**Appendix C**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table C1.  *Model Predicting Code Breaker Accuracy Across Critical Trials* | | | | | |
|  | β | *SE* | *z*-value | *p*-value | 95% CI |
| (Intercept) | -4.92 | 1.17 | -4.21 | < .001\* | [-7.20, -2.63] |
| Generic CF | -1.37 | 1.59 | -0.86 | .39 | [-4.48, 1.74] |
| Contrastive CF | -2.00 | 1.58 | -1.27 | .21 | [-5.09, 1.09] |
| Lexical Guidance | 11.44 | 2.51 | 4.55 | < .001\* | [6.51, 16.37] |
| Trial Number | 0.05 | 0.08 | 0.71 | .48 | [-0.10, 0.20] |
| Face-to-Face | -1.28 | 1.64 | -0.78 | .43 | [-4.49, 1.93] |
| Generic CF  • Trial Number | 0.17 | 0.11 | 1.60 | .11 | [-0.04, 0.38] |
| Contrastive CF  • Trial Number | 0.34 | 0.11 | 3.12 | .002\* | [0.13, 0.55] |
| Lexical Guidance  • Trial Number | 0.03 | 0.24 | 0.14 | .89 | [-0.44, 0.51] |
| Generic CF  • Face-to-Face | -0.67 | 2.47 | -0.27 | .79 | [-5.52, 4.18] |
| Contrastive CF  • Face-to-Face | 1.96 | 2.22 | 0.88 | .38 | [-2.39, 6.31] |
| Lexical Guidance  • Face-to-Face | 2.12 | 3.23 | 0.65 | .51 | [-4.22, 8.45] |
| Trial Number  • Face-to-Face | -0.02 | 0.13 | -0.17 | .87 | [-0.27, 0.23] |
| Generic CF  • Trial Number  • Face-to-Face | -0.01 | 0.18 | -0.06 | .95 | [-0.37, 0.35] |
| Contrastive CF  • Trial Number  • Face-to-Face | -0.04 | 0.16 | -0.26 | .79 | [-0.36, 0.27] |
| Lexical Guidance  • Trial Number  • Face-to-Face | -0.18 | 0.30 | -0.59 | .56 | [-0.76, 0.41] |
| *Note*. The condition Control and setting Computer Player are mapped onto the intercept.  CF = corrective feedback, *SE* = standard error, CI = confidence interval, \* = significant. | | | | | |

**Appendix D**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table D1.  *Responses to Filler Items in Auditory Lexical Decision Task* | | | | | |
|  | | Condition | | | |
|  | | Control | Generic Corrective Feedback | Contrastive Corrective Feedback | Lexical Guidance |
| Filler Words | | | | | |
| Acceptance Rate (%) | Mean | 93.4 | 94.9 | 94.5 | 94.9 |
| (SD) | (24.9) | (22.1) | (22.9) | (22.0) |
| Reaction Time (ms) for “Yes” Answers | Mean | 525 | 477 | 494 | 478 |
| (SD) | (251) | (237) | (234) | (229) |
| Filler Pseudowords | | | | | |
| Acceptance Rate (%) | Mean | 21.1 | 22.6 | 20.8 | 20.6 |
| (SD) | (40.8) | (41.8) | (40.6) | (40.5) |
| Reaction Time (ms) for “No” Answers | Mean | 805 | 763 | 809 | 777 |
| (SD) | (383) | (389) | (373) | (346) |
| Filler /ɪ/-Pseudowords | | | | | |
| Acceptance Rate (%) | Mean | 10.3 | 14.5 | 13.0 | 14.5 |
| (SD) | (30.5) | (35.2) | (33.7) | (35.2) |
| Reaction Time (ms) for “No” Answers | Mean | 793 | 809 | 799 | 823 |
| (SD) | (344) | (384) | (327) | (369) |

We analyzed the three filler item types in Table D1 separately, using the same modeling procedures as with the critical items. For all item types, reaction times showed no significant effects of condition, but there were significant simple effects of setting: reaction times were slower in the face-to-face setting (in the Filler Words model: β = 0.09, *SE* = 0.04, *p* = .028, 95% CI [0.01, 0.17]; in the Filler Pseudowords model: β = 0.12, *SE* = 0.05, *p* = .022, 95% CI [0.02, 0.23]; in the Filler /ɪ/-Pseudowords model: β = 0.13, *SE* = 0.05, *p* = .011, 95% CI [0.03, 0.24]). Acceptance rates showed no significant effects of condition, setting, nor a condition-setting interaction for either Filler Words or Filler /ɪ/-Pseudowords. However, for Filler Pseudowords, there was one significant interaction between condition and setting: the combination of Lexical Guidance condition and face-to-face setting resulted in a lower acceptance rate for this item type, relative to the combination of Control condition and computer-player setting (β = -1.09, *SE* = 0.49, *p* = .03, 95% CI [-2.04, -0.14]).