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Abstract

In the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) there has been a demand for further research to look into how corrective feedback (CF) can aid adult second language (L2) learners’ language performance and development. More specifically, to what degree elicitations with prompts (i.e., a form of explicit correct feedback) can affect the modified output of adult learners of Spanish during task performance. Additionally, how face-to-face and telecollaboration environments might play a role in learner’s modified output. Therefore, this dissertation study examines the effects of elicitations with prompts by measuring learners’ modified output in producing the Spanish past tense – the preterit vs imperfect in two different learning environments.

In the current study participants were randomly assigned to four experimental groups, and two control groups, and were engaged in a retelling task in which they had to recount the events that occurred. Based on learner’s oral production, they were given corrective feedback in the form of elicitations with prompts, or no prompts for non-targetlike production of the Spanish past tense, whereas the control group received no corrective feedback. This was done through two learning environments that took place face-to-face and through telecollaboration. In sum, the results for this study show that the elicitation + prompts were overall more effective in promoting the production of modified output. In addition, the participants in the telecollaboration group also benefitted the most from the corrective feedback as measured by learners’ superior production of amount and type of modified output, outperforming the other groups. The category that had the most episodes of corrective feedback was morphology in comparison to aspect. This seems to suggest learners who receive elicitations in combination with prompts have an advantage to correcting their erroneous use of morphology not just in the FTF environment, but also in the telecollaboration environments among foreign language learners.
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CHAPTER 1: PROBLEM STATEMENT

1.1 Elicitations (+/- Prompts)

Long’s (1996) interactional hypothesis proposed that corrective feedback provided during interaction (e.g., learner-learner, teacher-learner) could promote interlanguage development by connecting input, internal learner capacities, selective attention, and output. Empirical work on corrective feedback in interactive scenarios overall suggests that it plays a facilitative role in adult second language acquisition (SLA); and thus, supports claims of the interactional hypothesis (Lyster, & Saito, 2010; Russell, & Spada, 2006; Mackey & Goo, 2007; Lis, 2010; Leeman, 2007; Gass, & Mackey, 2006, 2007; Mackey, 1998, 1999; Blake, 2000; Fuente, 2003; Mackey, & Oliver, 2002; Morris, 2005). The effectiveness of corrective feedback lies on its juxtaposition to erroneous utterances that aims to draw learners’ attention to the ‘gaps’ in their interlanguage while engaged in communication, and one of the most widely researched types of corrective feedback are elicitations (Nassaji, 2009; Loewen, 2006; Panova, & Lyster, 2002; Nicholas, Lightbown, & Spada, 2001; Lyster, 1998; 2001). Elicitations are considered to be explicit when they motivate learners to correct their original erroneous output without providing the learner with the correct form or any explanations of errors (Nassaji, 2013; Rashidi & Babaie, 2013). Much empirical work has already been devoted to examining the role of elicitations during interactions in the second language (L2) (e.g. Ammar, & Spada, 2006; Lyster, 1998; 2004; Yang, & Lyster, 2010; Dilans, 2010; Sheen, 2004; 2010; Lyster, & Ranta, 2013; Sheen, & Ellis, 2011; Nassaji, 2007; 2009; Adams, Nuevo, & Egi, 2011; Chiang, & Mi, 2011; Safari, 2013; Samburskiy, 2014; Kitade, 2000; Carroll, & Swain, 1993; Doughty, & Pica, 1986; Pica, & Doughty, 1985; Foster, & Ohta, 2005; Leech, et al., 2013), which are known to “push” the learner to self-correct the non-targetlike utterance by accessing the correct form in his/her
interlanguage. Therefore, elicitations can provide opportunities for pushed output as hypothesized by Swain (1985; 1988). That is, push the learner to pay attention to the meaning in order to successfully convey his or her own message. Consequently, learners’ ability to retrieve the targetlike form from their developing linguistic system can advance their interlanguage development. For example, in a study by Ammar and Spada (2006), low-proficiency and advanced learners benefited significantly from elicitations during task-based interaction. The reason behind this impact on production appeared to stem from the learners’ modification of his/her original output that followed a feedback episode that contained an elicitation as illustrated in the following example by Ellis and Sheen (2006, p.3):

**Participant:** What do you spend with your wife?

**Researcher:** What?

**Participant:** What do you spend your extra time with your wife?

In addition, studies done by Kim, & Mathes (2001) and Salemi, Rabiee, & Ketabi (2012) note that learners have reported a clearer preference for this type of explicitness, due to the dyadic nature of the interactions which helped learners recognize the interlocutor’s feedback (Nicholas, Lightbown, & Spada, 2001). In a study done by Lyster and Ranta (1997), it was suggested that elicitations led to more frequent learner uptake and was effective in leading to student-generated repair, because they helped “…L2 learners to acquire rule-based representations of grammatical gender and to proceduralize their knowledge of these emerging forms” (p 399).

Moreover, when elicitations are combined with another subtype of corrective feedback, known as ‘prompts’, a combination is potentially formed which can provide the source of the error (incorrect form) by making the elicitation more salient, as suggested in several studies (Lyster, & Saito, 2010; Lyster, 2002, 2004; Sheen, 2010; Lyster & Izquierdo, 2009; Loewen,
Empirical evidence suggests that the salient properties of prompts are more likely attended to by learners because they enhance learners’ perceptions of L2 input this is because prompts withhold the correct reformulation in addition to other linguistic clues (Lyster, & Saito, 2010; Li, 2009, 2014). They are defined as the particular use of “a verbatim repetition of a student utterance, often with adjusted intonation to highlight the error” (Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013, p. 4).

Unfortunately, an area of concern arises with several subtypes of elicitations that can have different effects on L2 learners’ language development and performance, as seen in studies by Ellis, Loewens, and Erlam (2006), and Lyster’s (2004). In their studies the use of corrective feedback included different degrees of explicitness, mixing metalinguistic clues which provide input for a more targetlike reformulation within a spectrum of clarification requests (wh-questions). This is an ill-advised protocol that can also have an effect on the findings due to the research skewing data groups with input (metalinguistic) and non-input enhancers (clarification requests). To avoid this, in this study there will be no input-providing types of corrective feedback (e.g. metalinguistic, recasts), and the two subtypes of explicit corrective feedback that are output-providing (e.g. elicitations, prompts) will be taken into account. These are ‘elicitation-prompt’ and ‘elicitation +prompt, also known as unmarked elicitation, and marked elicitation by Nassaji (2007). These terms and can be defined the following ways:

‘ELICITATION -PROMPT: The feedback elicited a reformulation without marking the error or making any reference to the error. This kind of feedback was mainly in the form of simple clarification requests such as “sorry?” “excuse me” and so forth.

Participant: …pero Teddy en el proceso estuve, no, estuve muy, muy...

“…but Teddy in the process (I) was, no (I) was very, very…”
Researcher: ¿Perdón?

“Excuse me?”

“ELICITATION +PROMPT: The feedback elicited a reformulation by marking the error or making reference to it in the form of interrogative repetition.

Participant: fueron a la playa y estab[ea el fin [del video].

“(they) went to the beach y and (I) was the end [of the video]”

Researcher: ¿Estaba el fin?

“(I) Was the end?”

Moreover, there is conflicting empirical evidence as to whether prompts can be beneficial across settings since laboratory studies have not yielded the same results as classroom quasi-experimental studies (Yang & Lyster, 2010). According to Sheen (2004), “…. the studies to date have each examined a particular instructional context (e.g. immersion classrooms or adult ESL) or laboratory setting, and it is not clear to what extent the findings can be generalized…” (p.264). To investigate this matter, this study will test to see if previous findings on prompts can be replicated into this laboratory study in the two different learning environments of face-to-face and telecollaboration. Furthermore, examine whether those learners found under the prompt group can benefit more, since in the study by Loewen and Nabei (2007) they found no significant difference across prompts.

No empirical study up to date has investigated elicitations +/- prompts with Spanish, where the majority of research has relied deeply amongst English as a Second Language (ESL) learners (e.g. Mackey et al., 2000; Jafarpour, & Hashemian, 2013; Keyvanfar, 2009; Cabrera, 2007; Jang, 2011; Rashidi, & Babaie, 2013; Samani, & Noordin, 2013; Naeni, 2008; Kim, 2008; Nassaji, 2007, 2009; Sauro, 2009; Adams et al. 2011; Ellis et al., 2001; Dilans, 2010; Ammar, &
Spada, 2006; Panova, & Lyster, 2002; Yang, & Lyster, 2010; Ellis et al., 2006;), French learners (e.g. Lyster, & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, & Izquierdo, 2009), English and French combined (e.g. Sheen, 2004;), German learners (e.g. Heift, 2010;), and Japanese learners (e.g. Takahashi, 2014). Therefore, this is the first study that embarks at analyzing elicitations +/- prompts with Spanish learners, since there is a need for more crosslinguistic studies to test elicitations with prompts amongst Spanish learners and examine their ability to function as a corrective feedback mechanism under both learning environments aforementioned.
1.2 Learning Environment (Face-To-Face; Telecollaboration)

In recent years, the interest in elicitations and modified output has begun to motivate empirical research on how online environments (e.g. telecollaboration) may differently effect learner perception and their subsequent language production (Gurzynski-Weiss & Baralt, 2014a; Baralt, 2010; Roushad, Wigglesworth, & Storch, 2015; Barron, & Black, 2015; Morris, 2005). According to Helm (2015), telecollaboration is a medium through which (1) language learning, (2) research, and (3) practice take place with the assistance of a computer. Telecollaboration has become known for engaging learners in online exchange using Internet communication tools for the advancement of language (Helm, 2015; O’Dowd, 2015; O’Dowd, & Waire 2009; O’Dowd & Ritter, 2013). The interaction can take place either synchronously (in real-time) or asynchronously (in delayed-time) (Ware, & Kramsch, 2005). Ultimately, in the 21st century these telecollaboration capabilities “…can be used as a viable classroom alternative for meeting a range of pedagogical goals” (Ware, 2005).

Studies (Belz, 2006, Lee, 2006, Sotillo, 2013, Levy & Kennedy, 2004) have already begun to investigate language development and performance through telecollaboration exchanges (Ware, 2008). “In the last decade, investigations of networked language learning have shown that this type of environment provides more equitable learner participation, with the instructor becoming part of the ongoing communicative process” (Sotillo, 2013, p. 470). As of now, studies suggest telecollaboration can provide extended social discourse opportunities similar to those found in naturalistic learning, making possible a pedagogical sphere potentially mirroring that of an L2 classroom (Belz, 2003, 2005, 2006; Belz & Kinginger, 2003; Abrams, 2003; Davis & Thiede, 2000, Schultz, 2000; Sotillo, 2000). Telecollaboration has become a source of cultural information and authentic language resources as a dynamic arena for
communication between individuals from different language backgrounds (Hauck, & Youngs, 2008). Telecollaboration projects are ideal since they offer learners an authentic context for taking part in real communication. One of the most well-established models of telecollaboration is the eTandem, which has formed the basis of many exchanges and has been adapted to different languages and contexts. It is a form of institutionalized online tandem learning, where individual students from different classes, with different native languages are paired and communicate together with the aim of learning each other’s language, where the focus tends to be on the development of linguistic competence. Simultaneously, learners are encouraged to provide feedback on their partners’ foreign language (Anikina, Sobinova, & Petrova; Bower, & Kawaguchi, 2011; Kotter, 2003). Empirical studies have also suggested that telecollaboration can increase opportunities for authentic interaction and the negotiation of meaning, producing more talk, and improving communication with peers and expert language users (Sadler, 2013; Belz, 2007; Takamiya & Ishihara, 2013; Eslami, Mirzaei, & Dini, 2015).

Still, findings are inconclusive as studies also suggest telecollaboration is no different from face-to-face (Blake, 2000; Lee, 2002) although learner outcomes have not been measured through modified output. Other scholars (Yamada & Akahori, 2007) continue to claim both learning environments offer a similar environment for learners to exhibit similar behaviors which include social cues such as nodding, smiling, and other gestures which facilitate learner interaction (Hackman, & Walker, 1990) in real time settings, where rapid responses are expected. Moreover, a recent study that investigated the accuracy of learner perception of feedback in relation to different feedback types “… found that the face-to-face learning environment gives learners significantly more opportunities to modify their [learners] output after receiving feedback and that learners take advantage of these opportunities more in the face-
to-face learning environment…” (Gurzynski-Weiss, & Baralt, 2014, p. 32). Meanwhile, Ziegler (2015) only found a small advantage for interaction in telecollaboration on measures of overall L2 production and learning outcomes, the marginal outcome differences between telecollaboration and face-to-face suggests the learning environment of communication has no statistically significant impact on the positive development benefits associated with the learning environment of interaction.

Additionally, the new medium requires learners to develop new types of literacy to successfully communicate in the target language (Salaberry, 2000a). Research is still inconclusive on the environmental impact of telecollaboration due to varying findings, and the limitations found in these studies. There is a need for further investigation of oral telecollaboration, including that of direct comparisons of audio video forms and their effectiveness as compared to learning in face-to-face contexts (Ziegler, 2015). That is why this research study will include the use of elicitations (+/- prompts) also in a telecollaboration environment to examine if the learning environment aids learners modify their output as a reaction to elicitations +/- prompts. This will be accomplished through the use of the video chat application Skype to determine whether it can serve as a potential channel for L2 learners of Spanish. This present is limited exclusively to oral communication exchanges and discounts the written modality from participants due to maintaining everything constant in the telecollaboration mode, the same as how learners would interact in the FTF mode.
1.3 Modified Output

In addition to research on corrective feedback, scholars have examined learners’ modified output as a result of interaction (or what other studies term “corrective feedback affect”) in L2 development. Modified output entails a learner’s modification of a non-targetlike form in reaction to corrective feedback (Egi, 2010); it is a learner’s immediate response to elicitation. Scholars have argued that language development is possible through the production of modified output (McDonough, 2005), regardless if a learner’s modification to the nontargetlike utterance is fully or partially repaired to a more targetlike version (Gass, 1997; Swain, 1995, 2005). Still, modified output is as important as the interaction itself, because as de Bot (1996) mentions, L2 learners need these opportunities to retrieve and restructure their knowledge. Feedback is what allows learners to become aware of their problematic output in the first place, leading learners to “push” to conduct an analysis, and eventually modify their output (Swain, & Lapkin, 1995; Lyster, 1998b; Panova, & Lyster, 2002). Consequently, “what occurs between the first and second output is part of the process of L2 learning” (Lyster, 2002, p.248). It encourages learners to reanalyze what they already have internalized and contributes to a destabilization of interlanguage forms. In Nobuyoshi and Ellis (1993), they provide “…support for the claim that “pushing” learners to improve the accuracy of their production results not only in immediate improved performance but also in gains in accuracy over time” (p.208).

As such, it gives the learner an opportunity to revise the response with a more correct form referred to as modified output, and this can aid L2 development (Ellis & He, 1999; Ellis, 1999; McDonough, 2005; Shehadeh, 1999, 2002, 2004; Swain, 1985, 1995, 1998; Egi, 2010; Mackey, et al. 2010; Pica, et al. 1989; Mackey, 2006; Nuevo, Adams, & Ross-Feldman, 2011). In addition, corrective feedback that leads to learner modified output includes feedback through
Elicitations (Ellis, and Sheen, 2006). “Elicitations directly elicit a self-correction from the student, often in the form of a wh-question” (Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013, p. 4). Elicitations along with prompts are known to be more explicit in comparison to the other types of corrective feedback (e.g. clarification requests, and reformulations) (Lyster & Saito, 2010; Sheen & Ellis, 2011) for not providing the targetlike reformulation and forcing the learner to actively formulate the correct form. They seem to function as a better stimulus than any other type of corrective feedback. As Mackey (1999) notes, if learners produce a more complex or accurate form in their modified output, they may be more likely to produce that form in their subsequent utterances, leading to more accurate L2 production, and potentially L2 development.

In this current study, once the learners have produced modified output as a result of corrective feedback, their modified output will be analyzed in with three possible categories to judge its correctness. This continuum includes: Repair, partial repair, and no repair. A modified output will be considered repaired, if the learner correctly modified the preterite/imperfect structure in their output following the corrective feedback episode. That is, both the verb ending (morphology) and aspect are correct. Partial repair will occur if the learner following the corrective feedback only partially corrected his/her nontargetlike utterance in terms of morphology or aspect. This means the morphology is correct, but the aspect is still erroneous, or vice versa. Finally, it will be considered no repair if the learner did not correct the nontargetlike grammatical structure, or did not make any modifications at all to the grammatical structure.

One recent problem from the research available urges the need to further examine modified output in the learning environment of telecollaboration, given the fact that there has already been plenty of empirical research of modified output that takes place FTF (e.g. Del Pilar et al., 2000; Egi, 2010; Linnell, 1995; Mackey, 2006; Mackey, & Oliver 2002; Shehadeh, 1999,
while the empirical research on modified output under the telecollaboration environment has been overlooked in the SLA field. In the last two decades alone there has only been a few research studies that look at modified output, when compared to FTF, that examine the use of telecollaboration (e.g. Heift, 2004; Payne and Whitney, 2002; Salaberry, 2000b; Kinginger, & Belz, 2005; Ware, 2005, Kinginger et al., 1999; Belz 2002, 2003; Sanz, & Morgan-Short, 2004). Among those few studies, lately there have been contradicting findings that look at modified output. For example, Gurzinski-Weiss and Baralt (2014b) found significant differences in learners’ use of feedback in the written modality that depended on the interaction environment, while the meta-analysis by Ziegler (2015) did not find any significant differences between telecollaboration and FTF, suggesting the mode of communication has no statistically significant impact on the positive developmental benefits associated with interaction. This divergence marks the need for more evidence to test modified output under both environments and analyze if the benefits from telecollaboration can outweigh the FTF environments, or continue to remain equivalent.
1.4 Target Form: Preterite/Imperfect

In Spanish SLA, English speakers have difficulty in acquiring Spanish past tense markers (preterite and imperfect) as their L1 marks aspetual distinction “independently of the opposition Progressive/Non-Progressive” (Montrul, & Slabakova, 2001, p. 3). In Spanish the preterite-imperfect contrast (mapping of Perfective-Imperfective semantic distinction) is obligatorily marked by means of verb endings (morphosyntactically). English does not make a fully parallel aspectual distinction and is less morphologically complex (Salaberry, 1999). Montrul and Slabakova (2001) suggest that for English L2 learners of Spanish learning any Romance languages’ preterite/imperfect contrast is one of the most difficult areas of grammar to master. This is due to the way learners acquire the distinction, in which it first appears through a focus on content words to process the meaning followed by a study of the inflections (Lee, 1999; VanPatten, 2004; Bardovi-Harlig, 1992). Moreover, specific adverbials found adjacent to the preterite/imperfect have been known to influence learners in the selection of aspect, since adverbials can also function as a lexical resource to guide them (Baker, & Quesada, 2009). In fact, in the acquisition of aspect, learners have been shown to understand the chronology of L2 input better and quicker when adverbials are present in addition to verb morphology (Lee et al. 1997; Boatwright, 1999; Musumeci, 1989).

While some studies suggest that English L2 learners of Spanish follow certain acquisition sequences with preterite and imperfect during various stages of their learning (Salaberry, 1999; López-Ortega, 2000; Anderson, 1991; Ortega, 2009), others argue that it is more likely that grammar-rules play a part in a learners’ inclination to depend on action/event verbs to make a selection of the aspect (Garcia & VanPutte, 1988), more often than not, the use of the preterite for all verbs of action/event (Hwu, 2013).
Learners using the preterite for all verbs of actions is noted also by Salaberry (1999, 2003) who analyzed the development of past tense verb morphology in L2 acquisition among L1 English speakers. Although he found that learners tended to use default markers of the past tense during the beginning stages of development of verb morphology, he also observed that beginning learners showed a tendency to use the preterite more often than the imperfect across all aspects. Further analysis reveals that the use of the preterite is only the highest with telic events (e.g. completed actions), while the use of the imperfect is the highest with statives (e.g. descriptions of the surroundings where the action took place). He concluded that aspect is not significant for beginning learners when choosing between the preterite or imperfect. Only the advanced learners are able to discriminate fine-grained differences in aspect (Salaberry, 2013).

More studies are still needed on the acquisition of the preterite and imperfect, particularly as a result of pedagogical interventions like corrective feedback that push for more targetlike production of the Spanish past tense. Although recent studies have looked into the development of the usage of the preterite and imperfect through Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) (Hwu, 2013), these corrective strategies are considered purely “input enhancing” (Sharwood Smith, 1991) by which language input becomes salient to the learner through error correction, and metalinguistic explanations. While the use of preterite and imperfect has received attention in CALL environment, a scant of research exists to how learners respond to learning the Spanish past tense in FTF and telecollaboration learning contexts. It is not enough for learners to simply be led to the form, as learners must also use it to comprehend the meaning of the sentence (VanPatten, 1996). Moreover, few studies have directly addressed the effect of production, or uptake. This study seeks to fill in several of these gaps by analyzing the preterite and imperfect
through telecollaboration, taking into account the type of mistake learners are more prone to make through oral communication; either in morphology, or aspect, or both.

Only a handful of studies in the last three decades have looked into the preterite/imperfect issues in Spanish. Some of those studies have been empirically based (e.g. Barnwell, 1987; Casteñeda, 2011; Liskin-Gasparro, 2000; Montrul & Slabakova, 2002), while others have focused on the teaching of the preterite/imperfect (e.g. Finnerman, 1987; Frantzen, 1995; Westfall, & Foerster, 1996). Furthermore, research done by Ortega (2009) has summarized the steps learners tend to follow when acquiring the past tense in Spanish, while two more have been descriptive articles (e.g. Ozete, 1988; Vendler, 1967) comparing both aspects. Despite the fact that all these research articles have provided findings that move SLA forward, it is also a call for more conducive empirical research that focuses on Spanish learners and their modified output from corrective feedback in their usage of the preterite/imperfect.
1.5 Purpose of the Dissertation Study

To address these gaps in the literature, the present study will investigate how the provision of elicitations +/- prompts in face-to-face and telecollaboration learning environments during task-based interaction can potentially lead and alter L2 learners’ modified output of the Spanish past tense (i.e., preterite and imperfect) following feedback episodes. This is highly relevant given that previous literature suggests a link between modified output and L2 development (e.g., McDonough, 2005; Ammar, & Spada, 2006; Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013; Adams, Nuevo, & Egi, 2010; Ellis, 2009; Ellis, Loewens, & Erlam, 2006). Specifically, in this dissertation study, elicitation +prompt will refer to providing learners with the source of their error (i.e. a nonetargetlike preterite or imperfect verb form), whereas elicitation –prompt will withhold the source of their error and just raise learners’ attention to the error by giving clarification requests (e.g. Excuse me? I don’t understand I’m sorry?). The findings of this study will shed light on the effects of prompts used as a beneficial subtype of corrective feedback in interaction contexts specifically regarding the preterite and imperfect. It is expected that prompts will place a heavy interest in providing sound research to promote their use in telecollaboration contexts, and potentially create implications for their use (e.g. video chat) inside the L2 classrooms.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents the most pertinent research on the topic brought forth in Chapter 1. It is a summary of the scholarly works, of either theoretical or empirical nature, that have helped construct the interaction hypothesis, and those in relation to corrective feedback, modified output, and telecollaboration, as well as the constructs regarding the Spanish past tense (preterite and imperfect). In this particular chapter, the chapter ends with the research questions to be addressed, and also puts forward hypotheses deriving from current literature.
2.1 The Interaction Hypothesis

The interaction hypothesis, first postulated by Long (1983a, 1983b, 1996) stems from the desire to create conversation in order to develop interlanguage grammar (Hatch, 1978), and make input comprehensible (Krashen, 1985). It stresses the need for learner modifications of output as a byproduct of interaction which aims to make input more comprehensible to L2 learners. It originates with a communication problem or an utterance not being entirely understood (Gass, & Torres, 2005). The negotiation of meaning that occurs throughout the discourse, in conjunction with the corrective feedback that is provided to the learner, lets learners know that their utterance was problematic (Mackey, 2006), and can often include negative feedback in varying degrees, which helps bring attention to the nontargetlike language forms learners have produced. It helps them to detect gaps in their L2 knowledge (McDonough, 2005). The negative feedback provided can include confirmation checks along with clarification requests (Ellis, Tanaka, & Yamazaki, 1994). “In this way, they [learners] can potentially reach mutual understanding through modifications of and adjustments to the sounds, structures, and vocabulary of their responses” (Pica, Hollida, Lewis, Berducci, & Newman, 1991, p. 55). It is through negotiation that input is made more comprehensible, and grammatical features are made more salient, consequently facilitating interlanguage development (Mackey, & Oliver, 2002). Throughout the interaction, learners get opportunities to understand and use the language that was not comprehensible (Long 1985; Gass, Mackey, & Pica, 1998). Therefore, the interaction positions learners in a place to receive more opportunities for output (Mackey, 1999), more specifically, modified output (Swain, 1995; 1998).
Overall, results of interaction have been found to have a large effect size among learners in immediate post-tests when acquiring lexical and grammatical items, as analyzed by Mackey and Goo (2007). These effects have been found to be even greater in short-term delayed post-tests and longer-term delayed post-tests. “This means that while there is a significant difference between the immediate and any of the delayed post-tests, no significant difference was found between the short-term and the longer-term delayed post-tests, both of which were large, also indicating durable interaction effects on language learning” (p. 425). In their meta-analysis, the interactional treatment groups showed a considerable change from the pre-test to the immediate post-test in the acquisition of linguistic target items, whereas the control/comparison group did not show a noticeable increase. Thus, interaction was significantly more effective than little or no interaction as shown by the immediate post-test. A more recent meta-analysis by Ziegler (2015) suggested interaction can potentially provide better learning outcomes with analysis that indicate a slight advantage in facilitating L2 learning results.

Therefore, following Ellis (2001), the interaction hypothesis will be adopted in this study where the interaction will be synchronous, and the feedback given to the learner will be unexpected. Ellis stresses the need for specific conditions where there is quick and unobtrusive incidental interventions. This is in order for there to be learner engagement with meaning, and learner attention towards grammatical structures.

“… learners have the opportunity to negotiate for meaning following a breakdown in understanding. Such negotiation serves to highlight linguistic forms that are problematic to them. It helps them to ‘notice the gap’ between the input and their own interlanguage and gives them opportunities for ‘pushed output’ (i.e., to
improve linguistic accuracy by reformulating utterances that were initially misunderstood).” (p.10)

A number of scholars (Ellis et al., 1994; Long et al., 1998; Mackey & Philp, 1998; Ellis & He, 1999; Mackey, 1999; Mackey, & Oliver, 2002; Lyster, 2010; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Yang & Lyster, 2010) have already found positive results suggesting that in fact there is a direct relationship between interaction and corrective feedback to advance L2 development. However, what remains unclear is whether the benefits of interaction noted by Mackey & Goo (2007) can also be replicated across different learning contexts (e.g., telecollaboration). That is a question researchers still need to address: whether the same outcomes of face-to-face interaction as postulated by the interaction hypothesis can also be found in telecollaboration settings as brought forward by Gurzynski-Weiss, & Baralt (2014).
2.2 Corrective Feedback

2.2.1 Inside Interaction

Corrective feedback in SLA refers to the responses that a learner receives in regard to their nontargetlike L2 production, which is mainly attributable to the negative evidence it entails (Li, 2010). Prior to the abundance of empirical studies (Norris, & Ortega, 2006; Mackey & Goo, 2007; Russell & Spada, 2006) it was questioned whether it was necessary for negative evidence to occur since positive evidence was considered to be enough (White, 1991). Subsequently negative evidence was seen as a punishment, and thus feedback that discouraged learning (Krashen, 1981; Truscott, 1999; Ur, 1996). However, in recent years corrective feedback has received praise for its effectiveness in supporting second language development, citing the importance of negative evidence (Gass, 1997; Long, 1996, 2007; Lyster, & Saito, 2010) and refuting the belief that positive evidence alone is sufficient or that negative evidence would be harmful to interlanguage development. The growing number of corrective feedback and SLA studies in the last decade (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Ellis, Loewen & Erlam, 2006, Loewen & Nabei, 2007, Lyster, 2004; McDonough, 2005) support the beneficial role that corrective feedback plays in facilitating the acquisition of L2 forms, difficult to learn through input alone. Furthermore, explicit CF can be used to draw learner attention to mismatches between their production and the targetlike realization of the hard-to-learn forms (Sauro, 2009). CF provides a particular way of encouraging repairs that involve more than learner repetition of the instructor utterance (Lyster, & Ranta, 1997), which can be used to reformulate a learner’s interlanguage system (Kubota, 1991).

“In both behaviorist and cognitive theories of L2 learning, feedback is seen as contributing to language learning. In both structural and communicative approaches to language teaching,
Feedback is viewed as a means of fostering learning, motivation and ensuring linguistic accuracy” (Ellis, 2009, p.4). Under the interaction and cognitive view, CF facilitates acquisition by activating internal processes such as attention. Meanwhile, sociocultural theory sees language acquisition occurring via interaction rather than as a result of interaction. From this perspective, Ellis (2009) claims L2 acquisition cannot be treated as a purely individual-based process (as it has been in cognitive and interactionist SLA) but rather as one shared between the individual and others. These dyadic interactions enable teachers to create contexts in which learners can participate actively in their own learning and in which the teacher can fine-tune the support that the learners are given. Furthermore, dialogic discourse demonstrates what a learner can and cannot do with assistance.

Additionally, it is understood that CF provides a context for key processing in language development that fuels the acquisition process. CF along with negotiation has been suggested to provide learners with opportunities for comprehensible input, modified output, focus on form, and feedback all in one (Linell, 1995). Given that CF could integrate these processes and provide them in a heightened form, Linell reasoned that interaction would aid interlanguage and provide a heightened form of awareness. Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) similarly support CF after erroneous output as a basis for language development. They posit that corrective feedback should be heavily dependent on mediation provided by others who co-construct a zone of proximal development in which feedback is relevant. The learner’s linguistic performance needs to be distributed evenly between the teacher and learner, so the teacher can take control and bring up to level the less proficient learners.

Lyster and Izquierdo (2009) drew on skill acquisition theory to hypothesize that learners who received corrective feedback will show improvements as a result of the opportunities that
corrective feedback provides. This feedback would consequently provide for a deeper level of processing as learners are pushed to retrieve target forms and produce modified output. They note that learners benefit from corrective feedback due to the intensive repetition on the same target feature and the given opportunities for immediate repair. Lyster, Saito, and Sato (2013) found learners have a preference to be corrected more than what teachers wish to provide. This is unfortunate since theoretical cognitive and social perspectives already exist that suggest corrective feedback is not only beneficial but may be necessary for moving learners forward in their L2 development. It can provide scaffolding opportunities for guided practice in the context of communicative interaction. It assists comprehension, and makes message meaning comprehensible to participating learners through signals and responses of negotiation, while additionally applying salience to form meaningful relationships in the L2. Language learning through interaction, and thus corrective feedback, reaches both learners’ needs to understand the target language and express it across modality with accuracy and appropriateness and learning processes, cognitive, psycholinguistic, and social (Pica, 1996b).

2.2.2 Elicitations

Elicitations have been referred to as “interaction” in some studies (e.g. Gass, & Torres, 2005; Pica, 1991; Fotos & Ellis, 1991), while in others classified as “interactional feedback” (e.g. Mackey, 2006). For the purpose of this study the definition followed for elicitations will be that of Nassaji (2009), where “elicitations… refer to feedback that does not correctly reformulate the learner’s error but instead pushes the learner to reformulate it” (p. 412). Elicitations can also be a reactive type of form-focused instruction that is typically provided while learners are engaged in interaction (Swain, 1995) and are considered effective in promoting noticing, therefore conducive to L2 development for being output-pushing (Philp, 2003; Sheen, 2007;
Trofimovich, Ammar & Gatbonton, 2007; Ellis, 2006). Elicitations engage retrieval information from long-term memory (Lyster, & Izquierdo, 200) because they have the feature of withholding correct forms or even signs of approval, making learners self-repair through modified responses (Lyster, 2004). The elicitations function as a signal to the learner that there is an error in their speech (Gurzynski-Weiss, 2010), and SLA researchers have argued that they can facilitate the L2 development (e.g Nassaji, 2009) due to elicitation strategies impeding the natural flow of communication and activating the kind of development mechanisms that result in explicit L2 knowledge (Ellis, Loewens, & Erlam, 2006).

2.2.3 +Prompts

Prompts have been referred to as a “negotiation of form” (e.g. Lyster, and Ranta, 1997”) and “form-focused negotiation” (e.g. Lyster, 2002). For the purpose of this study the term prompts will be used as the specific mechanism where the instructor replicates the learner’s error verbatim to highlight the error and make it more salient, while targeting just one of two linguistic structures s (Lyster, 2002, 2007; Lyster & Mori, 2006, 2008; Ranta & Lyster, 2007; Lyster & Izquierdo, 2009; Sheen, 2010), which responds to Swain’s (1985) call for immersing teachers to push their learners to greater accuracy in their output.

What prompts manage to do is signal that the learner’s utterance is problematic. It concurrently does not provide them with a correct reformulation of their nontarget utterance either (Lyster & Izquierdo, 2009). Learners who receive prompts benefit from the repeated exposure to confirmation checks and negative evidence. These supply learners with indicators to go back to their problematic utterance and fix it, which benefits learners as they are given the opportunity to modify their output through self-repair (Yang & Lyster, 2010; Lyster, 2002, 2004, 2007; Ranta & Lyster, 2007; Lyster & Mori, 2006, 2008). Prompts function as cues in guiding
learners towards a better response than the previous one produced (Lyster, 1998a, 2002; Nipaspong & Chinokul, 2010), and force the learner to engage in diverse planes of cognitive processing, including the retrieval of information (Yan & Lyster, 2010). This process of interactional moves makes feedback more cognitively engaging (Lyster, 2004). Additionally, prompts with a focus on form and self-repair benefit the learners’ retrieval and self-monitoring processes, assisting learners in developing their target language acquisition (Lyster 1998b, 2002; Nipaspong & Chinokul, 2010). Prompts are distinct from other forms of CF in terms of demand, or the degree of conversational urgency placed on interlocutors to react to negative feedback (Lyster, 2013). They are explicit in terms of their illocutionary force (McHoul, 1990). They stem from the interaction hypothesis, and encourage learners to produce their own target-like output (Ding, 2009), by serving to assist learners in the transition of declarative knowledge (knowing the grammatical structures) to procedural knowledge (using the grammatical structures) (Lyster, 2004).

In Lyster and Izquierdo’s (2009) study, learners receiving prompts made significant progress over time, improving from pretest to immediate posttest and then maintaining their improvement at the time of delayed posttesting. Their progress over time yielded significantly large effects. Ammar and Spada (2006) showed similar gains with learners in experimental groups, which used prompts, to be more effective than in the control group, who received no corrective feedback. The researchers explained: “Two central factors are likely explanations for the superior effectiveness of prompts: (a) the explicitness and clarity of this CF technique and (b) the multiple opportunities to produce the target form in reaction to the teacher’s corrective moves (i.e., uptake) that this CF technique provides” (p. 562). In Dilans (2010) study, the prompts group had higher rates of self and peer correction, leading to a much better rate of uptake than
the experimental and control groups. For learners in a study by Yang and Lyster (2010) the prompt group made significant gains on all measures, regardless of time (whether immediate or delayed post-test), mode (whether oral or written CF), and structure (whether regular or irregular past tense forms). “Additionally, only the prompt group showed any significant between-group differences in its favor, significantly outperforming the control group in the oral production of irregular past tense at the delayed posttest” (p. 253). Additionally, Lyster (2004) found form-focused instruction to be more effective when combined with feedback in the form of prompts, where students who received prompts developed more feedback appreciation. Their increase opportunity for conscious awareness from feedback predisposed them more toward a rule-based perspective, which led to changes in their rule-based representations. A summary of some of the more influential empirical laboratory studies from the last 16 years can be found in Table 1.

Table 1. Empirical Laboratory Studies of Elicitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Participants (n)</th>
<th>Treatment Task</th>
<th>Linguistic Content Targeted</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mackey &amp; Oliver (2002)</td>
<td>22 ESL learners</td>
<td>Spot the difference, story completion, picture placement, &amp; picture sequencing</td>
<td>Wh/Do-fronting, Questions, Negatives/Neg. &amp; SVO/ Neg. &amp; Verb</td>
<td>Learners w/ interaction &amp; feedback showed greater L2 development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heift (2004)</td>
<td>177 Beginning-intermediate German learners</td>
<td>Built-a-sentence, dictation, fill-in-the-blank, &amp; translation</td>
<td>Grammar &amp; vocabulary</td>
<td>Participants that were provided w/ the highlighted error in the feedback showed the most learner uptake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Task Type</td>
<td>Relevance Type</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassaji (2007)</td>
<td>42 ESL learners &amp; 2 native-speaker English teachers</td>
<td>Picture ordering/description task</td>
<td>None specific</td>
<td>Reformulation and elicitation resulted in higher rates of accurate repair when they were combined / prompts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassaji (2009)</td>
<td>42 ESL learners</td>
<td>Picture-sequencing/description task</td>
<td>None specific</td>
<td>More explicit forms of feedback led to higher rates of immediate &amp; delayed post-interaction correction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams et al. (2011)</td>
<td>71 ESL learners</td>
<td>Spot-the-difference task, picture story task, &amp; table seating task.</td>
<td>English past tense and locatives</td>
<td>Explicit correction led to a higher rate of modified output, even when results were examined by linguistic type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saito &amp; Lyster (2012)</td>
<td>65 EFL learners, 2 ESL teachers, and 5 Native Speakers listeners.</td>
<td>Word-reading task, sentence-reading tasks, and picture-description task.</td>
<td>Pronunciation of English /ɹ/</td>
<td>The FFI in conjunction with CF might be an effective &amp; efficient way to promote not only L2 grammar but also L2 pronunciation development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurzynski-Weiss &amp; Baralt (2014)</td>
<td>24 learners of Spanish</td>
<td>Information-gap tasks, &amp; Stimulated Recall</td>
<td>Morphosyntax, phonology, semantics, lexis, &amp; semantics</td>
<td>Learners were able to perceive CF in telecollaboration just as well as in FTF contexts, through task-based interaction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Modified Output

2.3.1 Theoretical Approaches

During interaction, when a learner receives corrective feedback on a specific non-targetlike utterance, the learner ideally follows this feedback episode by modifying his or her original output. This is an important process as it forces learners to reprocess their original output, which frequently leads to a noticing at a more profound and meaningful level as they consciously rethink their utterances (Mackey, Adams, Stafford, & Winke, 2010; Adams, Nuevo, & Egi, 2011; Swain, 2005; Swain & Lapkin, 1995, Shehadeh, 1999; 2001). The utterance that the participants reformulate, is known as modified output (Please see section 3.4 for a more in depth description). Regardless of whether the feedback is given by a native, or nonnative speakers, it is speculated that learners will still produce a similar amount of modified output (Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Panino, & Linnell, 1996; Shehadeh, 2007). Modified output can then frequently cause for additional feedback from both speakers, allowing for treatment sequences to go further (Egi, 2010; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Suzuki, 2005). Learners that are pushed to produce modified output become more cognitively engaged as deeper levels of processing are required (Lyster, 1998b; Panova, & Lyster, 2002). The attention required for both reanalysis and retrieval may also contribute to a disruption of interlanguage forms (de bot, 1996), as Swain, and Lapkin (1995) also report. Available interactionist research has already suggested that interactional modification facilitate L2 vocabulary comprehension (Lyster, & Mori, 2006), and other studies suggest that modified output is also closely related to learner perception to notice the gap between their interlanguages (Egi, 2008; Mackey, 2006). This strengthens existing knowledge representations, and helps focus learner-attention and memory on what is particularly relevant (Mackey, et al. 2010).
Although modified output used to measure L2 learning has at times been criticized in the literature (Long, 2006; Mackey & Philp, 1998), one particular study by Mackey et al. (2000) note that learners who demonstrate modified output are also able to accurately perceive the intent behind their teacher’s correction. It is believed that making changes to an utterance is related to interlanguage learning, regardless of whether the resulting modification is more, less, or equally as targetlike as the original (Mackey et al., 2010). Strong arguments have been made for the role that modified output plays in advancing learner interlanguage development (McDonough, 2005; Lyster, 1998b; Panova, & Lyster, 2002), including L2 vocabulary (Lyster, & Mori, 2002), as it draws attention to form in ways that stimulate the development of connections in memory (Bot, 1996). Given that modified output has a positive role in L2 vocabulary learning, it might also encourage the cognitive processing of morphosyntax and semantics (Swain, 1995) as modified output reflects learner question development (McDonough, 2005). This suggests a level of metalinguistic awareness that is facilitative of language learning, in addition to creating a context for L2 learning that is immediate (McDonough, & Mackey, 2006).

Several researchers have claimed that modified output operates by drawing learners attention to grammatical structures, making them more salient (McDonough, 2005; Swain, 1995) and serving as a site for learners to test their hypothesis and create errors in the target language (Gass, 2003; Swain, 1995; 2005). Van den Branden (1997) found that language learners who had been previously pushed in producing modified output not only produced a significantly greater quantity of output, but also provided more essential information and displayed a greater range of vocabulary. Similarly, Kubota (1991) found that teachers’ repetitions without change of error resulted in success in modification from the learners more frequently.
2.3.2 Full Repair, Partial Repair, and No Repair

The modified output of erroneous responses can be distinguished between into categories of Successful Repair, Partial Repair, and No Repair (Romanova, 2010; Sheen, 2008; Nassaji, 2011). Successful repair are those responses that successfully correct the last erroneous utterance following the provided feedback (Nassaji, 2007, p. 529):

**Successful Repair**

**PARTICIPANT**: One of the ladies, a little girl, she wear a short... short skirt.

**RESEARCHER**: She’s wearing a short skirt?

**PARTICIPANT**: Yeah, she’s wearing a short skirt.

Partial repair includes those responses that correct the last erroneous utterance, but only partially (Nassaji, 2007, p.529):

**Partial Repair**

**PARTICIPANT**: And they... the... three people pointer her.

**RESEARCHER**: Three people are pointing at her

**PARTICIPANT**: Pointing her.

With no repair one does not correct any part of the utterance, or makes wrong modifications, or modifies an error that had not been the target of the feedback. (Nassaji, 2009; 2007, p.530):

**No Repair**

**PARTICIPANT**: Her hair is bind above her head.

**RESEARCHER**: Oh, her hair is tied back.

**PARTICIPANT**: Yeah.
2.3.3 Language Learning

Episodes where learners partially and fully repair their errors are significantly more likely to recognizing the corrective feedback and also notice their interlanguage L2 mismatch (Egi, 2008), Given the developmental benefits, findings may partly explain why partial and full repairs of modified output have been found to be predictive of SLA (Swain, 2005; Loewen, 2005; McDonough, 2005). Nobuyoshi and Ellis (1993) conducted a study with L2 learners of English who had a fairly low-level proficiency but were capable of using at least some past-tense verb forms correctly. Learners were asked to perform two picture jigsaw communication tasks in which the subjects had to describe events that happened the previous weekend in their two tasks. Although most of the learners produced a substantial number of past tense errors, those that successfully reformulated erroneous utterances during the first administration of the task sustained the gain in accuracy during the second administration, and improved on their initial level of accuracy.

Pica et al. (1996) ran a study with 30 English L2 learners and 10 native speakers of English to analyze their interactions to see whether their interaction could address their needs for corrective feedback. Each subject dyad participated in a series of communication tasks, and the results revealed that native speakers of English and L2 learners of English produced similarities in the amount of output modifications. Learners appeared to be quite effective in segmenting portions of each other’s utterances as signals for message comprehensibility and as models of L2 morphosyntax. The sheer simplicity associated with segmentations appeared to make them a particularly efficient way for learners to let each other know they could be understood.

Havranek (2002) in a comprehensive study of oral corrective feedback that analyzed learners of English as a foreign language (German L1 speakers) was able to elicit 1700 instances
of corrective feedback through elicitations +/- prompts. To the learner, this included partial or complete repetition with questioning intonation, repetition with emphasis on the error, explicit invitations like “Try again” (p. 261). The study showed that those who simply corrected profited from the correction in about 50% of all cases as measured in a subsequent test. The researcher postulated that the focus of the utterance is significant since the demands on learner attention and processing capacity vary with focus. The success rate for those who had provoked corrective feedback indicated that learners found feedback useful and were able to learn from it. It was concluded that the learner was most likely to use the correct structure successfully later in a test if the learner was invited to correct their output and was also able to do so. Hayranek concluded that allowing learners to produce the target structures themselves helps build up routine access to it.

In the study by McDonough (2005) of Thai English as a foreign language, learners carried out a series of communicative tasks with native English speakers in four conditions that provided different types of negative feedback and modified output opportunities. There were four treatment conditions in order to increase the likelihood that learners would produce varying levels of correct modified output. The interactions were analyzed for evidence of modified output and operationalized narrowly as a learner’s response to an interlocutor’s negative feedback which involved the reformulation of a question form. Each instance of modified output was classified according to the developmental stage corresponding to the reformulation, and as learners began the study at what was considered stage 4, only modified output involving stage 5 questions were considered as having the potential to drive question development. The logistic regression model identified modified output which involved developmentally advanced questions as the only significant predictor of ESL question development. The researcher
concluded that a learner producing the correct modified output facilitated the rate at which the learner advanced through the developmental stages.

Loewen (2005) examined the effectiveness of corrective feedback on how it promoted L2 learning which took place through seventeen hours of naturally occurring communicative contexts. In correction tests, learners were asked during moments of corrective feedback to improve on erroneous sentences that they had produced. It was shown that the presence of modified output was the variable with the strongest predictor value. Corrective feedback with successful modified output was almost nine times more likely to result in correct test item scores than corrective feedback without successful modified output. Participants were able to remember and produce the targeted linguistic items almost 50% of the time on the immediate testing context and almost 40% in as delayed context.

There is also counter evidence research that questions modified output’s trajectory in language acquisition. Yoshida (2008) examined three Japanese language learners’ perception of corrective feedback in pair work in relation to their noticing and understanding of their partners’ corrective feedback to produce modified output. All the participants had previously completed the first year of Japanese at the high school, college level, or equivalent. As part of the study, the participants had to sit through tutorials that concentrated on the mechanics of the language such as grammar and vocabulary, along with its communicative functions. The tasks used in the study required the learners to make sentences using specific grammatical forms with given vocabulary or to change a given sentence. The data analysis revealed that the learners sometimes did not understand their partners’ corrective feedback needed produce modified output and their dissatisfaction with their interactions affected their understanding. In addition, assumptions were made to suggest that novices in expert/novice dyads may not be comfortable in stimulated
interactions that are meant to look into their modified output. Another study by Rosas and Leow (2004) examined whether processing a Spanish structure through a series of computer-based tasks differing in their degree of explicitness has an impact on learners’ subsequent ability to recognize and produce modified output of the target structure, immediately after exposure to the input, and over time. After analyzing the mean scores from the pretest to the posttest of the experimental groups, not only did the experimental groups make significant gains in modified output, but also the learners in the control condition. This finding suggested the learner acquisition (tested through modified output) wasn’t a result from the corrective feedback, but rather from the input from the initial exposure.

Ogino (2008) explored the impact of modified output of 28 L2 learners of Japanese through a quasi-experimental design, including a pre-test, post-test and delayed-post with randomization of groups. Using the predicate adjectives in the non-past tense as the target feature, production was triggered through a 20 minute oral interview view followed by a 15 minute mechanical drill. The modified output was elicited through clarification requests. The data were collected from 28 undergraduate students who were learning Japanese as a foreign language. This came to a total of 1,011 negations to analyze. The impact of modified output on L2 learning was measured in two different aspects of potential outcomes of modified output (i.e., grammatical accuracy and interlanguage development). In addition, the study investigated whether the non-targetlike forms which participants previously modified were then produced in the subsequent situations of use. The results did not clearly demonstrate whether or not production of modified output might sensitizes learners to avoid the use of the same non-targetlike form that they have previously modified. This indicated a possibility of the limited role of production of modified output in L2 learning.
In sum, studies suggested that Swain’s output hypothesis (1985; 2000) still is practical in today’s age as many studies indicated that modified output (e.g. full repairs, and partial repairs) leads to learning. While some studies suggest modified output leads language acquisition, others suggest it promotes proceduralization (e.g. Lyster 1998a), and others argue that it promotes fluency (e.g. de Bot, 1996; Skehan, 1998; Swain, 1995). Promoting modified output can force learners to process language which is more grammatically correct, or more based on the meaning of the L2. Swain, claimed that pushed output forces learners towards a deeper, grammatical processing, that potentially has a significant role in their development of L2 syntax and morphology. Similarly, de Bot (1996) argues that producing the linguistic form and making the cognitive connections is better than merely perceiving the forms. Therefore, it is possible for learners to produce modified output that immediately follows feedback in order to draw attention to some aspect of the learner’s utterance (Lyster and Ranta, 1997), whether it is partial or full repair.
2.4 Synchronous Online Interaction

2.4.1 Telecollaboration

Computers have become significant in L2 education, as the emergence of Internet-based communication that has the potential to create a paradigmatic shift in teaching L2s (Berge & Collins, 1995; Dede, 1993; Harasim, 1990; Bates, 1995). The idea of connecting learners via computers and the Internet, known as telecollaboration, has led to proposals that it represents another medium for promoting SLA (Higgins, 1998; Paulsen, 1995; Salaberry 1996, 1999; Zhao, 1996). In the telecollaboration learning environment, learners enroll in similar language courses and are in partnership with other dispersed learners or expert speakers of the language under study. Web tools used can include e-mail and synchronous- or real time- conversation in support of dialogue, debate, and social interaction exchanges (Belz, 2005; Kinginger & Belz, 2005). Inside the classrooms, telecollaboration is curriculum-based, teacher-designed and teacher-coordinated to match learner needs and preferences (Harris, 1999). Nonetheless, the latest trend in research remains proposing questions to find out how learners respond to interaction through telecollaboration (Lai & Zhao, 2007; Salaberry, 2000).

Research examining how online interaction can contribute to learners’ language development stems from SLA literature that has been originally focused on task-based learning, a focus on form, and a negotiation of meaning (Ware, & O’Dowd, 2008), coming especially from the transition of Long and Doughty (2003) interaction hypothesis into online environments. Additionally, recent studies suggest the potential that telecollaborative exchanges can have for language development through the use of corrective feedback from collaborating partners (Kessler, 2009; 2010; Sauro, 2009). Some research has suggested promising language development, such as in the acquisition of pronouns of address (Belz, & Kinginger, 2003; Kern,
1996), the development of modality and expressions of appraisal (Belz, 2003), the development of null-overt subject use and gender agreement (Dussias, 2006), and the acquisition of modal particles (Belz, & Vyatkina, 2005). Other studies that look into corrective feedback and tellecoboration have demonstrated that students favor the inclusion of a focus on forms as a part of their exchanges, further suggesting that corrective feedback may facilitate reflection and language development (Vinagre, & Maillo, 2007; Vinagre, & Lera, 2008). Recent findings by Ziegler (2015) further suggest that telecollaboration may be more facilitative of certain target forms which learners in the meta-analysis yielded a better effect size in outcomes, not just for oral, but for written ability as well.

2.4.2 Empirical Studies on Feedback

One of the few studies to expand on the implications of the effects of feedback through telecollaboration is Salaberry (2000a). He analyzed the effect of the interaction hypothesis through by comparing the effect of pedagogical tasks that were implemented in synchronous face-to-face instruction versus telecollaboration, looking at learner development of the past tense verbal endings in Spanish as an L2. Three tasks were performed by four English-speaking students studying Spanish, and only three broad stages of the development sequence were considered: present tense (no past-tense marking), preterite (achievements and accomplishments), and imperfect (states). The four participants at the time of the study were enrolled intermediate level learners enrolled in the third, and fourth semester of Spanish at the college level. They had also all taken Spanish during their high school years for at least one year. This meant the participants had been exposed to the stimulus, or target structure, sometime in their academic career before the study took place. Regardless, for the study, they were asked to perform a 28-item written cloze test, and an informal oral interview. The data were analyzed
with respect to the use of morphological markers of past tense (verb endings) in the three different contexts. The analysis revealed that the first signs of change in morphosyntactic development were more likely identified in the computer based interaction task than in the face-to-face oral task, suggesting elicitations +prompts were more effective in the telecollaboration environment. Therefore, it was possible that aspectual distinctions marked through morphosyntactic means were made more salient in an interactional format that maintained the functional focus on typical on-line face-to-face exchanges.

It was argued that communication in an electronic environment would have an impact on various patterns of classroom feedback, which in turn, may have consequences on the L2 acquisition process. Although promising results, the fact that only four participants took place stops it short of being able to make any conclusions or pedagogical implications. While it does provide positive evidence for computer interaction being used as another medium, the current dissertation study is able to attain more participants (n=69) in hopes of being able to make a more sound finding that can be generalized throughout intermediate learners of Spanish in the development of the past aspect.

Payne and Whitney (2002) conducted a naturalistic experiment to test the hypothesis that synchronous telecollaboration could indirectly improve L2 oral proficiency by developing the same cognitive mechanisms underlying spontaneous conversational speech. They wanted to determine whether individual differences in working memory capacity could effectively predict the rate of L2 oral proficiency development for different types of learners. The study employed a pretest and a posttest experimental design with two experimental groups receiving online role plays, online discussions of cultural texts or video, and other online communicative activities. The other two groups received identical instruction through face-to-face. Using 58 participants
from four sections enrolled in the third semester of Spanish, the treatment in this experiment was a curriculum design that used fully integrated technology in the form of development systems and online course management features. Their findings concluded that the participants who spent half of their instructional time in a synchronous online environment showed development in their oral proficiency over those meeting in the face-to-face classroom. Two t-tests indicated that those participants that conducted their class time in telecollaboration advanced more quickly than the control group suggesting that synchronous telecollaboration may offer some unique benefits to L2 learners that may be difficult to obtain in a conventional classroom setting. This study served as additional evidence that L2 oral proficiency can be improved on through telecollaboration and feedback in the target language.

Fernández-García and Martínez-Arberaiz (2013) recently examined whether the same interactive feedback features found in oral discussions in face-to-face learning environments were also present in telecollaboration, and if so, how many opportunities are provided for negotiation of meaning? They found that learners tended to indicate a breakdown in communication through an explicit statement, which would then be successfully resolved by the other learner providing a translation into English of the unknown word. This option for participants to resort to their L1 was an effective and fast means to return to the conversation.

Samani and Noordin (2013) took a different approach to the question of the effectiveness of feedback through telecollaboration, while simultaneously targeting new grammatical forms to thirty participants. The participants were non-English majors ranging in ages from 25-40 who were assumed to be at the upper-intermediate to advanced level of English. The researchers evaluated the students’ mastery of targeted grammatical itemsd through 60 multiple-choice
questions divided into pre and immediate posttests. During 4 online one-hour telecollaboration sessions, the participants were given feedback, as see in the following examples:

**Feedback, Telecollaboration**

RESEARCHER: An English language learner does or does not learn???

PARTICIPANT: *Whether or not an English language learner learns depends on his Motivation.*

Learner feedback through telecollaboration resulted in a significant improvement in the pre and posttests using same paired-samples T-tests. To answer one of the questions for this study, an ANCOVA was used in which the results indicated that participants who received a planned focus on form outperformed those in the control group on posttests, and using feedback through telecollaboration served as an effective means for development of grammar.

Conversely, findings are not conclusive as studies have suggest telecollaboration to be no different than to face-to-face (Blake, 2000; Lee, 2002), offering a similar environment for learners to exhibit similar behavior (Yamada, & Akahori, 2007), and thus provide no additional benefits for telecollaboration. These similarities in environment include social cues such as: Nodding, smiling, and gestures to facilitate learners’ interactions (Hackman, & Walker, 1990) through real time settings where rapid responses are expected. Furthermore, Vandergriff (2006) explored the impact of the communication medium comparing learner use in FTF and telecollaboration in combination with elicitations – prompts. The findings of this quantitative analysis suggested that telecollaboration alone had little impact indicated by the use of elicitations -prompts. The qualitative analysis suggested evidence that participants adapted strategies primarily to negotiate for meaning rather than to negotiate for L2 grammatical constructs. Therefore, this present research study will focus on predetermined specific targeted structures to ensure participants are being analyzed strictly on grammar through both learning
environments. Moreover, through the story retelling conversations that take place in telecollaboration the research will not provide any cues, or facial expressions of agreement/disagreement (similar methodology in FTF).
2.5 Spanish: Preterite vs. Imperfect

2.5.1 Formation of Aspect

The Spanish past tense includes the preterite and imperfect forms, where a single verbal ending simultaneously signals temporal and aspectual distinctions. The preterite depicts temporal situations as a single unanalyzable whole and can describe a one-time event in the past, whereas the imperfect describes an internal temporal structure, or a habitual activity considered to be a series of finished events (Montrul & Slabakova, 2002). In both Spanish and English, verb morphology conveys information about temporality, as in, for instance, the distinction between present and past tense (e.g. In English the ‘ed’ past tense morpheme). However, the English ‘ed’ verbal ending marks temporal distinctions only (i.e. past), while Spanish uses a single verb ending to signal both temporal and aspectual distinctions (Salaberry, 2000). This fact crucially affects the development task of English native speakers acquiring Spanish. The preterite and imperfect distinctions are also manifested with morphological differences, and it is important to note that for regular verbs, the root of the verb is based on the root of the first person singular. A brief summary of the endings for regular verbs of the preterite and imperfect have been provided in Table 2 and Table 3.
Table 2. Paradigms for the Regular Preterite Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HABLAR</th>
<th>COMER</th>
<th>VIVIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(To talk)</td>
<td>(To eat)</td>
<td>(To live)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>habló</td>
<td>comió</td>
<td>vivió</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Per. Sing./2nd Per. Sing. Form.</td>
<td>3rd Per. Sing./2nd Per. Sing. Form</td>
<td>3rd Per. Sing./2nd Per. Sing. Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hablaste</td>
<td>comiste</td>
<td>viviste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Per. Sing.</td>
<td>2nd Per. Sing.</td>
<td>2nd Per. Sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hablamos</td>
<td>comimos</td>
<td>vivimos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hablasteis</td>
<td>comisteis</td>
<td>vivisteis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hablaron</td>
<td>comieron</td>
<td>vivieron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Per Plu./2nd Per. Plu. Form.</td>
<td>3rd Per Plu./2nd Per. Plu. Form.</td>
<td>3rd Per Plu./2nd Per. Plu. Form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Paradigms for the Regular Imperfect Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HABLAR</th>
<th>COMER</th>
<th>VIVIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(To talk)</td>
<td>(To eat)</td>
<td>(To live)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hablaba</td>
<td>comía</td>
<td>vivía</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Per. Sing.</td>
<td>1st Per. Sing.</td>
<td>1st Per. Sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hablabas</td>
<td>comías</td>
<td>vivías</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Per. Sing.</td>
<td>2nd Per. Sing.</td>
<td>2nd Per. Sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hablabas</td>
<td>comía</td>
<td>vivía</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hablabamos</td>
<td>comíamos</td>
<td>vivíamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hablabais</td>
<td>comíais</td>
<td>vivíais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hablaban</td>
<td>comían</td>
<td>vivían</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A brief summary of some of the most used irregular verbs of the preterite and imperfect have also been included in the following tables, Table 4 and Table 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SER <em>(To be)</em></th>
<th>IR <em>(To go)</em></th>
<th>DAR <em>(To give)</em></th>
<th>HACER <em>(To do)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fui</td>
<td>1st Per. Sing.</td>
<td>fui 1st Per. Sing.</td>
<td>di 1st Per. Sing.</td>
<td>hice 1st Per. Sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fuiste</td>
<td>2nd Per. Sing.</td>
<td>fuiste 2nd Per. Sing.</td>
<td>diste 2nd Per. Sing.</td>
<td>hiciste 2nd Per. Sing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moreover, the term *aspect* within the imperfect tense conveys the internal temporal structure of events as described by verbs and phrases (Chung & Timberlake, 1985), also commonly called *grammatical aspect* which makes it possible for a sentence to denote a complete or an incomplete event (Comrie, 1976). It is argued that it represents different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation. For instance in an example taken from Smith (1991), the preterite aspect in “John built a car”, looks at the situation from outside and disregards the internal structure. On the other hand, the imperfect aspect, as represented by the progressive tense “John was building a car”, looks at the situation from inside and is concerned
with its internal structure without specifying beginning or end. In another example, this time by Salaberry (2000b), the distinctions between Spanish and English are shown:

\[
\begin{align*}
Juan\ durmió\ (\text{PRET}) & = \text{John slept} \\
Juan\ dormía\ (\text{IMP}) & = \text{John slept/John was sleeping} \\
Juan\ estaba\ durmiendo\ (\text{IMP}) & = \text{John was sleeping}
\end{align*}
\]

Again, as one can see, in comparison to English, the imperfect aspect value is not represented by a single tense in English, as it is in Spanish.

On the other hand, *Lexical Aspect* refers to aspectual classes of verbs, where the classification by Vendler (1967) includes the following four with common verb examples in Spanish: (1) States (e.g. *saber, conocer, querer, amar, tener, ser*), (2) Activities (e.g. *andar, correr, caminar, leer, escribir*), (3) Accomplishments (e.g. *escribir una carta, recuperarse de una enfermedad, correr un maratón*), and (4) Achievements (e.g. *alcanzar la cima, morir, llegar, florecer, nacer, encontrar*). This term *Lexical Aspect* of the imperfect tense can also be summarized in Figure 1 by one of the figures brought forth by Montrul and Slabakova (2002).

**Figure 1.** The Spanish Imperfect Aspect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish Imperfect Tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Habitual: <em>would/used to;</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple past tense (activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple past tense (states)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{\textcopyright 2000 by Paul Montrul} \\text{and Vera Slabakova}\]
2.5.2 L2 Acquisition

The classification of verb type is also important since Spanish L2 learners follow a sequence of eight developmental stages for the acquisition of verb morphology (Andersen, 1991). The first four acquisition stages are dependent on the association of particular verb types with specific verb endings: achievements with preterit, and states with imperfect. In other words, the speaker will have to know some type of verb classifications to place it as one of four different types, according to their inherent semantic values: states (last indefinitely), activities (arbitrary beginning and end point: process), accomplishments (inherent end point: durative), and achievements (inherent end point, but no duration: punctual). A more recent analysis by Ortega (2009) describes the stages learners must go through to acquire verb morphology and distinctions through six steps. Through each step, development unfolds in a gradual form-function mapping that is guided by verb morphology, and semantics. See Table 6 taken from Ortega (2009, p. 87).

Table 6. Stages in the Development of the Preterite and Imperfect in L2 Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form-function development</th>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Verb semantics (inherent lexical aspect)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergence of one form in one context</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PRETERITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preterite in achievements: <em>por fin los dos líderes de la parroquia cambiaron su actitud hacia mí</em> (‘finally, the two leaders of the parish changed their attitudes towards me’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Preterite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imperfect in states: <em>cuando era pequeña</em> (‘when I was young’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread to additional contexts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Preterite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imperfect in activities: <em>me dolía la cabeza mucho por la altitud</em> (‘my head hurt a lot because of the altitude’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preterite in accomplishments: <em>en las navidades pasadas vení a casa de mis padres</em> (‘last Christmas I came to my parents’ house’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Preterite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Imperfect in accomplishments: cada navidad venía a casa de mis padres (‘every Christmas I would come to my parents’ house’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preterite</th>
<th>Preterite</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preterite in activities: no sé por qué, pero ayer me dolió la cabeza toda la tarde (‘I don’t know why, but my head hurt all afternoon yesterday’)

Full form-function mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preterite IMPERFECT</th>
<th>Preterite Imperfect</th>
<th>Imperfect Preterite</th>
<th>Imperfect PRETERITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preterite in states: aquel día ... fue fatal (‘that day... was terrible’)

Imperfect in achievements se fue... porque no encontraba trabajo aquí en Dinamarca (‘he left... because he couldn’t find a job here in Denmark’)

Note. Capitalized labels indicate first emergence of a form with a given semantic verb type. Illustrations show cutting edge of interlanguage (i.e., new attested form-function pairings) at each successive stage.

Based on a pilot study done for this dissertation, the learners of this current study are expected to be at the 3rd stage of the possible 6 listed by Ortega (2009) as intermediate learners already have learned the preterite for achievements (equivalent to stage 1), such as “Señor Bean miró la televisión”, in addition to the imperfect for states (equivalent to stage 2), such as “Mr. Bean quería jugar con su pez”. By the time learners reach stage 3 of Ortega’s chart, they further their development of aspect by using the preterite for accomplishments (equivalent to stage 3), such as “Escuchó un gato en la fuente”, and the imperfect for activities (equivalent to stage 3), such as “El señor caminaba a la tintorería”. According to Ortega (2009), “…morphological forms may emerge in interlanguage to express grammatical notions related to time and temporality, such as grammatical tense and aspect” (p. 86). Moreover, at this 3rd stage, tense and aspect are guided by the inherent aspect or lexical semantics of each verb to which morphology is attached, and learners outgrow each state as they develop. In each state that L2 learners undergo, each is characterized by a reliance on a different set of resources that help them express temporarily: pragmatic, lexical, and grammatical structures. This means learners are more prone to select the preterite when it depicts the temporal situation as a single unanalyzable whole, and
the imperfect when it describes the internal temporal structure of the same situation. Salaberry (1999) further states that L2 learners of Spanish follow a particular sequence in the development of aspectual markers, influenced by the lexical aspect hypothesis: “Ø → punctual → telic → dynamic → statives” (p. 153). This coincides with Andersen (1991) where the Past tense verbal morphology in Spanish follows a sequence of stages.

In a different study, Slabakova and Montrul (2002) performed an experimental study, investigating the ways in which adult L2 learners of Spanish learned to connect form and meaning in the temporal and aspectual domain. The aim was to assess the linguistic intuitions of intermediate and advanced Spanish learners with respect to the subtle semantic nuances associated with preterite/imperfect tense morphology. This was measured through a Morphology Test where participants had to select from two choices the correct form of the verb in the past. “The test had a total of 30 blanks, correct answers included 15 preterite and 15 imperfect verb forms” (p. 13). They investigated whether, despite the morphological mismatch, L2 learners eventually acquired the semantic opposition in Spanish. The results from this study suggested that, in fact, there was a clear development timeline in acquiring the interpretive properties of Spanish imperfect and preterite tenses, evidenced by the intermediate learners who tended to begin acquiring the contrast, while the majority of advanced learners had already acquired it.

2.5.3 Pedagogical Interventions in Promoting the Past Tense

Westfall and Foerster (1996) have proposed a comprehensive approach to teaching the preterite and imperfect based on insights from language learning cognitive processing, semantic theories of discourse, and research on comprehension-based approach. The authors sought to explain why strategies that rely solely on aspectual distinctions were inadequate. This approach teaching the preterite and imperfect in two stages. The first involved a four-step presentation of
the temporal and discourse properties of each form/tense to develop a conscious knowledge of the preterite in learners. This approach proposed that one analyze the preterite and imperfect separately. Then they discussed the imperfect function to learners to describe a habitual action/state. Westfall and Foerster contrast the preterite and imperfect by presenting their aspectual differences as relating to the internal temporal development of situations, and that aspect is universal. For the preterite and imperfect to be combined in the form of general definitions, both aspectual and temporal properties were eventually discussed individually. The final step in the procedure was the real world use of discourse, where the learners took into account how the two interact. The second approach that the researchers examined to teaching the preterite and imperfect was for the learners to find themselves immersed with intense oral and written input of the structures among classroom activities that included: 1) Visual symbols for articulating the preterite and imperfect use, 2) Symbols for analyzing existing texts, and 3) A metaphor for constructing discourse.

Another pedagogical intervention was later taken by Salaberry (1999) who analyzed the development of past tense verb morphology in L2 Spanish among 20 college-level L1 English students. The learners were obtained from four different levels of Spanish that included second semester, third semester, advanced third semester, and an introductory literature course. The courses met from three to five times a week in which they were exposed to the past tense throughout the semester. To test for development the research analyzed participant’s oral movie narratives which were collected at two different times, two months apart. His research found that the reported reasons for their selection of aspectual morphology could be grouped into four categories: 1) The nature of the narrative task, 2) lexical aspect, 3) the role of the narrator in constructing discourse, and 4) the impact of instruction.
Salaberry (2013) included a broader discursive context in his study combined with advanced Spanish learners to contribute in the pedagogical implications previously set forth in SLA. The research sought to assess the knowledge representation of iterated eventualities, since L2 had been suggested to prefer imperfective with events. The learners were eventually tested by a discourse-based 30-item forced choice test (they had to choose either Preterite or Imperfect). They then gave the option to select the acceptability of the use of the Preterite or Imperfect from a small scale than ranged one through four. One meant “Unacceptable” and four meant “Acceptable”. The overall findings suggested distinctive outcomes, most importantly demonstrating L2 learners lack the ability to select grammatical markers to differentiate the meaning of aspect.
2.6 Research Questions and Hypothesis

In line with the previous studies mentioned, the present study aims to provide more empirical evidence into elicitations +/- prompts and their effects on learners’ modified output. Next, to investigate the differences that emerge from telecollaboration environments by comparing them to the traditional FTF settings in facilitating the efficacy of elicitations. Third, another goal of the study is to investigate if L2 learners where learners are more prone to commit errors morphology or aspect. Finally, if researchers want to consider elicitations +/- prompts as a component of language production, a quantitative and qualitative research agenda of learners’ corrective feedback episodes is in place. In sum, the goals of the study are: (a) to compare the effectiveness of elicitations +/- prompts in shaping learners’ modified output (b) to determine whether telecollaboration environments are effective in promoting the efficacy of elicitations that lead to modified output. (c) Whether the learners’ produced more modified output to repair morphology or aspect.

2.6.1 Research Question #1: Effects of Elicitations (+/-Prompts) on Modified Output

R1. To what extent does the provision of corrective feedback in the form of elicitations with prompts have an effect on Spanish L2 learners’ modified output of the Spanish preterite and imperfect?

2.6.2 Research Question #2: Face-to-Face vs. Telecollaboration

R2. What is the effect of learning environment, Face-to-Face versus telecollaboration, in mediating the efficacy of elicitations on leaners’ modified output?
2.6.3 Research Question #3: Morphology and Aspect

R3. Does a difference exist on the type of reparations learners make in their modified output as far as morphology and aspect?

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY AND KEY TERMS

This chapter details the design and methodology for the current dissertation to answer the two research questions, and further test their hypothesis offered at the end of the previous chapter, Chapter 2. It also presents the operationalization of four key variables: Elicitations, prompts, learning environments, and modified output. Within each major variable, principle key terms are also addressed and defined. These include: Prompts, Face-to-Face, Telecollaboration, and Full Repair/Partial Repair/ No Repair. In addition, as part of the methodology, the materials, coding procedures, participants, and information of the pilot study are included.
3.1 Elicitation

This study adopted Nassaji’s (2011) precise definition of elicitations that state:

“Elicitations […] were defined as feedback that did not provide the correct form, rather it pushed or prompted the learner to correct the error; thus, providing the learner with opportunities for self-repair. This included various kinds of elicitation strategies including clarification requests[…], and repeating learner error up to the point where the error had occurred and waiting for the learner to complete the utterance” (p. 21).

For this particular research study, the participants were provided with feedback immediately following non-targetlike target structures that included errors in tense-aspect, and morphology of the preterite/imperfect.
3.2 Prompts

Within elicitations, this study further focuses on a subdomain of elicitations, +/- prompts, (with and without prompts) by adopting Nassaji’s (2007) definition of prompts as signals that can be added to the feedback to highlight the error (or other verbal interrogative words and phrases). By being provided with explicit verbal prompts, the learner is pushed to respond to the feedback. For instance, example 1, the researcher provides feedback through an elicitation move with the addition of a prompt. At the same time does not provide the correct form, giving the learner an opportunity to self-correct. In these instances, by repeating the verb back to the participant it makes the error more salient. In example 1, underlining is used to denote such instances. An asterisk marks the erroneous utterance. In example 2, the researcher provides feedback using only a simple elicitation (i.e. clarification request), and no additional cues are offered to highlight the error.

**Example 1: (Elicitation, +Prompt)**

**Participant:** El oso de peluche estuve sucio y....

“The teddy bear (I) was* [MORPHOLOGY ERROR] dirty and…”

**Researcher:** ¿El oso de peluche estuve?

“The teddy bear (I) was*?”

**Participant:** ¡Estuvo!

“(He) was!”

**Example 2: (Elicitation, -Prompt)**

**Participant:** Y dormiste con la foto...

“And (you) slept* [MORPHOLOGY ERROR] with the picture…”

**Researcher:** ¿Qué?
“What?”

Participant: *Señor Bean durm… durmió con la foto del oso y..

“Mr. Bean (he) sle… slept, with the picture of the bear and…”
3.3 Learning Environments

3.3.1 Face-to-Face

The term *face-to-face* is used to describe the traditional learning environment of having a human face-to-face conversation (Stansfield, McLellan, & Connolly, 2004) that takes place within the same room (Nakano, Reinstein, Stocky, & Cassell, 2003) in which the speakers and interlocutors are present. The conversation, interaction, and participation takes place with the participant and researcher meeting in person (Etzioni & Etzioni, 1999). For this study, the participants who completed the face-to-face learning environment met the researcher in the same room to complete one video retelling task centered on the cartoon character Mr. Bean. The seating and table arrangement consisted of the individual participant and researcher sitting across the table and facing each other, similar to several previous SLA studies (Robinson, 1995; Gilabert, Baró, & Llanes, 2009; Baralt & Gurzynski-Weiss, 2011; Futaba, 2001; Stone, 2012; Gurzynski-Weiss, & Baralt, 2014a, 2014b; Gass, Mackey, & Ross-Feldman, 2005). The dialogue of each participant was digitally recorded by placing the recorder between each participant and the researcher.

3.3.2 Telecollaboration

The term *telecollaboration* is operationalized as the use of on-line communication tools for foreign language production, “… including email, web-based message boards, and videoconferencing” (O’Dowd, & Ritter, 2006, p. 624), which can be further defined as global communication for foreign language education with attention given to the use and social dimensions of language. It typically consists of learners working in distant locations rooted into contexts and institutional settings (Belz, 2002, 2003; Furstenberg, Levet, English, & Maillet, 2001; Kinginger, Gourves-Hayward, & Simpson, 1999; O’Dowd, 2004). For this study, the
participants who completed the telecollaboration learning environment participated and interacted with the researcher through synchronous oral communication using the video chat program *Skype* to complete the same video retelling task as the face-to-face group. This video chat program has been used in other studies, such as in Yanguas (2010), where promising results arose by successfully fostering speaking practice in the L2.
3.4 Modified Output

*Modified output* is defined as participant’s interactive move following the corrective feedback episodes, classified as the following: (1) Modified Output: Full Repair, (2) Modified Output: Partial Repair, and (3) No Repair.

### 3.4.1 Full Repair

For a participants’ modified output to be considered *full repair*, the reformulation needed to be targetlike, and the original error had to be corrected immediately following the feedback in a single participant turn (Romanova, 2010; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Suzuki, 2005). This is illustrated in the following example:

*Example 1 (Full Repair)*

**Participant:** Él fui en él. 

“He (I) went* [MORPHOLOGY ERROR] on it”.

**Researcher:** Él, ¿fui?

“He, (I) went*?”

**Participant:** Fue.

“(He) went”. ➔ **TARGETLIKE MODIFIED OUTPUT**

### 3.4.2 Partial Repair

For the repair to be considered *partial repair*, the learner’s reformulation needed to be at least 50% targetlike, or for only one part of the original utterance to be repaired immediately following the feedback, while the rest still needed correction (Romanova, 2010; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Suzuki, 2005). This is shown in the following example:

*Example 1 (Partial Repair)*

**Participant:** Mientras el oso de peluche fue a la tintorería, señor Bean....
“While the teddy bear (he) went* [TENSE-ASPECT ERROR] to the dry cleaners, Mr. Bean…”

Researcher: El oso de peluche, ¿fue?

“The teddy bear, (he) went*?”

Participant: ¡Oh! El oso de peluche estabe.

“Uh! The teddy bear (he) was* [MORPHOLOGY ERROR]. ↔ MORE
TARGETLIKE
MODIFIED
OUTPUT

3.4.3 No Repair

The category no repair indicates that the learner’s response showed either no reformulation or no target verb in the output as suggested by Romanova (2010). Note the following examples:

Example 1 (No Repair)

Participant: Señor Bean y el oso de peluche miré la televisón.

“Mr. Bean and the teddy bear, (I) watched* [MORPHOLOGY ERROR] television”.

Researcher: ¿Qué?

“What?”

Participant: Hmm, miré la película.

“Hmm, (I) watched* the movie” ↔ NO REFORMULATION

Example 2 (No Repair)

Participant: Y señor Bean y el pez fui a la tintorería.

“And Mr. Bean and the fish (I) went* [MORPHOLOGY ERROR] to the dry
cleaners”.

**Researcher:** *El señor Bean y el pez, ¿Qué?*

“Mr. Bean, and the fish, what?”

**Participant:** *El pez del fuente.*

“The fish of the fountain”.  

Responses that ignored the feedback, or provided a simple acknowledgment, such as “yeah/yes”, were also considered *No Repair* (Romanova, 2010; Nassaji, 2007, 2011). As observed in example 3:

**Example 3 (No Repair)**

**Participant:** *Él fui a la casa, y …*

“He (I) went*[MORPHOLOGY ERROR] to the house, and…”

**Researcher:** *Él, ¿fui?*

“He, (I) went*?”

**Participant:** *Sí.*

“Yes”

In addition, *No Repair* also includes evasion and negotiation. *Evasion* is observed when the participant’s modified output responds to the feedback given, but goes off-target, circulating around the feedbacks linguistic focus and may manage to finish the utterance (Lyster, & Ranta, 1997; Suzuki, 2005):

**Example 4 (No Repair)**

**Participant:** *y pude el oso de peluche en la ducha.*

“And he (I) placed*[MORPHOLOGY ERROR] the teddy bear in the shower”.

**Researcher:** *Y, ¿Qué?*
“And, what?”

Participant: Se, um, fue a poner el oso de peluche en la ducha.

“He, um, went to put the teddy bear in the shower”. ➔ EVASION

Negotiation involves dialogues or a sequence of turns that eventually leads to the correct reformulation (Romanova, 2010; Nassaji, 2007, 2011):

Example 5 (No Repair)

Participant: No podió nadar.

“He could* [MORPHOLOGY ERROR] not swim”.

Researcher: Señor Bean, no ¿Podió nadar?

“Mr. Bean, (he) could* not swim?”

Participant: ¿No es podió?

“It is not (he) could*?” ➔ NEGOTIATION

Researcher: Continúa.

“Continue”.

Participant: No, es ¿podió?

“It’s not, (he) could*?” ➔ NEGOTIATION

Researcher: Yo no sé. Continúa.

“I don’t know. Continue”.
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3.5 Target Structure

For the current dissertation, the preterite and imperfect past tenses were used as the target linguistic structures. First, the use of the preterit and imperfect is problematic for English speaking L2 learners of Spanish (Barnwell, 1987; Castañeda, 2011; Finneman, 1987; Montrul & Slabakova, 2001; 2002; Salaberry 1999; Westfall & Foerster, 1996). Second, more studies are needed on language performance of structures like the preterite and imperfect through a different learning environment other than face-to-face, such as telecollaboration, since online courses in the 21st century are beginning to currently be overwhelmingly. Third, from a pedagogical standpoint, L2 learners are continuously overwhelmingly exposed to lessons of the proper use of the preterite and imperfect with unsuccessful rates of acquisition among beginning and intermediate learners of Spanish in regards to the distinctions of aspect (Montrul & Slabakova, 2002). Therefore, the selection of this structure form will shed light on the production of the preterite and imperfect amongst intermediate level students, and thus, make potential sound recommendations for educators.
3.6 Study Design and Procedure

Prior to the participants’ arrival, they were randomly assigned into an experimental group, where the control group also completed the treatment task, but did not receive any feedback. The researcher hosted all the necessary tasks and materials online (video clips, questionnaires, and assessments) for the participants in the following websites: KwikSurveys (www.kwiksurveys.com), and Google Drive (www.google.com/drive). Prior to the participants arriving, the adequate documents and files were brought up in the laptop screen for easy access, and time saving. In the study itself, each participant was expected to spend with the researcher 50 minutes to an hour (depending on each participant’s progression of the required items), and were compensated for their time after successfully completing the study.

To begin the study, the researcher read the consent form to the participants and the participants gave consent to begin the study. After the students gave consent, they completed a Language Background Questionnaire that solicited personal data regarding their language use and exposure. It was made sure their identity was kept confidential. This was followed by a Proficiency Test following the protocols of the Elicited Imitation Test. Third, the participants completed a video retelling task that consisted of a brief practice oral production task in English, followed by the actual video retelling task. Both video clips (the practice and actual task) chosen were both animations films that portrayed the well-known comedian actor Mr. Bean as the protagonist. Regardless, for this task participants were allowed to take notes during the viewing of the video clip and take 5 up to minutes to review their notes once the video ended but had to put the notes away once they were ready to retell the events of the video. Finally, after the treatment task the participants completed an Exit Questionnaire. To summarize, Figure 2 below covers the steps that each participant took throughout the study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review of Consent Form</strong></td>
<td>• CONSENT PROCESS- Researcher goes over the consent process with participants and responds to questions. (3 min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Background Questionnaire</strong></td>
<td>• LANGUAGE BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE- Elicits participant's language experience and personal characteristics through Torres' (2013) Language Background Questionnaire. (10 min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Assessment</strong></td>
<td>• ELICITED IMITATION TEST- To measure participant's proficiency in Spanish. (10 min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment Tasks</strong></td>
<td>• VIDEO RETELLING TASK- Participants watched a video and interacted with the research to retell what happen in the video. (30 min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exit Questionnaire</strong></td>
<td>• DEBRIEFING QUESTIONNAIRE- Participants summarize their thoughts, and opinions with the researcher and the study itself. (5 min.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6.1 Language Background Questionnaire

To obtain information on participants’ previous exposure to the target language of Spanish, all the participants completed a self-rated Language Background Questionnaire (see Appendix B) in English, formerly used by Torres (2013). The questionnaire elicited information regarding the learners’ age, gender, and amount of daily exposure to their L1 and L2 at specific stages of their childhood and adulthood. This was in addition to: the participant’s travel abroad experience, the participant’s use of Spanish with their immediate family (if applicable), the frequent use and attitudes of Spanish and English in everyday situations, the participants’ formal & informal exposure to Spanish, and self-ratings in Spanish and English.

3.6.2 Elicited Imitation Test

The proficiency assessment known as an Elicited Imitation Test was used as a global L2 measure of syntactic complexity in the participants’ L2, where they hear, and then repeat utterances of different syllable lengths that demand real-time, integrative oral linguistic skills (Thompson, 2013; Wu & Ortega 2013). Following procedures in Christensen (2012) participant responses were recorded during the Elicited Imitation Test and afterwards stored in an external server and evaluated. In addition to Elicited Imitation Tests being cost-effective, Elicited Imitation Tests provide test-item construction, allowing one to focus on specific grammatical structures and lexical items (Graham, Lonsdale, Kennington, Johnson, & McGhee 2008; Lonsdale & Millard, 2014). As sentences increase in complexity, participants become less able to simply mimic the sounds of the sentence which means participants have to simultaneously decode the sentence for meaning and reproduce the meaning using their language productive skills. The more comprehension and linguistic skills the learner has, the better they will be able to reproduce what was heard (Burdis, 2014). Elicited Imitation Tests offer a good estimate of the
participant’s global oral proficiency levels in their L2 (Wu & Ortega, 2013). This type of test has been used in linguistic research, language acquisition studies (Slobin & Welsh, 1973; Okura, & Lonsdale, 2012), and as a tool for measuring language ability (Vinh, 2002; Erlam, 2006). For this research study, the Elicited Imitation Test created by Ortega, Iwashita, Rabie, and Norris (2002) is used (see Appendix C). Initially, the Elicited Imitation Test audio recording used, consists of explicit instructions for the participants explaining the process, and instructions for them to do. This is followed by six English sentences that function as a practice and then thirty sentences in Spanish as seen in Figure 3, ranging from seven to seventeen syllables.

Figure 3. Samples of the EIT

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><em>Quiero cortarme el pelo</em> (7 syllables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><em>¿Qué dice usted que va a hacer hoy?</em> (9 syllables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td><em>Las casas son muy bonitas pero caras</em> (12 syllables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td><em>El niño al que se le murió el gato está triste</em> (14 syllables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td><em>Después de llegar a casa del trabajo tomé la cena</em> (17 syllables)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Taken from Ortega et al. (2002)*

3.6.3 Video Retelling Task

For this study, before the participants watched the video, they were read explicit instructions of the procedures the treatment task would follow. These instructions also displayed on the computer screen for the reader to also follow as the researcher read. The participants then watched a nine minute cartoon video clip titled “Gold Fish”, based on the Mr. Bean character (Please see link for video):

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/0BxzwtOLz7ZffZkhM8dHdHMWJ1ejQ/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0BxzwtOLz7ZffZkhM8dHdHMWJ1ejQ/view).

The participants were informed that they could take notes while viewing the cartoon video clip and that after it ended, they would also be allowed five minutes to review their notes...
and gather their thoughts. In addition, participants were given in advance twelve snapshots of the chronological sequences that occurred in the video clip that they could use during their video telling as a cheat-sheet that included nine useful Spanish vocabulary nouns and seven verbs that could aid them in their retelling of the video. The same treatment task was applied to all the experimental groups, including the control group.

3.6.4. Exit Questionnaire

The participants completed an Exit Questionnaire (see Appendix D) at the end of the study. The questions asked the participant’s personal experience regarding the study, starting with if they learned anything from interacting with the researcher, followed by their thought process during the moments they were provided with feedback. The next questions asked about their level of comfort with the researcher to finish the tasks, and their opinions about going over their spoken responses. The last question asked what they thought the study was investigating. The complete Exit Questionnaire was five short answer questions.
3.7 Coding Procedure

3.7.1 Elicited Imitation Test

The coding for the Elicited Imitation Test followed the protocol underlined in appendices I and J of Ortega (2000). The protocol calls for each sentence of the participant to be coded in a scale that ranges from a maximum score of a 4 down to the lowest score possible of a zero. This means that after 30 sentences, each with a possible maximum score of 4 for each sentence, a perfect score would potentially be 120. Tables provided by Ortega indicated each score’s distinct descriptors and the criteria needed for each score numeration. Plenty of examples were also provided by Ortega and for each sentence a possible score of 0 meant the sentence contained a minimum repetition of 1 or 2 words, or no repetition at all if it contained silence. A score was also 0 if the learner started to repeat 1 or 2 words and then abandoned it. An example is “Mañana...” (Tomorrow…), or “Me gustaría las se se se el XXX” (I would like the XXX). When a sentence received a score of 1, it meant only about half of the idea units were presented in the string of sentence, and a lot of information in the original stimulus was left out, sometimes resulting in a meaning that was unrelated to the stimulus. This could happen when only 2 or 3 content words were repeated and no grammatical relation between them was attempted. An example is “Antes de poder seguir (3 sec.) perdió su cuarto” (Before being able to continue [3 sec.] he lost his room). Scores of a 2 were posited when the content of the string preserved at least more than half of the idea units in the original stimulus, and was meaningful. The descriptor for a 2 further emphasized that the meaning had to be close or related to the original, but departed slightly from its original content which ended up being inexact, incomplete, or ambiguous. An example of a score of 2 was “Después de cenar me fui a X tranquil” (After eating dinner I went to X calmly). A score of 3 meant the sentence contained its complete and
preserved meaning. Those sentences that included changes in grammar which didn’t affect meaning could be considered a 3. If there were any changes in grammar that could be interpreted as meaning changes from a native speaker perspective, then it was scored as a 2. Examples of category 3 descriptors are: “Me gustaría el precio de las casas (2 sec.) baja” (I would like the prices of the houses [2 sec.] down), “El niño que se m- murió cato esta triste” (The boy that d-dyed cato is sad), and “Quiero cortar mi pelo” (I want to cut hair). Last, but not least, category 4 descriptors were those repeated sentences that had exact repetition, meaning, that the string matched the stimulus exactly. Both form and meaning were correct without exception or doubt.

To test for inter and intracoder reliability for the coding of the Elicitation Imitation Test, the coding followed the procedure of Gurzynski-Weiss, and Baralt (2014), where the researcher coded 80% of the data, and the second coder selectively blinded coded the other 20% “… to ensure that the coding scheme can be used consistently, or reliably across multiple coders wherever possible” (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p. 242). The researcher created comprehensive datasets for the 20% from different parts of the main dataset (e.g. 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4) and conducted a training session to explain the goals of the coding to the second rater. This was followed by providing opportunities and sample data for the second rater to practice rating before they judged the actual data.

Once all data was finished, the researcher and second rater met to discuss the coding decisions to come to an agreement on any discrepancies, and the second rater reliability statistics were later calculated using Cohen’s Kappa. This represented the average rate of agreement for an entire set of scores, taking into account the frequency of agreements and disagreements by category. Moreover, in the coding scheme (e.g., coding repeated sentences as 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4), Cohen’s Kappa required that the researcher determine how many repeated sentences both raters
had coincided. The mean for Cohen’s Kappa to be valid needed to meet a score between .81, and 1.00 as suggested by Mackey, & Gass (2005). In this case Cohen’s Kappa was .82 (85%).

3.7.2 Language Background Questionnaire

A subjective measurement for language proficiency came from one of the dataset used from the Language Background Questionnaire (Appendix B) for each participant (n=69) to self-rate their skills in Spanish (reading, listening, speaking, and writing). Participants used a Likert scale numbered 6 through 1 where 6 meant Native Proficiency, and 1 meant Beginning Proficiency. The full scale ranged in the following way: “Native Proficiency = 6/ Near-Native Proficiency= 5/ Advanced Proficiency= 4/Intermediate Proficiency= 3/ Basic Proficiency= 2/ Beginning Proficiency= 1” (Torres, 2013, p. 113). These results were later averaged for each category. Similarly, the age of onset of the Spanish for each participant was reported, in which the results were also later averaged, in addition to the months of immersion, and years of formal courses. Lastly, the questionnaire also elicited participant’s attitudes toward the use of Spanish and daily language use of Spanish across different settings. Furthermore, the participants also had to rate their frequency use of Spanish in their daily lives. The questions provided multiple choice answers that varied in a Likert scale: Always= 5, Frequently =4, Sometimes=3, Rarely=2, Never=1, Does Not Apply= 0. The items that did not receive a response from the participants were left blank. The researcher then found the sum of the total number of responses based on the scale mentioned above to calculate a score for language use of Spanish. Finally, the researcher found the average of the responses from the participants. (Please see section 3.8.2 for all results).

3.7.3 Modified Output

All of the feedback episodes that emerged between the participant and researcher were transcribed by the researcher as well as a second transcriber to ensure consistency with
transcriptions. These included erroneous utterances by participants followed by feedback from the researcher and then responses to the feedback from participants. After the data was transcribed, the researcher created a coding procedure following Nassaji (2009) that included the operationalization and giving examples. Utterances were considered erroneous if they included a nontargetlike form of the preterite/imperfect, and varied depending on how much of the initial error was corrected by the participant after receiving feedback. The modified output by the learner was categorized as: Full Repair when the learner identified the error and made modified output that resulted in a targetlike utterance, Partial Repair when the modified output partially corrected the error, and No Repair if the learner did not identify the targeted error, or made any modifications. Then, the researcher tallied the total number of repair moves, or no repair moves if applicable, and calculated a composite for each one, followed by running a statistical analysis.

To test for inter and intracoder reliability coding of the modified output, the researcher created comprehensive data sets for the 20% from different parts of the main data set (e.g. Full Repair, Partial Repair, and No repair). Intercoder reliability statistics were calculated using Cohen’s Kappa, taking into account the frequency of agreements and disagreements by category within the trichotomous coding scheme (e.g., coding forms as Full Repair, Partial Repair, and No Repair). For this study Cohen’s Kappa resulted in .94 (96%).
3.8 Participants

3.8.1 Biographical Data

A total of 74 participants were recruited for this study from a medium size state university of higher education in the northeast of the United States. Due to some participants being exposed to Spanish since birth, as revealed in the completed Background Questionnaire, they were considered potential outliers and eliminated from the data set as this study focuses late adult L2 learners (n=69). Additionally, for participants to take part in the study they had to be enrolled in an Intermediate level Spanish course at the time the study was conducted. Therefore, the study tallied four experimental groups, and two control groups in which the conditions for each group can be seen in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th># OF PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tel + Prompt</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel - Prompt</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel Control</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTF + Prompt</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTF –Prompt</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTF Control</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8.2 Subjective Proficiency Ratings of LBQ

The Language Background Questionnaire was able to provide the average age of onset of Spanish for the participants (M=12.5, SD= 3.4). The participants had very little experience in a foreign country with an average of less than half a year in a Spanish speaking country (M=0.2,
The number of years of formal Spanish course work that the learners had taken (M=6.5, SD= 2.8). As a subjective measurement, the results showed that all the L2 learners rated their speaking abilities to be within at intermediate fluency, or intermediate level (M= 3.2, SD= 1.0). Self-assessments in reading resulted a slightly higher score within the intermediate (M=3.5, SD= 1.0). Writing (SD= 1.0) and listening (SD=1.2) scored equally (M= 3.4). Table 8 below summarizes the background information from the L2 learners in this study.
Table 8. Participants’ Spanish Language Background Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Age of on set</th>
<th>Months of immersion</th>
<th>Years of formal Courses</th>
<th>Reading self-rating</th>
<th>Writing self-rating</th>
<th>Speaking self-rating</th>
<th>Listening self-rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L2 (n=69)</td>
<td>12.5 (3.4)</td>
<td>0.2 (1.1)</td>
<td>6.5 (2.8)</td>
<td>3.5 (1.0)</td>
<td>3.4 (1.0)</td>
<td>3.2 (1.0)</td>
<td>3.4 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means are presented with SDs in parentheses. Self-ratings: 1 = lowest proficiency (Beginning Fluency); 6 = highest proficiency (native fluency)
Moreover, the section for language use provided a holistic view of the participant’s everyday use of Spanish outside the L2 classroom, such as “I speak Spanish with my parents or caretakers”, “I speak Spanish with my friends in my neighborhood”, and “I write in Spanish at work”. Using the Likert Scale where 5=Always, 4=Frequently, 3=Sometimes, 2=Rarely, 1=Never, and 0=Does Not Apply, the participants (n=69) were ranked between (M=1.90, SD=0.53) “Never” and “Rarely” in their use of Spanish as Figure 4 demonstrates.

**Figure 4. Results of Language Use**

![Likert Scale Diagram](image)

M=1.90 (SD=0.53)

### 3.8.3 Objective Proficiency Ratings of EI Task

An objective measurement used for language proficiency took part in an Elicited Imitation Task (EI Task) to evaluate learners’ proficiency. From the EI Task, the 69 participants could potentially reach a high score of 120 through the repetition of the 30 test items, or sentences that they were asked to repeat. The mean score (M=64, SD=23.70) is shown in Figure 4, in addition to the midpoint of the results of 72.5. The range varied by 93 points, where the lowest score from a participant was 26, and the highest 119.
Using the conversion scale from ACTFL (Bowden, 2015), the scores from the EI Task scores were configured to evaluate the level of the participant’s Spanish proficiency, as seen in Table 9. The scores attained from the participants in the EI Task placed them slightly above the Intermediate Mid level of 61, but a bit lower than the Intermediate High level of 85. Participants had a mean score of 64, while the lowest individual proficiency was, Intermediate Low.

Table 9. Numerical Conversions of EIT Scores to ACTFL’s Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elicited Imitation Task</th>
<th>ACTFL (SOPI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Superior (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Advanced High (2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Advanced Mid (2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>Advanced Low (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Intermediate High (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Intermediate Mid (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>Intermediate Low (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Novice High (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>&lt;novice high (--)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Maximum scores were 120 for the EIT and 3.0 for the SOPI.
In sum, both subjective and objective proficiency ratings provide evidence that the participants are in the intermediate-mid range based on the participant’s self-ratings and the EI tests. These are two pieces of evidence that provide the needed proficiency for this study.
3.9 Pilot Study

The pilot of this research study was done from the beginning of November 2014 through the middle of January 2015. The purpose was to test the experimental tasks and see what kind of modified oral output the experimental tasks would elicit from the participants. In conjunction to testing the experimental tasks as a stimulus, the pilot study was also done to see what kind of vocabulary and verbs the participants needed to know in order to retell the video in Spanish. Additionally, the website Google Drive and KwikSurvey were tested to stream the video clips, while KwikSurveys was verified to test and save the data of participants from the Background Language Questionnaires. The free multi-track audio recording software Audacity was also tested, along with the Sony ICD-PX333 Digital Flash Voice Recorder. The participants used a Dell 11.6” Touch-Screen Laptop to watch and listen to the content, in addition to using it to communicate through telecollaboration (only applied to the telecollaboration group). The researcher used a HP Pavilion 15.6” Touch Screen Laptop.

In this pilot study, all of the participants came from the same course, which was a second semester section of Intermediate Spanish. This level was chosen due to the linguistic feature of the preterite/imperfect had already been covered according to the syllabus and students also had enough knowledge of Spanish to have a conversation with follow-up questions. The target structure for the study is learned two semesters earlier in the second semester of Beginning Spanish. According to the Spanish program registration form, this level is equivalent to a student who has completed 5 years of high school Spanish. There were 28 participants who volunteered for the test pilot, and were given a copy of the approved Institution Review Board form for this pilot study. The participants received 3 extra credit points towards any Spanish class assignment for their participation in the pilot study.
3.9.1 Outcomes

Participants only attended one session as halfway through the study after approximately 16 participants, the researcher realized that the cartoon video clip the participants were to retell in Spanish was too time consuming, and contained too much for them to remember. The sequence of events were being told by students out of chronological order with too many long pauses. Despite learners being given “Cheat-Sheets” with useful vocabulary and verbs obtained from previous testing with Graduate level L2 learners participants were still being overwhelmed.

3.9.2 Modifications

Due to the outcomes from the pilot study, more major events were inserted into the snapshots (one of the cheat sheets they could use); they went from 8 originally to 12. Also, the researcher advised participants to take notes while they watched the video clip, and after the cartoon video clip ended, they were given an additional five minutes to go over their notes in addition to using the cheat-sheet to organize their thoughts. These cheat sheets kept getting modified after every couple of participants by adding more vocabulary, or changing the images that symbolized certain problematic vocabulary. The original video of 11 minutes was shortened to 9 minutes.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

This chapter presents a quantitative and qualitative analysis on the mean scores of Modified Output for the video retelling task, as well as the results on the Corrective Feedback experimental conditions with elicitations and prompts. The chapter is divided into sections based on each separate research question (RQ) proposed at the end of Chapter 2. For each research question, two subsections containing descriptive statistics and inferential statistics are provided. All results were analyzed with the statistical software package SPSS v. 23. The last section of the chapter provides a summary of the results for each section, along with a look at a few sample responses in the Exit Questionnaire in order to gauge participants’ perspectives on the study.
4.1 Research Question #1 on The Effects of Elicitations (+/- Prompts) on Modified Output

To what extent does the provision of corrective feedback in the form of elicitations with prompts have an effect on Spanish L2 learners’ modified output of the Spanish preterite and imperfect?

4.1.1 Descriptive Statistics for RQ #1

The total number of nontargetlike utterances per experimental group were tallied for Table 10 in the +prompt group (SUM=176, M=7.33, SD = 4.91) and –prompt group (SUM=147, M=7, SD=2.21).

Table 10. Total Nontargetlike Utterances per Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITION</th>
<th>SUM</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+Prompt</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>7.33 (per participant)</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Prompt</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>7.0  (per participant)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, in Table 11 the learners’ responses in regards to their degree of Modified Output were studied, using frequency tables, for each type of experimental condition (+/prompt):

+Prompt and full repairs (SUM=91); +prompt and partial repairs (SUM=18); and +prompts’ total repairs (SUM=109). Analyzing the next experimental group is –prompt and full repairs (SUM=20); -prompt and partial repairs (SUM=9); the sum of –prompts’ total repairs (SUM=29).

Table 11. Total Number of Repairs (vs. Nontargetlike Utterances) per Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Repairs</th>
<th>Partial Repairs</th>
<th>Total Repairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Prompt</td>
<td>91 (176)</td>
<td>18 (176)</td>
<td>109 (176)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Prompt</td>
<td>20 (147)</td>
<td>9 (147)</td>
<td>29 (147)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More analysis looked into the mean number of repaired outputs per participants. This required combining the experimental groups that received +/- prompts, in addition to the control,
to average the number of errors fully repaired. Table 12 lists the mean for +prompt group for the number of errors fully repaired ($M=3.70, SD=3.44, n=24$); –prompt group for the number of errors fully repaired ($M=0.95; SD=0.86, n=21$), and the control groups for the number of errors fully repaired ($M=0.41, SD=0.58$). Listed are the number of errors partially repaired in the +prompt group ($M=0.75, SD=1.07, n=24$), -prompt ($M=0.42, SD=0.59, n=21$); and control ($M=0.04, SD=0.58, n=24$) are listed.

Table 12. Mean Number of Total Repairs per Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Feedback Condition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Errors Fully Repaired</td>
<td>+prompt</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-prompt</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Errors Partially</td>
<td>+prompt</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repaired</td>
<td>-prompt</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2 Inferential Statistics for RQ#1

In running a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) there were five testable assumptions (Freedman et al., 2014): (1) There are no univariate or multivariate outliers. There can be no outliers in each group of the independent variable for any of the dependent variables. (2) There is multivariate normality across all dependent variables. This means that the dependent variables are normally distributed across the different combinations of independent variables. (3) There is a linear relationship between each pair of dependent variables for each group of the independent variable. (4) There is homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices. Box’s M test of equality of covariance tests this assumption and if it fails then Levenes’ test of homogeneity of variance can be done to see where the problem lies. (5) There is no
multicollinearity. This means your dependent variables should only be mildly to moderately, not highly correlated, with each other.

In an analysis of variance (ANOVA) there were two testable assumptions (Freedman et al., 2014): (1) There is multivariate normality across all dependent variables. This means dependent variables are normally distributed across the different combinations of independent variables. (2) There is a homogeneity of variance as tested by Levene’s Test of Homogeneity of Variance. Furthermore, the between subject ANOVAs for Number of Errors Repaired was significant at $F(5, 63) = 9.011, p. <0.001$ while the between subject ANOVA for Number of Errors Partially Repaired were not significant at $F(5, 63) = 2.263, p. = 0.059$. The criteria for effect size $r$ in L2 research for interpretation are $0.25$ for small, $0.40$ for medium and $0.60$ for large (Plonsky & Oswold, 2014). The partial eta squares was $.419 (r= 0.6473)$ for the Number of Errors Repaired and $.152 (r=.3899)$ for the Number of Errors Partially Repaired. The effect size here is considered to be large (75th percentile) for feedback type in the Number of Errors Repaired and medium (50th percentile) for the Number of Errors Partially Repaired. See Table 13.
### Table 13. Types of Modified Output: Between Subjects Contrasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>Observed Power&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>The Number of Errors Repaired</td>
<td>192.958&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.592</td>
<td>9.077</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Number of Errors Partially Repaired</td>
<td>6.188&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>2.263</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Number of Errors Repaired</td>
<td>195.276</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>195.276</td>
<td>45.930</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>The Number of Errors Partially Repaired</td>
<td>11.409</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.409</td>
<td>20.865</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Number of Errors Repaired</td>
<td>192.958</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.592</td>
<td>9.077</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>The Number of Errors Partially Repaired</td>
<td>6.188</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>2.263</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Number of Errors Repaired</td>
<td>267.853</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>The Number of Errors Partially Repaired</td>
<td>34.450</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Number of Errors Repaired</td>
<td>673.000</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>The Number of Errors Partially Repaired</td>
<td>52.000</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>The Number of Errors Repaired</td>
<td>460.812</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Number of Errors Partially Repaired</td>
<td>40.638</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> R Squared = .419 (Adjusted R Squared = .373)

<sup>b</sup> R Squared = .152 (Adjusted R Squared = .085)

<sup>c</sup> Computed using alpha = .05
4.2 Research Question #2 on Face-to-Face and Telecollaboration

What is the effect of learning environment, Face-to-Face versus telecollaboration, in mediating the efficacy of elicitations on learners’ modified output?

4.2.1 Descriptive Statistics for RQ #2

The total number of episodes of nontargetlike utterances per learning environment was tallied in Table 14 in telecollaboration ($SUM=198$, $M=5.65$, $SD=5.36$); and Face-to-Face ($SUM=136$, $M=4.0$, $SD=3.22$).

**Table 14. Total Nontargetlike Utterances per Learning Environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telecollaboration</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the total number of repairs that resulted from elicitations +/- prompts within each learning environment were tallied in Table 15 under Telecollaboration and face-to-face. The telecollaboration environment +prompt with full repairs ($SUM=64$); telecollaboration +prompt with partial repairs ($SUM=9$); and telecollaboration +prompt running total ($SUM=73$). Telecollaboration –prompt with full repairs ($SUM=11$); telecollaboration –prompt with partial repairs ($SUM=4$); telecollaboration –prompt running total ($SUM=15$). The face-to-face environment +prompts with full repairs ($SUM=27$); face-to-face +prompts with partial repairs ($SUM=9$); and face-to-face with running total ($SUM=36$). The face-to-face environment –prompt with full repairs ($SUM=9$); face-to-face –prompt with partial repairs ($SUM=5$); and face-to-face running total ($SUM=14$).
Table 15. Total Number of Repairs (vs. Nontargetlike Utterances) per Learning Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Environment</th>
<th>Full Repair</th>
<th>Partial Repair</th>
<th>Total Repairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telecollaboration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation + Prompt</td>
<td>64 (198)</td>
<td>9 (198)</td>
<td>73 (198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation – Prompt</td>
<td>11 (198)</td>
<td>4 (198)</td>
<td>15 (198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Face-to-Face</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation + Prompt</td>
<td>27 (136)</td>
<td>9 (136)</td>
<td>36 (136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation – Prompt</td>
<td>9 (136)</td>
<td>5 (136)</td>
<td>14 (136)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A general analysis looked into the mean number of repaired outputs per participants. This required combining the learning environments of telecollaboration and face-to-face. Table 16 lists the mean for telecollaboration for the number of errors fully repaired ($M=2.25$, $SD=3.32$, $n=35$) and face-to-face ($M=1.23$, $SD=1.41$, $n=34$). Moreover, listed are the number of errors partially repaired in the telecollaboration environment ($M=0.40$, $SD=0.77$, $n=35$) and face-to-face ($M=0.41$, $SD=0.78$, $n=34$).

Table 16. Mean Number of Repaired Outputs per Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Errors Fully Repaired</th>
<th>Language Feedback Environment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telecollaboration</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Errors Partially Repaired</th>
<th>Language Feedback Environment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telecollaboration</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 Inferential Statistics for RQ #2

There were linear relationships between the dependent variables (Number of Errors Repaired and Number of Errors Partially Repaired) and each level of the independent variable (Tel + Prompt, Tel – Prompt, Tel Control, FTF + Prompt, FTF – Prompt, FTF Control). Box’s M was equal to 82.495 and was significant at $F(12, 17924.724) = 6.291, p < 0.0001$. This means there was not a homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices. Furthermore, there was no multicollinearity found.

Tukey Post Hoc testing was done to see where the differences were between the six groups (Tel + Prompt, Tel - Prompt, Tel Control, Tel + Prompt, Face-to Face - Prompt, FTF Control) and the dependent variable (Number of Errors Repaired). Tel + Prompt ($M = 4.92, SD = 4.23, n = 13$) produced a significantly higher mean of modified outputs than Tel - Prompt ($M = 1.10, SD = .994, n = 10$) at $p = 0.001$, Tel Control ($M = .33, SD = .492, n = 12$) at $p < 0.001$, FTF - Prompt ($M = .82, SD = .751, n = 11$) at $p < 0.001$ and FTF Control ($M = .50, SD = .674, n = 12$) at $p < 0.001$. Furthermore, Tel + Prompt, ($M = 4.92, SD = 4.232, n = 13$) was not significantly different from the FTF + Prompt ($M = 2.45, SD = 1.753, n = 11$) at $p = .052$.

Plonsky and Oswald (2014) suggest using (.40) small, (.70) medium and (1.00) large when using cohen’s $d$ in L2 research for interpretation of effect sizes. The results indicated that the Tel + Prompt produced very large effect sizes when examining its impact on total number of modified outputs against the impact of Tel – Prompt ($d = 1.243$), Tel Control ($d = 1.524$), FTF – Prompt ($d = 1.35$), and FTF Control ($d = 1.459$).
4.3 Research Question #3 on Morphology, or Aspect?

Does a difference exist on the type of reparations learners make in their modified output as far as morphology and aspect?

4.3.1 Descriptive Statistics for RQ #3

The past tense’s morphology and aspect of erroneous occurrences were tallied under all experimental groups and learning environments to calculate the total elicitations +/- prompt episodes according to the past tense forms of morphology \((SUM=257)\) and aspect \((SUM=77)\) where the grand total \((SUM=334)\) is provided in Table 17.

Table 17. Total Nontargetlike Utterances per Morphology & Aspect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Morphology</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>257 (76.9%)</td>
<td>77 (23.0%)</td>
<td>334 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the total number of repairs in regards to the nontargetlike utterance per morphology and aspect. The nontargetlike utterances per learning environment are displayed in parentheses. The telecollaboration environment +prompt resulted in the highest number of total repairs, which was for morphology \((SUM=93)\); Telecollaboration –prompt for morphology \((SUM=60)\) and the control group \((SUM=4)\) for morphology. In aspect, the telecollaboration +prompt \((SUM=29)\) and telecollaboration –prompt \((SUM=13)\) are provided. The table also provides the control group under telecollaboration for aspect \((SUM=1)\). The face-to-face environment +prompts was tallied to produce total repairs in morphology \((SUM=38)\); face-to-face – prompt repaired morphology more \((SUM=51)\); face-to-face in the control group with no feedback tallied low \((SUM=6)\); Face-to-face +prompt tallied moderate total repairs for aspect \((SUM=16)\); Face-to-face –prompt tallied slightly greater numbers of total repairs \((SUM=23)\); The control group under face-to-face had no total repairs for aspect \((SUM=0)\). Finally, the total
for +prompt ($SUM=176$) and –prompt ($SUM=147$) are given, along with the total repairs for the control group ($SUM=11$).

**Table 18.** Total Number of Repairs (vs. Nontargetlike Utterances per Learning Environment) per Morphology & Aspect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+Prompt</th>
<th>-Prompt</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b) Telecollaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td>93 (198)</td>
<td>60 (198)</td>
<td>4 (198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>29 (198)</td>
<td>13 (198)</td>
<td>1 (198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Face-to-Face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td>38 (136)</td>
<td>51 (136)</td>
<td>6 (136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>16 (136)</td>
<td>23 (136)</td>
<td>0 (136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>176 (334)</td>
<td>147 (334)</td>
<td>11 (334)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3.2 Inferential Statistics for RQ #3**

The independent variable (aspect and morphology) and the impact it had on the dependent variable (corrective feedback) and an Independent Samples $t$-test was ran, shown in Table 19, The assumption of univariate normality was met, and the $t$ value for equal variances not met was significant $t (78.843) = 3.27, p < 0.001$ which means the Morphology ($M = 4.05, SD = 3.82$) produced the highest average feedback over Aspect ($M = .7826, SD = 1.08$). The effect size of elicitations +/- prompts being more conducive to helping learners produce more modified output on morphology over aspect was medium ($50^{th}$ percentile) at Cohen’s $d = .5567$ (Plonsky & Oswald, 2014).
Table 19. Mean Differences of Morphology & Aspect on Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>49.089</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback1</td>
<td>6.848</td>
<td>78.843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3 Post Hoc Analysis for RQ #3

To further analyze the type of verbs the learners were incorrectly producing, all of the verbs that the participants produced incorrectly were placed into four different categories based on their inherent semantic values, using Vendler’s classification (1967). These included: states (last indefinitely), activities (arbitrary beginning and end point: process), accomplishments (inherent end point: durative), and achievements (inherent end point, but no duration: punctual). The following examples show the difference among lexical aspectual classes: statives (to be, to have, to want), activities (to run, to walk, to breathe), accomplishments (to write a novel, to build a house, to make a chair), and achievements (to notice something/someone, to realize something, to reach the peak (Salaberry, 2000b).

There was a total of 59 different erroneous verbs produced by the 69 learners. These errors -categorized by type are the following: 55.17% activities (andar, brincar, buscar, comenzar, dormir, empezar, entretenir, escuchar, esperar, extrañar, gastar, hacer, ir, jugar, llevar, llorar, mirar, molestar, nadar, oír, parecer, perseguir, probar, repetir, reunir, saltar, seguir, sentar, sonar, tocar, traer, ver); 20.68% achievements (asustar, caer, decidir, despertar, enamorar, encantar, ensuciarse, olvidar, poder, revolver, robar, volver); 17.24% statives (apestar, estar, gustar, haber, interesar, necesitar, querer, saber, ser, tener); and 6.89% accomplishments (colectar, comer, poner, tomar). The categories “accomplishments” and “achievements” were further grouped into a major category called “+Dynamic” also marked as lexically preterite. While “activities” and “states” into “-Dynamic”, also marked as lexically imperfect. Simultaneously, the verb was marked as “+telic” or “-telic” depending whether the verb was bound or unbound, as having an end point of reference (Salaberry, 2013). For this
study, this protocol marked 24.05% of learners erroneous verbs as being (+Dynamic, +Telic), 5.17% (+Dynamic, -Telic), 53.44% (-Dynamic, +Telic), and 17.24% (-Dynamic, -Telic).
4.4 Summary of Results for Research Questions #1 - #3

1. “To what extent does the provision of corrective feedback in the form of elicitations with prompts have an effect on Spanish L2 learners’ modified output of the Spanish preterite and imperfect?”

This first research question was investigating how much elicitations +/- prompts affect the modified output that learners produce after producing erroneous utterances. Based on the results of this study the elicitations +prompt groups performed superior to the –prompt groups. The +prompt group had more full and partial repairs in which the total resulted higher that that of the – prompt group. The results indicated that the +prompt groups had a large effect size on the number of errors fully repaired, and a medium effect size on the number of errors partially repaired, when examining the modified output that targeted the grammatical structure of the preterite and imperfect.

2. “What is the effect of learning environment, Face-to-Face versus telecollaboration, in mediating the efficacy of elicitations on learners’ modified output?”

The second research questions sought to investigate how much effect the learning environments (face-to-face vs. telecollaboration) have on the efficacy of elicitations on learners’ modified output. Based on the results, there was a large effect size between both learning environments, leading to a significant difference, where the telecollaboration environment performed superior to the –prompt groups in addition to the control groups.

3. “Does a difference exist on the type of reparations learners make in their modified output as far as morphology and aspect?”
The last research question looked into the differences that there might be within the total repairs that learners include in their modified output. Across the experimental conditions and learning environments, morphology needed correction the most by the learners. Morphology reformulations were double of aspect, suggesting a medium effect size for elicitations +/- prompts to be more conducive for learners to produce modified output.
4.5 Exit Questionnaire for Question #1

What did you learn from your interaction with the researcher (i.e. when you were re-telling the events of the video)?

4.5.1 Summary of Responses

There was a slight, but non-significant, difference between the two learning environments, telecollaboration vs face-to-face, in the descriptive results. The telecollaboration group suggested to have produced more total repairs in Modified Output in comparison to the face-to-face group. Therefore, to better understand the reasoning, a sample of the participants responses to the exit questionnaire are provided below, Exit Questionnaire #1. One aspect that differentiated learners in the telecollaboration group from those in the face-to-face group is the total number of nontargetlike utterances. In the telecollaboration group there were a total of 198 of nontargetlike utterances, while in the face-to-face group there were 136 nontargetlike utterances. By default, the telecollaboration groups were less concerned with their grammar, and thus were more prone to produce erroneous utterances which meant these groups were provided with more elicitations +/- prompts for the students to modify their output. By nature this explains the slightly higher number of total repairs. In comparison, the face-to-face group deemed to be more in tune of their the grammar, verb conjugations, and expertise with their preterit/imperfect, entailing: (1) More targelike production, (2) Less nontargetlike utterances, and (3) less provision of elicitations +/- prompts.

Exit Questionnaire #1: What did you learn from your interaction with the researcher (i.e. when you were re-telling the events of the video)?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telecollaboration</th>
<th>Face-to-Face</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #2) “I learned to pause a little to gather my words”.</td>
<td>(Participant #4) “I can’t conjugate well on the spot”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #3) “I learned that retaining the information and talking about in Spanish was much harder than I thought it would be. It was much easier to think of the right things to say in my head…”</td>
<td>(Participant #5) “I learned I had some problems conjugating verbs in the past tense…”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #14) “I need more exercises in terms this kind of interaction”.</td>
<td>(Participant #6) “I’ve learned that I really need to review the endings of the preterite”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #19) “I learned that I need to work on my vocabulary because a lot of words I thought I knew I was struggling to remember”.</td>
<td>(Participant #10) “I learned to recall the events in the proper tense in this case it was the preterite”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #20) “I learned that I can understand something but it is slightly difficult for me to find the words to put my thoughts into words”.</td>
<td>(Participant #12) “I found myself pausing for the following reasons: lack of proper vocabulary, wanting to conjugate verbs in the past tense properly, wanting to form full sentences with proper agreement and wanting to pronounce the words correctly”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #22) “That I really need to practice speaking and thinking in Spanish more often, in order to better my ability to speak it today has proven that I cannot speak it that well”.</td>
<td>(Participant #17) “I have trouble conjugating in the past while speaking”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #25) “My memory in Spanish is fragmented as I recall events in English but have difficulty with translations of images into Spanish”.</td>
<td>(Participant #18) “…I need to practice my past tense language skills”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #27) “I need to work on my vocabulary. I need to study more vocab words that way I am not struggling to find the right word”.</td>
<td>(Participant #23) “I was more aware of the grammar errors I was making and what to fix”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #32) “Hard to keep attention to all the details of the video. I tried to narrate the story in its entirety but I think I told some minor details out of sequence. The mental organization of major events was easier”.</td>
<td>(Participant #34) “…The most difficult aspect of this for me is applying the knowledge I have and being able to conjugate in my head as I am speaking. Because I know what is correct, I just need to practice in order to apply it”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #33) “I learned that I focused too much on the events instead of telling what happened which made me learn that I should take it slow when speaking and not rush what I am saying”.</td>
<td>(Participant #42) “…I need more practice with endings, as I was still listing them off in my head for most verbs I would use”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #38</td>
<td>“I learned that I made quite a few mistakes in my retelling of the story that the researcher stopped me at. This made me have to rethink my choice of words”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #46</td>
<td>“I learned that a lot of the time I use the wrong tenses and that I am never quite sure which I should be using. When the researcher pointed out certain verbs, I was quick to change to the other version of the past tense”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #39</td>
<td>“I learned that I'm not the greatest at speaking in another language on the spot, but I definitely could work my way up there in no time”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #52</td>
<td>“I learned that I need to differentiate between preterit and imperfect tenses.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #43</td>
<td>“I noticed that if it was something that I have said before it was incredibly easier to say it again”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #53</td>
<td>“It is much easier to describe events that happened in the past when not also trying to recall the words of a second language”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #44</td>
<td>“I learned that its easy to lose your train of though when interrupted, even when its just to notify the speaker that the communication was either unclear or not heard correctly. It is hard to communicate effectively when there is no actual face-to-face contact during a conversation”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #58</td>
<td>“From my re-telling of the events in the video, I realized that I do not know nearly as many verbs in Spanish as I deemed necessary to re-tell the video effectively”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #45</td>
<td>“…I was surprised when repeating the sentences how difficult in was in Spanish and how they words did not stay in my mind unless I knew them extremely well”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #49</td>
<td>“I learned that I remembered the events better when I knew how to explain them in Spanish”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #50</td>
<td>“I am much more comfortable relaying the information in English than in Spanish”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #55</td>
<td>“I also realized telling a story in Spanish can be really hard”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #56</td>
<td>“I learned that I needed more clarity with my sentences and words. I also learned that I have a long way to go in my fluency of Spanish”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #61</td>
<td>“…that I need to practice more with my Spanish. Also speaking Spanish is very challenging.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 Exit Questionnaire for Question #2

What went through your mind when you received feedback from the researcher?

4.6.1 Summary of Responses

An overall analysis distinguishes a difference between both experimental groups of +/- prompts. There were large differences in the amount of modified output that learners provided, depending on whether or not they received a prompt with their elicitations. A more in depth insight of what was going through the participant’s minds while receiving the feedback can be observed in this second question of the Exit Questionnaire. In sum, the participants found in the +prompt groups were able to attend to their problematic grammatical structure, and questioned their grammar use, while the learners in the –prompt groups (learners who did not get the erroneous error repeated in the elicitation, but rather asked clarification requests) had a more difficult time acknowledging their problematic utterances. This lead to frustration for not being understood, guilt for not being able to speak properly, and appreciation for being granted another opportunity to correct their utterances. It is suggested the –prompt group was more attentive to their overall performance without too much clarity what, and if, an error had been made.

Exit Questionnaire #2: What went through your mind when you received feedback from the researcher?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+Prompt</th>
<th>-Prompt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #4) “What did I say wrong. Did I conjugate the verb incorrectly?”</td>
<td>(Participant #2) “I was thinking of how bad I butchered the vocabulary and verbs”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #10) “I was surprised because I thought I was struggling a lot to recall the verb endings very well”</td>
<td>(Participant #5) “I had to use different words when explaining…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #7) “I thought that I really need to practice. It's not that I didn't know the correct form of verbs to use, but that I couldn't remember them because I don't really practice them.”</td>
<td>(Participant #11) “I was hoping that he understood what I was trying to say at least a little bit”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #25) “Recall issues and past tense endings”</td>
<td>(Participant #14) “I get a new exercise in my mind”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #34) “When I received feedback, I tried to correct the mistakes I made. I always knew or had a good idea of what was wrong with my sentence or conjugation but at times it is difficult to find another way to express myself”</td>
<td>(Participant #17) “I felt like I don't know Spanish as well as I thought I did before doing this”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #49) “I was trying to figure out the correct conjugation so that the sentence would make more sense but sometimes I was not able to do so”</td>
<td>(Participant #23) “That I was able to figure out the certain things I knew how to say in Spanish and the things I needed to fix”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #58) “I am generally confident in my ability to decipher between preterite and imperfect, and my ability to use the correct conjugations. However, as the researcher provided feedback, questioning my choice of verb/verb ending, I began to question my choices”</td>
<td>(Participant #26) “A few times the researcher had difficulty understanding me, either because of my accentuation or the expressions I was trying to form. I did feel slightly stressed at the times he could not understand me, but for the most part I was able to explain myself using different words, and it was a rewarding experience to be able to push through with the researcher understanding me”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #67) “I knew what my mistakes were, it was very clear to me that I was conjugating verbs incorrectly”</td>
<td>(Participant #29) “I was extremely nervous because I usually can perform much better when I am not in an experiment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #70) “At first I thought that every time the researcher questioned my use of a verb in the past tense it was because it was wrong. After that I decided that the researcher is evaluating my confidence and did not change my use of a verb and stuck with my initial answer”</td>
<td>(Participant #38) “Constructive criticism”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #41) “That I had to think of another way to say what I was trying to say”</td>
<td>(Participant #44) “There was a few times”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were I became nervous, his tone sounded almost frustrated but stern. I wanted very badly to be able to communicate successfully and fluently. It definitely made me feel differently towards the conversation as a whole. It was difficult when instead of being corrected, like I'm used to, I was just given a situation where the person simply said they didn't understand. Definitely a lot of pressure to correct yourself and regain the confidence you had in the beginning.”

( Participant #47) “I was happy that he was able to understand what I was saying and that I think he was able to piece together a story from the sentences that I said when I was retelling what happened in the video that I watched”.

( Participant #50) “I appreciated another opportunity to clarify what I was trying to say. I tried to find other ways to get to the point that I wanted to make”.

( Participant #62) “The only concentration I had was trying to remember the sequence of events in the video”.
4.7 Exit Questionnaire for Question #3

Did you feel comfortable interacting with the researcher to complete the task?
Explain briefly.

4.7.1 Summary of Responses

An important factor to consider when looking at the overall results of this experiment depends on the level of comfort the learners had in the two learning environments during the completion of the task. Participants’ results are therefore divide between the telecollaboration, and face-to-face environment for this reason. There were no noticeable differences in comparing learning environments in regards to comfort levels manipulating data results for this study. For example, responses #1-5 in the face-to-face environment demonstrated negative, dissatisfied participants that felt nervous, under pressure to speak Spanish, and discomfort about not knowing what would happen next. While in the other learning environment, telecollaboration, the responses #1-5 also show negative evidence of discomfort and low self-esteem during the task. In contrast, the next five responses, #6-10, show equal positive feelings about interacting with the researcher under both learning environments. Those participants found under the face-to-face environment express optimistic comfort levels and enjoyed interacting with the researcher. Likewise, the telecollaboration proved to be the same.

Exit Questionnaire #3: Did you feel comfortable interacting with the researcher to complete the task?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telecollaboration</th>
<th>Face-to-Face</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) “…no. I was feeling a bit embarrassed by my lack of knowledge of the language especially in front of a fluent/native speaker, but that was more of my own insecurities”.</td>
<td>(1) “No, I did not feel comfortable interacting with the researcher, because I became very nervous and felt burdened about completing the task…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) “At times, I became anxious and nervous. It was hard to maintain eye contact throughout my mistakes…”.</td>
<td>(2) “… I almost always will feel uncomfortable speaking in Spanish in front of people, but I am working to overcome that”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) “… no. I know what I wanted to say, but I always get past tense confused with present tense”.</td>
<td>(3) “…no. I was feeling evaluated so that was putting me under pressure”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) “I did not feel very comfortable, because I could not find the good words rapidly and I don’t know the past tense very well, but I think it was a good exercise. I have to say that the interaction through Skype make things more difficult”.</td>
<td>(4) “I felt under pressure, because I am much used to being in a class when speaking Spanish”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) “I felt slightly uncomfortable, but that has nothing to do with the researcher himself. He is just a native Spanish speaker and I am not so I was trying my hardest to speak to the best of my abilities”.</td>
<td>(5) “I felt a little nervous, because I didn’t want my Spanish to sound bad”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) “Absolutely, the experiment was comfortable”.</td>
<td>(6) “Yes, I felt comfortable interacting with the researcher. I didn’t feel overwhelmed by the task, because everything was made clear”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) “Yes, I felt very comfortable and was ensured not to get discouraged. It was a comfortable and open environment”.</td>
<td>(7) “Yes, he was very professional and kind”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) “Yes, because the environment was very easy to work in”.</td>
<td>(8) “Yes, the researcher explained everything articulately, was patient, and most importantly, gave me a warning that some of the tasks might prove to be difficult…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) “I felt comfortable because I didn’t feel pressured to get everything correct”.</td>
<td>(9) “Yes I felt comfortable talking to the researcher”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) “Yes, I did because the researcher made it easy to understand direction and to know what I am doing”.</td>
<td>(10) “Yes I felt comfortable, he was nice”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8 Exit Questionnaire for Question #4

Were you motivated to complete the task? Explain briefly.

4.8.1 Summary of Responses

Question #4 of the Exit Questionnaire for this study aimed to see how motivated every participant was to complete the task. Especially, how much effort was being placed by the students that in return gives representable data at the present time that the study took place. Responses from every participant that participated was overwhelmingly eager to complete, not just the task, but the entire study itself. A few participants went as far as claiming they wanted to challenge themselves in their use of Spanish and see how far their skills could be reached. Others mentioned this study as an excellent form to use Spanish outside the classroom in a real world, non-rehearsed manner. These type of comments were across both learning environments, face-to-face and telecollaboration, along with both groups that fell under +/- prompts.

Exit Questionnaire #4: Were you motivated to complete the task? Explain briefly.
All Experimental & Control Groups in Both Learning Environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant #53</th>
<th>“I was motivated to complete the task. To my way of thinking it is like ripping off a band aid, the sooner it is done the less pain one will endure”.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant #54</td>
<td>“I was motivated to complete the task because I had everything planned out but I forgot some of the words I was trying to say…”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #55</td>
<td>“Yes, I was motivated to complete the task due to the fact that I can see what problems I have with my Spanish grammar”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #56</td>
<td>“I wanted to see how accurately I could accomplish this study”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #57</td>
<td>“I wanted to experience what it felt like to be a participant in a research project”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #58</td>
<td>“The repeating task was short I wanted to provide the best research information that I could, so I did my best to complete this, despite making numerous mistakes. The videos were both amusing, which made the second and third task non- tedious”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #59</td>
<td>“I was motivated to complete the task, not just because of being compensated for what I was doing but also because if I ever come to be in a similar situations trying to finish me getting my Ph.D. I would hope students would be willing to help me gather data”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #60</td>
<td>“I was motivated in a way to see how I would do being on spot to see if I could try to explain myself in the proper way”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #61</td>
<td>“Yes, because I knew what I wanted to say, but it was difficult to speak it in Spanish”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #62</td>
<td>“Absolutely, I felt that if I remembered the sequences of events in Spanish it would show that my Spanish is improving”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #63</td>
<td>“I was motivated, because I think this experiment is interesting. I was trying to challenge myself especially when I was repeating the Spanish sentences after the beep”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #64</td>
<td>“Yes, I think I did about as well as I could”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #65</td>
<td>Yes, I wanted to see my capability to be put on the spot with events I may or may not have been already learned the vocabulary on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #66</td>
<td>“Yes, I wanted to know if I would be able to do it, and I wanted to do well in front of the researcher”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #67</td>
<td>I was motivated to fix my mistakes…”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #68</td>
<td>“I was motivated to complete the task to the best of my ability. It was hard, but I think I did decent trying to explain everything”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #69</td>
<td>“Yes, I wanted to prove my knowledge and command of the Spanish language especially to a fluent/native speaker. Also, the more exposure one has to the language the better”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #70</td>
<td>Yes I wanted to do well for both his sake and mine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant #71</td>
<td>“Yes I was motivated to finish the task, because I knew it was within my capabilities and was not too difficult”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Participant #73 | “I was motivated to complete the task, because I want to improve my
Spanish speaking ability".
4.9 Exit Questionnaire for Question #5

What do you think the study was investigating?

4.9.1 Summary of Responses

None of the participants (n=69), either in the experimental groups, or feedback conditions under both learning environments, knew exactly the aims of the study (with the exception of 2 participants). There were no differences in response to what they thought the study was investigating either. This lends support to avoiding participants that might have provided skewed data. Therefore, rather than dividing the responses per groups, they are simply combined as example responses attained from the Exit Questionnaire. Many participants believed the study was in search of comparing their native English language with Spanish. Others believed it was analyzing participant’s level of confidence of sticking to their original utterance when they were questioned through the delivery of feedback, while others believed it was in examining how well their memory was.

Exit Questionnaire #5: What do you think the study was investigating?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Experimental &amp; Control Groups in Both Learning Environments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #54) “How non-native Spanish speakers respond when they’re given a certain task and asked to speak Spanish”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #55) “I think the study was investigating, how many participants have conversational skills in Spanish. And how many people at this level of Spanish academically can actually have a conversation in Spanish”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #56) “Retention between languages”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #57) “How one’s mind thinks in Spanish versus English”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #58) “The study seems to be investigating how a non-native speaker thinks when listening and speaking”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #59) “I think the study was investigating what mistakes non-native speakers make when listening, reading, or speaking a foreign language and why they make these certain mistakes”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #60) “Memory and how well we can use what we learned in real life, on spot situations”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #61) “How native English speaking speakers can switch to Spanish”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #62) “How literate I am in a second language”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #63) “I think the study was trying to see how people who don’t speak Spanish as a first language compared to native speakers memorize Spanish sentences, and are able to speak…”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #64) “L2 learners’ ability to use the two Spanish past tenses”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #65) “How confident people are speaking Spanish throughout progressive fluency levels versus the openness for correction”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #66) “How do people that are not native speakers react to situations in which they cannot remember a word or what had happened and how they use their knowledge of Spanish to fix the error or essentially how people react when they make an error”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #67) “The study was investigating how intermediate Spanish learners whose native language is English, reiterate information they are given whether it is by repeating sentences or re-telling a story, back into Spanish”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #68) “I think it was investigating how well native English speakers could retell a series of events in Spanish”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #69) “The differences between the usage of past tense between the two languages (i.e. passive sentence vs. non passive) and the ability of non-native non-fluent speakers of Spanish to remember and understand what the sentences in Spanish meant”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #70) “How people understand and learn the Spanish language”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Participant #71) “I think the study was investigating the confidence in using the second language rather than a critical look at the actual performance”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Participant #72) “Whether people can express and remember better with the language…”.

(Participant #73) “I think he was investigating how confident I am at speaking Spanish in the past tense”.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This final chapter presents a brief summary of the results, a more detailed discussion of the findings of the current study as it relates to the research questions proposed at the end of Chapter 2, and the implications that the data brings into the field of SLA. Furthermore, theoretical and methodological implications are brought forward, and pedagogical suggestions follow, as well as the study’s limitations and suggestions for future research.
5.1 Effects of Elicitations (+/- Prompts) on Modified Output

Research Question #1 asked to what extent does the provision of corrective feedback in the form of elicitations +prompts have an effect on Spanish L2 learners’ modified output of the Spanish preterite and imperfect. The results show a significant advantage for the participants in the +prompt groups over the –prompt groups suggesting the +prompt groups noticed their nontargetlike errors similar to the study by Gurzynski-Weiss and Baralt (2004). Both claim that prompts provide unique opportunities, where “learners can accurately perceive feedback as feedback” (33). What this means for prompts is that it is the additional error repetition to learners that help them identify their erroneous utterance. Prompt groups provided a more targetlike modified output where the results here support more findings from previous studies that suggest that prompts are generally effective and beneficial (Yang & Lyster 2010; Ellis et al. 2006). An example includes these findings by Ammar and Spada (2006) in which learners at both low and high proficiency levels were equally able to benefit from prompts. Similarly, in this study (n=69) learner’s proficiencies varied from beginning low at the novice level up to the more advanced levels, with an overall competence of Intermediate mid. Nonetheless, despite participants reaching the advanced levels, all the participants in the experimental groups still produced at least one nontargetlike utterance and thus received at least one episode of correct feedback through an elicitation +/-prompts that produced modified output. Those in the +prompts were prone to producing a full or partial repair in comparison to those found in the –prompt groups. Another study by Lyster and Izquierdo (2009) adds further evidence regarding prompts, where learners in their study benefited from repeated exposure to negative evidence as well as from opportunities to produce modified output. According to these researchers, experimental groups of +prompts have a statistical significance with full repairs because of the low number and
frequency of partial repairs needed to be statistically significant, as it also occurred in the study by Nassaji (2007). In his study, out of the total number of reformulations 5% led to partial repair, meaning 9 instances. Studies such as these compare the +prompts groups against the –prompts groups, which distinguish the +prompt as a better alternative. In this present dissertation study the independent variables of +/–prompt groups were not compared or contrasted against each other to see which is more beneficial, but rather effect sizes were measured against the dependent variable of modified output to gain more foretelling results. The +prompt groups were not only excelling in accomplishing full repairs, with large effect sizes, amongst the learners, but the +prompt groups also reached medium effect sizes amongst those learners reaching partial repairs. It was through the use of elicitations +prompts that learners’ were able to shift their focus back towards erroneous utterances more successfully than those in the –prompt groups.

The data found here provides suggestions for prompts aiding in learners overall repairs, both full and partial. This is innovative to what other studies have suggested (Lyster, 2004; Loewen & Philp, 2006) where modified output is comprised primarily of full repairs. For this study, partial repairs comprised 37.5% of the total repairs. A substantial amount when compared to Nassaji (2007) since partial repairs are known to contribute to learner uptake since the learner is still correcting one part of the original utterance through negotiations following interactional feedback (Sheen, 2008).
5.2 Learning environment (FTF/ Tele) and Repairs

Research Questions #2 addressed the issue of the possible effects of the learning environment mediating the efficacy of elicitations on learners’ modified output. After transcribing the conversations and analyzing the data, it was found that those reformulations produced by learners under the telecollaboration environment in this study had a large effect size based on the variance of full and partial repairs among the +/-prompt and control groups. This is similar to what Ziegler (2015) found in her meta-analysis that was based on the measures of overall L2 production, and learning outcomes. She found the production outcomes to be in favor of telecollaboration since learners required greater levels of processing of corrective feedback, rather than just comprehending to produce reformulations after receiving elicitations. This means the corrective feedback given tended to be perceived as more explicit by the learners under the telecollaboration environment. There are also other slight advantages under the telecollaboration environment for learners such as having additional time for processing and planning due to computer and connection lags, but still maintaining a real-tie feel of conversation done all online. She concluded that the mode of communication had a significant impact on developmental benefits delivered from interaction with added opportunities for learners to attend more closely to the form and content of the input.

Similarly, in this dissertation study the telecollaboration +prompts group performed a lot better overall. Those learners found in the face-to-face environment led to a low number of nontargetlike utterances because they were in tune with their verb conjugations, sought grammatical correctness, and remained focused in their paradigms (explicit information). In comparison, the learners found under the telecollaboration groups were more worried about the overall message sending through to the researcher, being understood, and remembering the
sequence of events from the video in chronological order, which led to high number of nontargetlike utterances and more opportunities to produce modified output. Therefore, it might be speculated that being placed in a different environment than what the learners are accustomed to might cause disorientation of learner’s explicit knowledge, shifting them to use their implicit knowledge.
5.3 Morphology or Aspect?

Research question #3 sought to find if a difference existed on the type of reparations learners made in their modified output in regards to morphology and aspect. The results revealed that the morphology category arose with the greatest quantity of nontargetlike utterances and with the greatest total number of total repairs (full and partial). To explain this dilemma, one of the possible reasons for morphology being more problematic to errors in comparison to aspect originates from the stages for the acquisition of verb morphology, as mentioned by (Andersen, 1991). For learners to successfully acquire the morphology, they would first need to be aware of some type of verb classification system to place each verb into one of the four types. These include states, activities, accomplishments, and achievements. Since the learners in this dissertation study were categorized as Intermediate Mid according to the ACTFL proficiency scale, they were still in what Ortega (2009) considers the 3rd stage (out of a possible of six). That is, the learners have learned the preterite for achievements under stage 1, and have had enough practice with the imperfect in stage 2. By the time learners reach stage 3 they have attained a basic understanding of aspect. This notion of learners acquiring a good establishment for aspect can be supported with the findings of Slabakova and Montrul (2002), where they found a clear development timeline in acquiring aspect. Their results demonstrated that intermediate level learners are able to successfully acquire the contrast in aspect, similar to the performance of the intermediate learners found in this dissertation study. The participants had the most control over aspect in the verbal categories of accomplishments (colectar, comer, poner, tomar) by only coming with a a 6.89% incorrect use of the them, while the major problematic category was morphological agreement for activities (andar, brincar, buscar, comenzar, dormir, empezar, entretener, escuchar, esperar, extrañar, gastar, hacer, ir, jugar, llevar, llover, mirar, molestar,
nadar, oir, parecer, perseguir, probar, repetir, reunir, saltar, seguir, sentar, sonar, tocar, traer, ver) in which it reached a 55.17% incorrect use of them. Finally, it should also be emphasized once more that these participants were taking Spanish courses at the time of this dissertation study, which means they came into the study with prior knowledge of the target form and no input knowledge was provided prior, or during the study.
5.4 Theoretical and Methodological Implications

The findings of this study lend support to the Interaction Hypothesis that states that interaction is the main source for opportunities to provide corrective feedback, and for learners to provide modified output to increase targetlike production. This correlates with findings such as those by Mackey (2006) where the results suggest that interactional feedback was positively correlated with L2 development for one of the forms on which learners received feedback.

Previous empirical studies (Nassaji, 2007; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Dilans, 2010; Ammar & Spada, 2006; Panova & Lyster, 2002) based their participant’s language proficiency solely on the classroom they were enrolled into at the moment the study took place. For this study, all the learners had their proficiency rated and averaged between Intermediate Mid and Intermediate High. Although there were a couple of particular participants that ranged between major levels of proficiency, more studies need to address this issue of targeting only specific levels of Spanish speakers.

Within the Second Language Acquisition field, there has also been a demand for natural ways to elicit conversation under laboratory studies, and thus a video retelling task seems appropriate as many studies have made note of them successfully eliciting conversation (Doughty, 2000; Sanz, 1994, 1996; Skehan, & Shum, 2014; Kiernan, 2005; Gass, Mackey & Alvarez-Torres, 1999; Lee, 2015; Ellis, 2006, 2008; Skehan & Foster, 1999; Ortega, 1999; Baralt, 2013). The video clip given to the participants in this study initially lasted over ten minutes, and eventually got shortened to a little over the eight minute mark after the test pilot, as participants had difficulty remembering the events from the video, or remembering them in sequential order. Therefore Snapshots, or cheat sheets, were of great help for them to recount the events. The Snapshots became important as a vehicle for elicitation, providing information in 12
simple images taken directly from the video lip. Future studies should keep using snapshots as a stimulus to elicit more learner output to ideally maintain the length of dialogue equal among all participants. Simple references to snapshot numbers triggered learners’ memory to describe further specific scenes. Furthermore, the additional cheat sheet list of potential vocabulary also allowed participants to maintain fluency in their speech without a breakdown or hesitation due to vocabulary. This allowed the participants’ speech to focus purely on grammar. Future studies should permit aids such as these for participants.

Finally, categorizing participants’ erroneous verbs into lexical categories is important as it correlates to a process that learners undergo when learning the preterite and imperfect. For example, “the Imperfect… appears to develop in association with specific lexical units (e.g., state verbs) and to mark specific aspectual concepts (e.g. habituality, progressivity)” (Salaberry, 2013, p. 261). Considering the most problematic verb type for learners in this study were “activities”, future studies need to take into account the verb types participants are expected to produce in the preterite and imperfect, where the researcher tailors the tasks for the learners to target the verbs they most likely will get incorrect.
5.5 Pedagogical Implications

The findings of this study suggest that elicitations that contain prompts can be more likely to have learners produce full repairs, bringing them closer to a more targetlike reformulation. It is also suggestive that when learners are active and aware of their mistakes in an interactive context in which they notice their mistakes, this will eventually lead to a more targetlike production. This suggests that researchers need to appropriately fit in more elicitations with prompts than without prompts into their studies. This is not to say that elicitations and prompts function as a “one size fits all” for errors, but rather that they should be used more frequently than before, and that it should be taken into consideration whether they are worth halting production and fluency for this should be left to researcher discretion. Moreover, the telecollaboration learning environment had greater results over the face-to-face environment with regards to the reformulations provided by students and their full and partial repairs. Therefore, these results have a great impact on current and future scholars and the way learners are approached, leading to suggest language courses can be taught online and still offer the same, or even better results than traditional language courses taught face-to-face.

The classification of verb types in the analysis was equally important since L2 learners tend to follow a sequence of developmental stages for the acquisition of verb morphology. Since in this study the most problematic verb types were “activities”, it is also noteworthy for L2 teachers to manage their preterite/imperfect distinctions not on holistic rules, but rather dig into specific categories and the verbs that compose them to disentangle the correct usage for verb conjugations.
5.6 Limitations and Future Research

One of the limitations of this empirical study stems from recruiting participants enrolled into intermediate level courses, without properly evaluating their proficiency before recruitment. Even though all participants from this study were categorized as a whole group as having an Intermediate Mid Spanish level of proficiency, and were all also students enrolled in Intermediate level courses, there were a few that tested into the beginning level category while others into the advanced level. This means future researchers need to avoid categorizing learner proficiency based on their course placement, but rather test their proficiencies.

In addition, secure and reliable wireless Internet connections are needed to avoid dropped calls while conducting research in the telecollaboration environment. There were a couple of times that the video chat would not function optimally, leading to lagging audio and not coinciding with the present video images on camera. Moreover, in this dissertation the snapshots were an excellent source for eliciting more descriptions in the participants’ story retelling. Although it was used as a tool for elicitation, its original purpose was for learners to utilize as a tool to remind them of major events that took place in the video. Some participants were able to speak tremendously without the guide of the snapshots, while others relied heavily on them. Future research should set a time requirement in speaking in order to elicit from students as much as possible while obtaining a good sample of their oral speaking abilities. This can possibly apply to keeping the number of corrective feedback constant against all testing conditions and learning environments.

In addition, a further limitation came where the researcher did not get a chance to meet with instructors, prior to the study, to make sure all students were being exposed to the same material regarding the preterite and imperfect across the curriculum. Therefore, future
researchers should meet with instructors to make sure there is consistency in teaching by incorporating the same lessons of the preterite and imperfect into the curriculum throughout all the sections, prior to the beginning of the semester. This will mark consistency and precision across the curriculum for all students to maintain exposure equivalent and make sure no student is being exposed to grammar in a different way. This includes teaching with the same activities, projects, and homework assignments. Similarly, another limitation was overlooked by not coinciding with other instructors as to the feedback type students would receive in class. For some participants, receiving elicitations with or without prompts might have been new to them, while for others it might have been something they are used to doing in class. Future researchers need to agree in the feedback to be given, if any. Lastly, future studies need to run a correlation test to see if the standard deviations between experimental groups have anything to do with learners’ proficiency, since it might be interesting to see if the more advanced learners produced fewer errors, thus needed less elicitations +/- prompts.
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THE PAST TENSE: L2 STUDENT’S STORY RETELLING IN SPANISH USING THE PRETERITE AND IMPERFECT IN CMC/FTF

This research study seeks 60 – 120 participants enrolled in the following Spanish courses: ASPN 201, ASPN 206, ASPN 208, ASPN 310, ASPN 312, ASPN 320, ASPN 344

About:
It aims to distinguish how Second Language, or Third Language Learners respond to different types of feedback when an error is made while speaking in Spanish. The participants for this research will be asked to do a background questionnaire, language assessment, watch short video clips and retell what happened, followed by completing an exit questionnaire.

Length of time: 55 – 65 minutes
Compensation: $25 Cash

Requirements:
1) Participants must not have been raised in a Spanish speaking home
2) Participants must not have participated in the pilot study of this research study in the Fall of 2015.

Please feel free to learn more about this research, or if you have questions by contacting the Principal Investigator:

Armando Robles
Ph.D. Student
Humanities 274
arobles@albany.edu
Department of Languages, Literature, & Cultures

This research is conducted under the direction of Dr. Maurice Westmoreland Department of Languages, Literature, and Cultures.
Appendix B
LANGUAGE BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

PARTICIPANT #__________

Sex:   M   F (Circle one)

AGE: ___________ Number of years living in the United States _________

Answer the following questions to the best of your ability.

1. At what age did you begin development Spanish? (for example: from birth or age 5)

2. At what age did you begin development English? (for example: from birth or age 5)

3. Did you start school in the United States? Circle one: YES NO

4. Have you studied in a Spanish-speaking country? (e.g., Puerto Rico, Mexico)
   Circle one: YES NO

   If you answer YES…. What country? _____________________ From age ___________ to age __________

5. Have you studied in a bilingual education, immersion or dual language program (a school where you learned Spanish and English at the same time)? Circle one: YES NO

   If you answered YES…. Which grades? ________________

6. Do you study Spanish in school now? Circle one: YES NO

7. Have you studied Spanish in the past? Circle one: YES NO

   If you answer YES, please write how many academic years you have been studying Spanish:

   ______

8. If you study Spanish, write briefly your main reason for studying Spanish.
9. Do you any of your parents or caregivers work? Circle on: **YES**  **NO**

*If you answer **YES**, please write the profession of your parent/caretaker:

   Parent/Caretaker #1: __________________________

   Parent/Caretaker #2: __________________________

10. What generation are you in the United States (1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 3\textsuperscript{rd})? __________

11. Do you travel to your family’s home country? **YES**  **NO**

*If **YES**, how often: _____________________  **For how long?** _________________________

12. Mark an **X** for the language(s) **you used most** in the following periods of your life:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SPANISH</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>BOTH SPANISH &amp; ENGLISH</th>
<th>OTHER LANGUAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 yrs. old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12 yrs. old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 yrs. old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18+ yrs. old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Rate your proficiency in Spanish and English (speaking, reading, writing, listening) according to the following scale (write the number next to each skill):

   \underline{6 = NATIVE FLUENCY}  \underline{3 = INTERMEDIATE FLUENCY}

   \underline{5 = NEAR (ALMOST) NATIVE FLUENCY}  \underline{2 = BASIC FLUENCY}

   \underline{4 = ADVANCED FLUENCY}  \underline{1 = BEGINNING FLUENCY}

   SPANISH  \underline{          }  ENGLISH  \underline{          }
14. Read the following statements about **Spanish** and circle the best answer.

a. Knowing Spanish is an important part of who I am.  
**STRONGLY AGREE**  **AGREE**  **DISAGREE**  **STRONGLY DISAGREE**

b. Knowing Spanish is useful.  
**STRONGLY AGREE**  **AGREE**  **DISAGREE**  **STRONGLY DISAGREE**

c. Knowing Spanish made school more enjoyable.  
**STRONGLY AGREE**  **AGREE**  **DISAGREE**  **STRONGLY DISAGREE**

d. Knowing Spanish has helped me make friends.  
**STRONGLY AGREE**  **AGREE**  **DISAGREE**  **STRONGLY DISAGREE**

e. Knowing Spanish is a valuable skill.  
**STRONGLY AGREE**  **AGREE**  **DISAGREE**  **STRONGLY DISAGREE**

f. Knowing Spanish is a necessary skill.  
**STRONGLY AGREE**  **AGREE**  **DISAGREE**  **STRONGLY DISAGREE**

g. Knowing Spanish at times is embarrassing.  
**STRONGLY AGREE**  **AGREE**  **DISAGREE**  **STRONGLY DISAGREE**

h. Knowing Spanish has been a barrier to development English.  
**STRONGLY AGREE**  **AGREE**  **DISAGREE**  **STRONGLY DISAGREE**

i. Knowing Spanish has made school more challenging.  
**STRONGLY AGREE**  **AGREE**  **DISAGREE**  **STRONGLY DISAGREE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>Listening</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
j. Knowing Spanish has made school less enjoyable.

STRONGLY AGREE    AGREE    DISAGREE    STRONGLY DISAGREE

k. Knowing Spanish had made it difficult to make friends.

STRONGLY AGREE    AGREE    DISAGREE    STRONGLY DISAGREE

15. Read the following statements about English and circle the best answer

a. I speak English with my parents or caretakers.

ALWAYS    FREQUENTLY    SOMETIMES    RARELY    NEVER    DOESN’T APPLY

b. I speak English with my brothers and sisters.

ALWAYS    FREQUENTLY    SOMETIMES    RARELY    NEVER    DOESN’T APPLY

c. I speak English with my relatives (cousins, uncles, grandparents).

ALWAYS    FREQUENTLY    SOMETIMES    RARELY    NEVER    DOESN’T APPLY

d. I speak English with my friends at school.

ALWAYS    FREQUENTLY    SOMETIMES    RARELY    NEVER    DOESN’T APPLY

e. I speak English with my friends in my neighborhood.

ALWAYS    FREQUENTLY    SOMETIMES    RARELY    NEVER    DOESN’T APPLY

f. I speak English with my teachers.

ALWAYS    FREQUENTLY    SOMETIMES    RARELY    NEVER    DOESN’T APPLY

g. I speak English to the school staff.

ALWAYS    FREQUENTLY    SOMETIMES    RARELY    NEVER    DOESN’T APPLY

h. I speak in English in my community (grocery stores, mall, supermarket, church, community center).

ALWAYS    FREQUENTLY    SOMETIMES    RARELY    NEVER    DOESN’T APPLY

I. I write in English at school.
J. I write in English (notes, e-mails, text messages, chat) at home.

K. I write in English at work.

L. I read in English at school.

M. I read in English at home.

N. I read in English at work.

O. I listen to English at school.

P. I listen to English at home.

Q. I listen to English at work.

R. I watch T.V. in English.

S. I listen to music in English.

T. I watch movies in English.
16. Read the following statements about Spanish and circle the best answer

a. I speak Spanish with my parents or caretakers.

b. I speak Spanish with my brothers and sisters.

c. I speak Spanish with my relatives (cousins, uncles, grandparents).

d. I speak Spanish with my friends at school.

e. I speak Spanish with my friends in my neighborhood.

f. I speak Spanish with my teachers.

g. I speak Spanish to the school staff.

h. I speak in Spanish in my community (grocery stores, mall, supermarket, church, community center).

i. I write in Spanish at school.

j. I write in Spanish (notes, e-mails, text messages, chat) at home.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Doesn’t Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k. I write in Spanish at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. I read in Spanish at school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. I read in Spanish at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. I read in Spanish at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. I listen to Spanish at school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. I listen to Spanish at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. I listen to Spanish at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. I watch T.V. in Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. I listen to music in Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. I watch movies in Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Read the following statements about **Spanish** and **English** and circle the best answer.

u. When I speak to my parents/caretakers, I switch between Spanish and English.
v. When I speak to my siblings, I switch between Spanish and English.

w. When I speak to my friends/peers, I switch between Spanish and English.

x. When I speak to my teachers, I switch between Spanish and English.

y. When I speak to members in the community (stores, supermarket, church), I switch between Spanish and English.

z. When I speak to the staff at school, I switch between Spanish and English.

aa. I feel more comfortable speaking with people who can switch between Spanish and English.
Appendix C
SPANISH ELICITED ImitATION TASK

1. Quiero cortarme el pelo (7)
2. El libro está en la mesa (7)
3. El carro lo tiene Pedro (8)
4. Él se ducha cada mañana (9)
5. ¿Qué dice usted que va a hacer hoy? (9)
6. Dudo que sepa manejar muy bien (10)
7. Las calles de esta ciudad son muy anchas (11)
8. Puede que llueva mañana todo el día (12)
9. Las casas son muy bonitas pero caras (12)
10. Me gustan las películas que acaban bien (12)
12. El chico con el que yo salgo es español (13)
11. Después de cenar me fui a dormir tranquilo (13)
13. Quiero una casa en la que vivan mis animales (14)
14. A vosotros os fascinan las fiestas grandiosas (14)
15. Ella sólo bebe cerveza y no come nada (15)
16. Me gustaría que el precio de las casas bajara (15)
17. Cruza a la derecha y después sigue todo recto (15)
18. Ella ha terminado de pintar su apartamento (14)
19. Me gustaría que empezara a hacer más calor pronto (15)
20. El niño al que se le murió el gato está triste (16)
21. Una amiga mía cuida a los niños de mi vecino (16)
22. El gato que era negro fue perseguido por el perro (16)
23. Antes de poder salir él tiene que limpiar su cuarto (16)
24. La cantidad de personas que fuman ha disminuido (17)
25. Después de llegar a casa del trabajo tomé la cena (17)
26. El ladrón al que atrapó la policía era famoso (17)
27. Le pedí a un amigo que me ayudara con la tarea (17)
28. El examen no fue tan difícil como me habían dicho (17)
29. ¿Serías tan amable de darme el libro que está en la mesa? (17)
30. Hay mucha gente que no toma nada para el desayuno (17)


Appendix D  
EXIT QUESTIONNAIRE

Participant #___________

1. What did you learn from your interaction with the researcher (i.e. when you were re-telling the events of the video)?
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

2. What went through your mind when you received feedback from the researcher?
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

3. Did you feel comfortable interacting with the researcher to complete the task? Explain briefly.
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

4. Were you motivated to complete the task? Explain briefly.
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

5. What do you think the study was investigating?
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
## Appendix E

### SCORING PROTOCOL FOR ELICITED IMITATION TASK

**EIT score 0 descriptor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Nothing (Silence)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Garbled (unintelligible, usually transcribed as XXX)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimal repetition, then item abandoned:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Only 1 word repeated</td>
<td>- Manana (10-item 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Only 1 content word plus function word(s)</td>
<td>- El examen que [gibberish] (09-item 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Despues mue- XX tranquilo (01-item 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tu que sepa a- m- muy bien (12-item 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Me gustaria las se se el XXX (16-item 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EIT score 1 descriptor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• When only about half of idea units are represented in the string but a lot of</td>
<td>- Antes de poder seguir (3 sec.) perdio su cuarto (02-item 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
important information in the original stimulus is left out; sometimes the resulting meaning is unrelated (or opposed) to stimulus

• Or when string doesn’t in itself constitute a self-standing sentence with some (related or not to stimulus) meaning (This may happen when only 2 of 3 content words are repeated and no grammatical relation between them is attempted)

EIT score 2 descriptor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• When content of string preserves at least more than half of the idea units in the original stimulus; string is meaningful, and the meaning is close or related to original, but it departs from it in some slight changes in</td>
<td>-Despues de cenar me fui a X tranquilo (11-item 12) -Ella sola cerveza y no come nada (05-item 17) -Quieres una casa que viven los alemanes an-animales (07-item 13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
content, which makes content inexact, incomplete, or ambiguous

-El chico con lo que es algo es español (08-item 12)
-El chico con yo salgo es muy bien (15-item 12)
-Después a trabajo tome la cena (16-item 25)

### EIT score 3 descriptor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Original, complete meaning is preserved as in the stimulus. Strings which are ungrammatical can get a 3 score, as long as exact meaning is preserved. Some synonymous substitutions are acceptable:</td>
<td>-Me gustaría el precio de las casas baraja (2 sec.) baja (15-item 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-El niño que se m- murio cayo esta triste (02-item 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-[gibberish] se ducha cada mañana (18-item 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Anything with or without ‘‘muy’ (very’) should be considered synonymous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Quiero cortar mi pelo (05-item 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Las calles de esta ciudad son anchas (13-item 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-El chico que yo salgo es español (06-item 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-El chico que el salgo es español (05-item 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-El examen no fue tan difícil como han dicho (12-item 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes in grammar that don’t affect meaning should be scored as 3. (Ambiguous changes in grammar that could be interpreted as meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
changes from a NS perspective should be scored as 2. That is, as a general principle in case of doubt about whether meaning has changed or not, score 2.)

- Las casa son muy bonitas pero caras (07-item 9)
- Quiero una casa en que viven mis animales (12-item 13)
- Dudo que saba a manejar muy bien (11-item 6)
- Ella he terminado X pintar sus apartamiento (11-item 15)

EIT score 4 descriptor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Exact repetition: String matches stimulus exactly. Both form and meaning are correct without exception or doubt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Addendum to scoring – correspondence with Lourdes Ortega on scoring:

From Harriet to Lourdes – questions related to scoring:

I've been enjoying using the EI task with my participants. I have a few questions that have arisen repeatedly in coding the task using your criteria, however, and I wondered if these came up for you also, and if so, if you remember and have time to let me know how you dealt with them:

1. Beginning to respond before the tone -- do you "count off" for that?

2. Self-corrections -- for example "Me gustaria que el precio de la ca...de las casas bajara."

Assuming the second is right, do you treat it as if the first part was never produced? In the case
of an otherwise perfect repetition, would this reduce the score to 3? It seems like it might only matter in the case of distinguishing a 3 and a 4.

3. Hesitations -- pauses in the sentence -- again, seems like it maybe only comes into play when the repetition is otherwise perfect. Did you count a sentence with a pause in it as non-perfect (3 rather than 4)?

4. False starts -- for example "La cantidad de personas que fuman ha dis disminuido".

From Lourdes regarding scoring

1-We did not get any cases of folks responding before the ring tone, although we did get a few people who may have begin to respond latching against the ring tone for the first few sentences. We didn't penalize that behavior because it seemed to be more a matter of getting used to the ring, and it wasn't pervasive at all across items or individuals. In other words, after a few stimuli, those people who were "rushing" got into the habit of waiting for the ring tone.

2,3,4: Self-corrections, hesitations, and false starts didn't count against people in our scoring. If someone self-corrected or hesitated but managed to repeat the stimulus as provided, we gave them a 4. The same was true for the other scoring levels, it was all based on their best final performance on the stimulus. Our thinking was that memory is not perfect, but their grammatical knowledge to parse a given stimulus is in place if they can reconstruct meaning and or form or both, even with difficulty (which is traceable in self-corrections, hesitations, or false starts).