

In the Name of God

**In the Name of God**



**University of Tabriz**

**Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign Languages**

**English Language Department**

**Thesis:**

Submitted in the Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree  
of Master of Arts (MA) in Teaching English (TEFL)

**Entitled**

**The Effects of Planning and Self- Efficacy on EFL Learner's Written Performance**

**Supervisor**

Prof. Massoud Rahimpour

**Advisor**

Dr. Ali Akbar Ansarin

**By**

Roghayyeh Nariman- Jahan

**June, 2010**

**In the Name of God**



**University of Tabriz**

**Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign Languages**

**English Language Department**

We hereby recommend that the thesis by

**Roghayyeh Nariman- Jahan**

Entitled

**The Effects of Planning and Self- Efficacy on EFL Learner's Written Performance**

Be accepted in the partial Fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in  
English Language Teaching (ELT)

**Supervisor:** Prof. Massoud Rahimpour

**Advisor:** Dr. Ali Akbar Ansarin

**Examiner:** Dr. Farahman Farrokhi

To my mother and memory of my father and my family,  
for their love and support

## Acknowledgements

I have to thank so many people for the important role they played in development of this study that I cannot do justice to everybody's contribution. First of all I should thank God for all His help through the years.

Then, I am greatly indebted to Professor Rahimpour whose help and support during the writing of this thesis were manifested in more ways than I can say without writing a whole other thesis on the subject. His wise counsel during the editing of my thesis drafts, his always available, unconditional, and insightful advice, precious support, and human compassion have been crucial to the completion of this thesis. I also acknowledge the cooperation and assistance of Dr. Ansarin, who not only ushered me through the test development and validation, but also provided me with useful comments which enabled me to convert turgid prose into readable English. Special thanks also go to the examiner, Dr. Farrokhi who evaluated the end-product of the study both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Special thanks also go to Dr. Yaghoubi who helped me in the painstaking process of data collection. I would also like to thank the sophomore and senior students (majoring in English) at Tabriz University who spent hours of their precious time responding to the research instruments.

Thanks are also due to Dr. Salimi, Dr. Fathi-Azar from psychology faculty, Mrs Behrouzi, and Mrs Shabbabi, my high school teacher, for their help and support.

Many thanks also go to my past and present teachers, Dr. Ajideh, Dr. Torabi, Dr. Kouhi, and others who have always supported me, and have been a pleasure to work with. I also thank Dr. Sader Majles, Dean of the M.A. Department and Dr. Saburi, Dean of English Department.

I would also like to thank Dr. Sadaghat, Dr. Asadollahfam, and Mr. Dadashi- Khas for their advice in doing the statistical analyses.

I wish to thank my family for suffering through the birth pangs of this study. I hope they will regard the result as worth their sufferings.

Last but not least, my thanks to my mother whose love, encouragement, and continuous support throughout all my previous academic endeavors has continued to be a precious source of inspiration.

Finally, I alone have to answer for any faults and any shortcomings of this study. To all, many thanks again for your assistance and encouragement.

## Abstract

<b>Name:</b> Roghayyeh	<b>Surname:</b> Nariman- Jahan
<b>Title of the thesis:</b> <b>The Effects of Planning and Self- Efficacy on EFL Learner's Written Performance</b>	
<b>Supervisor:</b> Prof. Massoud Rahimpour	<b>Advisor:</b> Dr. Ali Akbar Ansarin
<b>Degree:</b> Master of Arts	<b>Major:</b> English language Teaching
<b>University:</b> University of Tabriz	<b>Date of Graduation:</b> June 2010
<b>Faculty:</b> Persian Literature & Foreign languages	<b>Number of Pages:</b> 202
<b>Key Words:</b> Task, Planning, Proficiency, Self- efficacy, Writing, Concept Load, Fluency, Complexity, Accuracy	
<b>Abstract</b> <p>Building on preceding studies of the effects of planning on L2 learners' oral performances and drawing on Kellog's (1996) model of writing, the impetus of the present study was to scrutinize the impact of planning, proficiency, and self-efficacy on EFL learners' written task performance regarding concept load, fluency, complexity, and accuracy.</p> <p>172 low-proficiency and high-proficiency learners of English as a foreign language, aged between 18-25, were recruited and haphazardly assigned into two groups with pre-task planning and on-line planning. Each participant was then requested to execute three tasks namely, decision-making task, narrative task, and personal task and filled out the self-efficacy questionnaire. The first group was required to plan for their performance for 10 minutes and take notes before they performed the tasks, whilst the participants in the second group began writing immediately and take time as long as they like.</p> <p>The data were collected and coded to evaluate concept load, fluency, complexity, and accuracy of the participants' performance. The raw scores were then fed into the SPSS software and the data were analyzed utilizing paired samples t-test, Pearson correlation, Two-Way ANOVA, Three-way ANOVA, and LSD multiple test as a post hoc test. The results corroborated that planning time had no effect on the fluency, complexity, and accuracy. Nevertheless, it led to more production of concept load performance. Furthermore, the findings demonstrated that low-proficiency learners appear to benefit more from planning time with respect to concept load and fluency. On the other hand, high-proficiency learners were advantaged by planning time concerning accuracy on the most difficult tasks. Finally, this study made clear that there was a significant relationship between self-efficacy and narrative and personal tasks in terms of concept load in high-proficiency learners. What is more, there was no significant relationship between self-efficacy and decision-making tasks on the subject of concept load, fluency, complexity, and accuracy in both levels.</p> <p>The findings of the study may have pedagogical implications for the fields of syllabus design, language teaching, language testing, and teacher training bodies.</p>	

# Table of Contents

<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>Acknowledgements .....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Abstract.....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Table of Contents .....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>List of Tables .....</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>List of Figures .....</b>	<b>xix</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations .....</b>	<b>xxiii</b>
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.0. Introduction .....	3
1.1. Background of the study.....	6
1.1.1. What Is a Task? .....	6
1.1.2. Exercise, Activity, and Task .....	10
1.1.3. Features of Task .....	11
1.1.4. Types of Task-based Activities .....	13
1.1.5. Measuring Performance on Tasks .....	15
1.1.6. Task-based Language Teaching .....	16
1.2. Significance of the Study .....	18
1.3. The Organization of the Study .....	20
<b>Chapter 2: Review of the Related Literature .....</b>	<b>23</b>
2.0. Introduction .....	25
2.1. Planning .....	25



2.2. Principal Types of Task Planning .....	26
2.2.1. Pre-task Planning .....	28
2.2.2. Within-task Planning .....	29
2.3. Theoretical Background to the Study of Planning .....	30
2.3.1. Tarone's Theory of Stylistic Variation .....	30
2.3.2. Models of Speech Production and Writing .....	31
2.3.3. Cognitive Models of L2 Performance and Learning .....	34
2.4. Some Empirical Research .....	36
2.5. Self-efficacy .....	42
2.5.1. Social Cognitive Theory and Self-efficacy .....	43
2.5.2. Self-efficacy and Achievement .....	44
2.6. Final Remark .....	47
<b>Chapter 3: Methodology .....</b>	<b>51</b>
3.0. Introduction .....	53
3.1. Research Questions and Hypotheses .....	53
3.2. Variables .....	58
3.3. Design .....	59
3.4. Participants .....	60
3.5. Materials .....	62
3.6. Procedure .....	64
3.7. Measures .....	66
3.7.1. Definitions of Concept Load, Fluency, Complexity, and Accuracy .....	67
3.7.2. Measuring Concept Load, Fluency, Complexity, and Accuracy .....	69
<b>Chapter 4: Data Analysis .....</b>	<b>73</b>
4.0. Introduction .....	75
4.1. Testing Instruments .....	76
4.2. Data Analysis .....	76

4.2.1. The Effects of Planning .....	77
4.2.1.1. Planning Condition: Concept load Measure .....	78
4.2.1.2. Planning Condition: Fluency Measure .....	81
4.2.1.3. Planning Condition: Complexity Measure .....	84
4.2.1.4. Planning Condition: Accuracy Measure .....	87
4.2.2. The Effects of Proficiency .....	90
4.2.2.1. Low Proficiency: Unplanned vs. Planned condition (Concept Load)...	90
4.2.2.2. Low Proficiency: Unplanned vs. Planned condition (Fluency).....	94
4.2.2.3. Low Proficiency: Unplanned vs. Planned condition (Complexity) .....	96
4.2.2.4. Low Proficiency: Unplanned vs. Planned condition (Accuracy) .....	99
4.2.2.5. High Proficiency: Unplanned vs. Planned condition (Concept Load)....	102
4.2.2.6. High Proficiency: Unplanned vs. Planned condition (Fluency) .....	105
4.2.2.7. High Proficiency: Unplanned vs. Planned condition (Complexity) .....	108
4.2.2.8. High Proficiency: Unplanned vs. Planned condition (Accuracy) .....	111
4.2.3. The Effects of Self-efficacy .....	114
4.2.3.1. Self-efficacy: Low Proficiency (Language Performances) .....	114
4.2.3.2. Self-efficacy: High Proficiency (Language Performances) .....	117
4.2.4. The Effect of Interaction of Tasks and Planning Condition .....	120
4.2.4.1. Descriptive statistics .....	121
4.2.4.1.1. The Effects of Interaction of Planning Condition and Tasks.....	121
4.2.4.1.2. The Effects of Interaction of Planning Condition and proficiency....	126
4.2.4.1.2.1. Low Proficiency .....	127
4.2.4.1.2.2. High Proficiency .....	132
4.2.4.2. Inferential Statistics .....	137
4.2.4.2.1. The Effects of Planning .....	138
4.2.4.2.2. The Effects of Proficiency .....	140
<b>Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusions.....</b>	<b>147</b>
5.0. Introduction .....	149

5.1. Discussion and Conclusions .....	149
5.1.1. The Impact of Planning .....	150
5.1.2. The Impact of Proficiency .....	155
5.1.3. The Impact of Self-efficacy .....	161
5.2. Pedagogical Implications .....	163
5.3. Limitations of the Study.....	165
5.4. Suggestions for Further Research .....	165
<b>References .....</b>	<b>167</b>
<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>180</b>
Appendix A: Tasks given to the participants in each class .....	182
Appendix B: General Perceived Self- efficacy Scale.....	184
Appendix C: Instructions given to the participants in each condition .....	186
Appendix D: Raw Scores of participants .....	187
<b>Persian Abstract .....</b>	<b>202</b>

## List of Tables

<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>Table 1.1.</b> Definition of Task .....	7
<b>Table 2.1.</b> Planning Conditions .....	27
<b>Table 3.1.</b> Design of the Study .....	61
<b>Table 3. 2.</b> Task Order across the Groups .....	64
<b>Table 4.1.</b> Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing the Length of Time Spent on Tasks .....	77
<b>Table 4.2.</b> Paired Samples Test to Compare the Length of Time Spent on Tasks .....	78
<b>Table 4.3.</b> Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Concept Load under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....	78
<b>Table 4.4.</b> Paired Samples Test to Compare Concept Load under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....	79
<b>Table 4.5.</b> Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Concept Load of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....	80
<b>Table 4.6.</b> Paired Samples Test to Compare Concept Load of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....	80
<b>Table 4.7.</b> Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Fluency under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....	81

**Table 4.8.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Fluency under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....82

**Table 4.9.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Fluency of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....83

**Table 4.10.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Fluency of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....83

**Table 4.11.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Complexity under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....84

**Table 4.12.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Complexity under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....85

**Table 4.13.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Complexity of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....86

**Table 4.14.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Complexity of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....86

**Table 4.15.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Accuracy under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....87

**Table 4.16.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Accuracy under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....88

**Table 4.17.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Accuracy of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....89

**Table 4.18.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Accuracy of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....89

**Table 4.19.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Concept Load of Low Proficiency Learners under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....91

**Table 4.20.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Concept Load of Low Proficiency Learners under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....91

**Table 4.21.** Paired Samples Statistics for Concept Load of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....92

**Table 4.22.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Concept Load of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....93

**Table 4.23.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Fluency of Low Proficiency Learners under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....94

**Table 4.24.** Paired Samples Test to compare Fluency of Low proficiency Learners under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....94

**Table 4.25.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Fluency of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....95

**Table 4.26.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Fluency of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....96

**Table 4.27.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Complexity of Low Proficiency Learners under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....97

**Table 4.28.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Complexity of Low Proficiency Learners under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....97

**Table 4.29.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Complexity of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....98

**Table 4.30.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Complexity of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....98

**Table 4.31.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Accuracy of Low Proficiency learners under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....99

**Table 4.32.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Accuracy of Low Proficiency Learners under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....100

**Table 4.33.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Accuracy of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....101

**Table 4.34.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Accuracy of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....101

**Table 4.35.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Concept Load of High Proficiency Learners under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....101

**Table 4.36.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Concept Load of High Proficiency Learners under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....103

**Table 4.37.** Paired Samples Statistics for Concept Load of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....104

**Table 4.38.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Concept Load of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....104

**Table 4.39.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Fluency of High Proficiency Learners under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....105

**Table 4.40.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Fluency of High Proficiency Learners under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....106

**Table 4.41.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Fluency of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Condition Planned .....107

**Table 4.42.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Fluency of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....107

**Table 4.43.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Complexity of High Proficiency Learners under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....108

**Table 4.44.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Complexity of High Proficiency Learners under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....109

**Table 4.45.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Complexity of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....110

**Table 4.46.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Complexity of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....110

**Table 4.47.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Accuracy of High Proficiency Learners under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....111

**Table 4.48.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Accuracy of High Proficiency Learners under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....112

**Table 4.49.** Paired Samples Statistics for Comparing Accuracy of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....113

**Table 4.50.** Paired Samples Test to Compare Accuracy of Tasks under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....113

**Table 4.51.** Correlations between Self-efficacy and Language Performances of Low Proficiency Learners in Narrative Tasks ....115



<b>Table 4.52.</b> Correlations between Self-efficacy and Language Performances of Low Proficiency Learners in Personal Tasks .....	116
<b>Table.4.53.</b> Correlations between Self-efficacy and Language Performances of Low Proficiency Learners in Decision-making Tasks .....	117
<b>Table 4.54.</b> Correlations between Self-efficacy and Language Performances of High Proficiency Learners in Narrative Tasks .....	118
<b>Table 4.55.</b> Correlations between Self-efficacy and Language Performances of High Proficiency Learners in Personal Tasks .....	119
<b>Table 4.56.</b> Correlations between Self-efficacy and Language Performances of High Proficiency Learners in Decision-making Tasks .....	120
<b>Table 4.57.</b> Descriptive Statistics for concept load of Planning and Tasks .....	121
<b>Table 4.58.</b> Descriptive Statistics for comparing Fluency of Planning and Tasks .....	123
<b>Table 4.59.</b> Descriptive Statistics for Comparing Complexity of Planning and Tasks .....	124
<b>Table 4.60.</b> Descriptive Statistics for Comparing Accuracy of Planning and Tasks .....	125
<b>Table 4.61.</b> Descriptive Statistics for Comparing Concept Load under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition in Low Proficiency Learners .....	127
<b>Table 4.62.</b> Descriptive Statistics for Comparing Fluency of Low Proficiency Learners under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....	128
<b>Table 4.63.</b> Descriptive Statistics for Comparing Complexity under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition in Low Proficiency Learners .....	129

<b>Table 4.64.</b> Descriptive Statistics for Comparing Accuracy under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition in Low Proficiency Learners .....	131
<b>Table 4.65.</b> Descriptive Statistics for Comparing Concept Load under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition in High Proficiency Levels .....	132
<b>Table 4.66.</b> Descriptive Statistics for Comparing Fluency under Unplanned vs. planned Condition in High Proficiency Learners .....	133
<b>Table 4.67.</b> Descriptive Statistics for Comparing Complexity under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition in High Proficiency Learners .....	134
<b>Table 4.68.</b> Descriptive Statistics for Comparing Accuracy under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition in High Proficiency Learners .....	136
<b>Table 4.69.</b> Tests of Between-Subjects Effects to Compare the Concept Load of Planning and Tasks .....	137
<b>Table 4.70.</b> Tests of Between-Subjects Effects to Compare Fluency of Planning and Tasks .....	138
<b>Table 4.71.</b> Significance Differences of Fluency for Multiple Comparisons under Planning Condition .....	139
<b>Table 4.72.</b> Tests of Between-Subjects Effects to Compare the Complexity of Planning and Tasks .....	139
<b>Table 4.73.</b> Significance Differences of Complexity for Multiple Comparisons under Planning Condition .....	140
<b>Table 4.74.</b> Tests of Between-Subjects Effect to Compare Accuracy of Planning and Tasks .....	140

**Table 4.75.** Significance Differences of Accuracy for Multiple Comparisons under Planning Condition .....141

**Table 4.76.** Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Comparing Concept Load under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition across Proficiency .....141

**Table 4.77.**Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Comparing Fluency under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition across Proficiency .....142

**Table 4.78.** Significance Differences of Fluency for Multiple Comparisons across Proficiency .....143

**Table 4.79.** Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Comparing Complexity under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition across Proficiency .....143

**Table 4.80.** Significance Differences of Complexity for Multiple Comparisons across Proficiency .....144

**Table 4.81.** Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Comparing Accuracy under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition across proficiency .....144

**Table 4.82.** Significance Differences of Accuracy for Multiple Comparisons across Proficiency .....145

## List of Figures

<b>Figure 2.1.</b> Principal Types of Planning .....	26
<b>Figure 2.2.</b> Kellog’s Model of Writing Processes. Adapted from Ellis and Yuan (2004)....	33
<b>Figure 2.3.</b> The Conditional Relationships between Efficacy Beliefs and Outcome Expectancies.....	47
<b>Figure 3.1.</b> Skehan’s Three Aspects of Task Performance. From Ellis and Bakhuizen (2005).....	69
<b>Figure 4.1.</b> Mean Differences in the Rate of Concept Load under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....	79
<b>Figure 4.2.</b> Mean Differences in the Rate of Concept Load under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition across Tasks .....	81
<b>Figure 4.3.</b> Mean Differences in the Rate of Fluency under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....	82
<b>Figure 4.4.</b> Mean Differences in the Rate of Fluency under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition across Tasks .....	84
<b>Figure 4.5.</b> Mean Differences in the Rate of Complexity under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....	85
<b>Figure 4.6.</b> Mean Differences in the Rate of Complexity under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition across Tasks .....	87
<b>Figure 4.7.</b> Mean Differences in the Rate of Accuracy under Unplanned vs. Planned Condition .....	88