Focus on Form Instruction in EFL:
Iimplications for Theory and Practice

Dr. Farahman Farrokhi[*]
Associate Professor, University of Tabriz
Fattaneh Abbasi Talabari
M.A Student (TEFL), University of Tabriz

Abstract
   Language teachers usually face issues regarding the most effective methods of teaching. Teaching language to nonnative speakers of English involves certain problems and challenges at all levels of instruction. Due to the unsatisfactory results of focus on forms and focus on meaning instructions and their inevitable inadequacies, focus on form instruction along with its multiple techniques are regarded as a better candidate for classroom instruction. Focus on form instruction does not only pay attention to the importance of the communicative language teaching, but it also maintains the value of occasional and overt study of L2 grammatical forms. It is considered a more promising pedagogical choice than focus on forms and focus on meaning because of its communicatively need-oriented attention to form and its saliency in the language acquisition process. Focus on form may be essential to push learners beyond communicatively effective language toward target-like second language ability. It may also be part of a more efficient language learning experience in that it can speed up natural acquisition processes.

   Key words: Focus of form, Focus on Forms, Focus on meaning,Form,Form-focused,instruction.

1.The History of Focus on Form Instruction

This section, in briefly reviewing the history of language teaching methods, provides a background for discussion of focus on form instruction and its effects on language learning.

1.1.Traditional Language Teaching

Whereas today English is the world's most widely studied foreign language, five hundred years ago it was Latin for it was the dominant language of education, commerce, religion, and government in the western world (Richards and Rogers, 2001). As traditional grammarians were interested in the literary works of Latin, they tried to impose its grammar on any other language which they studied (Chastain, 1988). To them, morphology, the study of words, was more important than the study of language structures (syntax) or the study of sounds (phonology) (Richards and Rogers, 2001). They tried to analyze sentences of a language, label the parts with their names, and produce rules that explain how these parts may be combined. Each grammar point was listed, rules on its use were explained, and it was illustrated by some sample sentences. These rules were mainly prescriptive rather than descriptive in nature (Cook, 2005). Grammar translation method is an example of traditional language teaching approach.

1.2. Descriptive/Behavioristic Language Teaching

In the 1940s and 1950s, due to the criticisms directed toward traditional language teaching, the structural or descriptive school of linguistics was established along with a behavoristic paradigm among psychologists. According to this view, language is a fundamental part of total human behavior which could be dismantled into small pieces and units. Language was also viewed as a system of structurally related elements for encoding of meaning, the elements being phonemes, morphemes, words, structures, and sentence types. It regarded language learning as a process of imitation, practice, reinforcement and habit formation. Learning the language also consists of mastering the language elements and learning the rules by which these elements are combined. Language was identified with speech, and speech was approached through structure. It also claimed that children come into the world without any preconceived notions about the world or language, and they would shape their knowledge through various schedules of reinforcement (Brown, 2000; Schmitt, 2002). Audio-lingual and Oral/Situational language teaching methods were the two main examples of this view in which language is

regarded as a rule governed phenomenon which can be learned through mechanical habit formation.

1.3.Generative/Cognitive Language Teaching

In the 1960s, the generative-transformational school of linguistics along with a cognitive approach in psychology emerged through the influence of Chomsky (1966). His revolution turned linguists, psychologists, and language teachers toward the role of mind and abstract mental processes in teaching. According to this view, the main emphasis is on the learner's conscious awareness of rules, and the central attention is paid to the formal properties of language. It also aims to develop students' competence so as to enable them to formulate their own replies to previously unmet language situations. It also regards language as a creative, rule-governed communication, assigning the central role to the learner. It regards language learning as consisting of perception, acquisition, organization and storage of knowledge in such a way as to become an active part of the individual's cognitive structure. It also assigns a central and dominant role to the mental processes that are subject to the individual's control (Chastain, 1988).

According to this approach, teaching all expressions and sentences that students need is impossible as language is found to be infinitely varied. Therefore, the only achievable goal is to teach the system that makes language production possible (Richards and Rogers, 2001). Methods following this approach, such as Community Language Learning, Silent way, Total Physical Response, and Suggestopedia retained the drills of audio-lingual method but they also added some dozes of rule explanations and reliance on grammatical sequencing of materials.

1.4. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

Until recently, language teaching and learning focused on linguistic forms and on the descriptions of language structures. Then it was found that the generative rules proposed under the nativistic approach to language were abstract, formal, and explicit in nature, yet they dealt specifically with the forms and not with the deeper functional levels of meaning (Richards and Rogers, 2001). Rather than considering language learning as a process of general language structure accumulation, CLT regards language as an instrument of social interaction. Language learning is learning to communicate and every attempt to communicate is encouraged from the very beginning. So since 1970s, focus has shifted to semantic descriptions and to

language as a part of total communicative conduct of social communities (Chastain, 1988).

Putting emphasis on the semantic and communicative aspect rather than the grammatical characteristics of language, this theory leads to a specification and organization of language teaching content by categories of meaning and function (i.e. purpose for which people communicate; such as making requests, thanks,…) rather than by elements of structure and grammar. So, less attention is paid to the overt presentation and discussion of language elements (Brown, 2001). It was also believed that the target linguistic system will be learned best through the process of struggle to communicative and the sequencing is based on the consideration of content, function, or meaning that maintains interest (Chastain, 1988).

Communicative language teaching (CLT) is a communicative orientation that emphasizes affective, cognitive, and social factors, and its activities are inner directed and learner centered. Communicative competence (i.e. the ability to use the linguistic system appropriately and affectively) is the desired goal (Chastain, 1988). With the rise of communicative methodology in the late 1970s, it was suggested that teaching grammar was not only unhelpful but also it might be regarded as detrimental. So, the role of language instruction in second language classes was downplayed (Nassaji and Fotos, 2004).

1.5. 'Comprehensible Input Hypothesis'

Theoretically, the debate was first introduced by Krashen's (1981) distinction between conscious learning and unconscious acquisition of language. According to his acquisition/learning hypothesis, individuals may acquire a second language or may learn it. Those who pick up the rules of language subconsciously as they take part in communication acquire a second language whereas language learning is the result of learning the rules of language consciously in classroom situations (Chastain, 1988). Krashen (1981, 1985) also proposed that the goal of instruction is not to produce native-like speakers but to help them take advantage of the natural input available to them. Therefore, according to Krashen (1985), for grammar and vocabulary to be acquired, it is only enough to understand the language in which grammar and vocabulary are contained. So, he believed that language should be acquired through natural exposure, not learned through formal language instruction because it doesn't aid in spontaneous production of language.

Then, Krashen(1985) introduced his 'comprehensible input' hypothesis which deals with how individuals internalize and acquire language. Based on this hypothesis, if input is understood and there is enough of it, the necessary grammar and vocabulary are automatically provided. According to Krashen, the availability of input, which is comprehensible (i.e. i+1 or what is slightly beyond the learner's current level of language proficiency) to the learner is the only necessary and sufficient condition for language learning to take place. His 'input hypothesis' rests on the assumption that language acquisition consists mainly of adding rules to the interlanguage. He believes that positive evidence in the input, motivating particular structure, could stimulate the acquisition of that structure.

But Krashen's hypothesis, despite its appeal, did not go unopposed. The basic argument is that no matter how much correction learners receive, the complete set of evidence for building up a native-like grammar with all its complexities is not available in the input. It had been mentioned that those learners who do not have the advantage of language instruction, though fluent, developed wild grammars and produced untarget-like output (White, Spada, Lightbown, Ranta, 1991).

1.6. 'Noticing Hypothesis'

SLA research, however, goes beyond general interest in the need for comprehensible input (Chastain, 1988). Krashen's 'Comprehensible Input' hypothesis; that is, language can be learned through only exposure to comprehensible input, without some degree of learner's consciousness, has been found theoretically problematic (Khodayari and Attaollahi, 2005). The fact that learners don't utilize the input to which they are exposed as intake for learning led Schmidt (1990) to suggest that conscious awareness of a previously unlearned L_2 form or what he calls 'noticing' is a necessary condition for language learning to occur. Schmidt's 'noticing' hypothesis runs counter to Krashen's 'comprehensible input' hypothesis as it claims that 'intake is the part of the input that the learner notices' (Schmidt, 1990, p. 139).

1.7. Language Instruction

Following the concept of noticing as a pedagogical device for language acquisition to take place, Ellis (1990) introduced formal instruction as a view of language instruction which helps learners to develop awareness of target language features. According to Ellis, once consciousness of a particular feature has been raised through

formal instruction, learners remain aware of the target language feature and notice it in subsequent communicative input events which are considered to be crucial for further language processing, leading to the acquisition of the feature.

The role of language instruction in SLA must be considered in terms of the effect instruction has on the route of development (i.e., the general sequence or specific order of acquisition), on the rate of language development (i.e., the speed at which learning takes place), and on the success of language development (i.e., the proficiency level finally achieved). In general, instruction appears to offer three advantages over naturalistic SLA: (a) it speeds up the rate of learning, (b) it affects acquisition processes, leading to long term accuracy, and (c) it appears to raise the ultimate level of attainment (Doughty and Williams, 1998b). Form-focused instruction is regarded as one of the main types of formal instruction which is used to draw learners' attention to language form, either explicitly or implicitly (Spada, 1997). The following section offers a brief review, determining the strengths and limitations for language learning of a focus on forms and a focus on meaning, and highlights the possible advantages of a focus on form.

1.8. Focus on Forms

Focus on forms instruction is aimed at teaching/learning specific grammatical structures. It is very similar to traditional grammar instruction whose primary emphasis is on the teaching of language forms in isolation. It also involves the pre-selection of particular forms based on a linguistic syllabus and the intensive and systematic treatment of those structures. The instruction progresses as the learners show mastery of sequentially-presented grammatical forms (Long, 1991: Long and Robinson, 1998: Ellis, Basturkmen and Loewen, 2002). In this kind of language instruction, the teacher or syllabus designer is required to analyze or break the L_2 into its components, that is, words, collocations, grammar rules, phonemes, intonation and stress patterns, structures, notions, or functions. But it is considered as a non-communicative approach as it doesn't foster L_2 development which enables learners to function in real-world communication (Poole, 2005). So there exists no correspondence between the forms practiced and any kind of real-world meaning. Lack of any scope for the development of fluency is one of the most important consequences of such a rigid approach (Seedhouse, 1997).

1.9. Focus on Meaning

According to Long (1991) and Long and Robinson (1998) focus on meaning refers to a communicative approach to language teaching/learning which spends little or no time on the discrete points of language. Instead, the main purposes of such an approach are to use language in real-life situations, to emphasize meaning over form, and comprehension and fluency over production and accuracy. And the basic philosophy behind meaning-focused language instruction is that people learn languages best, inside or outside a classroom, not by regarding the language as an object of study, but by using it as a medium of communication. According to this view, language instruction is organized in terms of the purposes for which people are learning language and the kinds of language performances that are necessary to meet those purposes. Whereas learners are able to acquire linguistic structures without any instructional intervention, they don't usually achieve high levels of linguistic knowledge within an entirely meaning-focused instruction (Spada, 1997). They were found to have consistent difficulties with the basic structures of language as they cannot readily infer knowledge of language system from the communicative activities they do. This also happens as teachers accept every inaccurate interlanguage form without any comment or correction (Seedhouse, 1997).

1.10. Focus on Form

The emphasis on the role of language instruction along with Schmidt's 'noticing' hypothesis as the two main prerequisites for the acquisition of language made Long (1991) & Long and Robinson (1998) to feel that when students encounter problems and difficulties in their production and comprehension of language, it is the responsibility of their teachers and peers to help them notice their erroneous forms and supply them with the correct and appropriate forms. But this should not emulate teachers to focus on instructing specific grammatical items, leading to focus on forms instruction which progresses as learners master sequentially presented grammatical structures. They should aim to help students use language in a way that motivates realistic communicative use.

But it should also be different from the purely communicative instruction or what is termed as focus on meaning instruction in which little or no attention is directed to the study of discrete parts of language, instead, the main focus is on the use of language communicatively (Poole, 2005). So in terms of how to teach grammar and vocabulary, it is felt that the world of foreign/second language

teaching methodology has found itself endorsing extreme positions. To solve this problem, Long (1991) & Long and Robinson (1998) introduced the notion of focus on form instruction which, on one hand, highlights the significance of communicative language use and learner-centeredness, and on the other hand, emphasizes the overt study of problematic areas of L_2 forms.

Focus on Form is a kind of instruction which emphasizes the importance of communicative language teaching such as authentic communication, and also puts emphasis on occasional and overt study of L_2 grammatical structures (Poole, 2005). According to Long (1991) and Long and Robinson (1998), it tries to maintain a balance between focus on forms and focus on meaning through motivating teachers and learners to attend to form when necessary, yet within a communicative classroom environment. It has a dual, simultaneous focus on form and accuracy as well as meaning and fluency. It is also seen as a psycholinguistically plausible approach as it emphasizes the kind of attention to form that occurs in real-world situation, as it addresses learners' linguistic problems and as it motivates noticing which is considered necessary for acquisition (Seedhouse, 1997).

The importance of focusing on form is based on three main principles about second language acquisition:

(1) Learners acquire new linguistic forms as the result of attending to form in contexts where the primary concern is with the message rather than the language.

(2) Learners frequently experience difficulty in attending to and producing linguistic forms in communication as they have a limited information-processing capacity.

(3) They benefit from the opportunities that arise in communication to give focal attention to language forms (Ellis, Basturkmen, Loewen, 2001a).

1.10.1. How to Maintain a Focus on Form

Focus on form can be accomplished by providing opportunities for learners to negotiate topics which are meaningful to them. Teachers should allow learners, by reducing their own role in correction and scaffolding of learners' utterances, to manage the interaction (Seedhouse, 1997). They can also apply focus on form instruction in their classrooms by using principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) when they want to design activities and do assessment. Small size classes are regarded better candidates as they permit the teachers to work individually with students and students individually with their peers. Teachers and students are also required

to be proficient enough in English as to avoid any kind of code-switching during the course of interaction (Poole, 2005).

- **Focus on Form Techniques**

   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)

   2. Task-essential language (the necessity of using specific forms to complete a task) (Doughty and Williams, 1998b)

   3. Input enhancement (directing the learner's attention to a specific form in a text by highlighting, underlining, coloring, rule giving, …) (Long and Robinson, 1998)

   4. Negotiation (asking and answering questions about how a special form is learnt and taught) (Lightbown, 1998)

   5. Recast (corrective reformulation of children's utterances that preserve the child's intended meaning) (Long and Robinson, 1998)

   6. Output enhancement (Promoting students to produce output coating specific forms) (Doughty and Williams, 1998a)

   7. Interaction enhancement (an instructional treatment making students produce output by providing interactional modifications in order to help students notice a mismatch between their interlanguage and target language form) (Doughty and Williams, 1998b)

   8. Dictogloss (a procedure encouraging students to reflect on their own output by reconstructing a text which is read to them) (Swain, 1998)

   9. Consciousness-raising tasks (tasks promoting the occurrence of a stimulus event in conscious awareness and its subsequent storage in long term memory) (Harley, 1998)

   10. Input processing (interpreting input with the goal of incorporating the knowledge into one's interlanguage) (Williams and Evans, 1998)

   11. Garden path (a technique telling learners in advance about a linguistic regularity plus its exception by pointing out the error made at the moment of generality) (Doughty and Williams, 1998b)

- **Types of Focus on Form Instruction**

Table 2.3: Types of focus on form instruction

1. Planned (proactive) focus on form
2. Incidental focus on form
2.1. Reactive
2.1.1. Conversational
2.1.2. Didactic
2.2. Preemptive
2.2.1. Conversational
2.2.2. Didactic

(Ellis, Basturkmen, Loewen, 2001a, 2001b, 2002)

1. Planned (proactive) focus on form: This kind of focus on form involves the use of communicative tasks designed to elicit the use of particular linguistic structure in a meaning-based context. The teacher decides in advance what forms should be focused on. The form is selected based on the teacher's familiarity with the students and the general perception of the students' interlanguage needs or based on the systematic investigation of the areas in which the students have problems (Ellis, Basturkmen, Loewen, 2002; Nassaji, 2000).

2. Incidental focus on form: It involves the use of communicative tasks which are designed to elicit the use of general rather than specific forms. The forms are focused on in the process of communication, peripherally, and then the focus returns to communicative activity again (Ellis, Basturkmen, Loewen, 2002; Nassaji, 2000). It has two main kinds, reactive and preemptive focus on form.

2.1. Reactive focus on form: It refers to the treatment of learners' errors in a communicative context. It arises when learners produce utterances containing an actual error, which is then addressed by the teacher but sometimes by another learner. Thus it supplies the learners with negative evidence. It addresses a performance problem (which may or may not reflect a competence problem) and usually takes the form of a sequence, involving a trigger, an indicator of a problem, and a resolution (Ellis, Basturkmen, Loewen, 2001b, 2002).

2.2. Preemptive involves attempts to make a specific form the topic of conversation even though no error has occurred. It is initiated by means of a query that students addresses to the teacher. The participants take a time-out from communication to talk about some linguistic features. It involves the teacher or the learner initiating attention to form even though no specific problem in production has occurred. It addresses an actual gap in the learners' knowledge, and

usually consists of exchanges involving a query and a response (Ellis, Basturkmen, Loewen, 2001b, 2002).

Both reactive and preemptive are divided into two main categories, conversational and didactic focus on form.

2.2.1. Conversational focus on form: It involves the attention to form arose as the result of a communication problem.

2.2.2. Didactic focus on form: It involves an error treatment which consists of a pedagogic "time-out" from meaning-focused communication (Ellis, Basturkmen, Loewen, 2002).

1.10.2. Experimental Background of Focus on Form

Van Patten (1990) examined whether or not learners could consciously attend to both form and meaning when they were processing the input. Results suggested that learners had great difficulty in attending to both form and content, raising important questions about the role of consciousness in input processing.

Fotos (1993) examined the effectiveness of two types of grammar consciousness-raising tasks designed to develop formal knowledge of grammatical structures on the amounts of learners' noticing. Findings suggested significant improvements in learners' noticing as the result of task performance.

Nobuyoshi and Ellis (1993) had done a small scale study, suggesting that focused communication tasks such as "pushing" learners to produce more accurate output through teacher's request for clarification would contribute to L_2 acquisition. It was also found that pushing learners toward more accurate production led to both immediate and overtime improved performance.

Swain (1998) investigated the relationship between metatalk and second language learning in French immersion classes. The instruction about how to perform the task (dictoglass) was modeled for the two classes. The metatalk used for the metalinguistic group included the rules and metalinguistic terminology, while the metatalk for the comparison group didn't include rules and metalinguistic terminology. Results showed that explicit statement of rules and metalinguistic terminology helped capture students' attention and focused it on their own language use and provided them with an opportunity to reflect on and use their linguistic knowledge.

Kormos (2000) studied the role of attention in monitoring second language speech production in both first and second language. The results showed that learners' different stages of L_2 competence would not influence the amount of attention paid to the linguistic form of an

utterance. It was also found that the degree of the attention used in monitoring language speech differed markedly from first language to second language.

Muranoi (2000) investigated the effect of interaction enhancement (IE) on the learning of English articles among three groups, IE plus formal debriefing group (IEF), IE plus meaning-focused debriefing group (IEM) and a non-enhanced interaction group. Two major outcomes were found; (1). IE had positive effects on the learning of English articles, and (2). The IEF treatment had a greater impact than IEM treatment.

Ellis, Basturkmen, Loewen (2001a) examined the effectiveness of incidental ad transitory focus on form on learners' uptake in twelve hours of communicative ESL teaching. Results indicate that learners had more uptakes in reactive and student-initiated focus on form episodes. It was also found that the complexity of an episode and the nature of form being focused (whether meaning or grammar) would reflect the level of uptakes.

Ellis, Basturkmen, Loewen (2001b) investigated the effectiveness of preemptive focus on form in a 12-hour meaning-focused instruction. Results indicated that the majority of the episodes containing preemptive focus on form were initiated by students. Learners were more likely to uptake a form (i.e. incorporate it into an utterance of their own,) When it is raised by one of their peers. It was also found that in these preemptive focus on form episodes, learners dealt with form explicitly. Despite this, they didn't appear to interfere with the communicative flow of the teaching.

Poole and Sheorey (2002), in their case study, examined the spontaneous spoken output of an advanced Indian user of English in order to explore the validity of Schmidt's noticing hypothesis and also the value of focus on form instruction. The results indicated that the subject could notice and correct later all the errors he had committed during his spontaneous output, showing that his learned knowledge about the forms had not been fully internalized, casting doubts as to whether noticing could lead to acquisition of noticed language forms.

Burgess and Etherington (2002) investigated forty eight EAP teachers' attitudes to grammar and its teaching and learning within an EAP context. Results indicate that the majority of teachers appreciated the value of grammar for their students and show favorable attitude to focus on form approaches.

Gass, Svetics and Lemelin (2003) studied the effect of attention on the learning of different parts of language and how this differential

effect interacted with linguistic proficiency. The results showed that attention had the greatest effect on syntax and the least on lexis. It was also found that attention was most effective during the early stages and the least effective during the later stages.

Poole (2003) in his study described the types of forms learners attend to during form-focused instruction. Analysis of the data, gathered from nineteen international students studying in an advanced ESL writing class in a United States university, indicated that the majority of forms they attended to were lexical in nature. It was also found that focus on form instruction might not be valuable for second language grammatical learning.

Park (2003) in his experimental study investigated if, and how, externally-created salience might lead to learners' internally generated salience. The findings showed that increasing the perceptual salience of target forms did not lead to learners' noticing of forms. It was also found that noticing was affected by several factors such as learner readiness, knowledge of first language, and second language learning experience.

Lyster (2004a) in his article presents a comparative analysis of five quasi-experimental studies, investigating the effects of form-focused instruction on four areas of French known to be difficult for Anglophone learners; perfect vs. imperfect past tense, conditional mood, second person pronouns, and grammatical gender. Findings suggested that effective form-focused instruction included a balanced distribution of opportunities for noticing, language awareness, and controlled practice with feedback.

Lyster (2004b) in his quasi-experimental classroom study investigated the effects of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback on immersion students' ability to accurately assign grammatical gender in French. Analyses of data showed a significant increase in the ability of students exposed to form-focused instruction to correctly assign grammatical gender. It was also found that form-focused instruction is more effective when combined with prompts than with recasts or no feedback.

Farrokhi (2005) examined the possibility of integrating form-focused instruction and communicative interaction at the level of error correction. The database was drawn from transcripts of thirty one hours of classroom lessons including 752 error correction episodes. Findings revealed that 'marked recast' was a good corrective feedback that combines focus on form and focus on meaning at the level of error correction.

Loewen (2005) examined the effectiveness of incidental focus on form in promoting L_2 learning. Analysis of seventeen hours of naturally occurring, meaning focused instruction in twelve adult classes in a private language school in New Zealand revealed that learners could remember the targeted form sixty percent of the time one day after the FFEs (form-focused episodes) and fifty percent of the time two weeks later. So incidental focus on form might be beneficial to learners especially when they incorporated the targeted linguistic item into their own production.

Lee (2007) had done a research investigating the effect of textual enhancement. He concluded that it aided the learning of the target forms while having unfavorable meaning comprehension.

Haung (2008) had done a research in which he used EFL learners' analytical grammatical knowledge to design a post-task approach to foster learners' self-initiated attention. Students were asked to transcribe their dialogues cooperatively and then to reflect on different aspects of their oral production individually. It was found that learners paid close attention to their mistakes according to their individual learning needs and proficiency levels.

Farrokhi, Ansarin, and Mohamadnia (2008) investigated how five experienced EFL teachers initiated focus on form episodes to raise attention to form in elementary and advanced levels, through observing seventy hours of communicatively-oriented instruction between the teachers and their students. They also examined the frequency and type of focus on form episodes, i.e. vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. The results suggested that the proficiency of the learners did not affect the rate of learner-initiated focus on form episodes. This study also indicated that the overall distribution of the linguistic focus on form episodes varied across proficiencies.

2. Conclusions & Suggestions for Further Research

Although various differences in these studies make direct comparison among them difficult, an examination of several factors is instrumental in identifying the directions for future research. First, though clearly a desirable proficiency level, in most of the studies investigating the effects of focus on form and its techniques on language learning, participants were at advanced level of language proficiency (Poole, 2005). Second, most of the studies providing insights into the efficacy of focus on form have taken place in well-

funded, adequately-supplied with teaching and learning materials, generally free of classroom discipline problems and just in a few countries, such as the United States, New Zealand, and Japan (Poole and Sheorey, 2002). Finally, previous studies on the effect of focus on form on language learning mostly used short term treatment with rather limited exposure to the input (Williams, 1999; Leow, 1997). Further investigations in this line of research are still needed to shed more light on these issues. They should also investigate whether or not focus on form instruction leads to more language acquisition. This seems crucial, since no matter how often students are exposed to form during a focus on form instruction; the true value of it lies in its ability to improve the quantity and quality of language acquisition.

References

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (4ᵗʰ Ed.). New York: Pearson Education.

Burgess, J. & Etherington, S. (2002). *Focus on grammatical form: explicit or implicit? System* Vol. 30, pp. 433-458

Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing Second Language Skills: Theory and Practice* (3ʳᵈ Ed.). Harcourt Brace Jovanovich

Cook, V. (2001). *Second Language Learning and Teaching* (3ʳᵈ Ed.). London:

Arnold Doughty, c. & Williams, J. (1998a). Issues and terminology. *In focus on form in classroom L₂ acquisition*, C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), pp.1-11. New York: Cambridge.

Doughty, c. & Williams, J. (1998b). *Pedagogical choices in focus on form*. *In Focus on Form in Classroom L₂ Acquisition*, C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), pp. 197-261. New York: Cambridge.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, Sh. (2001a). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, Vol. 51 (2), pp. 281- 318.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001b). Preemptive focus on form in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 35 (3), pp. 407-432 Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2002). Doing Focus-on-Form. *System* Vol. 30, pp. 419-432.

Farrokhi, F. (2005). A practical step towards combining focus on form and focus on meaning. *Journal of Faculty of Letters and Humanities*, Year 49, No. 198

Farrokhi, F., Ansarin, A., & Mohammadnia, Z. (2008). Preemptive focus on form: teachers' practices across proficiencies. *The Linguistics Journal*, Vol. 3, Number 2.

Fotos, S. (1993). Consciousness Raising and Noticing Through focus on Form: Grammar Task Performance Versus Formal Instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol.14, No.4.

Gass, S., Svetics, I., & Lemelin, S. (2003). Differential effects of attention. *Language Learning*, Vol. 53 (3), pp. 497-545.

Harley, B. (1998). *The role of focus on form tasks in promoting child L₂ acquisition. In Focus on Form in Classroom L₂ Acquisition*, C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), pp. 156-174. New York: Cambridge.

Huang,S.C. (2008). Raising learner-initiated attention to the formal aspects of their oral production through transcription and stimulated reflection. *IRAL*, 46, pp. 375-392.

Khodayari, H. R. & Attaollahi, M. (2005). *Essential Topics for MA Entrance Exam in TEFL*. Tehran: Pardazesh.

Kormos, J. (2000). The Rrole of attention in monitoring second language speech production. *Language Learning*, Vol. 50 (2), pp. 343-384.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second Language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The Input hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. London: Longman.

Lee, S. (2007). Effects of textual enhancement and topic familiarity on korean EFL students' reading comprehension and learning of passive forms. *Language learning*, Vol. 57 (1), pp. 87-118.

Leow, R. P. (1997). Attention, awareness, and foreign language behavior. *Language Learning,* 51, pp. 113-155.

Lightbown, P. M. (1998). *The importance of timing in focus on form. In Focus on Form in Classroom L$_2$ Acquisition*, C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), pp. 177-196. New York: Cambridge.

Loewen, S. (2005). *Incidental Focus on Form and Second Language Learning*. US: Cambridge University Press.

Long, M. (1991). *Focus on form: a design feature in language methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & Kramsch (Eds.). Foreign Language research in Cross- cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Long, M. H. & Robinson, P. (1998). *Focus on form: theory, research and practice. in focus on form in classroom L$_2$ Acquisition*, C. Doughty & J.Williams (Eds.), pp. 85-114. New York: Cambridge.

Lyster, R. (2004a). Research on form-Focused instruction in immersion classrooms: implications for theory and practice. *French Language Studies* 14, pp. 321-341.

Lyster, R. (2004b). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-Focused instruction*. Second Language Instruction,* 26, pp. 399-432.

Muranoi, H. (2000). Focus on form through interaction enhancement: integrating formal instruction into a communicative task in EFL classrooms. *Language Learning*, Vol. 50 (4), pp. 617-673.

Nassaji, H. & Fotos, S. (2004). Current developments in research on the teaching of grammar. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, pp. 126-145.

Nobuyoshi, J., & Ellis, R. (1993). Focused communication tasks and second language acquisition. *ELT Journal*, Vol. 47 (3), pp.203-210

Park, E. S. (2003). Constraints of Implicit Focus on Form. *Teachers College Columbia University Working papers in TESOL and Applied Linguistics,* Vol. 4, No. 2.

Poole, A. (2005). Focus on Form Instruction: Foundations, Applications, and Criticisms. *The Reading Matrix*, Vol. 5, No. 1.

Poole, A. B. & Sheorey, R. (2002). Sophisticated noticing: examination of an indian professional's use of english. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 121-136.

Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (2nd Ed.). UK: Cambridge University Press.

Schmitt, N. (2002). *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second learning. *Applied Linguistics,* Vol. 11 (2), pp. 129-158.

Seedhouse, P. (1997). Combining form and meaning. *English Language Teaching Journal*, *51(4)*, 336-344.

Spada, N. (1997). Form-focused instruction and second language acquisition: A Review of Classroom and Laboratory Research. *Language Teaching* Vol. 30, pp. 73-87.

Swain, M. (1998). *Focus on form through conscious reflection. In Focus on Form in Classroom L$_2$ Acquisition*, C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), pp. 64-82. New York: Cambridge.

Van Patten, B. (1990). Attending to content and form in the input: an experiment in consciousness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, pp. 286-301.

White, L., Spada, N., Lightbown, P., & Ranta, L. (1991). Input enhancement and L_2 question formation. *Applied Linguistics*, 12 (4), 416-432.

Williams, J. (1999). Learner-generated attention to form. *Language Learning* Vol. 49 (4), pp. 583-625

Williams, J. & Evans, J. (1998). *What kind of focus and on which forms? In Focus on Form in Classroom L_2 Acquisition*, C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), pp. 64-82. New York: Cambridge.