Journal of Language and Translation
Volume 8, Number 1, March 2018 , (pp. 43 -55)

The Comparative Effect of Task Type and Learning Conditions on the Achievement of Specific Target Forms

Jafar Firouzi[1], Mona Khabiri[*2]
[1]Department of English Language and Literature, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran
[2]Department of English, Faculty of Foreign Languages, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Received: 25 April, 2017 Accepted: 16 June, 2017

Abstract
The completion mode (individual, collaborative) of the tasks and the conditions under which these modes are performed have been reported to play an important role in language learning. The present study aimed to investigate the effects of employing text editing tasks performed both individually and collaboratively, on the achievement of English grammar under explicit and implicit learning conditions. Eighty-four English learners participated in this study. Some text editing tasks were developed regarding the target grammatical structures and presented to the participants under the explicit and implicit learning conditions. Their grammar achievement was operationalized through a multiple-choice recognition test. The results indicated that there was no significant difference between the effect of implicit and explicit conditions when editing tasks were performed individually, but collaborative completion of this task resulted in a significantly higher grammar achievement under explicit condition than implicit one. The comparison of the individual and collaborative performance of the task, under implicit and explicit conditions, revealed no significant difference under implicit condition. Collaborative completion of the task under explicit condition, however, proved to yield higher levels of grammar achievement when compared with the individual mode of performance.

Keywords: Editing task, Explicit condition, Implicit condition, Language achievement

INTRODUCTION

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is an approach, which seeks to allow students to work somewhat at their own pace and within their own level and area of interest to process and restructure their interlanguage. It moves away from a prescribed developmental sequence and introduces learner freedom and autonomy into the learning process. The teachers' role is also modified to that of helper. Ellis (2003) argues that with task-based instruction and authentic materials, learners make far more rapid progress and are able to use their new foreign language in real-world circumstances with a reasonable level of efficiency after quite short courses. They are able to operate an effective meaning system, i.e. to express what

*****Corresponding Author's Email:
Mona.khabiri@iauctb.ac.ir

they want to say, even though their grammar and lexis are often far from perfect.

Hence, many researchers have examined task characteristics beneficial to learning. These include various types of planning, the effects of task repetition and the task type, the interaction between task and the grammatical structure, and collaborative and individual performance of the tasks (e.g. Foster & Skehan, 1999; Lynch & Maclean, 2001; Oxford, 2006; Tarone, 1985).

Moreover, the conditions under which the tasks are employed are considered to affect the degree of learning. For instance, how implicit and explicit learning conditions affect the acquisition and storage of the second language (L2) data in the mind attracted the attention of many researchers in field of applied linguistic (e.g. Dekeyser, 1998; Ellis, 2001; Robinson, 2002). Dekeyser (1998) favors the use of explicit learning conditions, arguing that explicit instruction may help the learners develop declarative knowledge before it can be proceduralized. Regarding the identification of the learning conditions, Robinson (2002) suggests that comparing the results across different leaning conditions with different degrees of explicitness may help Second Language Acquisition (SLA) researchers to determine the most optimal conditions for learning.

There has been a controversy over implicit and explicit learning conditions in the field of language pedagogy (Ellis, 2005, 2008). In some approaches, conscious and explicit presentation of materials is considered crucial (Long & Robinson, 1998; Sharwood Smith, 1981; Svalberg, 2007). In this view, successful language learning is characterized by conscious knowledge of syntactic rules or other grammatical paradigms (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). The teacher's job is to either promote conscious learning or provide explicit explanation on the target language, and the learners' task is to learn the rules and consciously practice them through their application to new instances or through translation. The theoretical support for the positive role of explicit instruction comes from Robinson (1995b) and Schmidt (1990, 1994a, 1995, 2001, 2010). In his noticing hypothesis, Schmidt (1990, 1995) postulates that awareness, at the level of noticing, is necessary and sufficient for the conversion of input into intake. Similarly, studies by Leow (1997, 2001), Rosa and O'Neill (1999), and Rosa and Leow (2004) have provided evidence for the positive role of explicit instruction in language learning. The results of these studies indicate that when learners are provided with explicit instruction, they can process the language consciously which increases the amount of learning.

Others, however, have leveled some strong objections against the role of conscious processes in language learning (McLaughlin, 1990; Tomlin & Villa, 1994; Truscott, 1998). Truscott (1998) argues that explicit teaching leads to the development of metalinguistic knowledge, which is of little use in language learning. In the same vein, Krashen's (1985, 1987) method of natural approach denies any positive role for explicit language learning and teaching. In fact, his distinction between learning and acquisition follows from the idea that acquisition results from unconscious process, whereas conscious process, which is of little value in language pedagogy, leads to learning.

Tasks and L2 Learning

Numerous studies investigated the role of tasks in language learning. Majority of the studies attempted to address task types, learning conditions, individual variables, and the type of language component involved. For example, Fotos and Ellis (1991) and Fotos (1993, 1994) examined the role of consciousness raising tasks on the acquisition of grammar. Fotos and Ellis (1991) asked the learner to cooperate with each other and come up with rule concerning the grammatical points under investigation. The results indicated a positive role for consciousness raising tasks on the acquisition of grammar.

Some researchers have particularly been interested in the role of task type in language learning (e.g. Izumi & Bigelow, 2000; Nassaji & Tian, 2010; Storch, 1999, Tocalli-Beller & Swain,

2007). It is argued that when used within a pedagogical context, different task types may generally provide different opportunities for learning (Swain & Lapkin, 2000). Empirical investigation supports Swain and Lapkin's position. For example, Nassaji and Tian (2010), comparing individual and collaborative editing and cloze tasks, reported that editing tasks were more effective than cloze tasks. Izumi and Bigelow (2000) investigated text-reconstruction tasks as part of structure-based production tasks. Their text-reconstruction tasks required learners to read a short written passage that had been seeded with the target structure (English hypothetical/counterfactual conditionals) and to underline the parts they felt were especially important for subsequently reconstructing the passage. In their study, text-reconstruction tasks were successful in eliciting attempts to use the conditional structure. Storch (1999) examined the effect of three types of tasks including cloze, text reconstruction, and short composition on the grammatical accuracy of the learners. The tasks were performed both individually and collaboratively. Results indicated that collaborative performance had a positive effect on the grammatical accuracy of the learners but varied according to the type of the task. That is, collaboration increased accuracy on the reconstruction and composition tasks compared with the cloze task.

Likewise, Foster and Skehan (1996) examined a personal information exchange task, a narrative task and a decision-making task in terms of their impact on accuracy, fluency, and complexity of learners' language performance. The participants in their study were 32 pre-intermediate-level students studying English as a foreign language at the college level. Foster and Skehan found that the personal task generated less complexity than the narrative and decision-making tasks although the personal task produced the greatest amount of fluency. In light of this result, they proposed that interactive tasks tend to be associated with greater accuracy, complexity, but lower fluency. Skehan and Foster (2007) further examined the effects of types of tasks, as well as different task implementation conditions, on the fluency, accuracy and complexity of the learner language produced. The three tasks chosen for this study were similar in type to the tasks used in Foster and Skehan (1996). They found that the decision task under planning conditions produced the highest complexity scores. The results of these two studies became the basis of Skehan's trade-off hypothesis that fluency, accuracy and complexity seem to enter into competition with one another, given the limited attentional capacities of second language users. However, Skehan and his colleagues' observation that more interactive tasks lead to more complex language performance did not find support in Michel, Kuiken, and Vedder's (2007) study, which found that the dialogic (i.e., interactive) task tended to elicit shorter and structurally simpler sentences than the monologic narrative task. In other words, it is suggested that interactivity may affect structural complexity negatively.

Implicit and Explicit Learning Conditions

Conditions under which learning takes place has drawn considerable attention from researchers in the area of applied linguistics. Some have focused mainly on the tasks that presented students with the target structure implicitly and others on the tasks that presented learners with the target structure explicitly. For instance, Housen and Pierrard (2006) investigated the effects of two types of input tasks on high- intermediate and advanced university students in Germany and analyzed their improvement in initiating and responding to speech acts and conversational routines. After 14 weeks of education and also listening to tapes and behaving on their own language, the result showed that both implicitly and explicitly instructed groups had improvement, but the explicit groups' improvement was higher than the implicit one.

Takimoto (2008) studied the Japanese elementary learners and how they developed pragmatic proficiency under two types of instruction (implicit and explicit). In explicit groups, learners received teacher explanations and they watched

some video clips of examples of target pragmatic forms. The implicit group watched the same video clips but they did not receive any explicit meta-pragmatic activities. Quantitative and qualitative results including role play, multiple-choice test, and self-reports showed the advantage of explicit instruction over implicit one just after 50 minutes.

Rosa and O'Neill (1999) did a similar study. They investigated the implicit and explicit instruction to understand which one results in greater language learning. They studied learners' performance on learning complement and complement responses. The procedure for both groups were the same, the only difference was that the implicit group watched some video clips and they were guided by performing on some questionnaire on the target features instead of teacher- fronted activities. After six 30 minutes lessons, self-assessment, discourse completion, and metalinguistic questionnaire, the results showed that both groups developed their pragma linguistic proficiency effectively, but only the explicit group developed their socio pragmatic proficiency effectively.

Takahashi (2005) investigated four input enhancement conditions: explicit instruction, form-comparison, form-search, and meaning- focused conditions. In explicit instruction, learners were provided by some metalinguistic and teacher explanations of the target forms. In form-comparison group, learners compared their own forms with those which provided by native speakers of English. In form- search form condition, learners compared forms of Japanese English language learners with English native speaker forms. Also, in meaning focused group learners simply listened, read, and answered comprehension questions based on the input. After four weeks of instruction, the results of discourse completion test and self-report demonstrated that the explicit group learned all different parts more successfully than the other groups.

The results concerning the positive role of explicit learning, however, were not conclusive. Fotos and Ellis (1991) studied the effect of input enhancement of explicit and implicit meta-pragmatic instruction on learning L2 pragmatics by intermediate and advance learners. The explicit group watched videos and 30 scenarios with subtitle, the implicit group watched the video without subtitle. The results after taking two listening comprehension tests and two pragmatic multiple-choice tests showed that there was no difference between explicit and implicit group. .

Thus, the finding of the current research study may provide additional support for the arguments mentioned above by shedding light on whether collaborative and individual text editing tasks performed under implicit versus explicit learning conditions would help Iranian intermediate learners to master the four target forms chosen by the researchers in a foreign context. Therefore, the researchers posed the following research questions:

1. *Is there any significant difference between the effect of individual text editing task in implicit and explicit learning conditions on EFL learners' grammar achievement?*
2. *Is there any significant difference between the effect of collaborative text editing task in implicit and explicit learning conditions on EFL learners' grammar achievement?*
3. *Is there any significant difference between the effect of collaborative and individual completion of the editing task on EFL learners' grammar achievement in implicit learning condition?*
4. *Is there any significant difference between the effect of collaborative and individual completion of the editing task on EFL learners' grammar achievement in explicit learning condition?*

METHODS

Participants

Participants in this study included 84 intermediate university students in the field of English

Translation and English Teaching at three universities: Islamic Azad University, Damavand Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran South Branch, and Islamic Azad University, Tehran North Branch. These participants were drawn from a subject pool of 110 learners, 26 of whom were eliminated at different phases of the study for different reasons. It was essential that participants be not familiar with the target structure. Therefore, those who scored above the expected chance score on the pretest were excluded from the study. Participants were also homogenized using the reading and writing sections of a piloted version of Preliminary English Test (PET) and those who scored between 70 and 95 were selected for this study. This range of scores corresponds to B1 level (intermediate) in the Council of Europe's Common European Framework of Reference. The participants were all native speakers of Persian and were between 21 and 27 years of age. From the biodata, they provided during the pretest, it was determined that they had more or less similar L2 learning history.

Materials

Target Grammatical Structures

The present study attempted to investigate the role of two types of tasks in the learning of English grammar under implicit and explicit learning conditions. The selection of target grammatical structures was constrained by a number of factors. Firstly, the target grammatical structures were selected from the grammar syllabus of the abovementioned universities intended to be taught during the semester. Secondly, these structures are among the ones, which are usually instructed to the EFL learners at the intermediate level. Thirdly, through a pilot study, it was found that most learners had problems with these structures and demonstrated little or no familiarity with them. Finally, it was assumed that learning of these grammatical structures was challenging for Iranian learners. In other words, these structures did not seem to be at the lower level of difficulty for the learners. Based on the criteria mentioned above, the four grammatical structures selected for the present study were:

1. Passive voice (simple past)
   The problem was discovered by the mechanic.
2. Gerund (after prepositions)
   I've always been interested in learning about different cultures.
3. Causative construction*I*
   usually get my neighbor to water my plants when I am on holiday.
4. Conditional sentence type II
   If I had some money, I would lend you a few dollars.

The first structure was simple past passive form. This form is used when we want to emphasize the action, what happened rather than who or what performs the action. Simple past passive form is constructed by adding *was* or *were* to the past participle of the verb: *The library was used/ libraries were used by children last summer.*

The second one was gerund construction. A gerund is a noun that has been formed from a verb. Any verb can be turned into a gerund by adding *ing* to the simple form of the verb. A gerund can be used in different way. One is after a proposition as its object: My brother is thinking about spending a year in Italy.

The third was a causative construction, which expresses the idea of someone causing something to take place. Causative constructions are similar in meaning to passive voice. And the forth one was conditional II, which refers to an action in the present time that could happen if the present situation were different.

Treatment Tasks

To present the target grammatical structures, the researchers used text editing tasks. In text editing tasks, the participants are given a text containing incorrect forms, and they are required to recognize and correct them. In the present study, first the target structures within the texts were made ungrammatical and then given to the participants to be corrected. Since it was planned to expose

the participants to the target structures on two occasions, it was necessary to include each of the structures in two different texts. As a result, four texts were selected and were used for editing purposes. Prior to their use, they were examined for their readability to make sure that they were at same level of difficulty and were appropriate for the intermediate level. The results (Flesch Reading Ease) indicated that the texts were suitable for the learners at the intermediate level of proficiency.

Instruments

Multiple Choice Grammar Test

To measure the grammar achievement of the learners, the researchers developed a multiple-choice test on target grammatical structures. The test consisted of 32 items, eight items for each structure. The test was piloted and the reliability index, along with the item difficulty and discrimination indexes, was calculated. The reliability was found to be 0.71, and the item facility indexes ranged between 0.29 and 0.78, with discrimination indexes being between 0.31 and 0.79.

Procedure

The present study was carried out in 4 sessions, the first session for the pretest and homogeneity purposes, the second and third for the administration of the tasks, and the fourth for the posttest. During the pretest phase, which took place one week before the treatment, the participants were given the PET and a multiple choice grammar test. Based on the findings of the pilot study, the participants were asked to complete the PET and the grammar test in one and half hours and 20 minutes respectively. The grammar test determined the initial familiarity of the learners with the structures under investigation.

The treatment took place in tow sessions, one session a week. For the purpose of the study, participants were divided into the following four experimental groups:

Group 1. Collaborative text editing, explicit learning condition

Group 2. Collaborative text editing, implicit learning condition

Group 3. Individual text editing, explicit learning condition

Group 4. Individual text editing, implicit learning condition

Prior to the administration of the tasks in all groups, the researchers provided them with a brief oral introduction of the target structures. Then they were given the tasks and asked to perform the tasks according to the instructions specific to each group.

In Group 1 (collaborative text editing, explicit), learners were given a text in which the target grammar structures were grammatically wrong. They were instructed to correct the grammatical errors in the text collaboratively. In order to make the learning condition explicit, following Dekeyser (2003), learners were asked to attend to the target structures and also were provided with an example for each. Similar procedure was followed in Group 2 (collaborative text editing, implicit) with the exception that the learning condition was implicit. Instead of drawing the learners' attention to the target structures and giving them examples, they were just provided with directions on how to perform the tasks.

In Group 3 (Individual text editing, explicit), learners were given a text with ungrammatical structures, and they were instructed to correct them individually. Explicitness of learning condition was created in the same way as Group 1. Similar procedure was followed in Group 4 (Individual text editing, implicit) with the exception that the learning condition was implicit.

In line with the objectives of the study, learners' grammar achievement was also measured after the treatment. The posttest was administered in a separate session after the termination of the treatment. It was the same as the pretest, but the items were randomly reordered in order to minimize the practice effect.

RESULTS

Answering Research Question 1

The purpose of the first research question was to examine whether doing an editing task individually under implicit and explicit learning conditions affected the learning of target structures in a different ways.

Prior to the use of ANCOVA, the data sets were examined for normality and homogeneity of variances. The results of Shapiro-Wilk tests indicated that data in some sets moderately violated the assumption of normality. However, since ANCOVA is robust to violations of normality (Steinberg, 2010), it was assumed to be appropriate to use ANCOVA, rather than a non-parametric test, to analyze the data.

A one-way ANCOVA, along with adjusted descriptive statistics was used to investigate the first research question. The high mean score for individual editing task in the explicit condition (M = 21.14), represented in Table 1, suggests that, this learning condition was more effective than the implicit condition in promoting learners' acquisition of the grammatical structures under investigation.

Table 1

Estimated Marginal Means for Individual Editing in Implicit and Explicit Conditions

Group5	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Implicit	18.266[a]	.876	16.496	20.036
Explicit	21.143[a]	.876	19.373	22.913

The ANCOVA results ($F_{(1, 41)} = 4.963$, $p = 0.031$), however, revealed that the difference between the mean scores was not statistically significant when the Bonferroin-corrected significance level is taken into account. Doing the editing tasks individually under implicit and explicit learning conditions did not differentially affect learners' grammar achievement.

Table 2

ANCOVA Results for the Posttest Mean Scores of Implicit and Explicit Conditions

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	171.769[a]	2	85.884	5.559	.007	.213
Intercept	2274.682	1	2274.682	147.242	.000	.782
Pre	29.928	1	29.928	1.937	.171	.045
Group5	76.666	1	76.666	4.963	.031	.108
Error	633.390	41	15.449			
Total	17889.000	44				
Corrected Total	805.159	43				

Answering Research Question 2

The second research question examined the effectiveness of collaborative performance of the editing tasks under implicit and explicit learning conditions.

A comparison was made between the posttest scores of collaborative editing tasks completed under implicit and explicit learning conditions. Reading the mean column in Table 3 indicated that the mean score for the explicit condition (Mean = 25.08) was higher than the mean for the implicit condition (Mean = 21.00).

Table 3

Estimated Marginal Means for Collaborative Editing in Implicit and Explicit Conditions

Gorup6	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Implicit	21.007[a]	.784	19.424	22.590
Explicit	25.087[a]	.825	23.421	26.753

Any significant difference was statistically examined through a one-way ANCOVA. As below Table 4 shows, the difference is statistically significant ($F_{(1, 41)} = 11.494$, $p = 0.002$). This indicates that if editing tasks are performed collaboratively under explicit learning conditions, learners' gains will be higher than when they collaboratively perform this task under implicit condition. The effect size, however, was small, suggesting that only a small part (about 20 percent) of the difference was accounted for by the learning condition.

Table 4

ANCOVA Results for the Posttest Mean Scores of Implicit and Explicit Conditions

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	236.341[a]	2	118.171	9.434	.000	.315
Intercept	3453.512	1	3453.512	275.706	.000	.871
Pre	9.012	1	9.012	.719	.401	.017
Group6	143.969	1	143.969	11.494	.002	.219
Error	513.568	41	12.526			
Total	23934.000	44				
Corrected Total	749.909	43				

Answering Research Question 3

The third research question was concerned with comparing the effect of collaborative and individual performance of the editing task on the learning of the target structures under implicit learning condition.

One-way ANCOVA was used along with adjusted descriptive statistics. The higher mean score for the collaborative completion (M = 20.77) of the editing task under implicit learning condition, as presented in Table 5, suggests that collaborative completion was more effective than individual completion (M = 17.91).

Table 5

Estimated Marginal Means for Collaborative and Individual Editing Tasks in Implicit Condition

Group9	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Collaborative	20.778a	.767	19.230	22.325
Individual	17.914a	.784	16.332	19.496

Table 6

ANCOVA Results for the Posttest Mean Scores of Collaborative and Individual Editing Tasks in Implicit Condition

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	94.769a	2	47.384	3.505	.039	.143
Intercept	3470.169	1	3470.169	256.683	.000	.859
Implicit Editing Pre	1.922	1	1.922	.142	.708	.003
Group9	92.170	1	92.170	6.818	.012	.140
Error	567.809	42	13.519			
Total	17560.000	45				
Corrected Total	662.578	44				

However, as the results presented in Table 6 indicate, the collaborative completion of the editing task did not prove to have a significantly more effect on the learners' grammar achievement under implicit learning conditions than the individual performance ($F_{(1, 42)} = 6.818$, $p = 0.012$). Both collaborative and individual completion of the editing tasks under implicit condition had almost similar impact on the acquisition of the target structures.

Answering Research Question 4

The fourth research question examined the effect of collaborative and individual performance of editing tasks on learner's grammar achievement under explicit learning condition.

A one-way ANCOVA along with adjusted descriptive statistics was employed to investigate this research question. Descriptive statistics, presented in Table 7, demonstrates that the participants who performed the editing task under explicit condition collaboratively obtained a higher mean (M = 25.19) on the posttest than those who completed the same task under the same condition individually (M = 21.63).

Table 7

Estimated Marginal Means for Collaborative and Individual Editing Tasks in Explicit Condition

Group10	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Collaborative	25.193a	.828	23.519	26.866
Individual	21.634a	.809	19.999	23.269

Table 8

ANCOVA Results for the Posttest Mean Scores of Collaborative and Individual Editing Tasks in Explicit Condition

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	203.287a	2	101.644	7.123	.002	.263
Intercept	2400.230	1	2400.230	168.213	.000	.808
Explicit Editing Pre	45.407	1	45.407	3.182	.082	.074
Group10	133.702	1	133.702	9.370	.004	.190
Error	570.759	40	14.269			
Total	24263.000	43				
Corrected Total	774.047	42				

According to the Table 8 above, results from the ANCOV analysis ($F_{(1, 40)} = 9.370$, $p = 0.004$), revealed that the difference between the two mean scores was statistically significant. Under explicit condition, collaborative performance was significantly more effective than individual per-

formance in promoting learners' achievement of the structures under investigation. However, there was a small effect size (Partial Eta Squared =0.190), suggesting that only about 20 percent of the difference was attributable to the learning condition.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

It is evident, from the findings that collaborative performance of editing task could result in better grammar achievement when implemented under explicit learning condition. This substantiates the effect of explicit learning condition.

However, the findings related to the first research question proved that individual performance of editing task have equal effect on learners' grammar achievement under explicit and implicit learning conditions. This means that when learners perform editing task individually, learning condition is not a determining factor in improving their grammar achievement. This might be because in editing tasks, learners should only find the ungrammatical structures and do not have to produce them and as a result, they can do so equally well under both learning conditions.

The findings suggested that the explicit learning condition was more effective for editing tasks in case they are performed collaboratively. This is compatible with the results of the studies conducted by Rosa and Leow (2004), Bitchener and Knoch (2009), Brender (2002), and Akakura (2012). Rosa and Leow (2004) found that there was a positive relationship between the explicitness of the learning condition, the level of awareness, and the amount of learning. Learners under more explicit conditions reported higher levels of awareness and higher amounts of learning in comparison to those under less explicit conditions.

Likewise, Bitchener and Knoch (2009) examined the effect of explicit instruction on the recall and retention of the articles given as written feedback on picture description tasks. Under the explicit learning condition, the learners additionally received 30 minutes of rule explanation. The explicit learning group significantly outperformed the other group on all posttests. Similarly, Brender's (2002) study indicated that explicit instruction led to improvement in cloze test scores and fewer errors in the essay task. Akakura's (2012) study examined the effectiveness of explicit instruction on second language learners' implicit and explicit knowledge of English. Explicit instruction on the generic and non-generic use of English articles was delivered by on-line activities. On measures of both explicit and implicit knowledge, significant effects were found for explicit instruction in relation with both generic and non-generic articles in the immediate posttest.

The results, however, partially contradicted those found by Tashima (2004, as cited in Akakura, 2012). Tashima compared the effect of explicit and implicit learning on the learning of English articles. The explicit group received three tutoring sessions on grammar explanation and exercises. No statistically significant gains were found after explicit instruction in choosing between definite and indefinite articles. Learners' L1 and the number of tutoring sessions might have been factors influencing the results of this study, making it different from the other studies mentioned above.

The results concerning the third research question indicated that collaborative and individual completion of editing tasks did not lead to significant differences in achievement under implicit condition. This finding suggests that explicitness of the learning condition acts as a mediating factor in relation to the effect of collaborative and individual performance of some task types like text editing. This may result from the fact that in editing tasks, learners' attention is drawn to the correction of the ungrammatical structures rather than the reconstruction of the whole utterance that contains the target form. Under the circumstances that explicit rules are presented to the learners, they can discuss and negotiate them in their groups to find out which rule is violated and thus how each ungrammatical structure can be corrected and edited. As a result, working collaboratively gives those more opportunities to use

the grammatical rules and structures more explicitly and hence learn them more efficiently. However, in the absence of such an explicit instruction, leaners cannot discuss rules or structures when collaboratively working in groups as they have not been motivated to focus on them; and thus, under implicit condition, individual and collaborative completion of the editing task do not yield different results in terms of grammar achievement.

References

Akakura, M. (2012). Evaluating the effectiveness of explicit instruction on implicit and explicit L2 knowledge, *Language Teaching Research*, *16* (1), 9-37.

Bitchener, J., &Knoch, U. (2009). The value of a focused approach to written corrective feedback. *ELT Journal*, *63*(3), 204-211.

Brender, A. S. (2002). Effectiveness of teaching articles to ESL students in writing classes using consciousness-raising methods. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *63*(1), 59A.

DeKeyser, R. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom SLA* (pp. 42-63). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dekeyser, R. (2003). Implicit and explicit learning. In C. J. Doughty, & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 314-448). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

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

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, N. C. (2005). At the interface: Dynamic interactions of explicit and implicit language knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *27*(2), 305-352.

Ellis, N. C. (2008). Usage-based and form-focused SLA: The implicit and explicit learning of constructions. In A. Tyler, Y. Kim, & M. Takada (Eds.), *Language in the context of use: Cognitive and discourse approaches to language and language learning* (pp. 93-120). Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Foster, P. & Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning and task type on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 1*8*(3), 299-323.

Foster, P. & Skehan, P. (1999). The influence of planning and focus of planning on task-based performance. *Language Teaching Research 3*(3), 215-247.

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

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

Fotos, S., & Ellis, R. (1991). Communicating about grammar: A task-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, *25*(4), 605–628.

Housen, A. &Pierrard, M. (2006). Investigating instructed second language acquisition. In A. Housen& M. Pierrard (Eds.) *Investigations in Instructed Second Language Acquisition*, (pp. 12-27). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Izumi, S., & Bigelow, M. (2000). Does output promote noticing in second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly*, *34*, 239-278.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.

Krashen, S. D. (1987). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Englewood Cliffs, N J: Prentice-Hall International.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leow, R. P. (1997). Attention, awareness, and

foreign language behavior. *Language Learning, 47*(3), 467-505.

Leow, R. P. (2001). Attention, awareness, and foreign language behavior. *Language Learning, 51*, 113-155.

Long, M. H., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 15-63). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lynch, T. & MacLean, J. (2001). A case of exercising: Effect of immediate task repetition on learners' performance. In M. Bygate., P. Skehan& M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks* (pp. 141-162). New York: Longman.

McLaughlin, B. (1990). Conscious versus unconscious learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*, 617-634.

Michel, M., Kuiken, F., &Vedder, I.(2007). The influence of complexity in monologic versus dialogic tasks in Dutch L2. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 45*(3), 241–259.

Nassaji, H., &Tian, J. (2010). Collaborative and individual output tasks and their effects on learning English phrasal verbs. *Language Teaching Research, 14*(4), 397-419.

Oxford, R. L. (2006). Task-based language teaching and learning: An overview. *Asian EFL Journal, 8*(3), 94-121.

Robinson, P. (1995b). Review article: Attention, memory, and the noticing hypothesis. *Language Learning, 45*(2), 283-331.

Robinson, P. (2002). Learning conditions, aptitude complexes, and SLA: A framework for research and pedagogy. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Individual differences and instructed language learning* (pp. 113-133). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Rosa, E., & Leow, R. P. (2004). Awareness, different learning conditions, and second language development. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 25*, 269-292.

Rosa, E., & O'Neill, M. D. (1999). Explicitness, intake, and the issue of awareness: Another piece to the puzzle. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21*, 511-556.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*, 129-158.

Schmidt, R. (1994a). Deconstructing consciousness in search of useful definitions for applied linguistics. *AILA Review*, 11, 11–26.

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (pp. 1-63). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Johnson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, R. (2010). Attention, awareness, and individual differences in language learning. In W. M. Chan, S. Chi, K. N. Cin, J. Istanto, M. Nagami, J. W. Sew, T. Suthiwan, & I. Walker (Eds.), *Proceedings of Classic 2010, Singapore, December 2-4* (pp. 721-737). Singapore: National University of Singapore, Centre for Language Studies. Retrieved from -20and%20individual%20differences.pdf

Sharwood Smith, M. (1981). Consciousness-raising and the second language learner. *Applied Linguistics, 2*, 159-168.

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (2007). Complexity, accuracy, fluency and lexis in taskbased performance: A meta-analysis of the Ealing research. In S. Van Daele, A. Housen, F. Kuiken, M. Pierrard& I. Vedder (Eds.), *Complexity, accuracy andfluency in second language use, learning and teac*hing (pp. 207–226). Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van BelgiëvoorWetenschappen en Kunsten.

Steinberg, W. J. (2010*). Statistics Alive!* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Storch, N. (1999). Are two heads better than one? Pair-work and grammatical accuracy. *System*, 27, 363-74.

Svalberg, A. M. L. (2007). Language awareness and language learning. *LanguageTeaching*, *40*, 287-308.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research 4*(3), 251-274

Takahashi, S (2005). Noticing in task performance and learning outcomes: A qualitative analysis of instructional effects in interlanguage pragmatics. *System, 33,* 437-461.

Takimoto, M. (2008). The effects of various kinds of form-focused instruction on learners' ability to comprehend and produce polite requests in English. *TESL Canada Journal*, 26, 31–51.

Tarone, E. (1985). Variability in interlanguage use: A study of style shifting in morphology and syntax. *Language Learning*, 35, 373-403.

Tomlin, R. S., & Villa, V. (1994). Attention in cognitive science and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16*, 183-203.

Tocalli-Beller, A., & Swain, M. (2007). Riddles and puns in the ESL Classroom:
Adults talk to learn. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational Interaction in Second Language Acquisition: Empirical Studies* (pp. 143-167). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Truscott, J. (1998). Noticing in second language acquisition: A critical review. *Second Language Research, 14*, 103-135.

Biodata

JafarFirouzi is a PhD candidate at the Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch. He is also a faculty member of English Department of Islamic Azad University, Damavand Branch. He has been teaching English at the universities and language institutes for 18 years. He has published some papers in academic journals and presented in several conferences.
Email: Jafarfirouzi@damavandiau.ac.ir

Dr Mona Khabiri is an associate professor in the field of Applied Linguistics at the Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch. She is also the director of the Journal of English Language Studies (JELS) in Iran. She mainly teaches the units in relation to language testing and assessment, research methodology, research seminar in the field of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), and teaching language skills at the graduate levels. Her main areas of interest include teacher education, cooperative learning, and language testing and research methodologies. She has published papers in international and national academic journals and presented in several national and international seminars.
Email: Mona.khabiri@iauctb.ac.ir