Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics, **Vol 25, November 2025, pp. 1561-1584**
DOI: 10.15738/kjell.25..202511.1561

KOREAN JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

ISSN: 1598-1398 / e-ISSN 2586-7474

http://journal.kasell.or.kr

The Effects of Integrated and Isolated Focus-on-Form Instruction with Consciousness-Raising Tasks on University Students' Writing Accuracy, Fluency, and Grammar Recognition

Hee Yeon Kang (Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Received: August 5, 2025
Revised: November 14, 2025
Accepted: November 19, 2025

Kang, Hee Yeon
Department of Education
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
107 Imun-ro, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul
Tel: 02-2173-2338
Email: vaho@naver.com

ABSTRACT

Kang, Hee Yeon. 2025. The effects of integrated and isolated Focus-on-Form instruction with consciousness-raising tasks on university students' writing accuracy, fluency, and grammar recognition. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 25, 1561-1584.

This study examined the effects of integrated and isolated Focus on Form (FonF) instructional models on writing accuracy, fluency, and grammar recognition among Korean university students. Ninety participants were randomly assigned to three groups: Integrated FonF (IG), Sequential Isolated FonF (SIG), and Reverse Sequential Isolated FonF (RSIG). Over a 15-week semester, participants completed pre- and post-tests involving essay writing and grammar recognition tasks. Writing accuracy was measured by error rates, fluency by words produced per minute (WPM), and grammar recognition through a targeted test. Results showed significant improvements in all groups, with IG and SIG groups outperforming RSIG. IG demonstrated the greatest gains in accuracy and fluency, benefiting from simultaneous attention to grammar and meaning, supported by real-time feedback. SIG showed notable improvements attributed to form-focused instruction preceding writing. RSIG, where form-focused activities occurred after writing, showed relatively limited progress. Statistical analyses confirmed these differences, highlighting the critical role of timing and integration in FonF instruction. Findings emphasize that integrating form and meaning-focused activities, timed to match learner needs and task demands, maximizes L2 writing development. This study offers pedagogical insights for curriculum design, advocating for real-time, contextualized grammar instruction to enhance writing proficiency in higher education.

KEYWORDS

Focus on Form (FonF), integrated FonF, isolated FonF, writing accuracy, writing fluency, grammar recognition

1. Introduction

Second language acquisition research has consistently highlighted the importance of directing learners' attention to linguistic forms to enhance both accuracy and fluency. Among various pedagogical methods, Focus on Form (FonF) instruction plays a pivotal role by embedding attention to language forms within communicative contexts, thereby supporting learners' acquisition of grammatical structures more effectively (Norris and Ortega 2000, Spada 2011, Williams 2005). Aligned with communicative-based approaches advocated by Long (1991) and Doughty and Williams (1998), FonF instruction engages learners in meaning-centered activities while simultaneously guiding their focus toward language forms, fostering deeper grammar recognition and usage.

FonF approaches are essential in improving learners' grammatical understanding and their ability to use target language forms fluently and accurately (Norris and Ortega 2000, Spada 2011). Although considerable research has examined how FonF may be implemented, clearer guidance is still needed regarding the optimal timing and sequencing of FonF in instructional contexts. Spada and Lightbown (2008) emphasized that the timing of FonF interventions—whether form-focused attention is integrated within meaning-focused tasks or delivered separately before or after—significantly impacts learning outcomes. They proposed two primary models: integrated FonF, where learners attend to language form simultaneously with meaning-based communication, and isolated FonF, where form-focused activities occur separately in time from meaning-centered tasks.

More recent studies underscore that both the timing and sequence of FonF relative to meaning-focused activities are critical for learners' recognition and acquisition of language forms (Ellis 2016, File and Adams 2010, Gui and Ismail 2024, Nassaji 2016, Xu and Li 2021). For instance, sequencing meaning-focused input before explicit form instruction can facilitate form recognition, particularly in receptive skills such as reading by prioritizing global comprehension (Ellis 2016, Spada and Lightbown 2008, Xu and Li 2021). Xu and Li (2021) further demonstrated that pre-task explicit FonF yields immediate and sustained gains in grammatical accuracy, while integrated FonF supports strong immediate improvements and post-task feedback enhances long-term retention. These findings illustrate that instructional design must carefully consider both timing and sequencing for effective FonF implementation.

In addition to timing and sequencing considerations, the types of FonF techniques employed also influence learning outcomes. Among these, grammar consciousness-raising tasks (CRTs) stand out for their explicit, collaborative, and learner-centered nature (Doughty and Williams 1998). CRTs encourage learners to actively analyze grammatical rules within meaningful contexts, improving both form recognition and communicative competence. Recent research highlights the pedagogical advantages of CRTs, especially when integrated with digital tools and data-driven learning; however, most studies focus on receptive skills rather than productive skills like writing (Ellis 2001, Richards and Reppen 2014). In the context of English education in South Korea, academic writing requires a delicate balance of grammatical precision and fluency. FonF offers a promising approach by embedding form-focused attention within communicative tasks to support these competing demands (Cho 2019, Kang 2018, Kim and Chung 2016).

Clarifying when and how FonF is most effectively applied is critical, as the sequencing of grammar instruction within meaning-focused tasks impacts not only accuracy, but also fluency and overall writing development (Amirian and Sadeghi 2012, Nguyen et al. 2022). Building on prior research, this study aims to advance understanding of optimal FonF implementation in academic writing by comparing integrated and isolated models and examining the sequencing of form-focused tasks relative to meaning-focused writing activities. The goal is to provide actionable insights to improve grammatical accuracy, fluency, and grammar recognition in L2 writing instruction, particularly in the context of South Korean EFL education.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Integrated and Isolated Focus on Form Instruction and L2 Learning

FonF has been a central topic in instructed second language acquisition (Ellis 2001, Norris and Ortega 2000, Spada 2011), with extensive debate over whether it should be delivered in integrated or isolated formats. Spada and Lightbown (2008) distinguished between integrated FonF, in which learners attend to linguistic forms while engaging in meaning-focused communication, and isolated FonF, in which attention to linguistic features is provided separately from meaning-focused activities. In their experimental studies with Canadian ESL learners, they found that integrated FonF promoted more sustained communicative practice, while isolated FonF allowed for more explicit grammatical awareness. These findings indicate that both approaches can be effective, but their value depends largely on timing, sequencing, and the instructional context (Spada et al. 2014). For instance, Spada et al. (2014) conducted a quasi-experimental study with 148 adult ESL learners across three instructional conditions, finding that integrated FonF resulted in significant gains in implicit knowledge, while isolated FonF led to higher scores in explicit grammar recognition. These results suggest that integrated FonF is particularly beneficial for enhancing natural language production, whereas isolated FonF can improve learners' explicit grammatical awareness.

Some research has also noted that certain FonF techniques may impose cognitive load on learners, depending on proficiency level and task complexity (Robinson 2001, Skehan 1998). This suggests that instructional decisions about timing and sequencing should consider potential cognitive overload and learners' processing capacity. Recent studies have further highlighted the role of timing and sequencing in FonF. Valeo and Spada (2016) surveyed 37 ESL teachers and 167 learners and found that over 70% of participants preferred pre-task FonF over post-task correction, citing clearer understanding and reduced anxiety. Peng and Barrot (2023) supported these findings, demonstrating that post-writing FonF within process-genre writing contexts significantly improved writing accuracy, particularly in reducing meaning-impeding errors. This further emphasizes the effectiveness of timely and contextually embedded feedback in writing instruction.

Research on integrated and collaborative FonF instruction has progressively deepened our understanding of its positive effects on linguistic accuracy and writing achievement as well as learning engagement and motivation. Swain and Lapkin (2013) provided foundational evidence on the role of metalinguistic engagement in FonF through think-aloud protocols and transcripts from French immersion learners completing jigsaw tasks. Their analysis showed frequent "language-related episodes," where learners paused to discuss grammatical forms, demonstrating that peer scaffolding can facilitate collaborative FonF. Building on this pioneering work, Özdemir (2024) tested 60 Turkish EFL learners in collaborative and individual writing conditions, revealing that collaborative FonF significantly improved fluency and functional adequacy.

Another line of research has examined FonF in relation to learner motivation and engagement. Xu and Li (2021) conducted an experimental study with Chinese EFL learners to investigate the impact of the timing of form-focused instruction across three conditions: pre-task, during-task (integrated), and post-task. Their findings showed that integrated FonF (during-task) significantly enhanced grammar acquisition. Extending this line of inquiry, Telila et al. (2023) employed a quasi-experimental design with 120 Ethiopian high school students, dividing them into experimental and control groups. The experimental group received an integrated FonF instructional intervention over one academic semester, resulting in significant improvements in writing accuracy and learner motivation relative to the control group.

The role of FonF can also vary depending on learners' proficiency level and linguistic background. Studies have

shown that beginner learners often benefit from isolated FonF due to its explicitness (DeKeyser 2007, Lyster 2004), while intermediate and advanced learners may benefit more from integrated FonF, which encourages more implicit language use in communicative contexts (Robinson 2001, Swain and Lapkin 2013). The integration of FonF in collaborative learning environments can also increase the level of metalinguistic reflection, leading to greater long-term retention and self-awareness in language learning.

Research in South Korea has provided additional insights into the implementation of FonF. Empirical studies with Korean university and secondary learners have confirmed that both integrated and isolated FonF can improve grammatical accuracy and language production, though effectiveness varies depending on task design and learner characteristics (Kim and Chung 2016). Survey-based research further suggests that Korean students tend to prefer integrated FonF, associating it with higher engagement and reduced anxiety, whereas isolated FonF is more strongly linked to traditional beliefs about grammar learning (Cho 2019). Other work has extended FonF to listening, demonstrating that targeted FonF can enhance receptive skills (Kang and Lee 2020). However, further research is needed with respect to writing to determine how these instructional options function in more complex productive tasks in the Korean EFL context.

Collectively, this body of research underscores the value of both isolated and integrated FonF, but highlights that the effectiveness of each model heavily depends on timing, sequencing, and instructional design. Recent studies, such as those by Peng and Barrot (2023), Özdemir (2024), and Telila et al. (2023), further strengthen the case for integrated and collaborative approaches, showing consistent benefits in accuracy, fluency, and learner motivation. This issue will be further examined in the present study.

2.2 Grammar Consciousness-Raising Tasks as a Focus on Form Technique

FonF encompasses a range of pedagogical techniques that vary in explicitness and the degree to which they interrupt communicative flow (Doughty and Williams 1998, Ellis 2016, Loewen 2011, Long and Robinson 1998). These include input flood, input enhancement, recasts, output enhancement, dictogloss, negotiation, interaction enhancement, and, notably, consciousness-raising tasks (CRTs), as defined by Doughty and Williams (1998) and Ellis (2001). Among FonF options, grammar consciousness-raising tasks represent a relatively explicit technique, intentionally drawing learners' attention to specific grammatical features through guided engagement with input and metalinguistic activities. Unlike purely deductive approaches, CRTs require learners to analyze authentic linguistic data, identify and explain grammatical rules, and apply their understanding through discovery-oriented learning tasks.

According to Ellis (2001), CRTs have several key objectives: to help learners notice grammatical forms that might otherwise escape their attention, facilitate connections between form and meaning, support the comprehension of input and monitoring of output, and ultimately foster analytical language recognition and greater learner autonomy. These aims align with the core principles of FonF, which hold that targeted attention to form within meaningful communicative contexts enhances both explicit knowledge and spontaneous language use (Doughty and Williams 1998, Long 1991).

Recent empirical studies support the efficacy of CRTs as a FonF technique. Interventions with vocational high school and secondary students indicate that CRT-based instruction leads to significant gains in grammatical accuracy and learner motivation compared to traditional, isolated, deductive grammar teaching (Boulton and Cobb 2017, Ellis 2016). For instance, Boulton and Cobb (2017) conducted a controlled study with 84 vocational high school students and found that a CRT + corpus-based approach produced significantly higher accuracy gains than traditional grammar drills. CRTs have also been integrated with data-driven learning (DDL) and corpus-based

methodology, enabling learners to explore authentic language usage and develop pragmatic competence alongside explicit form recognition.

Moreover, CRTs appear particularly effective when learners engage in collaborative problem-solving and peer negotiation, which can enhance metalinguistic engagement and learner autonomy (Abay 2021, Amirian and Sadeghi 2012, Suhaimi and Musdizal 2022). Abay (2021), for example, implemented CRTs with 52 secondary school learners and reported significant reductions in grammatical error frequency alongside higher motivation scores. Similarly, Suhaimi and Musdizal (2022) demonstrated that collaborative CRT tasks improved both accuracy and writing fluency among Malaysian university students. These studies demonstrate that CRTs not only improve grammatical accuracy but also encourage students to actively analyze, discuss, and apply grammatical rules, fostering deeper engagement with language.

Despite these positive outcomes, most CRT research has concentrated on receptive skills such as reading and listening, with relatively few studies examining productive skills like writing (Ellis 2001). Nevertheless, emerging research emphasizes the potential of CRTs in writing contexts, where learners must monitor and adjust output in real time. For instance, Abay (2021) and Suhaimi and Musdizal (2022) found that CRT interventions significantly improved students' writing accuracy and reduced grammatical errors, while also increasing motivation and participation. These findings highlight CRTs as a promising pedagogical approach for L2 writing instruction.

Integrating CRTs within writing instruction can maximize their impact on grammatical recognition and accuracy (Richards and Reppen 2014). The collaborative, discovery-based nature of CRTs aligns with current views on FonF, emphasizing interaction and the recursive negotiation of form and meaning. Digital technologies, including automated feedback and online collaboration platforms, are increasingly leveraged to extend CRTs' interactivity and support individualized learner feedback (Nguyen et al. 2022).

Finally, CRTs are most effective when appropriately tailored to learners' proficiency, backgrounds, and learning goals (Ellis 2001, Richards and Reppen 2014, Nguyen et al. 2022). Given the relative scarcity of L2 writing-focused CRT studies, particularly in the South Korean context, where few studies have addressed writing-based CRT/FonF, this study aims to fill this gap. Addressing the sequencing, personalization, and integration of CRTs will strengthen FonF as a comprehensive pedagogical approach, fostering both grammatical understanding and more proficient language production.

3. Method

3.1 Research Questions

Building on the review of prior research, the identified research needs, and the objectives outlined above, this study addresses the following research questions:

1) Does the integration versus separation of Focus-on-Form (FonF) tasks and writing tasks—administered in sequential versus reverse order—have differential effects on the accuracy of English writing?
2) Does the integration versus separation of FonF tasks and writing tasks—administered in sequential versus reverse order—have differential effects on the fluency of English writing?
3) Does the integration versus separation of FonF tasks and writing tasks—administered in sequential versus reverse order—have differential effects on learners' recognition of the target grammatical forms?

3.2 Participants

The participants were 90 first-year university students enrolled in the compulsory liberal arts course "College English" at a university in Korea. They were randomly assigned to three instructional groups representing different Focus-on-Form (FonF) conditions: one integrated group (IG), and two isolated groups differentiated by the sequencing of FonF and meaning-focused writing tasks. The isolated groups were split into a sequential isolated group (SIG), where FonF activities preceded the writing tasks, and a reverse sequential isolated group (RSIG), where FonF activities followed the writing tasks. The "College English" course aims to provide foundational academic English writing skills, making it an appropriate setting for investigating FonF effects on writing performance. Participants' general English proficiency level, as measured by the university's mock TOEIC test, ranged between 500 and 800, which is considered intermediate proficiency according to ETS (2019), ensuring comparability across groups. The mean TOEIC scores were balanced across groups (IG: 645, SIG: 648, RSIG: 647, $SD < 15$), ensuring comparability prior to intervention.

Prior to the intervention, all participants completed a grammar recognition test and an English essay writing assessment to measure baseline levels of grammatical recognition, writing accuracy, and fluency. Group homogeneity on these pretest measures was confirmed via analysis of variance (ANOVA), indicating no significant differences among groups. In accordance with ethical research standards, all participants provided informed consent before participating in the study. The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the relevant institutional review board.

3.3 Experimental Procedure

This study involved pre- and post-tests to measure learners' progress in essay writing and grammatical recognition. Before the intervention, participants completed a pre-essay writing test and a grammar recognition test. After the intervention, the same tests were administered again to evaluate improvements and compare differences between groups.

The research spanned a 15-week semester in 2024, with classes held twice a week for 2 hours each session. During the first half of the semester, all students received identical instruction covering foundational academic writing skills, including idea generation and organization, essay construction, writing topic and supporting sentences, ensuring unity and coherence, and avoiding plagiarism. This shared instruction established a common baseline before experimental treatments began.

In the second half of the semester, students were assigned to different experimental treatments based on their group. Over six weeks, FonF activities were conducted, focusing on target grammar points and relevant essay topics. Table 1 presents the experimental treatments by week, with explicit grammar points (e.g., tense, relative clauses) sequenced in line with writing tasks. Between sessions, students were not given additional grammar assignments, ensuring that the treatment was the main exposure. See Appendix A for specific examples of materials used for each instructional group.

Table 1. Target Grammar Forms and Essay Topics Each Week

Week	Target Grammar Point	Essay Topic
Week 1	Subject-Verb Agreement	"My Daily Routine: How I Manage My Time"
Week 2	Tense Usage	"My Learning Experience: How It Has Changed Over Time"
Week 3	Active vs. Passive Voice	"The Benefits and Drawbacks of Online Shopping"
Week 4	Gerund vs. Infinitive	"The Importance of Learning a Foreign Language"
Week 5	Positive/Comparative/Superlative	"Which Sports Are More Popular Around the World?"
Week 6	Relative Clauses	"The Most Memorable Place I've Visited and Why It's Special"

Table 2 summarizes the differences in experimental treatments by group and lesson. This design allowed comparison between integrated FonF—where form-focused and meaning-focused activities occur simultaneously—and isolated FonF, further divided by whether form-focused activities precede (SIG) or follow (RSIG) meaning-focused writing tasks. In the IG, learners engaged in writing tasks while concurrently focusing on grammatical forms. The instructor provided immediate, oral feedback on grammatical errors in real time as students wrote, which fostered continuous attention to form without disrupting the writing flow. Collaborative peer activities, including mutual grammar correction and discussion, were also facilitated to reinforce learning. In the SIG, learners first completed form-focused activities involving explicit grammar instruction and exercises targeting the relevant forms before commencing writing. This approach enabled students to approach writing with heightened recognition of target grammar. In the RSIG, learners finished meaning-centered writing tasks first, then engaged in form-focused activities afterward. This included reviewing and self-correcting their writing for grammatical accuracy.

Table 2. Differences in Experimental Treatments by Group

Group	Experimental Treatments	
	1st lesson	2nd lesson
Integrated Group	Meaning-focused activities + Form-focused activities	
Sequential Isolated Group	Form-focused activities	Meaning-focused activities
Reverse Sequential Isolated Group	Meaning-focused activities	Form-focused activities

Table 3 details the types of Focus-on-Form activities implemented across groups. Drawing on Ellis's (2001) model of consciousness-raising—which emphasizes interactive, discovery-based learning—all groups participated in pair or small-group work rather than individual tasks. Activities were generally implemented in the order listed, although some flexibility was allowed based on classroom dynamics; all listed activities were conducted at least once, with no activities intentionally skipped.

Table 3. Types of Focus-on-Form Activities as Grammar Consciousness-Raising

Group	Type of Activities
IG	- Real-time Grammar Feedback - Collaborative Writing - Simultaneous Grammar and Content Focus - Gamified Grammar Correction - Comparing Writing Styles
SIG	- Grammar rule introduction and practice - Grammar drills prior to writing - Textbook-based grammar exercises - Writing tasks post-grammar review - Peer grammar editing
RSIG	- Peer grammar editing post-writing - Free-topic content-focused writing - Content expansion tasks - Storytelling emphasizing the message - Sentence elaboration - Critical thinking essays on social topics

3.4 Data Collection

To address the first and second research questions related to writing accuracy and fluency, a total of 180 essays were collected from all participants, including both pre- and post-intervention compositions. Participants were asked to write essays on the same topic, *"The Impact of Digital Technology on Modern Society,"* within a 40-minute limit, expressing their opinions supported by three reasons. This topic was carefully selected to elicit use of six target grammar forms explicitly taught during instruction: subject-verb agreement, tense agreement, active/passive voice, gerund/infinitive use, positive/comparative/superlative adjectives, and relative clauses—common areas of difficulty for Korean EFL learners.

All essays were transcribed and coded for errors only regarding the six target grammar forms as seen in Table 1. Errors outside these categories were excluded from counting. Writing accuracy was coded with a rubric adapted from Polio and Shea (2014). Two trained instructors independently reviewed all essays to identify and tally the grammatical errors related to these forms. To ensure coding reliability, inter-rater agreement was calculated using Cohen's kappa coefficient, which yielded a high value of 0.95 indicating substantial agreement. Any discrepancies between raters were resolved through discussion until consensus was reached, using a detailed coding rubric designed for this study. Writing fluency data were collected by recording the total number of words each participant wrote and the time (in minutes) taken to complete the writing task.

For the third research question regarding grammatical recognition, a 30-item grammar recognition test was administered pre- and post-intervention. This test included 20 target items related to the focus grammar forms and 10 filler items assessing non-target forms. Only the results from the 20 target items were included in the final analysis. The test was developed by the researchers but validated by two external experts. Test items required participants to select the correct form, identify errors, and explain grammatical rules, scored dichotomously (1 = correct, 0 = incorrect). All participant data were anonymized and securely stored in compliance with institutional ethical standards.

3.5 Data Analysis

All collected data were analyzed to evaluate the effects of the instructional interventions on writing accuracy, fluency, and grammatical recognition. For each research question, the corresponding analytical procedures and statistical methods were applied as follows.

Writing accuracy was assessed through the widely recognized *error rate per 100 words* metric, calculated by:

$$\text{Error rate per 100 words} = \frac{\text{Total mumner of errors}}{\text{Total number of words}} \times 100$$

This metric standardizes error counts relative to text length, facilitating valid comparisons across essays of varying size (Polio and Shea, 2014, Larsen-Freeman, 2006). Writing fluency was computed as words per minute (WPM):

$$\text{Writing Fluency (WPM)} = \frac{\text{Total number of words written}}{\text{Total writing time in minutes}} \times 100$$

WPM objectively reflects production speed but does not capture grammatical accuracy or syntactic complexity; therefore, it was interpreted in conjunction with other measures (Kormos and Sáfár 2008, Larsen-Freeman 2006,

Ortega 2003).

Grammatical recognition was operationalized through the total correct answers on the 20 target grammar items. The test items included multiple-choice questions that required participants to select the correct form, identify errors, and explain grammatical rules. Each correct response was scored as 1 point, and the total score was used as an indicator of learners' explicit grammatical knowledge. Misspellings were considered correct if the grammatical intent was clear, while only those that obscured meaning were coded as 0. Partially correct explanations, however, were coded as 0, since communicative accuracy was the main criterion. This revised scheme ensured consistent scoring across raters. Higher scores indicated greater recognition of the target grammatical structures.

All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS v.29. Changes within groups between pre- and post-tests were analyzed using paired t-tests. One-way ANOVA was applied to examine differences among groups, followed by Tukey HSD post-hoc tests when significant effects were detected.

4. Results

This study aimed to analyze writing accuracy and fluency by first examining basic sentence and word statistics in students' pre- and post-intervention essays. The results include the total number of sentences, total word counts, average word counts, and measures of variability within each group. As shown in Table 4, the pre-intervention essays contained 592 sentences for the IG, 567 sentences for the SIG, and 576 sentences for the RSIG. Correspondingly, the total word counts were 6,031 (IG), 6,027 (SIG), and 5,948 (RSIG). Overall production was comparable across the three groups, with the IG producing the highest total word count, followed closely by the SIG, and the RSIG slightly lower. The average word counts per essay were 201 words (IG), 200 words (SIG), and 198 words (RSIG). The post-intervention essays showed increases in writing output across all groups, with total sentences rising to 648 (IG), 618 (SIG), and 630 (RSIG), total word counts increasing to 8,970 (IG), 7,541 (SIG), and 8,431 (RSIG), and average word counts increasing to 299 (IG), 251 (SIG), and 281 (RSIG).

Table 4. Sentence and Word Count Statistics for Pre- and Post-Essays by Group

	Total Sentence	Total Word	Average Word	SD	Min Word	Max Word
Pre-Essay						
IG	592	6031	201	25.11	155	236
SIG	567	6027	200	25.75	150	248
RSIG	576	5948	198	31.98	157	240
Post-Essay						
IG	648	8970	299	30.16	257	354
SIG	618	7541	251	26.91	167	297
RSIG	630	8431	281	21.27	242	313

These results indicate that all groups increased both the number of sentences and total word counts in their post-intervention essays. Notably, the IG demonstrated the most substantial increase in average word count per essay, signaling enhanced writing output compared to the others.

4.1 Accuracy

Accuracy was assessed by examining the frequency of grammatical errors in the students' essays. This study analyzed error counts and error rates in both pre- and post-intervention essays across the three groups, and compared the differences within and between groups using paired t-tests and ANOVA.

Table 5 presents descriptive statistics for the number of errors in the pre- and post-essays by group. In the pre-essay, the IG had an average error count of 9.37, the SIG had 9.90 errors, and the RSIG had 9.63 errors. Following the intervention, error counts decreased across all groups: IG averaged 5.97 errors, SIG averaged 5.33, and RSIG averaged 7.17 errors. The corresponding reductions were 3.4, 4.57, and 2.46 errors for IG, SIG, and RSIG, respectively. Paired t-tests confirmed that these reductions were statistically significant ($p < .001$), with Cohen's d indicating medium to large effects (IG: $d = 0.72$, SIG: $d = 0.68$, RSIG: $d = 0.31$), based on Cohen's (1988) benchmarks for small (0.2), medium (0.5), and large (0.8) effects.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics for Error Counts in Pre- and Post-Essays by Group

	n	Min	*SD*	Max	*M*
Pre-essay					
IG	30	5	3.264	14	9.37
SIG	30	4	3.122	15	9.90
RSIG	30	3	3.222	16	9.63
Post-essay					
IG	30	3	1.866	9	5.97
SIG	30	3	1.668	8	5.33
RSIG	30	4	1.392	9	7.17

Table 6 shows the descriptive statistics for the error rates (errors as a percentage of total words) before and after the intervention. In the pre-essay, error rates were similar across groups: 4.75% (IG), 5.04% (SIG), and 4.86% (RSIG). Error rates, calculated as a percentage of total words, decreased from 4.75% to 2.01% for IG, from 5.04% to 2.12% for SIG, and from 4.86% to 2.56% for RSIG. The reductions were 2.74%, 2.92%, and 2.30% respectively.

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for Error Rates in Pre- and Post-Essays by Group

	n	Total Words	Total Errors	Error Rate(%)
Pre-essay				
IG	30	6031	281	4.75
SIG	30	6027	297	5.04
RSIG	30	5948	289	4.86
Post-essay				
IG	30	8970	179	2.01
SIG	30	7541	160	2.12
RSIG	30	8431	215	2.56

Table 7 shows the paired t-test results for error rates within each group. All groups showed statistically significant reductions in error rates ($p < .001$), confirming that all instructional conditions contributed to improved accuracy. Table 7 summarizes the paired t-test results comparing pre- and post-essay error rates within each group.

Paired t-tests confirmed that these reductions were statistically significant for all groups (IG: $t(29) = -7.198$, $p < .001$, Cohen's $d = 0.72$, 95% CI [0.40, 1.04]; SIG: $t(29) = -9.538$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.68$, 95% CI [0.35, 1.01]; RSIG: $t(29) = -9.040$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.31$, 95% CI [0.05, 0.57]).

Table 7. Paired *t*-Test Results for Error Rates in Pre- and Post-Essays by Group

	M	*SD*	*t*	Sig.
IG (*n*=30)				
Pre-essay	4.75	1.902	-7.198	<.001
Post-essay	2.01	0.667		
SIG (*n*=30)				
Pre-essay	5.04	1.745	-9.538	<.001
Post-essay	2.12	0.659		
RSIG (*n*=30)				
Pre-essay	4.86	1.570	-9.040	<.001
Post-essay	2.56	0.506		

As shown in Table 8, one-way ANOVA revealed no significant differences among groups in pre-intervention error rates ($F(2,87) = 0.211$, $p = .810$), confirming baseline equivalence. However, post-intervention error rates differed significantly among groups ($F(2,87) = 6.503$, $p = .002$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.13$).

Table 8. One-Way ANOVA Results for Error Rates in Pre- and Post-Essays

	SS	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*Sig.*
Pre-essay	1.284	2	0.642	0.211	.810
Post-essay	4.930	2	2.465	6.503	.002

Post-hoc Tukey tests (see Table 9) indicated that IG outperformed RSIG ($MD = -0.542$, $p = .003$, $d = 0.54$, 95% CI [0.20, 0.88]) and SIG also outperformed RSIG ($MD = -0.432$, $p = .021$, $d = 0.44$, 95% CI [0.08, 0.80]), while IG and SIG did not differ significantly ($MD = -0.109$, $p = .771$). These results suggest that both integrated and sequential isolated approaches enhanced accuracy for learners more effectively than the reverse sequential approach.

Table 9. Post-Hoc Tukey HSD Results for Error Rates in Post-Essays

Groups		*MD*	*Sig.*
IG (n=30)	SIG	-0.109	.771
	RSIG	-0.542	.003
SIG (n=30)	IG	0.109	.771
	RSIG	-0.432	.021
RSIG (n=30)	IG	0.542	.003
	SIG	0.432	.021

In summary, both IG and SIG showed significant improvements in writing accuracy after instruction. The IG condition, which integrated form-focused and meaning-focused activities simultaneously, likely provided learners with real-time opportunities to notice and correct errors during writing, fostering enhanced grammatical recognition and facilitating error reduction. Similarly, the SIG, with form-focused activities preceding writing

tasks, enabled learners to internalize grammatical rules prior to production, which contributed to error prevention and improved accuracy, despite the absence of real-time feedback. In contrast, RSIG showed relatively smaller gains in accuracy. The delayed FonF after writing may have limited learners' opportunities for immediate error recognition and correction, reducing the effectiveness of this instructional approach. Therefore, the findings suggest that integrated and sequential isolated FonF approaches are more effective in enhancing writing accuracy than the reverse sequential isolated model, emphasizing the importance of timing and simultaneity in form-focused instruction to maximize learner gains.

4.2 Fluency

Fluency is a crucial aspect of writing that reflects the flow and ease of language production. In this study, writing fluency was operationalized by measuring the number of words written per minute (WPM) in both pre- and post-intervention essays.

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics for WPM by Group in Pre- and Post-Essays

	n	Min	*SD*	Max	*M*
Pre-essay					
IG	30	3.87	0.627	5.90	5.02
SIG	30	3.75	0.799	6.20	5.03
RSIG	30	3.92	0.643	6.00	4.95
Post-essay					
IG	30	6.42	0.754	8.85	7.47
SIG	30	4.17	0.672	7.42	6.28
RSIG	30	6.05	0.531	7.82	7.02

Table 10 presents the descriptive statistics for WPM across the three groups. In the pre-intervention essays, the IG produced an average of 5.02 words per minute, the SIG produced 5.03 WPM, and the RSIG produced 4.95 WPM. Post-intervention, all groups showed increases in fluency: IG increased to 7.47 WPM, SIG to 6.28 WPM, and RSIG to 7.02 WPM. The corresponding gains were 2.45 WPM for IG, 1.25 WPM for SIG, and 2.07 WPM for RSIG. Table 11 displays the results of paired t-tests comparing pre- and post-intervention fluency within each group. Paired t-tests confirmed significant improvements in all groups (IG: $t(29) = 14.030$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.75$, 95% CI [0.50, 1.00]; SIG: $t(29) = 6.272$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.41$, 95% CI [0.20, 0.62]; RSIG: $t(29) = 14.988$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.70$, 95% CI [0.45, 0.95]).

Table 11. Paired *t*-Test Results for WPM in Pre- and Post-Essays by Group

	M	*SD*	*t*	Sig.
IG (*n*=30)				
Pre-essay	5.02	0.627	14.030	<.001
Post-essay	7.47	0.754		
SIG (*n*=30)				
Pre-essay	5.03	0.799	6.272	<.001
Post-essay	6.28	0.672		
RSIG (*n*=30)				
Pre-essay	4.95	0.643	14.988	<.001
Post-essay	7.02	0.531		

One-way ANOVA results in Table 12 indicated no significant pre-intervention differences ($F(2,87) = 0.095$, $p = .910$), but post-intervention fluency differed significantly among groups ($F(2,87) = 24.952$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.36$).

Table 12. One-Way ANOVA Results for WPM in Pre- and Post-Essays

	SS	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*Sig.*
Pre-essay	0.091	2	0.46	0.095	.910
Post-essay	21.699	2	10.85	24.952	.000

Post-hoc comparisons as shown in Table 13 revealed that IG wrote significantly faster than SIG ($MD = 1.190$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.85$, 95% CI [0.55, 1.15]) and RSIG ($MD = 0.449$, $p = .026$, $d = 0.35$, 95% CI [0.02, 0.68]), and that SIG performed more slowly that RSIG ($MD = -0.741$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.62$, 95% CI [0.32, 0.92]). These results indicate that the integrated approach, which combined real-time form-focused and meaning-focused activities, was most effective in enhancing fluency.

Table 13. Post-Hoc Tukey HSD Results for WPM in Post-Essays

Group		*MD*	*Sig.*
IG (n=30)	SIG	1.190	<.001
	RSIG	0.449	.026
SIG (n=30)	IG	-1.190	<.001
	RSIG	-0.741	<.001
RSIG (n=30)	IG	-0.449	.026
	SIG	0.741	<.001

Overall, the fluency analysis indicated that the IG showed the highest fluency gains following instruction, likely due to the simultaneous engagement in form-focused and meaning-focused activities. This dual focus appears to facilitate both grammatical development and smooth, fluent writing production. The SIG demonstrated moderate fluency improvement, likely reflecting benefits from pre-writing form-focused preparation despite the temporal separation of form and meaning activities. Conversely, the RSIG, despite showing some fluency increase, had the lowest post-intervention fluency, possibly because form-focused activities occurring after the writing task disrupted the natural flow and continuity of writing, inhibiting fluency gains. The post-hoc analysis confirms these differences, highlighting the particular efficacy of the integrated approach in enhancing fluency in English writing. The results suggest that real-time attention to form during writing supports a more fluent and productive writing process, whereas delayed or sequenced form-focused intervention may limit fluency improvements.

4.3 Grammar Recognition

Grammar recognition, which refers to learners' ability to detect, identify, and understand target grammatical forms, is a crucial factor in evaluating second language grammar acquisition. In this study, grammar recognition was assessed using a grammar recognition test, and the results were compared across the three instructional groups using descriptive statistics, paired t-tests, one-way ANOVA, and post-hoc analyses.

Table 14. Descriptive Statistics for Grammar Recognition Test Scores by Group

	n	Min	*SD*	Max	*M*
Pre-test					
IG	30	7	2.635	16	11.57
SIG	30	8	2.001	16	11.83
RSIG	30	7	2.333	15	12.07
Post-test					
IG	30	15	1.251	19	17.23
SIG	30	14	1.125	20	16.90
RSIG	30	13	1.363	18	15.93

Table 14 presents the descriptive statistics for the grammar recognition test scores by group in the pre- and post-tests. In the pre-test, the IG had an average score of 11.57, the SIG scored 11.83, and the RSIG scored 12.07. Following the intervention, all groups improved their scores: IG achieved the highest average of 17.23, SIG scored 16.90, and RSIG scored 15.93. The gains from pre- to post-test were 5.66 for IG, 5.07 for SIG, and 3.86 for RSIG.

Table 15. Paired *t*-Test Results for Pre- and Post-Test Grammar Recognition Scores by Group

	M	*SD*	*t*	Sig.
IG (*n*=30)				
Pre-essay	11.57	2.635	21.114	<.001
Post-essay	17.23	1.251		
SIG (*n*=30)				
Pre-essay	11.83	2.001	25.680	<.001
Post-essay	16.90	2.333		
RSIG (*n*=30)				
Pre-essay	12.07	2.333	19.715	<.001
Post-essay	15.93	1.363		

Table 15 shows the results of paired t-tests comparing pre- and post-test grammar recognition scores within each group. It indicated significant improvements in each group (IG: $t(29) = 21.114$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.65$, 95% CI [0.33, 0.97]; SIG: $t(29) = 25.680$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.54$, 95% CI [0.22, 0.86]; RSIG: $t(29) = 19.715$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.29$, 95% CI [0.01, 0.57]).

One-way ANOVA results for grammar recognition scores are presented in Table 16. No significant differences were found between groups in the pre-test scores ($F = 0.344$, $p = .710$), indicating similar baseline grammar recognition levels. However, significant differences emerged in the post-test scores ($F = 8.754$, $p < .001$), suggesting differential effects of the instructional methods on grammar recognition.

Table 16. One-Way ANOVA Results for Pre- and Post-Test Grammar Recognition Scores

	SS	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*Sig.*
Pre-essay	3.756	2	1.878	0.344	.710
Post-essay	27.356	2	13.678	8.754	<.001

One-way ANOVA confirmed no pre-test differences ($F(2,87) = 0.344$, $p = .710$) but significant post-test

differences ($F(2,87) = 8.754$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.17$). Post-hoc analyses showed IG outperformed RSIG ($MD = 1.30$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.58$, 95% CI [0.28, 0.88]) and SIG outperformed RSIG ($MD = 0.967$, $p = .010$, $d = 0.44$, 95% CI [0.10, 0.78]), while IG and SIG did not differ significantly ($MD = 0.333$, $p = .558$, $d = 0.28$, 95% CI [-0.82, 1.49]).

Table 17. Post-Hoc Tukey HSD Results for Grammar Recognition Test Scores

Groups		*MD*	*Sig.*
IG (n=30)	SIG	0.333	.558
	RSIG	1.300	<.001
SIG (n=30)	IG	-0.333	.558
	RSIG	0.967	.010
RSIG (n=30)	IG	-1.300	<.001
	SIG	-0.967	.010

The significant improvements observed across all groups highlight that form-focused instruction effectively enhances grammar recognition. In particular, the comparable gains observed in IG and SIG, both involving real-time or pre-task grammar focus, underscore the benefit of timely grammar intervention. Conversely, the relatively smaller improvement in RSIG, which focused on post-task grammar correction, may be somewhat less effective than IG or SIG for enhancing learners' ability to recognize target grammatical forms.

5. Discussion

The findings of this study emphasize the critical role of timing and sequencing in FonF instruction, particularly in improving writing accuracy, fluency, and grammatical recognition. As highlighted in the Introduction, prior research has demonstrated that both integrated and isolated FonF approaches can be beneficial for language learning. However, their effectiveness largely depends on how and when form-focused instruction is embedded within communicative tasks (Norris and Ortega 2000, Spada 2011, Spada and Lightbown 2008, Williams 2005). This study strengthens the argument that FonF is most effective when integrated within meaningful tasks, with feedback provided concurrently or prior to the task rather than delayed (Norris and Ortega 2000, Spada and Lightbown 2008, Xu and Li 2021).

The results of this study align with the work of Spada and Lightbown (2008), Xu and Li (2021), and others who emphasize that real-time FonF—delivered during communicative tasks—maximizes learning outcomes. The IG, which received form-focused attention embedded within meaning-focused writing tasks, showed the largest improvements in both writing accuracy and fluency. This result corroborates findings by Richards and Reppen (2014) and Kang (2018), who argued that integrating FonF into communicative tasks enhances learner's language output among other factors, reinforcing grammatical structure in real-time, especially for intermediate learners of English. The IG's success suggests that providing timely form-focused instruction during meaningful writing tasks enables learners to immediately adjust their linguistic output, reinforcing grammatical structures during the drafting process.

By contrast, the RSIG, where form-focused feedback was provided after the writing task, showed limited improvement. These findings are consistent with Xu and Li (2021) and Amirian and Sadeghi (2012), who reported that delayed feedback restricts learners' ability to apply grammatical knowledge immediately. As noted in Peng

and Barrot (2023), delayed feedback can disrupt writing flow; in the present study, the RSIG also showed limited gains and reported some loss of writing momentum, which negatively affected fluency. These outcomes of the present study support the view that the timing of FonF interventions plays a crucial role in the immediate application of grammatical knowledge.

Additionally, fluency was another area where the IG group excelled, highlighting the benefit of integrated FonF. The simultaneous focus on both meaning and form in real-time tasks likely reduced cognitive overload, enabling learners to maintain a natural flow of language production. This finding mirrors Richards and Reppen (2014) and Kang (2018), who emphasized that integrated FonF promotes sustained concentration and greater output fluency. In contrast, the RSIG group's delayed feedback led to a loss of writing momentum, illustrating how delays in form-focused feedback hinder the natural flow of language production. This also aligns with Spada and Lightbown (2008), who highlighted that timely feedback strengthens working memory and facilitates deeper linguistic processing.

In terms of grammatical recognition, both the IG and SIG showed significant improvements, especially when FonF was provided before or during the writing task. These results reinforce the findings of Xu and Li (2021), who demonstrated that proactive FonF, provided either concurrently or pre-task, enhances learners' ability to internalize grammatical features. This aligns with Spada and Lightbown (2008), who highlighted that timely feedback strengthens working memory and facilitates deeper linguistic processing. The RSIG, on the other hand, exhibited less effective encoding of grammatical knowledge, likely due to the delayed feedback preventing immediate reinforcement, as was found in the present study.

These findings partially confirm Telila et al. (2023), who found that integrated FonF not only improved writing accuracy but also enhanced learner motivation. The IG group's significant improvement in both accuracy and fluency aligns with this research, which suggests that engaging learners in meaningful tasks with concurrent feedback fosters motivation and a positive attitude towards writing. Similarly, Özdemir (2024) demonstrated that collaborative FonF approaches enhance not only writing accuracy but also fluency. The IG group's success may have been partly due to collaborative engagement and peer scaffolding during the writing tasks, which facilitated mutual learning and error correction in real-time, especially for intermediate English learners.

While many of our results align with prior research, some contrasts and nuances emerged. For example, although the overall pattern was IG > SIG > RSIG, several comparisons (notably IG vs. SIG on some measures) were non-significant, suggesting that pre-task (SIG) FonF can sometimes approximate the benefits of integrated FonF for certain outcomes. These subtleties imply that the superiority of integrated FonF is not uniformly large across all measures and may depend on the specific outcome (accuracy vs. fluency vs. recognition), task design, and learner characteristics.

This study contributes to FonF theory by highlighting context-sensitive nuances—particularly in a South Korean EFL university setting with intermediate learners. Using an academic writing task and sequencing manipulations, our findings suggest that while integrated FonF generally offers the strongest gains, pre-task (sequential isolated) FonF can produce comparable results in some domains, possibly because Korean EFL learners in this study benefited from explicit pre-task preparation and collaborative peer support. Thus, existing two-model theory (integrated vs. isolated) is usefully refined by considering moderating factors such as proficiency, task complexity, and classroom practices.

In summary, this study confirms that the integrated FonF model is the most effective in improving writing accuracy, fluency, and grammatical recognition. These results support the growing consensus in the literature that FonF has its maximum pedagogical impact when form-focused instruction is embedded within meaningful communicative tasks and provided in a timely manner (Amirian and Sadeghi 2012, Xu and Li 2021). The findings

also underscore the importance of considering individual learner differences and context-sensitive FonF interventions, as well as the timing and sequencing of feedback, to optimize learning outcomes. By personalizing FonF instruction and providing real-time feedback, educators can enhance learners' linguistic development and improve their overall writing performance.

6. Conclusion

This study investigated the effects of integrated and isolated FonF instruction on Korean university students' writing accuracy, fluency, and grammar recognition. By systematically comparing three instructional models—integrated FonF (IG), sequential isolated FonF (SIG), and reverse sequential isolated FonF (RSIG)—the research provides comprehensive evidence on the influence of form-focused task timing and integration within academic writing contexts.

The findings revealed that both IG and SIG significantly improved students' accuracy and grammar recognition, with IG leading to the highest gains in both accuracy and fluency. Specifically, the IG model, which integrated form-focused attention concurrently with meaning-focused writing tasks, resulted in superior linguistic performance across multiple dimensions of writing. In contrast, the RSIG model, which introduced form-focused feedback only after completing the writing task, showed comparatively limited improvement in writing performance, particularly in terms of fluency. These results underscore the disadvantages of delayed form-focused intervention, aligning with previous research that emphasizes the benefits of real-time FonF.

Taken together, these findings provide several instructional implications for EFL university writing contexts. First, integrated FonF techniques should be adopted whenever feasible, given that real-time corrective feedback during drafting—combined with structured peer scaffolding—was associated with the largest gains in fluency and accuracy in the IG condition. Second, when fully integrated, real-time support is impractical due to class size or workload constraints, brief pre-task consciousness-raising activities that foreground target forms immediately before writing can serve as an effective alternative; the SIG approach produced notable improvements in accuracy and grammatical recognition. Third, instructors should avoid relying solely on delayed, post-task corrective activities (RSIG) as the only form-focused intervention, given the smaller fluency gains observed. Finally, sequencing grammar foci to closely match weekly writing topics and keeping form-focused activities concise and task-relevant will help minimize cognitive load and preserve writing flow.

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations. The participant group was limited to Korean first-year university students, which may restrict the generalizability of the findings. In addition, the intervention period, though integrated into a semester-long curriculum, may not fully capture long-term effects on writing development. Future research should pursue longer-term and mixed-methods designs, including qualitative investigation into learner perceptions, cognitive processes, motivation and engagement during integrated FonF activities, to better understand how and why certain FonF implementations succeed or fail in specific contexts.

In conclusion, this research provides robust evidence supporting the efficacy of integrated FonF instruction for improving accuracy, fluency, and grammar recognition in L2 writing. The study underscores that the integration and timing of form-focused activities are critical to maximizing learning outcomes. By embedding grammar instruction in meaningful communicative contexts, this research offers important guidelines for designing effective, learner-centered writing instruction. Further studies that examine FonF in different educational contexts, including online learning environments and non-university settings, will be essential in broadening the applicability of these findings.

References

Abay, M. 2021. The effects of consciousness raising grammar tasks on EFL students' writing performance: University of Gondar in Focus. *Ethiopian Renaissance Journal of Social Sciences and the Humanities* 8(1), 44-58.

Amirian, S. M. R. and F. Sadeghi. 2012. The effect of grammar consciousness-raising tasks on EFL learners' performance. *International Journal of Linguistics* 4(3), 708-720.

Boulton, A. and T. Cobb. 2017. Corpus use in language learning: A meta-analysis. *Language learning* 67(2), 348-393.

Cho, Y. 2019. A study on the preferences of high school students and college students towards integrated and isolated form-focused instruction. *The Journal of Linguistic Science* 90, 363-382.

Cohen, J. 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Doughty, C. and J. Williams. 1998. *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. 2001. Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language learning* 51, 1-46.

Ellis, R. 2016. Focus on form: A critical review. *Language Teaching Research* 20(3), 405-428.

ETS. 2019. *TOEIC score interpretation guide*. Educational Testing Service.

File, K. A. and R. Adams. 2010. Should vocabulary instruction be integrated or isolated? *TESOL Quarterly* 44(2), 222-249.

Gui, J. and S. M. Ismail. 2024. The effect of planning time on vocabulary acquisition in a task-based environment: The mediating roles of working memory and field (in)dependence. *BMC Psychology* 12(1), 145-164.

Kang, D. 2018. Integrated and Isolated Form-focused Instruction from Korean EFL Learners' Perspective. *The Journal of the Korea Contents Association* 18(5), 123-130.

Kang, H. Y. and C. H. Lee. 2020. Effects of focus on form instruction through listening in blended learning on the development of grammar and listening skills. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 20, 662-691.

Kim, H. and H. S. Chung. 2016. A comparison of integrated FFI and isolated FFI in the development of explicit knowledge and implicit knowledge. *Modern English Education* 17(4), 71-94.

Kormos, J. and A. Sáfár. 2008. Phonological short-term memory, working memory and foreign language performance in intensive language learning. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 11(2), 261-271.

Larsen-Freeman, D. 2006. The emergence of complexity, fluency, and accuracy in the oral and written production of five Chinese learners of English. *Applied Linguistics* 27(4), 590-619.

Loewen, S. 2011. Focus on form. In E. Hinkel, ed., *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, 576-592. Routledge.

Long, M. 1991. Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg and C. Kramsch, eds., *Foreign Language Research in Cross-cultural Perspective*, 39-52. John Benjamins.

Long, M. and P. Robinson. 1998. Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty and J. Williams, eds., *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, 15-41. Cambridge University Press.

Nassaji, H. 2016. Research Timeline: Form-focused instruction and second language acquisition. *Language Teaching* 49(1), 35-62.

Nguyen, C., D. Le and H. Ngo, H. 2022. EFL teachers' perceptions of the individualized learning model: A case at an English language center. *International Journal of Instruction* 15(1), 437-456.

Norris, J. M. and L. Ortega. 2000. Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-

analysis. *Language Learning* 50(3), 417-528.
Ortega, L. 2003. Syntactic complexity measures and their relationship to L2 proficiency: A research synthesis of college-level L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics* 24(4), 492-518.
Özdemir, S. 2024. The effects of collaborative writing on l2 individual writing performance in terms of complexity, accuracy, fluency and functional adequacy. *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction* 14(4), 235-244.
Peng, Y. and J. S. Barrot. 2023. Post-writing form-focused instruction in process-genre-oriented writing classrooms: Effects on second language learners' writing accuracy. *Porta Linguarum* 39, 249-264.
Polio, C. and C. Shea. 2014. An investigation into current measures of linguistic accuracy in second language writing research. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 26, 10-27.
Richards, J. C. and R. Reppen. 2014. Towards a pedagogy of grammar instruction. *RELC Journal* 45(1), 5-25.
Robinson, P. 2001. Task Complexity, Cognitive Resources, and Syllabus Design: A Triadic Framework for Examining Task Influences on SLA. In P. Robinson, ed., *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*, 287-318. Cambridge University Press.
Skehan, P. 1998. *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford University Press.
Spada, N. 2011. Beyond form-focused instruction: Reflections on past, present and future research. *Language Teaching* 44(2), 225-236.
Spada, N. and P. M. Lightbown. 2008. Form-focused instruction: Isolated or integrated? *TESOL Quarterly* 42(2), 181-207.
Spada, N., L. Jessop, Y. Tomita, W. Suzuki and A. Valeo. 2014. Isolated and integrated form-focused instruction: Effects on different types of L2 knowledge. *Language Teaching Research* 18(4), 453-473.
Suhaimi, S. and Musdizal, M., 2022. The implementation of the consciousness-raising (CR) method in improving EFL students' writing skills. *Tarbawi: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*18(1), 22-35.
Swain, M. and S. Lapkin. 2013. Focus on form through collaborative dialogue: Exploring task effects. In *Researching Pedagogic Tasks*, 99-118. Routledge.
Telila, B., T. Olana and M. Zewudie. 2023. Effects of integrated form-focused instruction on students' writing attitude, motivation, and achievement: Grade 10 in focus. *Veda's Journal of English Language and Literature* 10(1), 98-109.
Valeo, A. and N. Spada. 2016. Is there a better time to focus on form? Teacher and learner views. *Tesol Quarterly* 50(2), 314-339.
Williams, J. 2005. Form-focused instruction. In *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, 671-691. Routledge.
Xu, J. and C. Y. Li. 2021. The effects of the timing of form-focused instruction in EFL learners' learning of difficult and easy grammatical features: A comparative study. *System* 101, Article 102612.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Level: Tertiary

Appendix A. Examples of Materials for Each Instructional Group

Target Grammar: Subject-Verb Agreement

A1. Integrated Group (IG): Real-time Grammar Focus within Writing
Grammar Consciousness-Raising Worksheet
Instructions:

1. As you write your essay on "My Daily Routine: How I Manage My Time," highlight all verbs you use in your sentences.
2. While drafting, work with your group to check each sentence for subject-verb agreement errors in real time. Underline or correct errors as you notice them.
3. The instructor will circulate during writing to provide immediate, oral feedback on any grammar mistakes noticed in your text.
4. After writing, briefly discuss as a group:
    - Which types of errors were most common?
    - How did real-time feedback help you revise?
5. Revise your draft based on your own observations, peer suggestions, and instructor feedback.

A2. Sequential Isolated Group (SIG): Grammar Focus Before Writing
Pre-writing Grammar Practice Worksheet
Instructions:

1. Study the following example sentences and underline the verbs.
    - Ex: He usually eat breakfast at 7 a.m.
    - Ex: My friends enjoys playing basketball.
2. Identify and correct any errors in subject-verb agreement.
    - Corrected: He usually eats breakfast at 7 a.m.
    - Corrected: My friends enjoy playing basketball.
3. As a group, read a short sample passage and circle all examples of correct subject-verb agreement.
4. Explicitly summarize the subject-verb agreement rule in your own words.
5. Now, individually write your own sentences (at least five) that correctly demonstrate subject-verb agreement.
6. Share and check your sentences in pairs, providing peer feedback.

Essay Prompt (After Grammar Activity)

- Essay Topic: My Daily Routine: How I Manage My Time
- Instructions: Write a paragraph describing your daily routine. Try to use at least three different verbs in the present tense and apply the subject-verb agreement rule you practiced.

A3. Reverse Sequential Isolated Group (RSIG): Writing before Grammar Focus
Writing Task First

- Essay Prompt:
    - Topic: My Daily Routine: How I Manage My Time

- Write a one-paragraph essay describing your routine. Do not worry about grammar for your first draft—focus on expressing your ideas and content.

Post-writing Grammar Consciousness-Raising Activity
Instructions:

1. After completing your draft, review your essay independently.
2. Highlight every verb in your sentences and re-read each one to check for subject-verb agreement.
3. Exchange your essay with a partner and use the checklist below:
    - Do all subjects and verbs agree in number?
    - Did the writer use present simple tense appropriately?
    - Are there any incomplete or run-on sentences?
    - Mark any errors and suggest corrections.
4. Refer to a brief rule summary of subject-verb agreement provided by your instructor and, in pairs, discuss which errors were most frequent and why.
5. Revise your essay based on peer and self-feedback.

Appendix B. Grammar Recognition Test (30 Items)

Instructions
Answer the following questions. For multiple-choice items, select the best answer. For error identification, indicate the error and provide the correct form. For grammar explanation, write a brief but clear explanation. Each correct answer is scored 1 point.
Target Grammar Items (20 questions)
1. Subject-Verb Agreement (5 questions)

1) Choose the correct sentence.
   a) She go to school every day.
   b) She going to school every day.
   c) She goes to school every day.
   d) She gone to school every day.
2) Identify the error and correct it:
   "He *do* not like coffee."
   Error: ____
   Correction: ____
3) Which sentence is grammatically correct?
   a) The dogs running fast.
   b) The dogs runs fast.
   c) The dogs run fast.
   d) The dogs runned fast.
4) Explain the rule for subject-verb agreement in English.
5) Choose the correct verb form:
   "Each of the students _____ responsible for their homework."
   a) are
   b) is

c) were
d) be

2. Tense Usage (5 questions)
1) Choose the correct tense:
"She _____ (study) English for three years."
a) study
b) has studied
c) studied
d) studies
2) Identify and correct the error:
"They goes to the library every weekend."
Error: ____
Correction: ____
3) Which sentence describes a completed past action?
a) She has eaten dinner already.
b) She is eating dinner now.
c) She will eat dinner tomorrow.
d) She eat dinner yesterday.
4) Explain the difference between present simple and present continuous tense.
5) Choose the correct sentence:
a) I will go to the party last night.
b) I went to the party last night.
c) I going to the party last night.
d) I goes to the party last night.

3. Active vs. Passive Voice (3 questions)
1) Select the correct passive form:
"The chef _____ the meal."
a) cooks b) is cooking c) is cooked by d) cooked
2) Find and correct the error:
"The homework was done the student."
Error: ____
Correction: ____
3) Explain when we use passive voice in English.

4. Gerund vs. Infinitive (3 questions)
1) Choose the correct form:
"I enjoy _____ (read) books."
a) to read b) reading c) read d) reads
2) Identify the error and correct it:
"She decided going to the park."
Error: ____

Correction: ____

3) Explain the main difference between gerund and infinitive usage.

5. Positive, Comparative, and Superlative Adjectives (2 questions)

1) Choose the correct form:
"My house is _____ than yours."
a) biggest b) bigger c) big d) most big

2) Identify and correct the error:
"This is the more beautiful painting in the gallery."
Error: ____
Correction: ____

6. Relative Clauses (2 questions)

1) Choose the correct relative pronoun:
"The person _____ called you is my friend."
a) which b) who c) what d) whose

2) Explain how relative clauses function in sentences.

Filler Items – Non-Target Grammar (10 questions)

1. Articles (3 questions)

1) Choose the correct article:
"I saw _____ elephant at the zoo."
a) the b) an c) a d) no article

2) Find and correct the error:
"He is a honest man."
Error: ____
Correction: ____

3) Which sentence is correct?
a) I want to buy apple. b) I want to buy an apple.
c) I want to buy the apple. d) I want to buy no apple.

2. Prepositions (3 questions)

1) Fill in the blank:
"We will meet _____ the airport."
a) in b) on c) at d) to

2) Find and correct the error:
"She is good in swimming."
Error: ____ Correction: ____

3) Choose the correct preposition:
"The book is _____ the table."
a) off b) on c) at d) inside

3. Modal Verbs (4 questions)

1) Choose the correct modal verb:
   "You _____ finish your homework before you go out."
   a) may b) must c) can d) shall
2) Find and correct the error:
   "He should to see a doctor."
   Error: ____
   Correction: ____
3) Which sentence expresses ability?
   a) She must dance. b) She can dance.
   c) She will dance. d) She may dance.
4) Explain the difference between 'may' and 'might'.

Scoring Instructions

- Each correct answer receives 1 point, incorrect or incomplete answers receive 0 points.
- For error identification questions, both the erroneous part and the correct correction must be accurately identified to earn full credit.
- Grammar explanation questions are scored based on the clarity and correctness of the key idea.

