ post-tests), the researchers evaluated the learning  gains (progress from pre to posttest) of each learner by comparing the mean scores of each group in the form of paired t-test in pre-tests and post-tests for each group. The level of significance was pre-set to .05 (p<.05).

After the pre/ post-tests, the researcher took two types of t-test, an independent t-test and a paired t-test. Independent t-test was tabulated for comparing the pre-tests and the post-tests of two groups (experimental and control group); paired t-tests were run between pre-tests and post-tests of each group separately.

The researchers used an observation checklist (Appendix B) that contained some items to see if the teacher used the related items in classes. That is to say, the researchers observed the classes for six weeks to ascertain that the teacher was following FFI or traditional method in classes.

## 5. Results and Discussion

The descriptive statistics for the pre-test scores of FFI and traditional method of grammar teaching are presented in table 1.

Table1. *The Descriptive Statistics of the Experimental and Control Groups*

| Groups | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experimental | 23 | 14.65 | 1.071 | .223 |
| Control | 22 | 13.98 | 1.053 | .224 |

Table 2. *Independent Samples Test on the Pre-test of the Experimental and Control Groups*

| Pre | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | f | Sig. | t | df | Significance-value | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Equal variances assumed | .085 | .772 | 4.643 | 4342.695 | .12 | 1.470 | .317 | .832 | 2.109 |
| Equal variances not assumed | | | 4.645 | | .12 | 1.470 | .317 | .832 | 2.109 |

As depicted in table 2, there was no statistically significant difference between the means of pre-tests administered to both control and experimental groups. This revealed the two groups' grammatical knowledge was not different prior to the study.

Table 3 depicts the descriptive statistics for the post-test scores of FFI and the traditional method of grammar teaching.

Table 3. *Descriptive Statistics of the Experimental and Control Groups*

| Groups | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experimental | 23 | 16.22 | 1.278 | .266 |
| Control | 22 | 15.14 | 1.283 | .274 |

Table 4. *Independent Sample T-Test on the Post-test of the Experimental and Control Groups*

| post | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | f | Sig. | T | Df | Significance-value | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| Equal variances assumed | .003 | .959 | 2.831 | 43 | .007 | 1.081 | .382 | .311 | 1.851 |
| Equal variances not assumed | | | 2.831 | 42.893 | .007 | 1.081 | .382 | .311 | 1.851 |

According to table 4, the experimental group, who received FFI, had significantly outperformed the control group, who received the traditional method of teaching grammar. This clearly indicates that FFI has been an effective method for teaching grammar to the pre intermediate EFL learners.

Table 5 shows the results of the paired samples statistics.

Table 5. *Paired Samples Statistics between the Pre-test and Post-Test Scores of the Experimental Group*

| | **Paired Differences** | | | | | T | df | Significance -value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| **Pair1pre - post** | -1.56522 | 1.56165 | .32563 | -2.24052 | -.88991 | -4.807 | 22 | .000 |

Table 5 illustrates the results of paired samples t-test. A significant difference was found between pre-test and post-test scores of FFI, demonstrating that the scores of post-test of experimental group were significantly improved. Therefore, FFI positively affected lower intermediate EFL Iranian learners' grammar learning.

Table 6. *Paired Samples Statistics between Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores of the Control Group*

| | **Paired Differences** | | | | | T | Df | Significance -value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| **Pair1pre - post** | -1.955 | 1.704 | .363 | -2.710 | -1.199 | -5.381 | 21 | .25 |

Table 6 showed the results of Paired Samples t-test. There was no significant difference between pre-test/post-test scores of learners who received traditional grammar method. Therefore, traditional method did not have any significant effect on the lower intermediate EFL Iranian learners' grammar learning.

**6. Discussion**

The study was performed with the aim of assessing the effect of FFI instruction on Iranian lower-intermediate EFL learners' grammar learning. The findings of the study indicate that the FFI approach positively affected grammar learning of the lower intermediate EFL Iranian learners. This is, in line with the findings of the study carried out by Ellis, Basturkmen and Loewen, (2001), illustrating that when the second language learning context is entirely experiential and the focus is on meaning, learners may not acquire all linguistics features and their functions like the natives. This is true even if the learners are exposed to meaningful input and have interactive opportunities  at hand. Furthermore, the research work performed in classrooms shows that, in order to compensate for the limitations of SLA atmosphere, some communicative activities should be introduced. In addition, to enhance the learners' communicative competence, the inclusion of 'focus on form' into the mainstream instruction syllabus is shown to be necessary. So FFI is effective and beneficial method to second language learners.

In addition, although the experimental group and the control group received the same syllabus, the results highlighted some significant differences between the achievement of learners attending FFI and traditional grammar instruction in teaching English grammar to lower-intermediate EFL learners. Long(2000), Laufer and Girsai ( 2008) , and Fotos and Nassaji's (2007), found similar results; according to Long "FFI is in sharp contrast with traditional grammar instruction or focus on forms instruction, which places a focus on forms themselves in isolation" (Long, as cited in Muranoi, 2000, p. 618). Focus on forms is an approach equated with the traditional method of language teaching which entails teaching discrete linguistic structures in separate lessons in a sequence determined by the syllabus (Laufer and Girsai, 2008). Long (2000) emphasized the great thing about FFI is that it is learner-centered, taking the needs of the learner into account, and hence, matching the learner's internal learning process. (Fotos and Nassaji, 2007) Therefore, this can account for the advantages of FFI over focus on forms or traditional instruction.

## 7. Conclusion

This research attempted to compare the effectiveness of two methods of teaching grammar (FFI and traditional grammar focus on forms) to intermediate students. As (Wilkins 1976 cited in Long and Robinson, 1998) states, FFI by introducing certain activities into the grammar teaching syllabus aims at raising learners' attention and helping them to accurately and appropriately use the language. Despite the crucial roles the FFI approach plays in enhancing the learners' grammatical competence, grammar teaching is still taught traditionally. Owing to the fact that most grammar classes require learners to observe grammatical accuracy and use grammar to communicate ideas, the inclusion of the focus on form approach seems to be of utmost importance in EFL contexts. Teachers by employing integrated, skills-based grammar lessons in their classes can help learners to acquire and use the language more appropriately. The findings of this study are useful for language teachers and syllabus designers. It requires teacher to incorporate FFI in teaching grammar in the class. It mainly encourages teachers to use FFI as an effective method to teach grammar. Setting appropriate educational conditions and instructional methods for students is one of the important implications of this study as well.

## 8. Limitations of the study

Although the study sufficiently addressed the research questions of this study, there are a number of limitations. The participants of the study were all females and from one city and hence might not be the true example of Iranian EFL learners. The same study could be replicated with samples of different cities as well as with male learners.

Furthermore, since the instrument used for collecting the data was multiple choice tests only, the findings might not be generalized thoroughly. Employing different types of tests would make it more practicable to generalize the results.

**Reference**

Baleghizadeh.S.(2010).*Focus on form in an EFl: communicative classroom*. Novitas-ROYAL, (Research on Youth and Language), 2010, 4 (1), 119-128.

Basturkmen, H., Ellis, R. , Loewen, S. (2001). Learner Uptake in Communicative ESL Lessons. *Language Learning,51*(2), 281-318.

DeKeyser, R. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in second language acquisition* (pp. 42-63). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Diller, K. C. (1978).  *The language teaching controversy*. New York: Newbury House.

Doughty, C. (1991). Second language instruction does make a difference. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*(4), 431-469.

Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. William (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114-138).New York: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 197–261). New York: Cambridge University Press.

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

Zennure Elgün-Gündüz , Sumru Akcan & Yasemin Bayyurt (2012). Isolated form-focused instruction and integrated form-focused instruction in primary school English classrooms in Turkey. *Language, Culture and Curriculum,25* (2), pages 157-171.

Ellis, R. (1995). Interpretation Tasks for Grammar Teaching. In  TESOL QUARTERLY,

Vol. 21, No. 1, 87-102Ellis, R. (2001) 'Introduction: Investigating Form-Focused Instruction', Language Learning, 51(1), 1-46.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 83-107.

Fotos, S., & Nassaji, H. (Eds.). (2007). *Form-focused instruction and teacher education.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howatt, A. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Laufer, B., & Girsai, N. (2008). Form-focused instruction in second language vocabulary learning. *Applied Linguistics, 29* (4), 694-716.

Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology in

K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.). *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Long, M., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 15-63). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Long, M. (2000). Focus on form in task-based language teaching. In R. Lambert & E. Shohamy (Eds.), *Language policy and pedagogy: Essays in honor of A. Ronald Walton* (pp. 179- 192). Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.

Muranoi, H. (2000). Focus on form through interaction enhancement: Integrating formal instruction into a communicative task in EFL classrooms. *Language Learning, 50*,617-673.

Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 50* (3), 417-528.

Pawlak, M. (2006). *The place of form-focused instruction in the foreign language classroom*. Poznan, Poland: Kalisz–Poznań.

Poole, A. (2005). Focus on form instruction: Foundations, applications and criticisms. *The Reading Matrix, 5(1),* 47-56.

Richards, C.J., Gallo, B.P., & Renandya, A.V. (2002). Exploring teachers' beliefs and the processes of change. *PAC Journal, 1*(1), 41-58.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge.

Saeidi, M. (2009). Multiple intelligence-based focuses on form and Iranian EFL learners' accurate use of grammar. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 117-136.

Saslow. J.,& Ascher.A. (2007). Summit: English for Today's World1A. *ISBN US Edition: 978-013-110705-2,*7.

Schmidt, R. (1994). Deconstructing consciousness in search of useful definitions for applied linguistics. *AILA Review, 11*, 11-26.

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

Sharwood Smith, M. (1993). Input enhancement in instructed SLA: Theoretical bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15*,165–79.

Spada, N., & dos Santos Lima, M. (2008). Integrated and isolated FFI: Views from ESL and EFL teachers and learners. *Modern Language Journal, 85* (2), 244–258.

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (2008). Form-focused instruction: Isolated or integrated? TESOL Quarterly , 42, 181-207.

Van Patten, B. (1990). Attending to form and content in the input. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12,* 287-301.

Wilkins, D. 1976. *Notional syllabuses.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Appendix A**

**Grammar Questionnaire**

1.   Robert………………away two or three times a year.
a)   is going usually   b) is usually going   c)usually goes   d)goes usually
2.   It was a boring weekend. ……………anything.
a)   I didn't    b) I don't do    c) I didn't do  d)I don't
3.   Sarah has lost her passport again. It's the second time this …………………… .
a) has happened     b)happens     c)happened     d)is happening
4. …………a car when you were living in London?
a) Had you      b) Were you having   c)Have you had    d) Did you have
5. Don't worry ………………late tonight.
a) if I'm     b)when I'm     c)when I'll be     d)if I'll be
6. ------------ it was not a good stadium, we won the match.
a. However    b. Although     c. So     d. Therefore
7. Whenever I come here, I remember---------- of childhood
a. --------       b. memories    c. to memorize     d. memorizing
8. It is very pleasant to camp out in this good weather. I wish my mom ----- also here.
a. was     b. were    c. is     d. would be
9.  She looks -------.
a. a tired    b. a tired person      c. tired        d. tired person
 10.What ------- you do if you -------- in that difficult situation.
    a. will/if     b. would/were       c. will/was          d. will/were
11. It was ------hot that we went to the beach
  a. so        b. such        c. such a        d. too
12. He ----a happy life since his wife --- in an accident two years ago.
a. does not have-has died          c. did not have-died
b. has not had-has died            d. has not had-died
13. If I ------ him I ------ accept that stupid suggestion.
a. was/wouldn't    b. were/didn't     c. were/wouldn't       d. was/didn't
14. I talked to her -------- she changed her mind.
a. so      b. so that     c. that         d. as
15. As the youngest member of the club, Mr. Johnson ------- tennis there regularly from 1960 to 1970.
a. is used to playing          b. used to play
c. was used to play            d. used to playing
16. The candidates -------- by the jury after many interviews.
a. were selected       b. will select      c. is being selected    d. selected
17. I know why you failed the exam. You --------- studied harder.
a. should         b. should have     c. should had     d. had to
18. She was a student at Oxford University -------- he was studying law.
a. so    b. where    c. therefore     d. hence
  19. a) How many chocolates did you eat?
b) -----------
   a. Too much    b. A few   c. Any     d. More
20. You --------- tried to repair your TV. Whenever your TV has a problem--- an electrician to repair it.
  a. shouldn't/have           b. shouldn't have/get
  c. shouldn't have/have        d. shouldn't get

21. a) The phone's ringing.
b) -------
a. I'll answer it                    b. I answer it
c. I going to answer it           d. I should to answered it
22. The population of Mexico City ------------- to 30 million by the year 2010.
a. will grow      b. grows      c. are growing      d. going to grow
23. Finally, I had the electrician ------- my TV antenna.
a. adjusted          b. adjust      c. adjusting          d. to adjust
24. a) I don't eat vegetables very often.
b. ------------------- .
a. So do I        b. Neither do I        c. None   d. I not
25. He ---- a degree in History in 1998.
a. take             b. takes            c. took         d. taken
26. On my way back home, my car broke down and I took it to that garage and ----
a. repaired it      b. had it repair        c. had repaired it        d. had it repaired
27. a) Someone is at the door!
b) ---------
a. I go.      b. I'll go!        c. I shall go!              d. I myself am going!
28. He attended Oxford University and ------------ a degree in Economics.
a. take          b. takes        c. took          d. taken
29. I ------- to study harder this year.
a. will        b. am going          c. am getting to      d. I will going
30. It was -------- nice film that I decided to stay at home and watch the whole film.
a. so       b. such a        c. such          d. as

## Key Answer

| # | A | B | C | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 |  | ✓ |  |  |
| 2 |  |  | ✓ |  |
| 3 | ✓ |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 5 | ✓ |  |  |  |
| 6 |  | ✓ |  |  |
| 7 |  | ✓ |  |  |
| 8 |  | ✓ |  |  |
| 9 |  |  | ✓ |  |
| 10 |  | ✓ |  |  |
| 11 | ✓ |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 13 |  |  | ✓ |  |
| 14 |  | ✓ |  |  |
| 15 |  | ✓ |  |  |
| 16 | ✓ |  |  |  |
| 17 |  | ✓ |  |  |
| 18 |  | ✓ |  |  |
| 19 | ✓ |  |  |  |
| 20 |  | ✓ |  |  |
| 21 | ✓ |  |  |  |
| 22 | ✓ |  |  |  |
| 23 |  | ✓ |  |  |
| 24 |  | ✓ |  |  |
| 25 |  |  | ✓ |  |
| 26 |  |  |  | ✓ |
| 27 |  | ✓ |  |  |
| 28 |  |  | ✓ |  |
| 29 |  | ✓ |  |  |
| 30 |  | ✓ |  |  |

## Appendix B: Observations Checklists

| | |
|---|---|
| observation of FFI class(A1) | |
| 1. Input flooding (providing a plethora of natural examples of the form in focus in a text on the assumption that the very high frequency of the structure in question will attract the learner's attention to the relevant formal regularities)(Doughty and Williams, 1998a) | 1 |
| 2.Focused on forms is an approach equated with the traditional method of language teaching which entails teaching discrete linguistic structures in separate lessons in a sequence determined by the syllabus (Laufer and Girsai, 2008). | 0 |
| 3.Focused on forms does not match learning processes, is not needs-based, and often results in boring lessons(cited in Fotos and Nassaji, 2007, p.12). | 0 |
| 4. Negotiation (asking and answering questions about how a special form is learnt and taught)(Lightbown, 1998) | 1 |
| 5.Task-essential language (the necessity of using specific forms to complete a task) | 1 |
| 6.The approaches to teacher education, the point has often been made ( Carandall 2000:35) that traditional approaches have usually been top-down viewing teachers as passive knowledge recipients, whereas current constructivist approaches emphasize active roles for teacher cognition, reflection, and research. | 0 |
| 7.Form focused instruction involves attempts to intervene directly in interlanguage construction by drawing learners' attention to or providing opportunities for them to practice specific features based on a linguistic syllabus and systematic treatment. | 1 |
| 8.explicit correction,where a teacher clearly indicates that the learner has said something incorrectly, and provides the correct form own output by reconstructing a text which is read to them) | 1 |
| 9.elicitation, where the teacher attempts to draw out the correct forms from learners (Ellis 2001). | 1 |
| 10.By means of methodological options that induce attention to form in the context of performing a task. Two methodological options that have received considerable attention from researchers are (a) the provision of time for strategic and on-line planning (Yuan and Ellis, 2003; Foster and Skehan, 1996) and (b) corrective feedback (Lyster, 2004) explicit correction,where a teacher clearly indicates that the learner has said something incorrectly, and provides the correct form. | 1 |

| | |
|---|---|
| observation of FFI class(A2) | |
| 1. Input flooding (providing a plethora of natural examples of the form in focus in a text on the assumption that the very high frequency of the structure in question will attract the learner's attention to the relevant formal regularities)(Doughty and Williams, 1998a) | 1 |
| 2.Focused on forms is an approach equated with the traditional method of language teaching which entails teaching discrete linguistic structures in separate lessons in a sequence determined by the syllabus (Laufer and Girsai, 2008). | 0 |
| 3.Focused on forms does not match learning processes, is not needs-based, and often results in boring lessons(cited in Fotos and Nassaji, 2007, p.12). | 0 |
| 4. Negotiation (asking and answering questions about how a special form is learnt and taught)(Lightbown, 1998) | 1 |
| 5.Task-essential language (the necessity of using specific forms to complete a task) | 1 |
| 6.The approaches to teacher education, the point has often been made ( Carandall 2000:35) that traditional approaches have usually been top-down viewing teachers as passive knowledge recipients, whereas current constructivist approaches emphasize active roles for teacher cognition, reflection, and research. | 0 |
| 7.Form focused instruction involves attempts to intervene directly in interlanguage construction by drawing learners' attention to or providing opportunities for them to practice specific features based on a linguistic syllabus and systematic treatment. | 1 |
| 8.explicit correction,where a teacher clearly indicates that the learner has said something incorrectly, and provides the correct form own output by reconstructing a text which is read to them) | 1 |
| 9.elicitation, where the teacher attempts to draw out the correct forms from learners (Ellis 2001). | 1 |
| 10.By means of methodological options that induce attention to form in the context of performing a task. Two methodological options that have received considerable attention from researchers are (a) the provision of time for strategic and on-line planning (Yuan and Ellis, 2003; Foster and Skehan, 1996) and (b) corrective feedback (Lyster, 2004) explicit correction,where a teacher clearly indicates that the learner has said something incorrectly, and provides the correct form. | 1 |

| | |
|---|---|
| observation of FFI class(A3) | |
| 1. Input flooding (providing a plethora of natural examples of the form in focus in a text on the assumption that the very high frequency of the structure in question will attract the learner's attention to the relevant formal regularities)(Doughty and Williams, 1998a) | 1 |
| 2.Focused on forms is an approach equated with the traditional method of language teaching which entails teaching discrete linguistic structures in separate lessons in a sequence determined by the syllabus (Laufer and Girsai, 2008). | 0 |
| 3.Focused on forms does not match learning processes, is not needs-based, and often results in boring lessons(cited in Fotos and Nassaji, 2007, p.12). | 0 |
| 4. Negotiation (asking and answering questions about how a special form is learnt and taught)(Lightbown, 1998) | 1 |
| 5.Task-essential language (the necessity of using specific forms to complete a task) | 1 |
| 6.The approaches to teacher education, the point has often been made ( Carandall 2000:35) that traditional approaches have usually been top-down viewing teachers as passive knowledge recipients, whereas current constructivist approaches emphasize active roles for teacher cognition, reflection, and research. | 0 |
| 7.Form focused instruction involves attempts to intervene directly in interlanguage construction by drawing learners' attention to or providing opportunities for them to practice specific features based on a linguistic syllabus and systematic treatment. | 1 |
| 8.explicit correction,where a teacher clearly indicates that the learner has said something incorrectly, and provides the correct form own output by reconstructing a text which is read to them) | 1 |
| 9.elicitation, where the teacher attempts to draw out the correct forms from learners (Ellis 2001). | 1 |
| 10.By means of methodological options that induce attention to form in the context of performing a task. Two methodological options that have received considerable attention from researchers are (a) the provision of time for strategic and on-line planning (Yuan and Ellis, 2003; Foster and Skehan, 1996) and (b) corrective feedback (Lyster, 2004) explicit correction,where a teacher clearly indicates that the learner has said something incorrectly, and provides the correct form. | 1 |

| | 1 |
|---|---|
| observation of FFI class(A4) | |
| 1. Input flooding (providing a plethora of natural examples of the form in focus in a text on the assumption that the very high frequency of the structure in question will attract the learner's attention to the relevant formal regularities)(Doughty and Williams, 1998a) | 0 |
| 2.Focused on forms is an approach equated with the traditional method of language teaching which entails teaching discrete linguistic structures in separate lessons in a sequence determined by the syllabus (Laufer and Girsai, 2008). | 0 |
| 3.Focused on forms does not match learning processes, is not needs-based, and often results in boring lessons(cited in Fotos and Nassaji, 2007, p.12). | 1 |
| 4. Negotiation (asking and answering questions about how a special form is learnt and taught)(Lightbown, 1998) | 1 |
| | 0 |
| 5.Task-essential language (the necessity of using specific forms to complete a task) | |
| 6.The approaches to teacher education, the point has often been made ( Carandall 2000:35) that traditional approaches have usually been top-down viewing teachers as passive knowledge recipients, whereas current constructivist approaches emphasize active roles for teacher cognition, reflection, and research. | 1 |
| 7.Form focused instruction involves attempts to intervene directly in interlanguage construction by drawing learners' attention to or providing opportunities for them to practice specific features based on a linguistic syllabus and systematic treatment. | 1 |
| 8.explicit correction,where a teacher clearly indicates that the learner has said something incorrectly, and provides the correct form own output by reconstructing a text which is read to them) | 1 |
| 9.elicitation, where the teacher attempts to draw out the correct forms from learners (Ellis 2001). | 1 |
| 10.By means of methodological options that induce attention to form in the context of performing a task. Two methodological options that have received considerable attention from researchers are (a) the provision of time for strategic and on-line planning (Yuan and Ellis, 2003; Foster and Skehan, 1996) and (b) corrective feedback (Lyster, 2004) explicit correction,where a teacher clearly indicates that the learner has said something incorrectly, and provides the correct form. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| observation of Traditional Instruction class(A1) | |
| 1. Input flooding (providing a plethora of natural examples of the | 0 |
| form in focus in a text on the assumption that the very high frequency | |
| of the structure in question will attract the learner's attention to the | |
| relevant formal regularities)(Doughty and Williams, 1998a) | 1 |
| 2.Focused on forms is an approach equated with the traditional method of | |
| language teaching which entails teaching discrete linguistic structures in | |
| separate lessons in a sequence determined by the syllabus (Laufer and Girsai, 2008). | 1 |
| 3.Focused on forms does not match learning processes, is not needs-based, and often | |
| results in boring lessons(cited in Fotos and Nassaji, 2007, p.12). | 0 |
| 4. Negotiation (asking and answering questions about how a | |
| special form is learnt and taught)(Lightbown, 1998) | 0 |
| 5.Task-essential language (the necessity of using specific forms to complete a task) | 1 |
| 6.The approaches to teacher education, the point has often been made ( Carandall 2000:35) | |
| that traditional approaches have usually been top-down viewing teachers as passive knowledge recipients, | |
| whereas current constructivist approaches emphasize active roles for teacher cognition, | |
| reflection, and research. | 0 |
| 7.Form focused instruction involves attempts to intervene directly in | |
| interlanguage construction by drawing learners' attention to or | |
| providing opportunities for them to practice specific features based on a | |
| linguistic syllabus and systematic treatment. | 0 |
| 8.explicit correction,where a teacher clearly indicates that the | |
| learner has said something incorrectly, and provides the correct form | |
| own output by reconstructing a text which is read to them) | 0 |
| 9.elicitation, where the teacher attempts to draw out the | |
| correct forms from learners (Ellis 2001). | 0 |
| 10.By means of methodological options that induce attention to form in the | |
| context of performing a task. Two methodological options that have received | |
| considerable attention from researchers are (a) the provision of time for | |
| strategic and on-line planning (Yuan and Ellis, 2003; Foster and Skehan, 1996) | |
| and (b) corrective feedback (Lyster, 2004) explicit correction,where | |
| a teacher clearly indicates that the learner has said something incorrectly, | |
| and provides the correct form. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| observation of Traditional Instruction class(A2) | 0 |
| 1. Input flooding (providing a plethora of natural examples of the form in focus in a text on the assumption that the very high frequency of the structure in question will attract the learner's attention to the relevant formal regularities)(Doughty and Williams, 1998a) | 1 |
| 2.Focused on forms is an approach equated with the traditional method of language teaching which entails teaching discrete linguistic structures in separate lessons in a sequence determined by the syllabus (Laufer and Girsai, 2008). | 1 |
| 3.Focused on forms does not match learning processes, is not needs-based, and often results in boring lessons(cited in Fotos and Nassaji, 2007, p.12). | 0 |
| 4. Negotiation (asking and answering questions about how a special form is learnt and taught)(Lightbown, 1998) | 0 |
| 5.Task-essential language (the necessity of using specific forms to complete a task) | 1 |
| 6.The approaches to teacher education, the point has often been made ( Carandall 2000:35) that traditional approaches have usually been top-down viewing teachers as passive knowledge recipients, whereas current constructivist approaches emphasize active roles for teacher cognition, reflection, and research. | 0 |
| 7.Form focused instruction involves attempts to intervene directly in interlanguage construction by drawing learners' attention to or providing opportunities for them to practice specific features based on a linguistic syllabus and systematic treatment. | 0 |
| 8.explicit correction,where a teacher clearly indicates that the learner has said something incorrectly, and provides the correct form own output by reconstructing a text which is read to them) | 0 |
| 9.elicitation, where the teacher attempts to draw out the correct forms from learners (Ellis 2001). | 0 |
| 10.By means of methodological options that induce attention to form in the context of performing a task. Two methodological options that have received considerable attention from researchers are (a) the provision of time for strategic and on-line planning (Yuan and Ellis, 2003; Foster and Skehan, 1996) and (b) corrective feedback (Lyster, 2004) explicit correction,where a teacher clearly indicates that the learner has said something incorrectly, and provides the correct form. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| observation of Traditional Instruction class(A3) | 0 |
| 1. Input flooding (providing a plethora of natural examples of the | |
| form in focus in a text on the assumption that the very high frequency | |
| of the structure in question will attract the learner's attention to the | |
| relevant formal regularities)(Doughty and Williams, 1998a) | 1 |
| 2.Focused on forms is an approach equated with the traditional method of | |
| language teaching which entails teaching discrete linguistic structures in | |
| separate lessons in a sequence determined by the syllabus (Laufer and Girsai, 2008). | 1 |
| 3.Focused on forms does not match learning processes, is not needs-based, and often | |
| results in boring lessons(cited in Fotos and Nassaji, 2007, p.12). | 0 |
| 4. Negotiation (asking and answering questions about how a | |
| special form is learnt and taught)(Lightbown, 1998) | 0 |
| 5.Task-essential language (the necessity of using specific forms to complete a task) | 1 |
| 6.The approaches to teacher education, the point has often been made ( Carandall 2000:35) | |
| that traditional approaches have usually been top-down viewing teachers as passive knowledge recipients, | |
| whereas current constructivist approaches emphasize active roles for teacher cognition, | |
| reflection, and research. | 0 |
| 7.Form focused instruction involves attempts to intervene directly in | |
| interlanguage construction by drawing learners' attention to or | |
| providing opportunities for them to practice specific features based on a | |
| linguistic syllabus and systematic treatment. | 0 |
| 8.explicit correction,where a teacher clearly indicates that the | |
| learner has said something incorrectly, and provides the correct form | |
| own output by reconstructing a text which is read to them) | 0 |
| 9.elicitation, where the teacher attempts to draw out the | |
| correct forms from learners (Ellis 2001). | 0 |
| 10.By means of methodological options that induce attention to form in the | |
| context of performing a task. Two methodological options that have received | |
| considerable attention from researchers are (a) the provision of time for | |
| strategic and on-line planning (Yuan and Ellis, 2003; Foster and Skehan, 1996) | |
| and (b) corrective feedback (Lyster, 2004) explicit correction,where | |
| a teacher clearly indicates that the learner has said something incorrectly, | |
| and provides the correct form. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| observation of Traditional Instruction class(A4) | |
| 1. Input flooding (providing a plethora of natural examples of the form in focus in a text on the assumption that the very high frequency of the structure in question will attract the learner's attention to the relevant formal regularities)(Doughty and Williams, 1998a) | 0 |
| 2.Focused on forms is an approach equated with the traditional method of language teaching which entails teaching discrete linguistic structures in separate lessons in a sequence determined by the syllabus (Laufer and Girsai, 2008). | 1 |
| 3.Focused on forms does not match learning processes, is not needs-based, and often results in boring lessons(cited in Fotos and Nassaji, 2007, p.12). | 1 |
| 4. Negotiation (asking and answering questions about how a special form is learnt and taught)(Lightbown, 1998) | 0 |
| 5.Task-essential language (the necessity of using specific forms to complete a task) | 0 |
| 6.The approaches to teacher education, the point has often been made ( Carandall 2000:35) that traditional approaches have usually been top-down viewing teachers as passive knowledge recipients, whereas current constructivist approaches emphasize active roles for teacher cognition, reflection, and research. | 1 |
| 7.Form focused instruction involves attempts to intervene directly in interlanguage construction by drawing learners' attention to or providing opportunities for them to practice specific features based on a linguistic syllabus and systematic treatment. | 0 |
| 8.explicit correction,where a teacher clearly indicates that the learner has said something incorrectly, and provides the correct form own output by reconstructing a text which is read to them) | 0 |
| 9.elicitation, where the teacher attempts to draw out the correct forms from learners (Ellis 2001). | 0 |
| 10.By means of methodological options that induce attention to form in the context of performing a task. Two methodological options that have received considerable attention from researchers are (a) the provision of time for strategic and on-line planning (Yuan and Ellis, 2003; Foster and Skehan, 1996) and (b) corrective feedback (Lyster, 2004) explicit correction,where a teacher clearly indicates that the learner has said something incorrectly, and provides the correct form. | 0 |