Implementation of Task-based Collaborative Dialogues in EFL Speaking Classes: Focus on Achievements and Perceptions

Haniyeh Shirazifard *   **Gholam-Reza Abbasian** **

Ahmad Mohseni ***   **Mojgan Rashtchi** ****

Abstract

Collaborative dialogue (CD) in developing L2 skills known as 'knowledge-building dialogue', in spite of its momentum in foreign language acquisition, has rarely been conjoined and empirically investigated with a Task-based approach. To this end, the present research was conducted with a two-fold aim: firstly, investigating the effect of task-based collaborative dialogue on English as a foreign language (EFL) learners' speaking ability, and secondly, exploring teachers' and learners' perceptions of the exercised treatment process. The participants of the study consisted of 100 Iranian B.A. TEFL and Translation Studies students were identified as relatively homogeneous with regard to their language proficiency through administering Oxford Placement Test (OPT) and ten Iranian EFL teachers. The experimental group was exposed to task-based collaborative dialogues, while the control group experienced conventional mainstream teaching the speaking skill. Upon completing the treatment, CD questionnaires were administered to the experimental group of learners and teachers to investigate their perceptions of implementing CDs in speaking classes. Subsequently, the teachers and 12 students from the experimental group attended the semi-structured interview sessions to explore their views regarding the efficiency of task-based CDs. The findings indicated that the experimental group outperformed the control one regarding speaking skill. The results of the questionnaires and the semi-structured interviews complemented each other and indicated that the teachers and the learners adopted positive views toward applying the task-based CD. The findings offer some implications for the stakeholders, including material developers, EFL learners, and teachers, to incorporate task-based collaborative dialogues in second language education.
Keywords**: Collaborative Dialogue, Speaking Skill, Task-based Language Teaching**

* Ph.D. Candidate, Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, haniyehshirazifard@gmail.com
** Associate Professor, Imam Ali University, gabbasian@gmail.com, Corresponding Author
*** Associate Professor, Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, amohseny1328@gmail.com
**** Associate Professor, Islamic Azad University, North Tehran Branch mojgan.rashtchi@gmail.com

© Shiraz University

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)
41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

156

**Haniyeh
Shirazifard**

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

Nowadays, English language learning has become a necessity worldwide, and the ability to speak English is one of the major aims of many people (Khabiri & Firooz, 2012). The progress of the productive language skills of Iranian students has grown to be the main concern of academics who teach English in the classroom because there are rare opportunities to interact in Iranian EFL settings (Shirbagi, 2010). Rajablou and Shirvan (2017) stated that the EFL context in which Iranian students grow up is insufficiently supportive of allowing them to speak English in their daily lives. This may be one of the components that stifles their motives to acquire English. On the other hand, most EFL learners are keen on speaking English like native speakers or at least meeting their daily needs through English (Abvali & Mohammadi, 2016). Hence, a special kind of instruction should be followed as a solution to this concern and problem. A chain of instructional guidelines has driven Iranian EFL teachers over many years to implement a communicative learner-centered approach to classroom English teaching (Razmjoo & Riazi, 2006; Zohrabi, Torabi, & Baybourdiani, 2012). What can significantly contribute to their endeavor is the chance given to EFL students to be involved in language-enhancing communications in the classroom (Abvali & Mohammadi, 2016).

The comprehensible input hypothesis proposed by Krashen (1985) focuses on the input and interaction hypothesis introduced by Long (1996) with emphasis on the input modification are two theories that significantly consider the type of input learners should receive in the classroom (Abvali & Mohammadi, 2016). With regard to the significance of the output that was ignored in the above-mentioned hypotheses and in line with these movements in the field of second language acquisition (SLA), Swain (1997, 2000) proposes collaborative dialogue (CD) as a "knowledge-building dialogue" (p. 97), and as an interactive platform, defined it as a dialogue where language proficiency is built by the collaborative attempts of a group of students. Swain (1997, as cited in Yilmaz, 2008) maintained that in CD, EFL/ESL students try to remove language mistakes via collaborative attempts and, as a consequence, they can move over their ongoing cognitive and linguistic levels. Through CD, students practice together to tackle language issues and/or co-construct their language proficiency or knowledge of the linguistic system (Swain et al., 2002). Additionally, CD seems to be highly compatible

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)	**157**
41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195	**Haniyeh Shirazifard**

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

with Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory (SCT) since the former one could present a rich setting for learners to be aware of language forms (Swain, 2000). Swain (2001) tried to create the relationship between output and L2 enhancement in terms of Vygotskian SCT with a particular focus on the output reflective function or the metalinguistic role of output or metatalk. A fundamental principle of Vygotsky's SCT is that all types of learning, including language acquisition stem from mediation, "the process through which humans deploy culturally constructed artifacts, concepts, and activities to regulate (i.e., gain voluntary control of and transform) the material world or their own and each other's social and mental activity" (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 79). Language mediates thinking as a pivotal manifestation of representative artifacts and helps acquisition, consequently.

In order to create a better connection between mediation and second language learning, Swain maintained that productive skills are not merely the message transferred by language users but rather cognitive acts which form and reform cognition (Swain, 2006). As Swain (2001) puts it, the metalinguistic role of output is significant in thinking about the kind of activities in which language teachers can involve immersion learners that may aid them in developing their current L2 level to more native-like language use.

Crucial interconnected concepts in SCT- mediation and internalization, the zone of proximal development (ZPD), the agency, and participation-provide a critical objective to examine the co-construction of knowledge and meaning in a CD environment. Therefore, the two significant aspects highlighted in SCT, as the theoretical framework of the present research, are mediation and internalization, portrayed by Lantolf and Thorne (2006) as the method by which human beings deploy objects, ideas, and activities culturally built to regulate their material world and the social and mental activity of each other. Having connected output with mediation and internalization as the main underpinnings of SCT, Swain (2000) provides a comprehensive description of how output might be useful to SLA in the interactive context, that is, collaborative dialogue. The focus on the significance of cooperative work in improving L2 skills is in line with the notion that L2 acquisition is not restricted to personal attempts but is mainly related to "the mutuality of learning in activity, and collective human relationships" (Donato, 2004, p.

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)
41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

158

Haniyeh
Shirazifard

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

299-300). As a result, the particular kind of treatment initiatives, like incorporating task-based, learner-learner, or peer-peer collaborations in L2 teaching and learning, maybe a remedy for the EFL learners' limited exposure to the L2 out of the classroom, and they could develop their oral proficiency in the classroom context.

According to Ellis and Shintani (2014), task-based language teaching (TBLT) is an advanced expansion of the strategy of communicative language teaching (CLT). CLT methods were the solution to traditional learning methods (Ellis & Shintani, 2104). The ultimate goal of TBLT is to promote communication skills for learners by involving them in meaning-focused communication when assignments are completed. They stressed that promoting the development of communication skills relates to language (i.e., acquiring fresh language) and interactional skills (i.e., using the target language to engage in discourse) among learners. TBLT is even more advocated in different educational settings after the reports of its effectiveness in attaining potential outcomes have been proved (Khatib & Dehghankar, 2018). Incorporation of task-based instruction, collaborative dialogues, and tenets of the SCT is not that much new approach to developing SLA; however, their utilities as to each skill in general and the productive skills, in particular, are still worthy of consideration. Therefore, the current study is significant at two levels of theoretical and pedagogical values. This study is significant theoretically because, based on the related literature, the CD is significant in L2 instruction, which facilitates and results in EFL/ESL students' academic success (Howe, & Abedin, 2013; Sun & Chang, 2012; Swain & Watanabe, 2013). Most previous studies (Christie, Tolmie, Thurston, Howe, & Topping, 2009; Kim & McDonough, 2008; Shehadeh, 2011; Zeng & Takatsuka, 2009) empirically illustrated the positive effects of CD on language instruction and showed that the process was leading to internalization of newly-learned language features. With regard to the significance of this study, given its pedagogical values, the present study is significant as the findings could enhance the beliefs of EFL teachers and learners of speaking skill practices in the classroom setting and also develop the oral proficiency of EFL learners through an interactive context by implementing task-based collaborative dialogues. This study can have educational consequences for EFL teachers and EFL teacher training courses

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)	**159**
41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195	**Haniyeh Shirazifard**

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

as both teachers and teacher trainers can implement the results of this study to enhance teacher development and related issues. Finally, EFL teachers' and learners' perceptions concerning the effects of CD on productive skills may suggest further insights into the advantages and disadvantages of task-based CD inclusion in L2 teaching and learning.

As far as the Iranian EFL setting is concerned, the progress of Iranian EFL students' productive language skills has grown to be the primary concern of academics due to rare interaction opportunities and insufficient support (Rajablou & Shirvan, 2017; Shirbagi, 2010). Therefore, it is common for EFL instructors to include task-based collaboration in L2 instruction in today's EFL classrooms. This view is rationalized on the grounds that EFL learners achieve shared goals while working together on EFL tasks and practicing implementing the L2 for social interaction. Through task-based collaborative interactions, they can accumulate their linguistic repertoire together and co-build L2 development with their peers. Motives like these, alongside some areas, are often overlooked in the current CD studies. So, this study focused on a triple aim: to explore the effect of mediated task-based CD on the EFL learners' speaking proficiency on the one hand and to study the perceptions of the Iranian EFL students and teachers on the incorporation of mediated CD in speaking classes on the other.

As a consequence, this study is an attempt to explore the following questions,

1. Is there any significant difference between the effects of the incorporation of conventional and task-based collaborative dialogues in developing Iranian EFL learners' speaking skills?

2. What are the perceptions of Iranian EFL learners towards incorporating task-based collaborative dialogue in developing their speaking skills?

3. What are the perceptions of Iranian EFL teachers towards incorporating task-based collaborative dialogue in developing learners' speaking skills?

Literature Review

Watanabe and Swain (2007) explored the impacts of the distinctions of L2 competence in dyads and communication patterns on second language acquisition (SLA) and analyzed each dyad's CD regarding language-related episodes (LREs) and dyad communication patterns (Storch, 2002) and each

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)

160

Haniyeh
Shirazifard

41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

individual's posttest result. The findings revealed that while the learners were involved in collaborative interaction patterns, they were more likely to get better posttest results, disregarding their peers' proficiency level. Zeng and Takatsuka (2009) explored L2 students' CDs in synchronous task-based computer-mediated communication (CMC). The results indicated that the students helped each other to attend linguistic forms through CDs that improved their language learning. Pattanpichet (2011) studied the impact of applying collaborative learning on learners' oral proficiency. The findings indicated that collaborative learning activities had significant effects on the development of the students' speaking performance. Dobao (2012) analyzed the interaction between intermediate and advanced learners and native speakers (NS) in search of collaborative dialogue. The study explored how the existence of a native speaker interlocutor spontaneously produced during task-based communication impacts the repetition and essence of lexical LREs. The findings confirmed that lexical LREs are more prevalent in learner-NS than in learner-learner communication. The collaborative or non-collaborative direction of the respondents towards the exercise, influenced by their objectives and participation level in the assignment, appears to hold a greater impact on the essence of the communication and the opportunities it provides for LREs and acquisition than the dyad's general skill. In a study, Swain and Watanabe (2013) investigated CD as a source of L2 acquisition. They concluded that it is a great part of L2 acquisition, which helps students in the process of learning. Marashi and Gholami (2020) comparatively investigated the role of cooperative and individual offline planning in speaking classes in relation to EFL learners' personal features. They found a significant effect of the independent variables on impulsive and reflective learners' speaking performance, while no significant differential effects between them as to the target personal variables. Gamba (2013) explored the impacts of the implementation of self-directed and collaborative speaking tasks on pre-intermediate learners' oral proficiency regarding their disinclination to speak English inside and outside the classroom. The findings showed that incorporating continuous self-directed and collaborative oral activities on a weekly basis improves the learners' fluency since they have more opportunities to enhance their oral practice removing an implicit hurdle of fear while speaking in the L2. In addition, collaborative work provided

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)

41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

161

Haniyeh
Shirazifard

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

them with shared knowledge developing in individual and academic settings. Taguchi and Kim (2014) looked at the impacts of CD on learning the request speech act. Their results indicated that the collaborative group produced the L2 head act more successfully than the individual one. Abvali and Mohammadi (2016) studied the effects of task-based collaborative dialogue on the Iranian EFL pre-intermediate students' oral proficiency. The findings revealed that CD had a crucial effect on developing the students' oral proficiency, and female students outperformed the male ones in their speaking skill improvement. Naserpour, Zarei and Esfandiari (2022) tried to relate the task to cognitive involvement in the comprehension of lexical collocations. They concluded that , although the highest mean belongs to output-oriented tasks, output-oriented and input-oriented tasks with higher involvement loads gained higher mean scores than those with lower indices of involvement load. So, according to them, the higher the involvement load index of input-oriented and output-oriented tasks, the better the comprehension and production of collocation. Payant and Kim (2019) examined the collaborative dialogue process, operationalized as LREs, regarding the productive (oral and written) modes of two decision-making tasks and the succeeding L2 development. The findings showed a greater proportion of lexis-based LREs that during the speaking mode were more prominent. Posttest accuracy results indicate that LREs encouraged the growth of the target language. Alizadeh Tabaqi et al. (2019) studied the impact of CD on the effectiveness of request implicit instruction (head act and preparator). The results revealed that the collaborative dialogue group outperformed the non-collaborative dialogue group in the production of L2 requests, and evidence of noticing the pragmatic forms was checked in the collaborative task. Fakhar Ajabshir and Panahifar (2020) explored the effectiveness of teachers' scaffolding and peers' CDs on the production of requests, apologies, and refusals. They also investigated the impact of symmetrical and asymmetrical proficiency pairings during the learners' CD on speech acts usage. The results showed that the peers' CD group outperformed the teacher's scaffolding one. Asymmetrical pairs also performed better than their symmetrical ones. Obviously, teaching measures affect not only academic achievement but also attitudes and feelings. For example, based on Salimi's and Karimabadi's (2020) findings, the most

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)
41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

162

Haniyeh Shirazifard

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

significant theme that emerged from the interview was students' overall satisfaction with the flipped classroom model. In the same vein, Saeedy Robat, Khodabakhshzadeh and Ashraf (2021), in pursuit of "the best method," found that the mean effect size for the eight language teaching methods separately ranged from a positive medium-size effect of g=0.56 for explicit instruction to a strong positive effect of g=2.22 for output-based instruction. And generally, they revealed that the multiplicity and unity of language teaching were confirmed; language teaching methods produced almost unified effective outcomes within their diversified contexts.

Unlike extensive studies on the effect of CD on the receptive skills of learners (e.g., Ahmadian et al., 2014; Beheshti & Ahmadi Safa, 2020; Kim et al., 2006; Seba, 2008; Storch, 2002; Vaughn et al., 2001; Vaughn et al., 2011), few studies (e.g., Abvali & Mohammadi, 2016; Gamba, 2013; Pattanpichet, 2011) have investigated how task-based collaborative dialogue aids L2 oral proficiency. Therefore, contrary to this prevalent trend, the implementation of task-based collaborative dialogues in EFL classes in general and speaking skill instruction in particular and the attitudes and perceptions of EFL teachers and learners towards such an initiative seem to be missing links in the literature. To this end, the present paper aims to shed empirical light on these issues.

Method

Participants

The participants of the study consisted of two groups. The first group was 100 B.A. TEFL and Translation Studies students of both genders, 38 males and 62 females, who took the conversation course offered by the language laboratory. And the second group was ten EFL teachers, six males and four females, selected based on their familiarity with collaborative dialogue instruction. The results of the Oxford Placement Test (OPT) were the homogeneity criterion of the students' proficiency level. However, randomization was practically impossible due to the university registration norms. Thus, intact classes were used as the research sample. In effect, based on OPT results, only those learners whose marks fell one standard deviation above or below the mean were regarded as the participants of the present

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)

163

**Haniyeh
Shirazifard**

41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

study, and their test results were considered for the sake of data analysis. The native language of the participants was Persian.

Moreover, the participants in the qualitative part consisted of 10 teachers, who participated in the quantitative phase, and they were described in detail at the beginning of this section, and 12 learners (five male and seven female) who were purposefully chosen from the experimental group, including high achievers, medium achievers, and low achievers based on their speaking pretest and posttest performance. The rationale behind selecting learners from high, medium, and low achievers was to investigate the views and perceptions of participants of different proficiency levels towards CD.

Instrumentation

Oxford Placement Test (OPT)

The original OPT was employed in this study. The rationale behind selecting this test was that it is both easy to run and feasible for grading learners into different proficiency levels. It consists of three sections: Section 1 assesses students' grammar knowledge, section 2 examines students' vocabulary repertoire, and section 3 assesses their writing skill. Furthermore, the OPT reliability index was measured and was in an acceptable range (r=.80). In addition, this test's construct validity was confirmed (Wistner, Sakai, & Abe, 2009).

Speaking Pretest and Posttests

To measure the speaking skill of the participants, the speaking sections of the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) exam was used as the pretest and posttest of the study, and they scored based on the IELTS scoring system developed by British Council. An analytic scoring method was employed. Two experts in the field reviewed and confirmed the validity of the tests. Their inter-rater reliability indices were estimated through the Pearson correlation and the results showed the raters' significant agreements on pretest (r (48) = .590, p = .000) and posttest (r (48) = .671, p = .000) of oral proficiency.

Semi-structured Interview

Upon administering the posttest, the semi-structured individual interviews were undertaken with ten teachers and 12 learners (five male and seven female) who were purposefully chosen from the experimental group. The purpose of the interview was to extract more in-depth data on the

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)
41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

164
Haniyeh
Shirazifard

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

learners' and teachers' views towards implementing CD in speaking class. The interview sessions were held face-to-face, and the language of the interviews was English. They were conducted within one month, and each session took about 10 to 15 minutes. The questions of the interview were extracted from the CD questionnaires by the researchers. Then, to ensure the interview questions' content validity, they were reviewed and confirmed by two experts in the field. There were two types of interview questions for the learners and teachers, each of which consisted of ten questions (see Appendix A). The interviews were audio-recorded and then transcribed with the participants' permission.

Learners'-Teachers' Questionnaires

In the present study, two pre-fabricated and already validated questionnaires were employed. Details of them are reported as follows:

Learners' Questionnaire

A questionnaire developed and validated by Kouros and Abrami (2006) was used to investigate the learners' perspectives on CD quantitatively. The construct validity of the questionnaire was measured and reported by applying exploratory factor analysis (Kouros & Abrami, 2006). Its reliability was estimated through the Cronbach's alpha (r=.83) (see Appendix B). The questionnaire has 54 Likert-scale items (i.e., strongly disagree to strongly agree) in which 23 items assessed negative points of using CD, and 31 items checked the positive ones. Each item had five choices, so the maximum score was 270. To speed up the analysis process, 23 negatively phrased items were reverse coded. The descriptive statistics showed that although some means were high, the responses' variability was in a good range (SDs: 0.76 to 1.27).

Teacher's Questionnaire

To assess EFL teachers' attitudes towards the use of CD, the Collaborative Learning Implementation Questionnaire (CLIQ) was implemented. It was developed to identify the perceptions of the EFL/ESL teachers towards applying collaborative learning in EFL classes. It was developed and validated by Abrami, Poulsen, and Chambers (2004). In their study, the questionnaire was supported by exploratory factor analysis, and it was reported that this questionnaire enjoyed construct validity. Its reliability was also estimated through Cronbach's alpha (r=.88) (see Appendix C). It consisted of 48 Likert-based items (i.e., strongly disagree to strongly agree)

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195	**165** Haniyeh Shirazifard

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

in which 26 items assessed negative points of implementing CD, and 22 items checked the positive ones. Each item had five choices, so the maximum score was 240. To speed up the analysis process, 26 negatively phrased items were reverse coded. The descriptive statistics indicated no items with uniformly extreme means, while the responses' variability was good (range of SDs: 0.70 to 1.28).

Data Collection Procedure

Regarding the essence of the questions of the study, an explanatory sequential mixed-methods research design was applied; therefore, the present research was first run based on a quantitative approach followed by a supportive qualitative one (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

Quantitative Phase

First, the OPT test was administered to four intact classes of 120 EFL students, based on which 100 learners whose marks fell one standard deviation above or below the mean were considered as the participants. They were then divided into two groups, namely, control and experimental groups. Next, the speaking module of the IELTS exam was administered to two groups as the pretest. The speaking test was rated based on the IELTS speaking band score descriptors.

The notion of the task-based CD was explained to the experimental group, and during the 16 classroom sessions of 90 minutes, CD tasks of speaking were employed for the purpose of teaching speaking skills. To select the CD tasks, the researchers reviewed the literature on CD, and the tasks were selected from Swain and Lapkin's (2001) study. Two experts in the field confirmed the tasks to implement in the study. The present study implemented two types of tasks: jigsaw and dictogloss. As far as the researchers of the present study reviewed the literature, no study in the Iranian EFL context applied these two tasks simultaneously in the form of collaborative dialogues for the purpose of speaking skill instruction. In jigsaw tasks, the students keep, ask, and provide essential information to perform the task (Yilmaz, 2008). The students possess different parts of a puzzle, and only by mixing these parts can they fulfill the task. The two-way exchange is ensured by the separate pieces of information each participant receives. In dictogloss tasks, a brief text has been read to the students with the normal rate of speech, and

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)

41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

166

Haniyeh Shirazifard

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

they can write down notes as they listen. After that, the learners practice collaboratively in small dyads to recover their version of the primary text. The implemented tasks were two-way convergent tasks that required the learners to share information to successfully complete the task. The learners were divided into ten small groups, and each group consisted of five students to implement CD tasks. Considering both of these tasks, the learners practiced in groups and discussed the subject. In doing the Jigsaw task, the teachers chose some images from students' course books. The teacher divided images into two parts as each part was a complement to another part. The learners of each group were encouraged to share their knowledge to recognize the context. In dictogloss tasks, the instructors read the text aloud twice. Simultaneously, the students could jot down the text that they had heard. To reconstruct the text, the learners of each group should collaborate. The learners were made aware of the aim of CD, which is modifying learners' output to be more comprehensible concerning grammatical, phonological, or morpho-syntactic dimensions, and also providing extra information while responding to peer's feedback about the original utterance incomprehensibility or incompletion (Poupore, 2004). As a consequence, they modified their oral production where needed to ease the process of comprehension and discussion.

In the control group, the conventional type of teaching speaking was practiced. The teachers introduced the topic of the lesson, and the students discussed the topic individually. The teachers corrected the students' errors, and they received the required feedback from the teachers on their speaking performance individually. There was not any form of collaboration in the instruction of the control group.

Upon the completion of the treatment, another version of the IELTS speaking test was run as posttest and scored based on the rubric explained in the previous paragraph. Lastly, the questionnaires were administered to the students and teachers to investigate their perceptions of task-based CDs in the speaking classes.

Qualitative Phase

The semi-structured individual interviews were administered to ten teachers and 12 students (five male and seven female) who were chosen from the experimental group. The learners were purposefully selected from high

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)

167

Haniyeh Shirazifard

41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

achievers, medium achievers, and low achievers based on their speaking pretest and posttest performance. Before undertaking the interview sessions, the participants were informed about the goal and the time of the interview. The interview sessions were conducted by the first author of the study, and 10 to 15 minutes were dedicated to each interview. Then, all interviews were audio-recorded, and were also transcribed with the participants' permission. In order to remove the affective barriers and concerns of the students, they were assured that the results of the interview did not have any effects on their educational records.

Data Analysis

To analyze the data, descriptive and inferential statistics were used. To analyze the quantitative data, analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was implemented, and SPSS version 22 was employed. The skewness and kurtosis indices and their ratios over standard errors were applied to probe the normality of the present data. The homogeneity of variances was checked using Levene's test of homogeneity of variances. The descriptive qualitative content analysis technique (Creswell, 2012) was used to analyze the qualitative data. All of the responses to each of the ten interview questions were the unit of analysis for coding the data. The transcripts were scrutinized and then coded to identify the categories and sub-categories. The categories and sub-categories were reviewed multiple times and categorized into the main themes.

Results

Given the sampling procedure and essence of the data, the data normality was probed through skewness and kurtosis indices and their ratios over standard errors. Since the absolute values of the ratios were lower than 1.96, it is concluded that the data did not show any severe departure from a normal one.

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)

41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

168

Haniyeh Shirazifard

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics; Testing Data Normality

Group		N	Skewness			Kurtosis		
			Statistic	Std. Error	Ratio	Statistic	Std. Error	Ratio
Experimental	Pretest Speaking	25	.353	.464	0.76	-1.324	.902	-1.47
	Posttest Speaking	25	-.905	.464	-1.95	.443	.902	0.49
Control	Pretest Speaking	25	.479	.464	1.03	-.657	.902	-0.73
	Posttest Speaking	25	.243	.464	0.52	-.824	.902	-0.91

The second assumption, homogeneity of variances, was measured applying Levene's test of homogeneity of variances. As shown in Table 2, the non-significant results of the test revealed that the homogeneity of variances assumption was met on the speaking posttest (F (1, 48) = .092, p = .763).

Table 2

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Posttest Speaking	.092	1	48	.763

The first research question addressed "the differential effects of incorporation of conventional and task-based collaborative dialogues on developing Iranian EFL learners' speaking skill", and to answer it, the parametric statistical analysis (ANCOVA) was employed. Table 3 displays the descriptive statistics of the two groups on the speaking posttest after controlling the effects of the pretest. The results indicated that after receiving task-based collaborative dialogues, the experimental group outperformed the control group on posttest of speaking (M = 6.17 vs. M = 4.68).

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195	**169** **Haniyeh Shirazifard**

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics; Posttest of Speaking by Groups with Pretests

Group	Posttests	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Experimental	Speaking	6.173	.084	6.003	6.343
Control	Speaking	4.687	.084	4.517	4.857

According to Table 3, the task-based CD group (M = 6.17) significantly outperformed the control group (M = 4.68) on the speaking posttest after controlling the effect of pretest (Mean Difference = 1.48, $p = .000$, 95 % CI [1.24, 1.72]). Thus, the first null hypothesis as "there was not any significant difference between the effects of incorporation of conventional and task-based collaborative dialogues in developing Iranian EFL learners' speaking skill" was rejected. As Table 4 shows, the experimental group had a significantly higher mean on the speaking posttest (Mean Difference = .580, $p = .000$, 95 % CI [.360, .801).

Table 4

Simple Effect Analysis; Posttests of Speaking between Groups with Pretest

Group	(I) Skills	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Experimental	Speaking	.580[*]	.110	.000	.360	.801
Control	Speaking	.420[*]	.110	.000	.200	.641

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

The second research question addressed the perceptions of Iranian EFL learners towards incorporating task-based CD in developing their speaking skill, and to answer this question, the questionnaire and the semi-structured interview were applied. At first, the quantitative part, the questionnaire results, was presented, and then the qualitative part was provided.

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)

170

Haniyeh
Shirazifard

41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

Table 5 displays the frequencies and percentages of the students' perceptions of the positive aspects of task-based CD.

Table 5
Positive Aspects of Task-Based Collaborative Dialogues (Students' Questionnaire)

		Frequency	Percent
Choices	Strongly disagree	70	5.10
	Disagree	144	10.50
	Undecided	279	20.40
	Agree	523	38.40
	Strongly agree	322	23.60
	Total	1338	98.0

The results showed that 61 percent of responses "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the positive aspects of task-based collaborative dialogue. On the other hand, more than 15 percent of responses "disagree" or "strongly disagreed" with the idea that task-based CD had any positive aspects, and 20.40 percent were "undecided."

Table 6 displays the frequencies and percentages of the students' perceptions of negative aspects of task-based CD.

Table 6
Negative Aspects of Task-Based Collaborative Dialogues (Students' Questionnaire)

		Frequency	Percent
Choices	Strongly disagree	154	20.80
	Disagree	215	29.10
	Undecided	157	21.30
	Agree	141	19.10
	Strongly agree	57	7.70
	Total	724	97.70

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195	**171** Haniyeh Shirazifard

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

The results showed that more than 59 percent of responses "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" with the negative aspects of task-based CD. On the other hand, about 26 percent of responses "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the idea that task-based CD had negative aspects, and 21.30 percent were "undecided."

The results of the learners' questionnaire showed that most of the learners adopted positive views toward applying collaborative dialogues in the speaking classes. Most of the learners selected "agreed" options to answer the questionnaire items.

Regarding the qualitative phase of the second research question, 12 experimental group students were interviewed to investigate their views on the implementation of CD in speaking class. The descriptive qualitative content analysis technique (Creswell, 2012) was applied to analyze the data. The transcripts of the interviews were reviewed many times and then coded to investigate the categories and sub-categories. The categories and sub-categories were reread several times and classified into the main themes.

The analysis of the learners' interviews, as illustrated in Table 7, showed that CD could enhance group members' interaction and communication through cycling knowledge and learners' involvement in the communication process.

Table 7

The categories, sub-categories, and the main themes of the learners' interview

Categories	Sub-categories	Main themes
Functions of collaborative dialogue	-Learners' commitment -Time management -Learners' rapport -Learners' responsibility/ accountability -Peer learning	-Learners' accountability -Peripheral learning process
Learning opportunities	-Knowledge transformation -Peer corrective feedback -Enjoy full learning -Self-development	- Peer collaboration -Reflective learning
learners' cohesive community	-Learners as friends -Learners' levels of knowledge i+1 knowledge -Learners' rapport	- Integrative knowledge -Integrative learning

Categories	Sub-categories	Main themes
Learners' communications	-Teacher as a coordinator -Shared information -Peer problem solving -Information sharing -Shared participation	- Knowledge Cycle - Learners involvement
Learners' perceptions	-Being active participant - Level of stress -Fun class -Rapport -Learners cooperative approach	- Learners' learning management
Materials/syllabus	-Comprehensibility -Content presentation -Flexible syllabi	- Learners material adjustment
Teaching/ learning effectiveness	-Stress Management/ facilitative stress -Task devotions/ responsibility -Shyness management	- Learner-based teaching/ learning -Learner-centered class
Assessment	-Self confidence -Individual differences -Fairness -Teacher as a facilitator	-Individual-based Assessment -Formative Assessment
Individual differences	-Varieties and similarities in ethical and affective variables -Different and same variables in the same group -Balance and process of communication -Group acceptability	- Proficiency-based CD - Establishing Rapport

Reza one of the learners in this regard noted

> By implementing CD in our speaking class, I engaged in discussion with my classmates within a group, and after that, we could transfer our ideas and knowledge across the groups and could also receive new ideas and information regarding the topic of the discussion. This kind of knowledge circulation and involvement helped us improve our self-confidence to express our idea easily. I think this type of instruction can increase my responsibility for the learning process.

Ali one of the learners, maintained that "learning from the classroom environment is one of the positive points of group works by implementing CD". Therefore, implementing CD led to peripheral learning.

Some of the participants believed that task-based CD could develop their reflection on the task. And also maintained that implementing this type of

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)

173
Haniyeh Shirazifard

41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

instruction required them to use other information sources, such as websites, to fulfill the tasks, which would result in integrating the new and additional knowledge for task completion. Mahtab pointed out that "integrating different sources of information and knowledge through surfing the net was a big help in doing the tasks". As a result, the CD can enhance reflective learning and knowledge integration. Zahra, in this respect, pointed out

> During communication and collaboration with my peers in a group, I felt that I could reflect on my accuracy and fluency through receiving feedback from the members of our group and also other classmates. I think collaboration with my classmates can enhance my self-development and give me the ability to detect errors in my speaking and remove them with the help of the teacher or a more proficient peer.

Hossein stated, "The main advantage of CD was searching for new information about the topic. When I communicate in a group, I like to implement and express new ideas and information about the topic of our discussion".

In addition, the interviews' results showed that CD's positive or negative roles might impact learners' positive or negative attitudes towards CD and be created in their learning management. Mona, in this regard, noted, "I feel that after this course, I can manage my learning process using different strategies that I have learned through this course". The CD could enhance the effective use of learning materials if learners could find the possibility of its adjustment in the learning context. Nazanin, one of the top students of the experimental group, said that,

> Using a coursebook in regular classes is very boring because we should just focus on its practices and instructions, but in this class, our coursebook turned into an interesting tool for our discussion. For example, we discussed the pictures and images of each lesson, and every person expressed his/her idea about them from his/her point of view. In this way, simple pictures became the source of more discussion and new information.

Furthermore, the analysis of learners' interviews demonstrated that the CD could contribute to learner-based learning and teaching. It could also

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)

174

Haniyeh Shirazifard

41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

TESL Quarterly

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

affect learners' assessment process by proposing individual-based modeling of assessment. Keyvan, in this respect, noted, "In this class, we could talk a lot, and the teacher gave us many opportunities for speaking, and she mostly had the role of our friend to decrease our anxiety. It was not the teacher-oriented class at all". Fateme believed that,

> In other classes, the students are waiting for teacher feedback and teacher correction, but in this class, we got the ability to correct our errors through interaction with our peers in the group. Personally, I think my self-assessment ability improved during this course.

Some students believed that the teacher could assess their course performance and give them the required feedback. Ali, in this regard, noted, " One of the advantages of this course was teacher assessment during the class that helped us recognize our faults and errors".

Accordingly, the results of the learners' interviews indicated that learners would interpret a positive/negative model of CD through controlling affective variables, adjusting knowledge presentation, and expanding the community of practice. Mahtab stated that,

> In this course, gradually, I could manage and control my anxiety during my speaking performance. It was a great help to my speaking skill. During the collaboration with my classmates, I made new friends, and I felt a sense of belonging to a new community.

Interestingly, the results of the learners' interviews lend support to the findings of the questionnaire, in which the learners had the positive views towards implementing CD in the class, and the results of the quantitative and qualitative data complemented each other.

The third research question addressed the perceptions of Iranian EFL teachers towards incorporating task-based collaborative dialogue in developing learners' speaking skills. To answer this question, the questionnaire and the semi-structured interview were applied. At first, the quantitative part, the questionnaire results, was presented, then the qualitative part was provided.

The teachers' questionnaire with 48 items covered positive and negative aspects of task-based CD. Table 8 displays the frequencies and percentages

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195	**175** **Haniyeh Shirazifard**

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

of the teachers' perceptions of positive aspects of task-based CD. The results showed that almost 80 percent of responses "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the positive aspects of task-based CD. On the other hand, 13.63 percent "disagreed" with the idea that task-based CD had any positive aspects, and 7.27 percent were "undecided".

Table 8

Positive Aspects of Task-Based Collaborative Dialogues (Teachers' Questionnaire)

		Frequency	Percent
	Disagree	15	13.63
	Undecided	8	7.27
Choices	Agree	43	39.10
	Strongly agree	44	40.00
	Total	110	100.00

Table 9 displays the frequencies and percentages of the teachers' perceptions of positive aspects of task-based CD.

Table 9

Negative Aspects of Task-Based Collaborative Dialogues (Teachers' Questionnaire)

		Frequency	Percent
	Strongly disagree	27	18.88
	Disagree	75	52.44
Choices	Undecided	6	4.20
	Agree	25	17.48
	Strongly agree	10	7.00
	Total	143	100.00

The results showed that more than 80 percent of responses "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" with the negative aspects of task-based CD. On the other hand, about 25 percent "agreed" or "strongly agreed" of responses with

	Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)	**176**
TESL Quarterly	41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195	**Haniyeh Shirazifard**

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

the idea that task-based CD had negative aspects, and 4.20 percent were "undecided". The results of the teachers' questionnaire demonstrated that most of the teachers adopted positive views toward the implementation of collaborative dialogue in the speaking class.

Regarding the qualitative phase of the third research question, the semi-structured interviews were administered to 10 EFL teachers. The descriptive qualitative content analysis technique (Creswell, 2012) was used to analyze the data. The transcripts of the interviews were reviewed many times and then coded to investigate the categories and sub-categories. The categories and sub-categories were reread several times and classified into the main themes.

As Table 10 shows, the results of teachers' interviews analysis indicated that self-development (including learners' responsibility, peer learning), reflectivity (including learner's adaptation), and learners' affective variables were found to be the factors that could be potential positive effects of the 'CD' on learners from teachers' perspectives.

Table 10

The categories, sub-categories, and the main themes of the teachers' interviews

Categories	Sub-categories	Main themes
Collaborative dialogues' effects on learners	-Peer learning -Learner's responsibility -Self-development -Reflective learners -Learners affective factors -Learner's adaptation	- Self-development - Reflectivity - Learners affective factors
Improving the effective factors of the collaborative dialogue	-Individual differences -Community Structure -Teacher' roles -Learners' rapport	-Individual differences -Teachers' roles
Collaborative dialogue and teachers' performance	-Teaching process -Content-based teaching -Class presentation -Establishing rapport -Information sharing -Individual differences	-Facilitating teaching process -Construing a learner-based instruction methodology -Playing an effective role model for learners
Theoretical understanding of the collaborative dialogue	- Established theories - Implementation evidence -Implementation environment	- Literature-based - Evidence-based

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)

177

Haniyeh Shirazifard

41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

Categories	Sub-categories	Main themes
	-Implementation frequency/uses -Current theories -Literature	
The potentiality of the collaborative dialogue implementation	-Place conditions -Number of students/ learners time and needs -Level of the students -Course objectives -Teacher abilities or skills -Teacher or institution management	- Controlling variables of place of implementation - Course management and objectives - Teacher/learner prerequisite participation
Learners' attitudes toward collaborative dialogue	-Safety/feeling -Happiness/fun -Shyness -Knowledge facilitation -Knowledge transformation -Self confidence -Group learning	- Affective filters - Information processing
Learners' learning success	-Learners' rapport -Peer corrective feedback -Simplicity of new information -Cooperative task-based learning -Learners' responsibility	-Learners' process of learning -Learners' cognitive processes
Collaborative dialogue and use of learning materials	-Simplicity of the contents -Levels of the materials -Content comprehension	- Comprehensibility - Material adjustment
Assessment of collaborative dialogue	- Assessment as learning - Assessment of learning	- Diagnostic assessment -Achievement assessment

Mohammad, one of the proficient teachers in this respect, noted,

> One of the main features of task-based CD is improving students' self-development in which they could foster their learning through interaction with their classmates in a friendly context, which would result in self-reflection since they try to adapt themselves to the current situation of the learning context.

Narges pointed out, "I believe that task-based CD can remove the learners' affective filters, and consequently, it could increase their motivation to participate in the task fulfillment cycle. Accordingly, learning takes place in a non-threatening environment".

In terms of the improvement of the positive effective factors of the CD on learners from teachers' perspective, the results of the interviews revealed that the variables of individual differences as well as teacher' roles could be used as the effective factors, and the teachers believed that CD could improve teacher performances through facilitating teaching process (e.g., content-based teaching, class presentation). Arman, who is an experienced teacher in using the TBLT approach, criticized the traditional method of teaching and praised the task-based CD,

> In traditional language teaching methods, individual differences are mostly ignored, but in TBLT and, especially, task-based CD, individual differences play a significant role in the process of learning. For example, I try to arrange groups in task-based CD according to extroversion and introversion dichotomy. Therefore, reserved students could find opportunities to participate in class activities through interaction with extroverted peers.

Most of the teachers argued that construing a learner-based instruction methodology, including establishing rapport, sharing information, and engaging learners, could play an effective role model for learners in and out of the classroom. Maryam said that "one of the main characteristics of the CD is engaging the whole students in the class activities; as a consequence, they can share their ideas within and across groups". Mohsen maintained that,

> One of the hot topics in the SLA field is teacher-learner rapport. In task-based CD, rapport can be easily established in a friendly environment, and the students could have a close relationship with their teacher; consequently, it could enhance their motivation to take part in class activities.

The results also indicated that CD could be implemented effectively through controlling variables, including place of implementation, course management, objectives, and teacher/learner participation. Arman stated that,

> Implementing CD in the Iranian EFL context can be challenging if the teacher is not familiar with the principles and prerequisites of CD. Besides, many factors, such as course objectives and place of implementation, play a critical role in using the CD.

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)
41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

179

**Haniyeh
Shirazifard**

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

Some teachers believed learners accept or reject CDs because of either affective filters or information processing. Accordingly, the analysis demonstrated that learners' success acceptability could be explained in terms of their process of learning and cognitive processes. Ali, one of the expert EFL teachers in this respect, noted

> I applied task-based CD in my classes, and I found that the students may adopt different reactions and views towards implementing CD based on the type of the task. In other words, task type could have an essential role in the process of learning.

Sara maintained, "EFL teachers should consider the cognitive and affective aspects of tasks, and definitely, it requires a great deal of expertise".

Moreover, the findings indicated that CD might contribute to the effective use of learning materials through comprehensibility and material adjustment. Mohammad argued that,

> By applying CD, a teacher could adjust the instructional materials to meet the emerging needs of the learners. Personally, when I use the task-based CD in my class, I mostly employ audio-visual materials to teach the new language items.

Learners' performance could also be evaluated in terms of formative and achievement assessments (summative assessments). In this respect, Sara stated, "I can assess my students during the task completion, and it is very helpful since I could find the extent of learners' uptake in the learning process". Another factor that many teachers noted during interviews was the learner's self-assessment. They strongly believed that applying task-based CD can increase the self-assessment ability of EFL learners through constant interaction with their peers. Maryam pointed out, "Using CD could enhance students' self-reflection, and as a result, they gradually acquire the ability to assess their performance".

The findings of the teachers' interviews are in harmony with the results of the questionnaire, in which the teachers had positive views towards implementing CD in the class, and the results of the quantitative and qualitative data complemented each other.

TESL Quarterly	Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195	**180** Haniyeh Shirazifard

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

Discussion

In line with the first research question, the findings revealed that the task-based CD was effective in terms of speaking, in which the task-based group outperformed the control group. Synthesizing task-based teaching and CD leads to task-based collaborative dialogue whereby learners are required to use dialogue and interaction while completing tasks. The finding can be justified based on Swain's (2000) theory of output hypothesis and the mediating acquisition through CD. She stated that by resorting to the tenets of SCT and CD, one could learn from more proficient learners or teachers and reach a modified output. Ellis (2000) and Nunan (2006) maintained that during task completion, students are involved in specific types of language use and cognitive procedure necessary for L2 acquisition. Based on Ellis (2003), Skehan (1996), and Ellis (2009), TBLT was successful in supporting SLA. Derakhshan (2018) concluded that TBLT helps EFL learners perform better. Moreover, TBLT could improve EFL/ESL students' oral proficiency (e.g., Ashraf Ganjouee et al., 2018; Birjandi & Ahangari, 2008; Ahangari & Abdi, 2011; Erten & Altay, 2009; Geng & Ferguson, 2013; Pham & Nguyen, 2014; Madarsara & Rahimy, 2014). Aleksius et al. (2021) recommended that TBLT could be implemented in the speaking classes to develop the EFL/ESL learners' communicative competence. In line with these conceptualizations, the findings regarding the impacts of task-based CD on speaking skills are in line with Pattanpichet (2011), who studied the impacts of applying CD to improve learners' English speaking proficiency, and his findings indicated that collaborative learning activities had significant effects on the improvement of the student's oral proficiency. The results also yield support to Gamba's (2013) findings, which confirmed the significant effect of task-based CD on improving oral skills among pre-intermediate EFL students. The results are also in line with the findings of Abvali and Mohammadi's (2016) study, which revealed that CD significantly affected the speaking skill of Iranian EFL students. The results also lend support to the findings of Taguchi and Kim (2014), who explored the impacts of CD on the learning of the request speech act. Their results indicated that the collaborative team could produce the target head act more successfully than the individual group. The findings also yield support to the results of Alizaded Tabaqi et al. (2019), who studied the impact of CD on the effectiveness of request implicit instruction

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)

41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

181

Haniyeh Shirazifard

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

(head act and preparator) in which their results showed that the CD group performed better than the non-CD group in the production of the L2 preparators and head acts. The results are also in harmony with Fakhar Ajabshir and Panahifar (2020), who investigated the effectiveness of teachers' scaffolding and peers' CDs on the production of requests, apologies, and refusals. The results showed that the peers' CD group outperformed the teacher's scaffolding.

Regarding the second research question, the learners' views of the application of CD in the speaking class, the findings showed that 61 percent of responses "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the positive aspects of task-based CD. The qualitative results are also in line with the results of the questionnaire in which the students adopted positive views regarding the implementation of CD in the speaking class. The findings lend credence to the results of the research that explored EFL/ESL students' views on collaborative group or pair work (e.g., Abahussain, 2020; Green, 1993; Khodabakhshzadeh & Samadi, 2017; Littlewood, 2011; Mishra & Oliver, 1998; Storch, 2005; Trinder, 2013) in which their findings indicated that learners adopted positive views concerning collaborative activities and preferred to work in groups, especially in collaborative tasks that required them to learn in small groups or pairs. The results of the interviews revealed that the application of CD could affect learners' performance through learners' accountability, which is in agreement with the findings of Laal, Geranpaye, and Daemi (2013) and Jacobs (2004), who found accountability and joint responsibility as important factors in collaborative learning. Furthermore, the students believed that sharing ideas with peers helps them use peripheral learning, that is, learning from the environment or other students. This finding also confirms Sorensen's (2014) finding that peripheral learning is one of the outcomes of CD. In addition, qualitative results revealed that task-based CD could create a peer learning environment, which leads to collaborative learning and knowledge transformation, enjoyable learning, self-development, and reflective learning enhancement among the EFL learners, as confirmed by Kirschner (2004), Jacobs (2004), Weissberg (2006), Ashton-Hay and Pillay (2010), Vick, Crosby, and Ashworth (2010), and Biria and Jafari (2013). The learners believed that CD could enhance group-members interaction and communication through cycling knowledge and

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)

41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

182

Haniyeh
Shirazifard

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

learners' involvement in the communication process. These findings lend credence to the results of Watanabe and Swain (2007) and Stortch (2013), who explored meaningful and purposeful collaboration and engagement helps learners digest and learn the new materials through sharing and cycling knowledge and information, and also using collaborative tasks result in collective cognition in which two or more individuals could get perceptions that would not have gained alone.

Concerning the third research question addressing the EFL teachers' perceptions regarding the application of CD, the results indicated that the teachers adopted significantly positive views towards CD implementation in speaking classes, and the qualitative and quantitative results complemented each other to reach more valid and reliable findings. The teachers agreed that CD is a process where learners share their ideas and knowledge in groups, mostly in task-based teaching. The results are in harmony with the findings of different research studies (e.g., Bonk, & King, 2012; Little, 1995; McDonough, 2004; Storch, 2005, 2013; Watanabe & Swain, 2007). These researchers confirmed that CD could happen in dyads or in groups, and it is rooted in constructivism and sociocultural theory of learning (Vygotsky, 1978). Moreover, the qualitative findings showed that self-development (e.g., learners' responsibility) and reflectivity (e.g., learners' adaptation) could be the potential results of implementing CD. Learners could be responsible for their own learning and could be active learners, and it can be extended to students' work in groups, making it more effective. This finding lends support to the results of Conzemius and O'neill (2001) and Jacobs (2004), who believed that there is shared responsibility in learning in groups so that learners can attain their utmost achievements. Furthermore, the findings revealed that implementing CD led to peer learning, which agrees with the findings of Watanabe and Swain (2007) and Zeng and Takatsuka (2009), who found that learners could learn new things from their peers and work in groups. The teachers also believed CD could improve teacher performances by facilitating the teaching process, construing a learner-based instruction methodology, and establishing rapport and information sharing. These findings support the results of Ahmadi et al. (2014) and Yumi and Erina (2015), who explored that CD could be a significant factor in enhancing interaction and generating ideas that develop teacher performances via

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195	**183** **Haniyeh Shirazifard**

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

facilitating the teaching process. Furthermore, using this kind of dialogue increases the rapport between teachers and students, which may ease the teaching and learning process (Khodamoradi, Irvani, Jafarigohar, & Amerian, 2013). The teachers also argued that learners accept or reject CDs because of either affective filters or information processing. According to Swain and Watanabe (2013), cognition and emotions are two inseparable parts of language learning. Hence, if emotions or affective factors, such as interest and motivation, are ignored, it would be very hard to convince learners to perform tasks or use CD. As a result, EFL teachers should carefully select instructional tasks regarding learners' interests and proficiency levels to develop the applicability and efficiency of collaborative dialogues in EFL classes. The results also showed that CD might contribute to the effective use of learning materials through material adjustment. This finding yields credence to the results of the learners' interviews in which task-based CD helps students learn difficult materials by modifying and adjusting them through using different knowledge and information sources where the learners can talk and share their ideas and make the materials more comprehensible and compelling for their peers. This finding lends credence to the findings of Aiken, Bessagnet, and Israel (2005), who found that learners can modify the materials and what they are learning by implementing CD.

Conclusion

The present study aimed to explore the effect of mediated task-based CD on the EFL learners' oral proficiency on the one hand and to study the perceptions of the Iranian EFL students and teachers on the incorporation of mediated CD in speaking classes on the other. The findings showed that students in the task-based CD group outperformed the control group in terms of speaking proficiency. According to the results, the task-based CD significantly improved the learners' oral performance and created a positive learning context. Collaboration dialogues provided the learners with a deeper comprehension of the topic, and they had more possibilities to learn the new language points and knowledge. Moreover, the findings indicated that the teachers and the learners adopted significantly positive views towards applying the CD in the speaking class. The task-based CD instruction is based on the theory that students could perform more efficiently when they

| Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) | **184** |
| 41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195 | **Haniyeh Shirazifard** |

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

concentrate on the task than the language items per se. In addition, the CD could help EFL teachers develop learners' communicative ability, present incentives for native-like experiences, and practice oral performance promptly upon receiving enough co-constructed meaning. According to the results, the present study may hold a number of pedagogical implications for EFL learners, EFL instructors, and material developers.

The task-based CD instruction applied in this study could help improve EFL learners' speaking performance and make a positive learning context for several reasons. Firstly, collaboration among the learners leads to a sense of harmony among EFL students and stronger familiarity with each other. With frequent collaboration with their partners during task completion, EFL learners become more and more familiar with the tasks and the method of task completion. Secondly, while their familiarity and friendship are developing, their anxiety and affective filters are decreasing since the learners' feedback indicated that they were relaxed and enjoyed their learning and activities in the class. Thirdly, the CD is a proper and efficient educational procedure for large classes, and the implementation of pair or group work could be a remedy for developing EFL learning, specifically productive skills, such as speaking. Moreover, EFL teachers can provide learners with tasks that increase the implementation of CD and lead them to more collaboration in EFL classes. Finally, EFL material developers could include CD speaking tasks into EFL instructional materials, encouraging learners' collaboration in class activities.

The study suffered from some limitations. Regarding the sample of the study, finding the EFL teachers who were qualified and willing to participate was very difficult. Therefore, the findings have been affected as they cannot represent Iranian EFL teachers. Consequently, future studies could be conducted using a random sample of EFL teachers. Secondly, the length of the study may be another potential limitation. The data collection took more than three months due to the university syllabus, and some participants lost interest throughout this time and proved to be uncooperative with the researchers, which may have adverse effects on the study results. As a result, further studies could explore the impact of the task-based CD on oral performance through a shorter treatment period. Generalizations of the findings of this study to other settings, like language centers, should be made

	Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195	**185** Haniyeh Shirazifard

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

with caution. Therefore, future research could replicate this study in other contexts, such as language centers.

Declaration

References

Abahussain, M. O. (2020). Investigating EFL learners' perceptions of collaborative writing. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *10*(3), 32-47.

Abrami, P. C., Poulsen, C., & Chambers, B. (2004). Teacher motivation to implement an educational innovation: Factors differentiating users and non-Users of cooperative learning. *Educational Psychology, 24*(2), 201-216.

Abvali, P., Mohammadi, M. (2016). The affordances of collaborative dialouges: The case of EFL learners' speaking performance. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, *6*(2), 124-133.

Ahangari, S., & Abdi, M. (2011). The effect of pre-task planning on the accuracy and complexity of Iranian EFL learners' oral performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *29*, 1950-1959.

Ahmadi, N., Motallebzade, K., & Fatemi, M. (2014). The effect of cooperative learning strategies on Iranian intermediate students' writing achievement. *Open Access Library Journal*, *1*(09), 1–9.

Ahmadian, M., Amerian, M., & Tajabadi, A. (2014). The effect of collaborative dialogue on EFL learner's vocabulary acquisition and retention. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 3*(4), 38-45.

Aiken, R. M., Bessagnet, M., & Israel. J. (2005). Interaction and collaboration using an intelligent collaborative learning environment. *Education and Information Technologies*, *10*(1), 67-82.

Aleksius, M., Widiati, U., Suharmanto. & Prayogo, J. A. (2021). Task-based assessment in using other-initiated repair strategies of the pre-service EFL teachers. *International Journal of Instruction*, *14*(1),761-778.

Alizaded Tabaqi, A., Yaqubi, B., & Abadikhah, S. (2019). The effect of collaborative dialogue on EFL learners' noticing of pragmatic forms. *Journal of English language Teaching and Learning*, *11*(24), 1-28.

Ashraf Ganjouee, A., Ghonsooly, B., Hosseini Fatemi, A. (2018). The impact of task-based instruction on the enhancement of Iranian intermediate EFL learners' speaking skill and emotional intelligence. *Applied Research on English Language, 7*(2), 196-214.

Ashton-Hay, S., & Pillay, H. (2010). *Case study of collaborative learning in two contexts: what do English language learners gain. Collaborative Learning: Methodology, Types of Interactions and Techniques*. Education in a Competitive and Globalizing World. Nova Publishers, New York.

Beheshti, S., & Ahmadi Safa, M. (2020). Effects of audio-visually prompted collaborative dialogue on EFL learners' listening comprehension development. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, *39*(2), 1-42.

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)	**186**
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)	**Haniyeh**
41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195	**Shirazifard**

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

Birjandi, P., & Ahangari, S. (2008). Effects of task repetition on the fluency, complexity and accuracy of Iranian EFL learners' oral discourse. *Asian EFL Journal*, *10*(3), 28-52.

Biria, R., & Jafari, S. (2013). The impact of collaborative writing on the writing fluency of Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *4*(1), 164–175.

Bonk, C. J., & King, K. S. (2012). Searching for learner-centered, constructivist, and sociocultural components of collaborative educational learning tools. In *Electronic collaborators* (pp. 61-86). Routledge.

Christie, D., Tolmie, A., Thurston, A., Howe, C., & Topping, K. (2009). Supporting group work in Scottish primary classrooms: improving the quality of collaborative dialogue. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *39*(1), 141-156.

Conzemius, A., & O'Neill, J. (2001). *Building shared responsibility for student learning*. Alexandria, Va: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Creswell, J.W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed-methods research (2ⁿᵈ ed.)*. Sage Publications, Los Angeles.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4ᵗʰ ed.)*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Derakhshan, A. (2018). The effect of task-based language teaching instruction on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing performance. *International Journal of Instruction*, *11*(4), 527-544.

Dobao, A. F. (2012). Collaborative dialogue in learner–learner and learner–native speaker interaction. *Applied linguistics*, *33*(3), 229-256.

Donato, R. (2004). Aspects of collaboration in pedagogical discourse. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *24*(1), 284-302.

Ellis, R. (2000). Task-based research and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, *4*(3), 193-220.

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

Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *19*(3), 221-246.

Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. N. (2014). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Erten, İ. H., & Altay, M. (2009). The effects of task-based group activities on students' collaborative behaviors in EFL speaking classes. *Journal of Theory & Practice in Education (JTPE)*, *5*(1), 33-52.

Fakhar Ajabshir, Z., & Panahifar, F. (2020). The effect of teachers' scaffolding and peers' collaborative dialogue on speech act production in symmetrical and asymmetrical groups. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *8*(1), 45-61.

Gamba, A. (2013). *Enhancing fluency in speaking through the use of collaborative and self-directed speaking tasks*. Master thesis, Universidad de La Sabana, Department of Foreign Languages and Cultures.

Geng, X., & Ferguson, G. (2013). Strategic planning in task-based language teaching: The effects of participatory structure and task type. *System*, *41*(4), 982-993.

| Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195 | **187** Haniyeh Shirazifard |

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

Green, J. M. (1993). Student attitudes toward communicative and non-communicative activities: Do enjoyment and effectiveness go together? *The Modern Language Journal*, *77*(1), 1-10.

Howe, C., & Abedin, M. (2013). Classroom dialogue: A systematic review across four decades of research. *Cambridge journal of education*, *43*(3), 325-356.

Jacobs, G. M. (2004). *Cooperative learning: Theory, principles, and techniques*. Paper presented at the First International Online Conference on Second and Foreign Language Teaching and Research.

Kim, A. H., Vaughn, S., Klingner, J. K., Woodruff, A. L., Klein Reutebuch, C., & Kouzekanani, K. (2006). Improving the reading comprehension of middle school students with disabilities through computer-assisted collaborative strategic reading. *Remedial and special education*, *27*(4), 235-249.

Kim, Y., & McDonough, K. (2008). The effect of interlocutor proficiency on the collaborative dialogue between Korean as a second language learners. *Language teaching research*, *12*(2), 211-234.

Kirschner, P. A. (2004). Design, development, and implementation of electronic learning environments for collaborative learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *52*(3), 39-46.

Khabiri, M., Firooz, M. (2012). The comparative effect of practicing cooperative learning and critical thinking on EFL learners' writing. *Issues in Language Teaching (ILT)*, 1 (2), 371-394.

Khatib, M., Dehghankar, A. (2018). The impact of task-based language teaching on ESP learners' productive skills: From task-based instruction to investigation of learners' and instructors' attitudes toward the course. *Issue in Language Teaching (ILT), 7*(2), 1-28.

khodabakhshzadeh, H., Samadi, F. (2017). The effect of collaborative writing on Iranian EFL learners' task achievement in writing and their perception. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 7*(1), 113-119.

Khodamoradi, A., Iravani, H., & Jafarigohar, M. (2013). The effect of teacher's scaffolding and peers' collaborative dialogue on the acquisition of English tenses in the Zone of Proximal Development: A sociocultural perspective. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, *2*(2s), 336-346.

Kouros, C., & Abrami, P. C. (2006). *How do students really feel about working in small groups? The role of student attitudes and behaviours in cooperative classroom settings*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

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

Laal, M., Geranpaye, L., & Daemi, M. (2013). Individual accountability in collaborative learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *93*, 286-289.

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Little, D. (1995). Learning as Dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System, 23*(2), 175-182.

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195	**188** Haniyeh Shirazifard

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

Littlewood, W. (2011). Communicative language teaching: An expanding concept for a changing world. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. II, pp. 541–557). London, England: Routledge.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W.C.Ritchie & T.K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press, San Diego.

Madarsara, M. A., & Rahimy, R. (2014). Examining the effect of task complexity and sequence on speaking ability of Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *4*(1), 247-254.

Marashi, H. & Gholami, M. (2020). Applying cooperative and individual offline planning in speaking classes: A comparison of impulsive and reflective EFL learners. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTL)*, *39*(3.2), 1-34.

McDonough, K. (2004). Learner-learner interaction during pair and small group activities in a Thai EFL context. *System*, *32*(2), 207-224.

Mishra, S., & Oliver, R. (1998). Secondary school ESL learners' perceptions of pair work in Australian classrooms. *TESOL in Context*, *8*(2), 19-23.

Naserpour A. , Zarei, A. & Esfandiari, R., (2020). The Effects of Task Orientation and Involvement Load on Learning Collocations. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, *39*(1), 71-114.

Nunan, D. (2006). Task-based language teaching in the Asia context: Defining'task'. *Asian EFL Journal*, *8*(3), 12-18.

Pattanpichet, F. (2011). The effects of using collaborative learning to enhance students English speaking achievement. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC)*, *8*(11), 1-10.

Payant, C., & Kim, Y. (2019). Impact of task modality on collaborative dialogue among plurilingual learners: a classroom-based study. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 22*(5), 614-627.

Pham, V. P. H., & Nguyen, T. B. (2014). The effects of communicative grammar teaching on students' achievement of grammatical knowledge and oral production. *English Language Teaching. 7*(6), 74-86.

Poupore, G. (2004). Quality interaction and types of negotiation in problem-solving and jigsaw tasks. In C. Edwards & J. Willis (Eds.), *Teachers exploring tasks in English language teaching* (pp. 242-255). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rajablou, F., & Shirvan, M. E. (2017). Iranian English language learners' attitude towards their accent in English language: An ecological approach. *Englishes in Practice*, *4*(1), 1-30.

Razmjoo, S. A, & Riazi, M. (2006). Do high schools or private institutes practice communicative language teaching? A case study of Shiraz teachers in high schools and institutes. *The Reading Matrix, 6*(3), 340-363.

Saeedy Robat, E., Khodabakhshzadeh, H., & Ashraf, H. (2021). The effectiveness of English language teaching methods: A meta-analysis in pursuit for "the Best Method", *Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTL), 40*(1), 187-235.

Salimi, E.A., & Karimabadi, M. (2020). The efficacy of classroom flipping on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' engagement and their perception of the

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)	**189**
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)	
41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195	**Haniyeh Shirazifard**

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

flipped classroom model. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTL)*, *39*(3.2), 143-180.

Seba, R. G. (2008). *From collaborative writing to reading comprehension: a case study on focus on form through collaborative dialogue as a means to enhance reading comprehension in English*. Doctoral dissertation, Dissertação, Univ. Federal Fluminense, Rio de Janeiro.

Shehadeh, A. (2011). Effects and student perceptions of collaborative writing in L2. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *20*(4), 286-305.

Shirbagi, N. (2010). An exploration of undergraduate students' motivation and attitudes towards English language acquisition. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, *20*(2), 1-14 .

Skehan, P., (1996). Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction. *Readings in Methodology*, *3*, 13-23.

Sorensen, P. (2014). Collaboration, dialogue and expansive learning: The use of paired and multiple placements in the school practicum. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *44*(1), 128-137.

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

Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *14*(3), 153–173.

Storch, N. (2013). *Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Sun, Y. C., & Chang, Y. J. (2012). Blogging to learn: Becoming EFL academic writers through collaborative dialogues. *Language Learning & Technology*, *16*(1), 43-61.

Swain, M. (1997). Collaborative dialogue: Its contribution to second language learning. *Revista canaria de estudios ingleses*, *34*, 115-132.

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. (2001). Examining dialogue: Another approach to content specification and to validating inferences drawn from test scores. *Language Testing, 18*, 319-346.

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). London: Longman.

Swain, M. (2006). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced language proficiency. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95–108). New York, NY: Continuum.

Swain, M., Brooks, L., & Toealli-Bcller, A. (2002). Peer-Peer dialogue as a means of second language. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *22*, 171-185.

Swain, M., & Watanabe, Y. (2013). *Languaging: Collaborative dialogue as a source of second language learning*. The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics, 3218-3225.

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)

41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

190

Haniyeh
Shirazifard

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

Taguchi, N., & Kim, Y. (2014). Collaborative dialogue in learning pragmatics: Pragmatic related episodes as an opportunity for learning request-making. *Applied Linguistics,37*(3), 1-23.

Trinder, R. (2013). Business students' beliefs about language learning in a university context. *English for Specific Purposes*, *32*(1), 1–11.

Vaughn, S., Klingner, J. K., & Bryant, D. P. (2001). Collaborative strategic reading as a means to enhance peer-mediated instruction for reading comprehension and content-area learning. *Remedial and Special Education*, *22*(2), 66-74.

Vaughn, S., Klingner, J. K., Swanson, E. A., Boardman, A. G., Roberts, G., Mohammed, S. S., & Stillman-Spisak, S. J. (2011). Efficacy of collaborative strategic reading with middle school students. *American Educational Research Journal*, *48*(4), 938-964.

Vick, R. M., Crosby, M. E., & Ashworth, D. E. (2000). Japanese and American students meet on the web: Collaborative language learning through everyday dialogue with peers. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 13*(3), 199-219.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. *Readings on the development of children*, *23*(3), 34-41.

Watanabe, Y., & Swain, M. (2007). Effects of proficiency differences and patterns of pair interaction on second language learning: Collaborative dialogue between adult ESL learners. *Language Teaching Research*, *11*(2), 121-142.

Weissberg, R. (2006). Scaffolded feedback: Tutorial conversations with advanced L2 writers. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing, contexts and issues*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Wistner, B., Sakai, H. & Abe, M. (2009). An analysis of the Oxford Placement Test and the Michigan Placement Test as L2 proficiency tests. *Hosei University Repository*, *58*, 33-44.

Yilmaz, Y. (2008). *Collaborative dialogues during tasks in Synchronous Computer-mediated Communication*. Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, College of Education.

Yumi, F., & Erina, S. (2015). Effects of cooperative learning on writing activity of English for special purposes in Japanese university students. *Journal of Academic Society for Quality Life*, *1*(1), 32–39.

Zeng, G., & Takatsuka, S. (2009). Text-based peer-peer collaborative dialogue in a computer-mediated learning environment in the EFL context. *System*, *37*(3), 434-446.

Zohrabi, M., Torabi, M. A., & Baybourdiani, P. (2012). Teacher-centered and/or student-centered learning: English language in Iran. *English Language and Literature Studies*, *2*(3), 18-30.

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)

41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195

191

Haniyeh Shirazifard

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

Appendix A: Interview Questions

A: Teacher's Interview Qestions

Q1. What is your general perception of the positive effects of task-based collaborative dialogue on learners?

Q2. How can task-based CD be enhanced and optimized?

Q3. What are the effective factors of the task-based CD on teachers' performance and professionalization?

Q4. What do you think about the ability to implement task-based CD?

Q5. What are the obstacles to this process?

Q6. How do you evaluate learners' attitudes toward task-based CD? and why?

Q7: How effective is task-based CD in students' success? and why?

Q8. What is the role of task-based CD in effective use of learning materials?

Q9. How do you evaluate the performance of learners in the CD process?

Q10. What is your overall perception of the positive and negative effects of task-based CD on teaching methodology?

B: Leraner's Interview Qestions

1. How can task-based collaborative dialogue influence your performance as a learner?

2. What teaching, learning and communication opportunities could task-based CD provide you with?

3. What is the effect of task-based CD on group-members integration and why?

4. How can task-based CD enhance group-members interaction and communication?

5. What is the attitude of the learners towards task-based CD and why?

6. What is the role of task-based CD in the effective use of learning materials?

7. What is the role of task-based CD on the success of teaching and learning?

8. What is the role of task-based CD on effective assessment of learners' performance?

9. How could task-based CD be manipulated with individual characteristics?

10. What is your general perception of the positive/negative effects of task-based CD on teaching and learning aspects?

| | Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ)
(Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) | **192** |
| TESL
Quarterly | 41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195 | **Haniyeh**
Shirazifard |

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

Appendix B: Learner's Questionnaire

Directions:

This questionnaire asks about your attitudes toward implementing collaborative dialogue in this classroom.

Use your experiences from this class to answer these statements. For each of the statements, circle the answer that most closely corresponds to how you think and feel about the statement.

Response Scale:

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Undecided

Agree

Strongly Agree

If you strongly disagree with the statement, circle a; if you disagree with the statement, circle b; if you can not decide, or feel in between, choose c; if you agree with the statement, circle d; and if you strongly agree with the statement, circle e.

1. When I work in a group, I do better quality work.
2. When I work in a group, I end up doing most of the work.
3. When I work with other students, I am able to work at my own pace.
4. When I work in a group, I want to be with my friends.
5. The work takes longer to complete when I work with other students.
6. My group members do not respect my opinions.
7. I enjoy the material more when I work with other students.
8. My group members help explain things that I do not understand.
9. I become friends with my group members.
10. When I work in a group, I am able to share my ideas.
11. My group members make me feel that I am not as smart as they are.
12. The material is easier to understand, when I work with other students.
13. My work is better organized, when I am in a group.
14. My group members like to help me learn the material.
15. My group members get a good grade even if they do not do much work.
16. The workload is usually less when I work with other students.
17. I feel I am part of what is going on in the group.
18. One student usually makes the decisions in the group.
19. Our job is not done until everyone has finished the assignment.
20. I find it hard to express my thoughts, when I work in a group.
21. I do not think a group grade is fair.
22. I try to make sure my group members learn the material.
23. My grade depends on how much we all learn.
24. It is difficult to get together outside of class.
25. I learn to work with students who are different from me.
26. My group members do not care about my feelings.
27. I do not like the students I am assigned to work with.
28. I let the other students do most of the work.

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195	**193** Haniyeh Shirazifard

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

29. I get to know my group members well.
30. I feel working in groups is a waste of time.
31. When I work in a group, I get the grade I deserve.
32. My group members do not like me.
33. I have to work with students who are not as smart as I am.
34. When I work in a group, there are opportunities to express your opinions.
35. When I work with other students, the work is divided equally.
36. We can not complete the assignment unless everyone contributes.
37. My marks improve when I work with other students.
38. I help my group members with what I am good at.
39. My group members compete to see who does better work.
40. The material is more interesting when I work with other students.
41. When I work in a group, my work habits improve.
42. I like to help my group members learn the material.
43. Some group members forget to do the work.
44. I do not care if my group members get good grades.
45. It is important to me that my group gets the work done on time.
46. I am forced to work with students I do not like.
47. I learn more information, when I work with other students.
48. It takes less time to complete the assignment, when I work with others.

	Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195	**194** Haniyeh Shirazifard

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

Appendix C: Teacher's Questionnaire

Directions:

We appreciate your cooperation in completing this questionnaire. Please circle the response on the answer sheet that best corresponds to your position. For each of the following statements, please circle the response on the answer sheet that best corresponds to your position, according to the following response scale.

Response Scale:

A. Strongly Agree

Agree

Undecided

Disagree

Strongly disagree

If I use collaborative learning, the students tend to veer off task.

I understand collaborative learning well enough to implement it successfully.

The costs involved in implementing collaborative learning are great.

Competition best prepares students for the real world.

The amount of collaborative learning training I have received has prepared me to implement it successfully.

Collaborative learning holds bright students back.

There are too many demands for change in education today.

Collaborative learning is consistent with my teaching philosophy.

My students presently lack the skills necessary for effective collaborative group work.

For me to succeed in using collaborative learning depends on receiving support from my colleagues.

Using collaborative learning is likely to create too many disciplinary problems among my students.

Using collaborative learning enhances my career advancement.

For me to succeed in using collaborative learning requires support from the school administration.

Collaborative learning contradicts parental goals.

Collaborative learning is a valuable instructional approach.

Peer interaction helps students obtain a deeper understanding of the material.

My training in collaborative learning has not been practical enough for me to implement it successfully.

Collaborative learning is appropriate for the grade level I teach.

If I use collaborative learning, too many students expect other group members to do the work.

It is impossible to implement collaborative learning without specialized materials.

I feel pressured by the administration to use collaborative learning.

Collaborative learning places too much emphasis on developing students' social skills.

I believe I can implement collaborative learning successfully.

Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (TESLQ) (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills) 41(3), Summer 2022, pp. 155-195	**195** **Haniyeh Shirazifard**

IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED COLLABORATIVE DIALOGUES IN EFL

I have too little teaching experience to implement collaborative learning successfully.

Engaging in collaborative learning enhances students' social skills.

It is impossible to evaluate students fairly when using collaborative learning.

There is too little time available to prepare students to work effectively in groups.

There are too many students in my class to implement collaborative learning effectively.

Using collaborative learning promotes friendship among students.

My students are resistant to working in collaborative groups.

Engaging in collaborative learning interferes with students' academic progress.

Implementing collaborative learning requires a great deal of effort.

Collaborative learning is inappropriate for the subject I teach.

Collaborative learning enhances the learning of low-ability students.

I feel pressured by other teachers to use collaborative learning.

Collaborative learning is an efficient classroom strategy.

Collaborative learning helps meet my school's goals.

Implementing collaborative learning takes too much class time.

Using collaborative learning fosters positive student attitudes towards learning.

I find that collaborative learning is too difficult to implement successfully.

Collaborative learning would not work with my students.

I prefer using familiar teaching methods over trying new approaches.

If I use collaborative learning, my classroom is too noisy.

I believe I am a very effective teacher.

Implementing collaborative learning takes too much preparation time.

I feel a personal commitment to using collaborative learning.

Collaborative learning gives too much responsibility to the students.

The physical set-up of my classroom is an obstacle to using collaborative learning.