Dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences through online collaborative tasks: Self-efficacy and self-regulation in academic writing among Iranian intermediate TEFL students

Morteza Rahimi Yeganeh[1], Shaban Najafi Karimi [1,*]

[1] Islamic Azad University of Qaemshahr, Qaemshahr, Iran

Abstract

Previous studies have highlighted the possible effectiveness of instructing formulaic sequences in enhancing writing self-efficacy and self-regulation behaviors among EFL learners. However, few studies have probed into the nature of dialogic interaction within online task-based collaborative writing instruction, especially among university students. Therefore, the present study investigated the effect of dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences through online collaborative task-based academic writing instruction on the writing task performance, as well as self-efficacy and self-regulation behaviors of Iranian intermediate TEFL students. To this end, 60 Iranian intermediate TEFL students from two branches of Islamic Azad University were identified through Oxford Placement Tests. They were further assigned to two groups: experimental (n = 30) and control (n = 30). The experimental group received online collaborative task-based academic writing instruction, while the control group followed the conventional writing instruction in place at their universities. The results showed the impact of online collaborative task-based instruction with a focus on formulaic sequence on the Iranian intermediate TEFL students in terms of their writing task performance, self-efficacy, and self-regulation. Overall, results revealed the effectiveness of the proposed writing instruction in terms of improving the writing task performance, and self-efficacy and self-regulation measures. Findings bear pedagogical implications and provide fresh insights and new avenues for future research in this same domain.

1. INTRODUCTION

Acquisition of proficient writing skills is imperative for students across all academic fields to establish a distinct authorial voice within the scholarly community. (Newfields, 2003)as a fundamental attribute of higher education. Nevertheless, existing literature has indicated that Asian students, for instance, frequently encounter challenges in cultivating and mastering the practical competencies required for effective writing (Fujioka, 2001). A plausible explanation for this

---

* Corresponding Author: Shaban Najafi Karimi, Assistant professor, English Department, Islamic Azad University of Qaemshahr, Qaemshahr, Mazandaran, Iran. Email: s.najafi.k@iau.ac.ir

This article is based on a Ph.D. dissertation by Morteza Rahimi Yeganeh (First Author) Ph.D. Candidate, English Department Islamic Azad University of Qaemshahr, Qaemshahr, Mazandaran, Iran. **Email**: rahimy2002@yahoo.com

phenomenon may reside in the observation that learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) often lack awareness of self-regulated learning strategies pertinent to writing. A proficient writer must adeptly manage cognitive, metacognitive, motivational, and linguistic processes while generating extended texts (Boscolo & Hidi, 2007).

Zimmerman (2000) articulated self-regulation in writing as the "self-initiated thoughts, feelings and actions that writers employ to achieve various literary objectives, including the enhancement of their writing abilities and the improvement of the quality of the texts they produce" (p. 76). Writers are required to "navigate rules and mechanics while simultaneously maintaining a focus on the overall organization, form and features, purposes and goals, as well as the needs and perspectives of the audience" (Harris et al., 2002). Given the demanding and labor-intensive nature of this task, professional writers are inclined to utilize a variety of self-regulatory strategies to effectively manage and navigate the intricate dynamics of the writing process (Zimmerman, 2000).

That being said, numerous studies have substantiated the affirmative impact of self-efficacy and self-regulation on writing achievement (e.g., Abadikhah et al., 2018; Bakry and Alsamadani, 2015; Hammann, 2005; Magno, 2009; Zimmerman and Bandura, 1994). Contemporary research has further explored its interrelation with other psychological constructs, such as motivation, anxiety, and metacognition (Cetin, 2015; Csizer and Tanko, 2015; Ning and Downing, 2012; Vrieling et al., 2012), as well as feedback and portfolio assessment (Lam, 2014, 2015). However, there appears to be a dearth of research examining the application of self-efficacy and self-regulated learning strategies within the context of academic EFL writing.

In this regard, dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences can potentially improve EFL learners' self-efficacy in academic writing by providing structured language tools and fostering a supportive learning environment. Formulaic sequences, which are pre-constructed phrases or expressions, can help learners feel more confident in their writing by offering ready-made language structures that can be adapted to various contexts. This approach aligns with the principles of self-efficacy, which emphasize the importance of mastery experiences and social modeling in building confidence. In fact, dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences can significantly enhance the writing proficiency of EFL learners by fostering self-efficacy and self-regulation. This approach encourages collaboration and encourages the students to engage in discussions and negotiations, ultimately leading to improved writing skills and confidence in their abilities.

Conversely, while dialogic instruction can enhance writing proficiency, some learners may struggle with self-regulation and self-efficacy due to individual differences in motivation and prior experiences, indicating that a one-size-fits-all approach may not be effective for all EFL learners. In this regard, studies showed that teacher-led collaborative modeling enhances writing abilities by allowing students to compose and edit texts together, leading to better performance in writing assessments (Tahmasebi & Khodabakhshzadeh, 2017). Collaborative instruction not only improves writing skills but also fosters positive attitudes towards writing, which can further boost self-efficacy (Talebi et al., 2024). Thus, the present study attempts to investigate the effect of dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences through online collaborative task-based academic writing instruction on the self-efficacy and self-regulation of intermediate Iranian TEFL students.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

An important set goal for almost all second or foreign-language learners is to attain native-like proficiency in all four language skills, including writing. This aspiration is particularly evident in their desire to write like native speakers in terms of both accuracy and fluency (Derakhshan et al., 2016). In fact, this desire has prompted the development of various approaches, methods, and techniques that promise to assist learners in achieving their goals or dreams (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Mastering writing, considered as one of the most important and challenging skills in

learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL), can contribute to two significant theoretical constructs in the field, namely self-efficacy and self-regulation.

The sense of accomplishment that comes with mastering this daunting skill can enhance learners' beliefs in their ability to successfully perform tasks, which in turn plays a crucial role in their overall success in learning different components of the language. According to Bandura (2000), self-efficacy can have greater predictive power than learners' actual performance or aptitude. Besides, self-efficacy has been shown to have a positive influence on learners' self-regulation, regarded as an integral part of social cognitive theory (Bandura, 2000). In this theory, the interdependent relationship among the environment, behavior, and personal factors, encompassing physiological, cognitive, and affective aspects, operate in concert to ascertain the varying degree of an individual's achievement in executing a task. According to this notion, human beings possess the capability to exert influence over their surroundings rather than assuming the role of a passive entity devoid of agency. This capacity is predominantly manifested through their perception of self-efficacy (Schunk, 2003).

In this regard, it has been postulated that enhancing the proficiency of EFL learners by facilitating the acquisition of formulaic expressions, as a pivotal component of natural language, can augment their sense of self-efficacy and self-regulation (Wray, 2013). This is evidenced in the literature, wherein it is demonstrated that these expressions enable more efficient communication in both speaking and writing (Thoai, 2020). Consequently, learners can experience a sense of accomplishment in effectively conveying their intended message with decreasing reliance on assistance from teachers or more proficient peers (Wray, 2013). Thus, an influential factor in this regard is the teaching of formulaic language whose frequent use by EFL learners can significantly improve their linguistic, psycholinguistic, and communicative competency, leading to a more native-like fluency and proficiency. As learners become more proficient in using these fixed expressions, their confidence in their language abilities grows, thereby boosting their self-efficacy.

Formulaic Sequences

Formulaic sequences, also known as multiword chunks or lexical bundles, are groups of words that are commonly used together and possess a specific meaning that is often challenging to deduce from the individual component words alone (Wray, 2013). Due to their widespread prevalence and practicality in conveying meaning efficiently, formulaic sequences can be found in all aspects of language, including conversation, writing, and even specialized domains such as academic and technical language (Conklin & Schmitt, 2012). Therefore, they are a fundamental component of English as foreign language learning (EFL) and are frequently used by native speakers in natural conversation in the form of pre-constructed phrases or sequences. Their significance extends to various aspects of language learning, making it an essential focus for effective language acquisition. For instance, the ability to decode spoken and written production relies heavily on recognizing and understanding formulaic language, as native speakers employ these sequences extensively in their everyday speech patterns Yeldham (2018) and written compositions.

Furthermore, formulaic language serves as an indicator of language competency and proficiency levels. Proficient language users tend to employ a wide range of formulaic sequences effortlessly, demonstrating their advanced language skills (Rafieyan, 2018). On the other hand, less proficient learners may struggle to incorporate such expressions into their speech or written production. Therefore, the acquisition and utilization of formulaic language provide learners with a valuable tool to showcase their language abilities (Thoai, 2020), particularly in writing skill. Formulaic sequences provide learners with a repertoire of language tools that can be used to construct academic texts, thereby reducing the cognitive load associated with writing and increasing confidence (Davis & Morley, 2018). The use of formulaic sequences can empower

students by enabling them to participate more confidently in academic discourse, as they have access to language that is recognized and valued in academic settings (Davis & Morley, 2018).

Corpus linguistic research revealed that language itself is formulaic, with native English speakers frequently using formulaic sequences for communication. Consequently, research in second language acquisition (SLA) has taken note of this observation and extensively examined the role of formulaic sequences in enhancing English language learners' writing proficiency. In recent years, research on the specifications, functions, and application of formulaic language in various aspects of learning English as a foreign language has flourished, making it an integral and effective component of applied linguistics and second/foreign language learning and teaching (Wood, 2015). One strand of studies has speculated the possible effectiveness of dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences through collaborative writing instruction on the EFL learners' self-efficacy and self-regulation behaviors. Thus, in what follows, they will be described in more length.

Dialogic Instruction, Self-Efficacy, and Self-regulation

Dialogic instruction, which involves interactive and collaborative learning, can create a low-stress environment where learners feel comfortable experimenting with language. This can lead to increased self-efficacy and self-regulation as learners gain mastery over language use through practice and feedback (Gheitasi Azami, 2024). Collaborative writing activities, such as those facilitated by online platforms, have been shown to improve writing self-efficacy and self-regulation by providing opportunities for peer feedback and shared learning experiences (Li, 2023).

The impact of self-regulation strategies on the quality of academic writing among EFL learners is significant, as evidenced by various studies (e.g.,Anggraeni et al. (2024); Al-Jiboury (2024); Fan and Wang, 2024; Nikcevic-Milkovic et al., 2022). Self-regulated learning (SRL) enhances students' writing skills by fostering autonomy, self-monitoring, and strategic planning. This multifaceted approach not only improves writing performance but also addresses individual learner characteristics, such as anxiety and perceived difficulty. Previous studies showed that SRL-based instruction can significantly improve academic writing skills, including contextualizing and summarizing, across different self-efficacy levels (Anggraeni et al., 2024). The Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) model provides a systematic approach that teaches students specific strategies for managing writing tasks (Al-Jiboury, 2024).

Research indicated that the use of self-regulated strategies can mitigate writing anxiety, leading to improved performance. Configurations of cognitive, metacognitive, and motivational strategies are particularly effective (C. Fan & J. Wang, 2024). Besides, longitudinal studies revealed that regular exposure to SRL processes correlates with improved writing quality, particularly among higher proficiency writers (Nikcevic-Milkovic et al., 2022). In general, the impact of dialogic instruction on the development of self-efficacy and self-regulation in EFL learners' academic writing is significant, as evidenced by various studies that highlighted the benefits of collaborative and reflective practices.

Critically, while self-regulation strategies are beneficial, some EFL learners may struggle to implement these strategies effectively due to varying levels of motivation and external support, highlighting the need for tailored interventions in EFL contexts. In this regard, dialogic instruction, facilitated by online collaborative task-based instruction, which emphasizes interaction and feedback, fosters a supportive learning environment that enhances learners' confidence in their writing abilities.

Collaborative Task-Based Instruction

Studies have demonstrated that structured learning activities, including the use of formulaic sequences, can lead to significant improvements in writing self-efficacy among EFL learners (Kamil, 2024). In this regard, collaborative task-based writing instruction, which often incorporates formulaic sequences, has been found to enhance self-efficacy and self-regulation by providing learners with clear goals and opportunities for success (Iravani, 2023). For instance, a study involving Chinese EFL learners showed that online collaborative writing significantly improved self-efficacy compared to traditional methods (Li, 2023) . Implementing process-oriented and genre-based approaches in writing instruction has also been shown to enhance self-efficacy. Another study found that after 14 weeks of such instruction, participants reported a notable increase in their confidence levels in academic writing (Zhang, 2018). Additionally, formative feedback mechanisms, including self and peer assessments, contributed to this growth by providing learners with constructive insights into their writing (Moussaoui, 2024).

In particular, a number of studies in the related literature have dealt with the inter-relationship between the instruction of formulaic sequences and the development of writing skills on the one hand and its effects on developing self-efficacy and self-regulation on the other. To begin with, (Guleker, 2015) study set out to look at the impact learner reflections at a university EFL writing course have on self-efficacy beliefs about the writing course and on the attitudes towards reflection in general. Results showed that reflection increases self-efficacy of the course and students see reflection as a valuable tool. In the same vein, Zhang (2018) explored the change of EFL learners' level of self-efficacy in process-genre academic writing instruction. The teaching experiment was conducted for 14 weeks. A total of 59 graduate students participated in the experiment. Before the experiment, the results showed that the general level of EFL graduates' self-efficacy in academic writing was relatively low. After 14 weeks of academic writing instruction conducted by the process-genre approach, the participants' self-efficacy improved significantly. In the interview, participants also reported an increasing level of confidence in academic writing.

Anggraeni et al. (2024) investigated the effectiveness of self-regulated learning-based instruction and regular writing instruction on academic writing skills among university English as Foreign Language students with different self-efficacy levels. It also delved into the students' voices regarding the effectiveness of self-regulated learning-based instruction and regular writing instruction. For these aims, forty students in the experimental group received self-regulated learning-based instruction intervention, and another forty students received regular writing instruction. Forty out of eighty students were selected using purposive sampling to obtain the qualitative data. Self-efficacy questionnaires, argumentative essay writing tests, observations, writing diaries, and semi-structured interviews were utilized to gather quantitative and qualitative data. The results of quantitative data showed that self-regulated learning-based instruction and regular writing instruction effectively enhanced academic writing skills (contextualizing, summarizing, and sourcing) across university English as Foreign Language students' high, moderate, and low self-efficacy levels. Results obtained from observations, writing diaries, and interviews contended the benefits and challenges of self-regulated learning-based instruction and regular writing instruction.

In a similar survey, (Li, 2023)investigated the influence of online collaborative writing instruction on writing performance, writing self-efficacy, and writing motivation of Chinese EFL learners. The experimental group utilized collaborative writing and peer-editing activities outside the classroom, while the control group received traditional in-class instruction. The study spanned a duration of 13 weeks, during which writing tasks, writing motivation scales, and writing self-efficacy scales were employed to collect data. The findings revealed that the experimental group exhibited significantly greater improvement in writing performance, motivation, and self-efficacy

compared to the control group. By leveraging collaborative writing, instructors can foster improved performance, increased motivation, and enhanced self-efficacy among EFL learners.

Moussaoui (2024) conducted a quasi-experimental study seeking to enhance the writing quality and self-efficacy beliefs of Algerian undergraduate learners. The study employed task-based writing instruction within the process approach framework and various forms of formative feedback (self-, peer-, and teacher feedback). Data were collected through pre- and post-intervention writing tests to assess the participants' writing quality, as well as pre-and post-intervention surveys, along with post hoc interviews, to measure their writing self-efficacy levels. The analysis of the findings revealed that, in comparison to their pre-intervention performance, the participants exhibited varying degrees of progress in writing quality and a moderate increase in their self-reported writing self-efficacy levels. These results suggested that adopting a process-oriented task-based approach to teaching academic writing, along with diverse forms of formative feedback, positively enhanced EFL learners' writing skills and fostered more positive beliefs in their English writing abilities.

Nikcevic-Milkovic et al. (2022) study employed the social-cognitive model of writing to explore the issue of students' self-regulated learning (SRL) in EFL writing, with a special emphasis on the most important processes and strategies that may influence the quality of writing performance. The authors also wanted to explore whether there is an improvement in the quality of writing performance due to regular students' exposure to EFL learning at the university level. The quantitative part of the study involved 104 students (53 undergraduates and 51 graduates), while the qualitative part focused on two groups of higher and lower-proficiency writers. The quantitative part of the study pointed out a significant difference between the first and second measurement points in the quality of students' writing performance both at the undergraduate and graduate levels of study. Students in the second measurement point had a better writing performance than those in the first. The qualitative research results showed that higher-proficiency writers exhibited better SRL processes compared to lower-proficiency writers. The research findings suggest that students' writing proficiency benefits from incorporating more SRL processes in EFL learning/teaching in the Croatian educational context.

Tuyet (2024) aimed to create and assess an intervention to enhance academic writing and SRL abilities among English learners (ELs). ELs have a significant presence on American university and college campuses. Although many ELs succeed academically and get degrees, they often struggle with academic writing due to poor English competence and opportunities for practice. Evidence-based interventions are needed to improve academic writing skills for English Language Learners (ELs). Research suggests that incorporating self-regulated learning (SRL) instruction into writing courses is a promising approach.

Similarly, (Yang, 2024) examined how six EFL learners developed motivation and employed self-regulated learning strategies in writing in a university-level English writing course designed based on the socio-constructivist approach. Analysis of semi-structured interviews and self-reflections revealed that the participants experienced positive changes in writing motivation, including enhanced task interest, clarified writing goals, and increased self-efficacy in writing, as they engaged in interrelated social, interactive and collaborative writing activities. They also used various self-regulated learning strategies, such as goal setting, self-monitoring, self-assessment, self-reflection, seeking external help, revising, and self-selected models, to improve writing skills.

Cunying Fan and Juan Wang (2024) study classified self-regulated writing strategies into four distinct types: cognitive, metacognitive, social behavioral, and motivational. These types were combined with L2 learners' writing anxiety and writing difficulty to form conceptual models to predict high or low writing performance. Fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA) was used to gain a detailed understanding of the causal intricacies of writing performance. Data was

collected from a sample of 94 students attending a university in eastern China. fsQCA revealed a variety of configurations associated with EFL writing performance, with six of them leading to high performance and four to low performance. These configurations highlight the complex causal relationship between students' use of self-regulated writing strategies and their writing performance while considering their writing anxiety and perceived writing difficulty. The study provided theoretical and practical implications for L2 teachers and educators who wish to enhance L2 learners' writing performance.

Rahimi Yeganeh et al. (2024a) conducted a rigorous investigation into the utilization of formulaic language within both individualistic and collaborative writing instructional contexts. The findings of this research indicated that the application of formulaic language instruction exerted a statistically significant effect. Nonetheless, the variances observed among the experimental groups did not attain statistical significance. This study elucidates prospective benefits for educators involved in language instruction directed towards the enhancement of student development and achievement. Furthermore, the results of this inquiry may provide valuable insights for individuals engaged in the creation of educational materials, curriculum development, and policy formulation.

In another effort, Rahimi Yeganeh et al. (2024b) explored the ramifications of formulaic language instruction on autonomy, self-efficacy, and writing proficiency among a group of 80 Iranian undergraduate intermediate TEFL learners. For this analysis, participants were randomly assigned to either an experimental group (n = 40) or a control group (n = 40). The experimental group engaged in a collaborative EFL writing intervention, while the control group participated in their traditional mainstream classes, which emphasized individual learning of formulaic sequences. The findings revealed that the explicit instruction of formulaic language within a collaborative learning framework significantly improved the writing performance, self-efficacy, and autonomy of the experimental group in comparison to their control group peers. The authors suggested that when learners engage in communicative writing activities with their peers, they are provided with opportunities to negotiate meaning, exchange ideas, and collaboratively construct knowledge. This cooperative environment facilitates the enhancement of EFL writing through the integration of formulaic language. Additionally, the results from the interviews underscored that the collaborative instruction of formulaic sequences yields numerous advantages, including beneficial knowledge exchange, prompt written feedback, enhanced linguistic features, superior work quality, accelerated task completion, increased confidence and self-efficacy, greater autonomy, improved interpersonal skills, enhanced negotiation capabilities, and ultimately, refined management competencies.

The present study

While the use of formulaic sequences and dialogic instruction shows promise in enhancing self-efficacy and self-regulation behaviors, it is important to consider individual learner differences and the need for personalized instruction. Some learners may benefit more from other instructional methods, such as task-based activities, collaborative writing, or dialogic interaction, which also have been shown to improve self-efficacy and self-regulation in academic writing (Bozorgian et al., 2022; Iravani, 2023; Li, 2023). In accordance with Zimmerman and Bandura (1994) conceptual framework of academic self-regulation, the present study seeks to conduct a survey aimed at investigating the inter-relationship between the instruction of formulaic sequences and the development of writing skills and its impact on developing self-efficacy and self-regulation. Drawing upon findings of the previous studies in the related literature and based on the objectives of the present study, the following research questions have been postulated.

Research Questions

Q1: Does teaching of formulaic sequences have any significant effect on EFL learners' self-efficacy?

Q2: Does teaching of formulaic sequences have any significant effect on EFL learners' self-regulation?

Q3: Does teaching of formulaic sequences through dialogic interaction have any significant effect on EFL learners' writing performance?

3. METHODOLOGY

Design

The study employed a quasi-experimental pre-test and post-test design, which was quantitative in nature (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). The emphasis was primarily on quantitative data collection and analysis, which involved examining the responses provided by the participants in the questionnaires and their writing tasks. Due to the objective of establishing a cause-and-effect relationship between the independent variable (dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences through online collaborative task-based instruction) and dependent variables (academic writing performance, self-efficacy, and self-regulation), the study employed a quasi-experimental design. However, random assignment of the participants to the experimental and control groups was not possible due to resource constraints. Therefore, convenience sampling was used as a practical alternative (Ary et al., 2019).

Participants

The original pool of the present study consisted of 80 undergraduate TEFL students who were studying at two branches of Islamic Azad University, namely South Tehran Branch and Central Tehran Branch. They included male and female students who came from diverse ethnic backgrounds. Although they had different mother tongues, they all spoke Farsi as the official language. Besides, they had varying levels of proficiency in English. However, they were later homogenized through the Oxford Placement Tests (OPTs) and 60 TEFL students were identified as the ones with an intermediate level of English language proficiency, which was deemed appropriate for the study as it enabled them to handle formulaic sequences and successfully complete the required tasks. The participants' age range was between 19 and 30 years.

Instruments and material

The four instruments and the two materials used in this study are described below.

Oxford Placement Test

An Oxford Placement Test (OPT) (see Appendix A), developed by Dave (2004), was used to identify the homogeneous participants in terms of language proficiency. The OPT consisted of 200 multiple-choice items distributed in two sections, namely listening and grammar. Each section, comprising 100 items, required the participants to choose what word they heard (e.g., 'oarsman' or 'hoarseman'?). Besides, they had to check the correct grammar-related option in terms of the verb tense or sentence structure. Participants had 60 minutes to complete the test. OPT has a high internal consistency reliability of .94, which is very good (Muhammadpour et al., 2024).

Writing Self-efficacy Questionnaire

A Writing Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (WSEQ) (see Appendix B), adapted from Rahimi and Abedini (2009), was used to assess the participants' writing self-efficacy. WSEQ consisted of 18 Likert-Scale items, requiring the participants to indicate their level of agreement with each statement on a scale of 1 to 5, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree: (1) strongly disagree; (2) moderately disagree; (3) slightly disagree; (4) moderately agree; and (5) strongly

agree. They were given 10 minutes to respond to the questionnaire items. The face and content validity of the questionnaire was checked and confirmed by two professors in the subject-specific field. The questionnaire demonstrated good internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.83.

Questionnaire for Self-Regulated Learning Writing Strategies (QSRLWS)

A Questionnaire for Self-regulated Learning Writing Strategies (QSRLWS) (see Appendix C), developed by Shen and Wang (2024), was used to measure the participants' self-regulated learning of writing strategies. QSRLWS consisted of 44 items organized into 12 self-regulated learning writing strategies, namely self-initiation (4 items), planning (3 items), monitoring and evaluation (3 items), revising (4 items), text-generating (4 items), resourcing (3 items), social assistance or collaboration (6 items), acting on feedback (3 items), interest enhancement (3 items), emotional control (3 items), motivational self-talk (4 items), and self-consequence (4 items). The participants were kindly asked to state on a 5-point Likert Scale ranging from 1 to 5 how often they did each of the items. The Likert Scale ranged from 1 (never do), 2 (seldom do), 3 (sometimes do), 4 (often do), and 5 (always do). They were given 20 minutes to respond to the questionnaire items. The overall Cronbach's alpha consistency reliability for all items was equal to 0.94, and that for each of the 12 types of SRL writing strategies ranged from 0.79 to 0.92, indicating a high reliability for each scale (Shen & Wang, 2024).

Writing scoring rubric

An analytic writing scoring rubric (see Appendix D), adapted from Wiseman (2012), to assess the writing tasks before and after the treatment, which involved dialogic instruction of the formulaic sequences through online task-based collaborative writing instruction. The rubric consisted of five domains that reflected the construct of second language writing, as determined through a rigorous content-validation process. This process involved examining existing writing rubrics, analyzing student writing samples, seeking input from faculty members, aligning the domains with curricula and course objectives, and incorporating feedback from raters. The newly developed analytic rubric encompassed the following subdomains: task fulfillment, topic development, organization, register and vocabulary, and language control. The performance criteria for each domain were designed to differentiate between different levels of proficiency.

Writings tasks

The writing tasks were prepared after considering the participants' opinions about the writing topics prior to the treatment. Each participant was asked to propose up to three topics, and the most frequently suggested themes were randomly selected as the writing prompts. The aim of this process was to ensure that the selected writing topics appealed to the interests and preferences of as many participants as possible. Eventually, a total of 10 topics were finalized, covering areas such as the environment, tourism, globalization, academic ethics, economic factors, and features of imagined communities. Besides, following the guidelines for IELTS essay writing exam, the participants were instructed to write a 300-word essay on one of the selected topics, utilizing as many of the formulaic sequences as possible during the pretest and posttest phases and were given 40 minutes to do so.

Materials for dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences

Various materials were utilized to teach formulaic sequences, including news articles on a range of topics such as sports, science, politics, and economy. Additionally, short stories and paragraphs on different subjects were incorporated to cater to the diverse preferences of the participants. Care was taken in the selection of these readings to avoid using overly specialized or technical texts that

participants may have had limited background knowledge on, as this could potentially detract from the focus on formulaic language.

Procedure

Initially, ethical approval for conducting the research was sought from the deans of the two universities. Further, written online informed consents were obtained from a total of 80 undergraduate TEFL students conveniently selected from Islamic Azad University South Tehran Branch and Central Tehran Branch. An important ethical consideration was ensuring the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants' identities. There were no conflicts of interest to disclose. Next, all the participants completed the 60-minute Oxford Placement Tests (OPTs) in session one. Following Dave (2004) interpretation table of the OPT results, those whose scores fell within the range of 127 to 142 were identified as having intermediate language proficiency, totaling 60 individuals.

Subsequently, the 60 Iranian intermediate TEFL students were requested kindly to go through the pretesting phase by taking the writing task and completing the self-efficacy and self-regulation questionnaires. Then, the participants were assigned to either the control group or the experimental group, each with 30 participants. The experimental group underwent the treatment (i.e., dialogic instruction of the formulaic sequences through online collaborative task-based writing instruction), while the control group continued with their regular mainstream classes. The treatments took 10 sessions to complete. The treatment employed in the present study was as follows.

To meet the research objective, the online explicit instruction of formulaic sequences was carried out from sessions two to 11. The targeted formulaic sequences were explicitly presented to the experimental group participants online on the Adobe Connect Platform, and the instructions for accomplishing the tasks were given explicitly. This approach adhered to the guidelines proposed by Pellicer-Sanchez and Boers (2018), which suggested three ways of creating intentional learning conditions: (1) instructing learners to explore texts for the presence of formulaic language, (2) engaging learners in decontextualized formulaic language-focused activities that are not necessarily tied to any particular input text, and (3) involving learners with specific characteristics of formulaic language that can enhance memorability.

To this end, in order to familiarize the participants with the formulaic sequences, at the beginning of the intervention, a number of academic formulaic sequences were visually enhanced and defined as a technique to raise their awareness of them, following the approach suggested by (Peters & Pauwels, 2015). Therefore, the experimental group was consistently prompted to identify instances of formulaic sequences and phrases in the texts through an activity called "text chunking," which was previously employed by (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009). Subsequently, the glossing of formulaic sequences was gradually reduced, and the learners were tasked with independently recognizing these instances in the text.

In order to enhance the learning of formulaic sequences, the intervention was not restricted to exposing the instances of formulaic language via explicit instruction. Following the reading and input phase of the treatment, an output phase was introduced, which required the participants to actively utilize and recycle the formulaic language in a dialogic manner in the form of writing tasks. To this end, they were grouped together and given an output writing task to accomplish. The manner in which this was done varied according to the participants' preferences. These activities included employing the formulaic sequences in a writing task, for which the participants had to respond to questions using the formulaic sequences learned. After finishing the task, they would read and comment on each other's works to refine them. They were given the opportunity to discuss and share knowledge in groups. Finally, the teacher would collect and correct the papers and further provide corrective feedback.

The rationale for employing diverse methodologies and activities for acquiring formulaic language was derived from the findings of Peters and Pauwels (2015), which indicated that in order for EFL learners to transition from mere recognition of formulaic language to the ability to produce it appropriately, they need to undergo a substantial period of successive exposure and engagement at varying levels of activation and involvement through dialogic interaction. In simpler terms, in order for learners to effectively and naturally utilize their knowledge of formulaic language in output and communicative tasks, they must engage in extensive practice with the newly acquired language. The significance of providing ample opportunities for learners to consolidate their knowledge to the point where it can be readily accessed (procedural knowledge) is widely acknowledged in the field (Gatbonton & Segalowitz, 2005).

Following each treatment session, the participants in the experimental group were instructed to write a 300-word essay on one of the selected topics, utilizing as many of the formulaic sequences as possible that they had learned during the treatment session. This process was repeated for a total of 10 sessions and lasted 40 minutes each time. Due to time constraints and the curriculum that needed to be covered, writing assignments were also assigned as homework. The written samples were collected and exchanged among the peers, who were provided with specific instructions on which aspects of the text to focus on based on the previously explained writing rubrics. The feedback received from peers was then negotiated between the writer and the peer, and the writers were asked to revise their texts based on the feedback provided. The teacher was available to assist if any difficulties arose.

In addition to exchanging feedback on the appropriate use of formulaic sequences, the peers were also prompted to discuss the potential impact of learning formulaic sequences on their self-efficacy and self-regulation in terms of writing the linguistic units. This step was taken under the assumption that it could lead to an increased awareness of the potential effects of the independent variable of interest (dialogic instruction of the formulaic sequences through task-based online collaborative writing instruction) on the dependent variables of interest (writing performance, self-efficacy, and self-regulation). Alongside the feedback exchange for writing, these discussions were also conducted over the course of 10 sessions.

During the post-treatment phase in session 12, all the participants were required to take the writing task and complete the self-efficacy and self-regulation questionnaires. They were collected to be analyzed and compared with the pre-test results to find out the potential effect of learning formulaic sequences through dialogic interaction on their performance.

Data analysis

After checking and confirming the reliability of the questionnaires in terms of Cronbach's Alpha statistics, the paired and independent samples *t*-tests were employed as a statistical procedure to compare the writing, self-efficacy, and self-regulation pre-test and post-test results, with the aim of examining the potential effects of the treatment on the participants' performance. The paired and independent samples *t*-tests were run to compare the within-group and between-group differences in the participants' performance on the writing, self-efficacy, and self-regulation measures.

4. RESULTS

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 29 (IBM SPSS Statistics 29.0), was used to analyze the participants' performance. After confirming the acceptable reliability of the instruments in terms of the Cronbach's Alpha statistic and the normality of the pre-and post-test data using the Shapiro-Wilk test, paired samples t-tests were run to compare the pre-and post-test performances of the participants under the online collaborative task-based instruction of the formulaic sequences. Further, independent samples *t*-tests were performed to compare the mean

scores of the control and experimental groups in the pre-test and post-test phases in order to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences in terms of their writing, self-efficacy, and self-regulation performances before and after the treatment. Effect sizes were also reported in terms of the statistical tests performed.

In what follows, Tables 1 and 2 present the descriptive and inferential statistics related to the paired samples *t*-test run on the performances of the participants in each group from the pre- to the post-test.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics Related to the Participants' Performances on Writing Task, and Self-Efficacy and Self-regulation Questionnaires

		Writing		Self-efficacy		Self-regulation	
Group		WR.pre	WR.post	SE.pre	SE.post	SR.pre	SR.post
EG	M	12.53	15.43	13.23	15.03	24.33	34.53
	STD	1.40	1.30	1.54	1.40	1.72	2.92
CG	M	12.37	14.70	12.73	14.30	23.77	31.53
	STD	1.24	1.23	1.43	1.36	2.07	3.71

Note on Table 1: EG = Experimental Group; CG = Control Group; WR = Writing; SE = Self-efficacy; SR = Self-regulation; M = Mean; STD = Standard Deviation

Table 2: Results of Paired Samples t-Test Related to the Participants' Performances on Writing Task, and Self-Efficacy and Self-regulation Questionnaires

						95% CI				
Group			M	STD	STDEM	Lower	Upper	*t*	*df*	Sig.
EG	Pair1	WR	-2.90	1.78	.32	-3.56	-2.23	-8.88	29	.00
	Pair2	SE	-1.80	1.29	.23	-2.28	-1.31	-7.60	29	.00
	Pair3	SR	-10.20	2.57	.47	-11.16	-9.23	-21.66	29	.00
CG	Pair1	WR	-2.33	1.78	.32	-3.00	-1.66	-7.14	29	.00
	Pair2	SE	-1.56	.77	.14	-1.85	-1.27	-11.08	29	.00
	Pair3	SR	-7.76	3.71	.67	-9.15	-6.38	-11.46	29	.00

As evident from Table 1 and Table 2, the two groups displayed a statistically significant difference from the pretest to the posttest as a result of receiving their respective treatments. However, to respond to the following three research questions, we had to compare the performances of the two groups in terms of their writing performance and self-efficacy and self-regulation measures. To this end, the results of running independent samples *t*-tests are given below.

Research Question One

The first research question strove to examine whether dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences through online task-based collaborative writing instruction had any statistically significant effect on EFL learners' self-efficacy. The answer to this question was affirmative. To answer the first research question, an independent samples *t*-test was run on the self-efficacy scores of the two groups and the results are given in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Results of Independent Samples t-Test Related to the Participants' Performances on Self-Efficacy Questionnaire

		Levene's ToEV		t-Test for EoM					95% CI	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	MD	Std. ED	Lower	Upper
Self-efficacy	EV A	.00	.94	2.05	58	.04	.73	.35	.01	1.44
	EV NA			2.05	57.96	.04	.73	.35	.01	1.44

Note on Table 3: EV A = Equal Variance Assumed; EV NA = Equal Variances Not Assumed; MD = Mean Difference; Std. ED = Standard Error Difference; CI = Confidence Interval; EoM = Equality of Means; ToEV = Test for Equality of Variances

Table 3 indicates that the experimental group that received dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences through online task-based collaborative writing instruction displayed a statistically significant difference in terms of self-efficacy scores compared with their control group peers; $t(58) = 2.05$; $p = .04$. The effect size for this statistical significance was equal to Cohen's $d = .52$, which was considered a medium effect size (Cohen, 1992).

Research Question Two

The second research question probed whether dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences through online task-based collaborative writing instruction had any statistically significant effect on EFL learners' self-regulation. The answer to this question was affirmative. To answer the second research question, an independent samples t-test was run on the total self-regulation scores of the two groups and the results are given in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Results of Independent Samples t-Test Related to the Participants' Performances on Self-Regulation Questionnaire

		Levene's ToEV		t-Test for EoM					95% CI	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	MD	Std. ED	Lower	Upper
Self-regulation	EV A	1.88	.17	3.47	58	.00	3.00	.86	1.27	4.72
	EV NA			3.47	54.96	.00	3.00	.86	1.27	4.72

Note on Table 4: EV A = Equal Variance Assumed; EV NA = Equal Variances Not Assumed; MD = Mean Difference; Std. ED = Standard Error Difference; CI = Confidence Interval; EoM = Equality of Means; ToEV = Test for Equality of Variances

Table 4 reveals that the experimental group that received dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences through online task-based collaborative writing instruction displayed a statistically significant difference in terms of the total self-regulation scores compared with their control group counterparts; $t(58) = 3.47$; $p = .00$. The effect size for this statistical significance was equal to Cohen's $d = .89$, which was considered a large effect size (Cohen, 1992).

We were also interested to examine what self-regulation constructs, in particular, improved significantly as a result of the treatment. Therefore, the same procedure was followed for the related constructs and the results are presented in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Results of Independent Samples t-Test Related to the Participants' Performances on Self-Regulation Constructs

		Levene's ToEV		t-Test for EoM					95% CI	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	MD	Std. ED	Lower	Upper
Self-initiation	EV A	.09	.75	-.23	58	.81	-.03	.14	-.32	.25
	EV NA			-.23	57.57	.81	-.03	.14	-.32	.25
Planning	EV A	.00	.94	4.66	58	.00	.70	.15	.39	1.00
	EV NA			4.66	52.58	.00	.70	.15	.39	1.00
Monitoring& Evaluation	EV A	13.12	.00	4.28	58	.00	.63	.14	.33	.92
	EV NA			4.28	44.13	.00	.63	.14	.33	.93
Revising	EV A	5.77	.01	4.23	58	.00	.83	.19	.43	1.22
	EV NA			4.23	48.61	.00	.83	.19	.43	1.22
Text-generating	EV A	.56	.45	3.45	58	.00	.60	.17	.25	.94
	EV NA			3.45	53.92	.00	.60	.17	.25	.94
Resourcing	EV A	1.75	.19	2.00	58	.05	.30	.15	.00	.60
	EV NA			2.00	54.28	.05	.30	.15	.00	.60
SocialAssistance&Collaboration	EV A	.00	.98	2.55	58	.01	.80	.31	.17	1.42
	EV NA			2.55	57.67	.01	.80	.31	.17	1.42
ActingonFeedback	EV A	42.92	.00	2.33	58	.02	.43	.18	.06	.80
	EV NA			2.33	41.04	.02	.43	.18	.05	.80
InterestEnhancement	EV A	.73	.39	-1.31	58	.19	-.23	.17	-.58	.12
	EV NA			-1.31	56.56	.19	-.23	.17	-.58	.12
EmotionalControl	EV A	4.46	.03	-1.43	58	.15	-.26	.18	-.63	.10
	EV NA			-1.43	54.58	.15	-.26	.18	-.63	.10
Motivational SelfTalk	EV A	.00	.97	-1.25	58	.21	-.33	.26	-.86	.20
	EV NA			-1.25	57.93	.21	-.33	.26	-.86	.20
Self-Consequences	EV A	1.20	.27	-1.50	58	.13	-.43	.28	-1.00	.14
	EV NA			-1.50	56.62	.13	-.43	.28	-1.00	.14

Note on Table 5: EV A = Equal Variance Assumed; EV NA = Equal Variances Not Assumed; MD = Mean Difference; Std. ED = Standard Error Difference; CI = Confidence Interval; EoM = Equality of Means; ToEV = Test for Equality of Variances

Table 5 reveals that the experimental group that received dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences through online task-based collaborative writing instruction displayed a statistically significant difference in terms of the self-regulation constructs, such as planning (p = .00), monitoring and evaluation (p = .00), revising (p = .00), text-generating (p = .00), resourcing (p = .05), social assistance and collaboration (p = .01), and acting on feedback (p = .02), compared with their control group counterparts. The remaining constructs failed to reach statistical significance.

Research Question Three

The third research question queried whether dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences through online task-based collaborative writing instruction had any statistically significant effect on EFL learners' writing performance. The answer to this question was also affirmative. To answer the third research question, an independent samples t-test was run on the writing task scores of the two groups and the results are given in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Results of Independent Samples t-Test Related to the Participants' Performances on Writing Task

		Levene's ToEV		t-Test for EoM					95% CI	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	MD	Std. ED	Lower	Upper
Writing	**EV A**	.09	.76	2.23	58	.02	.73	.32	.07	1.39
	EV NA			2.23	57.83	.02	.73	.32	.07	1.39

Note on Table 6: EV A = Equal Variance Assumed; EV NA = Equal Variances Not Assumed; MD = Mean Difference; Std. ED = Standard Error Difference; CI = Confidence Interval; EoM = Equality of Means; ToEV = Test for Equality of Variances

Table 6 shows that the experimental group that received dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences through online task-based collaborative writing instruction displayed a statistically significant difference in terms of writing task performance compared with their control group counterparts. The effect size for this statistical significance was equal to Cohen's $d = .57$, which was considered a medium effect size (Cohen, 1992).

5. DISCUSSION

Although teaching formulaic sequences through dialogic writing instruction appears to be effective in boosting self-efficacy and self-regulation, it is crucial to account for the differences among individual learners, hence the need for tailored instruction. Therefore, this study aims to explore how dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences through task-based online collaborative academic writing instruction impacts the self-efficacy and self-regulation of Iranian intermediate TEFL students. To this end, three research questions were formulated.

The first research question probed whether teaching formulaic sequences had any significant effect on Iranian intermediate TEFL students' self-efficacy. Results pointed to the effectiveness of the dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences through task-based online collaborative writing instruction on the Iranian intermediate TEFL students' self-efficacy measure. Our results are generally in line with those of the previous studies (Gheitasi Azami, 2024; Guleker, 2015; Iravani (2023); Kamil, 2024; Li, 2023; Moussaoui, 2024; Zhang, 2018) in that collaborative task-based instruction of formulaic sequences can lead to EFL learners' improvement in terms of self-efficacy measures. The possible reasons are that dialogic instruction encourages interactive and collaborative learning, creating a relaxed atmosphere where students feel at ease experimenting with their language skills. This supportive environment boosts their confidence and ability to manage their learning as they grow more proficient through practice and constructive feedback (Gheitasi Azami, 2024). Additionally, collaborative writing activities—especially those held on online platforms—have proven effective in enhancing students' confidence in their writing and their ability to self-manage and self-regulate. These activities allow for peer feedback and shared learning experiences, which further enrich the learning process (Li, 2023) leading to improved self-efficacy among the EFL learners.

The second research question queried whether teaching of formulaic sequences had any significant effect on Iranian intermediate TEFL students' self-regulation. Results revealed the effectiveness of the dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences through task-based online collaborative writing instruction on the Iranian intermediate TEFL students' self-regulation measure. Our results are in agreement with those of previous studies (e.g.,Al-Jiboury, 2024; Anggraeni et al., 2024; Fan and Wang, 2024; Nikcevic-Milkovic et al., 2022; Tuyet, 2024) in that self-regulation can improve writing task performance. The possible reasons are that collaborative task-based instruction of formulaic sequences can foster autonomy, self-monitoring, and strategic planning, gradually leading to improved self-regulation among EFL learners. This multifaceted approach not only improves writing performance but also addresses individual learner characteristics, such as anxiety and perceived difficulty. Also, previous studies showed that SRL-

based instruction could significantly improve academic writing skills, including contextualizing and summarizing, across different self-efficacy levels (Anggraeni et al., 2024).

Besides, the results were indicative of the outperformance of the experimental group in terms of a number of self-regulation constructs, such as planning, monitoring and evaluation, revising, text-generating, resourcing, social assistance and collaboration, and acting on feedback, which seems to be the explicit outcome of the proposed treatment in this study. These findings are in line with those of (Cunying Fan & Juan Wang, 2024; C. Fan & J. Wang, 2024) in that a configuration of self-regulated writing strategies, such as cognitive, metacognitive, social-behavioral, and motivational, can be particularly effective in enhancing the EFL learners' self-regulatory behaviors leading to improvements in writing task performance. This can be achieved under task-based collaborative writing instruction. Therefore, it stands to reason that there is a relationship between EFL learners' use of self-regulated writing strategies and their writing performance.

The third research question asked whether teaching formulaic sequences through dialogic interaction had any significant effect on Iranian intermediate TEFL students' writing performance. Results indicated the effectiveness of the dialogic instruction of formulaic sequences through task-based online collaborative writing instruction on the Iranian intermediate TEFL students' writing task performance. Our results run in tandem with those of previous studies (Li, 2023; Rahimi Yeganeh et al., 2024) in that the collaborative instruction of formulaic sequences would lead to the betterment of writing performance, self-efficacy, and autonomy. The possible reasons are that when learners engage in communicative writing activities with their peers, facilitated by dialogic interaction, they are blessed with opportunities to negotiate meaning, exchange ideas, and collaboratively construct knowledge. This cooperative environment facilitates the enhancement of EFL writing through the integration of formulaic language. Also, collaborative instruction of formulaic sequences yields numerous advantages, including beneficial knowledge exchange, prompt written feedback, enhanced linguistic features, superior work quality, accelerated task completion, increased confidence and self-efficacy, greater autonomy, improved interpersonal skills, enhanced negotiation capabilities, and, ultimately, refined management competencies.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the results showed the impact of online collaborative task-based instruction with a focus on formulaic sequence on the Iranian intermediate TEFL students in terms of their writing task performance, self-efficacy and self-regulation. These students thrive in the supportive nature of collaborating online, sharing thoughts and constructive feedback, and learning from their peers around them in a low-pressure environment. By tackling writing tasks together, they were emboldened to experiment with language and/or their own voices without the fear of being shot down, building their confidence organically. Learning formulaic sequences this way offered the students practical tools that conditioned the generation of writing fluency, which in return nourished smoother and more coherent expression overall. These types of collaboration and direct instruction fostered a model of growth and support.

Therefore, the findings bear pedagogical implications for all the stakeholders, including the TEFL professors, TEFL students, curriculum designers, and policymakers. The online collaborative task-based instruction could be considered an effective pedagogy that can help TEFL students deal with the complexities related to written production. We are preparing these learners for success in their education not only by developing their competency in written language and increasing their confidence and self-regulation but also by equipping them with these essential skills that will stay with them for life. Training against these will better equip individuals to succeed in academic contexts, which will subsequently enable individuals to do better in real-world scenarios.

Moreover, collaborative writing tasks can be adapted to focus the students on formulaic sequences to enhance their writing skills. As a result, they are able to recognize reoccurring phrases and sentence structures, allowing their writing to become increasingly clearer and more effective. Also, participation in cooperative work can greatly increase student self-efficacy. As students share their work and are critiqued by peers, they become more confident in their language skills and start to take risks in their writing. That said, a virtual co-learning environment helps create a sense of community for learners. Such peer support encourages students to immerse themselves in the learning journey while also creating a milieu for discussing various points of view and backgrounds. Also, with the rise of online collaboratively taught instruction, students are honing tactics that apply to wider worlds outside of school, connecting classrooms with meaningful exchanges outside. This flexibility is essential in a more globalized world. Finally, this equips them for future endeavors that demand written communication, as they have developed strong writing and self-management skills, instilled confidence and equipping them for the academic and professional worlds.

However, the present study was limited in terms of a number of factors. For example, the convenience sampling method would limit the generalizability of the findings; that is, the current sample could not be adequately representative as only Iranian intermediate TEFL students of only two branches of Islamic Azad University, namely South Tehran Branch and Central Tehran Branch were selected as the participants in this study. Therefore, the findings may not generalize to larger populations or other educational contexts. The overall quality of the instruction might have been influenced by the students' internet access and quality. Besides, there might have been varied levels of technology awareness among the participants. The study duration, including the intervention sessions, might also have played a negative role. Thus, other study designs, such as longitudinal might be needed to add to the robustness and rigor of the results. In order to provide a more in-depth picture of how the intervention aided the experimental group students, adding a qualitative aspect including semi-structured interviews, observation protocols, and self-reports could be useful.

Also, the study was delimited to Iranian intermediate TEFL students only, which turned the spotlight on language proficiency. Therefore, the findings might not be useful for advanced or beginner learners, which may also provide valuable insights into correlations and open new avenues for future research. Besides, the intervention relied heavily on formulaic sequences and left other mechanics of writing untouched. In addition, the study was conducted online and cannot be generalized to face-to-face settings. The conversation may have looked quite different, provided these same instructional practices were at play in traditional classrooms. Another delimiting factor was the duration of the collaborative writing tasks, which could have restricted variations in how the participants interacted with each other during the study.

References

Al-Jiboury, A. B. A. (2024). Using self-regulated strategy of development in teaching writing for Iraqi EFL university students. *Journal of Language Studies*, *8*(6), 233-247. https://doi.org/10.25130/lang.8.6.14

Anggraeni, C. W., Mujiyanto, J., Rustipa, K., & Widhiyanto, W. (2024). Effects of utilizing self-regulated learning-based instruction on EFL students' academic writing skills: a mixed-method investigation. *Research Square*, 1-39. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4651154/v1

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen Irvine, C. K., & Walker, D. (2019). *Introduction to research in education*. Cengage Learning.

Bandura, A. (2000). Self-efficacy: The foundation of agency. In W. J. Perrig & A. Grob (Eds.), *Control of human behavior, mental processes, and consciousness: Essays in honor of the*

60th birthday of August Flammer (pp. 17-33). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2000-08381-002

Boers, F., & Lindstromberg, S. (2009). Selecting chunks for the L2 classroom. In *Optimizing a lexical approach to instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 55-78). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230245006_4

Boscolo, P., & Hidi, S. (2007). The multiple meanings of motivation to write. In S. Hidi & P. Boscolo (Eds.), *Writing and motivation* (pp. 1-16). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1163/9781849508216_002

Cohen, J. (1992). Statistical power analysis. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *1*(3), 98-101. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep10768783

Conklin, K., & Schmitt, N. (2012). The processing of formulaic language. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *32*(1), 45-61. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190512000074

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

Dave, A. (2004). *Oxford placement test 2: Test pack*. Oxford University Press.

Davis, M., & Morley, M. (2018). Facilitating learning about academic phraseology: Teaching activities for student writers. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.v0i0.468

Derakhshan, A., Khalili, A. N., & Beheshti, F. (2016). Developing EFL learner's speaking ability, accuracy and fluency. *English Language and Literature Studies*, *6*(2), 177-186. https://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v6n2p177

Fan, C., & Wang, J. (2024). Configurational impact of self-regulated writing strategy, writing anxiety, and perceived writing difficulty on EFL writing performance: an fsQCA approach. *Scientific Reports*, *14*(1), 11125. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-61537-x

Fan, C., & Wang, J. (2024). Configurational impact of self-regulated writing strategy, writing anxiety, and perceived writing difficulty on EFL writing performance: an fsQCA approach. *Scientific Reports*, *14*(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-61537-x

Fujioka, M. (2001). Asian students' English writing experience.*Proceedings of the 27th Annual JALT Conference*

Gatbonton, E., & Segalowitz, N. (2005). Rethinking communicative language teaching: A focus on access to fluency. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *61*(3), 325-353. https://doi.org/10.1353/cml.2005.0016

Gheitasi Azami, A. (2024). The Effects of Growth Mindset Intervention on Iranian EFL Learners' Vocabulary Development. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, *9*(2), 20-29. http://ijreeonline.com/article-1-845-en.html

Guleker, R. (2015). Promoting habits of reflection and self-efficacy through guided reflection in an EFL writing course. *European Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, *1*(2), 78-82. https://revistia.com/index.php/ejls/article/view/750/749

Harris, K. R., Graham, S., Mason, L. H., & Saddler, B. (2002). Developing self-regulated writers. *Theory into Practice*, *41*(2), 110-115. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1477462

Iravani, N. (2023). The Effect of task-based writing instruction on Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners' self-efficacy and epistemic beliefs. *Educational Considerations*, *49*(1). https://doi.org/10.4148/0146-9282.2354

Li, Y. (2023). The effect of online collaborative writing instruction on enhancing writing performance, writing motivation, and writing self-efficacy of Chinese EFL learners. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1165221

Moussaoui, S. (2024). Process-oriented task-based instruction and multiple feedback forms. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies*, *18*(1), 96-116. https://doi.org/10.53543/jeps.vol18iss1pp96-116

Muhammadpour, M., Zafarghandi, A. M., & Tahriri, A. (2024). The effect of metacognitive intervention on the listening performance and metacognitive awareness of high-and low-working memory capacity EFL Learners. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *53*(5), 70. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-024-10102-8

Newfields, T. (2003). Helping EFL students acquire academic writing skills. *Journal of Nanzan Junior College*, *30*, 99-120.

Nikcevic-Milkovic, A., Nikcevic-Milkovic, A., Balenovic, K., & Brala-Mudrovcic, J. (2022). Self-Regulated learning and socio-demographic factors in students' L1/L2 writing proficiency. *Journal of Language and Education*, *8*(1), 110-116. https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2022.11581

Pellicer-Sanchez, A., & Boers, F. (2018). Pedagogical approaches to the teaching and learning of formulaic language. In A. Siyanova-Chanturia & A. Pellicer-Sanchez (Eds.), *Understanding formulaic language: A second language acquisition perspective* (pp. 153-173). Routledge.

Peters, E., & Pauwels, P. (2015). Learning academic formulaic sequences. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *20*(1), 28-39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2015.04.002

Rafieyan, V. (2018). Role of knowledge of formulaic sequences in language proficiency: Significance and ideal method of instruction. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *3*(1), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-018-0050-6

Rahimi, A., & Abedini, A. (2009). The interface between EFL learners' self-efficacy concerning listening comprehension and listening proficiency. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, *3*(1), 14-28. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/111876

Rahimi Yeganeh, M., Najafi Karimi, S., & Marzban, A. (2024). Developing autonomy and self-efficacy in writing among intermediate Iranian EFL learners through collaborative versus individual instruction of formulaic sequences. *Journal of Language and Translation*, *14*(4).

Rahimi Yeganeh, M., Najafi Karimi, S., & Marzban, A. (2024a). Effect of Instruction of formulaic language on writing ability of intermediate EFL learners. *Journal of Language and Translation*, *14*(3), 127-143. https://doi.org/10.30495/TTLT.2024.1047676

Rahimi Yeganeh, M., Najafi Karimi, S., & Marzban, A. (2024b). Developing autonomy and self-efficacy in writing among intermediate Iranian EFL learners through collaborative versus individual instruction of formulaic sequences. *Journal of Language and Translation*, *14*(4).

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Schunk, D. H. (2003). Self-efficacy for reading and writing: Influence of modeling, goal setting, and self-evaluation. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *19*(2), 159-172. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573560308219

Shen, B., & Wang, L. (2024). Development and validation of Questionnaire for Self-regulated Learning Writing Strategies (QSRLWS) for EFL learners. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 1-31. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2024-0230

Tahmasebi, R., & Khodabakhshzadeh, H. (2017). Enhancing writing ability and self-regulation through teacher-led collaborative modeling. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *6*(2), 239-248. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.2p.239

Talebi, M., Shangarffam, N., & Mall-Amiri, B. (2024). Exploring into the role of teachers' self-efficacy and resilience in IELTS context: A qualitative approach. *Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies*, *4*(1), 84-102. https://doi.org/10.1.23.240/jals.2024.07311127794

Thoai, T. N. L. (2020). Observing EFL teachers' use of formulaic language in class. *Indonesian JELT: Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, *15*(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.25170/ijelt.v15i1.1410

Tuyet, T. (2024). Intervention Development for Self-Regulated Writing among English Learners: A Single-Case Design Study. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, *4*(3), 1399-1410. https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049x.2024.4.3.2953

Wiseman, C. S. (2012). A comparison of the performance of analytic vs. holistic scoring rubrics to assess L2 writing. *International Journal of Language Testing*, *2*(1), 59-92.

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

Wray, A. (2013). Formulaic language. *Language Teaching*, *46*(3), 316-334. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444813000013

Yang, M. (2024). Fostering EFL university students' motivation and self-regulated learning in writing: A socio-constructivist approach. *System*, *124*, 103386-103386. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103386

Yeldham, M. (2018). The influence of formulaic language on L2 listener decoding in extended discourse. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *12*(2), 105-119. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2015.1103246

Zhang, Z. (2018). Academic writing difficulty of Chinese students: The cultural issue behind Chinese and British academic writing styles. *Studies in Literature and Language*, *17*(2), 1-7. http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/view/10570

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation* (pp. 13-39). Academic Press.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Bandura, A. (1994). Impact of self-regulatory influences on writing course attainment. *American Educational Research Journal*, *31*(4), 845-862. https://doi.org/10.2307/1163397

Al-Jiboury, A. B. A. (2024). Using self-regulated strategy of development in teaching writing for Iraqi EFL university students. *Journal of Language Studies*, *8*(6), 233-247. https://doi.org/10.25130/lang.8.6.14

Anggraeni, C. W., Mujiyanto, J., Rustipa, K., & Widhiyanto, W. (2024). Effects of utilizing self-regulated learning-based instruction on EFL students' academic writing skills: a mixed-method investigation. *Research Square*, 1-39. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4651154/v1

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen Irvine, C. K., & Walker, D. (2019). *Introduction to research in education*. Cengage Learning.

Bandura, A. (2000). Self-efficacy: The foundation of agency. In W. J. Perrig & A. Grob (Eds.), *Control of human behavior, mental processes, and consciousness: Essays in honor of the 60th birthday of August Flammer* (pp. 17-33). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2000-08381-002

Boers, F., & Lindstromberg, S. (2009). Selecting chunks for the L2 classroom. In *Optimizing a lexical approach to instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 55-78). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230245006_4

Boscolo, P., & Hidi, S. (2007). The multiple meanings of motivation to write. In S. Hidi & P. Boscolo (Eds.), *Writing and motivation* (pp. 1-16). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1163/9781849508216_002

Cohen, J. (1992). Statistical power analysis. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *1*(3), 98-101. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep10768783

Conklin, K., & Schmitt, N. (2012). The processing of formulaic language. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *32*(1), 45-61. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190512000074

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

Dave, A. (2004). *Oxford placement test 2: Test pack*. Oxford University Press.

Davis, M., & Morley, M. (2018). Facilitating learning about academic phraseology: Teaching activities for student writers. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.v0i0.468

Derakhshan, A., Khalili, A. N., & Beheshti, F. (2016). Developing EFL learner's speaking ability, accuracy and fluency. *English Language and Literature Studies*, *6*(2), 177-186. https://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v6n2p177

Fan, C., & Wang, J. (2024). Configurational impact of self-regulated writing strategy, writing anxiety, and perceived writing difficulty on EFL writing performance: an fsQCA approach. *Scientific Reports*, *14*(1), 11125. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-61537-x

Fan, C., & Wang, J. (2024). Configurational impact of self-regulated writing strategy, writing anxiety, and perceived writing difficulty on EFL writing performance: an fsQCA approach. *Scientific Reports*, *14*(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-61537-x

Fujioka, M. (2001). Asian students' English writing experience.*Proceedings of the 27th Annual JALT Conference*

Gatbonton, E., & Segalowitz, N. (2005). Rethinking communicative language teaching: A focus on access to fluency. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *61*(3), 325-353. https://doi.org/10.1353/cml.2005.0016

Gheitasi Azami, A. (2024). The Effects of Growth Mindset Intervention on Iranian EFL Learners' Vocabulary Development. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, *9*(2), 20-29. http://ijreeonline.com/article-1-845-en.html

Guleker, R. (2015). Promoting habits of reflection and self-efficacy through guided reflection in an EFL writing course. *European Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, *1*(2), 78-82. https://revistia.com/index.php/ejls/article/view/750/749

Harris, K. R., Graham, S., Mason, L. H., & Saddler, B. (2002). Developing self-regulated writers. *Theory into Practice*, *41*(2), 110-115. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1477462

Iravani, N. (2023). The Effect of task-based writing instruction on Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners' self-efficacy and epistemic beliefs. *Educational Considerations*, *49*(1). https://doi.org/10.4148/0146-9282.2354

Li, Y. (2023). The effect of online collaborative writing instruction on enhancing writing performance, writing motivation, and writing self-efficacy of Chinese EFL learners. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1165221

Moussaoui, S. (2024). Process-oriented task-based instruction and multiple feedback forms. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies*, *18*(1), 96-116. https://doi.org/10.53543/jeps.vol18iss1pp96-116

Muhammadpour, M., Zafarghandi, A. M., & Tahriri, A. (2024). The effect of metacognitive intervention on the listening performance and metacognitive awareness of high-and low-working memory capacity EFL Learners. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *53*(5), 70. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-024-10102-8

Newfields, T. (2003). Helping EFL students acquire academic writing skills. *Journal of Nanzan Junior College*, *30*, 99-120.

Nikcevic-Milkovic, A., Nikcevic-Milkovic, A., Balenovic, K., & Brala-Mudrovcic, J. (2022). Self-Regulated learning and socio-demographic factors in students' L1/L2 writing proficiency. *Journal of Language and Education*, *8*(1), 110-116. https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2022.11581

Pellicer-Sanchez, A., & Boers, F. (2018). Pedagogical approaches to the teaching and learning of formulaic language. In A. Siyanova-Chanturia & A. Pellicer-Sanchez (Eds.), *Understanding formulaic language: A second language acquisition perspective* (pp. 153-173). Routledge.

Peters, E., & Pauwels, P. (2015). Learning academic formulaic sequences. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *20*(1), 28-39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2015.04.002

Rafieyan, V. (2018). Role of knowledge of formulaic sequences in language proficiency: Significance and ideal method of instruction. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *3*(1), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-018-0050-6

Rahimi, A., & Abedini, A. (2009). The interface between EFL learners' self-efficacy concerning listening comprehension and listening proficiency. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, *3*(1), 14-28. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/111876

Rahimi Yeganeh, M., Najafi Karimi, S., & Marzban, A. (2024). Developing autonomy and self-efficacy in writing among intermediate Iranian EFL learners through collaborative versus individual instruction of formulaic sequences. *Journal of Language and Translation*, *14*(4).

Rahimi Yeganeh, M., Najafi Karimi, S., & Marzban, A. (2024a). Effect of Instruction of formulaic language on writing ability of intermediate EFL learners. *Journal of Language and Translation*, *14*(3), 127-143. https://doi.org/10.30495/TTLT.2024.1047676

Rahimi Yeganeh, M., Najafi Karimi, S., & Marzban, A. (2024b). Developing autonomy and self-efficacy in writing among intermediate Iranian EFL learners through collaborative versus individual instruction of formulaic sequences. *Journal of Language and Translation*, *14*(4).

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Schunk, D. H. (2003). Self-efficacy for reading and writing: Influence of modeling, goal setting, and self-evaluation. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *19*(2), 159-172. https://doi.org/10.1080/10573560308219

Shen, B., & Wang, L. (2024). Development and validation of Questionnaire for Self-regulated Learning Writing Strategies (QSRLWS) for EFL learners. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 1-31. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2024-0230

Tahmasebi, R., & Khodabakhshzadeh, H. (2017). Enhancing writing ability and self-regulation through teacher-led collaborative modeling. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *6*(2), 239-248. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.2p.239

Talebi, M., Shangarffam, N., & Mall-Amiri, B. (2024). Exploring into the role of teachers' self-efficacy and resilience in IELTS context: A qualitative approach. *Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies*, *4*(1), 84-102. https://doi.org/10.1.23.240/jals.2024.07311127794

Thoai, T. N. L. (2020). Observing EFL teachers' use of formulaic language in class. *Indonesian JELT: Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, *15*(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.25170/ijelt.v15i1.1410

Tuyet, T. (2024). Intervention Development for Self-Regulated Writing among English Learners: A Single-Case Design Study. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary*

Research and Studies, *4*(3), 1399-1410.
https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049x.2024.4.3.2953

Wiseman, C. S. (2012). A comparison of the performance of analytic vs. holistic scoring rubrics to assess L2 writing. *International Journal of Language Testing*, *2*(1), 59-92.

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

Wray, A. (2013). Formulaic language. *Language Teaching*, *46*(3), 316-334.
https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444813000013

Yang, M. (2024). Fostering EFL university students' motivation and self-regulated learning in writing: A socio-constructivist approach. *System*, *124*, 103386-103386.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103386

Yeldham, M. (2018). The influence of formulaic language on L2 listener decoding in extended discourse. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *12*(2), 105-119.
https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2015.1103246

Zhang, Z. (2018). Academic writing difficulty of Chinese students: The cultural issue behind Chinese and British academic writing styles. *Studies in Literature and Language*, *17*(2), 1-7. http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/view/10570

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation* (pp. 13-39). Academic Press.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Bandura, A. (1994). Impact of self-regulatory influences on writing course attainment. *American Educational Research Journal*, *31*(4), 845-862.
https://doi.org/10.2307/1163397