**The Impact of Pre-task Instruction and Task Rehearsal on Fluency, Accuracy and Complexity of Iranian EFL learners’ writing**

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of pre-task instruction and task rehearsal, on fluency, accuracy, and complexity of Iranian EFL learners’ writing. To achieve this, Forty-five foreign language learners with little access to the l2 outside the classroom participated in this study. They were both male (44%) and female (56%). Measures of fluency, accuracy, and complexity were utilized to measure students’ writing. Data were analyzed using MANOVA and ANOVA. The results of the study revealed that pre-task instruction and task rehearsal have positive effect on the learners’ writing. The result of the study and their pedagogical implications were discussed.
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1. **Introduction**

Second language acquisition researchers have studied the notion of planning with reference to different theories; One of these models is the “computational model”(Lantolf ,1996 ), which is based on an analogy between the human mind and a computer by which human being possesses limited capacity in terms of the amount of information that can process from input to output. These limits can lead language learners to prioritize one aspect of language over another. Levelt’s (1989) model of speech production, on the other hand, considers speakers as complex information processors who are capable of translating intention, thought, and feeling into articulated speech. This model identifies three autonomous processing stages in language production: (1) conceptualizing the message, (2) formulating the language representation, and (3) articulating the message.

Over the last 20 years, the majority of studies on task planning have been concerned with L2 learners’ oral production (Bygate, 2001; Ellis, 2003; Mojavezi, 2014). We have learned a great deal about how the opportunity to plan before or during a task may improve some aspects of L2 speech. However, we have little knowledge about what L2 learners actually do to plan for a task. In the meantime, there is currently a hot debate between Skehan’s trade-off hypothesis (1998) and Robinson’s (2001, 2007) cognition hypothesis and all of the studies which have tested these two hypotheses and have tried to falsify one of them have focused on oral performance. This study tries to shed light on the effect of pre-task instruction and task rehearsal on writing ability. In other words, an important goal of this study would be to see which hypothesis (cognition or trade-off) is more consistent with the data which will be obtained in an EFL context.

1. **Review of Literature**

Recent years have seen enormous growth of interest in task-based language learning and teaching. There are several reasons for this surge of interest. First, a ‘task’ is a construct of equal import to both second language acquisition researchers and language teachers (Ellis, 2003). Second, task-based pedagogy is capable of a wide range of interpretations. That is, any single task, Ellis (2003) states, has the potential to be performed in a number of ways, depending on how the participants orient to it. This perceived *flexibility* of task-based tradition can deflect some of the criticisms leveled against it. One of these criticisms is based on the claim that performing tasks and language use does not *necessarily* lead to fluent and accurate production or language acquisition (Reinders, 2009).

From the vantage point of information processing theories, this is in part due to the fact that language learners’ attentive or processing capacity is restricted, and hence, they cannot process ‘schematic’ and ‘systemic’ knowledge simultaneously (see Carroll, 2008; Ellis, 1994, 2003, 2005; Skehan , 1998a, 1998b, 2007a; Skehan & Foster 1999, 2001; Van Patten, 2009). This being so, language learners tend to *bypass* language form in favor of meaning drawing on their wide repertoire of communicative strategies to which they have access (Skehan, 1998a).

* 1. Concept mapping as a form of pre-task instruction

The present study adopted concept mapping as an instructional strategy and examined its potential for improving ESL (English as a Second Language) learners’ written production. Concept mapping was first developed by Hanf (1971) as a model for improving the teaching of study skills. It typically starts with students generating words relevant to the topic and sorting them into groups of associated words. Students then develop their ideas on the topic and draw organizational structures, which can either be linear or hierarchical.

The technique of concept mapping has been widely practiced and studied under different terms, such as semantic mapping (e.g., Cronin, et al., 1992; Heimlich and Pittelman, 1986; Lipson, 1995; Schultz, 1991), cognitive mapping (e.g., Boyle, 1996; Peresich, et al., 1990; Reynolds and Hart, 1990) and webbing (e.g., Brown and Salisch, 1996; Norton, 1993; Pieronek, 1994). The distinction between these terms is not clear in the literature, and they are likely to be used as equivalent in both L1 and L2 studies. A major reason for selecting this strategy as a target instruction is that concept mapping is recognized to be effective for both conceptual and linguistic development (Heimlich and Pittelman, 1986) and is widely implemented in classroom instruction.

A number of studies have reported the positive effects of concept mapping in a variety of instructional settings. For example, it has been used as a technique for increasing vocabulary (Harley et al., 1996; Johnson and Steele, 1996; Morin and Goebel, 2001), improving reading comprehension (Baumann and Bergeron, 1993; Carrell et al., 1989; Lipson, 1995; Tang, 1992) and writing skills (Cronin et al., 1992; Schultz, 1991), and facilitating the comprehension of concepts in subject areas (Park, et al., 1999; Roth, 1994). Concept mapping also helps students in special education programs to promote their literacy knowledge (Boyle, 1996; Englert and Mariage, 1991; MacArthur, 1996; Sinatra, et al., 1994). In writing contexts, concept mapping has been said to facilitate the process of writing (Pieronek, 1994; Renner, 1992; Rey, 2000; Washington, 1988); however the extent of empirical research on mapping is limited and most of the studies were done in L1 writing contexts. For example, Cronin et al. (1992) reported the progress of a district plan for secondary schools in Mississippi, demonstrating that mapping strategies had promoted students’ understanding of text organization and writing processes based on the results of writing tests over a four-year period.

2.2. Task Rehearsal

To build Task repetition involves asking language learners to repeat the same or slightly altered tasks at intervals of, for example, one or two weeks (Bygate and Samuda 2005: 43). In task repetition, the first performance of the task is regarded as a preparation for, or a pre-task activity before, further performances (Ellis 2005). At first glance, this might seem reminiscent of behaviorist drills which are based on the assumption that that language learning happens through a process of habit formation through repetition. (For instance, Paulston and Bruder (1976: 12) identified different types of repetition drills and defined them as ‘plain repetition of the cue’).However, in its new conceptualization, task repetition does not at all refer to ‘verbatim’ repetitions of the cues in the second language classroom; rather it involves the repetition of familiar form and content (Bygate 2006). This new conceptualization is in part informed by the view that our attention and processing capacity during communication activities is inherently restricted in some important ways - for instance, L2 learners cannot, focus on both meaning and form simultaneously. By repeating the same or similar tasks, therefore, learners might be able upon what they have already done so as to ‘buy time’ not only to do mental work on what they are about to communicate but also to access and (re)formulate words and grammatical structures more efficiently, effectively and accurately.

The effects of task repetition on L2 oral production have been examined in a number of studies. For example, Bygate (1996, 2001) documented the positive effects of task repetition on fluency and accuracy of second language output. Gass et al. (1999) found similar patterns regarding the effects of task repetition with L2 learners of Spanish, while Lynch and McLean’s (2000) study revealed that recycling had positive effects on both accuracy and fluency in an English for Specific Purposes context. Similarly, Ahmadian and Tavakoli (2011) found that task repetition could be used as a pedagogic tool to direct L2 learners’ effect of task repetition on complexity and fluency of L2 speech and, more recently, Hawkes’ attention towards form.

Generally speaking, however, research findings and empirical evidence lend support to the effectiveness of task repetition to improve language performance with some trade-off effects being reported. In reviewing task repetition literature there are three important points which need to be brought to attention: (a) design of the study (between-groups vs. repeated-measures designs); (b) the time interval between the two occasions of task performance; and (c) operationalization of ‘task repetition’ (whether the same task has been used or slightly altered tasks and the number of repetitions that they adopt). In the present study which is a between-groups design, there is a one-week interval between the two occasions of performing the same task. Having in mind the above mentioned points we review some closely relevant studies below. This will pave the ground for us to formulate appropriate hypotheses regarding the effects of task repetition.

**3. Method**

3.1. Participants

This study was a between-groups design that aimed to examine the effects of pre-task instruction and task rehearsal on fluency accuracy, and complexity, and fluency of EFL learners’ writing.

The participants in this study were 45 intermediate level EFL learners recruited from two teacher education centers in Iran. A special effort was made to identify students who are at the same level of ability. To this aim, 160 participants mastering in Language Teaching and was administered “Oxford Placement Test 2” (Allan, 1992), as a pre-test, to select the students with equivalent language proficiency at the outset of the study.

3.2. Instruments

In this study, measures of fluency, accuracy, and complexity was used to evaluate the quality of the participants’ written production:

3.2.1. Fluency measures

Measuring fluency as a construct in writing has been a hot debate from the 1970s. In the first attempt, Hunt (1970) tried to measure children’s L1 writing fluency. He used the construct of a T-unit, or minimal terminal unit, accompanied by any associated dependent clauses. He chose T-units rather than sentence length because it was well known that children in their native language could and would write long sentences solely using coordination. More recent studies validated this construct by using the number of syllables per minute (e.g., Chenoweth, A., & Hayes (1998), Chenoweth and Hayes (2001), Ellis and Yuan (2004), Ellis and Yuan (2005).

Following the theoretical rationale for measuring fluency, this study will utilize the same measures used by Chenoweth and Hayes & Ellis and Yuan (2004) for measuring writing fluency, that is, syllable per- minute: the total number of syllables produced divided by the total number of seconds a participant will take to complete the task multiplied by 60.

3.2.2. Complexity measures

a. ***Syntactic complexity****:* It deals with the ratio of clauses to T-units in the participants’ production. T-unit rather than C-unit will be employed in this study because the task performance is mono-logic and contains few elided utterances. It should be noted that T-unit analysis was initially developed to assess written language and has been replaced by C-unit analysis for oral production.

b. ***Syntactic variety***: It is the total number of different grammatical verb forms used in the task. Grammatical verb forms include tense (e.g., simple past, past continuous), modality (e.g., *should*, *have to*), and passive voice.

3.3.3. Accuracy measures

For accuracy measurement the following two criteria will be used:

a) **Error-free clauses**: the percentage of clauses that do not contain any errors. Errors were defined as deviant from standard norms with respect to syntax, morphology, and/or lexicon. Lexical errors are defined as errors in lexical form or collocation (e.g., \**I was waiting you*). So, all errors in syntax, morphology, and lexical choice will be considered.

b) **Correct verb forms**: the percentage of accurately used verbs in terms of tense, aspect, modality, and subject-verb agreement.

3.4. Procedures

3.4.1. Data collection

For data collection, the participants were required to write an argumentative under the different planning conditions. The topic was: “Some people believe that watching Television is harmful. Others maintain that it is beneficial. What is your idea? Use specific reasons and examples to support your idea”.

3.5.2. Data Analysis

All writing productions of different groups under the above-mentioned conditions were segmented, coded, and scored based on the measures chosen for assessing complexity, accuracy, and fluency. To ensure that the segmentation and scoring of the transcripts are conducted reliably, the data was segmented, coded, and scored by two independent experts. Then, inter-coder/inter-rater reliability coefficient magnitudes was estimated. SPSS version 22.0 was used to check the normality of distribution via skewness and kurtosis indices. Each aspect of accuracy and complexity was submitted to MANOVA. Finally writing fluency was measured using one- way ANOVA followed by Post-Hoc Tukey tests.

1. **Results and Discussion**

In the present study the impacts of pre-task instruction and task rehearsal on accuracy, complexity, and fluency of EFL learners’ writing were investigated. This study tried to examine the following research hypothesis:

The first research hypothesis was directed toward identifying the impact of pre-task instruction and task rehearsal on complexity writing of Iranian EFL learners. It was hypothesized that pre-task instruction and task rehearsal have no influence on EFL Learners’ writing complexity. To this aim, complexity was measured in two different ways: syntactic complexity and syntactic variety. So, the higher the obtained score, the better the complexity of language would be. Table4.1. summarizes the descriptive on learners’ complexity writing.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4.1.Descriptive Statistics on students’ writing complexity** | | | | | | |
| Groups | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
| S. complexity (Group 1) | 15 | 1.10 | 1.60 | 1.28 | .14 | .021 |
| S .Complexity(Group 2 ) | 15 | 1.30 | 1.70 | 1.49 | .11 | .014 |
| S. complexity (Group 3) | 15 | 1.50 | 2.30 | 1.86 | .22 | .051 |
| S. variety (Group 1) | 15 | 11.10 | 16.50 | 13.54 | 1.59 | 2.54 |
| S. variety (Group 2) | 15 | 14.40 | 22.30 | 17.51 | 2.70 | 7.29 |
| S. variety (Group 3) | 15 | 15.60 | 32.10 | 22.33 | 2.78 | 6.94 |
| Valid N (list wise) | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |

As indicated in table 4.1.it became clear that mean scores on syntactic complexity and syntactic variety of group three is more than groups two and one. Group three preformed significantly differently from both groups two and one. Also learners in group two outperformed those in group one. Thus it can be inferred that the mean scores of learner group two is higher than that of group one. However, In order to test the null hypothesis, a one-way between –group multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed to investigate the impact of pre-task instruction and task rehearsal on syntactic complexity and syntactic variety of EFL learners. Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity.

Checking preliminary assumption on using MANOVA, the researcher conducted Multi- Analysis of Variance (MANOVA). The result of this analysis is shown in table 4.4.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4.4. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects** | | | | | | |
| Source | Dependent Variable | Type III Sum of Squares | D.F | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Groups | Syntactic -complexity | 2.59 | 2 | 1.29 | 45.36 | .000 |
| Syntactic-variety | 523.75 | 2 | 261.87 | 21.94 | .000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

As shown in table 4.4.syntactic complexity and syntactic variety are significant (p=.000). F value was significant. This indicates that there is significant difference between / among the groups. It is also necessary to find out where the difference is posited. So, The Null Hypothesis has been rejected. To further examine the place of differences between the groups, Post-Hoc Tukey test was conducted. The result of the Post-Hoc indicated in table 4.5.

Table4.5. Post-Hoc Tukey Test

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dependent Variable | (I) Groups | (J) Groups | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. |
|
| **Syntactic complexity** | no planning | Pre-task instruction without task rehearsal | -.20\* | .061 | .005 |
| task planning with task rehearsal | -.58\* | .061 | .000 |
| Pre-task instruction without task rehearsal | no planning | .20\* | .061 | .005 |
| task planning with task rehearsal | -.37\* | .061 | .000 |
| task planning with task rehearsal | no planning | .58\* | .061 | .000 |
| Pre-task instruction without task rehearsal | .37\* | .061 | .000 |
| **Syntactic variety** | no planning | Pre-task instruction without task rehearsal | -3.97\* | 1.26 | .008 |
| task planning with task rehearsal | -8.35\* | 1.26 | .000 |
| Pre-task instruction without task rehearsal | no planning | 3.97\* | 1.26 | .008 |
| task planning with task rehearsal | -4.38\* | 1.26 | .003 |
| task planning with task rehearsal | no planning | 8.35\* | 1.26 | .000 |
| Pre-task instruction without task rehearsal | 4.38\* | 1.26 | .003 |

The above table indicates syntactic complexity and syntactic variety in the three groups.

considering syntactic complexity, the essay by planners who had both pre-task instruction and task rehearsal contained the most syntactically complex sentences, averaging 1.86 clauses per T-unit, whereas those who had no pre-task planning Without any opportunity to rehearse the task provided the least syntactically complex with 1.28 clauses per T-unit.

Regarding syntactic varieties, as measured by the total number of different grammatical verb forms used in the task, the essay by planners who had both pre-task planning and task rehearsal contained the most syntactically complex sentences, averaging 22.33 clauses per T-unit, whereas those who had no pre-task planning Without any opportunity to rehearse the task provided the least syntactically complex with 13.54 clauses per T-unit.

The results of this study support the findings of the previous studies suggesting significant differences among the groups with different task conditions. In Robinson’s theory, task complexity is determined by two sets of features, ‘resource directing’ (e.g. whether or not the task requires reasoning) and ‘resource depleting’ (e.g. whether or not there is opportunity for strategic planning). These two factors ‘interact and affect task production in measurable ways’ (p. 31).In contrast, accuracy and, in particular, complexity are achieved by learners drawing on their rule-based system and thus require syntactic processing. Complexity is distinguished from accuracy in that it is related to the ‘restructuring’ that arises as a result of the need to take risks whereas accuracy reflects the learner’s attempt to control existing resources and to avoid errors.

The result of this study, also, support Ellis (2003, 2008) Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005) ideas, who maintain that complexity is characterized as the extent to which the language produced in performing a task is elaborate and varied (Ellis 2003, p.340) and pertains to learners’ tendency to take risks to use the cutting edge of their linguistic knowledge which may ultimately lead to the process of restructuring (Ellis, 2008; Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005). Thus, these findings led to the rejection of the first Null Hypothesis.

The second research hypothesis was directed toward identifying the impact of pre-task instruction and task rehearsal on accuracy writing of Iranian EFL learners. It was hypothesized that pre-task instruction and task rehearsal have no influence on EFL Learners’ writing accuracy. Accuracy was measured in two ways:Error-free clauses and Correct-verb forms. In order to test the null hypothesis, a one-way between –group multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed to investigate the impact of pre-task instruction and task rehearsal on syntactic complexity and syntactic variety of EFL learners. Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and multicollinearity. The results of analysis indicated no violation on the assumptions. Table4.6. summarizes the descriptive statistics on students’ writing accuracy.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4.6. Descriptive Statistics on Students’ Writing Accuracy** | | | | | |
|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Correct\_verb\_G1 | 15 | .69 | 1.30 | 1.00 | .20 |
| Correct\_verb\_G2 | 15 | .68 | 79.00 | 6.19 | 20.14 |
| Correct\_verb\_G3 | 15 | .87 | 1.50 | 1.20 | .20 |
| Error\_free\_G1 | 15 | .06 | 1.10 | .71 | .23 |
| Error\_free\_G2 | 15 | .59 | 1.30 | .87 | .18 |
| Error\_free\_G3 | 15 | .78 | 1.40 | 1.00 | .16 |
| Valid N (list-wise) | 15 |  |  |  |  |

As mentioned, the above table indicates descriptive statistics on students’ writing accuracy. Group one are the students with no pre-task instruction and task rehearsal, group two are the participants with pre-task instruction without task rehearsal, and group three are the students having opportunities for both pre-task instruction and task rehearsal.

The result of the descriptive statistics indicates that group three had the highest mean on both measures, followed by group two, and group one had the lowest mean. However, In order to test the second null hypothesis, a one-way between –group multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed to investigate the impact of pre-task instruction and task rehearsal on writing accuracy in terms of error -free clauses and also correct verb forms(table 4.7.).

**Table 4.7.Post-Hoc on students’ accuracy**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Source | Dependent Variable | d. f. | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Corrected Model | Correct-verb-forms | 2 | .02 | .95 | .39 |
| Error-free-clauses | 2 | .16 | 4.87 | .01 |
| Intercept | Correct-verb-forms | 1 | 46.65 | 1514.27 | .000 |
| Error-free-clauses | 1 | 31.43 | 955.91 | .000 |
| Groups | Correct-verb-forms | 2 | .02 | .95 | .39 |
| Error-free-clauses | 2 | .16 | 4.87 | .01 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

As the above table indicates the significant level for correct verb form is .39 and error -free clauses is .01. So we can infer that the result of analysis is not significant. So the null hypothesis has been retained.

The third research hypothesis was directed toward identifying the impact of pre-task instruction and task rehearsal on fluency writing of EFL learners. It was hypothesized that pre-task instruction and task rehearsal have no influence on EFL learners’ writing fluency. To this end, fluency was measured in One-way ANOVA. The researcher used the Construct of a T-units or minimal unit rather than sentence length T-units. So, the higher the obtained score, the better the fluency of language would be.

**Table4.8. One-way ANOVA for Fluency**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sum of Squares | D. f. | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 7.71 | 2 | 3.85 | 62.36 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 2.59 | 42 | .06 |  |  |
| Total | 10.31 | 44 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

As indicated in the above table, the result of between groups one-way ANOVA is significant. However, in order to show the difference between the groups Tukey Post- hoc tests were conducted. The result of the Post-Hoc is indicated in table (4.9.).

Table4.9. Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Fluency

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (I) Groups | (J) Groups | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. |
|
| no planning | Pre-task instruction without task rehearsal | -.24\* | .09 | .03 |
| task planning with task rehearsal | -.97\* | .09 | .000 |
| Pre-task instruction without task rehearsal | no planning | .24\* | .09 | .03 |
| task planning with task rehearsal | -.73\* | .09 | .000 |
| task planning with task rehearsal | no planning | .97\* | .09 | .000 |
| Pre-task instruction without task rehearsal | .73\* | .09 | .000 |

Thus, these findings lead to the rejection of the third Null Hypothesis as well. In terms of fluency in writing, it can be surmised that pre-task instruction aids fluency in writing in two principal ways: First, it facilitates process and text planning for content and organization. This is reflected in the pre-task instructors organize the information that needs to be conveyed, establishes the setting and describes the characters, identifies the main events, and evaluates them will find the pressure on working memory lessened during on-line assembly (Raab, 1992, cited by Zimmerman, 2000) Second, pre-task instruction may help to increase L2 writers’ confidence in their ability to write clearly and effectively and, for this affective reason, may reduce their need to engage in extensive monitoring, Zimmerman found that writers revise more when writing in their L2 than in their L1. Chenoweth and Hayes (2001) found that L2 writers who were more proficient wrote more fluently than less proficient writers; pre-task planning, therefore, may compensate for lack of L2 proficiency where fluency is concerned. The results of this study support the findings of the previous studies suggesting significant differences among the groups with different task conditions.

The result of this study, also, support Foster & Skehan(1996 ) ideas, believe that a number of studies have shown that when learners have the opportunity to plan a task before they do it, they are more fluent than when planning is not possible. Task repetition is said to be particularly useful to increase learners’ fluency and complexity. Probably because “when learners know what they are going to talk or write about they have more processing space available for formulating the language needed to express their ideas with the result that the quantity of the output will be enhanced and also the fluency and complexity” (Ellis, 2003, pp.246-7). An alternative view, promulgated by Robinson, is that pre-task planning simplifies the task and thus obviates the need to attend closely to form during performance but assists automatic access to stored language and so leads to greater fluency.

1. **Conclusion**

The key finding of this research , as discussed in the preceding chapters was as follow : First , the analyses indicated that there is reasonably positive correlation between pre-task instruction , task rehearsal and some aspects of learners’ writing . This study revealed that learners with having opportunity, pre-task instruction and task rehearsal try to improve their writing. Secondly, the study showed that there is a significant positive correlation between task rehearsal, pre-task instruction and EFL learners’ writing achievement. In other word, having higher opportunity in pre-task instruction and task rehearsal, the higher the learners’ achievement in writing. In summary, it is clear that pre-task instruction enhances learner output in a written task. This is manifested in greater quantity, fluency, and complexity of language, although such planning appears to have little effect on accuracy.

5.1. Implications of the study

Teachers and researchers are well-aware of teacher on EFL learners’ writing and achievement. We can hypothesize that having opportunity, pre-task instruction and task rehearsal can influence learners’ writing and achievement in different settings and it is not context bound. It is also important that educational contexts, as well as schools’ administrators provide high opportunity in order to increase pre-task instruction and task rehearsal so that EFL learners’ writing will be improved.

The concept of task repetition has clear implications for pedagogy. Research into task repetition provides insights into how teachers might develop the pre-, while- and post-task phases of lessons. Research also explores the ways in which tasks might be linked within lessons (and across sequences of lessons) to provide learners with opportunities to work repeatedly with similar linguistic content. Thus, instead of focusing upon the performance of tasks in isolation (which characterizes much research to date), the concept of task repetition moves the focus of debate clearly towards the pedagogic use of tasks within lessons.
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