The Effect of Teaching Grammar through Consciousness-Raising Tasks on High School English Learners' Grammatical Proficiency

Hamed Badpa[*1], Zahra Mardani[2]

[1] PhD. Student in TEFL, Department of English Language and Literature, Arak University, Arak, Iran

[2] MA. Student in TEFL, Department of English, Shahreza Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahreza, Iran

[1] *Corresponding Author's Email: hamedbadpa1377@gmail.com

[2] Email: zaahramardaniii@gmail.com

KEY TERMS

Grammar

Explicit Knowledge

Implicit Knowledge

Consciousness-raising Task

Practice Stage

ARTICLE TYPE

Original Research Paper

ABSTRACT

This quasi-experimental study investigates the impact of teaching grammar through indirect consciousness-raising tasks. To this end, sixty-six male intermediate-level students of four intact classes at a public high school in Dashtestan, Bushehr, Iran, participated in the study. Two standardized pretests were administered to further ensure learners' homogeneity. Two classes formed two experimental groups receiving grammar consciousness-raising tasks, and the other two classes formed two control groups receiving traditional grammar lessons. Considering the first research question, pre-test and post-test mean values of the second-grade experimental group as well as the third-grade experimental group's pre-test and post-test mean values obtained through independent sample t-test indicated that consciousness-raising tasks were effective enough to help subjects make significant progress. Regarding the first research question, although the mean score of the second-grade experimental group was higher than the mean score of the control group, this difference was not significant. In the case of third-grade experimental and control groups values on the post-test respectively, CR task grammar instruction was more significantly effective than traditional grammar instruction.

1. Introduction

English occupies an important position in educational programs. Consequently, the country has implemented the teaching of the English language at various levels of education. English language has a significant importance in communication (Badpa, et al., 2023). The way of teaching English has been constantly changing through time. New methods have been designed to improve the process of teaching and learning. In the history of target language teaching the role of grammar has been an issue of controversy (Richards & Renandya, 2002). Grammar, known as the science of language, is an

essential component of language learning, which is a complex activity (Jasmina & Farmonovna, 2023). Although various approaches have been proposed to teach grammar, the inductive and deductive approaches are the best known due to their unique characteristics for teaching grammar effectively (Badpa, 2024). As many students have no experience of situational learning and therefore struggle to construct new sentences on their own, teachers continue seek their active participation in the lesson and help them to construct new sentences following the rules taught to them (Kim & Won, 2020).

The first approach is reflected in the grammar translation method and cognitive code learning while the second attitude is reflected in the natural approach and the strong version of communicative language teaching. In other words, target language educators have alternated between teaching approaches. Research suggests that empirical evidence helps in selecting methodologies for teaching grammar (Munir et al., 2023).

With the emergence of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the 80s, language instruction focusing on grammatical forms had been discouraged due to the assumption that the target language learners proceed in a fashion similar to the first language learners (Krashen, 1985). In first language acquisition, input is crucial in providing what is termed positive evidence. This refers to utterances that give the learner unconscious knowledge of what the language allows (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). Therefore, this notion became popular that instruction in the classroom should focus on providing a variety of comprehensible input. The grammar of any language is determined by its structure and system, which are expressed in syntax and morphology (Badpa, 2024).

In the field of English language teaching, there has been a debate on the appropriateness of different methods and techniques used by language teachers and scholars to teach grammar. The grammar debate has largely preoccupied theorists and practitioners. Nassaji and Fotos (2004) have argued that this focus has been motivated in part by discussions in the field of cognitive psychology over the role of explicit versus implicit language learning and whether such learning occurs through conscious manipulation of information or primarily through unconscious processes.

Grammar teaching has always been one of the most controversial issues in English language teaching (ELT) depending on the method or era (Brown, 2001). Some authors like Krashen (1997) deny the role of teaching in the acquisition of grammatical features, while current views agree on the importance of consciousness-raising tasks (CR TASK) which is the subcategory of form-focused-instruction. The rationale for the use of CR TASK is related to explicit knowledge as a facilitator for the acquisition of implicit knowledge. It is also supported by the cognitive psychological opinion that learning is more effective if it involves greater depth of processing like what is done by discovery learning through problem-solving (Ellis, 2003). Moreover, CR TASK is corroborated by Schmidt's noticing hypothesis. It is worth exploring how the use of CR TASK complies with contemporary second language acquisition theories.

According to Nassaji and Fotos (2004), "The 1980s hypothesis that language can be learned without some degree of consciousness has been found theoretically problematic" (p. 127). Schmidt (2001) suggested that conscious attention to form or noticing creates an essential condition for language learning. The role of this hypothesis in interlanguage development has been advocated by several researchers (Ellis, 1993, 1994; Fotos, 1993, 1994; Fotos & Ellis, 1991). In addition, investigators such as Skehan (1998) have presented findings indicating that learners are limited language processors

who cannot process target language input for both meaning and form at the same time (cited in Nassaji & Fotos, 2004).

According to Ellis (2003), CR tasks primarily aim to trigger cognitive comparison and develop awareness at the level of understanding as well as to build an explicit representation of the targeted feature, consequently, paving the way for the integration of the target structure at a later time rather than immediate acquisition.

Mohamed (2004) found that indirect consciousness-raising was more effective than direct consciousness-raising when applied to high-intermediate ESL learners with various first language backgrounds but not to low-intermediate learners, suggesting that the proficiency of learners can determine the effectiveness of the CR task. Ellis (2003) also agrees with Mohamed that their effectiveness may be a function of learners' proficiency level, and without having this proficiency, they may not be able to benefit from a CR task. However, in a follow-up study, Mohamed (2004, p. 232) found that proficiency does not play any role in learners' task preference regarding CR. In this project, fifty-one students were studied in two groups to determine their attitudes to learning grammar by two types of CR tasks. One group was given a deductive CR task which provided explicit explanations of a grammar structure while the other group received an inductive CR task which required the learners to discover the grammar rules for themselves. Examining the two CR tasks suggests that deductive and inductive CR tasks are effective learning tools that can be used in the language classroom to make learners aware of forms where formal instruction is necessary.

Some other researchers do not consider these tasks as deductive and inductive. They attempt to find out "whether explicit knowledge acquired from the completion of the CR task aids subsequent noticing of the targeted feature" (Ellis, 2003, p. 166) and how it facilitates the acquisition of implicit knowledge. Schmidt's (1990) noticing hypothesis suggests that negative feedback helps learners to notice the gap between inter-language forms and target forms, and noticing the gap has been hypothesized to assist inter-language development. Other studies have focused on the role of consciousness-raising and noticing as corrective feedback. In line with this, Naeini (2008) focused on the role of error correction as an indication of consciousness-raising, aimed to explore the effects of form-focused instruction and feedback type on learning. The analysis of the data indicated the outperformance of the participants in the experimental group over the performance of the participants in the control group.

Consciousness-raising at the level of notice has also been the interest of the researchers who favored using first language (L1) in the classroom to facilitate second language acquisition (L2). For example, Scott and De La Fuente (2008) investigated the impact of L1 use in CR tasks and found that L1 use in a CR task led to more collaboration among dyads and more efficient language processing than in a corresponding task where only L2 was used. The findings of this study indicated that learners use the L1 even when they appear to be operating exclusively in the L2.

To investigate the effectiveness of consciousness-raising tasks versus the deductive approach as two types of form-focused instruction in teaching grammar to Iranian high school EFL learners Shokouhi (2009) conducted a study. The results of his study showed that in the short-run, CR tasks were as effective as the deductive approach in promoting the learners' grammatical knowledge while in the long-run the CR group maintained their gains more effectively than the deductive group. Along the same line, Behrouzi (2012) carried out a study to investigate the effectiveness of CR tasks on

Iranian elementary EFL learners' syntax acquisition versus traditional grammar instruction. He found that consciousness-raising tasks resulted in more significant gains in understanding the target structure than traditional grammar instruction.

Mohamed (2004, p. 229) has argued that grammar "CR tasks have not been fully researched". Hence, the evidence for the efficacy of grammar CR tasks as form-focused tasks is meager and the relevant literature is insufficient to extrapolate findings to language pedagogy. As all studies reviewed above focused on certain specific target structures, the findings are not necessarily conclusive and any attempts to generalize them are not warranted. Thus, a CR task that has been proven effective in facilitating the acquisition of one linguistic feature may not necessarily be effective when applied to other linguistic features. Perhaps, the problem is that different linguistic features have different degrees of linguistic complexity and different frequencies of occurrence in communication. The target rules that are less complex and have frequent occurrence in communication may be easier to learn and internalize, and grammar instruction is more likely to have an immediate effect; the target rules that are more complex and have less frequent occurrence in communication may pose learning difficulty, and grammar instruction seems to have a delay effect (Ellis, 1992). Therefore, the need for more research on different linguistic features and target structures is needed. Accordingly, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

RQ1. Does teaching grammar through CR tasks have any significant role in developing the grammatical proficiency of high school learners?

RQ2. Are there any significant differences between teaching grammar through CR tasks and teaching grammar through traditional approaches including practice and mother tongue explanation?

2. Methodology

2.1 Participants and Setting

Sixty-six male intermediate-level students being members of four intact classes at a public high school in Dashtestan, Bushehr, Iran, participated in the study. The intention was to put together a subject sample that was homogeneous concerning their proficiency. All the participants' language proficiency levels were determined through the Nelson Language Proficiency test of Flower and Coe (1976). The fact that the students were required to take part in the classes as a part of their school curriculum helped to achieve zero subject mortality by the end of the study. Language learners participating in this study were all native speakers of Farsi ranging in age from 16 to 17 years.

2.2 Instrumentation

To explore the answer to the research questions the researcher applied the following instruments and instructional materials:

2.2.1 Nelson English Language Test

The Nelson language proficiency test (from Cambridge Exam English.com) was administered to further ensure learners' homogeneity regarding their knowledge of grammatical structures in every grade. Every test consisted of 20 multiple-choice items and 10 gap-fill items constructed based on the

grammar points of students' textbooks. The 30-item pretest was used also as the posttest. The time allotted for the exam was 30 minutes. A reliability index of 0.70 was achieved which is, though low, considered acceptable.

2.2.1 Pre-test and Post-tests

After examining the homogeneity of the experimental and control groups through the administration of the Nelson language proficiency test, before the treatment a standardized grammar test was administered as a pretest to both groups in grade two, and another one was administered as a pretest to both groups in grade three. These tests (from Cambridge Exam English.com) were administered to further ensure learners' homogeneity regarding their knowledge of grammatical structures in every grade. Every test consisted of 20 multiple-choice items and 10 gap-fill items constructed based on the grammar points of students' textbooks. The 30-item pretest was used also as the posttest. The time allotted for the exam was 30 minutes.

2.3 Materials

2.3.1 Inductive Grammar Consciousness-Raising Tasks

Inductive grammar CR tasks used in this study were adapted from Alexander (1990) and Hopkins and Nettle (2003). These tasks met the main criteria established by Ellis (1992, 2003) and Willis, D. & Willis, J. (1996) in which the characteristics of tasks were as follows: linguistic feature isolation, provision of data illustrating the targeted feature through underlining, color-coding, boldfacing and italicizing, encouraging learners' utilizing intellectual effort to understand the targeted feature; clarification in the form of further data and explanation, and non-obligatory production.

2.3.2 Second and Third-Grade High School Books

Another source used for both the control and experimental groups was some of the grammatical points of second and third-grade high school books. Second-grade high school grammatical points chosen for the study were as follows: conditional sentence (type 1), conditional sentence (type 2), and the article "the", relative pronouns, verb+ to + verb, preposition of time, and reflexive pronouns. Third-grade high school grammatical points utilized in this study included: the gerund, verb + object + infinitive, the order of adjectives, linking verbs, present and past participles used as adjectives, and the passives. Moreover, there were different types of follow-up exercises in the textbooks that students did after each lesson.

2.4 Research Procedure

The first step in conducting this research was selecting four classes (two second-grade classes and two third-grade classes at high school level) as two pair groups: control groups and experimental groups. As mentioned earlier, the learners had one required 90-minute period plus a 45-minute make-up session in English per week. The research was conducted during the 90-minute session over nine weeks for each of the four classes. As the experiment was performed on two grades, the first session for all classes was devoted to administering the proficiency tests. A week after this proficiency test, two pre-tests containing grammatical points of second and third-grade textbooks of high school were

administered to the students of second and third grade, respectively. Then, an independent t-test was for both groups in every grade.

Students in both groups at the two levels were exposed to an instructional program over six weeks. Every weekly 90-minute class was allocated to one grammatical point except passives which received a weekly 90-minute class plus a make-up session of instruction. The control groups (CG) were instructed through the traditional approach of PPP approach (presentation, practice, and production) and the participants in the experimental groups (EG) received their instruction through CR tasks. The same procedure was used in the other five weeks of instruction. After the treatment i.e., the last session of the experiment, both pair groups were post-tested and a series of t-tests were run to determine the probable efficacy of the independent variable and to compare the experimental and control groups' performances on the post-tests.

3. Data Analysis

This section presents the analysis of the study data.

3.1 Performance of the Subjects on the General Proficiency Test

Before the treatment, to observe whether the subjects enjoyed the same level of English general proficiency, a Nelson English Language Test was administered to four groups. One-way ANOVA was run to compare the mean scores of four groups to make sure that the groups did not differ significantly before the treatment. Results from the One-Way ANOVA test revealed that there was not a significant difference at the $p < .05$ level among the four groups (Table 1).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of All Subjects on the Nelson General Proficiency Test

Performance	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	F	%	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Minimum
Experimental G2	20	29.70	4.44	.99	27.61	31.78	12	6	2.07	.88
Experimental G3	22	30.13	3.31	.70	28.66	31.60	4	2	3.10	.95
Control G2	10	30.10	7.76	2.45	24.54	35.65	2	1	3.33	1.14
Control G3	14	29.71	2.43	.64	28.31	31.11	11	5.5	2.16	.77

Table 2 displays the number of participants, mean value, standard deviation, and standard error of means, interval of means, and minimum and maximum scores in both experimental and control

groups for each grade. Table 2 shows that there is no statistically significant difference among groups since Sig. value is .986 which is greater than .05.

Table 2

One-way ANOVA of Groups on the Nelson general Proficiency Test

Performance	Sum Of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.90	3	.96	.049	.986
Within Groups	1226.54	62	19.78		
Total	1229.45	65			

3.2 Performance of the Subjects on the Pre-test

The homogeneity of the subjects was compared in two steps: first, the homogeneity of the experimental and control groups in the second grade, and then the homogeneity of the experimental and control groups in the third grade.

3.2.1 Performance of Two Second-Grade Classes on the Pre-test

The collected data from the pre-test were analyzed through an independent samples t-test. The homogeneity of the experimental and control groups in the second grade was the main concern.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of Groups' Performances

	Role	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Performance	Experimental G2	20	8.05	1.93	.43
	Control G2	10	8.80	2.85	.90

The group statistics are displayed in Table 3. As indicated in this table, the number of subjects in the experimental and control groups was 20 and 10, respectively. Moreover, the subjects' pre-test mean scores were 8.05 for the experimental group and 8.80 for the control group in the second-grade high school. Regarding what is displayed in this table, subjects were at the same level of language proficiency regarding the targeted grammatical points.

The independent-sample t-test for the performance of the experimental and control groups in the second grade on the pre-test is shown in Table 4. Based on the results of the two groups, it was concluded that they were homogenous in terms of their grammatical ability.

Table 4

Independent-Samples T-test for the Performance of Two Classes on the Pre-test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Performance	Equal Variances Assumed	3.211	.084	-.852	28	.401	-.75	.87	-2.55	1.052
	Equal Variances Not Assumed			-.748	13.25	.467	-.75	1.00	-2.91	1.411

3.2.2 Performance of Two Third-Grade Classes on the Pre-test

The collected data from the pre-test were analyzed through another independent-sample t-test. The homogeneity of both experimental and control groups in the third grade on the pre-test is the main concern. The group statistics including several subjects, mean, standard deviation, and standard error mean are shown in Table 5. As indicated in this table, the number of subjects in the experimental and control groups was 22 and 14, respectively. The subjects' pre-test mean scores were 6.40 for the experimental group and 6.21 for the control group in the second-grade.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics of Groups' Performances

	Role	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Performance	Experimental G3	22	6.40	1.76	.37
	Control G3	14	6.21	1.76	.470

Table 6 shows the independent-sample t-test for the third-grade pre-test performance of the experimental and control groups. Based on the results of the two groups, it was concluded that they were homogenous in terms of their grammatical ability.

Table 6

Independent-Samples T-test for the Performance of Two third Grade Classes on the Pre-test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
performance	Equal variances assumed	.004	.951	.323	34	.749	.19481	.60273	-1.03009	1.41970
	Equal variances not assumed			.323	27.853	.749	.19481	.60260	-1.03985	1.42946

3.3 Data Analysis for Research Question One

The first research question aimed to investigate the probable impact of CR tasks on learners' grammatical proficiency; the hypothesis considered for this research question was a null/no-difference hypothesis. To test the null hypothesis one of the studies that predicted CR tasks have no significant effect on the intermediate EFL learners' grammatical proficiency, a series of paired-sample t-tests were run to compare the average scores of the second and third-grade experimental groups on the pre-test and post-test. The comparison of the pre-test and post-test of the second-grade treatment group revealed a remarkable achievement in the grammatical proficiency mean scores of the participants.

Table 7

Paired Samples Statistics for the Second-Grade Experimental Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest	8.05	20	1.93	.43
	Posttest	25.05	20	3.89	.87

The paired sample statistics of this experimental group are shown in Table 7. As indicated in this Table, the mean scores of the subjects on the pre-test and post-test were 8.05 and 25.05 respectively. The results of the paired-sample t-test for the performance of the second-grade experimental group on the pre-test and post-test are shown in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 8

Paired Samples Correlations of the Second-Grade Experimental Group

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Pretest & Posttest	20	.824	.000

Sig. (2-tailed) = p-value = .000 < 0.05 = ạ

The paired samples correlation of the experimental group is displayed in table (8). The correlation is .824. If correlation is closer to number 1, two variables have more significant impact on each other. The comparison of the pre-and post-tests of the third-grade treatment group revealed a remarkable achievement in the grammatical proficiency mean scores of the participants Table 9.

Table 9

Paired-Samples T-Test for the Performance of the Second Grade Experimental Group on the Pre & Posttests

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pretest - Posttest	-17.00	2.55	.57	-18.19	-15.80	-29.76	19	.000

The paired sample statistics of this experimental group are shown in Table 10. As indicated in this table, the mean scores of the subjects on the pre-test and post-test were 6.40 and 24.27 respectively.

The results of the paired-sample t-test for the performance of the third-grade experimental group on the pre-test and post-test are shown in Tables 9 and 10.

Table 10

Paired Samples Statistics for the Third-Grade Experimental Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest	6.40	22	1.76	.37
	Posttest	24.27	22	3.66	.78

Accordingly, the results rejected null Hypothesis one of the studies that predicted CR tasks have no significant effect on the intermediate EFL learners' grammatical proficiency.

Table 11

Paired Samples Correlations of the Third-Grade Experimental Group

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Pretest & Posttest	22	.843	.000

Therefore, consciousness-raising tasks developed for the second and third-grade experimental groups were effective enough to help subjects make significant progress in their grammatical proficiency.

Table 12

Paired-Samples T-test for the Performance of the Third Grade Experimental Group on the Pre-test and Post-test

		Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-Tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of The Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pretest – Posttest	-17.86	2.37	.50	-18.91	-16.81	-35.25	21	.000

Accordingly, the results rejected null Hypothesis one of the studies that predicted CR tasks have no significant effect on the intermediate EFL learners' grammatical proficiency. Therefore, consciousness-raising tasks developed for the second and third-grade experimental groups were effective in helping the participants make significant progress in their grammatical proficiency.

The comparison of the pre-and post-tests of the second-grade control group also revealed a remarkable achievement in the grammatical proficiency mean scores of the participants.

Table 13

Paired Samples Statistics for the Second Grade Control Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Posttest	23.80	10	4.49	1.42
	Pretest	8.80	10	2.85	.90

The paired sample statistics of this control group are shown in Table 13. As indicated in this Table, the mean scores of the subjects on the pre-test and post-test were 8.8 and 23.80 respectively.

Table 14

Paired Samples Correlations of the Second Grade Control Group

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Posttest & Pretest	10	.983	.000

Sig. (2-tailed) = p-value = .000 < 0.05 = ą

As Tables 13 and 14 indicate the positive form of critical t (+26.893) is greater than 2, therefore the differences are meaningful. The second-grade control group has shown a great improvement.

The comparison of the pre-and post-tests of the third-grade control group also revealed a remarkable achievement in the grammatical proficiency mean scores of the participants.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

Needs analysis is the foundation step in designing courses (Almaiah & Alyoussef, 2019; Bernard & Zemach, 2003) and can be used for evaluating current courses for their weaknesses and strengths (Atefi Boroujeni & Moradian Fard, 2013). Through this sort of systematic collection of data specially that in the present study a mixed method was employed, a sound syllabus can be designed. While Thi-Qar University presents English for Academic Purposes course like many other universities, it seems that an on-going evaluation of the courses can have a contributing effect on the quality of courses. It has been stated that the English courses offered at Iraq Universities mostly ignore this important step and lack this stage. The theory which supports needs analysis is humanism which focuses on caring for human needs and looks for humanistic values (Seel, 2011).

The findings of the present study concerning the importance of the reading skill are in line with other researcher views such as Spector-Cohen et al. (2001) who believe in the inclusion of strategies for reading comprehension as well as linguistic forms. Furthermore, Taşçı (2007) also found similar results in the study conducted in Turkey on the students' needs. The participants viewed reading as a primary important skill. Moreover, in the Saudi context also Alsamadani (2017) stated that students prioritized reading together with speaking. The same findings are also reported by Zohoorian (2015), who conducted needs analysis in the Iranian context and found out that reading was the prominent skill. Other researchers who report the same findings are Rostami and Zafarghandi, (2014) based on whose study the main skill of concern was selected as reading by the majority of the students (85%). The reading skill was also selected as the only skill the students of law needed in the Israel context.

Unlike the findings of the present study, in Algeria listening and speaking were the most important skills according to the students' views. These findings were in line with the study conducted in Thailand by Prachanant (2012) where speaking was the most important skill. As for the speaking skill, seminar skills are also mentioned by Gillett (2016) as an important aspect for EAP courses. The findings concerning the problems in English language learning were also in line with Prachanant's (2012) study in which the participants emphasized their problems of inability in understanding foreign accents that relates to pronunciation as well as understanding vocabularies and difficult expressions.

As far as the four language skills are concerned, it can be safely concluded through the analysis of the quantitative data that reading skill was the prioritized skill followed by the speaking skill.

Moreover, it can be concluded that students suffer from their poor vocabulary as well as the complex use of Reading materials found in general and professional texts. Thus, the courses must tailor their focus on the reading and speaking skills. Also, it is concluded that more practice on pronunciation is needed which seems to be an ignored component. One of the sub skills to be focused on is 'understanding the main idea' which can be covered by instructors in their courses.

It can be inferred from the interviews that the students' needs are not limited to the campus use and they need this skill out of campus for reading English subtitles or e-books. While for the speaking skill the most important item was presenting in seminars or conferences, the students also needed it for off campus or for using the cyberspace conversation. The needs of the students for the listening skill were mainly limited to following instructions of the lecturers at campus. However, it seems that they also need it for listening to educational materials. The main concern of the students was the preparation of essays and term projects. Thus, it seems that the inclusion of complementary courses on academic writing can be helpful. It is also concluded that the students must be categorized and registered based on their proficiency levels. Moreover, having placement tests to determine the proficiency levels before sending the students to different groups can be supportive.

References

Alexander, L. G. (1990). Longman English Grammar Practice for Intermediate Students. New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited. Retrieved from http://dl.lux.bookfi.org/genesis

Almaiah, M. A., & Alyoussef, I. Y. (2019). Analysis of the effect of course design, course content support, course assessment and instructor characteristics on the actual use of E-learning system. *Ieee Access*, 7, 171907-171922. DOI: 10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2956349

Alsamadani, H. A. (2017). Needs Analysis in ESP Context: Saudi Engineering Students as a Case Study. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(6), 58-68. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.8n.6p.58

Atefi Boroujeni, S. & Moradian Fard, F. (2013). A Needs Analysis of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) Course for Adoption of Communicative Language Teaching (A Case of Iranian First-Year Students of Educational Administration). *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 2(6), 114-123.

Badpa, H. (2024). A New Perspective Towards Teaching Grammar: Inductive or Deductive? A Case Study of Iranian Elementary EFL Learners. International Journal of Language and Translation Research, 4(2), pp.29-44.

Badpa, H., Zare Behtash, P., & Zare Behtash, E. (2023). The Interrelationship between Literature and Language Teaching: Drama and Speaking. Journal of New Trends in English Language Learning (JNTELL), 1(1).

Behrouzi, P., & Kazemirad, F. (2012). The effect of consciousness-raising tasks on Iranian elementary EFL learners' syntax acquisition. International Journal Of Linguistics, 334-347.

Bernard, R., & Zemach, D. (2003). Materials for specific purposes. In B. Tomilson (Ed) *Developing materials for language teaching*. London: Gromwell Press.

Brown, H. D. (2001). Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. New-York: Longman.

Ellis, R. (1993, spring). The structural syllabus and second language acquisition. TESOL QUARTERLY, 27(1), 91-113. Retrieved from http://203.72.145.166/TESOL/TQD_2008/VOL_27_1.PDF

Ellis, R. (1994). The study of second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from http://libgen.org/get?nametype=orig&md5=CA34E1B344BEC8812FDD52DD84858ED3

Ellis, R. (2003). Task-based language learning and teaching. New York: Oxford Univesity.

Flower, W.S. & Coe, N. (1976). Nelson English Language Tests. London: Butler and Tanner Ltd.

Fotos, S. & Ellis, R. (1991). Communicative about grammar: A task-based approach. TESOL Quarterly, 25(4), 605-628. Retrieved from http://www.hpu.edu/Libraries_HPU/Files/TESOL/TQD/VOL_25_4.pdf

Fotos, S. (1993). Consciousness-raising through a focus on form: Grammar task performance versus formal instruction. Applied linguistics, 14(4), 385-407.

Fotos, S. (1994). Integrating grammar instruction and communicative language use through grammar consciousness-raising tasks. TESOL Quarterly, 28(2), 323-351.

Gillett, A. (2016). EAP management. In *The Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes* (pp. 530-546). Routledge. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315657455-48/eap-management-andy-gillett

Hopkins, D. & Nettle, M. (2003). Developing grammar in context. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: bookfi.org

Jasmina, T., & Farmonovna, O. N. (2023). Modern ways of teaching English to school students. Journal of New Century Innovations, 27(1), 64-

Kim, J., & Won, E. (2020). Effects of inductive and deductive grammar instruction based on the noun phrase accessibility hierarchy: On Korean EFL middle school students. Language & Literature, 46, 169-197.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Pergamon Press Inc. Retrieved from http://dl.lux.bookfi.org/genesis/494000/bded8d96dba887e103f7b79f4f110acb/_as/%5BStephen_D._Krashen%5D_Principles_and_Practice_in_Se(BookFi.org).pdf

Krashen, S. D. (1997). Foreign language education. Culver: Language Education Association.

Mohamed, N. (2004). Consciousness-raising tasks: A learner perspective. ELT, 58(3), 228-237. Retrieved from http://203.72.145.166/ELT/files/58-3-2.pdf

Munir, N., Ahmad, M. B., & Bhatti, H. (2023). Challenges in teaching grammar to secondary school English learners in district Vehari. Global Language Review, 8(2), 31-43.

Naeini, J. (2008). Error correction: An indication of consciousness-raising. Novitas Royal, 2(2), 120-137. Retrieved from http://novitasroyal.org/naeini.pdf

Nassaji, H & Fotos, S. (2004). Current developments in research on the teaching of grammar. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24, 126-145. doi:DOI: 10.1017/S0267190504000066

Nassaji, H. & Fotos, S. (2011). Teaching grammar in second language classrooms: Integrating form-focused instruction in a communicative context. New York: Routledge.

Nassaji, H. (2000). Towards integrating form-focused instruction and communicative interaction in the second language classrooms: Some pedagogical possibilities. The Modern Language Journal, 241-250. Retrieved from http://libgen.org/scimag/get.php?

Prachanant, N. (2012). Needs analysis on English language use in tourism industry. *ProcediaSocial and Behavioral Sciences*, 66, 117-125. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.253

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2002). Methodology in language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rostami, F., & Zafarghandi, A. M. (2014). EAP needs analysis in Iran: The case of university students in chemistry department. *Journal of language Teaching and Research*, 5(4), 924. doi:10.4304/jltr.5.4.924-934

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. Applied Linguistics, 11(2), 129-158. Retrieved from http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/PDFs/SCHMIDT

Schmidt, R. (1993). Awareness and second language acquisition. Annual Review Of Applied Linguistics, 206-226. Retrieved from http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/PDFs/SCHMIDT%20Awareness%20and%20second%20language%20acquisition.pdf

Schmidt, R. (1994). Deconstructing consciousness is search of useful definitions for applied linguistics. In J. H. Hulstijn, & R. Schmidt (Eds.), Consciousness in second language learning (pp. 11-27). AILA Review.

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. Retrieved from nflrc.hawaii.edu/.../SCHMIDT

Schmidt, R. (2010). Attention, awareness, and individual differences in language learning. In S. C. W. M. Chan, J. Istanto, M. Nagami, J. W. Sew, T. T. Suthiwan, & I. Walker, Proceedings of CLaSIC (pp. 721-737). Singapore: National University of Singapore. Retrieved from

http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/PDFs/SCHMIDT%20Attention,%20awareness,%20and%20individual%20differences.pdf

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

Scott, V. M., and De la Fuente, M. J. (2008). What is the problem? L2 learners' use of the L1 during consciousness-raising form-focused tasks. The Modern Language Journal, 92(1), 100–113. Retrieved from http://www.gwu.edu/~rgsll/spanish/spanishfaculty/delafuente2008.pdf

Seel, N. M. (Ed.). (2011). *Encyclopedia of the Sciences of Learning*. Springer Science & Business Media. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6

Shokouhi, A. H. (2009). Consciousness-raising tasks versus deductive approach: Two form-focused instruction types in teaching grammar to Iranian high school EFL learners. Journal of Education, 4(4), 51-70. Retrieved from http://dro.deakin.edu.au/eserv/DU:30045975/shokouhi-consciousnessraising-2009.pdf

Skehan, P. (1998). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. Applied Linguistics, 17(1), 38-62. Retrieved from http://mafrashab.persiangig.com/.nxWIvKRo45/document/A%20framework%20for%20the%20implementation%20of%20task-based%20instruction.pdf

Spector-Cohen, E., Kirschner, M., & Wexler, C. (2001). Designing EAP reading courses at the university level. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20(4), 367-386. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00019-3

Taşçi, Ç. (2007). *An analysis of medical students' English language needs* (Masters' thesis). Retrieved from http://www.thesis.bilkent.edu.tr/0003344.pdf

Willis, D. & Willis, J. (1996). Consciousness-raising activities. Retrieved from www.willis-elt.co.uk/documents/7c-r.do

Zohoorian, Z. (2015). A needs analysis approach: An investigation of needs in an EAP context. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(1), 58-65. http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0501.07

Appendix 1

Table 7

Frequencies and Percentages of the Items on the students' attitudes and preferences

Item	Strongly disagree		disagree		Not sure		Agree		Strongly agree	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Q1	0	0	1	.5	9	4.5	84	42	106	53
Q2	0	0	1	.5	13	6.5	123	61.5	63	31.5
Q3	14	7	150	75	28	14	6	3	2	1
Q4	1	.5	3	1.5	6	3	54	27	136	68
Q5	0	0	2	1	10	5	170	85	18	9
Q6	1	.5	0	0	11	5.5	43	21.5	145	72.5
Q7	3	1.5	3	1.5	22	11	155	77.5	17	8.5
Q8	0	0	0	0	15	7.5	37	18.5	148	74
Q9	0	0	0	0	10	.5	104	52	86	43
Q10	1	.5	0	0	9	4.5	105	52.5	85	42.5
Q11	0	0	0	0	21	10.5	121	60.5	58	29
Q12	1	.5	3	1.5	32	16	119	59.5	45	22.5
Q13	1	.5	0	0	35	17.5	115	57.5	49	24.5
Q14	0	0	0	0	12	6	111	55.5	77	38.5
Q15	0	0	93	46.5	55	27.5	34	17	18	9
Q16	0	0	2	1	11	5.5	53	26.5	134	67
Q17	1	.5	1	.5	9	4.5	118	59	71	35.5
Q18	0	0	1	.5	7	3.5	113	56.5	79	39.5
Q19	1	.5	0	0	13	6.5	94	47	92	46
Q20	11	5.5	32	16	110	55	47	23.5	0	0
Q21	6	3	40	20	40	20	112	56	2	1