Investigating the Effect of Input-based and Output based Instruction through Divergent and Convergent Tasks on Iranian EFL Learners' Learning English Idioms

Fatehi Rad, Neda and Atashdast, Mohammad Reza

Department of English Language, Kerman Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kerman, Iran

Abstract

Task-based language Teaching (TBLT) has been formed as an approach wherein learners are allowed to communicate language use through tasks due to the limitations of the traditional PPP (Presentation, Practice, and Performance) approach. Among different kinds of tasks, according to Ellis (2008), convergent/divergent tasks can be mentioned which have been originated from concepts of knowledge formation. At a broader level, tasks are divided into input-based tasks and output-based tasks. This study aimed at investigating the effect of output-based and input-based divergent and convergent tasks on learning English idioms among Iranian EFL intermediate-level learners. In so doing, this study used a quantitative quasi-experimental pre-test post-test control group design. The participants of the study consisted of 75 male intermediate EFL learners studying English at a private language institute in Zahedan, Iran, who were selected through convenience sampling. To collect the data, Oxford Placement Test (OPT) and two researcher-made idiom tests were used. To analyze the data, descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were run. The results showed that output-based and input-based divergent and convergent tasks had a significant effect on learning English idioms among Iranian EFL intermediate-level learners. The findings have some implications for EFL teachers, learners, and curriculum planners.

Keywords: Convergent Task, Divergent Task, Idiom, Input-Based Task, Output-Based Task, Task-based language Teaching (TBLT)

Introduction

Task-based language Teaching (TBLT) has been formed as an approach wherein learners are allowed to communicate language use through tasks due to the limitations of the traditional PPP (Presentation, Practice, and Performance) approach (Firouzi & Khabiri, 2018). As put by Douglas and Kim (2014), in this approach, language learning is considered as a developmental process through which learners' communication and interaction can be promoted so that they can use the

target language naturally when exposed to activities. "This trend has developed into a practical framework for the communicative classroom in which the learners perform task-based activities through the cycles of pre-task preparation, task performance, and post-task feedback" (Skehan, 2014, p. 68). In recent years, TBLT has been touched from different angles with the emphasis on meaning, real-world language use, and communicative-oriented activities in an attempt to merge different language skills (Firouzi & Khabiri, 2018).

TBLT has a long history and holds a central place in current language acquisition research and also in language pedagogy in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT) (Abbasian & Chenabi, 2016). More particularly, in the context of Iran, the importance of TBLT, as an inevitable aspect of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), is added due to the fact that in many language institutes, English textbooks are utilized wherein task-based activities are used (Mahdavirad, 2017).

Among different kinds of tasks, according to Ellis (2008), convergent/divergent tasks can be mentioned which have been originated from concepts of knowledge formation. Skehan (2001) argued that convergent tasks are those tasks that collaborate in meaning negotiation among the interlocutors. Convergent tasks are defined as those tasks which need true justified knowledge, abstract thinking, and active experimentation. They permit collaboration in negotiation of meaning and seek just one goal (Skehan, 2001). In contrary, divergent tasks are defined as those tasks which need new significant knowledge, have different outcome choices, and seek more than one goal (Hommel, 2011). These tasks need students' independent works which can be done differently according to cognitive styles of students and which have different outcomes (Swan, 2005).

At a broader level, tasks are divided into input-based tasks and output-based tasks. Output based tasks are defined as focused tasks which are oriented toward eliciting specific structures production (Ellis, 2003). Output-based instruction seeks to encourage students to communicate. In this kind of instruction, learners are provided with a situation wherein they should do production tasks at the outset of the lesson or activity. In contrary, input-based tasks refer to those tasks which "obligate learners to process a specific feature in oral or written input" (Ellis, 2003, p. 157). Proponents of input-based instruction take the position that learning takes place by being exposed to language input in the form of written or oral texts and linguistic explanations (Basturkmen,

2006). Based on a cognitive perspective, language development is occurred through exposure to input. It has been shown that it is input which facilitates acquisition (Gass, 1997).

Furthermore, almost all languages contain some linguistic items which are called 'idioms' or 'idiomatic expressions'. The main characteristic of idioms is that their meaning is not predictable from the meanings of the individual words constituting them. According to Larson (1984), "Idiom is a string of words whose meaning and emotive connotations are different from the meaning conveyed by the individual words" (p. 20). This unpredictability of the meaning of the idiom from the meaning of individual words is both a merit and a demerit. It is merit in the sense that it "enriches the languages and produces a strong impression on people and it is a demerit in the sense that learning idioms and expression seem to be one of the complicated issues for learners" (Khedri & Falahati Qadimi Fumani, 2016, p. 136). Therefore, learners' lack of adequate knowledge of the meaning of the idioms may lead to some difficulties for them because an idiom is not the same as the meaning of individual words it is made of. This shows that learners should have an adequate knowledge of linguistic and extra-linguistic aspects of both languages (Ezzati Vazifehkhah, 2017). But it cannot be ignored that idioms are among the demanding areas for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners since various languages have various perspectives on idioms (Wan Ramli, 2014). On the other hand, learning idioms is challenging for EFL learners and they have difficulties with this feature of English learning. In detail, some language learners suffer from their lack of idiom knowledge (Zarei & Khojasteh, 2018). However, it is seen that although some studies have dealt with the effect of different task types on English skills, output-based and input-based divergent and convergent tasks are among the least studied areas in the field of TBLT (Abbasian & Chenabi, 2016). To bring more information about this problem, the present study sought to investigate the effect of output-based and input-based divergent and convergent tasks on learning English idioms among Iranian EFL intermediate-level learners. Accordingly, the following research questions were formulated in the present study:

1. Does input-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks have any significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' learning English idioms?
2. Does output-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks have any significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' learning English idioms?

Literature Review

TBLT

This study was theoretically rooted in Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT). TBLT was brought into teaching profession by Prabhu (1987). Prabhu (1987) described a task as a practice where learners utilize the method of thinking to present an effect from the inputs they take. TBLT is an approach wherein students are allowed "to do something at their own pace and in their own degree and scope of desire to process and rebuild their interlanguage. It moves away from a determined structural series and provides learner independence and self-sufficiency into the learning methodology" (Ellis, 2003, as cited in Firouzi & Khabiri, 2018, p. 43). According to Ellis (2003, as cited in Firouzi & Khabiri, 2018), TBLT helps learners progress more rapidly and enables them to use their new foreign language in real-world circumstances with a reasonable level of efficiency.

With the arrival of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) methodology in the primary 1980's and much concentration on learners' interactive capabilities in the past two decades, the word task-based language teaching (TBLT) came to widespread utilization in the domain of second language learning with the aim of improving proceeded syllabus and developing communicative activities to improve learners' authentic language utilization (Jeon & Hahn, 2006). Richards and Rodgers (2001) mentioned that "task-based language training alludes to a methodology according to the utilization of tasks as the basic parts of designing and direction in language training" (p. 223). Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is a strategy which recommends pupils textbook that they have to regularly participate in the procedure of with goal of accomplishing a purpose or fulfill a task. Just like repetitive tasks that we do daily like making the tea, writing a paper, speaking with someone on the phone, TBLT tries to improve pupils' interlanguage through bringing a task and then employing language to deal with it. When we want to train a subject, we would consider "which approach I have to use". As a matter of fact, the reply is "That relies too much on where you decide to go". Because we desire to train English in relation to task-based, after that how we must bring about those systematic techniques for implementing the tasks in our classroom becomes essential and considerable (Hashemi, Azizinezhad, & Darvishi, 2011).

Empirical Studies

Few studies have tackled Namaziandost, Dehkordi and Shafiee (2019) examined the relationship between input-based practices and output-based practices and vocabulary learning of Iranian EFL learners. They discovered that both of these performances increase productive vocabulary recognition and their influences are the same. Moreover, Yaqubi, Rayati, and Gorgi (2010) conducted a study concerning output-based tasks and word learning in reading comprehension tasks. They concluded that output-based instruction can enhance EFL learners word recognition through multiple-choice questions, fill-in-the-gap questions and writing articles with the target vocabularies. Tabrizi and Koranian (2016) tried to study the effect of input-based teaching on the speaking capability of Iranian EFL learners. To do this, 50 female EFL learners were selected from a whole population of 80 according to an IELTS interview and were accidently distributed to an experimental category and a control category. The experimental category obtained input-based instruction while the participants in the control category obtained conventional instruction. The mean grades of categories on the pre-test were analyzed through an unconventional samples t-test. The outcomes indicated that the students who obtained input-based instruction were better than the other students in the control category. This contributed to the conclusion that input-based instruction impacts speaking capability of EFL learners. Marashi and Tahan-Shizari (2014) conducted a research to examine the effect of convergent and divergent situation tasks on EFL learners' essay writing. The results showed that convergent tasks were more effective than divergent ones on EFL learners' essay writing.

In a descriptive study conducted by Alshiraida (2014), the role idiomatic expressions play in learners' comprehension was supported. As argued by Alshiraida (2014), given that idiomatic expressions are culture-bound, they can influence foreign language learners' comprehension. Therefore, these expressions should be introduced in foreign language textbooks and taught by the teachers of the foreign language. However, he recommended teaching idiomatic expressions in context because the meaning of these expressions is not clear from the literal meaning of their individual constituents. Baştuğ and Salihagić (2014) investigated the interplay between idiom knowledge and idiom production. Unexpectedly, no significant correlation was found between idioms knowledge and idioms production. In other words, the researchers reported that although learners' knowledge of idioms was at a good level, they did not use the idioms in their speaking

or writing. Valizadeh and Ahangari (2016) conducted a quasi-experimental study to examine the impact of context on Iranian female advanced English learners' idiom learning. Similar to the previous studies, both short term and long term effects were explored in this study. It was reported that extended context significantly affected the participants' idiom learning in both immediate and delayed conditions. In a recent study by Pucelj (2018), the association between EFL learners' attitudes towards idioms and their idiom learning strategies was investigated. The findings indicated that the participants' attitude towards learning idioms is positive. Besides, they used different learning strategies in the process of learning new idioms. Finally, a positive and significant correlation was found between EFL learners' attitudes towards idioms and their idiom learning strategies.

Method

Design

This research used a quantitative quasi-experimental pre-test post-test control group design in order to examine the effect of input-based and output based instruction through divergent and convergent tasks on Iranian EFL learners' learning English idioms.

Participants

The participants of the study consisted of 75 male intermediate EFL learners studying English at a private language institute in Zahedan, Iran. The sampling method of the study was convenience sampling in the form of five intact classes that were homogenized through the Oxford Placement Test (OPT). The five classes were assigned into five groups (i.e., Input-based instruction through convergent task group, Input-based instruction through divergent task group, Output-based instruction through convergent task group, Output-based instruction through divergent task group, and the control group), each consisting of 15 students. The participants' age ranged from 15 to 24. All the participants' mother tongue was Persian.

Instruments

The research used the following instruments for the purpose of data collection:

Oxford Placement Test (OPT)

The first instrument was the Oxford Placement Test (OPT) which was employed to ensure about the homogeneity of the participants at the outset of the study. This test is composed of 40 multiple choice items (20 items on grammar and 20 items on vocabulary). Reliability of the test was reported as .80 and its validity was confirmed through factor analysis (Wistner, Hideki, & Mariko, 2013).

Two idiom tests

To measure the participants' idiom retention, the researcher made two idiom tests (one as the pre-test, and the other one as the post-test) based on the book English Idioms in Use by McCarthy and O'Dell (2002). Each test consisted of 30 items wherein an idiom was provided in the items and the students were asked to select the correct meaning of the idiom from the choices.

For the goal of this research, Cronbach's Alpha reliability of the tests were calculated for the pre-test and post-test as .81 and .90. Moreover, the content validity of the tests was confirmed by expert judgment through asking a group of five ELT experienced university teachers with more than 10 years of teaching experience to check and confirm the content of the tests.

Data Collection Procedure

Considering the research ethics, at first, consent of the authorities and the participants was taken by the researcher. Then, the researcher explained the potential advantages as well as the purposes of the study to them. Moreover, all the participants were told that their participation is completely voluntary and there is no need to write their names on the test sheets.

For data collection purposes, first, the sample was homogenized through OPT and assigned into five groups. Then, the idiom pre-test was administered among the five groups. Next, the five groups benefited from eight educational sessions of the institute two times a week. Each session lasted about 90 minutes. Before more explanations, it is worth noting that due to prevalence of COVID-19 Virus, the educational sessions were held online using WhatsApp Application. During the treatment period, in addition to the mainstream teaching method used in the institute, the first experimental group benefited also from input-based instruction through convergent task, the second experimental group from input-based instruction through divergent task, the third experimental group from output-based instruction through convergent task, and the fourth

experimental group from output-based instruction through divergent task. But the control group just received the mainstream method of teaching reading as placebo.

In the first experimental group (input-based instruction through convergent task), the teacher provided the learners with decision making tasks. In these tasks, the participants were asked to come to a decision about finding the correct answer to five multiple choice reading items. More particularly, the teacher put the participants into pairs which were provided with five multiple choice reading items and they were asked to select the appropriate choice. In these tasks, the members of pairs were asked to negotiate with each other to select a choice and justify their choices. Finally, one member of the pair presented the result of their negotiations as well as a justification for their selection to the classroom.

In the second experimental group (input-based instruction through divergent task), consciousness raising (CR) tasks were used. In this group, the learners were provided with some passages, and an attempt was made to isolate specific issues from the passages for focused attention. Then, the information illustrating the target issues were presented to the learners and they were asked to express their opinion regarding the issues.

In the third experimental group (output-based instruction through convergent task), dictogloss (DIG) tasks were utilized. That is, the teacher read one short text twice at normal speed which included a specific topic. While the teacher was reading the text for the second time, the students were allowed to take notes and then discussed the topic after listening and taking notes to be sure about what they understood. After these steps, they wrote their own texts in pairs by reconstructing the original texts and submitted them to the teacher.

In the fourth experimental group (output-based instruction through convergent task), jigsaw tasks were used. More particularly, the learners were divided into pairs wherein different members were provided with different pieces of information on a topic by the teacher. Then, they were asked to individually produce a paragraph on the information they received.

One week after the last educational session, the idiom post-test was administered in the five groups.

Data Analysis

To analyze the data, descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were run. Descriptive statistics including mean, standard deviation, and standard error of mean scores were calculated to see the participants' performance pattern in the pre-test and the post-test. Besides, one-way ANOVA was used to compare the scores of the five groups in the pre-test and the post-test.

Results

To answer the first research question Does input-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks have any significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' learning English idioms?, first, descriptive statistics was summarized for the three groups (experimental group 1, experimental group 2, control group) in the pre-test and the post-test. The results are provided in tables 1 and 2:

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for the Pre-test

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Experi mental 1	15	13.56	.32	.26
Experi mental 2	15	13.48	.44	.28
Control	15	13.00	.40	.22

According to the results of Table 1, the means of experimental group 1, experimental group 2 and control group in the pre-test were 13.56, 13.48, and 13.00, respectively. Moreover, the standard deviation values obtained included .32, .44, and .40.

Table 2 shows the results of descriptive statistics for the post-test:

Table 4.2

Descriptive Statistics for the Post-test

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Experi mental 1	15	19.10	.20	.15
Experi mental 2	15	19.60	.35	.37
Control	15	14.52	.31	.40

According to the results of Table 2, the means of experimental group 1, experimental group 2 and control group in the post-test were 19.10, 19.60, and 14.52, respectively. Moreover, the standard deviation values obtained included .20, .35, and .31.

Then, the three groups' mean scores in the pre-test were compared with each other through running one-way ANOVA. The results of one-way ANOVA for the pre-test are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

One-way ANOVA for the Pre-test

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	18.633	2	9.317	.383	.684
Within Groups	1386.350	42	24.322		
Total	1404.983	44			

As seen in Table 3, the observed between-group difference was not significant (F=.383, p>.0.05). This means that there was no significant difference among the means of the three groups in the pre-test.

Then, the three groups' mean scores in the post-test were compared with each other through running one-way ANOVA. The results of one-way ANOVA for the post-test scores are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

One-way ANOVA for the Post-test

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1197.467	2	598.734	10.622	.000
Within Groups	3212.826	42	56.365		
Total	4410.294	44			

As shown in Table 4, the observed between-group difference was significant (F =10.622, p<.0.05). This means that there was a significant differences among the means of the three groups in the post-test.

To locate the significant differences, the Tukey post hoc test was used, the results of which are shown in Table 5:

Table 5

Results of Tukey Post hoc Test for the Post-test

(I) Group	(J) Group	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound
Experim ental 1	Experime ntal 2	2.37414	.715	-4.0178	7.9170

	Control	2.37414	.000	4.3326	16.2674
Experimental 2	Experimental 1	2.37414	.715	-7.9170	4.0178
	Control	2.37414	.004	2.3830	14.3178
Control	Experimental 1	2.37414	.000	-16.2674	-4.3326
	Experimental 2	2.37414	.004	-14.3178	-2.3830

The Tukey test indicated that the mean scores of the experimental group 1 and experimental group 2 were significantly different from that of the control group. This shows that each of the two tasks was more effective than traditional method on learning English idioms. This means that input-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks had a significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' learning English idioms. However, there was no significant difference between the two types of tasks in terms of their effectiveness on learning English idioms.

To answer the second research question 'Does output-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks have any significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' learning English idioms?', the mean scores of the three groups (experimental group 3, experimental group 4, control group) were compared with each other. To this end, first, descriptive statistics was run. The results are shown in Table 6:

Table 6
Descriptive Statistics for the Pre-test

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Experi mental 3	15	12.00	.12	.15
Experi mental 4	15	12.33	.31	.34
Control	15	11.80	.20	.13

According to the results of Table 6, the means of experimental group 3, experimental group 4 and control group in the pre-test were 12.00, 12.33, and 11.80, respectively. Moreover, the standard deviation values obtained included .15, .34, and .13.

Then, the three groups' mean scores in the pre-test were compared with each other through running one-way ANOVA. The results of one-way ANOVA for the pre-test are shown in Table 7.

Table 7

One-way ANOVA for the Pre-test

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	16.003	2	7.133	.420	.755
Within Groups	1242.101	42	18.950		
Total	1311.821	44			

As seen in Table 7, the observed between-group difference was not significant (F=.420, p>.0.05). This means that there was no significant difference among the means of the three groups in the pre-test.

Then, the three groups (experimental group 3, experimental group 4, control group)' mean scores in the post-test were compared with each other through running one-way ANOVA. Before that, descriptive statistics was run which led to the following results:

Table 8 shows the results of descriptive statistics for the post-test:

Table 4.8

Descriptive Statistics for the Post-test

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Experimental 3	15	19.20	.28	.19
Experimental 4	15	22.35	.16	.25
control	15	14.00	.10	.12

According to the results of Table 8, the means of experimental group 3, experimental group 4 and control group in the post-test were 19.20, 22.35, and 14.00, respectively. Moreover, the standard deviation values obtained included .28, .16, and .10.

Then, the means of the three groups were compared through one-way ANOVA. The results of one-way ANOVA for the post-test scores are shown in Table 9.

Table 9

One-way ANOVA for the Post-test

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1364.608	2	682.304	19.358	.000
Within Groups	1903.287	42	35.246		

Total	3267.895	44

As revealed by Table 9, the observed between-group difference was significant (F=10.622, p<.0.05). This means that there was a significant differences among the means of the three groups in the post-test.

To locate the significant differences, the Tukey post hoc test was used, the results of which are shown in Table 10:

Table 10

Results of Tukey Post hoc Test for the Post-test

(I) Group	(J) Group	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Experimental 3	Experimental 4	1.92884	.115	-10.6720	-.9613
	control	1.90194	.007	1.5361	11.1113
Experimental 4	Experimental 3	1.92884	.115	.9613	10.6720
	control	1.95273	.000	7.2249	17.0558
control	Experimental 3	1.90194	.007	-11.1113	-1.5361
	Experimental 4	1.95273	.000	-17.0558	-7.2249

The Tukey test indicated that the mean scores of the experimental group 3 and experimental group 4 were significantly different from that of the control group. This shows that each of the two tasks was more effective than traditional method on learning English idioms. This means that output-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks had a significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' reading skill. However, there was no significant difference between the two types of tasks in terms of their effectiveness on learning English idioms.

Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the effects of input-based and output-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks on Iranian EFL learners' learning English idioms.

With respect to the first research question on the effect of input-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks on Iranian EFL learners' learning English idioms, the results showed that both task groups significantly performed better than the control group. Accordingly, it can be said that input-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks had a significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' learning English idioms.

Regarding the second research question on the effect of output-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks on Iranian EFL learners' learning English idioms, the results showed that the three groups performed significantly different in the post-test. Moreover, both task groups significantly performed better than the control group. This means that output-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks had a significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' learning English idioms.

Although no previous study to the knowledge of the author has dealt with the effect of input-based and output-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks on Iranian EFL learners' learning English idioms, implicitly consistent with this study, Azimi, Behjat and Kargar (2016) reported that convergent and divergent tasks had a significant impact on Iranian EFL learners' vocabulary learning. Moreover, implicitly in line with the present study, Hamavandi and Golshan (2015) concluded that input-based instruction significantly affects EFL learners' English learning. Also, in a more recent study, Namaziandost, Dehkordi and Shafiee (2019) addressed the effect of input-based instruction on productive skills of EFL learners and reported that learners' vocabulary production significantly improved due to exposure to input-based instruction. Furthermore, in a foreign study by Ballester (2014), it was indicated that input-based instruction significantly improves oral skills of English learners. The significant effect of input-based tasks on different skills of English language was confirmed by some other researchers including Rasaei (2012), Salimi and Shams (2016), Sheen (2007), Taghvaee (2013), etc.

As a justification for the findings, it can be said that TBLT can significantly reduce learners' anxiety (Sami Ali, 2001) and this in turn, may have contributed to their increased learning English idioms. This justification is enhanced taking the significant negative role of anxiety in EFL learning into consideration. Another justification proposed by the researcher is that potentially TBLT increases learners' motivation to learn language and this leads to higher levels of English idiom learning among them. Furthermore, the researcher believes that another possible justification for the positive effect of input-based and output-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks on learning English idioms is that such tasks increase learners' autonomy and this leads to their significant improvement in their idiom learning.

Also, in justifying the findings, an argument can be referred to according to which TBLT improves learners' attitudes towards EFL learning (Tran & Lewis, 2012) and this can lead to its effect on idiom learning of learners. Another justification which can be stated for the findings is that TBLT enhances cooperative learning (Tekdal & Sonmez, 2018), and it can contribute to improvement of English idiom retention among learners.

Conclusion

The results showed that input-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks had a significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' learning English idioms. It was also shown that input-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks had a significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' learning English idioms.

The above findings are promising with a view to the arguments according to which idiom learning is considered as one of the main English language skills in various majors (Akbari, 2014; Ranjbar, 2012). The role of idiom learning in second and foreign language contexts cannot be dismissed because of exposure of many individuals with a high amount of written input in their life (Ranjbar, 2012).

Also, the results are enlightening and useful taking this issue into account that TBLT "has developed into a practical framework for the communicative classroom in which the learners perform task-based activities through the cycles of pre-task preparation, task performance, and post-task feedback" (Skehan, 2014, p. 68). The importance of these findings is also added when

noticing the argument that, recently, TBLT has been more emphasized and touched from different angles with the focus on meaning, real-world language use, and communicative-oriented activities in an attempt to merge different language skills (Firouzi & Khabiri, 2018).

All in all, it is concluded that input-based and output-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks has a significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' English idioms learning. Accordingly, it can be concluded that input-based and output-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks can be utilized in EFL classrooms in order to help EFL learners improve their idiom learning. Given that idiom learning is an essential part of language, this can have positive contributions to learning idioms in EFL settings. Moreover, considering the important role of idiom learning in the development of vocabulary knowledge and the belief that that improvement in learners' knowledge of other aspects of language can be based on idiom learning, using input-based and output-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks can have different direct and indirect positive outcomes in EFL classrooms.

In line with the findings of the study, the first implication of the study for English teachers is that they can use input-based and output-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks in their classes in trying to improve their students' English idiom learning. The implication of the study for EFL learners is that they can benefit from input-based and output-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks in trying to solve their problems with idiom learning. As implication of the findings for curriculum planners, it can be said that curriculum planners should develop the educational materials in a way that the use of input-based and output-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks is encouraged in teaching English idioms in English classes. More particularly, the future English curricula should be planned so that English idioms can be taught using input-based and output-based instruction through convergent and divergent tasks.

References

Abbasian, G., & Chenabi, F. (2016). Language skill-task corollary: The effect of decision-making vs. jigsaw tasks on developing EFL learners' listening and speaking abilities. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics, 9*(18), 1-24.

Abd El Sami Ali, M. F. (2001). The effect of using jigsaw reading technique on the EFL pre-service teachers' reading anxiety and comprehension. *Journal of Education College, 3*, 1-21.

Akbari, Z. (2014). The role of grammar in second language reading comprehension: Iranian ESP context. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98*, 122-126.

Alshiraida, F. S. (2014). The impact of teaching idiomatic expressions on foreign language learners' comprehension. *AL-USTATH, 210*(2), 219-226.

Azimi, S. A., Behjat, F., & Kargar, A. A. (2016). The impact of divergent and convergent tasks on Iranian EFL students' reading comprehension success. *Journal of Studies in Learning and Teaching English, 5*(1), 17-34.

Ballester, E. D. (2014). Development and validation of a brand trust scale. *University of Murcia*.

Baştuğ, H., & Salihagić, S. (2014). Elaboration on production of idioms and idiomatic expressions by ESL learners. *Sakarya University Journal of Education, 4*(2), 72-84.

Basturkmen, H. (2006). *Ideas and options in English for specific purposes*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Douglas, S. R., & Kim, M. (2014). Task-based language teaching and English for Academic Purposes: An investigation into instructor perceptions and practice in the Canadian context. *TESL Canada Journal, 31*(8), 1-22.

Ellis, N. C. (2003). *Constructions, junking, and connectionism*. Blackwell.

Ellis, N. C. (2008). The dynamics of second language emergence: Cycles of language use, language change, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal, 92*(2), 232-249.

Ezzati Vazifehkhah, A. (2017). Non-equivalence at idiomatic and expressional level and the strategies to deal with: English translation into Persian. *International Journal of Comparative Literature & Translation Studies, 5*(4), 31-37.

Firouzi, J., & Khabiri, M. (2018). The comparative effect of task type and learning conditions on the achievement of specific target forms. *Journal of Language and Translation, 8*(1), 43-55.

Gass, S. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Erlbaum.

Hamavandi, M., & Golshan, M. (2015). Differential potential of SLA output tasks versus input-based teaching of English grammar: A comparative study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 5*(10), 2083-2090.

Hashemi, M., Azizinezhad, M., & Darvishi, S. (2011). Using task-based language teaching, learning practically in English classes. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 31*, 526-529.

Hommel, J. (2011). *The practice of English language teaching*. Longman Press.

Jeon, I. J., & Hahn, J. W. (2006). Exploring EFL teachers' perceptions of task-based language teaching: A case study of Korean secondary school classroom practice. *Asian EFL Journal, 8*(1), 123-143.

Khedri, H., & Falahati Qadimi, M. R. (2016). Investigating the strategies used in translation of soccer idiomatic expressions from English to Persian based on the model proposed by Baker (1992). *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods (MJLTM), 7*(6), 135-142.

Larson, M. L. (1984). *Meaning-based translation: A guide to cross-language equivalence*. University Press of America.

Mahdavirad, F. (2017). Task-based language teaching in Iran: A study of EFL teachers' perspectives. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies, 5*(4), 14-21.

Marashi, H., & TahanShizari, P. (2014). Using convergent and divergent tasks to improve writing and language learning motivation. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 3*(1), 99-117.

McCarthy, M., & O'Dell, F. (2002). *English idioms in use*. Cambridge University Press.

Namaziandost, E., Dehkordi, E. S., & Shafiee, S. (2019). Comparing the effectiveness of input-based and output-based activities on productive knowledge of vocabulary among pre-intermediate EFL learners. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 4*(2), 23-39.

Nemat Tabrizi, A. R., & Koranian, K. (2016). The effect of input-based instruction on the speaking ability of Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 3*(4), 253-265.

Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford University Press.

Pucelj, M. (2018). Attitudes towards idioms and idiom learning strategies (M.A. thesis). J. J. Strossmayer University of Osijek, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Ranjbar, M. (2012). The relationship between grammatical knowledge and the ability to guess word meaning: The case of Iranian EFL learners with upper-intermediate level of proficiency. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2*(6), 1305-1315.

Rassaei, E. (2012). The effects of input-based and output-based instruction on L2 development. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language, 16*(3), 1-25.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Salimi, A., & Shams, K. (2016). The effect of input-based and output-based instruction on EFL learners' autonomy in writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 6*(3), 525-533.

Sheen, R. (2007). Key concepts in processing instruction. *ELT Journal, 61*(2), 161-163.

Skehan, P. (2001). Tasks and language performance assessment. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 167-185). Pearson Education.

Skehan, P. (2014). *Processing perspectives on task performance*. John Benjamins.

Swan, M. (2005). Legislation by hypothesis: The case of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 26*(3), 376-401.

Taghvaee, M. (2013). The impact of individual and collaborative output-based pedagogical approaches on learning English requests by pre-intermediate Iranian EFL learners (Unpublished M.A. thesis). University of Sistan & Baluchestan, Zahedan, Iran.

Tekdal, M., & Sonmez, S. (2018). The effect of using jigsaw cooperative learning technique in teaching computer literacy on students' achievement and retention. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 47*(1), 37-59.

Tran, V. D., & Lewis, M. (2012). The effects of jigsaw learning on students' attitudes in a Vietnamese higher education classroom. *International Journal of Higher Education, 1*(2), 9-20.

Valizadeh, S., & Ahangari, S. (2016). The impact of context on the learning and retention of idioms. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7*(15), 130-145.

Wan Ramli, W. N. H. (2014). The translation of simile in the Hunger Games Novel: Translation strategies. In *E-proceedings of the Conference on Management and Muamalah*.

Wistner, B., Hideki, S., & Mariko, A. (2013). An analysis of the Oxford Placement Test and the Michigan English Placement Test as L2 proficiency tests. Retrieved from https://www.hosei.ac.jp/bungaku/museum/html/kiyo/58/articles/Wistner.pdf

Yaqubi, B., Rayati, R. A., & Gorgi, A. (2010). The involvement load hypothesis and vocabulary learning: The effect of task types and involvement index on L2 vocabulary acquisition. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 1*(1), 146-163.

Zarei, A. A., & Khojasteh, A. (2018). The effect of dynamic assessment on EFL learners' collocational knowledge (M.A. thesis). International University of Imam Khomeini, Foreign Languages Department.