Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research
Volume 3, Issue 2, 2016, pp. 240-252
Available online at www.jallr.com
ISSN: 2376-760X

Investigating the Efficacy of Three Divergent Output Tasks in the Acquisition of Formulaic Expressions

Gholam Reza Abbasian
Assistant Professor, Imam Ali University and Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran

Fateme Aryanejad
MA of TEFL, Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran

Hengameh Arefinezhad *
PhD Candidate, Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran

Abstract
The significance of learning formulaic expressions in EFL/ESL is undeniable; however, few studies have been conducted on teaching through collaborative approaches. Accordingly, the current study intended to investigate the efficacy of three divergent output tasks including individual, collaborative pair, and group work in the acquisition of formulaic expressions among Iranian EFL learners. To this respect, 65 intermediate female students were divided into three experimental groups and were taught 76 formulaic expressions during 12 sessions. A test for participants' homogeneity as well as a test of formulaic expressions including 60 idioms to measure the participants' knowledge over the acquisition of idioms in two levels of comprehension and production was utilized. The findings of the present study indicated that the individual group outperformed the collaborative groups at the level of production which shed light on the negative side of collaboration.
Keywords: divergent task, collaborative, individual, pair work, formulaic expressions

INTRODUCTION

The history of language pedagogy reveals that vocabulary learning has been disregarded due to the assumption that vocabulary acquisition would take place spontaneously. Therefore, it was not regarded to be as serious as syntax or phonology (Decarrico, 2001; O'Dell, 1997, as cited in Milton, 2009). However, by the late 1970s and early 1980s, consensus met the view that vocabulary can be acquired naturally. This idea resulted in the revival of interest in vocabulary teaching and the recognition of the significance of vocabulary learning (Decarrico, 2009, as cited in Milton, 2009).

* **Correspondence:** Hengameh Arefinezhad, Email: h.arefinezhad@yahoo.com

In accordance with the significant role of teaching formulaic expressions, Gigatski (2012) asserts that improper performance is not due to inadequate vocabulary acquisition but lack of knowledge over the use of idiomatic expressions. To this respect, Swain (2005) believes that collaborative activities are effective because "when learners collaborate to produce output, they use language not only to convey meaning, but also to develop meaning (as cited in Nassaji & Tian, 2010, p. 399). Accordingly, collaboration is both well-known and controversial concept in language teaching.

Broadly speaking, Vygotsky (1978) condemns that in collaborative tasks students interact socially, thus, there are "a number of studies reported the effective role of collaboration on various aspects of second language learning" (Ingham, Levinger, Graves & Peckham, 1974; Lapkin, Swain & Smith, 2002; Lynch, 2001; Storch, 2005; Swain, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 1998, as cited in Abdikhah & Shahriyarpour, 2012, p. 688). Therefore, some studies including Abdikhah and Shahriyarpour (2012), Garcia and Asencion (2001), Kim (2008), and Reinders (2009) compare the efficiency of collaborative over the individual output tasks. However, some other researchers reject the efficacy of collaboration by illuminating the negative impacts of collaboration on the group members (Ringelmann, 1913; Williams, Harkins & Latane, 1981, as cited in Liden, Wayne, Jaworski, & Bennett, 2004).

From a socio-cultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1978), social interaction and collaboration are important requirements for learning. The socio-cultural framework provides a strong basis for using pedagogical activities that encourage learners to work together and produce language collaboratively. It has recently been a pedagogical concern to guide students to gain a deeper knowledge of formulaic expressions and to use them more actively.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Nature of Idiomatic Expressions

Generally speaking, formulaic expressions are strings of words which would be retrieved from memory as a whole and would not be generated or analyzed grammatically but would be recalled and used as fixed forms (Schmitt & Alali, 2012; Wray & Perkins, 2000).

Schmitt and Alali (2012) enumerate some of the features of formulaic expression and other researchers describe them as "ubiquitous, central, and at the very center of language acquisition" (Carter, 2004; McCarthy, 1998; Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992, as cited in Schmitt & Alali, 2012, p. 153). Given that formulaic word strings are attributed to a wide range of fixed expressions as "collocations, idioms, compounds, phrasal verbs, social routine formulae, proverbs, and standardized similes and binominal phrases" that can help the L2 learners perform better and then sound more proficient either in speaking or in writing (Dai & Ding, 2010, as cited in Boers, Demecheleer, Coxhead & Webb, 2014, p. 55).

According to Lundblom (2012) idioms occur frequently in classroom language where adolescents could have repercussions in reading comprehension, written composition, and vocabulary learning. Therefore, Schmitt and Alali (2012) conclude that due to the word-centered conceptualization of vocabulary, teaching formulaic expressions was not weighted adequately and that they were rarely taught as part of overall vocabulary competence. Additionally, they mention that little research has been conducted to discover different effective methods of teaching formulaic expressions.

Nature of Collaboration

Collaboration is a cross-disciplinary concept (Thomson, Perry, & Miller, 2008) which can be used in other settings (Bradshaw, 1997) and can be traced in many fields of human activities and especially education (Wood & Gray, 1991). To this respect, Thomson and Perry (2006) redefine collaboration as follow: "collaboration is a process in which autonomous or semi-autonomous actors interact through formal and informal negotiations, jointly creating rules and structures governing their relationships and ways to act or decide on the issues that brought them together; it is a process involving shared norms and mutually beneficial interactions" (as cited in Thomson et al., 2008, p. 98).

Lantolf (2000) asserts that collaboration helps the learners to do completion tasks together and do what they could not do individually. Accordingly, few studies highlight the role of collaboration on different aspects of language learning (Abdikhah & Shahriyarpour, 2012; Bradshaw, 1997; Dobao, 2014; Lapkin, Swain & Smith, 2002; Lynch, 2001; Swain, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 1998), although few studies attempt to analyze the impact of collaborative activities over the individual activities (Garcia & Asencion, 2001; Kim 2008; Reinders, 2009; Storch, 1999). By all means, Storch (1999) as well as Nassaji and Tian (2010) acknowledges that the collaborative tasks are partially effective.

Bingham (2003) believes that collaboration outcome should not be interpreted as success or failure because some determining factors such as time and different context may well change the result. However, he declares that “we should avoid labeling them in terms of success or failure unless we are able to identify that the most important indicators consistently point in the same direction overtime and across different contexts”(as cited in Thomson et al., 2008, p. 103).

Basically speaking, the requisites of collaboration survival are the participants’ ability to create and command collaborative values (Cropper, 1996), however, Nassaji and Tian (2010) state that the effectiveness of learners’ collaboration depends on their ability to work and solve language-related problems collaboratively.

Task-Based Instruction

Given that task-based language teaching is an approach to CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) which weighted task accomplishment. As a matter of fact, Ellis (2003) believes that “classroom interaction, learner-centered teaching, and authentic

language use" are the key features of TBLT (as cited in Baleghizade &Derakhshan, 2012, p. 144). Likewise, Skehan (2003) explores tasks from a cognitive point of view in terms of attentional resources utilized during task completion and its efficiency on performance, therefore, it can be concluded that employing tasks can play a significant role in the pedagogical environment.

Regarding the role of collaborative output task, Kowal and Swain (1994) argue that they are considerable in developing grammatical competence. Thus, from Storch's viewpoint, it can be concluded that collaborative output tasks include two types of feedback, namely internal auditory feedback and external peer feedback (2005). Broadly speaking, while the learners express their opinions and decisions about a problem they are giving the internal auditory feedback in fact, then they will receive their peers' feedback externally. Such give-and-takes help the language learners in finding the gaps, paying attention to the deficiencies, receiving feedbacks and promoting learning.

Through feedbacks, learners will test their hypotheses and can consciously analyze or reflect their own performance or each others' performance which will be led into internalizing the target language. This conscious reflection is called meta-talk or meta-linguistic which is a type of collaborative dialogue (Swain & Lapkin, 2001). It is argued that producing output provides learners with great opportunities at the level of processing (i.e. syntactic processing) which may be necessary for the development of target-like proficiency or accuracy (Izumi & Bigelow, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 1995).

Based on the ideas mentioned above, it could be concluded that both of the variables of the present study, namely formulaic expressions and collaborative output, are worthy of further scrutiny due to scarce literature. The current study concentrates on a subcategory of formulaic expressions, say idioms. So far, studies were mostly devoted to the investigation of the impact of collaboration on the acquisition of collocations and phrasal verbs, and few studies were carried out on the other subcategories of formulaic expressions, namely idioms.

The following research questions were formulated to evaluate the effect of the treatment provided on learning formulaic expressions at the level of production.

1- Is there any significant difference between the first group receiving individual output tasks and the second experimental group receiving pair-work collaborative tasks in learning formulaic expressions at the level of production?
2- Is there any significant difference between the first group receiving individual output tasks and the third experimental group receiving group-work collaborative tasks in learning formulaic expressions at the level of production?
3- Is there any significant difference between the second experimental group receiving pair-work collaborative output tasks and the third experimental group receiving group-work collaborative tasks in learning formulaic expressions at the level of production?

METHOD

Participants

Eighty female Iranian students were chosen from IranMehr Language Institute in Tehran, Iran. They were foreign language learners aged between 16 and 25 at intermediate level of language proficiency based on the institute's placement test. They were assigned to three different experimental groups to do the tasks individually, in pairs, or in groups of four. Since some of the students were absent at the time of pre or post testing the final number of students who underwent the study was 65.

Instruments

Two instruments were used in the present study including the institute's placement test to assess the students' level of language proficiency, and a test of formulaic expression which was a researcher made test andemployed at the time of pre and post-testing to measure the students' comprehension and production of the target formulaic expressions.The reliability of the placement test was computed through the KR-21 as .94. The result is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean		Variance	Kr-21
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	
PILOT	65	24	88	71.52	2.188	311.267	.94
Valid N (listwise)	65						

Data Collection Procedure

Since three intact groups were chosen for the present study, homogeneity of the students had been determined by the institute's placement test. So, the students were considered to be qualified for participating in the target classes. Initially, the pretest was administered to each group and the allotted time was reckoned to be an hour. This test was administered at the beginning of the study, exactly a session before beginning the treatment program. Although 75 formulaic expressions were taught during the instructional period, the test of formulaic expressions used at the time of pre/post testing included 60 formulaic expressions.

The actual training of formulaic expressions started from second session of the semester. Each session was initially devoted to an expression lesson. It is worth mentioning that the regular class time was 90 minutes long. However, the first 30 minutes of each session were devoted to formulaic instructions. The study went on for twelve successive sessions and the same procedure was followed in each session.

The classes were held every other day and 3 sessions a week and the students studied the expressions every session through the passages extracted from a book entitled American English Idioms. Subsequently, the newly learnt expressions were presented through three main stages, namely presentation, practice, and production.

RESULTS

This study aimed at investigating the effect of individual, pair, and group work collaborative tasks on the production of formulaic expressions by Iranian EFL learners. The data were analyzed through the parametric test of one-way ANOVA which is based on two main assumptions of homogeneity of variances and normality. As displayed in Table 2, the ratios of skewness and kurtosis over their respective standard errors were within the ranges of +/- 1.96.

Table 2. Testing normality assumption

Group		N	Skewness			Kurtosis		
		Statistic	Statistic	Std.Error	Ratio	Statistic	Std. Error	Ratio
Pair Learning	Pre-Production	20	-.014	.512	-0.03	-.165	.992	-0.17
	Post-Production	20	-.608	.512	-1.19	-.390	.992	-0.39
Collaborative Learning	Pre-Production	24	-.427	.472	-0.90	-.352	.918	-0.38
	Post-Production	24	-.330	.472	-0.70	-1.057	.918	-1.15
Individual Leaning	Pre-Production	21	.767	.501	1.53	.385	.972	0.40
	Post-Production	21	.223	.501	0.45	-1.065	.972	-1.10

One-way analysis of variances was run to compare the pair, group, and individual learning groups' means on the pretest of production in order to prove that they were at the same level of production of formulaic expressions prior to the administration of the treatment. Before discussing the results, it should be mentioned that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met (Levene's $F(2, 62) = .15$, $P > .05$).

Table 3. Levene's test of equality of error variances, pretest of production

F	df1	df2	Sig.
.157	2	62	.855

Table 4 displays the descriptive statistics for the three groups on the pretest of production. The group learning subjects ($M = 6.50$, $SD = 2.63$) showed the highest mean on the pretest of production. This was followed by individual learning group ($M = 6.29$, $SD = 3.16$) and pair learning group ($M = 5.85$, $SD = 2.73$).

Table 4. Descriptive statistics, pretest of production

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Pair Learning	20	5.85	2.739	.612	4.57	7.13
Group Learning	24	6.50	2.638	.538	5.39	7.61
Individual Learning	21	6.29	3.165	.691	4.85	7.73
Total	65	6.23	2.816	.349	5.53	6.93

Based on the results displayed in Table 5 (F (2, 62) = .29, P > .05, ω^2 = .022 representing a weak effect size), it can be concluded that there were not any significant differences between the means of the three groups on the pretest of production. Thus, it can be concluded that they were at the same level of production of formulaic expressions prior to the administration of the treatment.

Table 5. One-Way ANOVA, pretest of production by groups

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4.703	2	2.351	.290	.749
Within Groups	502.836	62	8.110		
Total	507.538	64			

Production of Formulaic Expressions

A one-way analysis of variances through the post-hoc Scheffe's tests was run to compare the pair, group, and individual learning groups' means on the posttest of production in order to probe the second three research questions. Before discussing the results, it should be mentioned that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met (Levene's F (2, 62) = 2.88, P > .05).

Table 6. Levene's test of equality of error variances, posttest of production

F	df1	df2	Sig.
2.884	2	62	.063

Table 7 displays the descriptive statistics for the three groups on the posttest of production. The individual learning group's subjects (M = 26.88, SD = 4.89) showed the highest mean on the posttest of production. This was followed by pair learning group (M = 20.45, SD = 8.87) and group learning group (M = 17.96, SD = 4.89).

Table 7. Descriptive statistics, posttest of production

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Pair Learning	20	20.45	8.876	1.985	16.30	24.60
Group Learning	24	17.96	6.147	1.255	15.36	20.55
Individual Learning	21	26.86	4.892	1.067	24.63	29.08
Total	65	21.60	7.675	.952	19.70	23.50

Based on the results displayed in Table 8, (F (2, 62) = 10.08, P < .05, ω2 = .21 representing a large effect size), it can be concluded that there were significant differences between the means of the three groups on the posttest of production.

Table 8. One-Way ANOVA, posttest of production by groups

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	925.120	2	462.560	10.082	.000
Within Groups	2844.480	62	45.879		
Total	3769.600	64			

The KR-21 reliability indices for the pretests and posttests of comprehension and production were .90, .78, .94, and .81.

Table 9. KR-21 reliability indices

	N	Mean	Variance	KR-21
Pre-Comprehension	65	6.57	11.718	0.90
Pre-Production	65	6.23	7.930	0.78
Post-Comprehension	65	30.32	158.472	0.94
Post-Production	65	21.60	58.900	0.81

DISCUSSION

The present study endeavors to monitor the impact of individual and collaborative pair and group tasks on idiom learning. The collaborative tasks were conducted in two groups of pair and small groups to measure the effect of pair and group work collaborative tasks on the acquisition of formulaic expressions.

As shown in table 8, there was no significant difference between the three experimental groups' pretests at the level of production. In other words, the three experimental groups were at the same level considering the production of the target formulaic expressions at the time of pretesting. However, a one way ANOVA analysis indicated a significant difference between the individual and collaborative groups at the time of post testing. The posttest results manifested that the individual group gained more in comparison with the collaborative groups at the level of producing the intended formulaic expressions.

The present study tackled the issue from a different point in which the effect of three different learning situations were subjected to the research, namely pair, small, and individual groups that were served respectively as collaborative experimental groups and the individual experimental group. All of the three experimental groups were monitored to measure the effect of number of participants on the acquisition of a form of lexical strings, say idioms which is classified under the category of vocabulary.

The findings showed that the performance of the pair work collaborative group was slightly better than the performance of the participants in the collaborative group involving four participants. The individual group, however, outperformed the collaborative groups. The findings in this regard stand in oppositions with the results reported by Nassaji and Tian (2010) and Dobao (2014). Both studies revealed that collaborative tasks could play roles in learning of either phrasal verbs or LREs, and the

increased number of students in collaborative tasks could partially result in better learning.

The findings of the present study were in favor of the group in which the participants had to accomplish the tasks individually. Several justifications could be provided for the individual group's superiority over the collaborative groups.

First, the results could be justified in terms of the idea that the participants who underwent the activities individually gained more because they were actively involved in task completions. Dobao (2014) assets "the data confirmed that lack of contribution did not necessarily mean lack of participation" (p. 20). She argues that the passive students of the collaborative groups also gained as the active students of the group, thus, she claims that no active participation does not mean no gain because the students will hear each other and will learn in silence. It can be said that in individual groups the least inclined students had been much more involved than the passive students of collaborative groups due to the fact that individual participant was the only one who had to go through the whole task, so more gain could be anticipated.

On the contrary William and Karau (1991) highlight that "as group size increases, factors other than individual effort (e.g., the effort of other group members and attributes of the task) increasingly determine group performance, and valued outcomes (e.g., a favorable evaluation) are diffused among all of the group members" (p. 571).

Second, the efficiency of the participants worked individually could be related to the kind of feedback they received. Dobao (2014) asserts that in collaborative groups the students were less likely to retain the collaboratively re-constructed lexical solutions because they were more inclined to learn and memorize the solutions which were presented by the teacher. Several scholars (Kim & McDonough, 2008; Storch, 2001, 2002, 2004; Watanabe & Swain, 2007, as cited in Dobao, 2014) have argued that the students' attitudes towards collaboration can play a determining factor in their participation as well.

Third, it had been eye witnessed that the passive students of the individual group -in comparison with the passive students of the experimental groups- asked for more feedbacks and contribution on their tasks because they could not count on other peers for completion tasks. Although it was argued that the passive students of collaborative groups were active observers and listeners (Dobao, 2014). They might not be as inclined as the passive individuals to take the floor, so it might have been a good rationale justifying the better performance of the learners involving in the tasks individually.

Thus, the findings could be attributed to the individuals' focus on the tasks because they would find themselves in a bind at the time of checking tasks, since the tasks were checked orally in the class exactly before starting the other activity.

Fourthly, as it had been discussed and proved in 70's to 90's, the idiomatic expressions were processed as single words, still literalness and familiarity factors play significant

roles in the recognition and comprehension of idioms. To this respect Cronk and Schweigert (1992) condemn that "literalness and familiarity are equally important in reading and comprehending idioms" (as cited in Mantyla, 2004, p. 64). It had been argued that familiar idioms had been lexicalized and are treated as single words while less familiar words with figurative meanings or properties took more time to process.

Accordingly, it can be claimed that the individuals performed better due to the very characteristic of unfamiliar idiomatic expression, say essential processing time. So, the students could go through the tasks individually and at their own pace, while working in groups. The participants of collaborative groups might have been rushed to answer without having enough time to process and analyze the unfamiliar expressions by themselves.

Finally, despite the fact that the individual group outperformed the collaborative groups, it has been witnessed that the students performed much better and more eagerly in any forms of the collaborative groups. Such a finding is in conformity with Dobao's (2014) and Nassaji and Tian's (2010) studies. To this respect, William and Karau (1991) assert that in collaboration the participants' role is "facilitated" and it seems that they cooperate coactively. They believe that such facilitation might not happen due to the increased number of the participants but they appoint that it might happen as a result of social facilitation theory, and then may lead to social loafing. The result of the current study is in conformity with William and Karau's (1991) study in the perspective of social loafing and the negative effects of collaboration on the students' performances.

CONCLUSION

The present study aimed to investigate the efficacy of three divergent output tasks including individual, collaborative pair, and group work in the acquisition of formulaic expressions among Iranian EFL learners. A comparison was made between the findings of the current study and previous studies, namely Nassaji and Tian's (2010) which had two groups of individual and pair, and Dobao's (2014) that benefited from two groups of pair and the small group including four participants. Nassaji and Tian (2010) examined the effect of individual and collaborative learning on the efficiency of acquisition of phrasal verbs, while Dobao (2014) administered a research to observe the impact of pair and small group learning on the acquisition of lexical language-related episodes (LREs).

The results reported by Nassaji and Tian (2010), and Dobao (2014) manifested the fact that there was no significant difference between the results of each of the groups from the view of retention while they slightly differed from one another in the view of learning. What the present study shares with both of the previously mentioned studies was the manifestation of no specific change from the retention aspect. As a matter of fact, some researchers are in favor of collaboration (Garcia & Asencion, 2001; Storch, 1999, as cited in Abdikhah & Shahriyarpour, 2012) and some others reject it (Ingham,

Levinger, Graves & Peckham, 1974; Ringelmann, 1913; Williams, Harkins & Latane, 1981, as cited in Liden et al., 2004.)

While the participants of the collaborative groups cooperated in the completion of the tasks, the findings of the current study unveiled that the individual group's performance was significantly distinguished. In other words, the individual group outperformed both of the collaborative groups. The findings in this regard stand in line with the studies rejecting the effectiveness of collaboration (Ingham, Levinger, Graves & Peckham, 1974; Ringelmann, 1913; Williams, Harkins & Latane, 1981, as cited in Liden et al., 2004).

Such a result is in conformity with the studies corroborated negative effect of collaboration on the individuals of a group. Free-rider theory, social impact theory, comprehensive theory, suckers effect hypothesis, social loafing hypothesis, social compensation hypothesis and social comparison hypothesis argued that the presence of peers in team works can cause some members to shirk, thus a member would be pressed to shoulder the group's work individually (Liden et al., 2004).

Wood and Gray (1991) point out that "collaboration needs the willing partners who are inclined to cooperate" (as cited in Bradshaw, 1997, p. 5). Thus, we can conclude that the students' willingness and attitudes can significantly influence the fruit of the teamwork (Piezon & Ferree, 2007). It has been asserted what can result in social loafing may be a belief or an impression that other partners are shirking the activity then one will try to avoid taking his/her responsibiliy as the other partners do (Karau & Williams, 1993; Sheppard & Taylor, 1999, as cited in Liden et al., 2004).

REFERENCES

Abdikhah, S., & Shahriyarpour, A. (2012). The role of output, input enhancement and collaborative output in the acquisition of English passive forms. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3(*4), 667-676.

Baleghizadeh, S., & Derakhshesh, A. (2012). The effect of task repetition and noticing on EFL learners' oral output. *International Journal of Instruction January*, *5*(1), 141-152.

Bingham, L. B., Fairman, D., J. Fiorino, D., & O'Leary, R. (2003). Fulfilling the promise of environmental conflict resolution. In R. O'Leary & L. B. Bingham (Ed.), *The promise and performance of environmental conflict resolution* (pp. 329-51). Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.

Boers, F., Demecheleer, M., Coxhead, A., & Webb, S. (2014). Gauging the effects of exercises on verb–noun collocations. *Language Teaching Research, 18*(1), 54.doi: 10.1177/1362168813505389

Bradshaw, L. K. (1997). *Interagency collaboration: Preconditions, progress, and pressures*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Evaluatio Association, San Diego, CA. Paper retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED416229.pdf

Cropper, Steve. (1996). Collaborative working and the issue of sustainability. In C. Huxham (Ed.), *Creating collaborative advantage* (pp. 80–100). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dobao, A. (2014). Vocabulary learning in collaborative tasks: A comparison of pair and small group work.*Language Teaching Research.*

Garcia, P., &Asencion, Y. (2001).Interlanguage development of Spanish learners: Comprehension, production, and interaction. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*, 377-401.

Gitsaki, C. (2012). *The Development of ESL Collocational Knowledge*. (PhD thesis) Center for Language Teaching and Research, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis: An experimental study of ESL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *24*, 541–577.

Kim, Y. (2008). The contribution of collaborative and individual tasks to the acquisition of L2 vocabulary. *The Modern Language Journal, 92*, 114-30.

Kowal, M., & Swain, M. (1994). Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness. *Language Awareness*, *3*(1), 73-93.

Lantolf, J. (2000). *Socio cultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lapkin, S., Swain, M., & Smith, M. (2002). Reformulation and the learning of French pronominal verbs in a Canadian French immersion context. *The Modern Language Journal*, *86*(4), 485-507.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Jaworski, R. A., & Bennett, N. (2004). Social Loafing: A field investigation. *Journal of Management*, *30*(2), 285–304.

Lundblom, E., & Woods, J. (2012). Working in the classroom: Improving idiom comprehension through class wide peer tutoring. *Communication Disorders Quarterly.* doi: 10.1177/1525740111404927.

Lynch, T. (2001). Seeing what they meant: Transcribing as a route to noticing. *ELT Journal*, *55,* 124-132.

Mantyla, K. (2004). *Idioms and language users: the effect of the characteristics of idioms on their recognition and interpretation by native and non-native speakers of English.* (Unpublished dissertation). University of Jyvaskyla, Finland.

Milton, J. (2009). *Measuring second language vocabulary acquisition.* Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Nassaji, H., & Tian, J. (2010).Collaborative and individual output tasks and their effect on learning English phrasal verbs. *Language Teaching Research*. doi: 10.1177/1362168810375364.

Piezon. S. L., & Ferree, W. D. (2007). *Perceptions of social loafing in online learning groups.* Paper presented on Distance Teaching and Learning, Madison, U.S.

Reinders, H. (2009). Learner uptake and acquisition in three grammar-oriented production activities. *Language Teaching Research*, *13*, 201-222.

Schmitt, N., & Alali, F. A. (2012). Teaching formulaic sequences: The same as or different from teaching single words? *TESOL International Association*, *3(*2), 153-180. doi: 10.1002/tesj.13.

Skehan, P. (2003). Task-Based instruction.*Language Teaching, 36*, 1-14.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97–114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. T*he Modern Language Journal, 82,* 320–337.

Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*, 153–173.

Storch, N. (1999). Are two heads better than one? Pair work and grammatical accuracy. *System*, *27*, 363-374.

Thomson, A.M., Perry, J.L., & Miller, T.K. (2008).Linking collaboration processes and outcomes. In R. O'Leary and L. Bingham (Eds.), *Collaborative public management*, 97-120.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Williams, K. D., & Karau, S. J. (1991). Social loafing and social Compensation: the effects of expectations of co-worker performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *61(*4), 570-581.

Wood, D. J. & Gray, B. (1991). Toward a comprehensive theory of collaboration. *Journal of Applies Behavioral Science, 27*(2), 139-162.

Wray, A., & Perkins, M. R. (2000). The functions of formulaic language: An integrated model. Lang*uage & Communication, 20*(1), 1-28.