

Cloze and Editing Tasks: Are They Effective in Teaching Lexical Collocations?

Mansoor Ganji*

Lecturer, Chabahar Maritime University, Iran

Saeed Ketabi

Associate professor, University of Isfahan, Iran

Abstract

Many recent researchers support the use of collaborative output tasks in L2 classrooms. This study compared the effects on the learning of English lexical collocations of two types of output tasks (reconstruction cloze task and reconstruction editing task). It aimed to see whether doing the tasks collaboratively led to greater knowledge of the target collocations than doing the same tasks individually and also whether the type of task would make a difference. The study was conducted in two intact intermediate adult English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) classrooms. The participants had to complete four editing tasks or four cloze tasks either individually or collaboratively, and they were asked to take a vocabulary knowledge scale test administered before and after the treatment. The results revealed that completing the tasks collaboratively (in pairs) led to a greater gain of collocation knowledge than completing them individually. The results, also, showed a significant difference between the effects of two task types, with the editing tasks being more effective than the cloze tasks in the learning of lexical collocations.

Keywords: output task, reconstruction cloze, reconstruction editing, lexical collocations

INTRODUCTION

Some researchers such as Brown (1974) cautioned our ESL/EFL field about the danger of ignoring vocabulary instruction, but scholars began to recognize the importance of vocabulary in teaching English as a second or foreign language in 1990s, and devoted themselves to the improvement of vocabulary instruction. Wilkins (1972) argued: "While without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed" (p. 111). Many researchers in the field of second language acquisition have emphasized the significance of vocabulary and have agreed that vocabulary is equally, if not more, important than language structure in language acquisition (Krashen, 1988).

In the domain of vocabulary research, most researchers have underlined the importance of word collocations, which are usually referred to as formulaic language. They believed that these formulaic expressions are very common in language discourse and using them distinguishes the native from non-native speakers (Conklin & Schmitt, 2007). Erman and Warren (2000) found that formulaic language accounts for around 59% of the spoken English and 53% of the written English discourse. Besides, Forster's study (2001) classified 32.3% of the unprepared and unplanned speech of the non-native speakers as formulaic language. Formulaic language facilitates language development for first and second language learners for they give the learners the necessary raw material which helps them improve their language (Bardovi-Harlig, 2002).

It is a widely accepted fact that L2 learners have problem with lexical collocations (Bahns & Eldaw, 1993; Nesselhauf, 2005). Collocations are one of the areas that produce problems for learners of English as a foreign language, and Iranian learners of English are by no means an exception. Sadeghi (2009) concluded that majority of Iranian EFL learners have problems with producing native-like collocations. Even though they have learned and memorized a large vocabulary, Iranian EFL learners face difficulties in properly combining words in speech or writing. Hill (1999) argued that the problem for most advanced learners is more with working with already half-known words and exploring their collocational fields than with encountering vast numbers of new words as. Not surprisingly, another common problem among Iranian EFL learners is that they can get high grades in grammar tests, but their writing is full of wrong collocations. Furthermore, quite a few surveys have revealed that advanced EFL learners' knowledge of collocations is not comparable to that of native speakers. Thus, it seems that developing collocational competence in EFL contexts is necessary for the above mentioned reasons. Besides incorporating collocations in the teaching materials, teachers should be equipped with successful and efficient teaching techniques, and teach their students the necessary strategies to enable them to master this important aspect of the language. Some researchers believe that we should incorporate the necessary collocations in the listening exercises and reading passages of the books in the hope that being exposed to the forms can help the students learn them.

However, previous studies of immersion and content-based classrooms have revealed that being exposed to input-based communication is not enough for developing a target-like accuracy. These studies indicated that although learners were exposed to meaning-based interaction and comprehensible input, they did not manage to master certain aspects of the L2 grammar (Swain, 1995). This might be due to the fact that learners in such contexts do not have enough opportunities to produce language and focus on form (Swain, 1998).

Recent SLA researchers approve of classroom activities that promote both interaction and attention to form in second language (L2) classrooms (Ellis, 2005; Williams, 2005; Long, 2006; Nassaji & Fotos, 2007; Pica, 2007). Pedagogical tasks that simultaneously allow for the negotiation of meaning and provide opportunities for feedback and

attention to form are one of the ways to achieve this goal (Van den Branden, 2006; Samuda & Bygate, 2008). Furthermore, some scholars have suggested using classroom tasks that require learners to work together and produce output collaboratively, since they provide effective opportunities for peer feedback and scaffolding (Lapkin & Swain, 2000; Swain, 2005; Swain, Brooks, & Tocalli-Beller, 2002).

Based on the sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1986), Swain has supported the use of classroom activities that help learners to work and produce output in pairs. Swain contended that such activities not only encourage learners to produce output but also provide important opportunities for scaffolding and peer feedback. The notion of Zone of Proximal Development emphasizes collaborative work because it is believed that collaborating within the ZPD might lead to internalizing and consolidating L2 knowledge and provide opportunities for problem-solving and negotiation of meaning.

According to the above mentioned studies, it seems that collaborative pair work may influence learners' performance on the in-class tasks, or even lead to a better understanding in comparison to individual work. However, studies in this area are still very limited, and hence there is a need for further research in this area (Kuiken and Vedder, 2002). Considering the promising results of the studies done in the area of output tasks and the necessity of teaching lexical collocations to Iranian EFL learners, this study aimed to investigate the impact of two output tasks, reconstruction cloze task and reconstruction editing tasks, on the learning of lexical collocations by Iranian EFL learners. In fact, the research questions of the study are as follows.

1. Do Reconstruction Editing and Reconstruction Cloze tasks have any significant effect on the learning of English lexical collocations?
2. Is Reconstruction Editing Task more effective than Reconstruction Cloze Task for the learning of English lexical collocations?
3. Are collaborative output tasks more effective than individual output tasks for the learning of English lexical collocations?

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A few studies have investigated Iranian EFL learners' knowledge of lexical collocations. Ganji (2012) investigated the influence of gender and years of instruction on Iranian EFL learners' Knowledge of Lexical Collocation. The participants were 43 English majors doing their B.A. in English Translation studies. They took a 50-item fill-in-the-blank test of collocations. The results showed that Iranian English majors were weak in lexical collocations, answering just more than 50% of the questions. A significant difference was found among the performance of the students at three academic levels, but freshmen had the best performance, not the seniors. However, there was no significant difference between boys and girls in their knowledge of lexical collocations. Noun-verb and adverb-adjective collocations were revealed to be the easiest and the most difficult type of collocation respectively.

One of the first studies investigating collaborative output tasks was conducted by Kowal and Swain (1994). They investigated a particular type of collaborative output task called dictogloss. Data were collected from intermediate and advanced French learners. The results revealed that when learners were participating in such a task, they noticed gaps in their knowledge, and they noticed the link between form and meaning, and received feedback from their peers. Nabei (1996) studied four adult ESL learners who worked in groups to complete a dictogloss, and found that the activity increased the chances for attention to form, scaffolding, and corrective feedback.

Swain and Lapkin (2001) investigated the effectiveness of a dictogloss task with a jigsaw task. Participants of the study comprised of two grade 8 French immersion classes, each class doing one of these tasks. The researchers analyzed the learners' interactions during the tasks in terms of language related episodes (LREs). They came to the conclusion that both tasks produced a similar and substantial amount of language related episodes. However, no significant difference was found between the two groups' posttest scores, suggesting that the two types of task produced comparable degrees of language gains. Garcia Mayo (2002) investigated the effect of dictogloss and text reconstruction tasks on producing LREs. Seven pairs of high intermediate to advanced EFL learners volunteered to participate in the study. The results indicated that the text-reconstruction group generated more LREs than the dictogloss group.

Storch (2005) investigated the effectiveness of collaborative pair work in two classes where students produced a written text either in pairs or individually. The study examined the accuracy, fluency and complexity of their writings and the nature of interaction during collaboration. The results showed that the pair work group produced more chances for communication and peer feedback, and that students who produced the text in pairs wrote shorter but more accurate and more complex texts than those who worked individually. In another study, Storch (2007) examined the learners' performance on completing an editing task individually or in pairs. The learners were asked to correct a short text as a regular classroom activity. Four intact ESL classes participated in the study. One of the classes completed the task in pairs, another one individually, and the other two classes had the choice to do it in groups or alone. No significant difference was found between the accuracy of the task when completed collaboratively versus individually.

Nassaji and Tian (2010) conducted a study to investigate the effect of collaborative and individual output tasks on the learning of English phrasal verbs. The study was conducted in two intact low-intermediate adult English-as-a-second-language (ESL) classrooms. The effectiveness of the tasks was determined by how successfully learners completed the tasks and also by means of a vocabulary knowledge test administered before and after the treatment. 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 an effect of

task type, with the editing tasks being more effective than the cloze tasks in promoting negotiation and learning.

METHOD

Participants

This study was conducted during a 3-month adult EFL program in a private language institute in Iran. Each semester consists of 40 sessions, each of which lasts for 90 minutes. The classes are held three times a week, either on odd days or even days. Two intact intermediate classes volunteered to participate in the study. The two classes were taught by the same teacher, who taught the same book in both classes. They were studying the book "Top Notch 2A". There were 15 students in one class (Class A), and 16 students in the other class (Class B). Their ages ranged from 20 to 28. They were all Iranian and native speakers of Persian. They had attended English conversation classes for at least a year in other institutes before enrolling in this center. There were 20 girls and 11 boys in the classes.

Research Design and Instruments

The study consisted of a pretest, a four-week long treatment, and an immediate posttest. At the beginning of the study, all the students in both classes took a pre-test of all the 20 lexical collocations through a Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS) which will be discussed in detail in the next section. In the second stage, all the learners were first introduced to the target lexical collocations through an input-based lesson, in which they were not allowed or asked to produce any output, but just to match the lexical collocations with their Persian translations after the teacher read aloud the text including the lexical collocations under investigation to them. This input-based lesson was the same for all of the tasks and learners. Previous researchers believed that students should get familiar and have some receptive knowledge of the language forms before they are asked to produce it (Swain & Lapkin, 2007).

Then, the treatment which lasted for four weeks started. Two types of tasks were used in the treatment of the study, Reconstruction Cloze Task (RCT) and Reconstruction Editing Task (RET). Thus, there were eight tasks designed and utilized in the study. During the treatment, students in class A (15 students) worked on the lexical collocation through Reconstruction Cloze Task. In reconstruction cloze task, the teacher first read the original dialogue from which the cloze task was taken very slowly two times, and the students were asked to listen to the text carefully and take notes regarding the content. After the reading was finished, the students were given the cloze version of the task and were asked to fill in the blanks with phrases according to the original dialogue. Each task included 10 missing parts, five of which were the target lexical collocations and the other five expressions were not focus of the study. The only difference was that seven of the students in this class did the task individually, which will from now on be called the Reconstruction Cloze Task Individually (RCTI) group. The other 8 students of this class did the task in pairs, four pairs; this group will be referred to as the

Reconstruction Cloze Task in Pairs (RCTP) group. This grouping arrangement remained the same for the whole treatment.

However, the students in Class B (16 students) received Reconstruction Editing Task. In this task, the teacher read the dialogue which contained the lexical collocations aloud to the students two times, and the students were asked to listen attentively and take notes on the content. When the reading of the text was done, the students received the text of the dialogue which contained erroneous lexical collocations, and they were asked to find the errors and correct the errors. Again, each task contained 10 errors, five of which were the lexical collocations under study and five irrelevant phrases. As indicated above, the class contained 16 students; where half of them (8 students) did the Reconstruction Editing Task Individually, and this group will be called (RETI). But four pairs (8 students) did the Reconstruction Editing Task in Pairs, so they will be referred to as (RETP).

Pretest and posttest

Three days before the treatment, the learners were pretested on their knowledge of the lexical collocations. Finally, one day after the treatment, their knowledge was posttested. The researcher used a Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS) (Paribakht & Wesche, 1993, 1996). The VKS is a five-point scale test that measures lexical knowledge on a continuum from no knowledge to the ability to produce the target word accurately in a sentence. This test was chosen because it was used in previous researches for the same purpose (Folse, 2006; Kim, 2008) and it is claimed to provide an effective measure of increase in vocabulary knowledge (Read & Chapelle, 2001).

The students' performance on pretests and posttests was measured according to the VKS scoring system proposed by Paribakht and Wesche (1996). That is, score 1 means the student has not seen the vocabulary, score 2 means he has seen the word before, but does not know the meaning, or if he provides a meaning or translation, it is wrong. A score of 3 is given when the students gave an acceptable synonym or translation. Score 4 means using the word in a semantically accurate but syntactically inaccurate sentence. And a score of 5 was awarded when the sentence provided was both semantically and syntactically accurate.

According to Kwon (2006), the reliability and validity of the Vocabulary Knowledge Scale have been established in a number of research studies by Wesche & Paribakht (1996) and Joe (1995, 1998). To estimate its reliability, Wesche and Paribakht administered the VKS to groups of students, and found a strong relationship (with correlations of 0.92 to 0.97) between the students' self-ratings on the elicitation scale and their response scores, which suggests that the students reported their level of knowledge of the target words accurately (cited in Kwon, 2006).

And regarding the validity of the instrument, Read (2000) argued that the VKS scale relates primarily to the 'receptive-productive' dimension of vocabulary knowledge. Although Wesche and Paribakht did not specifically discuss the receptive-productive

dimensions of vocabulary knowledge when designing the VKS scale, these different dimensions are presumably involved in the five distinct self-report categories. Since the previous studies investigating the same purpose use this vocabulary knowledge scale, it seemed wise therefore to the researcher to take advantage of this VKS scale.

Data analysis procedure

All the students in the study took the pretest at the beginning of the study. Since there were 20 lexical collocations in the pre-test and all the responses were measured against a five-level Vocabulary Knowledge Scale, the scores could range from 20 to 100. The least score was 20, because if the student pointed out that she/he had not seen the vocabulary before, their score for each item was 1. Then, they received the treatment in four different ways, in other words, doing the reconstruction cloze task and reconstruction editing tasks individually and collaboratively. After the treatment, they took the same test of VKS as posttest and their scores were recorded. Since there was one independent variable in the study with four different levels, One-way ANOVA was employed to see if the results of the post-test were significantly different or not. The descriptive statistics of the pre-test and posttest are also presented.

RESULTS

In order to see if the students had any prior knowledge of the lexical collocations under investigation, they took a pretest. The descriptive statistics of this pretest are summarized in Table 1. As the statistics show, the four different groups' means ranged from 28.12 to 33.12. In other words, the students either said that they had not seen the words before or if they provided any synonym or translation, it was wrong in most cases. The fact that the total mean was a little above 30 means that the lexical collocation introduced were almost new to the students. The Reconstruction Cloze Collaboratively group had the lowest performance with the mean of 28.12 and the highest mean belonged to the Reconstruction Editing Collaboratively group with 33.12 out of 100.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of pre-test of lexical collocations

Method of Teaching	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
R. Cloze Individually	30.1429	7	6.71884
R. Cloze Collaboratively	28.1250	8	5.24915
R. Editing Individually	33.1250	8	5.91457
R. Editing Collaboratively	31.6250	8	9.41029
Total	30.7742	31	6.92199

Although the descriptive statistics showed that the four different groups were almost equal at the outset of the study, it was not enough and to make sure that they were homogeneous regarding their level of lexical collocations knowledge, a one-way ANOVA was run. The results of which are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. One-way ANOVA results of the pre-test of lexical collocations

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	108.937	3	36.312	.738	.539
Within Groups	1328.482	27	49.203		
Total	1437.419	30			

The ANOVA results showed no significant difference among the four groups at the beginning of the study: $F(3, 27) = 0.738, p < .05$, indicating that the learners were homogeneous at the start of the study. Thus, the treatment which lasted for four weeks started. The researcher aimed to see the effects of four different forms of output tasks on the learning of lexical collocations. After the treatment, they took the same Vocabulary Knowledge Scale. Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics of the posttest and compares it with the pre-test.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of the post-test

Method of Teaching	Post-test Means	N	Std. Deviation	Pre-test Means	Actual Growth
R. Cloze Individually	46.7143	7	8.90158	30.1429	16.57
R. Cloze Collaboratively	49.7500	8	13.58308	28.1250	21.63
R. Editing Individually	49.6250	8	15.99944	33.1250	16.50
R. Editing Collaboratively	69.8750	8	7.19995	31.6250	38.25
Total	54.2258	31	14.83849	30.7742	23.45

The statistics in the table clearly showed an improvement from the pretest to the posttest in varying degrees in different groups. All in all, the performance of the students in the posttest was much better than the pretest, the total mean of the posttest was 23.45 points higher than the pretest mean. The amount of improvement in performance which equals the mean difference between the pretest and posttest is shown as Actual Growth and is bolded in the table. The highest amount of change was observed in the Reconstruction Editing Collaboratively group (38.25 points), while the group doing the same task individually (REI group) had the least improvement. As can be seen, the groups doing the tasks individually had much less improvement than those two groups doing the tasks collaboratively. Another One-way ANOVA was run to see if the improvement made from the pretest to the posttest was statistically significant or not. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4. One-way ANOVA results of post-test of Lexical Collocations

	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2683.741	3	894.580	6.159	.002
Within Groups	3921.679	27	145.247		

Table 4. One-way ANOVA results of post-test of Lexical Collocations

	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2683.741	3	894.580	6.159	.002
Within Groups	3921.679	27	145.247		
Total	6605.419	30			

The ANOVA results clearly showed a significant difference among the four groups at the end of the study: $F(3, 27) = 6.159, p < .05$, indicating that the learners were not homogeneous anymore after the treatment of the study. Thus, it was safe to say that the treatment had been quite successful in improving the knowledge of the students regarding the lexical collocations. Since it is not clear where exactly the differences lies, it is necessary to run a Post Hoc test. Thus, a Post Hoc Scheffe test was run, and the results are shown below. The mean differences which are significant are bolded and underlined. The results revealed that the only method or output task which differed from the other three tasks was doing the Reconstruction Editing Task Collaboratively. Therefore, it seemed that doing the editing task was more useful than the cloze task, and doing it collaboratively was the best method among these four methods.

Table 5. Results of posttest of lexical collocations Post Hoc Scheffe test

(I) Method of Teaching	(J) Method of Teaching	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
RCI	RCC	-3.03571	6.23743	.971	-21.6239	15.5525
	REI	-2.91071	6.23743	.974	-21.4989	15.6775
	REC	-23.16071*	6.23743	.010	-41.7489	-4.5725
RCC	RCI	3.03571	6.23743	.971	-15.5525	21.6239
	REI	.12500	6.02593	1.000	-17.8329	18.0829
	REC	-20.12500*	6.02593	.023	-38.0829	-2.1671
REI	RCI	2.91071	6.23743	.974	-15.6775	21.4989
	RCC	-.12500	6.02593	1.000	-18.0829	17.8329
	REC	-20.25000*	6.02593	.022	-38.2079	-2.2921
REC	RCI	23.16071*	6.23743	.010	4.5725	41.7489
	RCC	20.12500*	6.02593	.023	2.1671	38.0829
	REI	20.25000*	6.02593	.022	2.2921	38.2079

The next research question asked if there was any significant difference between the effects of Reconstruction Cloze Task and Reconstruction Editing Task on the learning of lexical collocations. Therefore, a t-test was run on the results of the posttest to reveal any difference between these two tasks. The results of this t-test clearly showed a significant difference between the two tasks, showing that editing task was much more

effective than the cloze task; the Reconstruction Editing Task mean was 11.41 points higher than the Reconstruction Cloze Task. Thus, it was revealed that the editing task led to better learning of the collocations.

Table 6. Results of t-test for the difference between cloze and editing tasks

	Levene's test results		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	Sig. df (2tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval		
							Lower	Upper	
Equal variances assumed	1.481	.233	-	29	.030	-11.41667	4.99261	-	-.20562
			.287				1.62771		

The last point which is mentioned in the results section is the comparison between the two conditions of doing the tasks. A comparison was made to investigate if doing the output tasks individually or collaboratively made any significant difference in the learning of lexical collocations. This was done using an independent sample t-test. Table 7 summarizes the results. As the results in the table below indicate, there was a significant difference between the two conditions. In fact, doing the tasks collaboratively led to a much better understating and gains of knowledge according to the results of the posttest.

Table 7. T-test results for the difference between individual and collaborative condition

	Levene's test results		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	Sig. df (2tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval		
							Lower	Upper	
Equal variances assumed	.099	.756	-	29	.028	-11.54583	4.98236	-	-
			2.31				21.735	1.3557	

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results showed that when learners carried out the two output tasks collaboratively, they learned more lexical collocations and learned better than when they carried them out individually. In fact, there was a significant difference between the effects of the two conditions of doing the tasks individually or collaboratively. This is not in line with the results of the study conducted by Nassaji and Tian (2010). Since comparison of the

learners' pretest and posttest scores in the study by Nassaji and Tian (2010) showed no significant difference between the collaborative and the individual tasks in terms of their effects on learning the phrasal verbs. He concluded that collaborative tasks led to a slightly more improved knowledge of the lexical collocations than the individual tasks, but the difference was not statistically significant. Thus, although the learners completed the tasks more successfully when they worked collaboratively, this during-task success did not translate into significantly greater gains of vocabulary knowledge in their study. But, in this study, doing the tasks collaboratively led to a better learning of the lexical collocations.

However, this finding regarding the superiority of pair work is supporting the results of some previous studies that have shown that collaborative activities may improve the accuracy of the target forms production (Kowal & Swain 1994, 1997; Nabei, 1996; Swain 1998; Lapkin & Swain 2000; Swain, Brooks, & Tocalli-Beller, 2002). Thus, they oppose the claim that although collaboration may lead to better task performance, it may not necessarily lead to subsequent learning of the targeted forms (Storch, 1997, 2005; Kuiken & Vedder, 2002).

There might be several reasons for such findings. One reason might be related to the nature of the interaction that usually takes place during pair work. Interactions among learners and their different reasons for accepting or rejecting each other's ideas might have helped them retain the collocations better than when doing them individually. While doing the task individually, the learner either remembers the collocation or not, it is a matter of all or nothing. He might have not evaluated, monitored or checked his choices. As a result, he is not involved with the meaning of the collocation, and may resort to the contextual clues available to guess the word, and hence will forget the collocation soon after the task. In other words, learners who work individually may leave the Language Related Episodes in the middle without any impact on their learning. This might happen because, unlike the Collaborative group, the learners who worked individually had no other source to depend on, and got disappointed soon and quit the exercise.

However, the interaction and conversation among the students in pair work might have led to the appropriation and internalization of the word knowledge. This is due to the learning opportunities that arise during collaborative work because the students focus on the occurrence of language-related episodes, defined as any part of a dialogue where the students talk about the language they are producing, question their language use, or correct themselves or others.

The next finding of the study was that the students doing the editing tasks outperformed the students doing the cloze tasks in the posttest. This was surprising to the researcher since the students' performances on the cloze tasks in the treatment were much better than their performances on the editing tasks. This could have been due to the nature of the two tasks; since in editing task, there is a higher degree of interaction and communication over the meanings than the cloze task. In other words,

in reconstruction cloze task, students have to remember some of the words missing from the text based on some contextual clues, so they might heavily rely on their memory and context rather than analysis. As might be expected, the editing tasks generated more instances of form-focused talk and feedback than the cloze tasks. Such a condition in the editing task might have shifted the learners' attention to the lexical collocations more deeply and; as a result, they could have resulted in deeper understanding and knowledge of the target items. Similar results about more interaction in the case of editing tasks were also reported in studies by García Mayo (2002) and Storch (2007).

The findings of the present study indicated the effectiveness of pair editing tasks for improving lexical collocations learning and focus on form. Therefore, they could be used as useful form-focused tasks in L2 classrooms. In sum, editing task is believed to be beneficial because it allows individual mental resources to develop and produces opportunities for the learners to directly focus on form when they try to express their intended meaning accurately and coherently.

This study suffers from a number of limitations which should be taken into account in future researches. The fact that there were not many participants in the two groups makes the generalizability scope limited. Future studies should include more participants. Another limitation of the study is that the two output tasks used in this study were in written form, future researchers might work on output tasks which are done in oral form. Another line of research might be the comparison of input-output tasks with output-only tasks. Finally, other researchers might like to do a qualitative research focusing on what happens during the interaction which happens while the task is done in pairs through video and audio recording, or analyse what the individual students do through think-aloud procedure.

REFERENCES

- Bahns, J., & Eldaw, M. (1993). Should we teach EFL students collocation? *System*, 21(1), 104-114.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2002). A new starting point? Investigating formulaic use of an input in future expression. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24(2), 189-198.
- Brown, D. F. (1974). Advanced vocabulary teaching: The problem of collocation. *RELC Journal*, 5(2), 1-11.
- Conklin, K., & Schmitt, N. (2007). Formulaic sequences: are they processed more quickly than nonformulaic language by native and nonnative speakers? *Applied Linguistics*, 29(1), 72-89.
- Ellis, R. (2005). Measuring implicit and explicit knowledge of a second language: A psychometric study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(2), 141-172.
- Erman, B., & Warren, B. (2000). The idiom principle and the open choice principle. *Text*, 20(1), 29-62.
- Folse, K. (2006). The effect of type of written exercise on L2 vocabulary retention. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(2), 273-293.

- Fotos & H. Nassaji (Eds.), *Form-focused instruction and teacher education: Studies in honor of Rod Ellis* (pp. 7–15). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ganji, M. (2012). On the effect of gender and years of instruction on Iranian EFL learners' collocational competence. *English Language Teaching*, 5(2), 123–133.
- García Mayo, M.P. (2002). The effectiveness of two form-focused tasks in advanced EFL pedagogy. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 156–175
- Hill, J. (1999). Collocational competence. *English Teaching Professional*, 11, 3–6.
- Kim, Y. (2008). The contribution of collaborative and individual tasks to the acquisition of L2 vocabulary. *Modern Language Journal*, 92(1), 114–130.
- Kuiken, F. & Vedder, I. (2002). The effect of interaction in acquiring the grammar of a second language. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37, 343–358.
- Kowal, M. & Swain, M. (1994). Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness. *Language Awareness*, 3(2), 73–93.
- Krashen, S. (1988). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Kwon, S. H. (2006). *Roles of Output and Task Design on Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of Florida, Florida.
- Lapkin, S. & Swain, M. (2000). Task outcomes: A focus on immersion students' use of pronominal verbs in their writing. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 7–22.
- Long, M. (Ed.) (2006). *Problems in SLA*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Nabei, T. (1996). Dictogloss: Is it an effective language learning task? *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 12(1), 59–74.
- Nassaji, H. & Fotos, S. (2007). Current issues in form-focused instruction. In S. Nesselhauf, N. (2005). *Collocations in a learner corpus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nassaji, H. & Tian, J. (2010). Collaborative and individual output tasks and their effects on learning English phrasal verbs. *Language Teaching Research Journal*, 14(4), 397–419.
- Paribakht, S. & Wesche, M. (1993). Reading comprehension and second language development in a comprehension-based ESL program. *TESL Canada Journal*, 11(1), 9–29.
- Paribakht, S. & Wesche, M. (1996). Enhancing vocabulary acquisition through reading: A hierarchy of text-related exercise types. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 52(2), 155–178.
- Pica, T. (2007). Time, teachers, and task in focus on form instruction. In H. Nassaji (Ed.), *Form focused instruction and teacher education: Studies in honor of Rod Ellis* (pp. 161–75). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Read, J. (2000). *Assessing Vocabulary*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Read, J. & Chapelle, C. (2001). A framework for second language assessment. *Language Testing*, 18(1), 1–32.
- Sadeghi, K. (2009). Collocational differences between L1 and L2: Implications for EFL learners and Teachers. *TESL Canada Journal*, 26(2), 100–124
- Samuda, V. & Bygate, M. (2008). *Tasks in second language learning*. London: Palgrave.

- Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(3), 153–173.
- Storch, N. (2007). Investigating the merits of pair work on a text editing task in ESL classes. *Language Teaching Research, 11*(2), 143–159.
- Swain, M. &Lapkin, S. (2001). Focus on form through collaborative dialogue: Exploring task effects. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 99–118). Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Swain, M. &Lapkin, S. (2007). 'Oh, I get it now!' From production to comprehension in second language learning. In D.M. Brinton & O. Kagan (Eds.), *Heritage language acquisition: A new field emerging* (pp. 301–19). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In B. Seidlhofer (Ed.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125–144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 64–81). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook on research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471–83). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Swain, M., Brooks, L., &Tocalli-Beller, A. (2002). Peer-peer dialogue as a means of second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*(1), 171–185.
- Van den Branden, K. (Ed.) (2006). *Task-based language education: From theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wilkins, D. A. (1972). *Linguistics in language teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Williams, J. (2005). Form-focused instruction. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook on research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 673–691). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.