Effects of Careful vs. Pressured Online Planning on Learning Multiword Expressions among Intermediate EFL Learners

Nasim Khodabakhsh

English Department, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran
nassim.khs1995@gmail.com

Hossein Heidari Tabrizi*

English Department, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran
heidaritabrizi@gmail.com

Abstract

This research was carried out to examine the effect of using *careful* online planning vs. *pressured* online planning on learning multi-word expressions among intermediate English learners. To this end, two samples of learners through an Oxford Placement Test (OPT) were selected as the careful online group and pressured online group. After the pretest, the researcher exposed the experimental group to all multi-word expressions, adapted from input text. The experimental group was supposed to listen to some audio files and learn the multi-word expressions and then they must have been able to produce those expressions while speaking. They were asked to watch a film of *The Donkey and The Master*, take notes, and retell the story in six minutes for pressured online planners and then the time for careful online planners. The first time was for pleasure; the second time, they were expected to retell the story using Multi-Words Expressions in the film. After three weeks of instruction, the posttest was given to the students of both groups to assess their achievement. After quantitative data analysis, an independent sample T-test was performed. The results indicate that pressured online planning was more effective. This study has implications for EFL teachers and instructors.

Keywords: Careful Online Planning; EFL Learners; Intermediate; Multi-Word Expressions; Pressured Online Planning

* Corresponding Author

1. Introduction

Research stresses the significance of online planning and the circumstances under which language learners interact via the multi-word expressions method. Most studies on online planning mainly deal with language production, especially oral production (Ellis, 2009), thus, disregarding the production of multi-word expressions. It has been claimed that restrained studies addressed the influence of planning on 2d language (L2) multi-word expressions (Rostamian, Fazilatfar, & Jabbari, 2018). Some recent studies examine controlling online planning and project situations (e.g., in particular, complexity) (Ong, 2014). Some of the others worked on L2 multi-word expressions that explore web planning (Kellogg, 1988, 1990) or assignment settings (Glynn, Britton, Muth & Dogan, 1982), even as some others observed their relations (Ellis & Yuan, 2004; Ong, 2014; Ong & Zhang, 2010, 2013).

Most examinations related to online planning mainly deal with the influence of assigning time to plan presentations of multi-word expressions (Ellis, 1987; Foster & Skehan, 1996). This is while some emphasize the significance of non-multiword expressions in lessening the intellectual request for interpretation, unity, and finding of thoughts (Elbow, 1973, 1981; Wason, 1980). Other studies enumerate the advantages of planning in decreasing the theorization method capacity, hence creating a better multi-word expression (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Ellis & Yuan, 2004; Flower & Hayes, 1980, 1981; Kellogg, 1988, 1990). The bones of the opposition lie in Kellogg's (1990) two differing theories.

In the domain of L2 acquisition, the concept of planning has been used inversely. Stemming from a quandary with mixed findings regarding accurateness, Yuan and Ellis (2003) operationalized the concept of 'online' planning, which they offered in contrast to no planning and pre-task planning. It contains mainly processes of communication conceptualization, lexico-grammatical explorations, and observing, all at the level of specific utterances-that is, at micro-planning rather than macro-one. When this online planning is unpressured/careful, the participants have the opportunity *to theorize, articulate, and communicate* their message cautiously. To put it short, the mechanisms which underlie both writing and speech construction, as theorized by Levelt and Braddely, could come down to one basic sentence: "people create dialogue first by *conceptualizing* the communication, then by *formulating* its language demonstration (that is, coding it), and finally by *pronouncing it*." This measurement is operationalized using permitting students greater performance time on the assumption of no time pressure; they would engage in greater hidden planning rather than students acting under time stress (Ellis, 2005). This form of planning is probable to tax 'working reminiscence less, because it takes place at some stage in the planning and manufacturing of particular words. Therefore, it can be more open than

planning strategies to different sorts of procedures in which speakers may need to interact during speech utterances.

Concentrating on one element of the processing and following outline situations that are not biased through the undertaking or different components of the conditions, it would be reasonable to anticipate that accurateness and complication would benefit via this planning shape (Bygate & Samuda, 2005). However, giving learners plenty of time should have a deleterious effect on fluency.

Multi-word expressions (MWEs) have recently drawn exponential attention in applied linguistics (Barfield & Gyllstad, 2009; Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009; Wood, 2015). MWEs can assist learners in promoting their language learning process. Learners can employ them to consider the interpretation of the planned meaning and produce other expressions with parallel meanings (McCarthy, O'Keeffe & Walsh, 2010). Moudraia (2001) also contended that MWEs are collocations with a part in L1 acquisition and learning any second or foreign languages. This indicates how these multi-word terminologies instruct teaching and learning should be considered truly. It should be stated that most previous studies focused on one single factor, namely, multi-word expressions under various reading conditions where target MWEs are typographically enhanced or glossed. Nonetheless, here, we further include underexplored massed online planning conditions. Moreover, we also apply online planning at two levels of careful and pressured online planning to see its impact on mining MWEs.

Undeniably, multi-word terminologies were integrated into SLA education, even in the circumstances disguised in favor of the verbalized capabilities to date. It is a single timewasting outgoing task which, in contrast to what seems to be achieved in peace, has continued to be an intellectual difficulty to begin not most effectively by English inherent presenters, but a large number of learners who learn English as their L2, making an all-out challenge to increase their language learning, and flip the overall language ability. Multi-word terminologies, with their numerous relevant factors, have been the concern of a myriad of studies both in L2 contexts. and in multi-word terminologies, causing various problems from grammatical accurateness and quality of multi-word terminologies (Jang & Lee, 2018; Polio & Shea, 2014; Rivera-McCutchen, 2014) and task difficulty (Adams, Alwi, & Newton, 2015; Rahimi & Zhang, 2018; Sadeghi & Mosalli, 2013) to reactions against the quality of multi-word terminologies (Akbarzadeh, Saeidi,& Chehreh, 2013; Boggs, 2019; Nguyen, 2018). Therefore, this study can fill the mentioned research gap by recognizing the impacts of careful online planning vs. pressured online planning on learning multi-word expressions among intermediate EFL learners.

2. Literature Review

This section reviews the studies on online planning (Elekaei et al., 2019a, 2019b, 2019c, 2020a, 2020b; Jafari & Chalak, 2016). Ahmadian and Tavakoli (2011) examined the effects of the simultaneous use of cautious online planning and task replication on the accurateness, difficulty, and articulacy in the spoken construction of EFL students. Participants in all four groups (n=15) watched a short chapter of a classical quiet video and then were asked to tell the story under the situations detailed for each group. The results of one-way ANOVAs revealed that the chance to involve simultaneously in careful online planning and assignment repetition increases meaningfully spoken construction. Payant and Reagan (2018) discussed manipulating task application variables among emerging Spanish students in the context of teaching. The results illustrated that repeating a task led to higher profits on the incidence and determination of lexis-cantered and language-related episodes.

The ability to employ multi-word terminologies (MWEs) or prefabricated collections of phrases, including decided form, meaning, and use, is an essential unit of learning and applying a language, as stated in Tavakoli et al. (2013). Consequently, both planned situations gave rise to noticeably greater perfect texts than unplanned situations; in the meantime, the mean tendency was on the way to different conditions. Also, the assessment of textual content difficulty and articulacy between four circumstances remained statistically insignificant. Wood (2015) suggested that the capabilities of multi-word terminologies might be reviewed as containing multiple phrases and secondly supplying characteristics, and lastly, they are prefabricated, saved, and recovered from recollection as a single unit. Clearly, the primary functions seem to be easier to evaluate than the remaining functions because multi-word terminologies are at the limited grammar and vocabulary.

Rostamian et al. (2018) examined the effect of online planning on intellectual procedures and the value of L2 multi-word terminologies, assessed by the CAF harmony, considering both multi-word terminologies courses and creation. Regarding the features of multi-word terminologies, it was revealed that providing pre-assignment and virtual planning might not end in coincident development of multi-word terminologies complication, accurateness, and articulacy, a finding that contradicts the analyses mentioned above. Consequently, it can be concluded that the Overload Hypothesis and the Limited Attentional Capacity Model were reinforced by the research results. An increasing bulk of studies point out that native speakers' knowledge of MWEs encourages their fluent linguistic processing though many L2 students do not desire it (Heidari Tabrizi & Onvani, 2018; Siyanova-Chanturia & Martinez, 2015).

Although there is sufficient research on the practicality of cautious and distressed online planning on speaking skills, there is nonstop experimental provision in supporting the preference of careful or pressured online planning in using multi-word expressions. Accordingly, we aimed to observe the impact of careful online planning and pressured online planning on multi-word expressions of Iranian intermediate EFL students' spoken construction. We intended to determine the outcome of the two online planning programs – careful and pressured – regarding the use of multi-word expressions in an EFL context in Iran. Therefore, based on the objective of this study, the following research question was formulated:

Is there any significant difference between the effects of using pressured online planning and careful online planning on mining multi-word expressions of Iranian Intermediate EFL learners' oral production?

3. Methods

This study is quasi-experimental with a pre-test, treatment, and post-test design. Online planning type (Careful vs. pressured) is the independent variable, whereas learning multi-word expression is the dependent variable. The participants were selected through non-probability sampling. They were assigned to two separate groups. The following sections thoroughly explain the participants' selection, the instrumentation, and the procedures.

3.1. Participants and Setting

Eighty intermediate female EFL learners at Kalammelal Institute of Language in Isfahan, Iran, were randomly selected. In order to homogenize the participants, the researcher provided them with an Oxford Placement test (OPT). The participants whose scores fell $(1 \pm M)$ 1 standard deviation above and below the mean were considered intermediate EFL learners. Therefore, 48 participants (19 males and 29 females) remained after homogenization. All participants were native speakers of Persian and had studied English from the beginner level to intermediate in the same institute. Moreover, they studied English in their schools as well, and their age ranged between 11 to 17. The demographics of the participants are presented below.

3.2. Materials and Instruments

In order to homogenize the participants and assess their ability level, an Oxford Placement Test (OPT, Allen, 1992) was administered. This test was administered as a standardized and reliable measure to check the homogeneity of subjects in terms of their language proficiency. This test included sixty multiple-choice

substances, which measure respondents' English language information concerning practice, prepositions, and lexis in the form of cloze passages and fill-in-the-blank pieces. The test is practical since there are few items and sufficient time (i.e., 30 minutes). In order to obtain the proficiency test consequences, the investigator decided to select those participants whose scores ranged from 28 to 36. Accordingly, 48 intermediate EFL learners were selected to participate in this study. We also used an oral production test to measure the students' multiple words expressions.

In oral production, fifteen questions were asked, and for the other group, after watching and covering the video, those fifteen questions were reasked, but the questions were paraphrased. The reliability and validity of the questions were tested before asking.

The instruction material used in the present study was the movie of "The *Donkey and his Master."* This short movie was chosen as an input text since it was rich in multi-word expressions. The multiple-word expressions used in the movies were asked through an oral production test as a post-test.

3.3. Procedures

First, 48 homogenous learners were designated with an OPT test. After the pretest, the students were randomly assigned to two groups: careful online planning and pressured online planning. Each group consisted of 24 participants.

In the first group, the careful online planning on multi-word expression was investigated, in which they were given time to finish the task. At first, they were exposed to the authentic listening materials instructions in which they were asked to watch Aesop's fable of *The Donkey and The Master*, take notes if necessary, and retell the story in six minutes. In the second group, the effect of pressured online planning on multi-word expression was studied. The participants completed the task in 5 to 6 minutes. For the careful online group, the members were given as much time as required to finish the task. Participants were at first exposed to the instruction of authentic listening materials. They were asked to watch a film, Aesop's fable of *The Donkey and The Master*, take notes if necessary, retell the story in 6 minutes for pressured online planners, and allow time for careful online planners.

The participants were exposed to all multi-word expressions drawn from input text (some audio files). In the meantime, they were encouraged to use such phrases in their speaking skills. After three weeks of mass listening support, the same conditions of the two groups of careful and pressured online planning were

established for the participants. In both groups, an oral production test was given as the post-test.

To analyze the results of both tests, SPSS Software was used. First, to find the mean and standard deviation of the multi-word scores, the pre-test scores of both groups were analyzed distinctly. The post-test scores of each group also followed the same procedure. To see if there were significant differences in both groups' multi-word learning, independent sample t-tests were employed. The hypothesis was confirmed at a 0.5 level of significance.

4. Results

4.1. The Pre-Test Results

An independent sample t-test was run on the participants' pretest and post-test scores. The descriptive statistics of the pre-test are offered in Table 1:

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of the Participants' Performance on the pretest

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Careful online planning group	24	12.1250	2.15311	.43950
Pressured online planning group	24	11.6250	2.24214	.45767

According to the table above, the mean of the careful online group in the pretest was more significant than the pressured online group (12.12 and 11.62). The standard deviation of the two groups was also different (.43 and .45). However, the post-test experimental group upgraded to a great extent. The independent sample t-test was performed in SPSS to observe the significance of the differences between the two groups (Table 2).

Table 2

The independent sample t-test for comparing the performance of groups (pre-test)

Independent Samples Test

	Levine's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.122	.728	.788	46	.435	.50000	.63453	-.77724	1.77724
Equal variances not assumed			.788	45.925	.435	.50000	.63453	-.77730	1.77730

According to Table 2, the mean differences between the two groups were insignificant (Sig= 43). This indicates that the students in the two collections had identical levels of multi-word knowledge.

4.2. Results of the Post-test

Table 3

Two-way *MANOVA Results of the Influences of Planning Time and Task Conditions on the Complexity, Fluency, and Accuracy*

Influence		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Planning time	Pillai's Trace	-162	2.514	9.00	396.000	.008	.054

	Wilks' Lambda	-842	2.575	9.00	316.536	.007	.056
Task condition	Pillai's Trace	-070	1.576	6.00	262.000	.154	.035
	Wilks' Lambda	-931	1.582a	6.00	260.000	.152	.035
Planning time * Task condition	Pillai's Trace	-144	1.110	18.00	396.000	.340	.048
	Wilks' Lambda	-861	1.110	18.00	368.181	.340	.049

The outcomes showed the key influence of online planning [Wilks' Lambda = 2.57, F (9, 396) = 2.75, p=0.007; fractional Eta Squared = .05, demonstrating an insignificant influence size]. No significant influence of assignment situations [Wilks' Lambda = .931, F (6, 262) = .1.58, p = 0.152; partial Eta Squared = .03, demonstrating an insignificant influence size], and also no interaction influence of online planning and assignment situations [Wilks' Lambda = .861, F (18, 396) = 1.11, p = 0.34; partial Eta Squared = .04, demonstrating an insignificant effect size] were established.

An identical statistical process was applied for analyzing post-test outcomes. The statistical analyses of the post-test for careful online planning and pressured online planning are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for the Participants' Performance on the Post-test

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Careful online planning group	24	12.6667	1.94862	.39776
Pressured online planning group	24	18.0417	1.36666	.27897

The mean score of the first group (careful online planning group) was raised from 12.12 on the pre-test to 12.66 on the post-test, which showed an

improvement in multi-word expressions mastery. The pressure online planning group's mean score increased from 11.62 on the pre-test to 18.04 on the post-test, indicating more improvement than in the first group. The post-test scores were submitted to an independent sample t-test analysis (Table 5) to determine if there were statistically significant differences in the impacts of pressured online planning and careful online planning on students' presentations in the two groups.

Table 5

Independent sample t-test for comparing the performance of groups (post-test)

Independent Samples Test

	Levine's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	3.065	.087	-11.063	46	.000	-5.37500	.48583	-6.35294	-4.39706
Equal variances not assumed			-11.063	41.219	.000	-5.37500	.48583	-6.35601	-4.39399

The results (Sig=000) explained that the difference between the two groups' presentations was statistically significant. In other words, pressured online planning had more effects on learning multi-word expressions among Iranian EFL learners.

5. Discussion

We attempted to compare the influences of careful online planning and pressured online planning on learning multi-word expressions among Iranian intermediate EFL students. We designed this research question: Are the effects of pressured online planning and careful online planning on mining multi-word expressions among Iranian EFL learners' oral production at the intermediate level significantly different?

The independent sample t-test revealed a significant difference between the presentation of groups of learners in careful online planning and pressured online planning, proving pressured online planning more effective on students' multi-word expressions.

The results are inconsistent with those of Ahmadian and Tavakoli (2011), wherein oral production of EFL learners was affected by careful planning conditions and reached a level of significant difference statistically. Additionally, the study lent support to studies, including Wood (2015) and Siyanova-Chanturia and Martinez (2015), both of which highlighted that using input text (here reading text) created significant improvement in the use of multi-word expressions rather than single words in their performance.

In another study by Ahmadian (2012), it was found that directed careful online planning has a positive effect on the construction of English courses and the worldwide complication of language in students' language, which contradicted our findings.

Our results agree with Skehan's (1998). They found that participants tend to use ready-made chunks of languages in pressured online planning conditions. On the contrary, our results contradict Rahbar and Dadloui (2014). The outcomes of their study showed that careful online planning positively affects the complication and accuracy of L2 linguistic knowledge.

6. Conclusions

The current study was intended to discover the influence of online planning on the multi-word learning of intermediate learners. The outcomes of this study supported the premise that online planning can develop multi-word expressions in learners. The results revealed that online planning in an EFL setting could influence learning satisfaction. Additionally, it was displayed that pressured online planning was more operational than careful online planning. In other words, the pressured online planning group surpassed the careful online planning group in using multi-word expressions, a linguistic complexity. It could be clarified how students focused and performed composing procedures, including their resources and components, in a partial period. Hence, it appears that the second-by-second occasions influence the significant feature for developing accurateness in online planning that help students to gain their grammar-based method to explore their linguistic repertoire to make the best use of their accurateness and practice linguistic components while performing the assignment.

As a result, it is unavoidable for language teachers to progress in different planning tasks in L2 classrooms. Moreover, instructors could aid students in

learning the way to apply planning approaches in classrooms by implicating numerous types of planning tasks in an EFL setting, for example, guided pre-task planning versus unguided pre-task planning. Additionally, in an EFL setting like this one, where the concentration is regularly on the method of language, especially multi-word terminologies, instructors can effectively plan students` multi-word expressions in the classes by constructing tasks and supplementing them with planning situations. In contrast, Khomeijani Farahani and Meraji (2011) asserted that the duration of online planning is vital but insufficient for developing multi-word terminologies.

The existing research and its outcomes can be substantial in terms of a variety of aspects. The research on challenge planning and situations are theoretically dependent on SLA studies and educational issues for second language specialists. It may offer perception for SLA investigators who are inquisitive about inspecting what students join too when making plans and how this could influence their use of language. The significance of planning for instructors depends on how it influences learners' language construction and inspires their inter-language progress. In Iran, the maximum regular process of multi-word terminologies preparation is the invention-cantered one that emphasizes raising L2 learners' linguistic capabilities. Rehearsal of multi-word terminologies procedure in an instructive setting is a precondition for reaching the authority's meta-cognitive understanding and monitoring instrument. The technique could reduce dependence on critical policymaking by teaching setting plans and sentence producing and reviewing abilities to emerge programmed. To this end, using assignments may engage students in using language decisively.

This study faced the following limitations: the qualitative phase of the data analysis was ignored. Second, the sample size was rather small (N=12). Third, the author's L1 multi-word terminologies capacity, working recall ability, processing capability, and technical awareness were not observed. Fourth, our research did not adequately address the affecting issues containing multi-word terminologies apprehension, attention grade, and stimulus as the mediator issues. Lastly, the association between the probable approaches engaged in different collections of essayists in the planning situation was not drawn. In addition, measuring the association between the speed of a writer's word recovery and vocabulary complication of multi-word terminologies presentation might be valuable.

References

Adams, R., Alwi, N. A. N. M., & Newton, J. (2015). Task complexity influences on the complexity and accuracy of writing via text chat. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 2*9, 64-81.

Ahmadian, M. J. (2012). The influence of 'massed' task repetitions on complexity, accuracy and fluency: does it transfer to a new task? *The Language Learning Journal, 39*(3), 269-280.

Ahmadian, M. J., & Tavakoli, M. (2011). The influences of simultaneous use of careful online planning and task repetition on accuracy, complexity, and fluency in EFL learners' oral production. *Language Teaching Research, 15*(1), 35-59.

Akbarzadeh, R., Saeidi, M., & Chehreh, M. (2013). The effect of oral interactive feedback on the accuracy and complexity of EFL learners' writing performance: Uptake and retention. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 2,* 105-126.

Allen, D. (1992). *Oxford placement test*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barfield, A., & Gyllstad, H. (2009). Introduction: Researching L2 collocation knowledge and development. In *Researching collocations in another language* (pp. 1-18). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Bereiter, C. & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of multiword expressions composition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Boers, F., & Lindstromberg, S. (2009). *Optimizing a lexical approach to instructed second language acquisition*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Boggs, J. A. (2019). Effects of teacher-scaffolded and self-scaffolded corrective feedback compared to direct corrective feedback on grammatical accuracy in English L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 46*, 1-13.

Bygate, M., & Samuda, V. (2005). Integrative planning through the use of task repetition. *Planning and task performance in a second language*, *11*, 37-74.

Elbow, P. (1973). *Writing without teachers*. London: Oxford University Press.

Elbow, P. (1981). *Writing with power*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Elekaei, A., Heidari Tabrizi, H. & Chalak, A. (2019a). Distance education and vocabulary podcasting tasks: Attitude in focus. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education (TOJDE), 20*(2), 105-120.

Elekaei, A., Heidari Tabrizi, H. & Chalak, A. (2019b). Investigating the effects of EFL learners' vocabulary gain and retention levels on their choice of memory and compensation strategies in an e-learning project. *CALL-EJ, 20*(2), 1-18.

Elekaei, A., Heidari Tabrizi, H. & Chalak, A. (2019c). The influence of autonomy on Iranian EFL learners' vocabulary podcasting tasks, gain and retention. Vocabulary *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching & Research, 7*(25), 127-141.

Elekaei, A., Heidari Tabrizi, H., & Chalak, A. (2020a). Evaluating learners' vocabulary gain and retention in an e-learning context using vocabulary podcasting tasks: A case study. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education (TOJDE), 21*(2),190-203.

Elekaei, A., Heidari Tabrizi, H., & Chalak, A. (2020b). A study into the impact of the choice of cognitive and meta-cognitive strategies and podcasts on vocabulary gain and retention levels in the telegram-based e-learning context. *Teaching English with Technology, 20*(2), 98-117.

Ellis, R. (1987). Interlanguage variability in narrative discourse: Style in the use of the past tense. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 9*, 12-20.

Ellis, R. (2005). *Planning and Task Performance in a Second Language.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ellis, R. (2009). The differential influences of three types of task planning on the fluency, complexity, and accuracy in L2 oral production. *Applied linguistics, 30*(4), 474-509.

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*(1), 59-84.

Flower, L. S., & Hayes, J. R. (1980). The dynamics of composing: Making plans and juggling constraints. In L.W. Gregg, & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing* (pp.31–50). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Flower, L. S., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. College *Composition and Communication, 32*(4), 365-387.

Foster, P., & Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning and task type on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*(3), 299-323.

Glynn, S. M., Britton, B. K., Muth, K. D., & Dogan, N. (1982). Writing and revising persuasive documents: Cognitive demands. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 74*, 557–567.

Heidari Tabrizi, H., & Onvani, N. (2018). The impact of employing telegram app on Iranian EFL beginners' vocabulary teaching and learning. *Applied Research on English Language, 6*(4), 1-18.

Jafari, S. & Chalak, A. (2016). The role of WhatsApp in teaching vocabulary to Iranian EFL learners at junior high school. *English Language Teaching, 9*(8), 85-92.

Jang, Y., & Lee, J. (2018). The effects of ideal and ought-to L2 selves on Korean EFL learners' writing strategy use and writing quality. *Reading and Writing, 32*, 1129-1148.

Kellogg, R. T. (1988). Attentional overload and writing performance: Effects of rough draft and outline strategies. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 14*, 355-365.

Kellogg, R. T. (1990). Effectiveness of prewriting strategies as a function of task demands. *American Journal of Psychology, 103*, 327–342.

Khomeijani Farahani, A., & Meraji, S. (2011). The influence of length of pre-task online planning on discourse-analytic measures and analytic ratings in L2 multiword expressions narratives. *Journal of English Studies, 1*(2), 21-37.

McCarthy, M., O'Keeffe, A., & Walsh, S. (2010). V*ocabulary matrix: Understanding, learning, teaching*. Andover, UK: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Moudraia, O. (2001). *Lexical Approach to Second Language Teaching*. ERIC Digest.

Nguyen, T. T. L. (2018). The effect of combined peer-teacher feedback on Thai students' writing accuracy. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 6*, 117-132.

Ong, J. (2014). How do planning time and task conditions affect metacognitive processes of L2 writers?. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *23*, 17-30.

Ong, J., & Zhang, L. J. (2010). Effects of task complexity on fluency and lexical complexity in EFL students' argumentative writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*, 218-233.

Ong, J., & Zhang, L. J. (2013). Influences of manipulation of cognitive processes on English-as- a-foreign-language (EFL) writers' text quality. *TESOL Quarterly*, *47*, 375–398.

Payant, C., & Reagan, D. (2018). Manipulating task implementation variables with incipient Spanish language learners: A classroom-based study. *Language Teaching Research, 22*(2), 169-188.

Polio, C., & Shea, M. C. (2014). An investigation into current measures of linguistic accuracy in second language writing research. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 26*, 10-27.

Rahbar, B., & Dadluei, N. (2014). The Role of Careful Online Planning on the Speaking skill of Iranian EFL learners. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *4*(1), 20-28.

Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2018). Multiword expressions task complexity, students' motivational beliefs, anxiety and their multiword expressions

production in English as a second language. *Reading and Multiword expressions, 32*, 761-786.

Rivera-McCutchen, R. L. (2014). The "insider" principal: Perceptions of the leadership effectiveness of an internal successor. *Journal of School Leadership*, *24*(5), 1014-1034.

Rostamian, M., Fazilatfar, A. M., & Jabbari, A. A. (2018). The effect of planning time on cognitive processes, monitoring behavior, and quality of L2 writing. *Language Teaching Research*, *22*(4), 418-438.

Sadeghi, K., & Mosalli, Z. (2013). The effect of task complexity on the quality of EFL learners' argumentative writing. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 1,* 115-134.

Siyanova-Chanturia, A., & Martinez, R. (2015). The idiom principle revisited. *Applied Linguistics, 36*(5), 549-569.

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

Tavakoli, M., Ghavamnia, M.,& Esteki, M. (2013). The Effect of Pre-Task and Online Planning Conditions on Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency on EFL Learners' Written Production. *Porta Linguarum*, *20*, 31-43.

Wason, P. C. (1980). Specific thoughts on the writing process. In L. W. Gregg, & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive Processes in Writing* (pp. 129-137). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wood, D. (2015). *Fundamentals of formulaic language: An introduction*. London, UK: Bloomsbury Publishing.

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), 1-27.