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ABSTRACT

Second language confidence (L2C) is considered a central component in language learning as it can affect the processes and outcomes of second language acquisition (Dörnyei, 2005). According to the functional model proposed by Sampasivam and Clément (2014), the two determinants that build towards L2C are self-involvement and richness of the contact experience. This study adds to previous research (e.g., Soyoof, 2018; Vincze & Joyce, 2018) by investigating, for the first time, the role of interlocutor type in the context of videoconferencing on the development of L2C in L2 and HL learners of Spanish.

The research questions that guided this study were: (1) Does interlocutor type (i.e., a peer on Zoom or a native speaker on Talk Abroad) play a role in the development of L2C in L2 and HL learners? Also, do these results vary over the course of the semester? (2) Are there differences in the participants’ perception of interlocutor type in terms of richness and self-involvement of the language contact? Also, do these results vary over the course of the semester?

Both the L2 learner (n= 32) and HL learner participants (n= 7) were students enrolled in a fifth-semester Spanish conversation course at a large, public U.S. university. Throughout the 16-week semester, they completed eight 30-minute videoconferences, four with a peer (L2-L2, HL-HL) on Zoom alternating with four with a trained and paid native speaker on Talk Abroad. The participants were provided instructions for each conversation, with the topics directly corresponding to course themes. In addition to the conversations, data also comes from the participants’ responses to an initial 29-item L2C questionnaire and eight post-conversation questionnaires including the original 29 items, 15 additional Likert-scale items, and 6 open-ended questions.

The results of this study suggest that the participation in multiple peer videoconferences
promotes both L2 and HL learners’ Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability and Self-Assurance over time. These outcomes can be explained, to an extent, by the integrated model of L2C proposed by Sampasivam and Clément (2014) given that both communicative contexts (i.e., HL-HL and L2-L2 peers) were perceived by the participants as prompting self-involvement, although they were not rated highly in richness. Regarding the virtual interactions with NSs on Talk Abroad, they were rated highly in both richness and self-involvement by both participant groups. In line with the theoretical framework, the L2 learners showed longitudinal increases in both factors of L2C as a result of interacting with NSs. However, interacting with NSs did not affect the HL learners’ L2C development, which cannot be explained by the existing model.

Overall, the findings of this research indicate that videoconferencing can pique language students’ interest and increase their exposure to linguistic forms, and, thus, is recommended as a course component to promote gains in L2 and HL learners’ L2C. Also, the intermediate-level participants in this study reported other benefits of the intervention such as its capacity to provide a context for practicing the target language and extensive reflection on course unit themes. Whereas the functional model of L2C was found to accurately explain the results for the L2-L2 peer dyads, NS-L2 learner dyads, and HL-HL peer dyads, it did not suitably apply to those of the NS-HL learner dyads. Thus, future research should ascertain the qualities of a contact experience that most effectively facilitates the HL learners’ L2C development, especially given that fostering HL learners’ confidence is critical for the heritage language’s vitality (Sánchez-Muñoz, 2016). Provided that remote learning is more commonplace than ever, this research is particularly relevant as it investigates the impact of technology on L2C development with the objective of informing pedagogical practices, however more research is needed to affirm these results and to answer the questions that remain.
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CHAPTER 1. BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1 Background

Since the 1960s, research in the field of second language acquisition has recognized that individual differences, often related to affect and cognition, play an important role in language learning outcomes (Dörnyei, 2005). Some of these differences include language aptitude, learning styles and strategies, foreign language anxiety, creativity, willingness to communicate, personality, memory, and motivation (for past reviews, see e.g., Dörnyei, 2005; Ortega, 2009). These traits can be tied to the notion of second language confidence (L2C), which is defined by Clément (1980) as a lack of anxiety when speaking in the second language coupled with high self-ratings of proficiency. Research on L2C can be traced back to work on second language motivation, which originated during the social psychological period and was originally pioneered by Gardner and Lambert (1959). Although previous scholars had contended that linguistic aptitude was the primary determinant of second language success, Gardner and Lambert asserted that a “motivation factor”, constituted of attitudinal and motivational components, was a counterpart to language aptitude in describing the variables related to second language achievement. Their findings led Gardner to continue developing and revising a theoretical framework in the attempt to account for individual affective variables in second language acquisition, culminating in the Socio-Educational Model published in 1985.

In its most recent phase, termed the process-oriented period, which started at the turn of this century, second language motivation theory has emphasized the dynamic nature of motivation, a characteristic intrinsic to Dörnyei’s (2009) L2 Motivational Self System, which is a model based on the idea of three possible selves: the Ideal L2 Self, the Ought-to Self, and the L2 Learning Experience. Within the model, the Ideal L2 Self refers to a learner’s conceptualization
as a successful L2 speaker and the motivation to close the gap between this imagined ideal and the actual self, and the *Ought-to Self* denotes the measures that the learner believes should be taken to avoid negative learning and social outcomes. As for the *L2 Learning Experience*, it is defined as the “situation-specific motives related to the immediate learning environment and experience” (Dörnyei, 2009, p. 29), which differs from previous frameworks in that it underlines that second language motivation is fluid, not static, as it may change over the course of short or long periods of time in accordance to the context; specifically, it may depend on, for instance, the pleasantness of the learning environment, the level of success of an interaction, the curricular materials used, the peer group of the learner, and the availability of role models or points of reference.

Stemming from this research on motivation, Clément (1980) proposed the Social Context Model and introduced the notion of ‘linguistic self-confidence’, which, in contrast to other second language acquisition models that focus primarily on cognition, is a socially defined concept as it is dependent on communication within the target language community and the frequency and quality with which it occurs. Linguistic self-confidence is operationalized in two respects: cognitively, using measurements of ‘perceived second language proficiency’, and affectively, using self-rated anxiety levels. In effect, when anxiety levels are low and proficiency levels are high, a high level of linguistic self-confidence can be achieved. According to Dörnyei (2005), second language acquisition and motivation are likely to be facilitated by linguistic self-confidence, but anxiety has an opposite, detrimental effect. Extensive research has investigated how linguistic self-confidence shapes and is shaped by the classroom (e.g., Espinosa, 2007; Jauregi & Bañados, 2008; Park & Lee, 2006; Pyun, Kim, Cho, & Lee, 2014; Tudini, 2003). It has also been explored in other contexts such as community-service (e.g., Hummel, 2013), mass
media access (e.g., Vincze & Gasiorek, 2016), pre-service teacher training (e.g., Lu, Goodale, & Guo, 2013), video games (e.g., Arslantas & Tokel, 2018; Soyoof, 2018), bilingual ethnolinguistic vitality (e.g., Freynet & Clément, 2015), internet-based behaviors and face-to-face communication (e.g., Vincze & Joyce, 2018; Vurdien, 2019), online social media use (Bailey & Rakushin-Lee, 2021), and study abroad (Martin-Rubió, 2015; Martin-Rubió & Cots, 2018).

Although L2C was first established within the Social Context Model, a framework that necessitated a quantity and quality of interaction between the learner and members of the target language community, the findings of Clément, Dörnyei, and Noels (1994) showed that foreign language learning contexts that include substantial indirect contact with the target language through media, but little to no direct contact with the target language community, can still facilitate L2C.

1.2 Functional model of Second Language Confidence (L2C)

Adding to Clément’s (1980) work, Sampasivam and Clément (2014) have, more recently, proposed a functional model of the determinants that build towards L2C integrating the two taxonomical dimensions of contact originally proposed in Harwood’s (2010) Contact Space Framework: involvement of self in contact and richness of the contact experience. The model that they put forth redefines the dimensions of richness and self-involvement as the authors propose that for language contact to be high in richness, the second language input should be varied, offer an abundance of language forms, and allow for feedback. Still, on the part of the learner, richness can be constrained by proficiency level and frequency of contact. Language input that is high in richness requires a greater level of self-involvement, particularly when the contact has perceived importance or personal relevance, prompting communicative engagement and interactivity. Furthermore, Sampasivam and Clément (2014) note that, in addition to
richness and self-involvement, the contextual variable of quality of contact, whether pleasant or unpleasant, will respectively facilitate or hinder L2C.

The present study builds on this previous research by examining for the first time the role of videoconferencing on the development of L2C in Spanish as this has yet to be explored within the proposed model by Sampasivam and Clément (2014). In their framework, they assert that computer mediated communication (CMC) is high in both richness and self-involvement, and, thus, is expected to lead to increased L2C. According to the authors, “CMC can benefit students by not only allowing them to communicate with peers using a different medium, but also allowing them to be in contact with and have authentic conversations with native[s]… [which] not only helps develop L2C and motivation, but can strengthen L2 ability and allow for the sharing of authentic cultural information” (p. 28-29). Furthermore, Freiermuth (2001) found that, when comparing face-to-face and online text-chat interaction within two NNS-NS pairs, language learners contributed more often and felt less hindered by their language deficiencies in the online context. Therefore, regarding the present study, CMC may provide a context that facilitates L2C, but little is known on the effect of interlocutor type, namely, peer or trained native speaker (NS), in videoconferencing.

1.3 Computer-mediated communication (CMC) and confidence

In the field of second language acquisition, early research on CMC most predominantly pertained to the use of asynchronous methods with communication taking the form of emails, social networks, forums, text-chat sessions, given that they allow for self-pacing and are less technologically demanding than synchronous CMC. A number of investigations (e.g., Fadilah, 2018; Arnold, 2007; Satar & Özdener, 2008) have shown that these types of interventions can increase learners’ confidence, willingness to learn, and oral abilities in the target language.
However, as more online tools and platforms have become available which are designed to enable and simplify synchronous oral communication, only a few studies have considered the role of videoconferencing, involving both audio and video, on the development confidence in the second language.

1.3.1 Introduction to Talk Abroad videoconferencing platform

In the previous literature that has explored the effects of synchronous CMC, the NS in question was either the researcher (e.g., Wu & Marek, 2010; Wu, Marek, & Chen, 2013; Wu, Marek, & Yen, 2012; Wu, Yen, & Marek, 2011) or a language coach or teacher (e.g., Abing, 2018; Dey-Plissonneau, 2020; Guillén & Blake, 2017; Jauregi & Bañados, 2008; Kern, 2014; Toyama, 2020; White, Zheng, & Skyrme, 2021). In contrast, the present study includes a different NS type, namely, a paid conversationalist on a videoconferencing platform called Talk Abroad. As elucidated in Henshaw (2016b) and Guillén et al. (2020), an alternative to unreliable and unpredictable open-access online chat sites that grant entry to any new user no matter their credentials (e.g., LiveMocha, Hello Talk, etc.) are platforms such as Conversifi and Talk Abroad (http://talkabroad.com) which is a service provider that organizes 30-minute conversations between language students and trained NSs, affording a number of benefits to learners such as supplementary conversation practice and access to speakers with authentic cultural knowledge and native language competence. Language programs at numerous U.S. institutions of higher education, including Michigan State University, University of Alabama, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Duke University, and University of Wyoming, among many others, have been using Talk Abroad. The NSs on this platform use strategies to engage students in the conversation by asking open-ended and follow-up questions; they also provide students with feedback on language forms and use when it is requested, but are not trained to draw attention to
language forms or correct the students because communication, or the exchange of ideas, is the principal objective of the interaction. Regarding the professions of the NSs, many times their employment on Talk Abroad is part-time, and, as a result, they may also work in fields other than education such as business, government, or medicine. In terms of outcomes, a number of studies have revealed that the use of Talk Abroad as a course component can promote intercultural competence (e.g., Tecedor & Vasseur, 2020; Warner-Ault, 2020), learner autonomy (e.g., Sama & Wu, 2019), lexical acquisition (Kessler, Loewen, & Trego, 2020), interest in continuing language study (Lang-Rigal & Galarreta-Aima, 2019), communication skills (e.g., Cuervo-Carruthers, 2017), and self-confidence (e.g., Conboy, Ugalde, & Reuber, 2017).

Specifically, Tecedor and Vasseur (2020) tracked the post-conversation reflections of 18 fourth-semester students of Spanish and studied their conceptualizations of the cultural differences that they were exposed to in four conversations with NSs on Talk Abroad. Throughout the academic semester during which the scaffolded conversations took place, the authors report that the students evolved their attitudes, beliefs, and interpretations of the target culture. Similarly, Warner-Ault (2020) found that, after participating in five conversations on Talk Abroad, 39 intermediate Spanish students showed a heightened cultural awareness and gains in their oral proficiency in the target language. Echoing these results, Sama and Wu (2019) observed in students’ post-conversation written reflections and exit questionnaire that the completion of four Talk Abroad conversations led to an increase in their oral fluency and accuracy, learner autonomy, and target-language engagement. Taking a distinctive approach to the implementation of Talk Abroad in a second-year university course, Kessler, Loewen, and Trego (2020) required 35 participants to transcribe the five conversations on Talk Abroad that they completed over the course of a semester in order to investigate whether they reported
noticing linguistic forms after conversing or after transcribing the interaction. The results showed that the authors’ task design promoted learners’ lexical, but not grammatical, noticing, which was found to have occurred both after participating in each conversation and after transcribing each audio recording.

In terms of previous research on the effect of videoconferencing with NSs on learners’ self-confidence, Conboy, Ugalde, and Reuber (2017) piloted three parallel studies at three different institutions of higher education in which the students, who were in Spanish or French courses that varied in proficiency level and content, spoke with NS students in a virtual dual immersion exchange or with NSs on Talk Abroad. At the first institution, 100 students in a Spanish course at the advanced-low level conversed for 20-25 minutes in two virtual dual immersion exchanges with NS student counterparts located in various Latin American countries. At the second institution, 26 students of intermediate French took part in four 30-minute conversations on Talk Abroad. Finally, at the third institution, 54 students of advanced French conversed on Talk Abroad in four 30-minute conversations. These three studies are presented together in this article because they shared similar post-conversation questionnaires that contained Likert-scale items which inquired about the participants’ perceptions of the videoconferencing logistics (e.g., punctuality, technical problems, etc.), conversational abilities (e.g., asking and answering questions, knowledge of target countries, knowledge of target cultures, etc.), and each intervention’s capacity for knowledge acquisition (e.g., support for the development of intercultural awareness, practicing of linguistic skills, etc.). The joint findings of all three pilot studies revealed that the participants reacted positively to the interventions and conveyed heightened self-confidence. Regarding the two pilot studies that used Talk Abroad, the students reported increased communicative competence and cultural awareness. Despite the fact
that, on the whole, both types of videoconferencing interventions appear to be well-received by the students, it is important to underline that each of the three institutions varied greatly in their methodologies ranging from no fixed conversational structure to substantial pre-task preparation and assigned conversation topics. Furthermore, although the results of these three pilot studies were derived from questionnaire data that inquired on a number of facets of the interactional experience ranging from technological logistics to intercultural awareness, no explicit theoretical model on confidence was employed in this research to ground this investigation. Indeed, the purpose of these three investigations, labeled in the original research as ‘pilot studies’, seems to be to offer an initial glance at the technological resources for videoconferencing that are currently available for adoption by language curriculums, but not, necessarily, to uncover the nuances nor track the long-term development of L2C, which is the objective of the present research.

Given that the literature is rather limited on the outcomes of the trained NS-learner conversations, perhaps it is important to document what has been found in terms of teacher-learner interaction as this relationship may be similar to the expert-learner roles found in Talk Abroad conversations. Nevertheless, it is important to begin this discussion by citing O’Dowd and O’Rourke (2019) who state that “there have been no in-depth studies to date of the particular learning outcomes and learning experiences that [Talk Abroad] has had in comparison to teacher-run exchanges”; as such, the subsequent comparison of these two expert-learner types is merely theoretical in nature. To continue, concretely, in face-to-face contexts, research on L2 learners has shown that teachers provide feedback (e.g., Bruton & Samuda, 1980), elicit information in the target language (e.g., Hall & Walsh, 2002), and validate or confirm responses with repetitions or more target-like paraphrases of the original contributions (e.g., Duff, 2000). According to Wu et al. (2011), “teachers have the unique opportunity to improve student
motivation through fostering desirable student goals, stimulating active learning, and leading dialogue” (p. 119). In contrast to teachers’ efforts to encourage students to achieve goals and stimulate active learning on, perhaps, specific linguistic concepts, *Talk Abroad* professionals merely serve to facilitate meaning-based communication without explicit or purposeful feedback on language use and form. For this reason, *Talk Abroad* professionals constitute a distinct NS type that has yet to be explored in the literature as related to their impact on L2 learners’ L2C development.

### 1.4 Second language (L2) learner interaction

Although previous research (for a review see Bowles & Adams, 2015) demonstrates that interaction with NSs facilitates L2 acquisition, peer conversation has also been shown to be beneficial by providing learners with comprehensible input, offering more opportunities for modified output in response to feedback than NS-learner interactions (e.g., Bruton & Samuda, 1980; Mackey, Oliver, & Leeman, 2003), and affording more negotiations for meaning than NS-learner and NS-NS interactions (Gass & Varonis, 1985). Furthermore, Gurzynski-Weiss and Baralt (2014) found that learners notice feedback from their peers in both face-to-face and online contexts. Apart from cognitive benefits, other studies have shown that peer interaction can increase affective and social dimensions such as students’ motivation to learn the target language (e.g., Wang et al., 2017), engagement in language learning (Lai et al., 2019), and sense of community in the learning context (Marull & Kumar, 2020; Peterson, Beymer, & Putnam, 2018).

In terms of perceptions, Sato (2006) found that learners felt less pressure with their peer interlocutor compared to the NS as they had more time to plan during the conversation and they felt that they could better recognize their peer’s grammatical features than those of the NS. Relatedly, the L2 learners in Varonis and Gass (1985) reported feeling more comfortable
interacting and negotiating meaning with peers than with NSs, which the authors allege may be due to the perceived commonality of “shared incompetence”. Echoing these sentiments, Blake (2000) claims that the face-threatening nature of negotiations is lessened in L2-L2 learner interactions due to a shared lack of expertise.

1.4.1 L2 peer synchronous computer-mediated interaction

Closely tied to the present study is the investigation by Lenkaitis (2020) in which 25 intermediate learners of Spanish from the same course participated in a total of six weekly synchronous videoconferences with a peer or in groups of three on Zoom. The conversation topics involved unit-related open-ended themes such as food, travel, or wellbeing. The analyses of the videoconference recordings, Likert-scale questionnaires, and pre- and post- treatment questionnaires revealed that the peer online conversations facilitated language processes and learner autonomy. As the author states, “although [research on] telecollaboration has shown that there are benefits of connecting with NSs … this study has also shown that there is a benefit of connecting with NNSs of the language being studied” (p. 503). More specifically, although the author documented errors in word choice and verb-subject agreement, overall the learners improved on grammatical structures, awareness of language forms, and level of comfort and satisfaction in their skills in the target language. Also included in the analysis was the notion of confidence, operationalized as ‘how long participants believed they could speak in the L2’ (p. 490), which showed gains over time. Therefore, this study demonstrates that peer videoconferencing can contribute to language acquisition and self-regulated learning. Still, more information is needed to understand the nuances of this pedagogical intervention and its capacity to facilitate L2C. This can be done by measuring its perceived richness and capacity for self-involvement, and these findings can then be compared to those of NS-learner videoconferencing.
in order to measure their impacts on L2C development and, in doing so, inform pedagogical practices.

Another related study by Lenkaitis and English (2017) explored the use of Zoom as a technological tool to increase L2 learners’ exposure to the target language and its culture. Over the course of two weeks, two 20-minute discussions were held in small groups composed of five L2 learners of Spanish and the topics of these conversations surrounded the telenovela *La Reina del Sur*. The comparison of the pre- and post- surveys revealed that the videoconferences increased the students’ motivation to learn Spanish and the analysis of the conversation recordings showed that each individual learner displayed distinct levels of engagement; interestingly, one learner was found to have barely spoken during the dialogue relative to the peers. The authors explain that in “groups of more than two… a participant can easily “hide” and have others control the conversation” (Discussion section, para. 10). Overall, this research underscores the idea that the use of videoconferencing among L2 peers may be an effective method to increase target-language exposure and foster engagement, however, as the authors affirm, it is worth investigating the use of this technology in a one-on-one setting given that the option to “hide” at the group level would no longer be available.

1.4.2 L2 learner-NS synchronous computer-mediated interaction

Related to the present research, in Wu, Marek and Yen (2012) 37 Taiwanese learners of English interacted in synchronous telecollaboration with an American researcher who taught them about different aspects of American customs and culture. After each session, the students were asked to collaborate in person with peers to develop a corresponding presentation but on Taiwanese customs and culture, which was then presented to the researcher using CMC in the next session. The questionnaire and interview data revealed that the CMC and the engagement in
peer learning resulted in increased motivation, satisfaction, and confidence. Within this study, the notion of confidence was operationalized in three items of a survey: “speaking English with other classmates”, “speaking English with English-speaking foreigners”, and “use of multimedia facilities on the Internet.” The study implemented a Likert-scale methodology where 1 signified “not confident at all” and 5 signaled “very confident.” Furthermore, in this study, CMC was not used at the individual level, but rather at the class level where the researcher presented to the entire language class and, after in-person preparation among peers, the student groups presented back to the researcher using CMC. Therefore, the amount of computer-mediated target-language production per student was limited and the measurement of its effects was quite coarse. Finally, as peer CMC was not implemented, a comparison was not made between the outcomes of the two interlocutor types, peers and NSs on the emergence of L2C.

Canals (2020) also investigated the use of synchronous CMC, but between pairs of 18 advanced students learning English in Spain with 18 high-intermediate students learning Spanish in Canada. The purpose of the study was to explore the effect of virtual exchanges on participants’ development of oral skills, willingness to communicate with peer NSs, and target-language motivation. The procedure for this study included two groups of Canadian learners, first, the control group, that was composed of Canadian-only dyads who completed five oral tasks in Spanish and the other, the experimental group, that completed two of the five tasks under the same conditions as the control group and three of the five tasks as a virtual exchange with the learners of English from Spain. The dyads were formed based on scheduling availability and in each session lasting 10-15 minutes the pairs carried out an open-ended task involving decision-making, comparison and analysis, information exchange, or collaborative writing. The data collected to measure gains in oral proficiency were students’ grades on oral evaluations, pre- and
post-experiment, which reached near-significance as a result of the virtual exchanges. Also, data from entry and exit questionnaires, when compared to the control group, showed that the students that took part in the virtual exchanges showed a greater willingness to communicate with NSs and heightened motivation in the target language. Therefore, the conclusions of this study point to the cognitive and affective benefits of the use of virtual interactions between language students and NS peers of the target language.

In sum, given that previous studies have found that CMC may be conducive to language learning, a question that remains is the role of interlocutor type, specifically, the effect of videoconferencing with a peer on Zoom compared to a NS on Talk Abroad on L2 learners’ L2C development.

1.5 Heritage language (HL) learner interaction

Throughout the United States, two types of Spanish language students, L2 and heritage language (HL) learners, are often enrolled in the same courses given that distinct tracks of language study are not offered at the majority of institutions (Beaudrie, 2012). According to Valdés (2000), unlike L2 learners who most often begin to study the second language after puberty, HL learners are bilinguals who begin speaking the minority language at home and have some degree of linguistic competency ranging from a passive understanding to production that is akin to that of monolingually-raised NSs. Most often, the linguistic outcomes of HL learners in the minority language are dependent on the abundance and richness of input that they are afforded at home and in the community. Although HL learners vary in proficiency, their unifying commonality is that they were first exposed to the minority language in early childhood in the home setting. In terms of mode of acquisition, since HL learners were exposed to the naturalistic input of their families, research has shown that their listening and speaking skills tend to be more
developed than other language abilities like writing and reading; this skill set is the reverse for L2 learners who primarily acquire the minority language in the classroom setting, and, thus, tend to be more knowledgeable on orthographic conventions and metalinguistic terminology, but are weaker in oral production (Bowles, 2011b). Due to the differences in linguistic and cultural experiences, more research is needed to address how the use of a technological tool such as videoconferencing between learners of the same background (i.e., L2-L2 and HL-HL) and between learners and NSs on Talk Abroad affects each type of learner’s development of L2C in order to inform pedagogical practices.

A number of studies have found that although HL learners are motivated to learn more about the language and culture, they lack confidence due to a perceived lower prestige of their variety or as a result of their underdeveloped competencies in areas such as writing, reading, and formal registers (e.g., Alarcón, 2010; Krashen, 1998; Renganathan, 2008). Concretely, Beaudrie and Ducar (2005) surveyed the needs and attitudes of 20 Spanish HL learners at the University of Arizona and found that “one of their main obstacles in communicating in Spanish was their lack of confidence… in their Spanish speaking abilities and a lack of confidence in the validity or prestige level of their own variety of Spanish” (p. 12). Noting these challenges, Sánchez-Muñoz (2016) asserts that the principal pedagogical objective for HL learners should be to help them “develop linguistic awareness and increased confidence while validating their own vernacular variety” (p. 205). She also argues that the classroom is a fertile environment in which HL learners, many for the first time, develop a range of registers, explore their ethnolinguistic identities, come in contact with other dialects and varieties of the language, and gain pride in their cultural and linguistic backgrounds.
To this end, previous research has investigated a number of factors that may impact the development of HL learners’ confidence in the target language. For instance, Belpoliti and Pérez (2019) explored the effect of HL learners’ participation in health fairs as part of the curriculum requirements for an advanced Spanish course on health professions. The HL students’ reflection essays revealed that the intervention increased their confidence to use Spanish in a formal register, allowed them to understand the needs of their local community, and bolstered their identity as emerging Spanish-speaking healthcare professionals. Echoing these findings, Lowther Pereira (2015) and Pascual y Cabo, Prada, and Lowther Pereira (2017) showed that service-learning in the local community can be a highly valuable component of HL pedagogy. Specifically, the participants in these studies reported increased levels of confidence as a result of using Spanish productively in professional contexts beyond the home and family. Apart from the local community, HL learners’ participation in study abroad programs has been found to develop their linguistic self-confidence (e.g., Menéndez & Isabelli, 2011; Quan, Pozzi, Kehoe, & Menard-Warwick, 2018) and ethnolinguistic identities (e.g., Shively, 2016; Quan, Pozzi, Kehoe, & Menard-Warwick, 2018). Nonetheless, no known study to date has explored how HL learners’ confidence is impacted by role of the interlocutor in CMC, whether a HL peer or a trained NS, despite the growing use of this mode of communication in the digital age.

1.5.1 HL peer synchronous computer-mediated interaction

According to Henshaw (2016a; 2016b), the research on the use of instructional technologies for HLs is still in its infancy. Nonetheless, in terms of the research that has shed light on HL-HL learner interactions in the online interface, Torres (2020) measured the accuracy and syntactic complexity of written tasks produced by HL-HL and HL-L2 learner dyads in the synchronous written CMC mode. The findings of this study showed that HL-HL peers produced
more dependent clauses than their HL-L2 counterparts, thus implying that their texts were more syntactically complex, which can be explained, in part, by their combined higher proficiency level than the dyads that contained an L2 learner participant. Similarly, HL-HL interaction was also investigated in Torres and Cung (2019) who examined whether mode of communication, synchronous written CMC or face-to-face, affected the prevalence and outcome of language-related episodes that emerged the interaction. The findings showed that more language-related episodes, that is, negotiations of language between interlocutors, occurred in the face-to-face mode whereas more self-repairs were initiated in the synchronous written CMC mode. Still, what has yet to be explored in the literature is the use of synchronous CMC with a visual component, namely, videoconferencing, between HL peers for the purpose of L2C development. Indeed, the present research aims to fill this gap and will also shed light on HL learners’ perceptions of self-involvement and richness afforded by the online conversations.

1.5.2 HL learner-NS synchronous computer-mediated interaction

Regarding NS-HL learner interactions, only two studies, Abing (2018) and Tecedor, Del Carpio, and Ochoa (2021), are known to the author to have investigated the outcomes of this dyad type in synchronous CMC. To begin, in Abing (2018) six HL learners of Spanish were paired with a NS language coach with whom they interacted on Skype for two months in twelve 45-minute sessions in the target language. During the sessions, the language coach used a task-based language teaching approach to motivate the HL learner to produce language in meaningful contexts. Based on their performance in the first two lessons, the HL learners were given a written evaluation with five learning objectives that would be the focus of the subsequent ten lessons. The results of the treatment as measured in perception questionnaires and conversational data showed that the HL learners gained confidence and improved their linguistic performance
related to fluency and vocabulary use in Spanish. Indeed, interacting with a trained, more proficient speaker of the target language using synchronous CMC appears to provide HL learners with cognitive and affective benefits.

As for the second study, grounded within the theoretical framework of communities of practice, Tecedor, Del Carpio, and Ochoa (2021) aimed to understand how HL learners negotiate their novice-expert identities in the context of videoconferencing. The data consisted of four 30-minute conversation recordings carried out by two HL learners of Spanish, one each with a NS of Spanish from Ecuador and one each with a L2 learner of Spanish from Arizona. To provide background on the NS, she held a bachelor’s degree and worked as a nutritionist, and the authors do not report that she was trained in any particular way prior to participating in the videoconferences. Regarding the conversation topics, they were relatively general in nature, revolving around themes such as ‘technology’, ‘environment’, and ‘politics’, and were provided to the dyads in order to guide the direction of their dialogue. The authors found that the HL-NS dyads implemented discourse strategies that appeared to position the NS as an expert, both linguistically and in terms of knowledge of the topic. Adding to these findings, the researchers also observed that, in certain moments, the NS interlocutor took a teacher-like role in order to provide unsolicited guidance on linguistic forms to the HL learner. Ultimately, this study adds to the field by shedding light on the interactional patterns that may occur in NS-HL learner dyads in the context of videoconferencing.

Given that a growing number of institutions connect language learners with trained NSs on online platforms such as Talk Abroad, assessing the impact of this NS interlocutor type, as compared to peer interaction in the same mode, on the development of L2C would allow HL language curriculums to be informed on the efficacy of these interventions. This is an especially
critical question given that increasing HL learners’ confidence has been asserted to be a cornerstone in the maintenance of the heritage language’s vitality (Sánchez-Muñoz, 2016). The results of a pilot study carried out to answer these questions are detailed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 2. PILOT STUDY

2.1 Introduction

A pilot study was carried out by the author in Spring 2020 to compare peer (L2-L2 and HL-HL dyads) and NS-learner videoconferencing on the development of L2C. The two research questions that guided this investigation were: (1) Does videoconferencing with a peer on Zoom and/or with a NS on Talk Abroad contribute to the development of L2C? (2) Are there differences in the perception of interlocutor type (i.e., a peer on Zoom vs. a NS on Talk Abroad) in terms of (a) richness and (b) self-involvement of the language contact? In terms of methodology, two groups were identified, namely, HL learners ($n = 10$) and L2 learners ($n = 28$) who were all students enrolled in the same three sections of a fifth-semester Spanish conversation course at a large U.S. public university.

The study began with a classroom visit in which the students were informed about the study and they were then asked to complete a language background questionnaire, a DELE proficiency test that has been used in previous research (e.g., Montrul & Slabakova, 2003), and an initial L2C questionnaire. With the information provided in the language background questionnaire, the two learner types were separated for the peer conversations so that each participant only interacted with a learner of their same background type (i.e., L2-L2 and HL-HL). The participants completed two 30-minute conversations, one with a NS on Talk Abroad and the other with a peer on Zoom. The two digital platforms, Zoom and Talk Abroad, are nearly identical in presentation and configuration as they both provide visual and audio capabilities for videoconferencing, justifying their use as comparable modes of communication in this research. The study followed a counterbalanced design in which half of the participants completed the first conversation with a peer and then with a NS, whereas the other half followed the reverse order.
The procedure was the same for both conversations including the duration requirement of 25-30 minutes and conversation topics related to study abroad, Hispanics and Spanish in the world, and products, practices, and cultural perspectives.

2.2 Results

The data for this study comprised the participants’ responses to an initial L2C questionnaire containing 29 Likert-scale items and two post-conversation questionnaires with the original 29-items in addition to 7 open-ended questions adapted from Park and Lee (2006) and Espinosa (2007). The results of a factor analysis revealed two underlying principal components in the data, Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability and Self-Assurance.

2.2.1 L2 learners

With respect the data on L2 learners, three one-way ANOVAs revealed a significant difference in the ratings associated with Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability as a result of the peer interaction, suggesting that the learners perceived themselves as more capable of comprehending and communicating in Spanish after videoconferencing with a peer than with a NS. The findings are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1

Results of repeated measures ANOVA: L2 learner Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>Post-Zoom</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p <.05.

Significant differences were also found related to Self-Assurance for both conversation types, indicating that the mere act of carrying out the synchronous CMC, no matter the
interlocutor, resulted in a more emotional confidence when reflecting on target language abilities. These results are given in Table 2.

**Table 2**

**Results of repeated measures ANOVA: L2 learner Self-Assurance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>Post-Zoom</td>
<td>* .000</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>* .000</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p < .05.

To answer the second research question related to the L2 learner data, qualitative and quantitative analyses showed that both interaction types fostered increases in L2C due to similar perceptions of richness and self-involvement. More specifically, 12 out of the 28 (42.8%) L2 learner participants expressed in the open-ended questions that they valued the time spent one-on-one with a NS who could guide them in their vocabulary and grammar use, as illustrated in this comment: ‘I think this online conversation has helped me to improve my Spanish in that I had a partner who was able to assist me, patiently listen, encourage me, and provide insight into how I can use words differently and improve my skills.’ Still, six out of 28 (21.4%) participants expressed feelings of intimidation when conversing with a NS, and, in some cases, had trouble understanding or responding to them during the conversation, as in this comment: ‘Hearing my partners accent and trying to understand the words she was saying. I am used to non-native speaker who don’t have an accent so it can be hard when native speakers talk to me.’ As for the outcomes of the peer conversation, 24 out of 28 (85.7%) L2 learner participants acknowledged the peer interaction as an effective way to continue sharpening their language skills, which is expressed in this comment: ‘The most valuable part of the online conversation was getting to practice the language for an extended period of time in an environment where both participants
are students. It is easier to speak when time goes on and when the other person is at about the same level as me. It was interesting to see how much grammar and vocabulary I could utilize in a conversation about a familiar topic when the conversation is not graded for correctness. I was able to come up with more abstract questions or responses, such as thoughts about the future of languages, when there was more time to fill with conversation’. Therefore, although the NS interlocutors offer native-level linguistic competence and a depth and breadth of cultural information, conversing with them may be perceived as intimidating for some L2 learners, whereas conversing with peers may be more familiar and less stress-inducing. For these reasons, each interlocutor type may be beneficial in their own ways for the development of L2C in L2 learners.

2.2.2 HL learners

With respect to the results of the HL learner data analyses, three one-way ANOVAs revealed no significant differences between the initial L2C questionnaire and post-conversation questionnaire responses for the items related to Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability. These results are provided in Table 3. The findings suggest that partaking in videoconferencing did not affect HL learners’ perceptions of their capacity to understand and convey ideas in Spanish, no matter the interlocutor type with whom they conversed.

Table 3

Results of repeated measures ANOVA: HL learner Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>Post-Zoom</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p <.05.
Nonetheless, significant differences were found between the items that loaded onto Self-Assurance in the initial L2C questionnaire and those from the post-conversation Talk Abroad questionnaire. Another instance of statistical significance was also revealed in the comparison of the items related to Self-Assurance in the Zoom questionnaire with those of the post-conversation Talk Abroad questionnaire, as presented in Table 4. This signifies that only the interaction with the NS produced an increase the HL learners’ emotional confidence when perceiving their communicative capacities in the target language.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>Post-Zoom</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p < .05.

To answer the second research question, HL learners’ responses to the open-ended questions from each post-conversation questionnaire were coded for perceptions of richness and self-involvement. The results revealed differing sentiments for the HL-HL peer interactions and for the HL-NS interactions. Specifically, for the NS-HL learner conversation, eight out of ten (80.0%) HL learners reported that the Talk Abroad conversation motivated them to communicate more elaborately on academic or cultural topics, as exemplified by this comment: ‘Yes, this conversation helped improve my Spanish a lot especially in discussing academic topics and global topics in general. I learned new words and used some new words to discuss topics I have never discussed in such detail in Spanish before.’ Also, four out of ten (40.0%) HL learners stated that it was beneficial for them to speak to a new NS from a different country and culture, as this comment conveys: ‘I think the conversation was very useful because it really tested my
ability to not only talk with someone in Spanish but talking to someone from a different Spanish-speaking country. Because of this I was able to practice my Spanish as well as learn some differences in Hispanic cultures.’ As for the HL-HL peer interactions, seven out of ten (70.0%) HL learners expressed that the interaction was useful practice, as illustrated in this comment: ‘I think it was very useful. I am confident it was also useful for my partner in this activity as we both had times when we were trying to express our thoughts and would forget one word or more that were important for the conversation. It is useful in the sense that we are practicing our oral Spanish skills in the best way possible which is verbally as Spanish speaking does not improve by not speaking Spanish. Listening and watching things in Spanish helps but the best way to practice is through conversation, which makes this online conversation very useful to everyone trying to improve their Spanish.’ Also, two (20%) HL learners stated that it was an interesting opportunity given that it is not commonplace for them to speak in Spanish beyond the the home or classroom environments. Still, another sentiment expressed by three out of ten (30%) HL learners after engaging in the peer videoconferencing was that they felt that they did not learn a substantial amount of new grammatical or lexical information from their partner.

2.3 Conclusion

In total, the NS-HL learner conversations were deemed a more beneficial context in which the learners could acquire and produce more linguistic features of the Spanish language as their partner provided native-level competence. The interaction also afforded an opportunity for the participants to learn about and share cultural information. Finally, the results of the qualitative analysis reveal that the peer interaction was perceived as lower in richness than the conversation with the NS with whom new words and inquiries about language form were
discussed. However, both conversation types seemed to foster *self-involvement* as they were considered to be worthwhile practice.

Nevertheless, it is important to note that the HL learners’ self-ratings were high for both their Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability ($M = 4.67$ out of 5) and Self-Assurance ($M = 4.66$ out of 5) on the initial L2C questionnaire. These high self-ratings may be related to their proficiency level ($M = 62.5\%$ accuracy on the DELE) compared to that of their L2 learner classmates ($M = 42.3\%$). Additionally, when comparing these two learner types, the literature shows that HL learners are strongest in oral production skills (Bowles, 2011b); in contrast, the L2 learners in this pilot study self-rated their speaking skills lowest.

### 2.4 Changes based on pilot study

On the basis of the pilot study’s results, the methodology of the present research was modified in a number of ways. Firstly, in contrast to the pilot study which included one conversation for each interlocutor type, the present study examined these relationships longitudinally over the course of a semester with four conversations per interlocutor type, that is, eight conversations in total. This change more authentically reflects the relatively standard practice of requiring four *Talk Abroad* conversations per semester as is customary at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, College of Charleston, and other institutions of higher education. Also, given that the participants in the pilot study did not have a sufficient amount of time to carefully complete the 50-item DELE proficiency test during the initial visit, the initial classroom visit for the full study was increased to the full 50-minute lesson period instead of a 30-minute segment. In terms of changes to the conversation instructions, this study provided a set of six questions in English for each of the four conversations in order to guide the learners if they found it challenging to speak freely with a peer in the target language for 30
minutes about the given topic. These questions were provided because the learners in this course fall into the intermediate proficiency level, which means that their discourse is characterized by strings of sentences and typically revolves around topics related to their immediate vicinity, so offering them ways in which to expand the conversation so that the 30-minute duration would be achievable was deemed an appropriate step. Finally, the post-conversation questionnaires used in the pilot study were not designed in a fine-grained way to explore the nuances of the interactions, namely, the type of knowledge gained (whether cultural or linguistic), a direct comparison of both conversations, and a more detailed inquiry on the dimensions of richness and self-involvement. These aspects are now included in the post-conversation questionnaires in revised versions of the 15-item Likert scale section and the free-response section.
CHAPTER 3. THE PRESENT STUDY

3.1 Research questions, hypotheses, and expected contributions

In sum, although previous studies have found that interaction between peers of the same linguistic background and between NSs and learners may be conducive to language learning, the question that remains is the size of the impact of each of these interlocutor types on the development of learners’ L2C when compared in the context of online synchronous CMC over the course of an academic semester. Therefore, the present investigation seeks to answer the following questions:

1. Does dyad type (HL-HL peers, NS-HL learner, L2-L2 peers, NS-L2 learner) play a role in the development of L2C in the context of videoconferencing?
   a. Does interlocutor type affect the ratings for Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability?
   b. Do the ratings of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability change over time due to multiple interactions with the same interlocutor type?
   c. Does interlocutor type affect Self-Assurance self-ratings?
   d. Do the Self-Assurance self-ratings change over time due to multiple interactions with the same interlocutor type?

2. Are there differences in the perception of interlocutor type in terms of (a) richness and (b) self-involvement of the language contact?
   a. Do perceptions of richness change over time due to multiple interactions with the same interlocutor type?
   b. Do perceptions of self-involvement change over time due to multiple interactions with the same interlocutor type?
As for hypotheses, Table 5 displays the outcomes of the NS-learner dyads and peer dyads from the small-scale pilot study and these results are expected to be echoed in the findings of the present study.

**Table 5**

*Facets of L2C yielding significant outcomes in the pilot study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction type</th>
<th>Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability</th>
<th>Self-Assurance</th>
<th>Richness</th>
<th>Self-Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L2-L2 learners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS-L2 learner</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL-HL learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS-HL learner</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More specifically, in terms of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability, only the L2 peer interaction is expected to show significant results when compared to the corresponding items in the initial L2C questionnaire. In contrast, all interaction types, with the exception of HL peer interaction, are hypothesized to prompt significant differences on the items related to Self-Assurance when compared to the same items on the initial L2C questionnaire. These same three interaction types are also predicted to be deemed high in *richness*, while all four interaction types are expected to yield high *self-involvement* as evidenced by the written perceptions of the participants from the pilot.

Despite results of the pilot study showing no significant differences for HL learners’ Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability and Self-Assurance as a result of HL peer videoconferencing, this dyad type is investigated once more in the present research due to the fact that multiple interactions are examined over time, which may reveal outcomes that are not realized immediately after only one communicative episode.
There are several expected contributions of this research. Firstly, the principal aim of this study is to inform language instructors on the pedagogical value of videoconferencing between peers and trained NSs for two types of students, L2 and HL learners, and shed light on how these interactions affect L2C development. As online language curriculums continue to grow, the field of second language acquisition needs to identify the most beneficial methods to foster L2C in a virtual context and this study specifically investigates the role of interlocutor type to partially answer this multi-faceted question. Furthermore, tracking how the students perceive the two interlocutor types over time can inform language instructors on how to most effectively approach this multiple-conversation course component. More specifically, if, for example, the participants’ perceptions of richness and self-involvement start with high ratings and end with lower ones over time for NSs, it may be recommended that the participants engage in fewer conversations with this interlocutor type. However, if the results show the inverse, multiple conversations with this interlocutor type will be recommended so that the participants benefit longitudinally in their L2C development.

3.2 Participants

The participants were students enrolled in a fifth-semester Spanish conversation course at a large U.S. public university. Enrollment permissions for this course are granted based on either departmental written proficiency test score or as a result of a student’s progression within the program. During the semester in which the data for the present study was collected, the course was divided into three distinct sections taught by three different instructors. For the peer interactions, the students were paired by section and met with their partner during their regularly scheduled lesson time. The participant pool included L2 and HL learners, which is the typical demographic composition of past enrollments in this course. For the L2 learner participants, it is
important to note that they were assigned a new partner, without repeating interlocutors, for each peer conversation. However, due to the limited number of HL learners enrolled in the course, five of the seven participants in this group spoke to the same peer interlocutor twice and two participants never repeated peer partners on any occasion. Regarding the NS interlocutors, the students were given full autonomy to speak with any trained NS on *Talk Abroad* that piqued their personal interest or that merely coincided with their availability. In a rare case, one L2 participant conversed with the same NS for three out of four of his *Talk Abroad* conversations, and two other L2 participants repeated with one NS twice (Appendix I). Apart from these three students, the 29 other L2 participants never conversed more than once with the same NS interlocutor. For the HL learners, two participants carried out two conversations with the same NS, but the other five HL participants conversed with a different NS for each of the four conversations on *Talk Abroad* (Appendix I).

### 3.2.1 L2 learner participants

The participants that were assigned to the L2 learner group were raised in an entirely monolingual-English context and were instructed in primary and secondary school in English. Outside of their current academic environment, they indicated using Spanish minimally and stated that they had never spent longer than six weeks in a Spanish-speaking country. At the start of the data collection period, 45 L2 learners were identified, however, seven individuals reported previous experience with *Talk Abroad* or other similar platforms, one student dropped the course, and five were removed due to a lack of participation in the required tasks. Thus, this study includes 32 L2 learner participants whose ages ranged from 18-22 (\(M=19.2\)), and, within this group, 28 were females and four were males. In terms of the participants’ Spanish proficiency, they self-rated their abilities in speaking (\(M=2.59\)), writing (\(M=3.31\)), reading (\(M=2.96\)),
3.15), and listening ($M=2.78$) with “1” referring to “beginner” and “5” to “like a native speaker”. Since speaking was the lowest self-rated skill, followed by listening, this suggests that the students recognize that their oral and aural skills may need the most practice, which is opportune for the incorporation of a course component like videoconferencing. Relatedly, it could likely be that these perceptions were one of the principal motivations for the students’ initial decision to enroll in this Spanish conversation course, which is an elective for the major and minor in the Spanish program at this institution. Regarding their 50-item DELE proficiency test scores, they ranged from 12 to 43 ($M=27.66$). Specifically, one participant scored in the novice level with a score of 12, 30 participants fell in the intermediate level ranging from 20-39 correct items, and one participant reached advanced proficiency as her score of 43 was in the range of 40-50 correct items.

3.2.2 HL learner participants

To be categorized as an HL learner, an individual had to report their native language(s) as either ‘Only Spanish’ or ‘Both Spanish and English’. Also, it was necessary that the language(s) spoken with at least one parent be either ‘Only Spanish’ or ‘Both Spanish and English’. Within the present study, all HL learners indicated that they spoke Spanish, whether entirely or in part, with both parents. At the start of the study, 12 individuals met these criteria, but due to the fact that two individuals reported previous experience with Talk Abroad and as a result of attrition throughout the 16-week data collection period, this number reduced to seven total participants, two males and five females with an age range of 19-21 years ($M=20.3$). Of these seven participants, three had parents who were both from Mexico, one had one parent from Mexico and the other from Ecuador, one had one parent from Ecuador and the other from the U.S., one had parents who were both from Honduras, one had parents who were both from the U.S. Regarding
the HL learners’ experience in Spanish-speaking countries, the participants ranged from no experience to 15 years of immersion. With respect to their Spanish proficiency, the participants self-rated their abilities in speaking \((M= 4.00)\), writing \((M= 3.71)\), reading \((M= 4.14)\), and listening \((M= 4.57)\) with “1” referring to “beginner” and “5” to “like a native speaker”. The fact that HL learners deemed their writing to be their weakest ability in Spanish echoes the conclusions of Bowles (2011b) who describes the facets of HL learner linguistic competencies. Also, on the 50-item DELE proficiency test, six out of seven HL learners reached intermediate proficiency as their scores fell within the range of 20-39 correct items and one HL learner reached advanced proficiency as her score fell within the range of 40-50 correct items. The individual outcomes for the DELE test and self-rated Spanish abilities are provided in Table 6.

**Table 6**

**HL learners DELE scores and self-rated skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym of HL participant</th>
<th>DELE score out of 50</th>
<th>Self-rated speaking score out of 5</th>
<th>Self-rated writing score out of 5</th>
<th>Self-rated reading score out of 5</th>
<th>Self-rated listening score out of 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonia</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estefanía</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begonia</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.3 Talk Abroad NS characteristics

All of the participants \((n= 39)\) carried out four conversations on *Talk Abroad* constituting 156 total conversations conducted by 65 different trained NS interlocutors. Regarding the nationalities of the NSs, 14 different countries were represented as displayed in Table 7.
Table 7

Number of Talk Abroad interlocutors and number of conversations conducted by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of different interlocutors</th>
<th>Number of conversations in present study</th>
<th>Percentage of total conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned previously, in terms of training, the NSs on the Talk Abroad platform are given strategies to engage language students in conversation with the use of open-ended and follow-up questions and are informed not to correct the students unless explicit information on language form or use is requested. Additional information on the NSs including their name initials, nationalities, and the pseudonyms of the participants that they conversed with is given in Appendix I.

3.3 Research design and data collection procedure

At the start of the study, during week three of the 16-week semester, the researcher visited each of the course sections for a 50-minute lesson period. During this visit, the participants were informed of the study (Appendix A), were invited to sign the IRB consent form (Appendix B), and were asked to complete the language background questionnaire (Appendix C), the initial L2C questionnaire (Appendix D), and the written 50-item DELE proficiency test
The language background questionnaire, which was designed by Bowles (2011a), served to distinguish between L2 learners and HL learners of Spanish and also match the participants (L2-L2 and HL-HL peers) for the online Zoom conversations. No L2-HL dyads were studied in the present research, only matched-background dyads. For each peer conversation, the students were emailed by the researcher who informed them of (a) the name and email address of their peer, (b) the date and time of the Zoom conversation, and (c) the instructions for the conversation (Appendix E). The order for the eight conversations is provided in Table 8, which does not include a counterbalanced methodology due to the logistical constraints of collecting data across a multi-section course throughout an academic semester. Although strict counterbalancing was not possible, this study ensured that half of the conversations on each topic began with peers and the other half began with NS, which was done so that each new topic would be broached without interlocutor bias.

**Table 8**

*Order and topics of conversations throughout the academic semester*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Interlocutors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Study abroad; travel</td>
<td>Peers (Zoom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>Study abroad; travel</td>
<td>NS-learner (<em>Talk Abroad</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>Cultural events</td>
<td>NS-learner (<em>Talk Abroad</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cultural events</td>
<td>Peers (Zoom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The world and news</td>
<td>Peers (Zoom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>The world and news</td>
<td>NS-learner (<em>Talk Abroad</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>Physical and mental health</td>
<td>NS-learner (<em>Talk Abroad</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Physical and mental health</td>
<td>Peers (Zoom)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructions were the same for all of the conversations, requiring that the duration be 30 minutes and completed entirely in Spanish. The first five minutes of all conversations were dedicated to general conversation so that the interlocutors would become familiar with one
another. The remaining 25 minutes of the interaction consisted of an open conversation on the topics given in Table 8, that is, the first two conversations surrounded study abroad and travel; the next set of two covered cultural events; the next set related to the world and news; and the final set covered physical and mental health. The conversation instructions (Appendices E and F) also included six guiding questions based on these themes. These topics reflected the themes of each unit of the course and were confirmed to be within the intermediate proficiency level range based on ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines (2012). For the Talk Abroad conversations (Appendix F), the students spoke to four different interlocutors of their choosing. After each of the eight total conversations, the participants completed a post-conversation questionnaire (Appendix H) administered using the Google Forms online platform. With the exception of the proficiency test and language background questionnaire, all other tasks associated with this research, including the eight conversations and the nine questionnaires (one initial and eight post-conversation), were standard components of the course, affording ecological validity to this study.

3.4 Materials

The data for this study came from the participants’ responses to the initial second language confidence questionnaire containing 29 5-point Likert-scale questions and the post-conversation questionnaires that included the same 29 Likert-scale questions from the initial L2C questionnaire, 15 additional Likert-scale questions, and between five and six open-ended free response questions (Appendix H). More specifically, the first post-conversation questionnaire, no matter the interlocutor type, contained five questions, however, for every subsequent questionnaire, the following additional item was included: ‘Compare this conversation to the other videoconferencing conversation(s) you have completed in SPAN 208’.

The questionnaires were designed following the guidelines in Dörnyei (2003) and the
content for the items was adapted from Park and Lee (2006), who studied anxiety and self-confidence in learners of English as a Second Language, and Espinosa (2007), whose questionnaire was reduced for brevity as it studied a number of motivational and attitudinal variables in learners of Spanish. All post-conversation questionnaires were completed online using the Google Forms platform and were completed immediately after each of the eight computer-mediated conversations.
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

4.1 Data analysis

The conversation recordings were spot-checked to verify that the participants followed the instructions and carried out the interaction in Spanish. Specifically, the researcher opened each recording and checked in several places without watching each conversation in its entirety. Also, this process allowed the researcher to confirm that the conversations did not differ sizably in depth and breadth of content. The data from the initial L2C questionnaire and the post-conversation questionnaires were entered into Excel, the results for the negatively worded questions were numerically inverted, and then SPSS 27 was used for statistical analyses.

To answer the first research question, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to compare the consistency of the pilot study’s factor loadings based on the data from the 29-item initial L2C questionnaire with the corresponding data from the present study. The results of this confirmatory factor analysis showed that the data set for the present study did not adequately fit the 2-factor model identified in the pilot study. These findings could possibly be explained by the onset of the COVID-19 global pandemic (which occurred after the pilot study was conducted, but was an ongoing event during the data collection period for the present study) that prompted social confinement due to extended periods of quarantining, which may have impacted how individuals perceive socialization behaviors and their role as communicators. Relatedly, it is important to underline that, for the students who participated in the pilot study, videoconferencing was a novel tool that was not yet fully incorporated into curricula of higher education, whereas for the students in the present study, due to the measures taken to accommodate social distancing and quarantining, videoconferencing on platforms such as Zoom had already been an everyday experience for these participants for almost an entire calendar
year, precisely, between nine and ten months.

In order to compare the data collected in initial L2C questionnaire the pilot study and present research, 29 two-tailed dependent t-tests were performed to measure if a statistically significant difference would be revealed for each of the 29 items. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 9.

Table 9

*Results of comparison of initial L2C questionnaire items for present study and pilot study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pilot Study Mean</th>
<th>Pilot Study SD</th>
<th>Present Study Mean</th>
<th>Present Study SD</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I can learn to speak Spanish better.</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I am a good Spanish speaker now.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I am a good student.</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I am an important member of my class.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I don’t feel shy speaking Spanish to my classmates.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I don’t feel shy speaking Spanish to my professor.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I don’t feel shy speaking Spanish to other speakers outside of class</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I think that I will speak Spanish very well someday.</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 I think that I will get an A or an A+ in this class.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 I don’t feel scared when my professor talks to me in Spanish.</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 I don’t feel scared when my classmates talk to me in Spanish.</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 I don’t feel scared when other speakers talk to me in Spanish outside of class.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 I don’t feel scared when I speak in Spanish to my professor.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>Mean 3</th>
<th>Mean 4</th>
<th>Mean 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I don’t feel scared when I speak in Spanish to my classmates.</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I don’t feel scared when I speak in Spanish to others outside of class.</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I don’t worry about whether I speak better in Spanish than my classmates.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I don’t worry about whether my classmates speak better in Spanish than me.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I don’t worry about whether my classmates will get a higher grade than me.</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I don’t worry that I will make a mistake when speaking in Spanish.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I don’t worry that people will laugh at me if I speak in Spanish.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I don’t feel more scared in Spanish class than in other classes.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I don’t worry about whether my professor will correct my Spanish mistakes.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I don’t worry about whether my classmates will correct my Spanish mistakes.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I am confident when having conversations in Spanish with native speakers of Spanish.</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Even when I make mistakes speaking in Spanish, I feel like I can still communicate.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I am confident when having conversations in Spanish with my classmates.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I feel confident using Spanish, even though I may not speak Spanish well.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>When Spanish is spoken to me, I feel that I can understand most of it.</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As is shown in Table 9, 11 items reached statistically different values between the initial L2C questionnaire in the pilot study with those of the present study. Taking a closer look at the patterns of the findings, among the items that are related to the students’ general perspectives of communicating in Spanish and being an effective learner (i.e., items 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 19, 20, 21, 25, 27, 28, and 29), two out of 13 items showed statistical significance. In terms of students’ perceptions of their interactions with the professor (i.e., items 6, 10, 13, and 22), two out of four items reached significance. Regarding communication with native speakers or speakers from outside the classroom (i.e., items 7, 12, 15, 24), two out of four items reached statistical significance. Finally, perceptions involving classmates constituted nine items (i.e., items 4, 5, 11, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26) with five reaching statistical significance. The results of these identified patterns demonstrate that the participants’ confidence levels when perceiving general facets of language learning were primarily maintained, but that, when conceptualizing interactions in the classroom, whether with a professor or a peer, their confidence levels declined significantly. A possible explanation for this is that, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, for nine to ten months prior to data collection, university courses were conducted entirely online without an in-person classroom environment in which to boost interpersonal rapport, and the impact of this change in mode could be demonstrated in the data of the questionnaire items.

Therefore, in order to assess the responses from the 29-item initial L2C questionnaire for the present study, a new factor analysis was conducted. The minimum eigenvalue for an
The underlying factor was set at 1. Bartlett’s test of sphericity ($\chi^2 = 935.628$, KMO = .533, $p < .001$) denoted sufficient correlations within the questionnaire for extraction. Two factors were isolated based on a visual inspection of the scree plot, confirming that a two-factor model was most appropriate. These two factors constitute 50.55% of the variance in the data. The model was rotated using Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization and only covariances above .50 were grouped onto the factor. The results including factor loadings are displayed in Table 10.

Table 10

*Initial L2C questionnaire factor loadings: Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability and Self-Assurance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Initial L2C Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability</th>
<th>Self-Assur.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I don’t feel shy speaking Spanish to my classmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I don’t feel shy speaking Spanish to my professor.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I don’t feel shy speaking Spanish to other speakers outside of class.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I don’t feel scared when my professor talks to me in Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I don’t feel scared when my classmates talk to me in Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I feel scared when other speakers talk to me in Spanish outside of class.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I don’t feel scared when I speak in Spanish to my professor.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I don’t feel scared when I speak in Spanish to my classmates.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I don’t feel scared when I speak in Spanish to others outside of class.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I don’t worry about whether my classmates speak better in Spanish than me.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I don’t worry that I will make a mistake when speaking in Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I don’t worry that people will laugh at me if I speak in Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I don’t feel more scared in Spanish class than in other classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I don’t worry about whether my professor will correct my Spanish mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I am confident when having conversations in Spanish with native speakers of Spanish.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I feel confident using Spanish, even though I may not speak Spanish well.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I feel comfortable practicing my Spanish almost any time and place.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The two underlying factors identified in this analysis are parallel to what Clément (1980) asserts are the two constituting components of L2C: high self-ratings of target-language proficiency paired with a lack of anxiety when communicating. For the purposes of this study, the construct ‘high self-ratings of proficiency’ has been given the label of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability and a ‘lack of anxiety’ has been labeled Self-Assurance. The definitions of these terms as they pertain to the present study are elaborated as follows: Factor one corresponded to a set of six questions and was labeled Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability as the items represented the participants’ perceived capacity to comprehend and communicate meaning in the target language, specifically, the items primarily entailed communicative outcomes related to the classroom environment and interactions with the professor. Another set, entailing 11 items from the initial L2C questionnaire, loaded on to factor two which was labeled Self-Assurance. These items pertained to the participants’ relationship to their own and others’ affective reactions and entailed social outcomes, especially between themselves and peers or NS interlocutors from outside of the classroom, when communicating in Spanish.

The items for each factor were then summed and t-tests were used to examine whether differences were found between the 29-items from the initial L2C questionnaire and the same items in each of the eight post-conversation questionnaires.

4.2 Research question 1a: Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability development by interlocutor type

4.2.1 L2 learners

To measure the impact of interlocutor type on the development of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability in L2 learners, a two-tailed dependent t-test was conducted to compare the means of the summed items (i.e., responses to questions 6, 10, 11, 13, 21, 22) from the four Zoom post-conversation questionnaires with those from the four Talk Abroad post-conversation
questionnaires. The findings revealed no statistically significant difference between the ratings for the conversations with peer interlocutors \((M=4.01, SD=1.14)\) and those for the interactions with NSs \((M=4.06, SD=1.21)\), \(t(767) = -0.97, p = .332, d = -0.04\). These results suggest that interlocutor type does not appear to affect the ratings associated with the development of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability in L2 learners.

4.2.2 HL learners

Given that the HL learner group is comprised of seven participants, the results for this learner type will be provided using descriptive, not inferential, statistics. To determine whether interlocutor type played a role in the development of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability in the HL learner group, the mean rating across participants was calculated for each of the eight post-conversation questionnaires. As compared to the initial mean rating of 4.67 out of 5.00, the mean rating for peer interactions was 4.67 out of 5.00 whereas the mean rating for the four *Talk Abroad* conversations was 4.47 out of 5.00, as displayed in Table 11 and Figure 1.

**Table 11**

Results for Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability: Means for HL learners by interlocutor type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Zoom 1</th>
<th>Zoom 2</th>
<th>Zoom 3</th>
<th>Zoom 4</th>
<th>Zoom total</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. 1</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. 2</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. 3</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. 4</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite the mean rating for the peer conversations being identical to the initial mean rating (i.e., 4.67 and 4.67), an analysis of results for each peer conversation may imply that conversing with peer interlocutors could, quite possibly, facilitate the development of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability. More specifically, although the rating decreased to 4.33 out of 5.00 after the first peer conversation, the second, third, and fourth peer conversations’ ratings increased to 4.64, 4.78, and 4.91, respectively, with the fourth and final mean rating considerably higher than the initial mean rating. In contrast, the mean ratings for the Talk Abroad conversations slightly declined after the first interaction to 4.57 out of 5.00, and from there decreased further and fluctuated, but never again met, or even surpassed, the initial mean rating for Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability. These outcomes may suggest that, over time, peer interlocutors may foster the emergence of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability in HL learners, whereas NS interlocutors do not seem to play a role in the development of this dimension.
4.3 Research question 1b: Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability development over time

4.3.1 L2 learners

In order to measure changes in Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability over time and by interlocutor type, the data for the items that loaded onto the Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability factor were summed for all questionnaire data. A one-way repeated-measures ANOVA with Bonferroni correction was performed to statistically compare the mean scores of the items that loaded onto Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability in the initial L2C questionnaire with those for each of the eight post-conversation questionnaires. The values given by the Wilks’ Lambda multivariate test determined that mean ratings for Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability differed statistically significantly over time \( \Lambda = .751, F(8, 184) = 7.606, p = < .001 \). The results for the pairwise analyses are shown in Table 12 and Figure 2.

Table 12

Results of initial vs. post-conversation data for L2 learners: Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire (chronological)</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 1</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 1</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 2</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>&lt; .001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 2</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 3</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 3</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.043*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 4</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>&lt; .001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 4</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>&lt; .001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*= p < .05.
As displayed in Table 12, with the exception of the first and third peer videoconferences, all other interactions resulted in a statistically significant difference in ratings of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability as compared to those of the initial L2C questionnaire. Longitudinally, the ratings of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability steadily increased, with the initial questionnaire rating of 3.66 out of 5.00, the intermediate conversations gradually rating higher than the initial score, and the fourth and final peer and Talk Abroad conversations each reaching 4.23 out of 5.00, which is the highest rating provided by the L2 learners on this factor. These results indicate that, from the very start of the intervention, the participants may have perceived the first peer videoconference as an extension of their normal routine given that during the data collection period, which coincided with the COVID-19 pandemic and its related preventative measures, the vast majority of the students’ academic experiences were conducted entirely online. However, the first conversation conducted on Talk Abroad may have reframed their outlook on the purpose of the 30-minute videoconferences, that is, from this point forward, the videoconferences were seen as fertile domains in which to practice and learn Spanish forms and content by means of a
longer, in-depth conversation that is truly distinct from the class routine. As a result, their ratings of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability continued to progress further with each conversation and interlocutor type did not play a definitive role in these observed increases.

These findings are also bolstered by the responses given by the participants on the open-ended items in the post-conversation questionnaires, specifically, items 1 and 2: “Do you think the conversation was useful? Explain.” and “Do you think that this conversation helped boost your confidence in Spanish? Why?”. The most mentioned themes related to Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability within the responses to these two free-response questions are provided in Table 13; it is important to note that a student’s response may have contained more than one theme and, as such, the percentages provided below may not add to 100% in certain cases.

Table 13

Results of L2 learner qualitative data over time: Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire (chronological)</th>
<th>Themes by number of L2 participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 1</td>
<td>I can understand and be understood - 21 out of 32 (65.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can hold a 30-minute conversation – 18 out of 32 (56.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My language abilities fall short – 6 out of 32 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similar proficiency level – 3 out of 32 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 1</td>
<td>Native speaker linguistic reference – 22 out of 32 (68.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can understand and be understood – 20 out of 32 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can hold a 30-minute conversation – 9 out of 32 (28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My language abilities fall short – 4 out of 32 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 2</td>
<td>I can understand and be understood – 24 out of 32 (75.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native speaker linguistic reference – 12 out of 32 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can hold a 30-minute conversation – 5 out of 32 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My language abilities fall short – 3 out of 32 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 2</td>
<td>I can understand and be understood - 20 out of 32 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can hold a 30-minute conversation – 11 out of 32 (34.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My language abilities fall short – 5 out of 32 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similar proficiency level – 2 out of 32 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 3</td>
<td>I can understand and be understood – 22 out of 32 (68.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can hold a 30-minute conversation – 8 out of 32 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My language abilities fall short – 5 out of 32 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-Talk Abroad 3</th>
<th>I can understand and be understood – 20 out of 32 (62.5%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native speaker linguistic reference – 8 out of 32 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My language abilities fall short – 8 out of 32 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can hold a 30-minute conversation – 5 out of 32 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 4</td>
<td>I can understand and be understood – 23 out of 32 (71.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native speaker linguistic reference – 9 out of 32 (28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My language abilities fall short – 4 out of 32 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can hold a 30-minute conversation – 2 out of 32 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 4</td>
<td>I can understand and be understood - 20 out of 32 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can hold a 30-minute conversation – 6 out of 32 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My language abilities fall short – 5 out of 32 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similar proficiency level – 3 out of 32 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the qualitative analysis for the development of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability in L2 learners revealed that the participants’ principal focus was on understanding and being understood by their partner, which was the most frequent theme in every post-conversation questionnaire. Also, the unexpected and surprising accomplishment of holding a 30-minute conversation was referenced by 18 of the 32 (56.3%) L2 participants after the first peer interaction, but this reduced in importance as the semester proceeded, with only two (6.3%) mentions to this idea after the fourth and final Talk Abroad conversation and six references (18.8%) after the fourth and final peer conversation. In a similar vein, the novelty of a NS interlocutor also diminished over time with 22, 12, 8, and 9 references after the first, second, third, and fourth Talk Abroad conversations, respectively. For these reasons, the results suggest that over time the importance of conversation duration and interlocutor type seem to gradually reduce, but what remains at the forefront is the successful transmission and reception of ideas, that is, effective communication. These findings are illustrated in Excerpt 1, which is a comment provided by an L2 learner “Bradley” after carrying out in his second peer conversation on Zoom.
Excerpt 1

I do think this conversation was useful because while speaking with those who have a level of Spanish much higher than you allows you to learn more, I think talking with those at your level of Spanish is important too. In these types of conversations, you can be more confident and free in your use of your Spanish knowledge, and you do not have to be worried as much about making mistakes. You don't have anyone to impress because you are at a similar level, and you're both just trying to get better.

4.3.2 HL learners

To measure the long-term changes in Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability within the HL learner group, the data related to this factor was summed and the mean was calculated for each individual within the nine questionnaires, that is, the initial L2C and the eight post-conversation questionnaires. Given the small sample size of this group of learners, no inferential statistics were run on the data, however, the descriptive statistics are provided in Table 14, Figure 3, and Figure 4.

Table 14

Results for Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability: Chronological individual means for HL learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym of HL participant</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Zoom 1</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 1</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 2</th>
<th>Zoom 2</th>
<th>Zoom 3</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 3</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 4</th>
<th>Zoom 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonia</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estefanía</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begonia</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M)</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It should be noted here that the HL learner named Antonia completed four conversations on *Talk Abroad*, but only carried out three peer conversations due to a health issue preventing her from participating in the third peer conversation. For this reason, no data is presented in Table 14 nor in Figure 4 for her third peer conversation. Returning back to the findings, the results given in Table 14 and Figure 3 show that the HL learners’ Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability over time.
Ability decreased after the first videoconference compared to the baseline rating of 4.67 out of 5.00 and only the fifth and eighth videoconference ratings, that is, the third and fourth peer interactions, surpassed the initial ratings reaching 4.78 and 4.90 out of 5.00, respectively. These findings suggest, firstly, that the development of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability may not be immediate and, also, that this facet of L2C may only be facilitated by means of peer interaction over time. These outcomes for Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability were also represented in the HL learners’ responses for open-ended questions 1 and 2, a summary of which is given in Table 15.

**Table 15**

*Results of HL learner qualitative data over time: Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire (chronological)</th>
<th>Themes by number of HL participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Post-Zoom 1                   | I can understand and be understood – 4 out of 7 (57.1%)  
                                 | It helped to talk with someone at same level – 2 out of 7 (28.6%)  
                                 | My language abilities fall short – 2 out of 7 (28.6%)  
                                 | I can hold a 30-minute conversation – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)  |
| Post-Talk Abroad 1            | Native speaker linguistic reference – 5 out of 7 (71.4%)  
                                 | I can understand and be understood – 4 out of 7 (57.1%)  
                                 | My language abilities fall short – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)  |
| Post-Talk Abroad 2            | I can understand and be understood – 5 out of 7 (71.4%)  
                                 | My language abilities fall short – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)  
                                 | My language abilities fall short – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)  |
| Post-Zoom 2                   | I can understand and be understood – 2 out of 7 (28.6%)  
                                 | It helped to talk with someone at same level – 2 out of 7 (28.6%)  
                                 | Source of feedback - 1 out of 7 (14.3%)  
                                 | I speak better than my partner – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)  |
| Post-Zoom 3                   | I can understand and be understood – 3 out of 7 (42.9%)  
                                 | Partner was source of vocabulary - 3 out of 7 (42.9%)  
                                 | I can hold a 30-minute conversation – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)  |
| Post-Talk Abroad 3            | I can understand and be understood – 3 out of 7 (42.9%)  
                                 | Native speaker linguistic reference – 2 out of 7 (28.6%)  |
| Post-Talk Abroad 4            | I can understand and be understood – 4 out of 7 (57.1%)  
                                 | Native speaker linguistic reference – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)  
                                 | I can hold a 30-minute conversation – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)  
                                 | My language abilities fall short – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)  |
| Post-Zoom 4                   | I can understand and be understood – 4 out of 7 (57.1%)  
                                 | Partner was source of vocabulary - 2 out of 7 (28.6%)  |
The themes displayed in Table 15 repeat rather consistently for every conversation held, however, what varies is the presence, or lack thereof, of the perception that “My language abilities fall short”, which appears as a response in all questionnaires except for third and fourth peer conversations and the third Talk Abroad conversation. Nevertheless, it is important to highlight that the HL learners most frequently commented on their communicative success represented by the theme “I can understand and be understood” in all post-conversation questionnaires, which is illustrated in Excerpt 2 in a comment by “Virginia” written after her second Talk Abroad conversation.

**Excerpt 2**

I was happy talking and using new tenses and I really tried expanding my vocabulary and I had her help me when I couldn't think of the word I wanted to say. I rarely speak Spanish outside of with my parents (about 10 mins x 5 times a week) so it's nice trying to keep the conversation going for 30 mins completely in Spanish. it feels good. [sic]

4.4 Research question 1c: Self-Assurance development by interlocutor type

4.4.1 L2 learners

To determine the impact of interlocutor on the emergence of Self-Assurance in L2 learners, the means of the summed items (i.e., responses to questions 5, 7, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 24, 27, 29) from the four Zoom post-conversation questionnaires and those from the four Talk Abroad post-conversation questionnaires were statistically compared using a two-tailed dependent t-test. No statistically significant difference was found between the ratings of Self-Assurance for the conversations with peer interlocutors ($M= 3.53, SD= 1.25$) and those with NSs ($M= 3.60, SD= 1.25$), $t(1407) = -1.42$, $p = .155$, $d = -0.04$. Based on these findings, it appears that the development of Self-Assurance is not impacted by interlocutor type.
4.4.2 HL learners

To measure whether interlocutor type affected the HL learners’ Self-Assurance, the mean rating was calculated for the eight post-conversation questionnaires for all participants. When compared to the initial mean rating of 4.35 out of 5.00, the overall mean rating for the peer videoconferencing was 4.53 out of 5.00 and the overall mean rating for the Talk Abroad interactions was 4.38 out of 5.00, as displayed in Table 16 and Figure 5.

Table 16

Results for Self-Assurance: Means for HL learners by interlocutor type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Zoom 1</th>
<th>Zoom 2</th>
<th>Zoom 3</th>
<th>Zoom 4</th>
<th>Zoom total</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. 1</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. 2</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. 3</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. 4</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5

As shown in Table 16, the overall mean rating for peer interactions on Zoom surpassed the initial rating, and, it is also worth highlighting that, after a decline after the first peer conversation, the mean ratings for each subsequent peer interaction increased to 4.65, 4.58, and
4.75 for the second, third, and fourth conversations. As for the Talk Abroad conversations, the first interaction produced a slight decline in mean rating, however, the subsequent ratings for the NS interlocutors only raised slightly beyond the initial mean rating at 4.38, 4.44, and 4.40 for the second, third, and fourth conversations. Therefore, these results imply that peer videoconferences may foster the emergence of Self-Assurance in HL learners more effectively than those with NSs on Talk Abroad.

4.5 Research question 1d: Self-Assurance development over time

4.5.1 L2 learners

To track changes over time and by interlocutor type for Self-Assurance, defined as the participants’ affective reactions and perceptions of social outcomes when communicating in Spanish, the data from the items that loaded onto this factor was summed from the initial L2C questionnaire and from the eight post-conversation questionnaires. In order to statistically compare the mean scores of the items that loaded onto Self-Assurance in the initial L2C questionnaire with those for each of the eight post-conversation questionnaires, a one-way repeated-measures ANOVA with Bonferroni correction was conducted. The results of the Wilks’ Lambda multivariate test revealed that the mean ratings for Self-Assurance differed statistically significantly over time Λ = .581, F (8, 344) = 31.016, p = < .001. The results for these analyses are shown in Table 17 and Figure 6.

Table 17

Results of initial vs. post-conversation data for L2 learners: Self-Assurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire (chronological)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 1</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 1</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>&lt; .001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 2</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>&lt; .001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 2</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>&lt; .001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 3</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>&lt; .001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 3</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>&lt; .001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 4</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>&lt; .001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 4</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>&lt; .001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = p < .05.

Figure 6

As presented in Table 12, with the exception of the first peer interaction, the difference in mean rating for Self-Assurance reached statistical significance for all videoconferences when compared to the initial L2C questionnaire. Longitudinally, all ratings steadily increased from the initial score of 2.91 out of 5.00 to the final score for the fourth peer conversation of 3.89 out of 5.00. All intermediary ratings between the start and end points of the data collection period gradually rose, with only the third peer conversation showing a very slight decline relative to its two adjacent scores. For this reason, it seems that merely carrying out videoconference over time, no matter the interlocutor with whom the learner converses, may be an impetus for gradual increases in Self-Assurance in L2 learners. These findings were also observed in the L2 learners’
qualitative data, specifically the responses to the open-ended questions 1 and 2 of the free-response questions, which is organized by the frequency of identified themes related to Self-Assurance in Table 18.

Table 18

Results of L2 learner qualitative data over time: Self-Assurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire (chronological)</th>
<th>Themes by number of L2 participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 1</td>
<td>Conversation was comfortable, low-stress – 9 out of 32 (28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I struggled, felt frustrated – 5 out of 32 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was nervous about grade or professor listening – 2 out of 32 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was not judged for Spanish abilities – 1 out of 32 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 1</td>
<td>Conversation was comfortable, low-stress – 6 out of 32 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I struggled, felt frustrated – 3 out of 32 (9.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I felt intimidated – 2 out of 32 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 2</td>
<td>Conversation was comfortable, low-stress – 5 out of 32 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I struggled, felt frustrated – 5 out of 32 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 2</td>
<td>Conversation was comfortable, low-stress – 6 out of 32 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I struggled, felt frustrated – 4 out of 32 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was not judged for Spanish abilities – 1 out of 32 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 3</td>
<td>Conversation was comfortable, low-stress – 6 out of 32 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I struggled, felt frustrated – 4 out of 32 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 3</td>
<td>Conversation was comfortable, low-stress – 6 out of 32 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I struggled, felt frustrated – 4 out of 32 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 4</td>
<td>Conversation was comfortable, low-stress – 4 out of 32 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I struggled, felt frustrated – 1 out of 32 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 4</td>
<td>Conversation was comfortable, low-stress – 7 out of 32 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I struggled, felt frustrated – 4 out of 32 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is shown in Table 18, across all conversations the most frequently mentioned facet of Self-Assurance was the low-stress, comfortable nature of the interaction and the second most common perception was the feeling of frustration. It is important to note that the majority of responses did not include information related to emotional dispositions or social denotations, but rather focused on the content learned during the conversation and the success, or lack thereof, of the communicative performance. Nonetheless, to illustrate the way in which affective reactions
were reported and the information that they conveyed, Excerpt 3 provides a comment written by “Bridget” after her first Talk Abroad conversation.

**Excerpt 3**

Definitely had a confidence boost during the conversation. I was really nervous going into the conversation since I have never talked to a native for this long before. However, we kept the conversation going the entire time and I felt super comfortable speaking in front of her.

**4.5.2 HL learners**

To measure the changes in Self-Assurance over time in the seven HL learners, the data loaded onto this factor was summed and the mean was calculated for each individual for each of the nine questionnaires, i.e., the initial L2C and the eight post-conversation questionnaires. Due to the small sample size of this participant group, no inferential statistics were conducted on the data, however, the descriptive statistics are shown in Table 19, Figure 7, and Figure 8.

**Table 19**

*Descriptive results for Self-Assurance: Chronological individual means for HL learners*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym of HL participant</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Zoom 1</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 1</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 2</th>
<th>Zoom 1</th>
<th>Zoom 2</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 3</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 4</th>
<th>Zoom 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonia</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estefanía</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begonia</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of Table 19 and Figure 7 show that the HL learners’ development of Self-Assurance gradually increases over time, with the mean ratings for the peer conversations surpassing the initial mean rating of 4.35 out of 5.00 more pointedly than those for the Talk Abroad conversations. Concretely, although a slight decline is observed after the first peer
interaction, the Self-Assurance ratings steadily increase with each conversation until marginal decreases are seen for the third and fourth *Talk Abroad* conversations. Then, for the final conversation, that is, the fourth peer interaction, the highest mean rating across all conversations was reached at 4.75 out of 5.00. These findings were also observed in the HL learners’ qualitative data, displayed in Table 20 by frequency of themes, which comes from the responses to questions 1 and 2 in the post-conversation questionnaires.

**Table 20**

*Results of HL learner qualitative data over time: Self-Assurance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire (chronological)</th>
<th>Themes by number of HL participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 1</td>
<td>I struggled, felt frustrated – 2 out of 7 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was not judged for accent in Spanish – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conversation was comfortable, low-stress – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 1</td>
<td>Conversation was comfortable, low-stress – 3 out of 7 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I was not judged for Spanish level – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 2</td>
<td>Conversation was comfortable, low-stress – 2 out of 7 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I struggled, felt frustrated – 2 out of 7 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 2</td>
<td>Conversation was comfortable, low-stress – 4 out of 7 (57.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 3</td>
<td>I was not judged for accent in Spanish – 1 out of 6 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conversation was comfortable, low-stress – 1 out of 6 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I struggled, felt frustrated – 1 out of 6 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 3</td>
<td>Conversation was comfortable, low-stress – 2 out of 7 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I struggled, felt frustrated – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 4</td>
<td>Conversation was comfortable, low-stress – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I felt intimidated – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 4</td>
<td>Conversation was comfortable, low-stress – 2 out of 7 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firstly, it is important to underscore the fact that the HL participants’ comments primarily involved evaluations of their communicative performance and they also touched on the content learned in the conversation, without specifying sentimental or social perceptions. Nevertheless, the most frequently mentioned emotional facet conveyed after the first peer conversation was frustration, but for all subsequent conversations the comfortable, low-stress nature of the
interactions was what was most commonly reported, which coincides with the outcomes of the quantitative data. These results are exemplified in the comment by “Fernando” after the second Talk Abroad conversation as shown in Excerpt 4.

Excerpt 4

I did not fear making mistakes as much, as my partner had a very calm and nice aura. It was welcoming, while not being overbearing, so I felt like my Spanish was truly worked on this conversation.

4.6 Research Question 2a: Richness of videoconference by interlocutor type

To answer the second research question, a factorial analysis was conducted on the 15 Likert-scale questions presented directly after the 29-item L2C section in the eight post-conversation questionnaires. These 15 items were used to inquire on the participants’ perceptions of richness and self-involvement for each interaction. To begin the analysis, the data from the eight post-conversation questionnaires was aggregated in a single data set. Then the factor analysis was conducted with the minimum eigenvalue for an underlying factor set at 1. Within the data set, sufficient correlations for extraction were denoted using Bartlett’s test of sphericity ($\chi^2 = 1535.611$, KMO = .867, $p < .001$). Three factors were isolated based on a visual inspection of the scree plot, confirming that a three-factor model was most appropriate. These three factors constitute 58.11% of the variance in the data. The extraction method was Principal Components and the model was rotated using Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. Only covariances above .50 were grouped onto the factor. The results including factor loadings are displayed in Table 21.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Post-Conversation Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Self-Involvement</th>
<th>Richness</th>
<th>Cultural Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My partner gave me feedback on my Spanish forms or language use during this conversation.</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My partner used Spanish forms and structures that were varied and abundant.</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>When I did not understand my partner, I asked for clarification.</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I learned new cultural aspects during this conversation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I learned new Spanish language forms during this conversation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I gained confidence in my Spanish skills during this conversation.</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I was able to practice the Spanish that I already knew in this conversation.</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I could express my ideas and thoughts effectively during this conversation.</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I could understand my partner without difficulty or effort during this conversation.</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>What we talked about during this conversation was interesting to me.</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I participated actively in the conversation.</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My motivation to learn Spanish has increased as a result of this conversation.</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I would like to have more conversations like this one in the future.</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I appreciate Hispanic cultures more after conversing with my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I found this conversation useful.</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first factor corresponded to a set of nine items and was labeled *self-involvement* as the items signified the participants’ engagement in the communicative event, including active participation and perceptions of usefulness. The second factor was labeled *richness* as the three items that loaded onto this factor corresponded to the participants’ comprehension of language, recognition of the availability of feedback, and acknowledgement of the interlocutors’ abundant
use of varied language forms. Finally, the third factor was labeled cultural depth as the three items that pertained to this factor connoted that new cultural and linguistic information was acquired and that Hispanic cultures were appreciated more as a result of the conversation.

Given that the second research question specified the two dimensions that build towards L2C in the functional model devised by Sampasivam and Clément (2014), namely richness and self-Involvement, the analyses of the subsequent results sections will only attend to these two dimensions and not the third factor labeled cultural depth, however, this additional facet will be addressed in the discussion section.

4.6.1 L2 learners

To determine whether the L2 learners perceived differences in richness by interlocutor type, the items that loaded onto the richness factor (i.e., questions 1, 2, 3) were summed for each of the eight post-conversation questionnaires and these data sets were divided into two final sets, one for each of the two conversation types. A two-tailed dependent t-test was conducted to statistically compare the mean ratings by interlocutor type. The findings revealed a statistically significant difference between the mean ratings for richness for peer interlocutors ($M = 3.95, SD = 1.18$) and that for NS interlocutors ($M = 4.25, SD = 1.02$), $t(383) = -4.05, p = < .001, d = -0.21$.

These results indicate that the L2 learners may perceive the conversations with NS interlocutors to be more abundant in language forms and offer more opportunities for feedback than those with peer interlocutors.

4.6.2 HL learners

To measure the difference in the perceived richness of the videoconferences carried out with both interlocutor types, the mean rating across participants was calculated for the items that loaded onto this factor for each of the eight post-conversation questionnaires. As displayed in
Table 22 and Figure 9, the mean rating for the *richness* of the peer conversations was 4.12 out of 5.00 whereas that for the NSs interactions was 4.74 out of 5.00.

**Table 22**

*Descriptive results of richness by interlocutor type: Means for HL learners*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zoom 1</th>
<th>Zoom 2</th>
<th>Zoom 3</th>
<th>Zoom 4</th>
<th>Zoom mean</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. 1</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. 2</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. 3</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. 4</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9**

The findings presented in Table 22 suggest that, overall, the HL learners perceived the conversations with NSs as higher in *richness*, that is, that they provided more opportunities for feedback and afforded more varied language forms than those with a peer. This pattern was also apparent across ratings given that the highest rated peer conversation, the fourth, reached a mean of 4.24 out of 5.00, which was still lower than the lowest rated *Talk Abroad* conversation, the second, which reached a mean of 4.29 out of 5.00.
4.7 Research question 2b: Richness of videoconference by interlocutor type over time

4.7.1 L2 learners

To measure *richness* over time, the data from the loaded items was summed in the eight post-conversation questionnaires and the means were calculated. The descriptive results for the mean ratings by conversation is given chronologically in Table 23 and Figure 8.

Table 23

Descriptive results for richness: Chronological means for L2 learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zoom 1</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 1</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 2</th>
<th>Zoom 2</th>
<th>Zoom 3</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 3</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 4</th>
<th>Zoom 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10

L2 learners: Mean ratings of *richness* over time

The results presented in Table 23 and Figure 10 show that, over time, perceived *richness* trends upward given that all subsequent ratings are higher than the initial conversation rating of 3.76 out of 5.00. Specifically, for the peer conversations, this trend rises and then slightly decreases for the final conversation, but for the Talk Abroad conversations, the ratings gradually
scale upwards without any intermediate declines, raising from the first conversation at 4.11 out of 5.00 to the fourth conversation reaching 4.36 out of 5.00. Therefore, these findings suggest that only the NS is perceived as an interlocutor with whom the dimension of richness consistently increases over time. This outcome is also observed in the qualitative data for free-response question three, which was designed to tease out the facets of richness that the participants’ noted in each videoconference: “Did you learn any new Spanish language forms in this conversation (e.g., new words, phrases, grammar aspect)? Please specify and explain.” The themes identified in the participant responses for this question are organized by frequency in Table 24.

**Table 24**

*Results of L2 learner qualitative data over time: Richness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire (chronological)</th>
<th>Themes by number of L2 participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 1</td>
<td>I did not learn any new linguistic features – 12 out of 32 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I learned a few new words – 12 out of 32 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I refreshed known linguistic forms – 6 out of 32 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I learned phrasing, verbal forms – 2 out of 32 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 1</td>
<td>I learned a few new words – 17 out of 32 (53.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I did not learn any new linguistic features – 9 out of 32 (28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I refreshed known linguistic forms – 5 out of 32 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I learned how to pronounce forms – 1 out of 32 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 2</td>
<td>I learned a few new words – 19 out of 32 (59.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I did not learn any new linguistic features – 9 out of 32 (28.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I refreshed known linguistic forms – 3 out of 32 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I learned phrasing, verbal forms – 1 out of 32 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 2</td>
<td>I did not learn any new linguistic features – 17 out of 32 (53.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I learned a few new words – 8 out of 32 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I refreshed known linguistic forms – 6 out of 32 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I learned phrasing, verbal forms – 1 out of 32 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 3</td>
<td>I did not learn any new linguistic features – 14 out of 32 (43.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I learned a few new words – 12 out of 32 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I refreshed known linguistic forms – 4 out of 32 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I learned phrasing, verbal forms – 2 out of 32 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most common trend observed in the qualitative data shown in Table 24 is that, for all peer conversations no new linguistic features were learned, whereas the opposite is true for all NS-learner conversations in that the most common theme for these interactions is the learning of new words. Over time what is seen is that starting with the first peer conversation 14 students (43.8%) indicated learning new language features, whether words or phrasings, for the second peer conversation this number reduced to 9 students (28.1%), for the third peer conversation it increased to 14 students (42.8%), and for the fourth peer conversation it declined slightly to 12 students (37.5%). As for the Talk Abroad conversations, for the first interaction learning new language features was reported by 18 students (56.3%), for the second this number increased to 20 students (62.5%), for the third this number sustained at 20 students (62.5%), and for the fourth it slightly declined to 18 students (56.3%). Beyond these vacillations, what remains consistent is the difference in richness when comparing interlocutor type, given that, after every conversation, the L2 participants reported that the NSs afforded more language forms and

Table 24 (cont.)

| Post-Talk Abroad 3 | I learned a few new words – 19 out of 32 (59.4%)  
|                    | I did not learn any new linguistic features – 9 out of 32 (28.1%)  
|                    | I refreshed known linguistic forms – 3 out of 32 (9.4%)  
|                    | I learned phrasing, verbal forms – 1 out of 32 (3.1%)  
| Post-Talk Abroad 4 | I learned a few new words – 15 out of 32 (46.9%)  
|                    | I did not learn any new linguistic features – 12 out of 32 (37.5%)  
|                    | I refreshed known linguistic forms – 2 out of 32 (6.3%)  
|                    | I learned phrasing, verbal forms – 1 out of 32 (3.1%)  
|                    | I learned how to pronounce forms – 1 out of 32 (3.1%)  
|                    | I learned a dialectal difference in word use – 1 out of 32 (3.1%)  
| Post-Zoom 4 (12)   | I did not learn any new linguistic features – 18 out of 32 (56.3%)  
|                    | I learned a few new words – 9 out of 32 (28.1%)  
|                    | I learned phrasing, verbal forms – 3 out of 32 (9.4%)  
|                    | I refreshed known linguistic forms – 2 out of 32 (6.3%)  

feedback than peer interlocutors. These findings are illustrated in the comment by “Stacey” in Excerpt 5 and “Joe” in Excerpt 6 after the fourth Talk Abroad conversation.

**Excerpt 5**

Yes. When I did not know a word or phrase, Maria helped me out. It was beneficial listening to her speak in Spanish because she used many different words and phrases.

**Excerpt 6**

I did. A couple words that I now know I need to practice are "tal vez" and "probar". I also learn a comparison sentence "....tan......como...." [sic]

### 4.7.2 HL learners

To determine whether the perceptions of richness in the seven HL learners varied over time, the data loaded onto this factor was summed and the mean was calculated for each individual for each of the eight post-conversation questionnaires, as shown in Table 25, Figure 11, and Figure 12.

**Table 25**

Descriptive results for Richness: Chronological individual means for HL learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym of HL participant</th>
<th>Zoom 1</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 1</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 2</th>
<th>Zoom 2</th>
<th>Zoom 3</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 3</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 4</th>
<th>Zoom 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonia</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estefania</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begonia</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As is shown in Table 25 and Figure 11, initially the peer conversations were provided a rating of *richness* at 4.14 out of 5.00, then the second conversation declined to 3.76 out of 5.00, then the third conversation increased to 4.33 out of 5.00, and the fourth conversation reduced
slightly to 4.24 out of 5.00. As for the NS-learner interactions, the mean ratings for richness started at 4.95 out of 5.00 for the first conversation, then the second declined substantially to 4.29 out of 5.00, then the third increased to 4.81 out of 5.00, and the fourth conversation reached 4.90 out of 5.00. In total, with the exception of the second peer and NS conversation, it appears that the richness afforded by each interlocutor types tended to remain steady, with the peer interlocutor ranging from 4.14 to 4.33 out of 5.00 and the NS interlocutor ranging from 4.81 to 4.95 out of 5.00. Therefore, these results suggest that the HL learners perceive the NSs as offering richer linguistic data and feedback than their peer interlocutors. These findings are echoed in the responses to open-ended question three from the post-conversation questionnaires, that is, “Did you learn any new Spanish language forms in this conversation (e.g., new words, phrases, grammar aspect)? Please specify and explain,” which are presented in Table 26 by theme and frequency.

Table 26

Results of HL learner qualitative data over time: Richness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire (chronological)</th>
<th>Themes by number of HL participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 1</td>
<td>I learned a few new words – 4 out of 7 (57.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I refreshed known linguistic forms – 2 out of 7 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t remember – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 1</td>
<td>I learned a few new words – 3 out of 7 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I learned phrasing, verbal forms – 2 out of 7 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I learned a dialectal difference in word use – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I did not learn any new linguistic features – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 2</td>
<td>I learned phrasing, verbal forms – 3 out of 7 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I learned a few new words – 3 out of 7 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I learned how to pronounce forms – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 2</td>
<td>I did not learn any new linguistic features – 5 out of 7 (71.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t remember – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I refreshed known linguistic forms – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 3</td>
<td>I did not learn any new linguistic features – 5 out of 6 (83.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I learned a few new words – 1 out of 6 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26 (cont.)

| Post-Talk Abroad 3 | I learned a few new words – 6 out of 7 (85.7%)  
I learned phrasing, verbal forms – 1 out of 7 (14.3%) |
| Post-Talk Abroad 4 | I learned a few new words – 5 out of 7 (71.4%)  
I did not learn any new linguistic features – 2 out of 7 (28.6%) |
| Post-Zoom 4 | I did not learn any new linguistic features – 7 out of 7 (100%) |

As Table 26 shows, over time the peer conversations declined substantially in *richness*. Specifically, four out of seven students (57.1%) reported having learned new linguistic information in the first conversation, but no participants indicated learning new forms in the second conversation. For the third peer conversation, one student (14.3%) indicated learning new phrasing or verbal forms and, for the fourth peer conversation, no linguistic *richness* was reflected in any student comment. As for the NS-HL learner conversations, for the first interaction, six out of seven students (85.7%) reported *richness*, with three learning new words, two learning new phrases or verbal forms, and one learning a dialectal difference in word use. For the second conversation on *Talk Abroad*, all learners (100%) reported learning new linguistic features, with three (42.9%) learning new phrasing or verbal forms, another three (42.9%) learning new words, and one (14.3%) learning how to pronounce forms. Regarding the third interaction, six students (85.7%) reported learning new words and one indicated learning new phrasing or verb forms. Finally, after the fourth conversation, five out of seven students (71.4%) indicated learning new words. Therefore, overall, the conversations on *Talk Abroad* conversations were perceived as high in *richness* and this idea was maintained over time according to the themes expressed in the HL learners’ free responses. In contrast, the peer conversations declined substantially over time in their perceived *richness*, which is a sentiment that is captured in the comment by “Fernando” after participating in his third peer interaction, displayed in Excerpt 7.
Excerpt 7

No, I did not learn anything new, but I was able to expand on things I knew a little about. I do not regularly talk or watch the news, so having more one-on-one exposure helped me out.

4.8 Research Question 2c: Self-involvement in videoconferencing by interlocutor type

4.8.1 L2 learners

To determine if interlocutor type affected the L2 learners’ perceptions of self-involvement, the items that loaded onto this factor (i.e., questions 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15) were summed for each of the eight post-conversation questionnaires and these data sets were divided into two final sets, one for peer and one for NS interlocutors. A two-tailed dependent t-test was conducted and the results showed no statistically significant difference between the self-involvement ratings for peer interlocutors ($M = 4.49, SD = 0.73$) and those for NS interlocutors ($M = 4.46, SD = 0.77$), $t(1151) = 1.128, p = .259, d = 0.033$. These findings suggest that interlocutor type does not seem to play a role in the learners’ perceived level of communicative engagement, interactivity, and personal relevance.

4.8.2 HL learners

To measure whether interlocutor type impacted the HL learners’ perceived self-involvement in the videoconferences, the mean rating was calculated across participants for the items that loaded onto this factor using the data from each of the eight post-conversation questionnaires. As presented in Table 27 and Figure 13, the mean rating for the self-involvement prompted within the peer conversations was 4.74 out of 5.00 whereas that for the NSs conversations was 4.87 out of 5.00.
Table 27

Descriptive results of self-involvement by interlocutor type: Means for HL learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zoom 1</th>
<th>Zoom 2</th>
<th>Zoom 3</th>
<th>Zoom 4</th>
<th>Zoom mean</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. 1</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. 2</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. 3</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. 4</th>
<th>Talk-Ab. mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13

The results presented in Table 27 and Figure 13 denote that the HL learners may perceive all of the videoconferences as comparable in usefulness and the level of interactivity that they evoke, meaning that the HL learners’ self-involvement in the virtual conversation does not appear to be contingent on interlocutor type.

4.9 Research question 2d: Self-involvement in videoconferencing by interlocutor over time

4.9.1 L2 learners

To determine if longitudinal changes emerge in the L2 learners’ perceptions in self-involvement for the online conversations, the data was summed for the items that loaded onto this factor within the eight post-conversation questionnaires. The descriptive results for these analyses are shown in Table 28 and Figure 14.
Table 28

Descriptive results for self-involvement: Chronological means for L2 learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zoom 1</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 1</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 2</th>
<th>Zoom 2</th>
<th>Zoom 3</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 3</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 4</th>
<th>Zoom 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14

As is displayed in Table 28 and Figure 14, over time, the dimension of self-involvement remains relatively steady for the peer conversations with the first, second, third, and fourth conversation ratings reaching 4.49, 4.58, 4.42, and 4.48 out of 5.00, respectively. For this reason, it appears that active engagement with peers is consistent across conversations for the L2 learners. In terms of the NS-L2 learner interactions, the same trend is observed with the first, second, third, and fourth conversations reaching ratings of self-involvement of 4.38, 4.45, 4.52, and 4.49 out of 5.00. Therefore, no changes over time nor differences between interlocutor type appear to be present for the dimension of self-involvement, suggesting that the L2 learners find
all videoconferences to be of personal relevance, and, as a result, remain actively engaged in all contexts. These outcomes are reiterated in the responses for the first open-ended question in the post-conversation questionnaire, “Do you think the conversation was useful? Explain.”, which are organized in Table 29 by frequency of theme.

**Table 29**

*Results of L2 learner qualitative data over time: Self-involvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire (chronological)</th>
<th>Themes by number of L2 participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 1</td>
<td>Useful – 32 out of 32 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 1</td>
<td>Useful – 31 out of 32 (96.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat useful – 1 out of 32 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 2</td>
<td>Useful – 32 out of 32 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 2</td>
<td>Useful – 31 out of 32 (96.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat useful – 1 out of 32 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 3</td>
<td>Useful – 30 out of 32 (93.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat useful – 1 out of 32 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not useful – 1 out of 32 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 3</td>
<td>Useful – 32 out of 32 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 4</td>
<td>Useful – 31 out of 32 (96.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not useful – 1 out of 32 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 4</td>
<td>Useful – 30 out of 32 (93.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat useful – 2 out of 32 (6.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results displayed in Table 29, show that the L2 learners perceived all conversations as useful, that is, that they were personally relevant and engaging, with no substantial changes over time observed by interlocutor type. Both Excerpt 8 written by “Dora” after the fourth *Talk Abroad* conversation and Excerpt 9 written by “Bradley” after the fourth peer conversation encapsulate these sentiments of usefulness and interactivity.

**Excerpt 8**

Yes, I think this conversation was very useful because I felt more confident, we talked about topics that were interesting, my partner taught me knew words, and the conversation felt more comfortable. For the last conversation I feel sad in a way because I like doing these conversations because they are extremely,
extremely useful. [sic]

Excerpt 9

I did think the conversation was useful, I liked being able to talk about the same topic as in one of the Talk Abroad conversations. It gives an opportunity to talk to a native speaker and a speaker more on my level.

4.9.2 HL learners

To track the changes in ratings of self-involvement over time in the HL learner group, the items that loaded onto this factor were summed within the eight post-conversation questionnaires and the mean was calculated at the individual and group levels, as shown in Table 30, Figure 15, and Figure 16.

Table 30

Descriptive results for self-involvement: Chronological individual means for HL learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym of HL participant</th>
<th>Zoom 1</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 1</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 2</th>
<th>Zoom 2</th>
<th>Zoom 3</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 3</th>
<th>Talk-Abroad 4</th>
<th>Zoom 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonia</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estefanía</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begonia</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>4.75</th>
<th>4.86</th>
<th>4.81</th>
<th>4.73</th>
<th>4.86</th>
<th>4.89</th>
<th>4.92</th>
<th>4.63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As presented in Table 30 and in Figure 15, the mean ratings for *self-involvement* are relatively stable for all peer conversations, with a rating of 4.75 out of 5.00 for the first, 4.73 for the second, 4.86 for the third, and 4.63 for the fourth conversations. As for the interactions on *Talk Abroad*, the ratings of *self-involvement* are also fairly steady as the first conversation settled
at 4.86 out of 5.00, the second at 4.81, the third at 4.89, and the fourth at 4.92. Overall, the ratings are higher for the NS-HL learner interactions, which is a perception that is echoed in the responses for the first open-ended question in the post-conversation questionnaires which inquired on the usefulness of each interaction. The results for this analysis are displayed by frequency of theme in Table 31.

**Table 31**

*Results of HL learner qualitative data over time: Self-involvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire (chronological)</th>
<th>Themes by number of HL participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 1</td>
<td>Useful – 7 out of 7 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 1</td>
<td>Useful – 7 out of 7 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 2</td>
<td>Useful – 7 out of 7 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 2</td>
<td>Useful – 6 out of 7 (85.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not useful – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 3</td>
<td>Useful – 7 out of 7 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 3</td>
<td>Useful – 7 out of 7 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Talk Abroad 4</td>
<td>Useful – 7 out of 7 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Zoom 4</td>
<td>Useful – 6 out of 7 (85.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not useful – 1 out of 7 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is presented in Table 31, the HL participants indicated that all videoconferences were useful, however, one student (14.3%) expressed that the second and fourth peer conversations were not useful, whereas this was never reported for any interaction on *Talk Abroad*. To elaborate on these findings, the perceptions of self-involvement are illustrated in Excerpt 10, written by “Virginia” after the fourth peer conversation, and Excerpt 11, written by “Rafael” after the first *Talk Abroad* conversation.

**Excerpt 10**

I think it was! My partner is definitely much more of an advance Spanish speaker than I am, but it really pushed me to listen what she said and made me want to speak Spanish better. We completely understood each other, and it’s almost as if we push each other to have more intellectual conversation. [sic]
Excerpt 11

Yes, I felt like I was able to talk with a native speaker of Spanish from Honduras and I was able to remember some phrases that I used to use.

4.10 Summary of results

The first research question asked whether interlocutor type affects the development of L2C and if changes occur over time due to multiple videoconferences. To begin, a factor analysis was conducted on the Likert-scale responses within the initial L2C questionnaire and two underlying components were found and labeled Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability and Self-Assurance.

The results of statistical analyses showed that the L2 learners’ Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability increased steadily over time with no definitive observed effect of interlocutor type. Specifically, when comparing the mean ratings of the items that loaded onto Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability from each post-conversation questionnaires with those from the initial L2C questionnaire, all conversations but the first and third peer interaction reached statistical significance. Therefore, these findings, paired with the results of the qualitative analyses, indicate that the mere act of videoconferencing in the target language may facilitate L2 learners’ Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability with the effects growing over time after conversing with both interlocutor types.

With respect to the development of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability in HL learners, the mean rating for the peer conversations was identical to the mean rating from the initial L2C questionnaire, however, a closer analysis revealed that only the peer conversations produced an upward trajectory in ratings over time whereas the mean ratings for NS interactions fell below the initial mean rating and never met or even surpassed this threshold over time. These findings, in conjunction with the observations denoted in the HL learners’ open-ended responses, suggest
that only peer conversations, when carried out over multiple instances, may prompt HL learners to develop their Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability.

As for the emergence of Self-Assurance in L2 learners, the mean ratings for all conversations steadily increased no matter the interlocutor type. Specifically, with the exception of the first peer interaction, the mean ratings for Self-Assurance for each conversation reached statistical significance when compared to the mean rating for the same items in the initial L2C questionnaire. Thus, it appears that, no matter the interlocutor, the L2 learners’ Self-Assurance increased over time with the trajectory advancing upward after each interaction. This outcome was also confirmed in the analyses of the L2 learners’ open-ended responses.

Regarding HL learners, the results revealed that interlocutor type played a role in their development of Self-Assurance. Concretely, the overall mean rating for peer conversations was slightly higher than the initial mean rating, and, despite a decline after the first peer conversation, the mean ratings by conversation trended upwards over time, with the final three conversations surpassing the initial mean rating. In contrast, the overall mean rating for the Talk Abroad conversations was nearly identical to the initial mean rating and the individual mean ratings over time remained relatively consistent with no directional trend noted. These results, coupled with the qualitative data, may imply that over time only the peer videoconferences foster the development of Self-Assurance in HL learners.

The second research question aimed to shed light on the perceived capacity of each interlocutor type as related to the two dimensions that build towards L2C, namely, richness and self-involvement, within the functional model put forth by Sampasivam and Clément (2014). A factor analysis was conducted to identify the Likert-scale items in the post-conversation
questionnaires that loaded onto the factors of *richness* and *self-involvement* and statistical analyses were carried out.

For both the L2 and HL learners, the interactions with NSs were perceived as higher in *richness than* the conversations with peer interlocutors, and this was consistent over time. These findings suggests that the NSs provide more abundant and varied language forms and offer more opportunities for feedback than the peer interlocutors. The themes identified in the free-responses for both learner types confirm these outcomes.

As for *self-involvement*, the results were parallel for the L2 and HL learners: videoconferencing with both interlocutor types was consistently perceived as useful, engaging, and personally relevant with no directional trend noted in the mean ratings for each individual conversation. These findings were also confirmed in the free-response data as well.

In Table 32, the overall results of this study are presented with a check mark representing where significant outcomes were yielded for each facet of L2C by dyad type.

**Table 32**

*Facets of L2C yielding significant outcomes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction type</th>
<th>Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability</th>
<th>Self-Assurance</th>
<th>Richness</th>
<th>Self-Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L2-L2 learners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS-L2 learner</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL-HL learners</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS-HL learner</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next chapter, these results will be discussed at length in relationship to previous literature on the development of confidence in the target language, the L2C functional model by Sampasivam and Clément (2014), and the use of videoconferencing as a pedagogical tool for L2 and HL learners. Additionally, the theoretical implications of this study and related pedagogical
recommendations will be provided. Finally, the limitations of this study and directions for future research will be addressed.
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

This research work adds to the field of Second Language Acquisition by shedding light on the effect of interlocutor, in the context of videoconferencing, on the longitudinal development of L2C in L2 and HL learners. The interlocutors in question are peer learners and trained and paid NSs on Talk Abroad, which, to the knowledge of the author, have never been compared in their capacity to foster L2C development. Furthermore, with respect to the functional model of L2C proposed by Sampasivam and Clément (2014), this study provides evidence on the perceived affordances of the contact experiences by interlocutor type in terms of richness and self-involvement, which are the two dimensions that are asserted to facilitate L2C. This chapter begins with a discussion of the results of the two research questions that guided this investigation. Then, the theoretical and pedagogical implications of the present research will be deliberated and directions for future research will be proposed.

5.2 The role of interlocutor in videoconferencing on the development of L2C over time

The first research question asked whether interlocutor type plays a role in the development of L2C in L2 and HL learners and if changes occur over time due to multiple interactions. To answer this question, a factor analysis was conducted on the data from the initial L2C questionnaire and two underlying components were identified, Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability and Self-Assurance. In this study, Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability is defined as the perceived capacity to comprehend and communicate meaning in the target language and Self-Assurance denotes the emotive sentiments and perceptions of social outcomes when communicating in the target language. This section discusses the findings for both aforementioned facets of L2C, presented by learner type.
5.2.1 L2 learners: Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability

Differing from the hypothesis that postulated that the L2 learners’ Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability would develop as a result of peer interaction alone, the results showed that this factor increased over time, following a stable upward trend, with no observed impact due to interlocutor type. Concretely, when compared to the initial L2C questionnaire mean rating, all conversations subsequent to the first peer interaction reach statistical significance, with the exception of the third peer conversation, implying that the students’ Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability developed due to both peer and NS-learner videoconferences. These findings align with previous research that has examined the outcomes of L2 learners’ participation in multiple conversations on Talk Abroad in that this intervention was shown to facilitate participants’ oral proficiency (e.g., Warner-Ault, 2020), oral fluency and accuracy (e.g., Sama & Wu, 2019), communication skills (e.g., Cuervo-Carruthers, 2017), and communicative competence (e.g., Conboy, Ugalde, & Reuber, 2017). To illustrate these findings, Excerpt 12 presents a comment written by “Joe” after his second Talk Abroad conversation.

Excerpt 12

Yes, very much. I could understand him very well, because he spoke very clearly. I have always been worried that, if I needed to speak to someone in Spanish, they would have to slow down immensely in order for me to understand. After this conversation, I no longer feel that that would be the case.

In terms of peer videoconferencing and Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability development, the results of Lenkaitis (2020) closely match those found in the present study. Specifically, after partaking in six weekly peer conversations on Zoom, gains over time were observed in the participants responses to a question that asked them how long they believed that they could speak in the target language. Furthermore, it was found that the students improved on awareness of language forms and grammatical structures. These results coincide with those of the present
study and are exemplified in Excerpt 13, which is a comment written by “Patty” after her second peer videoconference.

**Excerpt 13**

I think this conversation made me much more confident in my Spanish speaking abilities because I found that I was not scared for my partner to ask me questions and I saw that it didn't take me as long to think of my answers. It is also good to have a block of time to just be able to speak in Spanish and practice it. [sic]

It appears that the mere act of successfully completing each 30-minute online conversation served as demonstrable evidence of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability, which is substantiated by the number of open-ended responses that referenced the 30-minute duration of the conversation as an achievement. Concretely, after the first peer conversation, 18 out of 32 students (56.3%) commented on their excitement and surprise of being able to hold a conversation in the target language for 30 minutes, and this number gradually declined over time as it was no longer novel, but rather, may have formed an integral part of their Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability. Relatedly, Kessler, Loewen, and Trego (2020) documented an open-ended comment that underlined the extensive 30-minute duration of the *Talk Abroad* conversation, which was deemed noteworthy and helpful for language processes. The duration of the interaction and its effect on perceived ability is commented on by “Carmen” after her first *Talk Abroad* conversation, as displayed in Excerpt 14.

**Excerpt 14**

Sí! nunca en un millón de años creería que puedo hablar con un hispanohablante nativo por 30 minutos y comprender todo. Sí, tuve muchos errores, pero mantengo conversación por todo el tiempo, y fue (principalmente) fluido. [sic]

“Yes! Never in a million years would I believe that I can speak with a native Spanish-speaker for thirty minutes and understand everything. Yes, I had a lot of errors, but I maintain[ed] conversation the whole time and it was (largely) fluent.”
In summary, although previous studies on L2 learners have found similar results to those of the present research, no known investigation has examined the role of interlocutor, whether a peer or a trained NS, in participants’ development of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability. The findings of this research reveal that L2 learners’ Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability gradually increases over time as a result of the 30-minute videoconferences in the target language, no matter the interlocutor type involved. Indeed, this outcome could be explained by the fact that the L2 learners in this study primarily pertained to the intermediate proficiency level, and, as such, would benefit from all opportunities for practice. In contrast, L2 learners at the advanced or superior levels may not benefit from this intervention to the same extent due to the fact that their Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability may already be relatively high and, as such, their room for growth would be more limited, but this has yet to be investigated in the literature.

5.2.2 HL learners: Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability

It was predicted that neither interlocutor type would play a role in the development of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability in the HL learners, however the findings showed that the only peer videoconferences exhibited a definitive upward trajectory in facilitating HL learners’ Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability. Still, the overall mean rating for peer interactions was identical to the baseline initial rating. In contrast, the ratings for the Talk Abroad conversations declined below the initial mean rating and, over time, never again reached or even surpassed the initial baseline mean rating. These results conflict with those of Abing (2018) who found that HL learners improved their linguistic performance as a result of videoconferencing with a NS language coach; it should be mentioned that the language coach in this study worked with each participant individually over the course of 12 weeks on achieving five tailor-made language goals. Nonetheless, perhaps the findings of the present study can be explained by Tecedor, Del
Carpio, and Ochoa (2021) who found that, after conversing with a NS and an L2 learner, the HL learners’ “success in claiming their own authenticity as topical experts or as legitimate members of the Spanish-speaking [community of practice] was at times constrained by their linguistic abilities” (p. 10). In this way, the HL learners in the present study may have had to manage a number of aspects when videoconferencing in the target language, at the forefront of which may have been their intermediate-level linguistic proficiency and the ongoing maintenance of their identity as an HL learner. This sentiment is exhibited in a comment by “Antonia” after the first Talk Abroad conversation, which is displayed in Excerpt 15.

**Excerpt 15**

> Yes because my father is from Ecuador and I have visited many times but she has helped me learn other traditions and the culture than from what I thought. I learned some new words. [sic]

Additionally, these results could also be illuminated by the fact that, on the whole, HL learners tend to display more developed aural and oral skills as a product of their language acquisition, which took place in a naturalistic setting at a young age (Bowles, 2011b). This may explain the HL learners’ initial rating of Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability which reached a high baseline mean score of 4.67 out of 5.00. For these reasons, it is quite possible that eight 30-minute oral online interactions may not be an intervention that substantially raises the HL learners’ Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability from its already high starting point.

**5.2.3 L2 learners: Self-Assurance**

In line with the hypotheses, L2 learners’ Self-Assurance was found to gradually increase over time after videoconferencing with both interlocutors. Additionally, with the exception of the first peer interaction, all other post-conversation questionnaire data yielded statistical significance when compared to that from the initial L2C questionnaire. Overall, it appears that
videoconferencing in the target language, no matter with whom, prompts gains in Self-Assurance in L2 learners with the increases appearing as an upward trajectory over time after each sequential conversation.

These outcomes coincide with those of previous research on in-person L2 peer interaction which has been shown to promote the development of affective and social dimensions such as motivation (e.g., Wang et al., 2017) and a sense of community in the learning context (e.g., Marull & Kumar, 2020; Peterson, Beymer, & Putnam, 2018). Furthermore, in Sato (2006) the students reported feeling less pressure and more comfortable with a peer interlocutor than with a NS, which is also echoed by the results of Varonis and Gass (1985). Finally, Blake (2000) also found that student interactions were perceived as less face-threatening due to the students’ shared commonality of lacking expertise in the target language. In terms of the research on peer interaction in the context of CMC, in Lenkaitis (2020), the L2 learners reported feeling comfortable when conversing with peers on Zoom. In the present research, this sentiment is captured in a comment by “Stacey” which was written after the fourth peer conversation, as displayed in Excerpt 16.

**Excerpt 16**

All of the videoconferencing conversations went excellent. I felt comfortable with all of my TalkAbroad partners as well as my peers during our talks. [My classmate] was a great partner who I could really listen to and converse with in Spanish without worries.

With respect to interactions with NSs, Wu, Marek, and Yen (2012) showed that when Taiwanese learners used CMC to interact with a NS of English their motivation and feelings of satisfaction increased. Similarly, the learners in Canals (2020) also displayed a greater willingness to communicate and heightened motivation to learn Spanish after conversing virtually with NS students from Spain. Related to the present study, the following comment,
presented in Excerpt 17, was written by “Gemma” after the second *Talk Abroad* conversation and provides a nuanced perspective into the difference in level of comfort or ease of conversation when interacting with NSs and peers.

**Excerpt 17**

I think that it's easier to talk with someone fluent in Spanish rather than a classmate because it's easier for them to piece together what I am saying, however I am a lot less nervous with classmates.

In summary, when conversing with both peers and NSs, the emotional reactions and perceptions of social outcomes of the L2 learners indicated a greater level of ease over time, with each conversation contributing to this upward trajectory. The only exception to this trend is the first peer conversation, however a possible explanation for this is that the participants needed a period of adjustment to understand how the videoconferencing sequence would work. Overall, it is important to underline that the L2 learners’ Self-Assurance increased over time no matter the interlocutor with whom they were videoconferencing.

5.2.4 *HL learners: Self-Assurance*

In the case of HL learner Self-Assurance development, the results suggest that interlocutor type played a role, given that, overall, the mean rating for peers was slightly higher than the initial mean rating, whereas the mean rating for NSs remained near baseline. These outcomes are contrary the hypothesis that the interactions with NSs, not peers, would prompt the emergence of Self-Assurance in HL learners.

When accounting for the effect over time, the ratings for peers trended upwards while those for NSs stayed relatively constant with no directional trajectory observed. Therefore, these findings indicate that, when accounting for longitudinal changes, only multiple instances of peer interaction seems to facilitate the emergence of Self-Assurance in HL learners. To illustrate these
outcomes, two free-responses are provided; the first is Excerpt 18, which was written by “Fernando” after partaking in the second *Talk Abroad* conversation, and the second is Excerpt 19, which was written by “Begonia” after completing the fourth peer conversation.

**Excerpt 18**

This conversation felt very familiar compared to the other [*Talk Abroad* conversation]. The other felt as if I was talking to a friend that was mentoring me. This one felt as if I was talking to family. I felt more calm in this conversation, so it helped my Spanish come out more fluently. Both topics were also very interesting to me, so either way both conversations helped me with my Spanish on topics I normally talk about.

**Excerpt 19**

[“Rafael”] was my partner for two of the conversations and I enjoyed speaking to him. He is very open minded and we have similar intersecting identities. In terms of my Spanish, comparing my first and last conversations I feel a lot more confident not only in my Spanish vocabulary but also my anxiety has reduced when speaking.

Perhaps Tecedor, Del Carpio, & Ochoa (2021), who investigated the expert-novice identities in NS-HL learner dyads, can clarify the findings of present research. Specifically, if the NSs in this study were also positioned as the expert in the NS-HL learner dyads, this may have prompted the HL learners to feel less at ease as compared to when conversing with an interlocutor of the same status, that is, a peer HL learner. This postulation is bolstered by a segment of Excerpt 18 in which the HL learner reports feeling as though he “was talking to a friend that was mentoring” him, implying that there were perceptible roles in the interaction with the NS being the mentor. Nevertheless, provided that the present research is the only known study to track the longitudinal effects of videoconferencing with peers and NSs on HL learner confidence development, specifically related to the affective responses that are reported after the intervention, no other analogous studies serve as a point of reference to frame these results.
5.3 Interlocutor type and dimensions of L2C model over time

The second research question aimed to shed light on the perceived qualities of each interlocutor type in terms of their capacity to offer richness and prompt self-involvement, which are the two dimensions of the contact experience that facilitate the development of L2C, according to the integrated framework proposed by Sampasivam and Clément (2014). To answer this question, the data from the postConversation questionnaires was summed and a factor analysis was conducted, the results of which identified three underlying factors labeled richness, self-involvement, and cultural depth. In terms of richness, this component of L2C describes a context that affords an abundance of varied language forms and provides opportunities for feedback. Regarding self-involvement, this refers to active engagement in an interaction that is deemed personally relevant. The third factor, cultural depth, will be elaborated upon in the implications section of this study. For now, the upcoming section will provide a discussion of the findings by learner type for the two dimensions that build towards L2C, namely, richness and self-involvement.

5.3.1 L2 learners: Richness

It was predicted that the L2 learners would deem both interlocutor types as high in richness, however, the results of the postConversation questionnaire data, both quantitative and qualitative, revealed that the L2 learners considered the NSs as more consistent purveyors of richness than their peers. In other words, the L2 learners appeared to perceive only the NSs as sources of abundant linguistic input who also provided opportunities for feedback. Echoing these findings is the study by Kessler, Loewen, and Trego (2020) in which the L2 learners reported in their postConversation questionnaires that they noticed new lexical, but not grammatical, features when interacting with NSs on Talk Abroad. These findings are consistent with those of
the present study in that, when commenting on the language features noticed or learned during a videoconference, the L2 learners provided single words or a list of words considerably more often than verbal forms in their response. For example, in the qualitative analysis for the second Talk Abroad conversation, 19 out of 32 students (59.4%) reported learning new words whereas only 1 out of 32 (3.1%) learned new grammatical information. This outcome is also expressed in Excerpt 20, which is written by “Jillian” after she completed her second Talk Abroad conversation.

**Excerpt 20**

I didn't realize that the word for guinea pig is "cuy" not "cuyo" (I'm not sure where I got that) so she corrected me on that. She also reminded me of the word for rabbit because I forgot how to say it in Spanish.

Moreover, previous studies on expert-learner interaction have revealed that experts elicit language production from learners (e.g., Hall & Walsh, 2002), provide feedback (e.g., Bruton & Samuda, 1980), and reformulate or paraphrase learners’ language production in order to validate or refine the learners’ original utterance (Duff, 2000). These documented interactional patterns may provide an explanation for the higher ratings of richness for the NS interlocutors compared to peer learners found in the present study. Relatedly, in Excerpt 20 “Jillian” states that she was corrected by the NS on the word for guinea pig, consequently, these form-focused instances, which may be more frequent in NS-learner dyads than peer dyads, could possibly drive the learners to view the NS as a more reliable and effective source of linguistic information than a peer learner. Referring back to the integrated model of L2C by Sampasivam and Clément (2014), given that the dimension of richness is rated higher for interactions with NSs, this indicates that these interlocutors may be more effective in fostering L2C development in L2 learners than peer learners.
5.3.2 HL learners: Richness

As hypothesized, the findings for the HL learners revealed higher ratings of richness for the interactions with the NSs than those with their peers. These results are congruent with the HL learners’ free-response answers, which showed a decline over time in the number of mentions of new linguistic information learned in the peer interactions whereas this was the most frequently expressed theme for every Talk Abroad conversation.

As for previous research on the richness afforded to HL learners by NSs, in Belpoliti and Pérez (2019) the HL learners expressed an increase of confidence in using Spanish in a formal register as a result of helping NSs at health fairs. Additionally, service-learning was another context that allowed HL learners to use Spanish productively in a professional setting with NSs, as detailed in Lowther Pereira (2015) and Pascual y Cabo, Prada, and Lowther Pereira (2017).

These findings align with previous studies that have attested that HL learners may consider their variety of Spanish to be of lower prestige (e.g., Alarcón, 2010; Beaudrie & Ducar, 2005; Krashen, 1998; Renganathan, 2008), and, therefore, may place value on the language used by the NS interlocutors. These patterns also emerged in the NS-HL learner interactions detailed in Tecedor, Del Carpio, and Ochoa (2021) in which the NS was positioned as the linguistic expert and was also found providing unsolicited feedback to the HL learners in a teacher-like role. To illustrate this idea, Excerpt 21 illustrates a case where the NS provided feedback to the HL learner, which was written by “Virginia” after the third Talk Abroad conversation.

Excerpt 21

Yes because I find myself making less mistakes or thinking less about what I have to say. My pronunciation I wish would sound less Americanized because I feel like I want my accent to match my nationality, but I definitely feel better speaking with native speakers because im improving in variation [sic]

Therefore, given that the HL learners may deem their language variety to be of lower
prestige and that the NSs may offer them unsolicited linguistic feedback, it is presumed that, under these conditions, the HL learners would very likely perceive their interactions with NSs as a context that affords more richness than conversing with peers.

Finally, similar to the L2 learners, the HL learners also reported noticing or learning lexical items, and not grammar, most frequently in the open-ended responses. For example, in the third Talk Abroad conversation, 6 out of 7 HL learners (85.7%) indicated learning new lexical items whereas 1 out of 7 (14.3%) stated that they learned grammatical features. To exemplify this, Excerpt 22 displays a student comment written by “Virginia” that describes the linguistic features learned during the first Talk Abroad conversation.

**Excerpt 22**

me dijo que usa obligatorio mas que mandatorio. Yo creo que yo estaba usando spanglish. [sic]

She told me to use ‘obligatory’ rather than ‘mandatory’. I think that I was using Spanglish.

In sum, as related to the integrated model of L2C by Sampasivam and Clément (2014), these findings suggest that NSs are perceived by HL learners as affording more richness in virtual interactions, and, as such, may provide a contact experience that better facilitates the HL learners’ L2C as related to this dimension.

5.3.3 L2 learners: Self-involvement

Coinciding with the hypotheses, the results for the L2 learners showed that videoconferencing in the target language prompted self-involvement, with no statistical difference observed by interlocutor type. That is, both types of interactions were deemed engaging and personally relevant and, as such, incited active student participation in each
conversation held. In terms of changes over time, no directional trajectory was observed in the mean ratings across conversations.

Relatedly, in Sama and Wu (2019) the L2 learners reported an increase in target-language engagement in their exit-questionnaires and post-conversation reflections as a result of participating in five *Talk Abroad* conversations. Similarly, Kessler, Loewen, and Trego (2020) found that the L2 learners, who completed five *Talk Abroad* conversations, considered the intervention to be enjoyable and the authors explain that *Talk Abroad* “has the capacity to expand the walls of the classroom… [and] L2 learners can engage in meaningful, real-time interactions using the target language” (p. 22). This perspective is featured in a comment written by “Rosalyn” after the fourth *Talk Abroad* conversation, displayed in Excerpt 23.

**Excerpt 23**

I think this was my most enjoyable conversation yet. I was able to understand my partner better and it was easier for my to ask for clarification when I did not understand something. [sic]

As for the results of the peer videoconferences, they align with the findings of Lenkaitis (2020) who showed that, after participating in six weekly peer-to-peer Zoom sessions, the L2 learners “had a ‘drive to learn’… [and] they were engaged in the learning process” (p. 498). Similarly, in Lenkaitis and English (2017), the five L2 learners who carried out two group-level videoconferences reported that the conversations boosted engagement in target-language dialogue. Still, the authors found that one learner was not as participatory within the virtual discussions, so, based on these findings, the present study implemented a one-on-one methodology in order to avoid the possibility of learners “hiding” at the group level. Lastly, Lai et al. (2019) also found that in-person peer interaction facilitated engagement in language
learning. Additional evidence for these outcomes is found in a comment written by “Dora” after completing her fourth peer videoconference, as presented in Excerpt 24.

**Excerpt 24**

> I enjoyed this conversation a lot and it was probably one of my favorites in comparison to others. I liked this topic and I felt as though my partner and I had a great conversation because we were able to go back and forth very well.

Overall, the findings suggest that L2 learners perceived the videoconferences, no matter with whom, as engaging and personally relevant, fostering their active participation in target-language discourse. When accounting for the integrated model of L2C (Sampasivam & Clément, 2014), these outcomes suggest that both interlocutor types prompt *self-involvement*, and, as such, both appear to be contexts that facilitate L2C development in L2 learners.

**5.3.4 HL learners: Self-involvement**

As predicted, the HL learners reported that videoconferencing with both interlocutor types was enjoyable and interactive. Also, there was no observable directional trend in the mean ratings of *self-involvement* for each individual conversation over time, suggesting that this engagement was maintained across topics and interlocutors. These themes are encapsulated in the comment written by “Fernando” after partaking in the third peer conversation, given in Excerpt 25.

**Excerpt 25**

> This conversation was the most relaxed conversation I had with someone. It was also still productive as we learned more about the world around us. Conversing more with other students one-on-one versus class seems to be where people relax more and open up about ideas, at least in my experiences.

In sum, these results suggest that HL learners consider videoconferencing to be useful and engaging no matter the interlocutor type with whom it is carried out. In this way, both contexts are deemed fertile ground for the emergence of L2C, specifically pertaining to the
dimension of *self-involvement* within the integrated model. Given that the present study is the only known investigation that has examined the effects of videoconferencing between peer and NS-HL learners over time, the HL learners’ perceptions of *self-involvement* cannot be compared to the findings of any other previous research work.

5.4 Implications

This investigation was guided by the functional model of L2C (Sampasivam & Clément, 2014), which alleges that a contact space that is high in both *richness and self-involvement* will lead to increases in L2C. The authors also point to synchronous CMC as a context that, based on preliminary research, may facilitate L2C development, but they call for additional research to empirically verify these conclusions.

The findings of the present study, particularly for the L2 learners, lend support to the integrated model of L2C. Firstly, given that the NS-L2 learner interactions on *Talk Abroad* consistently reached high ratings in *richness* and *self-involvement*, the model would predict gains in L2C, which was what was found over time in the L2 learners’ Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability and Self-Assurance. As for the peer videoconferences, they were perceived as lower in *richness*, but the L2 learners’ evaluation of *self-involvement* was indistinguishable among interlocutor types. In this way, the integrated model would predict that the L2 learners would show slightly less development in their Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability and Self-Assurance after videoconferencing with peers, however this did not prove to be the case given that both factors increased longitudinally without interlocutor type affecting this trajectory. In sum, the NS-learner interaction appeared to foster L2 learners’ L2C, which is explained by the functional model as this contact space was rated highly in *richness* and *self-involvement*. However, the same gains in L2C were observed for peer interaction despite the fact that this contact space was
deemed lower in *richness*, which conflicts with the anticipated findings based on the theoretical framework. Therefore, it appears that the integrated model does indeed describe, to a degree, the components that facilitate L2C development in L2 learners.

In contrast, the results for the HL learners did not necessarily coincide with what the functional model would have predicted. Concretely, despite the HL learners perceiving the NSs as providing a contact space that is high in both *richness* and *self-involvement*, which according to the framework would lead to heightened L2C, no gains were observed over time in the learners’ Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability or Self-Assurance. As for the HL peer interactions, they were considered to be as high in *self-involvement*, but lower in *richness*, as the conversations with the NSs. These perceived attributes of the peer interaction would, in theory, prompt an increase in L2C, and this projection was affirmed in the HL learners’ gains in Self-Assurance and, over time, in their Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability.

These results put into question the applicability of the integrated model of L2C for HL learners and this is discussed in two regards. Firstly, provided that the theoretical framework is accurate, a greater number of videoconferences may be needed for HL learners in order to detect changes in their L2C development. This is particularly relevant given the mode in which this learner type acquired the language, namely, orally and in a naturalistic setting. In this way, the present study’s eight online conversations may not have been sufficient for observable changes in the HL learners’ L2C. Regarding the second consideration, it could very well be that, due to their linguistic background and target-language experiences, the functional model of L2C may require further depth or nuance for HL learners. As the present study is the first research work known to the author to apply the integrated model of L2C in a context involving HL learners, future research is needed to investigate these postulations.
Regarding the claim by Sampasivam and Clément (2014) that synchronous CMC is high in both *self-involvement* and *richness*, by and large the findings of this study appear to support this assertion. Concretely, all videoconferencing types (i.e., NS-L2 learner dyads, L2 peer dyads, NS-HL learner dyads, HL peer dyads) were rated highly in *self-involvement*. However, only the NS on *Talk Abroad* was rated highly by both learner types in *richness*, suggesting that not all CMC is equally regarded in what it provides to the learner. In other words, this study demonstrates that interlocutor type does impact the affordances of the synchronous CMC, specifically in terms of *richness*.

Before embarking on the discussion on *cultural depth*, which was identified in this study as the third underlying component in the second factor analysis, it should be underscored that a growing number of scholars in the fields of second language acquisition, psychology, and linguistics assert that understanding a language denotes not only grasping the language code but also processing the socio-cultural information integrated within said code (Usó-Juan & Martínez-Flor, 2008). Indeed, Sampasivam and Clément (2014) remark on the significance of the acculturation process, stating that a “person’s general contentment in the society of settlement… are influenced by changes in cultural values, attitudes, and behaviours. Sociocultural adaptation encompasses the ability to successfully interact and fit into the new culture, and pertains to behavioural adjustments” (p. 29). From this standpoint, cultural acquisition adds a degree of depth and breadth to a learner’s repertoire in the second language, and it is postulated that these gains may correspondingly trigger L2C development as well. To elaborate, processing cultural information allows the learner to adapt to the target-language environment, which may lower his or her anxiety and heighten his or her willingness to communicate with target-language speakers. Cultural acquisition may also grant the learner access to an additional layer of richness in the
input. In other words, having the capacity to comprehend subtleties in meaning hinges on cultural knowledge, which, when developed, would allow a learner to reach depths in meaning beyond mere surface-level language data. To support these conclusions, a comment by “Carly” illustrates that learners recognize cultural information as a distinct facet of their target-language learning, which was written after the fourth peer videoconference and displayed in Excerpt 26.

**Excerpt 26**

During conversation with classmates, I am less nervous and I am more comfortable with expressing my thoughts. However, conversations on TalkAbroad help me learn new words and new cultural aspects more often than conversations with classmates.

Although the objective of the present study was not aimed at elucidating the methods that most effectively allow for the transmission of cultural information to language learners nor if said transmission plays a role in the emergence of L2C, related insights were uncovered in the process of analyzing the collected data, which will be discussed in this section. The purpose of this peripheral analysis was to determine the relationship between the results of the three underlying components: *cultural depth, richness,* and *self-involvement.* This was operationalized by comparing the means of the items that loaded onto *cultural depth* with those of *self-involvement* and *richness* across conversations. The outcomes of this analysis for the L2 learners are provided in Figure 17.
For the L2 learners, the data displayed in Figure 17 reveals that *cultural depth* does not appear to have an overt relationship with either of the two established dimensions of the integrated model of L2C. Specifically, *self-involvement* and *richness* prove to be relatively stable and converge over time, whereas the data for *cultural depth* does not follow a definitive trend and is quite volatile in nature. When returning to the overall findings of this research work, these outcomes suggest that the two existing dimensions of the integrated model of L2C are satisfactory in explaining L2 learners’ longitudinal gains in L2C, while the third dimension, *cultural depth*, did not seem to play a clear role here.

As for the HL learners, the same analysis was carried out to track the relationship between the three identified dimensions and their mean ratings, as presented in Figure 18.
Figure 18

*HL learners: Comparison of results of cultural depth, richness, and self-involvement over time*

Figure 18 shows that the HL learners’ ratings for *richness* somewhat mirror those for *cultural depth*, while *self-involvement* is relatively steady and does not appear to be related to the other two dimensions. When comparing these findings to those of the larger study, the patterns for the three dimensions do not explain the HL learners’ L2C outcomes, which is evidence that the integrated model of L2C does not fit in this context. Specifically, despite the peers being rated lower in *cultural depth* and *richness* than the NSs, unexpectedly, the HL learners’ Self-Assurance and Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability showed gains over time but only as an effect of peer videoconferencing. These results could be due to the HL learners feeling more at the level of an expert or feeling more competent in comparison to their HL peers than the NSs. In sum, it appears that this third dimension, *cultural depth*, does not inform the theoretical framework and, as such, additional hypotheses need to be put forth and examined in order to determine the qualities of a contact space that, in fact, facilitate HL learner L2C development.
Returning to the study at large, three principal differences were identified between its results and those of the pilot study. Firstly, the perceived novelty of the videoconferencing technology was much more apparent in the pilot study, which may be attributed to the students’ limited experience with telecollaboration prior to the start of the global COVID-19 pandemic. The ten-month separation between data collection periods was a time of transition for the learners during which their daily habits changed due to global shut-downs, social distancing, and quarantining. In this way, students quickly became familiar with the technological tools, such as Zoom and many others, that would allow them to continue to making progress on their academic, professional, and personal goals. Additionally, getting to know new people, such as classmates, in online videoconferencing became more regular; consequently, although the pilot study revealed that a portion of the L2 learners perceived the NSs on Talk Abroad as intimidating, this sentiment was rarely, if at all, expressed in the responses analyzed for the present study. Finally, these adaptations to “the new normal” may explain the divergent results of the factorial analysis carried out on the 29-item initial L2C questionnaire for the pilot study and the present research, which is described in detail in chapter four.

Based on the findings of this study, several pedagogical recommendations are offered. To preface, the view of the author is that the priority of an educator should be the alignment of the course goals and students’ needs with the careful selection of curricular components to meet those ends. It should also be borne in mind that the following pedagogical implications are primarily aimed at the intermediate level as this corresponds to the participants’ demonstrated proficiency in the present study.

Firstly, if the objective is to promote L2 learners’ L2C, this research work demonstrates that videoconferencing with either interlocutor type, a peer or trained NS, may be a means to
achieve this goal. As for HL learners, the findings point to peer videoconferences as the contact space that promotes their L2C development most notably. Still, if it is of importance to expose the students to an abundance of varied language forms and a depth of authentic cultural information, this may only be possible in videoconferences with paid and trained NSs on platforms such as Talk Abroad. Ultimately, the decision to implement peer videoconferences over conversations on Talk Abroad may hinge on monetary or logistical constraints.

This study followed a methodology that was not limited to a specific communicative task, but rather, the videoconferences followed on open-dialogue approach guided by overarching themes which were supported with six optional discussion questions. This reflects, to a certain degree, same procedure for L2 learners in Lenkaitis (2020) and with HL learners in Tecedor, Del Carpio, and Ochoa (2021). This topic-guided conversational method should be the one used in subsequent implementations in order to accurately replicate the conditions of this study in which observed gains in L2C were achieved for both learner types.

Furthermore, the preparation for the videoconferences was also found to be indispensable given that the learners deemed the conversations as an effective way to conclude each course unit and apply the studied content and their language knowledge to an extensive-duration communicative context. Without this preparation, these intermediate-level students might have instead expressed that they did not possess sufficient information on the conversation topic nor the linguistic competency necessary to successfully carry out each 30-minute virtual interaction.

In the past, incorporating eight 30-minute target-language interactions into a course curriculum would likely have been deemed logistically impossible given that a substantial amount of valuable lesson time would have been removed in consequence. However, technological tools such as Zoom and Talk Abroad can facilitate these types of interactions
outside of the classroom, and, as a result, the in-person lessons can remain entirely intact.

Furthermore, videoconferencing is advantageous in that it is typically conducted in settings that are more comfortable, quiet, and convenient for the learner when compared to a classroom in which multiple dyads are conversing simultaneously.

Lastly, it should be highlighted that although all HL learners in this study come from Spanish-speaking households, they expressed a level of enjoyment when conversing with peers of their same linguistic background, which suggests that pairing HL learners may be beneficial for their linguistic, cultural, and identity development. Also, the HL learners mentioned that both interlocutor types allowed them to speak in Spanish for an extended duration on topics that they likely would not have discussed in depth with their families such as environmental policies, political events, other countries’ products and practices, etc. In this way, the HL learners seem to recognize that the videoconferences on these topics are, indeed, distinct from casual interactions with family members that speak the target language, and, therefore, are seen as useful.

5.5 Limitations and directions for future research

The present research examined the role of interlocutor type in the context of videoconferencing on intermediate L2 and HL learners’ L2C development over time. In terms of methodology, the small number of participants in both learner groups, with 32 participants in the L2 learner group and seven in the HL learner group, may limit the generalizability of the results and, therefore, it is recommended that future research involve a greater number of participants. Additionally, the implementation of a methodology that includes both an experimental and a control group would allow future researchers to isolate the results that are, indeed, attributable to the intervention; this is especially relevant given that all of the participants were enrolled in the same Spanish conversation course. Also, future research should include data on a third dyad
type, namely, HL-L2 learner pairs, in order to shed light on the perceived qualities of their shared contact space and whether their videoconferences impact their L2C development over time. Investigating this dyad type is more relevant than ever given that there is a “growing number of heritage language (HL) learners in language courses… [and] the interaction between second language (L2) and HL learners has not been fully explored in the research” (Henshaw & Hetrovicz, 2021, p. 43). The results of this particular investigation could be used to better inform the pedagogical practices and curricular policies of language programs in which both of these learner types are enrolled. Given that this is the first investigation to apply the functional model of L2C to contact spaces with HL learners, other studies should test this model in other communicative contexts with this distinctive learner type in order to verify the postulations inherent to this framework.

Since the participants in this study settled at the intermediate range of proficiency, the question remains as to how advanced learners of the target language would perceive the CMC contact experience with both interlocutor types and if they would also display gains in L2C (cf. Arnold, 2007). Finally, according to O'Dowd and O'Rourke (2019), more evidence is need to distinguish the language learning benefits of conversations held between teachers and individual learners as compared to those between trained NSs and learners on platforms such as Talk Abroad. The results of this type of investigation would inform educators on the intervention type that best suits their students’ language learning needs.

Despite the fact that perceived richness of each contact space was measured in the present study, this does not imply that the noticed language forms were actually acquired and longitudinally retained by the students. This idea finds support in Kessler, Loewen, and Trego (2020) who state that “just because a student reported noticing certain vocabulary or grammar,
this does not mean by extension that he/she acquired that L2 target feature and/or has the ability to use it productively” (p. 24). Thus, a future study could implement a methodology in which language-related episodes are identified in the videoconferences and then immediate and long-term tailor-made post-tests are implemented to measure learning and retention of specific forms. Also, within the same investigation an analysis could be carried out to determine the interlocutor type from whom a learner most often requests language-related information and also explore whether interlocutor type plays a role in the number and type of language corrections afforded to the learner.

5.6 Conclusion

The objective of this study was to explore the role of interlocutor in videoconferencing, whether with a peer or a trained NS, on the emergence of L2C in L2 and HL learners. The results of this study suggest that the participation in multiple peer videoconferences promotes both L2 and HL learners’ Self-Perceived Linguistic Ability and Self-Assurance over time. These outcomes can be explained, to an extent, by the integrated model of L2C proposed by Sampasivam and Clément (2014) given that both contact spaces (i.e., HL-HL and L2-L2 peers) were perceived by the participants as prompting self-involvement, although they were not rated highly in richness. Regarding the virtual interactions with NSs on Talk Abroad, they were rated highly in both richness and self-involvement by both participant groups. In line with the theoretical framework, the L2 learners showed longitudinal increases in both factors of L2C as a result of interacting with NSs. However, this same interaction type did not affect the HL learners’ L2C development, which cannot be explained by the existing functional model.

Overall, the findings of this research indicate that videoconferencing can pique language students’ interest and increase their exposure to linguistic forms, and, thus, is recommended as a
course component to promote gains in L2 and HL learners’ L2C. Also, the intermediate-level
participants in this study reported other benefits of the intervention such as its capacity to
provide a context for the practicing the target language and extensive reflection on course unit
themes. Whereas the functional model of L2C was found to accurately explain the results for the
L2-L2 peer dyads, NS-L2 learner dyads, and HL-HL peer dyads, it did not suitably apply to
those of the NS-HL learner dyads. Thus, future research should ascertain the qualities of a
contact space that most effectively facilitates the HL learners’ L2C development, especially
given that fostering HL learners’ confidence is critical for the heritage language’s vitality
(Sánchez-Muñoz, 2016). Provided that remote learning is more commonplace than ever, this
research is particularly relevant as it investigates the impact of technology on L2C development
with the objective of informing pedagogical practices, however more research is needed to affirm
these results and to answer the questions that remain.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Script for in-class visit & email announcement

You are invited to participate in a voluntary research study. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between your individual perceptions and engagement in videoconferences in Spanish.

With the exception of this consent form and the questionnaire about your background, all of the study components will already form part of your final grade for Spanish 208 (Oral Spanish).

Note that if you do not participate in this study there will be no effect on your course grades. Also, your instructor will not know if you have consented or not to this study until after the final grades for the semester have been posted.

By participating in this research, you will help to broaden the knowledge of Spanish language educators and the course components they include in their curriculum.

If you have any questions, you can contact Lauren Hetrovicz at lhetrov2@illinois.edu and/or Dr. Bowles at bowlesm@illinois.edu
Appendix B: IRB consent form

You are being asked to participate in a voluntary research study. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between your individual perceptions and engagement in videoconferences in Spanish. Participating in this study will involve answering a questionnaire about your background, completing an online test in Spanish, completing an online initial questionnaire, participating in two synchronous computer-mediated conversations, and completing two post-conversation online questionnaires. With the exception of this consent form and the questionnaire about your background, all of these components will already form part of your final grade for Spanish 208 (Oral Spanish), so there is nothing beyond the assigned course components that you will need to do to partake in this study.

Note that if you do not participate in this study there will be no effect on your course grades. Also, your instructor will not know if you have consented or not to this study until after the final grades for the semester have been posted.

By participating in this research, you will help to broaden the knowledge of Spanish language educators and the course components they include in their curriculum.

Principal Investigator Name and Title: Melissa Bowles, Associate Professor Department and Institution: Department of Spanish and Portuguese, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Contact Information: (217) 244-3944, or bowlesm@illinois.edu

What procedures are involved?

You will answer a few questions about what languages you speak and what Spanish classes you have taken at UIUC. Then you will complete online a Spanish test and an initial questionnaire about your perceptions of Spanish.

Then, as part of the course, you will complete eight computer-mediated conversations and, right after finishing each conversation, will complete an online survey.

Will my study-related information be kept confidential?

Faculty, staff, students, and others with permission or authority to see your study information will maintain its confidentiality to the extent permitted and required by laws and university policies. The names or personal identifiers of participants will not be published or presented.

Will I be reimbursed for any expenses or paid for my participation in this research?

You will not be paid for your participation nor reimbursed for any expenses incurred.

Can I withdraw or be removed from the study?


If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time. Your participation in this research is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate, or to withdraw after beginning participation, will not affect your current or future dealings with the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

The researchers also have the right to stop your participation in this study without your consent if they believe it is in your best interests or you were to object to any future changes that may be made in the study plan.

**Will data collected from me be used for any other research?**

Your information will not be used or distributed for future use, even if identifiers are removed.

**Who should I contact if I have questions?**

If you have questions about this project, you may contact Melissa Bowles at (217) 244-3944 or bowlesm@illinois.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study or any concerns or complaints, please contact the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 217-333-2670 or via email at irb@illinois.edu.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Your decision to participate, decline, or withdraw from participation will have no effect on your current status or future relations with the University of Illinois.

Please print this consent form if you would like to retain a copy for your records.

I have read and understand the above consent form. I certify that I am 18 years old or older. By clicking the “Submit” button to enter the survey, I indicate my willingness to voluntarily take part in this study.

SUBMIT
Appendix C: Language background questionnaire

1. Email Address:

2. At what time does your SPAN 208 section start? _____ am/pm

3. First name:

4. Last name:

5. Your university email address (______@illinois.edu):

6. Age:

7. Sex: (a) male, (b) female (c) other___

8. Occupation other than student (if none, then please write N/A):

9. Place of birthday (which country?):

10. If you were born in the United States, indicate which state you are from:

11. Where is your MOTHER from (please write the name of a country)?

12. MOTHER's native language: (a) only English, (b) only Spanish, (c) both English and Spanish, (d) other___

13. Where is your FATHER from (please write the name of a country)?

14. FATHER's native language: (a) only English, (b) only Spanish, (c) both English and Spanish, (d) other___

15. What is/are your native language(s)? (a) only English, (b) only Spanish, (c) both English and Spanish, (d) other___

16. What language(s) did you speak at home as a child? (a) only English, (b) only Spanish, (c) both English and Spanish, (d) other___

17. What language(s) do you use at work/school?

18. Indicate whether you interact with any of the following people in Spanish. Check all that apply. (a) grandparents, (b) mother, (c) father, (d) siblings, (e) other relatives, (f) friends, (g) none of the above

19. In your daily life, how much English and Spanish do you use? Estimate a percentage for each language. English: Spanish:

20. Estimate your Spanish SPEAKING ability on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = "beginner" and 5 = "like a native speaker". (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)
21. Estimate your Spanish WRITING ability on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = "beginner" and 5 = "like a native speaker". (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

22. Estimate your Spanish READING ability on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = "beginner" and 5 = "like a native speaker". (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

23. Estimate your Spanish LISTENING ability on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = "beginner" and 5 = "like a native speaker". (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

24. Have you ever spent more than 1 week in a Spanish-speaking country? (a) Yes, (b) No

25. If so, where?

26. If so, how long?

27. What UIUC Spanish classes have you taken prior to this semester? Mark all that apply.
   a. SPAN 101  d. SPAN 141  g. SPAN 202
   b. SPAN 122  e. SPAN 142  h. SPAN 204
   c. SPAN 130  f. SPAN 200  i. SPAN 228

28. What UIUC Spanish classes are you taking this semester other than SPAN 208? Mark all that apply.
   a. SPAN 200  c. SPAN 204  e. other
   b. SPAN 202  d. SPAN 228

29. Do you have prior experience using Talk Abroad or a similar platform that allows you to speak to native speakers in the target language (i.e. LiveMocha, Conversifi, Hello Talk, etc.)? (a) yes, (b) no

30. If you marked “yes”, explain please where/when/how/with who. If not applicable, please write N/A.

31. If you do, indeed, have experience with Talk Abroad or a similar platform (inquired in the question above), was/were your experience(s) positive or negative? Explain your answer. If not applicable, please write N/A.

32. How much experience do you have speaking with your peers in Spanish classes (i.e., if you did not learn Spanish at home – with peers of this same language background; if you started learning Spanish at home – with peers of this same language background)?

          Never 1 2 3 4 5 Very often

33. Explain your answer to the question above.
Appendix D: Initial L2C questionnaire

1. I can learn to speak Spanish better.
   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

2. I am a good Spanish speaker now.
   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

3. I am a good student.
   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

4. I am an important member of my class.
   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

5. I don’t feel shy speaking Spanish to my classmates.
   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

6. I don’t feel shy speaking Spanish to my professor.
   Strongly agree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

7. I don’t feel shy speaking Spanish to other speakers outside of class.
   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

8. I think that I will speak Spanish very well someday.
   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

9. I think that I will get an A or an A+ in this class.
   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

10. I feel scared when my professor talks to me in Spanish.
    Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

11. I feel scared when my classmates talk to me in Spanish.
    Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree
12. I feel scared when other speakers talk to me in Spanish outside of class.

   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

13. I feel scared when I speak in Spanish to my professor.

   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

14. I feel scared when I speak in Spanish to my classmates.

   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

15. I feel scared when I speak in Spanish to others outside of class.

   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

16. I worry about whether I speak better in Spanish than my classmates.

   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

17. I worry about whether my classmates speak better in Spanish than me.

   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

18. I worry about whether my classmates will get a higher grade than me.

   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

19. I worry that I will make a mistake when speaking in Spanish.

   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

20. I worry that people will laugh at me if I speak in Spanish.

   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

21. I feel more scared in Spanish class than in other classes.

   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

22. I worry about whether my professor will correct my Spanish mistakes.

   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

23. I worry about whether my classmates will correct my Spanish mistakes.
Strongly disagree  (1)  (2)  (3)  (4)  (5)  Strongly Agree
24. I am confident when having conversations in Spanish with native speakers of Spanish.

Strongly disagree  (1)  (2)  (3)  (4)  (5)  Strongly Agree
25. Even when I make mistakes speaking in Spanish, I feel like I can still communicate.

Strongly disagree  (1)  (2)  (3)  (4)  (5)  Strongly Agree
26. I am confident when having conversations in Spanish with my classmates.

Strongly disagree  (1)  (2)  (3)  (4)  (5)  Strongly Agree
27. I feel confident using Spanish, even though I may not speak Spanish well.

Strongly disagree  (1)  (2)  (3)  (4)  (5)  Strongly Agree
28. When Spanish is spoken to me, I feel that I can understand most of it.

Strongly disagree  (1)  (2)  (3)  (4)  (5)  Strongly Agree
29. I feel comfortable practicing my Spanish almost any time and place.
Appendix E: Instructions for Zoom conversations

Instructions for first peer Zoom conversation

1. Zoom Conversation Information

The Zoom conversation requires two steps: (a) conversing with your partner and (b) completing this post-conversation survey.

*Important*: This Zoom conversation will take place *at the same hour* as your normally scheduled SPAN 208 class. As a result, you will NOT see your TA in your normal Zoom classroom today.

2. Instructions for the Zoom Conversation

Step one: As soon as you enter into Zoom, the platform will start recording the conversation. **Do not stop the recording.** When both partners are ready for the conversation to begin, each person needs to state their full name.

Step two: During the first five minutes of the recording, get to know each other (ideas: where are you from, what are your hobbies, what classes are you taking this semester, what are your goals for the course, what are your favorite foods/movies/books/stores/etc.)

Step three: For the next 25 minutes of the 30-minute conversation, converse **only** about the following topics: **Study abroad; travel**. The following questions are to help guide you throughout the conversation if you would like to reference them. You do not have to answer these questions but they are a good place to start if you find you are running out of things to discuss.

**Important: The entire conversation needs to be in Spanish**

a. What are the most important factors when deciding which study abroad program to choose?
b. What challenges do you think students face when studying abroad?
c. Should study abroad be mandatory for university students? For Spanish majors?
d. What do you think are the major differences between study abroad and extended travel in general?
e. When you travel, what is most important to you (i.e., relaxing, exploring the area, understanding the history, trying new foods, doing physical activities, etc.)? Explain.
g. What experiences abroad have you had?

Step four: Complete this post-conversation survey.
Instructions for second peer Zoom conversation

1. Zoom Conversation Information

The Zoom conversation requires two steps: (a) conversing with your partner and (b) completing this post-conversation survey.

*Important*: This Zoom conversation will take place *at the same hour* as your normally scheduled SPAN 208 class. As a result, you will NOT see your TA in your normal Zoom classroom today.

2. Instructions for the Zoom Conversation

Step one: As soon as you enter into Zoom, the platform will start recording the conversation. **Do not stop the recording.** When both partners are ready for the conversation to begin, each person needs to state their full name.

Step two: During the first five minutes of the recording, get to know each other (ideas: where are you from, what are your hobbies, what classes are you taking this semester, what are your goals for the course, what are your favorite foods/movies/books/stores/etc.)

Step three: For the next 25 minutes of the 30-minute conversation, converse **only** about the following topics: Cultural events. The following questions are to help guide you throughout the conversation if you would like to reference them. You do not have to answer these questions but they are a good place to start if you find you are running out of things to discuss.

**Important: The entire conversation needs to be in Spanish**

a. Where you live, what do you think is the most important cultural event of the year and why?
b. Explain this cultural event in detail in terms of food and practices; what do you think this cultural event represents in terms of the society’s values?
c. Have you ever participated in a cultural event that was different or new for you? Explain your experience.
d. What cultural event from a different country would you like to attend one day? Why?
e. What is your favorite food from where you live? What is your favorite food from another country? Explain your choices.
f. What makes a practice to be accepted as a facet of culture? (e.g., las corridas de toros)

Step four: Complete this post-conversation survey.
Instructions for third peer Zoom conversation

1. Zoom Conversation Information

The Zoom conversation requires two steps: (a) conversing with your partner and (b) completing this post-conversation survey.

*Important*: This Zoom conversation will take place *at the same hour* as your normally scheduled SPAN 208 class. As a result, you will NOT see your TA in your normal Zoom classroom today.

2. Instructions for the Zoom Conversation

   Step one: As soon as you enter into Zoom, the platform will start recording the conversation. **Do not stop the recording.** When both partners are ready for the conversation to begin, each person needs to state their full name.

   Step two: During the first five minutes of the recording, get to know each other (ideas: where are you from, what are your hobbies, what classes are you taking this semester, what are your goals for the course, what are your favorite foods/movies/books/stores/etc.)

   Step three: For the next 25 minutes of the 30-minute conversation, converse **only** about the following topics: The world and news. The following questions are to help guide you throughout the conversation if you would like to reference them. You do not have to answer these questions but they are a good place to start if you find you are running out of things to discuss.

   **Important: The entire conversation needs to be in Spanish**

   a. In your opinion, what is the best way to stay informed about the news?
   b. What kinds of news do you like to read about (health, sports, politics, science, fashion, etc.)? Explain.
   c. What do you think are the most important things going on in the world today?
   d. Do you think that social media has helped or hindered the public’s knowledge of the news? Explain.
   e. In your opinion, does the media type play a role in how well (or not) people are informed about the new (i.e. television program, online short video, newspaper article, documentary, magazine, etc.)? Explain.
   f. What are the benefits and disadvantages to staying tuned in to the news on a daily basis?
   g. What is a recent news event that you have heard of or something significant that has happened recently in your community?

   Step four: Complete this post-conversation survey.
Instructions for fourth peer Zoom conversation

1. Zoom Conversation Information

The Zoom conversation requires two steps: (a) conversing with your partner and (b) completing this post-conversation survey.

*Important*: This Zoom conversation will take place *at the same hour* as your normally scheduled SPAN 208 class. As a result, you will NOT see your TA in your Zoom class today.

2. Instructions for the Zoom Conversation

Step one: As soon as you enter into Zoom, the platform will start recording the conversation. Do not stop the recording. When both partners are ready for the conversation to begin, each person needs to state their full name.

Step two: During the first five minutes of the recording, get to know each other (ideas: where are you from, what are your hobbies, what classes are you taking this semester, what are your goals for the course, what are your favorite foods/movies/books/stores/etc.)

Step three: For the next 25 minutes of the 30-minute conversation, converse only about the following topics: Physical and mental health. The following questions are to help guide you throughout the conversation if you would like to reference them. You do not have to answer these questions but they are a good place to start if you find you are running out of things to discuss.

**Important: The entire conversation needs to be in Spanish**

a. What do you think are the best steps to take to stay in good physical health?
b. What do you think are the best ways to relieve stress and maintain mental health?
c. In your opinion, which is more difficult to achieve on a daily basis: eating healthy foods or exercising. Explain why.
d. What are your country’s most prominent health issues? Why do you think this is?
e. In your opinion, what are some solutions for the issues that you mentioned in previous question?
f. What is good physical health for you? Beyond what you have heard conventionally in a magazine or pamphlet, what does being healthy mean to your life? For example, does weight matter?
g. Have you or someone you know ever changed any of habits to be healthier? What did you or did they do specifically? What were the results? (Remember, this can be for physical and/or mental health)

Step four: Complete this post-conversation survey.
Appendix F: Instructions for Talk Abroad conversations

Conversation #1

1. During the first 5 minutes of the recording, get to know each other (ideas: where are you from, what are your hobbies, what are your favorite foods/movies/books/stores/etc.).

2. For the next 25 minutes of the 30-minute conversation, converse only about the following topics: Study abroad; travel. The following questions are to help guide you throughout the conversation if you would like to reference them. You do not have to answer these questions but they are a good place to start if you find you are running out of things to discuss.

   **Important: The entire conversation needs to be in Spanish**

   a. What are the most important factors when deciding which study abroad program to choose?
   b. What challenges do you think students face when studying abroad?
   c. Should study abroad be mandatory for university students? For Spanish majors?
   d. What do you think are the major differences between study abroad and extended travel in general?
   e. When you travel, what is most important to you (i.e., relaxing, exploring the area, understanding the history, trying new foods, doing physical activities, etc.)? Explain.
   g. What experiences abroad have you had?

3. Complete this survey directly after the Talk Abroad conversation

Conversation #2

1. During the first 5 minutes of the recording, get to know each other (ideas: where are you from, what are your hobbies, what are your favorite foods/movies/books/stores/etc.)

2. For the next 25 minutes of the 30-minute conversation, converse only about the following topics: Cultural events. The following questions are to help guide you throughout the conversation if you would like to reference them. You do not have to answer these questions but they are a good place to start if you find you are running out of things to discuss.

   **Important: The entire conversation needs to be in Spanish**

   a. Where you live, what do you think is the most important cultural event of the year and why?
   b. Explain this cultural event in detail in terms of food and practices; what do you think this cultural event represents in terms of the society’s values?
c. Have you ever participated in a cultural event that was different or new for you? Explain your experience.
d. What cultural event from a different country would you like to attend one day? Why?
e. What is your favorite food from where you live? What is your favorite food from another country? Explain your choices.
f. What makes a practice to be accepted as a facet of culture? (e.g., las corridas de toros)

**Conversation #3**

1. During the first 5 minutes of the recording, get to know each other (ideas: where are you from, what are your hobbies, what are your favorite foods/ movies/ books/ stores/ etc.)

2. For the next 25 minutes of the 30-minute conversation, converse only about the following topics: **The world and news**. The following questions are to help guide you throughout the conversation if you would like to reference them. You do not have to answer these questions but they are a good place to start if you find you are running out of things to discuss.

   **Important: The entire conversation needs to be in Spanish**

   a. In your opinion, what is the best way to stay informed about the news?
   b. What kinds of news do you like to read about (health, sports, politics, science, fashion, etc.)? Explain.
   c. What do you think are the most important things going on in the world today?
   d. Do you think that social media has helped or hindered the public’s knowledge of the news? Explain.
   e. In your opinion, does the media type play a role in how well (or not) people are informed about the new (i.e. television program, online short video, newspaper article, documentary, magazine, etc.)? Explain.
   f. What are the benefits and disadvantages to staying tuned in to the news on a daily basis?
   g. What is a recent news event that you have heard of or something significant that has happened recently in your community?

3. Complete this [survey](#) directly after the *Talk Abroad* conversation

**Conversation #4**

1. During the first 5 minutes of the recording, get to know each other (ideas: where are you from, what are your hobbies, what are your favorite foods/ movies/ books/ stores/ etc.)

2. For the next 25 minutes of the 30-minute conversation, converse only about the following topics: **Physical and mental health**. The following questions are to help guide you throughout the conversation if you would like to reference them. You do not have to answer
these questions but they are a good place to start if you find you are running out of things to discuss.

**Important: The entire conversation needs to be in Spanish**

a. What do you think are the best steps to take to stay in good physical health?
b. What do you think are the best ways to relieve stress and maintain mental health?
c. In your opinion, which is more difficult to achieve on a daily basis: eating healthy foods or exercising. Explain why.
d. What are your country’s most prominent health issues? Why do you think this is?
e. In your opinion, what are some solutions for the issues that you mentioned in previous question?
f. What is good physical health for you? Beyond what you have heard conventionally in a magazine or pamphlet, what does being healthy mean to your life? For example, does weight matter?
g. Have you or someone you know ever changed any of habits to be healthier? What did you or did they do specifically? What were the results? (Remember, this can be for physical and/or mental health)

3. Complete this survey directly after the Talk Abroad conversation
Appendix G: DELE proficiency test

MULTIPLE CHOICE

Instructions: Select the item that best completes each sentence.

1. Al oír del accidente de su buen amigo, Paco se puso _________.
   a. alegre       b. fatigado       c. hambriento       d. desconsolado

2. No puedo comprarlo porque me___________.
   a. falta       b. dan             c. presta       d. regalan

3. Tuvo que guardar cama por estar _____________.
   a. enfermo     b. vestido       c. ocupado       d. parado

4. Aquí está tu café, Juanito. No te quemes, que está muy _____________.
   a. dulce       b. amargo       c. agrio       d. caliente

5. Al romper los anteojos, Juan se asustó porque no podía ______ sin ellos.
   a. discurrir       b. oír        c. ver       d. entender

6. ¡Pobrecita! Está resfriada y no puede _____________.
   a. salir de casa       b. recibir cartas       c. respirar con pena       d. leer las noticias

7. Era una noche oscura sin _________.
   a. estrellas       b. camas       c. lágrimas       d. nubes

8. Cuando don Carlos salió de su casa, saludó a un amigo suyo: -Buenos días,_____.
   a. ¿Qué va?       b. ¿Cómo es?       c. ¿Quién es?       d. ¿Qué tal?

9. ¡Qué ruido había con los gritos de los niños y el ______ de los perros!
   a. olor       b. sueño       c. hambre       d. ladrar

10. Para saber la hora, don Juan miró el _____________.
    a. calendario       b. bolsillo       c. estante       d. despertador
11. Yo, que comprendo poco de mecánica, sé que el auto no puede funcionar sin_.
   a. permiso b. comer c. aceite d. bocina

12. Nos dijo mamá que era hora de comer y por eso ____________.
   a. fuimos a nadar b. tomamos asiento c. comenzamos a fumar d. nos acostamos pronto

13. ¡Cuidado con ese cuchillo o vas a ____________ el dedo!
   a. cortarte b. torcerte c. comerte d. quemarte

14. Tuvo tanto miedo de caerse que se negó a ____________ con nosotros.
   a. almorzar b. charlar c. cantar d. patinar

15. Abrió la ventana y miró: en efecto, grandes lenguas de ______ salían llameando de las casas.
   a. zorros b. serpientes c. cuero d. fuego

16. Compró ejemplares de todos los diarios pero en vano. No halló ____________.
   a. los diez centavos b. el periódico perdido c. la noticia que deseaba d. los ejemplos

17. Por varias semanas acudieron colegas del difunto profesor a _______ el dolor de la viuda.
   a. aliviar b. dulcificar c. embromar d. estorbar

18. Sus amigos pudieron haberlo salvado pero lo dejaron ____________.
   a. ganar b. parecer c. perecer d. acabar

19. Al salir de la misa me sentía tan caritativo que no pude menos que ___________ a un pobre mendigo que había allí sentado.
   a. pegarle b. darle una limosna c. echar una mirada d. maldecir

20. Al lado de la Plaza de Armas había dos limosneros pidiendo ___________.
   a. pedazos b. paz c. monedas d. escopetas
21. Siempre maltratado por los niños, el perro no podía acostumbrarse a ______ de sus nuevos amos.
   a. las caricias       b. los engaños       c. las locuras       d. los golpes

22. ¿Dónde estará mi cartera? La dejé aquí mismo hace poco y parece que el necio de mi hermano ha vuelto a ______.
   a. dejármela       b. deshacérsmela   c. escondérmela   d. acabármela

23. Permaneció un gran rato abstraído, los ojos clavados en el fogón y el pensamiento ______ .
   a. en el bolsillo   b. en el fuego     c. lleno de alboroto d. Dios sabe dónde

24. En vez de dirigir el tráfico estabas charlando, así que tú mismo ______ del choque.
   a. sabes la gravedad b. eres testigo   c. tuviste la culpa d. conociste a las víctimas

25. Posee esta tierra un clima tan propio para la agricultura como para ______.
   a. la construcción de trampas   b. el fomento de motines  c. el costo de vida d. la cría de reses

26. Aficionado leal de obras teatrales, Juan se entristeció al saber ______ del gran actor.
   a. del fallecimiento   b. del éxito    c. de la buena suerte d. de la alabanza

27. Se reunieron a menudo para efectuar un tratado pero no pudieron ______
   a. desavenirse   b. echarlo a un lado   c. rechazarlo   d. llevarlo a cabo

28. Se negaron a embarcarse porque tenían miedo de ______.
   a. los peces       b. los naufragios  c. los faros       d. las playas

29. La mujer no aprobó el cambio de domicilio pues no le gustaba ______.
   a. el callejeo   b. el puente   c. esa estación        d. aquel barrio

30. Era el único que tenía algo que comer pero se negó a ______
   a. hojearlo       b. ponérselo    c. conservarlo  d. repartirlo
El sueño de Joan Miró

Hoy se inaugura en Palma de Mallorca la Fundación y Joan Miró, en el mismo lugar en donde el artista vivió sus últimos treinta y cinco años. El sueño de Joan Miró se ha __________ (1). Los fondos donados a la ciudad por el pintor y su esposa en 1981 permitieron que el sueño se ______________ (2); más tarde, en 1986, el Ayuntamiento de Palma de Mallorca decidió ______________ (3) al arquitecto Rafael Moneo un edificio que ____________ (4) a la vez como sede de la entidad y como museo moderno. El proyecto ha tenido que ______________ (5) múltiples obstáculos de carácter administrativo. Miró, coincidiendo ____________ (6) los deseos de toda su familia, quiso que su obra no quedara expuesta en ampulosos panteones de arte o en ______________ (7) de coleccionistas acaudalados; por ello, en 1981, creó la fundación mallorquina. Y cuando estaba ____________ (8) punto de morir, donó terrenos y edificios, así como las obras de arte que en ellos ______________ (9).

El edificio que ha construido Rafael Moneo se enmarca en ______________ (10) se denomina “Territorio Miró”, espacio en el que se han ______________ (11) de situar los distintos edificios que constituyen la herencia del pintor.

El acceso a los mismos quedará ______________ (12) para evitar el deterioro de las obras. Por otra parte, se ______________ (13), en los talleres de grabado y litografía, cursos ______________ (14) las distintas técnicas de estampación. Estos talleres también se cederán periódicamente a distintos artistas contemporáneos, ____________ (15) se busca que el “Territorio Miró” ____________ (16) un centro vivo de creación y difusión del arte a todos los niveles.

La entrada costará 500 pesetas y las previsiones dadas a conocer ayer aspiran ______________ (17) que el centro acoja a unos 150.000 visitantes al año. Los responsables esperan que la institución funcione a ______________ (18) rendimiento a principios de la ____________.
(20) semana, si bien el catálogo completo de las obras de la Fundación Pilar y Joan Miró no estará listo hasta dentro de dos años.

1. a. cumplido  b. completado  c. terminado
2. a. inició  b. iniciara  c. iniciaba
3. a. encargar  b. pedir  c. mandar
4. a. hubiera servido b. haya servido  c. sirviera
5. a. superar  b. enfrentarse  c. acabar
6. a. por  b. en  c. con
7. a. voluntad  b. poder  c. favor
8. a. al  b. en  c. a
9. a. habría  b. había  c. hubo
10. a. que  b. el que  c. lo que
11. a. pretendido  b. tratado  c. intentado
12. a. disminuido  b. escaso  c. restringido
13. a. darán  b. enseñarán  c. dirán
14. a. sobre  b. en  c. para
15. a. ya  b. así  c. para
16. a. será  b. sea  c. es
17. a. casos  b. aspectos  c. niveles
18. a. a  b. de  c. para
19. a. total  b. pleno  c. entero
20. a. siguiente  b. próxima  c. pasada
CAN-DO STATEMENTS

"Can-do": Mark the boxes of the tasks that you believe you can perform entirely in Spanish.

☐ I can write on a wide variety of familiar topics using connected sentences.

☐ I can understand the main idea in messages and presentations on a variety of topics related to everyday life...

☐ I can understand the main idea of texts related to everyday life and personal interests or studies.

☐ I can participate in conversations on familiar topics using sentences and series of sentences. I can handle...

☐ I can express myself fully not only on familiar topics but also on some concrete social, academic, and prof...

☐ I can write on a wide variety of general interest, professional, and academic topics. I can write well-organiz...

☐ I can understand the main idea and most supporting details on a variety of topics of personal and general i...

☐ I can understand the main idea and most supporting details in texts on a variety of topics of personal and ...
Appendix H: Post-conversation questionnaire

1. I can learn to speak Spanish better.
   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

2. I am a good Spanish speaker now.
   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

3. I am a good student.
   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

4. I am an important member of my class.
   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

5. I don’t feel shy speaking Spanish to my classmates.
   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

6. I don’t feel shy speaking Spanish to my professor.
   Strongly agree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

7. I don’t feel shy speaking Spanish to other speakers outside of class.
   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

8. I think that I will speak Spanish very well someday.
   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

9. I think that I will get an A or an A+ in this class.
   Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

10. I feel scared when my professor talks to me in Spanish.
    Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree

11. I feel scared when my classmates talk to me in Spanish.
    Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly Agree
12. I feel scared when other speakers talk to me in Spanish outside of class.

   Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

13. I feel scared when I speak in Spanish to my professor.

   Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

14. I feel scared when I speak in Spanish to my classmates.

   Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

15. I feel scared when I speak in Spanish to others outside of class.

   Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

16. I worry about whether I speak better in Spanish than my classmates.

   Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

17. I worry about whether my classmates speak better in Spanish than me.

   Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

18. I worry about whether my classmates will get a higher grade than me.

   Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

19. I worry that I will make a mistake when speaking in Spanish.

   Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

20. I worry that people will laugh at me if I speak in Spanish.

   Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

21. I feel more scared in Spanish class than in other classes.

   Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

22. I worry about whether my professor will correct my Spanish mistakes.

   Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

23. I worry about whether my classmates will correct my Spanish mistakes.
24. I am confident when having conversations in Spanish with native speakers of Spanish.

25. Even when I make mistakes speaking in Spanish, I feel like I can still communicate.

26. I am confident when having conversations in Spanish with my classmates.

27. I feel confident using Spanish, even though I may not speak Spanish well.

28. When Spanish is spoken to me, I feel that I can understand most of it.

29. I feel comfortable practicing my Spanish almost any time and place.

1. My partner gave me feedback on my Spanish forms or language use during this conversation.

2. My partner used Spanish forms and structures that were varied and abundant.

3. When I did not understand my partner, I asked for clarification.

4. I learned new cultural aspects during this conversation.

5. I learned new Spanish language forms during this conversation.
6. I gained confidence in my Spanish skills during this conversation.
   Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

7. I was able to practice the Spanish that I already knew in this conversation.
   Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

8. I could express my ideas and thoughts effectively during this conversation.
   Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

9. I could understand my partner without difficulty or effort during this conversation.
   Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

10. What we talked about during this conversation was interesting to me.
    Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

11. I participated actively in the conversation.
    Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

12. My motivation to learn Spanish has increased as a result of this conversation.
    Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

13. I would like to have more conversations like this one in the future.
    Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

14. I appreciate Hispanic cultures more after conversing with my partner.
    Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree

15. I found this conversation useful.
    Strongly disagree   (1)   (2)   (3)   (4)   (5)   Strongly Agree
Free response questions for post-Zoom questionnaire:

1. Did you know your partner before this conversation? (a) No; (b) Yes, we are acquaintances, but I did not know this person well prior to this conversation; (c) Yes, we know each other from multiple classes; (d) Yes, we are friends, even beyond the classroom.
2. Do you think the conversation was useful? Explain.
3. Do you think that this conversation helped boost your confidence in Spanish? Why?
4. Did you learn any new Spanish forms in this conversation (e.g., new words, phrases, grammar aspect)? Please specify and explain.
5. Did you learn any new cultural information this conversation? Please specify and explain.
6. (Relevant for second conversation and beyond) Compare this conversation to the other videoconferencing conversation(s) you have completed in SPAN 208.

Free response questions for post-Talk Abroad questionnaire:

1. Did you know your Talk Abroad partner before this conversation? Explain.
2. Do you think the conversation was useful? Explain.
3. Do you think that this conversation helped boost your confidence in Spanish? Why?
4. Did you learn any new Spanish language forms in this conversation (e.g., new words, phrases, grammar aspect)? Please specify and explain.
5. Did you learn any new cultural information this conversation? Please specify and explain.
6. (Relevant for second conversation and beyond) Compare this conversation to the other videoconferencing conversation(s) you have completed in SPAN 208.
Appendix I: Pseudonyms and origins of Talk Abroad native speakers by conversation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L2 LEARNERS</th>
<th>Conversation #1, Partner Initials and Origin</th>
<th>Conversation #2, Partner Initials and Origin</th>
<th>Conversation #3, Partner Initials and Origin</th>
<th>Conversation #4, Partner Initials and Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>M.A.G., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>R. C., Guayaquil, Ecuador</td>
<td>L.C., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>L. B., Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>M. S. B., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>Y. J. A., San José, Costa Rica</td>
<td>C. M. B., Yucatán, México</td>
<td>D. G., Bogotá Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>M.A.G., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>M. S. B., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>L.C., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>A. M. G. D., Cancún, México</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dora</td>
<td>A. F., Leon, Spain</td>
<td>A. B. T., Quito, Ecuador</td>
<td>L.C., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>M. S., Venezuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniella</td>
<td>N. A., El Salvador</td>
<td>S. S., Honduras</td>
<td>S. R., Guatemala</td>
<td>M. S. B., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brianna</td>
<td>M. G., Guatemala</td>
<td>R. T. L., Cusco, Perú</td>
<td>M. S. S., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>S. S., Honduras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>B. P., Guatemala City</td>
<td>R. C., Guayaquil, Ecuador</td>
<td>L. B., Argentina</td>
<td>J. P. L., Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>A. F., León, Spain</td>
<td>P. N., Venezuela</td>
<td>W. C., El Salvador</td>
<td>C. D. R., Guatemala City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>S. S., Honduras</td>
<td>D. R., Nicaragua</td>
<td>D. R., Nicaragua</td>
<td>D. R., Nicaragua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>M. M., El Salvador</td>
<td>K. C., Guatemala City</td>
<td>A. F., León, Spain</td>
<td>W. C., El Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>M. S., Venezuela</td>
<td>K. C., Guatemala City</td>
<td>M. A. H., Costa Rica</td>
<td>M. S. B., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>D de la T., Jalisco, México</td>
<td>S. S., Honduras</td>
<td>M. J. T., Quito, Ecuador</td>
<td>L. C., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian</td>
<td>L. C., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>M. J. T., Quito, Ecuador</td>
<td>M. C., Mérida, México</td>
<td>Y. M., Mendoza, Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey</td>
<td>A. F., León, Spain</td>
<td>C. M. B., Yucatán, México</td>
<td>C. L. P. R., Cusco, Perú</td>
<td>M. I. R., Barcelona, España</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td>City, Country</td>
<td>City, Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>A. F., León, Spain</td>
<td>E. A., El Salvador</td>
<td>A. L., Cancún, México</td>
<td>V. V., Costa Rica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalyn</td>
<td>N. A., El Salvador</td>
<td>V. V., Costa Rica</td>
<td>M. F. A., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>S. M., Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patty</td>
<td>S. S., Honduras</td>
<td>M. S. B., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>M. F. A., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>M. S., Venezuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemma</td>
<td>S. M., Ecuador</td>
<td>B. V., Tijuana, México</td>
<td>M. I. R., Barcelona, España</td>
<td>B. V., Tijuana, México</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>Y. M., Mendoza, Argentina</td>
<td>C. M. B., Yucatán, México</td>
<td>M. I. R., Barcelona, España</td>
<td>C. B., Perú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>M. I. R., Barcelona, España</td>
<td>S. A., México</td>
<td>E. C., El Salvador</td>
<td>D. G., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>J. Q., Guatemala</td>
<td>D de la T, Jalisco, México</td>
<td>M. S. S., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>E. H., Honduras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>C. A., Mérida, México</td>
<td>S. S., Honduras</td>
<td>R. C., Guayaquil, Ecuador</td>
<td>L. B., Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget</td>
<td>D de la T, Jalisco, México</td>
<td>C. R., Managua, Nicaragua</td>
<td>M. H. M., Heredia, Costa Rica</td>
<td>S. A., México</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>D. C., Tegucigalpa, Honduras</td>
<td>M. S. B., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>J. S., Buenos Aires, Argentina</td>
<td>D de la T, Jalisco, México</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretta</td>
<td>M. A. G., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>M. I. R., Barcelona, España</td>
<td>Z. R., México</td>
<td>M. S. S., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carly</td>
<td>N. N. A. A., Mérida, México</td>
<td>D. G., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>M. S., Venezuela</td>
<td>B. V., Tijuana, México</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td>D de la T, Jalisco, México</td>
<td>M. A. G., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>N. A., El Salvador</td>
<td>D. G., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>A. M. G. D., Cancún, México</td>
<td>M. A. G., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>G. M., Valencia, Spain</td>
<td>G. B. G., Yucatán, México</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL LEARNER Pseudonyms</td>
<td>Conversation #1, Partner Initials and Origin</td>
<td>Conversation #2, Partner Initials and Origin</td>
<td>Conversation #3, Partner Initials and Origin</td>
<td>Conversation #4, Partner Initials and Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>K. C., Guatemala City</td>
<td>N. N. A. A., Mérida, México</td>
<td>M. S., Venezuela</td>
<td>C. A., Mérida, México</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estefanía</td>
<td>C. A., Mérida, México</td>
<td>A. L., Cancún, México</td>
<td>N. N. A. A., Mérida, México</td>
<td>A. M. G. D., Cancún, México</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonia</td>
<td>M. J. T., Quito, Ecuador</td>
<td>M. A. G., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>M. S. S., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>A. C., El Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>P. N., Venezuela</td>
<td>L. C., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>L. C., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
<td>M. S. S., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael</td>
<td>E. H., Honduras</td>
<td>L. S. T., Honduras</td>
<td>E. C., El Salvador</td>
<td>D. C. T., Honduras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>M. H. M., Heredia, Costa Rica</td>
<td>A. A., Nicaragua</td>
<td>A. A., Nicaragua</td>
<td>D. G., Bogotá, Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begonia</td>
<td>C. L. P. R., Cusco, Perú</td>
<td>L. M., Guatemala City</td>
<td>B. P., Guatemala City</td>
<td>C. M. B., Yucatán, México</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The HL learner named Antonia completed four conversations on *Talk Abroad*, but only carried out three peer conversations due to a health issue preventing her from participating in the third peer conversation.