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Abstract

This study aims to analyse the process of acquiring English vocabulary by non-native Swedish speakers at a lower secondary and an upper secondary school. What cross-linguistic influences, if any, may occur when students acquire English as L3 having Swedish as L2? What role do different proficiency levels of Swedish play in vocabulary acquisition of English? The answers to these questions will hopefully enhance understanding of the whole learning process for both students and teachers alike.

To observe and analyse the impact of different proficiency levels of the Swedish L2 on the English L3 a cross-sectional study has been carried out. Three different groups of students and their respective English teachers have participated in the study. Vocabulary tests that were to detect any cross-linguistic influence between Swedish and English have been fulfilled by the students. All the students and their teachers have been interviewed and observed. A distinct cross-linguistic influence between Swedish and English manifested itself in the students’ vocabulary tests. The results of the interviews and observations illustrated similarities and differences in the process of the vocabulary acquisition by the three groups of English L3 learners.
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1. Introduction

The fact that English is not only a widespread foreign language in Sweden, but also a fundamental part of secondary school curricula promotes its acquisition at all levels of everyday life. The increasing mobility of the world population has resulted in a unique situation in Sweden where English is taught to many students who are already learning Swedish as a second language; in secondary schools, English teachers regularly encounter students whose native language is not Swedish. The spectrum of native languages is colourful and diverse (i.e. Polish, Arabic, Spanish, Chinese, Croatian, etc.) and can be found all in one classroom. Such cultural and linguistic diversity in school caused by population mobility is one of the most important aspects that should be taken into consideration by teachers (Cummins, 2001:15-16).

Teaching English to multilingual students (i.e. students who have already acquired more than one language) is a complex and flexible process. A teacher of English finds him/herself in a situation where English has to be taught not only as a second language to native Swedish speakers but as a third or even fourth language to non-native Swedish speakers. Both learning and teaching a third language differs in many ways from teaching and learning a second language, as it involves more than one previously acquired language and more complex relationships among the languages take place (Cenoz & Jessner, 2000:40-41, Cenoz, Hufeisen & Jessner, 2001:8). First of all, the order of the acquisition of two languages and three languages is different. Languages can be acquired one after another or simultaneously if it is two languages we talk about. When one more language is involved, the order of acquisition becomes even more complex: for example, all three languages are acquired at the same time, or two are acquired before the third language, or first one language is acquired and then the other two languages are learnt (Cenoz & Jessner, 2000:40). The diversity of the order of such acquisition can be even greater. Research and discussion on multilingualism that have been taking place for some decades now have proven that the presence of a second language (which was previously considered not to be so important) actually has a meaningful effect on the acquisition of an additional language (Grosjean, 2008, Cenoz & Jessner, 2000). An additional language or a third language (henceforth L3) is regarded as any language which is acquired by a person who already has at least two languages at his disposal (De Angelis, 2007:3-4). Teaching English as an L3 becomes an even more complex task if one takes into account the diversity of proficiency levels of the second language that students have acquired: different proficiency levels play distinct roles “as to the degree and manner in which a background language will influence an L3” (Falk, 2010:32). Information on proficiency levels of all languages acquired before the target language is central for methodology and will distinguish a monolingual learner who is acquiring the second language from a multilingual one who is acquiring an L3 (De Angelis, 2007:10-12 and 33-34).

During acquisition of an additional language cross-linguistic interference when knowledge from one language transfers and affects another language occurs (Odlin, 1989, Ringbom, 2001). More data on cross-linguistic interference between a second language that manifests itself as a source language and a target language would provide teachers with better understanding of processes that non-native Swedish students undergo while acquiring English as L3. Being equipped with more knowledge on this topic is very important to me; I have been dealing with multilingual students for many years now.
1.1 Aim

The main purpose of this study is to survey the impact of Swedish as an L2 on vocabulary acquisition of English as an L3. I will focus on the influence that different kinds of proficiency levels of L2 may have on the learning process of L3 as well as on different transfers in lexis.

1.2 Research questions

In connection with the aims mentioned above more practical research questions arise:

- Is there any cross-linguistic influence on vocabulary acquisition of L3 English and if so does it come from an L1 or the Swedish L2?
- Does the influence vary with proficiency level of students’ L2?
- What strategies do students with high and low proficiency levels of Swedish use to facilitate the acquisition of English vocabulary?
- What strategies do teachers use when teaching new vocabulary to students with different proficiency levels of Swedish as L2?
- Should a teacher encourage students to search for translations of English words and phrases in Swedish or in their own native languages? If so, why?
2. Literature background

Several issues will be raised in this section: some points from the Swedish National Curriculum related to the main topic of the present study, definition of the linguistic terms that will be frequently used henceforth and an overview of previous studies in additional language acquisition conducted by researchers from different countries.

The main factors that may influence transfer in third/additional language perception and production will be brought into focus.

2.1 Defining linguistic terms

In the present study such terms as \(L2\), \(L3\), cross-linguistic influence \((\text{henceforth CLI})\) and language transfer will be used often. As the definitions of all the mentioned terms are not as obvious as they might seem (Odlin, 1989:25), I will reflect on each of the term to clarify their usage.

Hammarberg (2009) mentions that though it is possible to regard L1, L2 and L3 as chronologically acquired languages, one should keep in mind several aspects which may “defy linear ordering” (Hammarberg, 2009:4). One of the mentioned aspects is simultaneous acquisition of two foreign languages which makes it difficult to decide which language should be defined as L2 or L3 (Hammarberg, 2009). Therefore, if definition of L1 is not much questioned and one can refer to it as to a language which a person learnt in infancy (Hammarberg, 2009:5), the term of L3 may refer to different kinds of concept. Hammarberg (2009) mentions that difference between the quality of the acquisition of L2 and L3 depends upon previous experience a student may have with a non-native language (Hammarberg, 2009:6), and draws a conclusion that L2 can be viewed as any language “encountered and acquired after infancy” while L3 is a non-native language “which is currently used or acquired” by a person who already has some knowledge of L2 (Hammarberg, 2009:6).

In the present study L1 will correspond to any native language a student may have, L2 will correspond to Swedish (without taking into consideration any other languages acquired previously to Swedish or English) and L3 – to the English language.

Two more terms which I will frequently use, transfer and cross-linguistic influence, are often used interchangeably (Odlin, 1989:1). Odlin gives the following definition: “Transfer is the influence resulting from similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been previously (and perhaps imperfectly) acquired” (Odlin, 1989:27). As for cross-linguistic influence, it is considered to be a broader definition which includes some other definitions “such as transfer, avoidance and L2-related aspects of language loss” (Sharwood Smith & Kellerman, 1986:1 as referred to in Cenoz, 2007:1).

Both mentioned above terms will be used depending upon whether the linguistic phenomenon described is general (cross-linguistic influence) or more specific (language transfer).

Two more terms frequently used in the literature concerning additional language acquisition are acquiring and learning. Krashen (1981:1-3) made clear definitions of language learning and language acquisition. The main difference between these two phenomena according to him is that learning is a
conscious process while acquisition is a natural process. Still, many contemporary researchers (e.g. Cenoz, 2001, De Angelis, 2007, Hammarberg, 2009, Odlin, 1989 and Ringbom, 1987) use both terms to describe the process of an additional language acquisition. In this study no strict distinction between the mentioned above terms will be made either.

2.2 Swedish National Curriculum for the Compulsory School

One of the crucial points in language acquisition is vocabulary acquisition as “lexical items are basic to all of the four [language] skills” (Brown, 2007:435) which are: listening, speaking, reading and writing. According to the syllabus for compulsory schools (Lgr 2011, English version) students must to be able to use words and other expressions and create comprehensible linguistic constructions as well as “understand details in spoken language and texts” (Lgr 11:35, English version). A teacher's duty is to ensure that acquisition of necessary vocabulary has been successfully achieved. On top of all that a teacher is supposed to assist each student individually and as effective as possible. (Lgr 11:10, English version). Recognition of the fact that bilingual and multilingual students should be assisted in a different manner than monolingual ones are would support and improve the whole teaching progress especially in multicultural classes.

The fact that bilingualism of students is not ignored is manifested in the “Kommentarmaterial till kursplanen i engelska” (2011). It highlights several similarities between Swedish national curriculum and Common European Framework of References for Languages (Kommentarmaterial, 2011:10-11) and mentions the fact that though Swedish syllabus includes most of the points from CEFR still one of them, mediation, has been removed (Kommentarmaterial, 2011:11). Mediation, or interpretation, is an important language skill. The fact that it was sacrificed for the sake of gaining more homogeneous base of studies for all students at compulsory schools illustrates that bilingualism is taken into account more seriously every time a new syllabus is created or up-graded.

2.3 Previous research on L2/L3 acquisition

For several decades researchers have tried to understand the process of additional language acquisition and most of them agree that the theories which would support such understanding cannot be based only on the ways L2 learners' acquire a target language. It is impossible to shrug off the empirical evidences that manifest: all previously gained languages have impact on the acquisition of the target language (Cenoz & Jessner, 2000:39-50, De Angelis, 2007:3-6).

Previous research (e.g. Hammarberg, 1998 and 2009, Ringbom, 1987 and 2002) on influence of L2 on the acquisition of L3 carried out in Sweden and Finland have shown that degree of influence of both L1 and L2 on L3 depends on several interacting factors such as level competence of L2, degree of similarities between languages (Hammarberg, 2009:18) and cross-linguistic influence “between non-native languages in a European context” which primarily occurs in lexis (Ringbom, 1987:114).

2.3.1 Proficiency level of previously acquired languages.

The competence of languages acquired before L3 is more complex than just “sum of monolingual competences” (Cenoz & Jessner, 2000:40-42 and 2001:9). All languages acquired previously to the L3
interact in a complex manner which sometimes is yet unclear to linguists due to the lack of research on this topic (De Angelis, 2007:3-5).

Most researchers agree that CLI is more likely to occur at the early stages of L3 learning when students try to fill knowledge gaps in the target language with the information they possess in L2 (Odlin, 1989, Ringbom, 1986:151-153).

One should be careful though to assume that proficiency level and language transfer occur only at early stages in the target language. The surveys on L3 acquisition carried out by Ringbom (1987) who examined students with Finnish or Swedish as L2 and Dewaele (1998, as referred to in De Angelis, 2007) who examined students with French or English as L2 illustrate that students' lexical transfer took place at all levels of proficiency.

Many researchers (Ringbom, 1987, Williams & Hammarber, 1998, Ahukanna1981, Clyne & Cassia, 1999 as referred to in De Angelis, 2005:34) indicate that lexical transfer can occur equally from non-native languages which students know quite well or not so well. This fact illustrates that even a short period of time while a student acquired L2 affects both perception of and production in L3 (De Angelis, 2005:34). Falk (2010) suggests that: “if the proficiency level of the L3 is low, a low-proficiency background language tends to be activated, and if the proficiency level of the L3 is high, a high-proficiency L2 or the L1 tends to be activated.” (Falk, 2010:33).

All suggestions and empirical evidences described above lead to a conclusion that even non-native languages that a student does not know well cannot be ignored in research on CLI between L2 and L3 (De Angelis, 2007:35)

### 2.3.2 Age factor

The age issue is much discussed in linguistic literature. Different suggestions on what is a critical period for foreign language acquisition will inevitably lead us to different hypothesis from psycholinguistics and neurolinguistics (Singleton, 1989) that suggest that there is the so-called critical period for second language acquisition (Singleton, 1989:38, 80) which even concerns L3 learners (Cenoz, 2001, Muñoz, 2006). Singleton (1989:80) describes several positions on this issue which are quite different: one is that younger second language learners are more successful and sufficient than the older ones, and a counter-proposal that claims older students being more successful than the younger ones. Two following explanations may clarify these mutually exclusive statements: younger learners are better and faster at acquiring oral/aural skills. Their proficiency level in communication is also better than that of the older learners. However the older learners respond more accurately and faster to formal instructions when compared to the younger ones (Singleton, 1989:80-82 and 94-99).

Odlin (1989:137-138) suggests that both children and adult learners show their strong and weak sides while acquiring a new language: thus, children of certain age are better at learning and imitating language prosody while adult students are better at writing and have better metalinguistic awareness.

Whether this hypothesis may be applied to the third language acquisition is still unclear as empirical knowledge on it is sparse (De Angelis, 2007). Some empirical evidence on this issue can be found in research on L3 acquisition conducted by Cenoz and Jessner (2001) which showed that older students were more accurate in perception “of linguistic distance that could influence the source language they use when transferring terms from one of the languages they know”(Cenoz & Jessner, 2001:9-10). This may depend upon cognitive and metalinguistic development (Cenoz, 2001:9). Another research in which young children and teenagers participated have demonstrated that L3 learners frequently use vocabulary of L2 at the early stage of their L3 production, but the types of lexical transform vary. Both
transfer of form and transfer of meaning may take place during the L3 acquisition process (Ringbom, 1986 and 2001).

2.3.3 Language distance and cross-linguistic similarities

A study carried out by Filatova (2010) on L3 acquisition by students who previously acquired L2 showed that when students produced in L3 transfer from L2 was frequent while almost no transfer from L1 could be registered (Filatova, 2010:86). It may be caused by the phenomenon that is described by De Angelis (2005 as referred in Filatova, 2010) as association of foreignness and perception of correctness: students feel that their native lexis cannot be correct when they speak a foreign language, thus they tend to borrow words and word constructions from L2, as they consider it more correct to use (Filatova, 2010).

The term “foreignness” raises a question: what do students experience as a “foreign” language? Hammarberg (2009) describes how his informant in the case study, Williams, showed strong tendency to rely more on German, her L2, than on English, her L1, in acquisition of Swedish, L3, even when English as equally as German could be applied to the learning process. Williams herself stated that “she did not want to sound English” and Hammarberg explained this phenomenon as “foreign language effect” (Hammarberg, 2009:82-83). Though English and German are very similar to Swedish it can be said that German has more similarities than English in such areas as lexicon and this cross-linguistic similarity may also explain “the reliance on German as L2 rather than on English as L1” (Hammarberg, 2009:124). Hammarberg (2009:128) points out that cross-linguistic similarities between background languages and L3 are usually discussed in term of language distance.

Language distance or linguistic typology is the distance objectively and formally defined between two or more languages and plays an important role in the acquisition of an additional language (Cenoz, 2000:42, De Angelis, 2007:22). Generally it is argued that acquisition of L3 may be influenced mostly by a background language which is closest to it. Two examples can illustrate this statement: in a study with students who had Spanish as L1 and Basque as L2 (Cenoz, 2001) reports showed that students relied mostly on Spanish which is typologically closer to English and the same observation was made about students who relied more on Swedish than Finnish in a study conducted by Ringbom (1987). However, in 2003 Ringbom conducted another study which has shown that even such distant languages as Swahili and Finnish have lexical and morphological similarities and they do not escape the attention of students who constantly search for them (Falk, 2010: 31). Several other studies (Odlin 1989, Kellerman 1977, 2001 as referred to in De Angelis, 2007) proved that learners may rely on their knowledge of very distant languages while acquiring L3 (De Angelis, 2005:23). Relatedness and formal similarity should not be mixed up with each other as learners perceive them at different levels. Everything depends on how learners judge the overall level of closeness between languages (De Angelis, 2007:22-28).

2.3.4 Different types of lexical transfer

Lexicon is the area of language which has enjoyed much attention of scholars. It may depend upon the fact that language transfer and cross-linguistic influence are manifested very clearly in lexis and are easy to recognize. The phenomenon a teacher of an additional foreign language often observes while the students acquire the third language is lexical interference (Filatova, 2010:86).

The levels of transfer vary. Ringbom (2002) believes that there are three of them: overall, item and system level. If overall level refers to the perception of all similarities between languages, the item level is more associated with interlingual identifications during the learning process (De Angelis,
The item transfer (Ringbom, 2002), when learners assume that two words of the same form have the same meaning, may lead to negative effects at the early stage and to positive effect at the later stage of L3 acquisition. This would mean that if at the early stage students tend to make form transforms, which are often erroneous, at the later stage they revise the interlingual associations and connect those associations to the meaning of lexical items (Ringbom, 2001, De Angelis, 2007).

The system transfer means that learners identify meaning but not form of the words and words constructions, best known as semantic extension and loan translations. (Ringbom, 2001:59-68)

Deeper insight of such process usually leads to one manifestation: cognates/deceptive cognates are those words which students usually transfer from L2 into L3 and vice versa (Molnár, 2010:337). Whether such correlation is positive or negative is still disputed.

A figure of overt cross-linguistic influence in L3 production designed by Ringbom (1987:117) shows that cognates as seen in false friends are of varying systematic relationship. They may be of different meaning (e.g. Swedish “fabrik” vs. English “fabric”), similar but not context-identical (e.g. Swedish “grounded” vs. English “found”) and even of near-identical meaning (e.g. Swedish ”hound”/”hund” vs. English “dog”). All these – semantic extension, loan translations, borrowings, both hybrids and complete language shifts – are only some of most obvious lexical transfer.

When it comes to issue of transfer of different classes of words, one may find out that transition words of content and words of form varies depending on the semantic weight of the words in question. While producing in L3 learners rely equally on L1 and L2 when it comes to both content words such as nouns and verbs and form words such as prepositions and pronouns (De Angelis, 2007:43–44). The results of survey made by Williams and Hammarberg showed that 92% of words which they labeled as WIIP (Without an Identified Pragmatic Purpose) came from L2 German and 4% from L1 English (Hammarberg, 2009:47–49). Recent studies (Odlin & Jarvis, 2004, Gibson & Hufeisen, 2003 as referred to in De Angelis, 2007:46–49) claim function words are not transferred equally from all L2s and L1s. The test results where students with the same L1 but different L2s took part varied much and the conclusion drawn from the test was the following: function words are transferred from non-native languages but this applies only to some types of them (De Angelis, 2007:46–47).

### 2.4 Summary of literature background

The linguistic research mentioned above describes the acquisition of an additional language as a complex process which can be compared with but should not be mistaken for the second language acquisition (e.g. Cenoz, 2000 and 2007, De Angelis, 2007, Hammarberg 2009, Ringbom, 1985). There are many factors that have impact on additional language acquisition. Such factors are: age, proficiency level of the source and target languages, the typological distance between L1, L2 and L3 as well as cross-linguistic similarities. These factors along with two more factors, recency of use and exposure to non-native language environment, which were not highlighted in this study (De Angelis, 2007) have a decisive effect on the process of lexical transfer that occurs during the acquisition of a target language.
3. Methods

I have conducted a cross-sectional study (Odlin, 1989:165) in which students and groups of students with different proficiency levels of Swedish as L2 are compared to each other during one period of time.

To ensure reliability of the results I decided to use two main methods: interviews, some of which will include short vocabulary tests, and observations.

3.1 Interviews and tests

To gather as much information as possible I decided to interview both students and teachers. It has helped me to gain a better understanding of the L2/L3 phenomenon seen from different angles.

Interviews are usually divided into two main groups: qualitative and quantitative ones (Bjørndahl, 2005, Johansson & Svedner, 2010). Both types of interviews have strong and weak points, therefore using two sorts of interviews instead of one provides us with more diverse information.

Both qualitative and quantitative interviews can be structured differently (Bjørndahl, 2005:96-99, 113-114, Johansson & Svedner, 2010:34-35): informal conversational interviews, general interview guide approach, standardized open-ended interviews and closed-fixed response interviews (Johansson & Svedner, 2010, Bjørndahl, 2005). I decided to carry out the following types of interviews with the students:

1. short closed-fixed interviews which along with short vocabulary tests will give me more accurate and unbiased information (Bjørndahl, 2005:96-99, 113) about the students' proficiency level;
2. short standardized open-ended interviews which could give a deeper insight of the case and provide me with unanticipated and original answers (Bjørndahl, 2005:96-99, 113, Johansson & Svedner, 2010).

When interviewing teachers I used standardized open-ended interviews (Bjørndahl, 2005:113) which usually are not very time-consuming and make it possible to focus on most important points without drifting away from the main topic of the conversation (Bjørndahl, 2005, Johansson & Svedner, 2010:34-35).

3.2 Observations

A better reflection and further analysis of any study can be gained by such a method as observation (Bjørndahl, 2005: 26-36). Observations as well as interviews are also classified according to different grades of structure, from low to high (Johansson & Svedner, 2010:46-51, Bjørndahl, 2005:42 and 110-111). There are several other categories of observations: overt vs. covert and participant vs. non-participant (Bjørndahl, 2005:42-43). One can choose between participating during one's own observations or only observing and registering the data (Johansson & Svedner, 2010:56, Bjørndahl, 2005:110); between being as open as possible about the goals of one's research and being very obscure on this topic (Bjørndahl, 2005). The latest one would though question the ethical aspects of the survey (these aspects will be highlighted and referred to later on in this study, see section 3.5.3).
Taking into consideration all strong and weak points of different types of observations as well as ethical dilemmas I might face, I conducted a low-structured non-participant highly overt observation (Bjørndahl, 2005:42). As I had not received the permission to use any video or sound recorders during the lectures, I took notes during the lectures and wrote short reflections in a logbook after the lectures (Bjørndahl, 2005:64, 112) which made my observations low-structured. Logbooks and journals are helpful when one wants to clarify the “hidden” meaning of the observation which will later facilitate the evaluation of the registered data (Bjørndahl, 2005:61-62).

The methods of my study described above have provided me with the following data:

- Three qualitative and quantitative interviews with the teachers mentioned above.
- Fourteen quantitative interviews with the students.
- Fourteen vocabulary tests.
- Observation of three independent lectures.

Several researchers (Jick, 1979, Holme & Solvang, 1996 as referred to in Bjørndahl, 2005:115) speak in favour of combining different methods: the obtained information is then more complete and unbiased which ensures the validity and reliability of the whole study.

### 3.3 Participants of study

To observe the whole spectrum of the proficiency levels of Swedish as L2 I have chosen the following participants for my study:

1. Fourteen non-native Swedish speakers aged 13 - 18 are divided into three groups: the first group includes 3 beginners in Swedish, the second group consists of 3 students with a good proficiency level of Swedish and the third group consists of 8 students with Swedish or another language as dominant native language. Almost all of them have the same level of daily exposure to Swedish as L2. The students in the first group have the following L1s: Armenian and Bulgarian, Armenian and Russian, and Polish respectively. Two students in the second group have Polish as L1 and one speaks Tigrinya. In the third group one student has Kurdish as L1, one -- Spanish as L1, three students have Arabic and three other students have Polish as L1. All the interviewees come from a state-run school.

Some remarks about the students’ L1s, L2 and L3 should be made here. Strictly speaking for the three male students from the IVIK class (“Introduktionsutbildning för nyanlända elever inom ramen för gymnasieskolans individuella program”) Swedish was chronologically L3 not L2. Nevertheless, taking into consideration that they have been acquiring both English and Swedish simultaneously for the latest 6, 12 and 24 months respectively it would be more appropriate to mark the languages as Lx/Ly. Such factors as daily exposure to the Swedish language and amount of months the students have been acquiring these two languages can also contribute to L2 and L3 shifting positions with each other (Cenoz & Jessner, 2000, De Angelis, 2007, Hammarberg, 2009). A warning about the accuracy of numbering the languages should be made in the case of at least two of the students in grade 8 as well. They mentioned that they are illiterate in their other native languages (Arabic and Kurdish) and called these languages “my other native language” which makes one aware of the fact that the students themselves consider Swedish being their mother tongue. Whether Swedish should be considered their additive native language is not quite clear as more accurate interviews and investigation should have been made. It may happen that Swedish is their L2 but of a very high proficiency level. Falk (2010:33) mentions that when the proficiency level of L2 becomes very high and can be compared to that of L1,
it actually loses the status of L2. In such case it is also appropriate to mark the native language and Swedish as Lx/Ly or even L1+ L1.

2. One teacher of Swedish and English at IVIK program at an upper secondary state-run school in a suburb of Stockholm.
3. One teacher of Swedish as a Second Language and English at a lower secondary state-run school in a suburb of Stockholm.

Choosing appropriate participants for a study is as important as choosing appropriate methods. Johansson & Svedner (2010) mention that we all have our own assumption when choosing participants for our studies. These assumptions may affect the results of a survey (Bjørndahl, 2005). I assumed that students with different proficiency levels of Swedish as non-native language fitted in my study and could provide me with necessary data. Since I had to keep in mind the age factor, I decided that it is appropriate to interview students in grades 7 and 8 as well as students at IVIK program in high school.

3.4 Preparations for method implementation

I had to anticipate possible reactions to the questions as well as how time consuming the interviews and tests could be. As I have many multilingual students at my own school, first I made several pilot interviews with my students and two pilot interviews with my colleagues. It helped me to find out how much time it could actually take to interview a teacher and a student.

After having mailed cover letters (see Appendix 1 and 2) to the principals of the schools and getting permission both in oral and written form to come and interview teachers and students, I made sure that written consent of the parents to younger students and oral consent of the elder students (18 years old) and teachers were obtained too.

I prepared two vocabulary tests: one list of words to be translated from English and another list of words to be translated from Swedish. Inspired by the table of cognates created by Ringbom (1983) I tried to choose cognates and false cognates, in order to see whether it would hinder or help students to find correct translations and what possible lexical transfer may occur between Swedish and English and vice versa. For example, “fabrik” is very often mistaken for “fabric”, but “knee” could give a good clue for translation.

Before carrying out the observations and interviews I visited the schools twice in order to establish good relationship with the students, most of whom were rather nervous and suspicious: they were worried that the tests and the interviews could affect their grades at school. As soon as I succeeded in ensuring them that the only person whose final grade would be affected by their answers was I, it was time to proceed with the observations and interviews.

The three teachers agreed willingly to participate in my study and co-operated as much as their schedule allowed them to.

In this study each student was given a number according to the order in which all the students had been interviewed: thus, a student from grade 8 who was the second one to answer the questions was mentioned as student 8:2 and a student from IVIK program who answered the questions first went under the name IVIK:1. The teachers are given the following fictional names:
1. Teacher at grade 7: “Carolina” (teacher of Swedish and English at a lower secondary school, Swedish qualification, native Swedish speaker, 40 years old)

2. Teacher at grade 8: “Louise” (teacher of English and French at a lower secondary school, Swedish qualification, native English and French speaker, 37 years old)

3. Teacher at IVIK class: “Anna” (teacher of Swedish as a foreign language, Swedish and English at an upper secondary school, Swedish qualification, native Swedish speaker, 41 years old)

3.5 Implementation

All observations and interviews were carried out on Wednesdays and Fridays between March 7, 2012 and March 28, 2012 at a lower secondary school and an upper secondary school (both state-run) in a suburb of Stockholm.

3.5.1 Observations

I decided to carry out the observations before interviewing my respondents for one main reason: the answers my interviewees would provide me with could affect their own behavior during the lectures I was to observe. They could try to live up to their answers: e.g. if someone says “I never use a dictionary during the lecture”, one could restrain oneself from doing so even in case when it may be necessary.

As it was not possible to attend any lecture which would be totally dedicated to the vocabulary acquisition, I stayed for 15 minutes only at the lecture at the high school, for 15 minutes at the lecture with seventh-graders and for about 25 minutes at the lecture with grade 8.

During the mentioned above episode of the lecture at grade 8 the teacher introduced new vocabulary in the context of a new chapter from the textbook. The new words were introduced and discussed. The students read the new text and afterwards they were given a chance to find out even more new words and try to explain them using different strategies. As the observations were of a very low-structure and had as their aim only to record usage of English, Swedish or any other language, no particular detailed information about the texts and words was recorded.

When attending the lecture at grade 8, I sat by the wall in the middle of the classroom facing the class from the left side. Such position provided me with a good overview of all my respondents. The teacher was mostly standing at the whiteboard occasionally coming up to one or another student. There were 21 students present.

During the lecture in grade 7 I sat next to the group of the students facing all of them. I could hear clearly everything that was said. There were 8 students present. This was a lesson of English as a modern language and not the basic course of English for grade 7. All of the students usually receive individually adapted supervision in Swedish as a second language and English during such lectures. Three of the respondents from grade 7 were working with a new text from their textbook. The teacher explained the new words from the text first. The students read the text and then were asked to explain some of the words.

During the lecture at the upper secondary school, the whole IVIK class was divided into two groups as there were students with two different proficiency levels of English. The group I was observing received an assignment from the teacher and was working independently while the teacher assisted the other group of the students. My observation group had namely to go through several words from a
sample of a reading part for the national examination for grade 9. I was sitting beside the group and had a perfect view of what was going on. There were 6 students in the group.

To hear and see everything during the observations was crucial to me as I had no possibility to record the lectures and go through them once more. This was also one of the reasons why my observations were low-structured: there was no time for taking detailed notes. The only phenomenon observed was the language both the students and the teachers used to explain new vocabulary: English, Swedish or any other.

After each observation I made short notices in a logbook which allowed me to make an approximate evaluation of what I had seen and heard.

3.5.2 Tests and interviews

According to the arrangements made beforehand, as soon as the observation was completed I handed out the vocabulary tests to everyone in class 8. This was done in order to keep the whole class working with the same assignment and not to divide it into two groups which could be considered an unpleasant intrusion: the class is used to work in specially designed groups of 4-5 classmates which include both the respondents of this study and the other students who were not participating in the present study.

The teachers at grade 7 and IVIK class had more flexible lessons and could divide their classes into two groups: one group of the participants of the present study and one group of the non-participants. Thus, only the respondents of the present study were asked to write the vocabulary tests while the rest of the class was assisted by the respective teacher. It took about 10-15 minutes for the students to write the tests. After that I left class 8 and interviewed all the students after classes one by one in the same classroom. It took about half an hour to interview all 8 students.

With the permission of the teacher, the three respondents in grade 7 first wrote the vocabulary tests and then were interviewed in the same classroom, also one by one. The classroom was rather big, there were only 8 students there and it was easy to find a quiet place where the students could be interviewed undisturbed.

The three students at high school were interviewed in the school cafeteria before lunch when it was still empty and quiet there. All three students were interviewed at the same time. We were disturbed only once by a passing by classmate who wondered what we were doing. Before the interview, all my respondents wrote the vocabulary tests.

The students had to answer four closed-ended questions (See Appendix 3.2) which they did very fast and gave a short answer to the last open-ended question. Some of them were asked one more question concerning the result of the vocabulary test.

Before the students started to fulfill the tests, I asked them to imagine that there was no one around to help them with the translation. They had to translate all the words they recognized very fast, without giving them a second thought and after that look at the words they could not translate and write beside them what bilingual dictionaries they would use in case they could. This was done in order to simulate a situation when the responsibility of explaining the meaning of a new word lies entirely on a student. Such simulation could trigger a genuine reaction of the respondent and clarify one point: whether the students regardless their proficiency levels of Swedish still rely on their L1 both consciously and subconsciously.
The teachers were interviewed a week later: Carolina was interviewed during her lunch break in an empty classroom; Anna was interviewed in the morning before her lessons. It took about ten–fifteen minutes to interview each of them. Louise chose to answer the questions by e-mailing them back to me. Her answers were thorough and complete, while the answers obtained from the two other teachers were short but very clear.

3.5.3 Ethical considerations

The main rules established by the Swedish Research Council (2011) were followed in this study. In the latest report issued by the Council (God forskningssed, VR, 2011:42) it is mentioned that when a study is conducted at schools overt observations are preferable. During such observations all participants are aware of the goal of the research as well as the way in which the study will be conducted. In the case of the present study all participants were informed and asked for the permission to conduct the observations. The observations have not been video or audio recorded because neither the teachers nor the parents of the students granted their permission (VR, 2011:44). All participants of the study were informed of the main goals and the process of the study (VR 2011:43). The written consent signed by the parents (VR, 2011:45) made it possible to interview the students and offer them a vocabulary test. All the teachers issued their consent orally. In this manner two of the main ethical codes were followed: all participants were informed about the research work and the consent of the participants of the study was obtained.

In the cover letters (See Appendix 1 and 2) sent to the principals of the schools as well as to the parents of the students the principals of anonymity, confidentiality and secrecy (VR, 2011:66-68) were mentioned. It was promised to all the participants that neither their names nor the name of their schools nor the name of the municipality the schools are situated in would be mentioned. All names used in this study will be fictional. It was also promised to the participants that as soon as this study was published all the information in form of the written tests, interviews and observation journals would be destroyed.

However all the participants were informed that all the information obtained and recorded during this study could be required by the examiners and professors at Stockholm University before the study was approved. In this case the names of the students would be eliminated (by covering them with black ink), but all the written material would be handed in if required in order to ensure the validity of the collected data (VR, 2011:39 and 70). This information was delivered orally and no consent in written form was asked for.

Hopefully, this study is following the main ethical codes which include overtness of the research, offering explicit information to the participants as well as obtaining their consents and ensuring the anonymity and confidentiality of the information obtained (VR, 2011:40-46, 65-68, 70, 119-120).

3.6 Data processing

Sorting out the data obtained during the implementation is crucial for making the results of the study comprehensible (Johansson & Svedner, 2010). All the information received was divided into three main categories: the results of the vocabulary tests, the results of the interviews and the results of the observations.

The test results were categorized and tabulated according to the nature of the errors committed by the respondents. Ringbom (1983:208-209) offers two separate tables for comparing such errors: one table
illuminates lexical transfer which includes loan translations and semantic extensions, and the second one is a table of borrowings that is considered to be an umbrella term for such concepts as complete language shift, hybrids and blends, relexifications and “false friends”/cognates. Several examples of the lexical transfer and borrowings the students have produced are presented in a comprised and simplified variant of the tables mentioned above.

As this is a cross-sectional study (Odlin, 1989:165) and has as its aim to compare different groups of respondents, the students' interviews were categorized group wise according to their proficiency levels of Swedish. The results were compared with each other in order to find differences and similarities. The results were related to the research question which had an aim to clarify what different strategies the students may use while acquiring new vocabulary in an additional language.

The teachers' interviews were also compared to each other and both similarities and differences in teaching strategies were reflected upon. The results of the interviews provide not only the answer to the research question about teaching strategies but would also create a more or less complete picture of the whole process of vocabulary learning as it is not only students, but teachers as well that participate in it.

The information obtained from the observation and the reflections following them (Bjørndahl, 2005:58) which were recorded in a logbook were also categorized group wise according to the L2 proficiency level of each group. The results of the observations had to confirm the results of the interviews and give a broader view of strategies used for vocabulary acquisition by both students and teachers. Finally, the results of the interviews were compared to the results of the observations to decide whether they contradicted each other or if the findings were similar.
4. Result

In this section the results of vocabulary tests conducted in three different classes, the results of the interviews and observations will be presented thematically according to the research questions of the present study. Some of the questions will be illustrated mostly by the results obtained from the vocabulary tests and some -- by the results from interviews and observations. To make the comparison of the results comprehensible only several generalized points from all interviews and observations illustrated by several quotations will be presented here. More detailed information from interviews and observations is available in section Appendix 4, 5 and 6.

4.1 Cross-linguistic influence and the impact of different proficiency levels in L2

One of the aims of the present study is to clarify whether different proficiency levels of Swedish as L2 causes different kinds of impact on vocabulary acquisition of English as L3. Such impact is easily illustrated by cross-linguistic influence on vocabulary acquisition: lexical transfer and borrowings. As previously mentioned (see section 3.5), a simplified variant of Ringbom’s (1983) two tables is used here to compare the results of the CLI. The following lexical transfer and borrowings occurred in the tests completed by the students in three different classes:
This table summarizes the errors found in the vocabulary tests (complete information of the test results can be found in section Appendix 5). In vocabulary tests fulfilled by the IVIK students no borrowings.
occurred while several loan translations took place. The mistakes made by the 7th and the 8th graders differ quantitatively but not much qualitatively. Loan translations are few but borrowings and false friends occur frequently. During the tests the students were only observed and were not helped, neither did they use any dictionaries. The results of the tests will be discussed further in section 5 and a short analysis will be offered.

4.2 Different strategies in vocabulary learning

To find out what strategies the students normally use when learning new English vocabulary one closed and one open-ended question was asked. The results were sorted group wise and provided me with the following table:

Table 2. The results of the students' interviews:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>When you see a new word in a text, you translate it into:</th>
<th>Tell me, what do you usually do when you learn new words or translate a new text, for example, from your textbook?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IVIK</td>
<td>e), b), e)</td>
<td>Translate/google translate, read the words, listen to the words, and train until I remember them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>d), c), c)</td>
<td>Translate/google translate, write the words, train, ask someone to check me, look for pictures, and listen to music. Divide the words into two columns, English and Swedish, cover each column and check myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>Seven students answered a), one student answered e)</td>
<td>Translate/google translate, read the words, write, ask someone to check me, train until I remember, listen to music. Divide the words into two columns, English and Swedish, cover each column and check myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the interviews give account of the strategies which students use when they have to work without teacher’s assistance and have the sole responsibility of learning new vocabulary. The strategies of students with different proficiency levels of Swedish do not vary much, though the choice of the language used for interpretation of new English words varies depending on the students’ proficiency level of Swedish.

The results of the interviews cannot be compared to the observation results and thus the grade of their reliability cannot be checked. The observations took place in a classroom where the teacher plays a very important role and the teaching process has a big impact on the students' vocabulary learning.
while the strategies described by the students are used by them outside the classroom without any supervision of an adult educator.

### 4.3 Different strategies of vocabulary teaching

The results of the interviews with the three teachers show that their highest priority is to make their English lessons as authentic as possible meaning that they mostly use English while conducting their lectures. All three teachers accentuated the importance of teaching words in context and encouraging students to explain them in English only, before looking for the words in bilingual dictionaries. Louise gave a very detailed account of her way of teaching vocabulary and pointed out the importance of first identifying new words that may prove to be difficult. Pre-teaching the new vocabulary using visual back-ups and Frayer's model (a graphical organizer for word analysis) contributes to a better vocabulary learning according to Louise. She also mentioned the importance of supporting the development of students' metacognition and letting “them use cognate awareness” as long as they do not fall for false cognates. One more point is important for vocabulary teaching: to co-operate with other English teachers at school, says Louise who teaches the group of the students with the highest proficiency level of Swedish presented in this study.

Anna, who teaches an IVIK class, there students have the lowest proficiency level of Swedish, mentioned the following teaching strategies: to encourage students to use the English language daily and try to use it in everyday situations. The classroom vocabulary teaching is quite traditional: discussing the words in English and trying to explain them in the context is the most popular strategy. To promote the acquisition of new vocabulary a teacher should motivate students for studying. According to Anna, students who are highly motivated learn new vocabulary faster and more efficiently. Choosing topics that the students are interested in as well as listening to music helps significantly in vocabulary acquisition.

Carolina is a teacher of grade 7, there students with Swedish as a second language chose to have extra lessons of English instead of another Modern Foreign language. According to the school law, as early as in grade 6 students should be offered one more foreign language to study, such as German, French or Spanish, though students are allowed to have extra English and Swedish as a second language instead of a Modern Foreign language. All the respondents from grade 7 have Swedish as L2, though they have a higher proficiency level than the students of the IVIK class. Carolina says that the students use Swedish quite often during the lessons, though while teaching English she encourages them to use English only. Her teaching strategies are also quite traditional: explaining words in the context and using visual supports. According to Carolina, audio-books would contribute to better and faster vocabulary acquisition: “When students both see the text and hear it, they understand the words better and they remember them better”. Triggering students' competitive feelings by offering them a bingo word game, giving them positive feedback is very important too.

When comparing the results of the interviews we can clearly see a pattern: regardless of the students' proficiency levels of L2 and L3 the teachers use mostly same strategies: teaching new words in context and avoiding usage of any other language but English.

Anna, whose students are both older and more experienced learners, gives them more freedom and responsibility to choose how to learn new vocabulary and how to assist themselves in the learning process. Carolina, whose students are not highly motivated and need to be assisted more in the learning procedure, tries to create classroom situations that encourage students to study and progress.
Louise, whose class is not homogeneous in what concerns students proficiency levels of both Swedish and English, tries to offer equal opportunities for vocabulary acquisition for everyone in the classroom which she does with the help of Frayer’s models of vocabulary teaching, immersion and direct vocabulary instructions.

The results of observations show that all three teachers used the teaching strategies they described: all words were explained in the context and mostly English was used. The IVIK students who have the lowest proficiency level of Swedish received all instructions in English; in grade 8 there students have the highest proficiency level of Swedish, everyone received explanations and instructions in English unless the teacher had to speak Swedish when some of the students were reluctant to use or understand English at all, while students at grade 7 whose proficiency level of Swedish is considered to be an average one, were taught both in English and in Swedish. Thus, the observations and reflections written in the logbook afterwards do not contradict with the answers to the questions provided by the teacher respondents.

4.4 Usage of native language in vocabulary acquisition of English

The aim of the present study is to clarify the impact of L2 on the vocabulary acquisition of L3, but excluding the impact of the students’ L1s or just ignoring this phenomenon is not appropriate: L1 is also a background language just like L2 when it comes to the additional language acquisition. It was not possible to investigate exactly what impact different L1s may have on vocabulary acquisition of L3 English, as this would require some knowledge of at least the lexis of the respective L1. Still, it was possible to find out whether the L1s had any impact whatsoever and whether they were considered by both the students and the teachers to be an important factor in the third language acquisition.

During the interviews both Louise and Carolina made it very clear that the students in grades 7 and 8 do not use their native languages while learning new vocabulary, whereas the IVIK students who still rely considerably on their native languages and besides have access to the popular Google translator service tend to use their L1s, though sparsely according to Anna.

None of the three teachers would willingly allow students with Swedish as L2 overuse it during the lectures. The observations confirmed this statement made by all the teachers. Here are the results of the observations that show the frequency of usage of English, Swedish or any other languages:
Table 3. Observing the students. Usage of different languages in the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>SWEDISH</th>
<th>Other languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IVIK</td>
<td>5 words of 8 were explained in English only</td>
<td>Two words (by the student IVIK:2)</td>
<td>two words (Bulgarian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>one word (Russian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>two words (Polish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>When answering questions and reading (approximately half of the time)</td>
<td>When explaining words and asking for instructions (approximately half of the time)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>Sparsely, while asking for instructions, twice asking for a word definition</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The observations confirmed the teachers’ interviews: only the IVIK students tend to use their native languages while acquiring new English vocabulary. Students from the grades 7 and 8 had not used any other languages but Swedish and English and no usage of any bilingual dictionaries during the lecture episodes was recorded either.

When asked whether they usually translated words from English into their own native languages, students gave the following answers:

- Students from the IVIK class translate everything into their native languages, though two of them first try to guess the meaning of the words,
- Two of the students from grade 7 first translate the words into their native language and then into Swedish, and one of them does it vice versa
- Only one student in grade 8 first tries to guess the meaning of the word and then translates it into his native language, while all the other students use Swedish for translation.

The results of the students’ interviews show that IVIK students who have the lowest level of proficiency in Swedish still rely considerably on their L1s, students from grade 7 whose proficiency level of Swedish is higher tend to use both L1 and L2 for better comprehension of the English vocabulary and the group of 8th graders with the highest proficiency level of Swedish do not use their native languages at all when learning new vocabulary in English (with the exception of one student).

4.5 Summary of the results

The results of the tests, interviews and observations have been categorized according to the proficiency levels of Swedish thus creating three major groups that can be compared with each other: IVIK class, grade 7 and grade 8. One can detect some recurring similarities and differences between the three groups that have been recorded and compared. The results of the teachers’ interviews contributed to a more thorough picture of the vocabulary acquisition process while the results of the observations confirmed the interview results and insured a higher validity of the present study.
5. Discussion

The following section offers the result analysis which is categorized according to the research questions. The results of the present study will be compared to previous research conducted by the scholars mentioned in section 2 and an attempt to identify any discrepancy and analogy between the results of the previous studies and the results of the present study will be made. The reliability of the choice of methods, the implementation process and the results of the present study will be discussed and analyzed too and finally, recommendations for further research will be offered.

5.1 Discussion: cross-linguistic influence on vocabulary acquisition

Previous research works (e.g. Cenoz, 2001 and 2003, De Angelis, 2007, Falk, 2010, Hammarberg, 2009, Ringbom, 1983, 1985 and 2001) provide us with rich empirical data on the impact of L2 on L3 acquisition and particularly, the impact that different proficiency levels of L2 have on all areas of L3, inter alia, lexis (see section 2). The studies conducted in different countries involving different L1s and L2s confirm a viewpoint shared by such researchers as De Angelis and Dewaele: L2 has a certain impact on the acquisition of L3 lexis regardless the proficiency level of the L2. Ringbom (1987) mentions that lexical transfer takes place at all proficiency levels of L2, thus, it is not a question of whether L2 is activated regardless of its proficiency level during the L3 acquisition or not, but rather a question of to what degree L2 is activated and what particular lexical transfer and borrowings may occur.

The cross-linguistic influence between Swedish and English was manifested in the vocabulary tests the students had written. Lexical transfer occurred regardless the proficiency levels of the students’ L2 and L3. Both transfers of meaning and form have been recorded. It was, though, impossible to define any positive transfer: in order to do so I had to carry out a longitudinal study and compare progress different groups of students made in language acquisition (Odlin, 1989:36, 167). In the case of the present study only negative transfer in form of errors was noticed and recorded (Odlin, 1989:36).

As mentioned above (see section 4.1) a simplified variant of Ringbom's tables was used to sum up the data obtained (see Table 1, section 4.1). The results show that the most conclusive borrowings and lexical transfer came from Swedish and English, not from L1. The obvious similarity of word forms explains their frequent activation by non-native speakers of Swedish (Ringbom, 1983). This phenomenon confirms the impact which the factor of language distance, here between two languages of Germanic group, has on production in either L2 or L3 (Cenoz, 2001, De Angelis, 2007, Hammarberg, 2001). Most respondents of the present study speak different L1s and though most of the L1s belong to Indo-European language family neither of them belongs to the Germanic subdivision of languages. The language distance is also a very important factor when it comes to cross-linguistic influence. Students tend to make more borrowings from a source language that is typologically closer to the target language (De Angelis, 2007:22, Cenoz, 2001).

If we look at the differences between borrowings and lexical transfer made by groups of students with different proficiency levels of Swedish, it becomes obvious that it is not the quantity but the quality of the CLI that varies from one group to another. The character of the transfer is more formal in case of
low-proficiency level of L2 and more semantic in case of high proficiency level of L2 (Ringbom, 1987 as referred in Falk & Bardel, 2010:196).

For example, in the tests written by the IVIK students loan translations occur frequently while no hybrids or language shifts could be traced at all. On the contrary, the group of 8th graders has made only one loan translation, while language shifts were as frequent in the tests made by this group as in the tests carried out by the 7th graders. The usage of false cognates occurs equally often in the tests completed by all three groups. The word “Dutch” has puzzled many. While one group of the respondents became suspicious and although muttering: “Duetsch? Deutsch?” they chose to search for the word in a dictionary, the other group assumed that “Dutch” sounded familiar and interpreted it as “tysk” and even “Tyskland”. It may be the association of foreignness (De Angelis, 2005 as referred in Filatova, 2010:88) that triggered such a reaction. The word fitted best with the most far-fetched but formally similar “foreign” variant -- “deutsch”.

If we shift our focus to the quantitative result of the tests, it becomes obvious that 8th graders fulfilled the tests most successfully, while the 7th graders showed the poorest results. The low proficiency level of their English as L3 may have had an impact on the results as well and cannot be ignored (Falk & Bardel, 2010:196), though in the case of the 7th graders no careful diagnosis of the L3 proficiency level was made. It was surprising that the students from the IVIK class who had the lowest proficiency level of Swedish translated words from Swedish into English even better than the 7th graders who had a higher proficiency level of Swedish as L2. They wrote respectively 13, 8 and 9 out of 17 translations from Swedish into English correctly. I would note cautiously that this may be an indication of positive transfer (Odlin, 1989:36): the Swedish cognates helped the respondents to interpret the words into English successfully. The fact that the students had a well-developed language awareness cannot be ignored either.

It may happen that it was not the students' proficiency level of Swedish that had the greatest impact on the English vocabulary but rather different levels of metalinguistic awareness (Cenoz, Hufeisen & Jessner, 2001:9). The importance of age factor was obvious too: students who were 18 years old had better linguistic awareness than those who were 13 years old. The saying “the older is the better” is worth mentioning as the older students showed better ability to “master some segmental contrast” (Odlin, 1989:138). The fact that multilingual students have high levels of linguistic awareness and usually refer to their L2 while learning an additional language is mentioned by many researchers who support their statements with certain empirical data (Bono, 2011:25-49, Cenoz, 2003:71-83, Otwinowska-Kasztelanic, 2011:1-18).

Metalinguistic awareness was one of the factors that was not closely surveyed in this study and became apparent only after the analysis of the results had been completed. This factor as well as the age factor and the language distance factor had a certain impact on the nature of the cross-linguistic influence that was observed.

The fact that cross-linguistic influence in form of lexical transfer and borrowings occurs at all stages of the acquisition of L3 regardless the proficiency level of L2 was confirmed by the results of the tests, as well as the fact that the cross-linguistic influence varies when different proficiency levels of L2 are activated . The main aim of the present study was to survey both of these factors.
5.2 Learning and teaching strategies in vocabulary acquisition of L3 English

To enrich existing and in order to learn new vocabulary both students and teachers use different strategies that may prove efficient or not so efficient depending on the students’ age, proficiency level of L2 and L3 and many other factors. The research questions about learning and teaching strategies used by the teachers and students were meant to highlight the process of L3 acquisition and survey whether it varied from one proficiency level of L2 to another.

No great difference between the strategies for acquisition of L3 English was noticed in regard to the proficiency levels of L2: all the students used the same strategies apart from the choice of the language they used for translating new words. To summarize the difference or rather the similarities, the following conclusion may be drawn: the strategies do not differ much; it is only the choice of the background languages that differs. Thus, the IVIK students whose Swedish is of a low proficiency level activate their L1s more often than the students from the other two groups. The 7th graders whose L2 Swedish is of a higher proficiency level than the L3 English activate it most of the time and the 8th grader whose L2 Swedish is of a very high proficiency level and sometimes may be even an additive L1, activate it seldom during in the classroom and sparsely outside the classroom while acquiring L3 English. Falk (2010:32-33) mentions that both the proficiency levels of the target and the background languages affect the way these two interact with each other. If the proficiency level of the TL is rather low, the background language of a much higher proficiency level is activated to solve any communicative problems that may arise during the acquisition of the TL. This became quite obvious during the observations conducted in the three classes.

The teachers’ answers were meant to illustrate what strategies the students are offered to use during the lessons and will presumably do so. Though the strategies used by each teacher did not vary much either, one main difference was noticed. Anna, whose students were the oldest learners with a high level of linguistic metacognition, were given more responsibility and freedom to acquire the new vocabulary in the way they themselves see as the most appropriate. Anna relied considerably on their ability to find solutions for the tasks she offered and neither restricted them from nor encouraged them to use Swedish or their L1s. Though these three respondents, whose proficiency level of Swedish was very low, used their respective L1s for interpreting English vocabulary, the vocabulary tests manifested the impact that Swedish had when it came to translating words from Swedish into English. The Swedish cognates helped the students to find the English variant of the words. Thus, even the background language of a very low proficiency level had been activated (Ringbom, 1987) which confirms the theory about very complex interaction of all background languages regardless their proficiency levels in the acquisition of an additional language (Cenoz, 2003).

Molnár (2010:340-341) mentions the positive effect which teaching new vocabulary through cognates of background languages may have on L3 vocabulary acquisition. This fact provides some ground for discussions of how re-activating of an L2 which is typologically close to L3 in the classroom may contribute to more efficient learning of new vocabulary. Is it always necessary to keep English lessons for the non-native Swedish speakers free from Swedish or should the Swedish L2 be given more space? Jessner (1999 as referred in Molnár, 2010:340) recommends using all background languages in the classroom in order to let students “look for equivalent expressions”. This strategy may help students with low proficiency level of the target language, in case of the present study it may concern the 7th graders most of all. The students in grade 7 used Swedish approximately half of the time they were observed and according to Carolina they use Swedish quite willingly during all other English
lessons. Carolina does not see it as a positive phenomenon but rather as an inevitable one. She tried to avoid using Swedish during English classes, but the observation showed that, though unwillingly, she used it as much as her students did when explaining the English tasks and new vocabulary. In a word, the students with low proficiency level of L3 rely much on their L2 which is of higher proficiency level (Hammarberg, 2009).

The question which still awaits a proper answer is: how much of L2 should such students be encouraged to use in order to achieve higher metalinguistic awareness? It is natural that L3 learners turn to their L2 when acquiring, for example new lexical items and it may prove beneficial to encourage students “reflect upon the points of commonality and the differences between their languages to help them draw on common, shared resources in their repertoires” (Bono, 2011:49).

5.3 The usage of native language L1 in vocabulary acquisition of L3

The fact that during the acquisition of an additional language all background languages are activated and interact in a very complex manner which is still not very clear and requires further researching is confirmed by many previous studies (Hammarberg, 2001 and 2009, Falk, 2010, Filatova, 2010; Ringbom, 1987). The present study had as its aim not only to survey the impact L2 Swedish may have on the acquisition of L3 English, but also clarify whether an educator of multilingual students may ignore the impact of their L1s on the L3.

Whether any transfer from L1s takes place during the L3 acquisition, and whether the usage of L1s is considered to be beneficial could be clarified by the research question “Should a teacher encourage students to search translation of English words and phrases in Swedish or in their own native language? Why?”(See section 1.3, present study). The questions from the interviews searched the answers rather covertly: nobody was asked directly whether they use bilingual dictionaries or not and whether they use their native languages or not.

The observations confirmed the teachers’ statements: the students in grades 7 and 8 neither used their native languages nor any bilingual dictionaries during the lessons. They wanted their lessons to be as authentic as possible.

The only group of students who were not restricted from using their native language dictionaries was the IVIK group. Whether it is beneficial or not was difficult to decide as the present study had not as its aim to trace any progress the students may have made. Still, some impact of the L1 was registered. Twice an obvious transfer from L1 to L3 English was recorded in the case of two IVIK students: one of them translated “chemist’s” as “химик” (Bulgarian “chemist”) and the other one interpreted it as “chemik” (Polish “chemist”). It might happen that some of the “false friends” were borrowed from Polish or Bulgarian and not from Swedish. Both De Angelis (2007) and Ringbom (2001) point to the fact that even between two very different and typologically distant languages some similarities, especially in the area of lexis, may be found and transferred from one language into another. In the case of the students from IVIK and grade 7 it is difficult to decide which false friends were borrowed from L1 and which from L2. Thus, to exclude the impact or usage of an L1 during the perception and production of L3 is not possible. Nevertheless, the impact of the L1s does not seem to play a crucial role in the vocabulary acquisition of L3 and does not prevent the teachers from implying their strategies successfully regardless their ignorance of the students’ L1s.
After analyzing the results of the interviews and the tests it became clear that most of the students’ with high proficiency level of L2 Swedish would not use their mother tongue at all while learning new English words. Still, it was interesting to discover that student 8:7, a native Spanish speaker, divided the unknown words into two groups: one group of words he would translate directly into Swedish, whilst the other group would be translated into Spanish first. Two words, “Dutch” and “chemist’s”, would be translated into Swedish, while the adverbs “especially, eventually, nearly, hardly” would be first translated into Spanish, according to the student. When I later asked him “Why?”, the answer was “Because I want to understand the words better”. Presumably, to understand the meaning of a noun is easier and can be supported by, for example, a picture, while adverbs are more confusing and a more careful verbal explanation is required. The formal similarity between the words may cause not only negative lexical transfer, but also contribute to obtaining a higher level of metalinguistic awareness: the student understands that though the form of the words may sound and look similar, they may have different meanings. This fact confirms once more the complex way in which all background languages function during the production in L3 (Cenoz, 2001, De Angelis, 2007, Hammarberg, 2009, Ringbom, 2001).

All the data obtained and the analysis carried out lead to one conclusion: the impact of L1 on L3 vocabulary acquisition can be neither ignored nor affected in any way by the educators who are not acquainted with all the L1s their students may speak. Still this fact does not prevent the educators from implying all the teaching strategies and conducting the lessons successfully. The students themselves do not consider their L1s to be necessary to use during the classwork, though they still rely on the L1s when not assisted by their teachers.

5.4 Summary of the discussion

The progress that all students will make while learning English in the classroom depends upon many different factors and phenomena. One of these is that Swedish for many of the students is not a native but a second language. In the case of multilingual students acquisition of English as a second language (as mentioned in the Swedish National Curriculum) transforms into acquisition of English as an L3. The process of acquisition of L2 and L3 differs in many ways (Ringbom, 1983, 1985, 1987 and 2001, Hammarberg, 2009, De Angelis, 2007 and Cenoz, 2000). The progress that the multilingual students will make at school while acquiring English may be achieved by a better understanding of the whole process of the acquisition of English as an additional language.

The area of language which has always enjoyed much attention of the scholars is lexis. Cross-linguistic influence manifests itself very clearly during the process of vocabulary acquisition (Filatova, 2010). The present study had as its aim to clarify whether the impact of different proficiency levels of Swedish as L2 on English as L3 varied and whether the impact of L1 could be ignored during the teaching and learning process, at least in the classrooms. For that purpose three different groups of students were chosen to be interviewed and observed. The teachers who worked with the respective group of students were also interviewed and observed. Thus, a cross-sectional study at grade 7, 8 and at IVIK class at a high school was carried out.

The results and the further analysis of these results were obvious: cross-linguistic influence takes place at all proficiency levels of both source and target languages, though the nature of such influence slightly varies. Whether the language transfer and borrowings were positive or negative (Odlin, 1989) was difficult to decide as the study searched only the confirmation of the phenomenon of CLI and not its evaluation.
All background languages are involved into L3 vocabulary acquisition and interact in a complex way, thus making it impossible to ignore the impact of L1 (Falk, 2010, Ringbom, 2001). Its impact is bigger when the proficiency level of Swedish is low and diminishes dramatically when the proficiency level of Swedish as L2 is high.

All the results obtained did not contradict the results of previous studies but rather confirmed earlier findings.

5.5 Validity and reliability

Validity of any study depends upon the insight which was gained during the implementation of the chosen methods: how deep and broad has this insight been? One more important point is how relevant the information obtained is, whether or not it is connected to the main aim of the study and the research questions.

To ensure the validity of the present study the interview questions were designed in order to provide relevant answers that could more or less highlight the main aim of the research. The students and the teachers were asked for information that could clarify the impact that three different proficiency levels of source language may have on the vocabulary acquisition of the additional languages.

Here it should be noted that the reliability of the answers provided by the IVIK students to the question about learning strategies can be questioned. All three of them were interviewed at the same time. The fact that each of them heard the answer which his classmates provided me with could explain why the answers to the last question of the interview did not vary much. It may happen that two of the IVIK students copied each other instead of giving personal genuine answers.

The observations were carried out to ensure the reliability of the answers the respondents have provided us with. One more purpose of carrying out observations was to reflect upon the whole process of L3 acquisition which would give a better ground for further analysis (Bjørndahl, 2005:26-36). The implementation of different methods usually provides a higher level of reliability of the study (Johansson & Svedner, 2010).

To obtain necessary data about possible CLI vocabulary tests were designed and offered to the students. To ensure a higher reliability of the results of the tests, they were conducted in the classroom under our supervision and it was ensured that no dictionaries or any other external help was used by the students. The time for completing the tests was not limited: thus, some of the students fulfilled the tests within 10 minutes and for some of them it took a little more time.

The fact that the results of the tests did not contradict much with the results of the similar tests and studies carried out by different researchers all over the world may also be interpreted as a sign of rather high level of the reliability of the present study. However, it should be taken into consideration that no careful investigation on how many languages the students have acquired previously to English has been made. This could have had a certain impact on the results which might be interpreted then in a different way. It was not clear whether English was L3 in the case of student IVIK: 1: he named two native L1s – Bulgarian and Armenian and later, in a private conversation mentioned that he acquired German previous to English and Swedish. Whether this language had a great impact on the lexical transfer when the student fulfilled the vocabulary test is not clear.

It is not clear either whether at least two of the 8th graders have Swedish as L2 or as an additive native language thus making it impossible to be quite sure whether the lexical transfer and borrowings they
made came from Swedish as L2 or Swedish as L1. Such lack of proper information about students' L1s, L2s and even L3s undermines the validity of certain parts of this study. Whether these flaws could have been avoided or not is an issue for a further discussion which will be offered in the next section.

One more point that could have diminished the level of the reliability of the present study is the so-called human factor: it was not carefully investigated whether the students while they were writing the tests and being interviewed were tired or in a hurry, or just irritated, thus we can only guess whether the vocabulary tests would have looked differently or the answers to the questions could have been longer and more accurate if conducted at a different period of time or under different circumstances.

### 5.6 Recommendation for future research

Many valuable articles and research studies on acquisition of an additional language have been published recently. The popularity of investigating the process of both perception and production among multilingual learners is increasing due to the increasing mobility of the multilingual human population in the recent three decades (Cummins, 2001:15-16, De Angelis, 2007:1). Any further research that would contribute to a better and deeper comprehension of the CLI between L3 (or even L3+x), L2 and L1 could provide educators with better teaching tools.

After the analysis of the results of all the tests, interviews and observations have been completed, it became clear that concentrating on some individual cases rather than trying to obtain much information about many participants would have been more beneficial for a study on CLI. Anyone who would consider investigating phenomenon of lexical transfer could benefit from conducting careful case studies that would include three or four participants instead of surveying three or more groups of students (and their teachers).

It is also advisable to concentrate attention on specific CLI phenomena rather than on CLI as a whole process. Many interesting studies about lexical transfer have seen the light recently, one of them is the theory of synonymic clusters (Filatova, 2010) and another is teaching through cognates (Molnár, 2007). To understand and implement such theories in a case study of one's own would provide a future teacher with useful linguistic data that could be applied to the further teaching process. After all, for a teacher it is crucially important to understand how certain theories maybe applied to the teaching process and used in everyday classroom situations and how they may be even improved through the whole teaching process.
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1. Cover letter to the school principals:

Hej!

Jag heter Maria Gevorkian, arbetar som högstadielärare i engelska samt kompletterar min lärarutbildning på Stockholms Universitet, ULV projekt (Utländsk lärare vidareutbildning).

Jag håller på att skriva en uppsats som handlar om hur studenter med svenska som andra språk lär sig engelska, speciellt engelsk vokabulär.

Jag tänkte ställa några korta frågor till lärare på eran skola och till samtliga elever. I fall ni tycker att det går bra, skulle jag gärna vilja auskultera en eller två engelska lektioner.

Jag kommer INTE nämna eran kommun, skola, lärare och studenter i min uppsats. ALL INFORMATION BLIR ANONYM. När min uppsats är godkänd och publicerad kommer den att finnas på nätet för alla som vill ta reda på vad jag kom fram med min studie.

Väldigt tacksam för samarbete,
Med vänlig hälsning,
Maria Gevorkian
Bästa Föräldrar!


Jag ville fråga er om jag får intervjua era barn? Alla frågor kommer att handla om engelska språket (ni kan gärna få kopior på alla mina frågor). Alla svar jag får från era barn är anonyma, dvs. era barns namn och namn på skolan de går till kommer inte att nämnas i min uppsats. ALLT BLIR HELT ANONYMT.

Mitt slutarbete kommer att finnas på Internet så fort det blir godkänd, så att ni alla kommer att se resultaten av dessa intervjuer.

I fall ni ger mig tillstånd att ställa frågor till era barn, snälla, skriv under:

Namn på elev:..............................................................................................................

Vårdnadshavarens underskrift:................................................................................

Datum:.........................................................................................................................
3. Interviews.

3.1 Questions for teachers:
1. How do your work with new vocabulary acquisition with students? Give some examples, please.
2. What language do the students usually use to translate new English words?
3. If the students do not understand the Swedish words they have to translate into English do they find them first in Swedish-English dictionary or do they try to translate the words into their own language and then into Swedish?
4. What in your opinion can help these students to enhance their English vocabulary?

3.2 Questions for students:
1. How old are you?
2. Were you born in Sweden? If not, when did you come to Sweden?
3. How much English did you know when you started learning Swedish? Choose one alternative:
   a) I could not speak English at all
   b) I could speak very little English, less than my classmates in Sweden did
   c) I could speak as much English as my classmates did.
   d) I could speak much better English than my classmates did
4. When you see a new word in a text you translate it:
   a) into Swedish
   b) into your native language
   c) first into Swedish and then into your native language
   d) first into your own language and then into Swedish
   e) first try to guess what the word means and then translate it into.....................(language)
5. Tell me what do you usually do when you learn new words or translate a new text for example, from your text book.

3.3 Test:
A: Translate into English. First, translate all words you can at once, without thinking too long, then use any dictionary you need: Swedish-English or any other language dictionary. Write beside a word which language you used to translate the word into:

B: Translate into Swedish all words you recognize. Then translate words you didn't know using a dictionary—English-Swedish or any other language dictionary you need. Write by the word, what language you used:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.1.</th>
<th>B.1.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ta examen</td>
<td>near</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alkoholfri</td>
<td>knee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gå med på</td>
<td>account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humör</td>
<td>too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nästan</td>
<td>hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fabrik</td>
<td>nearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svimma</td>
<td>feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annons</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hålla ett öga på</td>
<td>especially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sticka</td>
<td>hardly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pigg</td>
<td>remember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>äga rum</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentera</td>
<td>recognize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rullstol</td>
<td>eventually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falla</td>
<td>chemist's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se efter</td>
<td>actually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Observations. Results.

March 21, 2012, 14:00-14:15, Secondary school
GROUP 1, GRADE 7, 8 students present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USE ENGLISH</th>
<th>USE SWEDISH</th>
<th>USE ANOTHER LANGUAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 7:1</td>
<td>Tried to explain two English words, failed--</td>
<td>Failed to translate the same word into Swedish, used dictionary</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7:2</td>
<td>Mostly, Answered the questions, failed to explain a word</td>
<td>Used Swedish to explain the same word</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7:3</td>
<td>Tried once to explain a word, failed</td>
<td>Used Swedish to explain the words</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teacher          | First gave instruction | Repeated the instructions in Swedish | --

The instructions were given both in English and in Swedish: read the text, translate, what does it mean, etc.

The students use Swedish willingly, there is a feeling of competition—who is best at Swedish? Students have definitely more problems than their classmates in acquiring English but the main reason seems to be laziness and poor attitude towards the studies, rather than lack of ability. No bilingual dictionaries were used.

March 14, 2012, 10:00—10:25 Secondary school
GROUP 2, GRADE 8, 21 students present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USE ENGLISH</th>
<th>USE SWEDISH</th>
<th>USE ANOTHER LANGUAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>One exclamation in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8:1</td>
<td>While answering</td>
<td>While asking for instructions</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8:2</td>
<td>Almost all the time</td>
<td>Once asking for a definition of a word</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8:3</td>
<td>Did not talk</td>
<td>Did not talk</td>
<td>Did not talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8:4</td>
<td>While answering</td>
<td>Once asking for instructions</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8:5</td>
<td>Did not talk</td>
<td>Did not talk</td>
<td>Did not talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8:6</td>
<td>Did not talk</td>
<td>Did not talk</td>
<td>Did not talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8:7</td>
<td>While answering</td>
<td>Twice asking for instructions and a word</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8:8</td>
<td>While answering</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students tried their best to use English only but gave up too quickly. When they were not sure about the meaning of a word they started speaking in Swedish at once. If the teacher asked them to keep on speaking English usually they answered: “Jag orkar inte”. I had a feeling that it mostly depended on their unwillingness to fail in front of the other classmates who may be better at English. No tendency to use any other language was noticed. No bilingual dictionaries were used.

March 14, 2012, 14:00-14:15 High school

GROUP 3, IVIK 2012, 6 students present (one group out of two)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USE ENGLISH</th>
<th>USE SWEDISH</th>
<th>USE ANOTHER LANGUAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>5 words</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Twice looked up words at google translate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>5 words</td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>Once looked up a word in google translate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>5 words</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Twice looked up words in google translate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td>Gave instructions in English</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students worked in a group quite independently which happens often in such a class according to their teacher: there are students with at least three different proficiency levels of English there and the teacher works with each group separately while other groups fulfill a written or oral assignment. The students were highly motivated; they discussed the words from a sample retrieved from the website of Skolverket. Their task was to find the words in the text and explain them or at least use them in a sentence of their own. They co-operated well and avoided using any other language but English as long as they could. Actually they spoke only in English but several times they searched for words in Google translate. Bilingual dictionaries have been used.
### 5. Tests. Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>From English into Swedish</th>
<th>From Swedish into English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IVIK:1</strong></td>
<td>All words translated into Bulgarian. chemist's=химик (chemist)</td>
<td>nästan=close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fabrik=fabrik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 words: Swedish-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 words: correct translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IVIK:2</strong></td>
<td>chemist's=kemi</td>
<td>Ta examen= do a test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 words: used English-Russian-Swedish</td>
<td>svimma=swim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 words: correct translation</td>
<td>hålla et öga på= got a eye on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>äga rum=rent a room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 words: Swedish-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 words: correct translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IVIK:3</strong></td>
<td>nearly=i områden</td>
<td>Ta examen=take an exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chemist's=chemik(Pol)-chemist</td>
<td>alkoholfri= free from alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 words: English-Polish</td>
<td>gå med på=go with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 words: correct translation</td>
<td>nästan=next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fabrik=fabrik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>svimma=swim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hålla ett öga på= take an eye on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rullstol=rolling chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 words: Swedish-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 7:1</strong></td>
<td>Dutch=Tyskland</td>
<td>Ta examen=take exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eventually=eventuell</td>
<td>gå med på=go with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 words: English-Polish</td>
<td>fabrik=fabrik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 words: correct translation</td>
<td>advokat=advocat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 7:2</strong></td>
<td>Dutch=Tysk</td>
<td>10 words: Swedish-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 words: English-Polish</td>
<td>3 words: correct translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 words: correct translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 7:3</strong></td>
<td>nearly=närvarande</td>
<td>Alkoholfri=alkofree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hardly=svarast</td>
<td>16 words: Swedish-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>actually=akuelt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 words: English-Swedish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 words: correct translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 8:1</strong></td>
<td>account=användare</td>
<td>pigg—Swedish-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nearly=nära</td>
<td>16 words: correct translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chemist's=kemists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 words: English-Swedish (cannot read in Arabic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 words: correct translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student 8:2</strong></td>
<td>chemist's=kemists</td>
<td>Alkoholfri=no alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 words: English-Swedish</td>
<td>fabrik=fabric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Translation 1</td>
<td>Translation 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8:3</td>
<td>hardly=jobbigt chemist’s=kemist</td>
<td>6 words: Swedish-English 11 words: correct translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8:4</td>
<td>nearly=nära hardly=hårt chemist’s=kemist actually=aktuellt</td>
<td>7 words: Swedish-English 11 words: correct translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8:5</td>
<td>Dutch=tysk 7 words: English-Swedish 8 words: correct translation</td>
<td>Ta examen= take examination 8 words: correct translation 8 words: Swedish-Polish-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8:6</td>
<td>nearly=nära hardly=svårt Dutch=tysk chemist’s=chemist</td>
<td>Ta examen=exam swim=swim sticka=beat it! äga rum=own space/room 1 word: Swedish-English 12 words: correct translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8:7</td>
<td>Dutch=tysk actually=just nu especially,eventually,nearly,hardly-English-Spanish chemist’s=—English-Swedish</td>
<td>fabrik=fabrik swim=swim rullstol=rolchair 3 words: Swedish-English 11 words: correct translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8:8</td>
<td>too=till nearly=i närheten hardly=nästan Dutch=tysk chemist’s=kemist</td>
<td>Ta examen=exam swim=fantain äga rum=own space/rum 3 words: English-Swedish 11 words: correct translation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Interview results.

6.1 Teachers’ answers.

Carolina, Friday, March 23, 2012:

1. We mostly read the same texts they have already worked with in the classroom: I am here to extra help them. We try to pronounce all the words once more and I explain the words in the context.

2. They use only Swedish, I have not seen them using any other language in the classroom. Maybe at home they translate words into their own language—if they do their homework at all (smiles).

3. I try to explain everything in English; sometimes I find pictures on the Internet. It is easy when it is a noun, but when it is another part of speech, well, then I let them look for the translation. It is important they understand the word in the context. I have not seen them using other dictionaries, not yet. I hope, they understand when we speak in Swedish. They try their best. I think, it depends on their wish to become better at Swedish, it feels that they make a competition sometimes—who is better at Swedish. I can see it is very important to them.

4. I am sure that books with CD-ROMs are best: when students both see the text and hear it, they understand the words better and they remember them better. (I interrupt Carolina and tell her that I actually have such text books at my work place, we discuss them for about 5-7 minutes). Great, great, I wish we could buy such books too! (The reaction to my story). Then I think students learn English better in situations: drama lectures can help enormously! Then music, they like to listen to music, mostly in English...They remember words from songs much better than if they just see them in a text....Bingo games with words, you know, such cards with pictures, it helps, they like competitions—who is best, who is first, who can remember more words and so on...

And positive thinking—very important! If they make success, give them praise, tell them how smart they are...Very important to keep their self-confidence at high level.

Louise, Monday, April 2, 2012

1. New vocabulary is an important part of learning a new language. It is my belief as a teacher that students need both direct vocabulary instruction and immersion in an important content (see the chapter in Thornberg’s book about vocabulary acquisition). There is an interesting book by Fisher and Frey there they say that: “Before reading a text, identify key content vocabulary and vocabulary that may be difficult for language learners, such as phrasal verbs and prepositional phrases. ELL’s tend to acquire these language forms last because they do not exist in many languages. Also, identify potentially difficult idioms, homonyms, and slang phrases. Pre-teach essential vocabulary words and phrases through word walls, Frayer models with an opportunity to draw word representations, and, sparingly, bilingual and English language learner (visual) dictionaries. Use Google images to pre-teach vocabulary. "Google" the focus vocabulary words, and choose the images category. Connect the images to the vocabulary words. When vocabulary words are more conceptual than concrete, use the images to start a discussion rather than name an object. When possible, bring in realia to make the meaning of objects clear, physically demonstrate verb phrases or ask students to role-play, and use relevant film-clips to illustrate vocabulary. In short, use multiple modalities to teach vocabulary. Support students’ meta-cognition around vocabulary. Ask students to identify confusing or new words
during reading. Encourage students to use context clues before jumping to bilingual dictionaries. Encourage students to discuss possible meanings with partners and to keep vocabulary journals of newly acquired words. When the distance between a student’s L2 and L3 is close, they can use cognate awareness, as long as they are wary of false cognates, to further comprehension. Develop a whole-school vocabulary focus on words of the week grouped by common roots and affixes or by key academic vocabulary.”

2. and 3. They always tend to translate all new words into Swedish, even those that have another language. They usually Google words into Swedish if they don’t understand them. They never go into their own language. They also like me to explain what the word means in English if they don’t understand it. They want all new words to be learnt in some context which is “real” as it makes it easier to understand and remember.

4. I think that to enhance the students vocabulary, the best thing is to always use English and English ONLY in the classroom. It gives everybody the same opportunity to learn English under the same premises.

ANNA, Friday, March 30, 2012

1. Usually we go through all the new words from the text I ask them to explain the word in English or give and example using the word in a sentence of their own. They try to understand the word in the context. If they fail, I try to explain the word myself using English.

2. Well, it depends. Sometimes when I ask them to find the definition of a new word they find it in Swedish, but sometimes they use their own languages. As you have noticed, they use laptops during the lectures, so mostly it is Google translate they ask for help (laughing).

3. I have not paid much attention to it yet...I must think...We do not translate texts so often during the lectures, but I think that they usually translate the words directly from Swedish into English, I mean the students you have interviewed.

4. I believe that in case they are highly motivated to learn something, then they do it faster and the words tend to stay “there” longer. It must be a topic they are really interested in. I have noticed that music helps much: if they occasionally hear a word they have just learnt in a song they recognize it immediately, well according to them. I think music can help in this case. And, of course, daily usage. If the students use the language daily, the vocabulary increases gradually, but if they use English only during the classes, the chance to enhance the vocabulary is less.

6.2 A summary of the students' answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IVIK</th>
<th>GRADE 7</th>
<th>GRADE 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native languages: Polish, Armenian, Bulgarian and Russian 3) 2 years, 1 year, 6 months 4) e, b, e 5) translate, write, listen to, train.</td>
<td>Native languages: Polish, Tigrinya 3) 3 years, 4 years, 6 years 4) d, c, c 5) translate, write, train, listen to music, search for pictures</td>
<td>Native languages: Polish, Arabic, Spanish, Kurdish 3) 6 are born, 1--10 years ago, 1-5 years ago 4) 7--a, 1--e 5) translate, write, train, peer assessment, listen to music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>