

LUND UNIVERSITY

Multilingual EFL Students' Intentional Vocabulary Learning

Multimethods Development Research Based on a Word-Focused Task Nylander, Elin

2025

Document Version: Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA): Nylander, E. (2025). *Multilingual EFL Students' Intentional Vocabulary Learning: Multimethods Development Research Based on a Word-Focused Task.* [Doctoral Thesis (monograph), Centre for Languages and Literature]. Centre for Languages and Literature, Lund University.

Total number of authors:

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights. • Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study

or research.

You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117 221 00 Lund +46 46-222 00 00

Multilingual EFL Students' Intentional Vocabulary Learning

Multimethods Development Research Based on a Word-Focused Task

0 0 0

ELIN NYLANDER CENTRE FOR LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE | LUND UNIVERSITY



Multilingual EFL Students' Intentional Vocabulary Learning

Multilingual EFL Students' Intentional Vocabulary Learning

Multimethods Development Research Based on a Word-Focused Task

Elin Nylander



DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

Doctoral dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) at the Joint Faculties of Humanities and Theology at Lund University to be publicly defended on Friday 4 April 2025 at 13.00 in the Auditorium, SOL:H104, at the Centre for Languages and Literature, Helgonabacken 12.

Faculty opponent

Christina Lindqvist, University of Gothenburg

Organization: LUND UNIVERSITY

Document name: DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

Author(s): Elin Nylander

Date of issue: 4 April 2025 Sponsoring organization: Lund University

Title and subtitle: Multilingual EFL Students' Intentional Vocabulary Learning: Multimethods Development Research Based on a Word-Focused Task

Abstract:

Intentional vocabulary learning through tasks with an explicit vocabulary focus is essential for L2 learning (e.g., Laufer, 2005: Nation, 2007, 2022; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020). Yet, research suggests that in EFL classrooms in Sweden, there tends to be a reliance on incidental learning of vocabulary rather than intentional learning (D. Bergström, 2023). Studies (Eriksson, 2023; Warnby, 2023) also show that upper-secondary school students (aged 16-19) report lacking the vocabulary needed in order to easily read textbooks in English at university. There is a paucity of research on multilingual EFL students' intentional vocabulary learning centred on tasks (Galante, 2020; Gutierrez, 2024). This thesis project therefore presents a word-focused task used in five multilingual upper-secondary school EFL classrooms. The task is a sheet with seven sections. Each section suggests a separate way to gain, consolidate, and/or demonstrate target word (TW) knowledge recommended by vocabulary experts (Nation, 2022; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020). When using the task, students were invited to provide the following types of TW information: (1) TW synonym(s), (2) translation equivalent(s), (3) a TW illustration, (4) TW explanation(s), (5) example sentence(s) containing the TW, (6) a reference to moments when the TW has been heard or seen before, and (7) a word association. Students complete the task sections they find useful for learning the vocabulary using any language(s). The primary aim of this thesis project is to advance our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in uppersecondary school classrooms. To this end, the present study sheds light on the resources that EFL students with different multilingual backgrounds and proficiency levels in English visibly use to complete the word-focused task and potentially learn the vocabulary. An auxiliary aim is to contribute to the teaching of English in upper-secondary school by constructing, using, and evaluating the word-focused task developed. As such, the word-focused task is used as learning materials as well as a research tool.

This thesis project uses a range of different data: One quantitative study (Study 1), two multimethods studies (Studies 2 and 3) and one qualitative interview study (Study 4) were conducted. Studies 1–3 featured 97 unique EFL students. Study 4 turned the attention to their teachers' perceptions of the word-focused task and beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning. The teachers served as teacher collaborators shaping the thesis project. The word-focused task was used to explore the participating students' visible use of linguistic resources (e.g., TW explanations in English or Swedish) and non-linguistic resources (TW illustrations).

Results show that the visible use of linguistic resources varied depending on the participating students' expected proficiency levels in, and perceived usefulness of, the languages visibly used to complete the task. Results of the studies that measured learning revealed that completing the word-focused task had a moderate but positive effect on their TW knowledge. As to the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task, it was perceived as useful, although they said that scaffolding and student motivation was deemed necessary to optimise the task work. The study of teachers' beliefs revealed that intentional vocabulary learning was considered important in theory, but peripheral in practice. Future research could feature collaborating researchers, teachers, and special education experts for the purpose of optimising the word-focused task work for students with dyslexia.

Keywords: Intentional vocabulary learning, pedagogical translanguaging, adolescent learners of English in Sweden, teacher-researcher collaborations, development research, multimethods research

Classification system and/or index terms (if any) Language Engish ISSN and key title ISBN: 978-91-89874-80-0 Supplementary bibliographical information **Number of pages**:370

I, the undersigned, being the copyright owner of the abstract of the above-mentioned dissertation, hereby grant to all reference sources permission to publish and disseminate the abstract of the above-mentioned dissertation.

Signature

Date 2025-01-20

Multilingual EFL Students' Intentional Vocabulary Learning

Multimethods Development Research Based on a Word-Focused Task

Elin Nylander



Coverphoto by Simone Löhndorf Copyright pp 1-370 Elin Nylander, 2025

The Joint Faculties of Humanities and Theology Centre for Languages and Literature

ISBN 978-91-89874-80-0 (print) ISSN 978-91-89874-81-7 (digital)

Printed in Sweden by Media-Tryck, Lund University Lund 2025



Media-Tryck is a Nordic Swan Ecolabel certified provider of printed material. Read more about our environmental work at www.mediatryck.lu.se MADE IN SWEDEN

To my family

Table of Contents

	Ackn	Acknowledgements		
	Abstr	Abstract		
	Abbr	Abbreviations		
1	Introduction		16	
	1.1	Research rationale	16	
	1.2	Aim and research questions	20	
	1.3	Research design	21	
	1.4	Thesis outline	21	
2	The	The Swedish context: educational policy and the role of English		
	2.1	Educational policy in Sweden	23	
	2.2	Vocabulary in the policy documents	25	
	2.3	Student and teacher agency	29	
	2.4	The presence and status of English in Sweden	29	
	2.5	Summary	30	
3	Theo	Theory and previous research		
	3.1	Theory about intentional L2 vocabulary learning	32	
	3.2	Pedagogical translanguaging	39	
	3.3	Multilingual students' intentional vocabulary learning in the EFL classroom.	43	
	3.4	Teacher-researcher collaborations	50	
	3.5	Teacher perceptions and beliefs	51	
	3.6	Summary	52	
4	The	The word-focused task		
	4.1	Introduction to the word-focused task	54	
	4.2	Task design	55	
	4.3	Vocabulary learning theory underpinning the word-focused tas	sk	
		sections	59	

	4.4	The word-focused task as a research tool	66
	4.5	Summary	69
5	Metho	odology	70
	5.1	Research approach	70
	5.2	Recruitment of teacher collaborators and participating students	73
	5.3	Research design	76
	5.4	Data production	80
	5.5	Data analysis	85
	5.6	Research ethics	88
	5.7	Summary	90
6	Pilot s	tudy	92
	6.1	Introduction	92
	6.2	Methodology	93
	6.3	Results	95
	6.4	Taking stock of the pilot study	99
7	Study 1: Pedagogical translanguaging10		
	7.1	Introduction	101
	7.2	Preliminaries	102
	7.3	Aim and research questions	103
	7.4	Methods	104
	7.5	Results	112
	7.6	Discussion	123
	7.7	Taking stock of Study 1	130
8	Study 2: Perceptions and further use of the word-focused task		
	8.1	Introduction	131
	8.2	Preliminaries	132
	8.3	Aims and research questions	133
	8.4	Methods	134
	8.5	Results	141
	8.6	Discussion	164
	8.7	Taking stock of Study 2	167

9. Study 3: Individual students' intentional vocabulary learning	169
9.1 Introduction	169
9.2 Aim and research questions	170
9.3 Methods	171
9.4 Results	176
9.5 Discussion	204
9.6 Taking stock of Study 3	207
10. Study 4: Teacher collaborators' perceptions and beliefs	209
10.1 Introduction	209
10.2 Preliminaries	210
10.3 Aim and research questions	210
10.4 Method	210
10.5 Results	213
10.6 Discussion	228
10.7 Taking stock of Study 4	230
11. Discussion and concluding remarks	
11.1 Aims, research questions, and main results	232
11. 2 Discussion of results	234
11.3 Contributions of Studies 1–4	250
11.4 Limitations and suggestions for further research	251
Sammanfattning på svenska	255
Inledning	255
Metod och material	258
Resultat	259
Diskussion	261
References	264
Appendix 1: Decision from the Swedish Ethical Review Authority	281
Appendix 2: Consent form for teachers	283
Appendix 3: Consent form for students	
Appendix 4: Pilot study text and consent form	295

Appendix 5: Language background questionnaire (replicated with permission			
from Källkvist et al., 2022)			
Appendix 6: Example of PowerPoint presentation (Study 1)			
Appendix 7: Example text with TWs (The Power of the Pen)			
Appendix 8: Example of PowerPoint presentation (Study 2)			
Appendix 9: Interview guide for students (used with permission from Källkvist et al., 2022 and adapted to fit the purpose of the present study) 329			
Appendix 10: Interview guide for teachers (interview guide from Källkvist et al., 2024 served as initial inspiration)			
Appendix 11: Stimulated recall interview (SRI) instructions			
Appendix 12: Examples of task sheets (Task Version P, Task Version 1, and Task Version 2)			
Appendix 13: Test 1 example (test format used with permission from Gyllstad et al., 2023)			
Appendix 14: Test 2 example			

Acknowledgements

There are a number of people that I would like to thank for the help they have given me during my doctoral studies. First and foremost, I owe enormous thanks to my two supervisors: Henrik Gyllstad and Marie Källkvist. Your unwavering support and guidance has been invaluable. Your perspectives always complement each other so nicely. Thank you for believing in me and in my research ideas. You both inspire me greatly.

I would also like to thank Per Wennlund (prev. Snoder) for his very insightful and constructive feedback on an early version of this thesis. I could not have hoped for a better mock viva! In addition, I wish to express my gratitude to the faculty opponent and grading committee for accepting the task.

My sincere thanks go to all the PhD students and other members of staff from the English unit at the Centre for Languages and Literature in Lund. I have really enjoyed having you all as colleagues. Thank you to the members of the English linguistics seminar and the LAMINATE (Language Acquisition, Multilingualism, and Teaching) research platform for taking an interest in my work.

My deep thanks are due also to all the participating students and teacher collaborators for being so generous with your time and efforts. Without you, this thesis project truly would not have been possible.

I am very grateful to Mouhanad Sharabati and Sergio Rojo for helping me with all things Arabic and Spanish, respectively. Thank you to Simone Löhndorf for designing the thesis cover.

The work presented in this thesis has been generously supported by Lund University, Stiftelsen fil. dr. Uno Otterstedts fond för främjande av vetenskaplig undervisning och forskning, and Syskonen Anna Cecilia och Otto Sigfrid Granmarks stipendiefond.

On a more personal note, I want to thank all my friends for distracting me from the thesis work when needed, and for helping me remember what really matters. My biggest thank you goes to my family. You have always believed in my capacity, and you have supported me whole-heartedly throughout my entire PhD journey and beyond. For this, I am forever grateful. I dedicate this thesis to you.

Malmö, January 2025

Elin Nylander

Abstract

Intentional vocabulary learning through tasks with an explicit vocabulary focus is essential for L2 learning (e.g., Laufer, 2005; Nation, 2007, 2022; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020). Yet, research suggests that in EFL classrooms in Sweden, there tends to be a reliance on incidental learning of vocabulary rather than intentional learning (D. Bergström, 2023). Studies (Eriksson, 2023; Warnby, 2023) also show that uppersecondary school students (aged 16–19) report lacking the vocabulary needed in order to easily read textbooks in English at university. There is a paucity of research on multilingual EFL students' intentional vocabulary learning centred on tasks (Galante, 2020; Gutierrez, 2024). This thesis project therefore presents a word-focused task used in five multilingual upper-secondary school EFL classrooms. The task is a sheet with seven sections. Each section suggests a separate way to gain, consolidate, and/or demonstrate target word (TW) knowledge recommended by vocabulary experts (Nation, 2022; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020). When using the task, students were invited to provide the following types of TW information: (1) TW synonym(s), (2) translation equivalent(s), (3) a TW illustration, (4) TW explanation(s), (5) example sentence(s) containing the TW, (6) a reference to moments when the TW has been heard or seen before, and (7) a word association. Students complete the task sections they find useful for learning the vocabulary using any language(s). The primary aim of this thesis project is to advance our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in upper-secondary school classrooms. To this end, the present study sheds light on the resources that EFL students with different multilingual backgrounds and proficiency levels in English visibly use to complete the word-focused task and potentially learn the vocabulary. An auxiliary aim is to contribute to the teaching of English in upper-secondary school by constructing, using, and evaluating the word-focused task developed. As such, the word-focused task is used as learning materials as well as a research tool.

This thesis project uses a range of different data: One quantitative study (Study 1), two multimethods studies (Studies 2 and 3) and one qualitative interview study (Study 4) were conducted. Studies 1–3 featured 97 unique EFL students. Study 4 turned the attention to their teachers' perceptions of the word-focused task and beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning. The teachers served as teacher collaborators shaping the thesis project. The word-focused task was used to explore the participating students' visible use of linguistic resources (e.g., TW explanations in English or Swedish) and non-linguistic resources (TW illustrations).

Results show that the visible use of linguistic resources varied depending on the participating students' expected proficiency levels in, and perceived usefulness of, the languages visibly used to complete the task. Results of the studies that measured

learning revealed that completing the word-focused task had a moderate but positive effect on their TW knowledge. As to the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task, it was perceived as useful, although they said that scaffolding and student motivation was deemed necessary to optimise the task work. The study of teachers' beliefs revealed that intentional vocabulary learning was considered important in theory, but peripheral in practice. Future research could feature collaborating researchers, teachers, and special education experts for the purpose of optimising the word-focused task work for students with dyslexia.

Keywords: Intentional vocabulary learning, pedagogical translanguaging, adolescent learners of English in Sweden, teacher-researcher collaborations, development research, multimethods research

Abbreviations

CLT	Communicative language teaching
EAP	English for academic purposes
EFL	English as a foreign language
L1	First language
L2	Second language
QCA	Qualitative content analysis
RTA	Reflexive thematic analysis
SRI	Stimulated recall interview
TA	Thematic analysis
TBLT	Task-based language teaching
ТоТ	Time on task
TW(s)	target word(s)

1 Introduction

1.1 Research rationale

Situated in the Swedish context, this thesis project explores intentional English vocabulary learning. Intentional vocabulary learning is here defined as learning enabled through tasks explicitly designed to promote learning of vocabulary (Webb, 2020a). Unless otherwise stated, the terms *learn* and *intentionally learn* are used interchangeably with regard to vocabulary learning (as in e.g., Webb et al., 2020). The term *task* is used in a broad sense to denote any language learning activity performed by a student (see e.g., Busse et al., 2020). Vocabulary researchers agree that intentional vocabulary learning should be part of any well-balanced language course (see e.g., Laufer, 2005; Nation, 2007 ; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020). Yet, recent research suggests that English teachers in Sweden tend to believe that it suffices to rely on vocabulary learning happening *incidentally* as a by-product of other tasks such as reading (D. Bergström, 2023). This belief is also reflected in the Swedish National Curricula (including the syllabi for English) at both the secondary school level of compulsory school (with students aged 12-16) and the subsequent upper-secondary school level (with students aged 16-19) (Skolverket, 2021, 2022a). The English syllabi are communicatively oriented and the focus on intentional vocabulary learning is minimal compared to the emphasis on meaning-focused skills (Siegel, 2022; Snoder, 2022). The usefulness of English communication skills can hardly be overstated. However, studies (Eriksson, 2023; Warnby, 2023) show that students in upper-secondary school often are challenged by the lexical content of university-level textbooks in English, which suggests the need for systematic, intentional attention to vocabulary.

The present study attends to this problem by presenting a researcher-developed word-focused task designed for student intentional vocabulary learning. The design of the task was guided by research (e.g., Laufer, 2005; Schmitt, 2008) highlighting that learning new words is facilitated by *engagement* with (i.e., deep processing of) the vocabulary. The word-focused task is a sheet with seven sections. Each task section promotes engagement by suggesting that students provide one of the following types of information about a word (henceforth *target word*, abbreviated TW): (1) TW synonym(s), (2) translation equivalent(s), (3) a TW illustration, (4) TW explanation(s),

(5) example sentence(s) including the TW, (6) a connection to prior knowledge in the form of a reference to moments when students have heard or seen the TW before, and (7) a word association. The TW information can be in English and/or any other language(s). The provision of each kind of TW information is conceptualised as visible use of a *resource*, each recommended by vocabulary experts (Nation, 2022; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020) for gaining, consolidating, and/or demonstrating TW knowledge. Resources can be linguistic (e.g., a TW synonym in English) and non-linguistic (e.g., a TW illustration) (Blommaert, 2010; Galante, 2024). Engaging with the word-focused task requires cognitive work that remains invisible and goes beyond the scope of the present study. The wording *visibly used* is therefore central, as resources other than those seen on the participating students' task sheets may have been activated during the task work (Grosjean, 2008). Students are invited to visibly use the resources *they* find useful for learning the TWs, and they may leave task sections blank.

The research reported in this thesis features participating students from five intact classes (i.e., groups of students). Each class completed the word-focused task as part of their English course work, when I, the researcher, was visiting their classroom. All students could do so without participating in the research. Three students in total opted for this and their task sheets were not analysed. A distinction is therefore made between any students completing the task, and the participating students who consented to being part of the research.

This thesis project focuses specifically on *multilingual* students' intentional vocabulary learning in the context of multilingual English classrooms. Multilingual students are those with three or more languages in their *repertoires* (i.e., their collective linguistic and non-linguistic resources available at any point in time) (Baker & Wright, 2021; Blommaert, 2013). Multilingual classrooms are spaces where three or more languages co-exist (Baker & Wright, 2021). According to these definitions, virtually all students learning English in Sweden are multilingual, since the vast majority know English, Swedish, as well as an additional language learnt in school, and/or a heritage language used in the home environment to at least some degree (see e.g., Gyllstad et al., 2023; Källkvist et al., 2022).

Students growing up in Sweden are likely to frequently use and encounter English both within and outside of the school domain (Sundqvist, 2024). In contrast, students who are new to the Swedish context are sometimes (though not always) learning English and Swedish simultaneously and may not yet have the skills needed to use English outside of the classroom (Cunningham, 2023; Henry, 2019). Together, the participating students cover this entire spectrum and have different multilingual backgrounds. They will be referred to as *English as a Foreign Language* (EFL) students as a means to emphasise that the thesis project focuses on classroom learning (as in e.g., D. Bergström, 2023; Warnby, 2023). An L1 is here defined as "a language acquired from early infancy" (Hammarberg, 2018, p. 139). This means that students can have more than one L1 (Baker & Wright, 2021). The label L2 is used in the broad sense to refer to any non-native language, regardless of the situation, and whether the language is a technically second or foreign language (see e.g., Baker & Wright, 2021).

In the field of English language teaching, there have been different ideological currents such as Grammar Translation, the Direct Method, English Only, and Communicative Language Teaching (Siegel, 2022). Since then, there has been a multilingual turn (May, 2014) and a social turn (Block, 2003) in applied linguistics, highlighting the strong interest in students' funds of knowledge and in social and epistemic justice focused on in the comprehensive and influential *translanguaging* literature (see e.g., Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García, 2009; García & Wei, 2014). Translanguaging originated as an ideology (García, 2009) and is now a framework encompassing a skill, theory, ideology, and pedagogy (García & Wei, 2014). The wordfocused task enables *pedagogical translanguaging*, here defined as "a construct that refers to teaching approaches that involve the intentional and planned use of student multilingual resources in language and content subjects" (Juvonen & Källkvist, 2021, p. 1). Context sensitivity is important in pedagogical translanguaging research (Byrnes, 2020), not least because repertoires often are unique (Baker & Wright, 2021). Much pedagogical translanguaging research is therefore in the form of qualitative case studies, although calls have been made for more large-scale quantitative research (Prilutskaya, 2021). It therefore appears relevant to conduct pedagogical translanguaging research involving several groups of participating students, like in this thesis project.

Quantitative studies are common in the field of intentional L2 vocabulary learning, which has provided substantial theoretically-oriented knowledge about how to optimise the learning of new words (see e.g., Nation, 2022; Webb, 2020b). Qualitatively oriented research exploring the processes and beliefs surrounding intentional vocabulary learning in the classroom is less common (D. Bergström, 2023; Newton, 2021). Webb (2020a) also notes that because many vocabulary studies "summarise the vocabulary leaning gains in descriptive statistics tables, it is not clear to what extent individuals vary in their learning [...]" (p. 235). Thus, there appears to be a need for more research considering not only intentional L2 vocabulary learning per se, but also how individual students engage with targeted vocabulary using a task that is of actual value for students and teachers.

Such practical concerns are at the heart of *development research* (Van den Akker, 1999). This thesis project uses development research as an umbrella term for studies with a clear research-practice link. Examples include *action research*, which typically involves the researcher's own practice, *developmental research*, which features interactive and cyclic processes resulting in new products, and *design research* meant to improve the classroom environment (Van den Akker, 1999). In Swedish, Bergmark and Graeske

(2022) utilise the term *praktiknära forskning* in the same broad sense. They describe development research as *interventional*, that is, involving interventions in real teaching situations. It is also *iterative* with cycles of analysis, design, development, evaluation and revision. It is *involving*, as it involves collaborations with teaches at the different stages of the research, and *process-oriented*, with a clear focus on in improving and understanding the different interventions. Development research is also both *usage-oriented* with an emphasis on the usefulness of the research in real situations, and *theory-oriented*, as development research designs must be based on a theoretical framework.

The present study arguably meets the above-mentioned criteria for development research. It is interventional, as it involves interventions in the form of *learning units* (i.e., "organization[s] of learning activities resting upon a philosophical and psychological foundation and dealing with vital pupil experiences and valid subject matter[s]" (Del Popolo, 1966, p. 282) carried out in classrooms. It is iterative because the word-focused task underwent multiple cycles of revision in light of evaluations. The research is also involving in that the teacher participants and I collaborated during the implementation of the word-focused task. As a means to highlight the role of the teacher participants as active agents in shaping the research, they will henceforth be referred to as teacher collaborators (see Ushioda, 2023, p. 97). The present study is also process-oriented in that it has a focus on improving one intervention in light of the next one. This research is usage-oriented because the teacher collaborators' perspective on the usefulness of the task is explicitly considered, and theory-oriented in that the word-focused task is grounded in vocabulary learning theory. The thesis topic stems from a need for better support for multilingual EFL learners in general, and a paucity of individualizable tasks in particular, which I observed when working as a qualified English teacher. Thus, the present study has real-world teaching issues as its points of departure.

The thesis project features adolescent upper-secondary school students aged 16–17. The reason is that much of the existing research on multilingual EFL students' intentional vocabulary learning (e.g., Busse et al., 2020, 2021; Hopp et al., 2021) deals with primary school students below the age of 12. In the Swedish context, also researching older adolescent EFL students' vocabulary learning is particularly important given the substantial English vocabulary needed for tertiary education (Warnby, 2023).

The present study is part of a movement of classroom-related English vocabulary research in Sweden, members of which have provided much hands-on knowledge about English intentional (and incidental) vocabulary learning in Swedish schools (see e.g., D. Bergström, 2023; Gyllstad et al., 2023; Nordlund & Rydström, 2024; Snoder, 2019; Stridsman, 2024; Warnby, 2023). This thesis project differs from the aforementioned publications in that it offers a concrete word-focused task designed to

be used in a range of multilingual English classrooms. By constructing, using, and evaluating the word-focused task, it is hoped that this thesis project will be part of a solution to the lack of principled ways of working with intentional vocabulary learning identified in previous research (D. Bergström, 2023). By combining perspectives from intentional L2 vocabulary learning research and the pedagogical translanguaging literature, the present study also investigates intentional vocabulary learning both on the group level, on the individual level, and from a teacher perspective, using quantitative and qualitative data.

1.2 Aim and research questions

The primary aim of this thesis project is to advance our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in uppersecondary school classrooms. To this end, the present study sheds light on the resources that EFL students with different multilingual backgrounds and proficiency levels in English visibly use to complete the word-focused task and potentially learn the vocabulary. An auxiliary aim is to contribute to the teaching of English in uppersecondary school by constructing, using, and evaluating the word-focused task developed. As such, the word-focused task will be used as learning materials as well as a research tool.

The word-focused task will be integrated into unique learning units tailored to fit the needs of the respective classes. The units were didactic sequences consisting of 3–6 lessons. The students completed the word-focused task together with other English proficiency tasks related to a specific theme. Each unit fit the teacher collaborators' respective plans, which in turn were in line with policy documents as to the content to be covered. I designed each unit together with the teacher collaborators. As a means to bring in the teacher perspective (i.e., teachers' situated competence, developed through teacher education as well as years in the profession) on the usefulness of the wordfocused task for students in their respective classrooms, the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task in particular will be illuminated. Because the word-focused task provides an example of intentional vocabulary learning, the teacher collaborators will also be asked to talk about intentional vocabulary learning. This way, it may be possible to unpack their beliefs that may potentially explain their perceptions of the task.

The two thesis project aims are operationalised by formulating three overarching research questions (*RQs*):

- (*RQ*1) What resources do the participating students visibly use to complete the word-focused task?
- (*RQ2*) What is the effect of completing the word-focused task on the participating students' word knowledge of pre- and self-selected TWs?
- (*RQ3*) What are the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task, and their beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general?

The resources referred to in *RQ*1 are linguistic and non-linguistic. The linguistic resources are the languages the participating students visibly used to complete the different task sections (e.g., by providing a TW explanation in English, Swedish, or another language if applicable). The non-linguistic resources are TW illustrations. Prior knowledge in the form of references to moments when the TW has been heard or seen before is mediated through linguistic resources (Blommaert, 2010; Galante, 2024). The type of word knowledge targeted varies between the empirical studies because they feature different vocabulary tests covering different word knowledge aspects.

1.3 Research design

The thesis contains development research in the form of four empirical studies (Studies 1–4). Studies 1–3 address RQs1–2. Study 1 is a quantitative study, where the word-focused task was used and evaluated in three linguistically homogeneous classes, where the participating students all had similar multilingual backgrounds. Study 2 is a multimethods study featuring a refined version of the word-focused task and more linguistically heterogeneous participating students. Study 3 zooms in on specific individuals and their stimulated recalls of completing the word-focused task. Study 4 answers RQ3 by means of semi-structured interviews with the teacher collaborators. RQ3 is also addressed in Study 2, which sheds light on one of the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task, as elicited through an analysis of our teacher-researcher planning meetings.

1.4 Thesis outline

This thesis consists of eleven chapters. Following this introduction, Chapter 2 contextualises the research by discussing educational policy and the role of English in the Swedish context. Next, the theory and previous research underpinning the thesis

project are presented in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 is devoted to the design of the word-focused task. Chapter 5 presents the methodological foundation of the thesis project, and the data analysis methods used. Chapter 6 reports the results of a pilot study centred on the first version of the word-focused task. Chapters 7–10 contain four chronological studies, referred to as Studies 1–4. Chapter 11 features a discussion and concluding remarks. Here, the findings and limitations from previous chapters are discussed in relation to the aims and research questions. Conclusions are drawn, pedagogical implications are discussed, and suggestions for further research are presented.

2 The Swedish context: educational policy and the role of English

This chapter contextualises the thesis project by situating it within the Swedish school system and connecting the research focus to relevant wordings from national-level educational policy documents. The thesis ultimately examines individual student task work by means of an intentional vocabulary learning task (the word-focused task). It was designed to be individualizable (i.e., possible to complete by different students in different ways) and adjustable (i.e., available for individual teachers to adapt in light of their expertise and perceptions). Drawing on the notion of agency, the word-focused task will therefore be contextualised in relation to individual students and teachers. Lastly, the role of English in Sweden will be outlined, as it shapes the national-level educational policy.

2.1 Educational policy in Sweden

In Swedish schools, English is the first foreign language to be introduced, as well as the only mandatory foreign language (Education Act, 2010). Students are normally introduced to English sometime in grades 1–3, but occasionally as early as in preschool or the pre-school class (Sylvén, 2022). They then continue studying English in compulsory school (which includes secondary school), as well as the upper-secondary school. Though not mandatory, most students attend upper-secondary school from the age of 16 to 19 and enrol in a programme preparatory for higher education or a vocational programme (Skolverket, 2012).

This thesis project was conducted in upper-secondary school English classrooms in Sweden. As a means to contextualise the thesis, Figure 2.1 therefore provides an overview of Swedish educational policy at the national level.



Figure 2.1

Swedish national-level educational policy (adapted from Warnby, 2023, p. 12)

As shown in Figure 2.1, The Education Act operates on the parliamentary level. It stipulates that the teaching in Swedish schools must cater to *all* students and be based on research and best practice. Best practice equals the collective knowledge developed by in-service teachers as they systematically and critically examine and evaluate their own teaching (Education Act, 2010; Skolverket, 2024b). Issued by the government or the Swedish National Agency for Education (Skolverket), the national-level educational policy documents consist of (1) the curricula, (2) the subject syllabi (e.g., the syllabus for upper-secondary school English), and (3) the commentary materials. The curricula specify the fundamental tasks and values of schools in Sweden. The subject syllabi (e.g., the syllabus for upper-secondary school English) encompass the overarching aim of the subject, as well as the core content and grading criteria of each course. The core content is divided into three sub-categories: (1) Content of communication establishing what each course should contain, (2) Reception specifying required receptive skills, and (3) Production and interaction which establishes the productive skills needed after having completed each course (Skolverket, 2021). All passing grades (e.g., in English at the upper-secondary school) range from E (= Pass) to A (= Pass with distinction). The grading criteria specify what distinguishes one grade on a specific course from another, and what is required in each course (Skolverket, 2021). The commentary materials clarify excerpts from the subject syllabi. Student and teacher agency are central to Swedish educational policy (Hult, 2017). Students should be encouraged to influence

the teaching and reflect on what worked well and less well. The national-level educational policy documents are also interpreted locally through the agency of teachers and other members of staff at schools. They need to ensure that the teaching aligns with the policy documents as to the content to be covered (Hult, 2017;Siegel, 2022).

2.2 Vocabulary in the policy documents

This sub-section outlines the role of vocabulary in the relevant national-level educational policy documents. I will refer to the documents that were in place at the time of data collection because these documents shaped the thesis project as a whole. Focus lies on the two obligatory English courses at the upper-secondary school level (English 5 and English 6), as a vast majority of the participating students were enrolled in one of these two courses. The final upper-secondary school level English course (English 7) is beyond the scope of the present study, given that none of the participating students took this course. One group of participating students attended an upper-secondary school but were working towards a passing grade in the final English course at the compulsory school level. Therefore, the compulsory school curriculum and syllabus for English will be referred to as well. A new upper-secondary school curriculum (including a new syllabus for English) will come into effect on 1 July 2025 (Skolverket, 2024c).

2.2.1 The curricula

The upper-secondary school curriculum states that all students in national higher education preparatory programmes should be able to gain "sufficient knowledge to be well prepared for studies in higher education" (Skolverket, 2011, pp. 5–6, my translation). These preparations should arguably involve learning the advanced vocabulary needed to understand the lexical content of university-level textbooks in English, as these are common in tertiary education in Sweden. A passing grade in the final obligatory English course (English 6) is also required to enter university (Malmström & Pecorari, 2022; Warnby, 2023). The compulsory school curriculum specifies that all education at this level should support students' "development and learning in a long-term perspective" (p. 17), not least by preparing them for upper-secondary school. Presumably, this also involves a developing a robust English vocabulary. As shown below, this is needed at the upper-secondary school.

2.2.2 The syllabi for English

The aims

The overarching aims of upper-secondary and compulsory school level English are largely communicative in nature (Siegel, 2022). Upper-secondary school English courses should enable students to "*use* English in different situations and for different purposes", as they develop "an all-round *communicative* ability" through "language *use* in *functional* and purposeful contexts". The importance of utilising "different *strategies* to facilitate the *communication* when the knowledge of the language is not sufficient" is also stressed in the aim (Skolverket, 2021 p.1, my translation and emphasis). At the compulsory school level, the importance of "develop[ing] an all-round *communicative* ability", which includes the use of efficient communication strategies, is stressed (Skolverket, 2022a, p.43, my emphasis). In contrast, intentional vocabulary learning, which is more form-focused, is not explicitly part of the overarching aim for English on either level, meaning that there is no direct incentive here to focus on vocabulary (Snoder, 2022).

The core content

The core content of the upper-secondary school English courses contains no explicit references to intentional vocabulary learning per se. However, collocations should be covered in both English 5 and English 6, albeit in increasingly advanced ways (Snoder, 2022). Collocations are multiword items of words that go together (e.g., *make an effort*) and lend themselves well to intentional vocabulary learning (Boers et al., 2014; Gyllstad, 2007). In English 5, part of the receptive core content is about "[h]ow variation and adaptation are created through sentence structure, *words* and phrases, for example *collocations*" (Skolverket, 2021, p.3, my translation and emphasis). In English 6, students should also learn about "[h]ow variation and adaptation are created through sentence structure, *word formation and choice of words*, for example regional varieties and *collocations, in informal and formal contexts*" (Skolverket, 2021, p. 5, my translation and emphasis).

The *Production and interaction* category of the core content suggests a progression in terms of the productive skills needed in English 5 and 6, respectively. English 5 students should, among other things, be able to *explain and re-tell* information in English. In addition to this, English 6 students should also be able to *reason*. Such progression is only visible in the expected communicative skills, whereas the references to form-focused skills (e.g., vocabulary and grammatical structures) in the *Production and interaction* part of the core content remain identical for English 5 and 6. Students in both courses should master *"[l]inguistic phenomena*, including pronunciation, *vocabulary*, grammatical structures, sentence structure, spelling, coherence, inner and

outer structure and adaptation, in the students' own production and interaction" (Skolverket, 2021, p. 3 & 6, my translation and emphasis).

Except for the collocations aspect, there is thus a lack of progression between English 5 and 6 with regard to the vocabulary knowledge that is required. This is noteworthy. Students are expected to become more proficient in English as they advance from English 5 to English 6, and vocabulary knowledge is known to correlate with general language proficiency (Alderson, 2005). Therefore, it would have been reasonable to specify that students should have, say, a substantial vocabulary in English 5, a substantial and varied vocabulary in English 6 (for a similar discussion, see Warnby, 2023, p. 118). Just like with the rest of the syllabus, teachers would then be given the agency to decide specifically what this entails, using their professional judgement. No such vocabulary demands are expressed in the core content, however. Yet, students are required to develop increasingly sophisticated oral and written proficiency skills in both courses. Thus, one interpretation of the syllabus is that English 5–6 are largely communicative courses, where vocabulary knowledge plays a peripheral role (Seigel 2022; Snoder 2022).

In the core content of the final English course at the compulsory school level, tangible communicative skills are emphasised whereas intentional vocabulary learning per se is not. Students should encounter "linguistic phenomena" such as "*words* with different stylistic values and fixed expressions" as well as "pronunciation, grammatical structures and sentence structure" (Skolverket, 2022a, p.46, my emphasis). "[W]ords and fixed expressions" should also be part of "the students' own production and interaction" (Skolverket, 2022a p. 46). A more specific description of the expected vocabulary usage (e.g., the use of sophisticated or relatively advanced words) is lacking, whereas the required speaking- and writing skills are outlined in a more detailed way. For example, students completing the final compulsory school level English course are expected to communicate in "discussions and writing in which [they] explain, describe, instruct and defend their opinions" (Skolverket, 2022a, p.47).

The grading criteria

There are no explicit mentions of vocabulary knowledge in the grading criteria for English 5–6 at the upper-secondary school level nor in the final English course at the compulsory school level (Snoder, 2022). However, a robust vocabulary is a prerequisite of being able to demonstrate most (if not all) of what is expected in order to receive the different grades. For example, students with a passing grade (E) in English 5 should, among other things, be able to understand and interpret "[the] main content and clear details" in spoken and written English. They are also expected to speak "relatively clearly and relatively cohesively", using facilitative linguistic strategies "to a certain extent". (Skolverket, 2021, p. 3, my translation). English 5 students with the highest

grade (A) should be able to understand and interpret spoken and written English, in a more "well-founded and nuanced way, [considering] both the whole and [specific] details" than those with a passing grade. Students passing the final course at the compulsory school level must, among other things, be able to use spoken and written English in a variety of situations and for different purposes. They must also be able to use "strategies that facilitate and improve the interaction to some extent" (Skolverket, 2022a, p.49).

2.2.3 The commentary materials

The commentary materials for upper-secondary school English reiterate that an "increasing ability to use the vocabulary, phraseology, pronunciation, spelling, and grammar" of the language is expected as students advance through the different courses (Skolverket, 2022c, p. 9, my emphasis). Accordingly, "pronunciation, vocabulary and so on should be included among the linguistic phenomena that are brought up in the teaching" (Skolverket, 2022c, p. 9, my emphasis). Instead of providing specific guidelines for exactly how to treat vocabulary in the classroom, the commentary materials stress that individual teachers have "a great liberty of choice" with regard to the form-related aspects of the teaching (including vocabulary) (Skolverket, 2022c, p. 12). The commentary materials further specify that even though "some elements" in languages other than English are allowed, the teaching "should as far as possible be conducted in the target language English" (Skolverket, 2022c, p. 10, my translation, italics in original). Thus, whilst highlighting that teachers also have the agency to "stimulate the student[s] to use their entire repertoire[s] as a resource" (Skolverket, 2022c, p.10, my translation) when deemed appropriate, exclusive target language use is nevertheless given priority. Taken together, this all suggests that upper-secondary school English teachers have the agency to decide how to handle vocabulary in the classroom. Learning targeted English vocabulary through other languages is allowed, although exclusive language use should be prioritised.

The commentary materials for English at the compulsory school level also conceptualise vocabulary knowledge as part of a general language proficiency without specifying how to provide intentional vocabulary learning opportunities (see e.g., Skolverket, 2022b, p. 8). Importantly, they do not put a premium on exclusive target language use. Instead, they specify that the teaching should allow students to develop "their *individual multilingualism*, that is a communicative competence where all language skills and linguistic experiences are included and where the languages are closely connected and affect each other" (Skolverket, 2022b, p.8, my translation, italics in original). This presumably includes intentionally learning targeted English vocabulary using other languages as a resource.

2.3 Student and teacher agency

The present study defines student and teacher agency as their "socioculturally mediated capacity to act" (Ahearn, 2001, p. 112). The sociocultural perspective on student and teacher agency is germane to the thesis context because it presupposes that agency can be mediated through tools such as policies, curricular changes, and/or concrete artefacts like the word-focused task. According to the sociocultural perspective, student and teacher agency is also relational and mediated in interactions between students and teachers or teachers and researchers, for example (Tao & Gao, 2021). This tallies with the focus on classroom learning and teacher-researcher collaborations in the present study.

Student and teacher agency play important roles in Swedish educational policy (Hult, 2017). The upper-secondary school curriculum specifies that students should be encouraged to exercise agency by "hav[ing] a real impact on the ways of working [in school]" They should also get a chance to "use their knowledge as a tool to reflect over their experiences and their own way of learning". (Skolverket, 2011 p. 9, my translation). The same applies to the compulsory school level, where teachers should "plan and evaluate the teaching together with the pupils [students]" (Skolverket, 2022a, p.15). Both compulsory- and upper-secondary school level teachers have the agency to interpret curricula and syllabi and then systematically evaluate and plan their teaching accordingly (Hult, 2017; Skolverket, 2024a).

2.4 The presence and status of English in Sweden

English plays a prominent role in Swedish society (Sundqvist, 2020). Henry (2019) points to an intense Anglicisation happening in Sweden, where English is arguably becoming a second rather than foreign language for many adolescents such as the participating students (aged 16–17) from this thesis project. Many of them are likely to utilise and encounter English daily when, for instance, consuming news and popular culture in English, or interacting on social media platforms (Sundqvist, 2020). This means that English learning and use is not only connected to the classroom, but also to Swedish society and beyond (Henry, 2019).

English is also a high-status language associated with multiple domains, such as business, the workplace in general, and academia (Hult, 2012). Students are typically highly motivated to learn English and often see it as something they need for their future careers (Olsson, 2016). Importantly, however, Cunningham (2023) points out that students vary with regard to their exposure to *extramural English* (Sundqvist,

2009). Extramural English "encompasses both intentional and incidental informal learning of English through learner-initiated activities that can take place either online or in real life" (Sundqvist, 2024, p.2). Examples of extramural English activities include watching English-medium films or playing videogames in English.

Students who were born in Sweden may take the above-mentioned Anglicisation and extramural exposure for granted. For some, extramural English may have replaced classroom activities as the springboard and basis for learning English (Sundqvist, 2024). This makes it important that the English courses they take in school complement the English used and received extramurally (D. Bergström, 2023). Other students may come from different linguistic landscapes, where English is not as prevalent and ingrained into the youth culture as it is in Sweden. These students may, for example, need to develop Swedish and English simultaneously (Cunningham, 2023).

An advanced level of English is also necessary for tertiary education in Sweden, as it has become increasingly popular to offer education (i.e., freestanding courses as well as entire degrees) in English at Swedish universities. This is especially true for the subject area of Humanities, where the percentage of courses taught in English has doubled in the past ten years. It is also common to assign readings in English and carry out the teaching in Swedish (Malmström & Pecorari, 2022).

2.5 Summary

In sum, English vocabulary does play a role in the Swedish national-level educational policy documents. For example, the syllabus for upper-secondary school English overtly specifies that the teaching should facilitate vocabulary knowledge in general and collocational knowledge in particular. Teachers have the agency to decide specifically how to treat vocabulary in the classroom. For example, they may invite students to engage with new vocabulary using only English. Alternatively, students may use other resources (e.g., by translating TWs into, say, Swedish or Spanish). The latter alternative is particularly emphasised in the commentary materials for compulsory school English. At the upper-secondary level, visibly using languages other than English is allowed, but exclusive target language use is a priority. The syllabi for both upper-secondary and compulsory school level English are largely communicative, and the explicit incentives for focusing on vocabulary learning are minimal compared to the focus on communicative skills. This is noteworthy, seeing that much (if not all) of what expected for a passing grade in each course presupposes substantial English vocabulary knowledge.

This thesis project is situated in the Swedish context and focuses on EFL students aged 16–17. Here, a good command of English is required, not least in the school domain, where the obligatory English courses demand relatively advanced reading, writing, and speaking skills (Skolverket, 2021). A passing grade in the final obligatory course (English 6) is required to enter tertiary education, where students often face even greater English reading demands (Malmström & Pecorari, 2022). Students growing up in Sweden typically have easy access to extramural English and learn and use English both in and outside of the classroom (Henry, 2019; Sundqvist, 2020). In contrast, students who are new to the Swedish context may come from different linguistic landscapes, where English is not as prominent. These students may sometimes (but not always) need to learn Swedish and English extramurally on social media platforms (Cunningham, 2023). This all makes great demands on Swedish schools who, according to the Education Act (2010), must promote *all* students' learning. Next, Chapter 3 presents the theory and previous research behind the thesis project.

3 Theory and previous research

This chapter covers theory and previous research that underpin the present study. First, I present theory about intentional L2 vocabulary learning, which is the focus of my work. Given that my data were produced in multilingual classrooms, I then account for the construct of pedagogical translanguaging, which is an approach to teaching additional languages that invite students to use their complete language repertoires when learning and performing in the classroom. Following this, I account for relevant empirical studies which informed the focus and design of the research presented in this thesis.

3.1 Theory about intentional L2 vocabulary learning

Theory about intentional L2 vocabulary learning requires a definition of what a *word* is. In everyday use, words can be defined as linguistic building blocks used for communicative purposes. However, there is actually no comprehensive linguistic definition of a word (Snoder, 2022). Vocabulary researchers therefore define words in different ways using different distinctions depending on the aim of the research in question (Kremmel, 2021). All words have two facets related to form and meaning, respectively. The form of a word equals its pronunciation and spelling, and the meaning is the content of the word Some words are synonyms, meaning that multiple word forms share one meaning (Snoder, 2022).

To know a word, learners must be able to connect its form and meaning. Known as the *form-meaning link*, this is the most fundamental aspect of word knowledge (Nation, 2022; Snoder, 2022). The exact nature of form-meaning link mastery may vary. Each time a learner retrieves the form and meaning of a word their memory, the link between the two is strengthened. Learners make the form-meaning link when they are able to recall the meaning when seeing or hearing the word and can recall the form of a word when wishing to express a meaning in writing or speaking (Nation, 2022).

There is also a difference between learning an entirely new form and meaning and *relabelling*. *Relabelling* is when a student learns a new word in the L2 for which they already have concept in the L1 (Schmitt, 2010). Instead of learning the form, meaning,

and form-meaning link, the learner puts an L2 label on the known concept, and potentially finetunes the concept to match the L2 semantic representation. It is also possible to learn new concepts *through* an L2. This is especially common for students enrolled in tertiary education (say, a law programme which requires knowledge of legal vocabulary) in the L2. These learners have to learn the concept and the L2 label simultaneously, which is more cognitively demanding than relabelling (Nation, 2022; Schmitt, 2010).

First introduced by Anderson and Freebody (1981), another important distinction is that between vocabulary size (or breadth), and vocabulary depth. Vocabulary size equals quantitative vocabulary knowledge and how many words students know the formmeaning link of. Vocabulary depth refers to qualitative vocabulary knowledge that goes beyond the form-meaning link (Gyllstad, 2013; Nation, 2022). Nation (2022) presents an approach to vocabulary depth in the form of a descriptive framework of what it means to know a word. Nation (2022) specifically distinguishes between form-, meaning- and, use-related aspects of word knowledge, and categorises these as examples of either receptive (R) or productive (P) vocabulary knowledge. In Nation's (2022) view, it is thus not enough to, for instance, be able to pronounce and spell a word correctly in order to fully know it. To have deep knowledge of a word, one must also be able to demonstrate other types of knowledge and, for example, say in what patterns the word occurs and where, and account for when and how often the word can be utilized. Referring specifically to Nation's (2022) framework, González-Fernández (2022) points out that "[t]his detailed description of word-knowledge types provides a rich and precise picture of [...] lexical knowledge, which has made [it] the preferred and most widely accepted conceptualization among researchers investigating L2 vocabulary knowledge" (p.3). The framework is displayed in Table 3.1.
Table 3.1Nation's (2022) word knowledge framework

	<u>S</u>	
	Spoken	R What does the word sound like?
		P How is the word pronounced?
Form	Written	R What does the word look like?
TOITI		P How is the word written and spelled?
	Word parts	R What parts are recognizable in this word?
		P What word parts are needed to express the meaning?
	Form and meaning	R What meaning does this word form signal?
	5	P What word form can be used to express this meaning?
	Concepts and	R What is included in the concept?
Meaning	referents	P What items can the concept refer to?
	Associations	R What other words does this make us think of?
		P What other words could we use instead of this one?
	Grammatical	R In what patterns does the word occur?
	functions	P In what patterns must we use this word?
	Collocations	R What words or types of words occur with this one?
Use		P What words or types of words must we use with this one?
	Constraints on use	R Where, when, and how often would we expect to meet this
	(register, frequency)	word?
		P Where, when, and how often can we use this word?
R = receptive k	nowledge P = productive	

Nation's (2022) framework in Table 3.1 describes the aspects involved in word knowledge and does not denote vocabulary learning per se. Maximum vocabulary depth equals mastery of all the word knowledge aspects from Table 3.1, although knowledge of individual aspects can contribute to vocabulary depth as well. The word knowledge aspects develop in an incremental rather than static way, and may develop at different rates (Nation, 2022; Schmitt, 2014). Some of the word knowledge aspects from Table 3.1 (in particular those related to form and meaning) lend themselves well to intentional vocabulary learning, while others (e.g., collocational use and register) are closely related to the contextual use and are therefore likely to be learned incidentally (Schmitt, 2014). Known as the components or dimensions approach (Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020), this operationalisation of vocabulary depth has ample support in the research literature (see e.g., Cheng & Matthews, 2018; Li & Kirby, 2015; Webb, 2005). Rather than focusing merely on vocabulary size, the components approach assumes that learners should learn words well in order to use them appropriately and fluently. This, in turn, requires intentional vocabulary learning which goes beyond simply memorizing form-meaning links (Read, 2004; Webb & Nation, 2017).

The components approach has also been criticised (Schmitt, 2014). Meara and Wolter (2004) argue that it overemphasises the learning of individual words and fails to highlight the relationship between different words in the mental lexicon. Although this may be true from a psycholinguistic perspective, studies focused on intentional

vocabulary learning in the classroom typically does not operationalise vocabulary depth as network knowledge, as linkage between items per se is secondary in classroom research (Schmitt, 2014). Rather, Nation (2022) suggests that the word knowledge aspects from Table 3.1 can be used as a checklist by teachers when deciding what to focus on as they promote intentional vocabulary learning in the classroom.

The incremental nature of vocabulary learning is illustrated in Tseng and Schmitt's (2008) model simplified in Figure 3.1 below. It applies to intentional vocabulary learning in the sense that it encompasses conscious efforts to learn vocabulary (see e.g., p. 364).



Figure 3.1

A simplified version of Tseng & Schmitt's (2008) model of vocabulary learning (from Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020, p. 179)

According to the model in Figure 3.1, intentional vocabulary learning is a cyclical process that starts with at least some level of initial appraisal. *Initial appraisal* is the first interest, effort, or desire students feel to learn a word. The initial appraisal then affects the learners' *self-regulating capacity*, that is, their ability to understand and direct their own learning (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2018). The self-regulating capacity in turn drives the use of different vocabulary learning strategies. *Strategic Vocabulary Involvement* involves discovering and improving different ways to learn. *Mastery of Strategies* involves the ability to use specific overt vocabulary learning strategies. Also evident in Figure 3.1, learners reach the *Post-appraisal of Learning* after

the vocabulary learning has taken place. They then reflect upon the vocabulary learning (e.g., when receiving a vocabulary test result). The post-appraisal of learning can make learners positive to continue learning more words, or less inclined to continue learning. The post-appraisal of learning thus affects the initial appraisal of the new vocabulary learning, which closes the cycle (Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020; Tseng & Schmitt, 2008). The model shows how multiple learner variables shape the agentive nature of intentional vocabulary learning. This tallies with the present study, which is also learner centred.

Moreover, different words have different *learning burdens*. The learning burden of a word is the amount of effort required to learn it. Each aspect of what it means to know a word contributes to its learning burden. The more the word knowledge aspects correspond to knowledge the learner already has, the lighter the learning burden will be. A word may be relatively easy to learn and understand if parts of it are already known or if the word is a *cognate* in the learner's L1or another language they know (i.e., has the same origin as the corresponding word) (Nation, 2022; Webb & Nation, 2017; Smidfelt, 2019). Both psycholinguistic research (Lotto & de Groot, 1998) and research conducted in classrooms (e.g., Cenoz et al., 2022) points to a facilitative effect of cognates for vocabulary learning, although it was only partly confirmed by Rogers et al., (2015). For the purpose of being more specific, the present study echoes Lemhöfer et al., (2018) in operating with the terms *cognate* and *near-cognate*. The former is a word that is identical in form and the latter can deviate orthographically by one or several letters. Cognate knowledge and awareness can encompass both of these.

As established in Chapter 1 there is a difference between learning a word intentionally and incidentally. The present study defines intentional vocabulary learning as enabled through tasks explicitly designed to promote learning of vocabulary. Incidental vocabulary learning occurs as a by-product of other tasks, where the focus is on the content (Webb, 2020a). Intentional and incidental vocabulary learning are both important learning processes which complement each other (Boers, 2024; Webb, 2020a). Generally speaking, learning a word entails learning multiple word knowledge aspects, some of which (e.g., spelling) lend themselves well to intentional study, while others (e.g., collocational knowledge) may be easier to learn incidentally. Encountering a word in an incidental learning condition (e.g., reading it in a book) can also enrich and reinforce the word knowledge learnt intentionally (e.g., by means of a wordfocused task), and push learners to eventually use the word. This means that learners need both intentional and incidental vocabulary learning opportunities (Nation, 2022; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020). Nation (2007) suggests classifying all activities in a language course into one of the following four strands: (1) meaning-focused input (i.e., learning through listening and reading), (2) meaning-focused output (i.e., learning through speaking and writing), (3) language-focused learning (i.e., deliberate attention to grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation and spelling), and (4) fluency development (i.e., becoming fluent in listening, speaking, reading and writing). According to Nation, a well-balanced course should devote approximately the same amount of time to each strand.

There is overwhelming evidence that intentional vocabulary learning is crucial for EFL learners (see e.g., Laufer, 2005, 2020; Nation, 2007, 2021). Intentional vocabulary learning helps learners to quickly establish the form-meaning link and often results in large and rapid vocabulary learning gains, especially soon after the completing the task (Webb et al., 2020). Thus, the question is not whether intentional vocabulary learning is beneficial, but rather which word-focused tasks that are the most efficient (Laufer, 2020). One body of research evaluates the efficiency of different intentional vocabulary learning tasks in general (e.g., Laufer, 2005; Nakata & Webb, 2016; Webb et al., 2020). Laufer (2005), for instance, reviewed studies on intentional vocabulary learning tasks and found that engaging with words in isolation (e.g., by solving a crossword puzzle where the sole focus is on revising familiar vocabulary) lead to larger vocabulary learning gains than word-focused tasks that were paired with meaningfocused tasks (e.g., matching TWs from a text with appropriate synonyms and then answering reading comprehension questions about the text). Similarly, in their metaanalysis of 22 studies on the most commonly researched word-focused tasks, Webb et al., (2020) conclude that engaging with vocabulary word lists and flashcards lead to greater vocabulary learning gains than filling in the blanks- and writing activities, as elicited through immediate and delayed post-tests. On average, the learning gains of the activities in all 22 studies were 60.1% and 58.5% in the immediate post-tests targeting meaning recall and form recall, respectively. However, the gains evident in the delayed post-tests were considerably smaller; 39.4% and 25.1%. This shows that learning through word-focused tasks is not guaranteed, especially not long-term.

In order for word-focused tasks to be effective and result in long-term vocabulary learning gains, they should involve *retrieval* (i.e., opportunities to actively retrieve the meaning of a word from the memory). Retrieval necessarily involves repetition (Nation, 2022; Snoder, 2022). Each retrieval strengthens the form-meaning link and makes subsequent retrievals easier. Around seven repetitions involving retrieval tend to be needed to learn words intentionally, although there is there is learner variability with regard to the exact number of repetitions needed. Some words can be learned after two encounters, whereas others may not be learned even after 20 exposures (Webb & Nation, 2017). Vocabulary experts recommend *spaced learning*, where the repetitions are spread out rather than *massed learning*, where all the words are to be learned during a single session. This is because encountering words multiple times facilitates the integration of the vocabulary into learners' existing knowledge systems. Both the spacing between items within a single learning session and the spacing between each

vocabulary learning session should be considered. It was previously thought that both types of spacing should be gradually increased (Nation, 2022; Webb & Nation, 2017). However, Nakata (2015) showed that the amount of spacing is more important than gradual increase. Everyone who learns a word initially notices it and comprehends its meaning (e.g., through dictionary use or a teacher explanation). If the noticing is followed by retrieval, the memory of the word will be strengthened, because words that are retrieved are reactivated in the robust long-term memory. If learners only notice a word, it is only activated in the working memory, which does not lead to long-term retention. For example, flashcards are more efficient than word lists because the former involve retrieval whereas the latter only involve noticing (Webb et al., 2020).

It may seem as if intentional vocabulary learning always equals conscious and deliberate learning, whereas incidental vocabulary learning happens subconsciously without intention. This needs to be problematised, however, as the degrees of consciousness and intention involved in both processes vary. Students who intentionally learn words which they find useful, interesting, and important are likely to do so with a higher degree of intention than others (Webb, 2020a). Students who are instructed to engage in intentional vocabulary learning do not automatically focus on the targeted vocabulary (Jahan & Kormos, 2015). Similarly, incidental vocabulary learning is not necessarily intention-free, as students can encounter a word in an incidental learning condition (e.g., when watching television) and put conscious effort into learning it (Webb et al., 2020). Thus, the present study does not distinguish between intentional and incidental vocabulary learning based on the degree of consciousness and intentionality involved. Instead, the distinction is based on whether or not the learning is a result of a task with vocabulary learning as an explicit focus. This perspective on intentional and incidental vocabulary learning is ecologically valid, as it foregrounds the purpose of the activity, which is more important from a teaching and learning perspective than levels of intention per se (Webb, 2020a). An alternative definition of intentional vocabulary learning is learning that occurs when learners know they are being tested on the targeted vocabulary (Hulstjin, 2001). Often used in psychology research, this definition is not germane to the thesis context because it foregrounds vocabulary testing rather than intentional vocabulary learning, which constitutes the research focus (Webb et al., 2020). Next, I turn to the construct of pedagogical translanguaging.

3.2 Pedagogical translanguaging

The translanguaging framework started as an ideology (García, 2009), and has evolved into a skill, theory, ideology, and pedagogy (García & Wei, 2014). The present study defines translanguaging in general as "[t]he ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as *an integrated system*" (Canagarajah, 2011, p. 401, my emphasis) because the definition encompasses translanguaging as a combination of skill, theory, ideology, and pedagogy. For example, an individual can use translanguaging as a skill by engaging in fluid language use in a multilingual setting. Translanguaging theories theorise individual multilingualism, whereas the translanguaging ideology celebrates it in different ways (García & Wei, 2014). A teacher can use translanguaging as a pedagogy by, for instance, judiciously translating target language vocabulary into the students' strongest languages (see e.g., Busse et al., 2021).

Despite being different types of translanguaging, an important common denominator of translanguaging as skill, theory, ideology, and pedagogy is the conceptualization of individual multilingualism upon which they are based. Translanguaging scholars all assume, in one way or another, that the languages of an individual are not entirely separate and strictly bounded entities but rather are part of one continuous repertoire. As indicated in Chapter 1, repertoires are here defined as "[t]he collective resources available to anyone at any point in time" (Blommaert, 2013, p. 4). The resources can be linguistic (e.g., a TW translation in Swedish) or nonlinguistic (e.g., a TW illustration) (Galante, 2024). Blommaert's (2013) definition of repertoires is used because it foregrounds the availability, functionality, and usage of resources. This tallies with the focus in the present study on the resources visibly *used* to intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary. When referring specifically to the linguistic resources in a repertoire, I use the term *language repertoire* (as in Källkvist et al., 2022).

In this thesis project, the notion of *resources* is used in two ways. First, as shown above, linguistic and non-linguistic resources are what repertoires consists of (Blommaert, 2013). Second, the present study is part of a sustainable body of research (see e.g., Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Cummins, 2021a, Hornberger, 1987, 2002; Rodrick Beiler, 2021b) with a resource orientation towards multilingualism. The idea of *multilingualism as a resource* corresponds to the last of Ruíz's (1984) orientations to language as a problem, right and resource, respectively. Pedagogical translanguaging presupposes that it may be empowering and beneficial for students to use their individual multilingualism as an asset when, for instance, completing the word-focused task. Importantly, however, previous research (e.g., Sturm et al., 2024; Rodrick Beiler,

2021b; Wedin, 2017) stresses that not all students automatically have a resource orientation towards all the languages in their language repertoires.

In accordance with Grosjean's (2008) Language Mode theory, the present study presupposes that the resources utilised to intentionally learn vocabulary can be visibly used (e.g., identifiable on a task sheet). Alternatively, resources can be activated in the mental lexicon but remain invisible. The Language Mode theory stipulates that a multilingual who knows three languages can be in a dominantly monolingual mode where mainly one language is active, or at the other extreme in a trilingual mode where all three languages are highly activated. They can also be in an intermediate position in the form of a bilingual mode where mainly two out of three languages are active. The degree of activation of the different languages depends on contextual factors like who the individual is talking to, their perceptions of the languages involved, the type of interaction, the topic, and the individual's proficiency levels in the different languages. It is more likely that a language will be activated in the mental lexicon if the individual is proficient in it. Importantly, none of the languages an individual knows are ever completely deactivated in the mental lexicon according to the Language Mode theory. This agrees with the notion of non-selectivity, according to which all of an individual's known languages become active through related form and meaning representations that compete for attention in the processing. Thus, in the context of intentional vocabulary learning, it is arguably natural to allow EFL students to use any languages when intentionally learning English vocabulary (Carrol et al., 2016 ; Sunderman & Kroll, 2006).

With this in mind, the present study defines pedagogical translanguaging as "a construct that refers to teaching approaches that involve the intentional and planned use of student multilingual resources in language and content subjects" (Juvonen & Källkvist, 2021, p.1). This definition is used because it agrees with the focus of the thesis project. Specifically, pedagogical translanguaging is concurrently being developed by Cenoz and colleagues in the Basque Country (see e.g., Cenoz & Gorter, 2022) and by García and colleagues in the United States (see e.g., García et al., 2017). Both camps emphasise that judiciously using students' multilingualism as a resource in the classroom has pedagogical, socioemotional, and identity-related benefits. However, the two camps differ in their conceptualisations of the repertoire. The version of pedagogical translanguaging originating from the Basque Country focuses primarily on the development and use of students' linguistic resources. It is endorsed in much European research about pedagogical translanguaging and intentional vocabulary learning (e.g., Busse et al., 2020, 2021; Cenoz et al., 2022). The version of pedagogical translanguaging put forward by García and colleagues instead rests on a conceptualisation of individual multilingualism as a "semiotic meaning-making repertoire" (García & Otheguy, 2020, p.26). It emphasises the value of using both

linguistic resources (e.g., words in different languages) and non-linguistic resources (e.g., images and gestures) to promote learning. This conceptualisation of pedagogical translanguaging is endorsed in research from a variety of contexts beyond the United States, including Australia (D'Warte, 2019), Southern Europe (e.g., Rosiers et al., 2018) and Scandinavia (e.g., Gunnarsson, 2015; Källkvist et al., 2022; Rodrick Beiler, 2021b; Wedin, 2017). The emphasis on both linguistic and non-linguistic resources agrees with this thesis project, which concerns visible use of both linguistic resources (e.g., explanations and TW translations in any languages) and non-linguistic resources (TW illustrations) for intentionally learning targeted English vocabulary. The present study therefore adheres to the version of pedagogical translanguaging put forward by García et al., (2017), to which I turn next.

According to García et al., (2017), translanguaging as a pedagogy consists of three clearly intertwined strands, each highlighted in different sub-sets of research. The strands are known as (1) the translanguaging stance, (2) the translanguaging design, and (3) the translanguaging shift. All three strands all relate to *the translanguaging corriente*. The translanguaging corriente equals positive excitement towards translanguaging as a skill, which, much like a river, should flow through and permeate the classroom (García et al., 2017).

The translanguaging stance is the philosophy, ideology and belief system which recognizes the translanguaging corriente and aims of pedagogical translanguaging. The first two aims of pedagogical translanguaging recognised in the translanguaging stance are to (1) support students as they are trying to comprehend complex classroom content, and (2) enable them to develop the language skills (e.g., vocabulary knowledge) they need for different academic purposes (García et al., 2017). One body of research illustrates how aim (1) can be achieved by giving EFL students the possibility to negotiate ideas through any language when, for example, writing essays (see Gunnarsson, 2019, 2021; Velasco & García, 2014) or encouraging them to build background knowledge of a topic by researching in several languages (García et al., 2017). Other studies show how aim (2) can be accomplished by fostering metalinguistic awareness (as in e.g., Cenoz et al., 2022; Hopp et al., 2020; Smidfelt, 2019) or writing essay drafts in different languages before choosing which text version to hand in (Velasco & García, 2014). The two final aims of pedagogical translanguaging amount to (3) encouraging the students' own bilingualism and "ways of knowing" (García et al., 2017), as well as (4) supporting their socioemotional well-being (Busse et al., 2020, 2021; García & Kleyn, 2016) and identity development (García et al., 2017; Wedin, 2017). Related to aim (4), one sub-set of studies (e.g., Krulatz et al., 2018; Krulatz & Iversen, 2020;Wedin, 2017) specifically highlights the affordances of *identity texts*. In identity texts, students are encouraged to write about their own lived experiences and draw on their entire language repertoires. This is a way to practice self-reflection whilst

also developing the written proficiency skills needed to eventually write in the target language only (Cummins, 2021b).

The translanguaging design, equals strategically planned lessons *corresponding* to the translanguaging corriente. Flexibility is a key element of a successful translanguaging design because it allows both students and teachers to maximise the outcome of the teaching (García et al., 2017; García & Kleyn, 2016). The translanguaging shift *follows the movement* of the translanguaging corriente. It is about the micro-level decisions made by teachers in their everyday practice, and about how they respond to the needs and interests of students 'on the go'. The idea is that educators should allow students to interpret lesson content using their own unique experiences, interpretations, personalities, and perceptions to the classroom.

In sum, some of the affordances of pedagogical translanguaging are cognitive and explicitly related to language learning (e.g., Cenoz et al., 2022; Gunnarsson, 2019, 2021; Smidfelt, 2019). Other benefits are more implicitly connected to language learning and concern identity development (e.g., Wedin, 2017) and socio-emotional well-being (e.g., Busse et al., 2020, 2021). Whilst acknowledging these affordances, it is important to also point to Green's (1998) model of Inhibitory Control (IC). This model assumes that retrieving lexical items in a language which learners are less proficient in requires inhibition of the stronger language, although De Bot (2004) notes that deactivation may be sufficient. Either way, this line of research suggests that there is a value in 'supressing' one's strongest language in order to practice delivering in the target language only. This is an argument in favour of a monolingual approach, according to which exclusive target language use facilitates language learning. Even though using a *strict* monolingual approach empirical support (see e.g., Brevik & Rindal, 2020; Gyllstad et al., 2023; Källkvist et al., 2017), the present study assumes that EFL students must practice using only English (see also García & Wei, 2014, p. 74). As illustrated in Chapter 2, the upper-secondary school English courses referred to in this thesis make great demands on sophisticated and complex language use in speaking and writing, which cannot always involve translanguaging according to the learning outcomes and criteria (see Skolverket, 2021).

Focusing on pedagogical translanguaging involving the society majority language (Swedish in this case), Lundahl (2021) indicates that this is not equally useful for all EFL learners. Previous research also points to individual variation with regard to students' perceived usefulness of the society majority language in the EFL classroom. In the Swedish context, Källkvist et al. (2022) explored the language practices in one multilingual EFL classroom at the secondary school level (student age 14–16). The teacher systematically and judiciously implemented English-Swedish translanguaging. This was typically appreciated by the students, although the authors point to individual differences with regard to exactly how it was perceived. Some students framed the

teachers' use of Swedish as a helpful resource, whilst others deemed the translanguaging useful for their peers but not necessarily for themselves. Rodrick Beiler (2021a) explored the role of translanguaging across three different multilingual EFL classrooms in Norway. All participating students were approximately 17 years old, enrolled in the same EFL course, and taught by the same teacher. One classroom was a mainstream EFL classroom, where the participating students followed the 'traditional' trajectory of English courses without receiving supplementary instruction in the society majority language Norwegian. The other two classrooms were non-mainstream EFL classrooms where this trajectory was not followed. One of the two non-mainstream groups was an accelerated class taking the course one year early. The second non-mainstream group was a sheltered class where a majority of the participating students had a migration background and were retaking the EFL course in question. Rodrick Beiler (2021a) notably showed how individual participating students' own ideologies and orientations towards their multilingualism were reflected in the classroom practices in focus (English essay writing). Some participating students explicitly avoided English-Norwegian translanguaging and preferred to use English only, while others translanguaged and visibly also used other languages in their repertoires to plan and produce their English essays. With these individual differences in mind, I turn to previous research on the topic of the present study: Multilingual students' intentional vocabulary learning in the EFL classroom.

3.3 Multilingual students' intentional vocabulary learning in the EFL classroom

My review of the literature on multilingual students' intentional vocabulary learning in the EFL classroom points to three broad categories of research. The first one is (1) multilingual students' intentional vocabulary learning in the EFL classroom in general (see e.g., Gyllstad et al., 2023; Hopp et al., 2018). A separate sub-set of the research focuses on (2) immigrant students' intentional learning of science vocabulary (see e.g., Ardasheva & Tretter, 2017; Miller, 2009; Townsend et al., 2018). Finally, a third category of studies zooms in specifically on (3) multilingual EFL students' intentional vocabulary learning in pedagogical translanguaging conditions (see Busse et al., 2020, 2021; Cenoz et al., 2022; Galante, 2020; Hopp et al., 2021; Leonet et al., 2020). The previous studies rereferred to in this sub-section all concern multilingual students' intentional vocabulary learning in the EFL classroom. The participants are EFL leaners in the sense that they are learners of English in a classroom setting (as in e.g., Warnby, 2023). The participants are multilingual because they have three or more languages in their repertoires (Baker & Wright, 2021). The participants complete intentional vocabulary learning tasks used as research tools and explicitly designed to promote vocabulary learning (Webb, 2020a).

Some of the studies from the first two categories (e.g., Hopp et al., 2018; Townsend et al., 2018) and all the studies in the third category except Galante (2020) feature participating students below the age of twelve. This is noteworthy, as older multilingual EFL students' intentional vocabulary leaning also merits attention. For example, Chapter 2 established that a robust English vocabulary is required for both upper-secondary and tertiary education in Sweden. This, in turn, requires (1) research which helps adolescent students grant the English vocabulary needed, and (2) concrete intentional vocabulary learning opportunities and tools for the students (Warnby, 2023).

Another identified pattern in the literature concerns the role of the participating students' teachers in the research. In some studies (e.g., Gyllstad et al., 2023; Hopp et al., 2021), one or two researchers from the respective research teams served as guest teachers themselves and were assisted by the regular class teachers if necessary. Others relied entirely on research assistants (e.g., Busse et al., 2020; Hopp et al., 2020) to carry out the interventions. Virtually all studies point out the value of conducting research in authentic classrooms to ensure ecological validity. Yet, despite the central role of the teacher in these spaces, few studies explicitly feature locally situated teacher-researcher collaborations and consider the teachers' perceptions of the intentional vocabulary learning tasks used in the studies. One exception is Miller (2009), who created, implemented, and evaluated a series of word-focused tasks and a dictionary with useful science-specific vocabulary. The word-focused tasks and the dictionary (collectively referred to as 'learning materials') were aimed at immigrant EFL learners aged 15-20 in Australia. The research project stemmed from a need for intentional vocabulary learning materials identified by both the researchers and the Science teacher participants from the study. Together, they all "negotiated a consultative process" to develop the learning materials (p. 579). The researchers ultimately designed the materials, but the teacher participants' perceptions and needs were considered during the process, by means of teacher-researcher dialogues and focus group interviews. The findings showed that the participating students' lack of science-specific vocabulary in English was a major obstacle for their learning in Natural science as a subject. Before participating in the research, the Natural science teacher participants often assumed that students knew science-specific vocabulary without explaining it. The project informed the teacher participants about the importance of providing newly arrived EFL students with intentional vocabulary learning opportunities. The teacher participants perceived Miller's (2009) tasks and dictionary as useful.

Zooming in on the third category of research (multilingual EFL students' intentional vocabulary learning in pedagogical translanguaging conditions), my review of the literature suggests a considerably larger body of research concerning pedagogical translanguaging and writing (see e.g., De Los Ríos & Seltzer, 2017; Gunnarsson, 2015, 2019, 2021; Krulatz et al., 2018; Krulatz & Iversen, 2020; Laursen et al., 2020; Martin-Beltrán, 2014; Rodrick Beiler, 2021a; Rowe, 2018, 2019; Seltzer, 2019, 2020; Smith et al., 2020; Stewart & Hansen-Thomas, 2016; Velasco & García, 2014; Wedin, 2017; Zapata & Tropp Laman, 2016, to name but a few publications) than pedagogical translanguaging and intentional vocabulary learning (Busse et al., 2020, 2021; Cenoz et al., 2022; Galante, 2020; Hopp et al., 2021; Leonet et al., 2020).

I have identified six empirical studies explicitly focusing on multilingual EFL students' intentional vocabulary learning and pedagogical translanguaging: Busse et al., 2020, 2021; Cenoz et al., 2022; Galante, 2020; Hopp et al., 2021; Leonet et al., 2020. All six pieces of research are quasi-experimental intervention studies comparing the intentional vocabulary learning of experimental groups in a pedagogical translanguaging condition to the learning of control groups who are not exposed to pedagogical translanguaging. Out of the six studies, four (Busse et al., 2020, 2021; Hopp et al., 2021; Galante, 2020) focus on receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge in general. The other two concentrate on specific word knowledge aspects: cognate knowledge (Cenoz et al., 2022) and morphological awareness (Leonet et al., 2020).

Given that this thesis project also concerns multilingual EFL students' intentional vocabulary learning and pedagogical translanguaging, I will now review each of the six studies, respectively. Organised geographically and based on the age of the participating students, the first three studies (Busse et al., 2020, 2021; Hopp et al., 2021) concern German compulsory school students aged 8–10. The next two studies (Cenoz et al., 2022; Leonet et al., 2020) were conducted in the Basque country with 10–11-year-old participating students. The final study (Galante, 2020) is from the Canadian context and involves students aged 18–21.

Busse et al., (2020) explored the affective outcomes and vocabulary learning gains of a pedagogical translanguaging intervention involving tasks with metalinguistic awareness-raising, physical, verbal and translation-focused elements. The participating students (N = 42 mean age 8.7 years) were divided into one experimental group and one control group. All participating students worked with their usual textbook, but the experimental group also completed additional word-focused tasks informed by pedagogical translanguaging and L2 motivation research. After each lesson, positive and negative affective outcomes were targeted by means of a rating scale, and the students sat four written vocabulary tests targeting the targeted vocabulary from the intervention. Compared to the control group, the students in the experimental group showcased higher vocabulary learning gains than the control group and displayed higher positive affect throughout the intervention.

In a subsequent study, Busse et al., (2021) looked at the effect of one plurilingual and one motivational learning condition on students' well-being and receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge. The students (N = 51, mean age 8.7 years old) were beginner-level learners of English at a German compulsory school, and 63% of the students were multilingual for reasons related to migration. Pre- immediate and delayed post-tests were administered to target the potential learning of targeted vocabulary from the intervention, and after each lesson, students' well-being (referred to as positive affect contrasted with negative affect) was measured through a rating scale. Both informed by pedagogical translanguaging, the plurilingual learning condition (where students used the regular textbook and performed pedagogical translanguaging tasks) and the motivational condition (where students used the regular textbooks and performed tasks meant to foster well-being and appreciation of individual multilingualism) lead to larger receptive and productive vocabulary learning gains than that from the control group (who used the regular textbook only). This is noteworthy, seeing that the students in the plurilingual and motivational learning conditions spent less time learning the targeted vocabulary than the control group, and had less time to demonstrate their productive vocabulary knowledge. Negative affect was low, and positive affect was high in all groups, and although the students in the pedagogical translanguaging needed time and encouragement to get used to learning vocabulary in this way, the intervention positively affected their socioemotional well-being.

Hopp et al., (2021) explored the longitudinal effects of a six-month long pedagogical translanguaging intervention on German compulsory school students' (N = 122, mean age 9.6 years) English vocabulary and grammatical knowledge. All the tasks from the intervention blended in with the participating students' regular textbook, but those in the experimental condition (n = 67) performed pedagogical translanguaging tasks (e.g., about identifying near-cognates between English and a range of other language and learning about contrastive grammatical differences between English and other languages), whereas the control group (n = 55) performed tasks without connection to pedagogical translanguaging (e.g., engaged with targeted English vocabulary without making comparisons to other languages). The analysed data sets were (a) pre- and postintervention tests targeting receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge, grammatical skills, and metalinguistic awareness, and (b) structured interviews where the students were tested on their metalinguistic awareness. Irrespective of language background, all students in the experimental condition actively engaged with the pedagogical translanguaging tasks, and both the intervention group and the experimental group significantly improved their receptive lexical and grammatical skills. Importantly, however, there was no statistically significant difference between the

test scores of experimental groups and the control groups. Contrary to Busse et al., (2020, 2021), Hopp et al., (2021) thus conclude that pedagogical translanguaging does not have a statistically significant effect on the development of young EFL learners' grammar and vocabulary knowledge on the group level.

In the Basque country, Cenoz et al., (2022) implemented a pedagogical translanguaging intervention focusing on students' identification and awareness of English words and their equivalent near-cognates in Spanish and/or Basque. Twentyfour students (approximately 10 years of age) participated in the study, half of whom were in the experimental group, whereas the other half served as a control group. The cognate awareness and identification skills of the two groups were compared by means of think-aloud protocols and stimulated recall interviews (SRIs) based on a cognate identification task where students read a short text in English and were asked to work in pairs to collaboratively identify English w from the text with near-cognates in Spanish and/or Basque. Students from both groups successfully identified semantically and orthographically transparent near-cognates (e.g., 'dinosaur' in English and 'dinosaurio' in Spanish or 'dinosauro' in Basque), whereas less transparent nearcognates (e.g., 'scientist' in English and 'científico' in Spanish or 'zientzialari' in Basque) were more difficult to identify. Compared to the control group, the experimental group displayed deeper and more sophisticated cognate awareness. The experimental group was also more aware of the usefulness of cognate knowledge when inferring the meaning of unknown words in a text.

The same research team (Leonet et al., 2020) also implemented an intervention focused on raising morphological awareness through pedagogical translanguaging. The students (N = 104, mean age 10.7 years) were all EFL learners, with either Basque or both Basque and Spanish as their self-reported L1s. During a twelve-week intervention, three experimental classes (n = 64) were taught in Basque, Spanish, and English simultaneously during all their language classes. Two classes (n = 40) served as control groups and instead participated in traditional separate Basque, Spanish, and English classes, where exclusive target language use was encouraged. The data consisted of a background questionnaire, a morphological awareness and word formation test, a questionnaire targeting perceptions of pedagogical translanguaging, and ten-minute focus group discussions where students collaboratively reflected on what they learned during the intervention. Compared to the control group, the experimental group scored significantly higher on three out of seven items on the test. Analyses of the questionnaires and focus group discussions also showed a preference for visibly using Basque, Spanish, and English simultaneously as a resource for learning English vocabulary.

Galante (2020) looked at vocabulary learning in one monolingual learning condition and one learning condition informed by pedagogical translanguaging, respectively. Seven teachers and 129 students (aged 18 –21 years) from a 12-week English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course in Canada served as participants. In both learning conditions, a battery of tasks and tests was used to target the learning of the same vocabulary (idioms and discourse markers). Additional data sets were vocabulary tests carried out by the end of the intervention, classroom observations, and learner diaries where learners reflected on the vocabulary learning processes. The 'pedagogical translanguaging' treatment group scored significantly higher than the 'monolingual' control group on the end-of-intervention vocabulary tests, which suggests that pedagogical translanguaging facilitated their vocabulary learning. The diary entries showed that many participating students were not used to pedagogical translanguaging, even though they often used translanguaging as a skill outside of school. The diary entries suggest that the participating students' translanguaging practices became increasingly sophisticated and complex with time, although this was not confirmed by the classroom observations.

Taken together, the six studies show that pedagogical translanguaging can be successfully implemented in multilingual classrooms to promote intentional English vocabulary learning. Completing word-focused pedagogical translanguaging tasks can have a positive effect on students' receptive and productive TW knowledge in general (Busse et al., 2020, 2021; Galante, 2020), as well as their cognate knowledge (Cenoz et al., 2022) and morphological awareness (Leonet et al., 2020), although Hopp et al., (2021) did not observe a statistically significant positive effect of pedagogical translanguaging on the group level. Pedagogical translanguaging can also contribute to students' well-being as they engage in intentional vocabulary learning (Busse et al., 2020), although it may take time for students to get used to and benefit from this approach to intentional vocabulary learning (Busse et al., 2021; Galante, 2020; Leonet et al., 2020). All six studies operate on the group level rather than on the individual level. As mentioned in Chapter 1, this is unfortunate, as vocabulary studies zooming in on specific individuals can help us understand how learners vary in their learning (Webb, 2020a, p. 235). While there are case studies about individual students' intentional vocabulary learning in general (e.g., Schmitt, 1998), my review of the literature does not point to any intentional vocabulary learning studies with an explicit focus on individual multilingual EFL students, taking their multilingual backgrounds into account. Further, all six studies describe that word-focused pedagogical translanguaging tasks (e.g., games and hands-on tasks like creating multilingual vocabulary posters for the purpose of learning vocabulary) were used as research tools. The tasks used by Hopp et al., (2021) are outlined in detail in a separate publication (Hopp et al., 2020). However, neither of the six studies explicitly aim to contribute to education by describing and evaluating how the tasks used as research tools can be utilised as learning materials by in-service teachers. This is unfortunate, as my review of the literature points to a need for more intentional vocabulary learning tasks, especially in the Swedish context.

Chapter 2 showed that the Swedish syllabi for compulsory and upper-secondary school English are largely communicative in nature. Specifically, they align with Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (Snoder, 2022). The underlying goal of CLT is to enable students to speak, write, listen and read in a variety of contexts and for different purposes. Accuracy and intentional learning of vocabulary and grammatical rules at the word- and sentence level are deprioritised in favour of language use and fluency at the discourse level (Siegel, 2022). The affordances of CLT and the importance of communicative abilities in English can hardly be overstated. This is especially true in the Swedish context, where the aforementioned Anglicisation in society and beyond makes advanced communicative skills in English essential. At the same time, vocabulary researchers (e.g., Laufer, 2005; Nation, 2021, 2022; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020) stress that developing the robust vocabulary needed to communicate on this level requires systematic, intentional attention to vocabulary. As shown below, Swedish students of all ages need more opportunities to intentionally learn English vocabulary.

Stridsman (2024) calls for more individualizable intentional vocabulary learning tasks aimed at students aged 10-12 (grades 4-6). In an interview study, D.Bergström et al., (2022) shed light on how English teachers of students aged 13-15 (grades 7-9) conceptualize vocabulary knowledge, development, and instruction. The teachers (N =14) relied heavily on incidental vocabulary learning and appeared to lack principled approaches to intentional vocabulary learning in the classroom. Warnby (2023) looked at Swedish upper-secondary school students' knowledge of English academic vocabulary, that is vocabulary frequently used in academic contexts (Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020). The students' vocabulary knowledge varied considerably, and the average vocabulary test scores were relatively low. Eriksson (2023) explored Swedish first-year university students' perceptions of their own readiness and ability to read academic texts in English. A majority of the students (62%) perceived their lack of sufficient English vocabulary knowledge as the major obstacle, as it made the reading overly cumbersome and time-consuming. Together, all these studies highlight that Swedish students need more intentional vocabulary learning opportunities and tools to prepare for the English proficiency demands they face as they advance through the education system in Sweden. One way to start attending to this problem is to initiate more vocabulary-related teacher-researcher collaborations (D. Bergström, 2023; Nordlund & Rydström, 2024).

3.4 Teacher-researcher collaborations

Teachers and researchers interested in education share the same bigger-picture goal of helping students in the best way possible. Yet, Sato and Loewen (2022) point to a considerable gap between researcher's and teacher's professional communities and hence call for more teacher-researcher collaborations and high-quality bidirectional dialogues between them. Without these, researchers risk conducting studies which are merely circulated within academia rather than accessed by teachers who actually benefit from the findings. Teachers, in turn, may rely too heavily on their personal experiences if they are not informed by research that is relevant for them (Elgemark et al., 2023). Indeed, recent publications suggest a lack of evidence underpinning the teaching of English in Sweden (D.Bergström, 2023; Elgemark et al., 2023), despite the Education Act (2010) specifying that teaching should be based in research and best practice.

One solution to this problem is to involve both teachers and researchers in projects with a *Mode 2 perspective*. Such research is solution-focused, and of concrete value to in-service teachers (Elgemark et al., 2023). Mode 2 projects involving both teachers and researchers require teachers with a high level of *research literacy* (i.e., willingness to engage with and implement research). Importantly, the researchers must also have *practice literacy*, defined as an ability to understand what teachers want/need and conduct research accordingly (Berggren et al., 2023; Bergmark & Graeske, 2022). The present study echoes Berggren et al. (2023) who note that is it just as important (if not more central) for researchers interested in education to develop practice literacy, as it is for in-service teachers to evince research literacy.

Nordlund and Rydström (2024) present an example of an intentional vocabulary learning project with a Mode 2 perspective from the Swedish context. One researcher and a group of in-service teachers planned a series of intentional vocabulary learning exercises (referred to in this thesis as tasks). The participating students were primarily EFL students. Guided by relevant research literature, the teachers chose a range of vocabulary exercises to implement in the classroom. The outcomes of the different exercises were then evaluated by the researcher and the teachers for the purpose of refining the teaching based on research and best practice. Nordlund and Rydström (2024) conclude that interpreting research findings and testing vocabulary exercises together in this way improved the quality of the teaching. They also stress the value of intentional vocabulary learning materials which can be adapted to different courses and student groups. In addition to being widely applicable, such materials can be part of a quality enhancement work, as they allow teachers to systematically and cyclically plan, realise, and evaluate students' intentional vocabulary learning (see p. 19).

3.5 Teacher perceptions and beliefs

As a means to bring in the teacher perspective (i.e., teachers' situated competence, developed through teacher education as well as years in the profession) on the usefulness of the word-focused task for students in their respective classrooms, the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task in particular will be illuminated. Because the word-focused task provides an example of intentional vocabulary learning, the teacher collaborators will also be asked to talk about intentional vocabulary learning. This way, it may be possible to unpack their beliefs that may potentially explain their perceptions of the task. Perceptions are here defined as "mutual interaction[s] with things" (Abram, 1996, p. 42, my emphasis). Teacher beliefs are teachers' "personal theories" (Uljens, 1997, p. 4). Perceptions are sensations caused by something concrete (e.g., a task), whereas beliefs are more general personal theories (about e.g., intentional vocabulary learning) (see terminology in Gutierrez, 2024).

According to my review of the literature, studies concerning teachers' perceptions of vocabulary learning tasks (e.g., Gutierrez, 2024; Page & Mede, 2018) typically use Task-based language teaching (TBLT) as an overarching framework. Thus, the tasks in focus are typically communicative in nature and designed to promote incidental rather than intentional vocabulary learning. Gutierrez (2024) also points to a need for teacher perception studies which include "*locally situated*, longitudinal and cyclical evaluation[s]" of tasks in general (p. 2, my emphasis). More specifically, there appears to be a need for studies which take teacher perceptions of locally situated intentional vocabulary learning tasks into account, since most existing research focus on the learning- rather than task components.

Moreover, teacher beliefs can be considered an aspect of *teacher cognition*, defined by Borg (2006) as "[a]n often tactic, personally-held, practical system of mental constructs held by teachers which are dynamic, [that is] defined and redefined on the basis of educational and professional experiences throughout teachers' lives" (p. 35). There is a paucity of research on teacher cognition and intentional (and incidental) vocabulary learning in general (D. Bergström et al., 2022). By way of example, Newton (2021) refers to *The Routledge handbook of vocabulary studies* (Webb, 2020b), where only two chapters (Gu, 2020; Newton, 2020) address teacher cognition, albeit in very brief comments. The last two decades have nonetheless witnessed an increased interest in the topic (Chung & Fischer, 2022). More specifically, my review of the literature on teachers' beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning suggests the following: One category of studies focuses exclusively on university-level teachers (Niu & Andrews, 2012; Sánchez-Gutiérrez et al., 2022; Xie, 2013), whilst others compare secondaryand university teachers' beliefs about vocabulary (Lopéz-Barios et al., 2021). Other studies zooms in on in-service teachers outside of the university context (D.Bergström et al., 2022; Hermagustiana et al., 2017; Hestetræet, 2012). Within this latter category of research, a specific subset concerns teacher beliefs in relation to professional development programmes (Chung, 2018a, 2018b, 2022; Chung and Fischer, 2022). A final sub-category of research deals specifically with pre-service teachers' beliefs about vocabulary teaching and learning (Gao & Ma, 2011; Macalister, 2012).

Taken together, the above-mentioned research shows that teachers' beliefs about vocabulary teaching and learning can be shaped by numerous factors, not least their own experiences as students (Gao & Ma, 2011). Chung and Fischer (2022) illustrate that professional development programmes may have an impact on teacher beliefs, although actually implementing these belief changes in the classroom requires teachers to reflect upon their practices. Some teachers (e.g., those in Gao & Ma, 2011) report advocating intentional vocabulary learning as an activity in its own right, whilst others (e.g., those in D.Bergström et al., 2022, Hermagustiana et al., 2017, and Macalister, 2012) emphasise incidental vocabulary learning as a result of other activities, such as reading. Two studies about teacher beliefs from the Scandinavian context (D.Bergström et al., 2022 & Hestetræet, 2012) conclude that teachers need to be equipped with more word-focused tasks. The vast majority of the research on teacher beliefs about intentional (and incidental) vocabulary learning comes from the Asian context, which indicates a need to focus other parts of the world as well (see Lopés-Barrios et al., 2021). With this in mind, I turn to the chapter summary.

3.6 Summary

The field of intentional L2 vocabulary learning is vibrant and multifaceted. It is also largely quantitative in nature. This is natural, given that a vocabulary consists of easily quantifiable units (Nation, 2022). Previous research offers much theoretical knowledge about what it means to know a word and how to best support the internal intentional L2 vocabulary learning process (see e.g., Nation, 2022; Newton, 2021; Webb, 2022b). However, my review of the literature suggests a need for more locally situated and practically oriented studies specifically about multilingual EFL students' intentional vocabulary learning in the classroom. While there are studies that evaluate the efficiency of different intentional vocabulary learning tasks in general (e.g., Nakata & Webb, 2016; Webb et al., 2020), there appears to be a paucity of research centred on intentional vocabulary learning tasks aimed at multilingual EFL students, and which consider teachers' beliefs and perceptions of these tasks in the context of locally situated teacher-researcher collaborations. Therefore, the primary aim of this thesis project is to advance our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in upper-secondary school classrooms. To this end, the present study sheds light on the resources that EFL students with different multilingual backgrounds and proficiency levels in English visibly use to complete the word-focused task and potentially learn the vocabulary. An auxiliary aim is to contribute to the teaching of English in upper-secondary school by constructing, using, and evaluating the word-focused task developed. As such, the word-focused task will be used as learning materials as well as a research tool.

The word-focused task will be integrated into unique learning units tailored to fit the needs of the respective classes. The units were didactic sequences consisting of 3–6 lessons. The students completed the word-focused task together with other English proficiency tasks related to a specific theme. Each unit fit the teacher collaborators' respective plans, which in turn were in line with policy documents as to the content to be covered. I designed each unit together with the teacher collaborators. As a means to bring in the teacher perspective (i.e., teachers' situated competence, developed through teacher education as well as years in the profession) on the usefulness of the wordfocused task for students in their respective classrooms, the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task in particular will be illuminated. Because the word-focused task provides an example of intentional vocabulary learning, the teacher collaborators will also be asked to talk about intentional vocabulary learning. This way, it may be possible to unpack their beliefs that may potentially explain their perceptions of the task. The word-focused task is outlined in Chapter 4, to which I turn next.

4 The word-focused task

This chapter presents the word-focused task based on the information about intentional L2 vocabulary learning presented in Chapter 3. First, the word-focused task will be introduced, and the task design will be justified. Next, the vocabulary learning theory underpinning each task section will be outlined. In the present study, the word-focused task serves as a research tool used advance our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in upper-secondary school classrooms Therefore, this chapter also illustrates how the word-focused task was streamlined with the vocabulary tests from the thesis project.

4.1 Introduction to the word-focused task

As mentioned, the word-focused task is a sheet with seven sections. In each section, students can provide one of the following types of TW information: (1) TW synonym(s), (2) translation equivalent(s), (3) a TW illustration, (4) TW explanation(s), (5) example sentence(s) including the TW, (6) a connection to prior knowledge in the form of a reference to moments when students have heard or seen the TW before, and (7) a word association. The TW information can be in English and/or any other language(s). As specified in Chapter 2, this all agrees with the Swedish syllabi for the subject of English at the compulsory and upper-secondary school, not least because teachers have the agency to decide how to treat intentional (and incidental) vocabulary learning in the classroom (Warnby, 2023). Each task section suggests different uses of linguistic and non-linguistic resources (Blommaert, 2010). The linguistic resources referred to in the present study are the languages visibly used in the different task sections (e.g., when explaining a TW in English, Swedish, or another language if applicable). The non-linguistic resources are TW illustrations. Prior knowledge in the form of references to moments when the TW has been heard or seen before is mediated through linguistic resources (Blommaert, 2010; Galante, 2024) There is one task sheet per TW.

Following Webb et al., (2020, p. 733), the task is referred to as a word-focused task in order to highlight its explicit vocabulary focus. It should be acknowledged that *task* is a loaded concept used in several different ways (East, 2021; Ellis et al., 2019). According to the TBLT community, tasks need to meet specific criteria. Activities that do not meet these are considered exercises (Ellis et al., 2019). This thesis project is not a TBLT study, and the word-focused task was not designed with these characteristics in mind. Instead, the notion of task is used in the same broad sense as in previous pedagogical translanguaging studies (e.g., Busse et al., 2020, 2021; Cenoz et al., 20222) featuring intentional vocabulary learning tasks used as research tools.

4.2 Task design

The design of the word-focused task is based on Schmitt and Schmitt's (1995) *vocabulary notebooks*. Vocabulary notebooks allow learners to record substantial amounts of TW information, which can then be used to intentionally learn the vocabulary. The notebooks can come in the form of loose-leaf binders or take the shape of cards, which can be stacked on top of each other. The word-focused task contains one task sheet per TW. The layout of each task sheet corresponds to one of Schmitt and Schmitt's (1995) vocabulary notebook cards. Figure 4.1a below compares the word-focused task to a vocabulary notebook card. Figure 4.1b juxtaposes the word-focused task, flashcards (i.e., word cards) and word lists (i.e. glossaries).



English synonym(s)	
structures, lines	
Translation equivalent(s)	Target word illustration:
structur, Whiter, "surgger"	contour
xplanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
You can use it in make up to enhans	I put on some contour to highlight
other (portier,) in the face like the	my checkbones
cheelebones.	
have heard or seen this word before when	This word makes me think about the word
ry to be as specific as you can here	
in make up toturials	matte up

Figure 4.1a

The word-focused task in relation to Schmitt and Schmitt's (1995) vocabulary notebook cards

horror card front	skräck card back	horror = skräck ghost = spöke vampyr = vampire terrified= livrädd, förskräckt, skräckslagen
Word card/flash card		Word list/glossary
I arget word: <u>contour</u> I start working with this word at (write the tin I don't know this word Seen it, don't know the meaning St (think I) know this word English synonym(s)	he here) 10.145	
ranslation equivalent(s) Kontur		Target word illustration:
planation(s) in English and/or any other language(s)	. e	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
ve heard or seen this word before when to be as specific as you can here 10.KC = WR		This word makes me think about the word
I stopped working with this word at (write the I used a dictionary or some other resource whe RYes, I used OCO		

Figure 4.1b

The word-focused task in relation to flash cards and word lists

Figures 4.1a–b show that the word-focused task and Schmitt and Schmitt's (1995) vocabulary notebook cards differ from flashcards and word lists in that the TW information in the two former vocabulary learning materials is much richer than that in the others. Typically, flashcards and wordlists simply contain TWs and their L1 translation equivalents, whereas the vocabulary notebook cards and the word-focused task also allow other aspects of the TW to be considered. Importantly, this thesis project is not about vocabulary notebooks per se and does not explore students' strategic

learning of recorded TW information (as in previous vocabulary notebook studies like Holmberg Sjöling, 2023; Walters & Bozkurt, 2009). Instead, the *design* of the wordfocused task is based on the *format* of Schmitt and Schmitt's (1995) vocabulary notebook cards, as the layout allows students to focus on a small sub-set of TWs by considering multiple word knowledge aspects related to the words they are focusing on.

The word-focused task design is purposefully simple, and the instructions (see Appendix 12) specify that students should complete the task sections *they* find useful for learning the TWs This was all meant to make the word-focused task individualizable (i.e., possible to complete by different students in different ways) and adjustable (i.e., available for individual teachers to adapt in light of their expertise and perceptions). Pedagogically, individualizable tasks invite students to coordinate and orchestrate their own learning processes. This is known to facilitate learning, although it may be difficult and requires practice (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2018). Adjustable tasks can also be adapted to different courses and student groups and altered by individual teachers in light of their own expertise and systematic evaluations of the task (see Nordlund & Rydström, 2024, p. 19). From a research perspective, this thesis project required an individualizable and adjustable task. The reason is that the present study features a range of EFL students with different multilingual backgrounds and proficiency levels in English.

Unlike Schmitt and Schmitt's (1995) vocabulary notebooks, the word-focused task was explicitly designed to enable pedagogical translanguaging. Students are invited to engage with the TWs by visibly using self-selected linguistic and/or non-linguistic resources (e.g., TW translation equivalents and/or TW illustrations). This agrees with the first purpose of pedagogical translanguaging mentioned in Chapter 3; to support students as they are trying to comprehend texts and complex classroom content. The word-focused task can be used to facilitate intentional learning of any targeted vocabulary, including subject-specific terms and multiword items such as collocations. This tallies with the second purpose of pedagogical translanguaging, which is to enable students to develop the language skills they need for different academic purposes. In accordance with the third purpose of pedagogical translanguaging, students are encouraged to use their individual multilingualism and ways of knowing as resources, as the word-focused task can be completed by different students in different ways. Flexibility is key when implementing pedagogical translanguaging. It is also inherent in the word-focused task, as it was designed to be individualizable and adjustable. In pedagogical translanguaging, the value of allowing students to interpret lesson content using their own unique experiences, interpretations, personalities, and perceptions to the classroom is emphasised (García et al., 2017). This agrees with the task sections labelled I have heard this word before when... and This word makes me think about the word... Completing these task sections could activate students' prior knowledge, which, in turn, could be used as a resource for learning TWs (see De Schonewise & Klingner 2012). The word-focused task could also be used to foster the translanguaging corriente. As mentioned in Chapter 3, this is a form of excitement towards translanguaging and multilingualism. Importantly, however, fostering the translanguaging corriente is a potential by-product rather than the main purpose of the word-focused task, which primarily was designed to promote intentional vocabulary learning. Accordingly, the next sub-section outlines the vocabulary learning theory underpinning each task section.

4.3 Vocabulary learning theory underpinning the wordfocused task sections

The seven sections of the word-focused task were included because they each suggests one way to gain, consolidate and/or demonstrate vocabulary knowledge recommended by vocabulary experts (Nation, 2022; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020). What follows is an outline of the vocabulary learning theory behind each task section, respectively.

Synonym(s). In this section, the student can provide TW synonyms and establish the form-meaning link through the target language. This can be a useful way to intentionally learn vocabulary, given that the final goal is to be able to communicate the meaning of the word in the target language. Learning a word through its synonym it is particularly suitable if the translation equivalents only are partly synonymous with the TW due to grammatical, stylistic and/or cultural factors (Schmitt & Schmitt, 1995).

Translation equivalent(s). In this section, the student can provide translation equivalent(s) of the TW. This facilitates vocabulary learning in that learners often possess rich associations to the TW in languages other than the target language, which can help them learn the new word (Nation, 2022). Drawing on other languages when learning vocabulary is a fast way to establish the form-meaning link (Tian & Macaro, 2012). It is also something that many learners consider relevant (Rindal, 2024) report doing when asked about how they orchestrate their own vocabulary learning (see e.g., Barcoft, 2009, p. 82).

TW illustration. In this section, the student can provide a TW illustration. This may be easier for concrete nouns than for verbs and adverbs, for example. Importantly, the students can self-select which task sections to complete and do not have to provide TW illustrations. The targeted activity is the actual drawing of the TW rather than the use of ready-made photographs or pictures. A TW illustration can function as an instantiation of a word, which can be used to remember it. Drawing a TW illustration

may result in deeper processing than providing TW translation(s) and/or synonyms, as drawing requires more imagination than the latter options (Nation, 2022).

TW explanation(s). This task section invites students to explain the TW in English or any other language(s). Explaining is a common way of demonstrating and consolidating the meaning of word. Every time this is done, memory associations are strengthened. Explaining is also a way of practicing delivery of knowledge of TW meaning (Nation, 2022).

Example sentence(s). Here, students can write sentence(s) containing the TWs. Different studies point to different findings with regard to the usefulness of constructing example sentences containing TWs in order to learn them. Barcroft (2004) compared the effect of learning TWs by (a) writing them in sentences and (b) learning through looking at pictures representing the words. Although this is just one study that needs replication, the results indicate a negative effect of the sentence writing condition and suggest that putting words in sentences might actually inhibit learning at beginner stages. Pichette and Lafontaine (2012) compared the effect of reading versus writing sentences containing the TWs on incidental learning. An immediate recall test indicated that the writing task was superior to the reading task, although a delayed test suggested that this effect fades with time. Zou (2017) compared the effect of clozeexercises with 'gaps', writing sentences, and writing texts on word learning. The two latter tasks involving writing lead to better word learning than the cloze exercises. Thus, there appears to be a difference depending on whether a learner actively writes a sentence used for learning compared to if the learner does not construct the sentence themselves. Regardless, using sentence contexts in word-focused tasks is advisable, because it can provide valuable additional information which the learners can use to develop vocabulary depth (Nation, 2022).

Connections to prior knowledge. In the section labelled *I have heard this word before when*, the student can note when they have heard or seen a TW before. Thus, they can engage in intentional learning of the TW by connecting it to previous experiences, interests, or subject knowledge. Prior knowledge of this type is mediated through linguistic resources (Galante, 2024). The general importance of making connections to prior knowledge in the classroom is highlighted in the Swedish upper-secondary school curriculum (Skolverket, 2011). It specifies that the teaching should "draw on work-and life *experiences* that the students have gained during the education" (p. 7, my emphasis). De Schonewise and Klingner (2012) explain that one way of facilitating intentional vocabulary learning is to "[link] new information with prior knowledge, building on students' background knowledge, experiences, and interests" (p. 62). The authors hence echo Nation (2022), who also stresses the value of consciously connecting new words to previous knowledge when trying to learn them. In a context like the multilingual EFL classroom in Sweden, this is not only a requirement, but also

fairly natural, given the central role of English in many students' lives established in Chapter 2. Even though it has been established *that* activation of prior knowledge is beneficial when intentionally learning targeted English vocabulary (De Schonewise & Klinger, 2012), there are, to my knowledge, no studies investigating *how* prior knowledge is visibly used as a resource when engaging with vocabulary.

Word associations. In this final section, the student can provide a word association. Word associations have been extensively researched with the over-arching goal of exploring the organisation of learners' mental lexicon. The word associations may reveal students' knowledge of other words that go together with the TWs (Meara, 2009). Most importantly, however, the present study assumes that providing linguistic and experiential word associations is here viewed as another way of enabling deep and active vocabulary processing (Nation, 2022).

The suggestions in the seven task sections (e.g., drawing a TW illustration or providing a TW synonym) are conceptualised as seven ways to gain, consolidate and/or deliver knowledge of the TWs through visible resource use. Though theoretically possible, they are *not* regarded as seven *cognitive vocabulary learning strategies*, defined by Schmitt (1997) as "strategies which involve the manipulation of information in an immediate task for the purpose of acquiring or retaining that information" (p. 2). The reason is that according to the task instructions in Appendix 12, students should *complete* the word-focused task using the resources they find useful. Students are not instructed to repeatedly complete the same task sheet with the purpose of memorizing the TWs. Memorization is inherent in strategic vocabulary learning (Gu, 2020) but goes beyond the scope of the present study. That said, the word-focused task involves retrieval because it requires learners to actively retrieve TW information, either from their memory or from a dictionary (or similar) (Nation, 2022).

The word-focused task is meant to facilitate intentional learning of as many of the different word knowledge aspects from Nation's (2022) word knowledge framework as possible As mentioned in Chapter 3, the framework provides a rich

conceptualisation of word knowledge, which assumes that knowing a word involves not only receptive skills but also the ability to productively use the word in a variety of contexts. This, in turn, tallies with the conceptualisation of vocabulary knowledge from the present study. Echoing Nation (20222) vocabulary knowledge is regarded as part of language proficiency, and as something which requires explicit attention in the classroom, with the aim of enabling students to actually use the vocabulary they learn.

The receptive/productive distinction is not always useful, however, as there are productive elements in receptive vocabulary learning and vice versa (Nation, 2022). The present study therefore differentiates between *recognition* and *recall*. Recognition entails selection (e.g., choosing the right definition of a word in a test with a multiple-choice format) and recall entails supplementation (e.g., writing down a definition of a

word). A further distinction is made between *form recall, meaning recall, form recognition* and *meaning recognition*. Form recall involves providing the form of the TW. Meaning recall requires being able to say what the word means by, for example, providing a TW translation. Form recognition equals identifying the form of the TW, like when choosing between different forms in a multiple-choice format. Meaning recognition can be demonstrated by choosing between different potential meanings of the TW in a language other than the target language. Form recall is the most difficult level of word knowledge followed by meaning recall form recognition and meaning recognition in descending difficulty level (Schmitt, 2010). Gonzàlez-Fernàndez (2024) found that form-meaning recognition is the first to develop for L2 learners and a prerequisite for then developing recall mastery, which is complex and requites considerable time and training.

Tables 4.1a-b below illustrate which aspects of word knowledge students may demonstrate in the word-focused task. It also shows the types of recognition and/or recall knowledge that may be visible. The example data all concern same the TW (*urban*).

Task section number	Task section instructions	Example data	Type of recognition and/or recall possibly demonstrated in the task section (Schmitt, 2010)	Aspect of word knowledge for testing possibly demonstrated in the task section (Nation, 2022)
-	" English synonym(s) "	"metropolitan, nonrural []"	Meaning recall (supply definition/L1 translation, etc.)	Receptive and productive knowledge of form and meaning
7	"Translation equivalent(s)"	"urban,stadsmässig" (Svvedish. My translation: "urban, city-like".)	Meaning recall (supply definition/L1 translation, etc.)	Receptive and productive knowledge of form and meaning
ſ	"Target word illustration"		Meaning recall (supply definition/L1 translation, etc.)	Productive knowledge of meaning
4	"Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s)"	"[A]n adjective that describes nouns that are related to city []"	Meaning recall (supply definition/L1 translation, etc.)	Productive knowledge of meaning

 Table 4.1 a-b

 Word knowledge aspects and types of recognition and/or recall possibly demonstrated in the word-focused task

Aspect of word knowledge for testing possibly demonstrated in the task section (Nation, 2022)	Productive knowledge of written form Productive knowledge of grammatical functions Productive knowledge of use	Productive knowledge of associations other than word associations	Productive knowledge of word associations
Type of recognition and/or recall possibly demonstrated in the task section (Schmitt, 2010)	Meaning recall (supply definition/L1 translation, etc.)	Form recognition	Form recognition
Example data	" Urban areas is [sic.] fast and complicated." " [T]he city has a bit of an urban vibe."	" There's this site called [U]rban dictionary." "When in class and we talked about how architects plan cities."	"urbanisering" (urbanisation in Swedish)
Task section instructions number	"Example sentence(s) including the word English and/or any other language(s)"	"I have heard or seen this word before when Try to be as specific as you can here."	"This word makes me think about the word"
Task section number	٦	٥	7

Tables 4.1 a–b map the word-focused task on the conceptualisation from this thesis project of what it means to know a word. Tables 4.1a–b also highlight how the task was designed to let students either demonstrate (if they do not use any dictionaries or similar) or look up (if they do use dictionaries or similar) multiple vocabulary knowledge aspects. For example, the task invites students to show receptive and productive knowledge of TW form and meaning by providing TW synonym(s) in the first task section. By independently writing an example sentence containing the TW, students can, at least in theory, demonstrate knowledge of the written form, grammatical function(s), and use of the TW.

The word-focused task also invites *engagement* with the TWs in that the more students engage with a TW by completing different task sections (i.e., putting the TW in a sentence and drawing a TW illustration), the more likely it is that it will be learned. In attempts to specify this common-sense notion, Craik and Lockhart's (1972) *Depth/Levels of Processing Hypothesis* (D/LoPH) has been used as a stepping stone (Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020). The (D/LoPH) presupposes that the more attention learners give to a TW, the more it is manipulated, and the more likely it is that learners will remember it. Hulstjin and Laufer's (2001) *Involvement Load Hypothesis* (ILH) elaborates on the D/LoPH and assumes that high degrees of involvement with a TW increases the chance of learning it. Involvement has three components: *need, search*, and *evaluation* (see also Laufer & Hulstjin, 2001). Need is when a TW is required in order to achieve something. Search equals looking for information that is required to learn the word. Evaluation is when the TW (or information about it) is compared to the context in which it is used.

Meta-analyses (Liu & Reynolds, 2022; Yanagisawa & Webb, 2021) highlight that although the ILH may be a useful framework for evaluating the efficiency of a task, there are many other factors in addition to search, need, an evaluation that affect intentional vocabulary learning. Examples include specific personal goals and intentions, as well as the time spent on engaging with and learning a word (Gu, 2020; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020). Echoing Schmitt (2008), the present study therefore uses engagement as generic term for all involvement possibilities, and not just those referred to by Hulstjin and Laufer (2001). It is assumed that anything that results in increased and improved engagement facilitates vocabulary learning, which makes engagement the most important prerequisite for vocabulary learning to occur.

4.4 The word-focused task as a research tool

In the studies reported in this thesis, the word-focused task was used as a research tool to facilitate intentional learning of TWs. The observed learning of the targeted vocabulary (i.e., the TWs) was elicited through two vocabulary tests: Test 1 and Test 2. Test 1 was developed by Gyllstad et al. (2023). It served as an immediate post-test in Study 1, and as a pre-test in Studies 2–3. Figure 4.2 displays an example test item from Test 1 (TW *urban*).

4.urban	□ I don't know this word
	\Box Seen it, don't know the meaning
	\Box I (think I) know this word:

Figure 4.2 Example test item from Test 1

Figure 4.2 shows how Test 1 allowed students to demonstrate recognition (i.e. partial knowledge) by indicating whether they had seen the TW. When they (thought they) knew words from Test 1, they could show this by translating the word into any language, putting the word in a sentence, *or* providing an English synonym for it. These options were chosen because they are all ways of demonstrating meaning recall knowledge (Nation, 2022). Bruton (2009) stresses that in vocabulary tests like Test 1, well-established criteria are needed in order to determine what counts as correct demonstration of TW knowledge. As recommended by Bruton (2009), and Gyllstad et al., (2023), Test 1 was thus scored during a two-step process guided by criteria specified in the studies presented in this thesis. Test 1 is available in Appendix 13.

Test 1 measures the ability to supply meaning when given a word in the target language (Gyllstad et al., 2023). As mentioned in Chapter 3, this thesis project assumes that deep knowledge of a word equals knowledge of as many of the aspects from Nation's (2022) word knowledge framework as possible, and not just meaning recall. Targeting such deep vocabulary knowledge required a sensitive and more comprehensive measure, such as Test 2. Table 4.2 introduces Test 2 and shows how Nation's (2022) framework is reflected in the word-focused task and Test 2, respectively.

Table 4.2

Test 2 in relation to Nation's (2022) word knowledge framework and the word-focused task

Task section number	Task section instructions	Type of recognition and/or recall possibly demonstrated in the task section (Schmitt, 2010)	Aspect of word knowledge for testing possibly demonstrated in the task section (Nation, 2022)	Corresponding test- item in Test 2
1	"English synonym(s)"	Meaning recall (supply definition/L1 translation, etc.)	Receptive and productive knowledge of form and meaning	"Provide a synonym for [the TW] in English"
2	"Translation equivalent(s)	Meaning recall (supply definition/L1 translation, etc.)	Receptive and productive knowledge of form and meaning	"Translate [the TW] into Swedish or any other language"
3	"Illustration"	Meaning recall (supply definition/L1 translation, etc.)	Productive knowledge of meaning	-
4	"Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s)"	Meaning recall (supply definition/L1 translation, etc.)	Productive knowledge of meaning	"Explain [the TW] in English (or any other language)"
5	"Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s)"	Meaning recall (supply definition/L1 translation, etc.)	Productive knowledge of written form Productive knowledge of grammatical functions Productive knowledge of use	"Write a sentence that includes [the TW]".
6	"I have heard or seen this word (or part of the word) before when Try to be as specific as you can here"	Form recognition	Productive knowledge of associations other than word associations	"Write a different word which [the TW] makes you think of"
7	"This word makes me think about the word"	Form recognition	Productive knowledge of word associations	"Write a different word which [the TW] makes you think of"

Table 4.2 showcases how Test 2 is streamlined with the word-focused task. The word-focused task and Test 2 allow students demonstrate knowledge of multiple word knowledge aspects from Nation's (2022) framework. Thus, Test 2 is purpose-specific, and allows students to show partial knowledge, as recommended by experts on vocabulary testing (see Gyllstad & Schmitt, 2019). Because of space limits, Test 1 (exemplified in Figure 4.2 above) did not test all the word knowledge aspects. Test 2, however, is more exhaustive and covers more aspects of word knowledge. The option to draw a TW illustration to demonstrate TW knowledge was included in the word-focus task but not in Test 2. This was deemed a natural way to shorten the test, given that Test 2 contains multiple other test items targeting productive knowledge of meaning.

The word-focused task, Test 1, and Test 2 all emphasise meaning recall because it is important to master and required for reading comprehension (McLean et al., 2020). In Test 2 from Table 4.2 above, the participating students were also presented with three sentences containing each TW, where one was correct, and two were incorrect. They were then asked to identify and underline the correct sentence. This format was successfully used by Webb (see e.g., Webb, 2005, 2009) to target receptive knowledge of grammatical functions, and was thus deemed an appropriate counterbalance to the meaning-focused nature of the word-focused task and the tests.

Finally, when used as a research tool, each task sheet had a section where the participating students could indicate the time spent completing it. The purpose of this was to be able to account for the time-on-task (ToT) variable (Carroll, 1963). The Time on Task Hypothesis (ToTH) assumes that the more time that is allotted to learning a word, the more likely it is that learning occurs. Theoretically, spending time on learning a word allows it to be integrated into the mental lexicon, and the formmeaning link to be established, and spending time completing a task allows learners to be through and thus learn from it (Carroll, 1963; Huang et al., 2013). Empirically, some studies (e.g., Gao et al., 2024) corroborate the ToTH, whilst others (Busse et al., 2020) contradict it. In Busse et al.,'s (2020) study, the ToT analysis functioned as an evaluation of the two vocabulary learning conditions from their study and showed that the pedagogical translanguaging condition was particularly effective, as the participating students exposed to this condition learned more vocabulary than the control group despite spending less time on task. Similarly, the present study assumes that ToT is subsumed under evaluation. With this in mind, I turn to the chapter summary.

4.5 Summary

This chapter has presented the word-focused task. It is a sheet with seven sections, each devoted to one of the following types of TW information: (1) synonym(s), (2) translation equivalent(s), (3) a TW illustration, (4) explanation(s), (5) example sentence(s) containing the TW, (6) a connection to prior knowledge in the form of a reference to moments when students have heard or seen the TW before and (7) word associations, respectively. The TW information can be provided in English and/or any other language(s), and there is one task sheet per TW. Each task section suggests a separate way to gain, consolidate and/or demonstrate vocabulary knowledge recommended by vocabulary experts (Nation, 2022; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020). Together, the task sections also tally with Nation's (2022) word knowledge framework (i.e., the conceptualisation from this thesis project of what it means to know a word). The word-focused task design is based on Schmitt & Schmitt's (1995) vocabulary notebook cards. This layout ideally allows multiple word knowledge aspects to be considered and deep learning to occur. The word-focused task differs from vocabulary notebook cards because the task was designed to promote pedagogical translanguaging and intentional vocabulary learning rather than memorization and documentation of multiple word knowledge aspects. The word-focused task was conceived for two reasons: to serve as a research tool used to advance our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in uppersecondary school classrooms, and to facilitate students' intentional vocabulary learning. When used as a research tool, the word-focused task was streamlined with the two vocabulary tests from this thesis project: Test 1 and Test 2. Next, Chapter 5 constitutes the methodological foundation of the present study.
5 Methodology

This chapter introduces and justifies the research design and methods employed in the studies reported in this thesis. Sub-section 5.1 concerns the research approach and my researcher positionality. The recruitment of the teacher collaborators and participating students is discussed in Sub-section 5.2. In Sub-section 5.3, the research design is presented and motivated. Sub-section 5.4 accounts for the empirical methods employed to produce the data. Sub-section 5.5 introduces and justifies the transcription conventions, and the two analytical methods used. Sub-section 5.6 is devoted to research ethics. The chapter ends with a summary in Sub-section 5.7.

5.1 Research approach

The primary aim of this thesis project is to advance our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in uppersecondary school classrooms. To this end, the present study sheds light on the resources that EFL students with different multilingual backgrounds and proficiency levels in English visibly use to complete the word-focused task and potentially learn the vocabulary. An auxiliary aim is to contribute to the teaching of English in uppersecondary school by constructing, using, and evaluating the word-focused task developed. As such, the word-focused task will be used as learning materials as well as a research tool.

The word-focused task will be integrated into unique learning units tailored to fit the needs of the respective classes. The units were didactic sequences consisting of 3–6 lessons. The students completed the word-focused task together with other English proficiency tasks related to a specific theme. Each unit fit the teacher collaborators' respective plans, which in turn were in line with policy documents as to the content to be covered. I designed each unit together with the teacher collaborators. As a means to bring in the teacher perspective (i.e., teachers' situated competence, developed through teacher education as well as years in the profession) on the usefulness of the wordfocused task for students in their respective classrooms, the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task in particular will be illuminated. Because the word-focused task provides an example of intentional vocabulary learning, the teacher collaborators will also be asked to talk about intentional vocabulary learning. This way, it may be possible to unpack their beliefs that may potentially explain their perceptions of the task. The participating students were adolescents (16–17 years old).

These data were produced to address the three overarching research questions (RQs 1–3):

- (*RQ*1) What resources do the participating students visibly use to complete the word-focused task?
- (*RQ2*) What is the effect of completing the word-focused task on the participating students' word knowledge of pre- and self-selected TWs?
- (*RQ3*) What are the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task, and their beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general?

Approaching the above-mentioned aims and attempting to produce warranted answers to *RQs* 1–3 required quantitative and qualitative methods and data. Methods include interviewing, surveying, and other means through which the data are gathered (Hammond & Wellington, 2020, p. 127). Quantitative task-, test- and questionnaire data were gathered to address RQs 1–2. These were complemented with qualitative data in the form of written student evaluations and a reflection about taking one of the vocabulary tests, interviews, and teacher-researcher planning meetings.

Given the complexity of all pedagogical realities in schools, classroom-based research commonly feature multiple methods and data, and may also traverse epistemologies, i.e., theories about knowledge (Cohen et al., 2018; Dörnyei, 2007). I have conducted one relatively large-scale quantitative study, which presupposes a positivist theory of knowledge. Positivism is typically associated with the natural sciences, and foregrounds objectivity, validity, and avoidance of researcher bias (Dörnyei, 2007). The thesis also features a qualitative interview study, which presupposes an interpretative epistemology, allowing my own subjectivity and positionality to influence the analysis (Hammond & Wellington, 2020). The remaining studies reported in the thesis traverse both epistemologies. I will argue that this lends itself well for advancing our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in upper-secondary school classrooms.

At first glance, this thesis project might be considered mixed methods classroom research, where qualitative and quantitative methods and data are combined for the purpose of conducting classroom-based research (Dörnyei, 2007). However, I will argue that multimethods development research is a more suitable label for the overarching methodological framework of the present study. The reason is that a prerequisite for mixed methods classroom research is that the qualitative and

quantitative components are *integrated* and merged rather than juxtaposed (Anguera et al., 2018). In the present study, the qualitative and quantitative methods and data are not primarily integrated in the sense that they are always used to explore the same component (e.g., the vocabulary tests). Instead, they *complement* each other and allow explorations of EFL students' intentional vocabulary learning in the classroom both on the group level, the individual level, and from the teachers' perspective. Multimethods studies feature multiple complementary methods (i.e., ways of gathering data) and methodologies (i.e., rationales for applying methods) to address one overall goal (Schoonenboom, 2023). The two methodologies used in this thesis project are the development research methodology, and the constructionist (i.e., localist) methodology. The constructionist/localist methodology informs the perspective on interviews from the present study. It is outlined in Sub-section 5.4.8. Next, I turn to development research.

Development research is an umbrella term for research with a clear research-practice link (Van den Akker, 1999), similar to praktiknära forskning in Swedish (Bergmark & Graeske, 2022; Carlgren, 2019). This thesis project qualifies as development research because it may have implications for teaching (e.g., multilingual students' intentional learning of targeted English vocabulary in the classroom) by bridging the divide between theory and practice. The research was conducted in schools, and concrete needs of in-service teachers and/or other members of staff are used as a springboard, not least because the thesis topic stems from needs I observed when working as a qualified EFL teacher. These are two other criteria for development research (Bergmark & Graeske, 2022). Teacher participating in development research can act as coresearchers, but it is not a requirement (Carlgren, 2019; Van den Akker, 1999). The teacher collaborators and I were not co-researchers because I designed the word-focused task independently and used is as a research tool for this thesis project. However, the teachers were nonetheless *teacher collaborators* and not *teacher participants*, as they were "active agents" shaping the research "rather than subjects [...] of inquiry" (Ushioda, 2023, p. 197) Each teacher collaborator and I jointly designed a unique learning unit including the word-focused task work. Thus, I argue that the present study should be referred to as multimethods development research because this accurately describes the research design. Multimethods research and development research are both established terms in the literature (see e.g., Schoonenboom, 2023 and Van den Akker, 1999, respectively), although my review of the literature does not point to any other studies that combine the two terms in this way. Next, my researcher positionality will be established.

5.1.1 Researcher positionality

My interest in the thesis topic stems from being enrolled in upper-secondary school level teacher training and working as a qualified language teacher for two years. My research positionality can be placed on a par with that of a *third space professional*. This is a scholar who flourishes both in the classroom and in academia, and who combines the perspectives that ideally come forward during teacher-researcher collaborations in their research (Elgemark et al., 2023). I used my expertise as a vocabulary researcher to independently design the word-focused task and explain the underlying theory to the participating students and teacher collaborators. I relied on my upper-secondary school level teaching experience when planning and implementing the learning units together with the teacher collaborators, and when creating rapport with the participating students. Thus, although I ultimately needed to take on a researcher role, my researcher- and teacher competences combined arguably facilitated the research process. My double competence is sought after in development research projects because it can help maximise the outcome and value of the study for both teachers and researchers (Bergmark & Graeske, 2022).

5.2 Recruitment of teacher collaborators and participating students

The research design involved specific requirements. These made purposive sampling (i.e., participant recruitment based on specific criteria) necessary (Cohen et al., 2018). The teacher collaborators and I needed to have the time and means to develop a professional relationship characterised by reciprocity and a mutual respect for each other's practices because this is a prerequisite for all kinds of successful development research (Bergmark & Graeske, 2022). The research design also required teacher collaborators and participating students from a range of English classrooms.

Seeing the requirements inherent in the research design, I considered recruiting teachers whom I knew well, and who presumably would be suitable teacher collaborators. Three alternatives were to engage (1) my former supervisors during my own teacher training (*VFU-handledare*), (2) former student colleagues from my teacher training, and/or (3) former in-service teacher colleagues. These options were disfavoured because close interpersonal interactions with research participants can bring about conflicts of interest and make the study biased (Brinkman & Kvale, 2015, p. 97). To minimise the risk of the teacher collaborators being in a position of dependence vis-

à-vis their employers, I also chose not to contact teachers via headmasters or other school authorities.

Instead, I recruited the teacher collaborators by networking and establishing professional relationships with teachers whom I did not know personally. I approached more potential teacher collaborators than what was necessary with regard to the research design. In addition to enabling purposive sampling and minimising the risk of conflicts of interests, this allowed for participant redundancy. Redundancy was important because attrition and fluidity in the participant body is common in classroom-based research (Källkvist & Juvonen, 2021). The redundancy also minimised the risk of any form of position of dependence, as the execution of the thesis project was never dependent on specific teacher collaborators. Thus, this way of recruiting teacher collaborators was ultimately deemed the most ethically appropriate alternative.

I approached eight potential teacher collaborators during placement visits (*VFU-besök*) during which I visited upper-secondary school English classrooms for the purpose of assessing student teachers. One potential teacher collaborator was recruited through an extended professional network. After having networked with these nine potential teacher collaborators, I met with one of them (Tove) and pitched the study design. Tove initially consented to participate in the pilot study. Our collaboration then continued throughout Study 1 and Study 2, and thus lasted for two years in total (from May 2021 to May 2023, including the first e-mail correspondence up until my final classroom visit¹)

Prior to launching Study 1, I also met with two additional potential teacher collaborators (Petter and Gabriel). They participated in Study 1, after which they chose to withdraw from the thesis project for reasons that had nothing to do with the research. (Petter enrolled in professional development training and Gabriel got a new job). I therefore contacted the other potential teacher collaborators from the network, two of whom (Nora and Hillevi) consented to participate. The headmasters at the respective schools provided permission via e-mail after the teacher collaborators had consented to take part, and before the project was launched. Table 5.1 displays an overview of the teacher collaborators and the participating students.

¹ More specifically, on 11 May 2021, Tove agreed to participate in the pilot study in an e-mail. 31 May 2023, I paid a final visit to Tove and Class 1. During this visit, I shared the preliminary results of the thesis project, conducted a Q&A about studying English at Lund University (as suggested by Tove and the students in Class 1) and brought refreshments for them as a token of gratitude. During this two-year period, Tove and I met for teacher-research planning meetings before Studies 1–2 and implemented the learning units together.

Table 5.1

Teacher collaborator	School	Region	Municipality	Class number	English course	Corresponding CEFR-level
Tove	1	1	Major city	1	English 5–6	B1.2 B2.1
Petter	1	1	Major city	2	English 5	B1.2
Gabriel	2	2	City	3	English 5	B1.2
Nora	3	1	Major city	4	English 5	B1.2
Hillevi	4	2	City	5	Compulsory school-level English at the Language Introduction Programme for immigrant students	A1

Overview of the teacher collaborators and participating students

Table 5.1 shows that five teacher collaborators from four different schools in two Swedish municipalities feature in the research reported in this thesis. The teacher collaborators all chose to participate together with the participating students whom they taught. The participating students were all adolescents (16–17 years old) learning English at the upper-secondary school.

A majority of the participating students were enrolled in one of the two obligatory English courses offered on this level: English 5 and English 6. The participating students in Class 5 had been living in Sweden for maximum four years and were studying at the Language Introduction Programme (LIP), which accommodates newlyarrived students (J. Bergström et al., 2024). They were working towards a passing grade in compulsory-school level English (year 9) at an upper-secondary school.

5.3 Research design

The research design is summarized in Tables 5.2a–b below to give an overview of the studies reported. The studies are listed in chronological order. Tables 5.2a–b also show the data produced in each study, as well as the TWs in focus.

Table 5.2a

Overview of studies

Study	Participants	Expected CEFR-level of participating students	TWs	Data produced	Used version of the word-focused task
Pilot study	One intact class of pilot study participants (n = 25)	B1.2	intimidate and zoology	Word-focused task sheets	Pilot-version (Task Version P)
Study 1	Participating students in Class 1–3 (<i>N</i> = 68) (39 out of 68 participating students completed all tasks and tests)	B1.2	attention, urban, emporium, contour, opine, exhale, genial, android, fanzine, illegitimacy	Language background questionnaire data Pre-test scores Word-focused task sheets Immediate post- test scores Student evaluations	Task Version 1
Study 2	Participating students in Class 1 and Class 4 (<i>N</i> = 47) One teacher collaborator (Tove)	Class 1: B2.1 Class 4: B1.2	Class 1 and 4: atypical, eschew, solicitous Class 1: heterogeneity acclimatize	Teacher- researcher planning meetings Pre-test scores Language background questionnaire data Word-focused task sheets Immediate post- test scores Delayed post-test scores Student reflection about taking the immediate post- tests	Task Version 2

Table 5.2b

Study	Participants	Expected CEFR-level of participating students	TWs	Data produced	Used version of the word- focused task
Study 3	Individual participating students (<i>N</i> = 10) from Classes 1–5	A1-B2.1	Classes 1–4: A small set of the pre- selected TWs above, and self- selected TWs Class 5: <i>cellar</i> , <i>busy</i> , <i>house</i> , <i>far</i> , <i>swings</i> , and a small set of self-selected TWs	Language background questionnaire data Pre-test scores Word-focused task sheets Immediate post-test scores Student interviews Simulated recall interviews Language portraits Delayed post- test scores	Task Version 2
Study 4	Four teacher collaborators			Teacher interviews	-

Overview of studies (cont.)

Tables 5.2a–b summarise the flow of studies that make up the research design. Task Version P, Task Version 1, and Task Version 2 are all increasingly refined versions of the word-focused task introduced in Chapter 4. First, I independently designed pilot-version of the word-focused task (Task Version P) using my research expertise and teaching experience as a springboard. Next, I conducted an initial pilot study featuring Version P. The aim of the pilot study was to use Task Version P in one multilingual English classroom, in order to start evaluating the word-focused task. In light of the results and evaluations of the pilot study, Task Version P was revised and developed into Task Version 1. Task Version 1 was used in Study 1. Based on the results and evaluations of Study 1, Task Version 1 was then revised into Task Version 2. Task Version 2 was used in Study 2 and in Study 3.

The pilot study, Study 1, Study 2, and Study 3 are all related steps towards reaching the primary thesis project aim of advancing our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in uppersecondary school classrooms. Studies 1–3 all address this aim by shedding light on the resources visibly used by the participating students to complete the word-focused task, and on the observed learning of the targeted vocabulary (i.e., the TWs). This is done from different angles by focusing on intentional vocabulary learning on the group level, the individual level, and from the teachers' perspective, using complementary data sets. The participating students in Class 1–5 were multilingual. Their expected proficiency levels in English range from CEFR-levels A1 to B2.1. Thus, Study 1, Study 2, and Study 3 are also related steps towards reaching the auxiliary thesis aim: to contribute to the teaching of English in upper-secondary school by constructing, using, and evaluating the word-focused task developed.

Study 2 and Study 4 aim to bring in the teacher perspective (i.e., teachers' situated competence, developed through teacher education as well as years in the profession) by shedding light on the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task in particular, and their beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general. The overarching RQs1-2 are addressed in Studies 1–3. The overarching RQ3 is addressed in Study 2 and Study 4. The pilot study in Chapter 6 is followed by four separate chapters each devoted to one study. Chapter 7 contains Study 1. Chapter 8 displays Study 2. Chapter 9 features Study 3. Chapter 10 is devoted to Study 4. The thesis features 97 unique participating students: 68 participating students in Study 1, 26 new participating students in Study 2, and 3 new participating students in Study 3.

5.3.1 Rationale for design

This thesis project employs multimethods development research as an overarching methodological framework because the thesis to contribute to education in a hands-on way using multiple complementary methods and methodologies. The decision to conduct multimethods development research is primarily a response to the literature review from Chapter 3. My review of the literature points to a body of quasiexperimental intervention studies examining multilingual students' intentional vocabulary learning in specific conditions (e.g., Busse et al., 2020; Gyllstad et al., 2023). However, studies that account for the processes surrounding intentional vocabulary learning in general and intentional vocabulary learning in multilingual EFL classrooms in particular are less common (cf. e.g., Nation, 2022; Webb, 2020b). English teachers working in Sweden also need to be equipped with more concrete tools to facilitate intentional English vocabulary learning in the classroom (D. Bergström, 2023; Stridsman, 2024). Therefore, this thesis project has one learning component and one design component. The aim of the learning component is the primary thesis aim: to advance our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in upper-secondary school classrooms. The aim of the design component is the auxiliary aim: to contribute to the teaching of English in upper-secondary school by constructing, using, and evaluating the word-focused task developed. Development research is germane to both of these components. It encompasses both developmental research aiming to advance our understanding of teaching and learning in the classroom, and design research focused on developing learning materials (including tasks) (Van den Akker, 1999).

The clear research-practice connection inherent in development research also strengthens its ecological validity. Ecological validity equals the degree of similarity between the research and the authentic context that the study is investigating (Sato & Loewen, 2019). The present study echoes Cicourel (2007), who indicates that ecological validity can only be approximated in development research conducted in classrooms. Rather than aiming for completely 'authentic' data, the data should be "congruent with systematic time samples of events and activities within local institutional or organizational settings" (p. 735, italics in original). Seeing that this thesis project encompasses analyses of multiple data sources, and stems from relatively long engagements with the teacher collaborators (especially Tove), I argue that ecological validity is approximated in the present study. Echoing Van den Akker (1999), the implementations of the word-focused task are therefore referred to as interventions, defined as "products, programs, materials, procedures, scenarios, processes, and the like" (p. 5) carried out in real (albeit not completely authentic) teaching situations with the purpose of advancing our understanding of teaching and learning.

One sub-category of development research consists of small-scale locally situated case studies (Eriksson, 2018; Van den Akker, 1999). Within the field of pedagogical translanguaging, such research often employs linguistic ethnography as a methodological framework (Prilutskaya, 2021). Linguistic ethnography "studies the *local* and immediate actions of actors from their point of view and considers how these interactions are embedded in wider social contexts and structures" (Copland & Creese, 2015, p. 2, my emphasis). Locality is also prevalent in the present study, not least because the research partly zooms in on individual participating students' intentional vocabulary learning. In linguistic ethnography, this is known as taking an emic perspective and seeing something from the perspective of the participant (Rodrick Beiler & Dewilde, 2020, p. 357). Much like in the present study, linguistic ethnographers often combine the emic perspective with other angles (e.g., group-level analyses), using multiple methods and types of data (Copland & Creese, 2015). At the start of this thesis project, linguistic ethnography was therefore considered a potential overarching methodological framework. This option was rejected for two reasons. First, my review of the literature points to a need for more quantitative pedagogical translanguaging studies about intentional vocabulary learning, such as Study 1 (see also Prilutskaya, 2021). For this, linguistic ethnography is not ideal. Second, the present study aims to contribute with a word-focused task that can be used in a range of English classrooms. Involving teacher collaborators and participating students at multiple

schools was therefore prioritised over long-term engagement at one specific research site, which is common in linguistic ethnography (see e.g., J.Bergström et al., 2024; Rodrick Beiler, 2021b)

5.4 Data production

This sub-section describes and justifies the empirical methods employed to produce the data for the thesis. The information presented here expands on the overview of the events in the research design displayed in Tables 5.2a–b. The analytical methods of the data produced are described and justified in sub-section 5.5. The specific implementation procedures for each study are detailed in the pilot study (in Chapter 6) and Studies 1–4 (in Chapters 7–10). The data sets are listed in chronological order (i.e., the order in which they appear in the thesis).

5.4.1 The word-focused task revisited

As mentioned, the word-focused task is a sheet divided into seven sections. In each section, can provide one type of TW information, namely: (1) TW synonym(s), (2) translation equivalent(s), (3) a TW illustration, (4) TW explanation(s), (5) example sentence(s) containing the TW, (6) a connection to prior knowledge in the form of references to moments when students have heard or seen the TW before, and (7) a word association. The participating students engaged in intentional vocabulary learning of pre- and self-selected TWs by completing one task sheet per TW. They completed printed task sheets using pencils. This was considered more practical than using a digital format of the word-focused task, since all participating students did not necessarily have their own functioning school laptops. Further, the participating students were instructed to complete the task sections *they* found useful for learning the TWs. From a research perspective, the purpose of this task feature was to enable explorations of the resources EFL students with different multilingual backgrounds and proficiency levels in English visibly use the complete a word-focused task and potentially learn the vocabulary. This, in turn, was a means to advance our understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary. The analyses of the resources visibly used to complete the word-focused task will be displayed in the pilot study and Studies 1–3.

5.4.2 Language background questionnaires

The language background questionnaire data served the purpose of generating an overview of the participating students' language backgrounds (Dörnyei & Dewaele, 2022). This was a prerequisite for exploring how students with different multilingual backgrounds completed the word-focused task. All participating students filled out a language background questionnaire developed by Källkvist et al. (2022) (see Appendix 5). In the questionnaire, they outlined their language repertoires by self-reporting what languages they knew, how well they thought they knew them, as well as when and how they used each language. In Study 1, the questionnaire data were used to pinpoint the language backgrounds of the participating students in Class 1-3 on the group level. Study 2 features two classes: Class 1 and Class 4. Class 1 was rather linguistically homogeneous, whereas Class 4 was more linguistically heterogeneous. This difference between Class 1 and Class 4 was highlighted using the questionnaire data. In Study 3, the questionnaire data were used to learn about individual participating students' language backgrounds. The participating students also elaborated on their language backgrounds during the student interviews, as a means to obtain a nuanced picture of their language backgrounds (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 24). The language background questionnaire was replicated with permission from Källkvist et al., (2022).

5.4.3 Vocabulary tests

The thesis sheds light on the observed learning of the targeted vocabulary using two vocabulary tests : Test 1 and Test 2. Test 1 was replicated with permission from Gyllstad et al. (2023). It served as an immediate post-test in Study 1 and as a pre-test in Studies 2–3. I designed Test 2. It served as the immediate and delayed post-test in Studies 2–3.

The purpose of the pre-test was to elicit the participating students' knowledge of each TW before the task work. The immediate and delayed post-tests were needed to trace the short- and long-term vocabulary learning gains following the participating students' completing the word-focused task. This thesis project presupposes that intentional vocabulary learning is not a goal in itself, but rather a prerequisite for developing other proficiency aspects (e.g., reading), and for using the target language both in and outside of the classroom (see Nation, 2022). This conceptualisation of intentional vocabulary learning naturally includes retention over time. Using both immediate and delayed post-tests was therefore desirable, as intentional vocabulary learning studies without long-term measures of gains "can be said to have assessed vocabulary learning only in a limited sense" (Read, 2000, p. 50).

Statistically, in Study 1, a dependent t-test was used to determine whether the mean self-reported knowledge scores and the mean of the immediate post-test scores were significantly different from each other. In Study 2, dependent t-tests were used to compare the mean pre-test scores with the mean immediate and delayed post-test scores, respectively, and to compare the immediate and delayed means with each other. In Study 1, this analysis was followed by a multiple regression analysis in order to explore whether independent variables could predict the immediate post-test scores (Field et al., 2012).

5.4.4 Student evaluations and reflections

In Study 1, the student evaluations were used to evaluate Task Version 1, and to revise Task Version 1, thus developing Task Version 2. The participating students answered questions about the introduction of the learning unit, the task instructions, and Task Version 1. They could also self-assess the extent to which they thought they had learnt the TWs, and comment on the intervention as a whole. The student evaluation ended with an open question, where they could leave any additional comments. In Study 2, Class 1 was asked to write brief reflections about how they experienced taking the immediate post-tests, respectively. The written reflections were the teacher collaborator Tove's initiative, which tallied with her habitual teaching practices. Discussing all of the participating students' written reflections in detail is beyond the scope of Study 2. Instead, Study 2 illuminates one individual participating students' written reflection (Excerpt 8.3) as a means to thicken (i.e., deepen, nuance, and contextualise) the description of her intentional vocabulary learning.

Another purpose of the student evaluations and reflections was for the participating students to reflect on their own learning. The upper-secondary school curriculum states that students should be given ample opportunities to do so, as it is known to facilitate learning (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2018). The student evaluations and reflections were also meant to signal to the participating students that their perceptions were taken seriously. This is important from an ethical perspective (Källkvist et al., 2023).

5.4.5 Teacher-researcher planning meetings

Practically, the purpose of the teacher-researcher planning meetings was to design the learning units which the word-focused task work was a part of. I met with each teacher collaborator to decide the overall topic of each learning unit, such as Social sustainability or English as a global language We also jointly decided other tasks that may combine with the word-focused task. Each teacher collaborator ensured that the

learning units aligned with their own plan for the academic year, which, in turn, were in line with the syllabus for English as to the content to be covered. The two teacher collaborators at School 1 were colleagues and chose to plan virtually identical learning units together with me in Study 1. The other teacher collaborators, who all worked at separate schools, did not meet each other.

From a research perspective, the teacher-researcher planning meetings helped strengthen the ecological validity of the research. Because the teacher collaborators and I planned the learning units together, their' habitual teaching practices were approximated (Cicourel, 2007). The teacher collaborators and I also had time to develop our professional relationship, familiarise ourselves with each other's practices, and ensure that our collaboration functioned well for us both. This is important from a research ethics perspective because it is important that development research benefits both students, teachers, and researchers (Bergmark & Graeske, 2022). Three of the meetings with the teacher collaborator Tove were recorded, transcribed, and analysed inductively. The original purpose of the analysis was to contextualise our collaboration in Study 2 and shed light on the planning of the learning units from that study. The reason why I analysed three of the meetings with Tove and not all of them is it was during these three meetings that we actually planned the learning units and discussed the teaching. Our other meetings were primarily devoted to practicalities. I also recorded meetings with the other teacher collaborators. These recordings were not analysed due to space constrains. During two of the recorded meetings with Tove, she spontaneously shared her perceptions of the word-focused task, making this a prevalent theme of the analysis. Thus, the recorded teacher-researcher planning meetings were ultimately used to evaluate the word-focused task.

5.4.6 Stimulated recall interviews

The purpose of the stimulated recall interviews (SRIs) was to target individual participating students' mental processes surrounding the task work as a means to tap into how they completed the word-focused task (see Snoder, 2016). With scanned images of the targeted task work as the stimulus, individual participating students were encouraged to verbalise what they were thinking when engaging in intentional learning of the TWs in focus, both with regard to which task sections they chose to complete, and what they wrote in the respective task sections. Stimulated recall interviews (SRIs) are elicitations of thought processes and/or strategies used during a targeted activity or task (Gass & Mackey, 2017). A neighbouring sub-category of introspective methods is *think-aloud*, where participants are encouraged to verbalise their thoughts *during* an activity (Dörnyei, 2007). SRIs were considered more suitable than think-aloud because the latter option might have disrupted the task work in the classroom.

Seeing the nature of SRIs, they are conceptualised as students' own "interpretation[s] and representation[s] of the focal event or practice" (Rodrick Beiler, 2021, p. 35), rather than true or false reflections of what the participating students were thinking at the time of the event. Accordingly, SRIs "must always be interpreted within the framework of current theoretical concerns, and *in conjunction with other compatible and reliable data*" (Gass & McKey 2017 p. 132 my emphasis). In the present study, the SRIs were therefore triangulated with task data and vocabulary test scores, as a means to advance our understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary. The SRIs will be analysed in Study 3.

5.4.7 Language portraits

The language portraits were needed because they thickened the analysis of individual participating students' intentional learning of the TWs together with the other data sets. The individual participating students from Study 3 were instructed to colour the silhouette from Figure 5.1, whilst orally motivating the placement and colours of different languages. As they filled out the language portraits, the participating students elaborated on the role(s) that each language in their repertoire played in their lives and shared their perceptions of each language. This yielded information about their language-biographical narratives which was more complex and nuanced than the information in the language background questionnaires. The language portraits were also used as a tool to help the participating students ease in to the interviews, and as a point of reference throughout (see Busch, 2018; Rodrick Beiler, 2021b). A filled-out language portrait is displayed in Figure 5.1. The language portraits will be analysed in Study 3.





5.4.8 Teacher and student interviews

All pedagogical realities in schools are inherently complex (Uljens, 1997). Advancing our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in upper-secondary school classrooms therefore requires methods that allow for depth and nuance to come forward (Cohen et al., 2018). Interviewing is suitable for this, as the relational and dynamic nature of interviews make them appropriate for eliciting personal accounts that are more multi-dimensional than, for instance, questionnaire data (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). Accordingly, the purpose of the teacher interviews was to bring in the teacher collaborators' perspectives on the usefulness of the word-focused task for students in their respective classrooms by illuminating their perceptions of the word-focused task in particular, and their beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general. Bringing in the teacher perspective was important and worthwhile because it had implications for potential future largescale use of the word-focused task in schools. It was assumed that the teacher collaborators (as well as all educators) possess a specific and valuable form of expertise which differs from research expertise and is accumulated over the course of a teaching career (see also Källkvist et al., 2024). The student interviews were secondary data used to introduce four individual participating students from Study 3 and contextualize their word-focused task work.

Theoretically, this thesis project adopts a constructionist (i.e., localist) perspective on research interviews (Alvesson, 2011; Roulston, 2010) because it tallies with the research design. According to the constructionist perspective, interviews are situated accounts co-constructed by the interviewer and interviewee. The perspective presupposes that all interviews are unique and highly contextual, which, in turn, legitimizes the choice to zoom in on specific individuals such as the teacher collaborators and individual participating students from this thesis project. The teacher interviews will be analysed in Study 4. The student interviews will be analysed in Study 3.

5.5 Data analysis

5.5.1 Transcription

The recorded teacher-researcher planning meetings, SRIs, and interviews were first automatically transcribed using the Word 365 software. Then, I systematically went through each automatically generated transcript and applied the transcription conventions whilst listening to the corresponding recording. This mode of procedure was meant to render the transcription process as effective as possible whilst remaining an interpretative process which initiated the analysis of the data (Gubrium et al., 2012). The transcription conventions used were governed by the epistemologically interpretative research aims and the constructionist approach to interviews. Accordingly, I opted for speech-like rather than text-like transcriptions, where pauses, laughs, and 'uhm' and 'eh'-sounds deemed relevant to the meaning of what the participants were saying were spelled out. This was important because the constructionist perspective assumes that such nuances may be significant. For example, if an utterance is followed by soft laugh and a long pause, this should be spelled out in the transcript because it may suggest that the utterance is not neutral, but worth analysing further (Alvesson, 2011).

Transcriptions that are overly denaturalised and faithful to oral language "can make speech itself seem alien" (Bucholtz, 2000, p. 1461). Therefore, obvious re-starts that were not deemed relevant to the content were not transcribed. Importantly, I also refrained from 'correcting' speech which was not 'standardised' (e.g., *från <u>mitt</u> hjärna* instead of *från <u>min</u> hjärna* for *from <u>my</u> brain*). Altering non-standardised speech in transcriptions is an ideological act which privileges certain language features over others (Bucholtz, 2000). Doing so contradicts both the resource orientation towards multilingualism and the repertoire perspective adopted in this thesis project, since these perspectives both presuppose that all of an individuals' linguistic resources are valuable irrespective of the norms surrounding standardised language (Blommaert, 2010).

All interviews were conducted in Swedish because it was the most natural and least time-consuming option. Swedish is the society majority language, all of the participating students who were interviewed had been living in Sweden for at least four years, and I am an L1 user of Swedish. Thus, conducting the interviews in another language was deemed inefficient. To minimize the risk of details getting lost in translation, all Swedish utterances will be paired with an English translation (mine).

5.5.2 Reflexive thematic analysis

The teacher interviews and recorded planning meetings were analysed using reflexive thematic analysis (RTA). Often associated with Braun and Clarke (2006, 2019, 2021a, 2021b), RTA is a qualitative method that amounts to constructing patterns of meaning. RTA centres researcher reflexivity and active engagement with the data, which makes it compatible with my epistemologically interpretative research aims and the constructionist approach to the student and teacher interviews (see Braun & Clarke, 2021b, p. 331).

Braun and Clarke (2006) refer to thematic analysis (TA) more generally. More recently, Braun and Clarke (2019) conceptualise TA as a family of methods including

RTA. RTA is described an approach to TA which "procedures reflect the values of a qualitative paradigm, centring researcher subjectivity, organic and recursive coding processes, and the importance of deep reflection on, and engagement with, data" (p. 593). This stands in contrast to coding reliability approaches to TA, where coding frames are applied to the data to avoid subjectivity and bias, and codebook approaches to TA which use a codebook to map the analysis.

Braun and Clarke (2021a) point to methods outside of the TA family which resemble RTA. Out of these, *qualitative content analysis* (QCA) is described as being closest to RTA. Just like there are many forms of TA, there are multiple types of QCA. Generally speaking, both RTA and QCA offer tools to analyse qualitative data in a thematic and systematic manner. The major difference between QCA and RTA is that QCA emphasises researcher *objectivity* and quantification of themes, whereas RTA foregrounds researcher *subjectivity* and *pre-supposes* that researchers' pre-existing knowledge will influence the coding as they engage reflexively with the data (see e.g., Braun et al., 2022, p. 435). Thus, seeing that my own research positionality and active collaboration with the teacher collaborators undoubtedly affect my interpretation of the teacher-researcher planning meetings and the teacher interviews, RTA was considered more suitable than QCA for analysing the teacher interviews and teacher-researcher planning meetings.

5.5.3 Qualitative content analysis

Because of the objectivity and systematicity inherent to QCA, it was used to analyse the student evaluations and reflections, the SRIs, and the student interviews. My conceptualisation of QCA equals that of Mayring (2022), who describes it as "a systematic category-based set of techniques for analysing texts with strict theory-based rules, containing qualitative and quantitative steps of analysis (p. 315)". The student evaluations were open-ended questionnaire items, and the student reflections were short texts (approximately 40–50 words each). In both cases, self-reported perceptions were overt and quantifiable rather than latent. The focus was on determining how often the identified perceptions re-occurred in the evaluations and reflections because this was relevant when evaluating the word-focused task. The purpose of analysing the SRIs was to generate an overview of the resources that the 10 individual participating students recalled visibly using when completing the word-focused task. I also sought to zoom in on specific participating students in detail. This required a systematic analytical method, such as QCA (Mayring, 2022, p. 315)

The student interviews were analysed using QCA because I did not collaborate as closely and literally with the participating students who were interviewed as I did with the teacher collaborators. Thus, rather than analysing the student interviews in light of

our collaboration (and thus unavoidably being subjective), as was the case with the teacher interviews, the purpose of the student interviews was to thicken the analysis of individual participating students' task work . This, too, required a systematic analysis, making QCA more appropriate for than RTA for analysing the student interview data (Braun & Clarke, 2021a).

Mayring's (2022) inductive category formation technique (see pp. 317–318) was utilised to perform the QCAs because the top-down (i.e., general to specific) inductive approach allowed the analyses to be guided by the research aims. Here, the first two steps amount to defining the selection criterion and level of abstraction for a category. Then, one works through the material line by line and categorises passages. After working through 10–50% of the material, the categories are revised to ensure that they are clear, without overlaps, and adequate with regard to the aim of the analysis. After this, one works through the material again, to finally arrive at main categories, and/or an analysis of how frequently the categories occurred.

5.6 Research ethics

This thesis project brought about ethics issues that required an application to the Swedish Ethical Review Authority The project entailed the processing of the participating students' and teacher collaborators' educational backgrounds and language backgrounds, as elicited through the student and teacher interviews and language background questionnaires. These data are considered sensitive because they can reveal a person's ethnic background. The present study was conducted at municipal upper-secondary schools, which also requires ethical review (Etikprövnings-myndigheten, 2023). The application was formally approved before the project was launched (see Appendix 1).

The research design aligned with the specifications of two publications by the Swedish Research Council: *Good research practice* (Vetenskapsrådet, 2017) and *Principles for research ethics in humanities and the social science* (Vetenskapsrådet, n.d.). The principles from these two publications were followed because they specify the regulations for research ethics in Sweden that were in force when the project was designed. Vetenskapsrådet (n.d.) outlines four main requirements for research ethics related to information, consent, confidentiality, and usage, respectively. The four requirements stipulate the following: All participants must receive adequate information about the research. It is the participants themselves who decide whether they want to participate, and they can always withdraw from the study without motivation. Research can only feature participants who consent to participating and

this consent must be collected by the researcher. The participants' anonymity must be ensured, and all data must be securely stored and used only for research purposes.

In accordance with the above demands, written informed consent was granted from the five teacher collaborators and the 97 participating students in Studies 1-4. Twentyone out of the 97 participating students from Class 1 participated in both Study 1 and Study 2. They signed separate consent forms for each study. The student consent form (see Appendix 3) and the teacher consent form (see Appendix 2) contained information related to the information- consent- confidentiality- and usage requirements mentioned above. Parental consent was not needed because all the participating students were above 15 years of age (Vetenskapsrådet, 2017). The teacher consent forms were collected approximately two weeks after the initial project pitch, when the teacher collaborators had decided to participate. The student consent forms were collected during separate introductions with all the classes before the project was launched. During these introductions I explained the content of the consent forms. The students were then given ample time to read the consent forms and ask questions before choosing whether or not to participate. For the sake of transparency and clarity, the participating students and teacher collaborators who agreed to take part in the research all signed two copies of the consent forms. They gave one copy to me and kept the second copy themselves.

The students from Classes 1–5 completed the word-focused task as part of their course work because the learning units which the task work was a part of tallied with the teacher collaborators' respective plans for the academic year. The students could be present in the classroom and complete the word-focused task without participating in the research. Three students in total opted for this. Their task sheets were not analysed. It was important that the students did not feel pressured to participate in the research just because their teachers (i.e., the teacher collaborators) participated (Etikprövningsmyndigheten, 2023). The students could not be in a state of dependence vis-á-vis neither the teacher collaborators nor me as a researcher (Vetenskapsrådet, n.d.). To further eliminate any pressure to participate in the research, the teacher collaborators did not study the contents of any of the completed task sheets. All students were informed that whether or not they chose to participate in the research did not affect their grades whatsoever.

This thesis project was designed to be beneficial for everyone involved. For the teacher collaborators, research participation was a commitment which required engagement. That said, it is hoped that the participation diminished rather than increased their workload, since we collaboratively planned and implemented learning units which aligned with their plans for the academic year. On a more abstract level, the teacher-researcher collaborations were intended to be the start of more long-term professional relationship, which, in turn could lead to further reciprocal gains

(Elgemark et al., 2023). Studies 1–3 show that many participating students gained TW knowledge and new ways of engaging in intentional vocabulary learning from participating in the research. The participating students were positioned as experts and told that their input was valuable both for the thesis project, and for other students who might use the word-focused task in the future. Thus, they hopefully gained a sense of pride and accomplishment (Källkvist et al., 2023).

The data were stored in accordance with the ethics guidelines in Sweden (Etikprövningsmyndigheten, 2023; Vetenskapsrådet, 2017, n.d.). The physical data (the word-focused task sheets, language background questionnaires, vocabulary tests, and language portraits) were kept in a locked safe in the university offices. The digital student evaluations and reflections, all recordings, and all the transcriptions were saved on a hard disk which only I had access to. A spreadsheet with all quantified task-, test-, and questionnaire data were saved on the same hard disk. No names (only pseudonyms) were visible in any of the materials saved on the hard disk. One physical copy of the transcript codes and corresponding names was kept in the locked safe.

5.7 Summary

With multimethods development research as the overarching methodological framework, the primary aim of this thesis project is to advance our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in upper-secondary school classrooms. Because classrooms are complex spaces (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2018), research on the learning happening therein commonly features multiple methods and methodologies. It may also traverse different epistemological perspectives. Accordingly, the collected data were complementary in exploring multilingual EFL students' intentional vocabulary learning in the classroom from different angles (i.e., both on the group level, the individual level, and from a teachers perspective). The data were: (1) the word-focused task data, (2) language background questionnaires, (3) vocabulary tests, (4) student evaluations and reflections, (5) teacher-researcher planning meetings, (6) stimulated recall interviews, (7) language portraits, and (8) teacher and student interviews. The analyses in Studies 1-4 range from quantitative positivist inquiries to inherently qualitative and epistemologically interpretative RTAs. The thesis project also has a design component. Here, the aim is to contribute to the teaching of English in upper-secondary school by constructing, using, and evaluating the word-focused task developed. This required networking and recruitment of five collaborators who consented to being part of the research together with their students. I independently designed the word-focused task and used it as a research tool. The teacher collaborators and I were not co-researchers. Importantly, they were nevertheless teacher collaborators and not teacher participants, as they were "active agents" shaping the research "rather than subjects [...] of inquiry" (Ushioda, 2023, p. 197). The thesis project stems from a paucity of support for multilingual students of English in general and adjustable tasks in particular, which I identified when working as a qualified English teacher.

The next chapter features a pilot study where one intact class of 16-year-old multilingual English students completed the pilot version of the word-focused task (Task Version P) during part of one lesson. The pilot study was the first step towards using and evaluating the word-focused task. The outcomes of the pilot study constitute the basis of the first set of revisions made to the task design in Study 1.

6 Pilot study

6.1 Introduction

This chapter reports on a pilot study centred around the pilot-version of the wordfocused task (Task Version P). The primary aim of the pilot study was to use Task Version P in one multilingual English classroom in order to start evaluating the wordfocused task. The pilot study was designed to inform the subsequent Study 1 in general and the revision of Task Version P into Task Version 1 in particular. As a means to make the most of the pilot study, Task Version P came in two formats: Format A and Format B. Accordingly, a second aim was to investigate whether the format of the task (Format A vs. Format B of Task Version P) affected what resources the pilot study participants visibly used to complete it. A third aim was to pay attention to how the pilot study participants responded to the task and to me being in the classroom. For context, Figure 6.1 below shows a completed Task Version P task sheet.

English synonym(s) and/or translation equivalent(s) in any	Target word illustration:
other language(s)	Surving Human
hotfull, skrämman	
	AN AN ANS
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) in English and/or any other language(s):
any other language(3).	It was very intimidating when the large man was yelling
	the large man was yelling
	in my face
have heard this word before	This word makes me think about the word
the watched ne watched novies nunybe?	things that can
unvies maybe?	hurt me.

Figure 6.1a An example of a completed Task Version P task sheet

As is evident in Figure 6.1, Task Version P was a sheet with six sections. In each section, the pilot study participants could provide TW information: (1) TW synonym(s) and/or translation equivalent(s), (2) a TW illustration, (3) TW explanation(s), (4) example sentence(s), (5) a connection to prior knowledge in the form of a reference to moments when students have heard or seen the TW before, and (6) a word association. Format A of Task Version P is exemplified in Figure 6.1. Here, the pilot study participants were instructed to use English and/or any other language(s). Thus, they were implicitly instructed to primarily use English. Format B of Task Version P was identical to that in Figure 6.1 except the pilot study participants were instructed to use any language(s).

The task work from Figure 6.1 is in line with the task instructions (see Appendix 12) because all pilot study participants were told that they could leave task sections blank. From a research perspective, the purpose of this task feature was to enable analyses of the resources visibly used by the pilot study participants to complete the word-focused task and thus advance our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in upper-secondary school classrooms. Pedagogically, by self-selecting which task sections to complete, the pilot study participants were invited to plan their own course of action, which is known to facilitate learning (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2018).

Task Version P was meant to be individualizable (i.e., possible to complete by different students in different ways) and adjustable (i.e., available for individual teachers to adapt in light of their expertise and perceptions). This level of flexibility was necessary in order for the task to function as a research tool in a range of multilingual English classrooms. Presumably, an individualizable and adjustable task is also widely applicable. This was sought after because it tallies with the auxiliary aim of contributing to the teaching of English in upper-secondary school by constructing, using, and evaluating the word-focused task developed.

6.2 Methodology

The pilot study participants (n = 25) were an intact class of 16-year-old students enrolled in the first upper-secondary school English course in Sweden (English 5), which is in year 1 of upper-secondary school. They engaged in intentional vocabulary learning of two TWs (*intimidate* and *zoology*) by completing Format A or Format B of Task Version P. There was one task sheet per TW. I selected the TWs together with two experienced (13–24 years) university educators of English Linguistics, one of whom is also a certified teacher of English for the upper-secondary school level. The TWs were underlined, marked in boldface, and planted into a text which the pilot study participants read prior to completing Task Version P. The text was a snippet (155 words) about chimpanzees. The text is freely available on the Swedish national test website (University of Gothenburg, n.d.). Appendix 4 displays the text as it was presented to the pilot study participants, with the exception of an image at the top of the page which has been removed for copyright reasons.

In the classroom, the pilot study participants were first informed about the purpose of my visit. In accordance with the ethics guidelines in Sweden (Vetenskapsrådet, 2017, n.d.), I outlined the procedures, and all pilot study participants signed consent forms (see Appendix 4). As mentioned, the primary aim of the pilot study was to use Task Version P in one multilingual English classroom in order to start evaluating the wordfocused task. This did not require any information connected to the pilot study participants' identities. Ethically, such information should not be collected without due cause (Vetenskapsrådet, 2017). The pilot study participants were thus instructed *not* to write their names anywhere on the task sheets. Upon completing Task Version P, they were invited to self-report their language repertoires (strongest language first) in a specific section of Task Version P. The language documentation section is shown in Figure 6.2 below.

Finally, please fill in the following information about yourself, if you want to. It is anonymous, and you should not write your name anywhere.

This is the language I know best: _____

Other languages I know are:



Is there anything else that you would like to add?:

Figure 6.2

The language documentation section of Task Version P

Figure 6.2 shows the section of the Task Version P where the pilot study participants could self-report their language repertoires. All pilot study participants identified Swedish as their strongest language. The majority (72%, n = 18) listed Swedish followed by English another language, typically one taught at school such as French or Spanish.

The analytical focus was on what resources the pilot study participants visibly used to complete Task Version P, and not on correctness and intentional vocabulary learning gains. Each task sheet was therefore coded for visible language use and instances of synonyms, translations, example sentences, illustrations, and associations in different languages.

6.3 Results

As a first step towards evaluating the word-focused task, Table 6.1a shows the number of task sheets in the two different formats (A and B) were English was the only visibly used language. Table 6.1b displays the number of sheets where English and Swedish were visibly utilised.

Table 6.1a

Task sheets with English as the only language visibly used

Task format	Zoology	Intimidate
A: "English and/or any other language(s)", (n =11)	9	7
B "any language(s)", (n = 14)	5	2

Table 6.1b

Task sheets with visible use of English and Swedish

Task format	Zoology	Intimidate
A: "English and/or any other language(s)", (n =11)	2	4
B "any language(s)", (n = 14)	8	12

Tables 6.1 a–b show that the pilot study participants who were instructed to primarily use English often completed the task monolingually using the target language English. For example, nine out of 11 pilot study participants who were given Format A engaged with the TW *zoology* visibly using only English. Those who were instructed to use any

language(s) visibly used both English and Swedish to a larger extent than those who were instructed to use English and/or any other language(s). When engaging with the TW intimidate, for example, 12 out of 14 of the pilot study participants given Format B, compared to four out of 11 pilot study participants given Format A, visibly used English and Swedish.

Further, there were individual differences with regard to how the pilot study participants completed Task Version P. For example, Figures 6.3a-c below show how the pilot study participants A7, A9, and B10 completed the task.

English synonym(s) and/or translation equivalent(s) in any other language(s) frighten tervify Score threaten	Target word illustration:
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s): To intimidate is to scare or threaten, often to get your will through.	Example sentence(s) in English and/or any other language(s): They were so intimidated by their opponents that they surrended.
have heard this word before	This word makes me think about the word
isterning to english peakers in xample Movies	intimate

Figure 6.3a Pilot study participant A7

Target word illustration:				
Example sentence(s) in English and/or any other language(s)				
he Jag Skrämde hagon				
This word makes me think about the word				
Horror				

Figure 6.3b Pilot study participant A9

Synonym(s) and/or translation equivalent(s) in any language(s):	Target word illustration:
Explanation(s) in any language(s): En person som Studerar djur	Example sentence(s) in any language(s):
Thave heard this word before when Filmer, texter Och serier	This word makes me think about the word Animals and 200

Finally, please fill in the following information about yourself, if you want to. It is anonymous, and you should not write your name anywhere.

This is the language I know best: __________

Other languages I know are:

1. Engelska 2. Spanska 3. Danska 4. Norsky 5. 6. 7.

Is there anything else that you would like to add?:



In Figure 6.3a, pilot study participant A7 was implicitly instructed to primarily use English. The pilot study participant also completed the task monolingually in the sense that English was the only language visibly used. In contrast, pilot study participant A9 from Figure 6.3b contested the implicitly expected format but still followed the instructions. They engaged with the TW *intimidate* by providing an example sentence written in Swedish, despite being instructed to primarily use English. In Figure 6.3c, pilot study participant B10, who was instructed to use any language(s), visibly used Swedish in task sections (1), (2), (3) and (5), and English in task section (6). Even though the instruction in task section (2) is in English, the pilot study participant included Swedish words in their TW illustration and thus translanguaged by mixing linguistic and non-linguistic resources which were not in the target language (English). Despite being instructed to self-report their language repertoire (strongest language first) in English, pilot study participant B10 named them all in Swedish. Hence, pilot study participant B10 seems to have had a multilingual approach to the task work, and displayed their multilingualism slightly more holistically than, say, pilot study participant A9.

Fifteen of the associations from the section labelled *I have heard this word before when...* were related to media and popular culture. These were both general comments like "I have heard this word before when I watch movies" (pilot study participant B9) and references to specific films, TV-shows such as "the series Friends" (pilot study participant A5). This suggests that the pilot study participants' prior knowledge of popular culture was activated when engaging with the TWs using Task Version P (for similar findings, see Snoder, 2016).

6.4 Taking stock of the pilot study

The pilot study was considered successful overall because the above analysis shows that the pilot study participants did what they were instructed to do. Anecdotal evidence also suggests that the pilot study participants responded positively to Task Version P of the word-focused task and to my presence in the classroom. This all suggests that the word-focused task can be used in multilingual English classrooms. However, Task Version P also has limitations which should be considered in the process of developing the word-focused task. In the language-background-section from Figure 6.2, there was only room to self-report one language as a strongest language. In the upcoming studies reported in this thesis, the participating students should be given the opportunity to comment more elaborately on their language backgrounds, as not all multilinguals have only one first language (Baker & Wright, 2021). Further, not all pilot study participants seem to have grasped that they could leave task sections blank. It is possible that they were not used to the relatively free task format (see Wedin, 2017), although triangulated data sets would have been necessary in order to establish this with certainty. Regardless, a revised version of the word-focused task should further clarify that the participating students should complete the task sections *they* find useful for learning the TWs. To clarify the difference between TW synonyms and TW translation equivalents, there should be separate task sections for these two kinds of TW information. It will also be important to select future TWs more carefully than I did during the pilot study. The pre-selected TWs will need to be infrequent enough to be unknown to the participants, so that potential learning of the TWs can be explored (Schmitt, 2010). Instructions about which dictionaries (or similar) the participating students can use to complete the task will also be added.

In sum, the pilot study participants responded differently to Task-Version P of the word-focused task depending on how the instructions were phrased. Those who were instructed to primarily use English (i.e., English and/or any other language(s)) typically completed the task monolingually using the target language English. Those who were told to use any language(s) visibly used English and Swedish more frequently than the others. This suggests that Task Version P is adjustable. When used as a research tool, Task Version P can thus be adjusted in accordance with the study aims. When used as learning materials, the instructions in the different task sections can be adjusted to fit the needs of different students. The analysis shed light on three individual pilot study participants. Two of these contested the instructions carefully and completed the task accordingly, but in different ways. These individual differences suggest that Task Version P is individualizable and can be completed in different ways by different students. I will therefore further refine Task Version P and use it as a research tool in Study 1 featured in the next chapter.

7 Study 1: Pedagogical translanguaging

7.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I report the results of Study 1. It is a classroom intervention where 68 participating students from three different intact classes at two separate schools completed the word-focused task. Out of these, 39 participating students did all the task work and took all the vocabulary tests from Study 1. The task version featured in this chapter (Task Version 1) is a refined version of the task version from the pilot study (Task Version P). The intervention reported here lasted for 3–4 lessons. It was part of the participating students' English course work when I, in my researcher role, was visiting their classrooms. The participating students engaged with ten TWs (TWs 1–10) by completing Task Version 1. The TWs were underlined, marked in boldface, and planted into texts (Text 1 and Text 2). All participating students engaged with the same TWs, but the two texts in which the TWs appeared varied between classes. I selected all of the texts together with the teacher collaborators.

The word-focused task enables pedagogical translanguaging. It invites use of any language(s) as well as illustrations and prior knowledge in the form of references to moments when the TW has been heard or seen before, mediated through linguistic resources (Galante, 2024). This is meant to promote metalinguistic awareness, which is central to translanguaging as a pedagogy (Cenoz et al., 2022). The word-focused task is flexible as students are given the option to visibly use any of the resources suggested in the different task sections. This also aligns with pedagogical translanguaging (García et al., 2017). The pedagogical translanguaging component of the word-focused task is important, as my review of the literature suggests a paucity of pedagogical translanguaging research focusing on intentional vocabulary learning compared to writing in particular. Quantitative pedagogical translanguaging research (like the study reported in this chapter) is also scant (Prilutskaya, 2021). Most quantitative studies about pedagogical translanguaging and intentional vocabulary learning feature students below the age of 12 and do not focus on concrete tasks used as learning materials *and* as research tools. In contrast, this study features upper-secondary school students aged

16–17, and centres on the word-focused task. Following this introduction, Sub-section 7.2 describes how Task Version P was revised into Task Version 1. Sub-section 7.3 displays the aim and research questions addressed in this study (Study 1). Sub-section 7.4 is devoted to methodological considerations. The findings are presented in Sub-section 7.5 and discussed in Sub-section 7.6, before I take stock in Sub-section 7.7.

7.2 Preliminaries

Table 7.1 below summarises the changes made to the word-focused task after the pilot study in Chapter 6.

Pilot study version (Task Version P)	Evaluation	Revised version for Study 1 (Task Version 1)
Format A Providing TW information in English and/or any other language(s)	Satisfactory	Maintained
Format B Providing TW information in any language(s)	Unsatisfactory	Rejected
Language documentation section	Unsatisfactory	Rejected
Instructions about leaving task sections blank	Unsatisfactory	Revised
Instructions about use of websites, dictionaries, or similar	Unsatisfactory	Revised

Table 7.1

Revising the word-focused task

As is evident in Table 7.1, Task Version P came in two formats: Format A and Format B. In Format A, the pilot study participants were instructed to use English and/or any other language(s). In Format B, they were instructed to visibly use any language(s). The pilot study showed that both Format A and Format B are useful. However, Format A was ultimately deemed more appropriate for upper-secondary school English students than Format B, which was rejected. The reason is that Format A is more explicitly connected to the school subject (English) than Format B.

In the language documentation section of Task Version P, the pilot study participants could self-report one strongest language. This is a limitation because many multilinguals have more than one first language (Baker & Wright, 2021). Here in Study 1, the participating students' language repertoires will thus be more thoroughly documented in a language background questionnaire (see Appendix 5). Not all pilot study participants seemed to comprehend that tasks sections could be left blank. This was clarified in the Task Version 1 instructions (see Appendix 12). The instructions for Task Version 1 also specified that the participating students could copy TW information from any websites, dictionaries or similar. This is considered an ecologically valid form of engagement that can help promote deep vocabulary learning (see Schmitt, 2008). The ToT variable (Carroll, 1963) was not considered during the pilot study, even though such measures are helpful when evaluating the potential usefulness of tasks (see e.g., Busse et al., 2020). Task Version 1 therefore has a sections where the participating students can indicate when they started and finished completing each task sheet.

7.3 Aim and research questions

The aim of Study 1 is to advance our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in upper-secondary school classrooms by shedding light on the resources visibly used by the participating students to complete Task Version 1, and on the observed learning of the targeted vocabulary.

The following research questions (RQs) will be addressed:

- *RQ*1: What resources do the participating students visibly use to complete Task Version 1?
- *RQ2*: What is the effect of completing Task Version 1 on the participating students' word meaning recall knowledge of the pre-selected TWs from Study 1 (TWs 1–10)?

The resources referred to in *RQ*1 are linguistic and non-linguistic. The linguistic resources are the languages the participating students visibly use to complete the different task sections (e.g., by writing an example sentence in English, Swedish, or another language if applicable). The non-linguistic resources are TW illustrations. Prior knowledge in the form of references to moments when the TW has been heard or seen before is mediated through linguistic resources (Blommaert, 2010; Galante, 2024).

*RQ*1 and *RQ*2 above are related to the first and second overarching research question, respectively. *RQ*1 and *RQ*2 refer specifically to Task Version 1, whereas the overarching research questions refer to all versions of the word-focused task. In answering *RQ*1

above, I thus partially answer the first overarching research question. By addressing the above *RQ*2, I address the second overarching research question in part.

Here in Study 1, the word-focused task work will be integrated into learning units tailored to fit the needs of the respective classes. Each learning unit agreed with the teacher collaborators' respective plans, which in turn were in line with policy documents as to the content to be covered. This set-up was chosen to make the task work reported here more ecologically valid and meaningful than the task work from the pilot study, where the text containing the TWs was not chosen together with the class teacher. Next, the participants and research sites will be presented in more detail.

7.4 Methods

7.4.1 Participants and research sites

A total of 68 unique students from three intact classes consented to participating in Study 1 and completed Task Version 1. The participating students were all enrolled in the first upper-secondary school level English course (English 5) in Sweden. The mean age was 16.06 years. Thirty-nine out of the 68 participating students engaged with TWs 1–10, indicated self-reported knowledge of the TWs before completing Task Version 1, and took the immediate post-test covering TWs 1–10. The attrition can at least in part be explained by the COVID-19 pandemic, which affected the data collection. Schools remained open, although everyone was obligated to quarantine if showing symptoms, or whenever somebody they were living with tested positive. Several participating students (sometimes as many as 10 per lesson) therefore participated via link and completed a digital version of Task Version 1. These task sheets could not be collected.

One student completed the word-focused task as part of their course work, but did not consent to participating in Study 1. This students' task sheets were not analysed. Unless otherwise stated, the analyses reported here are based on the 39 participating students who completed all the tasks and tests featured here in Study 1. Table 7.2 below displays an overview of the participants.

Table 7.2Participant overview (Study 1)

	Regi on	Municipa lity	Scho ol	Program me	Mean overall grade of students in the program mea	Cla ss	Teacher collabora tor	Participat ing students (N)	Participat ing students (n)
	1	Major city	1	The Social Sciences Program me	316 out of 340	1	Tove	18	13
	1	Major city	1	The Humanit ies Program me	278 out of 340	2	Petter	25	13
	2	City	2	The Natural Sciences Program me	319 out of 340	3	Gabriel	25	13
Tot al	2	2	2	3	-	3		68	39

Note. All names in this thesis are pseudonyms.

^aThe overall grade equals the 16 highest grades in a student's report card from Grade 9, or the sum of 17 grades if a student has studied a modern language (often French, German, or Spanish). The letter grades (A–F) are transformed: A = 20, B = 17.5, C = 15, D = 12.5, E = 10, and F = 0, meaning that the highest possible overall grade is 340 (Skånegy, 2023).

Table 7.2 introduces the participating students and teacher collaborators. For context, note that the mean grades of those applying to two of the programmes were only 19 or 21 points from the maximum score of 340. As a means to further contextualise the present study, Table 7.3 below summarizes all the participating students' (N= 68) multilingual backgrounds, as reported in the language background questionnaire
Table 7.3

Multilingual backgrounds of	narticinating students	(N - 68) (terminology from	Baker & Wright 2021)
Multillingual backyrounus of	participating students	(11 - 00) (terminology nom	Daker & Wright, 2021)

	Language majority students, L1 Swedish		Simultaneous bilinguals		Simultaneous multilinguals		Sequential multilinguals		Questic submit	onnaire not ed
Class	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1 (<i>n</i> = 18)	11	61.1	4	22.2	1	5.5	1	5.5	1	5.5
2 (<i>n</i> =25)	14	56	6	24	-	-	-	-	5	20
3 (n =25)	19	76	4	16	-	-	1	4	1	4
Total (N = 68)	44	64.7	14	20.1	1	1.5	2	2.9	7	10.3

Note. The rounded percentages do not always sum up to 100 %.

All the participating students from this thesis project are multilingual in the sense that their repertoires encompass three or more languages (Baker & Wright, 2021, p. 461). More specifically, Table 7.3 shows that 44 of the participating students in Classes 1-3were language majority students. These are "students who are native speakers of the standard language variety [Swedish in this case] spoken by the dominant group of a given society" (Baker & Wright, 2021, p. 459). These participating students listed Swedish as the language they were exposed to first, and as their strongest language. In total, 14 participating students were simultaneous bilinguals who were exposed to Swedish and another L1 simultaneously before the age of three (Baker & Wright, 2021, p. 462). One participating student was a simultaneous multilingual exposed to three languages simultaneously from a young age (1.5 years). Two participating students were sequential multilinguals. They were born abroad and had an L1 other than Swedish. English and Swedish were L2s, as they were exposed to Swedish at three years old or later (Baker & Wright, 2021, p. 460). Baker and Wright (2021) note that "multilingualism [is] combined under bilingualism where there is similarity" and make distinctions between the two "as necessary" (p. 2). Here, a distinction between simultaneous bilinguals and multilinguals was necessary in order to provide adequate descriptions of the participating students' multilingual backgrounds that are congruent with prior multilingualism research. Next, I turn to the TWs in focus.

7.4.2 TWs

The 10 TWs from this study (TWs 1–10) are *attention*, *urban*, *emporium*, *contour*, *opine*, *exhale*, *genial*, *android*, *fanzine*, and *illegitimacy*. Table 7.4 below motivates the use of TWs 1–10. The table also displays the results of a pilot study which involved

two separate pilot study participants and was conducted to estimate the difficulty level of the TWs. The pilot study concerned TWs 1–10 specifically and is different from the pilot in Chapter 6.

Table 7.4

Motivation of TWs 1–10

Motivation	Result of pilot study with two pilot study participants
Attention: Abstract noun with near-cognates in other languages (e.g., 'attención' in Spanish, 'attention' in French and 'attenzione' in Italian	Known by both pilot study participants and thus considered an appropriate 'easy' word to start Text 1 with.
<i>Urban</i> : Adjective with potential links to participating students' prior knowledge (e.g., knowledge of the word urbanisation from Social Science lessons. Also a Swedish cognate ('urban').	Unknown to one pilot study participant
<i>Emporium</i> : Concrete noun with near-cognates in other languages (e.g., 'emporio' in Spanish) and potential links to participating students' prior knowledge (e.g., being familiar with the shopping mall Emporia).	Unknown to both pilot study participants.
<i>Contour</i> : Concrete noun with near-cognates in other languages (e.g., 'kontur' in Swedish) and potential links to participating students' prior knowledge (e.g., of contouring and make-up routines).	Unknown to one pilot study participant
<i>Opine</i> : Verb with near-cognates in other languages (e.g., 'opinion' in Swedish).	Unknown to both pilot study participants.
<i>Exhale</i> : Verb with near-cognates in other languages (e.g., 'exhalar' in Spanish) and potential links to participating students' prior knowledge (e.g., of content in yoga videos online).	Known by both pilot study participants and a good 'easy' word to start Text 2 with.
Genial: Adjective with a false friend in Swedish ('genial', which means 'brilliant').	Unknown to both pilot study participants.
Android: Concrete noun with cognates in other languages (e.g., 'android' in Swedish) and potential links to participating students' prior knowledge (e.g., from using android phones).	Partly correct by one pilot study participant, although answer looks like an inference.
<i>Fanzine</i> : Concrete noun with near-cognates in other languages (e.g., 'fansin' in Swedish) and potential links to participating students' prior knowledge (e.g., of words like 'fandom' and 'fan').	Unknown to one pilot study participant.
<i>Illegitimacy</i> : Verb with near-cognates in other languages (e.g., 'illegal' in Swedish)	Unknown to both pilot study participants.

The participating students engaged with the TWs from Table 7.4 by completing Task Version 1. The TWs were underlined, marked in boldface, and planted into two texts (Text 1 and Text 2). TWs 1–5 appeared in Text 1, and TWs 6–10 appeared in Text 2. All participating students engaged with the same TWs , but the two texts in which they

appeared varied between classes and were selected in collaboration with the respective teacher collaborators. The first text used in Class 1 is available in Appendix 7 as an example.

Each text contained three nouns (concrete and abstract), one verb and one adjective. Using nonsense words as TWs was deemed unethical because the task work needed to align with the syllabus for English 5. I included more nouns than verbs and adjectives because that reflects the frequency of those word classes in English (Estling Vannestål, 2015). It was also important to include words from different parts of speech, as this affects the learnability of words (Peters, 2020). It is possible to argue that the choice not to include multiword items such as collocations contradicts the design of the wordfocused task and the immediate post-tests. This is because the word-focused task has a section where students write an example sentence of the TW, which entails knowledge of how it is used in multiword items. The test format also includes example sentences as an option to demonstrate TW knowledge. Using a single word in a sentence entails knowing how it combines with other words. Importantly, however, using single words as TWs was ultimately deemed the most appropriate alternative, as this made it easier to pinpoint TWs which the students could engage with using their multilingualism as a resource, and which were interesting for different reasons. That said, the word-focused task was designed to be individualizable and adjustable and may thus be used to facilitate intentional learning of multiword items as well.

TWs 1–10 were partly selected on the basis of a vocabulary list presented by Nation (n.d.), where vocabulary items are grouped in 1–14K frequency bands according to how rare or common they are. The TWs were supposed to be infrequent so that a low level of prior knowledge of the TWs would be the case. Low frequency words are beyond the first 9,000 words of English (Nation, 2022). *Attention* and *exhale*, which were known by both pilot study participants, were presumably 'easy' TWs. They were therefore used as the first TW in each of the two texts , as a means to boost the participating students' confidence and make it easier for them to start completing Task Version 1. In contrast, the eight words from the 10K–14K frequency band (e.g., *illegitimacy*) were unknown to at least one pilot study participant. They were hence deemed difficult enough to be unknown to the participating students before the intervention, meaning that learning could happen as an effect of completing Task Version 1.

This thesis project echoes Peters (2020) who notes that the learnability of a word does not depend solely on frequency. Accordingly, Nation's (n.d.) vocabulary list was merely used as a tool to select appropriate TWs . TWs 1–10 from Table 7.4 are interesting for different reasons. Some words (e.g., *contour*) have near-cognates in Swedish and other languages, which increases the learnability (Busse et al., 2020; Peters, 2020). Given the research focus on pedagogical translanguaging, the near-cognates

were purposefully chosen as TWs, as it was deemed interesting to see if and how the participating students could make connections between languages in a way that could aid them when engaging in intentional learning of the TWs (as in e.g., Cenoz et al., 2022; Smidfelt, 2019). Some TWs (e.g., *emporium* and *android*) were chosen because it was assumed that the participating students could relate them to prior knowledge (e.g., knowledge related to android phones), which, in turn, could facilitate learning (De Schonewise & Klingner, 2012).

7.4.3 Procedures

The task work was integrated into learning units tailored to fit the needs of the respective classes. This study centres on Task Version 1 and discussing the learning units per se in detail is beyond the scope of this chapter. Instead, they are summarized in Table 7.5 and briefly explained below.

Table 7.5

Overview of the learning units

Overview					
Classes	School	Teacher collaborators (pseudonyms)	Overarching theme of the learning unit	Final (graded) examination at the end of the learning unit. This was not part of the study.	Summary of learning unit leading up to the final examination and containing the Task Version 1 task work (3–4 1– 1,5 -hour lessons)
Class 1 and 2	School 1	Tove and Petter	Social sustainability	Podcast recording about social sustainability, where the participating students discussed the topic in groups, referring to what they had learned during the learning unit as a whole.	Unit introduction and discussions based on the PowerPoint presentation in Appendix 6. Task Version 1 task work and discussions, part 1 TWs planted into the text: <i>attention, urban, emporium,</i> <i>contour</i> and <i>opine</i> Text: <i>The Power of the Pen</i> (see Appendix 7) Text work, browsing the Girl Rising webpage where the second text can be found. Task Version 1 task work and discussions, part 2 TWs planted into the text: <i>exhale, genial, android, fanzine,</i> and <i>illegitimacy</i> Text: <i>Keeping Girls Close to</i> <i>Learning: Adapting to the</i> <i>Changing World of COVID-19</i> Immediate post-test Student evaluations
Class 3	School 2	Gabriel	Living a good life	A test where the participating students wrote a blog post on the topic of living a good life, referring to what they learned from the learning unit as a whole.	1.Unit introduction and discussions based on a PowerPoint presentation 2. Task Version 1 task work and discussions, part 1 TWs planted into the text: attention, <i>urban</i> , <i>emporium</i> , <i>contour</i> and <i>opine</i> Text: <i>Local Officials Often Have</i> <i>Short-Term Interest in Designing</i> <i>Cities for High-Spending Adults,</i> <i>Not families</i> 3. Task Version 1 task work and discussions, part 2 TWs planted into the text: <i>exhale, genial, android, fanzine,</i> and <i>illegitimacy</i> Text: <i>How Cities Are Going</i> <i>Carbon Neutral</i> 4.Immediate post-test 5.Student evaluations

Table 7.5 shows that each learning unit had the same basic structure: a learning unit introduction, task work, an immediate post-test, and a student evaluation. The learning unit introductions centred on PowerPoint presentations designed to cover the topic of each learning unit as well as the vocabulary learning theory underpinning the word-focused task in an accessible manner. The exact format of each PowerPoint presentation varied since each learning unit was unique. The information about the word-focused task was identical in all the PowerPoint presentations from Study 1 (see Appendix 6 for an example). The resources suggested in the different sections of the word-focused task were referred to as "strategies" ('strategier') for learning vocabulary, and as and tips and tricks for "working with words" ('jobba med ord'). I intentionally used the term *strategy* instead of resource use with the students, because it was the term used by the collaborators, and because it is frequently used in the syllabus for upper-secondary school English (Skolverket, 2021).

The students in Class 1 and Class 2 completed more or less the exact same learning unit apart from minor spontaneous tasks. Since their teachers (the teacher collaborators Tove and Petter) worked at the same school, the three of us decided on the first text (*The Power of the Pen*) as a group. Tove and Petter then asked me to choose a second text from the Girl Rising website (https://www.girlrising.org/). I selected the text *Keeping Girls Close to Learning: Adapting to the Changing World of COVID-19* because it aligned with the rest of the learning unit. The texts were presented without accompanying images (as in Appendix 7).

The time between the task work and the immediate post-tests depended on the participating students' schedules. Some participating students could take the immediate post-test the day after the task work. Others took it up to a week after the task work. Technically, this means the test were not immediate. The immediate post-tests should ideally have been scheduled the same day as the task work. This was not possible, since the lesson time was limited, and priorities needed to be made in accordance with the research aims (see Sato & Loeven, 2019).

7.4.4 Data analysis and scoring

The participating students were instructed to provide target information that *they* found useful for learning the TWs. They could leave task sections blank. When coding the task data (i.e., analysing it with regard to the resources visibly used to complete Task Version 1), I therefore differentiated between intentionally blank task sections, and completely blank task sheets, where the participating students clearly had not engaged with the TW at all. I also noted which language(s) the participating students visibly used when given the option to use any language(s). Occasionally, I encountered translation equivalents such as 'robot' (for the TW *android*), which technically could

be in either Spanish, French, or Swedish, for example. These were coded as translations into 'unknown' language(s).

The immediate post-tests corresponded to the Test 1 format introduced in Chapter 4. For each TW, the participating students reported whether they did not know it, had seen it but did not know its meaning, or (thought they) knew the word. When they (thought they) knew a TW, they could demonstrate their TW knowledge by (1) translating the TW into any language, (2) putting it in a sentence, or (3) providing a TW synonym. In scoring, two dictionaries were consulted: The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (n.d.) and the Swedish-English dictionary Nationalencyklopedin (n.d.) online. Answers that matched the example sentences, definitions and/or translation equivalents in these dictionaries (e.g., the Swedish translation equivalent 'uppmärksamhet' for the TW *attention*) yielded 2 points. Partly correct answers which did not entirely correspond to the TW information in the dictionaries (e.g., 'sigh' as a synonym for *exhale*) resulted in 1 point. Reporting partial recognition (i.e., having seen a TW before but not knowing its meaning) also yielded 1 point. This will be critically discussed in Chapter 11. Incorrect answers which did not match the dictionaries (e.g., translating the TW genial in English into 'genial' in Swedish which is a false friend and means 'brilliant' and not 'friendly and happy') resulted 0 points. I did intra-rater rating, where I rated 25% of the test items twice with at least two weeks in between the ratings. Out of all test items (n = 100), one score was changed from 2 points to 1 point. Two scores were changed from 1 to 2 points, and two scores were changed from 0 points to 1 point.

7.5 Results

This sub-section displays the results of Study 1. First, I zoom in on what resources the participating students visibly used to complete Task Version 1. This is followed by an analysis of the time spent engaging with each TW. Next, I will focus specifically on the linguistic resources visibly used to complete Task Version 1. Lastly, the effect of completing Task Version 1 on the participating students' word meaning recall knowledge of TWs 1–10 will be presented.

7.5.1 Participating students' visible resource use

Visible resource use and time on task

Task Version 1 is a sheet with seven sections. In each section, students can provide one type of TW information, namely: (1) synonym(s), (2) translation equivalent(s), (3) TW

illustration(s), (4) explanation(s), (5) example sentence(s) containing the TW , (6) a connection to prior knowledge in the form of a reference to moments when students have heard or seen the TW before, and (7) word associations, respectively. There is one sheet for each TW. An example of a completed task sheet is displayed in Figure 7.1 below

Target word: contour	
start working	
I start working with this word at (write the time here) \0.0\	
\Box I don't know this word	
- Seen it, don't know u	
this word	
Translation equivalent(s)	
Kontur, skugge	
English synonym(s)	
Sharly C	Target word illustration:
Shape, form, onthing	the lines = Contour
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
	I am going to contor my cheaks
I have heard or seen this word before when	This word makes me think about the word
Try to be as specific as you can here	
On youtube when people are making thansels	Makenp
I stopped working with this word at (write the time here) <u>0</u> .05.	
□ Yes, I used	
M No	

Figure 7.1

A completed task sheet (Task Version 1)

In Figure 7.1, a participating student has engaged with the TW *contour*. The participating student has completed all task sections except task section (4), as there are no visible TW explanation(s). This was in line with the task instructions because all participating students were instructed to complete the task sections *they* found useful for learning the TWs (see Appendix 12). In Figure 7.1, the participating student reported knowing the TW. Importantly, is assumed that learning can happen as a result of completing the word-focused task even if students report knowing a TW. They may learn new word

knowledge aspects and learn the word more deeply compared to before the task work.

Figure 7.2 below shows the proportions of participating students that completed each of the seven task sections. The proportions are first represented visually in a bar chart. Below the bar chart, the same proportions are spelled out as percentages in a table



Figure 7.2

Proportions of participating students who completed each task section

Figure 7.2 suggests that 97% of all the participating students provided TW translation equivalents when engaging with the first TW (*attention*), and 26% drew a TW illustration. Also evident in the table, the participating students provided more TW synonyms, translation equivalents and explanations than illustrations and references to prior knowledge and word associations. Many participating students thus completed the first two task sections of the task sheets, whereas fewer completed the last two sections for each TW. This may be a sign of the task work being challenging, boring, or perhaps too repetitive. To further grasp this, the time spent engaging with each TW will be considered. Since the ToT analysis did not require vocabulary test scores, Table 7.6 displays ToT for all participating students (N = 68) and not just the 39 participating students all the tasks and tests from the present study.

Table 7.6

Time in minut es	TW1 attenti on	TW2 emporiu m	TW3 urba n	TW4 opin e	TW5 conto ur	TW6 exhal e	TW7 androi d	TW8 fanzin e	TW9 geni al	TW10 illegitima cy
Mean	4.90	4.02	4.04	3.42	3.83	3.25	3.19	3.40	3.14	3.73
SD	2.4	2.79	2.64	1.91	2.99	2.20	1.96	2.98	1.76	2.19

All participating students' (N = 68) time on task in minutes for each TW (TWs 1-10)

Table 7.6 suggests that when engaging with TWs 1–5, the participating students spent the most time on the TW *attention* and the least time on *opine*. When engaging with TWs 6–10, the participating students spent the most time on *illegitimacy*, and the least time on *genial*. As a group, they also spent most time on the very first TW and generally spent less time on the words from Text 2 (TW 6–10) compared to the words from Text 1 (TW1–5). One interpretation of the high mean ToT for TW1 is that the participating students initially needed time to comprehend the task format and then became more independent and efficient.

All participating students did not encounter the TWs in the exact same order. Class 1 and Class 2 read and engaged with the TWs in the following order: *attention*, *emporium*, *urban*, *opine*, and *contour* in Text 1, followed by *exhale*, *android*, *fanzine*, *genial* and *illegitimacy* in Text 2. For Class 3, the order was as follows: *attention*, *opine*, *contour*, *urban*, and *emporium* in the first text, followed by *exhale*, *genial*, *fanzine*, *android*, and *illegitimacy* in the second text. Thus, Tables 7.7 a–c display the ToT for each TW in order of appearance for each class, as a means to get a more fine-grained view of the data.

Class 1 (n =	Class 1 ($n = 18$) time on task in	< in minutes for TWs 1–10 in order of appearance	Ws 1–10 in o	rder of appe	arance					
Time in	TW		MT .	TW.	W	TW .	TW	ML	TW	TW
minutes	attention	emporium	urban	opine	contour	exhale	android	tanzine	genial	illegitimacy
Mean	4.88	4.59	4,14	2.85	4.00	3.13	2.93	2.13	3.73	3.36
G	27 C		1 V C	101	7 67				7 7 7	201
US	2.10	2.09	3.41	1.34	4.07	1.13	2.40	0.92	1.04	1.80
Table 7.7b										
Class 2 (n = 2	5) time on task	Class 2 ($n = 25$) time on task in minutes for TWs 1–10 in order of appearance	Ns 1–10 in or	der of appe	arance					
Time in	TW	TW	TW	TW	WL	TW	TW	TW	TW	TW
minutes	attention	emporium	urban	opine	contour	exhale	android	fanzine	genial	illegitimacy
Mean	5.35	3.83	4.54	3.00	3.21	3.17	3.88	4.06	3.14	3.47
SD	2.45	2.43	2.40	1.56	1.67	2.20	1.80	4.33	2.07	0.99
Table 7.7c										
Class 3 (n = .	Class 3 (n = 25) time on task in	< in minutes for TWs 1–10 in order of appearance	Ws 1–10 in o	rder of app∈	arance					
Time in	WT	TW2	TW3	TW4	TW5	TW6	TW7	TW8	6WT	TW10
minutes	attention	opine	contour	urban	emporium	exhale	genial	fanzine	android	illegitimacy
Mean	4.60	4.50	4.50	3.35	3.64	3.52	3.18	3.86	2.90	4.29
SD	2.10	2.35	1.91	1.94	3.61	2.77	1.65	3.44	1.64	2.87

Table 7.7a

116

Tables 7.7a–c suggest that some of the patterns found on a general level in Table 7.6 occur also on the group level. For example, Class 1 spent the most time on attention (mean 4.88 minutes) and less time on many words from the second text (e.g., a mean of 2.13 minutes on *fanzine*).

The high standard deviations for certain TWs in Table 7.6 and Tables 7.7a-c can be explained by the fact that three individuals spent an unusually long time (12–19 minutes) on the TWs in question. One possible explanation is that the participating students took a short break from the task work which they then included when calculating the time on task. This was the case for at least one participating student, who noted on their task sheet that they spent 16 minutes on one TW (*fanzine*) but also wrote a comment specifying that the task work per se did not take that long. Next, I turn to the languages visibly used to complete Task Version 1.

Visible language use

Tables 7.8a–b present an overview of the languages which the participating students translated TWs 1–10 into. Seeing the focus on visible resource use, the correctness (e.g., spelling) of the translations is secondary. Certain spellings may have lead me to categorise translations as being in 'unknown' languages, even though the participating students intended to write in, say, Spanish. The numbers in Tables 7.8a–b are based on the 39 participating students who did all the task work and took all the vocabulary tests from the present study. There may be more than 39 occurrences of TW translation equivalents because the TWs could be translated into multiple languages.

Table 7.8a

ഹ	
S	
\geq	
lts,	
ō	
Ś	
ing	2
oat	
ij	
(39	
ish	
_	1
Ē	
_	
÷	
ther .	
es other	
ges other	
nguages other	נ
languages other	נ
in languages other	נ נ
nts in languages other	נ
lents in languages other	נ נ
uivalents in languages other	
n equivalents in languages other	ר ר
n equivalents in languages other	ר ר
lation equivalents in languages other	נ ר
anslation equivalents in languages other	ר ר
translation equivalents in languages other	

		example	"kontur"	1	"italian: contorno"	ı
	our	и %	97		m	ı
TW5	cont	u	с С	0	-	0
		example	"Mena, anse, tycka/tänka, anta "	"spanish: opinion"	1	I
	Ð	%	97	m	I	ı
TW4	opin	% И	32	-	0	0
		example	"stadsbebodd stad"	1	1	5 19 "urban"
	2	%	81	ı	I	19
TW3	urba	и	22	0	0	ß
		<i>n</i> % example <i>n</i> %	"varuhus"		ı	I
	emporium	%	100	1	ı	1
TW2	empc	c	32	0	0	0
		example	"uppmärksamhet"	"uppmärksamhet attención"	"spanish: atención 0 italian: attenzione"	2.5 "Attencion!"
	tion	n %	06	ъ	2.5	2.5
TW1	atten	c	36	2	~	-
Languages			Swedish	Spanish	Italian	Unknown 1

Table 7.8b

TW translation equivalents in languages other than English (39 participating students, TWs 6-10)

Tables 7.8a–b show that Swedish dominates the TW translation equivalent section of Task Version 1. For example, the vast majority of the participating students engaged with the TWs *attention* and *exhale* by, among other things, providing the Swedish translation equivalents 'uppmärksamhet' and 'andas ut'.

In Task Version 1, the participating students were not asked to name the languages they visibly used. Some translations and word associations (e.g., 'robot' as a translation of the TW *android*) were therefore categorised as being in an 'unknown' language. Some participating students named the languages visibly used despite not being told to do so, while others did not. Example 7.1 below compares what three different participating students wrote in the translation equivalent section of the task sheet for the TW *android*.

Example 7.1

English or Swedish original	English translation (mine)
android	
android (the same I think)	
Android (jag tror det är samma på svenska)	Android (I think it's the same in Swedish)

Example 7.1 first shows a translation where the participating student has not specified the language visibly used. In line two of Example 7.1 a different participating student does not explicitly mention which language they are referring to, although it is possible to assume that they mean Swedish. In the last line of Example 7.1, the participating student specifies which language they visibly use (Swedish). Naming languages in this way was relatively common among the participating students both when translating, and when visibly using languages other than the target language (English) in other task sections. Leaving the visible resource use behind, I now turn to the observed learning of the targeted vocabulary (TWs 1–10).

7.5.2 Effect of completing Task Version 1 on the participating students' word meaning recall knowledge of TWs 1–10

This sub-section concerns the effect of completing Task Version 1 on the participating students' word meaning recall knowledge of TWs 1–10. Before engaging with TWs 1–10, the participating students self-reported their knowledge of each TW. At the top of each task sheet, they indicated whether they (thought they) knew the word, had seen it but did not know the meaning, or did not know the TW in question. These reports were turned into self-reported knowledge scores using numerals: 0 (*Don't know this*

word), 1 (*Seen it, don't know the meaning*), and 2 (*I (think I) know this word*). This scale matches the scoring of the immediate post-tests. As mentioned, incorrect answers on the immediate post-test yielded 0 points, partially correct answers yielded 1 point, and fully correct answers yielded 2 points. Figure 7.3 below juxtaposes the mean self-reported knowledge scores and the mean immediate post-test scores for each TW. The mean scores are presented visually in a bar chart and written out in a subsequent table.



Figure 7.3 The participating students' self-reported knowledge scores and immediate post-test scores (TWs 1-10)

Figure 7.3 shows the mean self-reported knowledge scores (represented by the green bars) and the mean immediate post-test scores (represented by the pink bars) for TWs 1–10. Also evident in the figure are the standard deviations (SDs) of the mean self-reported knowledge scores and the mean immediate post-test scores, respectively. The standard deviations indicate the spread of the scores. For example, the standard deviation for the mean immediate post-test score on TW8 (*android*) is 0.27. Compared to the other standard deviations, this is relatively low and suggests that the immediate post-test scores on TW8 were relatively homogeneous. Higher standard deviations signal more spread (Field et al., 2012).

The first TWs in each set of task sheets (*attention* and *exhale*) were meant to be relatively easy, so that the participating students could ease into the task work. Indeed, the mean self-reported scores on these TWs are equally high (1.97) with the same low standard deviation (0.16) suggesting little spread. *Attention* and *exhale* were also the best-known TWs after the task work with the highest mean immediate post-test scores (1.87 and 1.95, respectively). The TWs *urban* and *android* appear to have been the least well known by the participating students prior to completing Task Version 1. These TWs have the lowest mean self-reported knowledge scores (0.82 and 0.50, respectively). The mean immediate post-test scores for *urban* and *android* were 1.10 and 1.08, respectively. These are higher than the self-reported knowledge scores, which suggests that learning has occurred. To further grasp this, inferential statistics were needed.

Dependent t-tests revealed that the mean learning proportion was 26% (SD 17%). Comparing the participating students' total self-reported knowledge scores from before completing Task Version 1, to their total immediate post-test scores, yielded a statistically significant gain t (38) = -2.81, p = .008. This was also the case for the TWs from Task 2 (TW 6–10) t (38) = -3.59, p <.001.

As a final analysis, to investigate the potential influences of predictor variables on the scores on the immediate post-test, a multiple regression analysis was carried out. The regression model used total score on the immediate post-test as the outcome variable and included 'school', 'self-reported word knowledge', 'ToT', and 'task sections filled in' as forced entry predictors. Table 7.9 reports the regression results and its coefficients. As to the predictor effects, school was the only predictor that reached statistical significance.

Parameter	β	SE	t-value	pr (> t)	
(Intercept)	14.916	2.151	6.934	< .001 ***	
school 1	-1.316	0.604	-2.181	.036 *	
self-reported knowledge	0.126	0.109	1.152	.257	
ТоТ	-0.011	0.026	-0.435	.666	
task sections filled in	-0.247	0.128	-1.927	.062 .	

Multiple regression analysis for scores on TWs 1–10 in the immediate post-test

Note. Residual standard error: 1.757 on 34 degrees of freedom; Multiple R-squared: 0.289; Adjusted R-squared: 0.206,F-statistic: 3.471 on 4 and 34 DF, p-value: .018

Table 7.9 shows that the participating students of one of the two schools (School 2) scored higher than the other. The other predictors were not technically significant but the variable 'sections filled in' was very close with its p-value of .062. The negative sign in front of the beta value (-0.247) tells us that for each increase of the unit (i.e., one more section filled in), the beta estimate would go down by 0.247 in comparison to the intercept. The value of R-squared is a measure of how much of the variability in the outcome is accounted for by the predictors (Field et al., 2012). In this case, close to 30% in the outcome is predicted by the predictors. Adjusted R-squared, in this case just over 20%, indicates how much variance in the outcome would be accounted for, not in the actual sample, but in the underlying population that the sample comes from. Next, the present findings will be discussed and Task Version 1 will be evaluated.

7.6 Discussion

Table 7.9

Here in Study 1, Task Version 1 was integrated into learning units that lasted for 3–4 lessons. I planned each learning unit together with the teacher collaborators. The learning units also agreed with teacher collaborators' respective plans, which in turn were aligned with policy documents as to the content to be covered. This setup was chosen to maximise the ecological validity of the study. It also allowed me to evaluate the word-focused task developed, as stated in the auxiliary aim of the thesis project. An analysis of the proportion of participating students that completed each task section was presented. The purpose of this analysis was to advance our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in upper-secondary school classrooms by shedding light on the resources visibly used by the participating students to complete Task Version 1. This was followed by a ToT analysis showcasing the time spent engaging with each of the ten TWs from the study (TWs 1–10). The ToT analysis was included because ToT is subsumed under evaluation (Busse

et al., 2020). In the next sub-section, the ToT analysis will be paired with student evaluations of Task Version 1, as a means to further evaluate Task Version 1. The participating students' visible resource use was also highlighted in an analysis showing what languages they translated the TWs into. Lastly, Study 1 shed light on the observed learning of the targeted vocabulary (TWs 1–10). The participating students' self-reported knowledge of TWs 1–10 before completing Task Version 1 of the word-focused task. This was compared to their immediate post-test scores on TWs 1–10. I now turn to a discussion of the findings from Study 1, centred on the two research questions from Sub-section 7.3.

7.6.1 RQ1

The first research question addressed in this study (*RQ*1) focuses on the resources visibly used to complete Task Version 1. The participating students often provided TW translation equivalents in Swedish and TW synonyms. Drawing TW illustrations and visibly using prior knowledge in the form of references to moments when the TW had been heard or seen before, was less common. One interpretation of these findings is that the participating students visibly used TW translation equivalents in Swedish and TW synonyms because this is how they were used to engaging with English vocabulary, whereas the other options suggested in Task Version 1 were less familiar. The participating students were enrolled in the first upper-secondary school level English course in Sweden (English 5). As mentioned in Chapter 2, the syllabus for English 5–7 puts a premium on exclusive target language use, although pedagogical translanguaging and judicious use of Swedish is allowed (Hult, 2017; Skolverket, 2021). English 5–7 textbooks often feature English texts followed by Swedish-English wordlists, where English TWs from the text and their Swedish translation equivalents are juxtaposed (Lundahl, 2021).

To further grasp the visible resource use and evaluate Task Version 1, I performed a qualitative content analysis (QCA) (Mayring, 2022) of the participating students' anonymous student evaluations of the learning units from Study 1 (N = 44). The participating students were asked to freely reflect on what worked well and less well during the learning units. The QCA suggests two major themes labelled *New ways of engaging in intentional vocabulary learning* and *Appropriate difficulty level*, respectively. Example 7.2 below showcases four comments from four separate student evaluations. The first two comments exemplify the first theme, and the two final comments are typical examples of the second theme.

Example 7.	.2
------------	----

Swedish original	English translation (mine)
------------------	----------------------------

Det som har varit bra är att jag lärde mig en ny metod för att lära mig nya ord, t.ex. jag kan rita något som är relaterat till ordet [...]

Jag tycker att uppgifterna vi har fått har varit väldigt lärorika och jag har uppskattat att vi fick lära oss olika tekniker för hur man ska memorera och lära sig ett nytt ord [...]

Jag tyckte att det var bra att jobba med detta under dessa veckor. Det var en bra och lagom svårighetsgrad på orden och texterna. Jag tyckte att det var bra med tydliga instruktioner och inte jättesvåra uppgifter. Jag tyckte att texterna var lagom svåra.

Det har varit smidigt och roligt. Intressant med lite switch up och att få delta i forskning istället för vanligt skolarbete. Svårighetsgraden var bra. Inte för svårt så man inte förstod något men inte för lätt så man inte lärde sig något." What has been good is that I learned a new method for learning new words, e.g., I can draw something that is related to the word [...]

I think the tasks we have received have been very instructive, and I have appreciated that we got to learn different techniques for how one should memorize and learn a new word [...]

I think it was good to work with this during these weeks. The difficulty level of the words and texts was good and just right. I thought it was good with clear instructions and tasks that were not super difficult. I thought the difficulty level of the texts was just right."

It has been smooth and fun. Interesting with a little switch up and to get to participate in research instead of regular schoolwork. The difficulty level was good. Not too difficult so that you didn't understand anything but not too easy so that you didn't learn anything.

Example 7.2 should be interpreted with caution, as the comments are not necessarily representative of all the participating students. Yet, when asked to freely evaluate the entire learning units and not just Task Version 1 per se, seven participating students explicitly mentioned having learnt new "methods" ('metoder'), "techniques" ('tekniker') or "ways" ('sätt') of engaging in intentional vocabulary learning, as exemplified above. This tallies with Nordlund and Rydström (2024), whose participating students (primarily upper-secondary school EFL students in Sweden) also

noted having learnt new ways to engage in intentional vocabulary learning in their student evaluations.

The QCA also revealed nine descriptions of the difficulty level of the TWs as "good" ('bra') and two as perfect ('perfekt') or "great" ('toppen'), respectively. Eleven participating students described the difficulty level of the words as "just right" ('lagom') and two as "neither too easy nor too difficult" ('varken för lätt eller för svårt'). Two participating students described the difficulty level of the TW as "low" ('låg'), and "a bit too easy" ('lite för lätt), respectively. One participating student said that it was "okay difficult" ('okej svårt').

In sum, it appears that some participating students learned new ways of engaging in intentional vocabulary learning and that the level of difficulty was perceived as appropriate. Together with the findings reported in previous sections, this suggests that Task Version 1 (a word-focused pedagogical translanguaging task) is useful and can be successfully implemented in multilingual upper-secondary school English classrooms. This is in accordance with previous research highlighting the value of pedagogical translanguaging tasks for intentional learning of vocabulary (Busse et al., 2020, 2021; Cenoz et al., 2022; Galante, 2020; Leonet et al., 2022).

Previous studies (Busse et al., 2021; Galante, 2020; Leonet et al., 2020) suggest that students need time to get used to the formats of word-focused pedagogical translanguaging tasks. Here in Study 1, the participating students were introduced to the vocabulary learning theory underpinning each task section through PowerPoint presentations designed to be accessible and student-friendly (see Appendix 6). They were also given ample time to read the task instructions carefully, and to ease into the task work. That said, it is possible that the participating students would have completed some of the task sections (e.g., the task section devoted to TW illustrations) more frequently, had they had more time to get used to those ways of engaging with the TWs.

The frequent visible use of TW translation equivalents could also be a reflection of how the task work was framed and introduced. The above-mentioned PowerPoint presentations largely focused on the use of multilingualism as a resource when learning vocabulary. In in the next study, it will be important to clarify the theory behind *all* task sections, and not just those explicitly related to resources other than the target language (English).

Further, the ToT analysis showed that the participating students typically spent more time engaging with the first five TWs (especially TW1) than TWs 6–10. They often completed the first two task sections (by providing TW translation equivalents and synonyms), whereas completing the last two sections (references to prior knowledge and word associations) was less common. It may well be that the participating students completed the first two task sections more frequently than the others because they found the use of these resources to be most useful for learning the TWs. A more critical interpretation is that the participating students spent the most time engaging with TW1 because they were particularly thorough and motivated (perhaps because of the charm of novelty). Then, it is possible that they spent less and less time completing the task sheets and only completed the first two sections of each sheet because they went through the motions in a somewhat passive manner. Indeed, the QCA of the student evaluations revealed five comments suggesting that the work was repetitive and/or not varied. This makes *Monotonous task work* a somewhat salient theme, as illustrated in Example 7.3 below:

Example 7.3

Swedish original	English translation (mine)
Jag tycker att det har varit okej. Jag gillar egentligen inte när man göra [<i>sic</i> .] samma saker om och om igen. Men jag har varit aktiv och pratat en del. Orden tycker jag har varit lagom svåra. Samma sak med texterna.	I think it has been okay. I don't really like when you do the same things over and over again. But I have been active, and I have done some speaking. I think the words have been appropriately difficult. Same thing with the texts.
Det var enkelt fast det började bli tråkigt att göra samma typer av uppgifter varje lection [<i>sic</i>].	It was easy, but it started getting boring to do the same type of tasks every lesson.
Lite repetitivt, väldigt organiserat.	A bit repetitive, very organised.

Seeing Example 7.3, it appears that some participating students found the task work too repetitive and tedious. This theme was not found in a majority of the student evaluations. However, it is mirrored in the ToT analysis indicating that the participating students may have gone through the motions when completing Task Version 1. Vocabulary experts (e.g., Nation, 2022; Yangisawa & Webb, 2020) agree that learning multiple word knowledge aspects simultaneously (like in Task Version 1) can be cumbersome and increases the learning burden compared to when focusing on fewer word knowledge aspects at a time. In Study 2, the participating students will therefore focus on fewer TWs. As a means to further individualise the task work and

allow them to orchestrate their own learning, the participating could also self-select certain TWs to learn.

Further, the participating students occasionally named the languages they visibly used when completing Task Version 1 (e.g., 'svenska: andas ut' for *exhale*), despite not being explicitly instructed to do so. This was useful, as it helped me see which languages the participating students visibly used. In Study 2, the participating students should therefore be asked to specify which languages they are visibly using to complete the word-focused task.

7.6.2 RQ2

The second research question (RQ2) concerns the effect of completing Task Version 1 on the participating students' word meaning recall knowledge of the pre-selected TWs from Study 1 (TWs 1–10). Looking at the participating students' tests scores, the mean learning proportions were relatively small (26% of potential learning), although a statistically significant gain was observed comparing the total self-reported proportion scores to the total immediate post-test scores. This was also observed for TWs 6-10. A possible explanation for the low mean learning proportions is that the participating students engaged in massed learning of the TWs instead of spaced learning with spaced out repetition, as recommended by vocabulary researchers (Nakata, 2015; Nation, 2022; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020). As mentioned in Chapter 3, approximately seven repetitions involving retrieval tend to be needed to learn words intentionally, although certain words can be learned after two exposures, whilst others may not be learned after 20 encounters (Webb & Nation, 2017). Here in Study 1, the TWs were only encountered once before the immediate post-test (i.e., when the participating students completed Task Version 1). Rather than expecting the participating students to fully learn the TWs by completing Task Version 1, the task work should therefore be seen as a start of a long and incremental vocabulary learning process (Webb et al., 2020).

In Study 2, the participating students could be encouraged to use the TWs both in the word-focused task and in other tasks from the learning units (e.g., writing- or speaking tasks such as essays and discussions). Similar setups have been used in previous studies to enable TW repetition (see Gyllstad et al., 2023, p. 422). Using a TW in writing increases the chances of the word being learned (Zou, 2017). Using a TW in multiple related tasks involving several proficiency aspects facilitates learning and allows students to encounter the words in different meaningful contexts (Nation, 2007).

Moreover, here in Study 1, the participating students from School 2 were enrolled in The Natural Sciences Programme. This required high mean grades from secondary school: 319 out of the maximum 340 points. Thus, the participating students from School 2 presumably had high grades in many subjects (including English). This may at least in part explain why they scored significantly higher than the participating students from School 1. On the other hand, enrolling in The Social Sciences Programme and The Humanities Programme at School 1 also required relatively high mean grades: 316 and 278 out of 340 points, respectively. The other predictors from the multiple regression analysis were statistically insignificant. This highlights that advancing our understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary requires attention to multiple interrelated factors that are not always observable using statistical measures alone (Cohen et al., 2018; Webb 2020a, p. 235).

Further, Study 1 did not include a bona fide pre-test. Instead, the participating students self-reported their prior knowledge of each TW on the corresponding task sheet. It was possible to self-report partial prior knowledge of each TW. This aligns with the conceptualisation of vocabulary learning as an incremental process, as well as the components approach adopted in this thesis project (Nation, 2022). The selfreported knowledge could also be verified by looking at the completed task sheets per se. A separate pre-test should nonetheless be used in the upcoming empirical studies reported in this thesis. The reason is that pre-tests function as a baseline which, when compared with the participating students' task work and post-test results, can be used to more thoroughly establish the effect of completing the word-focused task on the participating students' word knowledge of TWs (Read, 2000). Study 1 also features an immediate post-test, but no delayed post-test. This is a limitation because it only enables a limited assessment of the vocabulary learning taking place. (Read, 2000; Webb et al., 2020). The lack of a delayed post-test also contradicts the conceptualisation of intentional vocabulary learning as a tool for developing other language skills, which, in turn, requires retention over time (see Nation, 2022).

Lastly, the participating students from Study 1 were linguistically homogeneous. The majority of them were language majority students (L1 Swedish). My review of the literature suggests a paucity of pedagogical translanguaging research concerning such mainstream students (see Duarte, 2019; Rodrick-Beiler, 2021b). Exploring pedagogical translanguaging in a range of classrooms with both mainstream and non-mainstream students is even less common (Rodrick Beiler, 2021b; Rosiers et al., 2018). Importantly, though, the primary aim of this thesis project is to advance our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in upper-secondary school classrooms. To this end, the research reported in this thesis sheds light on the resources that EFL students with *different* multilingual backgrounds and proficiency levels in English visibly use to complete the word-focused task and potentially learn the vocabulary. An auxiliary aim is to contribute to the teaching of English in upper-secondary school by constructing, using, and evaluating the word-focused task developed. In the upcoming empirical studies reported in this

thesis, it will therefore be important to also focus on more linguistically heterogeneous participating students.

7.7 Taking stock of Study 1

The aim of Study 1 was to advance our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in upper-secondary school classrooms by shedding light on the resources visibly used by the participating students to complete Task Version 1, and on the observed learning of the targeted vocabulary as revealed by self-reported prior knowledge of the TWs coupled with immediate posttest scores.

The participating students visibly used linguistic resources (mostly English and Swedish) and non-linguistic resources (TW illustrations) to complete Task Version 1. Providing TW translation equivalents and synonyms was common, whereas TW illustrations and connections to prior knowledge in the form of references to moments when students had heard or seen the TW before were less frequent. Most participating students spent more time engaging with the very first TW and generally less time on TWs 6–10 compared to TWs 1–5. Paired with the analysis of the student evaluations, this suggests that the task work was monotonous for some participating students. The mean learning proportions were relatively small (26% of potential learning, i.e., ~2.5 words out of 10 based on one exposure instance), although a statistically significant gain was observed comparing the total self-reported scores to the total immediate posttest scores. The same was observed for TWs 6–10.

8 Study 2: Perceptions and further use of the word-focused task

8.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I zoom in on the participating students in Class 1, whose teacher was Tove. I also bring in a new group of participating students, Class 4, and their teacher, Nora (see Table 5.1). On the group level, Class 1 and Class 4 are dissimilar in multiple ways. This is important given my focus on EFL students with *different* multilingual backgrounds and proficiency levels in English. To this end, Task Version 2 was administered to both these classes. Task Version 2 was integrated into two unique learning units, which I designed in collaboration with Tove and Nora, respectively. Qualitative and quantitative data sets are used to explore the participating students' task work and intentional vocabulary learning. Tove's perceptions of the word-focused task are also presented in this chapter.

Next, Sub-section 8.2 provides the preliminaries and Sub-section 8.3 displays the aim and research questions addressed. Sub-section 8.4 is devoted to methodology. The results are presented in Sub-section 8.5 and discussed in Sub-section 8.6, before I take stock and conclude Study 2 in Sub-section 8.7.

8.2 Preliminaries

Table 8.1 below summarises the changes made to the word-focused task after Study 1 in Chapter 7.

-		
Study 1 version (Task Version 1)	Evaluation	Revised version for Study 2 (Task Version 2)
General task format Providing TW information in English and/or any other language(s)	Satisfactory	Maintained
Instructions in the task sections	Unsatisfactory	Revised, instructions about naming languages added
Instructions about leaving task sections blank	Unsatisfactory	Revised, emphasised in the top right corner of each task sheet

Table 8.1

Revising the word-focused task

Table 8.1 shows that the differences between Task Version 1 and Task Version 2 are small but important. In Study 1, the participating students occasionally named the languages visibly used despite not being explicitly instructed to do so. This was useful because it facilitated the analysis of the resources visibly used to complete the word-focused task. In Task Version 2, the participating students are therefore instructed to indicate what language(s) the TW information is in. A blurb has been added to the top right corner of Task Version 2, reminding the participating students to visibly use the resources *they* find useful for learning the TWs. This information was included in the instructions for all task versions (see Appendix 12) but was further emphasised in the blurb from Task Version 2 to maximize student agency.

The QCA of the student evaluations of the learning units from Study 1 indicated that during the intervention, several participating students learned new ways to engage in intentional vocabulary learning. It also suggested that the task work may have been overly repetitive, tedious, and demanding for some participating students. Here in Study 2, the participating students will therefore engage with eight instead of ten TW s. Compared to Study 1, the word-focused task is also more explicitly embedded in other speaking- and writing tasks, as the participating students are encouraged to use the TWs orally and in writing. From a vocabulary research perspective, the purpose of this setup is twofold. First, it is hoped that letting the participating students see and utilise the TWs in multiple contexts will boost the learning (Webb et al., 2020, p. 730). Second, the emphasis on TW usage agrees with the conceptualisation of intentional

vocabulary learning as something that aids the development of other proficiency aspects (see Nation, 2022). In order to pinpoint potential long-term vocabulary learning gains, observed learning of the TWs is elicited through pre-tests, post-tests, and delayed post-tests, rather than relying solely on self-reported prior knowledge and an immediate post-test like in Study 1.

8.3 Aims and research questions

The aim of Study 2 is twofold. The first aim is to bring in the teacher perspective on the usefulness of the word-focused task for students in their respective classrooms, by illuminating the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task in particular. The second aim is to advance our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in upper-secondary school classrooms by shedding light on the resources visibly used by the participating students to complete Task Version 2, and on the observed learning of the targeted vocabulary.

Three research questions (RQs) will be addressed one by one in the following order:

- *RQ*1: What are the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task?
- *RQ2*: What resources do the participating students from Class 1 and Class 4 visibly use to complete Task Version 2?
- *RQ3*: What is the effect of completing Task Version 2 on the participating students' form recognition knowledge and meaning recall knowledge of the pre-selected TWs from Study 2?

RQ1 above relates to the third overarching research question addressed in this thesis project. Study 2 illuminates one teacher collaborator's perceptions of the word-focused task, whereas the third overarching research question concerns all the teacher collaborators featured in the thesis project. In addressing *RQ1* above, I thus answer the third overarching research question in part. *RQ2* and *RQ3* above are related to the first and second overarching research question, respectively. The *RQs* above refer specifically to Task Version 2 and the participating students in Class 1 and 4, whereas the overarching research questions encompass all versions of the word-focused task and all participating students from the thesis project. In answering *RQ2* above, I thus partially answer the first overarching research question. In answering the above *RQ3*, I answer the second overarching research question in part.

The resources referred to in *RQ2* above are linguistic (e.g., TW translation equivalents or explanations in English, Swedish, or another language if applicable) (see terminology in Blommaert, 2010; Galante, 2024). Next, I turn to the methodological considerations specific to Study 2 reported here.

8.4 Methods

8.4.1 Study overview

This chapter primarily concerns Class 1 and their teacher Tove. I also collaborated with Nora who taught Class 4. As mentioned in Chapter 5, I designed all versions of the word-focused task independently. I also chose the pre-selected TW s, although I always ensured that the teacher collaborators deemed the TWs to be suitable. After selecting the TWs from the present study, I brought Task Version 2 to teacher-researcher planning meetings with Tove and Nora, respectively. During these meetings, we collaboratively designed learning units which included Task Version 2 and catered to their specific students. Each learning unit led up to a final task, where the participating students were encouraged to use the TWs from the study. For ease of reference, Figure 8.1 below provides an introductory overview of Study 2.





Independent work and target word selection by the researcher resulting in Task Version 2, and vocabulary tests.



Teacher-researcher planning meetings involving the researcher and the teacher collaborator Tove. Planning learning unit for Class 1



Learning unit including Task Version 2 Pre-selected target words: heterogeneity, atypical, eschew, acclimatize, solicitous, xenophobia. Teacher collaborator and researcher active.



Final task (Cass 1): Podcast recording on the topic of the learning unit, where the participating students were encouraged to use the target words



Figure 8.1 shows how Task Version 2 was integrated into two unique learning units tailored to fit the needs of the respective classes, and how I designed each learning unit together with each teacher collaborator. Both Class 1 and Class 4 engaged with the TWs *atypical, solicitous* and *eschew* using Task Version 2 in the context of their respective learning units. This enabled a comparison of how the participating students from the two intact classes completed Task Version 2. The pre-selected TWs will be motivated in the next sub-section.



Teacher-researcher planning meetings involving the researcher and the teacher collaborator Nora. Planning learning unit for Class 4.



Learning unit including Task Version 2 and the pre-selected target words *atypical, eschew, solicitous.* Teacher collaborator and researcher active.



Final task (Cass 4): Seminar where the participating students were encouraged to use the target words

8.4.2 TW selection

Table 8.2 introduces the pre-selected TWs from the present study. It also displays the results of a pilot study conducted to assess the appropriateness of the TW s.

Table 8.2

Pre-selected TWs

Motivation and corresponding frequency level from Nation's (n.d.) frequency list	Class(es) learning the TWs	Result of pilot study with five pilot study participants
<i>Atypical</i> : Adjective with a Swedish near-cognate ('atypisk'). From the 12K frequency band.	Class 1 and Class 4	Unknown by one out of five pilot study participants
<i>Eschew</i> : Verb without a Swedish near-cognate or cognate. From the 14K frequency band.	Class 1 and Class 4	Unknown by five out of five pilot study participants
<i>Solicitous</i> : Adjective without a Swedish near- cognate or cognate. From the 13K frequency band.	Class 1 and Class 4	Unknown by five out of five pilot study participants
Heterogeneity: Noun with a Swedish near- cognate ('heterogeneitet'), and potential links to the participating students' prior knowledge (e.g., when discussing heteronormativity or the like in other classes) From the 11K frequency band.	Class 1	Unknown by four out of five pilot study participants
Acclimatize: Verb with a Swedish near-cognate ('aklimatisera'), and potential links to the participating students' prior knowledge (e.g., when discussing acclimatisation during Social Science lessons). From the 10 K frequency band.	Class 1	Unknown by three out of five pilot study participants
Xenophobia: Noun without a Swedish cognate or near-cognate per se, although the English word 'phobia' has a Swedish near- cognate ('fobi'). From the 14K frequency band.	Class 1	Unknown by five out of five pilot study participants

Table 8.2 shows the six pre-selected TWs: atypical, eschew, solicitous, heterogeneity, acclimatize and xenophobia. Both Class 1 and Class 4 engaged with the first three TWs. Class 1 also engaged with the last three TWs. Eschew, solicitous, and xenophobia were unknown to all pilot study participants. Thus, these TWs were deemed suitable, as they presumably would be unknown to the participating students prior to the task work. This, in turn, increased the chances of them learning the TWs (partially or fully) as a consequence of completing Task Version 2. The TW atypical was known by four out of five pilot study participants, thus deemed a relatively 'easy' TW, which the participating students could start with to ease into the task work. Just like in Study 1, using single words as TWs was ultimately deemed more suitable than multiword items

as this allowed me to pinpoint TWs which the students could engage with using their multilingualism as a resource, and which were interesting for different reasons.

Importantly, the TWs did not need to be completely unknown to all the participating student in Class 1 and 4. The reason is that in accordance with the components approach outlined in Chapter 3, it was assumed that even if a TW was partially known by a participating student prior to the intervention, they could still learn additional aspects of the TW (e.g., to use it in a sentence). If a participating student knew a TW very well and could complete all the task sections independently, the task work would still allow them to consolidate their TW knowledge. Thus, the TWs heterogeneity and acclimatize were considered appropriate even though they were not unknown to all five participating students from the pilot study.

8.4.3 Procedures

Given the focus on Class 1 in this study, Table 8.3 outlines the learning unit Tove and I designed for them.

	Summary of the learning unit containing the Task Version 2	Unit introduction and student-friendly repetition of the vocabulary learning theory underpinning the word-focused task (see PowerPoint presentation in Appendix 8). First exposure to the pre- selected TWs. Pre-test Engaging in intentional learning of TW s, completing Task Version 2 (part 1) Text: Is the future English or emoji?(part 1) TWs planted in the text: heterogeneity, atypical, eschew, and a self- selected TW Listening task Engaging in intentional learning of TW s, completing Task Version 2 (part 2) Text: Is the future English or emoji? (part 2) TWs planted in the text: acclimatize, solicitous, xenophobia, and a self-selected TW Reading a poem related to the topic of the learning unit (Assimilation- No! Integration- Yes! by Oodregoo Noonuccal) Writing a nagumentative essay (for practice only) arguing for or against a thesis statement related to the topic of the learning unit (e.g., 'English: A Language with too much power'). The students were encouraged to use the TWs in their essays. Immediate post-test Walthrough of final podcast assignment (+ recording of podcasts as homework) Student evaluations Four weeks after immediate post-test (same format as the immediate post-test) and podcast submission deadline.
	Final task which the learning unit led up to	Podcast recording about English as a global language, where the participating students were asked to discuss the topic in groups, referring to what they had learned during the learning unit.
	Overarching theme of learning unit	English as a global language
	Teacher collaborator	Tove
	School	- school
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Class	1 Class

 Table 8.3
 Overview of the learning unit designed for Class 1

138

The learning unit from Table 8.3 lasted for six lessons. Five lessons were one hour and 20 minutes, and the second lesson which was approximately two hours. Compared to Study 1 (in Chapter 7), Tove and I thus had more leeway to embed the word-focused task work in other speaking- and writing tasks. The pre-selected TWs were underlined, marked in boldface and planted into a text called Is the future English or emoji? (https://www.ef.com/wwen/blog/language/is-the-future-english/). The text was related to the theme of the learning unit: English as a global language. Tove and I chose both the text and the theme collaboratively during our teacher-researcher planning meetings. The text was divided into two parts, each of which contained three pre-selected TWs and were read on two separate occasions. The participating students also choose two self-selected TWs each to engage with (and potentially learn) by completing Task Version 2. The students self-selected one TW from the first part of the text, and a second TW from the second part of the text. There was also room for them to engage with two additional self-selected TWs if they had time (see Appendix 12). The listening task and poem from Table 8.3 were also connected to the English as a global language theme, and part of Tove's material bank which she had accumulated over the years in the profession. The word-focused task work was explicitly embedded in the argumentative essay and podcast assignment from Table 8.3 in that the participating students were encouraged to use the TWs in both the essay and the podcast recording. The essay and podcast assignment tallied with Tove's habitual teaching practices as she had previously used the same tasks with other students. Due to space constraints, the learning unit I designed with Nora for Class 4 will not be explored in detail. In brief, the learning unit was about utopias and dystopias. The participating students read two texts on the topic. The TWs atypical, eschew, and solicitous were planed into the text, underlined, and marked in boldface. Just like Class 1, Class 4 engaged with these TWs by completing Task Version 2. Class 4 was also encouraged to use the TWs orally during a seminar, which concluded the learning unit.

Before completing Task Version 2, the participating students in Class 1 and Class 4 took a pre-test covering the TWs. After completing Task Version 2, they also took an immediate and delayed post-test. This thesis project features two vocabulary test formats introduced in Chapter 4: Test 1 and Test 2. The pre-tests were in the Test 1 format. They covered the pre-selected TWs, and targeted meaning recall knowledge. For each TW in Test 1, the participating students first indicated whether they did not know it, had seen it but did not know its meaning, or (thought they) knew the word. When they (thought they) knew a TW, they could demonstrate this by translating the word into any language, putting the word in a sentence, *or* providing an English synonym for it.

In scoring, I consulted the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (n.d.) and the Swedish-English dictionary *Nationalencyklopedin* (n.d.) online. Reporting no

knowledge of a TW or providing incorrect answers which did not match the example sentences, definitions and/or translation equivalents in these dictionaries resulted in 0 points. An example is the Swedish translation equivalent 'typisk' instead of 'atypisk' for atypical. Reporting recognition (i.e., having seen the TW but not knowing its meaning) yielded 1 point. Partially correct answers which did not entirely match the dictionaries (e.g., the Swedish translation equivalent 'ovanlig' instead of 'atypisk' for *atypical*) yielded 2 points. Fully correct answers corresponding to the example sentences, definitions and/or translation equivalents from the dictionaries (e.g., 'atypisk' for *atypical*) yielded 3 points. Importantly, these scoring criteria differ from those in Study 1 (Chapter 7), where both partially correct answers and reports of recognition resulted in 1 point, and the maximum score was 2. The present study requires different scoring criteria because the observed learning of the targeted vocabulary is elicited through proportions scores making the pre-, immediate- and delayed post-test scores comparable. According to the scoring criteria from Study 1 (Chapter 7), partially correct answers and reports of recognition would have yielded equally high proportion scores (50%, i.e., 1 out of 2 points). This would have penalized those reporting actual TW knowledge, as this would have been placed on a par with reporting recognition.

The immediate and delayed post-tests from the present study (Study 2) corresponded to the Test 2 format. They targeted form recognition knowledge and meaning recall knowledge. For each TW, the participating students were asked to: (1) provide a synonym (2) provide a translation equivalent in a language of their choice (3) explain the TW in English or any other language, (4) write a sentence containing the TW, (5) provide a word association, and (6) identify a grammatically correct sentence containing the word from a list of three sentences in a multiple-choice format (see Appendix 14). Since the participating students self-selected different TWs, each immediate and delayed post-test was personalised (i.e., adjusted to cover the pre- and self-selected TWs learnt by each participating student). In scoring, TW translation equivalents partly matching those in Nationalencyklopedin (n.d.) yielded 1 point. Fully correct translation equivalents corresponding to those in Nationalencyklopedin (n.d.) resulted in 2 points. All the other test items yielded 1 point if they matched the information in the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (n.d.). The example sentences resulted in 1 point if they reflected knowledge of TW part of speech (e.g., 'It is important to <u>acclimatize</u> to the new culture'). I did intra-rater rating and rated 25% of the test items twice with a month between the ratings. Out of all analysed test items (n = 34), three were changed from two points to one point. Two scores were changed from one point to two points. Five scores were changed from zero to one , and two from one to zero. The scoring criteria and intra-rating will be critically discussed in Chapter 11.

Moreover, the recorded planning meetings with Tove (three meetings, 137 minutes in total) were transcribed and analysed inductively using reflexive thematic analysis (RTA) (Braun & Clarke, 2019). As discussed in Chapter 5, RTA is an inherently subjective analytical method and was therefore deemed suitable since I cannot be entirely objective vis-à-vis our teacher-researcher collaboration. I recorded and analysed the meetings during which we planned the learning unit. The original purpose of the analysis was to contextualise Study 2. The focus on teacher perceptions (see below) was unexpected, as Tove spontaneously shared her perception of the word-focused task. The recordings were automatically transcribed using the transcription function in Word 365. I then went through each automatically generated transcript and applied the transcription conventions outlined in Chapter 5 whilst listening to the recordings one by one. The transcripts were uploaded to the data analysis software NVivo because this allowed me to analyse them in accordance with the six recursive phases involved in RTA: (1) familiarisation, (2) coding, (3) generating initial themes, (4) reviewing and developing themes, and (5) refining, defining and naming themes, and (6) writing up the RTA (Braun & Clarke, 2021a, p. 39). As noted by Braun and Clarke (2019) this process is not always linear, and themes do not simply emerge, but are actively generated and constructed. They hence recommend summarising the themes and subthemes in a figure, such as Figure 8.2 below.

8.5 Results

This sub-section starts with the RTA (Braun & Clarke, 2019) of my teacher-researcher planning meetings with Tove. Next, the study sheds light of the resources visibly used by Class 1 and Class 4, respectively, to complete Task Version 2. Lastly, the observed learning of the targeted vocabulary (i.e., the TWs) will be explored.

8.5.1 Analysis of teacher-researcher planning meetings

The RTA encompasses three main themes: (1) *Tove's perceptions of the word-focused task and her own adaptation of it*, (2) *The learning unit in relation to the syllabus for English and Tove's plan for the academic year*, and (3) *Reciprocity and collaboration*. For ease of reference, Figure 8.2 below displays Themes 1–3 and their related sub-themes.


Figure 8.2 Overview of the RTA

Figure 8.2 summarises the RTA. Themes 1–3 are presented in this order because it aligns with the *RQs* addressed in this study. Theme 1 encompasses Tove's perceptions of the word-focused task. Themes 2–3 concern the teacher-researcher collaboration and planning of the learning units per se. In brief, Themes 2–3 suggest that using the core content of the syllabus for English as a springboard, Tove and I managed to plan a learning unit which aligned with the syllabus as well as Tove's own lesson planning and teaching ideology. According to the RTA, the teacher-researcher collaboration was characterized by reciprocity, as we arguably managed to make the learning unit fruitful for the students and for us by collaborating both during the meetings and in the classroom. The study reported in this chapter concerns Tove's perceptions, visible resource use, and observed learning of the TWs. Thus, discussing Themes 2–3 in more detail is beyond the scope of this chapter. Instead, I now turn to Theme 1: *Tove's perceptions of the word-focused task and her own adaptation of it.*

Theme 1: Tove's perceptions of the word-focused task and her own adaptation of it

At the start of the first of the recorded meeting (18 October 2022), Tove spontaneously shares the following: after participating in Study 1, she observed a need for her students in Class 1 to develop their English spelling skills. This led her to independently adjust the word-focused task and implement her own adaptation of it. Thus, Tove's version

of the word-focused task was a separate sub-theme of the RTA. Figure 8.3 below compares my Task Version 2 and Tove's adaptation, which she chose to call the Words of the Week task sheet.



Figure 8.3

The word-focused task and Tove's adaptation of it (printed with permission from Tove)

Words of Week I

		Bonus:Vocab of the SAT I.
This Week's Focus	Strategies	2.
	Translate word to your first language	3.
2.	Connect the word to other languages you might know	
З.	Use the word in a sentence	Bonus: Add two new words of
	Find synonyms and acronyms for the word	own choice
	Draw the word or your associations to it	,
	Try to remember a specific situation where you have met the word before	7.

In Figure 8.3, Tove opts for a digital task sheet, where her students can adjust the layout as they wished instead of using pen and paper like in my Task Version 2. Tove also encourages them to visibly use all the resources suggested in Task Version 2 except TW explanations. In addition to providing synonyms, they can fill in TW acronyms. Figure 8.3 shows that in Tove's adaptation of the word-focused task, the TWs is a mixture of pre-selected 'focus words' self-selected 'bonus words' from the American SATs wordlist (CollegeBoard, 2023). There is also room for learning two additional TWs of choice. In Excerpt 8.1 below, Tove comments on her perception of implementing the *Words of the Week* task sheet into her own teaching. Excerpt 8.1 is from the first of the recorded meetings (18 October 2022).

Excerpt 8.1

Swedish original	English translation (mine)
Tove: Det funkar ju bra, för vissa [elever] tar verkligen tillfället i akt. Dom vill liksom grotta ner sig i och göra det noggrant med några ord. Andra har svårt att motivera sig att liksom jobba på det självständiga sättet i och med att de får välja	Tove: It works well, because some [students] really seize the opportunity. They want to kind of dig into it and to it thoroughly with some words. Others find it difficult to motivate themselves to kind of work in that independent way since they get to choose
Jag vill inte alltid servera dom ord eftersom att dom är ju på så himla olika nivå. Så att det är svårt egentligen att Utan jag vill jag att dom ska driva det lite själva Men dom som behöver orden mest är mest drivna, tycker jag, till att göra det här arbetet, faktiskt []. Dom som är motiverade och känner att dom saknar ord att uttrycka sig, det är dom som känns som att dom arbetar mest intensivt. [] Och så kan vi ju titta på en elevs arbete då. Till exempel Linnéa som har använt detta mycket, upplever jag [visar uppgift på skärmen].	I don't always want to serve them words since they are on so many different levels. So it's difficult, really, to I want them to do that themselves a little bit But those who need the words the most are the most driven, I think, to do this work, actually. [] Those who are motivated and feel that they lack words to express themselves, those are the ones where it feels like they work the most intensely. [] And then we can look at a one students' work, then. For example Linnéa who has used this a lot, I feel [shows task sheet on the screen].

In Excerpt 8.1, Tove perceives the *Words of the Week* task sheet as more appealing to some participating students than others. Using the participating student Linnéa as an example, Tove notes that those who need to develop their vocabulary are motivated to complete the *Words of the Week* task sheet independently and self-select TWs to learn. For others, orchestrating their own learning and is more difficult. In Excerpt 8.1, Tove does not want to scaffold the TW selection too extensively.

In addition to Linnéa, Tove mentions the participating student Sahar in Excerpt 8.2 below. This makes *Individual participating students' task work* a separate sub-theme related to Theme 1 of the RTA:

Excerpt 8.2

Swedish original	English translation (mine)
Tove: Jag [har] en elev som har älskat det här och har gjort det börjat göra en egen kopia av det här [<i>Words of the week</i>] och fyller i massor och är jättepositiv [], Sahar.	Tove: I have one student who has loved this and who has stated making her own copy of this [<i>Words of the week</i>] and fills in lots and is really positive [], Sahar.

Excerpt 8.2 suggests that according to Tove, Sahar is intrinsically motivated to intentionally learn vocabulary and has created her own version of Tove's *Words of the week* task sheet. Indeed, when asked to reflect on her experience of taking the immediate post-test in writing, Sahar herself writes :

Excerpt 8.3

Swedish original

Sahar: Jag upplevde lätthet med att fylla i de flesta av orden förutom två (som jag främst gissade på). Anledningen till varför jag upplevde lätthet med de flesta av orden är eftersom jag har på min fritid samlat några ord från artikeln "Is the Future English or Emoji?" och antecknat ned dem i min egna ordbok. (Jag kände att med vissa ord, blev det [testet] näštan som en repetition).

English translation (mine)

Sahar: I experienced ease with filling in most of the words except two (which I primarily guessed on). The reason why I experienced ease with most of the words is that I, in my free time, have collected some words from the article "Is the Future English or Emoji?" and noted them in my own vocabulary notebook. (I felt that with some words, it [the immediate post-test] was almost like a repetition.

Excerpt 8.3 confirms Tove's observation about Sahar, as it shows that she independently engaged in intentional vocabulary learning in her free time by noting TWs in a vocabulary notebook, which appears to be similar to Tove's *Words of the week task sheet*.

Moreover, Tove's perception of the word-focused task led her to adjust the proportion of pre- and self-selected words between the time of the first recorded meeting (18 October 2022) and the second recorded meeting (10 November 2022). This is evident in the second meeting, where *Apprehensions related to student responsibility* was a separate sub-theme. Specifically, this sub-theme is visible in a discussion about including a mixture of pre- and self-selected TWs during the intervention:

Excer	pt	8.4
-------	----	-----

Swedish original

Elin: Kan man [vi] köra på en liten blandning av både ord som dom [eleverna] väljer själva och ord som vi väljer? Tror du det hade funkat?

Tove: Mm, det tror jag. Det tror jag. Men det jag har märkt i min egen undervisning är att jag kommer nog börja styra det [valet av ord] mer, för att det är inte alla som väljer ord. Vissa [elever] fastnar där lite och behöver lite mer styrning där. Så jag kommer börja använda ord från... Jag funderar på om jag ska ta [orden] helt enkelt från SATs ordlista. Alltså i möjligaste egentligen från mån undervisningen vi bedriver, kluriga ord vi möter där. Men blir det inte det så tror jag att dom känner igen det här upplägget med SATs, att jobba med den listan Så jag kanske kommer välja ut fem till tio ord nu fortsättningsvis.

English translation (mine)

Elin: Can you [we] go with a little mix of both words that they [the students] select themselves and words that we choose. Do you think that would have worked?

Tove: Mm, I think so. I think so. But what I've noticed in my own teaching is that I am probably going to start controlling that [the choice of TWs] more, because not everyone chooses words. Some [students] get stuck there a little bit and need more scaffolding there. So I will start using words from... I'm thinking about whether I should just simply take [the words] from the SATs wordlist. That is, as far as possible really from the teaching that we do, tricky words we encounter there. But if it's not that then I think they will recognise this setup with the SATs, working with that list. So I might choose five to ten words from now on.

In sum, the RTA of the recorded teacher-researcher planning meetings suggests that Tove perceived the word-focused task as something worth adapting and integrating into her own teaching. The fact that Tove spontaneously shared and reflected on her adaptation of the task in two separate meetings carried out three weeks apart also shows that she implemented and evaluated the word-focused task independently. Tove perceived the task as particularly useful for students like Linnéa and Sahar, who were both motivated to learn vocabulary, but for different reasons. Tove described Linnéa as a student who needed to develop her English vocabulary and therefore took an interest

In Excerpt 8.4, Tove refers to the latest version of the *Words of the Week* sheet from Figure 8.2. Excerpt 8.4 shows that between the first and second recorded meeting, she decides to scaffold the TW selection more than she initially set out to do in Excerpt 8.1 and use pre-selected TWs from the SATs wordlist. That said, Tove does not object to using a mixture of pre- and self-reported TWs in the intervention reported here.

in the *Words of the Week task sheet* and completed it diligently. Sahar was more intrinsically motivated and independently engaged in intentional vocabulary learning in her free time by noting TWs in her vocabulary notebook. This was observed by Tove and evident in Sahar's written reflection. Tove did not initially seek to control the TW selection too extensively but then stressed that individualisation and some level of control and guidance with regard to TW selection is necessary in order to optimize the vocabulary task work for all students. The next sub-section focuses on the resources visibly used by Tove's Class 1 and Nora's Class 4 to complete Task Version 2.

8.5.2 Visible resource use

This sub-section explores the linguistic resources visibly used by Class 1 and Class 4, respectively, to complete Task Version 2. The purpose of the analysis is to shed light on how students with *different* multilingual backgrounds and expected proficiency levels in English complete the word-focused task. This has implications for future use the word-focused task in different multilingual English classrooms. As a means to highlight the differences between Class 1 and 4, I will start by providing an overview of the participating students' multilingual backgrounds.

A majority of the participating students from Class 1 (n = 21, 87.5%) also consented to participating in Study 1 (Chapter 7). One student did not participate in Study 1 but consented to participating in Study 2 reported here. Between Study 1 and Study 2, two new students joined the group and two students transferred to other programmes. This fluidity in the student body means that the below description of Class 1 will not be identical to that in Study 1. Table 8.4 summarises the multilingual backgrounds of Class 1 and Class 4, as elicited through the language background questionnaire in Appendix 5.

Table 8.4

Multilingual backgrounds of	Tove's Class 1	and Nora's Cla	ss 4 (terminology from	Baker & Wright, 2021)

0.14/2 1 . 0.004

	majo	ents, L1		Iltaneous guals		ultaneous Itilinguals		uential Itilinguals	•	estionnaire not mitted
Class	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1 (<i>n</i> = 24)	15	62.5	6	25.0	1	4.2	2	8.3	-	-
4 (<i>n</i> = 23)	8	34.8	4	17.4	-	-	8	34.8	3	13.0
Total (N = 47)	23	48.9	10	21.3	1	21.3	9	19.1	3	6.4

Note. The rounded percentages do not always sum up to 100 %.

A total of 47 unique participating student consented to participate in the study reported in this chapter, although everyone did not complete all tasks and tests. Unless otherwise stated, the analyses are based on these 47 individuals. Two students in Class 4 chose to complete the word-focused task as part of their English course work without participating in the research. Their task sheets were not analysed. As mentioned, all the participating students are multilinguals with three or more languages in their repertoires (Baker & Wright, 2021, p. 461). More specifically, 62.5 % of the participating students in Class 1 and 34.8 % in Class 4 were language majority students. As mentioned in Chapter 7, these are "students who are native speakers of the standard language variety [Swedish in this case] spoken by the dominant group of a given society" (Baker & Wright, 2021, p. 459). In Class 1, 25.% of the participating students in Class 1 were simultaneous bilinguals who were exposed to Swedish and a second language simultaneously before the age of three (Baker & Wright, 2021, p. 462). In Class 4 this number was and 17.4%. One participating student in Class 4 was a simultaneous multilingual exposed to three languages simultaneously from birth. Eight point three per cent of Class 1 and 34.8% of Class 4 were sequential multilinguals. They were born abroad and had an L1 which was not Swedish. English and Swedish were L2s, as they were exposed to Swedish at three years old or later (Baker & Wright, 2021, p. 460). As pointed out in Chapter 7, Baker and Wright (2021) state that "multilingualism [is] combined under bilingualism where there is similarity" and make distinctions between the two "as necessary" (p. 2). Here, a distinction between simultaneous bilinguals and multilinguals was deemed necessary in order to provide accurate descriptions of the participating students' multilingual backgrounds. The differences between Class 1 and Class 4 with regard to multilingual backgrounds are further highlighted in Figures 8.4a-b. They display the participating students' selfreported strongest languages.



Figure 8.4a

Self-reported strongest language Class 1 (n = 24) Note. The rounded percentages do not always sum up to 100 %.



Figure 8.4b

Self-reported strongest language Class 4 (n = 23)

Figures 8.4a–b show that a majority of the participating students in Class 1 self-reported Swedish as their strongest language. Class 4 was more heterogeneous, in that 38.1% of the participating students who submitted the questionnaire listed languages other than Swedish as their strongest language, compared to 8.4% of Class 1. Participating students who self-reported English as their strongest language were included in the study even though they were not necessarily EFL learners, reason being that they were enrolled in EFL English courses (English 5–6).

I now turn to the languages visibly used by Class 1 and 4 to complete Task Version 2. Out of all 47 participating students, 42 (n = 24 from Class 1 and n = 18 from Class 4) engaged with the TWs *atypical*, *solicitous* and *eschew* by completing Task Version 2. All analyses that follow in this sub-section are therefore based on these 42 individuals. The participating students could leave any task sections blank. Tables 8.5a–b show the number of participating students in Class 1 and Class, respectively, that completed the translation equivalent task sections of the word-focused task sheets for *atypical*, *eschew*, and *solicitous* using what languages. Tables 8.5a–b below also show the number of participating students in each class who did not provide translation equivalents but instead left this task section blank.

Table 8.5a

Translation equivalents (Tove's Class 1, n = 24)

	Swedish translation equivalent(s) provided	Blank (no translation equivalents provided)
atypical	21	3
eschew	23	1
solicitous	21	3

Table 8.5b

Translation equivalents (Nora's Class 4, n = 18)

	Swedish translation equivalent provided	Arabic translation equivalent provided	Blank (no translation equivalent provided)
atypical	8	1	9
eschew	8	1	9
solicitous	7	1	10

The numbers in Tables 8.5a–b and 8.6 are raw scores and not percentages. Table 8.5a suggests that Class 1 typically translated each TWs into Swedish and rarely left the translation sections of the word-focused task blank. For example, 23 out of the 24 participating students who engaged with *eschew* provided a Swedish translation

equivalent and one participating student left the task section blank. Neither of the participating students from Class 1 visibly translated the TWs into languages other than Swedish. In Class 4, 8 out of 18 participating students translated *atypical* into Swedish. One participating student visibly translated *atypical* into Arabic, and 9 out of 18 did not visibly translate *atypical* into any language but left the translation equivalent task section blank.

The Arabic translation equivalents in Table 8.5b were all provided by the same participating student: Rawda. Rawda did not visibly use Swedish to complete Task Version 2 but instead complemented the Arabic translation equivalents with TW information in English. When self-reporting her language repertoire (strongest language first) in the language background questionnaire, Rawda listed Arabic followed by English and then Swedish. As a response to an open-ended questionnaire item about the languages that were important to her, Rawda also wrote the following about Arabic specifically:

Excerpt 8.5

Swedish original	English translation (mine)		
Rawda: Arabiska är det viktigaste, eftersom det är språket jag kommuniserat med min familj och det är min modersmål [].	Rawda: Arabic is the most important, since it is the language I use to communicate with my family, and it is my mother tongue [].		

Rawda's self-reported language repertoire and Excerpt 8.5 suggest that Rawda's visible resource use is at least in part related to her proficiency in Arabic, which she reports using in the family domain and refers to as her "mother tongue" ('modersmål') (i.e., heritage language).

Summing up, Class 1 typically translated the TWs into Swedish, whereas it was more common for the participating students in Class 4 to leave the translation section of the word-focused task blank. This raises the question of what resource(s) the participating students in Class 4 students visibly used to complete the word-focused task instead of TW translation equivalents. Tables 8.6a–b below show the number of participating students that completed the following:

(1) the synonym section but not the translation section of the word-focused task

(2) the translation section of the task but not the synonym section

(3) the synonym section and the translation section.

It was possible not to choose any of options (1)–(3) above, and, for example, only provide a TW illustration or a TW explanation instead. Table 8.6a, to which I turn first, concerns Class. 1 All numbers are raw scores and not percentages.

Table 8.6a

Completed synonym- and translation equivalent sections of the word-focused task (Tove's Class 1 n = 24)

	Completed synonym section but not translation equivalent section	Completed translation equivalent section but not synonym section	Completed both sections
atypical	3	1	20
eschew	1	0	23
solicitous	4	0	21

Table 8.6b

Completed synonym- and translation equivalent sections of the word-focused task (Nora's Class 4 n = 18)

	Completed synonym section but not translation equivalent section	Completed translation equivalent section but not synonym section	Completed both sections
atypical	8	3	6
eschew	7	2	7
solicitous	7	2	6

Note. The numbers in each row do not add up to 18 because the students could self-select which task sections to complete and choose not to fill in in neither TW translation equivalents nor TW synonyms.

Tables 8.6a–b show that the participating students Class 1 commonly completed both the translation equivalent task section and synonym task section of the word-focused task. This was less common among the participating students Class 4. For example, Table 6.6b reveals that six out of 18 of the participating students Class 4 provided TW translation equivalent(s) and synonym(s) for *solicitous* compared to 21 out of 24 the participating students Class 1. It was relatively common for the participating students in Class 4 to provide synonyms without also adding translation equivalents. For instance, 7 of 18 participating students provided synonyms but not translation equivalents for both *eschew* and *solicitous*.

Collectively, Tables 8.5a–b and Tables 8.6a–b show that Class 1 (taught by Tove) and Class 4 (taught by Nora) differed with regard to the linguistic resources visibly used to complete Task Version 2. Class 1 frequently translated TWs into Swedish and accompanied the translation equivalents with TW synonyms. In Class 4 it was relatively common to provide TW synonyms without also providing TW translation equivalents. This difference could at least in part be attributed to Tove and Nora's respective beliefs

about intentional vocabulary learning in general. As a reminder, in her adaptation of the word-focused task (the *Words of the Week* task sheet) Tove encouraged her students to visibly use most of the resources suggested in Task Version 2, including TW translation equivalents. When interviewed about her use of Swedish as a resource in the English classroom in general, Tove also said:

Excerpt 8.6

Swedish original	English translation (mine)
Elin: [] [D]u använder ju svenska lite, var du inne på. Hur kan det se ut?	Elin: [] [Y]ou use Swedish a little bit, you mentioned. What can that look like?
Tove: Pratar vi ordinlärning främst nu?	Tove: Are we primarily talking about vocabulary learning now?
Elin: Ja främst, men också i övrigt tanker jag.	Elin: Yes, primarily, but also beyond that, I'm thinking.
Tove: Men om vi fokuserar på ordinlärning, hur kan det se ut? Det kan vara när man översätter vad ord betyder, förklarar ett ord, ibland med engelska synonymer och ibland blir det rakt av på svenska bara, helt enkelt. Man direktöverätter [till] det vad det skulle kunna vara på svenska eller ber eleverna att göra det.	Tove: But if we focus on vocabulary learning, what can that look like? That can be when you translate what words mean, explain a word, sometimes with English synonyms and sometimes it's simply just a direct translation in Swedish, You translate it directly [into]what it could be in Swedish, or ask the students to do it.

Excerpt 8.6 suggests that Tove is positive towards using Swedish as a resource for facilitating intentional learning of English vocabulary. In contrast, Nora's beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general (as elicited through her teacher interview) are exemplified in Excerpt 8.7. Excerpt 8.7. is an excerpt from an extensive comment about teaching multilingual students in general and Class 4 in particular.

Excerpt 8.7

Swedish original

English translation (mine)

Nora: När jag ber dom kolla upp ord så ber jag dom kolla upp dom på engelska [...] Jag brukar använda Cambridge Dictionaries hemsida för jag tycker den oftast har enkla fina förklaringar med synonymer, man kan lyssna på orden och så där. Nora: When I ask them to look up words, I ask them to look them to look them up in English [...]. I usually use the Cambridge Dictionary website, because I think it usually has nice explanations with synonyms, you can listen to the words and so on.

Excerpt 8.6 and Excerpt 8.7 suggest that Tove, whose students frequently provided TW translation equivalents in Swedish, is more positive towards visibly using Swedish as a resource for intentionally learning English vocabulary than Nora. Nora instead opts for monolingual resource use in Excerpt 8.7, and her students completed the word-focused task monolingually using the target language English more often than Class 1. Thus, the teacher collaborators' contrasting beliefs may at least in part explain why the two classes completed the task in different ways. The next sub-section zooms in on the observed learning of the targeted vocabulary.

8.5.3 Observed learning of the TWs

To capture the observed learning of the pre-selected TWs, the analyses in this subsection are based on the participating students who took all the vocabulary tests and engaged with all the TWs in focus. These were 28 participating students (n = 14 from Class 1 and n = 14 from Class 4). Importantly, this study does not seek to compare the vocabulary learning gains of Class 1 and Class 4, since they engaged with the TWs in the context of separate and unique learning units. First, Table 8.7 displays the descriptive statistics for the TWs *atypical*, *eschew* and *solicitous*, which both Class 1 and Class 4 engaged with.

		ALL			CLASS 1			CLASS 4		
TW	Measure	PRE	IMP	DEL	PRE	IMP	DEL	PRE	IMP	DEL
atypical	SCORE M	1.70	4.70	4.59	2.14	5.79	5.79	1.23	3.54	3.31
	SCORE SD	1.14	1.94	2.24	0.77	0.58	1.05	1.30	2.22	2.50
	PROP M	0.43	0.67	0.66	0.54	0.83	0.83	0.31	0.51	0.47
	PROP SD	0.28	0.28	0.32	0.19	0.08	0.15	0.33	0.32	0.36
eschew	SCORE M	0.37	2.22	0.89	0.29	2.14	1.43	0.46	2.31	0.31
	SCORE SD	0.69	2.61	1.80	0.47	2.32	2.28	0.88	2.98	0.85
	PROP M	0.09	0.32	0.13	0.07	0.31	0.20	0.12	0.33	0.04
	PROP SD	0.17	0.37	0.26	0.12	0.33	0.33	0.22	0.43	0.12
solicitous	SCORE M	0.37	0.56	0.78	0.43	0.93	1.00	0.31	0.15	0.54
	SCORE SD	0.49	1.50	1.50	0.51	1.98	1.62	0.48	0.55	1.39
	PROP M	0.09	0.08	0.11	0.11	0.13	0.14	0.08	0.02	0.08
	PROP SD	0.12	0.21	0.21	0.13	0.28	0.23	0.12	0.08	0.20
Noto DDE - Droto	Moto BDE – Brotoct HMB – Immodiato nact toot Act Act DEI – Dalavid nact toot: CCOBE – row crave BDOB – normation crave			Dort tort: COD			mortion croroc	_		

Note. PRE = Pretest, IMP = Immediate post-test, DEL = Delayed post-test; SCORE = raw scores, PROP = proportion scores

Table 8.7 shows the means and standard deviations (SDs) of the participating students' pre-test, immediate post-test, and delayed post-test scores, respectively. In order to pinpoint the observed learning of the TWs, a distinction is made between raw mean scores (points) and mean proportion scores (mean of percentages) for all participating students combined and for Class 1 and Class 4, separately. Table 8.7 suggests that completing Task Version 2 had a positive effect on the participating students' form recognition knowledge and meaning recall knowledge of the pre-selected TWs. For atypical and eschew, the mean proportion scores increased between the pre-test and immediate post-test and then decreased slightly between the immediate and delayed post-tests. Looking at eschew, for example, the mean proportion scores for all the participating students were 9% (pre-test), 32% (immediate post-test), and 13% (delayed post-test). This suggests that the mean scores increased with 23 percentage points between the pre-test and immediate post-test. It then decreased with 19 percentage points between the immediate and delayed post-tests. For solicitous, the mean proportion scores for all participating students were generally low: 9% (pre-test), 8% (immediate post-test), 11% (delayed post-test). Table 8.8 below portrays the same picture as Table 8.7, the difference being that Table 8.8 displays inferential instead of descriptive statistics. Table 8.8 reveals whether the differences in mean proportion scores are statistically significant from each other. Any differences in the percentage points in Table 8.7 and 8.8 have to do with the rounding of the numbers.

	.,							
				95% CI of diff	_			
TW	comparisonM diff	SD	SEM	Lower Upper	t	df	р	
atypical	PRE - IMP246	.334	.064	[378,113]	-3.824	26	<.001	***
	PRE – DEL230	.377	.072	[379,080]	-3.165	26	.004	**
	IMP – DEL .015	.160	.030	[047, .079]	.515	26	.611	
eschew	PRE – IMP223	.386	.074	[377,071]	-3.021	26	.006	**
	PRE – DEL034	.309	.059	[156, .087]	578	26	.568	
	IMP - DEL .190	.377	.072	[.040, .339]	2.619	26	.015	*
solicitous	PRE – IMP .013	.233	.044	[079, .105]	.295	26	.771	
	PRE – DEL018	.251	.048	[118, .081]	382	26	.705	
	IMP - DEL031	.263	.050	[136, .072]	625	26	.537	

Table 8.8

Pairwise comparisons of proportion means for TWs atypical, eschew and solicitous (Tove's Class 1 and Nora's Class 4, N = 28)

Note. PRE = Pretest, IMP = Immediate post-test, DEL = Delayed post-test

The asterisks to the far right of Table 8.8 indicate statistical significance and p-values below 0.05. The mean difference (M diff) column specifies how many percentage points the difference in mean proportion scores correspond to. Table 8.8 suggests a statistically significant improvement between the mean proportion scores on the pretest and immediate post-test for *atypical*. This gain equals approximately 24 percentage points (24.6), as evident in the mean difference (M diff) column above, and in Table 8.7. There is also a statistically significant improvement between the pre-test and delayed post-test for *atypical*, and the pre-test and immediate post-test scores for *eschew*. There is a statistically significant decrease in the immediate and delayed post-test score for *eschew*. As a means to further pinpoint the learning gains, Table 8.9 focuses on the participating students who did not demonstrate any prior knowledge of the TWs (*atypical, eschew,* and *solicitous*) in the pre-tests.

participating students from Tove	(participating students from Tove's Class 1 and Nora's Class 4, who scored 0 in the pretest)	e's Class 1 and								
					95% CI of diff					
WL	comparison	M diff	SD	SEM	lower upper	t		df	d	
atypical	PRE - IMP	486	.329	.147	[894,077]	Ϋ́	-3.302	4	.030	*
	PRE – DEL	543	.370	.165	[-1.002,084]	'n	-3.283	4	.030	*
	IMP – DEL	057	.128	.057	[216, .102]	. [-	-1.000	4	.374	
eschew	PRE – IMP	233	309	.071	[382,084]		-3.284	18	.004	*
	PRE – DEL	113	.221	.051	[219,006]	-2.	-2.222	18	039.	*
	IMP – DEL	.120	.334	.078	[041, .281]	1.5	1.569	18	.134	
solicitous	PRE – IMP	059	.175	.042	[149, .031]	-	-1.383	16	.186	
	PRE – DEL	118	.233	.056	[237, .002]	-2.(-2.084	16	.054	
	IMP – DEL	059	.182	.044	[153, .035]		-1.329	16	.203	

The pairwise comparisons in Table 8.9 are based on a sub-set of participating students who scored 0 on the pre-tests. These were n = 4 for *atypical*, n = 19 for *eschew*, and n = 17 for *solicitous*. Like Table 8.8, Table 8.9 above also suggests a statistically significant improvement between the mean proportion scores on the pre-test and immediate posttest for *atypical*. This gain corresponds to 48.6 percentage points, as evident in the mean difference (M diff) column. The statistically significant improvement in the pre-test and delayed post-test for *atypical* corresponds to 54.3 percentage points. Further, Table 8.9 echoes the statistically significant improvement between the pre-test and immediate post-test scores for *eschew* from Table 8.8 and shows a statistical significance between the pre-test and delayed post-test corresponding to 11.3 percentage points. Next, I turn to the pre-selected TWs that only Class 1 engaged with. Table 8.10 shows the descriptive statistics for the TWs *heterogeneity, acclimatize*, and *xenophobia*.

			CLASS 1	
TW	measure	PRE	IMP	DEL
heterogeneity	SCORE M	0.57	2.86	2.50
5 ,	SCORE SD	0.65	1.79	2.21
	PROP M	0.14	0.41	0.36
	PROP SD	0.16	0.26	0.32
acclimatize	SCORE M	0.79	4.50	5.36
	SCORE SD	0.89	2.56	2.47
	PROP M	0.20	0.64	0.77
	PROP SD	0.22	0.37	0.35
xenophobia	SCORE M	1.64	4.79	4.50
	SCORE SD	1.15	1.37	1.29
	PROP M	0.41	0.68	0.64
	PROP SD	0.29	0.20	0.18

Table 8.10

Descriptive statistics for TWs heterogeneity, acclimatize and xenophobia (Tove's Class 1, N = 14)

Note. PRE = Pretest, IMP = Immediate post-test, DEL = Delayed post-test; SCORE = raw scores, PROP = proportion scores

Table 8.10 suggests that completing the word-focused task had a positive effect on the participating students' form recognition knowledge and meaning recall knowledge of the TWs *heterogeneity, acclimatize*, and *xenophobia*. For each TW, the mean proportion scores increased between the pre-test and immediate post-test. The mean proportion scores then decreased slightly between the immediate and delayed post-tests for all TWs except *acclimatize*, where the score instead increased even further. For example, the mean proportion score for *heterogeneity* increased with 27 percentage points between the pre-test and then it decreased with five percentage points between the immediate and delayed post-tests. As to *acclimatize* the mean proportion score increased with 44 percentage points between the pre-test and immediate and delayed post-test. Table 8.11 reveals the extent to which the differences in mean proportion scores are significantly different from each other.

	ו מוויאוסר כטוויףמוסטוס טו ףוסףטו מטו דווכמוס וטו דיאס ווכרבוספרויבוא, מכרוווומנובר מומ אבווסףווטטומ (וטאר ס בומסט ו' וא - דיד)			ילא, מככווו וומ נובר						
					95% CI of diff	of diff				
	comparison	M diff	SD	SEM	Lower Upper	Upper	t	df	٩	
heterogeneity	PRE - IMP	265	.292	.078	[434,	097]	-3.399	13	.005 **	
	PRE – DEL	214	.347	600.	[414,	014]	-2.312	13	.038 *	
	IMP – DEL	.051	.254	.068	[096,	.198]	.751	13	.466	
acclimatize	PRE – IMP	446	.296	.079	[618,	275]	-5.635	13	<.001 ***	
	PRE – DEL	569	.302	.081	[743, .	394]	-7.043	13	<.001 ***	
	IMP – DEL	122	.268	.072	[277,	.032]	-1.710	13	.111	
xenophobia	PRE – IMP	273	.315	.084	[455,	091]	-3.239	13	.006 **	
	PRE – DEL	232	.345	.092	[432,	033]	-2.515	13	.026 *	
	IMP – DEL	.041	.163	.043	[053,	.135]	.939	13	.365	
<i>Note</i> . PRE = Pre	Note. PRE = Pretest. IMP = Immediate posttest. DEL = Delayed posttest	diate posttest. DE	EL = Delaved p	osttest						

Table 8.11
Pairwise comparisons of proportion means for TWs heterogeneity acclimatize and xenophobia (Tove's Class 1 N = 14)
Mathematical second sec

הכווגטע שלפוסט קלי רובובאר. וועור NOTE. LINE -

163

Table 8.11 points to a statistically significant improvement between the pre- and immediate post-test scores for *heterogeneity*. The difference between the pre- and delayed post-test scores is also statistically significant. As to *acclimatize*, Table 8.11 shows relatively large and statistically significant improvements between the pre- and immediate post-tests (44.6 percentage points) and the pre- and delayed post-test (56.9 percentage points). The same results are presented descriptively in Table 8.10 (albeit with small differences due to the rounding of the numbers). Taken together, the results from this sub-section show that completing Task Version 2 had a positive effect on the participating students' form recognition knowledge and meaning recall knowledge of the pre-selected TWs. The mean proportion scores for each TWs typically increased with approximately 25 percentage points between the pre-test and immediate post-test and then decreased between the immediate and delayed post-tests. For eschew this decrease was statistically significant and corresponded to 19 percentage points. There was also a statistically significant improvement in the scores of the participating students who did not report any prior TW knowledge at all, although this was a small sub-set of the sample. For example, these individuals improved their pre-test and immediate post-test for *atypical* with 48.6 percentage points, and there was a statistically significant improvement between the pre-test and immediate post-test scores for *eschew*. The findings will be further discussed in Sub-section 8.6 below.

8.6 Discussion

The following discussion will be structured around the research questions put forward in Sub-section 8.3

8.6.1 RQ1

The first research question addressed in this study (*RQ*1) is about the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task. Specifically the teacher collaborator Tove's perceptions were elicited through an RTA of three of our teacher-researcher planning meetings. During one of the meetings, Tove spontaneously explained that she had integrated an adapted version of the word-focused task (the *Words of the week* task sheet) into her own teaching. According to the RTA, Tove perceived this as particularly useful for students like Linnéa and Sahar, described as individuals who needed/and or wanted to develop their vocabulary. Tove also noted that some level of scaffolding as to which TWs to engage with was necessary.

The RTA of the recorded teacher-researcher planning meetings showed that Tove adjusted used and evaluated the word-focused task independently between the first and the second recorded meeting (18 October and 10 November 2022). This suggests that Tove has a high level of research literacy (Berggren et al., 2023), that is, a will to engage with research and implement it into practice. It also indicates that the word-focused task is useful, and that the thesis project is characterized by at least some level of practice literacy and a Mode 2 perspective. This means that there is an emphasis on what teachers want and need which permeates the study (Elgemark et al., 2023). With this in mind, I turn to a discussion of how Class 1 and Class 2 actually completed Task Version 2 of the word-focused task.

8.6.2 RQ2

The second research question (*RQ2*) from the study reported in this chapter addresses the resources visibly used by the participating students from Class 1 and Class 4 to complete Task Version 2. Class 1 frequently provided TW translation equivalents in Swedish together with TW synonyms. This was not as common in Class 4, who instead completed the task monolingually using the target language English more often than Class 1. This finding contradicts the argument put forward in Study 1 suggesting that the participating students 'went through the motions' and frequently completed the TW translation equivalent section because it was one of the first sections on the wordfocused task sheets. Rather, the findings reported here in Study 2 suggest that Class 1 and Class 4 may have 'gone through the motions' in different ways.

Several factors could explain the above-mentioned differences between Class 1 and Class 4. As a reminder, 34.8% of the participating students in Class 4 were sequential multilinguals. Their mean AoO for Swedish was 11.86 years, and their mean age was 16.86. Thus, their length of residence in Sweden was approximately five years on average. Based on his own research findings accumulated over almost 40 years, Cummins (2017) points out that in general, it takes approximately 5-7 years for students with a migrant background to reach the same command of the society majority language (in this case Swedish) as their peers with a non-migrant background. Hence, it is possible that the participating students in Class 4 who did not translate the TWs into Swedish were not yet proficient enough in Swedish to find the translation equivalents useful (for a similar discussion see Källkvist et al., 2022). This accords with Lundahl (2021), who points out that visibly using Swedish as a resource for intentionally learning English vocabulary is not equally useful for all learners of English in Sweden. Rather, my review of the literature suggests that EFL students in Sweden need to be equipped with more intentional vocabulary learning opportunities and vocabulary learning tools that are accessible and applicable (D. Bergström, 2023; Stridsman, 2024; Warnby, 2023). With Tove's *Words of the Week task sheet* as a case in point, the study reported in this chapter suggests that the word-focused task is such as tool.

Further, the TW translation equivalents in Task Version 2 could be in any language(s). Visible use of Swedish aside, this raises the question of why it was more common in Class 4 than in Class 1 to complete the task monolingually using the target language English. Excerpts 8.6 and 8.7 showed that Tove, whose students frequently provided Swedish TW translation equivalents, showcased more positive beliefs towards using Swedish as a resource for intentionally learning English vocabulary than Nora. She instead expressed positive beliefs about intentionally learning English vocabulary synonyms, and her students typically completed the task by means of TW monolingually using the target language English. This implies that the participating students' visible resource use was not only governed by their own multilingual backgrounds and proficiency levels in the respective languages in their repertoires, but also their teachers' (i.e. the teacher collaborators') beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general. This, in turn, shows that intentional vocabulary learning in the classroom is complex and shaped by numerous interrelated factors (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2018). Next, I will discuss the observed learning of the TWs.

8.6.3 RQ3

The third research question (RQ3) reads: What is the effect of completing Task Version 2 on the participating students' form recognition knowledge and meaning recall knowledge of the pre-selected TWs from Study 2? The study suggests that the task work facilitated the participating students' intentional learning of the pre-selected TWs. On average, the mean proportion scores increased with approximately 25% between the pre-test and immediate post-test, although larger and smaller gains were also reported. For eschew, for example, the mean scores increased with 23 percentage points between the pre-test and immediate post-test. Then, there was a statistically significant decrease between the immediate and delayed post-tests corresponding to 19 percentage points. This agrees with Gyllstad et al. (2023), who also report a considerable drop between the immediate post-test and delayed post-test scores, attributed to limited systematic repetition of the TWs. Here in Study 2, the vocabulary learning gains of Class 1 and Class 4 are not directly comparable because they learnt the TWs in the context of unique learning units where the number of encounters with the TWs varied. Granted that the participating students in Class 1 completed all the tasks from the learning unit and used the TWs in their own production, they encountered the pre-selected TWs four times in addition to the vocabulary tests. These

were (1) in the introductory PowerPoint, (2) when completing Task Version 2, (3) when writing their argumentative essays containing the TWs, and (4) when recording their podcast episodes and using the TWs orally. Class 4 ideally encountered the preselected TWs twice in addition to the vocabulary tests: (1) when completing Task Version 2, and (2) when using the TWs orally in their final seminars. Class 1 were also more familiar with the word-focused task format than Class 4, since they also participated in Study 1, and since they completed Tove's version of the word-focused task. Although it would have been interesting to compare the vocabulary learning gains of the two classes in more similar learning conditions, the current setup was deemed superior because it increased the ecological validity of the study.

This study does not suggest that encountering a TW 2-4 times is sufficient to learn all the aspects involved in knowing a word (Nation, 2022). Quite the opposite, it echoes Webb et al. (2020) who stress that contextualised intentional vocabulary learning such as that reported here should be conceptualised as the beginning of an incremental vocabulary learning process. In order for it to lead to long-term vocabulary learning gains, systematic repetition of the TWs would have been required (e.g., Nakata, 2015). It should also be acknowledged that many of the large vocabulary learning gains (e.g., among the students who did not report any prior knowledge of *atypical*) were based on a small sub-set of participating students (n = 4) and may at least in part be attributed to the scoring criteria, as it was relatively easy to receive a high proportion score on the pre-test. Thus, rather than offering an ideal principled way of using Task Version 2, the study reported in this chapter suggests that the word-focused task *can* be used to facilitate intentional vocabulary learning for EFL students with different multilingual backgrounds granted that sufficient systematic TW repetition is enabled. Class 1 and Class 4 were enrolled in two different upper-secondary school English courses: English 5 (expected CEFR-level B1.2) and English 6 (expected CEFR-level B2.1). Thus, Study 2 also shows that the word-focused task is useful for students with different proficiency levels in English.

8.7 Taking stock of Study 2

In sum, Tove perceived the word-focused task as useful, as she independently adapted, implemented, and evaluated the word-focused task for use in her own teaching. Initially, Tove did not want to scaffold the TW selection too extensively. Three weeks later, she had decided to control the TW selection more than she initially planned. Class 1 often provided TW synonyms and Swedish translation equivalents, whereas it was more common in Class 4 than in Class 1 to complete the task monolingually using

the target language English. This difference in visible resource use may at least in part be attributed to the respective class teachers' contrasting beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general. The observed learning of the TWs was moderate (25% on average between the pre- and immediate post-tests), although the study suggests that Task Version 2 can be used to facilitate intentional vocabulary learning.

Finally, this chapter has shed light on Linnéa and Sahar in Class 1, and Rawda in Class 4. Linnéa needed to expand her vocabulary and was therefore particularly motivated to complete the word-focused task, as observed by her teacher. Sahar was intrinsically motivated and positive towards intentional vocabulary learning. Rawda was the only participating student who visibly used Arabic to complete the word-focused task. The literature review in Chapter 3 suggests a paucity of studies on multilingual EFL students' intentional vocabulary learning on the individual level. Thus, it would be interesting to explore these individuals' intentional vocabulary learning in more detail using additional data sets. Study 3, to which I turn next, therefore zooms in on Linnéa, Sahar, and Rawda in particular. It also features a range of additional participating students.

9. Study 3: Individual students' intentional vocabulary learning

9.1 Introduction

This study focuses on 10 participating students' stimulated recalls of engaging in intentional vocabulary learning of pre- and self-selected TWs using the word-focused task. The rationale for this focus is important. My review of the literature points to a body of quasi-experimental intervention research on multilingual EFL students' intentional vocabulary learning (e.g., Busse et al., 2020; Cenoz et al., 2022; Gyllstad et al., 2023). As mentioned in Chapter 3, Cenoz et al., (2022) explored one experimental groups' and one control groups' cognate awareness through stimulated recall interviews (SRIs). However, my literature review revealed no multimethods research that zooms in on specific multilingual EFL students and their intentional vocabulary learning using both SRIs and semi-structured interviews, like in the present study. I will argue that this focus complements the more large-scale quantitative studies currently dominating the field. The 10 participating students also have different multilingual backgrounds and proficiency levels in English.

Study 2 partly shed light on three individuals: Linnéa, Sahar, and Rawda. Linnéa and Sahar were particularly motivated to engage in intentional vocabulary learning. Rawda was the only participating student who visibly used Arabic to complete the word-focused task. In this chapter, I continue focusing on Linnéa, Sahar, and Rawda by exploring their intentional vocabulary learning in more detail than in Study 2. The present study also brings in a fourth individual, Sofia, since she was enrolled in the Language Introduction Programme (LIP), which accommodates newly-arrived students. Zooming in on Sofia is important because research about EFL students at the LIP is scant (J. Bergström et al., 2024). Studies about LIP students' intentional English vocabulary learning are, to my knowledge, non-existent.

I now turn to the aim and research questions. Next, I focus on methodology, followed by the resultsand discussion. I conclude the chapter by taking stock of the main results.

9.2 Aim and research questions

The aim of Study 3 is to advance our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in upper-secondary school classrooms by shedding light on the resources visibly used by the participating students to complete Task Version 2, and on the observed learning of the targeted vocabulary. The following research questions (RQs) will be addressed:

- *RQ*1: What resources do the participating students visibly use to complete Task Version 2?
- *RQ2*: What is the effect of completing Task Version 2 on the participating students' form recognition knowledge and meaning recall knowledge of a small set of pre- and self-selected TWs?

RQ1 and RQ2 above are related to the first and second overarching research question, respectively. The RQs above refer specifically to Task Version 2 and the participating students from the study reported in this chapter. The overarching research questions encompass all versions of the word-focused task and all participating students from the entire thesis project. In answering RQ1 above, I thus partially answer the first overarching research question. By addressing the above RQ2, I answer the second overarching research question in part. The resources referred to in RQ1 are linguistic and non-linguistic. The linguistic resources are the languages the participating students visibly use to complete the different task sections (e.g., by writing a TW explanation in English, Swedish, or another language if applicable). The non-linguistic resources are TW illustrations. Prior knowledge in the form of references to moments when the TW has been heard or seen before is mediated through linguistic resources (Blommaert, 2010; Galante, 2024). This study deals with visible resource use which can be identified in the SRI transcripts. As discussed in Chapter 3, completing the word focused task also requires further cognitive work that remains invisible and goes beyond the scope of the thesis project (Grosjean, 2008).

9.3 Methods

9.3.1 Participants

In this study, the participating students are divided into two groups based on their English proficiency levels: Group 1 and Group 2. In Group 1, the expected CEFR levels are B1.2–B2.1. The participating students in Group 1 also participated in Study 2. The study reported in this chapter features their individual recalls of engaging with specific TWs from Study 2 (e.g., *atypical* and *eschew*). In Group 2, the expected CEFR level is A1. The participating students in Group 2 are from a separate class which has not yet featured in the thesis (Class 5).

The present study considers the resources visibly used by all 10 participating students to complete Task Version 2 of the word-focused task, as elicited through SRIs. It also sheds light on the observed learning of the targeted vocabulary, as elicited through vocabulary test scores. Due to space constraints, the study then zooms in on four participating students (Linnéa, Sahar, Rawda, and Sofia) instead of all 10 participating students from. Tables 9.1a–b below.

	Self-reported information	Strongest language(s): Swedish Language(s) exposed to first: Swedish Self-reported language repertoire (strongest language first): Swedish, English, German, and Norwegian.	Strongest language(s): Swedish Language(s) exposed to first: Swedish, English, and Urdu simultaneously Self-reported language repertoire (strongest language first): Swedish, English, Urdu	Strongest language(s) :Arabic Language(s) exposed to first: Arabic Self-reported language repertoire (strongest language first): Arabic, Turkish, Swedish, English	Strongest language(s) : Swedish Language(s) exposed to first: Swedish and German Self-reported language repertoire (strongest language first): Swedish, German, English, Spanish	Strongest language(s): Swedish Language(s) exposed to first: Swedish Self-reported language repertoire (strongest language first): Swedish, English, Spanish	Strongest language(s):Swedish and English Language(s) exposed to first: Urdu Self-reported language repertoire (strongest language first): Swedish, Urdu, English, Danish, Punjabi.	Strongest language(s): Swedish Language(s) exposed to first: Swedish Self-reported language repertoire (strongest language first): Swedish, English, Spanish
n = 7) (terminology trom Baker & Wright, 2021)	Multilingual background	Language majority student, L1 Swedish	Simultaneous multilingual	Sequential multilingual	Simultaneous bilingual	Language majority student, L1 Swedish	Sequential multilingual	Language majority student, L1 Swedish
n = 7) (terminology f	Expected CEFR- level	B2.1	B2.1	B1.2	B2.1	B2.1	B1.2	B1.2
w (Group 1,	Age	16	17	16	16	16	17	16
Participant overview (Group 1	Participating student	Linnéa	Sahar	Rawda	Mikaela	Olle	Ibkar	Mimmi

Table 9.1a Participant overview (Group 1, n = 7) (terminology from Baker & Wright, 2021) 172

ole 9.1b	ticipant	nticipan
Tabl	Partio	

	t, 2021)
	Vrigh
	er & V
	m Bak
	ogy fro
	(terminology from Baker 8
	n = 3)
	ew (Group 2, n = 3) (term
	t overview
ile 9.1b	articipant o
able	artic

Table 9.1b Participant over	Table 9.1b Participant overview (Group 2, n =	= 3) (terminology frc	n = 3) (terminology from Baker & Wright, 2021)	
Participant Age	Age	Expected CEFR- level	Multilingual background	Self-reported information
Sofia	16	A1	Sequential multilingual	Strongest language(s): Spanish Language(s) exposed to first: Spanish Self-reported language repertoire (strongest language first): Spanish, Swedish, English
Sara	17	A1	Sequential multilingual	Strongest language(s): Arabic Language(s) exposed to first: Arabic Self-reported language repertoire (strongest language first): Arabic, Swedish, English
Singto	16	A1	Sequential multilingual	Strongest language(s): Thai Language(s) exposed to first: Thai Self-reported language repertoire (strongest language first): Thai, the Lao language, Swedish, English

Tables 9.1a–b summarise each participating students' multilingual backgrounds, as elicited through the language background questionnaire. Four participating students were language majority students, which means that they were exposed to Swedish from birth. Mikaela was a simultaneous bilingual, who reported being exposed to Swedish and German from birth, using one language with each of her two parents. Sahar was a simultaneous multilingual because she self-reported being exposed to Swedish, English and Urdu simultaneously before the age of 3. The other participating students were sequential multilinguals. They were born abroad and had an L1 other than Swedish. English and Swedish were L2s, as they were exposed to Swedish at the age of three or later (Baker & Wright, 2021, p. 460).

9.3.2 Procedures

This study features five types of data: (1) word-focused task sheets, (2) SRIs, (3) language portraits (Busch, 2018), (4) student interviews, and (5) vocabulary test scores on the TWs. As discussed in Chapter 5, these data were all needed to thicken (i.e., deepen, nuance, and contextualise) the explorations of the participating students' task work and intentional vocabulary learning. The Group 1 data were collected during the intervention reported in Study 2. The Group 2 data were collected during a separate intervention in January–February 2023. The word-focused task was then integrated into a unique learning unit tailored to fit the needs of the participating students. The learning unit encompassed six lessons, and I designed it together with the class teacher (the teacher collaborator Hillevi). The participating students in Group 2 were introduced to the word-focused task through a PowerPoint presentation in Swedish, as suggested by Hillevi. The instructions in the respective task sections were in English and the other instructions were in Swedish. This tallied with Hillevi's habitual teaching practices, as expressed during one of our teacher-researcher planning meetings.

All 10 participating students completed Task Version 2 and the subsequent vocabulary tests as part of their English course work when I, the researcher, was visiting their classrooms. The pre-selected TWs were planted into texts, underlined, and marked in boldface. As shown in Study 2, the pre-selected TWs which Group 1 engaged with were from the 10–14K frequency band of Nation's (n.d.) frequency list, as they needed to be infrequent enough for learners not likely to have met the words previously. The pre-selected TWs which Group 2 engaged with were in the glossary that accompanied the text they read as part of the learning unit. I selected the TW independently, but Hillevi confirmed that they were appropriate with regard to difficulty level. The test formats and scoring criteria were identical to those in Study 2.

After completing Task Version 2 and taking the subsequent vocabulary tests, all 10 participating students were interviewed individually. Due to space constrains, Study 3

only covers Linnéa, Sahar, Rawda, and Sofia's interviews. Each interview lasted for 10– 30 minutes. The interviews were recorded, semi-structured, and centred around the interview guide from Appendix 9 as well as language portraits such as that in Figure 9.1. The interview guide was used with permission from Källkvist et al., (2022) and adapted to fit the purpose of the present study. I piloted the interview guide during two separate pilot interviews held via Zoom. The participating students could choose to be interviewed either via link or at their respective schools. Linnéa and Sahar opted for the first option. Rawda and Sofia were interviewed on site.

Each participating student also participated in an SRI in conjunction with their interview. The SRIs were 5–15 minutes long and based on the standardised SRI instructions from Appendix 11. Each participating student was encouraged to retrospectively introspect about the thought processes they had when engaging in intentional vocabulary learning of three specific TWs by completing Task Version 2 of the word-focused task. Scanned pictures of the corresponding task sheets were used as prompts. In order to capture the participating students' intentional learning of a range of TWs, they were asked about (1) a TW which was a Swedish cognate or near-cognate, (2) a TW without an evident connection to Swedish, and (3) a TW where the specific individual had written something particularly interesting on the task sheet (e.g., a reference to prior knowledge deemed relevant to explore in detail).

The student interviews and SRIs were scheduled approximately one week after completing the word-focused task and taking the immediate post-test. The exact timing of each SRI depended on each participating students' schedule. It is possible to argue that the time between the task work and the SRI was too long and that I did not follow the recommendation to have the SRIs as quickly as possible after the primary activity (Gass & Mackey, 2017). Importantly, however, the SRIs were carried out as soon as realistically possible after the task work. Although it would have been ideal to have the SRIs even sooner, the participating students' learning and the teacher collaborators' plans were always prioritized over optimizing the research design. This was important from an ethical perspective (Etikprövningsmyndigheten, 2023).

The student interviews and SRIs were automatically transcribed by means of the transcription function in Word 365. I then went through each automatically generated transcript and applied the transcription conventions outlined in Chapter 5 whilst listening to the respective recordings. As discussed in Chapter 5, this was meant to make the transcriptions process as effective as possible and still remain an interpretative activity. The student interviews and SRIs were then analysed through QCA using Mayring's (2022) *inductive category formation technique* (see pp. 317–318). As mentioned, this analytical method was used because it enabled an objective and systematic overview of the themes from the student interviews, and the resources visibly used to complete the word-focused task. The interview- and SRI transcripts were

uploaded to the data analysis software NVivo because the functions of the software enabled me to first code the data and construct initial categories, before eventually arriving at the main categories of visible resource use in the SRIs, and the themes of the student interviews. I did intra-rater rating and coded ~ 45% of the data (six out of 14 transcripts) twice with five months between the ratings. The data that were coded twice were three out of 10 SRIs and three out of four student interviews. The following four changes were made to the six transcripts during the second coding: (1) In Linnéa's SRI, three instances were added to one of the codes. (2) One instance was moved from one code to another. (3) One theme in Sofia's student interview was divided into two subthemes. (4) The label of one theme in Sahar's interview was revised to better reflect the utterances that constituted it. Next, I turn to the findings of the study.

9.4 Results

This sub-section starts with an overview of the resources visibly used by the 10 participating students in Group 1 and Group 2 to complete the word-focused task. Following this, Linnéa, Sahar, and Rawda will serve as representatives of Group 1 for two reasons. They all featured in Study 2, which means that the findings reported here can complement and further explore their intentional vocabulary learning. Sahar, Linnéa, Rawda also have different multilingual backgrounds, meaning that analyses of their visible resource use and intentional vocabulary learning combined have implications for future large-scale use of the word-focused task. Sofia will serve as a representative of Group 2 because she is the only native speaker of Spanish. Thus, zooming in on Sofia can offer further implications regarding the usefulness of the word-focused task.

9.4.1 Visible resource use and the observed learning of the TWs

When completing Task Version 2, the participating students visibly used linguistic resources for (1) initial understanding, (2) consolidation, (3) association , and (4) demonstration of TW knowledge. These are non-technical terms which emerged inductively as a result of the QCA of the SRIs. The languages visibly used were English, Swedish, and/or other languages (Arabic, Spanish or Thai). Often paired with the use of an online dictionary, visibly using English for initial understanding meant using TW information in English (e.g., TW synonyms) to grasp what the TW meant. Those who recalled using Swedish for initial understanding retrieved Swedish translation equivalents of the TWs from an English-Swedish bilingual dictionary. They then used the Swedish translation equivalents of the TWs to gain an understanding of the TW and completed the translation equivalent task section. The visible use of linguistic

resources for consolidating TW knowledge includes refinements and corroborations of TW knowledge which the participating students either reported knowing before completing the task or recalled gaining as they completed Task Version 2. For example, Olle reported knowing the TW atypical but recalled retrieving TW synonyms from a website to "double check" ('dubbelkolla') its meaning. In doing so, he visibly used English for consolidation of TW knowledge. When using English, Swedish, or other languages for association, the participating students either recalled completing Task Version 2 by providing a literal word association or recalled inferring the meaning of the TW by associating it to other words they knew and provided that word association in the task section. Finally, the participating students recalled using English, Swedish, or other languages to demonstrate TW knowledge which they either had before completing the word-focused task or recalled gaining as they were completing the wordfocused task. Some participating students visibly used multiple linguistic resources when engaging in intentional learning of a TW (e.g., by providing an example sentence containing the TW in Swedish as well as a TW explanation in English). Others visibly used one linguistic resource throughout (e.g., provided TW synonyms only).

Table 9.2 compares the linguistic resources visibly used to complete Task Version 2 by the participating students in Group 1 and Group 2, respectively

Resource visibly used to complete Task Version 2	Total number of visible uses from SRI transcripts in Group 1 (n = 7)	Total number of visible uses from SRI transcripts in Group 2 ($n = 3$)
English		
English for initial understanding	13	0
English for consolidation	14	0
English for association	4	0
English for knowledge demonstration	10	0
Swedish		
Swedish for initial understanding	7	3
Swedish for consolidation	8	2
Swedish for association	2	0
Swedish for knowledge demonstration	0	3
Other language (Arabic, Spanish, or Thai)		
Other language for initial understanding	0	4
Other language for consolidation	0	0
Other language for association	0	0
Other language for knowledge demonstration	1	7

Table 9.2

Visible use of linguistic resources
As is evident in Table 9.2, Group 1 visibly used English to a larger extent than Group 2. For example, the QCA of the SRI transcripts reveals thirteen instances of participating students in Group 1 visibly using English (e.g., TW synonyms) gain an initial understanding of the TW and complete Task Version 2, while none of the participating students in Group 2 recalled doing so. In contrast, it points to four examples of Group 2 visibly using languages other than English or Swedish to gain an initial understanding of the TW and seven instances of participating students in Group 2 visibly using languages other than English or Swedish to gain an initial understanding of the TW and seven instances of participating students in Group 2 using other languages for demonstration of TW knowledge. The other languages visibly used by Group 2 (Arabic, Thai, and Spanish, respectively) were these participating students' self-reported L1s. In Group 1, only Rawda recalled visibly using languages other than English or Swedish to complete Task Version 2. She used Arabic to demonstrate her knowledge of the TW *atypical*. Arabic was Rawda's self-reported L1 and strongest language.

According to the QCA of the SRI transcripts, the participating students also visibly used TW illustrations and prior knowledge in the form of references to moments when the TW has been heard or seen before for demonstration and association of TW knowledge, respectively. For example, Linnéa recalled associating the TW *xenophobia* with a trip abroad where she had witnessed xenophobic behaviour. Olle recalled demonstrating knowledge of the TW *heterogeneity* by drawing heterogeneous stick figures communicating in different languages. Table 9.3 summarises the visible use of TW illustrations and prior knowledge to complete Task Version 2.

Resource visibly used to complete Task Version 2	Total number of visible uses in Group 1 ($n = 7$)	Total number of visible uses in Group 2 $(n = 3)$
Prior knowledge (i.e., references to moments when the TW has been heard or seen before) for association	0	7
TW illustrations for knowledge demonstration	3	4

Table 9.3

Visible use of TW illustrations and prior knowledge

Table 9.3 shows that it was more common for the participating students in Group 1 than in Group 2 to associate the TWs to prior knowledge in the form of references to moments when the TW has been heard or seen before. Three participating students in Group 1 and four in Group 2 visibly used TW illustrations to demonstrate TW knowledge.

Next, Table 9.4 displays an overview of the observed learning of the targeted vocabulary: a small set of pre- and self-selected TWs.

	Pre-test scores on the three words from the SRI	Immediate post-test score on the three words from the SRI	Delayed post-test score on the three words from the SRI
Group 1 (<i>n</i> = 7) Linnéa	<i>atypical:</i> 2 out of 3 points <i>eschew:</i> 0 out of 3 points xenophobia:2 out of 3 points	<i>atypical:</i> 6 out of 7 points <i>eschew:</i> 3 out of 7 points <i>xenophobia</i> :5 out of 7 points	<i>atypical</i> :5 out of 7 points <i>eschew:</i> 0 out of 7 points <i>xenophobia:</i> 4 out of 7 points
Sahar	<i>atypical:</i> self-reported recognition (1 point) <i>eschew:</i> 0 out of 3 points <i>heterogeneity:</i> self-reported recognition (1 point)	<i>atypical</i> : 6 out of 7 points <i>eschew</i> : 5 out of 7 points <i>heterogeneity</i> : 6 out of 7 points	atypical:6 out of 7 points eschew: 6 out of 7 points heterogeneity: 6 out of 7 points
Rawda	atypical: self-reported recognition (1 point) eschew: 0 out of 3 points solicitous: 0 out of 3 points	<i>atypica</i> 1:6 out of 7 points eschew:5 out of 7 points solicitous:0 out of 7 points	<i>atypical:</i> 5 out of 7 points <i>eschew:</i> 0 out of 7 points <i>solicitous:</i> 0 out of 7 points
Mikaela	<i>atypical:</i> 2 out of 3 points <i>eschew:</i> 0 out of 3 points <i>accumulated</i> (self-selected TW): -	<i>atypical</i> :6 out of 7 points <i>eschew</i> : 2 out of 7 points <i>accumulated</i> (self-selected TW:1 out of 7 points	<i>atypical</i> :5 out of 7 points <i>eschew</i> : 2 out of 7 points <i>accumulated</i> (self-selected TW):1 out of 7 points
Olle	<i>atypical:</i> self-reported recognition (1 point) <i>eschew:</i> : 0 out of 3 points <i>heterogeneity:</i> 0 out of 3 points	<i>atypical</i> : 5 out of 7 points <i>eschew</i> : 0 out of 7 points <i>heterogeneity</i> :1 out of 7points	<i>atypical: 7</i> out of 7 points <i>eschew:</i> 0 out of 7 points <i>heterogeneity:</i> 0 out of 7 points
Ibkar	<i>atypical:</i> 2 out of 3 points <i>eschew:</i> 3 out of 3 points <i>descending</i> (self-selected word):-	<i>atypical:</i> 5 out of 7 points <i>eschew:</i> 0 out of 7 points <i>descending</i> (self-selected word:0 out of 7 points	<i>atypical</i> : 5 out of 7 points <i>eschew</i> : 0 out of 7 points <i>descending</i> (self-selected TW): -

Participating students' vocabulary test scores (N = 10)

Table 9.4

179

Mimmi	<i>atypical</i> : self-reported recognition (1 point)	atypical: 0 out of 7 points	atypical: 0 out of 7 points
	<i>eschew:</i> 0 out of 3 points	eschew:0 out of 7 points	eschew:0 out of 7 points
	<i>dissenting</i> (self-selected TW): -	dissenting (self-selected TW):0 out of 7	dissenting (self-selected TW): 0
Group 2 (<i>n</i> = 3)		STIIDU	
Sofia	<i>cellar</i> : 0 out of 3 points	<i>cellar</i> : 0 out of 7 points	cellar: 0 out of 7 points
	<i>busy</i> : 0 out of 3 points	<i>busy:</i> 0 out of 7 points	busy: 4 out of 7 points
	<i>hous</i> e:3 out of 3 points	<i>house</i> :6 out of 7 points	house:6 out of 7 points
Sara	s <i>wings</i> (self-selected TVV): -	swings (self-selected TW): -	<i>swings</i> (self-selected TW) -
	c <i>ellar</i> : 3 out of 3 points	cellar: 6 out of 7points	<i>cellar</i> : 5 out of 7 points
	<i>busy</i> :3 out of 3 points	busy:6 out of 7 points	<i>busy:</i> 4 out of 7 points
Singto	<i>cellar</i> : self-reported recognition (1 point) <i>busy</i> : self-reported recognition (1 point) <i>far</i> (self-selected TW): -	<i>cellar</i> : 0 out of 7 points <i>busy:</i> 1 out of 7 points <i>far</i> (self-selected TVV):1 out of 7 points	<i>cellar</i> : 0 out of 7 points <i>busy:</i> 4 out of 7 points <i>far</i> (self-selected TW):0 out of 7 points

In Table 9.4, there are no pre-test scores covering the self-selected TWs. These were selected during the task work, after the pre-tests had been carried out. Sara was not tested on her self-selected TW swings from the SRI, reason being that she self-selected multiple TWs and was only tested on two of them. Table 9.4 suggests that completing Task Version 2 had an effect on the participating students' form recognition knowledge and meaning recall knowledge of the pre- and self-selected TWs. For example, Rawda and Linnéa did not report knowing *eschew* prior to the task work, but scored 5 and 3 points, respectively, out of the maximum 7 points on the immediate post-test covering the TW. Also evident in the table, the effect tended to decrease between the immediateand delayed post-tests, however, and completing the word-focused task did not always result in learning, For example, Rawda and Linnéa did not demonstrate any knowledge of *eschew* in their delayed post-test- Sofia did not report knowing the TW *cellar* prior to the task work and also did not display any knowledge of the TW in the immediate and delayed post-tests, as she scored 0 out of 7 points on both tests. As a means to further grasp the observed learning of the targeted vocabulary, I now zoom in specifically on Linnéa, Sahar, Rawda, and Sofia's intentional learning of specific TWs. They will be treated as separate cases for the purpose of advancing our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in upper-secondary school classrooms.

9.4.2 Zooming in on Linnéa, Sahar, Rawda, and Sofia

Here, the TWs in focus are *eschew* (learnt by Linnéa and Sahar), *atypica*l (learnt by Rawda) and *busy* (learnt by Sofia). These TWs are interesting for different reasons. Atypical has a near-cognate in the society majority language Swedish ('atypisk'). Given the facilitative effect of cognate knowledge on multilingual students' intentional vocabulary learning (Cenoz et al., 2022), it was deemed interesting to see whether Rawda could make use of the similarity between 'atypisk' and *atypical. Eschew* and *busy* were chosen because they do not have Swedish cognates or near-cognates, and because the participating students reported either partial or no knowledge of these TWs before learning them using Task Version 2. The first individual participating student in focus is Linnéa. First, Table 9.5 below displays introductory information about her and the data upon which the subsequent analysis is based.

Linnéa

 Table 9.5

 Introductory information about Linnéa

Language background	Student interview length	SRI length	TWs from SRI
Language majority student, L1 Swedish	29 minutes	8 minutes	atypical, eschew, xenophobia

Linnéa was born and raised in Sweden and reports using Swedish in the home environment. She studies English and German in school and occasionally uses Norwegian with her relatives. Linnéa's language portrait is displayed in Figure 9.1



Figure 9.1 Linnéa's language portrait

Linnéa describes Swedish as language she "knows the most and the best" ('kan mest och bäst'). Swedish is therefore placed at the heart of the portrait (in blue). Marked in green, English is placed in the stomach to signal a "gut feeling" ('magkänsla') associated with the language. Linnéa declares that using German (in red) requires a lot of mental effort, leading her to place it in the head of the portrait. Linnéa occasionally listens to and uses Norwegian, hence the black colour in the hand and ear of the portrait.

In Study 2, the teacher collaborator Tove used Linnéa as a case in point when noting that the participating students who needed to expand their vocabulary the most often were particularly motivated to engage in intentional vocabulary learning. Indeed, this kind of *focus on intentional vocabulary learning* was a salient theme in Linnéa's interview. Linnéa stresses four times that both my word-focused task and Tove's adaptation of it (the *Word of the Week* task sheet) are "very" or "really" good ('väldigt bra', 'riktigt bra'). She elaborates by specifying that she "has dyslexia" ('har dyslexi'). The dyslexia, Linnéa

says, "makes spelling a little bit more difficult" ('gör det lite svårare med stavningen'), and makes her want to "compensate" ('kompensera') by improving her vocabulary knowledge, as she believes this "elevates her texts a little bit" ('lyfter mina texter lite').

Primarily visible in an elaborate response to a question about preferred ways to learn vocabulary, one sub-theme from Linnéa's interviews suggests that she appreciates the use of *Swedish for clarification purposes* when engaging in intentional learning of targeted English vocabulary in the classroom. She also expresses a general preference for when her teacher Tove clarifies instructions and important lesson content using both English and Swedish. Together, these comments make up a theme from Linnéa's interview labelled *Swedish as a resource during English lessons*. With this in mind, I turn to her recall of intentionally learning the TW *eschew* displayed in Excerpt 9.1 below. During the SRI, the task sheet in Figure 9.2 was used as a prompt.

Word: <u>eschew</u> I start working with this word at (write the time here) <u>し</u> :の子 尾 I don't know this word	
Seen it, don't know the meaning	
S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	
Avoid, escape	Remember!: Please fill in the information which <u>you</u> feel wo help <u>you</u> learn the target words if you were to study them. Write as much as you need to learn the words ©
Franslation equivalent(s)	Illustration:
Please also write which language(s) the translation(s) is or are in Swezish-merika, hailla sig borta	
	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other langua
xplanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s): He would to eschew me because we got in a fight	
ave heard or seen this word (or part of the word) before when	This word makes me think about the word Please also write which language the word is in
ave heard or seen this word (of part of and	chaser nut
to be as specific as you can here	Chasew Not
the thic word at (write the time here):	(0: 15 It this word (If you used a bilingual dictionary, please state which one) □ No
I stopped working with this work and	th this word (If you used a bining during the
is seen or some other resource when	TI NO
Luced a dictionary of south	

Figure 9.2 Linnéa's task sheet with the TW eschew

Swedish original

Elin: Hur tänkte du här?

Linnéa: Det här ordet hade jag ingen aning om. Så jag sökte upp det och då var det 'avoid' eller 'escape'. Det finns [fanns] mycket andra glosor också, men dom kan jag inte ibland. Dom som är svårast. Så då tar jag sånna som jag brukar... 'Avoid' och 'escape', dom har jag hört innan.

[...]

Och sen så ville jag ha det [ordet] på svenska också och då var det 'undvika' eller 'hålla sig borta' på synonymer.se. Och sen så tog jag explanation in English. Då har jag bara testat. Då tänkte jag såhär: 'ja, 'undvika' eller 'escape'?' Ja, he wants to eschew me because we got in a fight.

[...]

Ja och det fick mig att tänka på 'cashewnöt' bara för att det heter ju *eschew* och man brukar inte ha det här dubbel v (w) så ofta. Så själva [ordet] 'undvika' får mig inte att tänka på cashewnötter utan bara stavningen.

English translation (mine)

Elin: How did you think here? [Literal translation].

Linnéa: This word I had no idea about. So I looked it up and then it was 'avoid' or 'escape'. There are [were] many other words as well, but those I don't know sometimes. The ones that are the most difficult. So then I take the kind that I usually... Avoid and escape, those I've, heard before.

[...]

And then I wanted it [the TW] in Swedish as well, and then it was 'undvika' or 'hålla sig borta' at synonymer.se. Then I took explanation in English. Then I've just tried. Then I thought like this: 'yeah, 'undvika' or 'escape'? Yeah, he wants to eschew me because we got in a fight.

[...]

Yeah and it got me thinking about 'cashew nut' just because it's called *eschew* and one doesn't usually have this dubbel v (w) very often. So [the word] 'undvika' per se doesn't make me think about cashewnuts, but just the spelling. Linnéa did not know the TW *eschew* before completing Task Version 2. This is corroborated by (1) her comment in Excerpt 9.1 above, (2) her self-reported prior knowledge in Figure 9.2 and (3) her pre-test score (0 points, see Table 9.4). Thus, Linnéa starts engaging with *eschew* by retrieving TW synonyms online, and thus visibly using English as a resource to gain an initial understanding of the TW. Next, the *Swedish as a resource during English lessons* from Linnéa's interview is reflected in her SRI , as she recalls corroborating her TW knowledge through Swedish translation equivalents, thus visibly using Swedish for consolidation. Excerpt 9.1 suggests that this allows her to independently form an example sentence and thus use English for associative purposes, by associating *eschew* with the Swedish word for cashew nuts ('cashewnötter'). Next, I turn to Linnéa's immediate and delayed post-test answers juxtaposed in Table 9.6.

Table 9.6

Linnéa's written answers on tests covering the TW eschew

	Immediate post-test	Delayed post-test
Synonym	Public annount	no answer provided
Translation in English or any other language	otista bort, avisa	no answer provided
Explanation in English or any other language	Det botyder att raken nägen/näget	no answer provided
Example sentence including the TW	I got rachaved by my family	no answer provided
Word association	cachew	cascher
Multiple choice	 (a) It is an eschew. (b) It eschewed. (c) It is very eschew. 	no answer provided

In Table 9.6, seeing that *eschew* means to 'deliberately avoid', the word meaning recall showcased in the immediate post-test is approximate rather than completely accurate, as evidenced by the provided synonym 'push away' and the approximate Swedish translation equivalents 'stöta bort' ('to push away') and 'avvisa' ('to reject'). Linnéa nevertheless demonstrates form recognition knowledge in both the immediate and delayed post-test, as she is able to associate the TW with a different word. Although the data does not reveal how Linnéa would have performed had she *not* been allowed to demonstrate her TW knowledge in Swedish, the use of Swedish as a resource in Table 9.6 highlights the value of maximising students' chances of demonstrating their knowledge by means of tests informed by pedagogical translanguaging. I now turn to Sahar and the introductory information in Table 9.7.

Sahar

Table 9.7

Introductory information about Sahar

Language background	Expected CEFR-level	Student interview length	SRI length	TWs from SRI
Simultaneous multilingual	B2.1	33 minutes	6 minutes	atypical, eschew, heterogeneity

Born in Denmark with parents from Pakistan, Sahar moved to Sweden with her family at an early age (1–2 years). In her language background questionnaire and interview, Sahar identifies Urdu as her heritage language used in the home domain. In her questionnaire, she reports learning Swedish, English, and Urdu simultaneously from a young age (1–2 years). When asked to self-report her language repertoire (strongest language first), Sahar lists Swedish first. In her interview, Sahar notes that English is "definitely number one" ('definitivt nummer ett') for her. This highlights the fluid nature of Sahar's language repertoire, illustrated in her language portrait in Figure 9.3 below.





Sahar declares that she frequently translanguages at home with her family. Yet, the QCA of Sahar's interview suggests a theme labelled *Multilingualism and translanguaging as a disruption for language development*. First, when asked whether knowing many languages is an asset, Sahar says:

Swedish original	English translation (mine)
Elin: Är det någonting bra att kunna så här många språk som du kan?	Elin: Is it a good thing to know as many languages as you know?
Sahar: Jag skulle säga nej. Jag såg det som en positiv grej innan, men jag tycker att det blir lite för mycket att hålla koll på. För om jag inte övar så mycket på hur min flow är i arabiska så blir jag inte bättre på det heller. Samma med Punjabi. Jag lyssnar på folk men jag övar inte på att själv tala det varje dag []. Och sen så är det också [så] att jag hackar väldigt mycket med språk. Jag har blivit bättre, men jag gör det fortfarande. Så det kan vara lite irriterande.	Sahar: I would say no. I saw it as a positive thing before, but I think it's a bit too much to keep a check on. Because If I don't practice that much on how my flow is in Arabic I don't get better at it either. Same with Punjabi. I listen to people, but I don't practice speaking it every day. [] And then it's also [the case] that I jerk [literal translation] very much with languages. I've gotten better but I still do it. So it can be a little bit annoying.

Excerpt 9.2 suggests that Sahar sees her multilingualism as a disruption for developing each language in her repertoire. She expresses a need to focus on one language at a time (e.g., first Arabic and then Punjabi), and thus conceptualises her multilingualism as additive. Accordingly, knowing many languages can impede the development of each language in her view. The *Multilingualism and translanguaging as a disruption for language development* theme is also evident in Excerpt 9.3, where Sahar is asked about exclusive target language use during English lessons:

Excerpt 9.3

Swedish original	English translation (mine)
Elin: [N]är du har lektion på engelska vill du då att alla bara ska prata engelska?	Elin: [W]hen you have a lesson in English, do you then want everyone to just speak English?
Sahar: Ja, jag tycker det är viktigt om man ska ha en consistensy i språket. Så om man är som jag och blandar lite engelska när [man] snackar svenska Det ska inte vara så egentligen, men Så [för att] det ska undvikas så tycker jag att man borde ha en flow.	Sahar: Yes, I think it's important if one is to have a consistency in the language. So if one is like me and mixes a bit of English when [one] speaks Swedish. It's not really supposed to be like that but So [for that to] be avoided I think one should have a flow.
Elin: Mm. Varför ska man undvika det, tycker du, att blanda [språk]?	Elin: Mm. Why should one avoid that, you think, to mix [languages]?
Sahar: Jag tycker man blir starkare som talare om man om man kan lära sig hantera när man ska använda olika språk och hur man ska göra det.	Sahar: I think you get stronger as a speaker if you learn to handle when you are supposed to use different languages and how you should do it.

In Excerpt 9.3 Sahar translanguages whilst also being hesitant to translanguage, as she conceptualises mixing of English and Swedish as something to be "avoided" ('undvikas') for the benefit of a monolingual "flow" in the classroom. Thus, one interpretation of Excerpt 9.3 is that it further highlights Sahar's additive conceptualisation of her multilingualism and shows that translanguaging is indexed

with ideology (a language-related understanding, belief and/or expectation) for Sahar. Sahar's preference for monolingual practices is also reflected in her task work, to which I turn next.

In Study 2, the teacher collaborator Tove described Sahar as particularly positive towards intentional vocabulary learning. When interviewed, Sahar pointed out that she indeed had "one of these little obsessions when it comes to learning new vocabularies in [her] free time" ('en liten sån här obsession med att lära mig nya vocabularies på min fritid'). With this in mind, Excerpt 9.4, displays Sahar's recall of learning the TW *eschew*. During the SRI, the task sheet from Figure 9.4 below was used as a prompt. Sahar did not know *eschew* prior to the task work, as corroborated by her pre-test score (see Table 9.4) and the self-reported prior knowledge of *eschew* from Figure 9.4.



Figure 9.4

Sahar's task sheet with the TW eschew

Excerpt 9.4

Swedish original

English translation (mine)

Elin: Nästa ord är eschew. Hur tänkte du här?

Sahar: Jag använde vocabulary.com här, och jag fyllde i synonymerna 'avoid', 'shun', 'escape', som är väldigt nära eschew. Och som explanation har jag skrivit ' If you eschew something you deliberately avoid it'. Jag tycker att den meningen var väldigt viktig för att jag skulle komma ihåg. Alltså 'deliberately', det lägger [till] en helt annan mening [betydelse]. Och som jag tänkte här var att om jag förklarar det, då är det enklare för mig att förstå example sentences som dom beskriver i vocabulary.com. Och här, meningen var inte att jag skulle fylla i den, men jag kände att det blev tydligare om gjorde det. And this word makes me think about the word give up. Give up something, så 'avoid'. Det är inte [en] synonym, men jag associerar det också så.

Elin: The next word is *eschew*. How did you think here? [Literal translation].

Sahar: I used vocabulary.com here, and I filled in the synonyms 'avoid', 'shun', 'escape', that are very close to eschew. And as an explanation I've written 'If you eschew something you deliberately avoid it'. I thought that sentence was very important in order for me to remember. Like 'deliberately', it adds a whole other meaning. And what I thought here was that If I explain it then it's easier for me to understand the example sentences that they describe in vocabulary.com. And here, the intention was not for me to fill that in, but I felt like it got clearer if I did. And this word makes me think about the word 'give up'. Give up something, so avoid. It's not [a] synonym, but I associate it like that too.

In Excerpt 9.4, Sahar first recalls retrieving TW synonyms from the website vocabulary.com, allowing her to use English for initial understanding. Later in the SRI, Sahar declares that the website (vocabulary.com) is her "source" ('källa') from which she retrieves English TW information such as the explanation of *eschew* from Excerpt 9.4. She recalls using this TW information to learn that eschew means 'to deliberately avoid'. Finally, she recalls using English for associative purposes by associating *eschew* with 'give up'. Table 9.8 juxtaposes Sahar's immediate and delayed post-test answers regarding the TW *eschew*.

Table 9.8 Sahar's written answer	Table 9.8 Sahar's written answers on tests covering the TW eschew	
	Immediate post-test	Delayed post-test
Synonym	Ignore	Avord
Translation in English or any other language	Ignorera	Ignorera
Explanation in English or any other language	To eschew sometring muans that you deliberately chose to forme sometring.	If you estrew something, you delievedely grave it.
Example sentence including the TW	I might have to earned this meeting. The truth is that I have up prepared at all	I am gang to escrew the meching with my lass pecande. I harbert prepared anythony.
Word association	"Throw" (an action/thought in the bin)	"Ignor"

191

 (a) It is an eschew. (b) It eschewed. (c) It is very eschew. 	
Multiple choice (a) It is an eschew. (b) It eschewed. (c) It is very eschew.	

Table 9.8 suggests that completing Task Version 2 of the word-focused task facilitated Sahar's intentional learning of the TW eschew. Sahar displays precise meaning recall knowledge of the TW, as she points to the deliberateness intrinsic to the meaning of eschew both in the immediate and delayed post-test. She demonstrates form recognition knowledge in that she can provide a word association in the form of a different word that the TW makes her think of. The Swedish the translation was approximate ('ignorera' instead of 'undvika'), and the multiple-choice item from the immediate post-test was incorrect. In the multiple-choice test item, Sahar treated *eschew* as a noun in the immediate post-test, but correctly as a verb in the delayed post-test. The next participating student in focus is Rawda. Table 9.9 displays introductory information about her.

Rawda

Table 9.9

Introductory information about Rawda

Language background	Expected CEFR level	Student interview length	SRI length	TWs from SRI
Sequential multilingual	B1.2	26 minutes	13 minutes	atypical, eschew, solicitous

Rawda was born in Syria and moved to Turkey at the age of five. She then left Turkey for Sweden together with her family at the age of 14. Figure 9.5 displays Rawda's language portrait.





Symbolised by a red heart in the portrait, Turkish is indexed with affective value for Rawda, as she repeats twice that she likes Turkish "very much" ('väldigt mycket'). Rawda places English in the head, as she reports thinking in English to a large extent. Arabic (in blue) and Swedish (in yellow) are placed in the arms to signal utility. Rawda is keen on learning Chinese and Korean and reports knowing a few words in both languages. They are placed in the legs and marked in her favourite colours (pink and purple, respectively).

In Study 2, Rawda was the only participating student who visibly used Arabic to complete the word-focused task. Questionnaire data revealed that Arabic was her selfreported L1 and strongest language. In the questionnaire, Arabic was described by Rawda as the most important language in her repertoire. Rawda also described Arabic as her "mother tongue" ('modersmål') (i.e., heritage language), and as a language used in the family domain. In Rawda's student interview, the utility aspect constitutes a major difference between Turkish on the one hand, and Arabic and Swedish, on the other hand. The QCA of Rawda's interview suggests a theme labelled Languages as *helpful.* This consists of two sub-themes, the first of which is *Arabic as a resource*. Unlike Turkish, Arabic is described by Rawda as a useful tool that she can "work with" ('jobba med'). Placing Arabic in one of the arms of the portrait, Rawda explicitly describes Arabic as helpful four times and specifies that it can help her "all the time" ('hela tiden') when talking "to others" and her "family specifically" ('när jag pratar med andra och mina familj specifikt'). The interview contains no such descriptions of Turkish. Swedish is described by Rawda as the language that "helps her the most now" ('hjälpa mig mest nu'), leading her to place Swedish in her strongest hand and arm. The second sub-theme is Swedish as a resource. This is not as prevalent in Rawda's interview as the sub-theme about Arabic, as she only refers to Swedish when describing her repertoire at the start of the interview.

Rawda's conceptualisation of Arabic as helpful is mirrored in a comment about intentional English vocabulary learning, as well as her word-focused task work discussed below. First, when asked which language(s) she prefers to have English vocabulary items translated into (if any), she says:

Excerpt 9.5

Swedish original	English translation (mine)
Elin: Vilket språk vill du ha orden översatta till []?	Elin: What language do you want to have the words translated into []?
Rawda: Mest [] arabiska, för jag kan faktiskt själv förklara till mig själv vad betyder det här ordet även om jag kan inte ordet på arabiska. Jag kan inte ordet, men jag kan [förstår] förklaringen till det, så jag kan själv förstå det liksom.	Rawda: Mostly [] Arabic because I can actually explain to myself what the word means even if I do not know the word in Arabic. I don't know the word, but I know [understand] the explanation of it, so I can, like, understand it myself.
Och [] min mamma är en arabiskalärare så hon kan arabiska väldigt mycket. [] Så hon kan förklara lätt mycket till mig. [] Hon hjälper till.	And [] my mum is an Arabic teacher, so she knows Arabic very well. [] So she can explain a lot of things easily for me. She helps.

Excerpt 9.5 sums up Rawda's self-reported perception of Arabic as a resource. The first half of the excerpt shows how Rawda uses Arabic to orchestrate her intentional learning of English words. The second half of Excerpt 9.5 suggests that she can receive scaffolding in Arabic from her mother when, for example, intentionally learning English vocabulary at home. Excerpt 9.5 also suggests that Rawda is proficient enough in Arabic to perceive it as useful for learning vocabulary. Next, Figure 9.6 displays Rawda's task sheet with the TW *atypical*.





In Figure 9.6, Rawda reports knowing the word atypical. Her recall of completing the task sheet is nevertheless interesting because it sheds light on the resources visibly used to complete the word-focused task. As mentioned in Chapter 4, it is also assumed that the participating students may learn previously unknown vocabulary knowledge aspects as a consequence of completing the word-focused task even if they report knowing a TW. The pre-test suggests partial knowledge of atypical (see Table 9.4). Rawda first recalls corroborating her knowledge of the TW using synonyms from a monolingual dictionary to "be more sure" ('vara mer säker'), thus visibly using Arabic for consolidation. Rawda then recalls retrieving a TW translation equivalent in Arabic "from her brain" ('från mitt hjärna') as it was "the only word that came [up]" ('den enda ordet som kom [upp]'), thus using Arabic to demonstrate TW knowledge. After this, she recalls drawing the barking (and thus atypical) cat from Figure 9.6 to further demonstrate her knowledge of *atypical*. Rawda also recalls associating the TW with a TV series and an encounter with a native English speaker outside of the classroom, thus using prior knowledge for association. Next, Table 9.8 displays Rawda's immediate and delayed post-test answers juxtaposed.

Table 9.10 Rawda's written a	Table 9.10 Rawda's written answers on tests covering the TW atypical	
	Immediate post-test	Delayed post-test
Synonym	non-typical	1011- typical
Translation in English or any other language	Avabic = cssls	Arabic - centration
Explanation in English or any other language	lt means that is not right, when something winsual happeus	It means that when something decsn't make sense or not rigth.
Example sentence including the TV	A lean eading gress is a atypical	H's atypical when a cut back like a dog.
Word association	LINUSU CI	Weather.
Multiple choice	a) It is an atypical. (b) It atypicaled. (c) It is very atypical.) $\#_{U_i}$, Oue	<u>a) It is an atypical.</u> (b) It atypicaled. (c) It is very atypical.

A native speaker of Arabic (with a total of 15 years of schooling in Syria) confirmed that the two translation equivalents provided in Table 9.10 were accurate. On the whole, the test results in Table 9.10 hence suggest Rawda can demonstrate form recognition knowledge and meaning recall knowledge of *atypical*, even though the explanations are partly rather than completely accurate, and the multiple-choice answer from the delayed post-test is incorrect. Table 9.10 highlights the value of pedagogical translanguaging, as the Arabic translation equivalents allow Rawda to demonstrate aspects of her knowledge which she may not have been able to show in an exclusively monolingual test format. Next, I turn to Sofia and the introductory information about her Table 9.11 below.

Sofia

Table 9.11

Introductory information about Sofia

Language background	Expected CEFR- level	Student interview length	SRI length	TWs from SRI
Sequential multilingual	A1	13 minutes	5 minutes	cellar, busy, house

Sofia moved to Sweden from Peru at the age of 12, and states in her interview that she started learning English two years ago. Sofia's language portrait is shown in Figure 9.7





Sofia places Spanish in the head of her language portrait and refers to it twice as "her language" ('mitt språk') that she "knows a hundred per cent" ('kan [till] hundra procent'). She describes her Swedish skills as "not so good, but better than [her] English" ('inte så bra, men bättre än [min] engelska') and places Swedish in the chest of the portrait (in blue). When interviewed, Sofia reports knowing "only a little, little bit" ('lite, lite bara') of Italian marked in purple in the portrait. English is placed in the feet (in red). She also declares that her English skills (marked in red in. the portrait) are limited to "words only" ('bara ord') and that writing in English is difficult. The abovementioned self-reported limited English proficiency makes up a theme in Sofia's interview. Sofia stresses that she "does not know much English" ('kan inte mycket engelska') and attributes this to the status of English in Peru. In her own words, Sofia did " not practice English in her country" ('inte träna engelska i min land') because "in Peru you do not need English. Everyone just speaks Spanish" ('I Peru du behöver inte engelska. Alla bara pratar spanska'). When asked about her extramural English exposure, Sofia says that although she occasionally watches films or TV series in English, she primarily encounters English during English lessons with her teacher Hillevi ('i lektion [...] med Hillevi').

Another theme in Sofia's interview is *Translanguaging for English learning*. The theme consists of two sub-themes, the first of which is *English-Swedish translanguaging in the classroom*. Sofia declares that although she appreciates exclusive target language use during her English lessons, "mixing English [and] Swedish is also good" ('det är bra också om vi blanda svenska [och] engelska'). She also reports (1) "mixing Spanish [and] English" ('blanda spanska [och] engelska') when planning her English writing and (2) translating new English words into Spanish using Google translate when reading texts in English. Reversely, she translates Spanish words into English when looking for specific vocabulary to use orally or in writing. This all makes *English-Spanish translanguaging for orchestrating individual learning a second sub-theme*. The *Translanguaging for English learning* theme is reflected in Sofia's word-focused task work and subsequent vocabulary tests, to which I turn next.

	OBSI: Fyll i den information som <u>du t</u> ycker skulle hjälpa <u>dig att</u> lära dig orden om du skulle lära dig dem. Skriv så mycket du behöver för att lära dig orden ©	Illustration:	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s): hengo vnuchas cosas que bac estay ocupado.	This word makes me think about the word Please also write which language the word is in	id det här ordet (skriv även vilket språk du slog upp ordet på) □ Nej
Ord: <u>busy</u> Jag börjar jobba med ordet klockan (skriv tiden här): □ Jag kan inte det här ordet BS Sett det, känner inte till dess betydelse □ Jag (tror att jag) kan det här ordet English synonym(s)			CUANDO UNU PORSONA HIPNO TOSUR POR hocor	Try to be as specific as you can here	Jag slutade jobba med ordet klockan (skriv tiden här): <u>そ・ひ</u> ら Jag använde en ordlista eller något annat hjälpmedel när jag jobbade med det här ordet (skriv även vilket språk du slog upp ordet på) 図 Ja, jag använde <u>のいまやや かいかも</u> で

Figure 9.8 Sofia's task sheet with the TW busy

Figure 9.8 displays how Sofia engaged with the TW *busy* by visibly using Spanish to complete Task Version 2. She visibly uses Swedish by providing TW translation equivalent 'upptagen'. It appears that at least some of this TW information is from Google translate ('google translet'), as indicated at the bottom of the task sheet. Excerpt 9.6 displays Sofia's recall of learning the word *busy*.

Excerpt 9.6

Swedish original	English translation (mine)
Elin: Sen undrar jag om ordet <i>busy.</i> Hur tänkte du när du jobbade med det? Kommer du ihåg vad du gjorde då?	Elin: Next, I wonder about the word <i>busy</i> . How did you think when you worked with it? [Literal translation]. Do you remember what you did then?
Sofia: Tog Google translate och skriver [en] mening.	Sofia: Took Google translate and write [a] sentence.
Elin: Okej, så du började med att översätta? Sofia: Mm.	Elin: Okay, so you started by translating?
Elin: Med hjälp av Google translate här på översättningen, eller?	Sofia: Mm.
Sofia: Ja.	Elin: With the help of Google translate here on the translation, or?
E: Ja. Och sen när du skulle förklara?	Sofia: Yes.
Sofia: Spanska. Elin: Ja. Gjorde du det med hjälp av Google eller själv eller hur?	Elin. Yes. And then when you were going to explain?
	Sofia: Spanish.
Sofia: Nej, bara jag.	Elin: Yes. Did you do that using Google or yourself or how?
	Sofia: No, just me.

Sofia found the SRI challenging, as the five-minute interview contains six instances of her asking for clarification. This led me to ask her questions. This is warned against in the literature on SRIs but was deemed appropriate from an ethical perspective to avoid any unnecessary pressure. Excerpt 9.6 should thus be interpreted with caution. That said, it suggests that Sofia used Spanish for initial understanding by retrieving Spanish TW information from Google translate. Then she recalls explaining the word independently in Spanish, suggesting that she used Spanish to demonstrate the TW knowledge gained through translating. I now turn to Sofia's immediate and delayed post-tests results regarding the TW *busy*.

Targeted word	Immediate post-test	Delayed post-test
knowledge aspect	Jay have into dema and	
Synonym Translation in English or any other language	no answer provided	no answer provided sv Upptage - ocupada
Explanation in English or any other language	no answer provided	När göra mänga saker
Example sentence including the TW	no answer provided	Now i'm busy.
Word association Multiple choice	no answer provided no answer provided	no answer provided Exempel: (a) It is a busy. (b) It busied. (c) It is very busy.

203

Table 9.12 shows that Sofia did not demonstrate any knowledge of the TW *busy* in the immediate post-test. Instead, she wrote a comment specifying that she did "not know this word" ('kan inte denna ord'). In the delayed post-test, Sofia nonetheless demonstrates meaning recall through Swedish and Spanish translation equivalents, and an explanation in Swedish. A native speaker confirmed that the Spanish translation was correct. Thus, Table 9.9 showcases affordances of pedagogical translanguaging in that the visible use of Spanish and Swedish allows Sofia to show vocabulary knowledge which she may not have been able to demonstrate using only English.

9.5 Discussion

The following discussion will be structured around the research questions put forward in Sub-section 9.2.

9.5.1 RQ1

The first research question addressed in this study (RQ1) covers the resources visibly used by the participating students to complete Task Version 2. The QCA of the SRIs showed that the participating students visibly used linguistic resources (English, Swedish, Arabic, Spanish, Thai) and non-linguistic resources (TW illustrations) complete Task Version 2. They also visibly used prior knowledge in the form of references to moments when the TW has been heard or seen before. Prior knowledge is mediated through linguistic resources (Blommaert, 2010; Galante, 2024). The participating students recalled using these resources to gain an initial understanding of the TWs, and/or consolidate, associate, or demonstrate TW knowledge. Group 1 (expected CEFR-level B1.2–B2) visibly used English to a larger extent than Group 2 (expected CEFR-level A1). One participating student in Group 1 (Rawda) visibly used Arabic to complete Task Version 2. This was also her self-reported L1 and strongest language. Group 2 visibly used languages other than English and Swedish more frequently than Group 1. In Group 2, the other languages visibly used (Arabic, Spanish, and Thai), were these participating students' self-reported L1s and strongest languages. Taken together, these findings suggest that the participating students completed Task Version 2 by visibly using the languages they were the most proficient in. This tallies with Grosjean's (2008) Language Mode theory. It stipulates that the degree to which a language is activated in the mental lexicon (e.g., when engaging in intentional vocabulary learning) depends on multiple factors, including proficiency.

Further, some participating students self-reported being relatively proficient in languages which they did not visibly use to complete Task Version 2. For example, Rawda did not visibly use Turkish to complete Task Version 2. Yet, when asked selfreport her language repertoire (strongest language first), Rawda lists Turkish after Arabic followed by Swedish and English. Sahar did not visibly use Urdu, even though she reported learning English, Swedish, and Urdu simultaneously from a young age (1 -2 years), and referred to Urdu as a heritage language used in the family domain. The reason why Rawda and Sahar did not visibly use Turkish and Urdu to complete Task Version 2 may be attributed to the perceived utility of the respective languages. Although Rawda reported being proficient in Turkish, it was primarily indexed with affective value rather than utility, as she liked Turkish lot, but did not report using it at present. In contrast, Arabic (which she visibly used to complete the word-focused task) was conceptualised as a resource, both for orchestrating her own intentional vocabulary learning, and when receiving scaffolding from her mother, who is an Arabic teacher. Sahar reported being proficient in Urdu, but did not seem to perceive it as a resource for intentionally learning English vocabulary, as she expressed a hesitation towards translanguaging and a preference for monolingual practices. Taken together, these findings suggest that the participating students visibly used the linguistic resources they perceived as the most useful for completing Task Version 2. This also agrees with Grosjean's (2008) Language Mode theory, which assumes that one's perception of a language part of one's repertoire affects the degree to which it is activated in the mental lexicon. The languages are never completely deactivated, however, as the different languages in the multilingual mental lexicon compete for attention during L2 processing. This is true both for beginner-level and more advanced learners (Conklin et al., 2016).

The above-mentioned findings are important with regard to implementing pedagogical translanguaging in the classroom in general and using the word-focused task in particular. They highlight that students do not automatically see their entire language repertoires as a resource for language learning in the classroom. This tallies with previous studies on pedagogical translanguaging and writing (Rodrick Beiler, 2021b; Wedin, 2017) where the participating students did not necessarily have a resource orientation towards their language repertoires. As pointed out by Rindal (2024), the issue of language choices made in language classrooms is complex and shaped by numerous factors, including personal beliefs about language use. The present study also echoes Byrnes (2020) who stresses the importance of context sensitivity with regard to pedagogical translanguaging. Accordingly, the word-focused task was, as mentioned, designed to be individualizable (i.e., possible to complete by different students in different ways). The fact that the word-focused task is individualizable was illustrated in the present study, since it provides in-depth descriptions of four

individuals with different multilingual backgrounds and expected proficiency levels in English (ranging from CEFR level A1 to B2.1) who all completed the word-focused task in unique ways. The study also shows how the word-focused task facilitated these participating students' intentional vocabulary learning of targeted English vocabulary, albeit to varying degrees. I will now discuss the observed learning of the TWs in more detail.

9.5.2 RQ2

The second research question (RQ2) deals with the effect of completing Task Version 2 on the participating students' form recognition knowledge and meaning recall knowledge of a small set of pre- and self-selected TWs. The overview of the participating students' vocabulary test scores in Table 9.4 suggests that the observed learning of the TWs was moderate. For example, four out of the six participating students in Group 1 who did not showcase knowledge of the TW eschew prior to completing Task Version 2 demonstrated partial knowledge on the immediate and/or delayed post-test. This is in accordance with Gyllstad et al., (2023) whose intentional vocabulary learning intervention (carried out in multilingual EFL classrooms over a series of lessons) also resulted in moderate observed vocabulary learning gains. A possible explanation for the gains reported here is that the participating students engaged in massed learning rather than spaced learning with systematic repetition. Webb and Nation (2017) stress that multiple repetitions (approximately seven) are needed for words to be learned intentionally. They also stress the learner variability, and that some words can be learned after two encounters and other words may not be learned even after 20 exposures.

On the other hand, the present study nevertheless points to observed learning of the targeted vocabulary. For example, Linnéa did not know the TW eschew prior to completing Task Version 2, as corroborated by (1) her SRI, (2) her self-reported prior knowledge on the task sheet and (3) her pre-test score (0 points, see Table 9.4). After completing Task Version 2, she demonstrated approximate meaning recall knowledge in her immediate post-test and form recognition knowledge in the immediate and delayed post-tests. This agrees with Webb et al. (2020) who highlight that repeated retrieval is needed for intentional vocabulary learning gains not to diminish with time. The findings also have implications for vocabulary testing and usefulness of the word-focused task. Specifically, they tally with Gyllstad and Schmitt (2019), who stress the importance of purpose-specific vocabulary tests allowing students to demonstrate partial knowledge. The findings also show that Task Version 2 can be used to facilitate intentional vocabulary learning, although spaced repetition and repeated TW encounters and retrieval are necessary to maximize the usefulness of the task. Lastly, the

test formats allowed the participating students to demonstrate TW knowledge in any language(s). Rawda, Linnéa, and Sofia all opted for this. Native speakers of the languages visibly used in the tests confirmed that the demonstrated knowledge was partially or completely correct. Although there are no data to reveal how they would have performed had they only been allowed to use English, this corroborates previous pedagogical translanguaging research (e.g., Gunnarsson, 2019; Velasco & García, 2014) pointing to the value of letting students use their entire language repertoires to orchestrate and/or demonstrate learning.

9.5.3 Limitations

SRIs are typically a new experience for most participants in any study (Gass & Mackey, 2017). Ideally, the participating students should therefore have practiced this before the actual data collection, as a means to maximize the quality of the recalls (Snoder, 2016). That said, the SRIs were nevertheless considered satisfactory, as the participating students did what they were instructed to do. It is possible that asking the participating students what instead of how they were thinking might have optimised the chances of accessing more retrievable recalls instead of explanations, although the study shows that the outcomes of the SRIs can be considered successful irrespective of this potential change to the instructions. Allowing the participating students to recall in a language of their choice might have allowed them to express themselves more freely. On the other hand, having an interpreter present also could have made the SRIs unnecessarily formal (Gass & Mackey, 2017). This would have been problematic from an ethical perspective, as the participating students needed to feel as comfortable as possible (Etikprövningsmyndigheten, 2023). Thus, conducting all the SRIs in Swedish (and clarifying the instructions when needed) was ultimately deemed the most suitable alternative.

9.6 Taking stock of Study 3

The participating students visibly used linguistic and non-linguistic resources for initiating, consolidating, associating, and/or demonstrating TW knowledge. The resources visibly used varied depending on the participating students' expected CEFR-levels. Group 1 (expected CEFR-level B1.2–B2.1) visibly used English to a larger extent than Group 2 (expected CEFR-level A1), whereas the participating students in Group 2 visibly used languages other than English and Swedish more than the participating students in Group 1. The other languages visibly used (Arabic, Spanish, and Thai) were

the participating students' self-reported L1s and strongest languages. The study has also shed light on four specific participating students: Linnéa, Sahar, Rawda, and Sofia. The QCA of their SRIs and the student interviews combined suggest that they visibly used the languages they perceived as useful for completing Task Version 2. The observed learning of the TWs was moderate, although the study shows that completing Task Version 2 may facilitate intentional learning of targeted English vocabulary. Next, Study 4 (Chapter 10) focuses on the teacher collaborators' perceptions and beliefs.

Study 4: Teacher collaborators' perceptions and beliefs

10.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I explore the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task and their beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general. The rationale for this research focus is fourfold. First, given their teaching experience coupled with their familiarity with the participating students, their perspectives warrant attention and documentation. For one, their perceptions may provide information that is useful if the task were to be used on a larger scale. Second, this thesis project positions the teacher collaborators as "knowledge generators" (Cummins, 2021a, p. 313). It is assumed that all educators possess expertise, including situated expertise, which is worth exploring, since it has accumulated over years in the profession, and differs from my research expertise (see also Källkvist et al., 2024). Third, shedding light on the teacher collaborators' perceptions and beliefs enables other educators reading this thesis to reflect on their own practices, which, in turn, may be informative and benefit their teaching. Fourth, the self-reported teacher perceptions and beliefs may have implications for researchers and teacher educators interested in vocabulary learning (see D. Bergström et al., 2022). This study is also a response to the literature review in Chapter 3, which suggests a paucity of locally situated research that centres on concrete vocabulary learning tasks aimed at multilingual EFL students and consider teachers' perceptions (however, see Miller, 2009; Nordlund & Rydström, 2024). The number of studies exploring teacher beliefs about intentional (and incidental) vocabulary learning more generally has grown over the past decade (Chung & Fisher, 2022). However, most of the existing research was conducted in Asia, which suggests a need to focus on contexts in other parts of the world (see López-Barrios et al., 2021).

Below, I begin by mentioning the preliminaries of the study, which is followed by a section devoted to the aim and research questions. I then turn to the methodology, followed by the results. I conclude by chapter by taking stock of the main results.

10.2 Preliminaries

What follows is an interview study featuring four of the teacher collaborators. The findings are generated through a reflexive thematic analysis (RTA) because the subjectivity inherent to this analytical method agrees with the research focus (Braun & Clarke, 2019). The analysis centres on three main themes from the entire data set, rather than separate sub-headings corresponding to each individual teacher collaborator. There are two reasons for this: (1) It facilitates an exploration of all the teacher collaborators' perceptions and beliefs combined, which, in turn, aligns with RTA as a method; (2) This study does not seek to evaluate each teacher collaborator's individual practices or explicitly compare the teacher collaborators with each other because that would contradict the purpose of RTAs (Braun & Clarke, 2021a).

10.3 Aim and research questions

The aim of Study 4 is to bring in the teacher perspective on the usefulness of the word-focused task for students in the teacher collaborators' respective classrooms by illuminating their perceptions of the word-focused task in particular, and their beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general. The following research question (RQ) will be addressed:.

• *RQ*1: What are the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task, and their beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general?

*RQ*1 above corresponds to the third overarching research question which the thesis project addresses. Next, I turn to the methodological considerations specific to the study reported in this chapter.

10.4 Method

This sub-section starts with an overview of the participants (i.e., the teacher collaborators). This is followed by an outline of the implementation procedures and the analytical process adhered to.

10.4.1 Participants

Table 10.1

Teacher collaborator overview

Pseudonym	Age	Gender	Teaching experience in years	Subjects taught	Students from Studies 1–3	Interview length
Tove	39	Female	12	English and Swedish	Class 1	36 minutes
Gabriel	42	Male	15	English and Italian	Class 3	44 minutes
Nora	32	Female	6	English and Civics	Class 4	56 minutes
Hillevi	54	Female	14	English, Japanese and Civics	Class 5	36 minutes

The teacher collaborators from Table 10.1 were all qualified in-service teachers of the upper-secondary school English (English 5–7, expected CEFR-levels B1.2–B2.2). They worked at four different upper-secondary schools. Hillevi participated in her capacity as an LIP teacher teaching beginner-level learners but also referred to her experience of teaching English 5–7. All the teacher collaborators were L1 speakers of Swedish.

10.4.2 Procedures

The interviews with the teacher collaborators were semi-structured, recorded, and guided by an interview guide. With permission, I piloted an adapted version of the interview guide from Källkvist et al., (2024) three times. In the piloted instrument, original questions about intentional vocabulary learning in general were kept, and questions about the word-focused task were added. The interview guide was revised after each pilot interview. The first two pilot interviews were longer than expected, and superfluous interview questions which were not directly relevant to the aim of this study were therefore deleted. After the final pilot interview guide (see Appendix 10) bore very little resemblance to that from Källkvist et al., (2024). The interview guide was semi-structured because this format allowed me to depart from the interview guide when necessary, whilst still adhering to a basic structure (Dörnyei, 2007).

As mentioned, two teacher collaborators (Gabriel and Petter) chose to withdraw from the thesis project for reasons that had nothing to do with the study. Gabriel was interviewed before our collaboration ended. Petter left the thesis project because he enrolled in professional development courses and therefore did not have time to be interviewed. Gabriel and Petter's withdrawals did not have any tangible effect on the thesis project since the research design was never dependent on individual teacher collaborators. As discussed in Chapter 5, the teacher collaborators were recruited through networking, and I approached more teachers than necessary for the study, as a means to ensure the redundancy needed. I did not know any of the teacher collaborators personally before our respective collaborations.

In the excerpts that follow, the Swedish terms *vokabulärövning* ('vocabulary exercise') or övning ('exercise') will be used to denote the word-focused task. In retrospect, I realise that vokabuläruppgift ('vocabulary task') or uppgift ('task') correspond more closely to the term 'word-focused task'. That said, the teacher collaborators presumably knew what I was referring to since they were familiar with the word-focused task. In the interview guide, both terms were used interchangeably (see Appendix 10). As mentioned, the suggestions in each of the seven sections of the word-focused task (e.g., drawing a TW illustration or providing a TW synonym) are not conceptualised as seven cognitive vocabulary learning strategies, but as seven kinds of visible resource use (see Blommaert, 2010; Galante, 2024; Grosjean, 2008) for gaining, consolidating, and/or demonstrating vocabulary knowledge. The reason is that strategic vocabulary learning involves memorisation (Gu, 2020), which is beyond the scope of this thesis project. The suggestions in the task sections were nevertheless referred to as vocabulary learning strategies in the classroom. Strategies was also the term used by the teacher collaborators, and it was thus deemed more student-friendly and accessible than 'visible resource use'. Accordingly, the term vocabulary learning strategy will be used in the present study as well.

10.4.3 Data analysis

As mentioned, RTA involves six recursive phases, namely: (1) familiarisation, (2) coding, (3) generating initial themes, (4) reviewing and developing themes, and (5) refining, defining and naming themes, and (6) writing up the RTA (Braun & Clarke, 2021a, p. 39). These are also the steps I took when analysing the teacher interviews. The interview transcripts were uploaded to the data analysis software NVivo, which allowed me to code the interviews and construct the initial themes after familiarising myself with the data. Because the software enables users to delete, edit and/or re-name themes, I could also review and develop the final themes, before refining, pinpointing, and labelling them. As noted by Braun et al. (2022), the six phases should be viewed as

an analytical starting point or roadmap rather than static procedures. Braun et al. (2022) warn against simply stating that the six steps were followed and describing themes as emerging as a result of the procedure. Instead, they recommend accounting for the development of the themes in a transparent manner by commenting on potential sub-themes, and pinpointing where in the analytical process the respective themes were constructed. Such reflexive descriptions are not always linear. For example, they may include accounts of how what was initially considered a main theme ended up being presented as a sub-theme or vice versa (in particular, see Braun et al., 2022 pp. 432–433). According to Braun and Clarke (2019), the inherently qualitative nature of RTA makes it irrelevant to quantify the data, whereas summarising the themes and sub-themes in a figure is appropriate. I considered all of these recommendations when conducting my RTA of the teacher interviews, to which I now turn.

10.5 Results

This sub-section contains my RTA of the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task in particular, and beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general. The RTA encompasses three main themes: (1) *Intentional vocabulary learning as peripheral*, (2) *Affordances and limitations of the word-focused task*, and (3) *Ideas for future development of the task*. For ease of reference, Themes 1–3 and their related sub-themes are displayed in Figure 10.1.



Figure 10.1 Overview of the RTA
In Figure 10.1, Themes 1–3 are presented in the above-mentioned order because Theme 1 was the most prevalent theme, followed by Theme 2 and Theme 3, respectively. The account of Theme 1 below will therefore be longer than that of Themes 2–3. Theme 1 encompasses beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general, and Themes 2–3 refer to the word-focused task in particular. I will argue that Themes 1–3 all have implications for future large-scale use of the word-focused task

Theme 1: Intentional vocabulary learning as peripheral

Primarily reporting vocabulary learning tasks related to word formation and linking words, the teacher collaborators all note the value of intentional vocabulary learning. The importance of scaffolding students' intentional vocabulary learning is highlighted, and Hillevi in particular points out that words should be actively noted down in order to be learned. Tove brings up her *Words of the Week* task sheet displayed in Study 2. As mentioned, this is an adaptation of the word-focused task, which Tove adjusted, used, and evaluated independently. *Words of the Week* is, as the name suggests, intended to be a re-occurring intentional vocabulary learning task.

Yet, the first theme displays an understanding of intentional vocabulary learning as a secondary rather than primary and thought-out activity in its own right. Theme 1 was first identified during the transcription stage. When coding, it was further refined and developed into two sub-themes, as the belief that intentional vocabulary learning is peripheral became evident both on the individual level and the group level.

The first sub-theme of Theme 1 is Intentional vocabulary learning as peripheral on the individual level. Here, Hillevi reports telling her students that repetition is a prerequisite for intentional vocabulary learning, and that a word should be encountered "around seven times" ('någonstans [runt] sju gånger") in order to be learned. However, Hillevi does not describe any testing or actual follow-up of any intentional vocabulary learning opportunities. Tove also does not mention how the Words of the Week task work is examined. Instead, she describes the task work as a means to "develop general language proficiency" ('allmänt språkutvecklande'), and as a task that does not explicitly count towards the final grade. Hillevi and Tove's lack of follow-up of intentional vocabulary learning suggests that it does not play a major role in the teaching, especially since it does not appear to be graded or tested. The apparent lack of vocabulary tests is worth stressing, as providing intentional vocabulary learning opportunities without assessing the TWs can foster a negative washback effect, where vocabulary is seen as less important than whatever is being tested. Reversely, although vocabulary tests may lead to an unproductive study-for-the-test-mentality, they can also create a positive washback effect, where the tests help signal that vocabulary is important, and hence build a positive attitude towards learning new words (Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020).

Nora describes the mere testing of the TWs from Study 2 as a valuable learning opportunity for her students on a meta-level, as the testing per se sheds light on the importance of intentional vocabulary learning. Nora's comment implies that she does not usually focus on intentional vocabulary learning, as it is unlikely that something unmarked would have been described as a distinguished learning opportunity in this way. This all suggests that intentional vocabulary learning plays a peripheral role in these teacher collaborators' teaching. Indeed, Nora does not report using vocabulary tests herself and instead explains that she sometimes teaches the meaning of specific words over the course of a single lesson, leading students to forget the vocabulary in question. When asked whether she has a strategic approach to "vocabulary" ('ordkunskap') in general, she says:

Excerpt	1	0.1	
Lacerpe	•	•••	

Swedish original	English translation (mine)
Elin: Skulle du säga att du jobbar med ordkunskap på ett strategiskt sätt?	Elin: Would you say that you work with vocabulary in a strategic way?
Nora: Nej det gör jag nog inte. Jag skulle absolut kunna vara mer strategisk.	Nora: No, I probably do not. I could absolutely be more strategic.

It should be acknowledged that the word "strategic" ('strategisk') from Excerpt 10.1 can have multiple meanings, including 'planned', 'systematic', and 'principled'. The excerpt also seems to refer to intentional and incidental vocabulary learning in general, as "vocabulary" ('ordkunskap') is used in a generic sense. With this in mind, one interpretation of Excerpt 10.1 which encompasses all potential meanings of 'strategic' is that Nora does not have a specific thought-out approach to intentional (and incidental) vocabulary learning in the classroom but rather identifies this as a potential development area.

Nora, Hillevi and Gabriel all state that they do not spend a lot of lesson time on intentional vocabulary learning. For example, Gabriel declares that he does not necessarily concentrate on deep learning of specific words: "If we have a text, we might not work with all the words all the time and go in that deeply" ('[H]ar vi en text, så kan vi kanske inte jobbar med alla ord hela tiden och gå in så djupt'). Similarly, Nora describes a "less is more" approach to vocabulary, emphasising incidental rather than intentional vocabulary learning. She says that she "focuses on" ('fokuserar på') letting the students "read and listen and meet a lot [of input] and pick the words up that way" ('läsa och lyssna och möta mycket [input] och på det sättet fånga upp orden'). This outlook is elaborated on in Excerpt 10.3.

Both Hillevi and Gabriel cite lack of time as a reason not to focus extensively on intentional vocabulary learning during lessons. Hence, they both stress the students' own responsibility to engage in intentional vocabulary learning outside of the classroom by, for example, making "glossaries" ('gloslistor') with words from texts they have read in class. There is however no mention of how the students should engage in intentional vocabulary learning of the words from the glossaries at home or be tested on this vocabulary. Relatedly, when asked how they might use the word-focused task, Hillevi and Gabriel both propose spending lesson time on introducing different ways to engage in intentional vocabulary learning during two to three lessons at the beginning, middle, and/or end of the school year, respectively. During the rest of the academic year, they suggest using the word-focused task as homework rather than a primary in-class task, but they do not describe any potential modes of procedure in detail. Although they were not explicitly asked to do so, it was possible for the teacher collaborators to report such details, as the interview question was an open-ended question about how they would prefer to utilise the word-focused task. Thus, whilst surely acknowledging the importance of intentional vocabulary learning, it appears to be peripheral in that the teacher collaborators do not report any specific principled and structured approaches to how intentional vocabulary learning should be done neither in nor outside of the classroom.

The sub-theme Intentional vocabulary learning as peripheral on the individual level also encompasses utterances suggesting that the teacher collaborators prioritise what they refer to as communicatively oriented "content" ('innehåll') rather than "form" ('form'), which, in their words, encompasses grammar and vocabulary. More specifically, the teacher collaborators seem to prioritise incidental vocabulary learning as a by-product of meaning-focused activities rather than intentional vocabulary learning enabled through tasks with an explicit vocabulary focus. Thus, a more technical research term for "content" is *Focus on Form* (FonF), which is when attention is paid to linguistic elements during an activity. A technical research term for "form" is *Focus on Forms* (FonFs) which involves systematic attention to words or grammatical items (Laufer, 2005).

I noticed an emphasis on speaking- and writing tasks in the teacher collaborators' accounts of their own teaching already during the transcription phase. When refining the themes, I noted that Nora in particular foregrounds the kind of communicative and usage-based approach to language learning typically associated with CLT. For example, Nora lists the creation of "podcasts" ('podcasts'), "presentations" ('presentations'), "debate[s]" ('debatt[er]') and "election campaigns" ('valkampanjer'), as typical

examples of tasks from her teaching, which implies a focus on communication and language use. Seeing the focus on what the teacher collaborators call "content" (i.e. FonF) over what they refer to as "form" (i.e., FoFs) in all the teacher interviews, the idea of *Communication as central* was initially considered a separate main theme. However, when finalising the themes, I realised that rather than forming a separate theme, these utterances reinforce Theme 1 as a whole (see e.g., Excerpts 10.5a–b below) and thus do not form their own theme.

The *Intentional vocabulary learning as peripheral on the individual level* sub-theme is further illustrated Excerpt 10.2 below. Here, Nora responds to a question about using the word-focused task in different student groups.

Excerpt 10.2

Swedish original	English translation (mine)
Elin: Tror du att den här typen av övning [uppgift] passar bättre i vissa klasser än i andra?	Elin: Do you think this type of exercise [task] fits better in some classes than others?
Nora: Ja det tror jag. Det tror jag absolut. När man frågar elever vad dom vill lära sig så säger dom 'jag vill lära mig ord'. Men när man ger dom och det är samma med grammatik när man ger dom övningar på detta så tappar dom intresse väldigt snabbt.	Nora: Yes, I think so. I absolutely think so. When one asks students what they want to learn they say 'I want to learn words'. But when you give them and it's the same with grammar when you give them exercises on this they lose interest very quickly.
Elin: Mm.	Elin: Mm.
Nora: Det enda negativa jag kan se med övningen [uppgiften] är att den kanske inte alltid är stimulerande för alla elever på samma sätt som man hade gjort den till en Kahoot eller så. Det blir lätt liksom lite stelt kanske, möjligtvis, även om jag tyckte alternativen var jättebra.	Nora: The only negative thing I can see with the exercise [task] is that it's maybe not always stimulating for all students in the same way as if you had turned it into a Kahoot or something. It easily gets a bit stiff, possibly, even though I thought the options were great.

The focus on "stimulating" ('stimulerande') tasks exemplified in Excerpt 10.2 merits attention. According to my RTA, this is an exceptionally pervasive re-occurring feature

in Nora's interview, which I noted already when interviewing her. As implied in Excerpt 10.2 and Excerpt 10.8 combined, Nora appears to see meaning-focused tasks as "stimulating" and thus motivating. This is contrasted with more form-focused and repetitive lesson components such as intentional vocabulary learning, which she refers to as potentially "non-stimulating" ('ostimulerande') and thus less motivating. Rather than focusing on intentional vocabulary learning, Nora thus describes an outlook on (rather than a principled approach to) incidental vocabulary learning informed by her teacher training as well has her expertise accumulated over the course of her teaching career:

Excerpt 10.3

Swedish original	English translation (mine)
Elin: Hur lär man sig nya ord på engelska som elev enligt dig?	Elin: How do you learn new words in English as a student in your view?
Nora: Det här kanske låter som att jag är lat, men jag satsar mycket på input-inlärning. Att man lär sig av att översköljas av ett språk då plockar man upp det. Jag har blivit skolad in i den tanken på något sätt att man lär sig inte av att separera ord för mycket från en text, utan man lär sig av att se ett ord många gånger i många olika kontexter och till slut skapar hjärnan egna mönster som gör att man förstår ett ord.	Nora: This might sound like I am lazy, but I focus a lot on input-learning. That you learn from being immersed by a language and then you pick it up. I have been trained into that way of thinking somehow. You do not learn from separating words too much from a text, but you learn from seeing a word many times in different contexts, and in the end the brain creates its own patterns that makes you understand a word.

Excerpt 10.3 shows that Nora prioritises incidental vocabulary learning in meaningful contexts.

Despite the emphasis on communication and incidental vocabulary learning, intentional vocabulary learning is not ignored by the teacher collaborators. As shown in Figure 10.1, my RTA thus suggests a sub-theme related to the sub-theme of *Intentional vocabulary learning as peripheral on the individual level.* It is labelled *Intentional vocabulary learning positioned as nevertheless important.* The word 'positioned' is central, as the aforementioned focus on communication suggests that the

teacher collaborators do not necessarily prioritise intentional vocabulary learning in the classroom just because they position it as important during the interviews. Rather, it is possible that the interview per se made them reflect upon the importance of intentional vocabulary learning, which, then becomes visible in the interview data. A case in point exemplifying the Intentional vocabulary learning positioned as nevertheless important sub-theme is a comment uttered by Gabriel. He says: "I think form is important. Just as important as content, or even more important than content sometimes, even". ('Jag tycker form är viktigt. Lika viktigt som innehåll, eller viktigare än innehåll ibland, till och med'). He therefore mentions focusing on intentional vocabulary learning and vocabulary depth "occasionally" ('ibland') during lessons. Similarly, Tove describes how she, based on her "professional experience" ('yrkeserfarenhet') has incorporated an increased deliberate focus on "linguistic development" ('språkutveckling') into her English teaching. When invited to elaborate on what this means, she says:

Excerpt 10.4

Swedish original	English translation (mine)
Tove Yrkeserfarenheten säger också att jag behöver kanske gå i den här riktningen lite mer.	Tove: The professional experience also tells me that I might need to go in this direction a little bit more.
Elin: Och med den här riktningen menar du…?	Elin: And by this direction you mean?
Tove: Just det här med att ta in formen på ett tydligare sätt. Det här kan missförstås som att jag isolerar språket och det var inte så jag menade. Utan mer att det [form] tar lite större plats och att man inte bara uppehåller sig vid kultur och samhällsfrågor och så där och pratar. Utan att man försöker identifiera utvecklingsbehov och jobba lite mer tydligt med dom i [elev]gruppen.	Tove: This thing with incorporating form in a clearer way. This can be misunderstood as me isolating the language, and that's not what I meant. But more that it [form] takes up a bit more room and that you don't just focus on culture and societal issues and so on and talk. But that you try to identify needs for improvement and work with those a little bit more clearly in the [student]group.

In relation to the main theme of Intentional vocabulary learning as peripheral, the word choices in both Gabriel's comment and Excerpt 10.4 are important. Gabriel's occasional focus on intentional vocabulary learning and vocabulary depth and Tove's increased focus on form both imply that intentional vocabulary learning plays a rather peripheral role in their teaching, as it is difficult to envision a will or self-identified need to focus on something that is already central. Thus, it is possible that the teacher collaborators believe intentional vocabulary learning to be important in theory but do not prioritise it in practice. Rather, in light of the aforementioned themes and sub-themes of the RTA, it appears that the teacher collaborators position intentional vocabulary learning to be important for the interview reminds them of beliefs and practical examples that agree with the focus of the interview.

The second sub-theme related to Theme 1 operates on the group level and refers to groups of teacher training students and English teacher colleagues. Nora reports learning about "vocabulary" ('ordkunskap') when studying to become an English teacher. Her main take-aways of this are summarised in Excerpt 10.3 above. However, neither Tove nor Gabriel or Hillevi recall focusing explicitly on neither intentional nor incidental vocabulary learning during teacher training. The teacher collaborators also do not report any shared vocabulary learning policies in their respective "teams of English teacher colleagues" ('amneslag'). Instead, when asked what the teams typically discuss in meetings, Hillevi and Tove note the following:

Swedish original	English translation (mine)
Elin: Har ni någon strategi eller policy kring när det kommer till ordkunskap i ditt arbetslag [ämneslag]?	Elin: Do you have a strategy or policy when it comes to vocabulary knowledge in your team [of English teacher collagues]?
Hillevi: I [ämneslaget] engelska är det mycket angående hur man ska sätta betyg. [] Om uppsatsskrivande och texter []. Vi har hållit på en del med litteratur, men inte ordinlärning så mycket.	Hillevi: Within [the team of English teacher colleagues] it's a lot about how to grade [] And essay writing and texts []. We have been working a bit with literature, but not that much with vocabulary learning.

Excerpt 10.5a

Swedish original

Elin: Har ni någon strategi eller policy när det kommer till ordkunskap i ditt arbetslag [ämneslag] ? Pratar ni tillsammans någonting om hur elever bäst lär sig ord? [...]

Tove: I ämneslaget i engelska har vi nu i två år haft muntlig språkfärdighet som ett fokusområde. Där har vi pratat om betydelsen av linking words och hur man kan få in det i olika övningar [...] och se hur det blir bättre flyt och så där. Men vi har inte fokuserat på ordinlärning sedan jag började här i övrigt [...]

English translation (mine)

Elin: Do you have a strategy or policy when it comes to vocabulary in your team [of English teacher colleagues]? Do you ever talk about how students learn words the best? [...]

Tove: In the team of English teacher colleagues we've had oral proficiency as a focus area for two years now. There we've talked about the importance of linking words on how you can incorporate that into different exercises to see how the fluency improves and so on. But other than that we have not focused on vocabulary learning[...]

One interpretation of Excerpts 10.5a-b is that the teachers collegially deprioritise discussions about intentional vocabulary learning in favour of discussing oral and written proficiency. For example, the only mention of vocabulary learning in Excerpts 10.5a-b is a reference to linking words introduced to develop fluency. Relatedly, Gabriel explicitly notes "a hierarchy in language teaching regarding literature and form" ('en hierarki i språkundervisning vad gäller litteratur och form'). Gabriel stresses that the perceived hierarchy is a generalisation and underscores that he does not advocate it, which further reinforces his above-mentioned comment about the importance of form as well as the sub-theme of Intentional vocabulary learning positioned as nevertheless important. This is all unsurprising, seeing (1) the above-mentioned sub-theme of Intentional vocabulary learning as peripheral on the individual level and (2) the marginal role of vocabulary learning and focus on communication in the national-level educational policy documents (see Chapter 2). Assuming that the meeting time is limited, having discussions aligned with policy documents as to the content to be covered seems logical. Yet, together with Gabriel's comment and the reported lack of focus on vocabulary learning during teacher training, Excerpts 10.5a-b illuminate the second sub-theme labelled Intentional vocabulary learning as peripheral on the group level.

Theme 2: Affordances and limitations of the word-focused task

The word-focused invites students to complete the task sections *they* find useful for learning the TWs. The purpose of this particular task feature is to make the task individualizable (i.e., possible to complete by different students in different ways) and thus maximise student agency by letting students orchestrate their own learning. My RTA suggests that according to the teacher collaborators, the main affordances of the word-focused task are related to the individualizable task feature and/or the different task sections per se. The first sub-theme related to Theme 2 is therefore labelled *Appreciated individualizable task feature and common ground for intentional vocabulary learning*.

For Nora, the idea of "choosing a strategy" ('välja en strategi') appears to be the most "interesting" part of the word-focused task ('det intressanta'), as "the options" ('alternativen') were described as "great" ('jättebra') (see also Excerpt 10.2, where Nora repeats this a second time). According to Tove and Hillevi in particular, the individualizable task feature also makes the word-focused task widely applicable, in that it can be used by different individual students as they see fit. Notice, for instance, how Hillevi thinks dyslectic students might benefit from completing the word-focused task:

Excerpt 10.6

1	
Swedish original	English translation (mine)
Elin: Min vokabulärövning [uppgift] som vi har använt på SPRI, tror du att den passar bättre i vissa klasser än andra?	Elin: My vocabulary exercise [word- focused task] which we have used at the LIP, do you think it fits better in some classes than others?
Hillevi: Jag tänker att för dyslektiker skulle den nog vara jättebra, faktiskt. Elin: Mm. På vilket sätt då?	Hillevi: I'm thinking that for dyslectics it would probably be great, actually.
Hillevi: Det blir fler ingångar till ett ord. Att	Elin: Mm. In what way?
inte bara liksom se det med stavningen, för det blir ju så fokuserat på stavningen i mycket material. Det måste ju kännas lite hopplöst för vissa.[] Om man nu inte lär in ordet genom stavningen, hur lär man in det då? Då måste man ha andra strategier. Så jag kan	Hillevi: There are more entry points [literal translation] to a word. To not just sort of see it with spelling, because everything is so focused on spelling in a lot of materials. That

tänka mig att den [uppgiften] skulle vara	must feel a bit hopeless for some []
jättebra då.	Now, if you don't learn a word
	through spelling, then how do you
	learn it? Then you have to have other
	strategies. So I can imagine that it
	[the task] would be great then.

One interpretation of Excerpt 10.6 is that one of the affordances of the task is that it can be adapted to students' individual needs, which makes it useful in a range of student groups.

All participating students from Studies 1–3 presented with PowerPoint presentations designed to cover the vocabulary learning theory underpinning the word-focused task in an accessible manner. The exact format of the presentations varied depending on the class. As mentioned in Chapter 7, the PowerPoint presentations referred to the visible resource use suggested in the seven task sections as "strategies" ('strategier') for learning vocabulary, and as and tips and tricks for "working with words" ('jobba med ord') as this was deemed student-friendly (see Appendix 6 and Appendix 8). Nora describes the presentation and suggested ways to engage in intentional vocabulary learning per se as particularly valuable for the participating students. She appreciates the "list of different strategies" ('lista av olika strategier') the students received in the PowerPoint presentations, covering not just the use of TW synonyms (which is reported as her most frequently taught vocabulary learning strategy), but also "lots of other different ways to learn" ('en massa andra olika sätt att lära sig'). The usefulness of showing students the vocabulary learning strategies per se is echoed by Hillevi and Tove. Gabriel points out that "[t]here's a lot [about] strategies in the syllabi" ('[d]et finns mycket [om] strategier i ämnesplanerna'), including the syllabus for English 5–7, and seems to see the visible resource use suggested in the seven task sections as examples of the strategies referred to in the syllabus. It is hence possible that the teacher collaborators appreciate the emphasis on vocabulary learning strategies per se, as this focus aligns with the syllabus.

Most teacher collaborators and participating students were part of one three-week intervention each, whereas Tove and Class 1 participated both in Study 1 and Study 2. Tove was also involved in the pilot study from Chapter 6, together with a separate group of pilot study participants. When asked whether she and the participating students in Class 1 work with vocabulary in a strategic way during lessons, she points to affordances of our teacher-researcher collaboration, which lasted for two years (from May 2021 to May 2023, including the first e-mail correspondence up until my final classroom visit):

Swedish original

Elin: Skulle du säga att du och eleverna arbetar med ordkunskap på ett strategiskt sätt på lektionerna?

Tove: Numera skulle jag säga det, för att nu har vi det explicit. Med tanke på att vi har deltagit i det här projektet så har vi alla ett gemensamt sätt att prata kring ordinlärning, kanske, och en förståelse för hur man lär sig ord.

[...]

Det är ofta jag refererar till de här tankarna som finns i de här strategierna när vi träffar ett nytt ord. Det har nog berikat mitt sätt att se på ordinlärning också, så att jag tycker vi hänvisar till det ganska ofta. Inte varje lektion eller så, men det finns i vår värld mer nu tror jag.

English translation (mine)

Elin: Would you say that you and the students work with vocabulary in a strategic way during the lessons [literal translation]?

Tove: Nowadays I would say so, because now we have it explicit. Seeing that we have participated in this project, we all have a common way to talk about vocabulary learning, maybe, and an understanding of how you learn words.

I often refer to the ideas that are in these strategies when we encounter a new word. It has probably enriched my way of looking at vocabulary learning as well, so I think we refer to it quite often. Not every lesson or anything, but it's in our world more now I think.

Excerpt 10.7 explicitly shows that for Tove, participating in the thesis project has not only illuminated different ways to engage in intentional vocabulary learning (referred to as 'strategies'). It has also enabled a common ground with regard to intentional vocabulary learning for her and her students. Nora also says that it is "great" ('jättebra') that the strategies and general idea behind the word-focused task will "accompany" ('följa med') the students in the future. Judging from this positive comment, the vocabulary learning theory underpinning the word-focused task might stay not only with the participating students, but also Nora herself. Relatedly, Gabriel advocates using the word-focused task to facilitate in-class discussions about individual intentional vocabulary learning preferences and conceptualises this as an awarenessraising activity. Other teacher collaborators thus express similar thoughts as Tove does in Excerpt 10.7, albeit somewhat more implicitly. Tove and Nora also point out important limitations related to the individualizable task feature. Their comments constitute a second sub-theme related to Theme 2: *Apprehensions related to student agency and responsibility*. Nora notes that when faced with a task emphasising student agency, students may opt for the easiest alternative, instead of completing the task sections "that make them [the TWs] stick" ('som gör att dom [orden] fastnar'). She therefore suggests scaffolding the word-focused task work by restricting and specifying the kinds of visible resource use (referred to by Nora as 'vocabulary learning strategies') in focus. As an example, Nora mentions that one lesson could be devoted to learning vocabulary by means of TW synonyms alone. Next, the teacher might devote an entire lesson to intentional vocabulary learning through word associations, TW illustrations, and all the other kinds of visible resource use, respectively.

Still focusing on the sub-theme of *Apprehensions related to student agency and responsibility*, recall that in Studies 2–3 the participating students engaged with a mixture of pre- and self-selected TWs. Both Nora and Tove point out that students self-selecting TWs to learn is not entirely problem-free. Drawing on her perception of using the vocabulary task in Study 2, Nora declares that choosing what TWs to learn meant that the participating students had to take responsibility for their own vocabulary learning in a way that not all of them neither could nor wanted to do. In Nora's view, some of her students appeared to see the usefulness of the vocabulary task work and wanted to learn new words for their own sakes. Others swiftly went through the motions, without necessarily grasping the long-term purpose of completing the wordfocused task. Referring to the *Words of the Week* task work, Tove also points out that many of her students explicitly asked her to pre-select TWs for them, leading Tove to conclude that learning self-selected TWs was not as motivating for her students as she had initially thought.

Theme 3: Ideas for future development of the task

Identified during the coding- rather than transcription-stage, Theme 3 is not as prevalent and encompassing as the other themes introduced thus far. The theme is therefore not divided into sub-themes, even though minor sub-divisions were identified. It is nevertheless considered a separate theme, since it specifically encompasses ideas for future development of the word-focused task. All four teacher collaborators suggest considering a digital task version. For Nora in particular, the rationale behind the potential digitalisation relates to the students' preferences and motivation:

Excerpt 10.8

C 1	• 1	1	
Swed	lish	original	

Elin: Skulle man kunna tänka sig någon slags digital variant av den här övningen [uppgiften]?

Nora: Det tror jag hade stimulerat en del [elever], om man hade gjort det [ordinlärningsarbetet] digitalt. På ett sätt är det bättre på papper, för att då skriver dom [eleverna] för hand och dom får alla de fördelarna. Så det tycker jag är bra. Men av någon anledning så upplever många elever att om det är på en dator så är det mer stimulerande. [...] Speciellt om man gör det lite mer som ett spel eller så. [...] Det beror lite på hur man ramar in uppgiften. Man kan göra det som en Kahoot eller ett escape room där eleverna ska ta reda på 'vad betyder det här ordet', så det blir lite kul. English translation (mine)

Elin: Could you imagine some kind of digital version of this exercise [task]?

Nora: That I think would have stimulated some students, to do it [the vocabulary task work] digitally. In one way, it's better on paper, because then they [the students] write by hand and they get all of those benefits. So I think that's good. But for some reason many students feel that if it's on a computer it's more stimulating [...] Especially if you turn it into a little bit more of a game or something like that. It depends a bit on how you frame the task. You could have it as a Kahoot or an escape room where students are going to find out 'what does this word mean', so that it gets a bit fun.

Like Nora, Hillevi describes the digital format as something the students might "prefer" ('föredra'). In Study 2, Tove's *Words of the Week* task sheet also came in a digital and adjustable format. As exemplified in Excerpt 10.8, none of the teacher collaborators frame this as automatically superior, however, but rather bring up pros and cons with both digital and analogue task formats. Hillevi, for example, also suggests creating a physical booklet with printed word-focused task sheets. This, she says, could potentially be done in co-operation with textbook publishers.

Lastly, the idea of learning vocabulary by connecting it to prior knowledge in the form of a reference to moments when students have heard or seen the TW before appears to be new to the teacher collaborators. Tove suggests developing this task section into a separate task:

Excerpt 10.9

Swedish original

Elin: Om du tänker dig att du själv skulle använda uppgiften eller något liknande material i en klass som du undervisar eller har undervisat, hur skulle du använda den eller anpassa den?

[...]

Tove: Jag gillar den här rutan: 'I've heard or seen this word before when....' Den hade jag kunnat tänka mig utveckla till en egen sak. Att dom [eleverna] spanar efter ord på sin fritid och att det skulle kunna vara ett återkommande inslag.

[...]

Med tanke på att många elever möter engelska så mycket på sin fritid så är det kul att också ta upp det i undervisningen. Dom [eleverna] skulle kunna få presentera för varandra ibland och hämta in... Jag tänker på ord som vi inte jobbar med så mycket i skolan, men som eleverna lär sig [utanför klassrummet]. [...] Att man får chans att liksom koppla det [ordinlärningen] till vad man har valt att göra på sin fritid på något sätt.

English translation (mine)

Elin: If you imagine that you yourself would use this task or some similar material in a group that you teach or have taught, how would you use it or adjust it? [...]

Tove: I like this section: 'I've heard or seen this word before when....' That one I might consider developing into its own thing. That they [the students] look for words in their free time and that this could be a reoccurring element.

[...]

Considering that many students encounter English so much in their free time it's fun to also bring that up in the teaching. They [the students] could present to each other sometimes and collect... I'm thinking about words that we don't engage with that much in school, but which the students learn [outside the classroom] [...] That you get a chance to sort of connect it [the vocabulary learning] to what you have chosen to do in your free time in some way.

Excerpt 10.9 suggests that the present study has informed Tove's teaching in a concrete way, in that it has inspired her to let her students engage in intentional vocabulary learning by connecting the TWs to their extramural English exposure. Tove's emphasis on students' own choices or "what you have chosen to do in your free time" ('vad man har valt att göra på sin fritid') relates to the seemingly appreciated (albeit not unproblematic) individualizable task feature. Seeing Excerpt 10.9, it appears that just

like in the word-focused task, Tove envisions a task with a relatively free format. With this in mind, I now turn to the discussion in Sub-section 10.6.

10.6 Discussion

The following discussion is centred around the research question introduced in Subsection 10.3.

10.6.1 RQ1

The research question addressed in this study (RQ1) reads: What are the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task, and their beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general? The findings suggests that the teacher collaborators perceived the word-focused task as useful. They emphasised the value of providing students with a range of ways different ways to engage in intentional vocabulary learning, as this had the potential of widening students' perceptions of their own learning, whilst simultaneously enabling a common ground of intentional vocabulary learning. The fact that the teacher collaborators appreciated the individualizable task feature suggests that the word-focused task also was perceived as individualizable. This is important, seeing the calls for such tasks made elsewhere (Cunningham, 2023; Stridsman, 2024).

The study reported in this chapter also sheds light on perceived limitations of the relatively free format of the word-focused task. In particular, Tove and Nora stressed not all students can nor want to self-select TWs and ways to complete the word-focused task in an efficient way. This observation is in accordance with McCrostie's (2007) study of vocabulary notebooks (i.e., records of TW information about self-selected vocabulary) kept by 124 university EFL students in Japan (exact age unclear) where self-selecting TWs posed a major challenge for the students. McCrostie (2007) thus concludes that students may need guidance when deciding what TW information to record and which TWs to focus on. Thus, it might be fruitful to restrict the number of task sections the students complete, a suggested by Nora. Tove concluded that learning self-selected TWs was not as suitable for her students as she had initially thought, which speaks in favour of concentrating on pre-selected TWs (e.g., like in Study 1).

The present study suggests that the teacher collaborators positioned intentional vocabulary learning as important in the teacher interviews. Hillevi and Gabriel reported implementing intentional vocabulary learning tasks involving word formation, and

Tove referred to her Words of the Week task sheet. These tasks did not seem to be followed up, however, and there was no mention of a structured and principled approach to intentional vocabulary learning in any of the interviews. In light of the focus on communication and meaning-focused tasks in the accounts of their habitual teaching practices, it is thus possible that the interview made them reflect on the importance of intentional vocabulary learning and subsequently bring up the examples that agreed with the interview focus. In practice, however, intentional vocabulary learning seemed to play a peripheral role in their teaching. This observation agrees with previous national (D. Bergström et al., 2022) and international (Hermagustiana et al., 2017; Macalister, 2012) teacher interview studies where the participants did not appear to focus on intentional vocabulary learning as a classroom activity in its own right but instead declared prioritising incidental vocabulary learning through reading- writingand speaking tasks. A possible explanation for the emphasis on meaning-focused skills in the teacher collaborators' accounts is that their teaching practices aligned with the communicatively oriented syllabus for English which was in place during data collection (Skolverket, 2021). This observation is consistent with that of D. Bergström (2023), who notes that the approach to vocabulary expressed by both the teachers and material developers from her thesis project can be interpreted as them adhering to curricular guidelines. As D. Bergström (2023) indicates, these findings have implications for Swedish educational policy because if teachers adhere to the policy documents, this ascribes great importance to the content and the way vocabulary is positioned in them. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the syllabus for English 5-7 does mention vocabulary. A new syllabus for English is also available for download at Skolverket and will come into effect on 1 July 2025 (Skolverket, 2024c). The most recent version of this syllabus available at the time of writing mentions vocabulary not only in the core content but also in the subject aim. Specifically, the aim reads that English in upper-secondary school should allow students to " develop linguistic confidence through, among other things, pronunciation, vocabulary, spelling, grammatical structures, sentence structure, and text creation" (Skolverket, n.d., para. 3, my translation). This presumably means that teachers need to pay attention to vocabulary, which has implications for the usefulness of the word-focused task in schools.

The identified belief that intentional vocabulary learning is peripheral should not be interpreted as criticism towards the individual teacher collaborators' practices. This is important, because it is assumed that a high degree of practice literacy and a sensitivity towards the teacher collaborators' practices are prerequisites for establishing the usefulness of the word-focused task (Elgemark et al., 2023). For example, rather than condemning the identified lack of shared vocabulary learning policies in the teacher collaborators' respective teams of English teachers, this chapter suggests a potential need

for such policies (see Lim Falk & Riad, 2023 for a similar discussion about the intentional vocabulary learning in multilingual L2 Swedish classrooms). As noted by Byrnes (2020) individual teachers should not be burdened with the responsibility of implementing major curricular changes related to, say, intentional vocabulary learning or pedagogical translanguaging on their own. Rather, such initiatives require systematic changes involving not only educators but also teams of teachers, headmasters, policy makers and not least researchers (see also Wedin, 2017).

10.7 Taking stock of Study 4

The study suggests that the teacher collaborators perceived the word-focused task as useful. They particularly emphasised the value of providing students with a range of ways to intentionally learn vocabulary and thus enable student agency. At the same time, the relatively free task format was perceived as potentially overwhelming and demotivating for some students. In light of the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task, a revised version of the task could include digitalisation and a separate activity connected to extramural English exposure, even though a digital format was not necessarily perceived as superior. Further, the study suggests that the teacher collaborators believe intentional vocabulary learning to be important in theory, as it is positioned as such during the interviews. Yet, the teacher collaborators did not declare any specific, principled, and structured approaches to intentional vocabulary learning. This suggests that they may not prioritise intentional vocabulary learning in practice but were reminded of its importance during their respective interviews. Three out of four teacher collaborators did not recall focusing on vocabulary learning during their teacher training, although Nora shared an outlook on incidental vocabulary learning informed by her education. On the group level, the teacher collaborators and their English teacher colleagues did not seem to have a shared vocabulary learning policy. Gabriel and Tove explicitly expressed both a will and need to focus more on "form" (i.e., FoFs). Although it is possible that they stressed this because it agreed with the focus of the interview, the emphasis on FoFs nevertheless has implications for largescale use of the task in schools. Lastly, it should be stressed that the most prevalent theme of the RTA (Theme 1) did not concern the word-focused task per se, but the peripheral role of intentional vocabulary learning more generally. This is likely to be a reflection of the interview guide used. Given that this study seeks to illuminate the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task in particular, and their beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general, it is possible to argue that the interview guide should have focused more on the word-focused task and less on

intentional vocabulary learning in general. Importantly, however, the present study has nevertheless shown that the self-reported perceptions and beliefs have implications for the potential usefulness and large-scale usage of the word-focused task. These will be discussed in Chapter 11, to which I now turn.

11. Discussion and concluding remarks

This chapter discusses the results of Studies 1–4 and concludes the thesis. Sub-section 11.1 reiterates the aims of the thesis project, revisits the three overarching research questions and summarises the main results. Sub-section 11.2 answers and discusses RQs 1–3 one by one in three separate sub-sub sections. Sub-section 11.3 specifies the contributions of the present study. Sub-section 11.4 concludes by addressing the limitations of the thesis project and proposing avenues for future research.

11.1 Aims, research questions, and main results

The primary aim of this thesis project was to advance our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in uppersecondary school classrooms. To this end, the present study sheds light on the resources that EFL students with different multilingual backgrounds and proficiency levels in English visibly use to complete the word-focused task and potentially learn the vocabulary. An auxiliary aim was to contribute to the teaching of English in uppersecondary school by constructing, using, and evaluating the word-focused task developed. As such, the word-focused task was used as learning materials as well as a research tool.

In Studies 1–4 (Chapters 7–10) the word-focused task was integrated into unique learning units tailored to fit the needs of the respective classes. The units were didactic sequences consisting of 3–6 lessons. The students completed the word-focused task together with other English proficiency tasks related to a specific theme. Each unit fit the teacher collaborators' respective plans, which in turn were in line with policy documents as to the content to be covered. I designed each unit together with the teacher collaborators. As a means to bring in the teacher perspective (i.e., teachers' situated competence, developed through teacher education as well as years in the profession) on the usefulness of the word-focused task for students in their respective classrooms, the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task in particular were illuminated. Because the word-focused task provided an example of intentional vocabulary learning, the teacher collaborators were also asked to talk about intentional

vocabulary learning. This way, it was possible to unpack their beliefs that may potentially explain their perceptions of the task.

The two thesis project aims were operationalised by formulating three overarching research questions (*RQs*):

- (*RQ*1) What resources do the participating students visibly use to complete the word-focused task?
- (*RQ2*) What is the effect of completing the word-focused task on the participating students' word knowledge of pre- and self-selected TWs?
- (*RQ3*) What are the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task, and their beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general?

Studies 1–3, whose results were described in Chapters 7–9, show that the participating students visibly used both linguistic resources (e.g., TW synonyms and translation equivalents) and non-linguistic resources (TW illustrations) to complete the wordfocused task. The visible use of linguistic resources varied depending on the expected proficiency levels in, and perceived usefulness of, the languages students used. Class 1, which was linguistically rather homogeneous, typically provided TW translation equivalents in Swedish paired with TW synonyms, whereas it was more common in Class 4 to complete the word-focused task monolingually using the target language English. As a reminder, in Class 4 the participating students were more linguistically heterogenous than Class 1. This difference between Class 1 and Class 4 with regard to visible resource use may at least in part be attributed to whether or not the participating students were L1 users of Swedish, the perceived usefulness of Swedish as a resource for learning targeted English vocabulary, and their teachers' contrasting beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general. In Study 3, the participating students with the highest expected CEFR-level (B1.2-B2.1) visibly used English to a greater extent than the beginner-level learners, who instead tended to use their self-reported L1 to complete the word-focused task. The in-depth descriptions of individual participating students' intentional vocabulary learning showed that some (though not all) appreciated using their L1 as resources for engaging with the TWs and demonstrating TW knowledge.

Studies 1–3 point to a moderate but positive effect of completing the word-focused task on the participating students' word knowledge of the pre- and self-selected TWs. More systematic attention to the TWs would have been needed to optimise the task work for the sake of learning the TWs.

The teacher collaborators perceived the word-focused task as useful because it provided a range of different ways to engage in intentional vocabulary learning. In

particular, Tove perceived the word-focused task as worth integrating into her own teaching. She independently implemented and evaluated her own version of the task, referred to as the Words of the Week task sheet. Studies 1-3 collectively show that the word-focused task is individualizable (i.e., possible to complete by different students in different ways) and adjustable (i.e., available for individual teachers to adapt in light of their expertise and perceptions). This is important, as the teacher collaborators noted that different levels of scaffolding were needed to accommodate to all students. The emphasis on student agency inherent in the word-focused task was perceived as interesting but not unproblematic, since the teacher collaborators stressed that not all students could nor wanted to efficiently orchestrate their own learning and self-select TW to learn. Study 4 showed that the teacher collaborators believed intentional vocabulary learning to be important in theory. In practice, however, it appeared to be deprioritised in favour of communicative tasks, and no principled approaches to intentional vocabulary learning or vocabulary learning policies within their respective teams of English teachers were reported. Next, the three overarching research questions of the present study (RQs 1–3) will be answered and discussed one by one.

11. 2 Discussion of results

11.2.1 RQ 1

RQ1 deals with the resources visibly used by the participating students to complete the word-focused task. Addressing RQ1, the topics discussed are (1) the use of self-reported L1(s) to complete the word-focused task, (2) the perception of languages as useful for completing the word-focused task, and (3) the influence of teachers' beliefs and teaching practices on students' resource use.

A main pattern in Studies 1–3 was that the participating students visibly used their self-reported L1 to complete the word-focused task. As mentioned, language repertoires are often unique and multilinguals may have more than one L1 (Baker & Wright, 2021). The points made in this paragraph concern the participating students who had one language (e.g., Swedish) which they were exposed to first and which they also listed first when asked to self-report their language repertoires (strongest language first). For example, the majority (61.1%) of the participating students in Class 1 were language majority students (L1 Swedish). On the group level, Class 1 commonly completed the word-focused task by noting down TW translation equivalents in Swedish paired with TW synonyms both in Studies 1 and 2. In Study 3, the three beginner-level English learners visibly used their self-reported L1 (Arabic, Spanish, and Thai respectively) to

gain an initial understanding of the TW (e.g., translating them using Google translate) and to demonstrate gained TW knowledge (e.g., by noting an example sentence in Spanish containing the TW). The in-depth descriptions of Linnéa, Rawda, and Sofia's intentional vocabulary learning in Study 3 showed that they all appreciated drawing on their respective L1 when learning English vocabulary. This was reflected in their task work and subsequent vocabulary tests, as they all visibly used their L1 to complete the word-focused task, and to demonstrate TW knowledge.

Taken together, these findings from Studies 1-3 are in accordance with the results of previous L2 vocabulary learning and pedagogical translanguaging research collectively highlighting the pedagogical and socioemotional value of using the L1 to gain, consolidate, and demonstrate word knowledge. Vocabulary researchers (e.g., Lee & Levine, 2020; Nation, 2022; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020; Tian & Macaro, 2012) agree that learning L2 vocabulary through L1 translation equivalents generally is faster and more efficient than drawing on TW synonyms, since it is an efficient way to establish the form-meaning link, and since learners tend to have rich associations to the word in their L1. Learning L2 vocabulary through the L1 is also something learners deem relevant (Rindal, 2024), and report doing when orchestrating their own vocabulary learning (Barcroft, 2009). Theoretically, the present findings support the Language Mode theory (Grosjean, 2008), according to which the languages of a multilingual never are completely deactivated in the mental lexicon, which arguably makes L1 usage for L2 vocabulary learning natural (Gyllstad et al., 2023). The value of utilising the L1 to consolidate L2 vocabulary knowledge has been established in previous research pointing to the efficiency of flashcards with an L2 TW on one side and an L1 translation equivalents of the TW on the other (Nation, 2022; Webb et al., 2020). Lastly, Linnéa, Rawda, and Sofia's vocabulary tests results and appreciation for using the L1 in Study 3 agrees with previous pedagogical translanguaging research establishing that judicious L1 use in the EFL classroom has both pedagogical (e.g., Velasco & García, 2014) and socioemotional (Busse et al., 2020, 2021; García & Kleyn, 2016) benefits.

Importantly, however, another major theme in Studies 2–3 was that the participating students did not automatically visibly use the languages they reported being most proficient in. Rather, they visibly used the languages they perceived as useful for completing the word-focused task. In Study 2, it was suggested that the differences between Class 1 and 4 with regard to visible use of Swedish could at least in part be attributed to differences in perceived usefulness of Swedish as a resource for learning English vocabulary in the two classes. Study 3 tapped into this empirically. For example, Sahar reported learning Swedish, English, and Urdu simultaneously from a young age (1–2 years), making it reasonable to assume that she might visibly use Swedish or Urdu to complete the word-focused task. However, the QCA of Sahar's

student interview showed that she was hesitant to translanguage and instead preferred focusing on one language at a time. This was reflected in Sahar's task work as she completed all the word-focused task sheets from Study 3 monolingually using the target language English. In contrast, Rawda framed her self-reported L1 (Arabic) as a resource for learning English vocabulary both when orchestrating her own learning, and when receiving scaffolding from her mother. This was visible in Rawda's task work and vocabulary tests, where she visibly used Arabic and English to gain, consolidate, and demonstrate TW knowledge. Sahar and Rawda's expected CEFR levels were B2.1 and B1.2, respectively. This should be interpreted with caution since Sahar reported being exposed to English from an early age (1-2 years), whereas Rawda reported that she started learning English abroad in year 5 of compulsory school. That said, Sahar and Rawda were, at least in theory, comparable in terms of expected proficiency in English but differed with regard to the languages they perceived as useful for completing the word-focused task. This is in accordance with the results of other studies on students' perceptions of using languages other than the target language in the EFL classroom. For example, Källkvist et al. (2022) point to individual differences with regard to secondary school EFL students' perceptions of their teachers' judicious, planned and purposeful use of English-Swedish translanguaging. Some participating students framed Swedish as a resource for themselves, whilst others stated that it was helpful for their peers but not necessarily for them. Rodrick Beiler (2021a) explored the role of translanguaging across three different multilingual EFL classrooms in Norway (student age approximately 17 years). Similarly to the present study, Rodrick Beiler (2021a) showed how the participating students' own ideologies and orientations were reflected in the classroom practices under study (English essay writing). Some participating students explicitly attempted to write in English only, while others drew on their entire language repertoires to, for instance, translate or structure their texts. One specific participating student from Rodrick Beiler (2021a) explicitly chose to translanguage. She expressed that the many languages she knew was a part of her identity and made her "feel closer to the world" (Rodrick Beiler, 2021a, p. 128). This stands in sharp contrast to Sahar's conceptualisation of her multilingualism as disruptive but agrees with Rawda's student interview, were Arabic and Turkish were indexed with utility and affective value, respectively. Thus, although the findings about Sahar and Rawda per se are not necessarily generalisable to a larger context, the present study echoes Byrnes (2020) in that context awareness is central when implementing pedagogical translanguaging tasks such as the word-focused task, as not all students will respond in the same way. Therefore, any efforts to implement pedagogical translanguaging should be tailored to the needs in that specific context, and even the needs of individual students in the classroom. This speaks in favour of using individualizable and adjustable tasks like the word-focused task.

A possible explanation for the linguistic resources visibly used to complete the wordfocused task is that the participating students' resource use was affected by their teachers' beliefs and teaching practices. Class 1 commonly provided TW translation equivalents in Swedish. Their teacher, Tove, advocated using Swedish as a resource for intentional English vocabulary learning, as elicited through her self-reported beliefs in Excerpt 8.6, and her adaptation of the word-focused task, where visible use of Swedish was encouraged. In Class 4, it was more common to complete the word-focused task monolingually using the target language English. Their teacher, Nora, expressed positive beliefs about a monolingual approach to intentional English vocabulary learning in Excerpt 8.7. In Study 4, Nora also stated that she typically told her students to learn TWs through TW synonyms. The explanation suggests that the participating students' visible resource use is socially and ideologically embedded in that it is shaped by their teachers' respective teaching ideologies (Uljens, 1997). Also, in spite of Tove and Nora's contrasting beliefs, Study 4 shows that Tove and Nora both perceived the word-focused task as useful. This suggests that it is widely applicable in that it can be useful for educators with different approaches to intentional vocabulary learning.

11.2.2 RQ 2

The second overarching research question reads: What is the effect of completing the word-focused task on the participating students' word knowledge of pre- and self-selected TWs? Study 1 targeted meaning recall knowledge of pre-selected TWs. Study 2 concerned form recognition and meaning recall knowledge of pre-selected TWs. Study 3 focused on form recognition and meaning recall knowledge of a small set of pre- and self-selected TWs. Answering RQ2, I will now discuss the observed learning of the targeted vocabulary (i.e., the TWs) in relation to previous research and vocabulary learning theory. I will also discuss the pedagogical implications of the findings related to RQ2 and offer guidelines for how to optimise the task work.

Studies 1–3 show that completing the word-focused task had a moderate but positive effect on participating students' word knowledge of pre- and self-selected TWs as measured by the vocabulary tests from the studies. In Study 1, the mean learning proportions were 26%, meaning that the participating students learned approximately 2.5 words out of 10 based on one encounter. There was a statistically significant gains between the self-reported prior knowledge proportion scores and the immediate posttest scores. In Study 2, the mean TW proportion scores typically increased by approximately 25 percentage points on average between the pre- and immediate posttest. For five of the TWs (*atypical, eschew, acclimatize,* and *xenophobia*), the gains between the pre- and immediate post-tests were statistically significant. The mean gain scores typically decreased between the immediate- and delayed post-tests. For one of

the TWs (*eschew*), this dip was statistically significant. Study 3 was descriptive. For example, the study showed that Rawda and Linnéa did not know the TW *eschew* prior to completing the word-focused task, but scored 5 and 3 points, respectively, out of the maximum 7 points on the immediate post-test after the task work. Rawda and Linnéa did not demonstrate knowledge of *eschew* in the delayed post-test. Thus, completing the word-focused task did not always result in long-term vocabulary learning gains.

The moderate observed learning gains and the patterns in the pre-, immediate-, and delayed post-test scores from Studies 1-3 agree with Busse et al., (2020) and Gyllstad et al., (2023). These previous studies on multilingual EFL students' intentional vocabulary learning were conducted in Germany and Sweden, respectively. In Busse et al., (2020), the mean student age was 8.7 years in Busse et al., (2020) and in Gyllstad et al., (2023), the students were 14–16 years old. Gyllstad et al. (2023) point to sizeable observed learning gains when comparing the participating students' pre- and immediate post-test scores. By way of example, one class from their study scored a mean of 0.86 out of 24 (3.6%) on the pre-test, 17.43 out of 24 (72.6%) on the immediate post-test and 9.71 out of 34 points on the delayed post-test (40.5%) in a learning condition where the participating students were encouraged to draw on Swedish translation equivalents when learning targeted English vocabulary (see p. 424). In Busse et al., (2020), the observed learning of the vocabulary was targeted through a series of vocabulary tests, one of which was a productive vocabulary test considering of spelling. Here, the intervention group scored a mean of 2.37/40 (5.9%) on the pre-test, 14.47 out of 40 (36%) on the immediate post-test and 13.58/40 (34%) on the delayed posttest (see p. 403).

At first glance, the observed learning of the TWs was considerably smaller in the present study compared to Gyllstad et al. (2023) and Busse et al., (2020). However, Gyllstad et al. (2023) and Busse et al., (2020) only targeted meaning recall knowledge, whereas Studies 2 and 3 targeted both form recognition and meaning recall knowledge. The immediate- and delayed post-tests from Studies 2 and 3 were also more complex than the vocabulary tests from Gyllstad et al. (2023) and Busse et al., (2020). Specifically, after the interventions in Gyllstad et al., (2023) the participating students could first demonstrate recognition (i.e. partial knowledge) by indicating whether they have seen the word in question. When they (thought they) knew a word, they could demonstrate this by translating the word into any language, including it in a sentence, or providing a synonym During the interventions from Busse et al., (2020) the participating students engaged with TWs related to the topic of the human body. The productive vocabulary test they took after the intervention was a sheet with a human body silhouette where the participating students could indicate the TWs (e.g., arm, head, tooth). In the immediate- and delayed post-tests from Studies 2 and 3, the participating students were asked to: (1) provide a TW (2) provide a TW translation equivalent in any language (3) explain the word in English or any other language (4) write a sentence containing the TW (5) provide a word association (6) identify a grammatically correct sentence containing the TW from a list of three sentences in a multiple-choice format (see Appendix 13 and Appendix 14). It should be borne in mine that the participating students from Gyllstad et al., (2023) and Busse et al., (2020) were younger than those from the present study, making it natural to use less complex tests. Yet, the fact that the immediate- and delayed post-tests from the present study were more elaborate than those from Gyllstad et al., (2023) and Busse et al., (2020) means that lower scores can be expected in Studies 2 and 3. Rather than comparing the vocabulary learning outcomes from different intentional vocabulary learning studies at face value, it is therefore important to discuss the results in relation to the tests used and the kind of knowledge they measured (Gyllstad & Schmitt, 2019).

When comparing the observed learning of the TWs with the results of previous studies, it is also worthwhile to take the time and effort spent on the TWs into account. As mentioned in Chapter 4, the ToTH (Carroll, 1963) assumes that the more time that is spent on learning a TW, the more likely it is that learning will occur. The findings from Busse et al., (2020) contradict the ToTH, as the intervention group scored higher on the vocabulary tests than the control group despite spending less time on engaging with the TWs. The authors argue that the high positive affect and motivation evinced by the experimental group led to high task engagement, which, in turn, may have led them to outperform the control group despite spending less time on the TWs. Both in Busse et al., (2020) and Gyllstad et al., (2023), the participating students (who were younger than those from the present study) encountered the TWs at least five times in different contexts such as games, Kahoots, and when creating and using their own flashcards. In Studies 1-3 the participating students encountered the TWs 2-5 times. In Study 1 all participating students encountered the TWs during one exposure instance, i.e., when reading the text containing the TWs and completing the word-focused task. In Study 2, five TW encounters were a best-case scenario for the participating students in Class 1, granted that they completed all the tasks from the learning unit and used the TWs in their own production, which was encouraged but not obligatory. The individuals who participated both in Studies 2 and 3 (e.g., Linnéa and Sahar) encountered the TWs from the SRIs one more time than the other students but still engaged in massed rather than spaced learning with relatively few TW encounters. Thus, it is possible that the high mean proportion scores in Busse et al., (2020) and Gyllstad et al., (2023) compared to the present study also have to do with a difference in time-on-task and the number of TW encounters.

When considering the moderate observed learning of the TWs, it is also worthwhile to discuss the completed task sections in relation to vocabulary learning theory. As discussed in Chapter 4, the word-focused task was designed to promote vocabulary depth and facilitate intentional learning of as many of the word knowledge aspects from Nation's (2022) word knowledge framework as possible. The word-focused task was designed to enable *engagement* with (i.e., deep processing of) the TWs by providing opportunities to gain, consolidate and/or demonstrate meaning recall knowledge and form recognition knowledge of TWs (see Table 4.1a–b).

González-Fernández (2024) presents a preliminary order in which form recall, meaning recall, form recognition and meaning recognition, respectively, are learnt. According to her study, form-meaning recognition is the first to develop for L2 learners and a prerequisite for starting to use a word and develop recall mastery. Thus, a prerequisite for developing vocabulary depth is that students get ample time to practice form recall, meaning recall, form recognition and meaning recognition in different contexts that allow students to not only gain and consolidate word knowledge but also elaborate and enhance it. Theoretically, the word-focused task was designed to facilitate this. However, Studies 1 and 2 collectively suggest that the participating students frequently completed the TW translation and/or synonym sections, whereas it was less common to complete the other task sections. Thus, a potential reason for the moderate observed vocabulary learning gains is that not all participating students had time to develop meaning recall knowledge of the TWs, and that the results would have been different had they filled in more task sections.

Accordingly, one option is to adjust the word-focused task instructions and instruct students to fill in all task sections instead of the ones they find useful. On the other hand, this is likely to be too cumbersome (Yasingawa & Webb, 2020). In Study 4, the teacher collaborator Nora suggested focusing on one task section at a time as a means to make task work more manageable. For example, she proposed that one lesson could be devoted to intentionally learning vocabulary by means of TW illustrations exclusively. Next, the teacher might devote an entire lesson to intentional vocabulary learning through word associations, TW synonyms and all the other kinds of visible resource use, respectively. It is possible that such a setup would make students more inclined to complete more task sections and thus promote vocabulary depth. Future longitudinal research will have to determine which and how many task sections students should complete over time with regard to optimising the chances of deep learning of TWs to occur.

I have now pointed to the complexity of the immediate and delayed post-tests from Studies 2 and 3, the difficulty inherent in developing meaning recall knowledge, and the number of TW encounters from the present study. Seeing all of this, the finding that completing the word-focused task had a moderate but positive effect on the participating students' TW knowledge indicates that the word-focused task *can* facilitate intentional vocabulary learning of multiple word knowledge aspects in uppersecondary school English classrooms. Importantly, this thesis project does not claim that the learning units from Studies 1–3 were ideal with regard to long-term TW retention. Rather, the task work from the learning units should be conceptualised as the beginning of a dynamic and incremental vocabulary learning process (Webb et al., 2020). Although some words can be learned after only two encounters (Webb & Nation, 2017), it was assumed that more systematic, intentional attention to the TWs would have been needed to maximize the vocabulary learning gains. It should also be stressed that a range of TW factors may affect learnability, including cognateness, ease of spelling and pronunciation (Peters, 2020; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020). This raises questions about how the word-focused task can be used as effectively as possible in the future.

Studies 1–4 collectively suggest that the word-focused task can be used as an in-class task and/or as homework. Studies 1–3 demonstrate that the task can be integrated into unique and ecologically valid learning units. In all three studies , the TWs were underlined, marked in boldface, and planted into texts which the students read as part of their course work, when I, in my role as researcher, was visiting their classrooms. In Study 2, the word-focused task was embedded in meaning-focused tasks, as the participating students were encouraged to use the TWs in argumentative essays, student-generated podcasts and/or oral seminars. Although the learning units per se were not explored in detail, this all suggests that the word-focused task could be integrated into learning units designed in light of the four strands proposed by Nation (2007). The word-focused task work could occupy about 25% of the course time together with other language-focused tasks. As a means to increase learning opportunities across the other strands, the TWs students learn using the word-focused task could then reoccur in meaning-focused tasks, like in Study 2.

However, in Study 4, the teacher collaborators Hillevi and Gabriel both suggested using the word-focused task as homework due to a perceived lack of time to use the word-focused task as an in-class task. The issue of time constraints surrounding intentional vocabulary learning in the classroom has been pointed out elsewhere (e.g., by Hermagustiana et al., 2017; Webb & Nation, 2017). This speaks in favour of using the word-focused task as homework, granted that students are given the means to complete it effectively at home. Next, I will therefore present examples of guidelines that could accompany the word-focused task, and help students optimise the wordfocused task work.

Individual learners vary in their intentional vocabulary learning (Gu, 2020; Webb & Nation, 2017) and there is an array of factors affecting the learnability of words (Peters, 2020). Thus, guidelines on how to best use the word-focused task need to be fairly general. As recommended by Nation (2022), the guidelines should specify that spaced repetition is a prerequisite for successful vocabulary learning, meaning that students should come back to the task sheets they have completed. For example, they

could be encouraged to first study their completed task sheets several times and then practice recalling what they wrote on the task sheets, perhaps by covering up parts of the filled-out task sheet and retrieving the information. Seeing the efficiency of flashcards as an intentional vocabulary learning tool (Webb & Nation, 2017; Webb et al., 2020), students could then be instructed to memorize the TWs from the task sheets by putting them on flashcards which they then study systematically. Alternatively, they could create their own fill-in-the-blanks sentences with TWs from the task sheets. As pointed out by Nation (2022), the guidelines could also encourage learners to take control of their learning, and stress that this makes the vocabulary leaning more effective and enjoyable. The guidelines could also inspire learners to try to find opportunities to use the words extramurally and/or in other tasks such as essays.

Because all classrooms are unique (Uljens, 1997) and because teachers working in Sweden have the agency to decide specifically how to treat vocabulary learning in their teaching (Warnby, 2023), each individual teacher using the word-focused task should decide if the above-mentioned suggestions work better as homework or as an in-class task. Studies 1–4 show that the task work was potentially overwhelming and demotivating for some students. This speaks in favour of using the word-focused task as an in-class task rather than homework, as this would allow teachers to help students follow the above-mentioned guidelines and manage the task work.

Further, a possible explanation for the relatively small observed vocabulary learning gains is that the vocabulary learning gains could have been larger had the word-focused task work been more motivating. In Study 1, the student evaluations of the learning units suggest that task work was perceived as overly repetitive, and thus potentially demotivating, by some participating students. In Study 2, Tove used Linnéa and Sahar as examples of participating students who diligently completed the word-focused task because they were motivated to do so. Tove described Linnéa as someone who saw a concrete need to develop her vocabulary and therefore was motivated to complete the word-focused task. Sahar was referred to as more intrinsically motivated. Study 3 confirmed Tove's observations. The in-depth description of Linnéa revealed that she was dyslectic and wanted to expand her English vocabulary knowledge as a means to compensate for the self-reported spelling difficulties she attributed to the dyslexia. Sahar expressed a strong interest in engaging in intentional vocabulary learning. Study 3 suggests that completing the word-focused task had an effect on both Sahar and Linnéa's TW knowledge. In Study 4, the relatively free task format was perceived as interesting but not unproblematic by the teacher collaborators, as they noted that not all students had the motivation to orchestrate their own learning efficiently.

The emphasis on student motivation in Studies 1–4 agrees with Nakata and Webb (2016) who stress that vocabulary learning tasks should have a clear motivating goal. Theoretically, the important role of student motivation in intentional vocabulary

learning also tallies with Tseng and Schmitt's (2008) model, according to which it is a key part of instigating, sustaining, and evaluating vocabulary knowledge. For example, they point to the importance of sufficient initial appraisal, that is, initial motivation to learn vocabulary. Initial appraisal can be indicated by "value, interest, effort, or desire" (p. 361, my emphasis). Studies 2 and 3 suggest that Sahar's initial appraisal took the form of an interest in intentional vocabulary learning, whereas Linnéa was driven by concrete needs. However, Tseng and Schmitt (2008) note that high initial appraisal alone is not sufficient for intentional vocabulary learning to be successful. Students must also be able to sustain their motivation and independently self-regulate their intentional vocabulary learning behaviours. Studies 2 and 3 suggest that Sahar, in particular, managed to do so successfully. In Study 2, Sahar reported studying the TWs at home and noting new vocabulary in her own vocabulary notebook which she had created. Study 2 suggests that the vocabulary notebook Sahar created was similar to her teacher Tove's Words of the week task sheet, and thus also my word-focused task. In Study 3 Sahar's work paid off as she, for example, scored 5 out of 7 points on the immediate post-test and 6 out of 7 points on the delayed post-test for the TW eschew, despite not reporting having prior knowledge of *eschew* prior to the task work. Future research will have to determine how students like Sahar gain and keep the motivation to engage in intentional vocabulary learning. It would also be interesting to explore how this motivation fluctuates with time (Gu, 2020; Tseng & Schmitt, 2008). Regardless, the in-depth descriptions of Sahar and Linnéa's intentional vocabulary learning from Study 3 make it reasonable to assume that the word-focused task is useful for intentionally learning targeted English vocabulary, although student motivation and agency affects the outcome of the task work. This explanation highlights the agentive and multifaceted nature of intentional vocabulary learning.

Further, Webb and Nation (2017) stress that students should be given ample time to understand the bigger-picture value of learning new words, and practice engaging in intentional vocabulary learning. This was taken into consideration in the present study. As mentioned, the students were introduced to the vocabulary learning theory underpinning the word-focused task through PowerPoint presentations meant to be accessible and student-friendly. The teacher collaborators and I also set aside time for the participating students to practice completing the word-focused task independently. As a means to promote student agency, learners could self-select which task sections to complete and orchestrate their of their own learning. That said, the teacher collaborator Nora noted that her students did not necessarily grasp the purpose of the task work. Thus, it is possible that the task work would have been more motivating if it had been framed differently, and if the purpose of the intentional vocabulary learning had been made clearer.

One option is to integrate the word-focused task into a learning unit or module explicitly aimed to help upper-secondary school students prepare for university-level studies in English. If the students are about to graduate from the upper-secondary school and enter tertiary education, this could be a way to connect the word-focused task work to a concrete and potentially motivating goal (Nakata & Webb, 2016). More specifically, Eriksson (2023) suggests providing upper-secondary school students with repeated exposure to English academic wordlist or subject-specific vocabulary lists as a means to ease the transition from upper-secondary school to university. She also proposes that upper-secondary school teachers and other members of staff should be more explicit about the amount and type of English required for higher education in Sweden, so that upper-secondary school students can make informed choices related to their tertiary education. In Study 2, the teacher collaborator Tove first let her students self-select 'bonus words' from the American SATs word list (CollegeBoard, 2023) which they engaged with using Tove's version of the word-focused task (see Figure 8.3). She also planned on pre-selecting TWs from the SATs wordlist as a means to scaffold the task work (see Excerpt 8.4). This makes it reasonable to assume that the wordfocused task could be successfully used to facilitate learning of pre- and selected TWs from word lists. Accordingly, the learning unit could start with an informative component explicitly pointing to the role of English in Swedish higher education, as suggested by Eriksson (2023). Here, individual upper-secondary school teachers should not be burdened with the sole responsibility for providing accurate information since it is not directly related to their practices. Instead, they could collaborate with guidance counsellors and instructors at local universities to ensure that the information is adequate (cf. Byrnes, 2020; Eriksson, 2023; Wedin, 2017). Next, students could practice the different ways of intentionally learning vocabulary suggested in the wordfocused task, with the purpose of becoming autonomous learners and finding tactics that work for them (as recommended by e.g., Nation, 2022). Then, they could be given the above-mentioned guidelines and subsequently engage in intentional learning of TWs from the Academic Word List (Coxhead, 2000) and/or subject-specific word lists (e.g., Coxhead & Hirsch, 2007; Ward, 2009) by completing the word-focused task. Each individual teacher could decide whether this should be done as homework or as an in-class task. Each teacher could also decide if all the TWs from the wordlists should be pre-selected (as discussed by Tove in Excerpt 8.4), or if students should also engage with self-selected TWs (as initially suggested by Tove, see Figure 8.2). Assuming that intentional vocabulary learning is a tool for developing other language skills (Nation, 2022), students should also get a chance to practice the TWs across several of Nation's (2007) four strands. For example, teachers could plant the TWs from the wordlists into appropriately challenging academic texts which students read as part of the learning unit. They could also be encouraged to use the TWs in, say, oral presentations of the

texts, thus enabling encounters in meaning-focused input and output, respectively. Importantly, this thesis project echoes Warnby (2023) in that different learners have different needs, meaning that focusing on academic vocabulary in this way may not be equally suitable for all students, especially since not all students choose to enrol in higher education. What matters is that the TWs students learn by completing the word-focused task are relevant (Newton, 2020).

As a means to create a positive washback effect and signal that vocabulary learning is important, students should be tested on the TWs they learn by completing the wordfocused task (Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020). The in-depth descriptions of individual participating students' intentional vocabulary learning and task work from Study 3 showed that the immediate and delayed post-tests maximized their chances of demonstrating their TW knowledge, as they could use any language(s) in their repertoires. The same test format could be used in the classroom, granted that teachers have the time and means to verify answers written in languages which they do not know. Alternatively, students could be instructed to answer only in English and/or the society majority language (Swedish in this case). As pointed out elsewhere (e.g., Galante, 2020; Tseng & Schmitt, 2008) learning new ways to engage in intentional vocabulary learning takes time, which requires patience from any teachers implementing the word-focused task.

11.2.3 RQ 3

Research question 3 focuses on the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task, and their beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning. In response to *RQ* 3, I will start by discussing the teacher collaborators' perceptions of the word-focused task and their participation in this thesis project as useful. Following this, I will discuss the fact that the student agency inherent in the word-focused task was perceived as interesting, albeit not problem-free. The teacher collaborators' beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general will be discussed in relation to previous research and Swedish educational policy. Lastly, I will zoom out and comment on the methodological and epistemological nature of the present study and the field of intentional L2 vocabulary learning more generally.

One pattern from Studies 2 and 4 was that the teacher collaborators perceived the word-focused task and their participation in this thesis project as useful. In Study 2, Tove perceived the task as a tool worth adapting, implementing, and evaluating within the context of her own teaching, as evidenced by her *Words of the Week* task sheet. In Study Nora appreciated the PowerPoint presentations used to introduce the vocabulary learning theory underpinning the task (see Appendix 7 and Appendix 8), Tove explicitly stated that her enriched her perspectives on intentional vocabulary learning.

Studies 2 and 4 thus suggest that the participation in this thesis project provided the teacher collaborators with new knowledge and tools for implementing intentional vocabulary learning. The fact that Tove did not only gain new knowledge but also used it in practice is important, as previous research shows that gained knowledge does not automatically result in changes in practice (Chung & Fisher, 2022).

The finding that the teacher collaborators perceived the word-focused task and their participation in this thesis project as useful is in accordance with the results of other teacher-researcher collaborations related to intentional vocabulary learning. Miller (2009) presents a series of researcher-developed intentional vocabulary learning tasks and a dictionary. These were aimed at immigrant EFL learners (aged 15–20) in Australia and used in the participating teachers' classrooms. The participating teachers perceived the tasks and the dictionary as useful, and the project reminded them of the importance of systematic, intentional attention to vocabulary. In the Swedish context, Nordlund and Rydström (2024) provide a hands-on example of how teacher-researcher collaborations can enrich intentional vocabulary learning in upper-secondary school EFL classrooms.

The discovery that the teacher collaborators benefitted from participating in the present study is important because it shows that the thesis project has explicitly contributed to the teaching of English in upper-secondary school. This, in turn, underscores the previously identified need to "bridge the divide between the wellestablished body of existing theoretically-oriented research on VLT [vocabulary learning and teaching] and the practical concerns of teachers and learners" (Newton, 2021, p. 138). For example, Gu (2020) points to a "disconnect between research and practice" (p. 282) and notes that efforts are needed to better communicate the research findings about vocabulary learning strategies (VLS) to the teachers and students who actually benefit from them. My review of the literature suggests that this disconnect also applies to field of international L2 vocabulary learning more generally. This raises questions about how the research community should extend its practical help to students and teachers as efficiently as possible. In Study 4, Nora was the only teacher collaborator who recalled focusing on vocabulary learning during teacher training. The teacher collaborators did not report any shared vocabulary learning policies within their respective teams of English teachers. Teachers' pre- and in-service training is known to affect their beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning and their actual teaching practices related to vocabulary (Chung, 2018b; Chung & Fisher, 2022). The value of shared intentional vocabulary learning policies has been highlighted by Lim Falk and Riad (2023) in a textbook aimed at L2 Swedish teachers. Accordingly, the present study suggests two potential lines of action for international L2 vocabulary learning researchers. These are to (1) to provide more research-based teacher training for preand in-service teachers of EFL, and (2) to assist EFL teachers in creating and

implementing shared vocabulary learning policies within their teams of English teachers. Locally, the need to focus more on intentional vocabulary learning in EFL teacher training has been pointed out elsewhere (D. Bergström, 2023; Stridsman, 2024), but not in light of teacher-researcher collaborations centred on a specific task aimed at multilingual EFL students, like in the present study. Internationally, Coxhead (2024) specifically stresses the need for guidance on *incidental* vocabulary learning, although she also welcomes more attention to vocabulary in teacher training more generally (see p. 120). Regardless, with regard to in-service teacher training, it is important that the teachers are given the time and means to actually reflect on the training and relate it to their own practices and expertise (Chung & Fisher, 2022).

Another main theme in Studies 2 and 4 was the teacher collaborators' apprehensions related to the responsibility and student agency inherent in the word-focused task. In Study 2, Tove noted that those who were motivated to expand their vocabulary completed the word-focused task diligently, whereas others did not. In Study 4, Nora said that some of her students saw the usefulness of the task and wanted to learn new words. Others completed the task in a passive way, without a long-term purpose in mind. Studies 2 and 4 collectively show how Tove's perception of letting her students self-select TWs to learn changed over time. During the first recorded teacher-researcher planning meeting (18 October 2022), she set out to let her students self-select TWs, as a means to accommodate to the students varying proficiency levels in English. In the second recorded teacher-researcher planning meeting (10 November 2022), Tove had decided to restrict the TW selection more than initially planned, as not all students could self-select TWs effectively without guidance. In her teacher interview (6 December 2022), Tove noted that her students explicitly asked her to select TWs for them, which further emphasised that this was appropriate. On the other hand, there is a negative flipside of the coin in that the students relied on her to select TWs for them. Thus, Studies 2 and 4 indicate that the word-focused task was perceived as useful, granted that the right amount of scaffolding is provided. Theoretically, the finding that some students need extra guidance with regard to the task work and TW selection tallies with Tseng and Schmitt's (2008) model of vocabulary learning, according to which autonomous intentional vocabulary learning may challenge some students and thus may require practice and assistance. As noted by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2018), students generally need to practice facilitate their own learning and benefit from guidance where they get help learning how to learn.

In relation to the teacher collaborators' beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general, another noteworthy finding is that the teacher collaborators positioned intentional vocabulary learning as important in theory. In practice, however, it appeared to play a marginal role. This result is unsurprising, as it agrees with previous research on Swedish EFL students' vocabulary learning and knowledge in grades 4–6 (Stridsman, 2024), 7–9 (D. Bergström, 2023), upper-secondary school (Warnby, 2023) and university (Eriksson, 2023). The present study nevertheless deepens our current understanding of the role of intentional English vocabulary learning in Swedish schools by focusing specifically on educators who taught adolescent EFL students' (aged 16–17), and who served as teacher collaborators. This thesis project and the research by Stridsman (2024), D. Bergström (2023), Warnby (2023) and Eriksson (2023) combined also have implications for the teaching of English in Sweden. Together, these studies show that students benefit from more intentional vocabulary learning opportunities in English on all levels, as they progress through the education system. Seeing the usefulness of the word-focused task established above, the present study suggests that the word-focused task can provide such opportunities and facilitate more systematic, intentional attention to vocabulary. Future research will have to determine the usefulness of the word-focused task for learners from other age groups and contexts than those in focus here.

Moreover, the teacher collaborators' beliefs about intentional vocabulary learning in general can at least in part be attributed to the communicative nature of the syllabi for compulsory- and upper-secondary school English discussed Chapter 2. Hult (2017) notes that in Sweden, the emphasis on CLT in the English syllabi first began to appear after revisions made in the 1970s. This was a response to prior versions of the syllabi, which had been largely focused on form and grammatical accuracy. Hult (2017) also points out that the 1990s, the syllabi were revised again, in order to align with the CEFR. With this came an even greater focus on communicative skills, which is evident in the syllabi referred to in this thesis project as well (Siegel, 2022). Now it appears that the pendulum has swung in that a focus on form is starting to reappear. The syllabus for upper-secondary school English in place at the time of the data collection for the present study has a slightly more explicit vocabulary focus than previous versions, as evident in the emphasis on collocations in the receptive core content (Snoder, 2022). As discussed in Study 4, the most recent version of the syllabus available at the time of writing is available for download at Skolverket and will come into effect on 1 July 2025. In this version of the syllabus, vocabulary is mentioned not only in the core content but also in the subject aim. This makes it reasonable to assume that EFL teachers now may have a more direct incentive to focus on intentional (and incidental) vocabulary learning in the classroom. Thus, the revised aim affects the significance of the thesis's contributions to the teaching of English in upper-secondary school. The reason is that because virtually all students in Sweden are multilingual (Gyllstad et al., 2023; Källkvist et al., 2022), EFL teachers from the Swedish context will presumably need to be provided with research focused on multilingual students' intentional English vocabulary learning, and word-focused tasks aimed at multilingual EFL students at upper-secondary school, if they are to align their teaching with the revised subject aim

and base their teaching on research and best practice, as specified in the Education Act (SFS 2010:800). Although other research (e.g., D. Bergström, 2023; Gyllstad et al., 2023) is useful in this regard, there are, to my knowledge, no previous studies from the Swedish contexts that focus specifically on the intentional vocabulary learning of EFL students aged 16–17 and zoom in both on mainstream students in upper-secondary school classrooms and non-mainstream students at the LIP. This means that both the learning- and design component of the present study are relevant to EFL teachers in Sweden.

Moreover, in terms of research methodology, this thesis project highlights the value of conducting multimethods research to investigate multilingual EFL students' intentional vocabulary learning. Here, Linnéa from Studies 2 and 3 combined is a case in point. The analysis of her intentional vocabulary learning was based on eight complementary data sets. These were: (1) word-focused task data, (2) Linnéa's language background questionnaire, (3) vocabulary tests (including test scores), (4) the teacher collaborator Tove's observations about Linnéa from our teacher-researcher planning meetings, (5) an SRI, (6) a language portrait, and (7) a student interview.

Among other things, the seven data sets combined revealed the following: completing the word-focused task had a positive effect on Linnéa's knowledge of the target-word *eschew*. This may at least in part be attributed to Linnéa's motivation to learn vocabulary and her appreciation for the word-focused task, as corroborated both by Tove and Linnéa herself. These findings would have been impossible to target using quantitative data alone, not least because Tove's observations were spontaneously shared during a recorded teacher-researcher planning meeting analysed by means of an inherently qualitative method (RTA) (Braun & Clarke, 2022).

As mentioned, the field of L2 intentional vocabulary learning is largely quantitative in nature (see e.g., Nation, 2022; Webb, 2020b). Quantitative research typically presupposes a positivist epistemology by emphasising objectivity, validity, and avoidance of researcher bias (Hammand & Wellington, 2022). In contrast, epistemologically interpretative research such as RTAs is inherently subjective (Braun et al., 2022). Repeated calls have been made for intentional vocabulary learning studies supplementing the experimental (or quasi-experimental) research currently dominating the field (see e.g., D. Bergström, 2023; Peters, 2009; Stridsman, 2024). Peters (2009), who has contributed a great deal of L2 vocabulary learning research with school-age children, argues strongly for juxtaposing quantitative post-test scores with qualitative interviews when researching intentional learning of L2 collocations. This, she noted, "can help us refine our understanding of the learning activity that is taking place" (p. 207). Focusing on incidental L2 vocabulary learning, Coxhead (2024) similarly notes that "a qualitative turn [...] is timely and much needed" (p. 221).
This thesis project echoes Peters (2009) and suggests that the qualitative turn called for by Coxhead (2024) also applies to intentional L2 vocabulary learning. However, whilst the need for a methodological turn within the field of intentional L2 vocabulary learning research is relatively well established (e.g., by Gu, 2020; Stridsman, 2024), my review of the literature does not point to any discussions explicitly focused on epistemology (i.e., theory of knowledge) rather than methodology (i.e., rationales for using specific methods and collecting various types of data) (however see Gu, 2020; Webb, 2020a, p. 235 for neighbouring comments). This is unfortunate, as epistemological discussions can help challenge long-held assumptions circulating within a field and lead to advancements in research (Cohen et al., 2018; Dörnyei, 2007). Accordingly, I would like to extend the calls for non-quantitative and experimental intentional L2 vocabulary learning research by suggesting an increased focus on epistemology within the field. This could involve theoretical discussions challenging positivist assumptions about generalizability and validity, as well as edited volumes that encompass epistemologically interpretative vocabulary studies (e.g., qualitative interview studies or in-depth descriptions of task work) and discussions about what an interpretative perspective may add to the field.

11.3 Contributions of Studies 1-4

The present study advances our current understanding of how multilingual students intentionally learn targeted English vocabulary in upper-secondary school classrooms. By exploring intentional vocabulary learning on the group level, and from the perspectives of individual learners and teacher collaborators, the studies enrich the existing body of research on multilingual EFL students' intentional vocabulary learning (e.g., Busse et al., 2020, 2021; Cenoz et al., 2022; Gyllstad et al., 2023), which is predominantly quantitative and quasi-experimental rather than centred on tasks used as learning materials in locally situated learning units. The analyses of the resources visibly used to complete the word-focused task give new insights into how EFL students with different multilingual backgrounds and expected proficiency levels in English intentionally learn TWs, also when given the agency to orchestrate their own learning. The student interviews and SRIs combined deepen our understanding of multilingual EFL students' intentional vocabulary learning on the individual level. The analysis of the teacher interviews complements earlier research (e.g., D. Bergström et al., 2022; Hermagustiana et al., 2017; Macalister, 2012) by focusing specifically on uppersecondary school EFL teachers acting as teacher collaborators. The teacher interview study also has implications for English teacher education in Sweden. Methodologically,

the thesis project demonstrates the value multimethods intentional vocabulary learning research, which is still scant. It also makes an epistemological contribution by traversing multiple theories of knowledge and illustrating the benefits of not only relying on positivist quantitative and statistical analyses but also inherently subjective and qualitative analytical methods. Further, the research reported in this thesis contributes to the teaching of English in upper-secondary school by presenting research focused specifically on multilingual EFL students' aged 16–17, and by offering an applicable, adjustable, and individualizable, word-focused task that can be used to facilitate intentional vocabulary learning in a range of English classrooms. Locally, the present study therefore adds to the existing body of classroom-related English vocabulary research by focusing on multilingual English 5–6 students as well as LIP students, and by answering the calls for more concrete intentional vocabulary learning tools made elsewhere (D. Bergström et al., 2022; Stridsman, 2024).

11.4 Limitations and suggestions for further research

This sub-section deals with the limitations of the thesis project, and outlines suggestions for further research. The limitations discussed include the absence of language proficiency tests, the number of teacher collaborators, the vocabulary test scoring criteria, and the generalisability of the findings beyond the classrooms where data were collected. The suggested avenues for future research are (1) intervention studies evaluating different formats of the word-focused task, and (2) collaborative projects with the aim of constructing, using, and evaluating the word-focused task as homework.

As to limitations, the data used for this thesis does not feature measures of students' language proficiency. Had I had such data, I would have allowed an exploration of the relationship between the participating students' proficiency in a language (the target language English and/or another language in their repertoires), and their visible use of the language to complete the word-focused task. This would have further deepened our understanding of their task work and intentional vocabulary learning. It also would have provided a more nuanced picture of the participating students' language repertoires (Baker & Wright, 2021). Exploring language proficiency per se was, however, not prioritised. There are two reasons for this. First, the primary aim of this thesis project does not focus on the participating students' proficiency levels in the languages in their repertoires, but on the resources they visibly used to complete the task and potentially learn the vocabulary. Although the participating students' *expected* English proficiency levels are important, language proficiency per se is also not explicitly

related to the auxiliary aim of constructing, using, and evaluating the word-focused task developed. Another reason relates to ethics. Testing language proficiency levels would add to students' burden of participating, and it is possible that they would have felt excessively assessed, which may have caused attrition.

Study 4 features four teacher collaborators whom I did not know prior to our teacher-researcher collaborations. The small number of interviewees affects the external validity (Dörnyei, 2007) of the study. However, external validity is associated with a positivist view of scientific knowledge as universal, whereas the constructionist/localist approach to interviews adopted in this thesis project instead conceives knowledge as co-constructed and socially situated. This makes external validity secondary for the benefit of analytic generalisation, which "involves a recent judgment about the extent to which the findings of one study can be used as a guide to what might occur in another situation it is based on an analysis of the similarities and differences of the two situations" (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p. 297).

Another limitation is the scoring criteria used to score the vocabulary tests in Studies 1-3. In Study 1, partially correct answers and reports of recognition both resulted in 1 point, which penalizes those demonstrating actual (albeit partial) TW knowledge, as this is placed on a par with merely reporting recognition. In the immediate and delayed post-tests from Study 2, all the example sentences where TWs were used in a standardlike way with regard to part of speech yielded 1 point. Thus, generic example sentences which did not necessarily reflect meaning recall knowledge (e.g., 'It is very atypical') resulted in the same score as example sentences where student meaning recall knowledge was more clearly demonstrated (e.g., 'A student scoring 100% on this quiz is <u>atypical</u>'). This is a limitation because it means that the vocabulary tests scores did not always accurately reflect the participants' TW knowledge. On the other hand, all vocabulary tests in the different studies were scored based on the same criteria, which is important with regard to reliability (Bruton, 2009). In Study 2, 12 out of the 34 vocabulary test scores that were rated twice were changed between the first and second intra-rating. This affects the reliability of the vocabulary test scores. To avoid similar limitations in the future, I would use more fine-grained scoring criteria (e.g., with 0.5 points for recognition and 1 point for partial knowledge demonstration). I would also implement inter-rating involving two independent raters.

The research project as a whole was conducted in a specific context, Sweden. However, the contributions of Studies 1–4 may be informative for wider contexts as well. For example, they corroborate previous international research showing that pedagogical translanguaging can be successfully implemented in multilingual EFL classrooms to promote intentional learning of vocabulary. As mentioned in Chapter 3, a majority of this previous research was conducted in primary school classrooms withs students below the age of 12 in Germany (Busse et al., 2020, 2021; Hopp et al., 2021),

the Basque country (Cenoz et al., 2022; Leonet et al., 2020), although Galante's (2020) participants were 18–21 years old and enrolled in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course in Canada. From a research perspective, the studies presented in this thesis also show the value of combining perspectives from international L2 vocabulary learning studies and pedagogical translanguaging research. As mentioned in Chapter 1, the choice to combine both perspectives is a response to my review of the literature, since calls have been made for more quantitative pedagogical translanguaging research like Study 1, as well as vocabulary research on the individual level like Study 3 (Kim & Webb, 2022; Prilutskaya, 2021).

As to avenues for future research, a potential continuation of this thesis project would be to conduct intervention studies establishing the usefulness of the different task formats proposed by the teacher collaborators. All the teacher collaborators were positive towards digitalising the word-focused task. Thus, future research could compare the efficiency of the paper-and-pencil format used in the present study and a digital task format with regard to observed learning, as well as student and teacher perceptions. Another suggestion was to focus on one task section at a time during separate lessons, as a means to make the task work more manageable. Testing this empirically, a separate study could compare the setup used in Studies 2–3, and a more scaffolded mode of procedure.

Furthermore, two teacher collaborators suggested using the word-focused task as homework. One participating student reported receiving scaffolding in Arabic from her parent when learning English vocabulary at home. Seeing this, a future study could contribute to the teaching of English in Swedish schools by constructing, using, and evaluating the word-focused task as translanguaging homework, defined by Svensson and Svensson (2022) as "assignments which students and parents (or other adults) do and discuss together, with the possibility of using all their linguistic resources" (p. 217). Revisions of the word-focused task into translanguaging homework could include adding a QR code to each task sheet leading to a website aimed at parents or other guardians. The website could present guidelines for optimising the use of the wordfocused task as translanguaging homework. The guidelines could be available in multiple languages, making it useful for as many parents and other guardians as possible. One teacher collaborator described the word-focused task as particularly relevant for dyslectic individuals like Linnéa, who indeed appeared to appreciate the word-focused task. Accordingly, the website could also contain information about how to best support dyslectic students' intentional vocabulary learning using the wordfocused task as translanguaging homework. This information could be developed by a team of vocabulary and multilingualism researcher(s), in-service EFL teacher(s), and special education teacher(s). The research may preferably be conducted on the compulsory school level (e.g., in years 7-9, with students aged 12-16). This would

answer The Swedish Schools Inspectorate's call for more projects bringing together teachers and special education teachers on this particular level (Skolinspektionen, 2023).

Sammanfattning på svenska

Inledning

Detta avhandlingsprojekt handlar om avsiktlig ordinlärning i flerspråkiga engelskklassrum på gymnasiet. Avsiktlig ordinlärning möjliggörs genom uppgifter som har ett explicit vokabulärfokus (Webb, 2020a). Termen uppgift (task) används i vid bemärkelse för att benämna alla aktiviteter som elever gör i klassrummet (se t.ex. Busse m.fl, 2020). Det råder konsensus bland vokabulärforskare om att avsiktlig ordinlärning är en viktig del av alla välbalanserade kurser i engelska som främmande språk (se t.ex. Laufer, 2005; Nation, 2007; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020). Tidigare forskning visar dock att engelsklärare i Sverige tenderar att prioritera oavsiktlig ordinlärning där lärandet av ord i stället antas ske genom mer implicita lärandemekanismer då eleverna exempelvis läser och lyssnar (D. Bergström, 2023). Detta är i linje med ämnesplanerna i engelska för högstadiet och gymnasiet (Skolverket, 2021, 2022a). De genomsyras av en handlingsorienterad språksyn med fokus på språkanvändning och kommunikativ kompetens. Fokus på ord lyfts fram mer i den nya ämnesplanen för gymnasieskolan som finns i tryck nu och som träder i kraft den 1juli. Det mesta (eller rentav allt) som eleverna förväntas uppnå förutsätter dessutom ett robust engelskt ordförråd (Siegel, 2022; Snoder, 2022). Studier (Eriksson, 2023; Warnby, 2023) visar också att många elever lämnar gymnasieskolan utan det engelska vokabulär som krävs för att effektivt kunna tillgodogöra sig engelskspråkig facklitteratur inom ramen för högre utbildning. Sammantaget tyder detta på att vokabulär bör få mer explicit systematisk uppmärksamhet i engelskklassrum på gymnasiet.

Mer specifikt handlar avhandlingsprojektet om *flerspråkiga* elevers avsiktliga ordinlärning. Flerspråkiga elever är individer vars *repertoarer* (d.v.s. deras sammantagna språkliga resurser) består av tre eller fler språk (Baker & Wright, 2021; Blommaert, 2013). Enligt denna definition är i princip alla elever som läser engelska i Sverige flerspråkiga, då de flesta kan engelska, svenska och ytterligare ett språk (t.ex. ett modernt språk eller modersmål) i någon utsträckning (se t.e.x Gyllstad m.fl, 2023; Källkvist m.fl, 2022). En viktig utgångspunkt i avhandlingsprojektet är *transspråkande pedagogik* (*pedagogical translanguaging*). Detta innebär ett planerat, strategiskt och medvetet användande av elevers flerspråkighet som en resurs (Juvonen & Källkvist, 2021). Det finns relativt lite forskning om flerspråkiga elevers avsiktliga ordinlärning på engelska som främmande språk (Galante, 2020). Majoriteten av av de studier som finns att tillgå är kvasiexperimentella studier där eleverna ofta är under tolv år och där fokuset inte ligger på uppgifterna som eleverna utför.

Mot bakgrund av detta kretsar detta avhandlingsprojekt kring en uppgift med ett explicit vokabulärfokus: den ord-fokuserade uppgiften (the word-focused task). Den ordfokuserade uppgiften är ett uppgiftsblad där elever kan fylla i information i sju olika fält. I varje del kan eleverna fylla i sju olika typer av information om ett ord (*target word*, förkortat TW). Dessa är: (1) synonym(er), (2) översättning(ar) av ordet, (3) en illustration som symboliserar ordet, (4) förklaring(ar), (5) exempelmening(ar) som innehåller ordet, (6) en koppling i form av en referens till när ordet hörts eller setts förut, och (7) en association till ordet. Allt detta rekommenderas av vokabulärexperter (t.ex. Nation, 2022; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020) för att initiera, befästa och/eller påvisa kunskap om ett ord. I studien får eleverna själva välja vilka av de sju delarna de ska fylla i och på vilket språk. På så sätt kan den ord-fokuserade uppgiften individanpassas. Eleverna får även orkestrera sin egen inlärning, vilket är nyttigt men kräver övning (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2018). Uppgiften är också justerbar så att individuella lärare själva ska kunna anpassa den till olika elevgrupper baserat på sina beprövade erfarenheter (se även Nordlund & Rydstöm, 2024, s. 19). Det finns ett uppgiftsblad per ord.

Avhandlingsprojektets primära övergripande syfte är att främja vår nuvarande förståelse för hur flerspråkiga elever avsiktligt lär sig utvalda engelska ord i gymnasieklassrum. Därför belyser avhandlingsprojektet de resurser som gymnasieelever med olika flerspråkiga bakgrunder och färdighetsnivåer i engelska synligt använder för att utföra den ord-fokuserade uppgiften och potentiellt lära sig orden. Fokuset på synligt använda resurser är viktigt, då resurser även kan aktiveras i det mentala lexikonet och förbli osynliga (Grosjean, 2008). Detta är dock bortom ramen för det här avhandlingsprojektet. Avhandlingsprojektet syftar till även att bidra till engelskundervisningen på gymnasiet genom att konstruera, använda och utvärdera den utvecklade ord-fokuserade uppgiften. I detta avhandlingsprojekt används den ordfokuserade uppgiften både som undervisningsmaterial och som forskningsverktyg.

Uppgiften integreras i skräddarsydda undervisningssekvenser (*learning units*) om 3– 6 lektioner som jag planerat och utformat tillsammans med elevernas lärare. Eleverna utförde den ord-fokuserade uppgiften tillsammans med andra uppgifter kopplade till ett specifikt tema. Varje undervisningssekvens stämde överens med respektive lärares plan för läsåret, samt aktuella styrdokument. För att få med lärarperspektivet (d.v.s. lärarnas kompetens utvecklad genom lärarutbildning samt under åren som yrkesverksamma) på den ord-fokuserade uppgiften och hur användbar den är för elever i lärarnas respektive klassrum, så belyser avhandlingsprojektet även lärarnas perspektiv på den ord-fokuserade uppgiften. Eftersom uppgiften tillhandahåller ett exempel på avsiktlig ordinlärning så blir lärarna också tillfrågade att prata om avsiktlig ordinlärning, i och med att deras syn på detta potentiellt skulle kunna förklara deras perspektiv på uppgiften.

Avhandlingsprojektet besvarar följande forskningsfrågor:

(1) Vilka resurser använder elevdeltagarna synligt för att utföra den ord-fokuserade uppgiften?

(2) Vilken effekt har utförandet av uppgiften på elevernas kunskap om förvalda och självvalda ord (*TWs*)?

(3) Vilka är de undervisande lärarnas erfarenhetsbaserade perspektiv på den ordfokuserade uppgiften, och deras tankar kring avsiktlig ordinlärning generellt?

Studie	Syfte	Empiriskt material	Analysmetoder
1	Att främja vår nuvarande förståelse för hur flerspråkiga elever avsiktligt lär sig specifika engelska ord i gymnasieklassrummen genom att belysa de resurser som synligt används av elevdeltagarna för utföra Version 1 av uppgiften, samt den observerade inlärningen av orden.	Enkät om elevers språkbakgrund Resultat av ordtester Uppgiftsblad Elevutvärderingar	Kvantitativa statistiska analyser Kvalitativ innehållsanalys (Mayring, 2022)
7	Att ta in lärarnas perspektiv på användbarheten av den ord-fokuserade uppgiften för elever i deras respektiv klassrum genom att belysa deras perspektiv på den ord-fokuserade uppgiften. Att främja vår nuvarande förståelse för hur flerspråkiga elever avsiktligt lär sig enskilda engelska ord i gymnasieklassrummen genom att belysa de resurser som synligt används av elevdeltagarna för att fylla i Version 2 av uppgiften, samt den observerade inlärningen av orden.	Inspelade planeringsmöten med forskare och lärare Enkät om elevers språkbakgrund Resultat på ordtester Uppgiftsblad En elevs reflektion kring ett av ordtesterna	Kvantitativa statistiska analyser Tematisk kvalitativ innehållsanalys (Braun & Clarke, 2019)
m	Att främja vår nuvarande förståelse för hur flerspråkiga elever avsiktligt lär sig specifika engelska ord i gymnasieklassrummen genom att belysa de resurser som synligt används av elevdeltagarna för utföra Version 2 av uppgiften, samt den observerade inlärningen av orden.	Enkät om elevers språkbakgrund Uppgiftsblad Verbal introspektionsdata Språkporträtt Elevintervjuer Resultat på ordtester	Kvalitativ innehållsanalys (Mayring, 2022)
4	Att ta in lärarnas perspektiv på användbarheten av den ord-fokuserade uppgiften för elever i deras respektive klassrum genom att belysa deras perspektiv på den ord-fokuserade uppgiften i synnerhet och deras tankar kring avsiktlig ordinlärning mer generellt	Lärarintervjuer	Tematisk kvalitativ innehållsanalys (Braun & Clarke, 2019)

Metod och material

258

För att besvara avhandlingsprojektets forskningsfrågor har fyra separata empiriska studier med olika metoder och studieobjekt genomförts (se ovan). Tillsammans klassas Studie 1–4 som flermetodsforskning (*multimethods research*) och praktiknära forskning research) (Schoonenboom, 2023; Van den (development Akker, 1999). Flermetodsforskning kännetecknas av kvantitativa och kvalitativa data som på ett kompletterande sätt används för att undersöka komplexa fenomen såsom avsiktlig ordinlärning i flerspråkiga engelskklassrum (Dörnyei, 2007; Schoonenboom, 2023). Praktiknära forskning syftar till att förbättra undervisning och/eller förutsättningar för lärande. Forskningen utförs på skolor och tar avstamp i skolpersonalens behov. Lärare kan vara medforskare, men det kan också handla om samverkansprojekt likt detta avhandlingsprojekt, där lärare och forskare samarbetar snarare än forskar tillsammans (Carlgren, 2019; Van den Akker, 1999).

Resultat

Studie 1

I Studie 1 användes och utvärderades en första version (Version 1) av den ordfokuserade uppgiften i tre språkligt homogena grupper (Klass 1–3). Samtliga elever läste Engelska 5 och majoriteten hade svenska som förstaspråk (L1). Fokus låg på de resurser som eleverna synligt använde för att utföra den ord-fokuserade uppgiften, samt på den effekt som arbetet hade på elevernas kännedom om orden från studien. Eleverna skrev ofta ner synonymer och svenska översättningar av orden på sina uppgiftsblad. Illustrationer och referenser till sammanhang då ordet hörts eller setts förut var däremot ovanliga. Eleverna spenderade mest tid på att arbeta med det första ordet och mindre tid på de fem sista orden jämfört med de fem första. Tillsammans med elevernas egna utvärderingar av undervissningssekvenserna tyder detta på att arbetet med orden kan ha varit för monotont för vissa. Samtidigt uppgav flera elever att de fått upp ögonen för nya sätt att lära sig nya ord på. Utförandet av uppgiften hade en relativt liten effekt på elevernas kännedom om orden från Studie 1, då de lärde sig cirka 2,5 av tio ord efter att ha mött dem under ett lektionstillfälle. Å andra sidan uppmättes en statistiskt signifikant skillnad på resultaten på ordtesten eleverna genomförde före jämfört med efter att de arbetat med den ord-fokuserade uppgiften.

Studie 2

Studie 2 kretsade kring en förfinad version av den ord-fokuserade uppgiften (Version 2). Uppgiften användes i två klasser: en språkligt homogen grupp (Klass 1), samt en ny och mer språkligt heterogen grupp (Klass 4). Studien belyste en av lärarnas (Toves) perspektiv på uppgiften baserat på en analys av tre inspelade gemensamma

planeringsmöten (teacher-researcher planning meetings). Studie 2 berörde även de resurser som Klass 1 och Klass 4 synligt använde för att utföra uppgiften, samt effekten av genomförandet av den ord-fokuserade uppgiften på elevernas lärande. Resultaten visade att Tove, helt självständigt och utanför själva avhandlingsprojektet, valt att implementera och utvärdera sin egen version av den ord-fokuserade uppgiften. Initialt var Tove positiv till att låta eleverna själva välja ord att arbeta med. Tre veckor senare hade hon bestämt sig för att styra valet av ord mer än vad hon tänkt från början, då flera elever behövde stöttning i detta. Majoriteten av hennes elever Klass 1 hade svenska som L1 och skrev ofta ner svenska översättningar av orden tillsammans med synonymer på engelska på sina uppgiftsblad. Eleverna i Klass 4, som ofta hade andra L1 än svenska, tenderade i stället att utföra den ord-fokuserade uppgiften helt på engelska. Förklaringar till detta resultat kan finnas i elevernas kunskaper i, och syn på, svenska som resurs, samt deras lärares egna praktiker. Studien pekar på en måttlig men positiv effekt av uppgiften på elevernas kännedom om orden, då deras testresultat förbättrades med i genomsnitt 25% efter att ha genomfört uppgiften. Detta tyder på att den ordfokuserade uppgiften kan användas för att möjliggöra avsiktlig ordinlärning men att instruktionerna bör modifieras för att optimera utförandet. Studien belyser även tre specifika elever som jag kallar Linnéa, Sahar och Rawda. Tove uppfattade sin elev Linnéa som motiverad att lära sig nya ord på grund av ett konkret behov av att utveckla sitt ordförråd. Tove beskrev Sahar som en elev med ett starkt inre driv att lära sig ord. Detta bekräftades av Sahar själv, som uppgav att hon frivilligt studerat orden från studien på sin fritid. Rawda var den enda eleven som synligt använde arabiska för att utföra den ord-fokuserade uppgiften.

Studie 3

I Studie 3 undersöktes Linnéa, Sahar, och Rawdas avsiktliga ordinlärning i mer detalj. Studien belyste även en fjärde elev, Sofia, som studerade engelska på nybörjarnivå på Språkintroduktionsprogrammet på gymnasiet. Linnéa, Sahar, Rawda och Sofias avsiktliga ordinlärning undersöktes genom kvalitativa och kvantitativa data (se tabell ovan). Utöver Linnéa, Sahar, Rawda och Sofia medverkade sex andra elever. Eleverna delades in i två grupper baserat på deras färdighetsnivåer i engelska: Grupp 1 och Grupp 2. Grupp 1 läste Engelska 5–6. Grupp 2 var nybörjare från Språkintroduktionsprogrammet. Studien visar att eleverna synligt använde språkliga och icke-språkliga resurser för att initiera, befästa, associera och påvisa kunskap om ord. Sättet de arbetade med orden på varierade beroende på deras färdighetsnivåer i engelska. Grupp 1 använde engelska och svenska mer än Grupp 2 som i stället tenderade att synligt använda sina respektive L1 (arabiska spanska och thailändska). Uppgiften hade en måttlig men positiv effekt på elevernas kunskap om ordern från studien.

Studie 4

Studie 4 belyste de undervisande lärarnas perspektiv på den ord-fokuserade uppgiften i synnerhet, samt deras tankar kring avsiktlig ordinlärning generellt. Datamaterialet bestod av semistrukturerade intervjuer med fyra av de medverkande lärarna och analyserades genom en reflektiv tematisk analys. Lärarna betraktade den ord-fokuserade uppgiften som användbar och uppskattade att eleverna erbjöds flera olika alternativ att lära sig nya ord på. Samtidigt uppfattades det relativt fria uppgiftsformatet som potentiellt överväldigande därmed omotiverade för vissa elever, som inte nödvändigtvis ville och/eller kunde ta ansvar för sin egen inlärning på det sätt som uppgiften krävde. Två förslag från lärarna var att eventuellt digitalisera uppgiften, samt skapa en fristående uppgift med koppling till elevernas fritidsengelska. I intervjuerna framhölls avsiktlig ordinlärning som viktigt och som ett potentiellt utvecklingsområde. I praktiken verkade det dock spela en relativt liten roll till förmån för kommunikativa uppgifter. Lärarna rapporterade inte något specifikt tillvägagångssätt gällande avsiktlig ordinlärning, utan verkade snarare påminnas om dess betydelse under intervjuerna. Ingen av lärarna uppgav någon gemensam policy kring ordinlärning inom sina respektive ämneslag. Resultaten bör inte tolkas som kritik gentemot de medverkade lärarna och deras praktiker, utan påvisar snarare vikten av att utrusta engelsklärare med forskningsbaserad information och konkreta verktyg som de kan använda för att utveckla sin vokabulärundervisning (jmfr. t.ex. Byrnes, 2020; Wedin, 2017).

Diskussion

Ett resultat var att eleverna synligt använde sina L1 som resurser när de genomförde den ord-fokuserade uppgiften. Detta är i linje med tidigare vokabulärforskning (tex. Lee & Levine, 2020; Nation, 2022; Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020; Tian & Macaro, 2012) som visar att det går snabbare och är mer effektivt att lära sig nya ord på ett L2 genom sitt L1 än genom synonymer på L2. Elevernas synliga användande av sina respektive L1 och uppskattning av detta stämmer även överens med tidigare forskning om transspråkande pedagogik, enligt vilken omdömesgill L1 användning har såväl pedagogiska (se tex. Velasco & García, 2014) som socioemotionella (Busse m.fl, 2020, 2021; García & Kleyn, 2016) positiva effekter.

Eleverna använde dock inte nödvändigtvis sina L1 för att utföra uppgiften, utan snarare de språk som de ansåg vara användbara för ändamålet. Ett typexempel på detta återfinns hos eleven Sahar. Enligt egen utsago lärde Sahar sig svenska, engelska och urdu simultant som liten (1–2 år gammal). I teorin hade hon rimligtvis kunnat använda alla dessa språk som resurser för att utföra den ord-fokuserade uppgiften. Hennes elevintervju tydde dock på att hon föredrog att fokusera på ett språk i taget snarare än att transspråka. Detta reflekterades i hennes arbete med den ord-fokuserade uppgiften då hon valde att utföra den helt på engelska. Andra elever (tex. Rawda och Linnéa) verkade däremot uppfatta sina L1 som resurser vid avsiktlig ordinlärning på engelska, vilket också reflekterades i deras arbete med den ord-fokuserade uppgiften. Detta är i linje med tidigare forskning som pekar på individuella skillnader gällande elevers syn på L1 användande i engelskklassrummet (se t.ex. Källkvist m.fl., 2022; Rodrick Beiler, 2021a).

Vidare visar avhandlingsprojektet att utförandet av den ord-fokuserade uppgiften hade en måttlig men positiv effekt på elevernas kunskap om orden från Studie 1–3. Detta är i linje med tidigare forskning med fokus på yngre flerspråkiga barns avsiktliga ordinlärning på engelska som främmande språk (Busse m.fl., 2020, 2021; Gyllstad m.fl., 2023). Avhandlingsprojektet visar således att det går att möjliggöra ordinlärning genom uppgiften. För att optimera arbetet hade eleverna behövt spendera mer tid på att möta orden i fler meningsfulla sammanhang. Inramningen av arbetet hade kunnat vara mer motiverande då motivation visade sig vara en viktig faktor. Detta gällde inte minst Linnéa som uppgav att hon var dyslektiker och därmed tycktes ha en konkret anledning att vilja utveckla sitt ordförråd. Ett sätt att göra arbetet mer motiverande skulle kunna vara låta den ord-fokuserade uppgiften utgöra en del av ett tematiskt arbete om engelskans roll på svenska universitet och högskolor, riktat till exempelvis elever på studieförberedande program i årskurs tre (se Eriksson, 2023).

Ytterligare ett resultat var att avsiktlig ordinlärning enligt lärarna ansågs vara viktigt i teorin, alltså när de uttryckte sina tankar om detta. I klassrumspraktiken ägnade man sig istället åt oavsiktlig ordinlärning och ett fokus på kommunikativa aktiviteter och innehåll. Förklaringar till detta resultat kan finnas i den handlingsorienterade och kommunikativa språksyn som genomsyrar ämnesplanen i engelska från läroplanen i gymnasieskolan. Resultatet stämmer även överens med tidigare svensk vokabulärforskning inom engelskämnet på mellanstadiet (Stridsman, 2024), högstadiet (D. Bergström m. fl. 2022), gymnasiet (Warnby, 2023) och universitetet (Eriksson, 2023). Detta avhandlingsprojekt skiljer sig från dessa tidigare studier eftersom det är ett praktiknära samverkansprojekt med ett flerspråkighetsperspektiv. Tillsammans tyder de ovannämnda studierna och detta avhandlingsprojekt på att avsiktlig ordinlärning intagit en marginell position inom engelskämnet på flera nivåer inom det svenska skolsystemet, samt att elever bör erbjudas fler möjligheter att utveckla sitt engelska ordförråd på ett systematiskt och strukturerat sätt. Utifrån gymnasielärarperspektiv är detta extra viktigt i och med den reviderade ämnesplanen i engelska som träder i kraft i 1 juli 2025. Där omnämns vokabulär både under ämnets syfte och i det centrala innehållet (Skolverket, 2024c).

Avslutningsvis tillför avhandlingsprojektet ny kunskap om hur flerspråkiga elever lär sig ord på engelska när de får orkestrera sin egen inlärning och använda sin som resurs för tillägna och flerspråkighet att sig påvisa ordkunskap. Avhandlingsprojektet bidrar även med en ord-fokuserad uppgift som går att individanpassa och som enskilda lärare kan justera utifrån elevgruppers olika behov och/eller sin egen expertis. I framtida undersökningar skulle det kunna vara möjligt att utvärdera olika format av uppgiften genom att exempelvis jämföra det relativt fria uppgiftsformatet från Studie 1-3 med ett mer styrt format där eleverna erbjuds mer stöttning. Vidare skulle forskare, lärare och specialpedagoger kunna samarbeta för att optimera utformandet och utförandet av uppgiften för elever med dyslexi.

References

- Abram, D. (1996). The spell of the sensuous: Perception and language in a more-than-human world. Vintage Books.
- Ahearn, L. M. (2001). Language and agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *30*(1), 109–137. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.30.1.109
- Alderson, J. C. (2005). *Diagnosing foreign language proficiency: The interface between learning and assessment.* Continuum.
- Alvesson, M. (2011). Interpreting interviews. Sage.
- Anderson, R. C., & Freebody, P. (1981). Vocabulary knowledge. In J. T. Guthrie (Ed.), Comprehension and teaching: Research reviews (pp. 77–117). International Reading Association.
- Anguera, M. T., Blanco-Villaseñor, A., Losada, J. L., Sánchez-Algarra, P., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2018). Revisiting the difference between mixed methods and multimethods: Is it all in the name? *Quality & Quantity: International Journal of Methodology*, 52(6), 2757–2770. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-018-0700-2
- Ardasheva, Y., & Tretter, T. R. (2017). Developing science-specific, technical vocabulary of high school newcomer English learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 20(3), 252–271. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1042356
- Baker, C., & Wright, W. E. (2021). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (7 ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Barcroft, J. (2004). Effects of sentence writing in second language lexical acquisition. *Second Language Research*, 20(4), 303–334. https://doi.org/10.1191/0267658304sr2330a
- Barcroft, J. (2009). Strategies and performance in intentional L2 vocabulary learning. *Language Awareness, 18*(1), 74–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410802557535
- Berggren, J., Kunitz, S., Haglind, M., Hoskins, A., Löfquist, A., & Robertson, H. (2023). Combining theory and practice: Findings from a collaborative project on oral task design. In G. Erickson, C. Bardel, & D. Little (Eds.), *Collaborative research in language education: Reciprocal benefits and challenges* (Vol. 20, pp. 11–28). De Gruyter Mouton
- Bergmark, U., & Graeske, C. (2022). *Praktiknära forskning i förskola och skola: Undervisning, forskning och utveckling i samverkan.* Studentlitteratur
- Bergström, J., Jonsson, C., & Norlund Shaswar, A. (2024). "English is not really a subject": Language ideologies and language learning in an introduction program. *TESOL Quarterly*, 0(0), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3355

- Bergström, D. (2023). Words in school: A study of vocabulary learning support in the Swedish EFL classroom [Doctoral dissertation, Luleå University of Technology].
- Bergström, D., Norberg, C., & Nordlund, M. (2022). "Words are picked up along the way" Swedish EFL teachers' conceptualizations of vocabulary knowledge and learning. *Language Awareness*, 31(4), 393–409. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2021.1893326
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A.(2017). Translanguaging in mobility. In Canagarajah, S. (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of migration and language*. Routledge.
- Block, D. (2003). The social turn in second language acquisition. Edinburgh University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). The sociolinguistics of globalization. Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2013). Language and the study of diversity. Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies, 74.
- Boers, F. (2024). Bridging intentional and incidental vocabulary learning. In M.F Teng & B.L Reynolds (Eds.), *Researching incidental vocabulary learning in a second language* (pp. 182– 195). Routledge.
- Boers, F., Demecheleer, M., Coxhead, A., & Webb., S. (2014). Gauging the effects of exercises on verb–noun collocations. *Language Teaching Research*, 18(1), 54–74. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168813505389
- Borg, S. (2006). Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice. Continuum.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 11(4), 589–597. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021a). Can I use TA? Should I use TA? Should I not use TA? Comparing reflexive thematic analysis and other pattern-based qualitative analytic approaches. *Counselling & Psychotherapy Research*, 21(1), 37–47. https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12360
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021b). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *18*(3), 328–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238
- Braun, V., Clarke, V., & Hayfield, N. (2022). 'A starting point for your journey, not a map': Nikki Hayfield in conversation with Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke about thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 19(2), 424–445. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2019.1670765
- Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Sage Publications.
- Brevik, L. M., & Rindal, U. (2020). Language use in the classroom: Balancing target language exposure with the need for other languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, 54(4), 925–953. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1002/tesq.564

- Bruton, A. (2009). The vocabulary knowledge scale: A critical analysis. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 6(4), 288–297. http://doi.org/10.1080/15434300902801909
- Busch, B. (2018). The language portrait in multilingualism research: Theoretical and methodological considerations. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*, 236, 1–13.
- Bucholtz, M. (2000). The politics of transcription. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *32*(10), 1439–1465. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00094-6
- Busse, V., Cenoz, J., Dalmann, N., & Rogge, F. (2020). Addressing linguistic diversity in the language classroom in a resource-oriented way: An intervention study with primary school children. *Language Learning*, 70(2), 382–419. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12382
- Busse, V., McLaren, L., & Dahm, A. (2021). Responding to migration-related diversity in the classroom: A comparison of diversity-sensitive approaches to stimulate word acquisition in early FL teaching. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development*, 45(5),1596– 1615. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.2005611
- Byrnes, H. (2020). Navigating pedagogical translanguaging: Commentary on the special issue. *System*, *92*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102278
- Carroll, J. B. (1963). A model of school learning. Teachers' College Record, 64(8), 1-9.
- Carrol, G., Conklin, C., & Gyllstad, H. (2016). Found in translation: The influence of the L1 on the reading of idioms in a L2. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *38*, 403–443. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263115000492
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, *95*(3), 401–417. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x
- Carlgren, I. (2019). Forskning i samverkan–om den undervisningsutvecklande forskningens bidrag, (pp. 51–72). In Y. Ståhle, M. Waermö & V. Lindberg (Eds.). *Att utveckla forskningsbaserad undervisning*. Natur & Kultur.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2022). Pedagogical translanguaging. Cambridge University Press.
- Cenoz, J., Leonet, O., & Gorter, D. (2022). Developing cognate awareness through pedagogical translanguaging. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *25*(8), 2759–2773. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2021.1961675
- Cheng, J., & Matthews, J. (2018). The relationship between three measures of L2 vocabulary knowledge and L2 listening and reading. *Language Testing*, *35*(1), 3–25. http://doi.org/10.1177/0265532216676851
- Chung, E. (2018a). Developing beliefs and practices regarding vocabulary teaching through a dialogic approach for professional development: A case study of English language teachers in Hong Kong [Doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge].

- Chung, E. (2018b). Revisiting second language vocabulary teaching: Insights from Hong Kong in-service teachers. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *27*(6): 499–508. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s40299-018-0412-3
- Chung, E. (2022). Effecting change in teachers' epistemological and pedagogical beliefs about vocabulary learning and teaching: The role of dialogic reflection. *SAGE Open*, *12*(1), 1–15 https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211071084
- Chung, E., & Fisher, L. (2022). A dialogic approach to promoting professional development: Understanding change in Hong Kong language teachers' beliefs and practices regarding vocabulary teaching and learning. *System*, 110, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102901
- Cicourel, A. V. (2007). A personal, retrospective view of ecological validity. *Text & Talk: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Language, Discourse & Communication Studies, 27*(5-6), 735– 752. https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2007.033
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8 ed.). Routledge.
- CollegeBoard. (2023). SAT Suite of assessments annual report. https://reports.collegeboard.org/media/pdf/2023-total-group-sat-suite-of-assessmentsannual-report%20ADA.pdf
- Copland, F., & Creese, A. (2015). *Linguistic ethnography: Collecting, analysing and presenting data.* Sage.
- Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 213–238. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/3587951
- Coxhead, A. (2024). Understanding teachers' and learners' perceptions of incidental vocabulary learning: Another piece of the puzzle. In M.F Teng & B.L Reynolds (Eds.), *Researching incidental vocabulary learning in a second language* (pp. 119–130).
- Coxhead, A., & Hirsch, D. (2007). A pilot science-specific word list. *Revue Française de Linguistique Appliquée*, 2, 65–78. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3917/rfla.122.0065
- Craik, F. I., & Lockhart, R. S. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, *11*(6), 671–684.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, *94*(1), 103–115. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x
- Cummins, J. (2017). Flerspråkiga elever: Effektiv undervisning i en utmanande tid. Natur & Kultur.
- Cummins, J. (2021a). *Rethinking the education of multilingual learners: A critical analysis of theoretical concepts*. Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2021b). Translanguaging: A critical analysis of theoretical claims. In P. Juvonen & M. Källkvist (Eds.), *Pedagogical translanguaging: Theoretical, methodological and empirical perspectives*. Multilingual Matters.

- Cunningham, U. (2023). Språk och lärande i engelska. In Å. Wedin (Ed.), *Språk, lärande och undervisning: Om nyanlända ungdomar på Språkintroduktion* (pp. 175–194). Studentlitteratur.
- De Bot, K. (2004). The multilingual lexicon: Modelling selection and control. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1(1), 17–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710408668176
- Del Popolo, J. A. (1966). A re-definition of the unit. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 43(5), 280–284.
- De Schonewise, E. A., & Klingner, J. K. (2012). Linguistic and cultural issues in developing disciplinary literacy for adolescent English language learners. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 32(1), 51–68. http://doi.org/ 10.1097/TLD.0b013e3182474c33
- Duarte, J. (2019). Translanguaging in mainstream education: A sociocultural approach. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 22(2), 150–164. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1231774
- D'Warte, J. (2019). Mapping languages and literacies with multilingual students in Australian classrooms. *The Reading Teacher*, 72(5), 663–669. http://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1785
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies.* Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Dewaele, J.-M. (2022). *Questionnaires in second language Research: Construction, administration, and processing* (3rd ed.). Routledge
- East, M. (2021). *Foundational principles of task-based language teaching*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003039709
- Education Act. (SFS 2010:800). https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokumentlagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/skollag-2010800_sfs-2010-800
- Elgemark, A., Henry, A., & Jansson, P. (2023). An affordance-focused approach for working with authentic materials: A practice–research initiative. In G. Erickson, C. Bardel, & D. Little (Eds.), *Collaborative research in language education: Reciprocal benefits and challenges* (pp. 41–59). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Ellis, R., Skehan, P., Shaofeng, L., Shintani. N., & Lambert, C. (Eds.). (2019). *Task-based language teaching: Theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108643689
- Eriksson, I. (2018). Lärares medverkan i praktiknära forskning: Förutsättningar och hinder. *Education and Learning*, *12*(1), 27–40.
- Eriksson, L. (2023). "Gruelling to read": Swedish university students' perceptions of and attitudes towards academic reading in English. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2023.101265
- Estling Vannestål, M. (2015). *A university grammar of English: With a Swedish perspective*. Studentlitteratur.

Etikprövningsmyndigheten. (2023). *Guide to the ethics review of research on humans*. https://etikprovningsmyndigheten.se/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/Guide-to-theethical-review_webb.pdf

Field, A. P., Miles, J., & Field, Z. (2012). Discovering statistics using R. Sage.

- Galante, A. (2020). Translanguaging for vocabulary development: A mixed methods study with international students in a Canadian English for academic purposes program. In Z. Tian, L. Aghai, P. Sayer, & J. K. Schissel (Eds.), *Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens* (pp. 293–328). Springer.
- Galante, A. (2024). Translanguaging drama: Embracing learners' perezhivanie for embodiment of the repertoire. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 27(9), 1258–1270. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2022.2069460
- Gao, X., & Ma, Q. (2011). Vocabulary learning and teaching beliefs of pre-service and inservice teachers in Hong Kong and mainland China. *Language Awareness*, 20(4), 327– 342. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2011.579977
- Gao, M., Quian, G., & Rasool., U. (2024). Effects of task-induced involvement and time on task on incidental L2 vocabulary acquisition. *Sage Open*, *14*(2), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241249340
- García, O. (2009). Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective. Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Caslon.
- García, O., & and Kleyn, T. (2016). *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments*. Routledge.
- García, O., & Otheguy, R. (2020). Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(1), 17–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1598932
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2017). *Stimulated recall methodology in applied linguistics and L2 research*. Routledge.
- González-Fernández, B. (2022). Conceptualizing L2 vocabulary knowledge: An empirical examination of the dimensionality of word knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 44(4), 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263121000930
- González-Fernández, B. (2024). How is vocabulary learnt?: An acquisitional sequence of L2 word knowledge, *TESOL Quarterly*, 0(0) 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3342
- Green, D. W. (1998). Mental control of the bilingual lexico-semantic system. *Bilingualism:* Language and cognition, 1(2), 67–81. http://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728998000133
- Grosjean, F. (2008). Studying bilinguals. Oxford University Press..
- Gu, P.Y. (2020). Strategies for learning vocabulary. In S. Webb (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook* of vocabulary studies (pp. 271–287). Routledge.

- Gubrium, J. F., Holstein, J. A., Marvasti, A. B., & McKinney, K. D. (2012). *The Sage handbook of interview research : The complexity of the craft* (2 ed.). Sage.
- Gunnarsson, T. (2015). *Multilingual students' writing in English: The role of their L1(s)* [Licentiate thesis, Lund University].
- Gunnarsson, T. (2019). Multilingual students' use of their language repertoires while writing in L2 English. *Lingua*, 224, 34–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2019.03.007
- Gunnarsson, T. (2021). Flerspråkiga elever skriver på engelska. In C. Bardell., G. Erickson., J. Granfeldt., & C. Rosén (Eds.), Forskarskolan FRAM Lärare forskar i de främmande språkens didaktik (pp. 15–40). Stockholm University Press. https://doi.org/10.16993/bbg.b.
- Gutierrez, X. (2024). Implementation of task-based language teaching in a Spanish language program: Instructors' and students' perceptions. *Language Teaching Research*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688241263945
- Gyllstad, H. (2007). *Testing English collocations: Developing receptive tests for use with advanced Swedish learners.* [Doctoral dissertation, Lund University].
- Gyllstad, H. (2013). Looking at L2 vocabulary knowledge dimensions from an assessment perspective: Challenges and potential solutions. In C. Bardel, C. Lindqvist & B. Laufer (Eds.), L2 vocabulary acquisition, knowledge and use: New perspectives on assessment and corpus analysis (pp. 11–28). EuroSLA.
- Gyllstad, H., & Schmitt, N. (2019). Testing formulaic language. In A. Siyanova-Chanturia & A. Pellicer-Sánchez (Eds.), Understanding formulaic language: A second language acquisition perspective (pp. 174–191). Routledge.
- Gyllstad, H., Sundqvist, P., Sandlund, E., & Källkvist, M. (2023). Effects of word definitions on meaning recall: A multisite intervention in language-diverse second language English classrooms. *Language Learning*, *73*(2), 403–444. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12527.
- Hammarberg, B. (2018). L3, the tertiary language . In A Bonnet & P. Siemund (Eds.) Foreign language education in multilingual classrooms. John Benjamins.
- Hammond, M., & Wellington, J. (2020). *Research methods: The key concepts* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.4324/9780429058165
- Henry, A. (2019). Young people and English. In A. Henry, P. Sundqvist, & C. Thorsen (Eds.), *Motivational practice: Insights from the classroom* (pp. 23–39). Studentlitteratur.
- Hermagustiana, I., Hamra, A., Rahman, Q., & Salija, K. (2017). Reflection of teacher cognition in EFL vocabulary instructional practices in Indonesia. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(5), 34–45. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n5p34
- Hestetræet, T. I. (2012). Teaching vocabulary in the primary classroom. In M. Allström & A. Pinter (Eds.), *English for young learners - Forum 2012: Proceedings from the conference in Uppsala 19 June 2012* (pp. 59–70). Uppsala University.

- Holmberg Sjöling, C. (2023). A longitudinal study of Swedish upper-secondary school students' vocabulary development. NJES Nordic Journal of English Studies, 22(2), 59–80. https://doi.org/10.35360/njes.717
- Hopp, H., Jakisch, J., Sturm, S., Becker, C., & Thoma, D. (2020). Integrating multilingualism into the early foreign language classroom: Empirical and teaching perspectives. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 14(2), 146–162. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2019.1669519
- Hopp, H., Kieseier, T., Jakisch., J., Sturm, S., & Dieter, T. (2021). Do minority-language and majority-language students benefit from pedagogical translanguaging in early foreign language development? *Multilingua*, 40(6), 815–837. http://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2020-0164
- Hopp, H., Kieseier, T., Vogelbacher, M., & Thoma, D. (2018). L1 effects in the early L3 acquisition of vocabulary and grammar. In A. Bonnet & P. Siemund (Eds.), *Foreign language education in multilingual classrooms* (pp. 305–330). John Benjamins.
- Hornberger, N.H. (1987). Bilingual education success, but policy failure. *Language in Society*, *16*(2), 205–226.
- Hornberger, N.H (2002). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy*, 1, 27–51. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014548611951
- Huang, S., Willson, V., & Eslami, Z. (2013). The effects of task involvement load on L2 incidental vocabulary learning: A meta-analytic study. *Modern Language Journal*, 96(4), 544–557. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2012.01394.x
- Hulstijn, J. H. (2001). Intentional and incidental second-language vocabulary learning: A reappraisal of elaboration, rehearsal and automaticity. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 258–286). Cambridge University Press.
- Hulstijn, J. H., & Laufer, B. (2001). Some empirical evidence for the involvement load hypothesis in vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning*, *51*(3), 539–558. https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00164
- Hult, F. (2012). English as a transcultural language in Swedish policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(2), 230–257. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.19
- Hult, F. (2017). More than a lingua franca: Functions of English in a globalized educational language policy. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 30*(3), 265–282. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2017.1321008
- Jahan, A., & Kormos, J. (2015). The impact of textual enhancement on EFL learners' grammatical awareness of future plans and intentions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *25*(1), 46–66. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12049
- Juvonen, P., & Kallkvist, M. (2021). Pedagogical translanguaging: Theoretical, methodological and empirical perspectives – An introduction. In. M. Källkvist & P. Juvonen (Eds.), *Pedagogical translanguaging: Theoretical, methodological and empirical perspectives* (pp. 1–6). Multilingual Matters.

- Kim, S.Y., & Webb, S. (2022). Individual difference factors for second language vocabulary. In S Li P Hiver & M Papi (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and individual differences* (pp. 282–293). Routledge
- Kremmel, B. (2021). Selling the (word) family silver?: A response to Webb's "lemma dilemma". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 43(5), 962–964. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263121000693
- Krulatz, A., & Iversen, J. (2020). Building inclusive language classroom spaces through multilingual writing practices for newly-arrived students in Norway. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 64(3), 372–388. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2018.1557741
- Krulatz, A., Steen-Olsen, T., & Torgersen, E. (2018). Towards critical cultural and linguistic awareness in language classrooms in Norway: Fostering respect for diversity through identity texts. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(5), 552–569. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1362168817718572
- Källkvist, M., Gyllstad, H., Sandlund, E., & Sundqvist, P. (2017). English only in multilingual classrooms? *LMS-Lingua*, 4, 27–31.
- Källkvist, M., Gyllstad, H., Sandlund, E., & Sundqvist, P. (2022). Towards an in-depth understanding of English-Swedish translanguaging pedagogy in multilingual EFL classrooms. *HumaNetten*, 48(1), 138–167. https://doi.org/10.15626/hn.20224807
- Källkvist, M., Gyllstad, H., Sandlund, E., & Sundqvist, P. (2023). Reciprocity and challenge in researcher-student collaborative labour in a multilingual secondary school. In G. Erickson, C. Bardel, & D. Little (Eds.), *Collaborative research in language education: Reciprocal benefits and challenges* (Vol. 20, pp. 59–70). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Källkvist, M., & Juvonen, P. (2021). Engaging teachers and researchers in classroom research: Issues of fluidity and time in two multi-sited projects. In P. Juvonen & M. Källkvist (Eds.), *Pedagogical translanguaging: Theoretical, methodological and empirical perspectives* (pp. 37–55). Multilingual Matters.
- Källkvist, M., Sandlund, E., Sundqvist, P., & Gyllstad, H. (2024). Translanguaging in lowersecondary multilingual ELF classrooms: Practices and beliefs among experienced teachers in Sweden. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics & TEFL*, *13*(1),23–44.
- Laufer, B. (2005). Focus on form in second language vocabulary learning. *EuroSLA Yearbook*, *5*, 223–250, https://doi.org/10.1075/eurosla.5.11lau
- Laufer, B., & Hulstijn, J. (2001). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.1.1
- Laursen, H. P., Baun, L., & Østergaard, W. (2020). Bubbles of becomings: From located investment to placemaking practices of engagement in the language classroom. *Language* and Education, 34(6), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2020.1775247

- Lee, J. H., & Levine, G. S. (2020). The effects of instructor language choice on second language vocabulary learning and listening comprehension. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(2), 250–272. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818770910
- Lemhöfer, K., Huestegge, L., & Mulder, K. (2018) Another cup of TEE? The processing of second language near-cognates in first language reading. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 33(8), 968–991. https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2018.1433863
- Leonet, O., Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020) Developing morphological awareness across languages: Translanguaging pedagogies in third language acquisition. *Language Awareness*, 29(1), 41–59, https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1688338
- Leung, C., & Valdés, G. (2019). Translanguaging and the transdisciplinary framework for language teaching and learning in a multilingual world. *The Modern Language Journal*, *103*(2), 348–370. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12568
- Li, M., & Kirby, J. R. (2015). The effects of vocabulary breadth and depth on English reading. *Applied Linguistics*, *36*(5), 611–634. http://doi.org/ 10.1093/applin/amu007
- Lim Falk, M., & Riad, T. (2023). Explicit ordundervisning: För andraspråkselever. Natur & Kultur.
- Liu, S., & Reynolds, B. L. (2022). Empirical support for the involvement load hypothesis (ILH): A systematic review. *Behavioral Sciences*, 12(10), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs12100354
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. (n.d.). https://www.ldoceonline.com/
- López-Barrios, M., San Martín, M.G., & Villanueva de Debat, E. (2021). EFL vocabulary teaching beliefs and practices: The case of two teachers in Argentina. *TESOL Journal*, 12(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.533
- Lotto, L., & de Groot, A. (1998). Effects of learning method and word type on acquiring vocabulary in an unfamiliar language. *Language Learning*, 48, 31–69. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00032
- Lundahl, B. (2021). *Engelsk språkdidaktik: Texter, kommunikation, språkutveckling* (5th ed.). Studentlitteratur.
- Macalister, J. (2012). Pre-service teacher cognition and vocabulary teaching. *RELC Journal*, 43(1), 99–111. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212439312
- Malmström, H., & Pecorari, D. (2022). Language choice and internationalisation: The roles of Swedish and English in research and higher education (Reports from the Language Council of Sweden 19). Institutet för språk och folkminnen. http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:sprakochfolkminnen:diva-2467
- Martin-Beltrán, M. (2014). "What do you want to say?" How adolescents use translanguaging to expand learning opportunities. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 8(3), 208– 230. http://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2014.914372

- May, S. (2014). *The multilingual turn. implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education.* Routledge.
- Mayring, P. (2022). Qualitative content analysis. In R. J. Tierney, F Rizvi, & K. Erkican (Eds.), *International encyclopaedia of education* (Vol. 12, pp. 314–322). Elsevier.
- McCrostie, J. (2007). Examining learner vocabulary notebooks. *ELT Journal*, 61(3), 246–255. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm032
- McLean, S., Stewart, J., & Batty, A.O. (2020). Predicting L2 reading proficiency with modalities of vocabulary knowledge: A bootstrapping approach. *Language Testing 37*(3), 389–411. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532219898380
- Meara, P. (2009). Connected words: Word associations and second language vocabulary acquisition. John Benjamins.
- Meara, P., & Wolter, B. (2004). V_LINKS: Beyond vocabulary depth. In D. Albrechtsen, K. Haastrup, & B. Henriksen (Eds.), *Angles on the English-speaking world 4* (pp. 85–96). Museum Tusculanum Press.
- Miller, J. (2009). Teaching refugee learners with interrupted education in science: Vocabulary, literacy and pedagogy. *International Journal of Science Education*, *31*(4), 571–592. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690701744611
- Nakata, T. (2015). Effects of expanding and equal spacing on second language vocabulary learning: Does gradually increasing spacing increase vocabulary learning? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 37(4), 677–711. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263114000825
- Nakata, T., & Webb, S. (2016). Vocabulary learning exercises: Evaluating a selection of exercises commonly featured in language learning materials. In B. Tomlinson (Eds.), *SLA research and materials development for language learning* (pp. 139–154). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315749082
- Nation, I.S.P. (n.d). *Paul Nation's frequency list of English word families (1K–14K)*. http://kurs.ht.lu.se/index.php?id=32247
- Nation, I.S.P. (2007). The four strands. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 2–13. http://doi.org/10.2167/illt039.0
- Nation, I.S.P. (2022). *Learning vocabulary in another language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). *How people learn II: Learners, contexts, and cultures.* The National Academies Press.
- Nationalencyklopedin. (n.d.). https://www.ne.se/ordb%C3%B6cker/
- Newton, J. (2020). Approaches to learning vocabulary inside the classroom. In S. Webb (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of vocabulary studies* (pp. 255–270). Routledge.
- Newton, J. (2021). Teacher and learner perspectives on vocabulary learning and teaching (VLT) In H. Mohebi & C. Coombe (Eds.), *Research questions in language education and applied linguistics: A reference guide* (pp. 137–142).Springer.

- Niu, R., & Andrews, S. (2012). Commonalities and discrepancies in L2 teachers' beliefs and practices about vocabulary pedagogy: A small culture perspective. *TESOL Journal*, *6*, 134–154.
- Nordlund, M., & Rydström, U. (2024). "Vanligtvis när man jobbat med vokabulär tänker man väl oftast på glosor": Systematisk vokabulärundervisning i engelska och moderna språk. *Lingua*, 2, 17–20.
- Olsson, E. (2016). On the impact of extramural English and CLIL on productive vocabulary [Doctoral dissertation, University of Gothenburg].
- Page, M. H., & Mede, E. (2018). Comparing task-based instruction and traditional instruction on task engagement and vocabulary development in secondary language education. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 111(3), 371–381. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2017.1391163
- Peters, E. (2009). Learning collocations through attention-drawing techniques: A qualitative and quantitative analysis. In A. Barfield & H. Gyllstad (Eds.), *Researching collocations in another language* (pp. 195–297). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Peters, E. (2020). Factors affecting the learning of single-word items. In S. Webb (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of vocabulary studies* (pp. 125–142). Routledge.
- Pichette, F., De Serres, L., & Lafontaine, M. (2012). Sentence reading and writing for second language vocabulary acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 33(1), 66– 82. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amr037
- Prilutskaya, M. (2021). Examining pedagogical translanguaging: A systematic review of the literature. *Languages*, 6(180), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages6040180
- Rindal, U. (2024). Explanations for language choice in the social context of the L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, *108*(4), 846–865. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12960
- Read, J. (2000). Assessing vocabulary. Cambridge University Press.
- Rodrick Beiler, I. (2021a). Marked and unmarked translanguaging in accelerated, mainstream, and sheltered English classrooms. *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 40(1), 107–138. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2020-0022
- Rodrick Beiler, I. (2021b). *Multilingualism as a resource in English writing instruction: Opportunities and obstacles in five linguistically diverse classrooms in Norway* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Oslo].
- Rodrick Beiler, I., & Dewilde, J. (2020). Translation as translingual writing practice in English as an additional language. *Modern Language Journal*, *104*(3), 533–549.
- Rogers, J., Webb, S., & Nakata, T. (2015). Do the cognacy characteristics of loanwords make them more easily learned than noncognates? *Language Teaching Research*, 19, 9–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814541752

- Rosiers, K., Van Lancker, I., & Delarue, S. (2018). Beyond the traditional scope of translanguaging: Comparing translanguaging practices in Belgian multilingual and monolingual classroom contexts. *Language and Communication*, 61, 15–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2017.11.003
- Roulston, K. (2010). Considering quality in qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative Research*, *10*(2), 199–228. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794109356739
- Rowe, L. W. (2018). Say it in your language: Supporting translanguaging in multilingual classes. *Reading Teacher*, 72(1), 31–38. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1673
- Rowe, L. W. (2019). Constructing language ideologies in a multilingual, second-grade classroom: A case study of two emergent bilingual students' language-use during ebook composing. *Linguistics and Education*, 52,1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2019.05.007
- Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal*, 8(2), 15–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464
- Sánchez-Gutiérrez, C. H., & Robles-García, P., & Serrano, M.P. (2022). L2 Spanish vocabulary teaching in US universities: Instructors' beliefs and reported practices. *Language Teaching Research*, 0(0), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221074443
- Sato, M., & Loewen, S. (2022). The research–practice dialogue in second language learning and teaching: Past, present, and future. *Modern Language Journal*, 106(3), 509–527. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12791
- Schmitt, N. (1997). Vocabulary learning strategies. https://www.norbertschmitt.co.uk/book-chapters.
- Schmitt, N. (1998). Tracking the incremental acquisition of second language vocabulary: A longitudinal study. *Language Learning*, 48(2), 281–317. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00042
- Schmitt, N. (2008). Instructed second language vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*, *12*(3), 329–363. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089921
- Schmitt, N. (2010). Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schmitt, N. (2014). Size and depth of vocabulary knowledge: What the research shows. *Language Learning*, 64(4), 913–951. http://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12077
- Schmitt, N. (2019). Understanding vocabulary acquisition, instruction, and assessment: A research agenda. *Language Teaching: Surveys and Studies*, 52(2), 261–274. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000053
- Schmitt, N., & Schmitt, D. (1995). Vocabulary notebooks: Theoretical underpinnings and practical suggestions. *ELT Journal*, 49(2), 133–143. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/49.2.133
- Schmitt, N., & Schmitt, D. (2020). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

- Schoonenboom, J. (2023). Mixed methods and multimethod research in education: six design decisions for collecting, combining, and developing datasets. In R. J. Tierney, F. Rizvi, & K. Ercikan (Eds.), *International encyclopaedia of education* (pp. 361–371). Elsevier. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-818630-5.11034-6
- Seltzer, K. (2019). Reconceptualizing "home" and "school" language: Taking a critical translingual approach in the English classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, *53*(4), 986–1007. http://doi.org/10.2307/45238628
- Seltzer, K. (2020). "My English is its own rule": Voicing a translingual sensibility through poetry. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 19*(5), 297– 311.https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2019.1656535
- Siegel, J. (2022). *Teaching English in secondary school : A handbook of essentials*. Studentlitteratur.
- Skolinspektionen. (2023). Det specialpedagogiska arbetet för att stödja lärare inom garantin för tidiga stödinsatser (no. 2022:8799), Tematisk kvalitetsgranskning 2023.
- Skolverket. (2011). Läroplan för gymnasieskolan: Gy11. https://www.skolverket.se/undervisning/gymnasieskolan/laroplan-program-och-amneni-gymnasieskolan/laroplan-gy11-for-gymnasieskolan
- Skolverket. (2012). Overview of the Swedish upper-secondary school. https://www.skolverket.se/getFile?file=2748

Skolverket. (2021). Engelska.

https://www.skolverket.se/undervisning/gymnasieskolan/laroplan-program-och-amnen-i-gymnasieskolan/gymnasieprogrammen/amne?url=-

996270488%2Fsyllabuscw%2Fjsp%2Fsubject.htm%3FsubjectCode%3DENG%26cou rseCode%3DENGENG06%26version%3D6%26tos%3Dgy&sv.url=12.5dfee44715d3 5a5cdfa92a3#anchor_ENGENG06

- Skolverket. (2022a). Curriculum for compulsory school, preschool class and school-age educare– Lgr22. https://www.skolverket.se/getFile?file=13128
- Skolverket. (2022b). *Kommentarmaterial till kursplanen i engelska: Grundskolan.* https://www.skolverket.se/getFile?file=9786
- Skolverket. (2022c). Kommentarmaterial till ämnesplanerna i moderna språk och engelska: Gymnasieskolan och kommunal vuxenutbildning på gymnasial nivå. https://www.skolverket.se/publikationer?id=9918

Skolverket. (2024a). *Systematiskt kvalitetsarbete–så fungerar det*. https://www.skolverket.se/skolutveckling/kvalitetsarbete/systematiskt-kvalitetsarbete----sa-fungerar-det

Skolverket. (2024b). Vetenskaplig grund och beprövad erfarenhet. https://www.skolverket.se/skolutveckling/forskning-och-utvarderingar/utbildning-pavetenskaplig-grund-och-beprovad-erfarenhet/det-har-ar-vetenskaplig-grund-ochbeprovad-erfarenhet

- Skolverket. (2024c). Övergripande information om Gy25. https://www.skolverket.se/regler-ochansvar/forandringar-inom-skolomradet/gy25----amnesbetyg-pa-gymnasialniva/overgripande-information-om-gy25
- Skånegy. (2023). Meritvärde. https://www.skanegy.se/informationssida/meritvarde
- Smidfelt, L. (2019). Studies on lexical inferencing and inter comprehension of Italian as a foreign language in a Swedish setting [Doctoral dissertation, Lund University].
- Smith, B. E., Khorosheva, M., & Pacheco, M. B. (2020). Emergent bilingual students and digital multimodal composition: A systematic review of research in secondary classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 56(1), 33–52. https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.298
- Snoder, P. (2016). Using qualitative methodologies in research on formal L2 collocation learning. In B. Sanromán Vilas (Ed.), *Collocations Cross-linguistically: Corpora, Dictionaries and Language Teaching* (pp. 193–218). Société Néophilologique.
- Snoder, P. (2019). L2 instruction and collocation learning: Classroom intervention research on input processing with L1 Swedish adolescent learners of English [Doctoral dissertation, Stockholm University].
- Snoder, P. (2022). Ord och uttryck i språkundervisningen. Studentlitteratur.
- Stewart, M. A. & Hansen-Thomas, H. (2016). Sanctioning a space for translanguaging in the secondary English classroom: A case of a transnational youth. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 50(4), 450–472.
- Stridsman, M. (2024). Ordförrådsutveckling i klassrummet: En fallstudie om aktiviteter och resurser i engelska i åk 4–5 [Doctoral dissertation, Umeå University]
- Sturm, S., Jakisch, J., Kieseier, T., & Hopp, H. (2022). Plurilingual foreign-language teaching in early EFL: Exploring student perspectives and profiles. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 21(2), 689–710. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2022.2105849
- Sunderman, G., & Kroll, J. F. (2006). First language activation during second language lexical processing: An investigation of lexical form, meaning, and grammatical class. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(3), 387–422. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060177
- Sundqvist, P. (2009). Extramural English matters: Out-of-school English and its impact on Swedish ninth graders' oral proficiency and vocabulary [Doctoral dissertation, Karlstad University].
- Sundqvist, P. (2020). Sweden and informal language learning. In M. Dressman & R. Sadler (Eds.), *The handbook of informal language learning* (pp. 319–322). Wiley.
- Sundqvist, P. (2024). Extramural English as an individual difference variable in L2 research: Methodology matters. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 0(0), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1017/ S0267190524000072

- Svensson, S., & Svensson, G. (2022). Homework and translanguaging: Multilingual parents' perceptions of and attitudes to participation in their children's schooling. In S. Ericsson, I.L. Grahn, & S. Karlsson (Eds.), Språklig mångfald: Rapport från ASLA-symposiet i Göteborg, 23–24 april 2020 (pp. 217–238). ASLA:s skriftsserie.
- Sylvén, L. K. (2022). Very young Swedish children's exposure to English outside of school. In: C. Bardel, C. Hedman, K. Rejman & E. Zetterholm (Eds.), *Exploring language education: Global and local perspectives* (pp. 121–155). Stockholm University Press. https://doi.org/10.16993/bbz.e.
- Tao, J., & Gao, X. (2021). Language teacher agency. Cambridge University Press.
- Tian, L., & Macaro, E. (2012). Comparing the effect of teacher codeswitching with English-Only explanations on the vocabulary acquisition of Chinese university students: A lexical focus-on-form study. *Language Teaching Research*, 16(3), 367–391. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/1362168812436909
- Townsend, D., Brock, C., & Morrison, J. D. (2018). Engaging in vocabulary learning in science: The promise of multimodal instruction. *International Journal of Science Education*, *40*(3), 328–347. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2017.1420267
- Tseng, W.T, & Schmitt, N. (2008). Toward a model of motivated vocabulary learning: A structural equation modelling approach. *Language Learning*, *58*(2), 357–400.https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2008.00444.x
- Uljens, M. (1997). School didactics and learning: A school didactic model framing an analysis of pedagogical implications of learning theory. Psychology Press.
- University of Gothenburg. (n.d.). *Smart chimps*. https://www.gu.se/sites/default/files/2021-08/En5_Bits_of_News_I%2BII.pdf
- Ushioda, E. (2023). An ethical perspective on collaborative research. In G. Erickson, C. Bardel, & D. Little (Eds.), *Collaborative research in language education: Reciprocal benefits and challenges* (pp. 197–205). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Van den Akker, J. (1999). Principles and methods of development research. Springer.
- Velasco, P., & García, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the writing of bilingual learners. Bilingual Research Journal, 37(1), 6–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2014.893270
- Vetenskapsrådet. (2017). *God forskningssed*. https://www.vr.se/analys/rapporter/vara-rapporter/2017-08-29-god-forskningssed-2017.html
- Vetenskapsrådet. (n.d.). Forskningsetiska principer inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning. https://www.vr.se/uppdrag/etik.html
- Walters, J., & Bozkurt, N. (2009). The effect of keeping vocabulary notebooks on vocabulary acquisition. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(4), 403–423. https://doi.org.10.1177/1362168809341509

- Ward, J. (2009). A basic engineering English word list for less proficient foundation engineering undergraduates. *English for Specific Purposes*, 28(3), 170–182. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2009.04.001
- Warnby, M. (2023). English academic vocabulary knowledge among Swedish upper-secondary school students [Doctoral dissertation, Stockholm University].
- Webb, S. (2005). Receptive and productive vocabulary learning: The effects of reading and writing on word knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *27*(1), 33–52. http://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050023
- Webb, S. (2009). The effects of receptive and productive learning of word pairs on vocabulary knowledge. *RELC Journal*, 40(3), 360–376. http://doi.org/ 10.1177/0033688209343854
- Webb, S. (2020a). Incidental vocabulary learning. In S. Webb (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of vocabulary studies* (pp. 225–239). Routledge.
- Webb, S. (Ed.). (2020b). The Routledge handbook of vocabulary studies. Routledge.
- Webb, S., & Nation, P. (2017). How vocabulary is learned. Oxford University Press.
- Webb, S., Yanagisawa, A., & Uchihara, T. (2020). How effective are intentional vocabularylearning activities? A meta-analysis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 104(4), 715–738. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1111/modl.12671
- Wedin, Å. (2017). Arbete med identitetstexter. Flerspråkigt skrivande för identitetsförhandling och engagemang. Nordand: Nordisk Tidsskrift for Andrespråksforskning, 12(1), 45–61. https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.2535-3381-2017-01-04
- Xie, X. (2013). Vocabulary explanation in English-major university classrooms in China. ELT Journal, 67(4), 435–445. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct031
- Yanagisawa, A., & Webb, S. (2020). Measuring depth of vocabulary knowledge In S. Webb (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of vocabulary studies* (pp. 371–386). Routledge.
- Yanagisawa, A., & Webb, S. (2021). To what extent does the involvement load hypothesis predict incidental L2 vocabulary learning? A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 71(2), 487–536. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12444
- Zapa., A Tropp Laman, T. (2016). "I write to show how beautiful my languages are": Translingual writing instruction in English-dominant classrooms. *Language Arts*, 93(5), 366–378.
- Zou, D. (2017). Vocabulary acquisition through cloze exercises, sentence-writing and composition-writing: Extending the evaluation component of the Involvement Load Hypothesis. *Language Teaching Research*, *21*(1), 54–75. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816652418

Appendix 1: Decision from the Swedish Ethical Review Authority

🔇 admincontrol

2021-00927 beslut.pdf

Signers:		
Name	Method	Date
Iunda Katarina Brodin	Method BANKID	Date 2021-04-19 16:00 GMT+2



This document package contains: - Front page (this page) - The original document(s) - The electronic signatures. These are not visible in the document, but are electronically integrated.

This file is sealed with a digital signature. The seal is a guarantee for the authenticity of the document. Document ID: 03889EDA22A74A48974B0AC6E7C1C080

THE SIGNED DOCUMENT FOLLOWS ON THE NEXT PAGE >



Dnr 2021-00927 Umeå avdelning övrig

BESLUT

Sökande forskningshuvudman Lunds universitet

Forskare som genomför projektet Henrik Gyllstad

Projekttitel Engelska i och utanför det flerspråkiga klassrummet: Inlärning, undervisning och användning

Etikprövningsmyndigheten beslutar enligt nedan.

BESLUT

Etikprövningsmyndigheten godkänner den forskning som anges i ansökan.

På Etikprövningsmyndighetens vägnar

Katarina Brodin Ordförande

Beslutet har fattats efter föredragning av vetenskaplig sekreterare Staffan Karp.

Beslutet sänds till Ansvarig forskare: Henrik Gyllstad Forskningshuvudmannens företrädare: Henrik Rahm

Etikprövningsmyndigheten

registrator@etikprovning.se | 010-475 08 00 | Box 2110, 750 02 Uppsala | etikprovning.se



This file is sealed with a digital signature. The seal is a guarantee for the authenticity of the document. Document ID: 03895EDA22A74A48974B0AC6E7C1C0B0

1(1)

Appendix 2: Consent form for teachers

Information till lärare

Du har blivit tillfrågad och har muntligt tackat ja till att delta i ett forskningsprojekt. I det här dokumentet får du information om projektet och om vad det innebär att delta.

Vad är det för projekt och varför vill ni att jag ska delta?

Du är inbjuden att delta i forskningsprojektet *Engelska i och utanför det flerspråkiga klassrummet*. Vi som ska genomföra studien är en forskande doktorand från Lunds universitet (Elin Nylander) och två handledare som är forskare från Lunds universitet (Marie Källkvist och Henrik Gyllstad).

Projektet handlar om lärande och kommunikation i flerspråkiga engelskklassrum. Syftet med projektet är att bättre förstå vilken roll en elevs olika språk har för inlärning av och kunskaper i engelska. Vi är även intresserade av din syn på flerspråkighet, språk, undervisning samt språksituationen på skolan och i Sverige, med tanke på din roll som undervisande lärare.

Doktoranden utför studien inom ramen för sin avlönade doktorandtjänst vid Lunds universitet.

Forskningshuvudman för projektet är **Lunds universitet**. Med forskningshuvudman menas den organisation som är ansvarig för studien.

Hur går studien till?

Den första delen av studien, som den här informationen handlar om, kommer att fortgå vid din arbetsplats under cirka två veckor. Därefter kan du komma att bli tillfrågad om fortsatt samarbete. Doktoranden (Elin Nylander) kommer att besöka skolan regelbundet under tvåveckorsperioden. Genom att ge ditt samtycke till att vara en av våra deltagande projektlärare samtycker du till att vi forskare får: (1) observera klassrumsundervisning

(2) tillgång till eleverna och lektionerna regelbundet då studien fortgår vid din arbetsplats för att genomföra undervisning och en rad språktester med de elever som tackar ja till detta

(3) genomföra ljudinspelning av klassrumsarbetet från punkt (2) med elever som gett sitt samtycke. Du kan själv kan komma att ingå i det inspelade materialet

(4) planera lektionsmomenten från punkt (2) tillsammans med dig, samt spela in dessa om du samtycker till det

(5) samla in enkäter från dina elever då studien fortgår vid din arbetsplats

(6) din hjälp med att dela ut och samla in samtyckesblanketter från elever

(7) intervjua dig om din syn på flerspråkighet, språk, undervisning samt språksituationen på skolan och i Sverige, med tanke på din roll som undervis

språksituationen på skolan och i Sverige, med tanke på din roll som undervisande lärare.

Lärarintervjun från punkt 7 och den gemensamma planeringen (punkt 4) sker när det passar dig, antingen i skolans lokaler eller på distans via exempelvis Zoom. Lärarintervjun från punkt (7) kommer att spelas in avseende ljud förutsatt att du samtycker till detta.

Vad innebär min medverkan?

Att medverka som projektlärare är ett åtagande som kräver planering och engagemang. Du kan dock alltid välja att boka om ett eller flera ovannämnda moment om det skulle behövas. Du kan också avstå från att vara med i delar av studien, eller avböja helt från att delta. Det innebär alltså inga risker för dig att vara med i studien, men du har hela tiden möjlighet att avbryta ditt deltagande om du känner skuld, obehag, stress eller liknande. Du behöver inte ange speciella skäl för varför du vill avbryta. Du kan alltid vända dig till någon av forskarna om du har frågor eller vill prata om något moment i efterhand (se kontaktuppgifter nedan).

I det här projektet står engelskklassrummet och skolämnet engelska i fokus. Eftersom lärarintervjun handlar om din syn på flerspråkighet, språk, undervisning samt språksituationen på skolan och i Sverige, så kan du också välja att komma in på personliga erfarenheter och åsikter, om du så önskar. Detta är dock helt frivilligt och det är alltid du själv som bestämmer vad du vill dela med dig av och göra som deltagande lärare i studien.

Vad händer med mina uppgifter?

Projektet kommer att samla in och registrera information om dig.

Vi kan komma att samla in följande information om dig, förutsatt att du går med på detta:

A. Personuppgifter såsom namn, personnummer, ålder och kön, födelseort, tidigare utbildning, och språk

B. Din språkbakgrund och syn på flerspråkighet, språk och undervisning i egenskap av undervisande lärare

C. Din syn på språksituationen på skolan och i Sverige

Informationen i punkt A-C hämtas från lärarintervjun som nämns ovan.

All information och all data som vi samlar in inom ramen för studien kommer att pseudonymiseras. Alltså kommer vi aldrig att använda ditt riktiga namn, utan ett annat namn som inte kan kopplas ihop med dig. Du kommer även att få ett så kallat kodnummer för att ytterligare säkerställa att du förblir anonym .

För att kunna ta fram de uppgifter vi samlar in om dig används en så kallad kodnyckel. Kodnyckeln förvaras i ett kassaskåp på Språk- och litteraturcentrum, Lunds universitet, så att informationen inte sprids eller kan kopplas till dig av någon annan än de som har nyckel till kassaskåpet. Det är endast den forskande doktoranden (Elin Nylander), den huvudansvarige forskaren (huvudhandledare Henrik Gyllstad), och den biträdande handledaren (Marie Källkvist) som har tillgång till kodnyckeln.

Allt ljudinspelat material sparas och förvaras digitalt på externa hårddiskar i kassaskåpet. I samband med att det sparas, anonymiseras det med hjälp av kodnyckeln, så att olika deltagare inte kan identifieras. Eventuella personnamn och ortnamn ersätts med pipljud och röster förvrängs. Avidentifikation sker alltså både i text (exempelvis i avhandlingen och eventuella artiklar) och under muntliga presentationer av studien (exempelvis föredrag).

Anonym data kommer att sparas även efter avhandlingsarbetets slut och kan komma att publiceras senare. Du förblir alltid anonym oavsett när datan publiceras.

Endast anonymiserat material lagras på datorer som är anslutna till Internet. När projektet är avslutat lämnas originalfiler till Lunds universitets arkiv.

All information och all data som vi samlar in inom ramen för studien kommer alltså att behandlas så att inte obehöriga kan ta del av dem. Ansvarig för dina personuppgifter är **Lunds universitet**. Om du vill ta del av uppgifterna eller vill att de
raderas ska du kontakta Henrik Gyllstad (kontaktuppgifter finns sist i detta dokument). Lunds universitets dataskyddsombud nås på telefonnummer 046-222 00 00 eller via e-post på dataskydssombud@lu.se. Om du är missnöjd med hur dina personuppgifter behandlas har du rätt att ge in klagomål till Datainspektionen, som är tillsynsmyndighet.

Hur får jag information om resultatet av studien?

Du har enligt lag rätt att en gång per år, gratis, få ta del av de personuppgifter vi registrerar om dig som en del av projektet. I sådana fall kontaktar du huvudansvarig forskare (se kontaktuppgifter sist i dokumentet).

Du kan även kontakta den huvudansvarige forskaren för information om de resultat som studien kommit fram till. Du behöver dock inte ta del av några resultat från studien om du inte vill.

Försäkring och ersättning

Som deltagande lärare i studien har du ett heltäckande försäkringsskydd, förutsatt att alla lärare på skolan är försäkrade under arbetstid. Ingen ersättning kommer att betalas ut till några deltagare då detta inte brukar ske vid den här sortens forskning. Däremot erbjuder vi följande:

(1) möjlighet att ta del av och bidra till ny forskning

(2) utvecklade lektionsupplägg för engelskundervisningen som är väl grundade i nuvarande forskning

(3) regelbunden hjälp med undervisning när studien fortgår vid din arbetsplats(4) att behålla visst forskningsmaterial i klassrummet efter projekttiden

Deltagandet är frivilligt

Ditt deltagande är frivilligt och du kan när som helst välja att avbryta deltagandet. Om du väljer att inte delta eller vill avbryta ditt deltagande behöver du inte uppge varför.

Om du vill avbryta ditt deltagande ska du kontakta den ansvariga för studien (se nedan).

Ansvariga för studien

Ansvarig för studien är Henrik Gyllstad, Docent i engelska vid Lunds universitet:

Henrik Gyllstad Språk- och litteraturcentrum Lunds universitet Box 201 221 00 Lund Telefon: XXXXX E-post: <u>henrik.gyllstad@englund.lu.se</u>

Biträdande handledare är Marie Källkvist, Docent i engelska vid Lunds universitet:

Marie Källkvist Språk- och litteraturcentrum Lunds universitet Box 201 221 00 Lund Telefon: XXXXX E-post: <u>marie.kallkvist@englund.lu.se</u>

Forskande doktorand är Elin Nylander, Doktorand i engelska vid Lunds universitet:

Elin Nylander Språk- och litteraturcentrum Lunds universitet Box 201 221 00 Lund Telefon: XXXXX elin.nylander@englund.lu.se

Samtycke till att delta i studien

Jag har fått muntlig och skriftlig information om studien och har haft möjlighet att ställa frågor. Jag får behålla den skriftliga informationen.

□ Jag samtycker till att delta i studien *Engelska i och utanför det flerspråkiga* klassrummet

 \Box Jag samtycker till att planeringsmöten med forskare som arbetar med studien spelas in

□ Jag samtycker till att uppgifter om mig behandlas på det sätt som beskrivs i forskningspersonsinformationen.

Signatur

Namnförtydligande

Ort och datum

Appendix 3: Consent form for students

Information till elever

Vi vill fråga dig om du vill delta i ett forskningsprojekt. I det här dokumentet får du information om projektet och om vad det innebär att delta. Eftersom du har fyllt 15 år kan du själv samtycka till att delta.

Vad är det för projekt och varför vill ni att jag ska delta?

Din skola och din lärare i engelska deltar i forskningsprojektet *Engelska i och utanför det flerspråkiga klassrummet* som drivs av en forskande doktorand (Elin Nylander) och två forskare (Henrik Gyllstad och Marie Källkvist) vid Lunds universitet. Projektet handlar om lärande och kommunikation i flerspråkiga engelskklassrum. Syftet med projektet är att bättre förstå vilken roll en persons olika språk har för inlärning av och kunskaper i engelska.

Forskningshuvudman för projektet är Lunds universitet. Med forskningshuvudman menas den organisation som är ansvarig för studien.

Hur går studien till?

Den här delen av studien kommer att pågå i cirka två veckor. Därefter kan du komma att bli kontaktad utav en av forskarna (Elin Nylander) även under vårterminen 2023. Elin kommer att besöka skolan regelbundet under vårterminen. Som deltagare i studien kan du då komma att bli tillfrågad om följande vid olika tillfällen på skoltid: (1) att regelbundet delta i olika lektionsaktiviteter där du arbetar med lektionsmaterial på engelska ensam och i grupp

(2) att göra olika mindre 'tester' eller 'quiz' som handlar om engelska

(3) att fylla i en enkät enskilt vid ett till två tillfällen

(4) att bli intervjuad, enskilt eller i grupp om din språkbakgrund vid ett till två tillfällen

(5) att träffa en utav forskarna (Elin Nylander) och prata om lektionsaktiviteterna från punkt

ett.

Aktiviteterna från punkt (1), (2) och (3) kommer att ske inom ramen för den vanliga engelskundervisningen på skolan. Ditt beslut om huruvida du väljer att vara med i själva forskningsprojektet påverkar dock <u>inte</u> dina eventuella betyg <u>överhuvudtaget</u>. Moment (1), (4) och (5) ovan kommer att ljudinspelas förutsatt att du samtycker till detta.

Intervjuerna från punkt (4) och (5) kommer att ske på skoltid, antingen i skolans lokaler eller på distans via exempelvis Zoom.

Vad innebär min medverkan?

I det här projektet står engelskklassrummet och skolämnet engelska i fokus. Intervjun från punkt (4) ovan kommer att baseras på en enkät om din språkliga bakgrund. Alltså kan även andra språk och skolämnen komma att tas upp. Eftersom intervjuerna handlar om din språkliga bakgrund så kan du också välja att komma in på personliga erfarenheter och berättelser om du så önskar. Detta är dock helt frivilligt och det är alltid du själv som bestämmer vad du vill dela med dig av och göra som deltagare i studien, det vill säga både under intervjuerna, i enkäterna och på lektionerna.

Det är alltid upp till dig om du vill svara på enkät- och intervjufrågorna. Du kan välja att inte delta i delar av studien, eller att helt avstå från att vara med. Det innebär alltså inga risker för dig att vara med i studien, men du har hela tiden möjlighet att avbryta ditt deltagande om du känner obehag. Du behöver inte ange speciella skäl för varför du vill avbryta. Du kan alltid vända dig till någon av forskarna om du har frågor eller vill prata om något moment i efterhand (se kontaktuppgifter nedan).

Vad händer med mina uppgifter?

Vi kan komma att samla in följande information, förutsatt att du går med på detta:

- A. Personuppgifter såsom namn, personnummer, ålder och kön, födelseort, tidigare utbildning, och språk
- B. Med vem, när, och i vilka sammanhang du använder de språk du kan
- C. Dina åsikter om språk, språkinlärning och språkanvändning
- D. Dina betyg i språkämnena

Informationen i punkt A-D hämtas från enkäterna och intervjuerna som nämns ovan. Informationen i punkt 4 hämtas från ansvariga på skolan. All information och all data som vi samlar in inom ramen för studien kommer att pseudo-nymiseras. Det betyder att vi aldrig kommer att använda ditt riktiga namn, utan ett annat namn som inte kan kopplas ihop med dig. Du kommer även att få ett så kallat kodnummer för att ytterligare säkerställa att du förblir anonym.

För att kunna ta fram de uppgifter vi samlar in om dig används en så kallad kodnyckel. Kodnyckeln förvaras i ett kassaskåp på Språk- och litteraturcentrum, Lunds universitet, så att informationen inte sprids eller kan kopplas till dig av någon annan än de som har nyckel till kassaskåpet. Det är endast den forskande doktoranden (Elin Nylander), den huvudansvarige forskaren (huvudhandledare Henrik Gyllstad), och den biträdande handledaren (Marie Källkvist) som har tillgång till kodnyckeln.

Allt ljudinspelat material sparas och förvaras digitalt på externa hårddiskar i kassaskåpet. I samband med att det sparas, anonymiseras det med hjälp av kodnyckeln, så att olika deltagare inte kan identifieras. Eventuella personnamn och ortnamn ersätts med pipljud och röster förvrängs. Avidentifikation sker alltså både i text (exempelvis i avhandlingen och eventuella artiklar) och under muntliga presentationer av studien (exempelvis föredrag). Anonym data kommer att sparas även efter avhandlingsarbetets slut och kan komma att publiceras senare. Du förblir alltid anonym, oavsett när datan publiceras. Endast anonymiserat material lagras på datorer som är anslutna till Internet. När projektet är avslutat lämnas originalfiler till Lunds universitets arkiv.

All information och all data som vi samlar in inom ramen för studien kommer alltså att behandlas så att inte obehöriga kan ta del av dem. Ansvarig för dina personuppgifter är Lunds universitet. Om du vill ta del av uppgifterna eller vill att de raderas ska du kontakta Henrik Gyllstad (kontaktuppgifter finns sist i detta dokument). Lunds universitets dataskyddsombud nås på telefonnummer 046-222 00 00 eller via e-post på dataskydssombud@lu.se. Om du är missnöjd med hur dina personuppgifter behandlas har du rätt att ge in klagomål till Datainspektionen, som är tillsynsmyndighet.

Hur får jag information om resultatet av studien?

Du har enligt lag rätt att en gång per år, gratis, få ta del av de personuppgifter vi registrerar om dig som en del av projektet. I sådana fall kontaktar du huvudansvarig forskare (se kontaktuppgifter sist i dokumentet). Du kan även kontakta den huvudansvarige forskaren för information om de resultat som studien kommit fram till. Du behöver dock inte ta del av några resultat från studien om du inte vill.

Försäkring och ersättning

Alla elever i svensk skola har försäkringsskydd under skoltid. Alltså har du som deltagare i studien ett heltäckande försäkringsskydd. Ingen ersättning kommer att betalas ut till några deltagare då detta inte brukar ske vid den här sortens forskning.

Deltagandet är frivilligt

Ditt deltagande i forskningsprojektet är helt frivilligt och du kan när som helst välja att avbryta deltagandet. Om du väljer att inte delta eller vill avbryta ditt deltagande i forskningsprojektet behöver du inte uppge varför, och det kommer inte heller att få några negativa konsekvenser.

Om du vill avbryta ditt deltagande i forskningsprojektet ska du kontakta den ansvariga för studien (se nedan).

Ansvariga för studien

Huvudansvarig för studien är Henrik Gyllstad, Docent i engelska vid Lunds universitet:

Henrik Gyllstad Språk- och litteraturcentrum Lunds universitet Box 201 221 00 Lund Telefon: XXXXX E-post: <u>henrik.gyllstad@englund.lu.se</u>

Biträdande handledare är Marie Källkvist, Docent i engelska vid Lunds universitet:

Marie Källkvist Språk- och litteraturcentrum Lunds universitet Box 201 221 00 Lund Telefon: XXXXX E-post: <u>marie.kallkvist@englund.lu.se</u> Forskande doktorand är Elin Nylander, Doktorand i engelska vid Lunds universitet:

Elin Nylander Språk- och litteraturcentrum Lunds universitet Box 201 221 00 Lund Telefon: XXXXX E-post: <u>elin.nylander@englund.lu.se</u>

Samtycke till att delta i studien

Om du samtycker, fyll i uppgifterna nedan och på nästa sida och lämna det ena pappret till Elin, eller till din lärare. Det andra behåller du själv. Samtycke till deltagande i studien

Genom att sätta ett kryss och skriva under ger du ditt samtycke till att det material som samlas in kan ingå i projektet *Engelska i och utanför det flerspråkiga klassrummet*

Jag samtycker till att följande används i forskningen:

Material	Samtycke (sätt kryss för "Ja")
Uppgifter om mig som behandlas på det sätt som beskrivs i forskningspersonsinformationen	
Mindre 'tester' eller 'quiz' som handlar om engelska	
Enkät om vilka språk jag kan samt när jag använder dem	
Ljudinspelning av intervju om min språkbakgrund och arbetet i klassrummet på lektionerna	
Ljudinspelning av arbete i klassrummet på lektionerna	
Uppgiftsmaterial från lektionerna	

Signatur

Namnförtydligande

Ort och datum

Denna lämnar du in

Samtycke till att delta i studien

Om du samtycker, fyll i uppgifterna nedan och på nästa sida och lämna det Elin, eller till din lärare. Det andra behåller du själv. Samtyelva till deltagende i studien

Samtycke till deltagande i studien

Genom att sätta ett kryss och skriva under ger du ditt samtycke till att det material som samlas in kan ingå i projektet *Engelska i och utanför det flerspråkiga klassrummet*

Jag samtycker till att följande används i forskningen:

Material	Samtycke (sätt kryss för "Ja")
Uppgifter om mig som behandlas på det sätt som beskrivs i forskningspersonsinformationen	
Mindre 'tester' eller 'quiz' som handlar om engelska	
Enkät om vilka språk jag kan samt när jag använder dem	
Ljudinspelning av intervju om min språkbakgrund och arbetet i klassrummet på lektionerna	
Ljudinspelning av arbete i klassrummet på lektionerna	
Uppgiftsmaterial från lektionerna	

Signatur

Namnförtydligande

Ort och datum

Denna behåller du själv

Appendix 4: Pilot study text and consent form

Smart Chimps

Sharing food may be a generous act, but there is often something in it for the sharer as well. It can be used to gain favors, pursue a potential partner, or even to show off. This is true for chimpanzees as well as people, only what chimps serve isn't a big box of candy. For example, a group of researchers observed chimps in the West African country of Guinea for two years. In 58 of 59 instances of food sharing, male chimps shared food stolen from nearby farms, including papaya and cassava. And in most cases, they offered some of the <u>loot</u> to a female chimp of reproductive age. The researchers note that chimps may also want to be bold and steal the food they want to share, perhaps as a way to <u>intimidate</u> others with their behavior. Further studies and <u>zoology</u> research may provide insight into the exact function of food sharing among chimpanzees.

Samtyckesblankett 2021-05-28.

Jag är doktorand i engelska vid Lunds universitet och skriver en avhandling. Syftet med avhandlingen är att titta närmare på hur elever lär sig nya ord på engelska. Därför vill jag vara med på en engelsklektion, be dig göra en uppgift, samt samla in den uppgiften och använda den.

Vad innebär det att tacka ja?

Den 31:a maj deltar jag (Elin Nylander) en stund på lektionen i engelska. Då gäller följande:

- Ordinarie lärare undervisar i klassrummet som vanligt
- Elin går igenom en uppgift mot slutet av lektionen
- Du genomför uppgiften. På samma papper blir du även ombedd att lista vilka språk du kan och får möjlighet att lämna kommentarer.
- Elin samlar in ditt svar på uppgiften, förutsatt att du tackar ja till detta

- Huruvida du tackar ja eller inte påverkar <u>inte</u> ditt betyg i engelska eller något annat ämne
- Att vara med är helt frivilligt och du kan närsomhelst välja att dra tillbaka din medverkan
- Enbart Elin och hennes två handledare får tillgång till ditt svar på uppgiften.
- Du är helt anonym och ska inte skriva ditt namn någonstans
- Ditt svar på uppgiften kan komma att visas i presentationer. Även då är du naturligtvis helt anonym.

Eftersom samtliga deltagare är över 15 så krävs inget samtycke från vårdnadshavare.

Skulle du ha någon fråga är du varmt välkommen att höra av dig till mig. Med vänliga hälsningar, Elin

Elin Nylander E-post: <u>elin.nylander@englund.lu.se</u> Telefon: XXXXXX VÄND

Om du samtycker, fyll i uppgifterna nedan och lämna det ena pappret till mig (Elin). Det andra behåller du själv.

Vill du <u>inte</u> samtycka behöver du <u>inte</u> fylla i blanketten.

Samtycke till deltagande under engelsklektion

Genom att sätta ett kryss och skriva under ger du ditt samtycke till att jag deltar på engelsklektionen och till att det jag samlar in kan visas under presentationer (helt anonymt). Du är också medveten om att du när som helst kan välja att avsluta ditt deltagande.

Samtycke (sätt kryss för "Ja")

För- och efternamn

Ort och datum

Appendix 5: Language background questionnaire (replicated with permission from Källkvist et al., 2022)

ENKÄT: Vilka språk talar du? När använder du dem? Vad tycker du om flerspråkighet och engelskundervisning?

Den här enkäten är en del av forskningsprojektet du deltar i. Enkäten består av två delar. I del A ber jag dig svara på vilka språk du talar och när du använder dem. I del B anger du vad du tycker om flerspråkighet och om undervisning i engelska.

Det finns mycket lite forskning om hur man bäst tar tillvara elevers kunskaper i olika språk i undervisningen i engelska. Dina svar används därför för att forskare och lärare bättre ska förstå hur elever vill att deras kunskaper i olika språk ska användas i undervisning och läxor.

Alla svar förblir anonyma, dvs. de kommer inte att knytas till ditt namn.

Förnamn och efternamn: _____

Klass: _____

Observera att ditt namn kommer att plockas bort och ersättas med en kod när vi analyserar svaren.

DEL A.

1. Är du	tjej?	
	kille?	
	vill inte svara	
2. Hur gamn	nal är du? år.	

3. I vilket land föddes du? _____

4. För dig som är född i ett annat land än Sverige, hur gammal var du när du flyttade till Sverige?

_____ år.

Vet ej □

5. Vilket eller vilka språk lärde du dig först?

11. Vilket eller vilka språk använder du och dina kompisar med varandra?

12. I skolan, vilka språk får du undervisning i?

13. Deltar du i modersmålsundervisning?

Ja □ Nej □ 14. I vilken årskurs började du lära dig engelska i skolan?

Om du inte kommer ihåg exakt årskurs, skriv när du tror det var.

15. Vilket språk använder du mest?

16. Vilket språk använder du helst?

17. Vilket/vilka språk använder du vanligtvis när du sms:ar eller liknande (t.ex. Facebook, Snapchat, WhatsApp, etc.)

Med kompisar:

Med syskon:

Med föräldrar:

18. Vilket språk använder du för inställningarna på din mobiltelefon?

Om du saknar mobiltelefon, lämna blankt.

19. Vilket eller vilka språk använder du när du tänker eller när du pratar med dig själv medan du gör följande saker? Skriv dina svar i tabellen.

dig sjalv medan du gor foljande saker: Skriv di	
Aktivitet	Skriv i rutan nedan vilket eller
	vilka språk du tänker på eller
	pratar med dig själv på medan
	du utför de aktiviteter som
	beskrivs.
Räknar matte	
Använder siffror och sifferkombinationer (till	
exempel koden till din mobiltelefon) eller	
räknar snabbt till 10	
Utövar fritidsaktiviteter (t.ex. spela fotboll, titta	
på film, laga mat) – skriv vilken aktivitet och	
språk)	
Söker information på Internet	
Försöker förstå något som du tycker är svårt	
Funderar på och planerar vad en uppsats eller	
annan text på engelska ska handla om	
annañ text pa engelska ska handia onn	
Uttrycker känslor	
Uttrycker åsikter	
Lär dig vad engelska ord betyder	
Lär dig engelsk grammatik	
L	۰

DEL B. I denna del anger du i hur stor grad du håller med om ett antal påståenden nedan, på en skala från 1 = Jag håller inte alls med, till 4 = Jag håller helt med. *Sätt kryss under den siffra på skalan (1, 2, 3, eller 4) som motsvarar vad du tycker.* Var vänlig svara på alla frågor.

	U	1 0	
Jag håller <u>inte alls</u> med			Jag håller <u>helt</u> med
1	2	3	4

	Påstående	Sätt kryss under den siffra som stämmer bäst med vad du tycker.			
		1 Håller <u>inte</u> med	2	3	4 Håller <u>helt</u> med
0	Exempel		×		
1	Att kunna flera språk är någonting bra.				
2	I dagens värld är det viktigt att kunna flera språk.				
3	Personer som kan flera språk har en större chans att lyckas i framtiden.				
4	Personer som använder alla sina språk kommer att ha nytta av det i framtiden.				
5	I Sverige är det viktigt att elever som kan flera språk får fortsätta använda dem.				
6	I Sverige ökar man sina chanser att få ett jobb om man kan flera olika språk.				
7	Om man kan engelska bra så ökar man sina chanser att få ett bra jobb.				
8	När man lär sig engelska är det bra att kunna flera andra språk.				
9	Jag lär mig engelska bäst om jag får använda andra språk jag kan på lektionerna.				
10	Jag lär mig engelska bäst om jag bara använder engelska på lektionerna.				
11	Det är viktigt att min engelsklärare vet vilka språk jag kan och använder				
12	När jag inte kommer på ett ord på engelska är det bra om min lärare uppmuntrar mig att tänka på andra språk jag kan.				
13	Det blir roligare att lära sig engelska om jag får använda andra språk jag kan				
14	Mitt självförtroende ökar om jag får använda andra språk än engelska på engelsklektionerna.				

		1	
15	När jag lär mig engelsk grammatik är det bra om läraren		
	förklarar på svenska.		
16	När jag lär mig engelsk grammatik är det bra om läraren		
	förklarar på engelska.		
17	Enbart för dig som har ett annat modersmål än svenska:		
	När jag lär mig engelsk grammatik är det bra om läraren		
	förklarar på mitt modersmål.		
18	När jag lär mig nya engelska ord är det bra om läraren		
	förklarar orden på svenska		
19	När jag lär mig nya engelska ord är det bra om läraren		
	förklarar orden på engelska.		
20	Enbart för dig som har ett annat modersmål än svenska:		
	När jag lär mig nya engelska ord är det bra om läraren		
	förklarar orden på mitt modersmål.		
21	Jag blir bättre på att skriva på engelska om jag använder		
	flera språk medan jag skriver, till exempel ord på ett annat		
	språk.		
22	Jag blir bättre på att skriva på engelska om jag bara		
	använder engelska medan jag skriver.		
23	När jag <u>läser</u> på engelska hjälper det mig om jag översätter		
	svåra ord till svenska eller andra språk.		
24	När jag <u>pratar</u> engelska hjälper det mig om jag ibland kan		
	använda ord på svenska eller andra språk.		
25	När jag <u>lyssnar</u> på engelska (t.ex. lärarens tal) hjälper det		
	mig om svåra ord översätts till svenska eller andra språk.		

Avslutande fråga:

Vilka språk är viktiga för dig? Beskriv gärna kort varför de är viktiga.

Om du har tillägg eller kommentarer om enkäten och dina svar, skriv dem här:

STORT tack för dina svar! Elin

Appendix 6: Example of PowerPoint presentation (Study 1)



Lesson aims during weeks 2-3

Learn more about social sustainability and girls' education

- Learn new English words from the texts we read
- · Work with English texts and words
- Evaluate what you thought worked for you

• Let's look specifically at some useful tricks for learning new vocabulary ('words')

- Research shows that when we learn new words in English, relating those new words to similar words in other languages we know, can help us remember and learn the new words (Nation, 2013)
- You are all very good at English! Do you use and hear English a lot outside the classroom?
- It might be helpful to somehow use some of that English from outside the classroom inside the classroom, when learning new English **vocabulary** (**'words'**)
- · Let's look at some examples

Example 1

- · Let's say you are trying to learn the English word opinion
- · An opinion is a thought or believe of something or someone
- En åsikt in Swedish
- If you are trying to learn the English word *opinion*, you could relate the word to a similar word in Swedish, *opinion*
- You could also get helped by other languages: French: opinion Spanish: opinión Italian: parere, opinione German: die Ansicht Modern Greek: άποψη, αντίληψη, γνώμη

Example 1
 And perhaps you have seen celebrities list unpopular opinions on Youtube? That could help you learn the English word opinion as well Similar examples are words like definition, revolution, restriction, communication
Example 2
Let's say, you are trying to learn the English word furious
Someone who is <i>furious</i> is extremely angry
• Rasande, ursinnig in Swedish
 If you are trying to learn the English word <i>furious</i>, you could get helped by other languages:
French: <i>furieux</i> Spanish: furioso Italian: furioso, arrabbiato German: rasend Modern Greek:μαινόμενος, μανιασμένος, έξω φρενών, βίαιος, άγριος, δαιμονιώδης



Example 3
Let's say, you are trying to learn the English word to vanish
• <i>To vanish</i> is to disappear or stop being present or existing, especially in a sudden, surprising way
• Försvinna; dö (blekna) bort; falla bort in Swedish
 If you are trying to learn the English word vanish, perhaps it helps you to think about the detergent Vanish?
Time left?
 If we have time, let's do a short activity in order to practice this way of thinking

Appendix 7: Example text with TWs (The Power of the Pen)

The Power of the Pen

Malala Yousazai was born on 12 July 1997 and grew up in Miagnora, which is the largest city in the Swat valley in Pakistan. In 2009, Malala began getting <u>attention</u> when she started blogging anonymously, describing in her writing how it was to live under the rule of the Taliban. The Taliban strengthened their grip on the Swat valley in 2007- banning girls from attending school and destroying several hindered schools and <u>emporiums</u>, among other things.

Malala was eventually forced to leave her home to seek safety but she later returned, speaking out about her right to go to school. However, Malala's commitment to her cause made her an enemy of the Taliban and in 2012 she was shot in the head while on a bus home from school. Malala was badly injured and was taken to hospital in an **urban** area in the UK after spending a few days in a Pakistani military hospital.

Against all odds, Malala recovered from her injuries and now she was suddenly famous not only in Pakistan but also throughout the world. In 2014, at the age of 17, Mala received the Nobel Peace Prize and through the Malala Fund she works globally for girls' right to education. In this extract from her autobiography, we find out how Malala first became known to the outside world- and the Taliban:

It was during one of those dark days that my father received a call from his friend Abdul Hai Kakar, a BBC radio correspondent based in Peshawar. He was looking for a female teacher or a schoolgirl to write a diary about what she <u>opined</u> about life under the Taliban. He wanted to show the human side of the catastrophe in Swat. Initially Madam Maryam's younger sister Ayesha agreed, but her father found out and refused his permission saying it was too risky.

When I overheard my father talking about this, I said "Why not me?" I wanted people to know what was happening. Education is our right, I said. Just as it is our right to

sing and play. Islam has given us this right and says that every boy and girl should go to school.

I had never written a diary before and did not know how to begin. Although we had a computer, there were frequent power cuts and few places had Internet access. So Hai Kakar would call me in the evening on my mother's mobile. He used his wife's phone to protect us as his own phone was bugged by the intelligence services. First, he would ask me to practice describing things like the view from my window in as much detail as possible, including all the colours and <u>contours</u> I could see. Then he would guide me, asking me to describe my day, or talk about my dreams. We could speak for half an hour or forty minutes in Urdu, even though we are both Pashtun, as the blog was to appear in Urdu and he wanted the voice to be as authentic as possible. Then he wrote up my words once a week as they would appear on the BBC Urdu website.

My first diary entry appeared on January 2009 under the heading I AM AFRAID: 'I had a terrible dream last night filled with military helicopters and Taliban. I have had such dreams since the launch of the military operation in Swat. 'I wrote about being afraid to go to school because of the Taliban edict and looking over my shoulder all the time. I also described something that happened on my way home from school: 'I heard a man behind me saying, "I will kill you." I quickened my pace and after a while I looked back to see if he was following me. To my huge relief, I saw he was speaking on his phone, he must have been talking to someone else.'

It was thrilling to see my words on the website, I was a bit shy to start with but after a while I got to know the kind of things Hai Kakar wanted me to talk about and became more confident. He liked personal feelings and what he called my 'pungent sentences' and also the mix of everyday family life with the terror of the Taliban.

I wrote a lot about school as that was at the centre of our lives. I loved my blue uniform but we were advised to wear plain clothes instead and hide our books under our shawls. One extract was called DO NOT WEAR COLOURFUL CLOTHES. In it I wrote, 'I was getting ready for school one day and was about to put on my uniform when I remembered the advice of our principal, so that day I decided to wear my favourite pink dress.'

The diary eventually received attention further afield. Some newspapers printed extracts. The BBC even made a recording of it using another girl's voice, and I began to see that the pen and the words that came from it can be much more powerful than machine guns, tanks or helicopters. We were learning how to struggle. And we were learning how powerful we are when we speak.

Some of our teachers stopped coming to school. One teacher said he had seen a beheaded corpse on the way in and could no longer risk his life to teach. Many people were scared. Our neighbours said the Taliban were instructing people to make it known to the mosque if their daughters were unmarried so they could get married off, probably to militants.

In January 2009 there were only ten girls in my class when once there had been twentyseven. Many of my friends had left the valley so they could be educated in Peshawar but my father insisted we would not leave. 'Swat has given us so much. In these tough days we must be strong for our valley', he said. From I am Malala by Malala Yousafzai and Christina Lamb.

Appendix 8: Example of PowerPoint presentation (Study 2)



English synonym(s)	Rememberl: Please fill in the information which <u>you</u> feel would help <u>you</u> learn the target words if you were to study them. Write as much as you need to learn the words ©
Translation equivalent(s) Please also write which language the translation is in	Illustration:
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
I have heard or seen this <u>word</u> (or part of the word) before when Try to be as specific as you can here	This word makes me think about the word Please also write which language the word is in

English synonyms

- Same in Swedish (synonym)
- Here you can put a different word in English which means the same thing as the word you are working with, IF this is a strategy that YOU find useful
- Example: **Beautiful** and **attractive** are synonyms of each other; these words mean roughly the same thing
- One effective way to learn vocabulary ('words') (Nation, 2013)



Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):
• Förklaring(ar)
• A way to show that you know the word, IF this is a strategy that YOU find useful
 When you explain a word, memory associations in the brain are strengthened and it becomes more likely that you will remember what the words mean later (Nation)
 These can be in English and/or other language(s)
 Example: Coffee: a hot drink made from the roasted and ground seeds (coffee beans) of a tropical shrub. AND/OR en varm dryck gjord på malda rostade bär (kaffebönor)
Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
• Exempelmening(ar)
 A way to show that you know the word, IF this is a strategy that YOU find useful
 A way to show that you know the word, IF this is a strategy that YOU find useful Writing example sentences containing the words you want to learn can be efficient a because it can give you context which can help you remember the word. When writing up example sentences, see if you can think of helpful sentences with helpful context.
 useful Writing example sentences containing the words you want to learn can be efficient a because it can give you context which can help you remember the word. When writing up example sentences, see if you can think of helpful sentences with helpful context. These can be in English and/or other language(s)
 Writing example sentences containing the words you want to learn can be efficient a because it can give you context which can help you remember the word. When writing up example sentences, see if you can think of helpful sentences with helpful context.

I have heard or seen this word before when....

- If you can connect the word you are learning to something from before, chances are that this will help you remember what the word means
- It is a way of working actively with a word which can help you remember it, IF this is a strategy that YOU find useful (Nation, 2013)
- Example: contour connection to make-up tutorials on YouTube
- Try to be as specific as you can here

This word makes me think about the word....

- When you connect the new word to a different word you already know, this is called a word association
- Example: coffee- kaffe
- Working with words in this way is another type of 'active' work, which makes it more likely that you will remember the word later, IF this is a strategy that YOU find useful (Nation, 2013)

Briefly discuss

- Which of these strategies do YOU find useful and why?
- Do you have any questions for Elin and/or Tove?

References

Nation, P. (2013). Learning vocabulary in another language (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

English as a Global Language
• We will read with texts called Is the future English or emoji? and
Assimilation or Integration?
 We will also work with a number of English words from those texts Work with words that will be extra useful in your final product
 You are part of a project. I am proud of it, and you should be very proud of yourselves that you take part in research
 Will learn more English! I will not share your scores with your teacher. All students work with the same activities, but I will only analyze the activities from those who have said 'yes.' I will only record those who have said 'yes'
Lesson aims during weeks 2-5

- Learn more about the topic of global Englishes and prepare for creating and recording a podcast.
- Learn and use many new English words from the texts we read
- Get a chance to work with English texts and words in different ways, and evaluate what you thought worked best for you
- Develop your writing in one of the exercises in this project

Record a Podcast

What will be of special focus in this product is following:

- * To what extent you succeed with using a varied, and rich language. (If you can, try to use the words from Elin's task)
- * To what extent you can adapt your tone and style to recipients (3rd year high school students in New Zealand)
- * To what extent your can express your arguments and ideas in a "relaxed" way
- * How you contribute to the conversation by asking questions, commenting, listening and speaking yourself
- * To what extent you are able to discuss the questions regarding language, power and status.
- * That you use, and how you use relevant sources to stress your arguments or ideas

English - a Global Language

-English is a global language used by people all over the world

-First language (L1) of many but also common second or foreign language language (L2 or L3)

-A common **lingua franca** or language that people use to communicate who do not share the same first language (Holmes & Wilson, 2017)

- More or less have to learn it? Not something we can eschew? Or?

English - a Global Language

-English is a global language used by people all over the world

-First language (L1) of many but also common second or foreign language language (L2 or L3)

 -A common lingua franca or language that "serves as communication between people who otherwise lack a common [mother] tongue" (Oxford World Encyclopaedia, 2014)

-Historical reasons: English became global of power of British empire, later American imperialism, then -Industrial revolution which mean that English became the primary language of technology US and UK both used English and were economically powerful (McKay, 2010)

English - a Global Language

-Dominates the Internet, popular culture etc.

-A powerful tool for uniting people from different countries and cultures

-Might even help combat xenophobia

The Future

- But what about in the future? Could for instance Spanish get the same role that English has today? Maybe Chinese? Arabic?
- Acclimatize to a new normal with different language as a global language?
- In the long run we don't know. But right now English continues to dominate because powerful nations like UK and US still dominate
- People will probably be solicitous about learning English also in the future

Varieties of Englishes

- BUT it is important to remember that there are many different **varieties** of English. There is heterogeneity here.
- Variety: umbrella term for accents, different linguistic styles, different dialects and even different languages which contrast with each other for social reasons (Holmes & Wilson, 2017).
- Not just British and American English, but also Australian English, Indian English, Spanish English 'Spanglish'), Singapore English ('Singlish') Swedish English ('Swenglish') etc.
- All equally valuable, not that one is more 'atypical' than the other

- Rights to use not only many varieties of English but also home language. As a consequences of colonialism, many languages has had to struggle to get the status and role in society as the speakers of the group wish.
- All the perspectives mentioned here will be the foundation to your final product, the podcast.





"Fluency in a language is more important than

accuracy". Do you agree?

 Yes, I think it is more important to be able to communicate, regardless of accuracy • I think accuracy of language is more important than any other aspect

• Other idea

References

Holmes & Wilson (2017). Introduction to Sociolinguistics (5th ed) Hornberger, N.H., & McKay, S.L. (2010). Sociolinguistics and Language Education. Multilingual Matters. Appendix 9: Interview guide for students (used with permission from Källkvist et al., 2022 and adapted to fit the purpose of the present study)

Intervjuguide för elever

FÖRE INTERVJUN: Information och etiska aspekter

Kort om syfte Samtycke Anonym, alltid rätt att dra tillbaka deltagande

DEL 1: Språkbakgrund och ideologier om flerspråkighet och språk

1. Hej och tack för att du vill vara med och bidra till mitt avhandlingsprojekt! Det uppskattar jag verkligen! Vi kan väl börja med att titta på porträttet som du har färglagt med olika färger som representerar dina olika språk. Hur var det att färglägga porträttet?

 \rightarrow Om övningen vekar uppfattas som barnslig, påpeka då att det absolut kan kännas så, men att informationen som eleven delar med sig av är jätteintressant och viktig för min forskning. Påpeka bara detta om det känns relevant?

2. Jag ser på porträttet vilka språk du kan. Berätta hur du tänkte här! → Vilka språk kan du? Vem talar du dem med? 3. Nu tänkte jag att vi kunde fokusera på engelskan. När började du läsa engelska? spela

4. Har du haft många olika lärare?

5. När du går in i klassrummet och ska ha lektion i engelska, vill du då att alla ska prata bara engelska?

6.Eller är det svårt att följa med när alla bara pratar engelska?

7.Skulle du ibland vilja säga något på ett annat språk? I så fall vilket?

8.Du kanske gärna blandar språk?

9.Hör du mycket engelska på fritiden?

10.I vilka sammanhang hör eller använder du engelska? Tror du att du har nytta av den engelskan du hör utanför klassrummet när du är i klassrummet? Känns det som att du tar med dig den in i klassrummet?

11.Vilka språk tror du att du kommer att prata i framtiden?

12. Finns det språk du tycker särskilt mycket om?

→ Koppla till enkäten

13.Vilket är det språk du kan bäst?

→ Koppla till enkäten

14.Om du fortsätter att lära sig flera språk i skolan tror du att du kommer att få nytta av det i framtiden?

15.Är det en fördel att kunna flera språk?

→ Koppla till enkäten

16.Vilka språk är viktiga i Sverige, tycker du?

DEL 2: Arbetssätt vid ordinlärning och övningarna

Vi går vidare till att prata lite om övningar som ni gör på lektionerna i engelska. Här är jag extra intresserad av sådant som handlar om att lära sig nya ord.

17.Finns det några särskilda övningar som ni gjort på lektionerna i engelska som du tycker om?

18. Vad är det som gör att du tycker om dem?

19.Skulle du vilja prata mer på lektionerna än du gör?

20.Finns det något annat du skulle vilja göra mer av – till exempel skriva mer, läsa mer, spela pjäser, eller något annat?

21. Tycker du att engelska är lätt eller ganska svårt?

22.Blir man bättre på engelska om man tvingar sig själv att prata engelska så ofta man kan?

23.Eller blir man bättre på engelska om man ibland kan blanda språk?

24.Eller om man får lov att första tänka igenom det man vill säga innan man behöver säga något på engelska?

25. Nu tänkte jag att vi skulle fokusera lite på din engelsklärare. Finns det något som läraren skulle kunna göra för att göra det lättare att lära sig engelska?

26.Brukar din lärare någon gång tala något annat språk än engelska på lektionerna? 27.Tycker du det är bra?

28.Vad är i så fall bra med det?

29.Händer det någon gång att du skulle vilja tala med din lärare på de språk du kan bäst?

30.När du ska skriva något eller redovisa en uppgift, händer det att du använder ett lexikon eller internet för att hitta rätt ord?

31. Vad använder du i så fall?

32. Använder du andra språk för att hitta rätt ord?

33. Tycker du det är bra med gloslistor som har översättningar av engelska ord?

34.I så fall, vilket språk vill du ha dem översatta till?

35.Minns du det första materialet som handlade om *The Power of the pen*? Vad lärde du dig av det materialet? Berätta gärna hur det var att arbeta med det.

→ Fråga generellt om task 1 och fånga upp intressanta detaljer

36. Minns du det andra materialet som handlade om Girl Rising och COVID19 Vad lärde du dig av det materialet? Berätta gärna hur det var att arbeta med det. \rightarrow Fråga generellt om task 2 och fånga upp intressanta detaljer

37.Tycker ni att materialen var bra?38.Kunde de varit bättre?

39.Efter att ha haft den här upplevelsen, skulle ni vilja att man undervisar på något sätt som ni sett exempel på i de här materialen?

40. Vad skulle du ge mig som forskare för råd om jag skulle göra nya ordinlärningsövningar och lektioner som de från förra terminen?

Appendix 10: Interview guide for teachers (interview guide from Källkvist et al., 2024 served as initial inspiration)

Intervjuguide för lärare

FÖRE INTERVJUN: Information och etiska aspekter

Kort om syfte Samtycke Anonymitet och rätten att dra tillbaka deltagande <u>Dina tankar är mycket värdefulla och det finns inget rätt eller fel.</u>

DEL 1: Bakgrundsinformation: Erfarenhet av att arbeta som lärare och utav lärarutbildningen

- 1.Berätta gärna om din språkbakgrund med hjälp av det lingvistiska porträttet
- 2. Hur länge har du arbetat som lärare?
- 3.Vilka ämnen?
- 4.Var studerade du till lärare?
- 5.Pratade ni om ordkunskap under din lärarutbildning? Med ordkunskap menar jag både elevernas ordinlärning och att som lärare undervisa kring och lära ut ord.

DEL 2: Ordinlärning och arbete med vokabulär

6.Nu tänkte jag att vi skulle fokusera på min vokabuläruppgift som jag ju har använt med dina elever. Tänk dig att du själv skulle använda min vokabuläruppgift eller något liknande material i en annan klass som du undervisar i eller har undervisat nyligen. Om jag gav den till dig, hur skulle du då använda eller anpassa den? Skulle arbetssättet skilja sig åt beroende på vilka klasser du använde uppgiften med? Passar min vokabulärövning bättre i vissa klasser än i andra, tror du?

7.Om du gillar min vokabuläruppgift som den är, vad är det då du gillar med den?

8. Skulle man kunna tänka sig en digital version av min vokabuläruppgift?

9. Hur lär man sig ord på engelska som elev, enligt dig? Vilka verktyg kan man behöva?

10. Kan andra språk vara till hjälp?

11.Hur ser du på att använda andra resurser än de rent språkliga när eleverna lär sig ord på engelska? Händer det att du använder bilder eller låter eleverna rita? Händer det att du eller eleverna drar kopplingar mellan ord på engelska och ord som de hör utanför engelskklassrummet (exempelvis på fritiden eller på andra lektioner)?

12. Vad anser du om att låta eleverna lära sig ord på engelska genom att översätta dem till svenska?

13. Förekommer det översättningar till andra språk? Moderna språk?

14. Hur ser du på att använda en mer enspråkig engelsk strategi, där eleverna lär sig ord på engelska genom engelska synonymer, förklaringar, eller exempelmeningar?15. Vilken roll spelar du som lärare när det kommer till elevernas ordkunskap i

engelska?

16. Finns det annat eller andra som också spelar roll?

17.Skulle du säga att du och eleverna arbetar med ordkunskap på ett strategiskt sätt på engelsklektionerna?

18.Har ni någon strategi eller policy när det kommer till ordkunskap i ditt arbetslag, språkämneslag eller liknande? Pratar ni tillsammans om hur eleverna bäst lär sig nya ord?

19.Hur ser du på ordkunskap i engelska? Är det en viktig del av engelskundervisningen? Är det en viktig del av att kunna engelska?

DEL 3: Ideologier

19.I din erfarenhet, är det bäst att bara prata engelska för att man ska lära sig så mycket engelska som möjligt?

20.Är det ibland bra att översätta till andra språk?

21. Tror du eller tycker du att det är viktigt för eleverna att deras språkliga och kulturella bakgrund görs synlig på olika sätt i klassrummet – elevers svenska bakgrund såväl som annan språklig och kulturell bakgrund?

Avslut: Har du några frågor till mig?

Appendix 11: Stimulated recall interview (SRI) instructions

SRI instructions in Swedish

Tack så mycket för att du tar dig tid att prata en stund med mig. Det uppskattar jag verkligen! Nu tänkte jag att vi skulle titta på hur du arbetade med några utav orden i texten [namn på text] med hjälp av vokabulärövningen. Jag kommer att fråga dig hur du tänkte när du arbetade med tre specifika ord som du jobbat med Jag undrar dels hur du tänkte när du valde vilka delar av övningen som du skulle fylla i (t.ex.. om du skulle skriva en översättning eller en exempelmening). Jag undrar också hur du tänkte när du bestämde vad du skulle skriva i de olika delarna (t.ex. hur en exempelmening skulle se ut)? Syftet är att bättre förstå hur du tänkte under arbetets gång. Det finns inget rätt eller fel. Försök att verbalisera dina tankar som du har i huvudet. För varje ord: Hur tänkte du här? Hur tänkte du när du valde vilka delar av övningen du skulle fylla i (t.ex.. översättningar eller synonymer)? Hur tänkte du när du bestämde vad du skulle skriva i de olika delarna (t.ex. hur en exempelmening skulle se ut)? Fråga om: Ett ord med koppling till svenska Ett ord utan koppling till svenska Ett tredje ord som verkar intressant som varje elev jobbat med

English translation (mine)

Thank you so much for taking the time to talk to me for a minute. I really appreciate that!

Now I was thinking that we should look at how you worked with some of the words in the

text [name of text] using the vocabulary task. I will ask you what [literally how] you were

thinking when you worked with three specific words that you have worked with I wonder

partly what [literally how] you were thinking when you chose what parts of the task to fill in

(e.g., if you were going to write a translation or an example sentence). I also wonder what

[literally how] you were thinking when you decided what to write in the different sections

(e.g., what an example sentence would look like)? The purpose is to better understand what

[literally how] you were thinking during the task work. There is no right or wrong. Try to

verbalize your thoughts that you have in your head.

For every word:

What [literally how] did you think here? What [literally how] did you think when choosing

which part of the task to fill in (e.g., translations are synonyms)? What [literally how] did you

think when deciding what to write in the different sections (e.g., what an example sentence

would look like)?

Ask about:

One word with a connection to Swedish

One word without a connection to Swedish

A third word that seems interesting that every student has worked with

Appendix 12: Examples of task sheets (Task Version P, Task Version 1, and Task Version 2)

Task Version P, Format A

- Please read the text called *Smart Chimps*
- Work with the two (2) target words which are <u>underlined and marked in</u> <u>boldface</u> in the *Smart Chimps* text.
- For each target word, please fill in information in the boxes below.
- Please choose which information to fill in
- Fill in the information which *you* feel would help *you* learn the words if you were to study them. Write as much as you need to learn the word.
- You decide whether or not you want to use one or several synonym(s), translation equivalent(s) and example sentence(s)
- The word *loot* from the text has been done for you as an example
- Please do not forget to fill in the information towards the end of this task, if you want to
- Your help is very important and valuable! THANK YOU! © /Elin

Target word: <u>loot</u>	
English synonym(s) and/or translation equivalent(s) in any other language(s) pillage, spoils	Target word illustration:
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s): Loot can be money and <u>valuable objects</u> that have been <u>stolen</u> , <u>especially</u> by an <u>army</u> from a <u>defeated enemy</u> or by <u>thieves</u> .	Example sentence(s) in English and/or any other language(s): The thieves got a lot of loot in the robbery.
I have heard this word before when I watched a documentary about <i>chimpanzees on TV</i>	This word makes me think about the word

Target word: <u>intimidate</u>	
English synonym(s) and/or translation equivalent(s) in any other language(s)	Target word illustration:
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) in English and/or any other language(s):
I have heard this word before when	This word makes me think about the word

Target word: <u>zoology</u>	
English synonym(s) and/or translation equivalent(s) in any other language(s)	Target word illustration:
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) in English and/or any other language(s):
I have heard this word before when	This word makes me think about the word

Finally, please fill in the following information about yourself, if you want to. It is anonymous, and you should not write your name anywhere.

This is the language I know best: _____

Other languages I know are:

1	
4	

Is there anything else that you would like to add?:

Tasł	Task Version 1, TWs 1–5
	Name: Class:
•	Please read the text called <i>The Power of the Pen</i> .
•	Work with the five (5) target words which are <u>underlined and marked in boldface</u> in the text.
•	For each target word, start by noting what time it is when you start working with the word.
•	Next, indicate whether you don't know the word, have seen the word but don't know the meaning, or (think you) know
	the word by putting a cross (x) in the most suitable box.
•	Then please fill in information in the boxes below.
•	Please choose which information to fill in.
•	Fill in the information which you feel would help you learn the target words if you were to study them. Write as much
	as you need to learn the words. This might mean that you leave certain boxes blank.
•	You decide whether or not you want to use one or several synonym(s), translation equivalent(s) and/or example
	sentence(s).
•	If you write about where you have heard or seen a target word before, try to be as specific as you can. For example, rather
	than writing 'in films or books', please specify the name of the film or book you heard or seen the word in, if possible. If
	you have heard or seen a word in a context, then try to describe that context.
•	You are welcome to use dictionaries or any other resources that you normally use when working with new words. If you
	use dictionaries or other resources, please indicate this by putting a cross (x) in the box below. Please also note which
	resource you used.
•	Also note what time it is when you stop working with each word. This is interesting for me to know. However, it is
	important that you take the time you need and that you do not rush.
•	The word education from the text has been done for vou as an example

- - The word education from the text has been done for you as an example •

- next to you by talking about your answers together. If you can, please record yourselves using your computers. Please do When you are done working with all five target words from the text, please share your answers with the person sitting NOT change anything on the sheets while talking to the person next to you.

342

I start working with this word at (write the time here) <u>14.15</u>

□ I don't know this word

 \Box Seen it, don't know the meaning

⊠ I (think I) know this word

English synonym(s)	
teaching, schooling, training	
Translation equivalent(s)	Target word illustration:
undervisning, utbildning éducation	
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
	The school is devoted to the education of children with reading
I have heard or seen this word before when Try to be as specific as you can here	This word makes me think about the word
I stopped working with this word at (write the time here)14.30I used a dictionary or some other resource when working with this word	ord
⊠ Yes, I used The Swedish-English and the Fren	The Swedish-English and the French online dictionary from www.ne.se

∩ No

Target word: attention

I start working with this word at (write the time here)_

□ I don't know this word

 \Box Seen it, don't know the meaning

□ I (think I) know this word	
English synonym(s)	
Translation equivalent(s)	Target word illustration:
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
I have heard or seen this word before when Try to be as specific as you can here	This word makes me think about the word
I stopped working with this word at (write the time here):	here):

I used a dictionary or some other resource when working with this word:

□ Yes, I used . °N □

Target word: <u>emporium</u>

I start working with this word at (write the time here)_

□ I don't know this word

 \Box Seen it, don't know the meaning

□ I (think I) know this word	
English synonym(s)	
Translation equivalent(s)	Target word illustration:
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
I have heard or seen this word before when Try to be as specific as you can here	This word makes me think about the word
I stopped working with this word at (write the time here):	here):

I used a dictionary or some other resource when working with this word:

□ Yes, I used _ °N □

Target word: <u>urban</u> I start working with this word at (write the time here)__ □ I don't know this word □ Seen it, don't know the meaning

□ I (think I) know this word	
English synonym(s)	
Translation equivalent(s)	Target word illustration:
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
I have heard or seen this word before when Try to be as specific as you can here	This word makes me think about the word
I stopped working with this word at (write the time here):	

□ Yes, I used __

Target word: opine

I start working with this word at (write the time here)_

□ I don't know this word

□ Seen it, don't know the meaning □ I (think I) know this word

English synonym(s)	
Translation equivalent(s)	Target word illustration:
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
I have heard or seen this word before when Try to be as specific as you can here	This word makes me think about the word
I stopped working with this word at (write the time here):	this word:

°N □

Target word: <u>contour</u> I start working with this word at (write the time here)_

 \Box I don't know this word

□ Seen it, don't know the meaning

□ I (think I) know this word	
English synonym(s)	
Translation equivalent(s)	Target word illustration:
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
I have heard or seen this word before when Try to be as specific as you can here	This word makes me think about the word
I stopped working with this word at (write the time here):	

□ Yes, I used __ □ No

Ţ	Task Version 2 (TWs: <i>heterogeneity, atypical, eschew,</i> and a self-selected TW)
	Full name (<i>för- och efternamn</i>): Class:
•	Please read the first part of the text called <i>Is the future English or emoji?</i>
•	Work with a total of four (4) words from the text. First, work with the three words which are <u>underlined and marked in boldface</u> in the text. Then, please choose at least one word from the text which is new to you and work with that word. If you have time, you
	may choose more words to work with.
• •	For each of the four (4) words, start by noting what time it is when you start working with the word. Next. indicate whether vou don't know the word. have seen the word but don't know the meaning. or (think vou) know the word
	by putting a cross (x) in the most suitable box.
•	Then please fill in information in the boxes below.
•	Please choose which information to fill in.
•	Fill in the information which <i>you</i> feel would help <i>you</i> learn the target words if you were to study them. Write as much as you need
•	to learn the words. I ms mignt mean that you leave certain sections blank. You decide whether you want to use one or several synonym(s), translation equivalent(s) and/or example sentence(s).
•	If you write about where you have heard or seen a target word before, try to be as specific as you can. For example, rather than
	or seen a word in a context, then try to describe that context.
•	You are welcome to use dictionaries or any other resources that you normally use when working with new words. If you use dictionaries or other resources, please indicate this by putting a cross (x) in the box below. Please also note which resource you used.
•	Also note what time it is when you stop working with each word. This is interesting for me to know. However, it is important that
	you take the time you need and that you do not rush.
•	The word <i>globalized</i> from the text has been done for you as an example

Your help is very important and valuable! THANK YOU! ③ /Elin

□ I don't know this word	
□ Seen it, don't know the meaning	
□ I (think I) know this word	
English synonym(s)	Remember!: Please fill in the information which <u>you</u> feel would help <u>you</u> learn the target words if you were to study them. Write as much as you need to learn the words ©
Translation equivalent(s) Please also write which language(s) the translation(s) is or are in	Illustration:
globaliserad	
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
I have heard or seen this word (or part of the word) before when	This word makes me think about the word
1 ry to be as spectric as you can nere listening to the Global News Podcast from the BBC.	r lease also write which language the word is in
	globalisering (in Swedish)
I stopped working with this word at (write the time here):	
I used a dictionary or some other resource when working with this word (If you used a bilingual dictionary, please state which one)	s word (If you used a bilingual dictionary, please state which one)

Word: <u>globalized</u> I start working with this word at (write the time here)_

ì å 5 ą 2

The Swedish-English online dictionary from www.ne.se ⊠ Yes, I used ____ □ No

I start working with this word at (write the time here)_

Word: heterogeneity

I used a dictionary or some other resource when working with this word (If you used a bilingual dictionary, please state which one)

°N □

□ Yes, I used _

351

<u>atypical</u>
Word:

I start working with this word at (write the time here)_

 \Box I don't know this word

 \Box Seen it, don't know the meaning

\Box I (think I) know this word	
English synonym(s)	Remember!: Please fill in the information which <u>you</u> feel would help <u>you</u> learn the target words if you were to study them. Write as much as you need to learn the words ©
Translation equivalent(s) Please also write which language the translation is in	Illustration:
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
I have heard or seen this word (or part of the word) before when Try to be as specific as you can here	This word makes me think about the word Please also write which language the word is in
I stopped working with this word at (write the time here):	

I used a dictionary or some other resource when working with this word (If you used a bilingual dictionary, please state which one)

□ Yes, I used

°N □

Word: <u>eschew</u> I start working with this word at (write the time here) I atart working with know this word I don't know the meaning I (think I) know this word	
English synonym(s)	Remember!: Please fill in the information which <u>you</u> feel would help <u>you</u> learn the target words if you were to study them. Write as much as you need to learn the words ©
Translation equivalent(s) Please also write which language(s) the translation(s) is or are in	Illustration:
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
I have heard or seen this word (or part of the word) before when Try to be as specific as you can here	This word makes me think about the word Please also write which language the word is in
I stopped working with this word at (write the time here):	with this word at (write the time here):

□ Yes, I used _____

∩ No

Please chose a word from the text that you want to work with and write it here: _ I start working with this word at (write the time here)_____

□ I don't know this word □ Seen it, don't know the meaning

□ Seen it, don t know the meaning □ I (think I) know this word	
English synonym(s)	Remember!: Please fill in the information which <u>you</u> feel would help <u>you</u> learn the target words if you were to study them. Write as much as you need to learn the words ©
Translation equivalent(s) Please also write which language the translation is in	Illustration:
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
I have heard or seen this word (or part of the word) before when Try to be as specific as you can here	This word makes me think about the word Please also write which language the word is in
I stopped working with this word at (write the time here):	y with this word at (write the time here):

I used a dictionary or some other resource when working with this word (If you used a bilingual dictionary, please state which one) ∩ No □ Yes, I used

If you have time, you can work with another word that you choose. Please write it here: I start working with this word at (write the time here) □ I don't know this word □ Seen it, don't know the meaning □ I (think I) know this word	ase write it here:
English synonym(s)	Remember!: Please fill in the information which <u>you</u> feel would help <u>you</u> learn the target words if you were to study them. Write as much as you need to learn the words ©
Translation equivalent(s) Please also write which language the translation is in	Illustration:
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
I have heard or seen this word (or part of the word) before when Try to be as specific as you can here	This word makes me think about the word Please also write which language the word is in
I stopped working with this word at (write the time here): I used a dictionary or some other resource when working with	I stopped working with this word at (write the time here):

4 b 5 O 2

□ Yes, I used _____

°N □

I start working with this word at (write the time here) I don't know this word	
□ Seen it, don't know the meaning □ I (think I) know this word	
English synonym(s)	Remember!: Please fill in the information which <u>you</u> feel would help <u>you</u> learn the target words if you were to study them. Write as much as you need to learn the words ©
Translation equivalent(s) Please also write which language the translation is in	Illustration:
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
I have heard or seen this word (or part of the word) before when Try to be as specific as you can here	This word makes me think about the word Please also write which language the word is in
I stopped working with this word at (write the time here): I used a dictionary or some other resource when working w	stopped working with this word at (write the time here):

If you have time, you can work with another word that you choose. Please write it here: $_$

I used a dictionary or some other resource when working with this word (If you used a bilingual dictionary, please state which one)

□ Yes, I used _

356

∩ No

If you have time, you can work with another word that you choose. Please write it here: I start working with this word at (write the time here)	write it here:
English synonym(s)	Remember!: Please fill in the information which <u>you</u> feel would help <u>you</u> learn the target words if you were to study them. Write as much as you need to learn the words ©
Translation equivalent(s) Please also write which language the translation is in	Illustration:
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
I have heard or seen this word (or part of the word) before when Try to be as specific as you can here	This word makes me think about the word Please also write which language the word is in
I stopped working with this word at (write the time here):	with this word at (write the time here):

a חירה מ IT you ą ĥ ת מ תורוור n n

°N N

□ Yes, I used _

357
If you have time, you can work with another word that you choose. Please write it here: I start working with this word at (write the time here) □ I don't know this word □ Seen it, don't know the meaning □ I (think I) know this word	oose. Please write it here:
English synonym(s)	Remember!: Please fill in the information which <u>you</u> feel would help <u>you</u> learn the target words if you were to study them. Write as much as you need to learn the words ©
Translation equivalent(s) Please also write which language the translation is in	Illustration:
Explanation(s) in English and/or any other language(s):	Example sentence(s) including the word in English and/or any other language(s):
I have heard or seen this word (or part of the word) before when Try to be as specific as you can here	This word makes me think about the word Please also write which language the word is in
I stopped working with this word at (write the time here): I used a dictionary or some other resource when working w	I stopped working with this word at (write the time here):

Ъ	
Isec	
S	
Ι	
	,
cs,	
~	

°N □

Appendix 13: Test 1 example (test format used with permission from Gyllstad et al., 2023)

QUIZ

Name:.....Class:....

Please write your first name, your last name, and your class above Please answer all questions to the best of your ability! For each question, there are three options.

- If you do not know a word, tick "I don't know this word" and move on to the next question.
- I have seen a word before but I don't know what it means, tick " Seen it, don't know the meaning" and move on to the next question.
- If you know a word, or if you think you know a word, please tick "I (think I) know this word". Then please show the meaning of the word by writing

o a **translation** in Swedish or another language you know, **OR** o an **explanation** in English, Swedish **OR** another language you know, **OR** o a **synonym** in English, **OR** o an **example sentence** containing the word in in English, Swedish **OR** another

language you know

Examples

a flute	⊠ I don't know this word □ Seen it, don't know the meaning □ I (think I) know this word:
b wrist	 □ I don't know this word ⊠ Seen it, don't know the meaning □ I (think I) know this word:
c house	 I don't know this word Seen it, don't know the meaning I (think I) know this word: <i>hus/building where you live</i>
1.garden	□ I don't know this word □ Seen it, don't know the meaning □ I (think I) know this word:
2.student	□ I don't know this word □ Seen it, don't know the meaning □ I (think I) know this word:
3.fanzine	□ I don't know this word □ Seen it, don't know the meaning □ I (think I) know this word:
4.urban	□ I don't know this word □ Seen it, don't know the meaning □ I (think I) know this word:

5.genial	□ I don't know this word □ Seen it, don't know the meaning □ I (think I) know this word:	
6. contour	□ I don't know this word	
	\Box Seen it, don't know the meaning	
	\Box I (think I) know this word:	
7. opine	□ I don't know this word	
-	□ Seen it, don't know the meaning	
	□ I (think I) know this word:	
8.exhale	□ I don't know this word	
	□ Seen it, don't know the meaning	
	\Box I (think I) know this word:	
9. emporium	□ I don't know this word	
	□ Seen it, don't know the meaning	
	\Box I (think I) know this word:	
10. android	□ I don't know this word	
	□ Seen it, don't know the meaning	
	\Box I (think I) know this word:	
11. attention I don't know this word		
	□ Seen it, don't know the meaning	
	\Box I (think I) know this word:	
12. illegitimacy 🗆 I don't know this word		
	□ Seen it, don't know the meaning	
	\Box I (think I) know this word:	

Appendix 14: Test 2 example

QUIZ TO TAKE <u>AFTER</u> THE TASK WORK

Name: Class:.....

Date:

Please write today's date above.

Please answer all questions to the best of your ability! For each word, please try to do the following. In this list, the word computer serves as an example test word. There is one page per test word (eight pages in total). If there is something you cannot answer, leave the section blank, and move on to the next question:

1. Provide a **synonym** for *computer* in English: Example: computer- laptop

2. **Translate** *computer* into a language of your choice: Example: computer- dator

3. Explain what *computer* means in English (or any other language): Example: computer-an electronic machine that calculates data very quickly, used for storing, writing, organizing, and sharing information electronically or for controlling other machine

4. Write a **sentence** in English that includes *computer*: Example: I used my computer to write up my essay

5.Write a different word which *computer* makes you **think of**: Example: computer- machine

6. One of the three sentences below is correct, whereas two are incorrect. Please **identify and underline** the one that is correct: Example:

(a) It is a *computer*(b) It computered(c) It is very computered

Word 1: heterogeneity

1. Provide a **synonym** for *heterogeneity* in English:

2. Translate *heterogeneity* into a language of your choice:

3. Explain what *heterogeneity* means in English (or any other language):

4. Write a sentence in English that includes *heterogeneity*:

5. Write a different word which *heterogeneity* makes you think of:

6. One of the three sentences below is correct, whereas two are incorrect. Please **identify and underline** the one that is correct:

Example:

- (a) It is heterogeneity.
- (b) It heterogeneitied.
- (c) It is very heterogeneity.

Word 2: atypical

1. Provide a **synonym** for *atypical* in English:

2. Translate *atypical* into a language of your choice:

3. Explain what *atypical* means in English (or any other language):

4. Write a sentence in English that includes *atypical*:

5. Write a different word which *atypical* makes you think of:

6. One of the three sentences below is correct, whereas two are incorrect. Please **identify and underline** the one that is correct:

Example:(a) It is an atypical.(b) It atypicaled.(c) It is very atypical.

Word 3: eschew

1. Provide a **synonym** for *eschew* in English:

2. Translate *eschew* into a language of your choice:

3. Explain what *eschew* means in English (or any other language):

4. Write a **sentence** in English that includes *eschew*:

5. Write a different word which *eschew* makes you **think of**:

6. One of the three sentences below is correct, whereas two are incorrect. Please **identify and underline** the one that is correct:

Example:(a) It is an eschew.(b) It eschewed.(c) It is very eschew.

Word 4: [self-selected TW]

1. Provide a synonym for [self-selected TW] in English:

2. Translate [self-selected TW] into a language of your choice:

3. Explain what [self-selected TW] means in English (or any other language):

4. Write a sentence in English that includes [self-selected TW] :

5. Write a different word which [self-selected TW] makes you think of:

6. One of the three sentences below is correct, whereas two are incorrect. Please **identify and underline** the one that is correct:

Example:

- (a) It is an [self-selected target word]
- (b) It [self-selected target word + ed]
- (c) It is very [self-selected target word]

2. Translate *acclimatize* into a language of your choice:

3. Explain what *acclimatize* means in English (or any other language):

4. Write a sentence in English that includes *acclimatize* :

5. Write a different word which *acclimatize* makes you **think of**:

6. One of the three sentences below is correct, whereas two are incorrect. Please **identify and underline** the one that is correct:

Example:

- (a) It is an acclimatize.(b) It acclimatized.
- (c) It is very acclimatize.

Word 6: solicitous

1. Provide a **synonym** for *solicitous* in English:

2. Translate *solicitous* into a language of your choice:

3. Explain what *solicitous* means in English (or any other language):

4. Write a sentence in English that includes *solicitous:*

5. Write a different word which *solicitous* makes you think of:

6. One of the three sentences below is correct, whereas two are incorrect. Please **identify and underline** the one that is correct:

Example:

- (a) It is a solicitous.
- (b) It solicitoused.
- (c) It is very solicitous.

Word 7: xenophobia

1. Provide a **synonym** for *xenophobia* in English:

2. Translate *xenophobia* into a language of your choice:

3. Explain what *xenophobia* means in English (or any other language):

4. Write a sentence in English that includes *xenophobia* :

5. Write a different word which *xenophobia* makes you **think of**:

6. One of the three sentences below is correct, whereas two are incorrect. Please **identify and underline** the one that is correct:

Example:(a) It is an xenophobia.(b) It xenophobiaed .(c) It is very xenophobia .

Word 8: [self-selected target word]

1. Provide a **synonym** for [self-selected TW] in English:

2. Translate [self-selected TW] into a language of your choice:

3. Explain what [self-selected TW] means in English (or any other language):

4. Write a sentence in English that includes [self-selected TW] :

5. Write a different word which [self-selected TW] makes you think of:

6. One of the three sentences below is correct, whereas two are incorrect. Please **identify and underline** the one that is correct:

Example: (a) It is a [self-selected TW] . (b) It [self-selected TW+ ed] . (c) It is very [self-selected TW] .



The Joint Faculties of Humanities and Theology Centre for Languages and Literature Lund University ISBN 978-91-89874-80-0

