"He is seated in the bank":
What EFL learners notice when writing with model compositions

Patricia Ollo Jiménez

Acknowledgements

First of all, I am especially grateful to Virginia who allowed me to collect data from their students and to all the students at *San Cernin* who completed all the tasks. Without their contributions, this study would have not been possible.

Likewise, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Amparo Lázaro Ibarrola for her precious help and guidance through all the stages of this work.

Abstract

Noticing, broadly defined as the attention paid to language, has been considered to be fundamental for L2 (second language) learning (Schmidt, 1990). Consequently, research has explored the potential of a wide array of tasks to promote students' noticing. Among them, in the context of writing, providing feedback with model texts, has been claimed to be an effective way to activate learners' attentional resources. However, most research to date has been conducted in SLA contexts and there has been little research on the use of models as a written corrective feedback tool to promote noticing in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context. Also, models have been examined mainly in terms of general noticing and their specific potential for L1 transfer in EFL writing remains unexplored.

Consequently, the present study will try to fill this gap by examining what a group of EFL teenager notice when writing and comparing their writings to a model composition with a special focus on L1 transfers which include lexical and structural items.

The sample comprised 19 EFL students in their 3rd year of Compulsory Secondary Education (ESO for its Spanish acronym) at a B2.1 proficiency level. In order to isolate the effect of the feedback method, the participants were randomly divided into an experimental group (n=10) and a control group (n=9). The study was carried out in three stages: (i) Stage 1/ pretest: all students have to write an individual composition based on a picture prompt designed ad hoc to address problematic features regarding L1 transfer. They also have to write down the problematic aspects they notice; (ii) Stage 2/ treatment: students from the experimental group have to compare their compositions to one model given and, again, note down the aspects they notice (iii) Stage 3/ post-test: all students rewrite the composition with the same picture prompt. The written texts produced by the participants were analysed in terms of the amount and type of noticing in Stages 1 and 2 and the subsequent improvement of the final composition with a special focus on the reduction of L1 transfer.

Results show that learners in Stage 1 notice overwhelmingly lexical problems and similarly, in Stage 2 the EG notice mainly lexical problems, which, in turn, overwhelmingly include L1 words, when comparing their writing with the model provided. Regarding L1 transfer, participants from the EG show a great decrease in their L1 lexical transfer in their final composition but L1 syntactical transfer is not reduced.

Therefore, the results provide support for the use of models as a corrective feedback tool in EFL contexts for L1 lexical reduction. A number of implications for research and pedagogy will be discussed.

Table of contents

1. Introduction

Numerous studies to date have recognised the essential role of noticing (Schmidt, 1990) in second/foreign language learning.

In this context, what techniques foster noticing has attracted the interest of many researchers. They have pointed out the crucial role played by corrective feedback (henceforth CF) in noticing (Hyun Kim, 2015). It seems that output *per se* might not be enough (Qi & Lapkin, 2001) and therefore learners need to be provided with feedback to be aware of their linguistic limitations (Ellis, 2009).

Nevertheless, the effectiveness of written corrective feedback (WCF) on L2 acquisition is not so clear-cut since it has been an underresearched topic until recently (see Hanaoka, 2006). In particular, discursive forms of feedback like models have rarely been studied. Models are texts written by native or native-like speakers that are tailored to the learners' age and proficiency as well as to the context and genre of the composition (Cánovas Guirao, Roca de Larios & Coyle, 2015). They are considered to hold an important role in "noticing the gap" (i.e. noticing the difference between L2 learners' interlanguage and the target language) since they provide alternative lexical, grammatical and propositional input (Hanaoka & Izumi, 2012).

On many occasions, learners fill those gaps in the target language (TL) with their first language (L1) (Agustín Llach, 2011). It seems that L1 transfer is inevitable in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and may hinder fluent productions (Yuan, 2014). In this context, the native quality of models makes them adequate to help learners notice their L1 transfers when comparing the models to their own production. However, to the best of our knowledge, there is no research to date on the amount of noticing of L1 transfer in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing.

It is within this backdrop that the present exploratory study investigated what 19 EFL learners noticed and incorporated in a three-stage writing task, if being provided with models helped them to reduce their L1 transfer and whether model texts could be considered effective as language-learning tools.

2. Models as a Feedback Technique

The crucial role played by noticing for L2 learning has been clearly acknowledged. Some authors claimed: "those who notice most, learn most" (Schmidt & Frota, 1986, p. 313) or "no noticing, no acquisition" (Ellis, 1995, p.167). Noticing can be triggered by producing output since

learners might find gaps between what they want to say and what they are able to say, i.e. notice the hole (Schmidt, 1990; Swain, 1985). This awareness of their linguistic limitations facilitates "more noticing in subsequent processing of target language input which may appear as feedback ("noticing the gap")" (Martínez Esteban & Roca de Larios, 2010, p.145). In this context, it seems that feedback is also fundamental to fully complete the process of noticing in L2 learning (Ellis, 2009).

As a consequence, examining what feedback technique might be more effective for promoting noticing has attracted the interest of many researchers. In this context, there is a growing body of research -although it is still underexplored -that delves into the relationship between models as a WCF technique and learners' noticing. As this paper focuses on models as a feedback technique, this section will offer a definition of models, its features as well as an insightful overview of its most relevant research outcomes.

2.1 Definition

In light of the inconclusive findings reported with direct feedback strategies such as Error Correction (i.e. the correction of learners' linguistic errors; Ellis, 2009), several researchers have suggested alternative feedback strategies such as the use of models texts (see Hanaoka, 2006). Models are texts written by native speakers or teachers taking into account learners' age, proficiency and level and also the content and the genre of the composition but not the texts previously written by the students (Martínez Esteban & Roca de Larios, 2010).

To some extent, the use of models as a feedback technique has been overlooked within the scope of SLA. However, nowadays models are said to play a greater role than it was originally thought. Indeed, different advantages (Martínez Estaban & Roca de Larios, 2010) can be associated with modelling over other traditional feedback strategies. To start with, models seem to be "more feasible since it does not require teachers to provide individual feedback" (Hyun Kim, 2015, p. 7). Moreover, models provide learners with native-like sets of L2 words and structures for a specific context to which learners usually lack of exposure (Manchón, 2009). Models are considered to play a dual role since they do not only make learners to focus on form but also on meaning (Hanaoka, 2006). Additionally, learners are pushed to identify their mistakes since errors are not explicitly marked either in their writings or in the model texts (Adams, 2003 in Martínez Esteban & Roca de Larios, 2010). In this way, models may stimulate cognitive conflict by providing students with input that might contradict their beliefs of the TL (Tocalli-Beller & Swain, 2005 in Martínez Esteban & Roca de Larios, 2010). In this context, models force learners to notice both similarities and differences between their interlanguage and the TL. Then, there is a greater

psychological validity in providing students with the model texts after the writing task has been done (Johnson, 1988 in Martínez Esteban & Roca de Larios, 2010). Nevertheless, students were traditionally exposed to models before completing the writing task and hence they often copied it (Cánovas Guirao et al., 2015). Consequently, they were not engaged in the process of noticing and output, which is considered to be fundamental for language learning (Schmidt, 1990).

The review of studies provided in the following sections based on research outcomes in EFL contexts will illuminate the discussion of the present exploratory study regarding the use of models as a WCF technique and its effect on L1 transfer reduction.

2.2 Empirical studies using models

In spite of the abovementioned advantages of models and its potential usefulness as a feedback for L2 writing, using models as a WCF has been an underexplored issue thus far.

Hanaoka (2007) conducted the pioneering study dealing with models by examining what Japanese college students of two different proficiency levels noticed when they wrote a story in response to a picture prompt (pretest), compared it with two models, and wrote immediate and delayed revisions (posttest). Results indicated that the participants were able to identify their linguistic gaps, to find solutions in the models provided and to incorporate them into subsequent revisions. Hanaoka also found that the participants noticed mainly lexical features and those which were related to the problems they faced were incorporated to a higher extent and retained longer.

A replication of this study was conducted by Martínez Esteban and Roca de Larios (2010), who analysed the role of models in individual and collaborative EFL writing among Spanish secondary school students at a low-intermediate proficiency level of EFL. The findings indicated that the participants overwhelmingly noticed lexical problems at the composing stage and incorporated a reasonable number of features found in the models in their subsequent revisions.

Coyle and Roca de Larios (2014) found that models helped 11-and 12-year-old EFL children engaged in a three-stage writing task to direct their attention toward language chunks and content rather than to grammar. Also, it was reported that children noticed and incorporated mainly lexical features. In the same vein, Cánovas Guirao, Roca de Larios, and Coyle (2015) explored the role played by models on the noticing and subsequent revisions of written output by 10-and 11-year-old EFL children. In line with previous research (Hanaoka, 2007; Martínez Esteban & Roca de Larios, 2010) participants focused mainly on lexis and chunks of language, but the improvement of the performance of both the experimental group (EG) and the control group (CG) led Cánovas Guirao et al. (2015) to point out the possible influence of task repetition.

García Mayo and Loidi Labandibar (2017) studied the effectiveness of model texts with two groups of Spanish secondary school pupils of different proficiency level of EFL: one at an elementary level and the other one at a low-intermediate level. They were also engaged in a three-stage writing task. Their findings acknowledged the role played by models as a WCF tool since learners, regardless of their proficiency, were able to notice their language gaps when producing written output-overwhelmingly lexical-, to find solutions in the models provided and to incorporate them in the final writing at Stage 3. In contrast to previous research which incorporated a CG to isolate the effect of models as a feedback tool (Cánovas Guirao et al., 2015), this recent research ruled out the effect of task repetition since the EG outperformed the CG in the revised written output.

In sum, research on models across different age groups and proficiency levels has coincided in acknowledging the effectiveness of models in drawing learners' attention to lexical features.

In the next section, L1 lexical and structural transfer will be tackled as well as the most pivotal L1 transfer in EFL writing studies for this paper will be reviewed.

3. L1 Transfer

As the present study focuses on the effect of models as a WCF tool not only for error reduction as previous studies have done, but also for L1 transfer reduction, an overview of L1 transfer in SLA must be presented.

L1 transfer is the influence of the mother tongue on the TL (Yuanhua & Xiaoling, 2016).

Several factors might affect the frequency and choice of L1 transfer, but the ones that have been the central focus of research are proficiency (e.g. Agustín Llach, 2009; Agustín Llach, 2014; Celaya & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010; Martínez Adrián & Gutiérrez Mangado, 2015), age (Celaya & Torras, 2001) and learning context (CLIL vs. NON-CLIL). In this paper, learners' proficiency will be the prime focus of attention due to the fact that lexical knowledge develops with proficiency (Agustín Llach, 2016) and so does the syntactical one.

This is a long-known fact that learners resort to their L1 as a scaffold in order to overcome L2 communicative difficulties in a given task (see Agustín Llach, 2014). That is, they fill the gaps in their TL production with their L1.

In SLA studies, L1 has been typically operationalized as the transfer of lexical elements and has been profusely studied yielding different categories of L1 lexical items. In the majority of studies of L1 transfer, the following categories have been defined and identified (Poulisse 1990 in Poulisse 1993; Celaya & Torras, 2001):

-Borrowings are insertions of L1 words in the L2 production without any attempt to adapt them to the TL. (1) illustrates an instance of borrowing:

 (1) I got *pelo* brown (English hair)

-Foreignisings are adaptations of L1 words to the TL structure so that they sound or look like the intended TL, as shown in (2):

(2) I am good *deportis* (English sportman/sportwoman)

-Finally, calques are L2 words as the consequence of L1 literal translation, as observed in (3):

(3) The best of my life I *passed* it there (Spanish pasar / English spend)

With the aim of analysing L1 lexical transfer in EFL writing as proficiency increases, several longitudinal or pesudolongitudinal investigations have been conducted to date.

As for pesudolongitudinal studies, Agustín Llach (2011) found how the production of borrowings decreased significantly from less proficient learners (grade 4) to higher proficient learners (grade 6). On the other hand, more advanced learners resorted significantly more times to calques than less proficient learners did. Likewise, Celaya (2007) observed a decrease of borrowings and an increase of foreignisings with grade (grade 5 to grade 7). Similarly, Celaya and Ruiz de Zarobe (2010) reported that learners aged 12 made more instances of borrowings than learners aged 16. This result aligns with the trend observed in the vast majority of studies dealing with written compositions (Agustin Llach, 2011; Agustín Llach, 2014; Celaya, 2007).

Regarding the longitudinal studies conducted to the present, Agustín Llach (2016) reported that borrowings increased with age over the last three years of primary education. These results are in sharp contrast to previous research findings (Celaya, 2007; Celaya & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010). Regarding foreignisings, Agustín Llach (2016) found an increase in the production of this category with grade although the differences were not statistically significant. On the other hand, in another recent study, Arratibel Irazusta (2015) found that less proficient secondary education learners more borrowings and foreignisings than more advanced learners in an oral task, being the differences only significant in the case of foreignisings.

In sum, the general finding is that as proficiency in the FL increases L1 lexical transfer decreases. However, García Mayo and Ibarrola (2015) found contradictory findings to this general trend since they observed that more proficient learners resorted to the L1 to a higher extent that their less proficient peers in an oral task. As for the qualitative analysis, learners that are more proficient produce fewer borrowings whereas calques appear to be more common. Nevertheless, findings dealing with foreignisings are contradictory, since its increased use with proficiency observed in previous research (Agustín Llach, 2011; Agustín Llach, 2014; Celaya, 2007; Celaya & Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010) is not supported by recent investigation (Arratibel Irazusta, 2015).

As previously stated, the main bulk of studies dealing with L1 transfer has focused on L1 lexical transfer and therefore research on L1 syntactical transfer is still scarce. However, L1 syntactical transfer has been found to be as frequent as the lexical one in EFL learners' productions (García-Pastor & Selisteán, 2015) and hence it cannot be neglected (Lázaro Ibarrola & Hidalgo, 2017).

In this context, Chapetón (2008) examined the influence of L1 syntactical transfer in the writing of an Italian learner of EFL and found that the most common error was the pro-drop parameter (i.e. the cases in which subjects were needed but were omitted).Italian, as Spanish, allows null elements, i.e. in some cases the subject can be omitted: "Comió cuatro manzanas". Nevertheless, it is not the case of English since except for the imperative, an overt subject is necessary. In the same vein, García-Pastor and Selistéan (2015) found that Spanish Secondary EFL learners were very likely to omit the subject when required and also tended to transfer the Spanish word order quite frequently.

Likewise, Agustín Llach (2015) while examining L1 lexical transfer errors in EFL writings at the end of primary and secondary education, felt puzzled by the pervasive L1 syntactical transfer ones, particularly by the confusion of the verb *to be* and *to have* like in *We have hot* for *It is hot* or the persistent use of have when referring age. Apart from that error, the most notable syntactical errors found were *Adjective + s*, *Noun + Adjective*, human objects preceded by to and reflexive verbs in Spanish but not in English. Moreover, she observed that those frequent errors in grade 6 were still visible in grade 10.

In sum, L1 transfer seems to be connected to age and level of proficiency and research has either concentrated on lexical or structural transfer and a comprehensive view is lacking.

In the light of the empirical findings reviewed, the next section will pose the research questions of the present exploratory study.

4. Research Questions

The present study sets off to investigate the effects of correcting through models in a group of EFL adolescents focusing on the amount and type of noticing and also, unlike previous studies, on the reduction of L1 lexical and structural transfer. The study was carried out with two groups of students: the control group (n=9) and the experimental group (n=10) in order to isolate the effect of the feedback method. The study comprises three stages: composing stage (1) where students had to write in response to a set of pictures, comparison stage (2) the experimental group was given the model text and rewriting stage (3) both groups had to write about the same set of pictures as in the first stage.

The research questions were the following:

Regarding overall noticing:

RQ 1: What problematic features (gaps) do EFL learners notice in Stage 1?

RQ 2: What do EFL learners notice in Stage 2 when comparing their writing to the model provided?

RQ 3: How many FNs from Stage 2 are incorporated in the students' final compositions?

Focusing on L1 transfer:

RQ 4: How many L1 items do students notice in Stage 2? And what type (lexical or structural)?

Are there any differences regarding L1 transfer in the final writings (Stage 3) of learners who were provided with the model text and those who were not?

5. Methodology

This section will describe the methodology of this study where participants, instruments, procedures and data analysis will be progressively covered.

5.1 Participants

The participants of this study were 19 Spanish students in their 3rd year of Secondary Education from one semi-private school in Navarre. They were 14-15 at the time of data collection and came from an intact class. All of them had Spanish as their L1 and they were learning English as a foreign language. No students reported to have a significant exposure to English outside school but one. This student reported to have native grandparents. As for their proficiency, according to their teacher, they had a similar level of English which might be regarded as B2.1.

Learners were randomly divided into two different groups: the control group (n=9) and the experimental group (n=10).

5.2 Instruments

Participants were administered the background questionnaire (see Appendix 1) in order to collect data about their personal information as well as about their linguistic background.

For research questions 1, 2 and 3 noticing was operationalized in the form of note-taking. Even if Hanaoka and Izumi (2012) noted some disadvantages of this technique like the difficulty to verbalize some concepts, it was used as the main data collection method due to the fact that the think-aloud protocol was not a viable option for a noisy classroom setting.

Finally, for research question 4, data was collected from two writings in response to the set of pictures (see Appendix 2). The picture prompt was designed ad hoc to address problematic features regarding L1 transfer as it is one of the objectives of the present exploratory study. For instance, picture number 3 was chosen to explore if learners transferred to English the Spanish structure *have+years* which was found to be pervasive in previous research (see Agustín Llach, 2015). L1 transfer was broken down into L1 lexical transfer and L1 syntactical transfer. L1 lexical transfer was classified into borrowings, foreignisings and calques (Poulisse 1990 in Poulisse 1993) and as for L1 syntactical transfer since there is not a fixed taxonomy, contrastive analysis between Spanish and English was carried out.

5.3 Procedures

The study was carried out in two 55-minutes lesson slots and consisted of three stages. The first and the second stages were carried out on the first day, and the third stage, one day later.

-**Stage 1**: composing stage. Each student was provided with a sheet of paper and asked to write two lines per picture (Appendix 2). Also, they were asked to note down any linguistic difficulties they experienced while writing on Sheet 2 (Appendix 3). Following Hanaoka (2007), several directions were given in Sheet 2 with the following examples of note-taking in Spanish: "No sé decir X y he decidido poner X", "He escrito X pero no sé si es correcto", "Quería decir X pero no sé si se entenderá", "No sé cuál es el pasado del verbo "cantar"", "No sé si tengo que poner el verbo con –ing o no". Both the control group and the experimental group completed this task. They were given a maximum of 20 minutes to complete this task.

-**Stage 2**: Comparison stage. It took place immediately after Stage 1. This stage was carried out by the experimental group only. The students were provided with their original writings and one

native-speaker model text of the set of pictures (Appendix 4). The participants were asked to take notes of all the differences they identified between their stories and the model texts (Appendix 5). Also, in this sheet specific examples of note-taking in Spanish were given: "No sabía decir X y he visto que en el modelo se puede decir X", "Me ha gustado mucho el modelo porque…", "Yo no había mencionado X pero en el modelo dice…", "No estaba seguro de si había dicho bien X pero veo en el modelo que…". A maximum of 20 minutes were allowed to finish the activity.

-Stage 3: Rewriting stage. One day after having completed Stage 2, both groups were asked to rewrite their compositions. As in previous stages, 20 minutes were allowed for this task. The learners had not been informed of this task in advance in order to prevent the participants of the experimental group from memorizing the model. The function of this stage is a post-test since the conditions are the same as in Stage 1. Consequently, the effects of the feedback on the learners' written output might become apparent.

Students were informed that none of the results would have an impact on their marks in any subject. They were given clear instructions in their L1 in order to avoid misunderstandings.

5.4 Data analysis

The data consisted of 30 original writings composed by the students (see Appendix 6), 30 sets of notes made during Stage 1 (see Appendix 7), 15 sets of notes made during the comparison stage (see Appendix 8), and 30 revised compositions (see Appendix 9).

In order to analyse what aspects of language the participants noticed, it was necessary to code into categories (i) the problematic features noticed in Stage 1 (PFNs); (ii) the features noticed in Stage 2 (FNs), and (iii) the features incorporated in the final writings. Following Hanaoka (2007), we coded PFNs and FNs into: lexis, grammar and content, but also, following Martínez Esteban and Roca de Larios (2010), we included spelling as a separate category. Additionally, as for RQ 4, data was coded into L1 lexical transfer and L1 syntactical transfer.

"The lexical category essentially includes anything that would fit into the categories: "What does this mean?" "How do you say this?" or "Which word should I use here?". In contrast, the grammar/morphology/syntax category includes items that revolve around tense choices, grammatical morphology, word order and other features generally considered part of grammar" (pp. 330-331). The spelling category included anything that would fit into the question "how do you spell this?" (pp. 152).

The following examples, all of them from the present database, illustrate the way in which PFNs (stage 1) and FNs (stage 2) were coded into the five categories.

1. Lexis

"I don't know how to say 'columpio' in English." (Stage 1 PFN)

"I didn't know how to say 'escayola' and I wrote 'bands' but now I know that 'escayola' is sling" (Stage 2 FN)

In the first example, the student wanted an English lexical item for a Spanish word but did not know how to translate it. In the second one, the participant notices the appropriateness of a model's lexical item.

2. Syntax

"I don't know if I have to use interest with -ing" (Stage 1 PFN)

In the first example, the student did not know how to make the adjective from the noun interest (-ing vs -ed). No instances of this category were found in Stage 2.

3.Spelling

"I do not know if 'magazin' is correct" (Stage 1 PFN)

"I was not sure it was 'wering' and I realized it is 'wearing'" (Stage 2 FN)

In the first example, the student did not know how to spell a word correctly. In the second one, the student realized the correct spelling of a word.

4.Content

"I did not mention that the boy was reading a newspaper in picture number 1" (Stage 2 FN).

In the example, the student noticed a comment that he had not included in his writing. No instances of this category were found in Stage 1.

As for L1 transfer, we divided it into lexical and structural. As for the taxonomy of L1 transfer (Poulisse, 1990 in 1993; Celaya & Torras, 2001), it will be repeated to help the reader. In this section, the different categories will be illustrated with examples taken from our database:

-Borrowings: "They are in a *culumpio*" (English swing).

-Foreignisings: "He is seated in a *bank*" (English bench, Spanish banco).

-Calques: "There is a *tea game*" (Spanish juego de té).

In terms of L1 syntactical transfer, since there is not a fixed taxonomy, data will be analysed in terms of the categories we identified in our corpora and based on contrastive analysis: English vs. Spanish (Agustín Llach, 2015; Odlín, 1989):

- Pro-drop parameter: Here __ is a boy
- Wrong preposition: *He is <u>in</u> a sofa*
- Human objects preceded by to: *He asked <u>to</u> the policeman*
- Definite article "the": *In <u>the</u> picture number one*
- Adj + s: the plural is marked in the adjective: *different<u>s</u> ways*
- Noun + adjective: *There are two <u>lampostt bended</u>*
- Have + years: "*She has 4 years old*"

Having described the research methodology of the study, the next section will present the results.

6. Results

Research Question 1

The first research question asked about the aspects of language the participants noticed while writing. Table 1 shows the frequencies, means and proportions of the problematic features noticed (PFNs) by the participants in Stage 1. Learners noticed a total of 112 PFNs (65 for the EG and 47 for the CG), that is, an average of 5.89 per participant, which is higher than Hanaoka's (2007) 3.5 PFNs per participant. These PFNs were mostly lexical (60% for the EG and 59.57% for the CG) which suggests that learners' attention at this stage was focused on trying to find the correct lexical item. The percentage here is lower than in Hanaoka's (2007) study that reported that students' noticing was lexically oriented 92.4% of the times. As Table 1 displays, learners were quite concerned with words' right spelling since difficulties in spelling were reported 25% of the times (21.5% for the EG and 29.79% for the CG). Difficulties in syntax and content accounted for 8.93% and 4.46% of the total PFNs, respectively. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that the larger standard deviation -for all the categories with the exception of the lexical one-suggests greater variation among learners' written compositions.

	All participants (19)				EG (10)				CG (19)			
	n	%	mean	s.d	n	%	mean	s.d	n	%	mean	s.d
Lexis	67	59.82%	3.53	2.5	39	60%	3.9	2.69	28	59.57%	3.11	2.37
Syntax	10	8.93%	0.53	0.77	6	9.23%	0.6	0.52	4	8.51%	0.44	1.01
Spelling	28	25%	1.47	2	14	21.5%	1.4	1.65	14	29.79%	1.55	2.5
Content	5	4.46%	0.26	0.56	4	6.15%	0.4	0.7	1	2.13%	0.11	0.33
Total	112	100%	5.89	1.05	65	100%	6.5	1.06	47	100%	5.22	1.15

Table 1. Frequencies, proportions and means of problematic features noticed (PFNs) in Stage 1 writing.

Research Question 2

The second research question asked about what aspects of language the participants noticed while comparing their writings to the model provided. Table 2 displays the frequencies, percentages and means of the FNs at Stage 2.

	EG(10)			
	n	%	mean	s.d
Lexis	39	83%	3.9	1.79
Syntax	0	0%	0	0
Spelling	3	6.38%	0.3	0.67
Content	3	6.38%	0.3	0.48
Total	47	100%	4.7	1.65

Table 2. Frequencies, proportions and means of features notices (FNs) in the Stage 2 comparison task.

Learners noted a total of 47 FNs (an average of 4.7 of features per participant). Hence, the total number of features noticed in this group was lower in Stage 2 than in Stage 1 (Stage 2, n=47; Stage 1, n=65). However, in consonance with Stage 1, learners noticed overwhelmingly lexical features (83% of the total). Nevertheless, they were not able to notice any syntactical features and their focus of attention decreased for the spelling ones (Stage 2, n=3; Stage 1, n=14).

Research Question 3

The third research question addressed how many FNs from Stage 2 are incorporated in students' final compositions. Table 3 displays the number of incorporations to subsequent revisions (Stage 3).

	EG (10)		
	n	mean	SD
Stage 2 FNs	47	4.7	1.65
Stage 3 incorporations related to the FNs	**24**	**2.4**	**1.35**

Table 3. Incorporations to subsequent revisions (Stage 3).

Learners incorporated 24 out of 47 features noticed at Stage 2 in their final compositions at Stage 3, i.e. 51% of the features, with an average of 2.4 per student.

Research Question 4

The fourth research question investigated the effect of models as a corrective feedback tool on L1 transfer both at a lexical and syntactical level.

First, to get an idea of the impact of the L1 in the written production of the students, Table 4 features the percentage of L1 transfer over the total number of words.

| | EG (10) | | | | | | | | CG (9) | | | | | | | |
| | Stage 1 (1530 words) | | | | Stage 3 (1535 words) | | | | Stage 1 (1348 words) | | | | Stage 3 (1360 words) | | | |
	n	%	mean	s.d	n	%	mean	s.d	n	%	mean	s.d	n	%	mean	s.d
L1 lexical transfer	**24**	1.56%	2.4	1.47	**12**	0.78%	1.2	0.89	**15**	1.11%	1.66	1.15	**11**	0.8%	1.22	0.69
L1 syntactical transfer	**55**	3.6%	5.5	1.62	**65**	4.23%	6.5	1.75	**29**	2.15%	3.22	0.94	**29**	2.13%	3.22	0.98
Total transfer	**79**	5.16%	7.9	3.09	**77**	5.01%	7.7	2.64	**44**	3.26%	4.88	2.09	**40**	2.94%	4.44	1.67

Table 4. Percentage of L1 transfer over the total number of words.

As displayed in Table 4, EFL learners from the present study did not resort frequently to their L1 when producing written output both at Stage 1 and Stage 3 (5.16 % and 5.01 respectively for the EG and 3.26% and 2.94% for the CG). Additionally, learners form both groups resorted to a higher extent to their L1 in terms of syntactical and grammar structures rather than to lexical items. For instance, 3.6% of the words in learners' compositions from the EG at Stage 1 accounted for L1 syntactical transfer whereas only 1.56% accounted for L1 lexical transfer. The same trend can be observed in participants' compositions from the CG at both stages.

Next, Table 5 shows a deeper analysis of L1 lexical transfer over the total number of words from both groups (EG and CG) at Stage 1 and 3.

	EG (10)								CG (9)							
	Stage 1 (1530 words)				Stage 3 (1535 words)				Stage 1 (1348 words)				Stage 3 (1360 words)			
	n	%	mean	s.d	n	%	mean	s.d	n	%	mean	s.d	n	%	mean	s.d
Borrowings	18	1.17%	1.8	2.09	9	0.58%	0.9	1.37	7	0.51%	0.77	1.39	4	0.29%	0.44	0.52
Foreignisings	4	0.26%	0.4	0.84	2	0.13%	0.2	0.42	8	0.59%	0.88	1.36	7	0.51%	0.77	0.97
Calques	2	0.13%	0.2	0.42	1	0.06%	0.1	0.31	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**24**	**1.56%**	**2.4**	**1.47**	**12**	**0.78%**	**1.2**	**0.89**	**15**	**1.11%**	**1.66**	**1.15**	**11**	**0.8%**	**1.22**	**0.69**

Table 5. L1 lexical transfer over the total number of words

As displayed in Table 5, learners from the EG made use of L1 lexical items 24 times at Stage 1 (1.56%), an average of 2.4 per student. Borrowings was the lexical category most frequently used among learners from this group (1.17%), whereas calques was the category least resorted to with only 2 instances. At Stage 3, L1 lexical transfer was half reduced (from 1.56% at Stage 1 to 0.78 at Stage 3). In consonance with Stage 1, students produced more borrowings than foreignisings and calques.

As for the CG, learners produced 15 instances of L1 lexical transfer at Stage 1 (1.11% of the total of words), an average of 1.66 per learner. In this case, the production of borrowings and foreignisings was very similar. However, CG learners did not produce any calques. At Stage 3, CG students produced 11 instances of L1 lexical errors (0.8% of the words). Hence, there was a slight reduction from Stage 1 to Stage 3, but not as acute as in the EG.

It is also worth mentioning that standard deviation figures were markedly high in all the categories, indicating that individual learners behave differently with respect to L1 lexical transfer while writing a composition.

Having presented the results for L1 lexical transfer, Table 5 displays the analysis of L1 syntactical transfer over the total of words in EG and CG learners' written compositions at Stage 1 and 3.

	EG (10)								CG (9)							
	Stage 1 (1530 words)				Stage 3 (1535 words)				Stage 1 (1348 words)				Stage 3 (1360 words)			
	n	%	mean	s.d	n	%	mean	s.d	n	%	mean	s.d	n	%	mean	s.d
Have +years	4	0.26%	0.4	0.51	3	0.19%	0.3	0.48	1	0.07%	0.11	0.33	1	0.07%	0.11	0.33
To+object	5	0.32%	0.5	0.52	3	0.19%	0.3	0.48	1	0.07%	0.11	0.33	1	0.07%	0.11	0.33
Pro-drop	12	0.78%	1.2	2.49	13	0.84%	1.3	2.36	4	0.29%	0.44	1.33	3	0.22%	0.33	0.7
Article "the"	21	1.37%	2.1	2.9	29	1.88%	2.9	2.97	12	0.89%	1.33	1.41	13	0.95%	1.44	1.56
Wrong Prep.	10	0.65%	1	0.94	13	0.84%	1.3	1.15	10	0.74%	1.11	0.92	12	0.88%	1.33	1.41
Adj. pl.	3	0.19%	0.3	0.48	3	0.19%	0.3	0.67	1	0.07%	0.11	0.33	1	0.07%	0.11	0.33
N+adj	0	0%	0	0	1	0.06%	0.1	0.32	0	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**55**	**3.59%**	**5.5**	**1.62**	**65**	**4.23%**	**6.5**	**1.75**	**29**	**2.15%**	**3.22**	**0.94**	**29**	**2.15%**	**3.22**	**0.98**

Table 6. L1 syntactical transfer at Stage 1 and Stage 3 over the total number of words

As shown in Table 6, EG learners produced 55 instances of L1 syntactical transfer errors at Stage 1 (3.59% of the total of the words), with an average of 5.5 errors per student. The most common syntactical transfer error was the wrong use of the definite article "the" (1.37%) followed by the pro-drop parameter (0.78%) and the wrong use of prepositions (0.65%). The structures of "to+object", "have+years" and adjectives in plural were transferred to a lesser extent (0.32%, 0.26% and 0.19% respectively). At Stage 3, there was an increase of L1 syntactical transfer errors with 65 instances (4.23% of the total of the words), an average of 6.5 per learner. In consonance with Stage 1, the same trend was followed with respect to the most common transfer errors.

On the other hand, learners from the CG made a total of 29 instances of L1 syntactical transfer errors at Stage 1 (2.15% of the total of the words and 3.22 per learner). The most frequent one was the wrong use of the definite article "the" and prepositions (0.89% and 0.74% respectively). At Stage 3, the same amount of transfer errors as in Stage 1 were made. Additionally, the most common transfer errors were the same as in Stage 1.

It is also worth mentioning that standard deviation figures were quite high in both groups. That means that participants from the present study behave differently with respect to L1 syntactical transfer.

To continue with, Table 7 shows how many L1 items students did notice in Stage 2.

	EG (10)		
	n	mean	SD
Noticed L1 items	13	1.3	1.82
Stage 2 FNs	47	4.7	1.65

Table 7. L1 items noticed in Stage 2

As shown in Table 7, leaners noticed 13 L1 items at Stage 2 out of the 47 FNs at this stage. More specifically, all these L1 items were L1 lexical transfer items since as displayed in Table 2 no grammar items were noticed at this stage.

Next, Table 8 displays a deeper analysis of this L1 transfer noticing at Stage 2 over the total number of L1 transfers at Stage 1.

	EG (10)			
	n	**%**	**mean**	**s.d**
Noticed L1 lexical transfer (over 24 L1 lexical transfers)	13	54.16%	1.3	1.82
Noticed L1 syntactical transfer (over 55 L1 syntactical transfers)	0	0%	0	0
Noticed total L1 (over 79 L1 transfers)	13	16.45%	1.3	1.82

Table 8. L1 items noticed at Stage 2 over the total L1 transfer

As shown in Table 8, learners noticed 13 L1 transfers out of the 79 they made at Stage 1 (see Table 4, 5 and 6 for further detail), i.e participants from the EG noticed 16,45% of L1 transfer in their original writings, which is quite a low percentage overall.

However, this low percentage is accounted for the inability of learners to notice any L1 syntactical transfer errors with the help of the model provided. In contrast, learners were able to notice more than half of their L1 lexical transfers (54.16%) when comparing their writings to the model.

7. Discussion

In this section, the 4 research questions posed for the present study will be discussed.

Regarding the first research question (*What problematic features (gaps) do EFL learners notice in Stage 1?*), results showed that learners noticed mainly lexical problems when producing written output (60%). At Stage 1, these problems were formulated due to lack of knowledge (e.g. "no sé decir 'columpio'") or potential solutions to the problems found. This is in line with previous research which found that learners noticed overwhelmingly lexical gaps in their interlanguage through output production (Hanaoka 2006, 2007; Cánovas Guirao et al., 2015; Coyle & Roca de Larios, 2014; García Mayo & Loidi Labandibar, 2017; Martínez Esteban & Roca de Larios, 2010). This deeply lexical concern can be due to the pervasiveness

of the lexical access in all L2 writing subprocesses (Manchón, Murphy, & Roca de Larios, 2007 in Martínez Esteban & Roca de Larios, 2010).

With respect to the second research question (*What do EFL learners notice in Stage 2 when comparing their writing to the model provided?*), participants from the present study noticed overwhelmingly features related to lexis (83%). This finding is consistent with previous research (Hanaoka, 2007; Coyle and Roca de Larios, 2014; Hyun Kim, 2015) which found that lexis remained the prime focus of attention at the comparison stage. Additionally, this finding was expected to a certain extent. At Stage 2, learners from the EG were asked to compare their initial writings of Stage 1 with the model text. During this process, it was natural that learners focused their attention on the problems they had while composing the writing. Hence, this outcome suggests that model texts are capable of prompting EFL learners' noticing of lexical features.

However, students were not able to notice any features related to grammar at Stage 2 (n=0). Thus, the outcomes of the present study might suggest that models are not a useful WCF tool for noticing gaps in grammar. This outcome is in line with the results of Hyun Kim (2015) but in sharp contrast to previous research (Hanaoka, 2007; Martínez & Roca de Larios, 2010) who reported an increase in attention to grammatical features at the comparison stage.

As for the features noticed related to content, the percentage of features noticed at Stage 1 and Stage 2 are very similar (6.15 vs. 6.38) and their attention to spelling features decreased at Stage 2 (21.15 vs. 6.38). As a consequence, that means that they focused their attention on lexical features to a higher extent than at Stage 1. This outcome runs counter to previous research (Hanaoka, 2007; Hyun Kim, 2014; García Mayo & Loidi Labandibar, 2017; Martínez & Roca de Larios, 2010) which suggested a beneficial role of models in helping learners to diversify their linguistic concerns. This result can be explained from a psycholinguistic point of view, with the Zeigarnik (1999 in García Mayo & Loidi Labandibar, 2017) effect that explains that unfinished tasks create anxiety in human's minds and as a consequence tend to be retained in memory for a longer period of time. In this context, since the vast majority of features noticed at Stage 1 were lexical, this created anxiety among students for knowing the unknown lexical items. When they were given the model text at Stage 2, learners tended to focus their attention on those features which created anxiety at the first stage, ignoring in this way the remainder features.

Research question number 3 addressed the effects of noticing in Stage 2 on subsequent revisions in Stage 3. Data showed that the participants from the EG, out of a total of 47 FNs in Stage 2, 24 were later incorporated in the subsequent revision stage. This figure aligns with previous studies (Hyun Kim, 2015; Martínez Esteban & Roca de Larios, 2010) who found that participants incorporated almost or half of the features noticed at Stage 2 in the writings of Stage 3. Nevertheless, it is very low compared to the 78% reported in Swain and Lapkin (2002). A reason that could account for the difference could be the fact that students from our present study are immersed in an instructional context where grammar and vocabulary are quite explicit whereas those in Swain and Lapkin's study were plausibly used to the implicit features demanded by models. Hence, as suggested by Martinez Esteban and Roca de Larios (2010), contextual factors might influence on learners' noticing and incorporation of feedback to a higher extent than the nature of the task itself.

As for the first part of the fourth research question, (*How many L1 items do students notice in Stage 2, and what type (lexical or structural)?*), learners noticed 13 L1 lexical transfer items in Stage 2. This result suggests that learners are able to notice more than half of their L1 lexical transfer mistakes (n=24) with the help of the model text. Hence, models appear to be a useful WCF technique for prompting learners' noticing of L1 lexical transfer items. Additionally, the fact that the amount of mistakes reduced in Stage 3 is almost the same as the number of L1 lexical items noticed at Stage 2 seems to evince that the model text provided is the responsible for that reduction. In the same vein, this result adds support to the existing evidence that noticing is fundamental for L2 learning.

On the other hand, learners were not able to notice any L1 syntactical mistakes. As a consequence, this result seems to evince that models are not an effective WCF tool for promoting L1 syntactical transfer noticing.

As for the second part of the fourth research question, *(Are there any differences regarding L1 transfer in the final writings (Stage 3) of learners who were provided with model texts and those who were not?),* the comparative and intergroup analysis (CG vs. EG) of participants' writings between Stage 1 and Stage 3 reveals that models are a helpful tool for L1 lexical transfer reduction but not for the syntactical one.

As for the L1 lexical transfer, participants from the EG reduced L1 lexical errors to 50% at Stage 3 if compared to Stage 1 (1.56% vs 0.78%). Interestingly, the three L1 lexical transfer categories were halved at Stage 3. Hence, it could be claimed that the model provided had an

equal impact on the three categories of L1 lexical errors. On the other hand, learners from the CG did not improve their writings at Stage 3 to such a great extent as the EG did in terms of L1 lexical transfer (1.11% vs 0.8%). Therefore, it seems that models as a WCF tool are a useful technique for L1 lexical transfer reduction, ruling out in this way the effect of task repetition.

In terms of the qualitative analysis, the category of 'borrowing' was the most used in both stages among learners of the EG and 'calques' the least resorted to in both groups (EG and CG). Nevertheless, in the case of the CG, the category most resorted to was 'foreignising'. A plausible explanation for this mismatch could be the fact that as recent investigation has suggested, foreignisings do not appear to be typical of more advanced learners (Arratibel Irazusta, 2015) and hence together with borrowings, they are used among less proficient learners since participants from the present study are considered to have the same level of proficiency. In relation to this, the fact that the category of 'calques' ranked the lowest one in both groups and in both stages suggests that learners from the present study do not command the proficiency needed for resorting to this strategy. This result is in line with previous research which found that calques are commonly used by more advanced learners (Agustín Llach, 2011).

Regarding L1 syntactical transfer, participants from the EG not only did not reduce their instances of L1 syntactical transfer errors from Stage 1 to Stage 3 but made more errors at Stage 3 (3.6% vs 4.23%). A plausible explanation for this result might be the fact that since learners were so focused on trying to remember and incorporating the lexical items they noticed in the model (Stage 2), they neglected the syntax in their subsequent revision at Stage 3. Hence, participants from the EG managed to reduce the amount of L1 lexical transfer errors but resorted to a higher extent to L1 syntactical transfer instead. Additionally, since they did not notice their syntactical mistakes when comparing their writings to the model at the comparison stage, this did not prevent them from making the same mistakes. On the other hand, learners from the CG made the same amount of L1 syntactical transfer errors at Stage 1 and 3. This can be explained through the fact that since the CG did not receive WCF, they tried to do the writing of Stage 3 as similar as the one they did at Stage 1. This result suggests that task repetition does not contribute to L1 syntactical transfer reduction.

As for the qualitative analysis, the most common L1 syntactical errors in both groups and in both stages were the definite article "the", the pro-drop parameter and the wrong use of prepositions. This finding partially aligns with previous research (Chapetón, 2007; García-Pastor & Selisteán, 2015) which found that the omission of the subject when needed appeared to be one of the most common L1 syntactical transfer error in Spanish EFL learners' writings.

Nevertheless, the definite article "the" and the wrong use of prepositions were not found to be as pervasive L1 syntactical transfer errors in previous research.

Besides, it is worth noticing that data from the present exploratory study show that EFL learners tend to transfer L1 syntactical structures to a higher extent than the lexical ones. Hence, L1 syntactical transfer should not be ignored in the research dealing with L1 transfer in the scope of SLA.

All in all, learners are able to notice their gaps when producing written output, search for solutions in the feedback provided with and incorporate a reasonable number of solutions in subsequent revisions. As for models as a WCF tool, it seems that models are useful for engaging learners in noticing lexical gaps but not for helping learners with grammar issues. As for the effect of models on L1 transfer, the analysis of learners' written production evince that models as a WCF have a positive impact on L1 lexical transfer reduction. However, it is not a helpful tool for L1 syntactical transfer reduction.

8. Conclusion

Due to the rapid interest in new WCF techniques in SLA in the last years, research has focused on shedding light on the gains models can offer to the development of writing in a FL context. They have been acknowledged to have great benefits in L2 writing. However, research conducted to date has not investigated its effect on L1 transfer. The present study has aimed to provide more empirical evidence to this field.

The present study investigated the role of models as a form of WCF in a three- stage writing task carried out by 19 EFL adolescent learners. The findings have highlighted the potential crucial noticing function of output since EFL secondary school learners were capable of noticing their linguistic gaps- overwhelmingly lexical- to find solutions in the model given and to incorporate them in subsequent revisions. Additionally, findings have shed light on the effectiveness of models on L1 lexical transfer reduction in EFL writings. As for the qualitative analysis, data showed that the three categories of L1 lexical transfer (borrowings, foreignisings and calques) are equally reduced. However, L1 syntactical transfer errors were not reduced with the help of the model provided.

The pedagogical implications of the study point to the usefulness of model texts as a WCF technique which were found to promote the noticing of different aspects of language-lexical,

grammatical, spelling and content- all of which are pivotal for the development of L2 writing. Specifically, the strength of models lies in their potential to provide learners with lexical items and expressions which are beyond their current repertoire. In this context, it would be recommended to provide learners with extensive practice and instructions on how to use models and on how to allocate their attention on different features apart from the lexical ones. Additionally, EFL teachers could prepare activities or class discussion to clarify any problematic issues students might have, reducing in this way the workload involved in the writing task.

However, due to the descriptive and exploratory nature of the present study, the results should be taken with caution. Firstly, a comprehensive text of general proficiency would have measured learners' English more accurately. Besides, analysis of the data with inferential statistics would have allowed us to see if intergroup differences reached statistical significant differences or not. Thirdly, this study only focused on the incorporation of solutions to the PFNs in Stage 1 and overlooked the incorporation of other features that would have helped to gain a deeper insight of the language learning potential of models.

Despite the limitations of this study, findings may be suggestive of further avenues to future studies. Future research should use longitudinal designs in order to investigate the long-term effects of modeling on learners' noticing as well as on L1 transfer as learners' proficiency increases. Additionally, the present study advocates more research on L1 syntactical transfer due to the fact that EFL learners appear to make more L1 syntactical transfer errors than lexical ones.

References

Agustín Llach, M. P. (2009). The Role of Spanish L1 in the Vocabulary Use of CLIL and non-CLIL EFL learners. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe & M. J. Jiménez Catalán (Eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe*, pp.112-129. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Agustín Llach, M. P. (2011). *Lexical Errors and Accuracy in Foreign Language Writing.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Agustín Llach, M. P. (2014). Exploring the lexical profile of young CLIL learners. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education, 2(1)*, 53–73. DOI: 10.1075/jicb.2.1.03agu

Agustín Llach, M. P. (2015). Lexical Errors in Writing at the End of Primary and Secondary Education: Description and Pedagogical Implication. *Porta Linguarum, 23*, 109-124.

Agustín Llach, M. P. (2016). Age and type of instruction (CLIL vs. traditional EFL) in lexical development. *International Journal of English Studies, 16 (1)*, 75-96. DOI:10.6018/ijes/2016/1/220691

Arratibal Irazusta, I. (2015). *'They start to busqu the jump'. A pseudolongitudinal study of crosslinguistic influence in L3 English CLIL learners*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of the Basque Country: Vitoria.

Cánovas Guirao, J., Roca de Larios, J., & Coyle, Y. (2015). The use of models as written feedback technique with young EFL learners. *System, 52*, 63-77.

Celaya, M.L. (2007). I study *natus* in English: lexical transfer in CLIL and regular learners.In R. Monray & A. Sánchez (Eds.), *25 years of Applied Linguistics in Spain: Milestones and Challenges*, 43-49.

Celaya, M. L., & Torras, M. R. (2001). L1 influence and EFL vocabulary: do children rely more on L1 than Adult learners? Proceedings of the XXV AEDEAN Conference. Granada: Universidad de Granada.

Celaya, M. L., & Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2010). First languages and age in CLIL and NON-CLIL contexts. *International CLIL Research Journal, 1(3),* 60-66. http://www.icrj.eu/13/article6.html

Coyle, Y., & Roca de Larios, J. (2014). Exploring the role played by error correction and models on children's reported noticing and output production in a L2 writing task. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 36*, 451–485.

Chapetón, C. M. (2008). Cross-linguistic influence in the writing of an Italian learner of English as a foreign language: An exploratory study. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal, 10*, 50-72.

Ellis, R. (1995). Interpretation tasks for grammar teaching. *TESOL Quartely, 29*, 87-105.

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal, 63*, 97-107.

García Mayo, M. P., & Lázaro Ibarrola, A. (2015). Do children negotiate for meaning in task-based interaction? Evidence from CLIL and EFL settings. *System, 54*, 40-54.

García Mayo, M. P., & Loidi Labandibar, U. (2017). The Use of Models as Written Corrective Feedback in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Writing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *37*, 110–127.

García-Pastor, M. D., & Selisteán, R. T. (2015). 'If I has a lot of money…': learner errors in foreign language writing. *Tejuelo, 22*, 120-140.

Hanaoka, O. (2006). Noticing from models and reformulations: A case study of two Japanese EFL learners. *Sophia Linguistica: Working Papers in Linguistics, 54*, 167–192.

Hanaoka, O. (2007). Output, noticing, and learning: An investigation into the role of spontaneous attention to form in a four-stage writing task. *Language Teaching Research, 11*(4), 73–93.

Hanaoka, O., & Izumi, S. (2012). Noticing and uptake: Addressing pre-articulated covert problems in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*, 332–347.

Hyun Kim, J. (2015). The Role of Models and Error Correction in L2 Young Learners' Noticing and Output. *English Teaching, 70*(2), 3-26.

Lázaro Ibarrola, A., & Hidalgo, M. A. (2017). Benefits and limitations of conversational interactions among young learners of English in a CLIL context. In M. P. García Mayo (ed), *Learning Foreign Languages in Primary School: Research Insights*, pp. 86-102. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Manchón, R. (2009). *Writing in foreign language contexts. Learning, teaching and research*. Clevendon: Multiligual Matters.

Manchón, R., Murphy, L., & Roca de Larios, J. (2007). Lexical retrieval processes and strategies in second language writing: A synthesis of empirical research . *International Journal of English Studies*, *2*, 149-174.

Martínez Adrián, M., & Gutiérrez Mangado, M. J. (2015). L1 Use, Lexical Richness, Accuracy and Syntactic Complexity in the Oral Production of CLIL and NON-CLIL Learners of English. *Journal of the Spanish Association of Anglo-American Studies, 37*(2), 175-197.

Martínez Esteban, N., & Roca de Larios, J. (2010). The Use of Models as a Form of Written Feedback to Secondary School Pupils of English. *International Journal of English Studies, 10*(2), 143-170.

Odlín, T. (1989). *Language Transfer: Cross-Linguistic Influence in Language Learning*. Cambrdige: Cambrdige University Press.

Poulisse, N. (1993). A Theoretical Account of Lexical Communication Strategies. In R. Screuder & B. Weltens (Eds.), *The Bilingual Lexicon*, pp. 157-189. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. V

Qi, D. S., & Lapkin, S. (2001).Exploring the role of noticing in a three-stage second language writing task. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 277–303.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*, 129-158.

Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language. A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversational in second language acquisition* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. *Input in second language acquisition*, *15*, 165-179.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2002). Talking in through: Two French immersion learners' response to formulation. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37,* 285-304.

Yuan, H. (2014). A Corpus-based Study on the Influence of L1 on EFL Learners' Use of Prepositions. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 4* (12), 2513-2521.

Yuanhua, Ch., & Xiaoling, L. (2016). Effects of L1 Transfer on English Writing of Chinese EFL Students. *Cross-cultural Communication, 12*(4), 50-53.

Appendix 1: general background questionnaire

	Información general
1.	**Nombre:**
2.	**¿Cuántos años tienes?**
3.	**¿Eres CHICO o CHICA?**
4.	**Curso:** _____ **ESO**
5.	**¿Cuál es la primera lengua que aprendiste en casa?** 1. Euskara 2. Castellano 3. Las dos 4. Otra (¿cuál?)_____
6.	**¿En qué idioma hablas con las siguientes personas?** Con tu madre _____ Con tu padre _____ Con tus hermanos/as _____ Con tus amigos _____
7.	**Hablo....** Castellano 1. Nada 2. Poco 3. Bien 4. Perfecto Euskara 1. Nada 2. Poco 3. Bien 4. Perfecto Inglés 1. Nada 2. Poco 3. Bien 4. Perfecto Otro (¿cuál?) _____ 1. Nada 2. Poco 3. Bien 4. Perfecto Otro (¿cuál?) _____ 1. Nada 2. Poco 3. Bien 4. Perfecto
8.	**¿A qué edad empezaste a hablar…?** Castellano _____ Otra lengua que no sea inglés (¿cuál?) _____
9.	**¿A qué edad EMPEZASTE a estudiar inglés?** _____ años
10.	**¿Dónde empezaste a aprender inglés?** ☐ **En el colegio** ☐ **Academia** ☐ **Otro (especificar)** _____
11.	**Además de en el colegio, ¿has recibido alguna vez clase particulares de inglés?** ☐ SI ☐ NO (Si la respuesta es SÍ)… **¿Cuántas horas semanales?** _____ horas **¿Durante cuántos años?** _____ años

Appendix 2: Set of pictures

Appendix 3: Initial noticing sheet

NOMBRE Y APPELLIDOS:

FECHA: **COLEGIO:**   **CURSO:**

Anota los problemas que has encontrado mientras escribías la redacción

Aquí tienes ejemplos:

No sé decir "X" y he decidido poner "X"

He escrito "xxxxx" pero no sé si es correcto

Quería decir "xxxx" pero no sé si se entenderá

No sé cuál es el pasado del verbo "cantar"

No sé si tengo que poner el verbo con –ing o no

Appendix 4: Model
Model

In the first picture there is a man sitting on a bench. He is reading a newspaper. There are also two bent lampposts. The man is in a park with tall trees, bushes and white and orange flowers. In the second one, a man is watching television in his living room. He is lying on the sofa and channel surfing with the remote control in his left hand. He looks quite relaxed. In the third picture, a little girl is celebrating her birthday with her parents and brother. The girl is four years old. There is a birthday cake with four candles on the table. The people are wearing birthday hats. In picture number four, there are two girls playing on swings. They are in a park with green shrubs at the back. They look like they are having a good time. In the following picture, I can see a tourist lost in a city. He is asking the policeman for directions. They are both looking at a map because the policeman is helping the tourist. In picture number six, the boy has a broken arm. His right arm is in a sling. He has probably had an accident. He is touching his face with his other hand and he seems to be in pain. In the last picture we can see a coloured tea set consisting of a red teapot, four yellow cups, a red jug, a red and yellow sugar bowl and four blue saucers.

Appendix 5: Feedback comparison sheet

NOMBRE Y APPELLIDOS:

FECHA: **COLEGIO:**   **CURSO:**

Anota las diferencias entre los modelos y la redacción y qué palabras, expresiones, etc. has aprendido gracias a el modelo

Aquí tienes ejemplos

No sabía decir X y he visto en el modelo que se puede decir X

Me ha gustado mucho el modelo porque….

Yo no había mencionado X pero en el modelo dice…

No estaba seguro de si había dicho bien X pero veo en el modelo que

Appendix 6: Original writing Stage 1

1. In the picture number one I see a man reading a news paper in the park with ~~three classes~~ a sun glaces.

2. There's a man watching some TV on a sofa while. He seems so relax and bored.

3. Here I can see a family that is celebrating the birthday of her dotter that have four years.

4. in this picture the are two girals having fun on a ~~carrousel~~ columpid and in a sunny day.

6. there's a boy who ~~can't~~ have his harm broken : He have a ~~treesher~~ Tshirt ~~blue~~ light blue.

5. Here it is a ~~grax~~ boy asking to a police man. They are in a aity ~~with carrocay~~ wich ~~crossed~~ is over crowded.

7. there are four cups, one tetera, one Jarra ~~and~~ one azucarero, four spoons and four platos.

Lexical
- borrowings: 5 → 004%
- ~~reign~~: 0
- calque: 0

Syntax
- have + years: 1.
- Pro-drop: 2.
- to + object: 1.
- the: 1

Total words: 117

Appendix 7: Sets of notes made at Stage 1

motivation '8'

MODELS – STAGE 1 SHEET 2

NOMBRE Y APPELLIDOS:

FECHA: COLEGIO: CURSO: 3º D

Anota los problemas que has encontrado mientras escribías la redacción

Aquí tienes ejemplos:

No sé decir "X" y he decidido poner "X"

1 lexis
No sé decir plato y he puesto plato

2 lexis No sé decir columpio y he decidido poner columpio

3 lexis No sé decir taza y he puesto cup

4. lexis " " tetera y he puesto tetera

5 lexis " " jarra y " " jarra

6 lexis " " azucarero y " " azucarevo

He escrito "xxxxx" pero no sé si es correcto

7 spelling He escrito men pero creo que es man.

8 verb He escrito asking pero no sé si esta bi

Ground

6 lexis
/8

1/8 spelling

1/8 grammar

Quería decir "xxxx" pero no sé si se entenderá

No sé cuál es el pasado del verbo "cantar"

No sé si tengo que poner el verbo con –ing o no

Solution

1/8

Appendix 8: Set of notes made at Stage 2 (comparison stage)

MODELS – STAGE 2 SHEET 3

NOMBRE Y APPELLIDOS:

FECHA: COLEGIO: CURSO: 3º D

Anota las diferencias entre los modelos y la redacción y qué palabras, expresiones, etc. has
aprendido gracias a los modelos

Aquí tienes ejemplos

No sabía decir X y he visto en el modelo A que se puede decir X ~~y en el modelo B que se puede decir X~~, me gusta más la palabra del modelo A porque ya la sabía pero no me acordaba

✓ incorporado

No sabía decir columpio y ahora se que es swing.

1. lexis

Me ha gustado mucho el modelo X porque. está es mucho mas
detallado y estructurado. oraciones

Yo no había mencionado X pero en el modelo A dice... Pain, sling, bushes (swing
✓ ✓ no
2 3 4
lexis lexis lexis

lexis

No estaba seguro de si había dicho bien X pero veo en el modelo que.... lo hice muy mal
oraciones.

3 incorporado
4   en sl.3.

Appendix 9: Revised composition at Stage 3

1: there's a man who is reading a news paper. on his side are two light post. there are many flowers and big threes. 23

2: Here is a man watching tv. He ~~seem~~ seems relaxead, he is wearing a blue teeshirt and white 19

3: ~~man~~ in this picture Ø is a girls having fun on his four birthday whit his parents and ~~brothers~~. hermanos (hermana + hermano) 19

4: ~~He~~ Here Ø are two girls on a ~~swing~~ swing; ~~It's~~ ~~care~~ ~~summy day~~ ~~they~~ having fun. It's a sunny day. 13

5: In this picture Ø is a tourist asking (for) a policeman for ~~now~~ ~~cause~~ directions to go to a place. 19

6: Ø Here is a boy ~~who~~ who is ~~bored~~ in pain because he have a sling on his arm. 16

7: there are ~~me~~ ~~individuals~~ four ~~cups~~ yellow cups, four green spoon, four blue (platos), one orange (telera), one (Jarra), one (azucarera) 26

|Lexis|. | |Syntax|.
borrowings: 4. • pro-drop 4.
algun: 0 →1 (brobas) • prep + direct 1.
~~ages~~: 0

✓121