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Abstract

Previous studies have shown that written corrective feedback (CF) addressing errors can help students to improve their language accuracy. In order to improve students’ vocabulary skills, studies suggest that less explicit corrective feedback methods are more successful than more explicit ones. This small-scaled study tried to investigate what CF methods are used by three teachers concerning vocabulary errors in students' written assignments, what method is preferred by the teachers and the students in their classes and why, whether the students have to post-edit the essays after the teacher has given them feedback and finally, whether the students and their teachers believe they improve their vocabulary after the given feedback. The results show that all teachers used a varied set of corrective feedback types. The written corrective feedback method preferred by teachers in this study are underline and underline and describe. The method preferred by students are underline and describe and direct correction. In order for the feedback to be effective, the students need to work with the given corrective feedback.
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Sammanfattning på svenska

Tidigare studier har visat att skriftlig korrigerande feedback som gäller språkfel kan hjälpa eleverna att förbättra sin språkriktighet. Studier tyder på att de mindre explikativa korrigerande feedbackmetoderna är mer framgångsrika, när det gäller att förbättra elevernas ordförråd. Den här studien undersökte vilka feedbackmetoder på vokabulärfel i skriftliga texter tre lärare använder, vilken metod som föredras av lärarna och deras elever, om eleverna bearbetar sina texter utifrån lärarens feedback och slutligen, om eleverna och deras lärare tror att eleverna lär sig ny vokabulär utifrån lärarens feedback. Resultaten visar att alla lärare använder en varierad uppsättning av korrigerande feedbackmetoder. Den skriftliga korrigerande feedbackmetod som föredras av lärarna i denna studie är understrykning och understrykning med förklaring. Den metod som föredras av eleverna är understrykning med beskrivning och direkt korrigerings. För att feedback ska vara effektiv måste eleverna bearbeta den feedback de fått av läraren.

Nyckeord: skriftlig korrigerande feedback, vokabulärfel, feedbackmetoder, direkt och indirekt feedback
1. Introduction and aims

English is an international language and has a large number of speakers. According to Clark et al (2008: 691), by the 1990s, English was spoken as a first language by around 375 million speakers and as a second language by around 375 million speakers in the world. Moreover, the estimated figure for people who speak English as a foreign language was 750 million (Clark et al., 2008: 691). It is difficult to predict how many people will speak English in the future but it is a number that continues to increase (Graddol, 1997: 60). Over the years, English has developed into a global language, which means that the language has achieved a genuinely global status; it has developed an important role that is recognized in every country (Clark et al., 2008: 691).

The Swedish Curriculum for the compulsory school, preschool class and the leisure-time centre 2011 says that knowledge of English can give new perspectives on the surrounding world, increase opportunities to create contacts, and provide greater understanding of different ways of living for students. The same document makes it clear that “students should also be given the opportunity to develop correctness in their use of language in speech and writing, and also the ability to express themselves with variation and complexity through teaching” (Skolverket, 2011).

One way to achieve correctness in the target language is through feedback from the teacher directed at errors that the learners have made in their written assignments. Among researchers there is disagreement on the benefits of corrective feedback on second language learners' written output. However, there is increasing evidence that corrective feedback can assist learning and current research does not debate anymore whether corrective feedback works but rather examines what kind of corrective feedback works best (Ellis, 2009: 6).

It is important for second language learners to have a large and varied vocabulary in order to fully understand what is being said in different contexts and in formal and informal situations. It is also important for the ability to express knowledge and experiences. Knowledge of words, although it is only one of several components in learning a language, plays a key role in language proficiency (Enström, 2004: 171). The more words an individual knows, the better he or she is equipped for linguistically demanding situations. According to Ur (2012: 50), in order to strengthen the student’s vocabulary learning process it is important to provide feedback because it improves the correctness of English in students’ writing. Chandler (2003: 290) also claims that for the students to achieve accuracy in their
use of language, feedback is necessary since it can be used as a tool to help students to reduce errors in their written assignments.

The main aim of this paper is to study corrective feedback as a tool to improve students’ vocabulary learning. The primary focus is on how teachers use corrective feedback in three classes in upper secondary school and what their beliefs about various feedback methods are. Another focus is on students’ preferences when it comes to feedback related to vocabulary errors and if they believe that it improves their vocabulary skills. In order to investigate this, these research questions are asked:

1) What feedback methods are used by the teachers regarding vocabulary errors in students’ written assignments?
2) What method do teachers prefer, and why?
3) What feedback methods do the students prefer when it comes to vocabulary errors?
4) Do students have to post-edit their essays after the teacher has given them feedback
   a) according to the teachers, b) according to the students?
5) Do students experience that they improve their vocabulary skills when they correct their vocabulary errors based on the feedback they get?

The material on which this study is based consists of a questionnaire answered by students and their teachers in three classes in upper secondary school.

2. Background

This background section will focus on previous studies on feedback, particularly with regard to feedback directed at vocabulary errors in second language acquisition. Some important concepts, namely second language acquisition, English as a second language and interlanguage are discussed in section 2.1. Section 2.2 gives a survey of first- and second-language learners’ acquisition of vocabulary from a general point of view. Finally, in 2.3, previous research on feedback in language acquisition is presented.

2.1 Some concepts of importance for the study

This section presents relevant definitions used in relation to the subject of this paper.

2.1.1 Language acquisition and language learning

Developing competence in a second language can be achieved by acquisition or learning. Language learning is a conscious process, where the learners obtain formal knowledge of a
language. Learning refers to explicit knowledge of rules, where learners are able to talk about these rules. Another way of developing competence in second languages is via language acquisition. This is the “natural” way to develop linguistic ability and is a subconscious process (Krashen & Terell, 1985: 26). This paper will use the two terms language acquisition and language learning, and will regard them as referring to the same process.

2.1.2 English as a second language

A second language (L2) traditionally refers to a language acquired in the environment in which the language is used and works as the main means of communication (Abrahamsson, 2009: 14). Often, a second language is seen as a complement to a person’s mother tongue or “first language” (L1). Second language acquisition refers to learning the language that is used by the majority of speakers in society or is the official language, but which is not the learner’s mother tongue (Crystal, 2008: 696; Cook 2003: 7). The term foreign language, on the other hand, refers to those languages that are learned in an environment where the language is not used for everyday communication. Foreign language acquisition is consequently when a learner acquires the language of another country (Cook 2003: 7; Abrahamsson, 2009: 14). However, the term second language acquisition is often used as an encompassing term for language learning (Abrahamsson, 2009: 15) and therefore, this paper will use the terms English as a second language (ESL) and second language acquisition, even though, strictly speaking (and according to the definitions given above), English is a foreign and not a second language in Sweden.

2.1.3 Interlanguage

Research shows that errors are important in the acquisition of a second language, since they are proof that the student is making progress in acquiring the language (Thornbury 1999: 116). The term interlanguage, coined by Selinker, stands for the type of language produced by second and foreign language learners who are in the process of learning a new language (Selinker, 1972). In short, it is a term used when second language learners produce results which are neither fully native-language-like nor target-language-like (Linnarud, 1997: 9). Lightbown and Spada (2006: 80) explain that interlanguage has “some characteristics influenced by previously learned languages, some characteristics of the second language and some characteristics such as the omission of function words and grammatical morphemes that seem to be general and to occur in all or most interlanguage systems.” Moreover, interlanguage is systematic, but also dynamic and evolves continually as learners receive more input and revise their hypotheses about the second language (Lightbown & Spada, 2006: 80).
Errors in interlanguage are evidence for the teacher that the learner’s language is developing. Errors should not be regarded as undesirable results of faulty learning, or even a threat to the continued learning process, but as entirely natural and inevitable forms that reflect the course of a natural developmental process (Abrahamsson, 2009: 47). Also Lightbown and Spada (2006: 77, 79) stress that an increase in the number of errors may be an indication of progress in language learning since errors can be regarded and explained in terms of learners’ developing knowledge of the structure of the target language.

2.2 Acquiring vocabulary

There is a difference in acquiring a first and a second language. In his article “Nine Ideas about Language”, Daniels (2008: 5) mentions that language operates by rules, which means that when a child begins learning his or her native language, he or she acquires a system of mostly subconscious rules. These rules concern sounds, words, the positioning of words and aspects of the social act of speaking. This makes it possible for the child to make meaningful and increasingly complex utterances. Which set of rules the child will acquire depends on what language is spoken in his or her environment. This is a reminder that human language is, in an important sense, arbitrary, e.g. a chair is a chair because it is has been decided on by the speakers of English that this combination of sounds meant chair.

Language is a species-specific trait of human beings and all children will acquire the oral language they hear around them as naturally as they learn to walk, provided that the child is not severely retarded or completely deprived of exposure to speech. The three major components of all languages are a sound system, a system of grammar and vocabulary. The vocabulary, also called the lexicon, is as Daniels calls it “the individual’s storehouse of words” and the young child tries to expand his or her lexical inventory (Daniels, 2008: 6). Children learn their native language swiftly, efficiently and they are not “taught” by their parents to talk; children learn to talk the surrounding language and use other speakers as their testing devices for their own emerging ideas about language (Daniels, 2008: 4).

The acquisition of a second language, on the other hand, may be a complex process. In learning a second language, the words do not come naturally and therefore they have to be taught. Second-language learners probably need to know several thousand word families (Ur, 2012: 64). The term word family means a word and all its morphological variants. The forms need, needs, needed, and needing count as a single word and also derivations of the base word, e.g. needful and necessity should be included in the word family (Ur, 2012: 2, 3, 7, 63, 64). Researchers today generally agree that in order to understand a text, one needs to be able to understand between 95% and 98% of its words. Thus, one of the important parts of
learning a second language is acquiring vocabulary. A learner never finishes this learning process because the acquisition of new vocabulary is an ongoing process (Ur, 2012: 63). The importance of vocabulary is also mentioned by Wilkins (1972:11) who said that “without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed.” Furthermore, Ur (2012:1) claims that it is important for students to use English both fluently and correctly in order to get the message across effectively while using standard lexical conventions. By lexical conventions Ur means e.g. a group of words like post office or expressions, like in any case (2012: 1).

2.3 Feedback in language learning

In order to see what words the students have learned, tests and essays can be used to measure their ability, knowledge or performance (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010: 5). One important part of assessment is giving feedback, and according to both Ur (2012) and Chandler (2003), getting feedback is integral to the learning process (Ur, 2012: 50; Chandler, 2003: 290). Making students aware of a mismatch between their interlanguage and the target language might well assist their second language acquisition (Chandler, 2003: 293). The purpose of teacher feedback, as described by Hattie and Timperly (2007: 81), is to give the learner information regarding aspects of his or her performance. One important aspect of being a teacher is to give students feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of their work, combined with suggestions for improvement. According to Hyland and Hyland (2001: 185), this kind of individualized attention, which is rarely possible under normal classroom conditions, is one of the ESL teacher’s most important tasks. The purpose of the feedback is to fill the gap between what the student understands, i.e. the level where the student is at the moment and what is aimed to be understood, i.e. the level which the student is aiming to reach (Sadler, 1989: 1).

2.3.1 Corrective feedback

Corrective feedback is the type of feedback that follows on an incorrect answer or response. The term corrective feedback has been used as an umbrella term in second language acquisition literature to cover negative feedback, error treatment and error correction (Sheen, 2011: 1). This paper will investigate this kind of feedback relating to vocabulary errors.

Almost everybody, like myself, has memories of their personal writing smothered down with the teacher’s coloured pen. However, errors as such are interesting to study. Firstly, they are visible features of learner language. Secondly, they give teachers useful information about what errors learners make. Thirdly, self-correcting errors may actually help learners in the
acquisition process (Ellis, 2002: 15). Errors are a natural part of a learner's interlanguage, and corrective feedback might contribute to correctness regarding vocabulary in the target language (Chandler, 2003: 293). However, corrective feedback can lower students' self-esteem, which can be a problem as motivation plays a key role in the student's learning. The feedback that is given has to strike a balance between motivating the student and focusing on what the student needs to improve. This can be a difficult balance to keep (Hyland & Hyland, 2001:187).

One distinction that can be made is the one between direct and indirect feedback (Ferris, 2006: 83). When the teacher gives the student writer the correct form, direct feedback is given. Direct feedback can appear in various forms, including crossing out an unnecessary word, phrase or morpheme, inserting a missing word or morpheme, or writing the correct word near the incorrect form, e.g., above it or in the margin. This implies that the student only needs to copy the correction into the final version of the text. Indirect feedback means that the teacher signals in some way that an error has been made but does not provide the correction. The teacher lets the writer know by means of an underline, circle, code or other mark that there is a problem but leaves it to the student to solve it (Ferris, 2006: 83).

Researchers have suggested that indirect error feedback is preferable because it forces students to engage and helps them to develop skills as self-editors. However, it has also been suggested that students at lower levels of L2-proficiency may not be able to self correct errors due to limited linguistic knowledge. That is why a careful combination of direct and indirect feedback may be most helpful to students (Ferris, 2006: 83). Hattie and Timperly (2007: 82) as well as Chandler (2003: 293) stress the fact that students need to do something with the error feedback besides receiving it, because that seems to be a crucial factor in learning.

2.3.2 Corrective feedback methods

There are many different ways in which corrective feedback can be given. The following descriptions of written corrective feedback methods are based on a study conducted by Chandler (2003).

Chandler's four different kinds of corrective feedback are: direct correction, underline and describe, describe and underline. Direct correction is used when the teacher gives the right answer directly, while underline and describe is the term used for when the error is underlined and an explanation given. Describe means that the error type is written in the margin of the text, without pointing out the location of the error and underline means that the teacher underlines the error without an explanation in the margin of the text (Chandler, 2003:281). In this paper's questionnaires, Chandler's four different kinds of corrective
feedback methods are used to describe different corrective feedback methods. For examples of Chandler's corrective feedback methods see Appendix 3.

2.4 Different types of vocabulary errors

As mentioned before, the language produced by language learners almost unavoidably contains errors of various types; this is part of the process of learning a language. Saengchan and Schmitt (2006: 3) stress that empirical evidence suggests that lexical errors are the most frequently occurring category of errors in written English. Their taxonomy includes the following categories:

- Misuse of homonym: Words that sound the same, but differ in meaning, spelling and usage, e.g. here - hear, it's - its.
- Confused words: Words which are similar in spelling, sound and meaning and, thus, are often confused, e.g. affect – effect, then – than.
- Wrong word forms: Using a verb instead of an adjective, which can considerably change the meaning, e.g. disable people instead of disabled people.
- Non-standard vocabulary: Words like wanna, gonna, kinda.
- Interference: Words that are directly translated from a learner's mother tongue. In Swedish, e.g. dush instead of shower.

One kind of error that deserves attention is interference. Interference refers to the errors a learner of English makes as a result of the learner's first language. Transfer is a term used to describe the influence of the native language on a second language. Positive transfer occurs when there are similarities between the learner's first and second language. Negative transfer is another term for interference; hence, errors due to negative transfer can be explained by referring to the native language of the learner (Heny, 1994: 162). For example, Scandinavian languages make no overt distinction between adjectives and their corresponding adverbs. A typical example of interference for Scandinavian speakers is that they use the adjective polite where the adverb politely should be used (Heny, 1994: 163), as in She spoke to me quite polite*.

Ferris (2006: 96) makes a distinction between “treatable” and “untreatable” categories of errors. Different categories of errors are affected differently by error treatment. In the first category, verbs, noun endings and articles can be mentioned. These errors occur in a patterned, rule-governed way, which makes it easier for students to self-edit these kinds of

---

1 The asterix is used for incorrect forms.
errors. Errors in the lexical category, i.e. word choice and idioms, are “untreatable”, meaning that there are no set of rules which can help students to avoid or fix those types of errors (Ferris, 2006:96). Sheen (2011: 46) believes that describing the differences between “treatable” and “untreatable” errors as described above is not without complication. It is not easy to see how such criteria can be applied by teachers; it is not so easy to determine whether an error is treatable or not.

2.5 Empirical studies on feedback in language learning

A lot of research on corrective feedback has been carried out and this section will present some of the studies conducted in this field of research.

2.5.1 Ferris and Roberts (2001)

In an experimental classroom study conducted by Ferris and Roberts (2001), 72 university ESL students’ differing abilities to self-edit their texts were investigated. The students were asked to write an in-class essay during the first week of class. The students were divided into three groups according to their feedback conditions: group A had their errors marked with codes from five different error categories, group B had their errors in the same five categories underlined but not coded and group C (the control group) got no feedback at all. The five different error categories were: verb errors, noun ending errors, article errors, wrong word (all lexical errors) and sentence structure (Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 168). After two weeks, the students received feedback and they were asked to spend 20 minutes self-editing their essays. In addition, the students were asked to answer two questionnaires, asking students about their prior experiences with English grammar instruction, about their own assessments and about their corrective feedback preference. The survey showed that all students wanted their errors to be corrected by the teacher and students clearly favored the more explicit (coding) approach, which was the treatment given to group A (Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 169, 177).

This study showed that the two groups who received feedback performed better than the no-feedback group on the self-editing tasks but that there were no significant differences between the “codes” and “no-codes” groups. Ferris and Roberts (2001: 172, 173) conclude that less explicit feedback seemed to help these students to self-edit just as well as corrections coded by error type. According to this study, all five categories were responsive to student self-editing and the findings suggest that even indirect feedback can help students to self-edit errors that are not rule-governed, such as word choice. The two groups which received feedback were more successful in the three “treatable” categories (verbs, noun endings and articles) than in the “untreatable” word choice (lexical) and sentence structure categories. The “no feedback” group, however, was more successful in editing word choice errors.
Previously, it has been suggested that students may be helped more by direct feedback when dealing with untreatable errors, but this study suggests that even lexical errors can be self-edited by students when no or indirect feedback is given. These findings are similar to those of the Robb et al. study (1986) in that indirect feedback (underling or highlighting) might help students to self-correct errors in their writing, even errors such as word-choice. In the short run, less explicit marking techniques may be as effective as more explicit techniques but it might not help strengthen students’ cognitive engagement, which is required to acquire linguistic structures and to reduce errors over time (Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 172, 177).

2.5.2 Chandler (2003)

Chandler (2003) conducted two studies on corrective feedback. The first study tried to investigate if error correction improves correctness in ESL student writing. The students, who came from East Asia, were all music majors, first- or second-year students at an American conservatory, and they were divided into two groups: one control group and one experimental group. The control group consisted of 16 undergraduates and the experimental group contained 15 similar students. There was no indication of differences between the students and both classes had the same teacher (Chandler, 2003: 271). The students were asked to write five assignments of five pages about their own life. The students in the experimental group received error feedback and were to correct all the errors before submitting the next assignment. The second study looked at the effects of various kinds of error correction; should teachers simply correct errors or should they mark errors for student self-correction? (Chandler, 2003: 272, 280). Both studies show that when students self-corrected all the grammatical and the lexical errors in their autobiographical writing, this improved their accuracy and fluency in later writing of the same type over the semester. It was not of importance whether the teacher corrected or underlined the errors (Chandler, 2003: 279, 291). Students who received no feedback made little or no improvement in their accuracy. Both the experimental and control group showed a significant increase in fluency over the semester (Chandler 2003: 291).

Chandler’s study shows that feedback on errors is necessary and that students need to make corrections for their proficiency to increase. Also, a large decrease in the number of errors was noticed when direct corrections were included in the margin of the text, but the method underline and describe was the best method for the students to learn how not to make the errors in the future (Chandler, 2003: 291).
2.5.3 Köhlmyr (2013)

A project on feedback in English L2 writing was initiated during the autumn of 2011 and two minor pilot studies were started to investigate the use or non-use of written corrective feedback in English classes at different levels in a few Swedish schools. The idea was to try and investigate several areas concerning the written feedback that is given to learners and to investigate how the written feedback is used. The main concern for the project was to discover if feedback is given at all and if so, what kind of feedback is provided (Köhlmyr, 2013: 179). In both pilot studies the focus was on written proficiency in English. The first pilot study was conducted in year 9 of the Swedish compulsory school and the second study in the first year of upper secondary school. Two different levels of education were investigated in order to compare results at a later stage. Questionnaires combined with interviews with teachers and questionnaires for the students were used to answer the research questions. A total of 210 learners of English and ten teachers from six different schools in the west of Sweden participated in the two studies. These studies used a version of Sheen’s typology for written corrective feedback (abbreviated WCF) (Köhlmyr, 2013: 180).

In the first pilot study, 110 learners from year nine and their six teachers participated. The second pilot study included 100 students and four teachers from three different upper secondary schools, looking into their attitudes towards and ideas about feedback. The main results of the studies showed that a varied set of corrective feedback was used by all teachers, depending on what kind of task or assignment they had given the learners (Köhlmyr, 2013: 183). The teachers in the first study often used either direct metalinguistic WCF, which means that they provided the correct form with an explanation as to what was incorrect, or indirect WCF with located error, which means that they simply indicated that there was a mistake and they located it for the learner (Köhlmyr, 2013: 183). The former method can be compared to Chandler’s direct correction (but this method has no explanation) and the latter method can be compared to Chandler's underline and describe (see section 2.5.2). The teachers in the second study mainly used indirect WCF with located error or indirect WCF without located error, where the error was shown to the learner but without locating the error (Köhlmyr, 2013: 185). The former correction method can be compared to Chandler's underline and describe and the latter method to describe (see section 2.5.2).

Concerning feedback method preference, 38% of the students in compulsory school preferred direct metalinguistic WCF, i.e. where the teacher provides the correct form with an explanation. This corrective feedback method was used most often by their teachers. In upper secondary school, 48% of the students also stated that they prefer direct metalinguistic WCF and another 8% liked direct non-metalinguistic WCF (the type without giving an explanation), although their teachers claimed to mainly use indirect WCF with or without
locating the error. Here a difference in preference among the learners’ and teachers’ choice of correction method can be seen (Köhlmyr, 2013: 185).

Both pilot studies also showed that students want and expect to get feedback. As many as 87% in upper secondary school and 70% in compulsory school seemed to think that corrective feedback is useful and necessary to develop their English skills. However, most of the learners in the studies did not seem to make use of the given feedback; 30% in compulsory school and 44% of the students in upper secondary school stated that they revised their assignments using the feedback comments. Round 46% in compulsory school and 52% of the students in upper secondary school mentioned that they only briefly read through the feedback notes but did nothing with them and another 4% said that they did not even read through the comments (Köhlmyr, 2013: 186).

2.5.4 Students’ and teachers’ preferences regarding corrective feedback methods

Among writing experts, there is a strong preference for indirect feedback, i.e. an error is indicated without providing the correct form, which requires that learners self-correct. These experts argue that indirect feedback helps L2 learners to develop their language proficiency (Sheen, 2001: 47; Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 164). According to Ferris and Roberts (2001) and Chandler (2003), this correction method is preferable for most student writers, because it does not only help students to solve problems, but it also gives knowledge about linguistic forms that may lead to long-term acquisition (Ferris, 2001: 163,164; Chandler, 2003: 291).

Previous studies indicate that L2 students prefer indirect feedback with error codes or labels over either the feedback methods direct correction or underline (Ferris and Roberts, 2001: 166). However, in Chandler’s study (2003), a direct feedback method is preferred by students. In Köhlmyr’s first pilot study (2013: 185) (compulsory school), the teachers used both a direct and an indirect feedback method, whereas the teachers of the second pilot study (upper secondary school) used indirect feedback methods. Most of the students in compulsory school preferred the direct feedback method where the correct form is provided by the teacher combined with an explanation. This feedback method is the one that teachers claimed to use more often. Also, most of the students in upper secondary school shared the same preference as the students in compulsory school, but the indirect method with or without locating the error is the one that teachers claimed to use more often (Köhlmyr, 2013: 185).
3. Methods and material

The main aim of this survey was to find out what kind of corrective feedback is given when it comes to students’ vocabulary errors in their written L2 English texts and to what extent second language learners and teachers believe students increase their vocabulary skills by means of such feedback. Another question this small scale study investigated is the teachers’ and students’ preferences for a certain corrective feedback method or methods. In order to get an answer to these research questions, three teachers were asked if they and their students were willing to participate in a survey. A teacher questionnaire and a student questionnaire were used as research instruments.

Section 3.1 presents the participants, section 3.2 describes the material used in the survey and section 3.3 presents the ethical considerations.

3.1 Participants

This survey was conducted in a Swedish upper secondary school in a small sized town in Sweden. The participants, aged 16 – 19, are from three different classes. Class 1 studied English 6 in the third year of a vocational program (construction and industrial) and consisted of ten male students. Class 2 studied English 6 in the second year, attending a national higher education preparatory program (economy and social studies), and consisted of 17 female students and six male students. Class 3 studied English 5 and was in the first year of a vocational program (construction and industrial) and there were six male students in this class. In total there were three female teachers and 39 students who participated in this survey. The teacher in class 1 had been teaching for 32 years and the teacher in class 2 had been a teacher for ten years. The teacher in class 3 had been an English teacher for twelve years. These classes will be subsequently named classes 1, 2 and 3; the teacher of class 1 will be referred to as T1, the teacher of class 2 as T2 and the teacher of class 3 as T3 in the results part.

3.2 Material

The intention was to collect data with the help of an interview with the teachers and a teacher and a student questionnaire. Due to an extended work load for all the teachers at the school where this survey was carried out, none of the approached teachers were willing to participate in an interview, but they agreed to fill in a questionnaire.

The teacher and the student questionnaires were made up mainly of multiple choice questions (see Appendix 1 and 2). Some additional questions were open and the students and teachers were asked to provide an extended answer. The survey used Chandler's typology
for written corrective feedback. Chandler names four types of such feedback (see section 2.3.2). In order to make sure that every student was able to understand the questions, the students were given a Swedish version of the questionnaire. The investigator visited the classes in person, in order to introduce the survey and distribute the questionnaires. This presence gave the participants an opportunity to ask questions.

The questionnaire directed at the teachers consisted of questions that dealt with issues concerning their feedback methods. Most of the questions included subquestions (see Appendix 1). The students were also given questions which included subquestions. Some of these questions were related to to what extent their teacher gave them corrective feedback in their written assignments and what kind of feedback they received when they had made vocabulary errors (see Appendix 2). Similar to the teacher questionnaire, the students were also asked which corrective method they preferred. Other questions aimed to find out whether students used the feedback received and which corrective method works best in their own opinion. As mentioned previously, this survey is concerned with corrective feedback directed at vocabulary errors. The categories of vocabulary errors used in the questionnaires are compiled from the taxonomy of lexical errors as described in Saengchan and Schmitt (2006; see section 2.4).

Questionnaire questions should ideally be as short and straightforward as possible, and the same question should not be asked twice in the same way (Denscombe, 2009: 164). After analyzing the collected data, two equivalent questions, 4a and 4b, were detected in the student questionnaire. The students had trouble answering these questions and since it is likely that the students did not understand what the categories represent, this study takes into consideration only the question where the alternatives were explained (question 4b).

### 3.3 Ethical considerations

This survey approached its task in an ethical manner, meaning that the data was handled with great care, that there was no unnecessary deception or distress caused during the data collection and that the participants had sufficient information to make an informed decision about their participation (Wray & Bloomer, 2006: 173).

Before handing out the questionnaires, the purpose and methods to be used were explained orally to the students and the teacher. The same information was also given in writing in the questionnaire and all participants received a sheet with examples of the different corrective feedback methods (see Appendix 3).

The students and the teachers were told that their participation was voluntary and they were asked if they wanted to participate in the survey. The participants were assured that their
identity would not be revealed and that the questionnaires only revealed the class code and the participants' gender and age, which means that confidentiality was assured (Wray & Bloomer, 2006: 174).

4. Analysis and results

The main results of this study are accounted for below. Section 4.1 will present the results from the questionnaires answered by the teachers from the three classes. Section 4.2 will account for the results from the student questionnaire.

4.1 Results of the teacher questionnaire

In order to investigate this paper’s main question, specific questions were designed concerning what corrective feedback methods are used by the teachers, what their beliefs are about various feedback methods, their preferences when it comes to feedback related to vocabulary errors and if they believe that the given feedback helps their students to improve their vocabulary skills. The main results of this study are summarised below focusing on these questions.

4.1.1 What feedback methods are used by the teachers?

The data show that all three teachers claim to use a varied set of corrective feedback types. The students in class 1 write one essay per semester and their teacher corrects only those vocabulary errors which cause comprehension problems. T1 claimed to use the corrective feedback methods underline and direct correction when she corrects vocabulary errors in her students' essays.

The students in class 2 write two essays per semester and their teacher explained that she corrects all vocabulary errors in the students’ longer texts. T2 did not explain what she means with “longer” texts. T2, like T1, claimed to use a varied set of corrective methods, namely underline, underline and describe and direct correction, when she corrects vocabulary errors in her students' essays.

T3 said that she does not correct all vocabulary errors in her students’ essays, only those errors that would make the reader confused. In order to correct the errors that need to be corrected, this teacher claimed to use the corrective feedback methods underline and describe and direct correction.

Table 1 provides a visual representation of the methods said to be used by the teachers in the three classes. All teachers use the corrective feedback method direct correction; T2 and T3
also use the method underline and describe. T1 and T2 use the method underline in order to correct vocabulary errors in their students' written assignments.

Table 1: What corrective feedback methods are used by the teacher directed at vocabulary errors in students' written assignments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underline</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underline and describe</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct correction</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T2 mentioned in the questionnaire that she uses a combination of corrective feedback methods depending on the student. This teacher believes it to be important to correct all vocabulary errors in the students' longer written texts because according to her, the students learn from their mistakes. T1 and T3 claimed only to correct those errors which would make it difficult for the reader to understand the content. T3 elaborated on this question and mentioned her dyslectic students. She wrote that she does not correct vocabulary errors unless they get another meaning, e.g. world – word.

The findings show that the correction method describe, where the teacher indicates in the margin that there is a vocabulary error on a certain line, is not used by any of the teachers in the three classes. This is a positive finding because this kind of correction seems to have the least effect on students' accuracy in their writing (Chandler, 2003: 164, 292).

4.1.2 What feedback methods do the teachers prefer, and why?

T1 and T2 preferred the correction method underline. The reason they give for preferring this method is because experience has shown them that it is how the students best improve their vocabulary skills. T3 prefers another correction method, namely underline and describe and she also explains that her experience has shown her that this is the method that helps students best improve their vocabulary skills. The methods that the teachers claimed to use most often are underline and underline and describe, both of which are indirect feedback methods. A reason for preferring indirect methods could be that they are less time consuming than other methods. A legitimate question could be to what extent the teachers are affected by the time factor. The advantage with indirect correction methods is that they do not only “engage the students in guided learning and problem solving”, but they also lead to “reflection about linguistic forms that may lead to long-term acquisition” (Ferris, 2001: 163, 164; Chandler, 2003: 291). Other studies suggest that indirect corrective feedback will not result in new learning but it may “strengthen already learnt but not fully internalized forms”
(Köhlmyr, 2013: 186). The best strategy is to use both indirect and direct feedback methods (Sheen, 2012: 47), which the participating teachers in this study say that they do.

4.2 Results of the student questionnaire

This section will account for the results of the student questionnaire.

4.2.1 What feedback methods do the students prefer?

When it comes to vocabulary errors, the majority of the students in class 1 preferred the correction method *underline and describe*. Most of the students in class 2 preferred the correction method *direct correction*, closely followed by the correction method *underline and describe*. In class 3, the majority of the students preferred the correction method *underline and describe*. The results showed that none of the students preferred the correction method *describe*. This kind of correction method is cognitively demanding because learners need to identify an error without location and this might be the reason why none of the students preferred this method.

One interesting finding is that most of the students in class 1 said that they prefer the method *underline and describe*, whereas the teacher claimed that she uses the corrective feedback methods *underline and direct correction* when she corrects vocabulary errors in her students’ essays. The teacher in class 3 claimed to use the corrective feedback methods *underline and describe* and *direct correction*. In this class, one student claimed that he preferred the correction method *underline*, which this teacher said she does not use. That students said they prefer a feedback method that is not used by their teacher could be due to the fact that some of the students were not aware of what correction feedback method their teacher uses when it comes to vocabulary errors. Another explanation is that these students do not understand the differences between these correction methods, even if they were explained before they answered the questionnaire. None of the students added any reasons of their own why they preferred the alternative they marked, although there was an opportunity to elaborate on this question. The results of what feedback methods the students prefer are shown in Table 2.
Table 2: What feedback do the students prefer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Class 1 (N=10)</th>
<th>Class 2 (N=23)</th>
<th>Class 3 (N=6)</th>
<th>Total (N=39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underline and describe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct correction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that the majority, 19 students out of 39, preferred the indirect feedback method *underline and describe*, which agrees with Ferris and Roberts' (2001: 174) study. According to them, indirect correction where the teacher marks the error and labels it with an error code is preferred by most student writers. In Chandler's study (2003:291), a majority of the students preferred the *direct correction* method because it is the easiest way for them to correct their errors, but they also experienced that *underline and describe* helps them best to avoid making those errors in future assignments (2003: 291).

4.2.2 Do students post-edit their essays after the teacher has given them feedback?

This study investigated whether students have to post-edit the essays after the teacher has given them feedback and to what extent the students actually apply the given feedback in their written assignments. According to the three teachers, their students have to correct vocabulary errors in their essays after the feedback is given back to them.

In class 1, four students answered that they correct their vocabulary errors after the teacher returned their essays with the feedback. Six students answered that they sometimes post-edit their essays after the feedback is given back to them. According to T1, her students have to correct vocabulary errors in their written texts after they have received her corrective feedback but the students do not appear to post-edit their essays all the time.

According to their teacher, the students in class 2 have to post-edit their essays but also in this class the students seem not to be aware of this fact. Twelve out of 23 students said that they correct their vocabulary errors after the given corrective feedback as they are supposed to. Two students claimed that they do not post-edit their essays after their teacher has given them feedback and nine students said that they sometimes correct their vocabulary errors in their essays.
The students in class 3 also have to post-edit their essays after the feedback is given to them according to the teacher. Four out of six students claimed that they correct their vocabulary errors in their essays. One student said that he does not post-edit his essays and another student answered that he post-edits his essays sometimes. Table 3 shows the results of the classes 1, 2 and 3 regarding the question whether students post-edit their essays according to themselves.

Table 3: Do students post-edit the essays after the teacher has given them feedback?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class 1 (N=10)</th>
<th>Class 2 (N=23)</th>
<th>Class 3 (N=6)</th>
<th>Total (N=39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 3 show that half of the students say that they post-edit their essays. A question arises whether the students in the three classes understand that they are supposed to correct their vocabulary errors every time after the feedback is handed to them or whether what the teachers said does not agree with what they actually do. Another question that comes to mind is whether the post-edited essays are read by the teacher. This seems to be an important factor when it comes to students’ motivation to revise their text, as can be seen in Köhlmyr’s study (2013: 186). If the answer is no on one or both of these questions, then one might wonder what purpose the feedback has and for what reason the teacher gives corrective feedback on students’ vocabulary errors in their essays.

**4.2.3 Do students experience that they improve their vocabulary skills based on the feedback they get?**

In class 1, six out of ten students said that they experience an improvement in their vocabulary skills based on the feedback they get. Twenty-one students in class 2 answered that they experience that they improve their vocabulary skills. All the students in class 3 said that they feel that they learn the right word or expression from post-editing their essay after feedback is given to them. It needs to be pointed out that one student in this class mentioned that he did not correct vocabulary errors after receiving feedback. Table 4 shows the results for the three classes on this question.
Table 4: Do the students in class 1, 2 and 3 experience that they improve their vocabulary skills based on the feedback they get?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class 1 (N=10)</th>
<th>Class 2 (N=23)</th>
<th>Class 3 (N=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As many as 33 out of 39 students claimed that they experience an improvement in their vocabulary skills based on the feedback they get. These findings agree with the findings of other studies. Students seem to want, expect to get and value feedback from their teacher: they believe feedback to be useful and necessary to develop their English skills (Köhlmyr, 2003: 186; Ferris, 2001: 166).

5. Discussion

To teachers who spend time providing error feedback on their students’ papers in order to help students improve their English skills in writing, the findings of the present study are encouraging. The majority of the student subjects claimed that they immediately applied the feedback they had received and according to them, in most cases, it helps them to avoid errors in future writing assignments.

In Köhlmyr's study (2013: 187), the participating teachers claimed that “nothing is really done with the feedback given” and the teachers stated that there is too little time to use feedback the way they would like to do. The question that Köhlmyr asks her readers is whether teachers ought to teach learners how to use feedback properly already at an early stage. Or should the focus of writing in class be on working with short pieces of writing such as mini-writing sessions? Also Ferris and Roberts (2001: 177) stress that mini-lessons about feedback methods could give more long-term growth in students’ accuracy than simply underlining or highlighting errors. Considering that the present survey shows that approximately half of the students never or only sometimes post-edit their essays after the given feedback, Köhlmyr's question is a relevant one.

As mentioned in section 2.5.1, the findings in Ferris and Robert's study suggest that there is no immediate advantage to more explicit indirect feedback in learners’ interlanguage. This is a fortunate finding, since less explicit feedback means less work for the teachers. Not surprisingly, the less explicit feedback method underline is also the preferred kind of feedback of two of the three teachers in the present study. Marking errors in this way may be faster and easier for teachers and this kind of feedback is more desirable with “untreatable”
errors (Sheen, 2012: 47). The preference of using less explicit feedback methods is also seen in Köhlmyr’s studies (2013: 188). However, Sheen (2012: 47) mentions that it helps L2 learners best when teachers use both direct and indirect approaches depending on the type of error and on learner factors, such as L1 background, L2 writing proficiency and the nature of the writing task. The importance of using a varied set of corrective feedback methods is also pointed out by Ferris and Roberts (2006: 83), which agrees with the present study, as a combination of indirect and direct correction feedback methods is claimed to be used by all three teachers in this study.

The students in Chandler’s study (2003: 287) preferred the feedback method direct correction because it is the fastest and easiest way for them to post-edit their written assignments. The students in the Ferris and Roberts’ study (2001: 166) preferred the feedback method underline and describe. In the present study, both these preferences are seen: 19 students prefer underline and describe and 14 students prefer direct correction. Both Ferris and Robert’s (2001) and Chandler’s (2003) study suggest that the method underline and describe helps students best to avoid making errors in future essays. One question that arises is to what extent teachers should take students’ preferences into account. How aware are students that a certain method helps them improve their written proficiency? Or do students prefer a certain feedback method because it reduces their effort when they rewrite their text?

6. Conclusion

The first research question asked was what feedback methods are used by the teachers directed at vocabulary errors in students’ written assignments. The results found that all teachers claimed to use a varied set of corrective feedback types, which is a positive result because this seems the best way to help learners to develop their L2 language.

The second research question dealt with what method the teachers prefer and why. When these teachers were asked for the reason why they liked a certain method, all three teachers answered that their experience has shown them that their preferred feedback method is the best way for their students to learn and avoid making errors in future assignments. T1 and T2 prefer the correction method underline and T3 stated that she preferred the method underline and describe. These findings suggest that T1 and T2 prefer the less time consuming methods. The teachers in Köhlmyr’s pilot study (2013: 185) also prefer an indirect correction method, which has been found to help L2 learners to develop their language proficiency best (Sheen, 2001; Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 164; Chandler, 2003).
Regarding the question what feedback methods the students prefer when it comes to vocabulary errors, six (60%) of the students in class 1 preferred the correction method *underline and describe*. This method is not used by their teacher, which could support the suggestion in Köhlmyr’s study that teachers and students need to be taught the different feedback methods and how to use them. In class 2, ten students (44%) preferred the method *direct correction* and nine students (39%) preferred the correction method *underline and describe*. In class 3, four students (66%) had the correction method *underline and describe* as their preference. The students in classes 1, 2 and 3 preferred the direct corrective feedback methods *underline and describe* and *direct correction*. This preference for direct correction methods agrees with previous research.

The teachers in class 1 and class 2 claimed to use the correction method *underline* most when correcting students’ vocabulary errors, though only five out of 33 students from these two classes preferred this correction method. In class 3, the preference for a certain correction method was shared by both the teacher and the students. These findings agree with Köhlmyr’s study (2013: 186), which might lead to the question whether feedback would be more effective when teachers are aware of the effects of different feedback methods.

The results for the fourth research question, whether students have to post-edit their essays after the teacher has given them feedback, was answered positively by the three teachers. All three teachers stated in the questionnaire that many errors made by their students concern vocabulary. These utterances strengthen the statement of Saengchan and Schmitt (2003: 3) that lexical errors are the most frequently occurring category of errors in written English. All teachers believe that post-editing is necessary because they believe that by making corrections, the students learn to avoid the same errors in the future. However, the results of this paper show that only half of the students (N=39) claim to always post-edit. The three teachers say that the students have to post-edit the written assignments after feedback is given to them but it seems that the teachers do not follow through and make sure that the students actually do so. It would be interesting to investigate the reason for these findings.

The final question concerns whether the students experience that they improve their vocabulary skills based on the feedback. In class 1, three students answered negatively but in the other classes all students felt that they learn the right word or expression from post-editing. These findings find support in most studies on error correction in L2 writing classes; studies like Ferris & Roberts (2001) have shown that error feedback from teachers improve students’ accuracy over time. This present study raises further questions for future investigations on this topic and it is hoped that researchers will continue to pursue this field of research for the benefit of both teachers and students. The most important question is whether to use indirect or direct feedback methods concerning lexical errors in learners’
interlanguage. Another question could be whether student preferences are of importance in order for feedback to be effective.

For more than two decades, attitudes and approaches toward student errors have been a source of debate among second language acquisition and second language writing scholars (Ferris, 2006: 81). Different types of errors need different types of error correction but teachers often provide feedback on all categories of errors in the same way. Though this present study obviously has its limits, it nevertheless provides evidence that can help teachers to reflect on and possibly change their feedback methods in order to help their students to improve their vocabulary skills.
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Appendix 1

Teacher questionnaire

Date: Class:

Personal information:

Gender
☐ Male
☐ Female

Age
☐ Under 30
☐ 30 - 50
☐ 50 -

How long have you been a teacher? ________________ years.

Introduction
I am interested to know to what extent you give your students corrective feedback directed at vocabulary errors in their written texts and tests. I am also interested to know to what extent you believe that corrective feedback directed at vocabulary errors will increase their vocabulary skills.

Different kinds of vocabulary errors are:
1. Confusion of homonyms: words that sound the same, but differ in meaning, spelling and usage, e.g. here - hear, it's – its.
2. Confusing words: words which are similar in spelling, sound and meaning and, thus, are often confused, e.g. affect – effect, then – than.
3. Wrong word forms: writing a verb instead of an adjective, which can considerably change the meaning, e.g. disable people instead of disabled people.
4. Non-standard vocabulary, e.g. words like wanna, gonna, kinda.
5. Interference of the mother tongue: words that are directly translated from Swedish, e.g. dush instead of shower.
Please answer the following questions:

1a) How many times per term do your students write an essay in school?

______________________________________________________________

b) How many times per term do your students write an essay at home?

______________________________________________________________

2) Do you correct their vocabulary errors in all written assignments?

☐ Yes
☐ No

3 a) Do you correct all vocabulary errors in your students' written assignment?

☐ Yes
☐ No

b) Why? Why not?

______________________________________________________________

4 a) What correction method do you use when correcting students' vocabulary errors?

(More than one alternative may be selected.)

☐ Underline: I only underline the error without explaining what is wrong.

☐ Underline and describe: the word is underlined and I indicate that it is a vocabulary error (e.g. by writing word choice in the margin).

☐ Direct correction: I write the correct word above the word in the text.

☐ Describe: I indicate in the margin that there is a vocabulary error on a certain line.

☐ Other:

______________________________________________________________

b) What correction method do you mostly use when correcting students' vocabulary errors?

(mark only one answer.)

☐ Underline: I only underline the error without explaining what is wrong.

☐ Underline and describe: the word is underlined and I indicate that it is a vocabulary error (e.g. by writing word choice in the margin).
5) Why is that your preference?
- Experience has shown me that this is how the students best improve their vocabulary skills.
- It has become a habit.
- It is the least time-consuming technique.
- Other:

6) What type of vocabulary error do you come across most often in your students’ writing?
(More than one alternative may be selected.)
- Misuse of homonyms: Words that sound the same, but differ in meaning, spelling and usage, e.g. here - hear, it’s - its.
- Confused words: Words which are similar in spelling, sound and meaning and, thus, are often confused, e.g. affect – effect, then – than.
- Wrong word forms: Using a verb instead of an adjective, which can considerably change the meaning, e.g. disable people instead of disabled people.
- Non-standard vocabulary: Words like wanna, gonna, kinda.
- Interference: Words that are directly translated from Swedish, e.g. dush instead of shower.
- Other:

7 a) Have you changed your correction method during your years as a teacher?
- Yes, several times
- Yes, once
- No. Go to question 9a
b) Why and how did you change your correction method when students make vocabulary errors?
8 a) Approximately, how large a part of your corrections concerns vocabulary?

- 0 - 20 %
- 30 - 40 %
- more than 50 %

b) Do you believe that vocabulary corrections are necessary?

- Yes, all errors should be marked
- Yes, but not all errors should be marked
- No

c) Why?

_________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________

9 a) Have your students influenced your correction method?

- Yes
- No. Go to question 10

b) If your answer was yes, describe in what way they have influenced your correction method:

____________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________

10 a) Do your students have to correct vocabulary errors in their written texts after they have received your corrective feedback?

- Yes
- No
- Sometimes

b) Do you feel that they learn from making vocabulary corrections?

- Yes
- No

c) Explain why you believe this: ____________________________

____________________________________________________________

Thank you for your participation!
/Chantal Scheilen Kågström
Appendix 2

Elevenkät

Datum:                                 Klass:

Personlig information

Kön
☐ Man
☐ Kvinna

Ålder
☐ 16
☐ 17
☐ 18
☐ Annat: _____________år.

Introduktion

Jag är intresserad av att veta hur och i vilken omfattning din lärare ger dig feedback på ordvalsfel i dina skriftliga texter. Jag är också intresserad av att veta vilken feedback method du föredrar, samt i vilken omfattning du anser att lärarens feedback förbättrar din ordkunskap.

Olika typer av ordvalsfel är:
1. Förväxling av ord som låter lika, men har olika betydelser, stavas annorlunda och används på ett annat sätt, t.ex. here – hear, it’s – its.
2. Förväxling av ord som är liknande i stavning, ljud och betydelse, t.ex. affect – effect, then – than.
3. Fel ordklass: t.ex. när ett verb används istället för ett adjektiv, vilket kan förändra betydelsen totalt, som disable people istället för disabled people.
4. Ord som hör till talspråket t.ex. ord som wanna, gonna, kinda.
5. Påverkan av svenska, t.ex. dush istället för shower.
Frågor:

1 a) Ger din lärare dig normalt feedback på ordvalsfel i skriftliga uppgifter?
   - Ja
   - Nej

b) Ger din lärare dig feedback på ordvalsfel i alla skriftliga uppgifter?
   - Ja
   - Nej

2 a ) Tycker du att det är viktigt att få feedback på ordvalsfel i dina skriftliga uppgifter?
   - Ja
   - Nej

b) Varför? Varför inte?

3) Vilken typ av rättning använder din lärare?
   (Mer än ett alternativ kan väljas.)
   - Understrykning: ordvalsfel är understruket utan någon förklaring om vad som är fel.
   - Understrykning med förklaring: felet är understruket och det finns en markering att det handlar om ett ordvalsfel (t.ex. läraren har skrivit word choice i marginalen.)
   - Direkt rättning: det rätta ordet är skrivet ovanför det ord som är fel i texten.
   - Marginalmarkering: i marginalen finns en markering att det finns ett ordvalsfel på en viss rad.
   - Annat:

4 a) Vilken typ av korrigering föredrar du? (Se fråga 3 för en förklaring av termerna.)
   (Markera bara ett alternativ.)
   - Understrykning
   - Understrykning med förklaring
   - Direkt rättning
   - Marginalmarkering
   - Annat:
b) Varför föredrar du den typ av rättning? (Markera bara ett alternativ.)

☐ Understrykning: Det får mig att fundera på vad jag har gjort fel och jag måste rätta ordet själv.
☐ Understrykning med förklaring: Jag behöver bara rätta felet.
☐ Direkt rättning: Jag ser direkt det rätta ordet skrivit ovanför det felaktiga i texten, vilket gör att jag lär mig det rätta ordet.
☐ Marginalmarkering: Jag måste leta efter felet och rätta det själv.
☐ Annat:

5 a) Föredrar du att få feedback på ordvalsfel fel i alla skriftliga uppgifter?

☐ Ja. Gå till fråga 6a
☐ Nej. Gå till 5b

b) När skulle du vilja få feedback på ordvalsfel?

_____________________________

_____________________________

6 a) Rättar du dina ordvalsfel när du får tillbaka din uppgift från din lärare?

☐ Ja. Gå till 6b
☐ Nej. Gå till 6c
☐ Ibland. Gå till 6b

b) Om du rättar dina fel, känner du att det hjälper dig att komma ihåg det korrekta ordet eller uttrycket?

☐ Ja
☐ Nej

c) Om du inte rättar dina ordvalsfel, hur förbättrar du då din ordkunskap baserat på din lärares feedback?

_____________________________

_____________________________

Tack för ditt deltagande!

/Chantal Scheilen Kågström
Appendix 3  These examples are taken from Chandler (2003: 282-283).

Direct correction

“I am from Saudi Arabia but I am American. My father had to work so that I also went there with him,” she said very slowly. I understood a few words, father, American, five years and I. I had to guess for whole time. I said that I didn’t understand at first time but I didn’t understand the most of things she said that I just moved my head like I knew what she was saying.

Underline and describe

“Mayu, would you go to the tofu shop and get two pieces of tofu?”

It was my first try to go to any store by myself.

“Me? Can I do it? Mmm…. It sounds too difficult for me.”

“No, it is easy. The tofu you need to take is called silk tofu. Only thing you need to do is to ask them, ‘Could you give me two pieces of tofu?’ That’s it.”

“O.K. If I say, ‘Could you give me two pieces of tofu,’ do they give me?”

“No, you should say, ‘silk tofu.’”
Describe

I crawled back to my sleeping bag and lied down again. I tried to do the method that Skip gave me to focus on my third eye; it did not work so well. I was still wide awake and feeling scared. I looked at my watch and it was almost two o'clock in the morning. Although the method hadn't worked yet, but I decided to try once more anyhow. I locked up; the moon had just slowly passed a piece of cloud and revealed itself once more. Just as I was closing my eyes to attempt the method again; suddenly I saw a black spot between my eyes and meanwhile, an extremely powerful energy as wind squeezed in to my body through the black hole with an ascending “V-Ong” sound… I was unable to make any sound out or move a finger.

Underline

Every day at four-fifty, you would see something magical happened. The building still looked ordinary as usual, but it seemed to radiate some kind of incantation that the people from all kinds of building in the huge school suddenly spilled out their building and flowed to it as natural as the water goes to the lower place. The building just like becoming a magnet in a sudden and the people like the spreaded iron sands which attached to it instantly.