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Abstract

This degree project aims to investigate how teachers negotiate their teaching practices and what determines their choice of working methods when it comes to teaching vocabulary. Since we are interested in teachers’ thoughts and opinions regarding vocabulary teaching, a selection of English teachers were interviewed. Our theoretical background is rooted in Nation’s (2001) theories on what it means to know a word, Schmitt’s (2000, 2007) theories on how vocabulary is acquired and on Lundahl’s (2012, 2014) perspectives on traditions in the English classroom. Additionally we used research articles for our analysis of the results. The results from our findings indicate that vocabulary is being taught in both a revised traditional- and a non-traditional way. Our results also show that education and contextual factors influence how teachers teach vocabulary. From our results, we can conclude that our informants teach vocabulary for communicative purposes, but that there is a considerable difference in their approach to vocabulary learning. In addition, we can also conclude that the informants all expressed the need for further professional development in English, and that there is a need for more research on how contextual factors affect teachers in their work.
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1. Introduction

Vocabulary learning is an essential part of language development. Even though vocabulary is an important part it is not explicitly mentioned in the Syllabus for English (Skolverket, 2011; Lundahl, 2012). It is however, mentioned implicitly. For example, as stressed in the Syllabus for English: students should be able to use the language in different situations; understand the most essential content in spoken English; express themselves both orally and in written form and vary their communication (Skolverket, 2011). Being able to achieve each one of these criteria requires a rich vocabulary. The focus in the Syllabus is on words and lexical phrases as tools for achieving communicative goals such as the ones mentioned above (Lundahl, 2012, p. 334). The basic view is that the students should, as efficiently as possible be able to participate in different communicative situations (Council of Europe, 2001). However, this means that the Syllabus does not provide any explicit support for the traditional way of learning where words are taught in isolation (Skolverket, 2011; Lundahl, 2012, p.334).

Even though the syllabus does not support a traditional approach (Skolverket, 2011) we have noticed during our teaching practicums that it is still quite common to use the same traditional vocabulary teaching method that we as teacher students experienced when we were younger. The dominant and most common way to teach vocabulary was, and still may be, the use of glossary lists in the form of homework where students are asked to memorize each word for an upcoming glossary test. As highlighted by research (Watts, 1995) it seems that teachers have a tendency to define “the importance of vocabulary knowledge in terms of the immediate classroom environment” rather than within “the context of larger environments such as the school or society” (p. 399).

One of our lectures, Bo Lundahl (2014), argues that language learning and teaching is still heavily influenced by traditions where words are separated from context; for example, the use of textbook and translations from the mother tongue to the target language is one of the methods that are still common in Swedish schools (p.27). This approach towards teaching vocabulary is now something that is considered outdated according to the current body of literature used in our education as teachers (Cameron,
2001; Lundahl, 2012; Read, 2007). A reason for this could be that the field of vocabulary acquisition has generally been a neglected field of research during the 1970s to the mid-1990s (Cameron, 2001; Lightbown & Spada, 2013; Hedge, 2000). It is not until recently that this has changed, and the field of vocabulary acquisition has now “become one of the most active areas in second language acquisition research” (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p. 60). Research shows for example that vocabulary acquisition happens according to the same principles as for first language learners and that “a great deal of this can be applied to second language learning” (Schmitt, 2000, p. 117). Moreover, the amount of exposure to the target language is essential for vocabulary acquisition (Schmitt, 2001). Even though research indicates this, the lack of exposure is still a common problem for the second language learners (Schmitt, 2001, p. 121). This leads us to investigate teachers’ beliefs regarding vocabulary teaching, and contextual factors that might affect their choice of working method.

1.1 Purpose and Research Questions

1.1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this study is to investigate teacher beliefs regarding teaching vocabulary to young learners in the Swedish school. We want to know more about how teachers negotiate their teaching practices and what determines their choice of working methods when it comes to teaching vocabulary.

1.1.2 Research Questions

In accordance with our purpose, two research questions guide our study regarding teachers in the Swedish 4-6 school system. These are as follows:

1. How do the teachers work with vocabulary learning and how do they motivate their choice of method?
2. What contextual factors affect the way they work?
2. Theoretical Background

In order to understand what may determine teachers’ beliefs regarding choice of working method, several key concepts must be unpacked and explained. Therefore, the theoretical background consists of three subsections: (1) an overview about what it means to know a word, (2) how vocabulary is acquired according to experts in the field and (3) a brief historical background regarding teacher beliefs and traditions in language teaching.

2.1 Knowing a Word

There are many aspects involved in “knowing a word”. This means that it is not enough only to know the word’s spelling or pronunciation, which is in fact the most common assumption by an average layperson (Schmitt, 2007, p.747; Nation, 2001, p. 47). With such knowledge, the student may use the word to some extent, but in the long run the understanding of how to use the word might be rather limited. In order to use the word in a variety of contexts and for different purposes the student must know much more than that (Schmitt, 2007, p.747).

One prominent scholar in this field is Paul Nation (2001) who lists several aspects that one needs to know in order to consider a word as fully “mastered” (see appendix 1.). Nation divides these aspects into three groups: form, meaning and use. Form includes three aspects: spoken-, written form and word parts. These include knowledge about how words are pronounced, spelling, the ability to recognize the different parts that the word is made up of and the ability to use the right parts in appropriate forms. Meaning on the other hand includes three other aspects: form and meaning, concepts and referents and associations. These aspects identify what kind of knowledge is needed to retrieve a word when speaking and writing. In order to do so one needs to understand that the word signals a particular meaning, can mean various things and describe different phenomenon, but that the concept the word is based on remains the same (Nation, 2001, p.51). The word fork can be used as an example and mean both “the fork we eat with” and “the fork in the road” depending on the context, and instead of learning all of the words “represented by the form fork, by learning the underlying concept of fork the learners have only one item to learn” (Nation, 2001, p.51). Use
includes the last three aspects that Nation lists in his table (see appendix 1.):
grammatical functions, collocations and constraints on use. This group involves
knowledge about its patterns of occurrence such as which words that typically occurs
with the word and what kind of grammatical patterns the word can fit into. It also
includes knowledge about when it is appropriate to use a word, e.g. accounting for the
social relationship when choosing a word to refer to another person. This means that
one must apply the right degree of formality suited for the situation (for a more detailed
explanation of these aspects see Nation 2001, p. 26-26).

Besides the aspects mentioned above, Nation (2001) argues that word knowledge is also
about distinguishing the difference between the words that we understand when meeting
them in written texts through reading or listening, and words that we use while speaking
or writing (Nation, 2001). In order to do so Nation emphasizes receptive and
productive knowledge. Crown (1986) defines receptive knowledge as knowledge “one
needs to know in order to understand a word while reading or listening” (p. 242). To
clarify, the receptive skills involve the ability to understand the spoken and written
language. The productive knowledge is on the other hand about “what one needs to
know about a word in order to use it while speaking or writing” (Crown, 1986, p.242).
As opposed to receptive knowledge, productive skills involve the ability to produce
language such as speaking and writing in the foreign language. This knowledge is
important since a student can, for example, know the meaning of a word when listening
and reading, but may not be able to spell the word correctly or produce it in the right
context. This means that the student acquires receptive knowledge, but might not
acquire productive skills. To be able to understand how words are acquired, one must
know what kind of knowledge that is needed in order to consider a word as fully
mastered.

2.2 How Vocabulary is Acquired

It is of importance to mention that even though there has been an increase in research in
the field of vocabulary teaching, learning, and acquisition we cannot know or have a
definitive understanding of the process of vocabulary acquisition “until neurologists are
finally able to physically trace words in the brain” (Schmitt, 2000, p. 117). What we
present here and what experts and researchers in the field know or stress are models and theories of how we think vocabulary acquisition happens. Here we present some of the aspects that we see as crucial in order to understand the current view of vocabulary acquisition.

Many different factors play a role in how language and words are acquired, especially for second language learners. According to Schmitt (2000) the learner’s first language, culture, age and motivation are some examples of factors that affect second language vocabulary acquisition (p. 116). Much of the research that has contributed to the understanding of how vocabulary acquisition happens has been with first language learners, but Schmitt (2000) also maintains that much of this research can be applied to second language learning (p. 117). In other words, one could say that second language vocabulary acquisition happens according to the same principles as for first language learners, but under different circumstances.

Language and vocabulary learning can be both incidental and explicit. Incidental learning happens when language is being used for communicative purposes (Schmitt, 2000, p. 120). According to Schmitt (2000) the dominant way of acquiring vocabulary in a first language is through incidental learning (p. 122). Verbal conversation and reading are examples of activities that can lead to incidental acquisition of words. The amount of exposure to the target language is essential to incidental vocabulary acquisition, but even though it is important, Schmitt (2000) highlights that the lack of exposure is still a common problem for the second language learner (p. 121).

Explicit or intentional learning on the other hand is the focused study of words (Zimmerman, 2014, p. 291). Schmitt (2000) states that “certain words make excellent targets for explicit attention”, and that technical vocabulary and the most frequent words in the language one is studying as targets for this kind of learning (p. 121).

This understanding of vocabulary acquisition is intimately related to the different aspects of word knowledge as incidental and explicit learning can target different aspects of vocabulary acquisition. As Schmitt (2007) emphasizes “[w]e can explicitly address some aspects, like meaning and grammatical characteristics, but aspects like collocation, register, and intuitions of frequency are only ever likely to be mastered
through extensive exposure to the target word in many different contexts” (p. 751).

As mentioned above, the amount of exposure to the target language plays a big role in how successful a learner is in acquiring vocabulary. When a learner is exposed to a new word for the first time, they are most likely to pick up a limited impression of a word’s form and meaning (Schmitt, 2000, p. 117). The learner’s understanding of this new word is also affected by the context in which the word occurs. Schmitt (2000) states that in a single exposure “it is only possible to gain the single meaning sense that was used in that context” (p. 117). According to Cameron (2001) learning words is a cyclical process (p. 74) which means that the knowledge of words is built over time. This means that students should meet words in different contexts in order to build knowledge and an understanding of how these words are used in the foreign language (Cameron, 2001, p. 74).

One aspect of vocabulary acquisition that experts in the field stress is that learning words seem to be incremental. What this means is that knowledge of, and about words are built up over time since new information and knowledge is added to the previous knowledge when words are met in new contexts and when words are being used by the learner (Schmitt, 2007, p. 751). Cameron (2001) points out the relationship between different word knowledge stating that “if we had to have complete knowledge of words before using them, we would be restricted to very limited vocabularies” (p. 74). She argues that vocabulary development is a continuous process where the learner needs to not only add new words, but also build knowledge about the words already known as the knowledge of these words are partial.

The understanding of vocabulary acquisition as incremental is related to the view that knowing a word entails many different kinds of knowledge and that not all of these can be learned simultaneously (Schmitt, 2000, p. 117). To understand better the incremental nature of vocabulary acquisition one could imagine the mastery of words on a scale “running from recognition of a word at one end to automatic production at the other” (Hedge, 2000, p. 116-117). Schmitt (2007) also points out that this conceptualization applies to all different aspects of knowing a word (p. 749). An example of this could be that someone could master the spelling of a word but not fully know how to pronounce it, or that someone could still use a word in a conversation without having full
understanding of its meaning; “our production races ahead of our comprehension” (Cameron, 2001, p. 74).

This concept of a gradual scale also affects the receptive and productive aspects of word knowledge; each aspect of word knowledge “may be receptively or productively known regardless of the degree of mastery of the others” (Schmitt, 2007, p. 749). According to Schmitt (2007), this makes vocabulary acquisition “a complicated but gradual process” (p. 749).

2.3 Traditions and Teacher Beliefs

Strong traditions tend to govern the way in which teachers teach and how students are supposed to learn (Lundahl, 2014, p. 27). These traditions find their base in different theories of how learning takes place and the specific purpose of education. Lundahl (2014) observes that the “greatest dividing line regarding the role of education is probably found between those who place the child at the center and those who emphasize knowledge” (p. 33). It can be hard to grasp the difference between these two positions but, as Lundahl (2014) declares, putting the child at the center entails “discovery-oriented approaches to learning and formative assessment”, and that learners should be “active in finding answers to their own questions” (p. 21). In contrast to this, emphasizing knowledge places the teacher at the center as the main source of knowledge. The teacher becomes the one who is supposed to transmit the right kind knowledge to the learners (Lundahl, 2014, p. 22). The key difference lies in the view of how language development takes place, as a social activity or as learning the “right” kind of information.

Another distinction that Ellis (2001) makes, but that is similar to the knowledge-centered thinking mentioned above, is the focus-on-form instruction (p. 14). This approach is evident in the traditional approach where students are required to see the language as an “object” rather than users of language. In such an approach the students study language bit by bit in which the underlying assumption is to learn “distinct entities” (Ellis, 2001, p. 14).
The traditions and views of language learning are for example reproduced in policy
documents and guidelines for schools and teachers. Lundahl (2014), for example,
stresses that the curriculum “is full of learner-centered ideals” (p. 21). The curriculum
(Skolverket, 2011) is designed in accordance with the view on language teaching and
learning represented in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages
(Council of Europe, 2001). In these documents, users and learners of a language are
seen primarily “as ‘social agents’, i.e. members of society who have tasks (not
exclusively language-related) to accomplish in a given set of circumstances, in a
specific environment and within a particular field of action” (Council of Europe, 2001,
p. 9). The basic view is that the students should, as efficiently as possible, be able to
participate in different communicative situations (Council of Europe, 2001). In other
words, the learner is a social agent based on the social constructivist view of language
developed from “the urge to participate in a social group” (Lundahl, 2014, p. 24).

The school and educational system does not exist in a vacuum, but is part of society and
is therefore also subjected to same mechanisms that affect and drive our society as a
whole. Policies that urge for earlier introduction of grading and in the increased focus
on documentation harbors an educational position and thinking that center around
knowledge as fixed and static (Lundahl, 2014, p. 22).

On an individual level, these traditions and views on how learning takes place are
represented in teachers’ beliefs. These beliefs affect how teaching and learning happens
in the classroom and can of course differ from teacher to teacher:

A belief is a proposition which may be consciously or unconsciously
held, is evaluative in that it is accepted as true by the individual, and is
therefore imbued with emotive commitment; further, it serves as a
guide to thought and behavior (M. Borg, 2001, p. 186).

One must have in mind that these beliefs are created in a certain context. No teacher
exists as a single independent atom free from the influence of contextual factors. Phipps
and Borg (2009) argues that “attempts need to be made to explore, acknowledge and
understand the underlying reasons” behind tensions between teachers’ beliefs and
practices (p. 388). Bateman (2008) emphasizes that teacher preparation courses can
“play an important role in the formation of prospective teachers’ belief systems” (p. 17). This statement is echoed in S. Borg’s research (2011, p. 378). These contextual factors can be structural, ideological, or practical “here and now”-choices that have to be made by the teacher. Phipps and Borg (2009) mention “prescribed curriculum, time constraints, and high-stakes examinations” as factors that can affect and restrict the extent to which the individual teacher can “act in accordance with their beliefs” (p. 381). This means that teaching is the product of an intricate relationship between teacher beliefs and context.
3. Methodology

In this section we will discuss our choice of method and describe our course of action. For clarification, the section is divided into five subsections: ethical considerations, selection process and participants, semi-structured interviews, procedure of the interviews and analysis of the data.

3.1 Ethical Considerations

According to Vetenskapsrådet (n.d) four main requirements should be considered when conducting a study: the information requirement, the consent requirement, the confidentiality requirement and the requirement of usage. Each one of these has been included in the degree project.

As a first step, we emailed the teachers a letter for participation (see appendix 2). The letter explained the purpose of the study and our selection criteria (English teachers in year four to six with minimum of one year teaching experience). The letter also informed the teachers of their rights such as the possibility to withdraw from participation, their anonymity and confidentiality of the collected material. Finally, we also informed the teachers that they could get access to the degree-project when finished and approved.

3.2 Selection Process and Participants

To find suitable participants for our interviews we emailed twenty-eight schools located in two different cities in Southern Skåne. Because our study was made within a limited time frame we chose to contact schools in our local area. We made a random selection of schools from the local municipal website.

Five schools in total responded, and four teachers from three of the schools participated in the study. With consideration to the confidentiality requirement, we will use fictitious names when referring to the participants in the text.
We will call the teacher from the first interview Elsa. She has worked as a teacher for over twenty years. At the moment she works in year four to six and teaches four subjects: English, Science, Mathematics and Technology. When she received her teaching degree she was not qualified to teach English, but after teaching English for over eight years, Elsa received specific eligibility.

The second teacher, called Isabella, received her teaching degree nineteen years ago and has worked as a teacher ever since. Currently she works as a teacher in year seven to nine, but she has also experience working with students in year four to six. Isabella has a lot of experience working with languages and teaches Spanish, English and German.

The third teacher, Jasmine, received her teaching degree eleven years ago and works currently as a “head teacher”, coordinator for the national tests, Social studies teacher, Swedish as a second language- and as an English teacher in year four. Jasmine has a lot of experience working with children and fifteen years’ experience of working with questions regarding language development before she became a teacher.

Aida is the last teacher we interviewed. She works at the same school as Elsa. She received her teaching degree fourteen years ago and has worked ever since. Currently Aida works as a “head teacher” and teaches three subjects: Mathematics, English and Science in year four to six.

All four teachers that we interviewed teach English, but not all work actively in our selected age group (year four to six). Three teachers, Aida, Elsa and Jasmine, teach in year four to six, but the fourth teacher, Isabella, does not. She currently works in year seven to nine, but has also experience working in year four to six. Since we were interested in how they teach, their motives and beliefs regarding vocabulary teaching and learning, we did not limit ourselves to only interviewing teachers in year four to six.

To participate in our degree project the teachers had to fulfill two requirements: qualification in English and at least one-year working experience. This is because we wanted to ensure that the participating teacher had experience working with vocabulary.
3.3 Semi-structured Interviews

In this degree project, four English teachers were interviewed. Interviewing as a method is often used in qualitative studies due to its efficiency of accessing peoples’ thoughts, opinions, experiences and feelings regarding a topic (Alvehus, 2013). Since we are interested in teachers’ beliefs regarding vocabulary, interviewing was the most suitable and effective way for achieving our purpose and answering our research questions. In preparation for the interviews, we created an interview-guide (see appendix 3.) consisting of questions that were carefully constructed in relation to the degree project’s purpose and research questions (see p. 7). Since we did not want to lead the teachers to a specific answer, we used partly “open” questions. We wanted the teachers to answer the questions with their own words, and leave room for unusual answers or reactions. Questions defined as “closed” were only used in the beginning of the interview to collect information about the teacher’s background. We chose to conduct the interviews in Swedish since we wanted to keep the conversations as easy as possible and avoid misunderstandings during communication.

3.4 Procedure of the Interviews

One day prior to each interview, we informed the teacher via email as to what kind of topics we would be dealing with during the interview. The reason behind this was that we wanted to prepare the teacher for the upcoming interview. In the same email, we also asked for permission to record the interview. All participants approved. Bryman (2011) highlights the importance of recording interviews since it is essential in improving the quality of the analysis. This is because it gives the interviewer the possibility to listen to the respondents’ answers multiple times. Therefore, we chose to record the interviews so that we could listen to the data when needed and carefully analyze the teachers’ answers.

We also gave the teachers the opportunity to decide the day, time and place for the interview to take place. We conducted three out of four interviews in a quiet classroom without any disturbance whereas the last one was held in a conference room. The
lengths of the interviews varied, but were held within a time frame between 17 to 46 minutes.
We both attended one of the interviews whereas the other interviews were held individually.

3.5 Analysis of the Data

After each interview, we listened to the recordings and took notes when the teachers said something interesting or relevant for the degree-project. When finished with the interviews we studied the notes and searched for patterns in order to structure the analysis. We later compared the notes from the interviews, transferred them into tables, and categorized them under specific topics related to the different answers. By doing so, we focused on finding similarities and differences in the answers given by the teachers. In the interest of saving time, we only transcribed the parts that were interesting and not the whole interview. Taking notes while listening to the recordings instead of a full transcript is known as “tape analysis” (Dörnyei, 2007, p.249). Doing so, we saved a lot of time because transcription requires a lot of time and careful listening and is sometimes, as Bryman (2011) describes it, time-wasting if only parts of the interview are interesting. Additionally, we used an encoding procedure. Symbols such as “(.)” were used when the teacher took a pause while speaking, a longer pause” (…)”, when words were not understood (xx) and “[...]” to filter out irrelevant information. Even though we conducted the interviews in Swedish, we will translate the quotes into English when presenting them in the result section.
4. Results

This section presents the data from the semi-structured interviews with four English teachers (Elsa, Jasmine, Isabella and Aida). We will present our results in categories corresponding to our research questions:

1. How do the teachers work with vocabulary learning and how do they motivate their choice of method?
2. What contextual factors affect the way they work?

We use two subsections: (1) how teachers work with vocabulary and how they motivate their choice of working method, and (2) what contextual factors affect teachers’ choice of working method. The first subsection (1) is written as a whole and not divided into themes since the teachers motivated and stated their working method at the same time. In order to distinguish the contextual factors, the second section (2) has been broken down into four themes: the general perception of vocabulary learning, education, collegial cooperation and challenges in the classroom.

4.1 How Teachers Work with Vocabulary and How Working Method is Motivated

All teachers that we interviewed mention the use of textbook and express somewhat similar views regarding its usage when teaching vocabulary. In addition to the textbook, Elsa creates, what she calls, “wacky sentences” in which she creates sentences using synonyms for the words mentioned in the textbook. Thereafter, she asks the students to find the “correct” word, using the words mentioned in the textbook, that fit in to the sentence. However, some of the teachers clearly state that they go beyond the textbook. Instead of only using the textbook, Jasmine works with songs such as “The Brushing Song”, movement and games when teaching vocabulary. One particular website that she uses and gets inspiration from is “The British Council Kids”. A common problem when using the textbook, according to Jasmine, is that the students think that they should learn the words just because they are in the book, and not because they might be useful for language use. In addition, Isabella states that, “in the English class we do not really
stick to the teaching material”, since she rather works with different types of texts from many different sources such as TV-shows, movies and articles from the internet.

Aida contributes another view on the role of textbook use in the English classroom. She states that she “does not have an ideology of having to invent the wheel again” and if someone has created good learning materials, she will of course use them. What seem to be important to Aida are the National Curriculum and the Syllabus for English, as they ultimately decide what material she uses. She explains that, “the textbook is a means to an end and if it helps me achieve the goals and purpose of the curriculum, then that is great”. In addition to the textbook, Aida works with glossary lists and with “everything that work”. She argues that, “one need not exclude the other, and you should definitely not reject things that work”. Aida describes glossary lists as “very good” since she thinks it is a great way of extending students vocabulary. However, this is not the only thing that she works with. She oftentimes mentions the use of technology such as different “apps” as a great way of working with vocabulary. One “app” that she mentions is “Quizlet” in which she uses to test her students on words from the textbook.

In addition to their ways of working, they all agree upon the importance of learning words. Three teachers, Jasmine, Aida and Elsa, claim that word knowledge means being able to use a word in a context, use the word correctly in a sentence, pronounce the word and spell the word correctly. On the contrary, Isabella does not prioritize spelling. According to her spelling is not that important and she feels that it is more important that the students can use the word when speaking, writing and use it in an appropriate context. Furthermore, Isabella argues that she knows a word is acquired when one can use it both in written and spoken form.

It comes to you naturally, when you are trying to speak and write. It is not enough that one understands it when reading a text. Many students think that when they search for words on their own ‘I understand, I
know all the words” and they comprehend the text, but if I would take them word by word they would not know all the words (Isabella, our translation).

What separates Aida from the others is that she mentions that word knowledge involves “many levels”:

If it is a word you can easily see if they can use it correctly in an appropriate manner, but it is more difficult to describe a ‘psychical phenomenon’ […]. It is more about how they can use it, and not exactly rewrite from the context it has been practiced. […]. If they can use it in a new context, it does not have to be a foreign context (xx), but a context that is slightly different from the context it has been practiced. Then I know that they have acquired the word (Aida, our translation).

Thereafter, we were interested in knowing how many times they repeat the words before introducing new ones. Three teachers: Jasmine, Isabella and Aida, explicitly mentioned that they repeat important and high frequent words several times. Isabella, for example, uses different games such as “Pictionary”, “Bingo” and “Memory” when repeating words. Aida states that she only repeats words that are important and difficult, but not words such as “skirt”. Jasmine, however, repeat as long as her students need it:

Even if you have written a lesson plan, you need to keep in mind what kind of students you have in front of you ‘what should they learn? What is it we are supposed to accomplish? What is the purpose and what is the goal?’ That is more important to me than moving on (Jasmine, our translation).

Elsa, on the contrary, does not repeat words due to her conviction that one should learn new words by continuously expanding one's vocabulary. Her method, “wacky sentences”, involves exposing her students to new words on a steady basis. Her argument towards not repeating words is that she believes that the students will learn the words in another way. Elsa was the only teacher expressing such a belief.
When asked why they work the way they do, none of the teachers came up with a similar answer. However, a common reason was the tendency to adjust their teaching. Before Elsa began working with “wacky sentences” she worked with glossary lists. Elsa did not think that glossary lists suited her students because she noticed that they could not use the words afterwards. She therefore introduced “wacky sentences” to her students because she wanted her students to be able to use the words, not only memorize them. She highlights the importance of “using the words in a context”:

They should feel that they can use them in a context and that it is not only glossaries and then not be able to use them anyway. One knows the words and one can rattle them off on Friday and still not be able to use them afterwards (Elsa, our translation).

Isabella, on the contrary, believes that variation is key since one method cannot satisfy every student’s need; “I am totally against using glossaries every week and using them exactly the same way. Absolutely, I can give the students glossaries for homework in the traditional way, but not this…Friday to Friday”. Jasmine on the other hand adjusts her teaching differently. She tries instead to find something that motivates her students, something that one student in the classroom grasps and can introduce to other students:

It could be a song, a song that is popular right now or group of artists that is popular. Then it something that we need to focus on, but in the beginning of my teaching career I was afraid of doing it. When I began teaching I noticed, it was not in fact that many years ago, but I thought that I should be like everyone else. So I thought to myself ‘should I continue like this, being the boring teacher, or should I do something entirely different?” (Jasmine, our translation).

Jasmine believes that allowing a student to explain and teach other classmates empowers the learning process with increased enthusiasm. While doing so, she adds that the students must use the language and explain important words before proceeding with the task.
Aida, however, views motivation differently. She emphasizes the importance of encouraging the students to “open their mouths” and let them speak, pronounce the words and let them pronounce them incorrectly. “Practice, practice and practice, voices should be heard and practice should not be silent”.

4.2 Contextual Factors

During the interviews with the teachers, we asked questions about, and followed up on, different contextual factors that could possibly affect teachers in their choices of working methods. We talked about general attitudes and views on vocabulary learning, education, further education and the need for professional development. We also talked about collegial cooperation and found that the practical situation varied between the teachers we interviewed.

4.2.1 The General Perception of Vocabulary Learning

When Elsa started teaching, in 1997, she immediately began using glossary lists and the reason was that “everyone did it” and “it was almost a proven fact, that this is how you teach, one should have glossary tests every Friday”. She continues saying that this was also the easiest way to begin extending young students’ vocabulary for her, and that this way of learning words was also something that she was familiar with from her own schooling.

Isabella, on the other hand, expresses different views. When Isabella began teaching, during the same year as Elsa, the use of glossary lists was already something that was seen as “distasteful” according to her. Instead of using glossaries, words should be taught in a context and not be measured through glossary tests. Isabella believes in variation when teaching words and mentions that the students sometimes want her to use glossaries when she works with something else, saying “we never work with glossaries”. She states that this may be something that they have done with their previous teachers, but that she is totally against using glossaries every week. When we asked Isabella if she thinks the students have high expectations on her using glossaries
she answers “it is mostly the parents, I think, especially this with glossaries because they have probably been taught that way themselves”.

4.2.2 Education

The teachers we interviewed are all authorized teachers, but there are some differences in their educational background. Elsa, for example, mentions that she “is not a real English teacher” as she does not have an education in the English subject. Furthermore, she explains that she is authorized based on her experience teaching English for many years before the system of authorization being implemented. Elsa expresses that she has a deep interest in teaching English and that she would like to know more, to update her skills and take part in professional development in the subject.

In the interview with Isabella, she comments on her access to further education and points out that it might be a question of money. Isabella works at a private school and points out that they are “pretty spoiled and […] can go to lectures even though it might be expensive”. She further explains that there is probably a difference between private schools and municipal schools in this case. For Isabella there is a curiosity for what is new and what current research is saying. Isabella also adds that she studies this on her own.

Out of all of the teachers we met, Jasmine was the one with the highest level of education and the longest practical experience of teaching languages. Before she began teaching, Jasmine worked with language development and in preschool for fifteen years. This experience has been very important and useful for her. Jasmine expresses her view on further education by saying that there is a lot of focus on “Mattelyftet” and “Läslyftet”, a competence improvement campaign and education directed towards mathematics and reading in Swedish, but that there is no such thing in English. A reason for this according to Jasmine is that most students reach the goals in English. She points out that she thinks that the goals are set too low in English and mentions that she thinks that if there is going to be a change in how English is being taught it is up to the individual teachers: “there is not much change (.) in terms of English teaching, if you do not do it yourself”.
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Three out of four teachers explicitly express an interest in further education and make it clear that they are curious about what current research is saying about vocabulary learning. Aida stands out from the rest by claiming that she is not in need of any methods or techniques on how to teach, but would rather just have more language education since she maintains that “what you do in Swedish you can also do in English”.

4.2.3 Collegial Cooperation

Teachers often work in collaborative teams and communicate with other teachers about their work. The way this collegial cooperation is organized can vary between schools or even among teams of teachers. When asked about collegial cooperation and contact with other teachers teaching English and what they do, Elsa states that she does not really know what other teachers do, expressing that she is fairly alone in her English work. In contrast to her situation, Isabella on the other hand has one colleague who is a language teacher and they meet regularly to exchange ideas; they work in different grades but still discuss different methods.

Aida explains that she gets inspired by others, such as “colleagues in the psychical room” but also “digital colleagues”. Her digital colleagues are those that she follows on “Twitter”.

I get a lot of inspiration from Twitter and from colleagues here, collegial meetings, and from the literature that I read on my own, of course […]. Much is interest and I also like to try out new things in the classroom. You get an idea from someone and then you try it yourself. Then maybe I come up with a little twist on it, and ‘maybe I should do it like this ‘and then I try it out and see how it goes (Aida, our translation).
For Jasmine “keeping yourself and your colleagues updated on new research” is important, but what really sets Jasmine apart from the other interviewees is her way of working with other teachers at her school:

For example, right now I am in the school development group... and we Swedish and English teachers (...) are going to write a three year plan and put up things like ‘how can I work subject integrated?’ and then there will be requirements like ‘during the autumn term in fourth grade you have to work with these two genres, you are going to do the same in English as in Swedish to make it coherent for the students’ (...) and for example when you work with words and concepts you can work with the same words and concepts in both subjects (Jasmine, our translation).

4.2.4 Challenges in the English Classroom

When asked the question if they see any challenges working with vocabulary in the English classroom, the teachers all agree that the different levels of language knowledge in the classroom pose a formidable challenge to them. While focusing on some different aspects of this challenge it still seems to be the main difficulty with teaching vocabulary for all the teachers we interviewed.

Furthermore, Elsa mentions the difference between students who use computers and “YouTube” all the time with students that have no such tendency. She states that students that spend a lot of time in front of the computer watching “YouTube” have a “terrific vocabulary” in contrast to students that has no such habits. In agreement with the answer of Elsa, Aida points out that it is “a challenge if you are going to ‘stimulate everyone’ ” in a classroom that has many very capable English users and a lot of students that are on a more basic level at the same time.

Isabella points to the different learning styles of her pupils mentioning that it is a challenge to satisfy or include all of them in her teaching. Jasmine has had the same issues, and her biggest problem used to be, that as a teacher she has to deal with many
different needs in the same class. She thinks that this is a main problem for all teachers. According to Jasmine, the “reality that you face [in the classroom] is not what you think it is”. This made her think about how she could meet the students’ needs and taking their current situation and level of knowledge in consideration. All the teachers we interviewed seem to battle with the same main challenge, the different levels of knowledge, and the different needs of the students in the classroom.
5. Discussion

In this section, we will discuss and analyze our findings in accordance with the theoretical background in this degree project. Our analysis has its starting point in teacher’s beliefs. In the first section, we will look closer at how these beliefs are created while the second section will deal with the relationship between teacher beliefs and context.

First of all, we would like to point out that we are in no way trying to judge or value the work of the individual teachers we have interviewed. In sharing these teachers’ experiences, opinions and thoughts, we have been granted a special kind of glasses with which we can gaze into the world of English teaching.

We build our analysis on the claim that “the greatest dividing line regarding the role of education is probably found between those who place the child at the center and those who emphasize knowledge” (Lundahl, 2014, p. 21). From our results, we can conclude that both child- and knowledge centered beliefs could be identified, and according to Lundahl (2014) these beliefs have powerful impact on how learning takes place (p. 32). This dichotomy is our starting point, not our end, and in this section we will elaborate on the relationship between how teacher’s beliefs are created and how they are ultimately shaped by context.

5.2 How Beliefs are Created

One of the major factors in creating teacher’s beliefs seems to be education. Bateman (2008) suggests that “[a]lthough new teachers’ attitudes and beliefs are influenced by a variety of factors . . . teacher preparation courses can play an important role in the formation of prospective teachers’ belief systems” (p. 17). Additionally, S. Borg (2011) argues that “through teacher education teachers’ beliefs can be strengthened and extended” and that “[t]eacher education can of course also be the source of new beliefs for teachers” (p. 378).
In our study, we can see an example of this in the case of Elsa and Isabella. Both teachers started teaching at the same time, in 1997, but they have different perceptions of the general attitude towards traditional ways of working with vocabulary, such as glossary lists. Elsa stated that “it was almost a proven fact, that this is how you teach, one should have glossary tests every Friday”, but Isabella expressed different views; that glossary lists were seen as something that was not ideal in teaching vocabulary. A possible reason for this difference in perception of vocabulary teaching could be that Elsa is not, according to herself, “a real English teacher” since she has no subject education while Isabella is an educated English teacher.

Furthermore, we can see differences in the approach to vocabulary teaching between the different teachers. Some teachers point out the importance of finding something that motivates and interests their students, and some varies their teaching in order to satisfy their students’ needs. While doing so, the focus shifts from the teacher as the primarily active role for transmitting knowledge to the students as productive and active participants (Lundahl, 2014, p.21).

On the other hand, even though teachers are trying to include new technologies as a way to adjust their teaching, they often presuppose traditional approaches to vocabulary learning (Lundahl, 2014, p. 20).

As an example, using apps as an activity for testing vocabulary instead of the traditional pen and paper test is based on the same traditional approach to vocabulary learning as using glossary lists. This form-focused idea leans heavily on the notion that word knowledge is fixed and static (Ellis, 2001, p. 2; Lundahl, 2014, p. 22), and that word knowledge should be continually tested on the basis that words are known when one can spell or translate them (Lundahl, 2014, p. 22).

We find that these different approaches to vocabulary learning can to some extent be connected to the different teachers’ level of education, understanding of vocabulary learning and experience in working with language development.

As education is crucial to the formation of teacher beliefs and practices it is an issue that the access to further education seems to be limited depending on where one works as a
teacher. Isabella told us that at her school, which is a charter school, they are privileged enough to have the opportunities to go to lectures and talks on English. Elsa expressed that she would gladly take part of further education, but as Jasmine pointed out there is no further education in English on offer for teachers who work in municipal schools.

Not having access to standardized further education leaves it up to the working teachers to educate themselves. Jasmine points out the importance of keeping oneself and one’s colleagues up to date on research, but this might be harder than it seems when there is no one to sift out what research is relevant for the particular field or when no one can explain crucial concepts and theories. Aida mentions the Internet as a resource of information and inspiration. Connecting with colleagues through the Internet can be an excellent source of information and inspiration but there is also the risk of teachers reproducing traditional views and ways of teaching vocabulary. Whether it is research, education or collegial exchange it could be critical to examine the actual content of the information. When it comes to vocabulary learning, what is actually being taught at teacher programs? What methods do teachers share among each other? Should it really be up to the individual teacher to find the right information?

5.3 Beliefs and Context

We would argue that teacher beliefs cannot be understood fully when separated from context. If teacher beliefs are formed in e.g. education, they are, when put into practice, ultimately shaped by context. Phipps and Borg (2009) explain that, “[c]ontextual factors . . . mediate the extent to which teachers can act in accordance with their beliefs” (p. 381). What this means is that independently of what a teacher believes, and that this belief can be restricted or aided by contextual factors such as the organization of the workplace.

An example of this tension between context and belief can be seen in the answers of Jasmine when she states that, to meet the different needs in the English classroom, “you have to change the whole way of working”. She also describes her work in the school development group where the teachers are going to “write a three year plan and we are going to put up things like ‘how can I work subject integrated?’”. To Jasmine it is
apparent that the context has to change if she and he colleagues are going to be able to work the way they want.

Another example of the tension between belief and context comes from the same teacher when she describes the relationship between having a set plan and satisfying the needs of the students:

> Even if you have written a lesson plan, you need to keep in mind what kind of students you have in front of you: ‘What should they learn? What is it we are supposed to accomplish? What is the purpose, and what is the goal?’ That is more important to me than moving on (Jasmine, our translation).

Teachers are expected to follow rules of procedure and meet deadlines according to the plan, but these aspects of working as a teacher are not always in line with what is best for learning. Consider the fact that acquiring vocabulary takes time; truly getting to know a word might take years of extensive use in a variety of different situations. In school, both teachers and students have to present results as evidence of how learning is progressing. This could be a problem for a teacher who wants to shift away from traditional ways of teaching vocabulary. How can a teacher show in a reliable way that their students have actually learned new vocabulary when they cannot show tests with scores? This is an example of how situation and context can alter or influence the work of a teacher. It takes a strong-willed and confident teacher to go against these contextual factors:

> Where core and peripheral beliefs can be implemented harmoniously, teachers’ practices will be characterized by fewer tensions; where, though, the actions implied by core and peripheral beliefs are at odds … peripheral beliefs will not necessarily be reflected in practice (Phipps & Borg, 2009, p. 388).

Teacher beliefs do not seem to equal the final “product”: how vocabulary learning happens. There seems to be a complex relationship between education, beliefs and
contextual factors. To be able understand why traditional ways of teaching vocabulary is still somewhat commonplace we certainly need to look beyond the individual teacher.
6. Conclusion

The results from our interviews do, to some extent, answer our research questions. For clarification, each conclusion will be organized under the corresponding research question:

1. How do the teachers we interview work with vocabulary learning and how do they motivate their choice of method?

The teachers we interviewed all worked with vocabulary learning in different ways based on the main premise that the students should be able to use words in different situations. For some, spelling was more or less important but everyone mentioned being able to adapt language for different situations in some way. We saw both examples of traditional vocabulary learning in revised form, and fundamentally different ways of approaching vocabulary learning where the students’ interests where in focus. All teachers aimed towards a more communicative approach to vocabulary learning where using language was the target. However, we cannot confirm whether the teachers meet this goal in practice since we did not observe them in their work.

2. What contextual factors affect the way they work?

The question of why vocabulary learning happens in a certain way was important for us to investigate. We found education to be one of the key factors in deciding what approach the different teachers had towards vocabulary learning. In the question of education, standardization, availability and content seem to be of importance. All teachers spoke about the different levels of English knowledge in the classroom as a concern, and standardized further education for English teachers could be beneficial to create the tools needed to meet these different needs.

Based on the theoretical background we could see how contextual factors either aid or interfere with teacher practices independently of what these practices are. One of the teachers worked hard to change the context she worked in. To some extent, she even
disregarded the conventional standards of keeping with a plan or a deadline in favor of the development of her students. Teacher confidence, experience and belief sometimes work as a force of change and we find that more research is needed in order to understand how different contextual factors affect teachers in their work.

6.1 Limitations

The number of participating teachers constitutes one of the major limitations of this study. Only interviewing four teachers leaves a lot to interpretation and chance. Time was of course a factor in this and if we would have had the time, we would have liked to interview more teachers.

Our choice of method constitutes the second major limitation to our study. Choosing interviews as a research method was a conscious choice since interviews are more personal than e.g. observations. The choice was based on ethics; we wanted to trust the teachers in their roles as professionals. We wanted their thoughts and views on vocabulary learning. This means that our results are based on what teachers say they do, not necessarily what they actually do.

6.2 Further Research

In accordance with Phipps and Borg (2009) who suggest that “studies which employ qualitative strategies to explore language teachers’ actual practices and beliefs will be more productive . . . in advancing our understanding of the complex relationships between these phenomena” (p. 388). We would suggest that further qualitative research on this topic could benefit from focus groups; teachers could discuss their experiences and thoughts with several other teachers rather than being interviewed individually. We think that a lot of thoughts and experiences on contextual factors are easier to target in this way since teachers might share similar experiences, and this field of research is of great importance to understand why teaching happens the way it does.
For further research, teacher’s beliefs on vocabulary, contextual factors affecting teachers in their practices and the content of education are all areas that would benefit from more research. Observational studies on how teachers work with vocabulary aided by a critical approach to, and discussion on, contextual factors could possibly broaden the understanding of the relationship between beliefs and practice.

6.3 Implications

The curriculum may be “full of learner-centered ideals” (Lundahl, 2014, p. 21), but this does not change the fact that many teachers still seem to work according to a more traditional approach to language learning.

According to the curriculum (Skolverket, 2011) students should be given the “opportunity to develop all-round communicative skills” and also be able to build “confidence in their ability to use the language” (p. 32). Knowledge-centered approaches to language learning simply do not do this. If we know that vocabulary acquisition is a “complicated but gradual process” (Schmitt, 2007, p. 749) this must surely have implications for how we teach. Considering that there are several different aspects of knowing a word, and that these aspects are learned through the use of language over time. How can we then possibly fit real vocabulary learning into the narrow school world of thirty five minute lessons, glossary lists, tests and grades? Are we supposed to give students their language, or are we going to present an approach to language learning that they find useful and can bring with them for the rest of their lives?

Teacher education programs have a huge responsibility in making sure that teacher students are given enough opportunities to analyze and develop their own core beliefs in a critical manner. Teachers and teacher students need to understand the practical implications of language research and they need to be able to grasp the essential difference between what Lundahl (2014) refers to as knowledge-and child-centered views. Teacher students should be able to delve deeper into both research and philosophy and ask themselves why the school system is still so eager to test, grade and
separate students from each other, especially when it comes to language learning which is a social activity.

Vocabulary acquisition does not end after school; it keeps going as long as we want to communicate with other human beings, as long as we are curious about language and the world we live in. This insight might put vocabulary learning in school in another perspective.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Paul Nation’s Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Spoken</th>
<th>Receptive</th>
<th>What does the word sound like?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>How is the word pronounced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td></td>
<td>What does the word look like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>How is the word spelled?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word parts</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td></td>
<td>What parts can we recognize in this word?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>What word parts are needed to express meaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Form and meaning</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>What meaning does this form signal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>What word form can be used to express this meaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept and referents</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>What is included in this concept?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>What items does the concept refer to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associations</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>What other words does this make us think of?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>What other words are possible to use instead of this one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Grammatical functions</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>In what patterns does this word occur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>In what patterns is this word required to use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collocations</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>What other words or types of words occur with this one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>What words or types of words must we use with this one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constraints on use (register, frequency, etc.)</td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>Where, when, and how often would we expect to encounter this word?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>Where, when, and how often can we use this word?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nation’s aspects involved in knowing a word (2001, p. 27)
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Vi är två lärarstudenter, Madeleine Siedlecki och Alexander Lundström, som läser grundläararutbildningen med inriktning årskurs 4-6 på Malmö Högskola. Vi har engelska som fördjupningsämne där vi är inne på vår sista termin och arbetar nu med examensarbetet. Under utbildningen har vi verksamhetsförlagd utbildning, det vill säga VFU, där vi båda har medverkat under engelsklektioner där vi har fått se hur våra handledare har jobbat med ordinlärning. Nu vill vi ta reda på hur andra lärare, bortsett från våra praktikskolor, arbetar med ordinlärning och era tankar kring era arbetssätt.
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Intervjun kommer att pågå mellan 30-45 minuter och kommer att ske på en tid och plats som passar dig. Intervjun är också frivillig vilket betyder att du kan avbryta din medverkan när som helst.

Informationsuppgifterna om dig och skolan du arbetar på kommer att vara anonyma, vilket betyder att intervju materialet kommer att bevaras i största konfidentialitet. Ingen annan, förutom vi två, kommer att ha tillgång till det material vi får in under intervjun.

När examensarbetet är färdigt och godkänt kommer det att publiceras på Malmö Högskolas databas vilket innebär att flertalet studenter kommer att kunna läsa och förhoppningsvis inspireras av vårt examensarbete. Vid intresse kan även du få ta del av vårt färdiga examensarbete.

Din medverkan hade betytt mycket för oss och vi hoppas att du vill vara med!

Om det finns ett intresse önskar vi ett svar från dig senast 30/1.
Du kan svara genom att kontakta oss:

Madeleine Siedlecki, 0768 6XXXXX, [e-mail]
Alexander Lundström, 0735 0XXXXX, [e-mail]

Med vänliga hälsningar,
Madeleine Siedlecki & Alexander Lundström
### Appendix 3: Interview-guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frågor Questions</th>
<th>Översättning Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>När tog du din lärarexamen? &lt;br&gt; Vilken skola? &lt;br&gt; Hur länge har du varit lärare? &lt;br&gt; Vilka årskurser har du jobbat i? &lt;br&gt; Vilka ämnen undervisar du i?</td>
<td>When did you receive your teaching degree? &lt;br&gt; Which school? &lt;br&gt; How long have you worked as a teacher? &lt;br&gt; In which grades have you worked in? &lt;br&gt; What kind of subjects do you teach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vad innebär det att kunna ett ord enligt dig? &lt;br&gt; - Var har du fått den informationen ifrån? &lt;br&gt; - Vad skulle du behöva för att lära dig?</td>
<td>What does it mean to know a word, according to you? &lt;br&gt; - Where did you receive that information? &lt;br&gt; - What would you need to educate yourself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>På vilket sätt arbetar du med ordinlärning i engelska? &lt;br&gt; - Kan du utveckla ditt svar? &lt;br&gt; - Kan du ge några exempel på hur du arbetar med ordinlärning under en lektion eller en arbetsvecka? &lt;br&gt; - Använder ni några texter när ni lär ut ord? Vad för texter isåfall?</td>
<td>In what way do you teach vocabulary in English? &lt;br&gt; - Can you develop your answer? &lt;br&gt; - Could you give me some examples of how you work with vocabulary acquisition during one lesson or a week? &lt;br&gt; - Do you use any texts when teaching vocabulary? If so, what kind of texts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vad tror du har påverkat dig i ditt val av arbetssätt? &lt;br&gt; - Kan du utveckla ditt svar?</td>
<td>What do you think have affected you in your choice of working method? &lt;br&gt; - Could you develop your answer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Har du ändrat ditt sätt att arbeta med ordinlärning under din tid som lärare?</td>
<td>Have you changed your way on working with vocabulary during your time as a teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vad tror du anledningen till ändringen var?</td>
<td>- What do you think was the purpose of the change?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hur ser det kollegiala samarbetet ut mellan dig och andra lärare på skolan?</th>
<th>How do the collegial cooperation look like between you and the other teachers at school?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Vet du om andra lärare arbetar på samma sätt med ordinlärning?</td>
<td>- Do you know if others work the same way with vocabulary as you do?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Är det såhär du vill arbeta?</th>
<th>Is this how you want to work?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Har du andra idéer om hur man kan arbeta med ordinlärning?</td>
<td>- Do you have any other ideas of how one can work with vocabulary acquisition?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>