Figures are *italicized*. Tables are in **bold**.

achievement goals, emotions' effect on 145–146

ANOVA method of analysis 49

anxiety 142–143, 163–165

articulation speech module 19

artificial intelligence (AI) 175, 250

asynchronous modality 179

attention, learner *see* Cognition Hypothesis; Kellogg's working memory model; Limited Attentional Capacity Model; Triadic Componential Framework

audience type 86–87

augmented reality (AR) 250

authentic-language databases (corpus linguistics) 194–208; overview 194–195, 206; application of 246–247; CALF approach 195–196, 197–200; cohesion 204; epistemic stance 204–206; future research 207–208; genre, studies of 202–204, 208; principles 195–196, 200–203; register, studies of 200–202; tools 196–197, 198, 202, 203, 204, 205; for tracking learner development 207

between-group design 34, **41**, 47

behavior as evidence of learning 102–103, 104

behavioral engagement 117

bilingual speech production models *see* speech production and dialogue models

broaden-and-build theory 140, 143–145, 146–147

Canva 187

CH *see* Cognition Hypothesis

choice 106, 109, 125–128, 244

COCA (Corpus of Contemporary American English) 196–197

Cognition Hypothesis (CH): overview 4–5, 239; compared to LACM 33–34, 242–243, **243**; and emotions 138; and engagement theories 99; limited support for 7, 78; for oral L2 studies 32–33; and technology 157–159, 161–162, 166–167; and writing processes 55–56, 77–78, 177; *see also* Stabilize, Simplify, Automatize, Restructure, Complexify model; Triadic Componential Framework

cognitive engagement 117

cognitive function, emotions' effect on 142–144

cognitive information processing approach 238–239

Cognitive Load Theory 99

Cognitive Task Complexity (CTC) and second language (L2) performance: overview 3–10, 238–252; authentic-language databases (corpus linguistics) 194–208; emotions 134–147; engagement, issues in 116–130; engagement, theories of 97–111; meta-research study (systematic methodological synthesis) 215–234; oral L2 studies, research review 32–51; speech production and dialogue models 17–28; virtual collaborative writing 174–188; virtual interaction 155–168; writing processes systems models 55–70; writing research, gaps in 75–88

cohesion 204

Coh-Metrix indices 202

communicative stress 49

computer-mediated communication (CMC) 175–176, 185–186

conception speech module 19

conceptual demands *see* resource-directing task complexity

conceptual lexicon 20

content familiarity 120–121

content support 57–59, 83–84, 86; *see also* scaffolding

control-value theory 140, 141–142, 144–145

corpus linguistics *see* authentic-language databases

Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) 196–197

CTC *see* Cognitive Task Complexity and second language performance

data-driven learning (DDL) 246

declarative grammatical knowledge 20

dialogic vs monologic task conditions 49

differentiated learning tasks 246–247

Digital Game-Based Learning (DGBL) 163–165

discoursal perspectives 204

EF-Cambridge Open Language Database (EFCAMDAT) 198

emotions 134–147; overview 134–135; anxiety 142–143, 163–165; compared to task complexity frameworks 135–138; evocation of 139, 141–142; impact of 139–141, 142–146; marginalization of 138–139; positive 143–144; subjective compared with objective task complexity 136–137, 139–141, 146; Task Complexity-Emotion Interaction Framework 146–147; trait emotions 139–141

encoding 20–23, 58–59, 67, 84–95

engagement, issues in 116–130; overview 116–118; choice 125–128; conclusions 128–130; engagement with language (EWL) 117–118; Flow theory 100, 117, 129; future research 130; measuring issues 129–130; resource-directing aspects 121–123; resource-dispersing aspects 118–121; task types and CALF 123–125; types of engagement 117

engagement, theories of 97–111; overview 97–98; approaches 104–105; behavior as evidence of learning 102–103, 104; choice 106, 109; and CTC theory 98–99, 102–106; definitions 97, 103; future

research 109–111; measurement practices 103–104; motivation compared to engagement 243–245; reclaiming engagement, principles for 101–102; research characteristics 105–106; self-regulatory control 109–110; self-repair as indicator of 36, 103–104; studies 106–109, **107**; teacher noticing and learner engagement 102; types of engagement 99–102; *see also* engagement, issues in

engagement with language (EWL) 117–118

entrainment 24; *see also* interactive-alignment accounts

epistemic stance 204–206

experiences, as knowledge store 19

extraneous load 99

eye-tracking technology 85, 184–185

face-to-face (FTF) task mode 122, 159

Flow theory 100, 117, 129

formulation speech module 19

formulation system of writing process *see* writing processes systems models

functional approach 196, 200–203

Gachon Learner Corpus 203

games 163–165

germane load 99

Google Docs 187

group design 34, **41**, 47

group size 185

individual differences (ID) variables 165–166, 226–227, **226**

individual learner performance 207

individualization 250–251, 252

intentional reasoning 121–122

interaction, peer 178–179

interaction definition of task complexity 135–136

interactionist perspective of language acquisition 175

interactive inference, mechanisms of 24

interactive-alignment accounts 17–18, 23–26, *24*, 27

interdisciplinarity 251, 252

intrinsic complexity 99, 137

Kellogg's working memory model: cognitive processes in writing 56–57, 65–69, 75–76; planning, impact of 61–62; planning and task complexity, interactions between 62–65; task complexity in L2 writing 58–60

keystroke logging 84, 85, 184

knowledge stores 19–20

L2 Syntactic Complexity Analyzer (L2SCA) 197

LACM *see* Limited Attentional Capacity Model

language features use, extent of 227–230

language-related episodes (LREs) 36, 51

learner-centeredness compared to programmatic education 106

learning gains 36, 47, 51

lemmas 20, 21

Levelt, Willem J. M. 19–20, 104–105; *see also* speech production and dialogue models

lexemes 20, 21

Lexical Complexity Analyzer 198

lexicons 20

Limited Attentional Capacity Model (LACM): overview 3–4, 5, 239–241; compared to CH 33–34, 242–243, **243**; and technology 156–158, 161–162; and writing processes 55–56, 77–78, 177; *see also* Cognition Hypothesis

longitudinal learner development 207, 248–249, 251

long-term memory 20; *see also* working memory

LREs (language-related episodes) 36, 51

macro- and micro-planning 20, 22, 65–66

macrostructure support 83–84, 86; *see also* content support; scaffolding

MANOVA method of analysis 49

Measure of Textual Lexical Diversity (MTLD) 198

memory 20; *see also* working memory

mental lexicon 19

metadiscoursal perspectives 204–206

meta-research study (systematic methodological synthesis) 215–234; overview 215; coding scheme of study **222–223**; future research 233–234; goals of study 218–219; language features use 227–230, **227–228**; literature review 216–218; means of CTC research 224–227, **224**, **226**; methodology of study 219–224; publication of CTC research **221**; research contexts, designs, and analyses in studies 230–233, **231–232**; systematic methodological synthesis defined 215, 217–218; target languages of learners **230**

methodological synthesis, systematic *see* meta-research study

micro- and macro-planning 20, 22, 65–66

Model of Cognitive Task Complexity in EFL Writing Processes 65–69, *67*

monitor loops 20

monitoring system of writing process *see* writing processes systems models

monologic vs dialogic task conditions 49

motivation 97–100, 137–142, 144–146, 165, 243–244, 247–251

MTLD (Measure of Textual Lexical Diversity) 198

multimodality 176, 186–187

Multiplayer Online Games (MMOGs) 163–165

neuroscientific methods of measurement 110

novelty 23–24, *24*, 243, 247–248

objective task complexity 136–137, 146

observation compared to prediction 105

oral second-language studies, research review 32–51; overview 32–34; analysis methods 49; discussion of studies 47–51; group design **41**, 47, 48; methodology of current study 34–40, **38–39**; reasoning tasks 49; results of current study 40–46, *40*, **42**, **43**, **44**, **46**; source distribution of study **41**; task conditions, monologic vs dialogic 49; task sequence 42, 43, 47, 158, 249–250, 252; technology for task design 49–50; validation 50

Output Hypothesis 22

pauses in speech 84–85

peer interaction 178–179

percolation 25

performance-approach goals 145–146

performance-avoidance goals 145

phonological loop resource pools 56–57

phraseological approach 196

Plot 187

positive psychology (PP) 140, 143–145, 146–147

prediction compared to observation 105

priming 24

procedural demands *see* resource-dispersing task complexity

procedural grammatical knowledge 20

process compared to product focus 105

processing efficiency theory 142–144

psycholinguistic compared to psychological approach to engagement 104–105

reasoning demands 76–79, 224–225

resource pools 56–57

resource requirement definition of task complexity 135–136, 137

resource-directing task complexity: and engagement 121–123; evocation of emotions in 141–142; features of 4–5, **5**, 22–23, 224–225, **224**; and L2 writing processes 76–80; for oral L2 studies 32–34; *see also* Cognition Hypothesis; Triadic Componential Framework

resource-dispersing task complexity: and engagement 118–121; evocation of emotions in 141–142; features 4–5, **5**, 23, **224**, 225; and L2 writing processes 80–84; for oral L2 studies 32–34; technology as a variable 168; *see also* Cognition Hypothesis; Triadic Componential Framework

Robinson, P. *see* Cognition Hypothesis; Stabilize, Simplify, Automatize, Restructure, Complexify model; Triadic Componential Framework

scaffolding 123–124, 158, 175, 185, 245, 249; *see also* content support

SCMC (synchronous computer-mediated chat) mode 122

self-regulatory control 109–110

self-repair 36, 46, 51, 103–104, 160–161

sequencing of tasks 5–6, **6**, 10, 42, 43, 47, 158, 249–250, 252; *see also* Stabilize, Simplify, Automatize, Restructure, Complexify (SSARC) model

situation models 17–18, 23–26, *24*, 27

Skehan, P. *see* Limited Attentional Capacity Model

social engagement 117

sociocultural perspective in virtual collaborative writing 175

Speaking: From Intention to Articulation (Levelt) 104–105

speech production and dialogue models 17–28; overview 17–18; entrainment 24; interactive-alignment accounts 17–18, 23–26, *24*, 27; Levelt's L1 speech production modules 19–20; speech dialogue models 23–28; speech production models 17, 19–23, *21*

spreading activation 19

Stabilize, Simplify, Automatize, Restructure, Complexify (SSARC) model 5–6, **6**, 9–10, 99, 240–241, 249–250, 252; *see also* Cognition Hypothesis; Triadic Componential Framework

story content plans 58–59

structural equation modeling tool 110

structuralist definition of task complexity 135–136

subjective task complexity 136–137, 139–141, 146

SvCMC (synchronous video-based computer-mediated communication) mode 119, 121–122

syllabary 19, 21

synchronous computer-mediated chat (SCMC) mode 122

synchronous video-based computer-mediated communication (SvCMC) mode 119, 121–122

Syntactic Complexity, Accuracy, Lexical Complexity, and Fluency (CALF) 5, 7, 9–10, 35–36, 195–196, 197–200

systematic methodological synthesis *see* meta-research study

TAACO (Tool for Automatic Analysis of Cohesion) 204

task characteristics 243–244

task complexity: definitions 4, 97, 99, 135–137; *see also* Cognitive Task Complexity and second language performance

Task Complexity-Emotion Interaction Framework (TCEIF) 146–147; *see also* emotions

task conditions 5, 141, 157, 168

task design 49–50, 70, 247–248, 251

task difficulty 137, 157, 163–166, 240–243

task familiarity 5, 82

task modality 185–187

task modes 122

task motivation 99–100

task repetition 119–121

task sequence 5–6, **6**, 10, 42, 43, 47, 158, 249–250, 252; *see also* Stabilize, Simplify, Automatize, Restructure, Complexify (SSARC) model

task structure 180–181

task type 84–85

tasks, conceptual demands of *see* resource-directing task complexity

tasks, procedural demands of *see* resource-dispersing task complexity

teacher noticing and learner engagement 102

technology: current use of 245–247; eye-tracking 85, 184–185; future use of 250, 252; keystroke

logging 84, 85; for task design 49–50, 70; *see also* virtual collaborative writing; virtual interaction

text chat transcriptions 160–161

Tool for Automatic Analysis of Cohesion (TAACO) 204

trade-off effects *see* Cognition Hypothesis; Kellogg's working memory model; Limited Attentional Capacity Model; Triadic Componential Framework

trait emotions 139–141

treatment-effect studies 36, 47

Triadic Componential Framework: overview 99, 239, 240–241; and emotions 138, 141; issues regarding 129; *see also* Cognition Hypothesis; Stabilize, Simplify, Automatize, Restructure, Complexify model; task conditions; task difficulty

Trinity Lancaster Corpus (TLC) 205

t-test method of analysis 49

validation of task complexity 35, 50, 225–226, **226**

video chats 159–160

virtual collaborative writing 174–188; overview 174; benefits to CTC 181, 184–185; collaborative writing 175–177, *176*, 179; CTC and collaborative writing 178–181; CTC and L2 writing 177–178; future research 184–188; processes focus 185; research summary **182–183**; tasks, nature of 186–188; tools for 186–187, **187**

virtual interaction 155–168; overview 155–156; adapting materials for 166; affordances of 157, 160; anxiety's effect on 163–165; and CH and LACM 157–160, 166–167; as complexity feature 168; familiarity with 156, 162, 167–168; FTF compared to 159; future research 166–168; and individual differences 165–166; and input, multiple channels of 168; self-repair during 160–161; and sequencing 158; and task difficulty 157, 163–166; and types of technology 157, 159, 160–163, **164**, 168

virtual reality (VR) 162, 245–246, 250

visuo-spatial loop resource pools 56–57

working memory: anxiety's impact on 142–143; and learners' perceptions of tasks 241; and technology 158, 160, 161; *see also* Kellogg's working memory model

writing processes systems models 55–70; overview 55–56; and attention allocation 8–9, 57–65, 67–70; Cognition Hypothesis (CH) 55, 57; LACM 57; Model of Cognitive Task Complexity in EFL Writing Processes 65–69, *67*; planning, impact of 61–65; and resource pools 56–57; speaking compared to 55; task complexity, effects of 57–60; technology for task design 70

writing research, gaps in 75–88; and Kellogg's working memory model 75–76; and LACM 77–78; resource-directing tasks 76–80; resource-dispersing tasks 80–84; task complexity and L2 writing processes 84–87; technology use in 84, 85; future research 87–88

writing software 187

Written English Corpus of Chinese Learners (WECCL) 197

within-group design 34, **41**, 47

Zoom fatigue 167