

Students learners Effect of Strategic Planning vs. Task-Repetition on Iraqi Intermediate EFL Learners` writing Performance: A case study of Baghdad University

Dunya shakir khaleel

dunyashakir93@gmail.com

Baghdad college for Economics university

College of education

Abstract

The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of strategic planning versus task-repetition on writing performance of Foreign Language Learners of English at Baghdad University, Iraq. In the present study 60 (20 males and 40 females) Iraqi EFL learners participated. They were intermediate students of Baghdad University. They were in three groups, two experimental groups and one control group. Each group contained 20 participants. Participants in one experimental group wrote one task based on strategic planning with familiarizing students with lexical and grammatical items which were necessary for completing the task and in another experimental group students wrote one task twice (task repetition). In control group students wrote the task with no planning condition (traditional writing). The collected data was analyzed using Kruksal-Willas test. The results of data analysis showed strategic planning and task-repetition had significant effect on learners` grammatical accuracy, but there was not any significant effect on writing performance of learners regarding fluency. No significant different effect was found between strategic planning and task-repetition on writing performance of learners in terms of grammatical accuracy and fluency.

Key terms: Writing, Planning, Strategic Planning, Task–Repetition, Accuracy, Fluency

تأثير التخطيط الاستراتيجي مقابل تكرار المهام على أداء الكتابة لدى متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية
كلغة أجنبية في المستوى المتوسط في العراق: دراسة حالة جامعة بغداد

م.م. دنيا شاكر خليلي

كلية بغداد للعلوم الاقتصادية الجامعة/ كلية التربية

ملخص

هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى دراسة تأثير التخطيط الاستراتيجي مقابل تكرار المهام على الأداء الكتابي لمتعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية بلغات أجنبية في جامعة بغداد، العراق. شارك في هذه الدراسة 60 طالباً عراقياً (20 ذكراً و40 أنثى) من متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، وهم طلاب في المرحلة المتوسطة بجامعة بغداد. قُسموا إلى ثلاث مجموعات: مجموعتان تجريبيتان ومجموعة ضابطة. ضمت كل مجموعة 20 مشاركاً. كتب المشاركون في المجموعة التجريبية مهمة واحدة تعتمد على التخطيط الاستراتيجي مع تعريف الطلاب بالمفردات والقواعد اللازمة لإكمال المهمة، وفي المجموعة التجريبية الأخرى كتب الطلاب مهمة واحدة مرتين (تكرار المهمة). في المجموعة الضابطة، كتب الطلاب المهمة دون شرط التخطيط (الكتابة التقليدية). حُلّت البيانات المُجمّعة باستخدام اختبار كروكسال-ويلاس. أظهرت نتائج تحليل البيانات أن للتخطيط الاستراتيجي وتكرار المهام تأثيراً كبيراً على دقة القواعد النحوية لدى المتعلمين، ولكن لم يكن هناك أي تأثير

كبير على أداء المتعلمين الكتابي فيما يتعلق بالطلاقة. ولم يتم العثور على تأثير مختلف بشكل كبير بين التخطيط الاستراتيجي وتكرار المهام على أداء الكتابة لدى المتعلمين من حيث الدقة النحوية والطلاقة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الكتابة، التخطيط، التخطيط الاستراتيجي، تكرار المهام، الدقة، الطلاقة.

Introduction

Strategic planning's popularity in public organizations cannot be denied (Vandermission 2023). In terms of language learning, writing is probably the most difficult skill to acquire. It is something most native speakers never master and is more challenging for second language learners (Khorasani & Sadzadeh, 2015). As Chastain (1988) stated writing is not only a way of communication through which language

learners can express what is going on in their minds, but also it can help language learning with its “unique feature” (p.244) .

According to Hyalnd (2003) nowadays, the teaching of writing occupies a much further essential situation in the field of second or foreign language teaching rather than two or three decades ago. He states that it is related to the relativity of network communication on writing skill. A growing body of research has been dedicated to exploring the different aspect of taskbased language teaching (Salimi, Alaviani, Hosseini, & Shafaei, 2012).

Task type may be one of the critical factors in finding out if writers are able to automatize certain characteristics of writing tasks involve with additional cognitive load to process those aspects (Foster & Skehan, 1996; Franka & Haslett, 2002, 1994, cited in Rezazade, Tavakoli & Eslami-Rasekh, 2011).

Another factor which impacts on learners' performance is planning task or task condition, according to Ellis (2005) task-based planning is categorized into pre-task and withintask planning. These two categories are different from each other based on the time which is dedicated to the planning that takes place before or during the task performance. Bui (2014) considered task readiness as an alternative theoretical framework to planning. Therefore, the researcher aims to find the effects of task readiness (strategic planning and task -repetition) on narrative task on Iraqi EFL learners ` writing output.

Due to the practicality and beneficiary of task-based language teaching in classes and importance of task in learning English as a foreign language, this study devoted its exploration on utilizing different tasks in writing skill to find out whether any changes occurred on learners `writing performance. To the researcher experience, learners of English as a foreign language had difficulty in writing performance due to its complex and generative phase of this skill. Therefore, researcher

preferred to work on the ways to enhance the writing skills by using task (story telling picture) to explore the effectiveness of task on learners' production in their writing skills.

Statement of the problem

The effective teaching strategy in writing class must be considered to get the best students' writing (Rianti et. al 2022). Writing skill is one of the problematic areas for EFL learners. Both educators and teachers are concerned with a more efficient and useful methods of teaching which can best meet learners' need. In writing, planning (task condition) is the most important issue which creates more organized and process-oriented task (Bagheridoust & Allahyari, 2013). Since planning is considered as one of the task implementations factors that is manipulated by variation in time and also utilizing different type of task such as descriptive and narrative tasks, learners and teacher can observe the learners' performances in different situation. Besides, Bui (2014) believes that these findings can be useful for syllabus design, material development and in second language theory as well (Rahimpour & Safari, 2011; Williams and Burden, 1997).

This study the researcher aims to find the probable differences of task readiness on narrative writing performance of learners. **Research**

Questions

The following research questions were proposed to address the purpose of this study:

Q1: Does task strategic planning versus task-repetition have any significant different effect on Iraqi Intermediate EFL learners' grammatical accuracy in writing performance?

Q2: Does strategic planning versus task-repetition have any significant different effect on

Iraqi Intermediate EFL learners' fluency in writing performances?

Research Hypotheses

H01: Strategic planning versus task–repetition does not have any significant different effect on Iraqi EFL learners’ grammatical accuracy in writing performance.

H02: Strategic planning versus task repetition does not have any significant different effect on Iraqi EFL learners’ fluency in writing performance.

Review of Literature

Task based language teaching in writing

Many TBLT research studies have investigated oral language production and, accordingly, there is a paucity of task–based research on written language production (Ong & Zhang, 2010, cited in salami & Dadashpour, 2012). Written proficiency can be regarded as an aspect of language proficiency; it includes the ability to produce both a variety of genres and rhetorical features, and a range of vocabulary and systematic structures (Wolf–Quintero, Inagaki and Kim 1998: 2, cited in Palviainen, Kalaja & Mantyla, 2012).

Based on Grabe and Kaplan (1996) and Johns (1997) the text produced by EFL writers is always, as in any other writing situation, the product of a socio–cognitive process requiring complex cognitive abilities, linguistic and cultural competence as well. To develop such competence, as Cabral (2004) mention, the teacher should assume a non–traditional role in classroom, which implies his/her ability to identify students’ problem and to facilitate collaborative construction of knowledge. The teacher also needs to know the sociocultural needs of the students to be able to challenge them and to promote their involvement with the task presented (e.g., writing a letter asking for/giving advice).

This writing task was designed according to methodological principles of the TBLT: it provided time for negotiation between the teacher and

the students, and among the students themselves; it included real communicative language activities; it allowed the students to think about topics that interest them and also to share their opinions on these same topics (cited in AshariTabar & Alavi, 2013).

The traditional form-focused and product-oriented instruction has been the dominate method of teaching Iraqi students to write in their L2. So as the result, the errors in the surface level have been omitted and the focus has shifted to the final products within an emphasis on accuracy. TBLT establishes the strong version of communicative language teaching (Ellis, 2003). Although, through the use of focus on form in TBLT, lessons can be interrupted by providing focus to linguistic difficulties as and when it is necessary to aid communication (Long, 1990). This interruption could come from the speaker who raises questions about his own linguistic gaps, the teacher, or other learners. Researchers such as Nunan (1989) and Ellis (2003) claim that interactional feedback, negotiation of meaning, attention to form, and modified language output that occur as a result of focus on form could potentially promote L2 learning (cited in Ismail, Abd. Samad, Bee Eng & Noordin, 2012).

According to Bagheri (2007) due to this focus on the final product, Iraqi learners have had little opportunity to edit and revise their texts or to interact with peers or on instructor during the completion of writing tasks. Thus, Iraqi learners have failed to achieve a high level of L2 writing proficiency partly because of these form-focused, product-oriented instructional practices. With the rise of communicative language teaching in Iraq since the late 1983, a pedagogical shift from a traditional, product-oriented approach to a processoriented approach has been motivated to enhance L2 writing abilities in communicative way.

Some researchers such as Riazi and Riasati (2011) have proposed that prewriting exercises, multiple drafting cycles, interaction through instructor feedback, or peer review sessions would be beneficial to Iraqi learners from the process-oriented perspective. (Cited in Panahi, 2013). TBLT organizes the learning process by tasks to be performed in the target language not by functions, notions, topics, and structures. Task-based language teaching, which requires learners to transact tasks resembling their real-life language needs, demands language learners to perform planning at different stages of their learning (cited in Alavi & Tabar ,2012).

Tasks

Considered as language learning goals, tasks are activities in which a person engages to attain an objective, and which necessitate the use of language (Van den Branden, 2006). In a similar vein, Richards and Renandya (2002) define a task as an activity that learners carry out using their available language resources and leads to a real outcome. Finally, Samuda and Bygate (2008) consider a task as a holistic pedagogical activity that involves language use and has a pragmatic, non-linguistic outcome (cited in Alavi & AshariTabar, 2012).

Planning

Planning for TBLT can happen in different levels, such as linguistic elements plan (eg. choice of words or phrases) sentences plan, structure plan (Clark & Clark, 1977, cited in Bagheridoust & Allahyari Fakoor, 2013). In writing research, planning has been considered as a kind of reflection that is associated with other reflective processes like inferencing and decision making (Hayes & Gradwohle Nash, 1996). However, planning is believed to be different from other reflective processes because it happens in a different environment from the task itself. Hayes and Gradwohle Nash (1996)

divided planning into two types. The first type is process planning, which is related to the writer and the strategies used by him or her while writing and performing a task. The second type of planning according to them is text planning which refers to the content and form of written task. Ellis (2005) stated planning in task-based learning and teaching can be divided into pre-task planning and within-task planning. He also adds pre-task planning divided into rehearsal (provides learners 'opportunity to perform the task before the main performance) and strategic planning (learners' preparation of the subject of the task they will or perform or what Ellis (2005) states they" have access to the actual task materials." Within-task planning divided into pressured (learners need to engage in quick planning and also pressured task is the result of unplanned language discourse, learners don't have enough time) and unpressured (gave learners enough time to plan on line). Within-task planning is achieved by manipulating the time available to learner for on line planning (cited in Mehrang & Rahimpour, (2010) and Salimi, Alavinia & Hoseini, 2010).

Task type (genre mode) in writing

Task types may be one of the crucial factors in determining if writers are able to automatize certain features of writing tasks or deal with additional cognitive load to process those aspects (Foster and Skehan, 1996; Franken & Haslett, 2002; Sweller, 1994). Developing a text with main and supporting ideas is the certain goal for the writer trying to produce an effective text. Several strategies need awareness regarding the type of writing task and the genre of the text required. Its purpose as a message, its degree of formality, its layout, and its particular rhetorical structure are also definitive to consolidate the four sub-skills. Because beginners in writing needed to cope with basic grammar elements that supply them opportunities to provide relevant information through the construction of single meaningful paragraphs, the written

responses expected belonged to the genre of description (Brown, 2006). For example, argumentative writing requires writers to generate complex information, which makes it more demanding than descriptive writing. In contrast, descriptive writing is characterized as a task that has a clear inherent structure (Foster & Skehan, 1996), which requires writers to describe individual actions or characters (cited in Rezazade, Tavakoli & EslamiRasekh, 2011). Foster and Skehan's framework have been very influential in taskbased research within the cognitive framework. But there are also a number of other empirical studies that have shown that there are important differences in the language that learners produce while performing different tasks. These studies tend to look at particular features of learner language that vary by task. Two relevant studies to this research have found differences relating to task type in syntactic complexity (Duff 1986) and nominal and verbal constructions (Bygate 1999, *ibid*)

Duff (1986) investigated task type among eight pairs of non-native speakers. She focused on both quantity and quality of interaction in two tasks. One task required the participants to solve a problem together; the other assigned them different viewpoints on an issue which they had to debate. The quantity of their language production was measured in cunits, defined as "a word, phrase, or sentence that in some way contributed pragmatic or semantic meaning to a conversation". The quality was measured by the number of turns, types of questions, syntactic complexity. Results revealed that the problem-solving task generated more turns (per individual and for the whole task), and more c-units per task. The debate task resulted in more words per turn, more words per c-unit, and more syntactic complexity.

In another study, Bygate (1999) investigated the effects of two different tasks on grammatical complexity. Two argumentation tasks and two narrative tasks were used. Participants were asked to prioritize a list of

options in the argumentative task and in the narrative task they had to tell a story based on a series of pictures. Complexity was measured in terms of length of T-unit, subordination, number of verb arguments, and type of subordination. Findings suggested that the narrative task had more words per T-unit, but there was no significant difference considering the use of subordination. Results showed that the argumentation task presented a language that contained more ‘verbal’, while the narrative task had more ‘nominal’ output. Bygate’s results offer further proof of the often-unexpected differences in learner speech on different tasks. It is evident from the above studies that the type of task presented to learners can lead to great variability in the results (ibid). Huot (1990) reviewed five studies that specifically examined the role of genre or discourse mode on the writing performance of secondary and postsecondary writers. Of the five studies he reviewed, three of the studies found syntactical differences (Crowhurst, 1980; Nold & Freedman, 1977;

& Rosen, 1969) between 38 students’ writing in various genres, and one study found differences in number of T-units and overall length (Rosen, 1969). In Quellmalz, Capel, and Chou’s (1982) study of 11th and 12th-grade students, the researchers examined the effects of genre on raters’ perceptions of writing quality. Students were asked to write a narrative and expository response and were evaluated using five different criteria: general impression, focus, organization, support, and mechanics. Quellmalz *et al.* (1982) found that the levels of performance varied based on the different genre modes. As a result, they warned that educators should be hesitant to judge a student’s writing ability based on one writing sample in a single genre or form. Based on this assumption the researcher study is on two modes of genre: narrative and descriptive in different condition. Narrative task type is referred to the rendition of an event from a certain perspective, a related

happening, with a focus on the process of telling it, on the rendition itself (Cihodariu, 2012).

According to Alavi and AshariTabar (2012) reports the effect of task type and pre – task planning condition on the accuracy of Intermediate EFL learners` writing performance was investigated. 120 intermediate EFL students were randomly assigned to 3 experimental groups and one control group. While experimental groups were subjected to different pre-task planning conditions (individual, paired, and group), the control group performed tasks without any planning. During the treatment they experienced task modeling, presentation and completion. A factorial design was followed in this study, and data collected were analyzed through ANOVAS that showed task type and pre-task planning condition influenced the writing accuracy of the participants in a way that resulted in greater accuracy in the decisionmaking task in the experimental groups, so ensuring the effectiveness of the treatment in mitigating the long-standing problem of EFL learners in achieving higher levels of accuracy when a specific task type is concerned.

To affirm the effectiveness of teaching EFL learners through task-based procedure, Malmir (2008) investigated the effect of this approach on learners' quality of writing. He found that both experimental narrative and expository groups did significantly better than control narrative and expository groups who did not experience a task-based writing procedure. Then, it appears that the role of task types and planning conditions have not been explored in examining writing qualities of language learners in a foreign language learning context (cited in Alavi & AshariTabar,2012).

The results of statistical analysis showed that in decision making tasks, task complexity had significant effect on accuracy and fluency of learners, but it did not have significant effect on syntactic complexity. In case of information-gap tasks, data analysis revealed that there was

statistically significant effect of task complexity on three areas of linguistic performance. Also, the results revealed that there is a significant difference between two tasks in terms of fluency, but the difference was not so outstanding in terms of accuracy and syntactic complexity.

Methodology

Participants and Setting

In this study 60 Iraqi EFL learners participated. They were intermediate students in Baghdad University, Iraq. Convenient sampling was applied. The participants were in three groups, two experimental groups and one control group. Each group contained 20 Participants, 20 males and 40 females and their age ranged from 20 to 28. Arabic was the native language of the participants. The participants took part in English class twice a week.

Instrumentation

Oxford Placement Test

Version two of oxford Placement Test was utilized as a tool for homogenizing students` level.

Narrative Task

In this study for data collection the narrative task (story telling) was utilized for the writing as a pre-test task and also as a post-test task in three groups. Story telling task comprised six pictures and it was about a girl who wakes up in the morning and eats breakfast. She goes to the park and she has some problems with answering the phone. Students in three groups wrote narrative tasks based on picture story (Appendix B) with no planning condition for pretest. For collecting data as a post-test the same narrative task was used. Students were asked to write a story based on different parts of the picture in different condition. During posttest, in first experimental group strategic planning was used, teacher provided learners material (grammatical and lexical items which were

necessary for completing writing task) for their writing to help them, and in another experimental group students wrote the same task twice as a task–repetition without time interval. In control group learners used traditional writing with no planning condition and they wrote a narration based on story–telling pictures. Task of writing was validated by two experts. To make sure about the reliability of the writing `scores Inter–rater reliability was conducted. The participants' narrative accounts were rated in terms of their accuracy and fluency (AF), (Wolfe–Quintero et.al., 1998 and Polio's, 1997). AF was operationalized as follows: 1. Accuracy: the number of error–free T–units per T–unit; and 2. Fluency: the number of words per T–unit. The interrater reliability was estimated and the validity of the narrative tasks was confirmed by two experts.

Procedure

In this research, to homogenize students Oxford Placement Test (OPT) was administered to all participants at the beginning of the study. Students who scored one standard deviation below the mean and those who scored one standard deviation above the mean were selected as the participants of study. Pretest was adopted by asking learners in three groups to write the same narration with at least seventy words in 40 minutes, in this occasion learners wrote the narration base on sequence of pictures without planning, like traditional writing. In order to collect data as a post– test for the writing after one week, students wrote narrative in three groups, in one experimental group, at this time, before writing, 5 minutes were given to learners to plan their writing. After that, students wrote narrative task on strategic planning (Appendix B), in this occasion learners were familiarized with necessary grammatical and lexical items, they need to complete the writing task by their teacher. In another experimental group at first students wrote narrative task in twenty minutes based on sequence of the pictures on the story and then after a short break (10 minutes) they wrote the same

task for the second time in twenty minutes without intervention of their teacher (task–repetition). In control group students wrote the same narrative task with no planning condition (traditional writing), learners wrote the narration based on what they got from the pictures, and in order to make sure about the reliability of the scores taken from the students, the intra–rater method was done, and it was obtained through Cronbach alpha. Cronbach alpha yielded a score of 0.75 revealing acceptable and appropriate reliability. The recorded data were transcribed and analyzed according to their CAF Following WolfeQuintero et.al (1998) and Polio's (1997) guidelines.

The aim of this study was to find the effects of task readiness (strategic and task repetition) on grammatical accuracy and fluency on narrative task of learners' writing performance, and at the end students' results in three groups were compared by the use of spss software. In this study Kruskal – Wallis test was applied if the result was significant MannWhitney U test was conducted as a data analysis.

Results and discussions

Findings related to research question one

. The first research question investigated whether effect of strategic planning versus task repetition have any significant different effect on Iraqi EFL learners' grammatical accuracy in writing performance.

Q1: Does task strategic planning versus task –repetition have any significant different effect on Iraqi EFL learners' grammatical accuracy in writing performance?

H01: Strategic planning versus task repetition does not have any significant different effect on Iraqi EFL learners' grammatical accuracy in writing performance.

To answer this question, since data were non parametric Kruskal – Wallis test measured grammatical accuracy of learner's in writing

performance in three groups (two experimental group and one control group).

Test of Normality

Selecting a proper method in order to analyze data and draw conclusion about research hypotheses is in an indispensable step. Hence, being informed of how data were distributed is of great importance. In this study normality was assessed through using Kolmogorov–Smirnov test and also Shapiro–Wilk. Normality describes a symmetrical, bellshaped curve. Statistical hypotheses of normality test are as follows:

H1: Data are not normally distributed.

H0: data are normally distributed.

Table 1 shows p value in most of the variables are less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$) so the null hypothesis is rejected, and it indicates that the data were not normally distributed.

Consequently, non-parametric statistics can be utilized in order to analyze the data.

Table 1. *Test of Normality*

	Kolmogorov–Smirnov ^a			Shapiro–Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Accuracy pre –test 1	.241	20	.003	.839	20	.003
Accuracy post–test 1	.253	20	.002	.849	20	.005
Accuracy pre–test 2	.311	20	.000	.779	20	.000
Accuracy post–test 2	.164	20	.166	.922	20	.110
Accuracy control pre	.209	20	.022	.887	20	.024
Accuracy control post	.234	20	.005	.874	20	.014

Descriptive statistics

Table 2 provides statistics for each group's performance on two occasions pre–test and post– test and it included minimum, maximum, mean, standard deviation skewness and kurtosis of scores. It provides

descriptive statistic of grammatical accuracy for each group performance in pre-test and post-test. As depicts in the table, the first experimental group mean was 0.49 in pre-test and the standard deviation was 0.10. The mean and standard deviation of the post-test in first experimental group were 0.62 and 0.10 which shows a definite increase in scores. Also, table 2 shows that second experimental group had an improvement in the mean scores from the pre-test to the post-test, from 0.10 to 0.59, and there aren't any changes in the control group the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test are both the same and it showed the mean score of 0.44.

Table2. *Descriptive Statistics of Grammatical accuracy*

	<u>Min</u>	<u>Max</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Std. Deviation</u>	<u>Skewness</u>	<u>Kurtosis</u>
Accuracy pre-test.1	.30	.60	.4950	.10501	-.498	-1.001
Accuracy post test.1	.40	.80	.6250	.10195	-.890	.849
Accuracy pre-test.2	.30	.60	.5100	.10208	-.548	-1.225
Accuracy post-test.2	.40	.80	.5900	.12524	.029	-.938
Accuracy control pre-test	.30	.60	.4450	.09987	-.024	-.933
Accuracy control post-test	.30	.80	.4450	.13169	1.042	1.238

Inferential statistics of first research question

Kruskal-Wallis test revealed a statistically significant difference in optimism across three different groups in grammatical accuracy.

Table 3. *Kruskal-Wallis test*

Test Statistics^{a,b}	
Optimism	
Chi-Square	18.089
Df	2

Asymp. Sig. .000

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

Table 4. *Mean Rank (Kruskal–Wallis test)*

Ranks

group	N	Mean Rank
1	20	39.40
2	20	34.58
3	20	17.52
Total	60	

Table 4 shows the mean ranks of three groups in terms of accuracy. The mean rank of experimental group 1 and experimental group 2 are 39.40 and 34.58, there in comparison with group 3 (control group) with the mean rank of 17.52 two experimental group got better scores in Grammatical accuracy.

Table5. *Mean Rank group 1 with 3 (Mann–Whitney U test)*

Ranks

G	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
1	20	27.62	552.50
3	20	13.38	267.50
Total	40		

According to Table 5 the mean rank of group 3 (control group) is 13.62 and the mean rank in group 1 is 27.62. Therefore, the experimental group 1 gained better scores in comparison with control group.

Table 6. *Mann–Whitney U test group 1 with group 3*

Test Statistics^b

OPTIMISM

Mann–Whitney U 57.500 Wilcoxon W 267.500

Z -3.942

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) .000

Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)] .000^a

As Table 6 shows Mann–Whitney U test between group 1(experimental 1. task repetition) with group 3(control group) was assessed to compare two groups. P value showed 0.00 which is less than the 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). Hence, there was a significant difference

G	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	between
2	20	26.35	527.00	experimental
3	20	14.65	293.00	group 1 and
Total				control group.

Consequently, the experimental group had better performance in comparison with control group. **Table 7.** *Mean Rank Mann-Whitney U test between group 2 with group 3*

Ranks

40

As Table 7 shows the mean rank of group 3 is 14.65 and the mean rank in group 2 is 26.35. So, group 2 (experimental group) had better performance and getting better scores in comparison with control group 1.

Table 8. *Mann–Whitney U test between group 2 with group 3*

Test Statistics^b

OPTIMISM

Mann–Whitney U 83.000 Wilcoxon W 293.000

Z -3.228

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) .001

Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)] .001^a

Table 8 showed Mann–Whitney U test between group 2(experimental 2: strategic planning) with group 3(control group) was assessed to compare two groups. p value showed 0.00 which was less than the

0.05 ($p < 0.05$). Hence, there was a significant difference between experimental group 2 and control group. Consequently, the experimental group had better performance in comparison with control group.

Table 9. Mean Rank Mann–Whitney U test group 1 with group 2

Ranks

	G	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
1	20	22.28	445.50	
2	20	18.72	374.50	
	Total	40		

Table 10. Mann–Whitney U test group 1 with group 2

Test Statistics ^b		optimism
Mann-Whitney U		164.500
Wilcoxon W		374.500
Z		-.998
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.318
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	.341 ^a	
a. Not corrected for ties.		
b. Grouping Variable: VAR00006		

As Table 9 and table 10 shows Mann–Whitney U test between group 1(experimental 1: task repetition) with group 2(experimental 2: task repetition) was assessed to compare two groups. P value showed 0.31 which was more than the 0.05 ($\text{sig} > 0.05$). Hence, there aren't any statistically significant differences between two groups' performance. Although the mean rank of experimental group 1(task –repetition) was better than mean rank of another experimental group (strategic planning), there weren't any significant differences between two groups. Consequently, the null hypothesis related to research question one was accepted.

H01: Strategic planning versus task repetition does not have any significant different effect on Iraqi EFL learners' grammatical accuracy in writing performance.

Findings related to second research question

Q2: Does strategic planning versus task–repetition have any significant difference

effect on Iraqi EFL learners` fluency in writing performances?

To answer this question, the same process as it was for the first research question (grammatical accuracy) was conducted, and the result analyzed in SPSS software.

Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics was calculated for the second question that is shown in table 11. In this table also we see information such as mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis.

Table 11. *Descriptive Statistics of fluency*

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Fluency pre-test 1	20	10.00	15.00	12.1000	1.71372	.456	-1.320
Fluency pre-test 2	20	9.00	15.00	11.9500	2.01246	.592	-1.018
Fluency control pre	20	10.00	14.00	12.5500	1.60509	-.100	-1.276
Fluency post-test 1	20	10.00	19.00	13.1500	2.49789	.779	-.128
Fluency post-test 2	20	9.00	18.00	13.2500	2.59301	.177	-1.078
Fluency Control post	20	10.00	15.00	12.6500	1.66307	-.216	-1.459
Valid N	20						

Table 11 provides descriptive statistic of Fluency for each group performance in pretest and post–test. As is shown in the table, the calculated mean and standard deviation of scores for pre–test in the first experimental group are 12.10 and 1.71 and the mean and standard deviation for post–test in first experimental group are 13.15 and 2.49 which shows an increase. Also, for the second experimental group the mean scores increase from 11.95 to 13.25. In control group in pre–test the mean is 12.55 and there are not any changes in post– test and the mean score are 12.65.

Inferential statistics of the Second Research Question

Since data are not distributed normally, test of Kruskal –Wallis was used to compare learners' writing fluency performance in three groups (two experimental group and one control group).

Table 12. Mean Ranks Kruksal–Wallis test of fluency

Ranks			
	G	N	Mean Rank
fluency	1	20	30.98
	2	20	32.20
	3	20	28.32
Total		60	

As Table 12 shows the mean ranks in terms of fluency in first and second experimental groups are 30.98 and 32.20. The mean rank in control group 3 is 28.32. Therefore, there are slight differences among three groups and experimental group 2 had better performance. Consequently, no significant differences are found among mean ranks of three groups regarding fluency.

Table 13. Kruksal–Wallis test of fluency

Test Statistics ^{a,b}			
optimism			
Chi-Square	.525	df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.769		

As demonstrates in table 13 p value is 0.76 which is more than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$). Consequently, Kruskal–Wallis test isn't reveal a statistically significant difference in optimism across three different groups in fluency. There is also the mean rank table which shows there are not many changes among the mean ranks of three groups, the mean rank of control group is 28.32, the mean rank in experimental group one (task repetition) is 30.98 and the mean rank in second experimental group (strategic planning) is 32.20. We can conclude that

there isn't any statistically significant difference on Iraqi EFL learners' fluency in writing performance in three groups. So, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Discussion

According to Larsen–Freeman (2009) writing is non–linear and generative process and learners encounter different problems during a writing task. Therefore, in this study writing was under examination in terms of accuracy and fluency. The following section discusses the result that has been obtained from the data analysis. The present study investigates the effect of strategic planning versus task–repetition on Iraqi EFL learner's writing performances. As it was discussed in chapter two, Bui (2014) proposed the new concept of task readiness and he divided it into two groups (task external readiness and task internal readiness). In this study in one experimental group learners expose to strategic planning (task external) and in another experimental group task–repetition was utilized to enhance learners writing performance.

Strategic planning versus Task–repetition in writing regarding accuracy

In this section the research question and null hypothesis are as follow:

Q1: Does task strategic planning versus task –repetition have any significant different effect on Iraqi EFL learners' grammatical accuracy in writing performance?

H01: Strategic planning versus task repetition does not have any significant different effect on Iraqi EFL learners' grammatical accuracy in writing performance.

Regarding this question and non parametric data Kruksal–Wallis test was conducted. The p value of the test is 0.00 which was less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). So, there is a significant difference between three groups in writing performance in terms of accuracy. To find out which of the

group had significant effect with another group, Mann–Whitney U test was conducted to compare the groups two by two.

Bei (2013) believed that task–repetition have significant effect on learners` grammatical accuracy in their writing performance. Based on the result of this study which was conformed Bei`s findings, it can be concluded that, the sig value was 0.00 which was less than p value ($p<0.05$). So, using task–repetition in writing was effective in comparison with no–planning group in terms of grammatical accuracy, and utilizing strategic planning again showed significant effect on accuracy of the learners` writing performance in comparison with the control group with no planning in their writing with the p value of 0.00 which was less than 0.05 ($p<0.05$). The result of Mann–Whitney U test showed the p value was 0.31 which is more than p value ($p>0.05$). Therefore, there isn`t any significant difference effect between two experimental groups (strategic planning and task–repetition) on learners` writing performance regarding grammatical accuracy and the mean rank of task–repetition was 22.28 and the mean rank of strategic planning was 18.72. So, there was a slight difference between two groups` performance but it was not significant. Findings of this study were against Salimi and Fatollahzade (2012) findings regarding grammatical accuracy. They explored the effect of strategic planning and task familiarity on learners` writing performance and the result showed no significant effect was found in terms of grammatical accuracy in strategic planning group (Cited in Soleimani & Kargozari, 2014). The results of this study were in line with the Indrathne`s findings (2013). He explored the results of written narrative task repetition in which the participants displayed increased performance in accuracy. In particular, Adams (2003) in line with Bygate and Samuda (2005) has assumed that attentional resources for translating and executing stages can be enhanced through task repetition(cited in Azizzade and Dobakhti,2015).

Based on the inferential analysis, strategic planning versus task–repetition doesn't have any significant difference effect on learners' grammatical accuracy in their writing performance. Consequently, the null hypothesis related to first research question was accepted.

Strategic planning versus Task–repetition in writing regarding fluency

In this study the second research question and null hypothesis were as follow:

Q2: Does strategic planning versus task– repetition have any significant different effect on EFL learners' fluency in writing performances?

H02: Strategic planning versus task repetition does not have any significant different effect on Iraqi EFL learners' fluency in writing performance.

With regarding to fluency again according to research question one Kruksal –Wallis test was conducted. The result showed the p value was 0.76 which was more than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$). So, there aren't any significant differences between three group, and there aren't much differences among mean ranks of three group. The mean rank of experimental group one was 30.98, the mean rank of second experimental group was 32.20, and in control group the mean rank was 28.32. therefore, there was a slice improvement was between groups which was not significant.

These findings can be attributed to the findings of Skehan (1998) who claimed that trade–off effects are likely to occur between different aspects of language production as a result of human's limited attentional resources (i.e. learners are not able to pay a balanced attention to different aspects of language simultaneously). Strategic planning didn't have significant effect on writing in terms of fluency.

These findings were odds with Foster and Skehan (1996), Salimi and Dadashpour (2012b). In respect to using task–repetition findings

revealed that there isn't significant effect on writing performance in term of fluency. So, these findings were against a number of previous studies (e.g. Bei, 2013; Bygate,2001; Gass et al,1999; Larson–Freeman,2006) in which task repetition led to producing more fluent language findings regarding fluency. Although one might argue that most of the mentioned studies related to oral performance and may not be comparable with the present study which has focused on written performance. However, as Kellog (1996) argued, the processes learners use while engaging in oral and written production are very similar to each other. Therefore, using strategic planning and task–repetition had no positive impact on learners' writing performance regarding fluency. Consequently, there isn't any significant difference effect between strategic planning and task–repetition on learners' writing performance in terms of fluency.

Conclusion

Drawing on the results of the present and previous studies, strategic planning influenced the grammatical accuracy, in contrast it didn't have any influence on fluency of learners' writing performance. In the case of task–repetition regarding grammatical accuracy significant effect was found, this resembles Bygate's (1996) finding in which he states that the participants of his study could perform better on the second condition because they spend less time on content planning in the repeated performance. On the other hand, there wasn't any significant effect in terms of fluency. These contrastive findings were in agreement with the Skehan Trade – off–Hypothesis which stated that participants couldn't pay attention to accuracy and fluency at the same time (Skehan, 2007). At the same time these findings can be in odds with Robinson's (2001) Cognition Model in which he claimed attentional resources are not limited and learners like native speakers have the capacity to attend to more than one aspect of language simultaneously.

In the case of comparing experimental groups, there wasn't found any significant different effect on learners between strategic planning and task-repetition in terms of accuracy and fluency. Therefore, influences of strategic planning and task-repetition on writing performance of learners are partly the same.

References

- Abdollahzadeh, S., & Fard Kashani, A. (2011). The effect of task complexity on EFL learners' narrative writing task performance. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 8, 1-28.
- Alavi, S. M., & AshariTabar, N. (2012). The effect of task type and pre-task planning condition on the accuracy of intermediate EFL learners' writing performance. *The Journal of Applied Linguistic*, 5(1), 37-60.
- Asgharikia, P. (2014). The effect of task type, strategic planning and no planning on written performance of Iranian intermediate EFL learners, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 276-285.
- Abedifirouzjaie, J. (2014). The effect of different strategic planning foci on the accuracy of writing task performance, *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*, 16(1), 43-58.
- Azizzadeh, L., Dobakhti, L. (2014). The effect of task repetition on improving Iranian high - intermediate EFL learners' fluency in narrative writing fluency, *International Journal of Language and Applied Linguistics world*, 6(4), 396-409.
- Bagheridoust, E., & AllahyariFakour, K. (2013). The effect of planning on accuracy in argumentative/compare and contrast writing of Iranian EFL learners. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 4 (12), 3764-3773.
- Bei, X. G. (2013). Effect of immediate repetition in L2 speaking task: A focus study. *English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 11-19.

- Brown, D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. NY: Pearson Education.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 267–296.
- Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second language skills: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: Horcourt Brace Jovanovic, Inc.
- Cihodariu, M. (2012). Narrative as instrumental research and as attempts of fixing meaning. Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analyzing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford Baghdad university Press.
- Haghverdi, H. R., Biria, R., & Khalaji, H. R. (2013). The impact of task–planning and gender on the accuracy of narrations composed by Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4*, 74–83.
- Khorasani, M. R., & Sadzadeh, A. (2015). The effect of direct and peer feedback on accuracy of EFL learners' written performance. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods, 2*, 296–308.
- Kim, Y. (2013). Promoting attention to form through task repetition in a Korean EFL context. In: McDonough, K., Mackey, A. (Eds.), *Second Language Interaction in Diverse Educational Settings* (pp. 3–24). John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Meraji, S.R. (2011). Planning time, strategy use, and written task production in a pedagogic vs. a testing context. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2*(2), 338–352.
- Meyers, A. (2006). *Composing with confidence: Writing effective paragraphs and essays*. London: Pearson Education
- Pallotti, G. (2009). CAF: Defining, refining and differentiating constructs: Special issue, complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF) in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics, 30*(4), 590–601.

Quellmallz, E. S., Capell, F.J., & Chou, C.(1982). Effect of discourse and response mode on the measurement of writing competence. *Journal of Education Measurement*, 19(4).

Rahmpour, 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), 274–280.

Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied Linguistic*, 21(1), 27–57.

Salimi, A., Alaviani, P., Hosseini,P., & Shafaei, A.(2012). The impact of task complexity and strategic planning time on EFL learners' accuracy and fluency in written task production.*International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 1(7),104–116.

Soleimani,H.,& Kargozari, H. R. (2014). Uncovering new trends of investigation in written task. *International Journal of Asian Science*, 4(9), 991–1002.

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

Skehan, P. (2009). Modelling Second Language performance: Integrating complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexis. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(4), 510–532.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B.

Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H. G.Widdowson* (pp. 125–144). Oxford: Oxford Baghdad University Press.

Rianti, W., Angraini, V., Afriyeni, Y., & Rasyidah, U. (2022). Analysis of Teaching Strategies. Doi: 10.35445/alishlah.v14i3.1866.

Vandersmissen, L, & George, B. (2023). Strategic planning in public organizations:

Reviewing 35 years of research.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2023.2271901>

Wolfe–Quintero, K., Inagaki, S., & Kim, H.Y. (1998). *Second language development in writing*. Hawaii: Hawaii Baghdad university Press

APPENDIX A(OXFORD PLACEMENT TEST)

Where can you see these notices?

1. YOU CAN LOOK, BUT DON'T TOUCH THE PICTURES

in an office

in a cinema

in a museum

2. PLEASE GIVE THE RIGHT MONEY TO THE DRIVER

in a bank

on a bus

in a cinema

3. NO PARKING PLEASE

in a street

on a book

on a table

4. CROSS BRIDGE FOR TRAINS TO EDINBURGH

in a bank

in a garage

in a station

5. KEEP IN A COLD PLACE

on clothes

on furniture

on food

In this section you must choose the word which best fits each space in the text below THE STARS

There are millions of stars in the sky. If you look (6).....the sky on a clear night, it is possible to see about 3000 stars. They look small, but they are really

(7).....big hot balls of burning gas. Some of them are huge, but others are much smaller, like our planet Earth. The biggest stars are very bright, but they only live for a short time. Every day new stars

(8).....born and old stars die. All the stars are very far away. The light from the nearest star takes more (9).....four years to reach Earth. Hundreds of years ago, people (10).....stars, like the North

Star, to know which direction to travel in. Today you can still see that star.

- | | | | |
|-----|---------|---------|----------|
| 6. | a. at | b. up | c. on |
| 7. | a. very | b. too | c. much |
| 8. | a. is | b. be | c. are |
| 9. | a. that | b. of | c. than |
| 10. | a. use | b. used | c. using |

In this section you must choose the word which best fits each space in the texts.

Good smiles ahead for young teeth

Older Britons are the worst in Europe when it comes to keeping their teeth. But British youngsters (11).....more to smile about because (12).....teeth are among the best. Almost 80% of Britons over 65 have lost all or some (13).....their teeth according to a World Health Organisation survey. Eating too (14).....sugar is part of the problem

Among (15)....., 12-year-olds have on average only three missing, decayed or filled teeth.

- | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| 11. | a. getting | b. got | c. have | d. having |
| 12. | a. their | b. his | c. them | d. theirs |
| 13. | a. from | b. of | c. among | d. between |
| 14. | a. much | b. lot | c. many | d. deal |
| 15. | a. person | b. people | c. children | d. family |

Christopher Columbus and the New World

On August 3, 1492, Christopher Columbus set sail from Spain to find a new route to India, China and Japan. At this time most people thought you would fall off the edge of the world if you sailed too far. Yet sailors such as Columbus had seen how a ship appeared to

get lower and lower on the horizon as it sailed away. For Columbus this (16).....that the world was round. He (17).....to his men about the distance travelled each day. He did not want them to think that he did not (18).....exactly where they were going.

(19).....,

on October 12, 1492, Columbus and his men landed on a small island he named San Salvador.

Columbus believed he was in Asia, (20).....he was actually in the Caribbean.

16. a. made b. pointed c. was d. proved
17. a. lied b. told c. cheated d. asked
18. a. find b. know c. think d. expect
19. a. next b. secondly c. finally d. once
20. a. as b. but c. because d. if

In this section you must choose the word or phrase which best completes each sentence.

21. The children won 't go to sleep.....we leave a light on outside their bedroom.

A► except B► otherwise C► unless D►

but 22. I'll give you my spare keys in case you.....home before me.

A► would get B► got C► will get D►

get 23. My holiday in Paris gave me a great.....to improve my French accent.

A► occasion B► chance C► hope D►

possibility 24. The singer ended the concert.....her most popular song.

A► by B► with C► in D►

as 25. Because it had not rained for several months, there was a.....of water.

- A► shortage B► drop C► scare D► waste
26. I 've always.....you as my best friend.
- A► regarded B► thought C► meant D► supposed
27. She came to live her.....a month ago.
- A► quiteB► beyondC► alreadyD► almost
28. Don't make such a.....! The dentist is only going to look at yourteeth.
- A► fussB► troubleC► worryD► reaction
29. He spent a long time looking for a tie which.....with his new shirt.
- A► fixedB► madeC► wentD► wore
30. Fortunately,.....from a bump on the head, she suffered no seriousinjuries from her fall.
- A► otherB► exceptC► besidesD► apart
31. She had changed so much that.....anyone recognised her.
- A► almost B► hardly C► not D► nearly
32.teaching English, she also writes children's books.
- A► Moreover B► As well as C► In addition D► Apart
33. It was clear that the young couple were.....of taking charge of the restaurant.
- A► responsible B► reliable C► capable D► able
34. The book.....of ten chapters, each one covering a different topic.
- A► comprises B► includes C► consists D► contains
35. Mary was disappointed with her new shirt as the colour.....very quickly.
- A► bleached B► died C► vanished D► faded
36. National leaders from all over the world are expected o attend the.....meeting.
- A► peak B► summit C► top D► apex

37. Jane remained calm when she won the lottery and.....about her business as if nothing had happened.

A► came B► brought C► went D► moved

38. I suggest we.....outside the stadium tomorrow at 8.30.

A► meeting B► meet C► met D► will meet

39. My remarks were.....as a joke, but she was offended by them.

A► pretended B► thought C► meant D► supposed

40. You ought to take up swimming for the.....of your health. A► concern B► relief C► sake D► cause

Appendix B (story telling task)

