Journal of Language and Translation
Volume 4, Number 2(8), (pp.71-83), 2014

Reconstruction vs. Interaction-based Output Practice: (in relation to EFL learner's speaking skill and learning styles)

Gholam-Reza Abbasian[1*], **Fatemeh Rahmani**[2]
[1] Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign Languages, Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch
[2]Young Researchers and Elite Club, Sari Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran

Received: 15 March , 2014 Accepted: 17 October, 2014

Abstract
The belief that output practice is crucial in L2 learning affects foreign language teaching methodology. And researchers have endeavored to find the best ways to encourage learners to produce and practice whatever they hear as an input in the process of learning. Moreover, learning styles and the importance of matching learners' styles with those of teachers inspired the researchers to investigate the role of different learning and teaching styles. This study investigated whether two types of output practices (reconstruction vs. interaction) were effective in improving speaking ability in relation to the learners' learning styles. For this purpose, 54 female Iranian young EFL students at intermediate level were selected based on their performance in the Preliminary English Test (PET). Furthermore, Perceptual Learning Styles Inventory (Reid's, 1987) was administered to measure the participants' learning styles prior to the treatment. They were then divided into two groups that one group received the interaction practice-based treatment, while the other group was trained based on reconstruction practice. Finally, an interview was run as a post-test with the same topic with both groups. Meanwhile, their learning styles were also measured to pursue any the probable changes in learners' learning styles. The results indicated that interaction-based output practice had a greater effect on the improvement of young learners speaking proficiency, while no significant changes were revealed in their learning styles', though some changes were revealed in when the learning styles were approached discretely, indicating that when a trait is approached as a unitary construct or discretely in relation to certain variables, outcome would be different.

Keywords: Interaction, Reconstruction- Output Practice Type- Learning Styles- Speaking Skill .

INTRODUCTION

Although advocates of the Input Hypotheses believe that producing output only helps learners comprehend input from the interlocutors, most second language (L2) teachers and learners believe that practices in production (i.e., speaking and writing) are essential for developing L2 proficiency(Muranoi, 2007). The belief that output practice is crucial in L2 learning affects foreign language teaching methodology, so researchers have endeavored to find the best ways to encourage learners to produce and practice whatever they hear as an input in the process of learning. As Swain (2000, 2005) argued, output

Corresponding Author's Email:1.gabbasian@gmail.com

practice is crucial to L2 acquisition not only as a way of practicing already-existing linguistic knowledge but also as a way of creating new linguistic knowledge. She mentioned that L2 learners notice new linguistic features, formulate hypotheses about new grammatical forms, and test the hypotheses when they are provided with proper opportunities to produce L2 output.

There are some output practice techniques to encourage learners to produce output. Having learners reconstruct a text (story) that they have comprehended is one of the most effective output practice techniques that elicits learners' output and eventually promotes L2 learning. For example, Muranoi (2000a, cited in Dekeyser, 2007) examined the effect of output practice through text reconstruction on L2 production in both written and oral modes.

Output practice through interaction is another technique to improve second language proficiency. In this regard, Muranoi (2000) noted that findings of interaction studies lend support to the claim that L2 learners respond linguistically when asked by their interlocutors to clarify or confirm what they have said during interaction and thereby attempt to make their output comprehensible for mutual understanding. According to Muranoi, neither mere decontextualized output nor mere opportunities for free conversation lead L2 learners to develop a well-balanced communicative competence. He continued that what is not clear is what kind of output practice is required to develop productive skills with which L2 learners can communicate with other speakers appropriately in real life. So the question is what the best way is to push the learners to produce output and promote their interlanguage.

The other issue worth consideration is learning styles which play an important role in the process of learning. Many researchers have investigated the role of different learning styles and the importance of matching learners' styles with teaching (e.g., Felder & Henriques, 1995, Felder & Brent, 2005). As Banner and Rayner (2000) suggested, an individual pupil's approach to learning is central to educational achievement. And teacher's awareness to this approach is equally crucial for success in the classroom. They believed that the desire and the need to develop new ways of enhancing teaching and learning are shared by every teacher planning the next scheme of work, facing the school day or simply preparing a lesson. This fact alone represents good reason to consider the development of stylistic teaching and learning in the classroom.

Output hypothesis

Research on the second language development of immersion students shows that while immersion learners demonstrate native-like competence in listening comprehension and reading skills, they generally fall behind native speakers in their productive skills such as writing and speaking (Stein, 1999). Such findings have led researchers to challenge what they see as an overemphasis on the role of comprehensible input in the second language acquisition process. Comprehensible input, although constantly available to the immersion students, does not appear to be the only necessary factor for acquisition. In addition to comprehensible input, it is important to consider the role the learners' own output plays (Swain, 2000).

Swain (2005) suggests three major functions of output in SLA including: 1) attention to errors and shortcoming awareness and production in L2 are simultaneous and cause and effect to each other, 2) output acts as a means of trying out one's language and test various hypotheses, 3) speech and writing are mean for the learner's reflective production.

Output as Productive Practice

Output practice means practice in production (i.e., speaking and writing); and according to most second language (L2) teachers and learners, it is crucial for developing L2 proficiency. Muranoi(2007) states that this belief in the usefulness of output practice is reflected in conventional foreign language teaching methodologies, which typically

employ teaching procedures consisting of three major stages: presentation, practice, and production (i.e., the PPP model of Byrne (1976).

Interaction as Practice

According to Long's interaction hypothesis, second language learning is facilitated through interactional processes as it connects 'input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways' (Long 1996). This involves cooccurrence of input-output in oral interaction and that both computational and sociocultural theories of L2 acquisition have viewed social interaction as the matrix in which acquisition takes place. Interaction is not just a means of automatizing existing linguistic resources but also of creating new resources (Ellis 2005).

Modified Interaction

Long (1983 cited in Lightbown & Spada, 2006) believes that modified interaction is the necessary mechanism for making language comprehensible and what learners need is not necessarily simplification of the linguistic forms but rather an opportunity to interact with other speakers and work together to reach mutual comprehension. Through these interactions, interlocutors figure out what they need to do to keep the conversation going and make the input comprehensible.

In the same vein, Lightbown and Spada (2006), modified output does not always involve linguistic simplification. It may also include elaboration, slower speech rate, gesture, or the provision of additional contextual cues. So far then, "modification that takes place during interaction leads to better understanding than linguistic simplification or modification that is planned in advance." (p.44). Donato's findings presented in Storch (2002) are significant for research on group and pair work. These findings highlight the need to take into consideration the nature of group or pair functioning. However, Sato (1986, cited in Foster & Ohta 2005) questioned a direct positive relationship between interaction and development. She suggested that interaction did not foster development, at least in the specific area of morphosyntax that she was investigating (past tense making). Loschky (1994) investigated the effects of comprehensible input and interaction on vocabulary retention and comprehension. The result was largely inconclusive. Negotiation had a positive effect on comprehension, but no such claim could be made for retention. Similarly, Ellis, Tanaka, and Yamazaki (1994) also investigated the role of negotiation in vocabulary acquisition and word order based on which interactionally modified input yielded better comprehension rates and resulted in the acquisition of more new words.

Reconstruction as Practice

Having learners reconstruct the text is one of the most effective instructional techniques that elicits learner output and eventually promotes L2 learning. According to Thornbury (1997), reconstruction task has a long tradition in ELT methodology. Since this task type foregrounds meaning, it fits well into a task-based model of instruction, and because the starting point in this case is the whole texts, its use is consistent with a discourse-oriented view of language. According to Storch (1998), text reconstruction task can be used with a range of students by carefully choosing the text, and the function words to be omitted, to suit the language proficiency of the learners. Such tasks seem to be particularly appropriate for more advanced learners, pushing them to think beyond the sentence boundary and see the text rather than the sentence as a semantic unit.

As a complementary notion, noticing is an important element in reconstruction based output practice. For example, Schmidt and Frota (1986, cited in Thornbury, 1997, p.326) suggest that two kinds of noticing are necessary conditions for acquisition:

> *"- Learners must attend to linguistic features of the input that they are ex*
> *posed to, without which input cannot become intake.*
> *- Learners must notice the gap, i.e., make comparisons between the current*

state of their developing linguistic system, available as input."

Thornbury (1997) states that language teachers should try to promote noticing, by focusing their learner's attention on the targeted language in the input and on the distance to be covered between the present state of their interlanguage, on the one hand, and the target language on the other. Kowal and Swain (1994) used a text reconstruction procedure called dictogloss to provide learners with opportunities for production in L2. Their data suggested that the learners were pushed to reflect on the sentence and seek a solution by hypothesizing about language and applying prior knowledge when the students were faced with an apparent discrepancy.

The effect of output practice through text reconstruction on L2 production in both written and oral modes was examined by Muranoi (2000, cited in Dekeyser, 2007). Muranoi proposed a focus-on-form treatment that emphasized on the role of pushed output in L2 learning through guided summarizing. The instructional treatment is termed focus on form through guided summarizing (FFGS), in which L2 learners are directed to reproduce the story of a text they have comprehended through reading. Results indicated that (1) FFGS enhanced EFL learner's accuracy in the use of the perfect passive; FFGS performed in both oral and written modes had better effects than that performed in the written mode only; and (3) FFGS was effective only for those who were psycholinguistically ready to learn the target form (i.e., the acquisition of the simple passive and the perfect active was a developmental requisite for the learning of the perfect passive).

Speaking Skill in Light of Practice

Lourdunathan and Menon (2005) state that there are two parts to the speaking component: an individual presentation and group discussion. The former, requires candidates to convey facts, to explain, express preferences and to make decisions, while the latter deals with the ability of the candidates to interact and take turns, to negotiate meaning, to manage discussion and to close the discussion. They say that most of second language learners are, possible in light of their learning styles, strategies and their individual variations, able to communicate their ideas and thoughts fairly well in the individual task but they are not able to participate effectively in group discussion.

In most cases speaking ability differs from communicative and functional use of language in that they contain features which make them successful classroom activities. Nation (1997) calls these features "roles, outcomes, procedures, split information, and challenges". He suggests that by understanding these features, teachers can improve the speaking activities they use, and that they can create their own activities, based on individual features and on combinations of them. He further mentions that these features perform two tasks: they help achieve the learning goal of the speaking activity, and they motivate the learners and encourage them to join the activity.

Learning Styles

According to Oxford (2003), the term learning style is an overall pattern that provides broad direction to learning and makes the same instructional method beloved by some students and hated by others. Oxford (2001, cited in Oxford, 2003) argues that "learning style refers to the general approach preferred by the student when learning a subject, acquiring a language, or dealing with a difficult problem". (p.273). Within the area of learning styles, each individual reflects sensory style dimensions (visual/auditory/hands-on) and social style dimensions (extroverted/ introverted). Every person also has preferences along cognitive style dimensions, among which are concretesequential/abstract-intuitive,closure-oriented/open, detail-focused/holistic (sometimes called particular/global), and analyzing/ synthesizing. One can locate himself somewhere on a continuum

for each style dimension. For example, none of us is likely to be totally concrete-sequential, without an iota of abstract-intuition (Oxford 2003). Moreover, "learning styles might be thought of as cognitive, affective, and physiological traits that are relatively stable indicators of how learners perceive, interact with, and respond to the learning environment" (Keefe, 1979, cited in Brown, 2007, p.120).

Matching teaching styles to learning styles can significantly enhance academic achievement, student attitudes, and student behavior specifically in foreign language instruction (Oxford 1991, cited in Felder and Henriques 1995). Contrary to the rich literature on the application of variety of practices on language skill acquisition, there is still a big gap in area of two specific practice types (i.e., reconstruction and interaction) as to developing speaking performance on one hand and that of young EFL learners on the other hand. Moreover, this issue has rarely been investigated in relation to the EFL learners' learning styles. Then the uncertainties as to:

- *scarcity of empirical studies comparing the effects of different types of output practice techniques in relation to oral performance of EFL learners, role of reconstruction vs. interaction-based output practice, too few attempts to justify output practice types in relation to learning styles supposed to develop language skills, and the issue of oral performance and the importance of speaking skill in foreign language learning multiplied by the problem of EFL learners in overcoming their the difficulties in mastering oral skills, cooperatively shaped the motive behind this study such that attempts were made to empirically address three main research questions and test their respective null hypotheses such as 1) if reconstruction and interaction-based output practices are related in improving young learners' speaking performance; 2) if reconstruction and interaction-based output practices act differently in relation to the learning styles; and 3) if there are any differences between reconstruction and interaction-based output practices when the six components of the learning style are incorporated.*

Method

Participants

The participants were selected from a pool of young Iranian EFL learners, all studying English at high school and their first language was Persian. After selecting a homogeneous group via administration of the PET (Preliminary English Test), 54 intermediate female students of mainly fourteen years old were chosen out of 96 learners. Those who scored within one standard deviation above and below the mean were selected as the participants of the study. They were then randomly divided into two groups.

Instrumentation

To conduct the study four distinct instruments were employed including:

1. PET (Preliminary English Test)
2. Structured oral interviews as a posttest and pretest to measure speaking proficiency
3. Perceptual Learning Styles Inventory (Reid, 1984)

Procedure

To address the problem and the purposes, first sampling process was conducted through which among 96 participants, only 54 were identified and selected as homogeneous members based on their standing position on the normal distribution table curve as measured by PET. They then, received Learning Styles Inventory (Reid's) to measure their learning styles prior to the experiment. They also were exposed to a structured interview as a pre-test to measure exclusively their speaking ability.

Treatments

In the interaction-based group, the participants were organized into groups of 4-5 and for each sub-group a head was appointed. The members were encouraged to interact with each other in performing the tasks. The teacher asked the learners to do the tasks in their respective groups collaboratively, as one received the script asking the others in the group to work on the information gap exercises. On the contrary, in the reconstruction-based group the focus was more on each individual and the teacher encouraged each learner to do the tasks individually and reconstruct the task first orally, e.g., retell, and summarize depending on the task and then reconstruct it in written in order to either read in the classroom aloud or, if needed, submit to the teacher for final analysis and feedback. After the treatments for 12 sessions, a similar structured interview based on the course objectives was run to measure the effects of these two kinds of output practice.

To minimize error variance damaging test reliability (Farhady, Jafarpour, and Birjandi, 2006), two raters were invited to score the interview based on clearly defined rating scales. The scoring was done analytically and the learners' performances in the pretest and post-test were rated separately on scales covering accent, structure, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. These ratings were then weighed and added up to determine the final scores. Meanwhile, the learning styles inventory (Reid's) was administered again to measure the participants' learning styles after the treatment.

Results

Quantitative analyses of the participants' performance on the pre-test, post-test, and the questionnaires are presented and discussed with reference to the research questions addressed in this study.

Table 1.
Descriptive Statistics of PET (Preliminary English Test)

Test	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
PET	96	68.52	4.33

The PET (Preliminary English Test) was given as a homogeneity test to 54 students at intermediate level. The mean score of the students was 68.52 and standard deviation was 4.33.

Table 2.
Independent t-test Pretest of Speaking by Groups

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	3.211	.079	1.428	52	.159	.6296	.4410	-.2553	1.5145
Equal variances not assumed			1.428	48.761	.160	.6296	.4410	-.2567	1.5159

It should be noted that the assumption of homogeneity of variances is met (Levene's F = 3.21, P = .079 > .05). That is why the first row of Table 2, i.e. "Equal variances assumed" is reported.

Table 3.
Descriptive Statistics Pretest of Speaking by Groups

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Interaction	27	15.556	1.3960	.2687
Construction	27	14.926	1.8171	.3497

The results of the independent t-test (t (52) = 1.42, P = .159 > .05, r = .19 as a weak effect size) indicate that there was not any significant difference between interaction and reconstruction groups' mean scores on the pretest of speaking. Thus, it can be concluded that the two groups enjoyed the same level of speaking ability prior to the main study.

As displayed in Table 4, the values of skewness and kurtosis for the pretest and posttest of total learning styles are within the ranges +/- 2. Thus, the data enjoy normal distributions.

Table 4.
Normality Tests Pretest and Posttest of Total Learning Styles

Group		N	Skewness		Kurtosis	
		Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Interaction	PreStyle	27	-.084	.448	-1.215	.872
	PostStyle	27	-.082	.448	-.950	.872
Reconstruction	PreStyle	27	-.500	.448	-.346	.872
	PostStyle	27	-.315	.448	-.334	.872

Table 5.
Homogeneity of Variances

F	df1	df2	Sig.
.141	1	52	.709

As displayed in Table 5, the assumption of homogeneity of variances is also met (Levene's F = .141, P = .709 > .05).

Investigation of the Research Question 1

The first research question was "Is there any significant difference between reconstruction and interaction-based output practice in improving young learners' speaking ability?" To answer it, an independent samples t-test was run. As displayed in Table 6, the mean scores for interaction and reconstruction groups on the pretest of speaking are 17.33 and 15.66, respectively.

Table 6.
Descriptive Statistics Posttest of Speaking by Groups

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Interaction	27	17.333	1.1094	.2135
Construction	27	15.667	1.3868	.2669

The results of the independent t-test (t (52) = 4.87, P = .000< .05, r = .56 as represents a large effect size), as shown in table 7, indicate that there is a significant difference between interaction and reconstruction groups' mean scores on the posttest of speaking. Thus, it can be concluded that the first null-hypothesis **is rejected**. The interaction group outperformed the reconstruction group on the posttest of speaking.

Table 7.
Independent t-test Posttest of Speaking by Groups

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	3.025	.088	4.877	52	.000	1.6667	.3418	.9808	2.3525
Equal variances not assumed			4.877	49.610	.000	1.6667	.3418	.9801	2.3533

It should be noted that the assumption of homogeneity of variances is met (Levene's F = 3.02, P = .088> .05). That is why the first row of Table 7, i.e. "Equal variances assumed" is reported.

Investigation of the Research Question 2

The second research question was "Is there any significant difference between reconstruction and interaction-based output practice in relation to young EFL learners' learning styles?" To answer it, an analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was run to compare the interaction and reconstruction groups' mean scores on the posttest of total learning styles in order to probe any significant difference between their mean scores while controlling for possible effects of their entry learning styles as measured through the pretest. ANCOVA is four main assumptions, i.e. normality, homogeneity of variances, homogeneity of regression slope and linear relationship between the covariate and the dependent variable.

Table 8.
ANCOVA Posttest of Total Learning Styles by Groups with Pretest

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Pretest of Learning Styles	447.057	1	447.057	1096.867	.000	.956
Group	.031	1	.031	.075	.785	.001
Error	20.786	51	.408			
Total	66137.444	54				

The F-observed value for the effect of the independent variable (interaction vs. reconstruction), as table 8 shows, is not significant (F (1, 51) = .075, P = .785< .05; Partial η^2 = .001 as a weak effect size).). Based on these results, it can be concluded that there is not any significant difference between the mean scores of the interaction and reconstruction groups on the posttest of total learning styles after controlling for possible effect of their entry ability as measured through the pretest. Thus, the second null-hypothesis is **retained**.

Table 9.
Descriptive Statistics Posttest of Total Learning Styles by groups

Group	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Interaction	34.846	.123	34.599	35.094
Reconstruction	34.894	.123	34.647	35.142

As displayed in Table 9, the mean scores for interaction and reconstruction groups on the post test of total learning styles are 34.84 and 34.89,respectively.

Investigation of the Research Question 3

The third research question was "Are there any significant differences between reconstruction and interaction-based output practice in relation to the six components of the learning style?" To answer it, a multivariate ANOVA (MANOVA) was run to compare the reconstruction and interaction groups' means on the six components of the learning style. MANOVA is characterized by two main assumptions of homogeneity of covariance as measured through the Box's test, and homogeneity of variances. As displayed in table 10, the assumption of homogeneity of covariance is met (Box's M = 32.96, P = .118 > .05).

Table 10.
Assumption of Homogeneity of Covariance

Box's M	32.966
F	1.375
df1	21
df2	9945.308
Sig.	.118

In the same vein, table 11 shows the assumption of homogeneity of variances is also met. All of the components of the learning style enjoy homogenous variances, i.e. the P-values are higher than .05.

Table 11.
Homogeneity of Variances

	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Visual	.736	1	52	.395
Tactile	.006	1	52	.937
Auditory	1.260	1	52	.267
Group	1.555	1	52	.218
Kinesthetic	.884	1	52	.352
Individual	1.819	1	52	.183

Table12.
Between-Subjects Effects Components of Learning Style by Groups

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Group	Visual	439.185	1	439.185	14.407	.000	.217
	Tactile	312.963	1	312.963	6.158	.016	.106
	Auditory	106.963	1	106.963	3.925	.053	.070
	Group	535.185	1	535.185	7.728	.008	.129
	Kinesthetic	200.296	1	200.296	5.096	.028	.089
	Individual	711.407	1	711.407	8.131	.006	.135
Error	Visual	1585.185	52	30.484			
	Tactile	2642.963	52	50.826			
	Auditory	1417.185	52	27.254			
	Group	3601.185	52	69.254			
	Kinesthetic	2043.852	52	39.305			
	Individual	4549.630	52	87.493			
Total	Visual	71004.000	54				
	Tactile	58124.000	54				
	Auditory	68376.000	54				
	Group	73116.000	54				
	Kinesthetic	76912.000	54				
	Individual	65528.000	54				

Table13.
Descriptive Statistics Components of Learning Style by Groups

Dependent Variable	Group	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Visual	Interaction	38.593	1.063	36.460	40.725
	Reconstruction	32.889	1.063	30.757	35.021
Tactile	Interaction	29.556	1.372	26.802	32.309
	Reconstruction	34.370	1.372	31.617	37.124
Auditory	Interaction	33.778	1.005	31.762	35.794
	Reconstruction	36.593	1.005	34.577	38.609
Group	Interaction	32.593	1.602	29.379	35.806
	Reconstruction	38.889	1.602	35.675	42.103
Kinesthetic	Interaction	35.259	1.207	32.838	37.680
	Reconstruction	39.111	1.207	36.690	41.532
Individual	Interaction	37.037	1.800	33.425	40.649
	Reconstruction	29.778	1.800	26.166	33.390

Since the two assumptions of homogeneity of covariance and homogeneity of variances are met, the results of Between-Subject Effects can be reported. Based on the results displayed in Table 4.12 and Table 4.13, it can be concluded that;

A: There is a significant difference between the mean scores of the interaction (M = 38.59) and reconstruction (M = 32.88) on the Visual Learning Style (F (1, 52) = 14.40, P = .000 < .05, Partial η^2 = .21as it does represent a large effect size). The interaction group enjoys a significantly higher mean on Visual Learning Style.

B: There is a significant difference between the mean scores of the interaction (M = 29.55) and reconstruction (M = 34.37) on the Tactile Learning Style (F (1, 52) = 6.15, P = .016< .05, Partial η^2 = .10 as it does represent an almost large effect size). The reconstruction group enjoys a significantly higher mean on Tactile Learning Style.

C: There is a non-significant but moderate difference between the mean scores of the interaction (M = 3.77) and reconstruction (M = 36.59) on the Auditory Learning Style (F (1, 52) = 3.92, P = .053> .05, Partial η^2 = .07 as it does represent a moderate effect size). The interaction group enjoys a higher mean on Auditory Learning Style.

D: There is a significant difference between the mean scores of the interaction (M = 32.59) and reconstruction (M = 38.88) on the Group Learning Style (F (1, 52) = 7.72, P = .008< .05, Partial η^2 = .12 as it does represent an almost large effect size). The reconstruction group enjoys a significantly higher mean on Group Learning Style.

E: There is a significant difference between the mean scores of the interaction (M = 35.25) and reconstruction (M = 39.11) on the Kinesthetic Learning Style (F (1, 52) = 5.09, P = .028 < .05, Partial η^2 = .089 as it does represent a moderate effect size). The reconstruction group enjoys a significantly higher mean on Kinesthetic Learning Style.

F: There is a significant difference between the mean scores of the interaction (M = 37.03) and reconstruction (M = 329.77) on the Individual Learning Style (F (1, 52) = 8.13, P = .006< .05, Partial η^2 = .135 as it does represent an almost large effect size). The interaction group enjoys a significantly higher mean on Individual Learning Style.

Based on these results it can be concluded that the third null-hypothesis as there are not any significant differences between reconstruction and interaction-based output practice in relation to the six components of the learning style **is rejected**.

Conclusion and Discussion

The effect of output practice through text reconstruction on L2 production was examined by many researchers. For example, Storch (1998) investigated reconstruction practice in learners with different proficiency levels. Her findings revealed that learners with different proficiency level approach reconstruction tasks differently. In her study, the intermediate students tended to work on the task on a word-by-word basis while the more advanced students considered the entire sentence, and relationships between ideas in the text; and in groups where the students were approximately of the same level of proficiency, all members of the group participated in the task, while in the mixed-level groups more proficient learners tended to monopolize the conversational interactions.

Muranoi (2000) considered the effect of reconstruction practice within the research framework of focus on form. The results indicated that EFL learners' accuracy in the use of the perfect passive improved but it was effective only for those who were psycholinguistically

ready to learn the target form. Loschky (1994) investigated the effects of comprehensible input and interaction on vocabulary retention and comprehension. The result from his study is largely inconclusive. According to his findings, negotiation has a positive effect on comprehension, but no such claim can be made for retention. Similarly, Ellis, Tanaka, and Yamazaki (1994) also investigated the role of negotiation in vocabulary acquisition and word order. In that study, interactionally modified input yields better comprehension rates and results in the acquisition of more new words. Muranoi (2007) stated that findings of interaction studies lend support to the claim that L2 learners respond linguistically when asked by their interlocutors to clarify or confirm what they have said during interaction and thereby attempt to make their output comprehensible for mutual understanding. Muranoi (2000) reported the positive effects of a treatment that aims at guiding learners to modify and restructure their output by providing interactional modifications during a problem solving task. In this study, as it was mentioned above, the interaction group's speaking ability improved more; and group learning and negotiation of meaning had greater effect in improving EFL learners' speaking skill.

As to the second research question, the results of the analyses revealed that there is not any significant differences between the mean scores of the interaction and reconstruction groups on the post-test of total learning styles after controlling for possible effect of their entry ability as measured through the pretest. The findings of the present study is in direct contrast to Gilbert and Swanier's findings (2008) that learners' learning styles fluctuated from one lesson to another because learners' style did not change due to the effect of treatment.

The results of this study can be interpreted as that learners with different learning styles can adapt themselves with different teaching styles and make progress in learning; and teachers need to make some challenges for learners to experience different learning styles. The findings of the present study is to some extent according to Felder's (1996) idea that functioning effectively in any professional capacity requires working well in all learning style modes. If teachers teach exclusively in a manner that favors their students' less preferred learning style modes, the students' discomfort level may be great enough to interfere with their learning. On the other hand, if professors teach exclusively in their students' preferred modes, the students may not develop the mental dexterity they need to reach their potential for achievement in school and as professionals.

And finally, the third research question addressed the differences between reconstruction and interaction-based output practice in relation to the six components of the learning styles. The results of the analyses indicated some changes in sub-categories of learning styles; the interaction group showed higher means on visual and individual learning styles and the reconstruction groups indicated higher means on group, tactile and kinesthetic learning styles. Learners' learning styles in different aspects have been considered by many researchers. And sometime studies revealed different findings. For example, according to Johnson (1991, cited in Felder, 1995) small-group exercises can be extremely effective for both active and reflective learners (Johnson et al. 1991). On the other hand, Felder (1995) in his study found that as little as five minutes of group work in a 50-minute period can be enough to maintain the students' attention for the entire class. He argued that group work must be used with care, however: simply telling students to work together on problems or projects can do more harm than good. He believed that most references on cooperative learning (e.g., Johnson et al. 1991) point out that students often respond negatively to group work at first, and that the benefits of the approach are fully realized when the group work is structured to assure such features as positive interdependence, individual accountability, and appropriate uses of teamwork and interpersonal skills. Hsu (2007) studied the relationship between elemen-

tary students' learning styles with their academic achievements. The result revealed that students' preferred learning style was group learning styles. Visual, tactile and group learning styles were positive variables for language learning but had low relationship with school English achievements.

Findings of this study revealed that different kinds of treatments encourage learners to adapt themselves and employ different learning styles to promote and qualify learning. More specifically, the results confirmed the significant effects of interaction-based output practice on the improvement of speaking performance of the learners. Meanwhile, the investigation of the learners' learning styles in relation to the respective two types of practice showed no significant differences between these two groups and their learning styles as a whole.

Addressing the traits both discretely and holistically, it is concluded that feedback types affect nature of performance as the interaction-based treatment showed. Meanwhile, the ANCOVA run to compare the two groups' learning styles holistically showed no significant differences in their learning style before and after the treatment when the styles were approached as a whole. On the contrary, the MANOVA run to discretely compare the performance of the groups in the reconstruction and interaction feedback types in relation to the six components of the learning styles revealed that the interaction group enjoyed a significantly higher mean score on visual and individual learning styles, while the reconstruction group outperformed differently on Tactile, Group, and Kinesthetic Learning Styles. Similarly, no significant performance was explored as to the Auditory Learning Styles.

Theoretically, the major conclusion as to the learning style types is the fact that when a trait is approached discretely in relation to certain variables certain picture is displayed; however, when it is approached as a unitary construct, it is differently affected when the same variable/s is/are incorporated; indicating that that the subcategories of learning styles can be affected differently by different practice type. But, pedagogically, English instructors are encouraged to pay attention to consider practice and feedback type as an effective variable in their career in general and in teaching and practicing speaking skill in particular as interaction-based practice proved to entail a greater effect in improving speaking ability of the learners, which encourages the teachers to incorporate various activities and involve their learners in more negotiation-dominated situations to accomplish a task or activity. They are also invited to select and incorporate learners' styles of learning in the process of practicing language skills as certain learning style is activated, shaped and reshaped by certain practice type.

References

Banner, G. & Rayner, S. (2000). Learning language and learning style: principles, process and practice. *Language Learning Journal, 21,* 37-44.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching.* San Francisco State University.

Dekeyser, R.M. (2007). *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from Applied Linguistics and Cognitive Psychology*. Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. *Asian EFL Journal, 7(3),* 1-16.

Ellis, R., Tanaka, T., and Yamazaki, A. (1994). Classroom interaction, comprehension, and the acquisition of L2 word meanings. *Language Learning, 44,* 91-449.

Farhary, H., Jafarpur, A., & Birjandi, P. (2006). *Testing language skills: from theory to practice.* Tehran University.

Felder, R. M. & Brent, R. (2005). Understanding students differences. *Journal of Engineering Differences, 94(1),* 57-72.

Felder, R. M. (1995). Learning and teaching styles in foreign and second language education. *Foreign Language Annals, 28 (1),* 21-31.

Felder, R. M. (1996). Matters of style. *ASEE Prism, 6 (6),* 18-21.

Felder, R. M. & Henriques, E. R. (1995). Learning and teaching styles in foreign and second language education. *Foreign Language Annals, 28(1),* 21-31.

Foster, P. and Ohta, A. S. (2005). Negotiation for meaning and peer assistance in second language classrooms. *Applied Linguistics, 26(3),* 402-430. DOI: 10.1093/applin/ami014

Gilbert, J., & Swanier, CH. (2008). Learning styles: How do they fluctuate? *Institute for* learning *styles Journal*, 1.

Hsu, Y. (2007). Elementary school EFL students' learning style preferences and strategy use and their relationship with the students' English learning achievement. An unpublished MA thesis. Providence University.

Kowal, M., and Swain, M. (1994). Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness. *Language Awarness, 3,* 73-93.

Lightbown, P. M. and Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Long, M. H. (1996). *The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition: Handbook of second language acquisition*. New York: Academic Press.

Loschky, L. (1994). Comprehensible input and second language acquisition: what is the relationship? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16,* 303-25.

Lourdunathan, J., and Menon, S. (2005). Developing speaking skills through Interaction strategy training. *The English Teacher, 34,* 1-18.

Muranoi, H. (2007). Output practice in the L2 classroom. In Dekeyser, R. M. (Ed.), *Practice in a second language: perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology* (PP. 51-84). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nation, P. (1997). Speaking activities: Five features. *ELT Journal, 33 (1),* 22-30.

Oxford, R. L. (2003). Language learning styles and strategies: concepts and relationships. *IRAL, 41,* 271-278.

Storch, N. (1998). A classroom-based study: insights from a collaborative text reconstruction task. *ELT Journal, 52/4,* 291-300.

Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning, 52(1),* 119-158.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In

Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (PP. 97-114). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swain, M. (2005). Reformulation: the cognitive conflict and L2 learning it generates. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15,* 5-28.

Thornbury, S. (1997). Reformulation and reconstruction: tasks that promote noticing. *ELT Journal, 514,* 326-335.

Gholam-Reza Abbasian, an assistant professor of TEFL at Imam Ali University & IAU, has presented at (inter) national conferences, is the author & translator of about 15 books, publisher of scholarly articles and offers SLA, psycholinguistics, language testing, & research methods course at MA and PhD levels. He has been nominated as top scholar and the most successful teacher for seven consecutive years. He is the internal manager of JOMM, reviewer of Sage, FLA and GJER journals and a member of editorial board of JSSIR.

Fatemeh Rahmani, holds an MA in TEFL from IAU (Science & Research Campus, Tehran). She is also as member of Young Researchers and Elite Club of IAU (Sari Branch). She is involved in teaching English course at various private and public centers. Her areas of interest are research in teaching methods and psycholinguistics.