the advantage of noticing and consequently acquiring the particular linguistic features.

References

Alanen, R. (1995). Input Enhancement and Rule Presentation in Second Language Acquisition. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning* (pp. 259-302). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive Underpinnings of Focus on Form. In Robinson, P. (Ed.), *Cognition and Second Language Instruction.* (pp. 206-57) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C., Williams, J. (1998). Pedagogical Choices in Focus on From. In C. Doughty and J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 1-11). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (1991). *Second Language Acquisition and Language Pedagogy.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

_____ (2001). Introduction: Investigating Form-Focused Instruction. *Language Learning, 51,* Supplement, 1, 1-46.

_____ (2002). Does Form-Focused Instruction Affect the Acquisition of Implicit Knowledge? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 24,* 223-236.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen H., and Leowen, S. (2001). Pre-emptive Focus on Form in the Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 35* (3), 407-432.

_____ (2002). Doing Focus-on-Form. *System, 30* (4), 419-432.

Fotos, S. (1993). Consciousness-Raising and Noticing Through Focus on Form: Grammar Task Performance vs. Formal Instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 14,* 385-407.

_____ (1994). Integrating Grammar Instruction and Communicative Language Use Through Grammar Consciousness-Raising Tasks. *TESOL Quarterly, 28* (2), 323-351.

Fotos, S. & Ellis, R. (1991). Communicating about Grammar: A Task-Based Approach. *TESOL Quarterly, 25* (4), 605-628.

Galaczi, A. (2002). Input Enhancement and Acquisition. *Foreign Language Annals, 32,* 245-270.

Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input Enhancement, and the Noticing Hypothesis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 24,* 541-577.

Klapper, J., & Rees, J. (2003). Reviewing the Case for Explicit Grammar Instruction in the University Foreign Language Learning Context. *Language Teaching Research, 7* (3), 285-314.

Leeman, J., Arteagoitia, I., Fridman, B., & Doughty, C. (1995). Integrating Attention to Form with Meaning: Focus on Form in Content-Based Spanish Instruction. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning* (pp. 217-258). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Lim, J. (2001). The Effects of Different Types of Instruction: Focus-on-Form Study. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics, 5* (2), 253-266.

Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on Form: A Design Feature in Language Teaching Methodology. In K. deBot, C. Kramsch, & R. Ginsberg, (Eds.), *Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamin.

Long, M. H., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on Form: Theory, Research, and Practice. In C. Doughty and J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 15-42). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacWhinney, B. (1997). Implicit and Explicit Processes: Commentary. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19,* 277-282.

Muranoi, H. (2000). Focus on Form Through Interaction Enhancement: Integrating Formal Instruction Into a Communicative Task in EFL Classrooms. *Language Learning, 50* (4), 617-673.

Norris, J., & Ortega, L, (2000). Effectiveness of L2 Instruction: A Research Synthesis and Quantitative Meta-Analysis. *Language Learning, 50* (3), 417-528.

Rutherford, W. E. (1987). *Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching.* London & New York: Longman.

Schmidt, R. (1990) The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11* (2), 129-158.

Sharwood Smith, M. (1993). Input Enhancement in Instructed SLA: Theoretical Bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15* (2), 165-179.

VanPatten, B. (1990). Attending to Form and The Content in The Input: An Experiment in Consciousness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12* (3), 287-301.

VanPatten, B. & Cadierno, T. (1993). Explicit Instruction and Input Processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15* (2), 225-243.

Wong, W. (2003). Textual Enhancement and Simplified Input Effects on L2 Comprehension and Acquisition of non-meaningful Grammatical Form. *Applied Language Learning, 13* (2), 109-132.

the Focus-on-Form instruction.

Therefore it could be claimed that the experimental group who were exposed to Focus-on-Form instruction have had significantly greater results than their counterparts in the control group who received no specialized Focus-on-Form instruction.

Conclusion and Implications

According to the result of the independent t-test discussed above, a significant difference is found between the two groups. This implies that the experimental group outperformed the control group in noticing the intended morphological item (i.e. past tense morpheme- *ed*) in the input when their attention is drawn to them through textually enhanced in struction. This finding is in line with Fotos (1993), Leeman, Arteagoitia, Fridman and Doughty (1995), Alanen (1995), Izumi (2002), Galaczi (2002).

This study aimed at the very outset to investigate the effect of visual input enhancement on noticing and acquisition. Although it has been claimed that explicit type of instruction seems to be more effective than implicit type of instruction (Norris & Ortega, 2000) and although it has been noted that, when explicit instruction is combined with implicit instruction, the results will be more noticeable and remarkable (Mac Whinney, 1997), the findings of this study yield support to the efficacy of implicit instruction in an EFL setting. Such being the case, it can be claimed that *length of instruction* and *choice of linguistic features* can be the two determining factors in Focus-on-Form instruction. Taking this into account, in the present study, ten partial sessions of instruction were devoted to treatment – a rather long period compared to other studies done on form-focused instruction in which two or three tasks were done or two or three sessions were devoted to treatment.

Concerning the linguistic feature in the study, and considering the fact that "[focus on form] succeeds for simple morphological features because it makes such forms salient to the learner and because they can be processed" (Ellis, 2002), one could say that English regular past tense morpheme -*ed* is much easier than passive voices or interrogatives which require movements to different parts of the sentence. Although it is by no means concluded that implicit instruction is effective for all forms in all settings for all individuals, it can be cautiously hypothesized that implicit instruction can be replaced by explicit instruction for easier, less processable linguistic forms in EFL settings.

Taking the limitations of the study (e.g. the limited number of participants, their proficiency level, institutional constraints, etc.) into consideration, one should be very cautious in generalizing the finding to other areas of related concern. So, based on the findings obtained under such circumstances, the following implications are presented:

1. The first implication will be for language teachers in EFL settings. English language teachers are supposed to relinquish teacher - fronted explicit instruction methods, flooding learners with a myriad of explicit rules and, intead, they are advised to provide learners with abundant exemplars of the targed forms because, as concluded in the study, implicit instruction is effective for morphological forms as in regular past tense morpheme-*ed*.

2. The second implication should receive the attention of the writers of textbooks used in teaching English for Specitic Puposes (ESP). The selection of grammatical forms must be avoided in an old-fashioned, strucural, linear manner in designing ESP textbooks, but the choice of linguistic features should be based on careful scrutiny of learners' needs during their interactions with one another or with the teacher and, then the forms posing problems for the learners are more suitable to be selected for syllabus and istruction.

3. The third implication goes to textbook writers. They are recommended to introduce grammatical rules through consciousness techinques such as the one described and explained in the study. This has

Foreign Language Teaching Journal

Results

As for the data analysis stage, the pre- and post-tests were scored and the results for the 40 participant of the experimental and the control groups were tabulated. The pre-test and the post-test were identical GJ tasks including ten grammaticality judgement items on the regular past tense morpheme -ed. The descriptive statistics including the mean $(\overline{X})$, the variance (V) and the standard deviation (SD) of the pre-test results of the participants on the GJ task are as follows (Table 2):

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for both groups' pre-test

Group	$\overline{X}$	SD	V	N
Experimental	9.35	2.34	5.50	20
Control	6.30	2.05	4.22	20

The figures well indicate that the mean, the variance, and the standard deviation of the experimental and control groups are not that different. As the next step, the pre-test data were submitted to an independent two-tailed t-test to find whether the two groups had any significant difference prior to the treatment period (Table 3):

Table 3. Independent t-test for both groups on the pre-test

Critical T Value	Df	2-tailed Probability	Observed T Value
2.02	38	0.05	.94

The Observed t value was .94 which was less than the Critical t value of 2.02 at the probability level of $p \leq 0.05$. So, there was no significant difference between the two group .

After the treatment, the same GJ task used as the pre-test was used as the post-test. The descriptive statistics including the mean $(\overline{X})$, the variance (V) and the standard deviation (SD) of the post-test results of the experimental and the control groups on the GJ task are as follows (Table 4):

Table 4. Descriptive statistics for both groups' pre-test

Group	$\overline{X}$	SD	V	N
Experimental	8	1.65	2.7	20
Control	6.45	2.30	5.31	20

As it is observed the mean of the experimenatl group on the post-test shows an increase in contrast to the mean of the pre-test and also their standard deviation has decreased implying that the group's dispersion on the post-test has decreased in comparison with the pre-test SD as a result of the treatment. However, the mean of the control group had minor increase which might be due to the practice effect of the post-test. As a result, this effect also led to the relative increase in control group's SD.

Also the scores of the experimental and control groups on the post-test GJ task was submitted to an independent two-tailed t-test to realize whether there was significant difference between the two groups (Table 5):

Table 5. Independent t-test for both groups on the pre-test

Critical T Value	Df	2-tailed Probability	Observed T Value
2.02	38	0.05	2.47

A look at Table 5 reveals that the difference between the groups on the post-test is significant since the observed t value is greater than the critical t value at the probability level of $p \leq 0.05$. The difference between the experimental and the control group could be attributed to the effect of

Lim (2001), in her study representing the fourth type of FonF instruction, investigated how different types of FonF instruction affect L2 learning of the present perfect in English. Her participants, all from Korea, were divided into four groups who received different instructional treatments: 1) rule, 2) input enhancement, 3) rule + input enhancement, 4) input flood. The results demonstrated that the students who received rule instruction and visual enhancement of input scored better on the written production tests than the other groups in the short term, but not in the long-term. The findings of her experiment lead us to question the role of *attention* and *awareness* in the SLA process.

Research Question

The study was designed to answer the question: "Does the experimental group, who receive Focus-on-Form instruction (in the form of Textual Input Enhancement), outperform the control group, who are not exposed to Focus-on-Form instruction, on the regular past tense morpheme -*ed* on post-test Grammaticality Judgment (GJ) tasks?"

Desing and Procedure

The present study, while attempting to follow the framework set by Long (1991), and later refined by Ellis (2001), investigated how different types of instruction affect L2 learning of English regular past tense morpheme -*ed*. However, as Doughty and Williams (1998: 5) pointed out, "there is considerable variation in how the term focus on form is understood and used".

The participants of this research were 40 male lower-intermediate students studying at Jahad Daneshgahi of Isfahan University of Technology. They had the same level of grammatical competence determined previously through the language institute's placement tests. The participants were divided into two groups of 20: an experimental group and a control group. The age variable was not controlled in selection of the participants.

Before the treatment, a pre-test including a Grammaticality Judgment (GJ) task of 10 items was administered which elicited the intuition of the participants of both groups about the grammaticality of test items concentrating on the regular past tense morpheme- *ed*. The reliability coefficient of the test was reported to be. 89 (α =.89). The treatment lasted for five weeks, two sessions each week (i. e. 10 sessions of treatment on the whole) for both groups.

The experimental group was exposed to planned Focus-on-Form instruction in the form of grammar consciousness-raising tasks: the regular past tens morpheme -*ed* which was textually enhanced through bolding, underlining, capitalizing in 10 simple texts. The texts were followed by some questions which elicited the use of the regular past tense morpheme -*ed*. According to the literature in the field of foreign/second language instruction, a grammar consciousness-raising task is one of several teaching techniques that can be utilized in Focus-on-Form instruction (Fotos, 1994). It was hoped that learners of the experimental group would develop knowledge of the regular past tene morpheme -ed and come to an *awarencess* of the feature in communicative input afterwards - a process that Sharwood Smith (1993) also sees as essential for second language acquisition. Similarly, according to Schmit's (1990) *Noticing Hypothesis, awareness* of specific linguistic items in the input is necessary for language learning to occur.

The control group would read the same 10 texts as the experimental group but with unenhanced regular past tense morpheme -*ed* and no questions following the texts.

After the five-week period a post-test was administered to both groups. The post-test was the same as the pre-test GJ task with approximately the same reliability coefficient (α = .85).

raising tasks) and FonFs groups on adverb placement, indirect object placement, and relative clause usage. She found that the FonF group was as accurate as the grammar group (FonFs) on the three targeted grammatical items. The results of Fotos' study lent support to the use of grammar consciousness-raising tasks as one possible alternative to teaching with a FonM or with a FonFs approach. It integrates language use and grammar instruction in the classroom.

The second teaching method that characterizes FonF instruction is interaction enhancement. Muranoi (2000) investigated the effect of interaction enhancement (IE) on the learning of English articles by first-year Japanese college students. Muranoi used IE as a communicative instructional technique to enhance interaction by means of implicit negative feedback provided by the teacher through recasts (i. e. implicit reformulation of the learner's erroneous sentence) during a problem-solving task. To evaluate their performance on English articles, Muranoi used four different tasks that were completed individually: 1) an oral story description (OS) task, 2) an oral picture description task (OP), a written picture description (WP) task, and 4) a Grammaticality Judgment (GJ) task. Muranoi utilized two experimental groups and one contrast group. Only experimental groups 1 and 2 received enhanced instruction. The students in the contrast group also participated in strategic interaction (i. e. classroom interaction characterized by negotiation of meaning) but without any enhancement. The two types of IE differed only in the debriefing phase. Experimental group 1 received the interaction enhancement treatment plus a formal debriefing (IEF). Experimental group 2 received the interaction enhancement treatment plus meaning-focused debriefing (IEM). The contrast group received only the non-enhanced interaction treatment (NEI). The results of the immediate post-tests and the delayed post-tests were the following:

1) The IEF group and the IEM group performed significantly better than the NEI group (contrast group) on the use of the definite and indefinite articles. According to Muranoi, this suggests that IE (with corrective feedback) has a beneficial effect on the learners' restructuring of their IL system.

2) The IEF group was grammatically more accurate than the IEM group on the four different tasks of all post-tests. Therefore, this suggested that two different methods of IE differently affect learners' restructuring of their IL system.

3) The effects of IE were maintained between the immediate and the delayed post-tests. Finally, Muranoi concluded that guiding learners to focus on form within meaning-oriented instruction is beneficial to L2 acquisition, and that this can be done through interaction enhancement.

As a third teaching method based on FonF instruction, Wong (2003) drew learner's attention to formal features of L2 input through textual enhancement (TE). Wong's study investigated how TE as a form of input enhancement and increasing the comprehensibility of L2 input via simplified input (SI) (Van Patten, 1990, as cited in Wong, 2003), impacts adult L2 French learners' acquisition of French past participle agreement in relative clause constructions. Eighty-one participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: 1) exposure to TE and SI, 2) exposure to SI only, 3) exposure to TE only, and 4) exposure to unsimplified input without TE (comparison group). The participants were provided with three reading texts in French containing forms that were typographically altered to enhance their perceptual salience. SI was operationalized as providing participants with simplified versions of the three reading texts. Wong found that SI had a positive effect but not TE. Wong concluded that since the targeted grammatical feature had no communicative value in French, it might have negatively influenced the results of the study.

and visual enhancement (Sharwood Smith, ١٩٩٣; Lim, ٢٠٠١) are the most distinguised ones which suitably characterize Focus-on-Form instruction.

To examine the first teaching method characterizing FonF instruction, Fotos and Ellis (1991) conducted a pilot study on grammar instruction. First-year Japanese EFL college students were divided into three groups: 1) the grammar task was performed by groups of four students (n=16) and dyads (n=8), 2) in another classroom, a teacher-fronted grammar lesson was presented in English to 28 students, 3)the remaining students served as the control group (n=32) and did not receive instuction on the targeted feature of the study - dative alternation. The pre-, post- and final tests consisted of three identical grammaticality judgment tasks and were required to generate two rules on dative alternation. The post-test scores of the group with a grammar consciousness-raising task increased 10%, while the grammar-lesson students made a gain of 14%. The grammar consciousness-raising task appeared to have functioned equally well as the grammer lesson in the short-term and in the long-term (no statistical difference between both groups). Furthermore, the grammar task appeared to have promoted amounts of interaction with 63 negotiation counts in the L2 for performance of a two-way information gap task. This pilot study showed that grammar instruction and communicative language use could be simultaneously integrated through grammar consciousness-raising tasks. But the results were somewhat limited since only one grammatical feature was tested, i.e. dative alternation. In addition, the gains in L2 accuracy were not maintained in the delayed post-test.

Thus, Fotos (1994), in a replication of Fotos and Ellis (1991), utilized three grammar tasks: 1) adverb placement, 2) indirect object placement, and 3) relative clause usage. She administered these three tasks to three classes of Japanese ESL students. Class 1 received a FonFs treatment in the form of three teacher-fronted grammar lessons on adverb placement, indirect object placement, and relative clause usage respectively. Class 2 received a FonF treatment, in which the participants perfomed three grammar consciousness-raising tasks with the same grammatical features. Class 3 received a FonM treatment, characterized by three communicative tasks with no grammatical content. There was no control group. Pre-tests, post-tests, and delayed post-tests were administered to the three classes. All three groups scored better on the post-test than they did on the pre-test, and gains were maintained for the three groups on the delayed post-test. The gains made on the post-test and the delayed post-test by the three classes were significant within each group but not across groups.

To test her hypothesis that performance of the grammar consciousness-raising tasks led to as much L2 production as the FonM approach, Fotos analyzed the quantities of negotiation made during performance of the three tasks by the FonF group and the FonM group. The researchers counted the number of L1 and L2 negotiations made by both discussion groups separately. She also counted the number of L2 words and the average number of L2 negotiations per minute for each group. The results of these multiple measures of negotiation quantity were quite similar across the tasks and the groups. The average lenght of L2 words produced by the Japanese students in the FonF group was even slightly longer than the average length produced by the communicative group (FonM). For example, the FonF group produced a large portion of interactions in task 2, on the indirect object, because it was a combination of an information gap task and an agreed-upon solution task.

Fotos also compared grammatical accuracy across the FonF (with the grammar consciousness

45 FLT
No.88.Fall.Vol.23

Introduction

Formal instruction has been at the heart of the debate in second languae acquisition and subject to controversy and discussion among researchers of the field for at least 40 years (Ellis, 2001). In fact, the bulk of research since the mid-90s has especially focused on finding various foreign/ second language instruction methods to integrate formal instruction within a communicative framework. Pursuing this trend, many researchers have attempted to define and name the forms of instruction which can be applied to the second/ foreign language calssroom and there is still some debate over the precise terminology (Long, 1991; Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 2001).

Current views of second/foreign language classroom methodology have agreed on the importance of some *form-focused instruction* as an optimal solution to the inquiry. The most widely used terms in the field of form-focused instruction are those introduced by Long (1991).

Long and Robinson (1998: 23) maintain that "Focus on Form consists of an occasional shift attention to linguistic code features by the teacher and/or one or more students- triggered by perceived problems with comprehension and production". This *shift of attention* is supposed to occur during communication.

Ellis, Basturkmen, and Loewen (2001:411) define Focuse-on-Form instruction as a kind of instruction that: "1) occurs in discourse that is primarily meaning centered, 2) is observable (i.e., occurs interactionally), 3) is incidental (i.e., is not pre-planned), 4) is transitory, 5) is extensive (i.e., several different forms are attended in the context of a single lesson)."

In another attempt, Ellis, Basturkmen, and Loewen (2002) make a tripartite distinction of the form-based instruction based on the two fundamental criteria ofa) the primary focus of attention (form or meaning) and b) the distribution of attention to form (intensive or extensive attention to form):

1) Focus-on-FormS (FonFs), characterized by teaching the forms rather than the messages they convey (e.g. the grammar-translation method);

2) Focus-on-Meaning (FonM), in which no attention is paid to the forms used to convey a message, the instruction is devoted to communication only; and

3) Focus-on-Form (FonF), a balance between a Focus-on-FormS and a Focus-on-Meaning.

They contend that types of Focus-on-Form can be distinguished: Planned or incidental. Their categorization of the form-based instruction is shown in Table 1 in the following:

Table 1. Types of form-based instruction
(Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewon, 2002:420)

Types of Form-Focused Instruction	Primary Focus	Distribution
Focus-on-FormS	Form	Intensive
planned Focus-on-Form	Meaning	Intensive
Incidental Foucus-on-Form	Meaning	Extensive

By "planned" is meant pre-selected forms, by "intensive" is meant focusing on a preselected form many times, by "incidental" is meant unpreselected forms, and finally by "extensive" is meant candidacy of many unpreselected forms for focus.

The spate of the research into the effects of second language instruction to date have tracked the linguistic progress of one group exposed to essentially a FonF approach and another exposed to FonFs instruction (VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993; Norris & Ortega, 2000; Doughty, 2001; Ellis, Basturkmen, & Rees, 2003).

Various methods have been proposed to integrate formal instruction within a communicative framework. Among them 1) *grammar consciouness-raising tasks* (Rutherford, 1987; Fotos & Ellis, 1991; Fotos, 1994), 2) *interaction enhancement* (Muranoi, 2000), 3) *textual enhancement* (Wong, 2003), and 4) *input*

در پایان ، به منظر برآورد نتایج دو نوع آموزش متفاوت ، داده‌های به‌دست آمده از پس آزمون قضاوت دستوری در هر دو گروه آزمونه و شاهد با استفاده از آزمون t مورد مقایسه و بررسی قرار گرفت . نتایج به‌دست آمده از پس‌آزمون نشان داد ، گروه آزمونه که در معرض آموزش صورت‌محور قرار داشت ، نسبت به گروه شاهد که آموزش صورت‌محور دریافت نکرده بود ، عملکرد بهتری داشت . با توجه به نتایج به‌دست آمده ، به مدرسان زبان‌های خارجی توصیه می‌شود ، برای تدریس دستورزبان ، به روش‌های غیرمستقیم آموزشی ، نظیر آموزش صورت‌محور توجه بیشتری داشته باشند و به‌واسطه‌ی آن ، به اهداف روش‌های آموزش زبان «ارتباط‌ محور» نزدیک‌تر شوند . به‌علاوه ، نویسندگان کتاب‌های زبان‌آموزی و کتاب‌های انگلیسی برای اهداف ویژه می‌توانند ، به نیازسنجی دقیق درباره‌ی مشکلات ساختاری که زبان‌آموزان با آن‌ها مواجه هستند ، بپردازند و با استفاده از روش آموزشی صورت‌محور ، در صدد حل این مشکلات برآیند .

کلید واژه‌ها : آموزش صورت‌محور ، آموزش صُوَر ، آموزش معنا محور ، تکواژ زمان ماضی با قاعده ، برجسته‌نویسی متن .

Abstract

   Teaching grammar has always been a concern for teachers of foreign languages. Recently, there have been remarkably significant developments in the field, one of which is the Focus-on-Form instruction (i.e.teaching form while communicating meaning). Long (1991) distinguishes between Focus-on-Form instruction and Focus-on-FormS instruction which consists of teaching form without any concern for meaning. A typical instructional technique best associated with Focus-on-Form instruction is that of Input Enhancement (Sharwood Smith, 1993) which aims at teaching grammatical points through learner's inductive reasoning. In the present research two homogeneous groups of lower-intermediate language learners were selected and instructed on the regular past tense moroheme -ed in L2 English through ten different texts during five weeks of treatment; the experimental group was exposed to a kind of Focus-on-Form instruction in which the regular past tense morpheme -ed was textually enhanced; the learners were required to answer questions on the regular past tense morpheme upon reading the text. The control group, however, received normal instruction, according to which they would merely read non-enhanced texts. Two tests were administered to each group: a pre-test and a post-test. The data obtained through the post-test results of a Grammaticality Judgement (GJ) task from the experimental and the control groups were submitted to a t-test to analyse the results of the two different types of instruction. The post-test results showed that the students who were exposed to the Focus-on-Form instruction performed considerably better that the students who received no Focus-on-Form instruction. Based on the results obtained, teachers of foreign languages are recommended to abandon the traditional explicit rule presentation methods in favour of the more implicit methods currently in vogue in the Communicative Language Teaching. Moreover, writers of textbooks used in teaching English for Specific Purposes (ESP) are advised to carry out a careful investigation of learners' needs in problematic areas of language structure and focus on them through the Focus-on-Form instruction.

Key Words: focus-on-form instruction, focus-on-formS instruction, focus-on-meaning instruction, regular past tense morpheme, textual input enhancement.

چکیده

آموزش دستور زبان، همـواره در کانـون توجه مدرسان زبان‌هاى خـارجى بوده است. در سال‌هاى اخیر،
تحولات بسیارى در این زمینه به‌وجود آمده است که یکى از مهم‌ترین آن‌ها، آموزش «صورت محور» (آموزش
صورت به واسطه‌ى توجه به معنا) است که لانگ (۱۹۹۱) آن را از آموزش «صُور محور» (آموزش صورت بدون
توجه به معنى کلام) متمایز مى‌کند. یکى از مصداق‌هاى آموزش صورت محور، برجسته‌نویسى متن [شارورد
اسمیت، ۱۹۹۳] است که به توسط آن، زبان‌آموز براساس استدلال استقرایى، از نکته‌ى دستـورى
مورد نظر آگاهى مى‌یابد.

در تحقیق حاضر، دو گروه همگن از فراگیران زبان انگلیسى که سطح
بسندگى دانش زبانى آن‌ها پایین‌تر از متوسط بود، براى فراگیرى تکواژ
زمان ماضى با قاعده انتخاب شدند و ۱۰ متن متفاوت به مدت
پنج هفته در اختیار آنان قرار گرفت. با این تفاوت که گروه
آزمونه نوعى آموزش صوت محور دریافت مى کرد که
در آن، تکواژ زمان ماضى با قاعده در متون آموزشى
به‌صورت برجسته‌نویسى بود و زبان‌آموزان پس از
خواندن هر متن، باید به سؤالاتى پاسخ مى دادند که
مربوط به تکواژ زمان ماضى با قاعده مى‌شد. ولى گروه
شاهد صرفاً متونى را مى خواندند که در آن‌ها، تکواژ زمان ماضى
با قاعده بدون برجسته‌نویسى به کار رفته بود. هریک از گروه‌ها دو
آزمون دریافت کرد: یک پیش‌آزمون و یک پس‌آزمون.

Mohammad Ali Torabi, Ph.D in Linguestics, Tabriz
University & Mehdi Vaez Dalili (MA in TEFL)
English Teacher -jahad Daneshgahi of Isfahan
University of Technology

The Effect of Focus-on-Form Instruction on L2 English Acquisition: The Case of Regular Past Tense Morpheme