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براساس مطالعات انجام شده بر تاثیر انواع برجستگی متنی بر توجه به ساختار مورد نظر در مطلب ارائه شده به زبان آموز و یادگیری، و درک مطلب او، این تحقیق دو نوع برجستگی متنی به صورت جداگانه و ترکیبی با کاربرد تا تأثیر آنها بر یادگیری آموزشی دو نوعی (در رده‌بندی دو و چهار سطح یا گروهی) کرد. این برجستگی بر روی دو دانش‌آموز از جمله دانش‌آموز فارسی زبان کلاس 11 انجام شد. این مطالعه در 10 جلسه به مدت ساعاتی با طرحی شامل آزمون تبیین سطح پس آزمون پایانی و پس آزمون فوری بین دانش‌آموزان دو بندی انجام شد. شرکت کنندگان در این تحقیق 120 دانش‌آموز دختر دارای متوسط و نسخته شده در این کلاس درس انجام دادند که هر کلاس شامل 30 دانش‌آموز بود. به علت عدم امکان انتخاب تصادفی، هر کلاس به عنوان یک گروه تحقیق انتخاب شد. کلاس‌ها به سه گروه آزمایش تحت عنوان نیمه‌روشن و روشن و دو نوعی (که هر دو نوع نیمه‌روشن و روشن را دریافت کردند) و یک گروه کنترل نام گرفتند. نتایج آزمون‌ها با نرم‌افزار اس‌پی‌اسس تحلیل شد. نتایج نشان داد که ارایه برجستگی متنی تأثیر مثبتی بر یادگیری افعال دو و چهار دارد. برخی از گروه‌ها، گروه دو نوعی بهترین عملکرد بهترین عملکرد بهترین عملکرد را در آزمون پس آزمون فوری و پس آزمون موفقیت داشت. مقایسه گروه کنترل با گروه‌های آزمایش نشان داد که گروه کنترل در دو پس آزمون برابر ترین نمرات را کسب کرده است.
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**Abstract:**

According to the previous research on the effectiveness of textual enhancement formats (TE) on noticing the intended feature in the input and learning, acquisition, comprehension and intake of language learners, this study made use of two TE formats in separated and combined forms to investigate and measure their effects on the intake of phrasal verbs. This study is conducted on grade 11 native Persian-speaking students. The study was conducted in 10 sessions distributed over six weeks with a proficiency test, a pretest, an immediate posttest and a delayed posttest research design. The participants of this study were 120 female students of pre-intermediate level of a high school in Shiraz. The participants were in four intact classes; each class contained 30 students. Each class was selected as a group for the study because the researcher was not able to randomize. The intact classes were assigned to three experimental groups called the bold group, the highlight group, and two cues group (who received both TE formats in combination) and a control group. The scores of the tests were analyzed by SPSS software. The results revealed that textual enhancement affects the intake of phrasal verbs positively. Among the four groups, two cues group displayed the best performance in the immediate and the delayed posttests. Comparing the experimental and the control groups, the control group who was deprived of the enhanced texts got the lowest scores in the immediate and the delayed posttests.
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Chapter One
Introduction

1.1. Background

One main concern of language instructors is what samples of the target language (i.e. type of input) should be presented to the learners in order for an effective learning to take place. Another issue related to input is how it would be given to the learners, here implicitness and explicitness of input is the case. When rules are emphasized as the metalinguistic knowledge we deal with explicit learning and in cases that the knowledge is conveyed without awareness of the rules or the learners unintentionally attend to the input, implicit learning takes place. The issue of the implicitness/explicitness is the case when it comes to the grammar instruction.

The discussions of explicitness/implicitness in grammar instruction led researchers and teachers to test many different methods and approaches of language teaching to find the best way of presenting grammar. At one extreme, the advocates of Grammar translation method supported the formal and the decontextualized use of language, whereas at the other extreme, the proponents of natural and communicative methodologies denounced the formal concerns in language instruction.

The gap between these two positions persuaded some researchers to view second language instruction and learning from different perspectives. For example, Krashen (1982) proposed two independent processes of second/foreign language development. He called the first one, language acquisition, which is the subconscious process of language development. The second process is conscious. It is the result of instruction and knowledge of the grammatical rules. He believed that the first process is the competence that enables learners to be native-like. The second process is needed for editing speech and thinking of the grammatical rules. Krashen
(1982) proposed the “input hypothesis” which stated that in order for learning a new language the learners should be provided with comprehensible input. He believed that learning happens unconsciously, without awareness of the grammar of the target language. Because of this claim, the job of language teachers is just providing comprehensible input for the learners without any need for explicit instruction.

Other researchers have challenged Krashen’s (1982) hypothesis. They argued that just providing learners with sufficient input would not lead to learning. These challenges resulted in the idea of the necessity of noticing. Gass (1997) and VanPatten (1996) stated that input should be transferred to intake in order for the learners to acquire the new target forms. So, the input must be enhanced so that the learners notice this input and change it to the intake.

Schmidt (1990) proposed noticing hypothesis according to which noticing is sufficient and necessary to convert input to intake and all the input features which are relevant for the target system should be noticed. Schmidt proposed that the frequency of a form, perceptual salience, instruction, the current state of learners’ interlanguage, and task demands all play significant roles in directing attention, bringing some features of input into awareness, and indicating how the noticing takes place.

Schmidt (1993) claimed that “noticing” is the conscious awareness of the input. He explained that intake is chosen from the input to be stored in long-term memory while unattended items remain in the short-term memory and eventually disappear. Schmidt (1990, 1993) proposed two processes of “noticing” which must occur simultaneously. First, when the learners are exposed to the target form in the input, they must notice it. In the second process, they must notice the differences between how the forms are presented in the input and how they use these forms in their output.
A large number of researches have been conducted on the noticing hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990) and whether it is conscious or unconscious (e.g., Ellis, 1984; Fotos, 1994; Fotos & Ellis, 1991). Despite all of the controversies about noticing, it plays a significant role in teaching and learning languages. The idea of importance of noticing led to different approaches such as focus on form, and input enhancement for language instruction.

Long (1991) as a scholar who believed in communicative methodology, put forth the focus on form approach to propose his view towards language instruction in which the main focus is always on the meaning, but where there is a communicative need for form, attention could be drawn to it. Focus on form was derived from an assumed similarity between first and second language acquisition presuming that the processing of both languages is based on an exposure to comprehensible input in a natural interaction. So focus on form refers to bringing grammar to the attention of language learners as a part of communicative language practice.

Reviewing the literature of focus on form pointed that there are some techniques (such as input flooding, task-essential, output enhancement, and input enhancement) that are proven to be useful in providing forms as the meaning-based communication is going on. Focus on form instruction can be presented to the learners by using one or more of these techniques. Input enhancement is an implicit technique of focus on form which draws learners’ attention to the form indirectly.

Input enhancement is regarded as one of the implicit pedagogical practices of focus on form. Sharwood Smith (1991) devised the term input enhancement to denote an attempt to draw learners’ attention to specific features of input which are made deliberately salient. Rutherford and Sharwood Smith (1985) denoted that input enhancement techniques are very complex,
divergent and are not limited to formal grammar instruction techniques such as metalinguistic explanations.

Input enhancement can be created in many forms. For example, studies of Tomasello and Herron (1988, 1989) revealed that an idea can be capitalized by learner’s own analogizing tendency, overgeneralization in his/her interlanguage or first language transfer (cited in Sharwood Smith, 1993). One form of input enhancement is TE which includes different typographical alteration such as boldface, italic, underlining, changing the size and font, and highlighting to enhance specific features in the input.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Although, grammar has been regarded as an important component of language learning and instruction since the early beginning of language teaching and learning, it seems to be troublesome for language learners in ESL/EFL contexts especially in cases of complicated structures. Phrasal verbs are regarded to be one of the difficult structures for learners of English as a second or foreign language. Studies revealed that English language learners avoid using phrasal verbs, especially in their oral production. These studies provided some reasons for the learners’ avoidance of phrasal verbs. For example, Blau, Gonzales, and Green (1983) posited two categories for ESL/EFL learners’ problem with the phrasal verbs: semantic or meaning and syntactic or word order. In terms of semantic view, they argued that students do not regard the two or three word verbs as one lexical unit. The problem is more complicated when such constructs do not occur in their native language. So, they tend to overlook the particle of phrasal verbs, especially when the same meaning can be conveyed by one word verb. Consequently, they often escape the final word and produce ungrammatical sentences.
Regarding the syntactic perspective, Blau, Gonzales, and Green (1983) pointed to the problem of placement of the object of phrasal verbs. They encounter difficulty in realizing a phrasal verb as separable or inseparable. So, it may lead them to produce ungrammatical sentences. Sometimes the teachers and the textbooks make it more complicated by forcing students to memorize some specific verbs.

Moreover, many of the phrasal verbs are called idiomatic, which means they are not transparent in meaning. Therefore, it is sometimes impossible for the learners to guess their meaning by combining the meaning of their separated parts. Because of this problem, learners run into trouble in using the phrasal verbs.

Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999) argued that phrasal verbs seem odd and troublesome for ESL/EFL learners of non-Germanic languages. As a result, learners overlook the phrasal verbs and often overuse single-word verbs instead of using phrasal verbs.

Since Persian is a non-Germanic language, and to my knowledge, no other study examined the effect of TE on phrasal verbs, this study attempted to find the effects of TE as a way of teaching grammar implicitly on the intake of Iranian students of the phrasal verbs which they seem to overlook or to replace with other alternatives when occurring in the input.

1.3. Significance of the Study

Since grammar learning appeared to be difficult and complicated for language learners in ESL and particularly EFL contexts, different methods and approaches towards language learning viewed grammar instruction differently. At one extreme was Grammar translation that focused on grammar teaching separately and intensively. At the other extreme, some methods like the strong version of communicative language teaching (CLT) disregarded the importance of grammar and focused on mere communication. Among these two extremes, some approaches
such as the weak version of CLT found an in between way which regarded grammar as significant as other parts of the language learning process. Since these new trends believed that language grammar should be taught and learned through communication of meaning, different approaches to teach grammar emerged. Focus on form is one of the approaches that have been introduced as an implicit way of teaching grammar when the main focus is on the meaning. Focus on form includes different techniques. Input enhancement is regarded as the implicit form of focus on form. Through enhancing the intended parts of the input, those parts become more salient that might attract learners’ attention and lead to inductive learning of the form.

TE is a type of input enhancement that promotes the saliency of forms. TE changes some features of input in different ways to draw learners’ attention to them. It also encourages presenting grammar in meaningful contexts rather than in isolation. TE appeared to be effective for learners and other people involved in language learning and teaching.

The findings of this study might have some implications for people involved in teaching English as a foreign language such as teachers, students, and material designers. It may help teachers in presenting grammar in authentic and meaningful contexts as reading texts, students in noticing the enhanced parts of the input and acquiring them, and material designers in providing more attractive and effective materials.

1.4. Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this study was to present the phrasal verbs in a meaningful context of reading texts which may in return cause students to find grammar learning interesting and to enjoy it. This study also aimed to shed more light on the necessity and effectiveness of grammar in language learning for Iranian EFL learners, to convince them to change their perspectives towards the grammar, and to help them to overcome their horrors of complicated grammar forms
such as phrasal verbs. Furthermore, the present study attempted to determine and to measure the effects of conveying grammar implicitly through TE in reading comprehension context.

1.5. Research Questions

The current study intended to examine and measure three different TE formats (bold, highlight, and a mixture of both) on the intake of the phrasal verbs. For this aim, the present study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. Dose TE formats affect the intake of phrasal verbs?
   
   If yes,

2. Does the highlight format—yellow—of TE have a differential impact on the intake of phrasal verbs among Iranian EFL learners?

3. Does the bold format of TE have a differential impact on the intake of phrasal verbs among Iranian EFL learners?

4. Does the combination of Bold and Highlight format of TE have a differential impact on the intake of phrasal verbs among Iranian EFL learners?

1.6. Research Hypotheses

Alongside the above research questions, the following hypothesis was formulated in this study:

1. TE has no effects on the intake of the phrasal verbs.

1.7. Definition of Key Terms

1.7.1. Intake. Intake is some part of the input that learners attend to it consciously or unconsciously, and it goes beyond the short-term memory. Kumaravadivelu (1994) defined intake as intake factors and intake processes that are interacted and interwoven in synergic relationships, that each one is shaping and being shaped by others (p. 33). Most recently, Reinders (2012) defined intake as “Intake is a subset of the detected input (comprehended or
not), held in short-term memory, from which connections with long-term memory are potentially created or strengthened” (p. 29). Gass (1988) defined intake as “the apperceived input” by the apperception he meant “perceived in terms of past experience” (p. 201). In other words, it means understanding a new linguistic form by relating it to the previous knowledge.

1.7.2. Textual enhancement. TE is an implicit type of input enhancement, which is used as a technique to enhance some features in the input to be noticed by the learners. TE is manifested through typographical alteration such as boldface, highlight, capitalization, changing the font and size of some items of the input. Doughty & Williams (1998) defined TE as “an approach based on input to teach grammar that is an external form of input enhancement, which draws learners' attention to linguistic forms through physically manipulating certain aspects of the input to make them easily noticed” (p. 50). Also, they argued that since TE involves highlighting forms in meaningful texts, it meets the requirement of a focus on form approach. Sharwood Smith (1993) stated that TE involves the manipulation of input saliency, in order to direct learners’ attention to specific linguistic forms in the input.

1.7.3. Phrasal Verbs. A phrasal verb is a syntactic and semantic construct combined of a verb and a particle which is used idiomatically to convey a meaning different from the meaning expressed by the verb or particle in separation. Darwin and Gray (1999) argued that “Phrasal verbs can be defined as all verbs and particle combinations that function as a unit both lexically and syntactically such as bring about, take on and give up” (p. 65). Rong (2015) defined the phrasal verbs as “a phrase verb is a combination of verbs and adverbs or a preposition word” (p. 1).

1.7.4. Noticing. The notion of noticing is regarded significant in the process of language learning. Schmidt (1993) defined noticing as the sufficient and necessary condition to convert
input to intake (p. 4). Schmidt (2001) regarded noticing as the necessary attention in order to
virtually understand every aspect of second language acquisition (p. 6). Schmidt (1995) regarded
“noticing” as the low level of awareness, whereas the high level of awareness is the
understanding. So, “noticing” is the surface level, which shows the conscious occurrence of
some event, while the deep level related to the recognition of a general principle is called
understanding (p. 29).

1.7.5. Focus on form. Focus on form is an approach to draw the learners’ attention to
the form as the focus is on the meaning. Long (1991) defines focus on form as: “Focus of
form…overtly draws students’ attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in
lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication” (pp. 45-46). Long (1991)
also refers to focus on form as drawing learners’ attention to the linguistic forms when they arise
incidentally in input which focus is on the meaning or communication (p. 46). Spada (1997)
defined focus on form instruction as “any pedagogical effort which is used to draw the learners’
attention to language form either implicitly or explicitly” (p. 73).

1.8. Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

The present study investigated the effects of TE formats on the intake of high school
learners. Using the phrasal verbs as the grammatical feature of this study is one of the
delimitations. Another delimitation is using authentic reading texts as the context of presenting
the phrasal verbs. Moreover, having 30 participants in each group of the study can be regarded
as another delimitation. Administering a proficiency test is another delimitation of the present
study. The current study was also subject to some limitations, one of them is the researchers’
inability to randomly select and assign the participants into groups. This was owing to the
school constraints and being obligated to conduct the research in intact classes. One more
limitation was not being able to have participants from both genders due to the lack of the cooperation of schools.

Although we used oral production in the classes as a way of participants’ presentation, our tests just included multiple choice questions to measure their final performance. Another limitation owing to the time limitation was inability in using the oral protocol as a measuring instrument.
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2.1. Overview

This chapter reviews the most related empirical studies regarding the grammar teaching and learning and the importance of the grammar learning. This chapter is divided into three sections. The first part discusses the importance of noticing and reviews studies conducted on it. The second part deals with a focus on form and its effects on the grammar learning, as well as the rationale behind the focus on form instruction. The third section of the current chapter delves into TE and its implication in language learning, particularly in term of grammar learning, furthermore, it reviews the studies that were conducted to measure and investigate the effects of TE on learning the different features of input which shed some light on this study path.

2.2. Noticing

Learning a second or a foreign language, learners face two kinds of input. The first one is the interactional input, which means the target forms that the learners receive in communication with a native or non-native person. The second type is non-interactional input, which refers to the forms that are received in a non-communication context (N. Ellis, 1994). This input must change to intake in order for language acquisition to occur, whether it is the first kind or the second, acquiring a new language needs noticing.

There are two versions of noticing: the weak version proposes that learners do not need to notice the details of the input, if they just be aware of the global message is enough for the acquisition. The strong version says that noticing the details is necessary and those parts of the input would change to intake which are noticed in more details. Truscott (1998) disregarded the weak version with two reasons. First, in almost all discussions, proponents of the noticing hypothesis clearly prefer the stronger version; they argued that conscious awareness of the
grammatical forms is crucial in second language acquisition. Second, since virtually no one disputed the weak version, it revealed that it was not interesting to the researchers. Many studies (VanPatten and Cadierno, 1993; Allen, 2000; Salaberry, 1997; Song, 2010; Pan, 2012) have been conducted to investigate the effect of noticing on language acquisition. For example, Pan (2012) conducted a study to investigate the noticing function of output. Participants were 90 students of ESL programs in a university in China. They were randomly assigned into two experimental groups and a control group. The first experimental group was given the opportunity for output, the second experimental group engaged in comprehension-based activities, and the control group performed nothing. All groups took part in a treatment, a pretest, a posttest, and a delayed posttest. The target form of this study was the past hypothetical conditional in English. The form was either bolded or underlined in the reading texts. During the treatment: the first experimental group received a reading text in which the target structure was enhanced, they were asked to retell the text, the second experimental group was given a reading text in which the target form was enhanced, but they were asked to answer true or false comprehension questions, and the control group read the text with the target form enhanced, but they performed nothing. Five participants from each experimental group were randomly selected and interviewed to find out participants’ attention to the target form during treatment.

Although the experimental group one performed better than two other groups in the immediate posttest, comparing the results of two experimental groups in the delayed posttest the researcher found no unique effects of output. A closer examination of the data collected from the interview, revealed that retelling as a form of output does not always succeed in drawing the learners’ attention to the target form, but it revealed to be useful for other aspects such as vocabulary.
To examine the effectiveness of an output practice in the form of Chinese-to-English translation, on promoting noticing and acquisition of lexical phrases as the grammatical form, Song (2010) conducted a study on 36 students of a foreign language college of Qufu university. Conducting the pretest the participants were assigned into an experimental group and a control group. The study took four sessions with a pretest and a posttest design. As the treatment, the experimental group translated some Chinese sentences into English and the control group answered some comprehension questions related to the received input. After this phase, to evaluate noticing of the target form, participants were required to underline lexical phrases in the passage when they were provided with the input.

The experimental group received a model essay in which there were the native-like usages of the given words. The experimental group needed to underline sequences of words that they felt necessary for their subsequent tasks (translation). An essay was provided as the reading exercise for the control group who read and underlined parts needed for answering questions about the passage. In the second phase, the input passages were collected, using whatever they had learned from the model essay, the experimental group was asked to produce a second version of the translation and the control group was required to provide answers to comprehension questions about the essay. They were expected to notice the problems of their language when producing output and to be able to compare their interlanguage production with the native-like production provided in the essay.

As the posttest showed both groups were tested incorporating two methods of written tests as: a multiple-choice recognition test for control group and Chinese-English translation for the experimental group. The results indicated that both groups’ scores promoted significantly in the posttest compared to the pretest. It indicated that the treatment was effective for both groups.
Comparing the gain scores of both groups in the posttest, the researcher found that the experimental group outperformed the control group. The result supported the effectiveness of the output practice in developing acquisition of lexical phrases over that of input practice.

Researchers (e.g., Ellis, Tanaka, & Yamazaki, 1994; Loschky, 1994; Mackey, 2006; Mackey and Philp, 1998) argued that interactional feedback is associated with L2 learning because it causes learners to notice L2 forms. For example, Mackey (2006) conducted a study on the relationship between feedback, instructed ESL learners’ noticing of L2 form during classroom interactions, and their L2 development. Interactional feedback was provided to the learners in response to their production problems. Learners’ noticing was assessed through online learning journals, introspective comments while viewing classroom videotapes, and questionnaire responses. The participants of this study were 28 high-intermediate level students from two classes of a university-level of an intensive English program.

One class was randomly assigned as the control and the other as the experimental group. The target forms were questions, plurals, and the past tense. The material was a TV show developed by researcher and the teachers. The show provided the experimental group with an interactional feedback on problematic L2 grammatical forms, including the grammatical forms of the study. The control group was provided with the same input and linguistic forms as the experimental group except for the interactional feedback. All classes were videotaped and audiotaped. Noticing data were collected through learners’ reports of any mismatches between learners’ non-target like comprehension and production and the provided target form. The pretest and the posttest were administered to both groups. The results showed a positive relationship between the interactional feedback in the classroom, the learners’ reports about
noticing, and their learning of L2 forms. It was concluded that the interactional feedback affects noticing positively.

Three methods have been proposed to measure what learners notice to and when. One of the methods is the analysis of the immediate uptake of the discourse (Braidi, 2002; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). The other two methods are concurrent verbal reports such as think aloud protocol (Alanen, 1995; Lai, Fei, & Roots, 2008; Leow, 1997; Rosa & O’Neill, 1999) and retrospective verbal reports like stimulated recall (Mackey, 2006; Mackey, Gass, & McDonough, 2000). Corrective feedback as a type of stimulating recall is a strong choice for SLA researchers (Mackey, 2006; Mackey et al., 2000; Smith, 2012).

Smith (2012) conducted a study to investigate whether noticing to corrective feedback (explicit recast) could be measured by eye-tracking technology in a native and non-native task-based synchronous computer-mediated communication. The study included a pretest, an immediate posttest, and a delayed posttest. The participants were 18 university students from Asia who engaged in a short chat with a native speaker who provided them explicit corrective recast. To record their eye-tracking, a remote eye tracker was fastened to each computer screen. The eye tracker records were analyzed and compared with a stimulated recall by a Gaze Data Analysis Software. As the treatment, they watched a short animation video clip.

After watching the clip, they chatted with their interlocutor online. They retold the story for the interlocutor who gave them appropriate recast when it was necessary. Increased visual attention was regarded as noticing event. It was collected and compared with the results of both techniques (eye tracking and stimulated recall) to see whether both techniques have come across the same results. Results indicated the strength of both methods of measuring of what learners noticed in the corrective feedback during synchronous computer-mediated communication.
Furthermore, the obtained date from the eye tracking and stimulated recall revealed that although recast included various linguistic categories and learners engaged in similar amounts of input (the video), they noticed semantic and syntactic items more easily than morphological ones. Results suggested eye tracking as a potentially valuable tool in exploring the nature of noticing in SLA instruction and also the benefits of computer-mediated communication as a beneficial technique for language learning.

2.3. Focus on Form

Focus on form is an approach in language teaching and it emerged as an approach in response to the noticing concept. This approach is motivated by Long’s (1983) interaction hypothesis (cited in Long & Robinson, 1998) according to which interaction between learners and more knowledgeable person, or texts, especially the elaborated ones, has an important role in language development. This development occurs especially by the negotiation of meaning, which ends in modifications of the structure in interaction (Long, 1997, cited in Long & Robinson, 1998). Focus on Form, in contrast to Focus on Forms refers to “an occasional shift of attention to linguistic code –features by the teacher and/or one or more learners– triggered by perceived problems with comprehension or production” (Long & Robinson, 1998, p. 23).

Lightbown & Spada (1990) argued that only those experimental studies that succeeded in the isolated examination of form-focused instruction in a CLT context will reveal the exact role of this type of instruction. To achieve this end, the focus of the early researchers in CLT and content based instruction (CBI) was included focus on form instruction in meaning focused contexts to find its effects. It is worthwhile to know that the researches conducted over the past 20 years in CLT and CBI have revealed the value of focus on form instruction in a meaning-focused context. In addition, Spada, (2006) argued that the teachers who experienced the strong
version of CLT—an exclusive focus on meaning without any attention to grammatical forms (cited in Spada & Lightbown, 2008)—have indicated that, with no focus on form, some language features never would be presented in learners’ language, and some non-target like forms may insist for a long time.

The researches carried out on the effects of focus on form instruction in CLT and CBI classrooms showed that the learners’ knowledge and their use of some specific forms have changed due to the introduction of focus on form instruction (e.g., Lightbown & Spada, 1990; Day & Shapson, 1991; White, Spada, Lightbown, & Ranta, 1991). Lightbown & Spada (1990) conducted a study on students in Grades five and six in four classes to investigate the improvement of spoken English among French elementary school students in Canada. The participants received five months of intensive communicative instruction. The classes were observed with the focus on the learners’ use of the progressive *ing* form and the order of *noun-adjective* in noun phrases. Analyzing the observations, the researchers found that the target forms were different between classes in terms of production accuracy.

They found that the students of class one, were most accurate and class four was the least accurate one. Although, the learners of class four had the lowest accuracy, they were very good in speaking and comprehension skills. Then, the researchers went through analyzing the type of instruction that the teachers used in their class. They found a correlation between the type of instruction and the participants’ accuracy of specific grammatical features. Class one was the most accurate among four classes due to receiving the most form-focused instruction and class four was the least accurate one because the most focus of the instruction was on the meaning rather than the form. Lightbown and Spada’s (1990) study suggested that type of instruction have different effects on the production accuracy of second language learners and emerging form
focused instruction in a communicative meaning-based context could lead to more accuracy in linguistic knowledge and production. This study indicated that accuracy, fluency, and overall communicative skills may highly develop in an instructional context where is primarily meaning-based and the form instruction is provided when it is necessary.

Lyster (2004) in a comparative analysis described five quasi-experimental studies which investigated the effects of form-focused instruction on four features known as difficult forms for L2 learners of French: distinctions between the functions perfect and imperfect past tenses, the conditional forms, second-person pronouns, and grammatical gender. The total number of the participants of these studies was almost 1200 students in 49 French immersion classrooms in Canada. They participated in CBI classrooms where learners’ communicative ability and fluency, developed to high levels with low level of grammatical development and accuracy. Findings suggested the effectiveness of form-focused instruction in immersion contexts. Results revealed that noticing increased through noticing activities in which students had to classify utterances as formal or informal; language awareness developed through inductive rules, discovery activities, and comparing and contrasting language patterns followed by metalinguistic information, and controlled practice promoted through feedback. Form focused instruction indicated to be less effective in those areas of linguistic difficulty where persistent errors occur, because communicative practice involved lots of negotiation of meaning.

Swain (1995) hypothesized the noticing, hypothesis formation and testing, and metatalk as potential roles of output, which are more related to accuracy than to fluency in second language learning. He defined metatalk as the metalinguistic function of output in which learners use language to reflect on the language use. That is, learners’ own language leads to an awareness of something about their own language or the interlocutors’ language use. Many
researches have been conducted in support of Swains’s (1995) proposal about the effect of output (Swain, 1998; Swain and Lapkin, 1998, 2001; Benati, 2001, 2004, 2005). For instance, Swain (1998) studied two classes of grade eight in an early French immersion program to investigate the effect of output on the metatalk of the students in a context of dictogloss texts. The total number of participants was 48 who were the students of two different classes. The teacher and researcher modeled to participants how to reconstruct the structure after listening to the text for two times in a task of dictogloss. Both classes were same in terms of instruction of how doing the task except one thing which was receiving rules and terminology.

The metalinguistic (M) group, including 26 students received the modeled metatalk which included the rule and terminology of metalinguistic but the comparison (C) group including 22 students was not provided with rules and terminology. Participants completed four dictoglosses during three weeks; each week was regarded as one session. The two first sessions were devoted to familiarize students with the dictogloss procedure which covered two dictoglosses and the third session followed the same process, but students were tape recorded as working in pairs. The two first tasks focused on formation of plural nouns and adjectives, third one focused on the formation of feminine and masculine adjectives, and the last one on compound past and imperfect. Before listening to each dictogloss the new vocabularies were thought for about 5-10 minutes. The teacher also reviewed some rules related to the intended form, the aim of this explicit instruction was the highlighting their awareness about the aspects of form that expected them to cover in the dictogloss.

The dictoglosses were read two times; first time students just listened and for the second time they took notes to use to reconstruct the text. Then, they reconstructed the text in their own