Junior High school Students' Perceptions and Progress: Focus-on-Form VS. Focus-on-Forms Grammar Instruction

Shahla Heidarzade[1]*, Fatemeh Behjat[2], Ehsan Hadipourfard[3]

Abstract

Introduction: Recent studies suggest that focus-on-form (F-on-F) instruction has a positive effect on EFL students' language proficiency. However, few have looked at learners' perspectives on F-on-F instruction, particularly in an Iranian context. This study investigates the students' perceptions and progress towards F-on-F and F-on-Fs in grade eight high schools' learners of Iran.

Methodology: The present study was a mixed-methods research. In the quantitative phase of the study, two types of variables were involved. The independent variables were F-on-F, reactive and preemptive strategies, and F-on-Fs instruction, and the dependent variables were students' knowledge of grammar. The quantitative data was numerical based on the learners' performance in pre-test and post-test after receiving eight sessions of instruction. It included a qualitative phase as well. The qualitative phase of the research was done based on a semi-structured interview that was conducted after the treatment on grammar acquisition of F-on-F and F-on-Fs groups. As the researchers did not have access to the male students, the participants of this study were 60 EFL female junior high school students from Daneshgah Shiraz High school, which is located in Shiraz, Iran. They were at the age range of 15 to 16. To make sure that the criterion of homogeneity is met, the Independent Samples t- test employed to reveal that the two groups were homogeneous.

Findings: The findings show that there were positive attitudes among students towards F-on-F instruction in contrast to F-on Fs in learning grammar tenses. As it was a mixed method research, the results showed significant difference between the effect of the two strategies with the Focus-on-Form group outperforming the Focus-on-Forms group as well.

Keywords: EFL, Focus on Form (F-on-F), Focus on Forms (F-on-Fs), grammar instruction, learners' perceptions

[1] - Department of English Language, Shi. C. Islamic Azad university, Shiraz, Iran.
[2] - Department of English Language, Ab. C. Islamic Azad University, Abadeh, Iran* Corresponding Author: Fatemeh.Behjat@iau.ac.ir
[3] - Department of English Language, Shi. C., Islamic Azad University, Shiraz, Iran

Introduction

Finding a way on how to teach grammar has been the focus of investigation in the field of foreign language acquisition. Actually, by considering other research areas, teaching grammar has gained considerable amount of empirical research in foreign language acquisition (Borg & Burns, 2008).

The essence of F-on-F method lies on some profits that are proposed by some investigators and instructors. In practicing focus on form approach, a lesson starts with completing a communicative task. Then, the teacher tries to draw learners' attention to a grammatical point. That is, the teaching syllabus reflects the learners' 'inbuilt syllabus' (Nunan, 1998). Ellis, et al. (2001) categorized form-focused instructions into two types: F-on-Fs and F-on-F. In the first strategy, the focus is on the form, i.e. the linguistic features are attended to, but in the second one, the attention to form is taken through meaning-centered activities during a communicative task. Input enhancement technique was selected to be investigated in terms of efficiency in raising grammatical knowledge in various techniques that was introduced for this approach. The benefits of this technique were investigated through performing some focused tasks, the focus on English passive voice and was implemented in an academic EFL context to see if there is any superiority of one over the other in case of accuracy and thus acquisition of EFL grammar.

Two instructional methods, F-on-Fs and F-on-F, are compared with each other according to Long (1991). F-on-Fs instruction can be defined as a kind of traditional instruction in which the target L2 forms are taught in isolation or out of context or without any communicative activity. However, F-on-F is defined as "overtly drawing students' attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication" (Long, 1991, p 45).

There are many studies in the literature on F- on- F and F- on- Fs instruction. Ellis, et al (2001) classified form-focused instructions into two types: F-on-Fs and F-on-F. In the first type, the focus is on the form, i.e. the linguistic features are attended to but in the latter one, the attention to form is taken through meaning-centered activities during a communicative task. Among various techniques introduced for this approach, reactive and preemptive focus on form is chosen to be investigated in terms of efficiency in raising grammatical knowledge.

There are two kinds of F-on-F that can be identified whether the F-on-F is proactive (planned) or incidental; it means that they are reactive and preemptive (Long & Robinson, 1998). Reactive F-on-F arises when learners produce an utterance containing an actual or perceived error, which is then addressed usually by the teacher but sometimes by another learner (Marzban, 2012). So very simply, reactive F-on-F addresses errors (i.e. performance problems) which have emerged in the context of meaningful communication. Preemptive F-on-F, on the contrary, addresses problems which are predicted to occur and thus block communication (Baleghzade, 2010).

The effectiveness of these techniques was explored through performing some focused tasks, the focus of which was on English grammatical tips and vocabulary knowledge by different researchers such as Baleghzade (2010) and Marzban, (2012).

Based on Shintani (2013), in F-on-Fs, language is broken down into discrete elements such as words, grammar rules, notions or functions which are taught item by item in a linear, additive fashion. F-on-Fs constitutes a traditional approach to language teaching involving a linear syllabus, instructional materials and corresponding procedures which are designed to show and practice a series of linguistic items. In this type of instruction, the learners' attention is directed at linguistic form but meaning is not ignored.

Some researchers such as Rahimi Domakani (2008) underscored the significance of communication and meaning in form-focused instruction and stated that this type of instruction draws EFL students' attention to linguistic forms that might otherwise be overlooked and provides them with attentional resources that are required to acquire the target linguistic features.

Mohammadnia and Gholami (2008) demonstrated that the concept of F-on-F instruction arose from the rational belief that it paved the way for EFL students to pay attention to linguistic features in a meaningful context as they take place within a wider framework of meaning. Leeser (2004) asserted that the literature on developmental readiness suggests learners can process and use certain grammatical forms only when they have acquired less complicated structures (Lightbown, 1998; Mackey &Philp, 1998; Spada & Lightbown, 1993, 1999; Williams & Evans, 1998). This means that during communicative tasks, learners that are more proficient should be developmentally more advanced to notice and produce certain forms. The research on input processing and interaction reveals that proficiency can affect learners' processing of form in the input and the emergence of forms and structures in communicative exchanges.

Shach (2008) conducted a research on F-on-F and the overall benefits of F-on-F based on the language outcomes with advanced L2 or foreign language learners, or on the differences between form-focused and non-form-focused instruction. The study was on 78 upper-primary school children in Brunei, and showed that F-on-F tasks can be embedded in this communicative language teaching context, and that their use is perceived as effective by the children and concluded that the lessons seemed enjoyable and easy for learners. They had ability to perform well, were motivated to do more F-on-F tasks, and enjoyed the stories, illustrations and humorous cartoon characters, which also provided contextual support.

In an article, Shabani and Hosseinzadeh (2014) explored the effects of two types of F-on-F techniques, that is, teacher-initiated planned preemptive and reactive F-on-F aiming at increasing Iranian L2 learners' accuracy in and control over using third person singular -s in written narratives. The two treatments were presented as two distinct series of instructional program in which one group received a combination of teacher initiated preemptive F-on-F and pre-task planning and the other group received reactive F-on-F which included CF. The quantitative

results indicated that both types of instruction did promote accuracy similarly in using the target form. Moreover, the effects of teacher-initiated planned preemptive F-on-F have been suggested to be more stable. It can, thus, be interpreted and concluded that both techniques were equally effective in drawing attention to language, increasing accuracy, and enhancing learning, and that combining two F-on-F techniques could also result in more stability of the effects. The teachers should also consider the facilitative role that interaction between the teacher and his/her learners and among the very learners plays in performing the tasks.

In the study by Tajic, Karimi, Ramezani(2020), it was conducted that based on the occurrence of preemptive focus on form episodes (FFEs) in the classes of two male and two female English-language teachers, it aimed to explore the frequency of student-initiated and teacher-initiated FFEs as well as the uptake and no uptake moves in four classes. All cases of preemptive FFEs were identified in 6 h of instruction obtained from videotaping of four classes. Results confirmed that preemptive F-on-F does occur in the process of meaning-focused communication and that they are used by male and female teachers almost equally to deal with linguistic difficulties. The findings showed that student initiated and teacher-initiated FFEs occurred almost equally in four classes. Results can raise the awareness of ELT teachers about the benefits of employing preemptive F-on-F in the context of meaning-focused communications.

Azizpour and Alavinia (2021) selected 40 Iranian advanced EFL learners within the age range of 16-20 from a language school in Karaj, Iran. This study found that although F-on-F and F-on-Fs instruction have significant positive impacts on grammar acquisition of the subjunctive by Iranian advanced EFL learners, the students who received F-on-Fs instruction significantly outperformed the learners who were thought through F-on-F instruction. In this way, explicit instruction of the subjunctive can raise students' awareness of specific grammar rules, which can then help them notice the language forms in subsequent input. Thus, in the context of the teaching and learning the subjunctive, EFL learners' attention to detailed analysis of grammar rules facilitates comprehension and production.

The present study concerns itself with strategies which can be done to improve the quality of instruction in junior EFL high school classes. We should pool our recourses so that the students and teachers will have access to the new teaching materials. In doing so, material developers can take some action in order to improve the quality of coursebooks. The students will take advantages of the recent ways by participating in various activities which involve them in learning through different forms of instruction offered in F-on-F and F-on-Fs strategy that can improve students' knowledge of grammar.

In case of different features of F-on-F and F-on-Fs and the problematic issues that is related to foreign language education in Iran where English is learned as a foreign language in junior high schools, the aim of this study is to investigate the comparison of F-on-F instruction with F-on-Fs in the acquisition of a set of tenses by 8th grade students studying at a high school in Shiraz, Iran.

In the F-on-F instruction both reactive and preemptive instruction were used for further comparisons.

In the context of senior high schools, teachers complain that the students' knowledge of grammar is not so sufficient despite the amount of time and expense that they spend on taking part in language classes or instruction based on the pedagogy of their school schedules. It is worth exploring the relationship between F-on-Fs and F-on-F on students' knowledge of grammar.

Research Questions:

1. What are the students' perceptions on the role of Focus-on-Form and Focus-on-Forms instruction in learning grammar?

1.To what extent do Focus-on-Form and Focus-on-Forms instruction play any role in grammar performance of Iranian EFL junior high school learners?

Methodology

The present study was a mixed-methods research. In the quantitative phase of the study, two types of variables were involved. The independent variables were F-on-F, reactive and preemptive strategies, and F-on-Fs instruction, and the dependent variables were students' knowledge of grammar. The quantitative data was numerical based on the learners' performance in pre-test and post-test after receiving eight sessions of instruction. It included a qualitative phase as well. The qualitative phase of the research was done based on a semi-structured interview that was conducted after the treatment on grammar acquisition of F-on-F and F-on-Fs groups.

As the researchers did not have access to the male students, the participants of this study were 60 EFL female junior high school students from Daneshgah Shiraz High school, which is located in Shiraz, Iran. They were at the age range of 15 to 16. To make sure that the criterion of homogeneity is met, the Independent Samples *t-* test employed to reveal that the two groups were homogeneous. It is worth noting that the language learners were randomly assigned into three main groups, namely, F-on-F, reactive (Group 1N=20), F-on-F, preemptive (Group 2, N=20), and F-on-Fs (Group 3, N=20). Besides, it should be mentioned that the names of the participants were not disclosed in this study to maintain anonymity.

Randomly, forty students participated in the semi-structured interview conducted by the researcher. Twenty students were from F-on-F, reactive and preemptive groups, and twenty students were from F-on-Fs group. They were supposed to answer some questions related to these strategies in. Each interview lasted about five minutes. The answers were classified into the advantages, disadvantages and usefulness of F-on-F and F-on-Fs strategies in their grammar acquisition.

A pretest of the grammar knowledge was developed and administered by the researcher to determine the participants' knowledge of the tenses. It should be mentioned that three university professors of Applied Linguistics confirmed the content validity of the tests. Since the grammar and test was an achievement test, the content of the test was based on the subjects of instruction. After piloting the test, the reliability of the pretest was estimated using Cronbach's alpha formula. Its reliability using Cronbach's Alpha formula was 0.8587.

After eight weeks of instruction of the tenses, the same test of the tenses was administered to F-on-F reactive, F-on-F preemptive, and F-on-Fs groups as a posttest. The participants were expected to answer 30 items related to grammar knowledge.

A textbook entitled *Steps to Understanding* (Hill, L. A, 1981), in order to teach the grammar tenses, as its readability is 4 and the degree of its difficulty level is almost the same as the students' textbooks. It is worth noting that this book was a collection of attractive short stories designed for students at different levels and comprised various passages with related grammar rules. The researchers selected some stories randomly. Therefore, the researchers taught the grammar tenses based on eight units of the textbook that were bolded, italicized or underlined., along with some exercises that the students were supposed to highlight for the new patterns of grammar.

To better understand the pedagogic potential of implementing F-on-F tasks at Junior high schools for EFL learners, the present study examined the attitudes and performance of students regarding F-on-F and F-on-Forms instruction.

The F-on-Fs instruction group participated in the traditional instruction in which the target L2 forms are taught in isolation without any communicative activity (Long, 1991). In the present study, through F-on-Fs, the researcher followed what Long defined F-on-Fs as involving the explicit teaching of linguistic forms based on a structural syllabus. For example, the final stage of presentation-practice-produce (PPP) involves such activities.

F-on-F instruction group that is defined as "overtly drawing students" attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication" (Long, 1991), took part in communication activities.

In order to achieve the target of this study, eight stories were chosen from the book, *Steps to Understanding* (Hill, L. A, 1981), used to teach to F-on-F group. In the F-on F-group, the tenses were taught by resorting to focus on meaning strategies, and the importance of communicative language teaching principles and authentic communication were focused. Therefore, the teacher drew language learners' attention to the tenses through accomplishing communicative activities and employed negotiation in order to assist students in recognizing the properties of the tenses in context. Thus, it is worth noting that in the F-on-F group work was used for having more interaction. Besides, the teacher provided the students with a reading passage each session and

made the tenses salient through bolding, italicizing, and underlining verbs, and before finishing the work in groups, they were supposed to highlight or underline the verbs of suggested exercises in different colors, using colored pens or highlighters.

The teacher divided the language learners into groups of five, and asked them to take notes and use their notes to write a text different from the original version. First, the students listened to the text. Second, they were asked to read the text. In reactive group the students received feedback from their peers or the teacher. Finally, the instructor asked each learner to read the new story to class for more correction and giving suggestion for improvement. The correct form of the common errors was written on the board in different colors based on the tenses.

In the preemptive group, before reading the text, the teacher gave some suggestions, wrote them on the board based on her experience and problematic errors that the students have done already. The teacher tried to explain the errors which were important and frequent on the board, and called the learners' attention not to commit in their stories.

In the F-on-Fs group there was no focus on meaning strategy and the teacher taught the tenses by explicit explanation on the board. To this end, the teacher taught the tenses based on, presentation, practice, and production. Thus, she provided the language learners with an explanation of the tenses and noted that the tenses are, present, present continuous, and past regular and irregular. The students in different groups took part in grammar pre- and post- tests to check their grammar progress in the quantitative part of the study.

Research Findings

The first Research Question is: What are the students' perceptions on the role of F-on-F and F-on-Fs instruction in grammar acquisition?

In order to answer the research question, a semi-structural interview was conducted. 40 students were interviewed. Twenty students were from F-on-F group. Twenty students were from F-on-Fs group. The following tables show the summary, and content analysis of the interviews in case of grammar acquisition.

Table 1. Content Analysis of Focus-on-Form Approach: Advantages

Themes	Frequencies	percentage	Concept	Frequencies	percentage
Amusing exciting stories	11	61.11	amusing	3	17.65
			Exciting, sweet, interesting	4	23.53
			Not boring	2	11.76
			motivating	1	5.88
Group-learning	5	27.78	Group learning	3	17.65
			Student-centered	1	5.88

			Peer-correction	1	5.88
highlighting	2	11.11	highlighting	2	11.76

Based on Table 1, 17% of the students stated it was amusing, 23% said it was exciting, sweet and interesting, 11% not boring and 5% motivating. 17% said they learn better through group learning, 5% said it was student-centered and 5% with the benefit of peer- correction. 11% of them enjoyed highlighting in different colors for learning tenses. Two students reported it has no advantages.

Some advantages are reported here based on what students exactly said.

Student A said, "Stories made me amused and I will be involved in learning through F-on-F strategy, particularly when the stories are exciting''.

Student B said, "My classmates help me and correct my mistakes when I learn grammar in groups and try to reconstruct the story, I will be motivated to use the new grammar pattern in my stories''.

Student C said, "Highlighting increase my concentration and when I highlight the present and past tenses in opposite colors, I learn them''.

Student D said, "learning through F-on-F strategy makes me more active and it is not boring''.

Table 2. Content Analysis of Focus-on-Form Approach: Disadvantages

Themes	Frequencies	percentage	Concept	Frequencies	percentage
Not teacher-centered	4	40	Student- centered	4	40
Time- consuming	3	30	Time- consuming	2	20
			Take students' time	1	
Making noise of group work	2	20	Noise	1	10
			dull	1	
Lack of homogeneity	1	10	Different levels of students	1	10

Based on Table 2, the disadvantages are reported. 40% said F-on-F is student-centered, 20% reported it is time- consuming, 10% stated group work makes noise and is dull and also 10% said they lack homogeneity, and 10% mentioned it has different levels of language.

The students' perception in case of disadvantages are reported:

Student E said, "When the teacher explains the points and writes grammar tenses on the board herself, I learn them''.

Student F said, "F-on-F strategy takes a lot of time to get the grammar points and reconstruct the story''.

Student G said, "Group work makes a lot of noise, it is tedious and gives me a headache".

Student H said, "Some of my classmates have learnt grammar points in their language schools and can reconstruct the stories faster than me''.

Table 3. Content Analysis of Focus-on-Form Approach: Usefulness

	Frequencies	percentage
Useful	13	65
Not useful	7	35

According to Table 3, 65% of students believed that Focus on Form is useful for English grammar acquisition.

Table 4. Content Analysis of Focus-on-Forms Approach: Advantages

Themes	Frequencies	percentage	Concept	Frequencies	percentage
disciplined	5	45.45	Disciplined	5	45.45
Teacher-centered	5		Not student-centered	2	
		45.45			18.18
Not time consuming	1		Teachers' explanation is good	3	
					27.27
		9.09	Saving time	1	9.09

Based on Table 4, 18% of the students found it disciplined, 18% not student-centered. They thought that teachers' explanation on grammar is good (27%), and it doesn't take a lot of time (9%).

Some advantages are reported here:

Student I said, "F-on-Fs strategy is disciplined according to a pre-planned program that the teacher has prepared, and I learn her lesson''.

Student J said, "F-on-Fs strategy is not time consuming''.

Table 5. Content Analysis of Focus-on-Forms Approach: Disadvantages

Themes	Frequencies	percentage	Concept	Frequencies	percentage
repetitious like language institutions	2	10.53	repetitious	2	10.53
dull	4	21.05	dull	4	21.05
Not student-centered	6	31.58	Teacher-centered Not cooperation Practicing exercises	2 2 2	10.53
Time-consuming	3	15.79	Takes time	3	10.53
Not communicative	2	10.53	Not grouping	2	10.53
Hard for learning	2	10.53	hard	2	15.79

Based on Table 5, the disadvantages are reported. F-on-Fs is repetitious of what they do in language institutions (10%), dull (21%), teacher-centered, doesn't have cooperation, practicing exercises is tedious (31%) , time- consuming (15%), not communicative (10%), and it is not an easy way for learning grammar (15%).

Student K said, "F-on-Fs strategy is repetitious of what I have learned in my language school classes''.

Student L said, "In F-on-Fs strategy we do not have cooperation in learning so it is hard for me to learn grammar tenses''.

Table 6. Content Analysis of Focus- on-Forms Approach: Usefulness

	Frequencies	percentage
Useful	8	40
Not useful	12	60

According to Table 6, 60% of students believed that F-on-Fs is not useful for English grammar acquisition, whereas 40% of students found it useful.As the present study was a complementary phase of another previously published paper (Heidarzade, Behjat, & Hapipour, 2024), the result of the quantitative section is a duplication of what was reported before (p 81).

To check the homogeneity of learners, 110 students were selected. They took the OPT test, and 60 learners who were at the same level were chosen. Independent Samples Test was run, and the

mean scores of OPT between the two groups of Focus on Form and Focus on forms was shown. The findings are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Independent Samples Test on the Learners' Homogeneity

GROUP	Mean	Std. Deviation	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
			F	Sig.	t	sig
Focus on Form	18.8750	3.83096	.831	.366	1.030	.308
Focus on Forms	17.6500	5.24430				

As revealed in Table 7, the mean of OPT test in Focus on Form group is 18.8750 and the mean of OPT test in Focus on Forms group equals 17.6500. Based on the findings of Levene's Test, the equality of variances is admitted (F=0.831, p=0.366). There is no significant difference between the mean scores of OPT between the two groups.

To answer the first research question (1. To what extent do Focus-on-Form and Focus-on-Forms instruction play any role in grammar performance of Iranian EFL junior high school learners?), scores on the Focus on Form and Focus on Forms at both the pretest and posttest were summarized as descriptive statistics including mean, and standard deviation. Table 8 demonstrates the descriptive statistics summary of Focus on Form and Focus on Forms groups and compare them to determine whether any of the differences between the means are statistically significant, Mann-Whitney U Test was run to assess the null hypothesis.

Table 8. The Results of Mann-Whitney U

	GROUP	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Rank	z	sig
Pre-test	Focus on Form	24.2250	2.15416	31.49	-.628	.530
	Focus on Forms	23.8000	1.90843	28.53		
Post- test	Focus on Form	26.3500	2.65591	36.30	-3.658	.000
	Focus on Forms	22.9000	3.61139	18.90		

As the analysis of data in Table 8 shows based on Mann-Whitney U Test, in the pretest, there is no significant difference between the means of the two groups (Focus on Form and Focus on Forms) on the pretest of grammar scores (p =0.530, z=0.628). The analysis of the data revealed there is a significant difference between the means of the two groups in the posttest (p =0.000, z=3.658).

To sum up, the null hypothesis on the research question stating, Focus on Form VS. Focus on Forms instruction does not play any role in the grammar acquisition of Iranian EFL Junior high school learners is rejected.

To test the hypothesis, the Mann-Whitney U Test was calculated. As shown in table 8, and in the pre-test, there was not any significant difference between the means of the two groups in grammar test scores. It is bigger than 0.05 (p>0.05), (p-=0.530, z=0.628). However, in the post-test, there was a significant difference between the means of the two groups, and it is smaller than 0.05 (p=0.000, z=3.658). As the results of Mann-Whitney U show in Table 8, in the pretest, there is no significant difference between groups, but in the post-test, there is a significant difference between groups. Based on the result, this null hypothesis was rejected.

Discussion and Conclusion

Although Ellis (2015) pointed out that undoubtedly, in an EFL setting, intentional learning is beneficial, particularly for older students, the findings of this research revealed that F-on-F instruction is more vital for junior English language learners. Unlike Loewen (2018) who asserted that adult students are mostly accustomed to explicit learning and instruction, and they might gain more from F-on-Fs instruction, this investigation showed that junior high school learners will benefit from F-on-F instruction. In the same vein, unlike the findings of this study, Loewen (2018) asserted that while there has been a paradigm shift away from explicit instruction, recent research has shown that preemptive F-on-F instruction can be useful in improving junior high school students' grammar acquisition.

In F-on-F group teacher taught English grammar to junior high school students through making stories because the teachers' goal was to make the students communicate in a structured manner. The teacher also considered that grammar learning followed by highlighting assignments was the best method to understand and remember the grammar structure easily for this age. As stated earlier, these activities lead students' attention to grammar in activities and tasks that was enjoyable for them. The students communicatively learn grammar structure of tenses.

Considering these findings, it could be concluded that although both groups demonstrated improvement after the treatments, as shown above, the pretest and posttest of the test of grammar acquisition of the two instructional interventions F-on-F approach, and F-on-Fs approach examined to help the participants improve their grammar acquisition. But F-on-F approach showed a significant effect on grammar acquisition. The participants who received F-on-F instruction were observed to attain higher test scores compared to F-on-Fs group participants. Therefore, F-on-F instruction proved more effective than F-on-Fs instruction for the participants.

The teacher taught English grammar to junior high school students through making stories because the teachers' goal was to make the students communicate in a structured manner. The teacher also considered that grammar learning followed by highlighting assignments was the best method to understand and remember the grammar structure easily for this age. As stated earlier,

these activities lead students' attention to grammar in activities and tasks that were enjoyable for them. The students communicatively learn the grammar structure of tenses.

Findings of the study showed that grammar knowledge of grade eight students are highly influenced by F-on-F instruction. The participants received eight sessions of F-on-F instruction. It played a considerable role in the grammar acquisition of Iranian EFL Junior high school learners. Also, this research showed that in the case of grammar acquisition students improved their grammar through preemptive F-on-F significantly more than reactive F-on-F. When teacher writes some important points on the board in advance, the learners pay more attention to use them in the stories they reconstruct.

The results of this investigation are in line with Shach (2008), Mohammadnia and Gholami (2008), Othman and Ismail (2008), Shintani (2015), Soodmand Afshar (2021), Gumus (2021), Shabani and Vahidi (2023), who mentioned that attention to F-on-F instruction facilitates grammar acquisition significantly.

Furthermore, the results of this study are in contrast with the previous studies (e.g., Andrews, 2007; Dekeyser, 1995; Dorji, 2018; Lopez Diaz et al., 2019; Housen, 2005; Onalan, 2018; Robinson, 1996; Zamani et al, 2019), Rahimi Domakani (2021), and Azizpour and Alavinia (2021).

Moreover, the results of the study revealed that F-on-F approach was more effective than F-on-Fs approach for junior high school learners. Thus, F-on-F instruction of the tenses raised Iranian junior EFL learners' awareness of grammar rules and facilitated their acquisition of grammar present, and past tenses. In this case, Shakhsi Dastgahian (2021) examined three Iranian EFL teachers' incentives for supporting their established grammar instruction approaches through two ways of observations and interviews. The findings showed that Iranian EFL teachers were required to use communicative pedagogies to increase learners' communicative ability at secondary high schools. In the same vein, Kisselev, et al (2020) revealed that EFL teachers were required to provide their students with some form of explicit grammar instruction to improve structural accuracy.

More students believed that F-on-F was useful for English grammar acquisition. They found it, amusing, exciting, sweet, interesting, not boring, motivating. They learned better through group learning, and it was student-centered by peer correction. They enjoyed highlighting in different colors for learning tenses. two students reported it had no advantages. It can thus be implied that, F-on-F approach can be very beneficial for learners. Some disadvantages were reported as well. Focus on Form was student-centered, it was time- consuming, group work made noise, and it was dull. The students lacked homogeneity, and were at different levels of language proficiency.

Although the students mentioned some drawbacks, they believed that F-on-F was useful for English grammar acquisition. They found it disciplined, and not student-centered. They thought that teachers' explanation on grammar was good, and it did not take a lot of time.

Several disadvantages were also reported. F-on-Fs was repetitious of what they did in language institutions, dull, teacher- centered, and the students did not have cooperation. Practicing exercises was tedious, time-consuming, not communicative, and it was not an easy way for learning grammar. F-on-F activities had a lot of benefits. They not only give students motivation to learn grammar, and to be well prepared for international exams in which grammar, and vocabulary are of great importance, but also supply for them opportunities to develop their knowledge in the second or foreign language.

There are some strategies that can be used in classes and help the students to take advantage of the F-on-F instruction. These are instructions on how to teach F-on-F, For example, students can take part in group works and teacher can help them by asking for discussion and giving feedback on their summary and providing some stress-free conditions in class that students read exciting stories with enjoyment, and highlight the desired exercises for the new pattern of grammar in different colors as a homework. Highlighting in opposite colors as a key for learning present, and past tenses help students to improve their grammar acquisition. It can be considered as one of the best approaches and can be used by students in junior high schools who are interested in using highlighters for learning.

The teacher taught English grammar to junior high school students through making stories because the teachers' goal was to make the students communicate in a structured manner. The teacher also considered that grammar learning followed by highlighting assignments was the best method to understand and remember the grammar structure easily for this age. As stated earlier, these activities lead students' attention to grammar in activities and tasks that was enjoyable for them. The students communicatively learn grammar structure of tenses. Further, the results of the study revealed that F-on-F approach was more effective than F-on-Fs approach for junior high school learners. Thus, F-on-F instruction of the tenses raised Iranian junior EFL learners' awareness of grammar rules and facilitated learning their grammar of present, and past tenses.

Findings of the study showed that grammar knowledge of eight students are highly influenced by F-on-F instruction. The participants received 8 sessions of F-on-F instruction. It played a considerable role in grammar acquisition of Iranian EFL Junior high school learners. Also, this research showed that in case of grammar acquisition students improved their grammar through F-on-F strategy more than F-on-Fs way of learning.

Further, the results of the study revealed that F-on-F approach was more effective than F-on-Fs approach for junior high school learners. Thus, F-on-F instruction of the tenses raised Iranian junior EFL learners' awareness of grammar rules and facilitated learning their grammar of present, and past tenses.

It is concluded that students improved their grammar through F-on-F significantly more than F-on-Fs. The mentioned conclusion can be justified by the fact that correction is potentially embedded in focus on form.

References

Azizpour, Sh., & Alavinia, P. (2021). The Impact of Focus-on-Form and Focus-on-Forms instruction on grammar acquisition of the subjunctive by Iranian advanced EFL learners. *Teaching English Language Journal, 18* (2), 24-35.

Baleghizadeh, S. (2010). Focus on form in an EFL communicative classroom, *Novitas Royal journal*, *20*, 40-50.

Borg, S., & Burns, A. (2008). Integrating grammar in adult TESOL classrooms. *Applied*

Linguistics, 29(3), 456-482.

DeKeyser, R. M. (1995). Learning second language grammar rules: An experiment with a miniature linguistic system. *Language Studies in Second Acquisition, 17(3), 379-410.*

Dekeyser, R.M. (1998). Beyond focus on form: cognitive perspectives on learning and practical second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition. Cambridge,* 42-63.

Dorji, J. (2018). Teaching grammar: A survey of teacher's beliefs and attitudes in Bhutan. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(2), 530-541.

Ellis, R. (2001). Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning*, 51(1), 1-46.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H. and Loewen, S. 2001: Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Rua Re Learning, 51, 407 32.*

Heidarzade, Sh., Behjat F., Hadipour, E. (2024). The effectiveness of reactive and preemptive focus on form VS. focus on forms in teaching grammar tenses. *JSLTE ,13(3), 77-81.* Hill, L. A. (1981). *Steps to understanding*. Oxford: OUP.

Housen, A., & Pierrard, M. (2008). Investigating instructed second language acquisition. *In Investigations in instructed second language acquisition*. 1-30.

Kisselev, O., Dubinina, I., & Polinsky, M. (2020). Form-focused instruction in the heritage language classroom: Toward research-informed heritage language pedagogy. *Frontiers in Education,* 5(1) 53-63.

Leeser, M. J. (2004). Learner proficiency and focus on form during collaborative dialogue. *Language Teaching Research, 8(1), 55-81.*

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.* (Pp.196- 200). New York: Cambridge University Press.

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.

Loewen,S. (2018). The prior and subsequent use of forms targeted in incidental focus on form. In H. Nassaji & S. Fotos(ed.). *Form-focused instruction and teacher education: Studies in honour of Rod Ellis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Long, M., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice.

Lopez Diaz, A., Martinez, J., Jiménez, D. C., Perez, É., & Mateo, V. (2019). How we teach grammar: An exploratory study on how Dominican teachers deal with grammar teaching. *Online* Submission, 43(4), 110.

Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal*, *82, 338–356.*

Marzban,A., Mokhberi,M. (2012). The effect of focus on form instruction on intermediate EFL learners' grammar learning in task-based language teaching. *Science Direct production. Social and behavioral science.*

Mohammadnia, Z., & Gholami, J. (2008). Incidental focus on form: Does proficiency matter. *Teaching English Language*, 2(6), 1-26.

Nunan, D. (1998). *Syllabus design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Onalan, O. (2018). Non-native English teachers' beliefs on grammar instruction. *English Language Teaching,* 11(5), 1-13.

Othman, J., & Ismail, L. (2008). Using focus on form instruction in the teaching and learning of grammar in a Malaysian classroom. *Journal of Asia TEFL, 5(2), 93-116.*

Rahimi Domakani, M. (2008). The efficacy of focus on form on promoting second language learning. *Teaching English Language, 3(1), 1-18.*

Robinson, P. (1996). Learning simple and complex second language rules under implicit, incidental, rule-search, and instructed conditions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(1) 27-67.

Shabani,K. & Hosseinzadeh,S. (2017). A comparative study of the effects of teacher-initiated planned preemptive and reactive focus on form on L2 learners' accuracy in narrative writing, *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching.*

Shabani, K. & Vahedi, N. (2023). The Role of Class Participation Structure in the Effectiveness of Incidental Form-focused Instruction. *Language Related Research.*

Shak, J. (2008). Young learner perspectives on four focus-on-form tasks. *Language Teaching Research.* Published by: http://www.sagepublications.com.

Shakhsi Dastgahian, E. (2021). Teachers' incentive for grammar instruction in Iran's reformed EFL context. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics.*

Shintani, N. (2013). The effect of focus on form and focus on forms instruction on the acquisition of productive knowledge of L2 vocabulary by young beginning-level learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(1), 36-62.

Soodmand Afshar, H. (2021). Task-related focus-on-forms foreign language vocabulary development: Focus on spoken form and word parts. *System, 96(1), 102-406.*

Spada, N. & Lightbown, P. M. (1993). Instruction and the development of questions in L2 classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 205-224.

Tajic,L., Karimi,KH.,& Ramezani, A (2020).Realization of preemptive focus on form in the English-language teaching context. *Open linguistics.*

Williams, J. & Evans, J. (1998). Which kind of focus and on which kind of forms? In C.

Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), Focus on form in second language classroom (Pp. 139- 155). *NewYork: Cambridge University Press.*

Zamani, N., Youhanaee, M., & Barati, H. (2019). The role of sequencing isolated form-focused instruction and complexity in developing English grammatical knowledge by Iranian monolinguals and bilinguals. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning, 11(24), 323-350.*