
| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Evaluation of Teaching English Grammar Methods from Focus on Form Instruction Perspective on Unlock Textbook

Dr. Ayman Hamad Elneil Hamdan Abdala

Assistant Professor, English Department, College of sciences & Arts- Dhahran Aljanoub, King Khalid University, Saudi Arabia

Corresponding Author: Dr. Ayman Hamad Elneil Hamdan Abdala, **E-mail:** aabdala@kku.edu.sa

| ABSTRACT

The study investigates the evaluation of teaching English grammar methods implemented in the teaching grammar section in Unlock textbook and investigates how frequently different types of focus on the form used in teaching grammar in an intensive English course at King Khalid University can enable students to develop linguistic accuracy. Observation is conducted as an instrument of data collection. The findings of the study have revealed that teaching English grammar in Unlock textbook using an inductive approach is pedagogically effective and applying the reactive type of focus on form raises attention to linguistic forms and maximizes accuracy in writing. The study recommends that English teachers should teach grammar using an inductive approach and learner centeredness and English teachers should give students excessive practice on focus on form with meaning.

| KEYWORDS

Proleptic Approach, consciousness-raising, explicit knowledge, implicit knowledge, LEAD Principles, reactive, pre-emptive

| ARTICLE DOI: [10.32996/ijllt.2022.5.3.29](https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2022.5.3.29)

1. Introduction

Teaching English as a foreign language involves two perspectives – comprehension and production, but learning English requires linguistic association and non-linguistic association. All of them are cored on grammar which is regarded as the backbone of language and the mechanism of language that entails novelty. It involves accuracy, applicable language patterns, meaningful communicative structure, item-learning, and regularization in language. Grammar embodies two aspects –chain structure and choice (deep structure). Teaching English grammar means enabling language learners to use linguistic form accurately, meaningfully, and appropriately. Thus, grammar concentrates on linguistic forms within the context of performing communicative activities which have been termed "focus on form" (Long, 1991). Focus on form instruction focuses attention on the meaning and the attention to form arises out of meaning-centered configuration (Long and Robinson, 1998). Focus on form can enable learners to develop linguistic accuracy and it allows learners to take time out from a focus on meaning to notice linguistic items in the input, thereby overcoming a potential obstacle of purely meaning-focused lessons in which linguistic forms may go unnoticed (Doughty, 2001). Traditional grammar teaching focuses on the notion of competence, which embodies the knowledge of concepts and rules stored in minds of the learners. Nonetheless, shallow - end and the deep-end approach. The deep-end approach claimed that grammar should be acquired unconsciously. The deep-end approach proposed that neither the exposition to quality input nor its focus on output or production is sufficient to guarantee accurate and fluent language learning. Whereas, the shallow-end approach assumed that provision for grammar teaching arose from the needs of learners as perceived by language teachers (Swain, 2000). Unlock textbook focuses on grammar for productive skills, speaking, and writing, and it entails syntactical structure and lexis (the large size of lexicon, collocations, usage, parts of speech, sentence components, and phrasal verbs)(www.cambridge.org).

2. Aims of the Study

This study aims at observing and evaluating teaching English grammar methods implemented in the teaching grammar section in Unlock textbook and to investigate how frequently different types of focus on form used in teaching grammar in an intensive

English course at King Khalid University can enable students to develop linguistic accuracy, focus on meaning and notice linguistic

Copyright: © 2022 the Author(s). This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Published by Al-Kindi Centre for Research and Development, London, United Kingdom.

items in the input and maintaining the importance of teacher- learner-initiated pre-emptive focus on form and pre-emptive language related to focus on form instruction as reactive ones in leading to uptake. Furthermore, one objective is to maintain the importance of teacher-learner-initiated pre-emptive focus on form and pre-emptive language related to focus on form instruction as reactive ones in leading to uptake. To meet these objectives, the following research questions are formulated:

1. Do approaches and methods of teaching grammar used at KKU assist students to absorb grammatical rules properly in terms of practice?
2. To what extent does focus on form occur in a meaning-centered help freshmen studying English as an intensive English course to correlate form with meaning structural patterns?
3. Are there any significant differences in the use of reactive and pre-emptive types of focus on form in the English class?

3. Method

To address these questions, class observation is conducted and interactions between teachers and students are audio-recorded, transcribed, categorized, and compared in terms of the frequency of reactive and pre-emptive episodes, and the amount of uptake following them.

3.1. Participants

3.1.1. Teachers

Two English well-experienced teachers, teaching the English language as a foreign language for over fifteen years, participated in this study. Teacher one is an assistant professor specializing in ELT and he conducted much research on methods of teaching grammar and principles of structural formulation of well-formed structure. However, the other teacher is an associate professor specializing in TESOL and his professional background suggested that he has been teaching in preparatory year programs in different universities in Saudi Arabia. Additionally, he has conducted many research papers on syllabus design focusing on customization in terms of personalization and differentiation, and the role of L1 in English class.

3.1.2. Learners

The learners consisted of 46 university male students studying English as an intensive English course. They all speak Arabic as their mother tongue. They are highly motivated to learn English and so enthusiastic to join university. Moreover, they are interested in developing their English level and academic skills for attaining a high GPA and futuristic hopes. The learners' ages range from 19 to 22 years old and most of them are hard-working in terms of attending classes, doing exercises, class participation, and caring for good teaching methods matching their needs, desires, and social life circumstance from their cultural background perspective.

3.3. Instructional Setting

The observed students study English twelve hours per week and they meet four times a week. Each session lasts for fifty minutes and two sessions are always blended into one session. Thus, a break is determined by students' desire and the teacher in the middle of the blended sessions or it can be contacted at the end of the blended sessions. The textbook used as the material is named as *Unlock* which is designed by Cambridge Press. *Unlock* is a five-level academic skills course that combines carefully scaffolded exercises, a comprehensive approach to critical thinking, and a motivating video. *Unlock* has been developed using the Cambridge Learner Corpus, Cambridge Academic Corpus, and the English Vocabulary Profile. The course offers targeted skills development for students in an academic context. Its principled approach to critical thinking skills supports learners by giving them the tools they will need to analyze information, generate ideas, formulate their own opinions and express themselves effectively in speaking and writing tasks (www.cambridge.org). Every unit of *Unlock* opens with a visually stunning and inspiring Discovery Education TM video (supplied on the Teacher's DVD that is packaged with the Teacher's Book). These are used in every unit to introduce original angles on a range of academic topics. The videos promote discussion, motivate and engage learners, and help to ensure that you are working with materials that lead to real achievements in the classroom. The textbook includes critical thinking sections based on Benjamin Bloom's classification of learning objectives (Bloom's Taxonomy). These sections allow learners to develop the lower and higher order thinking skills that are essential for success in an academic context. (www.cambridge.org). The classroom activities include role-plays, jigsaw tasks (e.g., solving an environmental problem or some social problems such as unemployment or car accidents), general class discussions (e.g., discussion on a movie, a historical monument), opinion-gap tasks (e.g., making predictions about the future), reading comprehension activities (e.g., using the information in a passage to complete the missing words in a summary paragraph, paragraph heading matching, true/false/not-given statements). Learners go through the reading passages at home and discussed their understandings, and opinions on the topic and their answers to the various types of tasks following a reading passage in class. Listening activities include table, diagram, or map completion, multiple-choice questions and fill in the blanks. The listening tasks are all based on some dialogs or mini-lectures on social and academic English in authentic contexts. These tasks are completed during the class and teachers tried to devise some pre-listening and post-listening activities to engage their learners with the topic thematically and get them to express

their own ideas on the topic. There are some content-based questions based on the reading passage or the listening material in every unit. Regarding writing, there is a brainstorming activity on the writing topic in class. The participants are encouraged to share their views on the topic as teachers write most of the key ideas or expressions on the board. Then, learners are asked to develop and write an essay at home using their notes and ideas they picked up from the class discussion on the topic for the next class. As the most common class activities in the class are pair-work, group work, and whole-class discussions. Nevertheless, COVID 19 precautions deform all this process to be online teaching and flipped learning.

Step 2: Eliciting functions of the rule or rule elicitation

Step 2 aims to elicit the functions of the grammatical item taught accompanied by examples. This step furnishes the students with clear descriptions of the language focus uses so that students can apply the language focus appropriately in communicative settings. In this step, the teacher explicitly tells the students some features of the sentence, such as the verb form, commonly used time signals, and functions of the present perfect tense, so that students are well prepared for the exercises following the presentation/explanation. In addition, this step consolidates the students' comprehension of what they have guessed in Step 1 so that the students' wrong conclusions about the rule can be avoided. In other words, Step 2 enhances students' confidence in applying the rule communicatively. Any teaching media and aids could be used for eliciting the functions of the grammatical item (that is, the present perfect tense) taught. See Table 7 for a sample explanation of the present perfect tense.

Table 7. Step Two: Functions and examples of the present perfect tense

Functions	Examples
To grammarians, <i>Present Perfect</i> can be used to :	
Express an action/event that happened at an unspecified/ indefinite time in the past. In this case, we do not know when this action/event occurred. In other words, the exact time is unimportant.	- She has climbed a mountain. - They have seen this movie. - I have complained about the traffic before.
Express an action/event that has recently occurred, and it often may have a result in the present.	- He has broken the glass. - We have cleaned the floor. (Now, the floor is clean) - I have washed the car. (Now, It looks lovely)
Express an action/event that began in the past and continues up to the present (often used with 'for' or 'since'). In this instance, the action/event is incomplete. Note that when using time signals <i>for</i> and <i>since</i> both are different in use. The former denotes the length of time, while the latter indicates a certain period of time.	- John has lived in New York for four years. (He still lives in New York) - I have learned German since 1990. (I still learn German) - I have worn glasses for ten years. (I still wear glasses)
Express an action that happened repeatedly before now. In other words, such an action/event occurred more than once in the past. It may be repeated in the present or future. Note that this function should be differentiated from that of <i>simple present tense</i> indicating present habits.	- We have seen this movie twice. (We may see it again) - She has been here many times. (She may be here again) - John has visited Ohio four times. (He may visit it again)

Step 3: Familiarizing students with the rule in use through exercises or rule practice

Step 3 focuses on familiarizing the students with the grammatical item in use. The process followed in this step is that the teacher presents some exercises, checks for students' comprehension, and encourages active student involvement. The forms of the exercises used in Step 3 may vary according to the particular grammatical item being taught. For example, in the materials that I designed for teaching the present perfect tense, I use a series of seven exercises. I start by providing the exercise in the form of written question input (see Table 8). The students are required to write their answers using complete sentences on the basis of the questions asked. The reason for having the students write their answer in a complete sentence is that this ensures they are trained to make a complete sentence using the rule given.

Table 8. Step Three, Exercise 1: Written question input. Answer the following questions in a complete sentence.

1. How many letters has she written this month?
2. Where have you put my book?
3. How long have you studied here?
4. How many times has she been to Bali?
5. With whom has Maria spoken?
6. How long have they cleaned the floor?
7. How many years has your mother lived in a town?

The next exercise is a correct verb form completion problem. Students are required to fill out the appropriate grammatical item in the bracket based on the rule taught (see a present perfect tense example in Table 9). This exercise trains the students to be more familiar with the verb form used. Being familiar with the verb form is crucial because the verb form identifies the rule and its meaning.

Table 9. Step Three, Exercise 2: Correct verb form completion. Change the words in the bracket with an appropriate form.

1. She has not (attend) any meetings since she worked here.
2. Bill (be) (be) here since four hours ago.
3. I have never (see) snow before.
4. Bill's parents have (grow) rice crops since he was a child.
5. We have not (take) the TOEFL test.
6. Maria and Anna have (live) here for ten years.
7. I (not be) (see) you for a long time.
8. He (not be) (be) here since Christmas.

The third exercise given in Step 3 is a sentence transformation problem. For example, the students have to change sentences using simple present tense into those using the present perfect tense (see Table 10). In this respect, the students are challenged to write a correct sentence using the present perfect tense, and students are trained to be alert to using time signals as well.

Fourthly, a sentence composition problem using the time signals is given (see Table 11). In this case, the data are given, and the students are required to write sentences on the basis of the data available. The sample answer is provided to help the students to do this exercise easily. The students are also trained to apply the commonly used time signals (for example, *for* and *since*) in the case of using a certain rule (that is, the present perfect tense). For a more challenging activity, the time signals can be extended (that is, the use of *already* and *yet*; *during the four past years*, *over a few years*, and so on). In other words, the time signal-based exercise is given since in some cases, tenses are much influenced by certain time signals.

Table 10. Step Three, Exercise 3: Tense-based sentence transformation Change the following sentences into the present perfect form. You may include a certain time signal if required.

1. She does not go to school yet.
_____ .
2. We drink coffee.
_____ .
3. They read these books.
_____ .
4. He has breakfast.
_____ .
5. My mother boils much water.
_____ .
6. I still learn English.
_____ .

Table 11. Step Three, Exercise 4: Sentence composition 1. Make a sentence using time signals: "for" and "since" based on the following data. Number 1 has been done for you as an example.

No	Participant	Activity	A Period of Time	Length of Time
1	Pusporini	Take an English course	January 1996	10 years
2	Maria's Father	Work for a shoes company	1968	25 years
3	John and Bill	Study at college	Three months ago	3 months
4	We	Attend a workshop	9 o'clock	7 hours
5	They	Teach Javanese	Seven days ago	7 days
6	Jolene	Do this work	11 o'clock	A few hours
7	Sondak	Stay in a village	Some weeks ago	Some weeks

1. a. Pusporini has taken an English course since January 1996. b. Pusporini has taken an English course for 10 years.
2. a. _____
b. _____
3. a. _____
b. _____
4. a. _____
b. _____
5. a. _____
b. _____
6. a. _____
b. _____
7. a. _____
b. _____

In the fifth exercise, like the fourth, the students are required to write sentences using the time signals in which the data in the form of time expressions are provided (see Table 12). This exercise is intended to check students' progress in using the time signals (for example, *for* and *since*). In this respect, the teacher can monitor students' progress in such a form of exercise.

Table 12. Step Three, Exercise 5: Sentence composition 2. Make a sentence using the following keywords. Number 1 has been done for you as an example.

No.	Linking Verbs	Main Verbs	Adverb Signals
1.	Have	Be	Seven months
2.	Has	Visit	Lately
3.	Have	Write	Many years
4.	Has	Arrive	Just
5.	Have	Speak	Four years ago
6.	Has	Have lunch	Four times
7.	Have	Do the dishes	A couple of hours

1. They have been here for seven months.
2. _____.
3. _____.
4. _____.
5. _____.
6. _____.
7. _____.

The sixth exercise focuses on error recognition and correction. In this sense, the students have to identify and correct the mistakes in the sentences given. In the case of present perfect tense, error problems include verb form and time signals (see Table 13). This exercise checks students' comprehension about the application of the rule (that is, the present perfect tense). Moreover, the exercise trains the students to carefully notice inappropriate features of the rule (for example, the present perfect tense).

Table 13. Step Three, Exercise 6: Error recognition and correction

Correct the sentences below.

1. They has moved into a new apartment.
2. She has already saw this movie.
3. Maria and Anna have flown on an airplane since many times.
4. Mr. Regan has working for his company for 1977.
5. I have waited for you for three hours ago.
6. The lift has broke down.
7. We have clean this floor two times.
8. John Smith has wrote a number of short stories.
9. There has been some climatic changes lately in my town.

The final exercise is sentence construction or composition based on the tense functions (see Table 14). The exercise enables the students to practice with both form and function-based exposure. Furthermore, the function-based exercise can assist students to apply the rule in communicative tasks (that is, speaking and writing).

Table 14. Step Three, Exercise 7: Rule-function based sentence composition make two sentences using present perfect tense indicating:

1. An action that began in the past and is still occurring now with "for"
2. An action that happened more than once in the past, and may occur again in the future
3. An action that happened at indefinite time in the past
4. An action that began in the past and is still occurring now with 'since'
5. An action that has recently occurred, and it often may have a result in the present.

To sum up, in Step 3, a set of exercises are oriented towards form-function exposure so that the students have many opportunities to get closer to both forms and functions of the grammatical item learned. The aim is to enable students to use the grammatical item correctly in communicative tasks. I suggest that the model exercises given in Tables 8-14 relating to teaching the present perfect tense be developed into various forms of exercises relevant to specific grammatical items.

Step 4: Checking students' comprehension or rule activation

This step is geared to check students' comprehension of the grammatical item being taught. At this stage, the teacher provides an assessment of student comprehension to gauge whether the students completely grasp what they have been taught. The form of the evaluation can be in the form of sentence construction. This is used in order to have the students apply the concept of the grammatical item learned productively, not receptively. In this case, the students are required to work individually. This step can help the teacher redesign her or his further grammar teaching to facilitate the students' progress in applying the rule taught. An example of Step 4 relating to present perfect tense can be seen below in Table 15.

Table 15. Step Four: Students' comprehension of rule-based sentence construction

Make a sentence using the *present perfect tense* with time signals: *already, recently, for, during the past years, since, just, twice, and many times.*

1. _____ .
2. _____ .
3. _____ .
4. _____ .
5. _____ .
6. _____ .
7. _____ .
8. _____ .

Step 5: Expanding students' knowledge or enrichment

The last step is focused on expanding students' comprehension of the grammatical item being taught. In this phase, the teacher employs other activities to reinforce some concepts and even to relate new ones. S/he gives the students opportunities to do independent work and can set certain activities or tasks from the lesson as homework or an assignment. In the example of materials designed for teaching present perfect tense, I propose two tasks: pattern identification in a passage or a text (see Table 16) and inter-pattern comparison in meaning (see Table 17). Pattern identification in a passage or text provides students with an opportunity to do noticing or consciousness-raising. In this respect, the students are expected to be experts in applying the rule on the basis of their cognitive capacity. Inter-pattern comparison encourages the students to differentiate between the concepts they already know and the newly introduced grammatical item. This task can train students to think analytically.

Table 16. Step Five: Pattern identification in the passage or the text

Identify the clauses or sentences using present perfect in the following passage, and underline the verbs.

The whale is the largest animal that has ever lived. Some species grow to a length of over 30 meters and weigh up to 90 metric tons, or 90,000 kilos. Millions of years ago, whales lived on land and walked on four legs. Before recorded history, however, they went into the sea. It was really a return to the sea; the remote ancestors of all animals had originated in the sea. The remains of the whale's hind legs still exist inside its body, and there is other evidence that it was once a land mammal. It is warm-blooded, for example, and has respiratory, digestive, and reproductive systems somewhat like those of other mammals. For hundreds of years, people have killed some whale species for their blubber or whalebone. In recent years, it has become evident that the great sperm whale is especially in danger of becoming extinct. Unless we stop killing them, the species will soon disappear. Before the end of the twentieth

Table 17. Step 5: Inter-pattern comparison in meaning

Differentiate a couple of sentences based on aspect of meaning below.

1. A. She has had breakfast.
B. She had breakfast.
2. A. We have visited Bali four times.
B. We visited Bali four times a year.
3. A. They have lived in a remote area.
B. They lived in a remote area.
4. A. He has broken the cup.
B. He broke the cup.
5. A. I have studied Japanese for five years.
B. I studied Japanese for five years.
6. A. She has had breakfast.
B. She had breakfast.
7. A. George and Anna have waited for you for three hours.
B. George and Anna waited for you for three hours.
8. A. Pusporini has washed her motorbike.
B. Pusporini washed her motorbike.
9. A. Mary and Shirley have seen this movie.
B. Mary and Shirley saw this movie.

5.1 Principles and Knowledge Structure of Teaching Grammar

- The E- factors (efficiency and economy)
- The A-factors (appropriacy which includes age, needs, context, size and level)
- Input (exposure- intake –immersion))3.3
- scaffolding (temporal support and facilitation in doing the controlled practice)
- Learner awareness (attention, noticing and understanding)

5.2 Knowledge Structure of Teaching Grammar

Grammar gains its prominence in language teaching, particularly in English as a foreign language EFL and English as a second language (ESL), inasmuch as without a good knowledge of grammar, learners' language development will be severely constrained. Practically, in the teaching of grammar, learners are taught rules of language commonly known as sentence patterns. According to Ur (1999), in the case of the learners, grammatical rules enable them to know and apply how such sentence patterns should be put together. The teaching of grammar should also ultimately center attention on the way grammatical items or sentence patterns are correctly used. In other words, teaching grammar should encompass language structure or sentence patterns, meaning and use. For most teachers of English, the priority of teaching grammar is to assist learners to internalize the structures/rules of language, taught in such a way that they can be used for communication both written and spoken (Ellis, 2002). For this reason, the two terms practice and consciousness-raising are important to define in this paper since they play an important play in successful grammar teaching, especially in the case of EFL.

5.3 Practice

To begin with, it is claimed that practice is one of the keys to learning incorporated into a methodology with the following features:

1. a specific grammatical feature is isolated for focused attention;
2. the learners are required to produce sentences or statements comprising the targeted feature;
3. the learners will be provided with opportunities for repetition of the targeted feature;
5. there is expectation that the learners will perform the grammatical feature correctly; and the learners receive feedback (immediate or delayed) on whether their performance of the grammatical structure is correct or incorrect (Ellis, 2002; Richards, 2002).

It is generally accepted that practice can facilitate accuracy and fluency. In this regard, accuracy focuses on correct use of language (for example, rules of language). This can be achieved through controlled and semi-controlled activities or practice of grammar, for example. In fluency, after learners master the rules of language, they are required to apply the rules of language in the form of spoken or written language. A number of linguists recommend that at this stage errors or mistakes be tolerated since making mistakes or errors is not disgraceful, but natural and common practice. During fluency-oriented activities, a teacher is required to help learners to self-notice or self-correct. It is important to keep in mind that both accuracy and fluency are interdependent.

5.4 Consciousness-raising

Ellis (2002) defines consciousness-raising as an attempt to equip learners with an understanding of a specific grammatical feature, to develop declarative (describing a rule of grammar and applying it in pattern practice drills) rather than procedural (applying a rule of grammar in communication) knowledge of it. Richards, Plat, and Plat (1992) define consciousness-raising as follows:

It is an approach to the teaching of grammar in which instruction in grammar (through drills, grammar explanation, and other form-focused activities) is viewed as a way of raising learner's awareness of grammatical features of the language. This is thought to indirectly facilitate second language acquisition. A consciousness-raising approach is contrasted with traditional approaches to the teaching of grammar in which the goal is to instill correct grammatical patterns and habits directly (p. 78).

The main characteristics of consciousness-raising activities proposed by Ellis (2002) involve:

1. there should be an effort to isolate a specific linguistic feature for focused attention;
2. the learners are provided with data that illustrate the targeted feature and an explicit rule description or explanation;
3. the learners are expected to utilize intellectual effort to understand the targeted feature;
4. misunderstanding or incomplete understanding of the grammatical structure by the learners leads to clarification in the form of further data and description or explanation; and
5. learners are required (though not crucial) to articulate the rule describing the grammatical feature.

In short, in consciousness-raising, learners are required to notice a certain feature of language (that is, sentence patterns), but there is no requirement to produce or communicate the certain sentence patterns taught.

5.6 Explicit and Implicit Knowledge

It is useful to be aware that there are two kinds of knowledge necessary to gain proficiency in a second language. These are known as explicit (conscious learning) and implicit (subconscious acquisition) knowledge (Klein, 1986).

5.7 Explicit knowledge

According to Ellis (2004), in a practical definition, explicit knowledge deals with language and the uses to which language can be put. This knowledge facilitates the intake and development of implicit language, and it is useful to monitor language output. Explicit knowledge is generally accessible through controlled processing. In short, it is the conscious knowledge of grammatical rules learned through formal classroom instruction. In this respect, a person with explicit knowledge knows about language and the ability to articulate those facts in some way (Brown, 2000). For instance, Achmad knows every rule about present tense, but he frequently makes mistakes in speaking and writing. However, such knowledge is easy for him while having time to think of the rule and apply it (that is, in the context of a grammar exercise or a writing assignment). Thus, on the basis of Achmad's case, explicit knowledge is learnable; for example, when grammatical items are given to learners, they learn the items first in a controlled learning process. Explicit knowledge is also obtained through the practice of error correction, which is thought to help learners come to the correct mental representation of a rule. This works if there is enough time to operate it; the speaker is concerned with the correctness of her/his speech/written production; and s/he knows the correct rules (Krashen, 1987).

5.8 Implicit knowledge

Implicit knowledge is automatic and easily accessed and provides a great contribution to building communicative skills. Implicit knowledge is unconscious, internalized knowledge of the language that is easily accessed during spontaneous language tasks, written or spoken (Brown, 2000). Implicit knowledge is gained in the natural language learning process. It means that a person applies a certain grammatical rule in the same way as a child who acquires her/his first language (for example, mother tongue). According to Brown (2000), the child implicitly learns aspects of language (for example, phonological, syntactical, semantic, pragmatic rules for language), but does not have access to an explanation of those rules explicitly. As an example, Jack speaks and writes English with good use of present tense, although he has no idea about the grammatical rule behind it. To sum up, implicit knowledge is gained through a sub-conscious learning process. This is illustrated by the fact that native speakers of a certain language do not always "know" (consciously) the rules of their language (Krashen, 1987).

6. Rules of Teaching Grammar

- Rules of context (teach grammar in context not in isolation)
- Rules of use (explain how the rule is used in real life)
- Rules of economy (teach a suitable grammatical chunk that suits the learners' needs)
- Rules of relevance (teach the rules that are relevant to the learners' level and genre)
- Rules of condition (the input, output, feedback, and motivation)
- Rules of dimensions (form accuracy, meaning in communication, and appropriate use).

7. Maxims of Teaching Grammar

- Simple to complex
- Known to unknown
- Whole to part
- Part to whole
- Concrete to abstract
- Direct to indirect
- General to particular –
- Particular to general
- Regular to irregular

8. Ways of Viewing Grammar

In academia, teachers view grammar differently relying on their conceptualization and ideology. Hudson (2000) states that grammar can be viewed as rules, structure, mathematics, texture, subject, and formula. Halliday (1978, 39) views grammar as "a system of meaning potential" and he moved away from form-focused approaches to grammar, concerned with the structure of language, to a function-focused way of thinking about grammar as a system, which looks at "grammar as a meaning-making resource and to describe grammatical categories by reference to what they mean" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004, 10). In contrast to traditional school grammar, Halliday's functional grammar looks at how any given grammatical form, such as a verb, performs

different meaning-making functions in different communicative contexts. Through his concept of lexico-grammar, Halliday proposed "the unity of grammar and lexis" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 64), positioning grammar and vocabulary on a continuum, and he argued that syntax and morphology are both part of grammar" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 24). Thus meaning-making is not simply about the lexical meaning of words, as explained in a dictionary, but also about the way word choices and relationships, syntax, and grammatical choices also shape meaning.

9. How to Teach Grammar to Arab Learners

The form-focused instruction is massively used to produce knowledge about English grammar among the learners but they could not apply what they learned to spontaneous speech and written discourse. Conversely, implementing the Communicative Approach and Post communicative Approach which is excessively demanded to be implemented in English classes to produce students who communicate well but lack grammatical competency. Thus, a new scaffolded method that suits learners from cognitive, affective, and psychomotor perspectives should be innovated.

Frequency -- the regular occurrence of a certain structure in input

Perceptual Saliency -- highlighting or underlining to draw attention to a certain structure

Task Demands -- constructing a task that requires learners to notice a structure in order to complete it

Also, Rod Ellis outlines five teaching activities to develop grammatical knowledge of a problematic feature (Ellis 2002, pp. 30-31):

-Listening to Comprehend: Students listen to comprehend a text that has been structured to contain several examples of the target form

-Listening to notice: Students listen to the same text again but are given a gap-fill exercise. The target form is missing and the students simply fill it in exactly as they hear it to help them notice the form.

-Understanding the grammar point: With help from the teacher, the students analyze the data and "discover" the rule.

-Checking: Students are given a written text containing errors and are asked to correct them

-Trying it: Students apply their knowledge in a production activity

Ellis warns that this is not designed to develop implicit knowledge, but simply to develop awareness of grammar, which -- when supplemented with other forms of input and communicative tasks -- may aid in the eventual acquisition of implicit knowledge. Learners should be taught grammar through noticing which involves paying attention to the form and meaning of certain language structures in the input, so internalization of the rule is constructed.

"We do not actually try to influence the construction of the network (implicit knowledge) because learners can only do it themselves. We cannot implant rules into that network. Learners extract from the available information around them the regularities that form into their knowledge system." (Rayan, 2001: 202)

The teacher draws learners' attention to the target forms via implicit instruction that is based on an inductive approach and the possibility of using mother tongue in clarification and concept checking. So the learners analyze the provided text and synthesized a rule in scaffolding way. Then the teacher rehearses the target forms through drills and highlighting to draw attention to a certain structure. The teacher asks comprehension questions and constructs exercise that requires learner to notice a structure and complete it from a communicative productive way. In addition, the teacher stimulates a group discussion of the rule. The comprehension of the grammatical rules is verified by gap-filling exercises and providing the learners a chance to analyze the data and the correct rule in the feedback stage. The learners should apply their knowledge in production activities in pairs then individualistically.

Traditional grammar instruction is based on rote memorization, worksheets, workbooks, online practice, and grammar drills. Pedagogically traditional grammar instructions aim at improving students' writing and empowering them to understand the inner-workings of the English language. The key three powerful ways to empower students by teaching traditional grammar through reading and writing in context through authentic experiences with reading and writing are providing models. Modeling is good for applying grammar in writing. When students examine examples of what they are going to be writing, they have a deeper understanding of expectations, they can mimic the experts, and they are more likely to take risks with their writing. It is just plain good practice to provide students with mentor texts. The focus of mentor texts lies on form and overall language; however, moving the focus even deeper to examining the constructs of grammar will empower students to understand the language the author is using (Anderson & La Rocca, 2017). However, the research shows that the most effective method of teaching grammar is to give students the time and space to see language, use language, revise and edit language, and strengthen language through writing. To formalize my grammar teaching through writing, students should learn the grammar rules in a context that matters

and proofreading lists. When they make the correction, their writing becomes clearer and stronger, and the proofreading list gives them the language to identify the rule behind their revisions.

Proofreading list is useful to apply feedback and use grammar as a tool to improve meaningful writing (Dorfman and Diane, 2014).

10. The Grammar as Choice Pedagogy

Traditionally grammar is viewed as rules and correctness. It focuses on being explicit about how language works, and about how different language choices construct meanings in different contexts, using the correct grammatical terminology as part of that explicitness. Effective pedagogy for writing should include explicit grammar teaching which the basic creative form shapes written text is. Grammar choice helps students implement grammar in writing. Functionally-oriented thinking of grammar emphasizes the notion of grammar as choice entailing the goal of teaching is to support students' understanding of the crucial relationship between grammatical choice and meaning-making, to enable them to make choices from among a range of linguistic resources, and to be aware of the effects of different choices on the rhetorical power of their writing (Lefstein 2009, 382). The pedagogic approach is the importance of making connections for learners between a grammatical choice and how it subtly shapes or shifts meaning in their own piece of writing: in direct contrast to a traditional view of teaching grammar as a system with a set of grammatical terms in the hope that students will somehow connect the analysis of language to the production of it (Vande Kopple 1998, 5). To support teachers in implementing this pedagogy, LEAD Principles are created as a way of framing planning and teaching(Myhill, Watson, and Newman (2020). The LEAD Principles are:

Link: Make a link between the grammar being introduced and how it works in the writing being taught connecting grammar and writing; a functionally-oriented meaning-making

Example: Explain the grammar through examples, not lengthy explanations; teaching grammar-writing links explicitly.

Authenticity: Use examples from authentic texts to link writers to the broader community of writers showing student writers the grammar choices published writers make (and building the reading-writing links)

Discussion: Build-in high-quality discussion about grammar and its effects fostering metalinguistic understanding through dialogic talk

The LEAD Principles promote student learning about how written texts craft and shape meaning, not only at the lexical level of vocabulary choices but also a phrase, clause, sentence, and text levels.

11. Focus on Form Perspective

Long and Robinson (1998) classified focus on form into two major types: reactive and pre-emptive. Reactive focus on form happens when learners produce an utterance containing an actual non-target utterance, which is then addressed usually by the teacher but sometimes by another learner. Thus, it supplies learners with negative evidence. Reactive focus on form involves negotiation and is triggered by something problematic on the part of a learner. Reactive focus on form addresses a performance problem that may or may not reflect a competence problem. According to Varonis & Gass (1985), the discourse in reactive focus on form takes the form of sequences involving a trigger, an indicator of a problem, and a resolution. According to Ellis et al (2001), pre-emptive focus on form deals with a problem similar to reactive focus on form. Pre-emptive focus on form involves the teacher or learner initiating attention to form even though no actual problem in production has happened (Ellis et al., 2001b). In other words, pre-emptive focus on form addresses an actual or a perceived gap in the learners' knowledge. According to Varonis & Gass (1985), the type of discourse that takes place in pre-emptive focus on form consists typically of exchanges involving a query and response. Some instances of pre-emptive focus on the form will make this distinction clear. Teachers sometimes predict a gap in their learners' knowledge and seek to address it. Teachers take time out from focusing on meaning to address a perceived gap in the learners' lexical knowledge. Although such decisions interrupt the flow of communicative activity and disrupt the meaning-centeredness of activity, they highlight a specific form, assuming that this is justified on the grounds that the form in question will be problematic to the learners in some way. Teacher-initiated focus on form is initiated either by a query directed at the learner or by an advisory statement (Ellis,2002). One of the problems of such teacher-initiated pre-emption is that the perceived gap may not be an actual gap (Ellis *et al.*, 2001b). In learner-initiated pre-emptions; however, the gap is presumably real. Another important concept used in this study is uptake. In a series of studies, Lyster uses it to refer to learners' responses to the feedback they receive from teachers on their own efforts to communicate. Lyster and Ranta (1997, p. 49) have provided the following definition: "Uptake refers to a learner's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspect of the learner's initial utterance." Whereas Lyster and Ranta have related uptake to the provision of corrective feedback, Ellis *et al.* (2001a, 2001b, 2002) take a broader perspective on the uptake.

12. Data Analysis

The data are collected from the meaning-focused activities and teaching grammatical rules. A mini-size MP3 wireless recorder is employed to record whole-class interactions between the teachers and their students. This procedure provided data relating to any interaction involving the teachers and the whole class. Therefore, interactions between learners in pairs or between the teachers and individual learners in pair works are not audible, and thus not captured for analysis. All the analyzed data and quantification are solely based on the recorded interactions between the teachers and their learners which are audible to all of the learners and thus recoverable for the researchers. Using this method and during 20 sessions of instruction, the researchers collect 30 hours of classroom instruction, 10 hours from each teacher's class. In every session, the first and last 5 minutes when the teachers mostly greet and roll called the learners or give instructions for the homework or the next class, are not included in the analysis. Moreover, there is some focus on forms or grammar-oriented interactions which are also included in the analysis. To obtain a balanced rate of data for comparison, the researchers came up with 10 hours of meaning-oriented instruction per class, totaling 20 hours of naturally-occurring data in which teachers and their learners are involved in communicatively-oriented interaction on topics of general interest raised in that unit. Moreover, to collect further qualitative and confirmatory data in order to cross-check and interpret the audio-recorded data, one of the researchers is present in the class as a non-participant observer for 9 hours and takes field notes while trying to minimize any interference in the teaching process. The data are subjected to a detailed analysis, so the researchers first listened to the audio recordings, identified and then transcribed episodes in the classroom interactions in which participants made a departure from meaning-focused activities to deal with issues of methods of teaching grammar. The researchers subsequently listened to the recordings one more time to check the accuracy of their transcriptions. Afterward, raw frequencies, as well as percentages and uptake occurrences, were calculated. Since the data consisted of frequency counts of categorical data, Pearson's chi-square analysis is used. Moreover, the findings from audio-recorded data are checked and field notes from the observer are used to analyze and interpret the quantitative findings.

4. Results

4.1. Teaching Grammatical Rules in terms of Approaches

Grammar Teaching Approaches	Deductive		Inductive		Grand Total
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Teacher 1	112	(33.6%)	222	(66.4%)	334
Teacher 2	56	(18.2%)	251	(81.8%)	307
Total	168	(26.2%)	473	(73.8%)	641

Table 1 Teaching Grammatical Rules in terms of Approaches

The table1 shows the frequencies and percentages of teaching grammatical rules in terms of approaches in general and between two teachers in particular. In general, 168 (26.2%) instances of deductive approach occurred while there were 473 instances (73.8%) of inductive approach. Thus, the frequency of inductive approach is remarkably more than deductive approach. Regarding the proportion of deductive and inductive approaches, the first and second teachers applied the inductive approach more than deductive approach. i.e., 222 and 251 respectively. The findings represent a substantial discrepancy in the frequency of deductive and inductive approaches. A Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant difference, $X^2 = 19.34$ (1df, $p < .05$).

4.2. Correlating Focus on Form with Meaning in Structural Pattern

Focus on Form Approach	Focus on Form		Meaning in Structural Patterns	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Teacher 1	179	(80.6%)	43	(19.4%)
Teacher 2	219	(87.2%)	32	(12.8%)
Total	398	(84.1%)	75	(15.9%)

Table 2 Correlating Focus on Form with Meaning in Structural Patterns

The results of focus on form with meaning in structural patterns are presented in Table 2. Focusing on form is more than constructing meaning in general, namely 398 (84.1%) and (15.9%). Chi-square analysis shows a statistically significant difference, $X^2 = 3.87$ (1df, $p < .05$). Moreover, the second teacher focuses on form more than the second one, whereas, the second teacher focuses on constructing slightly more than the first one.

4.3. Using of Reactive and Pre-emptive Types of Focus on Form

Reactive and Pre-emptive Types of Focus on Form	Reactive	Pre-emptive	
	Frequency	Frequency	Percentage
Teacher 1	334	71	(17.5%)
Teacher 2	307	44	(12.5 %)
Total	641	115	(15.2%)

Table 3 Using of Reactive and Pre-emptive types of Focus on Form

The last research question in this study dealt with using of reactive and pre-emptive types of focus on form, Table 3 presents the number of all reactive and pre-emptive used in English class. The use of reactive and pre-emptive frequency is 334 and 71 (17.5%) for teacher 1. Whereas, it is 307 and 115(12.5%) for teacher 2. Chi-square analysis did not show any significant difference between the use of reactive and pre-emptive in teachers one and two, $X^2 = 3.63$ (1df, $p < .05$).

12.1 Discussion

The purpose of this study is to examine incidental focus on form as it arose naturally in the course of meaning-focused Unlock textbook involving students studying English as an intensive English course in the Saudi Arabia context. The 30 hours of evaluation of teaching English grammar methods from focus on form instruction perspective on Unlock Textbook. The deductive and inductive approaches are 168 and 473 respectively demonstrating a big difference in favor of inductive approach. The correlating focus on form with meaning in structural patterns is 398 and 75 respectively demonstrating a big difference in favor of meaning in structural patterns. Using of reactive and pre-emptive types of focus on form is 641 and 115 respectively demonstrating a big difference in favor of reactive. In a similar study, Ellis *et al.* (2001b) identified 448 instances of focus on form in an ESL context (New Zealand) with language learners from multiple nationalities mostly East Asian. Also, Lyster (1998b) reports 558 responding FFEs of immersion instruction. Lyster, however, only examined reactive LREs. Oliver (2000) found 614 teacher responses to erroneous learner turns (i.e., reactive focus on form) in four meaning-centered ESL lessons (two with adults and two with students). In the present study, the overall occurrence of focus on form is not as frequent as it is in Ellis *et al.* (2001b), Lyster (1998b), and Oliver (2000). However, the differences do not seem to be outstanding. The overall focus on form frequency in this study indicates that there are a substantial number of LREs in the observed lessons. Both teachers tried to

integrate focus on form instruction and meaning-oriented learning in their teaching. Focus on form is found to be a common occurrence in this EFL class. As Loewen (2004a) observed, currently there is little guidance for teachers regarding the optimal number of LREs in a meaning-focused lesson. Decisions about focusing on form in an activity may hinge on how comfortable the teacher and learners are with the frequency of it. This study has not directly addressed the optimal frequency of LREs but offers a descriptive picture of the amount of focus on form in an EFL class. As in ESL and immersion contexts, incidental focus on form occurred frequently in this EFL context. However, there are some differences in the distribution of reactive and pre-emptive. The first research question is concerned with the methods of teaching grammar. Based on the findings in Table 1, this study has revealed that inductive approach is more applicable than deductive approach. The second research question is about focusing on form that occurs in a meaning-centered and correlates form with meaning structural patterns. Table 2 shows that focusing on meaning in structural patterns is more applicable than focus on form. The third question is concerned with the use of reactive and pre-emptive types of focus on form. Table 3 shows that reactive type of focus on form is more applicable than pre-emptive type of focus on form. It means that in all of the observed lessons, both teachers and learners felt the need to raise attention to linguistic forms while there was not any actual error. The equal rate of reactive and pre-emptive in Ellis *et al.* (2001b) contrasts sharply with the findings of this study.

Williams (1999) in her study of learner-generated focus on form in the context of collaborative group work found that the learners did initiate focus on form but not very often. In contrast, Ellis *et al.* (2001b) reported that the majority of pre-emptive LREs in their study were learner-initiated in both classes they observed (76 out of 99 in class 1, and 89 out of 126 in class 2). In light of the following empirical and theoretical studies in the literature, the findings show that teachers' attitude is to the use of incidental focus on form. It is likely that some teachers regard incidental focus on form as an effective means of addressing linguistic items within meaning-focused lessons, and therefore incorporate it frequently into their lessons (Borg, 1998). On the other hand, other teachers may not opt to raise issues of linguistic form in meaning-focused activities on the grounds that it may disrupt the flow of communication. As Lyster and Ranta (1997) have pointed out, these teachers may fear that the side shows involving focus on form may damage conversational coherence. Furthermore, Ellis *et al.* (2002) maintain that teachers probably vary enormously in the extent to which they engage in teacher-initiated focus on form, reflecting their orientation to a communicative task. On the other hand, Mackey *et al.* (2004) demonstrated that experienced ESL teachers used more incidental focus on form techniques than inexperienced teachers, and inexperienced teachers are less likely to deviate from their planned lessons to exploit spontaneous learning opportunities mostly in the form of preemptive LREs.

13. Conclusions

Based on data analysis, the study finds out the following:

- Teaching English grammar in Unlock textbook using an inductive approach is pedagogically effective and it activates class interaction.
- Focusing on meaning in structural patterns plays a crucial in students' absorption of the grammatical rules practically.
- Applying a reactive type of focus on form raises attention to linguistic forms excluding actual error occurrence and it maximizes accuracy in writing.
- Teaching grammar assists learners internalize the structures and rules of the English language.
- Excessive practice of English grammar focusing on form with meaning facilitates accuracy in regard of correct use of language and fluency.

13.1 Recommendations

In the light of these findings the study recommends the following:

- English teachers should teach grammar using inductive approach and learner centeredness to enhance class interactivity, engagement and minimize teacher talking time, and maximize student talking time.
- English teachers should provide learners with excessive practice to facilitate accuracy and fluency through controlled and semi-controlled activities or practice of grammar through communicative tasks and fluency-oriented activities.
- English teachers should activate consciousness-raising to equip learners with an understanding of a specific grammatical feature, to develop declarative (describing a rule of grammar and applying it in pattern practice drills) rather than procedural (applying a rule of grammar in communication) knowledge of it.
- English teachers should focus on form-focused activities and applying the reactive type of focus on form raises attention to linguistic forms to maximizes accuracy in writing.

Acknowledgment: The author extends his appreciation to the Deanship of Scientific Research at King Khalid University for funding this work through General Research Project under grant number (project number: 68 /year: 2022).

Funding: This research received no external funding.

References

- [1] Alderson, J.C., and Banerjee J., (2001) Impact and washback research in language testing, in C. Elder, A. Brown, E. Grove, K. Hill, N. Iwashita, T. Lumley, T. McNamara and K. O'Loughlin (Eds.), *Experimenting with uncertainty: Essays in honor of Alan Davies* (150 – 161). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [2] Anderson, J., & La Rocca, W. (2017). *Patterns of Power: Inviting Young Writers into the Conventions of Language Grades 1-5*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.
- [3] Borg, S. (1998). Teachers' pedagogical systems and grammar teaching: A qualitative study. *TESOL Quarterly* 32, 9–38.
- [4] Brown, D. (1994). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Regents.
- [5] Cohen, A. D. (1994). *Assessing language ability in the classroom*. Second edition. New York: Heinle and Heinle.
- [6] Cortazzi, M. & Jin, L. (1996). This way is very different from Chinese ways: EAP needs and academic culture in T. Dudley-Evans & M. Hewings (Eds.), *Evaluation and Course Design in EAP* (205-216). London: Macmillan.
- [7] Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and Second Language Instruction* (206–25). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Dorfman, L, and Diane D (2014). *Grammar Matters: Lessons, Tips & Conversations Using Mentor Texts, K-6*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- [9] Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp.114– 138). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [10] Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.), (1998a). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [11] Elley WB (1994) Grammar teaching and language skill. In: Asher R (ed
- [12] Ellis, R. (2001). Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning*, 51(1), 1-46.
- [13] Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7(3). Retrieved on April 10, 2006, from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/sept_05_re.pdf
- [14] Gann M (1984) Teaching grammar: is structural linguistics really better? *English Quarterly* 17: 31-53.
- [15] Gass, S. and Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [16] Handoyo P. W. (2006) Approaches and procedures for teaching grammar,
- [17] Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 541-577.
- [18] Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- [19] Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press
- [20] Leeser, M. J. (2004). Learner Proficiency and Focus on Form during Collaborative Dialogue. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(1), 55-81.
- [21] Lightbown, P. (1998). *The importance of timing in focus on form*. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (177– 196). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- [22] Loewen, S. (2004a). Uptake in incidental focus on form in meaning-focused ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 54, 153-188.
- [23] Loewen, S. (2004b). The occurrence and characteristics of student-initiated focus on form. In H. Reinders, H. Anderson, MHobbs, & J. Jones-Parry, (Eds.), *Supporting independent learning in the 21st century. Proceedings of the inaugural conference of the Independent Learning Association* (pp. 86-93). Auckland: *Independent Learning Association Oceania*. Retrieved on April 16, 2005 from http://www.independentlearning.org/ila03/ila03_loewen%20.pdf
- [24] Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [25] Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In C. Ritchie, T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of Language Acquisition, vol. 2. Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 413-468). Academic Press, New York.
- [26] Long, M., Inagaki, S., & Ortega, L. (1998). The role of implicit negative feedback in SLA: *Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish*. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82, 357–371.
- [27] Long, M., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: *Theory, research, and practice*. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (15-41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [28] Lyster, R. (2002). The importance of differentiating negotiation of form and meaning in classroom interaction. In P. Burmeister, T. Piske, & A. Rohde (Eds.), *An integrated view of language development: Papers in honor of Henning Wode* (pp.381-397). Trier, Germany: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.
- [29] Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 399-432.
- [30] Poole, A. (2005). The kinds of forms learners attend to during focus on form instruction: *A description of an advanced ESL*
- [31] Ruday, S. (2013). Five Recommendations for Teaching Common Core Grammar to Elementary Students. *Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education*.
- [32] Schmidt, R. (2001). *Attention*. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (3–32). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [33] Sheen, Y. H. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8, 263-300
- [34] Shehadeh, A. (2003). Learner output, hypothesis testing, and internalizing linguistic knowledge. *System*, 31, 155-71
- [35] Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In: Doughty, C., Williams, J. (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 64–81). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [36] Swain, M. (2000). *The output hypothesis and beyond: mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue*. In Lantolf, J. (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97–114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.