Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, *35*(1), 62-82

© 2026 The Chinese University of Hong Kong

A Comparative Analysis of Pre-task Planning Conditions and their Effects on Intermediate EFL Learners' Oral Performance

Alireza KHORAM * arkhoram2017@gmail.com

English Language Department, Ministry of Education, Tehran, Iran

Task planning has received substantial attention from researchers within task-based language teaching. However, there is some uncertainty regarding the impacts of different classroom organizations in pre-task planning on task performance. Accordingly, this research examines how various planning conditions affect students' L2 oral performance in task-based activities in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency. Sixty intermediate EFL students were divided randomly into three experimental groups and one control group. While the control group performed without planning, experimental groups completed a decision-making task under different planning conditions: individual, pair work, or guided (with content and language guidelines). Findings showed that individual and pair work planning significantly improved fluency compared to guided planning, but not accuracy or complexity. Individual planners achieved the highest complexity levels, followed by pair work and guided planners, whereas guided planning produced better accuracy than both individual and group-based conditions. The findings suggest that variation in classroom structure in pre-task planning is beneficial to different areas of language performance.

Introduction

In recent decades, researchers have extensively studied various aspects of task-based language teaching (TBLT), particularly examining how task design and implementation variables affect learners' oral production. The construct of task planning has emerged as a significant focus of research (e.g., Ahmadian, 2011; Ahmadian, Tavakoli& Vahid Dastjerdi, 2015; Foster & Skehan, 1999; Khoram, 2019; Qin, 2019; Yuan & Ellis, 2003). Understanding planning concepts benefits both second language acquisition (SLA) researchers focusing on second language (L2) acquisition

theories and language educators seeking to enhance learning effectiveness (Ellis, 2005b). Consequently, numerous scholars have investigated the effects of planning on language production (e.g., Ellis & Yuan, 2004; Ellis, 2009; Foster & Skehan, 1996; Li, Chen & Sun, 2015; Mehnert, 1998; Ortega, 1999; Qin, 2022; Qin & Zhang, 2022).

Many research investigations focusing on task-based planning as an implementation variable and task design characteristics are grounded in fundamental principles derived from information processing theories which recognize limitations in human information processing capacity for input and output (Ellis et al., 2020). Learners possess finite attention resources, with different language modules competing for these limited capacities; focusing on one aspect (meaning) may compromise another (form) (Skehan, 1996; VanPatten, 1990, 2002). Accordingly, when multiple mental tasks require focused attention, it becomes unfeasible to distribute attentional resources equally among them at the same time. Planning time helps overcome working memory limitations, allowing learners to connect form with meaning through their developing linguistic knowledge (Ellis, 2005a). Thus, planned L2 production should enhance learners' expressive abilities (Foster & Skehan, 1999).

Skehan's (1998) limited attentional capacity model posits that the amount of information an individual can process at any given moment is constrained in significant ways. This model serves as a foundational element of the Trade-off Hypothesis, which informs our expectations concerning the effects of altering implementation conditions and task design characteristics (Skehan, 1998, 2009; Skehan & Foster, 2001). The Trade-off Hypothesis suggests that when a learner engages in a task, it is not possible to simultaneously focus on all performance aspects (i.e. complexity, accuracy and fluency). As Skehan (2009) argued, dedicating attention to one area may lead to diminished performance in others, unless the learner receives support by adjusting performance conditions, such as the amount of planning time provided, or by modifying the implementation conditions of task performance. He pointed out that if learners are permitted to plan prior to performing a task, their constrained cognitive resources may be alleviated during the actual performance, thereby providing greater capacity to focus on additional aspects of production. Likewise, Robinson (2001) argues that form and content do not necessarily compete for attentional resources. He points out that the manipulation of planning time results in a reduction of attentional and memory capacities. In his framework, planning is identified as a factor that depletes resources,

influencing the overall complexity of the task and the degree to which learners focus on form. Thus, pre-task planning is emphasized as an effective pedagogical strategy to assist L2 learners in performing tasks in their second language (e.g., Foster & Skehan, 1996; Yuan & Ellis, 2003).

Previous studies showed that advance planning enhances language production, particularly regarding fluency and complexity (Ortega, 1999). Multiple studies (Crookes, 1989; Foster & Skehan, 1996; Skehan & Foster, 1997; Wendel, 1997; Mehnert, 1998) show pre-task planning improves fluency. It also positively affects complexity, with planners producing more sophisticated language than non-planners (Ellis, 2004). According to Foster and Skehan (1996), learners who planned in detail used notably more subordinate clauses than those who planned minimally. In Wigglesworth's (1997) study, just one minute of planning enhanced language complexity only among advanced learners tackling challenging tasks, while Yuan and Ellis (2003) demonstrated that planning before the task enhanced linguistic complexity.

Ellis' (2009) review of 19 studies revealed that planning consistently enhanced fluency and structural complexity (e.g., Crookes, 1989; Foster & Skehan, 1996), but showed varied effects on accuracy, with some studies finding no significant impact (e.g., Yuan & Ellis, 2003) and others reporting positive effects (e.g., Foster & Skehan, 1996; Tavakoli & Skehan, 2005). These inconsistencies partly stem from variables like task type (e.g., Dawadi, 2019; Song & Lee, 2015) and content familiarity (e.g., Bui & Huang, 2018). In other words, the importance of what learners engage in during this preparation time is not always evident. As a result, the impact of each type of pre-task planning, or a combination of pre-task planning types, on the oral performance of L2 learners is still being explored.

Investigation into the impact of various planning conditions on the oral performance of L2 learners is crucial for both theoretical and practical applications (Ellis, 2009). With respect to practical implications, studies on task planning can enhance our understanding of task-based teaching methodologies (Ellis, 2009). The awareness of the key variables in task-based planning research aids teachers in making informed pedagogical choices, thereby increasing their effectiveness in helping learners acquire a new language (Skehan & Foster, 2008). Theoretically, it serves to evaluate assertions about the nature of variability in learner language and the credibility of speaking models. (Skehan, 2014). Therefore, further investigation under different conditions

could strengthen research findings. This study examined pre-task planning sources in the EFL context of Iran to guide instructors implementing TBLT. Given that complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) are essential for "greater functional proficiency" (Skehan & Foster 1999, p. 116), understanding how implementation conditions affect these three areas of L2 oral performance is crucial.

Literature Review

Ellis (2005a) explained planning as a "problem-solving activity" (p. 3) because participants need to decide "what linguistic devices need to be selected in order to affect the audience in the desired way" (p. 3). According to Ellis (2009), task planning includes two primary types of pre-task and within-task planning (also called online planning by Yuan & Ellis, 2003). These differ in timing: pre-task planning occurs before, while within-task planning happens during the task. Pre-task planning can be further subdivided into rehearsal and strategic planning. Rehearsal offers participants the chance to practice the task before the final performance, while strategic planning allows them to prepare by contemplating the content and manner of their expression. In this study, pre-task planning is exclusively focused on strategic planning. Ellis (2005a) identified various additional methods for categorizing pre-task planning. For example, students may engage in preparation for the main task either individually or in collaboration with their peers. Furthermore, instructors have the option to implement guided planning, wherein they provide students with clear directives on how to prepare, or unguided planning, which does not offer specific instructions. In the guided planning, instructors may focus on a specific linguistic form, meaning, or both. It is important to note, however, that the previous TBLT studies may not be directly comparable due to the differing instructions employed across studies (Ellis, 2005a). Moreover, the nature of students' activities during the unguided planning period is often ambiguous in many of these studies.

A substantial amount of research on task planning rooted in a cognitive research framework has been guided by a strong psycholinguistic model that is mainly developed for L1 speech production: Levelt's (1989) model of speech production. This model outlines that the speech process consists of three stages: conceptualization, formulation, and articulation. During speech production, the speaker engages in self-monitoring before articulating their speech and may reformulate it as needed (Kormos, 2006). These stages often demand the speaker's conscious

attention and can impose a cognitive load, particularly in the context of L2 oral production. Planning is essential for learners as it aids in identifying suitable message content and structuring their speech prior to articulation (Levelt, 1989). L1 speakers can engage in parallel processing, allowing them to generate ideas and formulate language simultaneously. In contrast, L2 speakers with insufficient language proficiency may struggle to manage both form and meaning at the same time due to limited cognitive resources (Skehan, 1998), leading them to adopt a serial processing approach, where they handle each stage sequentially. Effective planning can enhance speaking performance by facilitating the stages of conceptualization and formulation (Ellis, 2009; Kormos, 2011). Engaging in content and language preparation during pre-task planning can alleviate the cognitive load on the speaker, thereby optimizing working memory and attention (Ellis, 2005b). Consequently, this allows speakers to concentrate more on language production, resulting in improved fluency, accuracy, and complexity.

In this area of research, the speaking performance of learners is generally evaluated using the criteria of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF). A meta-analysis conducted by Johnson and Tabari (2022), which reviewed 36 studies on the impact of task planning on oral performance, indicates that strategic pre-task planning has a moderate positive influence on syntactic complexity and fluency, while its effects on lexical complexity and accuracy are minimal or negligible. Furthermore, various planning conditions, including the duration of planning time (Li et al., 2015), the structure of participation (Farahanynia & Khatib, 2022), and the language used for planning (Lambert et al., 2021), have been shown to influence CAF in diverse manners. Previous studies have examined the trade-offs associated with various measures of oral performance. In particular, increased complexity in cognitive tasks adversely affects learners' limited attentional resources, compelling them to navigate a trade-off among the constructs of CAF (Skehan, 2023). For instance, when given sufficient time, learners often focus on enhancing fluency and syntactic complexity; however, these improvements frequently come at the expense of lexical complexity, accuracy, or functional adequacy (Khatib & Farahanynia, 2020; L. Li et al., 2015). Comparable patterns have been observed in research concerning L2 writing (e.g., Rahimi & Zhang, 2017; T.S. Xu & Zhang, 2023; T.S. Xu et al., 2023).

However, many aspects regarding the sources of planning are still inadequately examined. Foster and Skehan (1999) highlighted that the majority of planning research has concentrated

solely on individual planning, where participants engage in planning independently. It is crucial to recognize that individual planning cannot be the exclusive method employed in real classroom settings, particularly those that emphasize communicative language teaching and interaction. Collaborative planning is more likely to take place in authentic situations, particularly within a TBLT framework (Willis, 1996). Foster and Skehan also highlighted the importance of investigating the impact of teacher-directed planning, which is anticipated to enhance efficiency for learners who may pursue diverse activities during individual tasks. In summary, there appear to be educational advantages associated with each planning approach, and comprehensive research in this area is anticipated to assist language practitioners in making more informed pedagogical choices when performing tasks in L2 classrooms.

The ongoing debate regarding the impact of various planning types on CAF in L2 oral production persists, owing to the ambiguous and occasionally conflicting findings of earlier research. Therefore, it is essential to thoroughly investigate the effects of different planning procedures to enhance the existing knowledge and ultimately improve the efficacy of planning in L2 educational settings. This study attempts to examine how manipulating three distinct planning sources-individual, pair work, and guided- might affect L2 oral performance, evaluated in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

Method

Participants

Sixty male EFL learners at intermediate level, aged 18-20 (mean age 19.5), were randomly chosen from 136 students at an Iranian English language institute. No one has reported having been in any English-speaking country. Having studied English for 6-7 months in an instructed environment, they were classified as intermediate based on the institute's criteria and placement assessments. The Oxford Placement Test (OPT) was administered to verify participant' homogeneity, with scores ranging from 50-55 out of 100 (M = 54.24; SD = 1.01), confirming their comparable proficiency levels. The participants were randomly assigned to four groups of 15 each. All of them signed written consent forms at the outset of the study.

Speaking Task

Following Skehan and Foster's (1999) approach, a monologic decision-making task was used, requiring participants to select survival items for a two-week desert island stay. This task type was selected for its non-dialogic nature and its previous use in task-type research (e.g., Foster & Skehan, 1996; Skehan & Foster, 1997), facilitating the comparison of results with previous investigations. Additional information regarding the task can be found in Appendix A.

Measurement of the CAF Triad

In order to evaluate the quality of the participants' spoken output, the criteria for measuring fluency, accuracy, and complexity were established for the segmentation, coding, and scoring of the recorded audio data. The CAF triad (complexity, accuracy, fluency) was measured using established metrics from previous oral production studies (e.g., Foster & Skehan, 1996; Geng & Ferguson, 2013; Wendel, 1997; Yuan & Ellis, 2003). Fluency was assessed through pruned speech rate (words per minute excluding false starts and fillers). Accuracy was calculated as the percentage of error-free clauses, considering syntactic, morphological and lexical errors. Complexity was determined by the ratio of total clauses to AS units. AS-unit is defined as ". . . a single speaker's utterance consisting of an independent clause or sub-clausal unit, together with any subordinate clause(s) associated with it" (Foster et al., 2000, p. 365).

Procedure

Consistent with earlier studies (e.g., Foster & Skehan, 1996; Geng & Ferguson, 2013; Ortega, 1999; Yuan & Ellis, 2003), participants in planning conditions received 10 minutes for pre-task preparation and were instructed to utilize the entire planning period. While note-taking was allowed during planning, these notes could not be used while performing the task. For those in the guided condition, the researcher provided planning guidelines addressing both content and language, verbally explaining the task and reading the guidelines aloud to participants. The participants' attention was drawn first to content by asking several 'priming' questions. (e.g., "*Will you take a sleeping bag if you want to live on a desert island?*"). Then, the researcher concentrated on grammar and lexical items: for instance, participants were recommended to deploy transition words or phrases (e.g., "*..furthermore,. however...,finally*") so that it is easy for listeners to follow what they are saying. (see Appendix B). When the participants asked for help, they were assisted

with the lexis and grammar suggestions. Meanwhile, those assigned to individual and paired conditions proceeded with the task without interference. The control group, lacking pre-task planning time, began the task immediately. Following the planning phase, each participant delivered a 4-5 minute oral presentation, which was recorded and transcribed for evaluating complexity, accuracy and fluency.

Results

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics showing fluency, complexity, and accuracy measurements across all planning conditions.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Fluency, Complexity and Accuracy Measurements

Measures		Individual condition	Pair condition	guided condition	No planning
Fluency	Means	74.45	79.91	64.28	60.28
Speech rate	SD	5.75	7.54	7.81	7.92
Complexity	Means	1.61	1.41	1.35	1.03
Clauses per AS-unit	SD	.25	.23	.31	.27
Accuracy	Means	3.78	3.91	3.65	6.15
Errors per 100 words	SD	.57	.49	.64	.48

The data clearly shows that no planning yields notably lower scores across fluency, complexity and accuracy compared to other conditions. Fluency scores peak in pair work and individual planning, both surpassing the guided condition. Individual planning yields the highest complexity scores, with pair work and guided conditions following in descending order; pair work participants produced marginally more complex language than those in the guided condition. For accuracy, the guided condition demonstrates superior results compared to other approaches. Overall, these results suggest that pair work and individual planning better facilitate fluency than guided planning, while guided planning enhances accuracy, and individual planning achieves the most balanced results across all three measures.

A MANOVA was conducted to evaluate how no planning and pre-task planning affected oral performance. The analysis revealed a significant main effect for planning condition (Wilks' Lambda .122, F = 12.76, p = .001), warranting further comparison between the no-planning condition and the three pre-task planning conditions. Table 2 demonstrates these findings.

Table 2. Simple Contrasts: No Planning vs. Guided Pre-task Planning

Variable	Contrast	Contrast estimate	Sig.
Fluency	No planning vs. guided planning	5.482	.045
	No planning vs. pair work planning	17.967	.001
	No planning vs. individual planning	16.186	.001
complexity	No planning vs. guided planning	.302	.002
	No planning vs. pair work planning	.274	.004
	No planning vs. individual planning	.491	.001
Accuracy	No planning vs. guided planning	-1.470	.001
	No planning vs. pair work planning	-1.252	.001
	No planning vs. individual planning	-1.611	.001

The data demonstrate that the no planning control condition is significantly different and lower than all of the pre-task planning conditions. This result is not surprising and aligns with earlier studies (e.g., Foster & Skehan, 1996; Ortega, 1999; Yuan & Ellis, 2003), which showed that pre-task planning benefits fluency and complexity. In this instance, a beneficial effect on accuracy was also observed.

A MANOVA was conducted to identify variations among the three planning conditions. Results revealed a statistically significant difference in oral performance linked to planning condition source, $F(7, 60) = 2.443$, $p = 0.002$, Wilk's Lambda= 0.370, $\eta 2 = 0.215$. Following this, the mean differences across the three planning conditions were examined using multiple one-way ANOVAs. Table 3 displays these ANOVA findings.

Table 3. One-way Analyses of Variance (ANOVAs) for CAF Measurements

Variable	Sum of squares	*df*	Mean square	*F*	P value
complexity	0.104	2	0.052	1.200	0.112
Accuracy	0.002	2	0.001	0.185	0.333
Fluency	763.698	2	381.849	8.2	0.001*

Note: * = significant at $p < 0.05$

The ANOVA findings indicate variations in fluency, complexity, and accuracy measurements across the three planning sources studied, with fluency showing a significant F-value of 8.2 ($p < .05$). The Tukey post hoc analysis revealed that pair work and individual planning yielded significantly higher fluency compared to guided planning ($p = .001$ and $p = .003$), while no meaningful fluency difference emerged between pair work and individual planning. The results suggest that guided planning did not lead to notably higher accuracy levels compared to other planning conditions, despite slightly higher mean scores. Likewise, individual planning failed to produce significantly greater complexity levels than other conditions, though the mean scores showed a slight advantage.

Discussion

This study set out to investigate the role of pre-task planning conditions in task performance. It examined how guided, pair, and individual planning conditions affect L2 spoken output in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency. It was found that the oral performance of learners improved due to pre-task planning. The findings support Skehan's (1998) proposal of a dual-mode system. Skehan argues that the rule-based system is likely to be "parsimoniously and elegantly organized, with rules being compactly structured" (p. 89). To access this system, task performers require additional time and focus. Consequently, when learners are provided with sufficient time and are not under time constraints, they may utilize their rule-based system. The application of this rule-based system in oral production accounts for a higher level of CAF metrics (Ellis et al., 2020). The research findings also aligns with information processing theory, which posits that human processing capacity is limited, preventing speakers from concentrating on all language aspects

during task performance. Additionally, the findings support Swain's (1985) output hypothesis, which asserts that speaking requires actual verbalization. In terms of task performance, pre-task planning encourages learners to recognize and address their weaknesses during their performance.

Consistent with prior research (e.g., Foster &Skehan, 1996; Khoram, 2019; Ortega, 1999; Sasayama, & Izumi, 2012; Yuan & Ellis, 2003), planning generally enhanced task performance. However, this study revealed stronger effects, showing substantial benefits of guided pre-task planning across all measures, including accuracy, whereas Foster and Skehan (1999) found only minor accuracy differences between planning conditions. This aligns with Levelt's speech production model (1989), suggesting that the psycholinguistic benefits of planning time enhanced access to lexical and grammatical resources and reduced cognitive load—enabled more accurate language production. The no-planning group, lacking preparation time, may have approached the task less seriously, potentially compromising accuracy efforts. This indicates that absence of planning could have negative affective and psycholinguistic consequences.

The study also revealed that guided planning somewhat improved accuracy, supporting Foster and Skehan (1999) and Geng and Ferguson (2013), while individual planning enhanced complexity. However, unlike Foster and Skehan (1999), these differences were not statistically significant, possibly due to limited sample size and different measurement criteria. The findings indicated that directing EFL learners' focus towards content and form enhances their ability to produce the linguistic elements with greater precision. Mochizuki and Ortega (2008) suggested that focused guided planning can positively influence accuracy. While Mochizuki and Ortega's study and the present investigation are not directly comparable due to differences in planning types, the overall results may support the effectiveness of guided planning in enhancing accuracy in the oral production of EFL learners, reinforcing the assertion that guided planning offers significant advantages in terms of accuracy (Mochizuki & Ortega, 2008).

The results of the current study regarding the efficacy of guided planning chime with previous research findings in relation to the beneficial impacts of planning on L2 oral performance (Lambert, Aubrey, & Leeming, 2021; Li, Chen, & Sun, 2015). Ellis et al. (2019) discuss one reason for the effectiveness of guided planning, asserting that pre-task instruction and practice may encourage learners to utilize the target structures or concepts more frequently. Furthermore, concerning the efficacy of guided planning, other scholars have reported beneficial outcomes. For

instance, Ahmadian (2012) emphasize that guided discussions assisted students in conceptualizing and organizing their ideas more effectively. In a similar vein, Ogawa (2016) found that teacher-led planning positively influences oral production. It can be posited that through pre-task planning, teachers not only facilitate the activation and extension of students' resources but also enhance their capabilities (Samuda, 2001).

Further analysis revealed varying effects of planning conditions on CAF measures. Pair-work planning significantly enhanced fluency compared to guided and individual planning, aligning with Geng and Ferguson (2013) but contradicting Foster and Skehan (1999). The latter found no advantages of group-work planning for any CAF measures. These conflicting results likely stem from differences in task types, fluency measurements, and planning group sizes. While this study and Geng and Ferguson (2013) focused on pairs, Foster and Skehan (1999) examined larger groups. Pairs may utilize planning time more effectively than larger groups, which often show considerable variation in collaborative efficiency (see e.g., Storch, 2002; Foster, 1998). The superior fluency of pair planners might be attributed to their mutual assistance in object identification and selection justification, essentially functioning as task rehearsal. This practice potentially enhanced cognitive processing during conceptualization, as described in Levelt's (1989) model, leading to more fluent task performance (Ahmadian & Tavakoli, 2011; Bygate, 2001).

Conclusion

This research seeks to provide empirical evidence about how pre-task planning is organized in TBLT classrooms and determine implementation factors that could reduce tasks' cognitive load for language learners while predictably directing performers' attention to specific language aspects (Skehan, 1998). It showed that task completion conditions significantly impact how tasks are ultimately performed. However, although a great deal of effort was put in to avoid some of the design, assessment, and analytic defects, several limitations need to be acknowledged. First, this research is constrained by its limited sample size, restricted dependent variable measures, and notably, its lack of ecological validity due to laboratory testing conditions. Thus, caution should be exercised when interpreting and extending these results to other learning environments. Second, despite the efforts made to select supplementary and separate measures, this investigation is still fairly limited with regard to the assessment of complexity, accuracy, and fluency. Future

investigations, hence, necessitate the utilization of more precise and profound assessments to measure these three constructs.

The findings of this study, along with Foster and Skehan (1999) and Geng and Ferguson (2013), suggests that while Pair/group work pre-task planning may enhance fluency, alternative planning approaches offer distinct advantages. Guided planning tends to improve accuracy rather than fluency, while individual planning promotes complexity. These findings are significant as TBLT methodology has often overlooked the value of guided and individual planning approaches. Individual planning strengthens learner autonomy, enables content selection, and allows for personal practice. However, it requires learners to rely solely on their own linguistic and metacognitive resources, which some may find overwhelming.

Pair/group work, particularly associated with TBLT, offers clear potential advantages both pedagogically and theoretically (as shown by Long & Porter, 1985; Pica & Doughty, 1985; Ahmadian & Long, 2021). However, research indicates these benefits are not consistently achieved (Foster, 1998; Storch, 1999, 2002). Results can sometimes yield minimal meaning negotiation, limited output modification, and subpar discourse quality - factors largely dependent on group composition, interaction quality, collaborative willingness, and related variables.

Each planning condition presents unique advantages and limitations, potentially affecting fluency, complexity, and accuracy differently. For example, pair/group planning typically enhances fluency rather than accuracy. Teachers should therefore diversify pre-task planning approaches instead of relying solely on pair/group work. This challenges the misconception that TBLT mandates small group work exclusively. Further research is needed on various effects of planning conditions during both pre-task planning and task execution before definitive recommendations can be made. Studies should examine how learner characteristics interact with different planning conditions in affecting performance measures. Future research might also explore how various task types (personal, narrative, information exchange) differently impact oral production.

References

Ahmadian, M. (2011). The effect of 'massed' task repetitions on complexity, accuracy and fluency: does it transfer to a new task? *The Language Learning Journal, 39*, 269- 280.

Ahmadian, M. J. (2012). The effects of guided careful online planning on complexity, accuracy, and fluency in intermediate EFL learners' oral production: The case of English articles. *Language Teaching Research, 16*, 127–147.

Ahmadian, M. J., & Long, M. H. (Eds.) (2021). *The Cambridge handbook of task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

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

Ahmadian, M. J., Tavakoli, M., & Vahid Dastjerdi, H. (2015). The combined effects of online planning and task structure on complexity, accuracy, and fluency of L2 speech. *The Language Learning Journal, 43*, 41-56.

Bui, G., & Huang, Z. (2018). L2 fluency as influenced by content familiarity and planning: performance, measurement, and pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research, 22*, 94–114.

Bygate, M. (2001). Effects of task repetition on the structure and control of oral language. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 23-48). London: Longman.

Crooks, G. (1989). Planning and interlanguage variation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11*, 367–383.

Dawadi, S. (2019). Roles of planning and tasks in EFL performance. *TESL-EJ, 23*(2). Available online: http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume23/ej90/ej90a8/.

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

Ellis, R. (2004). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2005a). *Planning and task performance in a second language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ellis, R. (2005b). Planning and task-based performance: theory and research. In R. Ellis (Ed.). *Planning and task performance in a second language* (pp. 3–34). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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*, 474-509.

Ellis, R. (2017). Position paper: Moving task-based language teaching forward. *Language Teaching, 50*, 507-526.

Ellis, R., Li, S., Zhu, Y. (2019). The effects of pre-task explicit instruction on the performance of a focused task. *System, 80*, 38–47.

Ellis, R., Skehan, P., Li, S., Shintani, N., & Lambert, C. (2020). *Task-based language teaching: Theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.

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.

Farahanynia, M., & Khatib, M. (2022). Participatory structure of planning and cognitive task complexity in L2 oral performance: A processing perspective. *Language Learning Journal*, *50*, 777–802.

Foster, P. (1998). A classroom perspective on the negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics, 19*, 1-23.

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

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.

Foster, P., Tonkyn, A., & Wigglesworth, G. (2000). Measuring spoken language: A unit for all reasons. *Applied Linguistics*, *21*, 354–375.

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

Johnson, M.D., & Tabari, M.A. (2022). Task planning and oral L2 production: A Research synthesis and meta-analysis. *Applied Linguistics*, *43*, 1143–1164

Khatib, M., & Farahanynia, M. (2020). Planning conditions (strategic planning, task repetition, and joint planning), cognitive task complexity, and task type: Effects on L2 oral performance. *System*, *93*, Article 102297.

Khoram, A. (2019).The impact of task type and pre-task planning condition on the accuracy of intermediate EFL learners' oral performance. *Cogent Education, 6*, 1675466.

Kormos, J. (2006). *Speech production and second language acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kormos, J. (2011). Speech production and the cognition hypothesis. In P. Robinson (Ed.),*Second language task complexity: Researching the cognition hypothesis of language learning and performance* (pp. 39–60). John Benjamins.

Lambert, C., Aubrey, S., & Leeming, P. (2021). Task preparation and second language speech production. *TESOL Quarterly*, *55*, 331–365.

Levelt, W. (1989). *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Li, L., Chen, J., & Sun, L. (2015). The effects of different lengths of pre-task planning time on L2 learners' oral test performance. *TESOL Quarterly, 49*, 38-66.

Long, M., & Porter, P. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*, 207-228.

Mehnert, U. (1998). The effects of different lengths of time for planning on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20*, 83–108.

Mochizuki, N., & Ortega, L. (2008). Balancing communication and grammar in beginning level foreign language classrooms: A study of guided planning and relativization. *Language Teaching Research*, *12*, 11–37.

Ortega, L. (1999). Planning and focus on form in L2 oral performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21,* 109–148.

Pica, T., & Doughty, C. (1985). Input and interaction in the communicative language classroom: A comparison of teacher-fronted and group activities. In S. M. Gass, & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 115-132). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Qin, J. (2019). Effects of repeated practice in pre-task planning on the acquisition of English personal pronouns by Chinese EFL learners. *System, 81*, 100- 109.

Qin, J. (2022). Potential contribution of SFL to task-based research: An examination of planning effects using genre-based theme analysis. *System, 104*, 102695.

Qin, J., & Zhang, Y. (2022). Pre-task planning and discourse cohesion: Analysis of Chinese EFL learners' referential use in oral narratives. *Language Teaching Research, 26*, 60-78.

Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L.J. (2017). Effects of task complexity and planning conditions on L2 argumentative writing production. *Discourse Processes*, *55*, 726–742.

Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, cognitive measures, and syllabus design: A triadic framework for examining task influences on SLA. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 287–318). Cambridge University Press.

Samuda, V. (2001) Guiding relationships between form and meaning during task performance: The role of the teacher. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain, (Eds.), *Researching pedagogical tasks: Second language learning, teaching, and assessment* (pp.119–140). London: Longman.

Sasayama, S., & Izumi, S. (2012). Effects of task complexity and pre-task planning on Japanese EFL learners' oral production. In A. Shehadeh, & C. Coombe (Eds.), *Task-based language teaching in foreign language contexts: Research and implementation* (pp. 23-42). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 17*, 38–62.

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

Skehan, P. (2009). Modeling second language performance: Integrating complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexis. *Applied Linguistics*, *30*, 510–32.

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

Skehan, P. (2023). Limited attention capacity and cognition: Two hypotheses regarding second language performance on tasks. In M. Bygate (Ed.), *Domains and directions in the development of TBLT* (pp. 123–156). Benjamins.

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1997). Task type and task processing conditions as influences on foreign language performance. *Language Teaching Research, 1,* 185–211.

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1999).The influence of task structure and processing conditions on narrative retellings. *Language Learning, 49*, 93–120.

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (2001). Cognition and tasks. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 183–205). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (2008). Complexity, accuracy, fluency and lexis in task-based performance: A meta-analysis of the Ealing research. In S. Van Daele, A. Housen, F. Kuiken, M. Pierrard, & I. Vedder, (Eds.). *Complexity, accuracy, and fluency in second language use, learning, & teaching,* (pp. 207-226). Wetteren: KVAB Universa Press.

Song, J.-Y. & Lee, J.-H. (2015). The effects of planning time and the number of elements on EFL learners' speaking performance. *Modern English Education, 16*, 59-80.

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

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

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass and C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-252). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury.

Tavakoli, P., & Skehan, P. (2005). Strategic planning, task structure, and performance testing. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Planning and task performance* (pp. 239-273). Amsterdam/Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

VanPatten, B. (1990). Attending to content and form in the input: An experiment in consciousness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12*(2), 287–301.

VanPatten, B. (2002). Processing instruction: An update. *Language Learning*, *52*, 755–803.

Wendel, J. (1997). *Planning and second language narrative production*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Japan.

Wigglesworth, G. (1997). An investigation of planning time and proficiency level on oral test discourse. *Language Testing, 14*, 85–106.

Wills, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Longman.

Xu, T.S., & Zhang, L.J. (2023). Effects of cognitive task complexity and online planning on second language learners' argumentative writing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, Article 1121994.

Xu, T.S., Zhang, L.J., & Gaffney, J.S. (2023). A multidimensional approach to assessing the effects of task complexity on L2 students' argumentative writing. *Assessing Writing*, *55*, Article 100690.

Yuan, F., & Ellis, R. (2003). The effects of pre-task and online planning on fluency, complexity and accuracy in L2 monologic oral production. *Applied Linguistics, 24*, 1-27.

Alireza KHORAM obtained his M.A in English Language Teaching from Allameh Tabataba'i University of Tehran and his PhD in Applied Linguistics from Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Iran. He has published a number of papers in scholarly journals and his main areas of research center on second language acquisition, teacher education, task-based language teaching and materials development.

Appendix A.

Tasks and Task Instructions

Decision-Making Task: how to survive on a desert island

Situation

You will need to survive on a small, isolated island surrounded by the sea for a duration of two weeks. You are permitted to bring a few small items to assist you in surviving on this island. Please review the following lists of items provided to you. You may select only four items from each category. It is essential that you make a decision regarding which items to take and provide justifications for your choices.

Group 1: *Food*: Fresh water, water-purification tablets, tea, coffee, beer, alcohol, milk, canned baked beans, dry tomato soup, meat, fresh vegetables, fruit, oil, salt, sugar.

Group 2: *Other essentials*: Knife, dishes, lighter, watch, bow and arrows, first aid kit, ropes, fishing pole, batteries, pillow, sleeping bag, sheet, extra clothes, favourite book, radio, paper and pen.

Task Instructions

You will have 10 minutes to prepare your presentation either with your partner, independently, or with the teacher. Planning guidelines are provided to assist you in structuring both the content and language of your presentation. You are encouraged to take notes, which you may refer to during the task. Following this preparation, you will need to present independently. Feel free to convey your thoughts on the subject matter. The duration of your presentation should be between 4 to 5 minutes. I hope you find this activity enjoyable. Please activate the recorder at the beginning of your planning session and deactivate it after your 5-minute presentation.

The no planning condition

I would like you to begin with the task. Please feel free to share your thoughts on this subject. Your presentation should last between 4 to 5 minutes. I hope you find this activity enjoyable. Kindly activate the recorder at the start of your talk and deactivate it after 5 minutes of speaking.

Appendix B. Written Planning Guidelines

Decision-making task: how to survive on a desert island

a) Content

1. Consider the potential challenges you might face and the strategies to address these challenges.

2. Identify four essential items that could aid in your survival on the island.

3. Provide a rationale for your selection of these items.

b) Language

1. Reflect on the vocabulary necessary to discuss this subject.

For instance, consider using adjectives or phrases when describing something or sharing your views, such as (un)necessary, (un)essential, luxurious, redundant, practical, valuable, handy, convenient, useful, available…

2. Reflect on the grammatical structures you may require.

For instance, contemplate how to structure your speech by incorporating transition words or phrases, such as *first, second, finally, however, in addition, besides, though, what's more*… to ensure that it is easy for your audience to follow your message.

●Pay attention to tenses and the correct forms of verbs.

●The introduction and conclusion of the presentation.