The Effects of Pre-task Planning on Iranian EFL Learners' Accuracy of Writing Performance

Maryam Sharafi-Nejad (Corresponding author)

School of Educational Studies

Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800, Penang, Malaysia

E-mail: msn12_edu085@student.usm.my

Shohreh Raftari

Faculty Member of Medicine Department

University of Medical Sciences, Kerman, Iran

E-mail: Raftari2004@yahoo.com

Shaik Abdul Malik Mohamed Ismail

School of Educational Studies

Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800, Penang, Malaysia

E-mail: samalik@usm.my

Lin Siew Eng

School of Educational Studies

Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800, Penang, Malaysia

E-mail: selin@usm.my

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the effects of guided task-based planning on the accuracy of

Iranian EFL learners' writing performance. Participants were forty eight EFL learners' studying at Islamic Azad University in Kerman, Iran. They were randomly divided into three experimental groups of sixteen students: one group with meaning-based pre-task planning; the other group with form-based pre-task planning; and the last one with meaning and form based pre-task planning. Participants in the form-based planning were taught how to plan the form of their written production in five minutes for eight following sessions. In meaning-based planning condition, the learners were given instructions about planning the content of their argumentative writings in five minutes for eight sessions. In the third group, however, the learners were helped to focus both on form and content in five minutes for eight following sessions. Then, they engaged in planning. The three groups received the same pre-test as post-test and the same topic in each of the eight sessions with the same examples. After collecting and analyzing the pretest and posttest data, the results showed the significantly superior effects of form- and meaning-based pre-task planning on the accuracy of the writing performance.

Keywords: Aspects of Language Production, Iranian EFL Learners, Strategic Planning, Writing Performance

Introduction

Writing skill plays an integral role in communication. As Akkaya and Kirmiz stated that writers can express their feelings, thoughts, desires and plans through writing (as cited in Gholaminejad et al. 2013, p.1138). There are four main skills of English such as listening, speaking, reading and writing; however, writing is considered as the most difficult skills. In this view, Jahin and Idrees (2012) mentioned that both native and non-native learners find it difficult to write a text in English. It is suggested that writing components such as purpose, content, audience, organization, vocabulary, mechanics, etc., should be taken into considerations. As known, English is considered as a foreign language in EFL context, where practice is less paid attention in English classrooms. Consequently, most learners perceived that writing seems to be a difficult task. In fact, in Iran context, writing performance of learners is low because they hardly recognize its importance in their academic life as well as in working life. In most institutions in Iran, the syllabus and textbooks are out-of-date. In fact, grammar, vocabulary, reading skill; and listening, speaking are focused, whereas writing skill is paid less attention. As a consequence, writing skill in this context becomes less practical.

Although a variety of techniques and procedures are applied in writing classrooms, they are less practical or communicative, leading to learners' poor performance in writing. For this reason, it is important to identify more effective ways to improve writing performance for learners. It means that, it is necessary to update the way to learn how to write effectively. Therefore, task-based language teaching has caught much attention of both researchers and teachers of writing (Izadpanah, 2011).

Writing model of Kellog's (1996) has been known as an effective theory of writing and planning studies. In this model, the theory of information processing is used to assess language production of learners. This model has a close association with writing processes of working memory model proposed by Baddeley's (1986, 2007). Many researchers (e.g., Ellis, 2003; Salimi & Fatollahnejad, 2012) highly appreciate this writing model due to the effectiveness of planning stage in written language production. According to this model, sub-components of language production are taken into considerations while planning. This model also emphasizes the effects of planning strategies on the production of authentic language. Model of Kellogg presents three basic systems in creating a text. Each system has two sub-components or processes. For example, formulation refers to planning in which the objectives of writing are designed, and the ideas are formulated with regard to these objectives, and then these ideas are well organized. Translating stage is a sub-component or process of formulation in which lexical components are selected and syntactic frame is used to encode the ideas generated in the planning stage. In this stage, language components are well prepared for execution. Programming is included in execution stage. In this stage, language output from translation is transformed into production schema for the proper motor system engaged (e.g., script or typing), and execution or the real creation of sentences. In monitoring stage, reading is focused. It means that, the writers are advised to read their own texts and then do editing as possible before and after producing a sentence as well as revise micro aspects of writing (i.e., linguistic errors), and macro aspects (i.e., paragraph and text organization). The degree to which a writer can be involved in monitoring depends on whether the writer has the time to

choose a refined draft approach or is involved in pressured text making. In other words, most EFL students face difficulties in English writing; as a result, they get less motivated and interested in producing writing texts. To improve language proficiency of learners, Montazeri, Hamidi, and Hamidi (2015) suggested using any strategy or technique to teach writing. To solve this problem, pre-task planning involving writing about different topics after planning the form, meaning or both should be applied in writing classrooms for EFL leaners, especially for learners in Iran. Also, it is essential that further research should be more conducted to examine the effects of directing learners' attention on the accuracy of production during writing task performance.

Literature Review

Planning and Written Production

Hayes and Flower (1980) highly appreciated planning time because writers have a chance to get information from the task environment and long-term memory, which makes the writing process less complicated (as cited in Manchon & Larios, 2007).   Ellis (1987) is one of the first researchers that investigated the effect of planning on written performance. According to him, planning helps learners gain access to their linguistic knowledge which has not been automatized. A study on examining the effects of on-line planning on the accurate use of the past tense verb form was done. In his study, three planning conditions and two tasks are established. For the first task, the participants were required to write a story based on a set of pictures. For the second task, the participants were required to tell a story that was written. For the third task, they talked about a new set of pictures given to them immediately. It was predicted that the first group had better writing performance because they had more planning time than other groups.   The results of this study showed that there was a significant effect of planning time on the accuracy of the regular past tense verb form. Group one prepared a narrative in a written form; whereas group two prepared a narrative in a spoken form respectively. Participants of these two groups used regular past tense form more precisely than those of the third group, who had less time of planning to produce an oral narrative. However, no statistically significant difference in the use of irregular past tense verb was found between the groups.   Ellis shows no difference between pre-task and on-line planning; however, at least on-line planning was applied in task one. His study criticized for a comparison between   speaking and writing (Crookes, 1989). Nevertheless, this was not the case for tasks two and three. In order to justify his findings, he resorted to dual-model of processing language. According to this researcher, to produce irregular past tense forms, learners need to have an access to exemplar-based system. On the other hand, to produce regular past tense, they should draw on their rule-based knowledge. It was concluded that planning provides opportunities for learners to gain access to their rule-based knowledge, and thus accuracy is improved.

Ellis and Yuan (2004) conducted a study on the effects of pre-task and on-line planning on written narrative task production of learners.   In this research, participants were asked to write a story with an interpretation based on a set of pictures. This study was done to compare the effects of planning on an oral task with a written task at the same condition. The no-planners

were asked to use pictures to write 200 words in 17 minutes. In pre-task planning condition, they were asked to write 200 words about the task in 17 minutes i.e. under real-time pressure with no or limited on-line planning. They spent 10 minutes planning before producing their written text. Meanwhile, the on-line planners were given as much time as they needed, and they were not asked to write a minimum of 200 words. The same measures were used in oral production. According to Ellis and Yuan, pre-task planning has a significant effect on fluency, complexity, but a slight effect on accuracy was found. There was a significant effect of on-line planning on the level of accuracy, complexity, but no significant effect was found on fluency. Contrast with these two groups, no-planners had a negative effect on fluency, accuracy, and complexity. That might be due to their little attention while they were involved in writing process.

In this view, many researchers (e.g., Ahmadian, 2012; Rahimpour & Nariman-Jahan, 2011; Rahimpour & Safarie, 2011; Rouhi 2006) carried out research on the effects of planning on oral and written narrative performance of Iranian learners. A cartoon was used for his narrative task (Rouhi, 2006). The participants for oral and written tasks in no-planning as the control group performed the task immediately after watching it within five minutes under real-time pressure. Pre-task planners were given 10 minutes prior to their performance.

They also should finish the task within five minutes and within the same time limitations. In order to create real-time pressure situation, speakers were told to finish their narration within five minutes at least wills 150 words, and writers should write 150 words at the same time limitation. On-line planners were instructed to perform the task without any time limitations as they were speaking and writing. He calculated complexity based on an index of subordination. Accuracy was measured based on the number of error-free clauses as a percentage of the total number of clauses; whereas fluency was measured based on the number of dysfluencies (Skehan & Foster, 1999). He measured dysfluency in written mode by counting the number of words reformulated. The findings of this study suggested that planning time has a positive effect on fluency in both oral and written modes. It increased more accurate speech in spoken form but not in written form. The results showed no effect on complexity.

Guided Pre-task Planning (Strategic)

Planning improves learners' communicative ability because it helps them have an access to grammatical, textual, and other linguistic factors to achieve their communicative goal (Bachman, 1990). Furthermore, through guided pre-task planning, learners are provided with metacognitive advice on how to deal with syntax, lexis, content, and organization (Ellis, 2003). In this research, guided planning was utilized as a pre-task planning. It helps students to learn either form or meaning of language, or both form and meaning at the same time. During writing, teacher-guided was used to help students to plan the content and know how to express the content for preparing the task performance.

Guided planning is used for pre-task planning to provide learners with detailed instructions about what and how to plan. In fact, through guided planning, learners can learn either form or meaning of language or learn both meaning and form, which helps students to pay attention to several aspects of language to improve their writing performance (Ellis, 2005).

Mehnert (1998) examined the difference in the accuracy of the students with 1-minute planning and the students without planning. The results showed that the guided planning group produced more accurate relative clauses (Kawauchi, 2005).

Task

To achieve the objective of writing, Ellis (2003) suggested focusing meaning in any work or activity. It also requires learners to use language pragmatically in a real-life like context. Task-based language instruction was first applied by Prabhu (1987) to teach plans and practice in Bangalore, located in Southern India in 1979. Prabhu began his great experiments of task in order to put his principles into action that appeared in his time. In this regard, students will get the point more effectively while they focus on their work instead of the language they are utilizing.

Form-based, Meaning-based and Meaning-form Based Instruction

Based on grammatical parts, grammar-focused and form-focused instruction is first used to teach foreign language through deductive learning, and then the rules of oral performance are used (Nishimura, 2000). For example, grammatical translation and audio-lingual ways are mainly applied. Larsen-Freeman (2001) suggested that students should first memorize grammatical principles and then practice the model by using substitution and translation drills precisely. Meaning-based instruction is considered as the next scheme of teaching. Based on this approach, children can learn their native language in a natural environment successfully. When adults can use and follow the natural principles of their first language learning, they could master their foreign or second language (Long & Robinson, 1998). In this view, natural approach and direct approach are applied because they focus on meaning rather than forms. Traditional grammatical teaching becomes out of date. If grammatical forms are taught separately, it is difficult for leaners to acquire language effectively (VanLier, 1988). In this sense, Lightbown and Spada (1990) also stated that meaning-based and form-based should be applied to teach speaking to get a high level of accuracy in grammar.

Form-based Planning and Meaning-based Planning

Form-based planning is regarded as a guided planning. In this approach, learners are required to master the form of language instead of its meaning. Learners are taught, and the time is set up before performing the tasks to determine how to write. Meaning-based planning is also characterized as guided planning. However, in meaning-based planning, learners are required to master the meaning of language instead of its form. Learners are taught, and the time is set up before performing the tasks to determine how to write (Ellis, 2005).

Accuracy

Accuracy refers to the ability of language users to use language precisely. To get high level of accuracy, language is controlled. For this reason, complicated structures are not advised to be used. Accuracy is also characterized as the extent to which the language produced conforms to target language norms (Skehan, 1996, Skehan & Foster, 1999).

Research Questions

1. To what extent does meaning-based pre-task (guided) planning influence the accuracy of writing performance by Iranian EFL learners with an intermediate proficiency level in comparison to form-based pre-task (guided) planning?

2. To what extent does meaning-based pre-task (guided) planning influence the accuracy of writing performance by Iranian EFL learners with an intermediate proficiency level in comparison to meaning and form based pre-task (guided) planning?

3. To what extent does form-based pre-task (guided) planning influence the accuracy of writing performance by Iranian EFL learners with an intermediate proficiency level in comparison to meaning and form based pre-task (guided) planning?

Methodology

Participants

This research was done in Kerman, located in South East of Iran. The participants were undergraduate students who were studying in the University of Islamic Azad. They major in English language. Since the study measures the effects of strategic planning conditions on learners' written performance, selected participants were students who passed their writing course. All of them entered the university in accordance with their score in Konkoor exam. The participants included 48 EFL learners in the 18-22 age range. Student who get the score in the range of 34-52, was selected, which was one standard deviation below and above the mean (Mean=43.8 and standard deviation=9.07). Later, they were randomly assigned into three groups.

Material

Nelson Test was used to determine a significant difference among the participants of three homogeneous groups. Three skills such as structure, vocabulary and pronunciation are included in the test. Additionally, the other material included six argumentative tasks. Learners of the three groups were required to write argumentative writing.

Six topics of argumentative tasks were selected from the book *'For And Against'* by L.G. Alexander. Argumentative writing task is a main instrument of this study. One topic was selected as pre-test and posttest.   Before and after the treatment phase, the topic was given to students. The topic of pre-test and post-test is: "It is foolish to give money to the baggers" To do a pilot test, eighteen students of another institute were chosen randomly to do the pre-test. The reliability of the pilot test was 0.90.

Measure of Accuracy

To measure accuracy, the number of error on free clauses is counted, and then a percentage of the total number of clauses participants is performed (Foster & Skehan, 1996; Rouhi & Saeed-akhtar, 2008; Yuan & Ellis, 2003). Error-free clauses have no errors on syntax, morphology, and lexical choices. The words which have lexical errors do not exist in English, or they are inappropriate (Ellis & Yuan, 2004; Menhert, 1998; Rouhi, 2006; Skehan

& Foster, 1997; Skehan & Foster, 1999; Yuan & Ellis, 2003). Furthermore, even if the participants correct by themselves, or change it to an incorrect form, or vice versa, in each case, the final word is measured.

T-Unit

T-Unit is used to measure linguistic complexity of sentences. The shortest unit refers to a sentence that can be shortened. It has one independent clause and whatever dependent clauses (Richards & Schmidt, 2002).

Data Analysis Procedure

To test the hypotheses of the study and to answer the research questions, the researcher investigates gain-score of pre-test and post-test phase in writing scores performance (gain score = post-test score– pre-test score). Then mean, standard deviation and significance of the students from the gain-score of pretest and post-test were considered.

Based on the data collected from the three groups did not violate the assumption of normality, and thus the researcher would be allowed to use parametric tests. So, the result of the tests of normality of the gain-scores on meaning, form, and meaning-form based accuracy groups and their histogram show that the parametric tests were used to compare the writing performance of the three groups. The significant values are higher than the cut-off value of .05 (Group one= .89; Group two= .19: Group 3= .29) in all three cases.

Table 1. One-Way ANOVA Result for Accuracy Measures

	ANOVA				
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.773	2	.386	12.576	.000
Within Groups	1.383	45	.031		
Total	2.156	47			

According to the results, the performances of the three groups were statistically different from each other. It shows that the sig value of .000 is much smaller than the cut-off value of .05 in one-way ANOVA result. Therefore, a Tukey Post hoc test was run and the results are displayed.

Table 2. The Result of POST HOC Test Multiple Comparisons

		TUKEY HSD				
(I) VAR00002	(J)VAR00002	Mean Difference(I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	950/0Cifidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1.00	2.00	.01750	.06198	.957	-.1327	.1677
	3.00	-.26000*	.06198	.000	-.1402	-.1098
2.00	1.00	.01750	.06198	.957	-.1677	.1327
	3.00	-.27750*	.06198	.000	-.4277	-.1273
3.00	1.00	.26000*	.06198	.000	.1098	.4102
	2.00	.27750*	.06198	.000	.1273	.4277

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

Based on the results, there is not any significant difference between two groups of the form-based pre-task planning and meaning-based pre-task planning in terms of accuracy. But there is a significant difference between the two groups of meaning-based pre-task planning and meaning and form based pre-task planning in the case of writing accuracy. Moreover, considering the results of the data, it shows that the mean difference between the two groups of for-based pre-task planning and meaning and form based pre-task planning is statistically significant in case of accuracy.

Discussions and Conclusions

According to Sangarun (2005), a focus on form, meaning, and form and meaning significantly influenced accuracy. In terms of Spanish noun-modifier agreement, Ortega indicated an improvement in accuracy through planning (1999). Moreover, some studies showed that accuracy is improved when pre-task planning is used (Ellis, 1987; Kawauchi, 2005; Menhart, 1998).

In a study conducted by Sangarum (2005) in Thailand, various types of planning are minimal, form focused, meaning-based and meaning-form based planning. In this study, 40 high school students were involved to perform in the condition of planning. Students were asked to pay attention to four specific structures in each task in the form-focused planning condition. The results indicated a positive effect of form-focused planning along with two other planning conditions on students' oral production including accuracy. However, there was no significant difference among the three pre-planning conditions. Consistent with the previous study that there may have not been successful in drawing the learners' attention to form and accuracy properly.

Foster and Skehan (1996) indicated the impact of the type of task on the effect of planning on accuracy. It was revealed that both detailed and un-detailed pre-task planning were more accurate than the non-planners on a decision making task, whereas only the un-detailed pre-task planners produced language with more accuracy on a decision-making task than non-planners. According to Menhert, planning has a positive impact on speaking performance in terms of accuracy, fluency and complexity, which are measured within 10 minutes in the

stage of planning (1998).

Some researchers revealed an improvement in accuracy through the pre-task planning. Others disagree with that finding.   For example, Skehan and Foster (1997) showed an improvement in accuracy on the personal and narrative tasks as a result of undetailed pre-task planning, but no improvement for the decision-making task. According to Foster and Skehan (1999), teacher-led pre-task planning could improve accuracy; however, during planning, learners lack their paying attention to form or meaning. Likewise, some researchers (e.g., Kawauchi, 2005; Menhert, 1998) found the same results, but it was not confirmed by Ellis and Yuan (2003, 2004). A combination of teaching of form and meaning leads to an improvement in accuracy on speaking performance (Lightbown & Spada, 1990).

Giving an instruction to students on how to use the planning time effectively is necessary. Therefore, pre-task (guided) planning is required in teaching and learning language. Indeed, without instructors' guidance, students find it difficult to know how to do in pre-task planning effectively if they are not guided. It means that, teachers must introduce meaning and form focused (guided) planning to students. Lightbown and Spada showed a significant effect of meaning-based and form-focused teaching on grammatical accuracy on grammar in speaking performance. For this reason, in this research, both higher level of accuracy in writing performance in meaning and form based pre-task (guided) planning is taken into considerations.

In this study, the hypothesis is confirmed that raising lower-intermediate learners' attention to both meaning and form of language is important to improving their performance. Meaning and form based pre-task (guided) planning improves low-intermediate learners' performance more than two other groups. Based on the results of this study, it is inferred that planning is effective. Different planning bases and learners' production: Focusing on only the meaning was like the form only in pre-task (guided) planning in which learners would not be able to increase writing accurately.

Based on the results of this study, language teachers can improve learners' accuracy on writing by first supplying them with instructions to make them focus on meaning and form for their subsequent production and then allowing them to plan their writings prior to their actual writing activity. Therefore, this study has important pedagogic implications for L2 writing by showing that meaning and form-based pre-task guided planning significantly influences the accuracy of writing performance.

Acknowledgements

References

Ahmadian, M., & Hosseini, S. (2012). The Relationship between Iranian English Learners' Linguistic Intelligence and their Writing Ability, and Writing Assessment Criteria. *Journal of Language, Culture, and Translation*, *1*(2), 1-22.

Akkaya, N., & Kırmızı, F. S. (2010). Relationship between attitudes to reading and time allotted to writing in primary education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*(2), 4742-4746. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.761

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford University Press.

Baddeley, A. (2007). *Working memory, thought, and action* (Vol. 45). OUP Oxford. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198528012.001.0001

Crookes, G. (1989). Planning and interlanguage variation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11,* 367-383. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100008391

Ellis, R. (1987). Interlanguage variability in narrative discourse: Style shifting in the use of the past tense. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 9,* 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100006483

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

Ellis, R. (2005). Planning and task-based performance: Theory and research. In R. Ellis (Eds.), *Planning and task performance in a second language* (pp. 3-34). Amsterdam: JohnBenjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/lllt.11

Ellis, R. (2009). The differential effects of three types of task planning on the fluency, complexity, and accuracy in L2 oral production. *Applied Linguistics*, *30*(4), 474-509. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp042

Ellis, R., & Yuan, F. (2004).The effects of planning on fluency, complexity, and, accuracy in second language narrative writing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26,* 59-84. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263104026130

Foster, P. & Skehan, P. (1999). The influence of source of planning and focus of planning on task-based performance. *Language Teaching Research, 3,* 215-247. https://doi.org/10.1191/136216899672186140

Foster, P., & Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning and task type on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18,* 299-323. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100015047

Gholaminejad, R., Moinzadeh, A., Youhanaee, M., & Ghobadirad, H. (2013). Writing attitudes of Iranian EFL students: a qualitative study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *4*(5), 1138-1145. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.4.5.1138-1145

Hamidi, H., & Montazeri, M. (2014). Dictionary of second language acquisition. Retrieved March 10, 2015, from http://www.iranelt.com/index.php/introduction-to-sla.

Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. S. (1980). *Identifying the organization of writing processes*. In L. W. Gregg, & E.R. Steinberg (Eds.). *Cognitive processes in writing* (pp. 3-30). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Heidari, F., Izadi, M., & Ahmadian, M. V. (2012). The relationship between Iranian EFL learners' self-efficacy beliefs and use of vocabulary learning strategies. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(2), 174. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n2p174

Housen, A.& Vedder, I. (2009).Complexity, accuracy, and fluency in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics, 30*(4),461-473. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp048

Izadpanah, S. (2011). The review study: The effect of task based approach on the advanced EFL learners' narrative vs. expository writing. *Sino-US English Teaching*, *8*(1), 32-37.

Jahin, J. H., & Idrees, M.W. (2012). EFL major student teachers' writing proficiency and attitudes towards learning English. *Umm Al-Qura University Journal of Educational & Psychologic Sciences*. 4 (1), 10-72.

Kawauchi, C. (2005). The effects of pre-task planning on the oral narratives of learners with low and high intermediate L2 proficiency. In R. Ellis (Eds. *Planning and task performance in a second language* (pp. 143-164). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/lllt.11.09kaw

Kellog, R. (1996). A model of working memory in writing. In C. Levy, & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing (pp. 57-71)*. Mahwa, NJ: Erlbaum.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001). The emergence of complexity, fluency, and accuracy in the oral and written production of 5 Chinese learners of English. *Applied Linguistic, 27*(4), 590-619. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml029

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2006). The emergence of complexity, fluency, and accuracy in the oral and written production of 5 Chinese learners of English. *Applied Linguistic, 27*(4), 590-619. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml029

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1990). *How languages are learned.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Long, M. H. & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: theory, research and practice. in *Focus On Form In Classroom L2 Acquisition*, C. Doughty & J.Williams (Eds.), pp. 85-114. New York: Cambridge.

Manchón, R. M., & de Larios, J. R. (2007). On the temporal nature of planning in L1 and L2 composing. *Language learning*, *57*(4), 549-593. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00428.x

Menhert, U. (1998). The effects of different length of time for planning on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20,* 83-108. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263198001041

Montazeri, M., Hamidi, H., & Hamidi, B. (2015, in press). A closer look at different aspects of private speech in SLA. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 5*(3). https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0503.04

Nishimura, K. (2000). Effective ways of communicative instruction in the Japanese EFL

classroom: Balancing fluency and accuracy. Retrieved June 12, 2014, from the ERIC database.

Ortega, L. (1999). Planning and focus on form in L2 oral performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21,* 109-148. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263199001047

Prabhu, N. S. (1987). Second language pedagogy. Oxford: Oxford university press.

Rahimpour, M. (2008). Implementation of task-based approaches to language teaching. *Research on Foreign Languages Journal of Faculty of Letters and Humanities*, *41*, 45-61.

Rahimpour, M., & Nariman-Jahan, R. (2011). The effects of planning on writing narrative task performance with low and high EFL proficiency. *English Language Teaching*, *4*(1), 120. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n1p120

Rahimpour, M., & Safarie, M. (2011). The effects of on-line and pre-task planning on descriptive writing of Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *1*(2), 274. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v1n2p274

Richards, I.C., & Schmidt, R. (2000). Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Language. Hawaii: A Pearson Education book.

Richards, J. C. and Renandya, W. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667190

Rouhi, A., & Marefat, H. (2006). Planning time effect on fluency, complexity and accuracy of L2 output. *Pazhuhesh-e zabanha-ye Khareji*, *27*, 123-141.

Rouhi, A., & Saeed-Akhtar, A. (2008). Planning time: A mediating technique between fluency and accuracy in task-based teaching. *The journal of Applied Linguistics*, *1*, 103-133.

Salimi, A., & Fatollahnejad, S. (2012). The Effects of Strategic Planning and Topic Familiarity on Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners' Written Performance in TBLT. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *2*(11), 2308. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.11.2308-2315

Sangarun, J. (2005). The effects of focusing on meaning and form in strategic planning. In R.Ellis (Eds.), *Planning and task performance in a second language* (pp. 111- 141).b Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sangarun.J. (2001). The effects of pre-task planning on foreign language performance. Doctoral thesis. University of Toronto, Canada.

Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 17,* 38-62. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/17.1.38

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1997). Task type and task processing conditions as influences on foreign language performance. *Language Teaching Research, 1,* 185-211. https://doi.org/10.1177/136216889700100302

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1999). The influence of task structure and processing conditions on narrative retellings. *Language Learning, 49*(1), 93-120. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00071

Van Lier, L. (1988). What's wrong with classroom talk? *Prospect, 3*(3), 267-283.

Wendel, J. N. (1997). Planning and second-language narrative production. Doctoral Thesis. Temple University.

Yuan, F. (2001). The effects of planning on language production in task-based language teaching. Doctoral thesis, Temple University.

Yuan, F., & Ellis, R. (2003).The effects of pre-task planning and on-line planning on fluency, complexity, and accuracy in L2 monologic oral production. *Applied Linguistics, 24,* 1-27. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/24.1.1