



The Effects of Collaborative and Individual Output Tasks on Learning English Collocations

Nasser Minaei¹, Ghafour Rezaie^{2*}

¹Department of English, Faculty of Humanities, Garmsar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Garmsar, Iran

²Department of English, Faculty of Humanities, Garmsar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Garmsar, Iran

Received: 14 July, 2013

Accepted: 20 December, 2014

Abstract

One of the most problematic areas in foreign language learning is collocation. It is often seen as arbitrary and an overwhelming obstacle to the achievement of nativelike fluency. Current second language (L2) instruction research has encouraged the use of collaborative output tasks in L2 classrooms. This study examined the effects of two types of output tasks (editing and cloze) on the learning of English collocations. The aim was to investigate whether doing the tasks collaboratively would lead to greater gains of knowledge of the target collocations than doing them individually. The knowledge of the target collocations was measured by means of a collocation knowledge test administered before and after the treatment. The results showed that collaborative output tasks led to greater collocation knowledge than individual output tasks. The results, however, showed an effect for task type in promoting the learning of the target collocations, with the cloze tasks being more effective than the editing tasks. One obvious implication is that teachers need to incorporate more collaborative output tasks into their instruction in their attempts to facilitate the acquisition of L2 collocations by the learners.

Keywords: collaborative output tasks, individual output tasks, collocation, editing task, cloze task

INTRODUCTION

Recent second language acquisition (SLA) research has pinpointed the importance of classroom activities and the degree to which these activities lead to communicative interactions and attention to form in second language (L2) classrooms (Ellis, 2003, 2005). For this purpose, the use of appropriate pedagogical tasks that simultaneously improve negotiation of meaning and attention to the form seems useful (Pica, 2005). There is enough evidence that ample exposure to meaning-based interaction and comprehensible input is not enough for successful

L2 learning, and learners will still be inaccurate with respect to some aspects of grammar (Harly & Swain, 1984; Lapkin, Hart, & Swain, 1991). It is because learners do not have enough opportunity for language production and focus on form (Swain, 1993, 1998).

From a sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1978, 1986, cited in Nassaji & Tian, 2010), social interaction and collaboration are essential for learning. Individual cognitive development cannot be achieved in isolation, and social enterprise is a need for learning. In other words, when learners collaborate with other learners, they use their existing knowledge to learn what they have not mastered independently (Aljaafreh

*Corresponding Author's Email: rezaie434 @gmail.com

& Lantof, 1994; Donato, 1994; Nassaji & Swain, 2000). When learners collaborate to produce output, they use language not only to convey meaning, but also to develop meaning. These activities are very helpful because when learners try to express their intended meaning, they can get help from their peers to be more precise in their own meaning (Swain, 2005). Given that learners often fail to use the words they already know in new collocations, teachers need to plan and implement an interventional instruction in relation to collocations (Channell, 1981).

Output Tasks

Findings of different studies have provided evidence for positive effect of output in language learning (Nobuyoshi & Ellis, 1993; Swain, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 2001). It is argued that producing L2 pushes the learners to become more aware of their problems in communication and process language more deeply by making their output more precise, coherent and appropriate (Swain, 2000). There are three major functions for learner output: noticing function, hypothesis-testing function, and metalinguistic function (Swain, 2005). The noticing function proposes that when learners produce output, they may find some gaps in their knowledge because they may understand that they are not able to say or produce what they want. The hypothesis-testing function suggests that when learners are communicating with others, they try to test different ways of saying the same thing and may also come to realize whether their utterances are comprehensible and well-formed or not. The metalinguistic function may encourage learners to consciously reflect upon language and think about what to say and what not to say. Collaboration may facilitate these functions. Kowal and Swain (1993) claim that collaborative output makes learners aware of the gaps in their knowledge, directs their attention to form, function, and meaning, and helps them receive feedback from their peers during task completion.

Output tasks are the tasks that provide the learners with opportunity to produce the target

language. Unlike comprehension, production requires the learners to focus more on the syntactic features of the utterance (Swain, 1985, 2000). When performed collaboratively, output may provide opportunities for deeper processing of the language data (Kowal & Swain, 1993). Various forms of collaborative output tasks are used in L2 classrooms. These include, among others, dictogloss, in which learners are required to collaboratively reconstruct a text presented to them orally (Kowal, & Swain, 1993), cloze tasks, in which learners are required to fill in the missing words collaboratively (Pica, 2005), and editing tasks, in which learners are required to amend a text to improve its accuracy (Storch, 2007).

Research on Collaborative and Individual Output Tasks

Numerous studies have investigated the roles of different types of output tasks under collaborative and individual conditions. The results have provided positive evidence for the effectiveness of collaborative tasks, with the task type acting as an important moderator variable. For example, Wajnryb (1990, cited in Nassaji & Tian, 2010) examined a particular pedagogical task called dictogloss. Their results showed that when learners were involved in the co-production of language through such tasks, they noticed gaps in their knowledge of language, their attention was drawn to the link between form and meaning, and they obtained feedback from their peers. Nabei (1996) conducted a similar study with four adult ESL learners who worked in pairs to complete a dictogloss, and obtained similar results. She found many instances where the activity promoted opportunities for attention to form, scaffolding, and corrective feedback.

The relative effects of different types of tasks have also been examined by many researchers. Swain and Lapkin (2001) compared the effectiveness of a dictogloss with a jigsaw task (in which pairs of students created a written story based on a series of pictures). Participants were two grade 8 French immersion classes. Each

class completed one of the tasks. The learners' interactions during the tasks were analyzed in terms of language related episodes (LREs), defined as episodes in which learners talked about, questioned, or self-corrected the language they produced. The results showed that both tasks generated a similar and substantial amount of language related episodes. There was no significant difference between the two types of tasks in terms of the overall degree of the learners' attention to form as reflected in their LREs. No significant difference was found between the two groups' posttest scores either, suggesting that the two types of task produced comparable degrees of language gains.

Similarly, Izumi (2002) compared the effectiveness of a dictogloss with a text reconstruction task (a text that had certain grammatical words missing, such as articles, prepositions and function words, and the learners had to supply them). Participants were seven pairs of high intermediate to advanced EFL (English as a foreign language) learners. The data were analyzed both quantitatively in terms of the frequency of LREs and qualitatively in terms of learners' focused attention on forms. The results indicated that text-reconstruction task generated more LREs than the dictogloss.

Some studies have compared the effectiveness of collaborative versus individual tasks. For example, Storch (2007) examined the effectiveness of pair work by comparing learners' performance on an editing task. The learners were asked to correct a short text as a regular classroom activity. The text contained errors on the use of language forms such as verbs, articles and word forms, and was based on a text produced by a previous ESL student. Four intact ESL classes participated in the study. One of the classes completed the task in pairs, another individually, and the other two classes had the choice of completing the tasks either in pairs or individually. The results showed that when the students completed the tasks in pairs they were actively engaged in interaction and reflection about language forms. Again, no significant dif-

ference was found between the accuracy of the task when completed collaboratively versus individually. The researcher suggested that one reason may have been related to the nature of the errors targeted. She argued that the majority of the editing items in the tasks were related to the use of articles and word forms, and hence the learners were not able to resolve such problems collaboratively. In another study, Storch (2005) examined the effectiveness of collaborative pair work where students produced a written text either in pairs or individually. The study examined both the product of their writings (in terms of accuracy, fluency and complexity) as well as the nature of interaction between the learners during collaboration. The results showed that the collaborative pair work led to many opportunities for the exchange of ideas and peer feedback. The results also indicated that students who produced the text collaboratively wrote shorter but grammatically more accurate and more complex structures in comparison with those who produced it individually.

The results from the above studies suggest that collaborative classroom tasks provide enough opportunities for learners to receive feedback and focus on the form. However, the results are mixed. In Nassaji and Tian's (2010) study collaborative tasks did not result in significantly greater gains of vocabulary than individual tasks. Concerning the task type, Long (2006) argues that reconstruction tasks are not different from each other in terms of their effects on learning collocation. Nassaji and Tian (2010), on the other hand, found that editing tasks were more effective than cloze tasks. So it seems necessary that new studies be conducted in order to examine the relative effects of collaborative and individual tasks on learning L2 collocations before solid conclusions can be drawn in this regard.

Collocations

As Liu (2010) argues, the term collocation has been defined in different ways. But the most widely accepted definition is provided by Nes-

selhauf (2003), who defines it as a type of word combination which is characterized by “arbitrary restriction on substitutability” (p. 225). Restriction on substitutability is not determined by the semantic properties of the elements involved in the collocation but is to some degree arbitrary. For example, in the combination *reach a decision*, the reason that other verbs cannot replace *decision* is arbitrary. Smadja (1993), on the other hand, puts emphasis on the frequency aspect of collocation and proposes that collocations are “combinations of words that co-occur more often than expected by chance” (p. 143).

Explaining that a collocation may consist of two or more words, Hill (2000) organizes English collocations into seven categories:

1. adjective + noun (*a huge profit*)
2. noun + noun (*a pocket calculator*)
3. verb + adjective + noun (*learn a foreign language*)
4. verb + adverb (*live dangerously*)
5. adverb + verb (*half understood*)
6. adverb + adjective (*completely soaked*)
7. verb + preposition + noun (*speak through an interpreter*)

Cowie (1992) argues that collocations are important in both receptive and productive language competence. In other words, they are very useful in both the comprehension and production of language. Memorizing collocations may prove a useful strategy to overcome some problems learners face in the course of language learning and use.

As Nattinger (1988, p. 75) claimed, “collocations teach students expectations about which sorts of language can follow from what has preceded. Students will not have to go about reconstructing the language each time they want to say something but instead can use these collocations as pre-packaged building blocks”. In fact, a language can be acquired faster and more efficiently when *chunks* are taught (Ellis, 2003). When learners use collocations, native speakers will understand them better. The use collocations by second language learners will help native speakers guess what they intend to convey

and compensate for other problems including pronunciation (Deveci, 2004).

A number of suggestions have been made about how to teach collocations. These include raising learners’ awareness, presenting collocations as individual words, recording collocations, and using dictionaries (Hill, 2000). Teachers need to raise learners’ awareness and noticing of collocations. Strategies like highlighting the collocations in the text may draw learners’ attention to them (Fox, 1998). Presenting the collocations as individual words may help learners know that these combinations of words should be treated as chunks. Similarly, using collocation dictionaries can provide students with enough opportunities to individually develop their own knowledge of collocations. To obtain the maximum benefit from using dictionaries in class, learners need a systematic way of recording the information they receive. Browsing the exemplifying sentences in dictionaries can also provide useful information on how the collocations are used; as a result, teachers need to train their learners to use dictionaries in this way (Hill, 2000).

Research Questions

In order to examine the effectiveness of collaborative and individual tasks in learning English collocations, the researchers put forth the following research questions:

1. Is there any significant difference between editing and cloze tasks in terms of their effects on learning English collocations?
2. Does collaborative vs. individual performance of output tasks have a differential impact on learning English collocations?
3. Do individual editing task performance and collaborative editing task performance differ in terms of their effects on the learning of English collocations?
4. Do individual cloze task performance and collaborative cloze task performance differ in terms of their effects on the learning of English collocations?

Method

Participants

This study was conducted in 4 low-intermediate classes. The participants were 30 adult university students. Their purpose was to participate in ILETS exam. Participants included 13 female and 17 male students and were all native speakers of Persian. Their age ranged between 20 and 30 years. Two instructors cooperated to conduct the study, and all participants followed the same instructional goal. Each instructor had two classes. The instruction was given during 8 weeks. The Oxford Placement Test was used to make sure that all the students were placed in the right level and that the learners did not differ in terms of their proficiency level. Those with extreme scores were excluded from the study. Finally, teachers were clearly aware of what they were supposed to do in their classes because of permanent contact with the researchers. Furthermore, there were some meeting sessions with one of the researchers to elaborate on the purpose of the study and the tasks that teachers had to use in their classes.

Instruments and Instructional Materials

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of two types of tasks on learning 40 English collocations as one of the most problematic areas in learning English. Another objective was to examine either collaborative or individual performance of the tasks would lead to higher gains. The two tasks investigated in the present study were *editing* and *cloze* tasks. They were selected because they seem to be more common in English language tests and classes. Totally, there were four tasks for each class, two editing tasks and two cloze tasks. In order to determine the effectiveness of these tasks and also the difference between individual and collaborative performing on tasks, learners were supposed to work on one cloze task and one editing task individually and one cloze task and one editing task collaboratively. All texts were extracted from “English Collocations in Use” (Reinders, 2010). Also, the tasks were designed based on

four original texts from this book about sport, everyday verbs, eating and drinking, and work. In addition, the selected collocations were believed to be appropriate to learners’ level and related to the content of their lessons. The texts were presented to the learners as a complementary part to their coursebook.

Each editing task contained ten erroneous collocations that learners were required to amend as closely as possible to the original collocations. Each cloze task contained ten missing collocations that learners were supposed to correctly supply.

The following examples illustrate editing tasks which focused on the use of “eating and drinking” collocations. Learners were required to identify the erroneous parts and then correct them. Prior to the treatment, the learners were familiarized with the target collocations through some texts enriched with those collocations.

Example 1

Tom: Kids eat far too much litter food.

Nelly: Yeah, but it’s hard to get them to eat good meals. They think they’re boring, meals which make you healthy and strong.

Example 2

Fran: Have you tried the new supermarket yet?

Jim: Yes, the new produce is excellent, and they have a big green food section.

Fran: Mm, yes. I actually think their prepared meals are good, too.

Cloze tasks on ‘eating and drinking’ included some missing collocations from the original text. The format of both editing and cloze tasks was adapted from Nassaji and Tian (2010). Learners were required to fill in the missing elements using their knowledge of collocations and also the collocations presented to them prior to the treatment session.

Example 1

Liam: I can’t believe _____ are good for our long-term health.

Todd: No, and I think _____ in general

are probably bad for us, not to mention _____.

Gail: The restaurant was leaving _____ lying round outside the fridge, and some people got _____ so the authorities closed it down.

Terry: Oh dear.

In order to measure the participants' knowledge of target collocations, the researchers constructed two multiple-choice tests, each consisting of 10 items. One of them was intended to be used after the first phase of the study, and the other after the second. The reliability of both tests was examined through item analysis and Cronbach's Alpha. The item discrimination indexes were found to range from 0.29 to 0.55 for the first test and from 0.35 to 0.63 for the second one. The Cronbach's Alpha values the first and second tests were 0.59 and 0.83.

Design and Procedure

This study was a quasi-experimental study, with pretest-treatment-posttest design, conducted with low-intermediate English learners. This study used two types of tasks, editing and cloze tasks. There were two editing and two cloze tasks to be performed collaboratively and individually by the learners, aimed at measuring the difference between individual and collaborative learning. The same learners worked on one of the editing tasks collaboratively and on the other individually. The same procedure was used in relation to the cloze tasks.

The study was conducted in two phases each lasting 4 weeks. In Week One, students were presented with a pretest based on the target collocations. In Week Two, they were exposed to original texts enriched by 20 target collocations. The learners were first required to read the texts on their own. The teacher monitored them while they were working on the texts. Then, the teacher elaborated on the text and provided the learners with the meaning of collocations. This phase was aimed at providing an initial familiarity with the target collocations. During the third week, the participants were given one editing

and one cloze task. Each of these tasks covered 10 collocations, making a total of 20. The teacher divided the learners into groups of two (who did the tasks collaboratively) and individuals (who did the tasks individually). This phase of treatment was carried out in two sessions, each lasting for about 45 minutes. . In Week Four, the first posttest, which was based on the collocations used in the first phase, was administered. They were asked to answer the 10 questions on the posttest in 10 minutes.

The second phase of the study followed the same procedure, differing only in the collocations and the way learners carried out the tasks. This time, those who did the tasks individually in the first phase performed them collaboratively and vice versa. During the first week of the second phase, the next 20 collocations were presented to the learners aimed at initial familiarization. In the second week, learners were provided with a pretest which included the new target collocations. In the next week, they were exposed to original texts enriched by target collocations. Learners were required to work on the text with the teacher elaborating on the texts and giving the meaning of collocations. Then, the participants were given the tasks, again one editing and one cloze task. This time, the students who did the tasks individually in the first phase of the study were required to do them collaboratively, and the learners who worked on tasks collaboratively in the first phase of the study, performed the tasks individually. Again, during the fourth week, the participants were exposed to a posttest based on target collocations. Similar to the first phase, they were required to answer 10 multiple choice questions in 10 minutes.

Teachers in this study were observed in both phases by one of the researchers to make sure that they were following the procedures appropriately.

Results

In this study, the researchers investigated two conditions, that is, performing tasks individually and performing tasks collaboratively. Furthermore, the differences between two types of re-

construction tasks (editing and cloze) were examined. There were two editing tasks (one conducted collaboratively and one individually) and two cloze tasks (one conducted collaboratively and one individually).

The pretest scores were analyzed in order to make sure that the groups were not significantly different from each other in terms of their knowledge of target collocations. Based on the research questions, four different comparisons were made. The results indicated that the groups (editing vs. cloze [$t(29) = 1.3$, $P = 0.203$]; individual vs. collaborative [$t(29) = 1.9$, $P = 0.054$]; editing individual vs. editing collaborative [$t(29) = 1.8$, $P = 0.072$]; cloze individual vs. cloze

collaborative [$t(29) = 1.7$, $P = 0.083$]) did not significantly differ in terms of their pretest mean scores. As a result, any significant differences found at the posttest phase can be attributed to the effects of treatment.

Research Question One was aimed at examining if there was a significance difference between editing and cloze tasks in terms of their effects on learning English collocations. In order to answer this research question, the researchers made a comparison between the results of posttests from cloze (both collaborative and individual) and editing tasks (both collaborative and individual). Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for cloze and editing tasks.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for Cloze and Editing Tasks

| | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-----------|---------|---------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| Pair 1 | editing | 13.3000 | 30 | 2.65421 | .48459 |
| | cloze | 16.0667 | 30 | 2.40593 | .43926 |

Reading the mean column of Table 1 reveals that the participants in cloze group performed better on posttest ($M=16.06$) than the editing group ($M=13.3$). This suggests that providing learners with cloze tasks may prove more useful than editing tasks in teaching English collocations.

In order to find out whether the mean difference between cloze and editing tasks was statistically significant, a paired-samples t-test was run. The results of the t-test [$T(29) = 11.614$, $p = 0.000$] indicated that the mean difference between cloze and editing task was statistically significant. The pertinent null hypothesis, therefore, was rejected at 95% level of confidence.

Based on the information presented above, cloze tasks are more effective than editing tasks. The results are in line with those of the study by Nassaji and Tian (2010), who found that learners performed more successfully in completing cloze tasks than the editing tasks.

Research Question Two examined if there was any significant difference between collaborative and individual performance of tasks in terms of their effects on learning English collocations. To answer the question, a comparison between the results of individual and collaborative posttest scores regardless of the type of the task was made. Table 2 elaborates on related descriptive statistics.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics of Individual and Collaborative Scores

| | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-----------|---------------|--------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| Pair 1 | individual | 6.7667 | 30 | 2.11209 | .38561 |
| | collaborative | 8.6333 | 30 | 1.40156 | .25589 |

As Table 2 shows, the posttest mean score for collaborative task ($M=8.633$) was higher than the posttest mean score for individual task

($M=6.766$). This means that doing tasks collaboratively has greater effect than doing them individually.

The statistical significance of the difference was checked through a paired samples t-test. The results indicated that the mean difference between collaborative and individual tasks was statistically significant [$T(29) = 6.805, p = 0.000$]. It is, then, concluded that collaborative and individual tasks had differential impacts on the learning of the target collocations. The results were compatible with those of the study by Nassaji and Tian (2010). They found that performing tasks collaboratively results in greater knowledge of phrasal verbs than performing the

tasks individually.

Research Question Three aimed at showing if performing editing task collaboratively or individually made any significant difference in acquiring English collocations. For this purpose, a comparison was made between the posttest scores of the editing tasks which were done individually and the editing tasks which were done collaboratively by the participants. A paired samples t-test and descriptive statistics were used. Table 3 presents the result of descriptive statistics.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics of Performing Editing Tasks Individually and Collaboratively

| | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|--------|--------------------|--------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| Pair 1 | Edit individual | 5.6333 | 30 | 1.82857 | .33385 |
| | Edit collaborative | 7.6667 | 30 | 1.34762 | .24604 |

As can be seen in Table 3, the mean score of participants in editing collaborative tasks ($M=7.666$) was higher than that of the participants in editing individual ($M=5.633$) tasks. This indicated a considerable improvement in collocation knowledge of the participants as a result of doing editing tasks collaboratively. It was, however, necessary to examine whether this difference was statistically significant. Therefore, a paired samples t-test was used. Findings demonstrate that the difference between editing collaborative and editing individual was statistically significant [$T(29) = 6.154, p = 0.000$]. It is then concluded that doing editing tasks collaboratively

results in great improvement in English collocations than doing them individually. The results were in line with those of Izumi (2002), who found that collaborative completion of dictogloss lead to higher gains of target forms.

The purpose of Question Four was to investigate if there was any significant difference in performing cloze tasks collaboratively or individually in terms of their effects on learning English collocations. For this purpose, the researchers made a comparison between the posttest results of performing cloze tasks individually and performing them collaboratively. The descriptive statistics are presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics of Cloze Individual and Cloze Collaborative

| | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|--------|---------------------|--------|----|----------------|-----------------|
| Pair 1 | Cloze individual | 7.2000 | 30 | 1.71001 | .31220 |
| | Cloze collaborative | 8.8667 | 30 | 1.16658 | .21299 |

Table 4 depicts that the mean score obtained by cloze collaborative group ($M=8.866$) is higher than the one obtained by cloze individual group ($M=7.200$). This suggests that collaborative group significantly performed better on cloze tasks than the group that performed them individually. In order to determine whether the

mean difference between these two groups was statistically significant, a paired samples t-test was employed.

Examining the significance of the mean difference, the researchers found statistically significant difference between cloze collaborative and cloze individual [$T(29) = 5.473, p = 0.000$].

Given that these groups were not significantly different from each other at the outset of the study, the pertinent null hypothesis was rejected at 95% level of confidence. Therefore, it can be concluded that using cloze collaborative tasks results in more knowledge of collocations than using cloze individual tasks.

Pedagogical Implications and Suggestions for Further Research

Based on what mentioned in the preceding section, it is obvious that using collaborative output tasks will help learners learn collocation better and more effectively. In view of the results obtained in this study, some pedagogical implications are proposed. One pedagogical implication of this study relates to the effectiveness of doing tasks collaboratively. As it was mentioned earlier, interaction always plays an important role in learning a foreign language in a way that learners can collaborate and interact with each other to produce correct target language forms. This proposes that teachers should be aware of conditions to which they expose their learners. Based on the findings of this study, it can be argued that interaction and collaboration may result in greater knowledge of collocations. So, they should plan for situations to expose learners with tasks that require them to interact and collaborate with peers in classrooms.

Another implication concerns the types of tasks to which learners are exposed. This study focused on cloze and editing output tasks and the results showed that performing editing tasks may not lead to higher gains in collocations. Based on this, it is suggested that teachers plan for using cloze tasks instead of editing tasks. In addition, because of the nature of editing task, performing them especially in lower levels may tire the learners and make them think that they are not good language learners. Furthermore, teachers should be always be aware of learners' level and their proficiency to expose them to appropriate difficulty level to make sure that they are motivated enough to participate in tasks collaboratively or individually. Also, given the

difficulty of collocations, teachers need to select those that match the proficiency level of the learners and be patient while learners are struggling with mastering the collocations presented to them.

Based on the results and limitations of the study, a number of recommendations for further study can be made. First, it is suggested the researcher make sure that the learners know how to collaborate and interact with each other. This can be done in different ways, such as, by showing them video-tapes of learners working collaboratively on similar tasks, explaining to and discussing with the learners how to participate in collaborative tasks and collectively solve the linguistic problems. Second, it seems necessary to investigate the other types of tasks to measure the effects of other types of tasks on learning English collocations.

Finally, because of the aforementioned reasons it seems that teaching collocations needs a precise understanding of the learning situation, exposing learners to appropriate conditions and task types, increasing teachers' awareness about the nature of collocations.

Conclusion

Offering a new approach in teaching has always been full of challenges, so it is suggested that scholars, investigators, and teachers share their thoughts and ideas, work together, design lessons, and help each other develop the effectiveness of educational programs (Takimoto, 2007). The motivation for present study was to find a way for teaching collocation in class which is a big area of weakness for both teachers, in a way that they do not know how to teach them, and learners. It is difficult for learners because they do not know how to learn them.

The present study was carried out to determine the effect of two conditions (collaborative and individual) on two types of output tasks (editing and cloze). For this end, participants were exposed to some tasks collaboratively and individually. The results of this study showed that working on collaborative output tasks lead to

greater improvement on learning collocation than individual output tasks. Also, cloze tasks were more effective than editing tasks.

In line with previous results, it seems that collocations are important in learning and teaching processes. But because of difficulty of the collocations and teachers' lack of knowledge of how to teach them, they are found to be problematic to teach. After all, it seems crucial that both teachers and learners reconsider collocations in their teaching and learning processes.

References

- Aljaafreh, A. & Lantolf, J. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 465–83.
- Channell, J. (1981). Applying semantic theory to vocabulary teaching. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 35, 115–22.
- Cowie, A.P. (1992). Multiword lexical units and communicative language teaching. In P. L. Arnaud & H. Bejoint (Eds.), *Vocabulary and applied linguistics* (pp. 1–12). London: Macmillan.
- Deveci, T. (2004). Why and how to teach collocations. *English Teaching Forum*, 16–20.
- Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & A. Gabriella. (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33–59). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fox, M. (1998). *Teaching collocations: Further developments in the lexical approach*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications.
- Harley, B. & Swain, M. (1984). *The interlanguage of immersion students and its implications for second language teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hill, J. (2000). Revising priorities: From grammatical failure to collocational success. In M. Lewis (Ed), *Teaching collocation* (pp. 47–70). Hove, England: Language Teaching Publications.
- Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis: An experimental study on ESL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 541–577.
- Kowal, M., & Swain, M. (1994). Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness. *Language Awareness*, 3, 73–93.
- Lapkin, S., Hart, D., & Swain, M. (1991). Early and middle French immersion programs: French language outcomes. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 48, 11–40.
- Liu, D. (2010). Going beyond patterns: Involving cognitive analysis in the learning of collocations. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44, 4–30.
- Long, M. (2006). Problems in SLA. *Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum*.
- Nabei, T. (1996). Dictogloss: Is it an effective language learning task? *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 12, 59–74.
- Nassaji, H. & Tian, J. (2010). Collaborative and individual output tasks and their effects on learning English phrasal verbs. *Language Teaching Research*, 14, 397–419.
- Nassaji, H. & Swain, M. (2000). Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: The effect of random vs. negotiated help on the learning of English articles. *Language Awareness*, 9, 34–51.
- Nattinger, J. (1988). Some current trends in vocabulary teaching. In R. Carter & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary and language teaching* (pp. 62–82). New York: Longman
- Nesselhauf, N. (2003). The use of collocations by advanced learners of English and some implications for teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 24, 223–242.
- Nobuyoshi, J., & Ellis, R. (1993). Focused communication tasks and second language acquisition. *ELT Journal*, 47, 203–210.
- Pica, T. (2005). Classroom learning, teaching ,

- and research: A task-based perspective. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 339–59.
- Reinders, H. (2010). Learner uptake and acquisition in three grammar-oriented production activities. *Language Teaching Research*, 13, 201–222.
- Smadja, F. (1993). Retrieving collocation from text: Xtract. *Computational Linguistics*, 19, 143–177.
- Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 153–173.
- Storch, N. (2007). Investigating the merits of pair work on a text editing task in ESL classes. *Language Teaching Research*, 2, 143–59.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensive input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass, & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50, 158–64.
- Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 64–81). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook on research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471–83). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (2001). Focus on form through collaborative dialogue: Exploring task effects. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 99–118). Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Takimoto, M. (2007). The effects of input-based tasks on the development of learners' pragmatic proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, 30, 1–25.
- Ghafour Rezaie** is assistant professor of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) at Islamic Azad University, Garmsar Branch, Garmsar, Iran. His main research interests include cognitive aspects of second language acquisition, research in applied linguistics, and language assessment. He has published and edited a number of research articles.
- Nasser Minaei** is MA graduate of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) at Islamic Azad University, Garmsar, Branch, Garmsar, Iran and an English teacher in state schools. His main research interests include pragmatic aspects of foreign language acquisition and language assessment.

