

Research Article

A STUDY OF THE RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF INDIVIDUAL AND COLLABORATIVE OUTPUT TASKS ON THE ACQUISITION OF ENGLISH PHRASAL VERBS

Shaban Najafi Karimi¹, Parviz Birjandi¹ and *Seyyed Mohammad Alavi²

¹*Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch, Tehran, Iran*

²*University of Tehran, Iran*

**Author for Correspondence*

ABSTRACT

The present study has attempted to investigate the usefulness of two types of output tasks - cloze and editing – in individual and collaborative conditions on the acquisition of English phrasal verbs. To do so, a time series quasi-experimental study was carried out, in which 54 Iranian intermediate EFL learners completed a cloze output task and an editing output task once individually and once in groups of three. After the participants completed each task, a multiple-choice post-test including the target phrasal verbs practiced in each section of the treatment was delivered to answer (40 phrasal verbs in all). Results of one-way repeated measures ANOVA on the pre-tests and post-tests showed that the participants' scores on the post-tests were slightly higher after doing the collaborative output tasks than those after doing the individual output tasks. Results of task completion analyses revealed that the subjects performed significantly better on collaborative output tasks than on individual output tasks. It has been concluded that in contrast to the presupposed effectiveness of collaborative work on the acquisition of target forms, the present study showed marginal beneficial effects on learning the target phrasal verbs as between the two output tasks, only collaborative editing task showed more positive effects than individual cloze task. Collaborative group activities, after all, proved very effective in completing both cloze and editing tasks, leading the researchers to the conclusion that they can be effective tools to create form-focused negotiations among learners in L2 classroom activities.

Keywords: *Cloze Task, Collaborative Output Task, Editing Task, Individual Output Task, Phrasal Verbs*

INTRODUCTION

Findings of the recent second language acquisition research have demonstrated a need for classroom activities that promote both communicative interaction and attention to form in second language classrooms (Ellis, 2005). One way to promote such opportunities is through pedagogical tasks that encourage negotiation of meaning, while at the same time providing opportunities for feedback and attention to form (Yuan & Ellis, 2003). In this relation, in order to provide effective opportunities for peer feedback and scaffolding, in the sense used by Vygotsky (1986), classroom tasks that require learners to work together and produce output collaboratively have been suggested by a group of researchers (Lapkin & Swain, 2000; Swain, 2005).

It has been argued by Swain (1985) that in comparison with input, there is more mental effort involved when learners are engaged in output processing; therefore, output is part of the learning process rather than the outcome of it. The rationale behind using output-based tasks in language classrooms is that learners mainly process input for meaning. But when they are pushed to produce output and subsequently provided with the relevant input, their attention is most likely drawn to the forms.

A review of the literature on the role of input and output reveals that there has always been a controversy over the effectiveness of providing learners with comprehensible input, input enhancement, output, and whether one or a combination of some is more beneficial in the process of learning language components (Izumi, 2002; Maftoon & Sharifi, 2012).

The purpose of the present study is to examine and compare the effectiveness of reconstruction cloze and reconstruction editing tasks in learning English phrasal verbs when the learners performed them collaboratively versus doing them individually.

Research Article

Phrasal verbs are an important part of English vocabulary that are widely used by native speakers of English, but they have been found to be difficult for second language learners to master (Hulstijn & Marchena, 1989; Kao, 2001; Moon, 1997), and the subject of how best to teach phrasal verbs is still quite controversial. The difficulty of learning phrasal verbs lies in the fact that they consist of different combinations of verbs and particles and often the meaning of the phrase is different from the meanings of its parts (Side, 1990). Since phrasal verbs are frequently used by native speakers both in written and spoken English, it seems important to research the effects of various classroom tasks that may encourage students to learn them.

Theoretical Frameworks

The Role of Output in SLA

For many years, the widespread belief held that output as the “outcome, or product, of the language acquisition device” (Swain, 2005) and was susceptible to attitudes of it being an end point in the language acquisition process; a view which was subsequently challenged (Swain, 2005). Swain (1995) proposes three functions for output, one of which is the noticing function, which posits that learners may notice the gap in their IL knowledge in an attempt to produce the TL, which then prompts them to solve their linguistic deficiency in ways that are appropriate in a given context. On the other hand, if relevant input is immediately available, the problems they face during production may make the learners to process the incoming input with more focused attention.

Recent studies (Storch, 2007; Swain *et al.*, 2002) demonstrate the impact of peer-peer dialogue on second language learning. Through interaction learners regulate or restructure their knowledge; therefore, learning, cognition and interaction are closely connected. Task research within the sociocultural framework has aimed to demonstrate how scaffolding can help students to reach a satisfactory solution when performing a task. Thus, the concept of output has been extended to be considered as a socially-constructed cognitive tool. As such, dialogue serves to learn the L2 by mediating its own construction (Swain, 2000). By means of external speech, internalization of knowledge is facilitated. This position is an additional reason in favor of the use of collaborative work in L2 learning.

Collaborative Learning

Collaborative learning entails knowledge construction within a context in which students interact with one another to attain a common goal (Izumi, 2002). Collaborative learning is believed to be more of a dialogic nature. Thus, knowledge enhancement depends upon the exchange of information between learners as they ask for clarification, verify each others’ understanding, and negotiate meaning as needed. Collaborative learning receives supports from Vygotsky’s (1986) Socio-cultural Theory in positing that through interactions with others, individuals can progress from their actual to their potential development level. From a socio-cultural perspective, human cognitive development is a socially situated activity mediated by language, that is, knowledge is socially constructed by interaction and is then internalized. Individuals learn how to carry out a new function with the help of an expert and then they can perform it individually.

Empirical Studies on Output Tasks and Second Language Acquisition

A number of studies have empirically investigated the effect of various output tasks on L2 learning. For example, Izumi (2002) investigated the role of output and the relative efficacy of reconstruction task and picture-cued writing task in noticing and learning of the English past counterfactual conditional. Results indicated that more noticing occurred overall for learners who had the opportunity to produce output compared to those who did not, although none of the tasks led to greater noticing of the target forms in the second input than in the first input. Also, the participants who received output opportunities during the treatments performed significantly better than those in the non-output condition on the production post-test, but no difference was found in the relative efficacy of the two output tasks.

In light of the above theoretical arguments, several studies have empirically examined the role of collaborative output tasks in L2 learning (Kowal & Swain, 1994; Kuiken & Vedder, 2002; Storch, 2007; Swain & Lapkin, 2002). For example, Kowal and Swain (1994) investigated a particular type of collaborative output task called dictogloss. Their results showed that when learners were involved in the

Research Article

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 benefited feedback from their peers. Kuiken and Vedder (2002) examined the effects of collaborative pair work by comparing the learners' performance on completing a dictogloss on learning English passive forms. The results of the qualitative analyses showed many instances where the interaction drew learners' attention to form. However, their results did not show a significant effect for collaborative interaction.

Storch (2007) examined the effectiveness of pair work by comparing learners' performance on completing an editing task individually or in pairs. 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 difference was found between the accuracy of the task when completed collaboratively versus individually. Nassaji & Tian (2010) compared the relative effectiveness of reconstruction cloze tasks and reconstruction editing tasks for learning English phrasal verbs in individual and collaborative conditions. The results showed that completing the tasks collaboratively led to a greater accuracy of task completion than completing them individually. However, collaborative tasks did not lead to significantly greater gains of vocabulary knowledge than individual tasks. The results, however, showed that the editing tasks were more effective than the cloze tasks in promoting negotiation and learning.

The Present Study

One conclusion that may be drawn from the above studies is that collaborative pair work may facilitate learners' interaction and attention to the target forms, but it may not necessarily lead to superior learning in comparison to individual work. Although several studies (Storch, 2007; Swain & Lapkin, 1995, Nassaji & Tian, 2010) have provided valuable insights regarding the effectiveness of collaborative tasks, very few of them investigated the output tasks in individual and collaborative setting comparatively. Moreover, most studies in the related literature have dealt with language structure, grammar, writing, or vocabulary in general, data is still thin in the related area as very few of them have included phrasal verbs as a subcategory of vocabulary (Nassaji & Tian, 2010). However, as Hare (2010), Kuiken and Vedder (2002), Nassaji & Tian (2010) and Storch (2007) stressed, studies in this area are still very limited, and hence there is a need for further research in this area. Research is needed to examine not only the effects of individual versus pair work on language tasks but also the possible effects of task types.

Research Questions

The research questions were based on the consideration of the results of the prior theoretical and empirical research discussed above. Accordingly, the following research questions have been examined in this study.

1. Do the subjects perform differently on learning the target phrasal verbs after completing close output task and editing output task?
2. Does completing the cloze output task collaboratively have a better influence on learning phrasal verbs than doing the same task individually?
3. Does completing the editing output task collaboratively have a better influence on learning phrasal verbs than doing the same task individually?
4. Do the subjects perform differently on completing cloze and editing output tasks in individual and collaborative conditions?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Method

This study is a quasi-experimental, time-series design. It is quasi-experimental in that the participants were not randomly selected, but chosen from intact classes. The participants, however, took part in a pre-test to check the homogeneity of the group. The study was conducted during a 15-week semester in two intact intermediate adult ESL classrooms in a university in Iran.

Participants

A total of 76 sophomore students from two intact classes majoring at English translation took part in this study. All of them had been studying English at the Azad University for two years. All the participants

Research Article

from the intact classes took part in a proficiency test which was used to check the homogeneity of the group in terms of their proficiency level.

Materials

Target Phrasal Verbs

Phrasal verbs are two-word or three-word idiomatic expressions, consisting of a verb and a particle or a combination of a particle and a preposition (Lewis, 1993). According to Trask (1993) a phrasal verb is a lexical verb “which consists of a simple verb combined with one or more particles” and whose meaning is typically unpredictable.

The target phrasal verbs have been derived from the book “English phrasal verbs in use” by McCarthy & O’Dell (2004). After selecting the interviews and short descriptive texts for the treatment sessions, they were slightly modified so that each text included five of the target 40 phrasal verbs, ten of which were given to the participants in completing each form of the output task.

Proficiency Test, Pre-test, and Post-tests

Before the treatment session began, all the subjects took part in a paper-based TOEFL proficiency test from ETS, which has been used to check the homogeneity of the group in terms of their proficiency level. The 40-item, multiple-choice pre-test which was designed by the researcher included the 40 target phrasal verbs used in the individual cloze, individual editing, and collaborative cloze and collaborative editing versions of the output tasks. The TOEFL proficiency test was utilized as a criterion to estimate the validity of the pre-tests and post-tests developed by the researchers in this study. Furthermore, an internal-consistency method (Cronbach’s Alpha) was used to calculate the reliability of the test. The reliability was estimated from the test scores in the pre-tests and the post-tests. The underlying reason was that there was little variability in the pre-tests and post-tests scores which might have decreased the reliability indices. The reliability measure for the pre-test and post-tests (0.76) was high enough to confirm the reliability of the test.

Each of the four ten-item, multiple-choice post-tests included ten items of the of the original 40-item pre-test. Each post-test was given to the participants at the end of each treatment session to check the subjects’ knowledge gain after each type of treatment.

The Output Tasks

The output tasks used in this study included cloze and editing tasks. Cloze tasks included completing a short descriptive text and a short interview with ten blanks to be completed with the given phrasal verbs. The editing task also included completing a short descriptive text and a short interview with ten erroneous sections related to the target phrasal verbs. The subjects were to spot the wrong sections of the texts and write the correct forms of the target phrasal verbs.

The output tasks used in this study were modified versions of cloze and text-editing tasks used in previous studies (Izumi & Bigelow, 2000; Nassaji & Tian, 2010). In a typical output task, the researcher or the teacher reads the text twice for the learners while they take notes. Then they are asked to reconstruct the original text through gap-filling exercise (in cloze task), correcting some sections in the text (in editing task) or rewriting the text (in dictogloss). In this research, however, the subjects were first exposed to the written input, and then were asked to complete the output tasks.

Research Design

The study was conducted during a regular 15-week semester at the Azad University. The study was carried out in six consecutive sessions in the middle of the semester. After taking the proficiency test, the subjects participated in the treatment sessions which were held in five sessions. In the first session, the 40 target phrasal verbs were given to the subjects in the form of multiple-choice tests to answer. This was to test their prior knowledge of the target forms. Then, in the four following sessions, the subjects were exposed to the target forms through completing one cloze output task and one editing output task in individual and collaborative conditions. For all four types of treatments, the learners were given two short texts – one short descriptive text and one short interview – each of which contained five of the target phrasal verbs (ten phrasal verbs for each form of the treatment). Also, a glossary of the target forms was handed out in each session so that the students might use them as a source for the meaning of the target

Research Article

phrasal verbs. In previous studies on output tasks (Nassaji & Tian, 2010), a mini lesson on the target phrasal verbs was given to the participants before they completed the output tasks.

In the first session, the subjects were asked to complete the individual cloze task. First, they were exposed to the written input - a short descriptive text and the interview - and the glossary of the target phrasal verbs. They were given 15 minutes to read the two short texts. They were told that they were going to read the texts in 15 minutes to get the main idea. Then, they were given the same texts, each with five blanks relating to the target phrasal verbs. They were asked to complete the texts in 25 minutes using the target forms given at the top of each text (each including one extra word). After the subjects completed the cloze task, the first ten-item post test of the target phrasal verbs practiced in this session was delivered to them to answer.

The same procedure was repeated in the second session of the treatment, in which the learners were asked to complete the collaborative cloze output task. In this session, however, they were asked to complete the task in small groups of three. Their interactions during the task were recorded by their own cell phones. Then they completed the second post-test including the ten phrasal verbs practiced in that session. In some of the previous studies, collaborative work has been done either in pair or in small groups of three or four learners (Izumi & Bigelow, 2000; Nassaji, & Tian, 2010; Storch, 2007).

In the third session, the subjects were asked to complete the individual editing task. First, they were exposed to a short descriptive text and the interview and the glossary of the target phrasal verbs. They were given 15 minutes to read the two short texts in 15 minutes to get the main idea. Then, they were given the same texts, but this time each text included five erroneous parts related to the target forms. The learners were asked to identify the erroneous parts and correct them. Then they answered the third post-test containing the ten phrasal verbs practiced in the same session. Editing tasks have been used by Izumi (2002), Izumi & Bigelow (2000), and Nassaji & Tian (2010) as output tasks in previous studies.

The same procedure was repeated in the fourth treatment session with the last ten phrasal verbs. The subjects, however, completed the editing task in groups of three, and their interactions during the task were recorded. After completing the collaborative editing task, the learners answered the last post-test including the ten target forms to which they were exposed in that session.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Effects of Cloze Task versus Editing Task

In order to investigate how cloze and editing tasks in individual and collaborative conditions influence the learning of English phrasal verbs, the data collected from the four performances of the participants were analyzed using one-way ANOVA for pre- and post-tests. Descriptive statistics of the performances of the participants on the pre-tests are presented in Table 1. As it can be inferred from the table, there was no significant difference among the performances of the participants on the four ten-item pre-tests containing forty target phrasal verbs in the four sections, each of which corresponding to the target forms that were used in the four types of output tasks. This indicates that the subjects had similar performances on the four pre-tests, with the mean scores of 3.16, 3.18, 3.02 and 3.42 for the individual cloze task, individual editing task, collaborative cloze task and collaborative editing task, respectively.

Table 1: Mean scores and SDs of the participants' performance on the pre-tests on output tasks

	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Indvcloze	54	3.16	1.28	1.00	6.00
Indvediting	54	3.18	1.19	0.00	6.00
Colcloze	54	3.01	1.22	1.00	6.00
Colediting	54	3.42	1.14	1.00	6.00

Also, one-way ANOVA was used to check if there was any significant difference on the participants' performances on the four pre-tests (Table 2). As the p value (0.73) is higher than .05, there was no significant difference in this regard. Results of one-way ANOVA of the participants' performances on the

Research Article

four post-tests (Table 3) indicate that the p value (0.000) is lower than the critical value. Thus, we conclude that there was a significant difference in the scores of the participants on the three post-tests. Regarding the fact that the subjects had similar performances on the same tests (used as pre-tests), we conclude that the difference on the scores on the post-tests is attributed to the four different treatments, namely individual cloze task, individual editing task, collaborative cloze task and collaborative editing task.

Table 2: Results of one-way ANOVA for the pre-tests on output tasks

	df	Mean Sq.	F	Sig
Indvcloze, indvediting, Colcloze & colediting	3	1.53	1.04	0.37

Table 3: Results of one-way ANOVA for the post-tests on output tasks

	df	Mean Sq.	F	Sig
Indvcloze, indvediting, Colcloze & colcediting	3	8.30	2.68	0.000

Results of Tukey’s Post Hoc analysis of the subjects’ performances on the two output tasks in individual and collaborative conditions through one-way repeated measures ANOVA are shown in Table 4. Paired comparisons of the participants’ performances on these tasks reveal that there was no significant difference between the participants’ performance on the individual cloze task and the individual editing task as the p value (0.727) in table 4 suggests.

Also, the difference between the learners’ performance on the individual cloze task and the collaborative cloze task was not significant (P = 0.422).

As it can be understood from the figures in table 4, there was no statistically meaningful difference between the learners’ performance on individual editing task and collaborative cloze task (p = 0.961), nor between individual editing and collaborative editing (p = 0.302).

Moreover, the learners did not show any significant difference in learning the target phrasal verbs after doing the collaborative cloze task and collaborative editing task with reference to the P value (0.592) in table 4.

Table 4: Results of one-way repeated measures ANOVA for the post-tests on output tasks

	Mean D	SE	Sig
Indvcloze-indvediting	-0.351	0.338	0.727
Indvcloze-colcloze	-0.518	0.338	0.422
Indvcloze- colediting	-0.944	0.338	0.029
Indvediting-colcloze	-0.166	0.338	0.961
Indvediting-colediting	-1.592	0.338	0.302
Colcloze-colediting	-0.425	0.338	0.592

The results in this regard seem to suggest that the type of output task, as studied in this research, does not show any significant difference in leading to learning English phrasal verbs.

Between the two types of cloze and editing output tasks used in the present study, no significant difference has been found regarding their relative effectiveness on the learning of the target phrasal verbs. Some of the previous studies tried to find out whether the type of output task makes a difference on learning L2 target vocabulary and structure.

Most of them, however, could not find any significant difference for the task effect (Izumi, 2002; Nassaji & Tian, 2010). Some other studies, however, concluded that those tasks that involve more cognitive load, in the sense used by Laufer & Hulstijn (2001), lead to a better learning of target forms.

Research Article

Taking the same results for the cloze and editing tasks into account, doing cloze output task collaboratively did not have a more positive influence on learning phrasal verbs than doing the same task individually.

As table 4 shows, between the two types of tasks in the two different conditions, the only significant difference, after all, was found between the participants' performance on the individual cloze task and collaborative editing task ($p = 0.029$). In other words, the difference of performance on the post-test was only statistically significant between the collaborative editing task and individual cloze task with reference to the p value in table 5 ($p=0.029$).

Effects of Collaborative Work on Learning Phrasal Verbs

Between the two close and editing output tasks in individual and collaborative conditions, it has been found that neither collaborative close task was more effective than individual close task, nor did collaborative editing task prove more useful than individual editing task. Only collaborative editing task showed a significant difference in leading to learning the target forms in comparison with individual cloze task.

Thus, it can be argued that the effect of task type was not strong enough to make a statistically significant difference, nor was the effect of collaborative task that strong to make a distinction. The aggregate effects of task type and collaborative work, however, were strong enough to make a statistically significant difference between the participants' performance on the collaborative editing output task and the individual close output task. Some of the previous studies (Storch, 2007; Kuiken & Vedder, 2002; Izumi, 2002) also suggest that although collaboration may lead to better task performance, it may not necessarily lead to subsequent learning of the target forms.

Thus, the findings do not support the presumed advantage of collaborative pair work over individual work or the idea that collaborative tasks are necessarily more effective than individual tasks. This may suggest that it is not the collaborative work itself, but how and under what conditions it is conducted that determines its beneficial effects for language learning.

Task Completion Results

Task completion analyses first compared the learners' success in completing the two output tasks individually and collaboratively. To this end, learners' performance in each task was examined in terms of the accuracy of producing the target items when they completed the tasks. Mean scores were calculated for the accurate responses on each task and each condition, and then were compared, using one-way repeated measures ANOVA.

Results of task completion on cloze and editing tasks in individual and collaborative conditions are depicted in table 5. The figures in the table indicate that the subjects had the best performance on completing collaborative editing task with 62 percent correct response, followed by collaborative cloze task with 54.6 percent correct response.

Then stand individual editing task and individual cloze task with 43.5 and 42.4 percent correct responses, respectively.

Table 5: Results of task completion

	N	No. of items	No. of correct responses	Percentage of correct responses
Indvcloze	54	540	229	42.4
Colcloze	15	150	82	54.6
Indvediting	54	540	235	43.5
Colediting	15	150	93	62

Research Article

Also, one-way ANOVA was used to check if there was any significant difference on the participants’ performances on completing the four tasks. As the p value (0.000) in table 8 indicates, there was a significant difference in this regard.

Table 6: Results of one-way ANOVA for the output tasks completion

	df	Mean Sq.	F	Sig
Indvcloze, indvediting, Colcloze & colcediting	3	18.46	7.42	0.000

Results of Tukey’s Post Hoc analysis of the subjects’ performances on completing the two output tasks in individual and collaborative conditions through one-way repeated measures ANOVA are shown in Table 7. Paired comparisons of the participants’ performances on these tasks reveal that there was a statistically significant difference between the participants’ performance on completing the individual cloze task and collaborative cloze task as the p value (0.043) in table 7 suggests. Also, the difference between the learners’ performance on completing the individual editing task and collaborative editing task was statistically significant (P = 0.002).

Table 7: Results of one-way repeated measures ANOVA for output tasks completion

	Mean D	SE	Sig
Indvcloze- colcloze	-1.22	0.46	0.043
Indvcloze- Indvediting	-0.29	0.30	0.763
Indvcloze- colediting	-1.95	0.46	0.000
Colcloze-indvediting	-0.92	0.46	0.186
Colcloze-colediting	-0.73	0.57	0.582
Indvediting-colediting	-1.66	0.46	0.002

Results of task completion analysis above revealed that the subjects had better performance on completing both collaborative editing task and collaborative cloze task in comparison with their performance on completing individual cloze and individual editing tasks. The findings regarding the effects of group work are consistent with the results of some of the previous studies that have shown that engagement in joint activities may improve task performance in terms of the accurate production of the target forms (Kowal & Swain 1994; Lapkin & Swain 2000; Lapkin, Swain & Smith, 2002; Nassaji & Tian, 2010).

We understand from the figures in table 8 that the students scored higher on completing the editing tasks than on doing the cloze task both in individual and in collaborative conditions. This could have been perhaps due to the higher degree of negotiation and scaffolding generated by the editing tasks than the cloze task when learners completed them collaboratively. An analysis of the transcriptions of the learners’ interaction during collaboration showed that the editing tasks generated more instances of form-focused talk and peer feedback than the cloze tasks. Such negotiations in the editing task could have oriented the learners’ attention to the phrasal verbs more effectively and hence could have resulted in deeper understanding of the target items.

The advantage of editing tasks over cloze tasks in promoting interaction may be related to their unique characteristics. Swain (2005) argues that such activities are effective because when learners collaborate to produce output, they use language not only to convey meaning, but also to develop meaning. These activities are also beneficial because when learners try to produce language through collaboration, they will not only produce output, but they may get help from their peers while they try to make their meaning precise (Kowal & Swain, 1994; Swain, 2005).

Conclusion

Four questions were posed above as to the relative effectiveness of these two types of output tasks on noticing and learning of phrasal verbs by L2 learners. Regarding the first question, we have found that the

Research Article

two types of tasks did not show a significant difference in learning the target forms. This is in line with some of the previous research that found the type of output tasks does not make a difference in the acquisition of the target forms.

Concerning the second research question, it was found that there was no statistically significant difference between the learners' performances on the individual and collaborative cloze tasks with reference to their learning of the target forms. Furthermore, with reference to the third research question, the results showed that the participants scored slightly higher on the post-test after completing the collaborative editing task in comparison with doing individual editing task, though not statistically significant. This suggests that collaborative editing output task may have the potential to foster learning of L2 vocabulary though it requires further research to confirm the results.

The last research question above was directed at the effects of the two types of output tasks on completing the tasks themselves and creating negotiations among the participants. The results indicated that the subjects had better performance on completing both collaborative editing task and collaborative cloze task in comparison with their performance on completing individual cloze and individual editing tasks. The findings regarding the effects of group work are consistent with the results of some of the previous studies that have shown that engagement in group activities may improve task performance in terms of the accurate production of the target forms.

All in all, the results indicate that collaborative editing task results in more negotiations among L2 learner and. The findings showed that collaborative group work led to better task completion but not necessarily better learning of the target phrasal verbs. The results, however, showed a significant effect for task type. In this study, of the two types of output tasks examined, the editing task was more effective in promoting learning and also generating opportunities for form-focused interaction. In light of the need for pedagogical tasks that can promote focus on form in L2 classrooms, these findings are important and suggest that editing tasks may be well suited to providing such opportunities, particularly for learning vocabulary and phrasal verbs. However, more research is needed to examine the effectiveness of these tasks along with other types of tasks for learning vocabulary and also other language forms.

Findings related to collaborative output tasks revealed that they were very effective in completing output tasks. The results provide some grounds for their potential use in creating negotiation of ideas while doing group work in classroom. The results, however, showed that such tasks have not been very effective in leading to better learning of the target phrasal verbs by Iranian EFL learners. The findings were not consistent with some of the previous research, which found positive effects for collaborative pair work on L2 learners' acquisition of target forms. This shows that, as asserted by Nassaji & Tian (2010), the presumed effectiveness of collaborative task on learning linguistic forms should be taken with more caution. Thus, further investigation in the related area is needed to find out whether collaborative output tasks are really influential in this regard or, if not, what the possible causes are.

REFERENCES

- Ellis R (2005).** Measuring implicit and explicit knowledge of a second language: A psychometric study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* **27** 141-72.
- Hare A (2010).** Incidental phrasal verb acquisition through second language reading, MA Thesis, Concordia University. Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- Izumi S (2002).** Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis: An experimental study on ESL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* **24**(4) 451-577.
- Izumi S and Bigelow M (2000).** Does output promote noticing and second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly* **34** 239-278.
- Kao R (2001).** Where have the prepositions gone? A study of English prepositional verbs and input enhancement in instructed SLA. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* **39** 195-215.
- Kuiken F and Vedder I (2002).** The effect of interaction in acquiring the grammar of a second language. *International Journal of Educational Research* **37** 343-58.

Research Article

- Lapkin S and Swain M (2000).** Task outcomes: a focus on immersion students' use of pronominal verbs in their writing. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics* **3** 7-22.
- Lapkin S, Swain M and Smith M (2002).** Reformulation and the learning of French pronominal verbs in a Canadian French immersion context. *Modern Language Journal* **86** 485-507.
- Laufer B and Hulstijn JH (2001).** Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: the construct of task induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics* **22**(1) 1-26.
- Lewis M (1993).** *The Lexical Approach* (Hove: Teacher Training Publications).
- Maftoon P and Sharifi S (2012).** The relative effectiveness of input and output-oriented tasks with different involvement loads on the receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge of Iranian EFL learners. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills* **4**(2) 27-52.
- McCarthy M and O'Dell F (2004).** *English Phrasal Verbs in Use* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Moon R (1997).** Vocabulary connections: Multi-word items in English. In: *Vocabulary: Description, Acquisition and Pedagogy*, edited by McCarthy M (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 40-63.
- Nassaji H and 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.
- Nassaji H and Tian J (2010).** Collaborative and individual output tasks and their effects on learning English phrasal verbs. *Language Teaching Research* **14**(4) 397-41.
- Neo M (2003).** Developing a collaborative learning environment using a web-based design. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* **19**(4) 462-473.
- Side R (1990).** Phrasal verbs: Sorting them out. *ELT Journal* **44** 144-152.
- 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 (1993).** The output hypothesis: just speaking and writing aren't enough. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* **50** 158-164.
- Swain M (2000).** The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In: *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning*, edited by Lantolf JP (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 97-114.
- Swain M (2001).** Integrating language and content teaching through collaborative tasks. *Canadian Modern Language Review* **58** 44-63.
- Swain M (2005).** The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In: *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, edited by Hinkel E (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates) 471-83.
- Swain M and Lapkin S (1995).** Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics* **16** 371-391.
- Swain M and Lapkin S (2001).** Focus on form through collaborative dialogue: Exploring task effects. In: *Researching Pedagogic Tasks: Second Language Learning, Teaching and Testing*, edited by Bygate M, Skehan P and Swain M (Harlow: Pearson Education) 99-118.
- Swain M and Lapkin S (2002).** Talking it through: Two French immersion learners' response to reformulation. *International Journal of Educational Research* **37** 285-304.
- Trask RL (1993).** *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics* (London: Routledge).