UNIVERSIDAD DE CHILE

FACULTAD DE FILOSOFÍA Y HUMANIDADES

DEPARTAMENTO DE LINGUÍSTICA

RATERS' RESPONSES TO THE LEXICAL FEATURES IN THE ENGLISH L2 WRITING OF INSTRUCTED INTERMEDIATE EFL LEARNERS.

Authors: Rodrigo Rocuant Galvez
Ana de Lourdes Tabilo Roca
Elizabeth Vega Garrido

Informe Final de Seminario de Grado para optar al grado de

LICENCIADO EN LENGUA Y LITERATURA INGLESAS

Profesor guía: Daniel Muñoz Acevedo

SANTIAGO DE CHILE

ENERO 2014

For Daniel

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Ésta será sin duda la sección más difícil de escribir. Hay tanto que agradecer y tantos nombres. Gracias profesores, aquellos que realmente marcaron mi paso por esta Universidad y de paso, mi vida. Nombrarlos quizá sería dejar a mucha gente de lado. Sólo diré que probablemente olvidaré contenidos y materias, pero nunca a las grandes personas que conocí en este camino, y que supieron apoyar y comprender a esta alumna con una vida de mamá, esposa, estudiante y más. Sin su apoyo, hubiese dejado la carrera hace años, sin duda.

Gracias a los amigos y compañeros que pude conocer en este período, a los de antes también, que fueron apoyo fundamental para no decaer. A mis compañeros, gracias por recibirme y permitirme ser yo misma, con lo bueno y lo malo que eso pudiera implicar. Nos reímos, sufrimos y nos acompañamos. Fuimos entre todos una especie de grupo de terapia, hay que decirlo. Me permitieron ser auténtica, con mi humor característico, con mis achaques y todo lo que soy. Gracias por eso.

A mi familia, los fundamentales. Gracias a mis hijitas, Isabel y Laura. Ustedes fueron, son y serán el motor de mi vida, la razón para levantarme cada mañana, para secarme las lágrimas cuando hay dolor, para reírme con más ganas cuando llega la alegría. Gracias por comprender a la mamá cuando no podía salir a jugar al parque porque tenía que estudiar, o cuando, por correr todo el día, llegaba cansada a la casa y no tenía energías. Gracias Chini por ser la mejor

hermana mayor y cuidar a tu hermanita tantas veces para que yo pudiera estudiar. Ustedes son lo mejor, lo mejor de la vida.

Gracias a mi esposo, Carlos. Ésta carrera finalmente duró lo mismo que llevamos de matrimonio prácticamente, y en todos estos años has sido el más firme y constante apoyo para mí. Nada de esto hubiera sido posible si tú no hubieras sido el compañero más fiel que Dios pudo haber puesto en mi camino. No habrá día de mi vida en que no dé gracias por tenerte a mi lado. Hemos reído y llorado estos años, miles de veces. Ahí has estado siempre, apoyándome de todas las maneras posibles. Eres mi centro y el amor de mi vida. Gracias a Dios por ti.

Gracias a mis padres y a mi hermano, que a pesar de la distancia, siempre me ayudaron y apoyaron. Su apoyo moral y su ayuda concreta fueron importantísimos. Papás, gracias porque al mirar hacia atrás en mi vida, sé que lo que soy se los debo a ustedes. Salir adelante, luchar a pesar de lo adverso, y no quedarse nunca en la mediocridad. Aspirar siempre a ser más y el mejor. Gracias por educarme. Gracias Mauricio Pato, hermano, por ver en ti un referente de que en la vida hay que amar lo que uno hace, y si no, mejor no hacerlo. Entregar la vida, vivir lo que amas, eso lo he aprendido de ti. Gracias.

Y al más importante. Gracias Señor, porque todas las personas que he mencionado han sido puestas en mi camino por ti. Gracias por amarme concretamente en cada uno de ellos. Gracias porque eres el que habita en lo más profundo de mi corazón. Gracias porque todo lo bueno que puede haber en mí, eres Tú, actuando de manera concreta. Gracias por los talentos que me confiaste. Recibe hoy otros tantos que gané con ellos.

Elizabeth Vega Garrido

En dedicación a:

Adair: Sobrino, ahijado -y diría que en cierta manera hasta mi primogénito. *The sʌn of my life*. Las palabras no son suficientes para expresar cuán profunda es tu significancia. Precursor de una nueva etapa, gestor de nuevos sueños. Has llegado a ser un inseparable compañero, cómplice de estudios, juegos, travesuras y hasta glotonerías; alumno y maestro, mi ayudante personal, coautor de esta tesis, pero más importante aún mi inspiración, pilar y la señal indicándome lo esencial de la vida, de lo aún soy capaz, por lo que vale la pena luchar.

Vicente el monstruito. Sobrino, ahijado, nuevo cómplice de aventuras; nuestro pequeño compañero indispensable en en este proceso que se cierra y una nueva etapa que se aproxima, y quién de seguro, nos llevará siempre a la acción.

En homenaje y tributo a la lucha interminable de mi madre; ejemplo de perseverancia, fuerza y entrega que siempre se antepone a su propio bienestar y comodidad.

En agradecimiento a:

Mis padres por finalmente darme el espacio y permitirme continuar desarrollando quien soy, a pesar de lo poco comprensible que pudiera resultarles.

Aquellos escasos pero inigualables -e invaluables- profesores y profesoras que han marcado todo un largo camino despertando tantas preguntas, inspirando -con su tan diferente y notable forma de ser- a lograr mostrar una pequeña parte de esa cosa especial que ell@s ya han alcanzado.

A todas las experiencias -buenas y malas- y, hasta aquella dolorosa, dulce, y adictiva oscuridad que han conducido a este confundido ser a fusionarse con sus demonios para saber no darse por vencido. Ello en pos de alcanzar la significancia, la apreciada tranquilidad, e intentar demostrar que la clave ha de estar siempre en intentar reparar (se) con honor, consecuencia, humildad pero dignidad e integridad.

Ana de Lourdes Tabilo Roca

Con el arduo trabajo que conllevó esta investigación se termina un episodio enriquecedor y significativo en el que participó mucha gente. Agradezco en general haber llegado a estudiar en este lugar porque me entregó herramientas más allá de lo académico. Por lo vivido aquí y por la gente que conocí, siento que hoy he crecido bastante con respecto a cuándo entre.

Agradezco en primera instancias a los que fuimos gestores de este trabajo, con muchas complicaciones a lo largo del año, pero que logramos finalizar manteniendo siempre un gran respeto y empatía.

Agradezco a mis compañeros, que si bien a muchos no pude conocer demasiado, más de una vez pude compartir risas y nunca sentí mala onda. En particular agradezco a Yeisil por el gran apoyo que significó para un tipo que vive en las nubes como yo. También a Elizabeth que a pesar de cargar una mochila tan pesada, es un ejemplo de esfuerzo.

Un agradecimiento a mis amigos de años que me ayudan a desligarme de la carga académica y poder siempre tomarnos un tiempo para compartir y reír. Imprimo acá mis deseos para que esta amistad la sigamos disfrutando por siempre.

A mi familia por su gran apoyo. Cada vez que los veo juntos veo la imagen de lo grande que se pudo construir con el gran esfuerzo de mis abuelos. En particular un gran saludo a mi tía Marlene que siempre me recibe con los brazos abiertos y me ha entregado el regalo de tener una segunda casa.

Agradezco a mis padres, a los que he visto pasar por muchas malas, pero siempre lo han entregado todo por mí. Son ambos un ejemplo de seguir adelante a pesar de los tropiezos, y espero poder responder de su misma manera cuando me toque a mí caerme fuerte.

Finalmente agradezco a Deniss. Estos dos años me has ayudado a aprender y crecer. Gracias por la paciencia que has tenido este año con todo el trabajo que he tenido. También has afrontado un golpe muy fuerte pero supiste seguir adelante. Me gusta verte tranquila y feliz a pesar de todo. Espero podamos seguir sumando experiencias juntos.

Rodrigo Rocuant Galvez

ABSTRACT

This research report presents a study on vocabulary use in the L2 writing performance of a group of students from the program of English Linguistics and Literature at the Universidad de Chile. The data for the study correspond to ten tests used in a previous study (Aranda et al, 2013) and categorized in Top and Bottom groups by four teachers in relation to the quality of their performance. In addition, the study used data from four interviews to the same four teachers in order to know the specific aspects they consider when assessing vocabulary use in L2 writing performance. The tests were analyzed qualitatively in search for lexical diversity and lexical sophistication features that could account for the difference in perceived quality between the two groups. Such features included the Lexical Frequency Profile for each test, the computation of MTLD, the presence of words related to the topic of the tests and the presence of lexical errors. The interviews were transcribed and a list of the most important aspects of assessment of L2 writing according to the teachers was elaborated. The aspects identified include lexical sophistication, lexical diversity, lexical error and topic appropriateness. The results of the tests' analyses and the interviews were contrasted, looking for the degree of coherence between them. Results show that, even when there is some degree of coherence between the tests' analyses and what the teachers say they evaluate, lexical error is the most meaningful aspect when comparing Top and Bottom tests. This is so even when teachers considered lexical sophistication as the most important aspect for them when assessing L2 written vocabulary.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1: **Introduction**

The topic of vocabulary in L2 writing has been developed over the last two decades. However, little research can be currently found on the assessment of vocabulary use in L2 writing performance. Some of the main questions that have been addressed in this area of research are related to the sophistication, diversity, accuracy and topic appropriateness of the vocabulary found in L2 writing products. These issues are interesting because there is a need to understand both the different aspects related to the learners' performance when writing in their L2. These aspects are, in turn, closely related to the features of vocabulary that teachers consider important when evaluating a concrete performance of L2 writing.

We report here a research study that aims at productive vocabulary and L2 writing. The research questions that guide the study are the following:

R.Q. 1: What do teachers state they evaluate when assessing the vocabulary of texts written in English 2?

R.Q.2: What are the differences between two groups of tests at different levels of proficiency in the aspects they consider relevant under RQ1?

R.Q. 3: Are the teachers' statements coherent with the differences in vocabulary features found between the higher and lower proficiency groups of texts?

To answer these questions, we conducted a qualitative analysis including part of the data collected from a previous study (Aranda et al 2013) and new data obtained from a set of interviews to four teachers. The text data comes from tests given to students from the program of English Linguistics and Literature of Universidad de Chile, and the interviews were applied to the teachers that evaluated the tests for the Aranda et al's (2013) study. The interviews were transcribed and analysed to look for specific aspects of vocabulary that teachers considered important when assessing their students' L2 writing. On the other hand, the tests were analysed using two computer tools: the Lexical Frequency Profile (Laufer & Nation, 1995) and Cohmetrix 3.0 (XXXX). Also, topic appropriateness and lexical errors issues were examined by listing the specific words related to the topic of the students' test and the listing of lexical errors in the same tests. These lists were compared with each one of the tests to measure the quantity of appropriate words regarding the topic and the quantity of lexical errors in each one of them. Two groups of texts at different proficiency levels were compared in relation to these measures. A final analysis was conducted exploring the coherence between what the teachers said they considered important features of vocabulary and the differences actually found between the two groups of texts.

This research report is organised as follows: Chapter 1 introduces the main constructs, the rationale and the general design of the study. Chapter 2 presents the literature reviewed for the study, including a revision of the most significant studies regarding vocabulary and L2 writing, lexical sophistication, lexical diversity, lexical errors and topic appropriateness. Chapter 3 presents the methodology used for the study, including the corresponding procedures for data

collection and data analysis. Chapter 4 reports the results of the study and in

Chapter 5 we offer a discussion of those results considering the main topics of

our literature review and the results of the study. Finally, Chapter 6 presents the

conclusion and limitations of the study as well as some suggestions for further

research on the area of vocabulary assessment in L2 writing.

Chapter 2: **Literature Review**

2.1 Introduction

According to Agustín Llach (2011) the L2 writing process constitutes a productive skill that "materialises through the visual channel" (2011;40). He explains that traditional views of L2 writing (such as the structuralist and behaviourist schools) relegated writing as a mere rendition of the oral language. Current views, however, support the idea that both skills act as independent, different, but related ways of communication (see, e.g. Harklau, 2002; Matsuda, 2003: 16; Weigle, 2002: 14 in Llach, 2012).

On the other hand, research on English language learning has addressed attention towards the importance of the development of vocabulary knowledge because it affects higher-level language processes. For example, August et al. explain that English language learners "who experience slow vocabulary development are less able to comprehend text at grade level than their English-only peers, and they may be at risk of being diagnosed as learning disabled, when in fact their limitation is due to limited English vocabulary and poor comprehension..." (2005;50). Vocabulary learning is then a fundamental component of the general process of L2 acquisition.

The authors also explain that knowing a word implies both depth and breadth of word knowledge. The former involves aspects like literal meaning, connotations, syntactic constructions, morphological options, and semantic associations in relation to a word. The latter, refers to the amount of known or

learned words. In this regard, they also indicate that previous research suggests that English language learners have a limited breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge when compared with monolingual English speakers.

Based on Cassany (1989) and Weigle (2002), Agustín Llach (2011) indicates that, "as regards vocabulary, writing displays a wider variety of words and words of lower frequency than oral texts" (p. 40). The relationship between vocabulary and writing is thus based on their mutual influence. In this regard, she states that both skills interact in a twofold manner as L2 writing practice helps to improve L2 vocabulary/lexical competence. In turn, vocabulary knowledge is critical for the writing activity and is considered a standard criterion for assessing writing.

2.2 The role of vocabulary in L2 writing proficiency

Vocabulary as part of the main criterion or indicators of writing quality has been justified by Agustin Llach. She observes that vocabulary is a qualitative scoring criterion found on most of scoring scales either holistic or analytic. Also, the choice of a lexical feature is often a "criteria descriptor when dealing with vocabulary use in compositions" (2011;63). Secondly, vocabulary becomes a quantitative criterion of writing quality as measures of lexical richness (like those we discuss in sections 2.6.1 and 2.6.2) have been found to correlate with essay scores of L2 writing proficiency.

Laufer and Nation (1995) explain that one of the characteristics of a well-written composition is the effective use of a rich vocabulary. They suggest that such feature influences positively on the reader. Along this line of thought, Fritz

and Ruegg (2013) review some proposals that have been made in order to define and characterise the quality of L2 writing in relation to vocabulary use. They quote Reid (2000), for example, who describes good vocabulary in a written essay as including both low-frequency and topic-appropriate words, a high percentage of content words, and no or few lexical errors. Overall, however, little is known about the specific relation between vocabulary, quality in written compositions, and the needed skills for it, as pointed out by Olinghouse and Wilson (2012).

2.3 Productive vs. receptive vocabulary abilities

According to Milton (2009), there is a distinction that can be drawn between the concepts of receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge. Receptive (or passive) vocabulary knowledge refers to the words that are recognized when heard or read. Productive (or active) vocabulary knowledge refers to the words that come to mind when speaking or writing. Receptive vocabulary knowledge is known to be larger than its productive counterpart.

Lee and Muncie (2006) also point out that most of the studies on vocabulary are devoted to receptive vocabulary, mainly because receptive knowledge is essential for production to occur. The relationship is also characterised by the fact that for vocabulary production, to occur, word selection is necessary. Meara & Fitzpatrick (2000) observe, for example, that the learner's productive lexicon involved in L2 writing performance is context-specific. This means that, depending on the context, the speaker is going to make the appropriate vocabulary choice to express himself appropriately.

The idea of vocabulary production being content dependent is further elaborated by Laufer and Nation (1999), who make a more specific distinction between the ability to produce a word response to a teacher's elicitation and to produce spontaneous wording. According to the authors, the former constitutes a case of free vocabulary production, i.e. the ability of making use of word on one's free will. On the other hand, the latter case corresponds to what they name controlled vocabulary production, i.e. the ability of using certain words when compelled to do so by a determined context, such as a filling-the-blank activity or a sentence-writing task. Overall, these proposals agree in that producing vocabulary requires developing a specific production ability that is different but related to that of recognising and interpreting words.

In fact, vocabulary knowledge has been shown to be fundamental for comprehension of L2 written products. Anderson and Freebody (1981), for example, observed a strong correlation between language comprehension and vocabulary. The authors suggest three hypotheses to account for support this correlation:

- The instrumentalist hypothesis: words' learning cause comprehension.
- The verbal aptitude hypothesis: a general ability is the main cause of both vocabulary and comprehension performance.
- The knowledge hypothesis: increases in knowledge cause vocabulary and comprehension skills.

Altogether, these hypotheses convey the idea that production of vocabulary in L2 writing is complex phenomenon consisting of the interaction of

L2 vocabulary knowledge and the corresponding abilities for its comprehension and production.

Laufer and Goldstein (2004) state that lexical knowledge regards the sum of interrelated components of knowledge, such as spoken and written form, word meaning, collocation and grammatical knowledge, connotative and associational and knowledge of social or other constraints to be observed in the use of a word. The authors also propose levels of knowledge, which consider, firstly, the level of familiarity with a word, to finally end in the correct use of the word in free production. Henriksen (1999) proposes three criteria to evaluate lexical knowledge:

- Partial to precise knowledge.

- Shallow to deep knowledge.

- Receptive to productive knowledge.

It is possible to infer that the degree of lexical knowledge, described according to these criteria, is directly related to the subject's performance in other components such as word meaning, grammatical knowledge, written form, etc. Thus, it is possible to assume that the vocabulary performance of an L2 writer can be related to the degree to which the vocabulary used is known by that learner.

2.4 Oral v/s written vocabulary production

As seen in the previous sections, the ability to produce a lexical item in a written text is a complex phenomenon. It seems thus appropriate to make the difference between oral and written vocabulary production as they also influence

22

differently on the performance of an L2 user. As discussed in section 2.3, the knowledge of a word is present in different degrees in the minds of L2 users and may therefore be affected by the mental conditions of the user under conditions of anxiety and confidence. Under such circumstances, for example, the user may feel more or less encouraged to use a more frequent or infrequent word. Also, the different kinds of tasks that the teacher requires from the students involve a different kind of difficulty either if they are written or oral tasks. The difficulties arise from the distinctive features of time and mental processes involved in the production of oral vs. written works.

The features that differentiate oral and written production have been studied largely. Chafe and Tannen (1987) made an overview of the studies that have taken the objective of identifying the differences between oral and written discourse. According to the authors, the capacity of written discourse to be stored and easily manipulated influenced earlier studies dealing with this issue. Later on the focus turned to oral language, as seen in the work of authors such as Saussure, Sapir and Bloomfield. Halliday (1979) stated, for example, that oral discourse involve more complex structures but a low use of content words. On the other hand, written discourse is characterized by simpler structures but more content words than spoken language. Some other studies have studied these factors separately (for example, Altman, 1996 and Laufer 1994).

Some research has been carried out on the oral production vocabulary. For example, Altman (1996) conducted a case study in an attempt to propose stages of development in vocabulary acquisition. He recorded oral samples to study the vocabulary output. This longitudinal study observed the development

of a single English speaking subject taking a course of Hebrew. Three first sample was recorded after three hundred hours of instruction, and then a recording every 100 hours of instruction. The recording collection lasted five and a half years. Results showed that new vocabulary appeared gradually over time. However, Altman wanted to know how the input received on classes contributed to this improvement. The analysis showed that half of the new lexical entries were due to the entries of the task that incorporated key terms for the activity. It was also possible to determine that the most important aspect of the new lexis were their morphological patterns. Especially with verbs, the ability to internalize verbs and their morphological construction is what made the subject able to produce new vocabulary. This could be particularly remarkable on Hebrew because it is a language that relies highly on morphological aspects as roots and affixations. Oral vocabulary production also seems to increase over time of instruction, and the most important aspect that encourages its improvement, according to Altman's work, could be the internalization of grammar rules.

Laufer (1994) conducted a study on the improvement of vocabulary in L2 writing production and wanted to find out if this changed over time. Under the non-existence of longitudinal studies to observe the development of writing production, she took twenty five Israeli first year University students of English and applied to them a series of writing tasks over the period of one year. She observed the lexical quality of the texts by means of the Lexical Frequency Profile. This is a computational programme that identifies how frequent are the words used in particular texts (see a more detailed description in section 2.6.2 below). The main assumption behind this procedure is, simply put, that better

texts have less frequent words. She also studied the lexical variation of those texts by calculating the *type/token ratio* of the texts, i.e. the relation between words that repeat in a text vs. the total word count of the same text. The assumption here was that better texts had less repetition of words (i.e. a higher Type/Token ratio). Any improvement on their productive performance was regarded as *incidental* vocabulary learning, because their program did not include explicit vocabulary training. The learners had to write in total three compositions: one at the beginning of the year, one at the end of first semester, and the last at the end of the second semester. To analyze them, the compositions of the same learner were grouped and the Lexical Frequency Profile (henceforth LFP) and Type/Token ratio were compared between them to find out how much the learners had improved in the sophistication and variation of their vocabulary in their writing performance.

Her results demonstrate that the changes occurred and that they were statistically significant. After one or two semesters of instruction, the subjects decreased the proportion of the most frequent words, while the non-frequent words increased. However, there was no significant improvement on the diversity of vocabulary, and in some students there was no improvement at all. These results also demonstrate that there is no direct relation between the increase of the lexical sophistication and lexical diversity (see sections 2.6.2 and 2.6.3 for more details on these constructs). As will be seen in the next section, measures of sophistication and diversity of vocabulary use in L2 writing production have been an important line of research in the area.

The distinction of oral and written productions for the students of an L2 is relevant as the difficulties and abilities required are different. Structures and use of words can be different between each other. The fact that retrieval in oral speech is online implies less time to select appropriate lexical items. The result is that the analysis of vocabulary use is more difficult in the oral media as there are less chances for less frequent words to appear in an oral text.

2.5 Assessment of L2 writing vocabulary performance

Quoting Bachman (1990), Laufer and Goldstein state that vocabulary tests should be formulated according to what the takers need, beyond the knowledge of decontextualized words. Different researchers recommend also different types of vocabulary tests, depending on the approach to the vocabulary knowledge. In their study, Laufer and Goldstein (2004) mention that vocabulary tests are based on just one of the subcomponents of knowledge components model measure, that is to say, comprehension of meaning, production of meaning, vocabulary use or word association.

According to Saville-Troike (1984) and Laufer (1997), tests of vocabulary size have been able to predict success in writing, reading, general language proficiency and academic achievement. These findings support the idea that there is a correspondence between vocabulary and general language skills, such as reading and writing. However, this evidence is limited by the fact that the tests are not designed to observe vocabulary in free production (see section 2.3) and thus vocabulary use is not observed in natural performance.

In relation to the assessment of L2 writing products, Laufer and Nation (1995) point out that there are four important measurements of vocabulary in written essays, namely: *lexical originality*, which refers to the number of tokens unique to one writer in the group divided by the total number of tokens used; *lexical density*, which refers to the percentage of lexical words in a text divided by the total number of words; *lexical words*, which are the content words, that is to say nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs; and finally, *lexical sophistication*, which is the comparison of advanced words in the composition with the total number of words.

In relation to the assessment of L2 writing vocabulary, Hiebert et al. (2007) indicate that there is a lot of work to do in relation to theoretical and practical aspects. Tradition, convenience, and psychometric standards have influenced the little work available on vocabulary assessment. The lack of clarity in the conceptualization of vocabulary and its relationship with other language assessment skills (like reading comprehension, for example), have also affected our understanding of vocabulary assessment. The man issue to account for here is the relationship between vocabulary learning, L2 writing proficiency and the other areas of vocabulary knowledge.

In this respect, Lee and Muncie (2006) point out that vocabulary size is considered an indicator of general language ability. The authors also propose that language ability is related to reading comprehension and quality of writing. The quality of a composition in an L2 is thus determined by the effective use of appropriate vocabulary, as also proposed by Laufer and Nation (1999) (see section 2.2 above).

According to the study of Laufer and Goldstein (2004) there is a hierarchy of vocabulary skills, understood within the passive/ active framework for vocabulary knowledge explained in section 2.3 above. *Active recall* is thus the ability to supply the target word in actual production. *Passive recall* is, in contrast, the ability to supply the meaning of a target word. *Active recognition* is the ability to recognize the target word when given its meaning. Finally, *passive recognition* is the ability to recognize the meaning of a target word when given meaning options (easier skill). These four constructs are essentially based on two dichotomous distinctions, namely: the ability of replacing a word form for a given meaning versus replacing the meaning for a given form, and the ability to recall versus recognizing word forms and/ or meanings.

Regarding vocabulary skills, Duin and Graves (1987) remark also the importance of intensive vocabulary instruction as a prewriting stage in order to improve learner's writing quality. The importance of teacher's elicitation in relation to learner's vocabulary skills is confirmed by Lee (2003). In his study, he worked with ESL subjects, and made two main activities based on writing. In the first one, the subjects had to write about a topic without teacher's instruction. He found that, when there is no teacher elicitation, only a 13.19% of the recognized vocabulary relevant to a writing topic was productive in a context of L2 composition. Then, the researcher provided target vocabulary, and the productive target vocabulary increased to 63.62%. This suggests that there is an important relation between target vocabulary instruction and production of target vocabulary.

Crucially, Laufer and Nation (1995) also state that learners are not able to reflect their vocabulary size when making productive use of language. This means that the L2 writer is not able to bring the complete set of words in his mind into productive vocabulary. This suggests that learning new vocabulary may not be necessarily effective to improve the use of such vocabulary in L2 writing production. Therefore, the authors suggest that an appropriate explicit target vocabulary instruction may allow a learner to improve significant aspects of his/her writing tasks. This is so because the learner can see how meaning can be successfully codified when an appropriate vocabulary choice has been made. Therefore, L2 instruction may help in making the learner able to transfer more and better context-specific receptive vocabulary into free productive vocabulary.

The presentation so far has concentrated on factors that are related to the individual L2 writer features. This perspective should be complemented by characterising the process of rating and judging the quality on L2 written product. In instructional contexts, the quality of L2 writing performance and the vocabulary used in it is assessed by language teachers.

2.5.1 Teacher's judgements

Teachers' judgements are thus another indicator of the quality of the vocabulary used by L2 writers. According to Schaefer (2008), there has been an increasing attention towards raters and what they do when assessing second language learners' writing. This is because it is expected that judgements of performance quality are performed consistently and objectively to obtain ratings reflecting learners' abilities and also avoid bias. The term bias was defined by

Engelhard as "the tendency on the part of raters to consistently provide ratings that are lower or higher than is warranted by student performances" (as quoted in Schaefer, 2008).

In this regard, the recognition of the presence of an element of subjectivity in raters' behaviours and judgements has led to the proposal of different models of measurement in research. In a review of models to avoid bias, Schaefer (2008) described different L2 writing studies carried out in Australia. The first was McNamara (1996), who analysed the results of the Occupational English Test (OET) and the second one was Lumley (2002, 2005), who analysed the writing component of the Special Test of English Proficiency (step). Both studies revealed significant differences between raters (which was expected) but also that grammatical accuracy was the most severely rated category, with raters being even unaware of that aspect of L2 writing.

It may result useful to bear in mind some observations in relation to raters' bias made by Schaefer (2008), who found that it appears to be a higher level of severity or leniency on the part of raters' judgements when assessing higher or lower proficient writers, respectively. This, he infers, could be sustained on variations in the raters' expectations caused by the influence of the cases aforementioned. However, he also found cases where the influence of those cases showed the opposite tendency on raters. These findings support the idea that raters are sensitive to some features of a written product than others.

2.5.2 Rater sensitivity to lexical features

Little research has been carried out focused on raters' decisions when assessing essays for lexis. Fritz and Ruegg review studies such as those by Engber (1995), Grobe (1981), and Santos (1988) which suggest that aspects such as the variety of words or the number of lexical errors "can affect a raters' opinion of the overall quality of an essay" (2013;174). However, they also indicate that there are not enough studies supporting a definite answer regarding how raters make a decision on lexis scores.

Fritz and Ruegg (2013) followed this research subject and expressed awareness of the complexity of the rating process through quoting Lumley (2002): "we can never really be sure which of the multitude of influences raters have relied on in making their judgments, or how they arbitrated between conflicting components of the scale" (2013;175). Fritz and Ruegg (2013) conducted a study based on findings and limitations of a previous study by Fritz, Ruegg, and Holland (2011). Their aim was to answer whether raters were sensitive either to accuracy, sophistication, or range of words when rating essays for lexis. A previous observational study analysing the lexis scores of EFL students (in Fritz, Ruegg, and Holland, 2011) revealed accuracy as the single significant predictor of score (i.e.: the more errors an essay had the lower the lexis score was). However, these results are limited by the fact that the sample essays used in the study were not representative of the wide range of students' proficiency.

The study was conducted on the writing section of an in-house, general proficiency test given annually at a foreign language university in Japan by

students majoring in English as a foreign language. Twenty seven raters were selected. They were experienced and qualified EFL university instructors (with master's degrees in TESOL or in the area of linguistics). According to their results, only accuracy was the statistically significant feature (Fritz and Ruegg, 2013, p. 178).

2.6 Standard measures of lexical richness

Assessment on L2 writing vocabulary has taken importance on the recent years of linguistic research, and thus several measures have emerged to quantify its features. Two of the most studied features that define lexical richness are lexical diversity and lexical sophistication. These two have developed tools and calculations to allow quantitative studies in this respect. The following chapters will define these concepts further and show how its studies have contributed to the study of L2 written vocabulary.

2.6.1 Lexical Diversity

Lexical diversity, also known as lexical variation, is a feature of lexical richness and has been defined as "the range and variety of vocabulary deployed in a text by either a speaker or a writer"(Mcarthy & Jarvis, 2007). This variable is applicable either to written and oral discourse. The rationale for the construct of diversity is that vocabulary use can be characterised by the amount of different types of words that an individual is able to produce in a text. The general assumption here is that samples that show high lexical diversity indicate that the subject has a higher command of the language than the one that have lower lexical diversity.

There are many different ways to measure lexical diversity. The traditional operation to measure Lexical Diversity is to consider two variables, namely: the total number of word forms of a text and the amount of different words that were produced in it. These variables are called *Tokens* and *Types*, respectively as Koizumi (2012) mentions. Some of the most important measures

33

presenter by her are based on the *TTR* relation, including: *Type/Token Ratio* (*TTR*) , Giroud's Index *R*, *D* , and *MTLD* . The variety of measures for lexical diversity is a result of the main problem that the construct faces, namely the problem of comparing texts with different quantity of words.

A main problem in interpreting these measures of lexical diversity is that they are known to be sensitive to text length. The performance on the text of an L2 writer in terms of lexis innovation changes dramatically if one takes into consideration that writers repeat words as texts become longer. In other words, the longer the text grows, it is more possible that the writer will recur to words that he or she had already used. Therefore, in the process of writing, types get harder to increase and the tokens keep summing up. In simple terms, the lengthier the text is, the lower the TTR score gets. Different measures thus, attempt to solve this problem by "stabilising" the computation of *TTR*. The variety of ways in which this has been attempted is noticeable in the literature.

As indicated above, *TTR* is obtained by dividing the number of different words with the total of words in a text. Giraud´s Index calculates the division of the types with the square root of the total tokens. *D* takes a different perspective on sample selection, by taking 35 random tokens and calculating *TTR* on them. This action is repeated one hundred times, and the result is the mean of the one hundred outcomes. To obtain *MTLD*, we must "Count (x) the number of times the text reaches *TTR* of 0.72 or below, from the beginning of the text through to the end." (Koizumi, 2012).

Mellor (2010) introduces other types of measures as Yule's *K*, *Hapax*, and *Advanced Giraud*. Yule's *K* is a measure that involves the number of words

34

types occurring in the text, how many times these words have occurred, and the total of tokens in the text. The Hapax calculation takes into account, in basic terms, the number of words that occurred only once in a text. It is claimed to be a reliable measure to identify native speakers and learners of a language. Finally, Advanced Giraud addresses a formula similar to Giraud´s Index (i.e. types divided by the square root of the tokens) but, in spite of the word types, it takes into consideration advanced word types. Advanced word types are then divided by the square root of the total tokens. Advanced word types are then sorted by subtracting the frequent types from the total types of the text.

Mellor (2010) tested a model based on the dimensions of quantity and content to predict the assessment of humans and showed that this combined model was better than a single dimension model to account for lexical diversity. Furthermore, he also wanted to analyze which lexical diversity measuring tool worked best. His study includes a review of some of the most important tools to measure lexical diversity. The analysis of them had as one of its objectives to find out which tool had received the less impact from text length. To this purpose, he defined quantity as essay length and by content he meant lexical diversity.

Mellor's (2010) study consisted of the collection of 34 essays from Japanese third year students of English as a foreign language at university. They had to write a thirty-minute essay that was later evaluated by a native speaker judge to sort them on five categories: good, above average, average, below average, and poor. To observe the importance of Lexical diversity he analysed the essays with several lexical diversity measures

As stated before, Mellor (2010) presents the problem of the standard TTR measure. Giraud's index is a response to the problem of TTR, as it divides by the square root of the number of word tokens, reducing the effect of lengthier texts. Other measures that work as a response to the issue of text length are Yule's K and D. Yule's K uses a formula that is proficient in its objective to be independent of text length, however it needs to be used in texts of one thousand words or longer. *D* is also calculated from a complex formula, however with the possibility to be used in shorter texts.

However, the study of Mellor did not take into consideration *MTLD*, which demonstrated to be an effective tool for the research carried out by Koizumi (2012). The objective of her study was to find out the lexical diversity measure that is less affected by text length. She also had the objective of exploring if there were any measure that was more appropriate to analyze short L2 texts (i.e. of less than one hundred words). To this purpose, she collected recorded samples from 20 Japanese learners of English as a foreign Language at junior and senior high schools. The records were from topics that were familiar and easy to develop by them. Each text lasted 225 seconds. From the 20 selected samples, Koizumi split each of them in 25 segments. These segments were of 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100, 110, 120, 130, 140, 150, 160, 170, 180, 190, and 200 tokens. Each of these segments had to pass through the four different lexical diversity measures (*TTR*, Giraud's Index, *D*, and *MTLD*).

The outcome of the study showed that *TTR*, Giraud, and *D*, were considerably affected by text length as it changed significantly between 50 to 100, 100 to 150, and 150 to 200 tokens. However, *MTLD* was not seriously

affected by text length. Regarding the analysis of short texts, *MTLD* also showed to be sensitive on the texts of 50 to 100 tokens. According to these results, Koizumi suggests that texts of 100 tokens should be considered as the minimum to carry out a research on *MTLD*.

2.6.2 Lexical Sophistication

Laufer and Nation (1995) define lexical sophistication as basically "the percentage of advanced words in the text" (p.309). They then make the point that the label 'advanced' "would depend on the researcher's definition" (p. 309) and that it should be determined by taking the learner's proficiency level into account. The weakness of the lexical sophistication construct arises then, according to the authors, from the fact that analysis on lexical sophistication of a same piece of writing will vary according to how 'advanced' vocabulary is defined, resulting in an unstable measure with limited uses, seriously flawed to be considered a valid and reliable tool of measurement (Laufer, 1994).

Other definitions of lexical sophistication are possible to find in Tidball and Treffers-Daller (2008). They quote Read (2000), for example, who defines lexical sophistication as "the use of technical terms and jargon as well as the kind of uncommon words that allow writers to express their meanings in a precise and sophisticated manner"(p.299). Malvern et al. (2004), in turn, define lexical sophistication as the appropriate use of low frequency vocabulary items.

The Lexical Frequency Profile was devised due to the limitations found in various measures of lexical richness such as *lexical originality*, *lexical density*, *lexical sophistication* and *lexical variation* (see Laufer, 1994 and Laufer and

Nation, 1995). The LFP procedure calculates the percentage of words used in a text at different vocabulary frequency levels. In this regard, Laufer proposes two different measures, one for advanced students and the other for less proficient students.

Calculations of LFP proceed by observing the total number of word families in order to classify and analyse them in terms of the first 1000 most frequent words, the second 1000 most frequent words, the academic vocabulary (UWL-University World List), and the words that may not be present in any of the afore mentioned lists.

2.7 Non-Standard measures of lexical richness

Although there are several studies that support the idea that lexical sophistication and lexical diversity are appropriate measures to discriminate lexical richness skills, it has been argued that there are other factors that demonstrate how skillful learners are in their L2 writing proficiency (Laufer and Nation, 1995).

There are other features beyond the standard ones that may conceivably affect teachers' sensibility, as the use of words appropriate to the subject and the low appearances of lexical mistakes that are not incorporated in the studies that have taken into account lexical sophistication and lexical diversity. The following sections address important points of lexical richness beyond the standards, including accuracy, intrinsic difficulty and topic appropriateness.

2.7.1 Accuracy

Accurate use of vocabulary can also be considered, at least theoretically, as an indicator of L2 writing proficiency. Lexical errors are also claimed as one of the most frequent types of errors found in written English (Meara, 1984). We understand lexical errors as the mistaken choice of a lexical item. Such kind of error often causes misunderstanding of the intending message as they affect directly to the meaning of the chosen words. Hemchua and Schmitt (2006) made an analysis of lexical errors made by Thai learners of English. They subcategorized lexical errors in different types to know the most frequent lexical errors they make and how these errors can be a result of transfer with their L1.

Their study consisted of 20 participants which were Thai English majors in their third year at university. They started to get English writing experience in their first year of university. Then they submitted for a paragraph writing course. Their instruction was never focused on vocabulary. They had to write an argumentative composition of about 300-350 words, in one and a half hours. The topic of the text was about urban and country life. The compositions were corrected by two native English teachers. Lexical errors were classified by the researchers into twenty four subcategories. The study only considered lexical errors; i.e syntactic errors were not taken into consideration. On the other hand, morphological errors were evaluated as they involved word structure. To classify the errors, they wanted to make clear boundaries by drawing numerous and specific categorisations. By their large error framework, they were able to carry out a quantitative study of the lexical mistakes in the writing samples.

In the analysis of their samples, the average was of 13.05 errors per paper. The most common mistakes involved near synonyms, preposition partners and incorrect suffixation. The most infrequent were prefix type, false friends, blending, and inappropriate co-hyponyms. Some other categories were not present at all: categories of vowel-bases formal errors, L1 borrowing, coinage, and using overly specific terms. These results show that there are specific types of errors that are especially difficult for the students to overcome.

Taking into consideration the formal type of errors, the most frequent error was the formal misselection of words (15.33% of all errors), followed by intralingual distortions (14.56%). However, L1 influenced errors were not important problems (6.9%). Regarding the misselection they blame the incomplete learning of the derivative forms of correctly acquired forms.

Regarding semantic type errors, the most frequent were collocation errors (26,05%). The other most important category was the confusion of sense relations (24,9%). Considering the broad categories, the semantic errors doubled in frequency the formal errors. In addition, near synonyms is the single most frequent type of error that is under the category of "confusion of sense relations". "These results suggest that formal errors were less problematic for the students than semantic errors." (Hemchua and Schmitt, 2006).

Among the twenty four error types, near synonyms were the most frequent, and it was also the type of error that was most present in all the papers. The three most frequent types of error (near synonyms, preposition partners, and suffix type) involved more than the 40% of the total of errors.

The study concludes then that "identifying the underlying cause of error is inexact and problematic. Nevertheless, in many cases a likely cause can be identified" (Hemchua and Schmitt, 2006). Thanks to their results, they calculated that 23.75% of the errors are attributable to L1 influence. Then, Thai language was not the most important issue in the lexical errors made by the subjects. However, it is still a significant factor that cannot be left aside in a study of lexical errors. It is also important to consider that the Thai language is not as similar to English as other languages as Spanish, and then it is expectable to find that in other languages the influence of interference between languages is different.

2.7.2 Intrinsic difficulty

There is much research on the interlinguistic interferences that hinder L2 learners from developing more proficient performances in their L2. Other less obvious factors have also been considered in L2 vocabulary research. The learners have to face the formal structure of some words that seem to be difficult to learn from anybody that is not a native speaker. A word can be difficult to learn or produce correctly in L2 writing because of its intrinsic properties such as length, or pronunciation complexity.

Swan (1997), for example, reviews the influence of the L1 in learning the vocabulary of a second language, addressing the intrinsic difficulties of words. He states that we all have an intuitive notion on vocabulary that let us state that some items are easier or harder than others. This notion usually arises from words that are long, that carry meanings with unclear boundaries, which are

difficult to pronounce due to consonant cluster, etcetera. Swan exemplifies these difficulties by saying that "an English child will learn to use the words postman, fat, and run earlier and more easily than collateral, metaphysical or denigrate".

However, Swan also claims that in the instance of learning a second language, the mother tongue will have an important influence on the way the learner approaches these difficulties. Hemchua and Schmitt (2006) wanted to compare quantitatively the number of errors caused by L1 influence and the ones made by intrinsic difficulty. Their findings demonstrated that most of the errors are due to the intrinsic difficulties of the language rather than due to L1 influence. However, if we complement these results with Swan's reflections, we can suggest that the mother tongue of the learners may play an important role in the occurrence of errors at the level of vocabulary

2.7.3 Topic appropriateness

There is not much research on the study of the influence of the number of topic appropriate words in the assessment of L2 written vocabulary and its use as a factor of lexical richness. In writing tasks, L2 students usually have to develop on a particular topic that may or may not be familiar for them. English classes involve vocabulary instruction in many domains which the teachers evaluate afterwards. There is not much research on teachers' judgement regarding the appropriate use of vocabulary according to a given topic. However, we can find studies which suggest that using appropriate vocabulary is a difficult task and that success in it is a meaningful indicator of proficiency development.

For example, a study carried out by Pulido (2003) observed how topic familiarity, second language reading proficiency, second language passage sight, affect incidental vocabulary acquisition. She tried to establish a relation with the personal difference between learners in their incidental vocabulary acquisition skills. The study implied that a factor such as topic familiarity would have an important impact on incidental vocabulary acquisition and the retention of that vocabulary. Then the gains in the reading of a familiar topic would be much greater than in the reading of an unfamiliar topic.

The assumption here helped us inferring that there is a facilitating factor for learners when they address familiar topics. The learners would be able to acquire a higher amount of vocabulary on the topics they feel comfortable with, and then able to produce richer texts on that topics. In Pulido's study, English speaking students of Spanish as an L2, were asked to read four narratives. Two of them had familiar vocabulary, titled "The trip to the supermarket" and "The doctor's appointment". The remaining texts involved less familiar vocabulary, which were titled "Publishing an article", and "Buying a house". These students had to answer a familiarity questionnaire that confirmed the first two texts were more familiar to them than the last two texts. The results showed that after two days, the vocabulary retention of the familiar topics was higher than the less familiar topics. Although this difference diminishes over time, it can be observed over the development of L2 proficiency.

In a related study, Stapleton (2013) carries out a research where he studies content familiarity subject. He studied the writing of Japanese university students of English. The aim was to observe their critical thinking skills as

reflected in their writing. Results demonstrated that the best critical thinking texts were generated from the familiar topics from where the learners were able to develop the content further

These studies demonstrate that it is correct to hold the assumption that teachers can expect richer texts in terms of content complexity and vocabulary from tasks in which the students feel more familiar writing about. This agrees with Laufer and Nation (1995) when they state that "there are many factors besides vocabulary size that could affect lexical richness in writing. These could include familiarity with the topic, skill in writing, and communicative purpose. This means, for example, that a change of topic could result in a marked change in lexical richness." In the same way, the teachers can expect that the students must be able to develop better vocabulary from the topics they have had instruction. Using pertinent vocabulary in writing is then a possible measure of lexical performance by the teachers.

2.8 Conclusion to the literature review

The literature reviewed in this chapter supports the idea that the field of study focused on the assessment of vocabulary use in L2 writing performance requires further research as it is still in its initial stages of development. As it was possible to observe, it was not until recently that the L2 writing process acquired a more relevant role as a productive skill, and that productive vocabulary started to be recognized as a central element. This was based on its role in both the development of L2 acquisition, and as a criterion in the assessment of L2 writing.

Based on Laufer and Goldstein's criteria to evaluate lexical knowledge (2004) we have been inferred that the vocabulary performance of an L2 writer may depend, to some extent, on how much of the vocabulary known by the learner is actually used. Notwithstanding this, readings concerning findings, both on the standard measures of lexical richness and on teacher's judgements when assessing L2 writing performance, seem to account for a complexity not fully understood yet. On the one hand, how significant are the lexical variables reviewed in relation to the quality of a L2 writing? On the other hand, how much this significance influences, or correlates with the raters' scores on L2 writings?

It seems thus important to investigate the assessment of vocabulary use in L2 writing performance. The study reported in the next chapters addresses these issues by asking the teachers which are the most important factors in the evaluation of L2 written vocabulary, and then comparing these results with the actual evaluations of written tests.

Chapter 3: **Methodology**

The present study has the purpose of looking for some of the variables that English L2 teachers use when they assess vocabulary in L2 writing. As shown in Chapter 2, the use of vocabulary in the production of a written text in an L2 is a complex phenomenon involving several factors that make it easier or more difficult for students to use words. The study was guided by three research questions, namely:

R.Q. 1: *What do teachers state they evaluate when assessing the vocabulary of texts written in English 2?*

R.Q.2: *What are the differences between two groups of tests at different levels of proficiency in the aspects they consider relevant under RQ1?*

R.Q. 3: *Are the teachers' statements coherent with the differences in vocabulary features found between the higher and lower proficiency groups of texts?*

To answer Research Question 1 (henceforth RQ1), we interviewed a group of teachers in relation to their perceptions of what good vocabulary use in L2 writing consisted of. Under Research Question 2 (henceforth RQ2), we compared two groups of texts written by English L2 university-level students at different proficiency levels. The aim here was to identify features of the vocabulary of those texts that could explain the proficiency difference. To answer RQ3, the data from RQ1 and RQ2 was observed in combination in order to evaluate the extent to which the perceptions of the teachers was related to the actual differences observed between the two groups of text samples.

The research design proposed here is, therefore, of a semi-exploratory exploratory nature, as it will be describing well-established vocabulary features as well as less-studied ones. The study is also of a qualitative nature, as it relies on aspects of the meaning and use of vocabulary regardless of the frequency of occurrence of those features.

The following chapter is divided into two sections. Section 3.2 reports and explains the collection of tests taken for the students and the interview data from teachers. Section 3.3 explains the analytical apparatus applied to answer the research questions posed above.

3.1 Data collection procedures

In order to answer the research questions, two types of data were collected. Firstly, four interviews applied to the teachers that evaluated and categorized the same tests for the quoted study. In these interviews, the teachers had to give their opinion about what good written vocabulary is, regarding two samples of the top and bottom tests. Secondly, ten of the tests taken for students for a previous study about feedback in L2 writing (Aranda et al, 2013) that were categorized by four teachers as Top or Bottom, depending on their judgement of the quality of their written vocabulary.

3.1.1 Collection of teachers' interviews

Under RQ1 and RQ3, self-reports were obtained in the form of interviews to the teachers who performed the evaluation used under RQ1 above. To that purpose, we arranged individual interviews with the teachers. It is important to mention that the interviews were taken during December of 2013,

that is to say, about one year after the tests were evaluated by the same teachers. The span between the two assessments of the same text was considered adequate to avoid a biased assessment of the vocabulary of the texts.

The interview consisted of three main questions. The first one was presented without any extra information or instruction regarding the interview, as follows:

> *1. Señale, a grandes rasgos, lo que usted considera como un buen uso de vocabulario escrito en inglés para nuestros estudiantes de pregrado.*

After the first question, the teacher was given two samples of the tests, one from the top and another one from the bottom according to the evaluation in the quoted study. After reading it, the teachers were asked the second question, as follow:

> *2. Subraye o encierre en un círculo ejemplos de lo que usted considera buen uso de vocabulario en las siguientes 2 pruebas.*

After this exercise, the teachers were asked the last question:

> *3. Señale características específicas de estas pruebas que contienen lo que usted consideró como buen uso de vocabulario.*

One of the teachers was interviewed in English, as it was his L2 and Spanish, his L3. The audios were recorded in .wav and .3gp formats, using two cell phones devices. Then, the interviews were transcribed *verbatim* (see appendix E for transcriptions of the interviews).

3.1.2 Collection of text data

Under RQ2 and RQ3, it was necessary to collect a selection of texts written in English by a group of Spanish L1 Chilean writers. The text data was taken from a previous study about written feedback in a university context (Aranda et al, 2013). In that study, students from 2° and 3° year from the program of English Linguistics and Literature of Universidad de Chile were asked to sit for a test, similar to other tests they had performed previously in the program. The participants were 9 students from second year and 10 students from third year.

The students were asked to write an argumentative text of about 250 words under timed conditions (40 minutes) in relation to the following topic (see Appendix A for the form of the test):

> *Should wealthy nations be required to share their wealth among poorer nations by providing such things as food and education? Or is it the responsibility of the governments of poorer nations to look after the citizens themselves?*

In Aranda et al. (2013), the teachers were asked to categorize the tests in terms of the quality of the writing into a group of very good (Top), very bad (Bottom), and not clearly good or bad (Middle. For our study, we selected five tests unanimously categorized as Top and five as Bottom in order to have illustrations of clearly different levels of proficiency according to the judgement of the teachers (see Appendix B to see the complete scripts).

3.2 Data analysis procedures

In order to answer RQ1 and RQ3, the interviews were transcribed and the main information was extracted in search for specific aspects of the tests that teachers look at when assessing vocabulary. The features of vocabulary use that we observed corresponded to those described in section 2.6, namely:

- Lexical Sophistication

- Lexical Diversity

- Topic Appropriateness

- Lexical Error

It is important to consider that teachers not only reported considering different aspects when evaluating L2 written products, but they also did so using their own terminology. The information provided by the teachers was categorized according to the main constructs used to measure lexical features of a text (referred to in Secion 3.1.2). Table 2 in section 4.1.1 summarises the categories that were used to reinterpret the reports by the teachers/ evaluators.

- Identification of Teacher
- Concept or quote from the teacher's interview
- Categorization according to the Theoretical Framework (i.e. lexical sophistication, lexical diversity, lexical accuracy, topic appropriateness)

The information organised in this way was examined in search for common and divergent aspects of vocabulary usage that were of interest for the

teachers. The numbers of times that the teachers mentioned each of the aspects were also counted to have a further indication of their importance to them. Here we were assuming that the more times the aspect is mentioned by the teachers, the most important it is for them when assessing L2 vocabulary writing (see results in section 4.1.1).

In order to answer RQ2, the transcriptions of the Top and Bottom tests were prepared for the application of two computational programmes, namely the Lexical frequency Profile found at the Lexical Tutor website (www.lextutor.ca/vp/eng/) and Cohmetrix 3.0 (www.cohmetrix.memphis.edu). The LFP is used to obtain indicators of lexical sophistication and Cohmetrix is used to obtain results of lexical diversity.

For the LFP analysis, punctuation marks, capital letters, proper nouns, spelling mistakes, words wrongly used and abbreviations were eliminated. Also, the texts had to be written with lower case letter. Then, the text of the tests had to be copy-pasted in the window displayed by LexTutor to submit it. The software then shows the results by means of a lexical profile (see an example below, in figure 1). The same texts were then edited by erasing the inflexions to copy and paste them in Cohmetrix 3.0. The Cohmetrix software was used to observe the MTLD measure of lexical diversity (see section 2.6.1 above).

Figure 1: Example of LFP analysis result

	Families	Types	Tokens	Percent
K1 Words (1-1000):	92	109	294	90.18%
Function:	...	...	(170)	(52.15%)
Content:	...	...	(124)	(38.04%)
> Anglo-Sax	...	...	(53)	(16.26%)
=Not Greco-Lat/Fr Cog:				
K2 Words (1001-2000):	5	5	10	3.07%
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	(2)	(0.61%)
1k+2k	...	...	...	(93.25%)
AWL Words (academic):	10	12	15	4.60%
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	()	(0.00%)
Off-List Words:	?	4	7	2.15%
	107+?	130	326	100%

Current profile

%	Cumul.
90.18	90.18
3.07	93.25
4.60	97.85
2.15	100.00

Words in text (tokens):	326
Different words (types):	130
Type-token ratio:	0.40
Tokens per type:	2.51
Lex density (content words/total)	0.48

Pertaining to onlist only

Tokens:	319
Types:	126
Families:	107
Tokens per family:	2.98
Types per family:	1.18
Anglo-Sax Index: (A-Sax tokens + functors / onlist tokens)	70.53%
Greco-Lat/Fr-Cognate Index: (Inverse of above)	29.47%

In order to obtain data on topic appropriateness and lexical errors, the tests were qualitatively analyzed. In relation to topic appropriateness, the analysis consisted in looking for the specific words related to the test's topic. In relation to lexical errors, we looked for the inappropriate use of words either by formal or semantic means (as defined by Hemchua and Schmitt, 2006). These words were organized in a chart as illustrated in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Example of topic appropriateness analysis

	Test 1
Topic appropriate words	Wealth
	Poor
	Colonialism
	Socieconomic
	Government
	Nations
	Citizens
	Resources
	Culture
	Supplies
	Political
	Refuge

With respect to RQ3, the results from both, the analysis of the tests through lextutor and cohmetrix and the analysis with reference to topic appropriateness and lexical errors were contrasted with the results of the teachers' interviews. The aim of this comparison was to establish the extent to which teachers' judgement expressed in the Top/ Bottom differences were coherent with the indicators of lexical sophistication and diversity actually used in the written performance of the participants. The coherence was established here whenever a particular feature was indicated by one or more of the teachers

(under RQ1) and that feature seemed to be characteristic also of the texts in the

Top or Bottom group (as observed under RQ2).

Chapter 4: **Results**

In this chapter, we will report the results of the analysis explained in Chapter 3 above. This chapter will be organised indicating the results obtained for each research question. Firstly, results for RQ1 indicate the factors that teachers said that are actually evaluated by them. Under RQ2, these factors were evaluated to see the differences between Top and Bottom tests in relation to the proficiency assessment made by the teachers in the study of Aranda et al (2013). Under RQ3, the teacher's reports are explored and contrasted in relation to the distinctive features observed for Top and Bottom groups of texts.

4.1.1 Results for RQ1: Teachers' perceptions on vocabulary assessment

As explained in section 3.2 above, teacher's interviews were analysed in order to identify the key concepts they used when evaluating vocabulary in L2 writing performance. It was then possible to categorise them broadly as referring to some of the established indicators of vocabulary use in L2 writing (as reviewed in Sections 2.6 and 2.7 above). In Table 2 the results of this reinterpretation are summarised. It is important to remark that the table displays the opinions of each one of the teachers, the quote of importance and the categorisation of the concept in the quote (in columns 1, 2 and 3, respectively):

Table 2: Teachers' interviews

Teacher	Concept or quote	Categorization according to the Theoretical Framework
1	""Establecer contextualmente terminos o conceptos que sean pertinentes"	Topic Appropriateness
1	"No me queda claro porqué esta persona optó por entrecomillar estos conceptos"	Lexical Error
1	"Hubiese sido mucho mas eficiente si el escritor o autor de este texto no hubiese sido tan redundante ni tan repetitivo con el termino "nation"	Lexical Diversity
1	" Hay una diferencia sustancial entre el concepto "nation" y "country", no son lo mismo, entonces acá de momentos también, se confunden los dos conceptos y se usan como sinónimos"	Lexical errors
2	"Alcanzar niveles comunicativos lo más específicos posibles, idealmente en el mundo académico"	Lexical Sophistication
2	"Conceptos más complejos"	Lexical Sophistication
2	"Abuso de comillas para dar cuenta de la especificidad"	Lexical Error
3	"Tiene que ser (el vocabulario) amplio, pertinente"	Lexical Diversity/Topic Appropriateness

3	"Tiene que estar relacionado con Depth and Breadth"	Lexical Sophistication/Lexical Diversity
3	"Uso de vocabulario de mas baja frecuencia"	Lexical Sophistication
3	"repetición de palabras claves"	Lexical Diversity
3	"El alumno no tiene claro...que es lo que significa el uso de las comillas"	Lexical Errors
4	"I would prefer the kind of vocabulary that is very descriptive, rich vocabulary"	Lexical Sophistication
4	"avoiding general adjectives"	Lexical sophistication
4	"It's using very complex vocabulary in the right situation"	Lexical sophistication

As can be observed in Table 2 above, the teachers referred in general to the same topics. As expected, the overall claim is that the main four factors that are evaluated in vocabulary are: Lexical sophistication, lexical diversity, lexical errors, and topic appropriateness. However, some teachers did not mention some of these features in their interviews. Teacher 1, for example, did not mention lexical sophistication; Teacher 2 did not mention topic appropriateness; and Teacher 4 only mentioned lexical sophistication. It is important to remark that some teachers mentioned issues related to grammatical words and discourse markers. For example, teacher 4 indicates that he paid attention to discourse markers and words which marked progression and order in the discourse. We did

not take these aspects into account in our study as we focused strictly on the judgement towards the lexical value of the texts. A remarkable finding is that three of the four teachers were concerned about the bad use of quotation marks. Teacher number 2 stated that it is a normal issue in Chilean learners of English, and it has to do when the speaker or writer do not know the precise word and uses another semantically close word with quotation marks. Due to this, we decided to include this phenomenon into the lexical error in section 4.1.2 as it can be seen as a case of semantic inaccuracy. The conclusion is that there is an overall agreement on what the teachers say they evaluate, and the variety of possibilities is reduced to the four variables already indicated.

However, if we count the times in which the factors of evaluation were present in teachers' answers (even if they were repeated by the same teacher) we have the following results:

Table 3: Teachers' mentions

Topic appropriateness	2
Lexical errors	4
Lexical diversity	4
Lexical sophistication	7

This distribution suggests that, although all factors are considered by teachers, topic appropriateness seems to be a less relevant construct than the others. In contrast, these results also suggest that lexical sophistication is a very important factor for the assessment of these teachers.

4.1.2 Results for RQ2: Lexical features of Top vs. Bottom tests

The texts collected here, i.e. Top vs. Bottom groups were compared in relation to two standard measures, lexical sophistication and lexical diversity, that have been studied widely in the L2 vocabulary literature. The tests were examined also on two non-standard measures, namely lexical errors and topic appropriateness. After calculating the average of responses of the teachers in these two broad labels (standard and non-standard measures), we can observe that the standard measures are more present in their answers about what do they say they assess than non-standard ones.

4.1.2.1 Standard measures: LFP and MTLD

As explained in section above, the tests were divided into a Top and a Bottom groups by the prior evaluation of the teachers. Then, they were measured by means of the Lexical Frequency Profile to observe their lexical sophistication. The results of this procedure are shown in Table 4 and 5, respectively.

Table 4: Top tests' lexical profile

	Text 1	Text 6	Text 7	Text 16	Text 39	average
K1 %	83,97	90,77	90,18	86,1	84,03	**87,01**
K2 %	6,09	4,8	3,07	6,1	4,94	**5**
AWL %	4,3	3,32	4,6	6,1	6,84	**5,032**
Off-List %	5,73	1,11	2,15	1,69	4,18	**2,972**

Table 5: Bottom tests' lexical profile

	Text 9	Text 10	Text 28	Text 42	Text 56	Average
K1 %	90,53	87,74	89,76	88,28	92,41	**89,744**
K2 %	4,21	3,77	5,37	3,45	3,45	**4,05**
AWL %	4,74	5,19	3,9	4,83	2,07	**4,146**
Off-List %	0,53	3,3	0,98	3,45	2,07	**2,066**

As indicated in section 4.1.1 above, lexical sophistication is the aspect of vocabulary that the teachers agreed and stressed the most in the interviews. The results and comparison of both tables show that there is indeed a better performance on the Top texts regarding the LFP profile. The Top tests show the use of a lower proportion of K1 words. This means that they recur less to the most frequent words of English. The rest of the measures contribute to this suggestion as they demonstrate that the Top tests have a more extensive use of

more infrequent vocabulary. For example, the average of K2 words in the Bottom tests is 4,05% while in the Top tests it is 5%.

However, there were tests in the Bottom group which had better results on some variables than some tests in the Top group. For example, we can observe that text 42 of the Bottom group had less use of K1 words than text 6 and 7 in the top group. It is important to remark for this and the results that text 42 seems to be a strange case of a bottom test. It is the test of the Bottom group that had the best overall results in the different measures made in this study. This test has not just have the best LFP profile of the Bottom group, but in some measures it is better than some of the tests in the Top group. The consequence of this test is that it had an impact on the averages of the Bottom group.

The results on lexical diversity are shown in terms of word count and MTLD in Tables 6 and 7 below.

Figure 6: Top tests' diversity

	Word count	MTLD
Test 1	279	100.608
Test 6	271	54.051
Test 7	325	43.527
Test 16	295	75.825
Test 39	263	93.468
Average	**286,6**	**73.496**

Figure 7: Bottom tests' diversity

	Word count	MTLD
Test 9	190	41.847
Test 10	212	76.78
Test 28	205	68.333
Test 42	288	62.025
Test 56	292	72.622
Average	**237,4**	**61.207**

Regarding lexical diversity, the results here show that the Top tests have an overall best performance on lexical variation than the Bottom tests. In line with the discussion presented in 2.6.1, it is necessary to mention that all measures of lexical diversity have an impact when texts with different lengths are compared. In the case of this study, the tests by the best performers are indeed longer. Then, the results are reliable as they also have better results on MTLD as after the effect of text length that should reduce the score of lexical diversity on the longer ones.

Two tests on the top group had considerably high MTLD scores compared to the others: Text 1 (100.608) and Text 39 (93.468). However, some others had scores which were lower than some scores from the Bottom group. For example, the scores from the texts 6 (54.051) and 7 (43.527) from the Top group were lower than the most of the Bottom group: Text 10(76.78), text 28 (68.333), text 42 (62.025), and text 56 (72.622).

4.1.2.2 **Non-Standard measures**

As shown in section 4.1.1, teachers demonstrated to be concerned about two issues that are not considered under the standard measures of lexical richness: topic appropriateness and lexical errors. Tables 8 and 9 below show the count of the topic appropriate words and of the lexical errors that each text contained.

Table 8: Top tests' topic appropriateness and lexical errors

	Topic appropriate words	Lexical Errors
Text 1	12	2
Text 6	8	3
Text 7	9	2
Text 16	16	0
Text 39	13	1
Average	11,6	1,6

Figure 9: Bottom tests' topic appropriateness and lexical errors

	Topic appropriate words	Lexical Errors
Text 9	7	3
Text 10	9	5
Text 28	11	3
text 42	16	2
text 56	8	12
Average	**10,2**	**5**

The results show that there are differences in the non-standard measures between the Top and the Bottom groups. Regarding topic appropriateness, the averages show that the top group had a better performance (11,6) when expressing words that were related to the topic than the bottom group (10,2). However, the difference is slight, and the best of the bottom group is equal to the best of the top group (16).

Regarding lexical errors, the students of the Top group got a more substantial distance from the Bottom group. The average of the top group is 1,6 while the average of the bottom group is 5. This result is remarkable as we can see that in the Top group there were tests with one or zero lexical errors. However, it is important to highlight test 56 that made much more errors than the rest of the Bottom group, and then altered the overall performance.

Overall, these results indicate that differences in lexical performance exist between the two groups. As expected, more substantial differences exist when considering lexical errors (see section 4.1.2 above). However, there is important overlap of cases between the groups in each measure and thus conclusions for the group are seriously limited.

4.1.3 Results for RQ3: Comparison of teacher's interviews and lexical features

The comparisons to answer RQ3 are reported here taking each variable of lexical richness separately.

4.1.3.1 Lexical sophistication

Lexical sophistication demonstrated to be the most mentioned aspect by the teachers (see section 4,1,1). This is the aspect that we inferred to be the most important by the teachers regarding their discourse on their assessment. The results of the tests were in general coherent with this perception in that most Top texts had better frequency profiles than Bottom texts (see section 4.1.2). However, the difference is very small between the groups and thus they cannot be speculated that these features are affecting the sensibility of teachers' evaluations. Supporting this point, the best performers in sophistication on the bottom group exceeded some of the scores of the top group (see section 4.1.2 above). These two facts prevent the study to place lexical sophistication as a determinant factor on the teacher's judgements.

4.1.3.2 **Lexical Diversity**

As the results in lexical sophistication, the Top group showed a more proficient performance in lexical diversity than the Bottom group (see 4.1.2).The MTLD score for is higher in the Top group (73.496) than in the Bottom group (61.207). What flaws the interpretation of lexical diversity as a decisive parameter for teacher's sensibility is that there are some tests in the top group that reached a low performance according to MTLD. Particularly, Test 7 from the Top group got a score (43.527). This result was smaller those for four of the Bottom tests. Due to this case, it is inappropriate again to suggest that lexical diversity is one of the most important factors that may impact teacher's sensibility.

4.1.3.3 **Topic appropriateness**

The topic appropriateness measure is among the variables that got the lowest difference between the top and bottom groups. The top group achieved a better performance with an average of 11,6 words while the bottom group got 10,2. Although it is present in the teacher's interviews as a factor for measuring vocabulary in writing, the small difference does not let the study to grant it a relevant place in teacher's assessment.

4.1.3.4 **Lexical Errors**

Lexical errors demonstrated to be an important issue for the assessment of L2 vocabulary in writing by the interviews to the teachers (4.1.1). Three of the teachers agreed that it was important for them that the students are able to

express their lexical knowledge accurately either formally or semantically. The results of the tests in lexical errors showed one of the most substantial differences between the Top and the Bottom groups. From the difference between the averages of the Top group (1,6 errors per test) to the average of the Bottom group (5 errors per test), we can conclude that the teacher's statement towards lexical error is clearly confirmed. The difference of almost four errors per test is significant enough in short texts of less than three hundred words.

Lexical errors thus seem to produce an impact on the teachers' sensibility towards the use of vocabulary in the assessment of these tests. Lexical error results can be considered thus an important feature for the teachers. However, it must be noticed that test 56 performed more poorly and seems to be driving much of the distance with the Top group.

Overall, these results indicate that the lexical variables observed in this study are not among those that may have influenced the judgement of teachers when assessing them. The only exception here is the case of lexical errors, which were mentioned by the teachers as relevant and showed important differences between the groups.

Chapter 5**: Discussion**

5.1 Introduction

In the present study we identified and observed four variables that the teachers referred to as fundamental to define a text containing good vocabulary. These variables are lexical sophistication, lexical diversity, topic appropriateness, and lexical errors. A comparison of the interviews with the actual features of two groups of tests at different proficiency levels (the Top and Bottom groups) indicated that the teachers seemed to be clearly responsive to lexical errors only. In contrast, the rest of the variables show partial differences between the Top and the Bottom groups and considerable overlap of cases.

5.1.1 Discussion for RQ1: Teachers' perceptions on vocabulary assessment

The interviews directed to the teachers identified four aspects of lexical richness which most of them agreed were relevant for them when they were evaluating the L2 written production of their students. These factors included the following: Lexical sophistication, lexical diversity, topic appropriateness and lexical errors. Among these, lexical sophistication was commonly mentioned in the teachers' interviews as a relevant factor, while topic appropriateness seemed to receive somewhat less attention.

It is important to consider that two teachers mentioned aspects regarding grammatical features (see Appendix E for the transcription of the interviews).

The study did not take those comments into consideration as the focus was on the lexical value of the written productions. Notwithstanding, it was possible to observe that these remarks seem to be in relation or accordance to both McNamara´s (1996) and Lumley's findings (2002, 2005) in section2.5.1. They found that the teacher's judgement towards vocabulary is interfered by their appreciation on grammatical factors. Our findings confirm their claim as our data shows instances in which the teachers openly express that they care about grammar when analysing vocabulary

Interestingly, three of the teachers identified the bad use of quotation marks in one of the tests handed in to them. We sorted them as lexical error, as their misuse is an inaccuracy of meaning. Our definition of lexical error, based on Hemchua and Schmitt (2006) comprehends bad use of lexis either by formal or semantic means. The common mistake regarding the use of quotation marks could be related to the writers' inability to use the precise word in certain context, or the writers' intention is to say something meant to be interpreted out of the literal meaning. The word used with quotation marks is then not intended to be used in the meaning of its form.

5.1.2 Discussion for RQ2: Teachers' perceptions on vocabulary assessment.

The tests were analysed in order to get results from the four lexical variables identified under RQ1. Here we observed both standard measures (lexical sophistication and lexical diversity) and non-standard measures (topic appropriateness and lexical errors).

Regarding the average in each one of the measures, there are differences between Top and Bottom tests. However, it is possible to observe that there are certain aspects in some tests in which the score of Bottom tests are higher or equal than those of the Top tests. In spite of this, there is an alignment between the tests categorized in the Top group with the best scores in each one of the measures. Particularly, lexical error is the most meaningful aspect in terms of difference of average between Top and Bottom tests. In contrast, the analysis of the tests tells us that there is a difference in all the features that the teachers stated, however the most salient is the case of lexical errors

However, results were not easy to interpret. As indicated in section 4.1.2, the bottom group incorporated a sample that altered, to some extent, the results of the tests of the bottom group (see appendix F for test 42). It showed the best performance of the Bottom group, and it even exceeded the results of some Top group tests. The variables we addressed are not enough to justify its categorization as a member of the Bottom group. Although it did not highlight in any of the variables neither, its influence is not strong enough as to contradict our results.

In general, the interpretation were not easy to make as in respect to the non-standard measures there are not studies in which we could compare and tell more precisely how significant the differences were. Furthermore, all measures are different between them and it is difficult for a study that wants to establish the prominence of one variable above another to analyse and state results between numbers that carry meanings not comparable between each other. Even if that was possible, it is necessary to discuss and establish criteria between the

researchers to establish results in a study like this. For example, lexical diversity demonstrated to be a shifting element within the same group, and the differences were more substantial across groups than within groups. This led us to discard it as a relevant difference. On the other hand, lexical errors demonstrated to have few or no appearances on the Top group, for which it was regarded as a more meaningful indicator of lexical use.

5.1.3 Discussion for RQ3: Teachers' perceptions on vocabulary assessment.

Although the Top tests seemed to perform better in the measures of lexical richness observed and, in most cases the difference war rather small. This means that it is not possible to claim that they are necessarily decisive when evaluating L2 writing proficiency. As shown in section 4.1.3, the exception here was the substantial agreement that could be observed between perceptions and actual differences in lexical errors.

This agreement is interesting, as the teachers tended to agree very consistently in that lexical sophistication was a relevant consideration when evaluating the vocabulary of a text. This shows that, even when teachers are coherent with what they say they evaluate, what they think is most important in L2 writing is not actually what concrete evidence shows. Then, it is possible to infer that there are other factors that influence teacher's decisions when evaluating L2 writing vocabulary.

In relation with non standard measures, that is to say, those related to topic appropriateness and lexical errors, they were necessary to be used,

71

considering teachers' observations on vocabulary assessment. Even when, according to the results, teachers expressed that lexical sophistication is the most important aspect to consider when assessing L2 written vocabulary, we could observe that lexical error was the aspect showing more differences between top and bottom tests. This means that there is an aspect evaluated under a non-standard measurement which seems to be more significant for assessment than teachers think it is.

The analysis of lexical errors was not an easy to perform as there is no lexical richness tool that shows the lexical errors of a submitted text. Making a study on lexical errors needs a further analysis to identify the errors and to mark clear boundaries. Hemchua and Schmitt's work (2006) was very helpful as it resolved the issue by stating several particular situations defined by them as lexical errors. Their types of error were under the label of either semantic or formal error, which helped us to define lexical error by these two broad labels. Although the definition was clear, the identification of lexical errors required a thorough study of each of the texts.

In spite of the case of text 42, all the rest of the tests average is actually coherent with the teachers' judgement over the tests, according to the results of the quantitative and qualitative analyses. Test 42 was a complex issue as it required the researchers a further analysis. However, as it demonstrated to be the exception of our data, it is not an invalidating issue. On the other hand, it influenced in increasing the scores of the Bottom group. If the study had not incorporated this test, it would have increased the results, and, for example, the importance of lexical errors would have been more evident. Especially in the

case of the non-standard measures in which the criterion of the researchers where

demanded, the case of test 42 was taken into consideration to resolve the

analysis.

Chapter 6: **Conclusions**

The present study has provided interesting insights regarding the three main research questions initially proposed. Firstly, it was possible to observe that the teachers focused their claims about L2 writing vocabulary assessment on four variables in which they generally agreed: lexical sophistication, lexical diversity, lexical error and topic appropriateness. The number of times these variables were mentioned in the interviews suggested that lexical sophistication is the most prominent feature in their judgements when assessing L2 writing vocabulary.

When comparing Top and Bottom tests in terms of their average in the four aspects measured, it was possible to observe differences in all of them. However, according to the results of the analyses, the most significant difference regarding Top and Bottom tests measures could be observed in lexical errors.

In relation with the coherence between teachers' judgements and the analysis of the tests, it is possible to conclude that there is indeed coherence between them. On the one hand, qualitative and quantitative measures presented a higher average on the Top tests than on the Bottom ones, and the most significant difference was observed in terms of lexical error. On the other hand, the analysis of the interviews that presented the four main aspects for L2 writing vocabulary assessment are also coherent with the results of the qualitative and quantitative measures of the tests in all the four aspects previously mentioned.

6.1 Limitations to the study

A limitation that the study had to face was the need of a tool that allow to observe the hierarchy of importance in what the teachers mentioned as the aspects of good L2 written vocabulary. The study offered a suggestion according to the numbers of times the variables were mentioned. Although this is a reasonably useful procedure for the purpose of this study, it was limited when attempting to compare directly one important feature with another. For the purpose of establishing the importance between variables, an open interview may have been replaced by a survey with fixed questions regarding determined vocabulary features. However this was not possible as the purpose of the interview was to identify the variables.

The results presented in this study may be limited because the data collected could be still more extensive in order to represent and generalize more accurately the analyses made over them. However these results are still useful as they support initial inferences regarding an under-researched area of L2 vocabulary studies and give more precise guidelines for further research.

6.2 Further research

In the process of research some interesting topics, for the purpose of assessment in lexical studies, were identified, for example, the interference of grammatical errors in the evaluation of L2 written vocabulary and the influence of both discourse and grammatical aspects in teachers' assessment on vocabulary. The data provided by the teachers' interviews and the studies of Mcnamara (1996) and Lumley (2002, 2005) refer to the influence of

grammatical errors when the teachers are rating L2 vocabulary. In this sense, it would be interesting to observe more research focused on this subject from a qualitative perspective in order to identify the source of such inconsistencies and its relation to the observed (lack of) awareness.

Considering the most relevant aspect when evaluating L2 writing vocabulary, it seems important to elaborate instruments that allow researchers to accurately measure teachers' assessment's criteria when evaluating L2 written vocabulary. Critically, such instruments should consider the effect of raters' bias and the presence or lack of awareness when inconsistencies occur. The aim here is the one adopted in our study, namely to clarify the relationship between the subjective relevance given to lexical richness in L2 writing assessment and actual empirical data that reflects those subjective perceptions. The present study provides evidence that this relation is not straightforward and that a better agreement between what we think we assess and what we actually assess is necessary.

REFERENCES

Agustín Llach, M. P. (2011). *Lexical errors and accuracy in foreign language writing*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

August, D., Carlo, M., Dressler, C. & Snow, C. (2005). The critical role of vocabulary development for english language learners. *Learning disabilities research & practice*, 20 (1), pp. 50--57.

Altman, R. (1997). Oral production of vocabulary: A case study. En Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition: *A rationale for pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 69.

Anderson, R. and Freebody, P. 1981. Vocabulary Knowledge. *Comprehension and Teaching Research Reviews*, pp. 77-117.

Bachman, L. 1990. Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing. *Oxford University Press*.

Chafe, W. & Tannen, D. (1987). The relation between written and spoken language. *Annual review of anthropology*, 16 pp. 383--407.

Duin, A. & Graves, M. F. (1987). Intensive vocabulary instruction as a prewriting technique. *Reading research quarterly*, 46 (3), pp. 311-330. [Accessed: 13 Dec. 2013].

Fritz, E. & Ruegg, R. (2013). Rater sensitivity to lexical accuracy, sophistication and range when assessing writing. *Assessing writing*, 18 (2), pp. 173--181.

Hall, C.J. (2002). The automatic cognate form assumption: Evidence for the parasitic model of vocabulary development. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 40: 69–87.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1979. Differences between spoken and written language: some implications for literacy teaching. In *Communication Through Reading. Proceedings of the Fourth Australian Reading Conference*, ed. G. Page, J . Elkins, B . O'Connor, pp. 37-52. Adelaide,SA: Aust. Read. Assoc.

Hemchua, S. and Schmitt, N. (2006). An analysis of lexical errors in the English compositions of Thai learners. *Prospect* 21, 3: 3–25.

Henriksen, B. 1999. Three Dimensions of Vocabulary Development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21 pp. 303-317.

Hiebert, E. A. 2007. Vocabulary assessment: What we know and what we need to learn. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 42 pp. 282-296.

Koizumi, R. (2012). Relationships between text length and lexical diversity measures: can we use short texts of less than 100 tokens?. *Vocabulary learning and instruction*, p. 60.

Laufer, B. (1994). The lexical profile of second language writing: does it change over time?. *Relc journal*, 25 (2), pp. 21--33.

Laufer, B. 1997. The lexical plight in second language reading: Words you don't know, words you think you know and words you can't guess. *Cambridge University Press.*, pp. 20-34.

Laufer, B. and Goldstein, Z. 2004. *Testing vocabulary knowledge*. Estados Unidos: University of Michigan.

Laufer, B. & Nation, P. (1995). Vocabulary size and use: lexical richness in l2 written production. *Applied linguistics*, 16 (3), pp. 307--322.

Laufer, B. and Nation, P. 1999. *A Vocabulary-size Test for Controlled Productivity*. [e-book]http://www.sagepublications.com/.Available through:Http://ltj.sagepub.com/content/16/1/33   [Accessed: December, 2013].

Lee, S. H. 2003. [online] Available at: http://www.savingthewahyanites.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Lee-2003-SLLearnersVocabularyUseInWritingAndTheEffectsOfExplicitVocabularyInstruction.pdf [Accessed: 10 Jan 2014].

Lee, S. H. and Muncie, J. 2006. From Receptive to Productive: Improving ESL' learners Use of Vocabulary in a Postreading Composition Task. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40 (2), pp. 295-320. Available at: www.jstor.org/stable/40264524 [Accessed: 22th November 2013].

Lumley, T. (2002). Assessment criteria in a large-scale writing test: what do they really mean to the raters?. *Language testing*, 19 (3), pp. 246--276.

Lumley, T. (2006). *Assessing second language writing*. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang.

McCarthy, P. H. M., & Jarvis, S. (2007). Vocd: A theoretical and empirical evaluation. Language Testing, 24(4), 459–488.

Malvern, D., Richards, B., Chipere, N. & Durán, P. (2004). *Lexical diversity and language development*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Meara, P. (1984). The study of lexis in interlanguage. In A. Davies, C. Criper & A. Howatt (Eds.), *Interlanguage*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Meara, P. and Fitzpatrick, T. 2000. Lex30: an improved method of assessing productive vocabulary in an L2. *System*, 28 (1), pp. 19-- 30.

Mellor, A. (2001). Essay length, lexical diversity and automatic essay scoring. *Memoirs of the osaka institute of technology, series b*, 55 (2), pp. 1--14.

Milton, J. 2009. *Measuring Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition*. [online] Available at: http://books.google.cl/books?hl=es&lr&id=mbFV1eQqxIQC&oi=f nd&pg=PA1&dq=receptive+productive+vocabulary+milton%2C+ J.+2009&ots=Ykd6XBk- oT&sig=9pmV3qKUthLmLJqeFJI7u6Cdrt8#v=onepage&q=recept ive%20productive%20vocabulary%20milton%2C%20J.%202009 &f=false [Accessed: 10 Jan 2014].

Pulido, D. (2003). Modeling the role of second language proficiency and topic familiarity in second language incidental vocabulary acquisition through reading. *Language learning*, 53 (2), pp. 233-- 284.

Olinghouse, N. G. & Wilson, J. (2013). The relationship between vocabulary and writing quality in three genres. *Reading and writing*, 26 (1), pp. 45--65.

Read, J. (2000). *Assessing vocabulary*. Cambridge [u.a.]: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Ringbom, H (1987). *The Role of the First Language in Foreign Language Learning*. Clevedon, PH: Multilingual Matters.

Saville-Troike, M. 1984. What really matters in second language learning for academic achievement?. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18 pp. 199-219.

Schaefer, E. (2008). Rater bias patterns in an efl writing assessment. *Language testing*, 25 (4), pp. 465--493.

Stapleton, P. (2001). Assessing critical thinking in the writing of japanese university students insights about assumptions and content familiarity. *Written communication*, 18 (4), pp. 506--548.

Swan, M. (1997). The influence of the mother tongue on second language vocabulary acquisition and use. In Schmitt, N. and McCarthy, M. (eds), *Vocabulary: Description, Acquisition, and Pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tidball, F. & Treffers-Daller, J. (2008). Analysing lexical richness in french learner language: what frequency lists and teacher judgements can tell us about basic and advanced words. *Journal of french language studies*, 18 (3), pp. 299--314.

Appendix

Appendix A: **Student's test form**

Academic Writing Task

Your name: _____

Date (dd/mm/yy): _____

You should spend about 40 minutes on this task.

Present a written argument or case to an educated reader with no specialist

knowledge of the following topic:

Should wealthy nations be required to share their wealth among poorer

nations by providing such things as food and education? Or is it the responsibility

of the governments of poorer nations to look after the citizens themselves?

You should write at least 250 words.

Use your own ideas, knowledge and experience and support your arguments

with examples and with relevant evidence.

Appendix B: **Transcribed tests**

Test 1
There seems to be a quite complicated relationship among wealthy and poorer
nations, as it is difficult to establish boundaries related to individual and shared
responsabilities considering the historical context (ie, is colonialism guilty of the
current socieconomic situation in Southafrica? If so, should the British government
take responsibility for SouthafricaÕs poverty?). It is easy to fall under the
ÒguiltinessÓ logic and find where there may be non: current governments are not
guilty of things that a previous government did, especially when the fault ocurred
several years before this ÒconvictionÓ.

I do not think that wealthy nations should take responsibility for poorer nationsÕ
citizens for several reasons: a) it is not their fault that a coutry has less resources or
wealth; b) they should not interfere with other culturesÕ lifestyles, which is bound to
happen when you provide something for other Ð the first approach would be to do it
as I think is best and not the way other people with different cultural background
need; and c) it does not create an opportunity for wealthier countries to take
advantage of a poorer / more vulnerable nation in any way.

There is, however, a certain shared responsability among all nations to do whatever
possible to help those in need Ð not for religious/moral reasons, but simply because
I recognise the others as my equals, as human beings just like me. But this help
should be limited to humanitarian reasons: wealthier countries should help
vulenerable nations with first aid supplies, political refuge and advice.

Poorer countries need to learn how to solve their own problems so they will not be in
debt to anybody else and to be able to resolve problems that may appear in the
future.

Unfortunately, there are many economical differences among countries in the world, that is, there are countries extremely rich and countries extremely poor. Now the question is: should those rich countries help the poorest ones? I think it is not easy to answer such a question because there are many issues to consider.

Personally, I think that many people might believe that poverty should be managed by the countries themselves, but I think it is not that easy if those countries donÕt have the resources to do it. I am not talking about the countries in the middle of the situation, that is, neather rich nor poor, but about African countries, for example, in which there is extreme poverty from several perspectives.

In thos cases, I think the richest countries should give a hand to the poorest ons, basically because if they are able to provide weapons for the war, they might be able to invest that money in better things such as food and education for the population. The best and clearest example is The United States of America, a powerful and rich country that has invested an important amount of money to provide weapons. Perhaps, it is not the best solution to donate food or ÔgiftÕ money for education because it is not a responsibility of other countries. However, they might help with their resources to improve the quality of life of the poorest countries by teaching them how to produce their own food, how to manage their countries better politicaly and economically, etc. In brief, they should help the poorest countries for them to improve their situation but not depending on other nations on themselves.

Test 7

First of all, we have to define what is considered a poor nation and why it should be helped by other nations. A poor nation can be considered either as a nation with poor inhabitants but a wealthy state or a nation with both, poor inhabitants and a risky state. Considering that distinction, we will be able to analise both cases in order to give an answer to the question.

Giving the first case, where the inhabitants of a nation are considered poor, but the nation possesses a wealthy state and government, we should say that the responsability must rely on the government without any help of foreign nations. Government should fix the problem because there are other issues that not fall upon the amount of money that the nations possess, but in the distribution of the money among the population of the country.

As examples of this situation we have several countries in the middle east or here in latin America, like Brazil, wich is considered a wealthy country, but it has a very high percentage of the population living in poverty, Without go any further, we have the case of Chile, where the distribution of money is a big issue: We have just the five percent of the nation considered as rich, having the rest a big mass of people considered ÒmediumÓ class.

On the other hand, we have nations where the distribution is not a problem, but the money that the nation as a complete entity composed by the population and government possesses. For instance we have the problems that Haiti has had in the last time because of its problem about the earthquake. Haiti was never a rich country and considering the situation, the issue fot worse. However, Haiti was helped by several other nations and organisations, including Chile.

In conclusion, a wealthy government must help its inhabitants providing food, education and health; and a poor nation with both, poor government and population, should be helped by other wealthy countries and organisations.

Test 16

Wealthy nations should be required to provide help to poorer countries. In many cases, as in nations of Europe such as Denmark or the Netherlands, we are witnesses of the high standars of life and production that exist among people. And, at the same time, it is almost unbelievable to even think about the high levels of poverty and unemployment which still persist in nations of South America, not to tell almost the entire continent of Africa.

It seems that wealthy nations are getting wealthier, and poor countries are getting poorer. If you are born in a family with no resources it is nearly obvious that your future is not going to be much different than your parent´s.

Governments of poor nations have the responsibility of giving a better life to their people, but most of the times that is not possible; foreign debt, few natural resources (which are mostly managed by rich countries) and deficient educational and health care systems make it seem as there is no way out.

However, there is. By debt relief (forgiveness of partial or total external debt) poorer countries could use that money to improve their economy and sustain their projects, supported by experts. In addition, wealthy nations should expand their educational systems to places where is clear that there are enormous differences in the matter. This way, a better education and economy would provide a better future for these nations, and, eventually, standards of life and governments themselves would be strong enough to sustain the countries on their own.

Even though it is a long way to go and it requires a lot of work from both wealthy and poorer nations and their citizens, it can be done, and it would not only improve people´s lives, but also politics, external relations and the environment itself.

 Test 39 Wealthy nations should be required to share their wealth among poorer nations, because, in many cases, they are at least at same level responsible for the situation of poorer countries. If we analize, for instance the case of many African countries, and make a contrast between their reality and that of the European nations, we will see that those richer nations have improved their situation by using the natural resources from these poorer nations for their own benefit, devastating natural areas and leaving those nations sunk in poverty, defenseless and with no right to complain.

This is also the case of our own country, Chile. Through the last decades, it has become quite common to see how transnational corporations have acquired the monopoly over our natural resources, such as electricity and das. However, this is not just an exclusive responsability of those foreign corporations, but also from a very poor knowledge of which would be the best ways for managing the country's resources. The same happens with mineral resources such as copper, one of the most important exportations of Chile, that in great part is under international control. A seen above, those more powerful nations seem to have the right of taking off the resources from these poorer nations as they please, increasing their power and richness by impoverishingothers.

The less they should do is to share that wealth with vulnerable countries and help them to develop an appropriate educational and health system. Richer nations have earn power and stability by using other nations resources, then, why not help them with a fair reward?

Test 9

The solution for poorer nations is not in reciving food or education from wealthy nation but in to get their help for getting out from poverty situation. It is the same situation when a child is growing up his parents reach him how to do his bed but after a while he is able to do it by himself.

As parents teach a child, the wealthy nations have to teach poorer nations to take the best system for their economy showing the disadvantages of their actual system or what thing their should improve or change for developing their capacity of growth. For example in Chile we have a wide source of natural resources but we do not take the necesary benefit from them because we do not have the support of the wealthy nations for the machinary and for new techonology. They prefer to come here and to get our resources throw the international companys.

But poorest nations have to have the disposition of to be helped by wealthy nations taking away personal benefits as well as wealthy nations have to try do not take benefits of them and both look for a solution for people.

We can talk about "generous people" in a common situation and using our "common sense" and to look like "better person" but in a political matter this situation is more complex because to share wealth among poorer nations require support from the citizens, and the government. In that sense, I agree with to share wealth in a intelligent way, for instance, trying to establish NGOÕs, to dinance educational institutions, to give economic instruction to the people, but the most important agree is to leave those poorer nations like a independent nation and trying to empower the autonomy of them.

If we think about those kind of solutions, we don't gave any "model nation" to follow, and that is obvious because each nation has responsabilities with his poorer citizens, so they donÕt have interest or inmediate priviledges about it. But in a for future that kinf of measures will be a reality, because we are in a stage near to the collapse of capitalism. Every nation is trying to avoid this break slowly but in our minds we can expect a little difference.

We know that it would be sound incredible, but we donÕt have to wait more time because every day in a lot of countries there are people waiting for a change.

First of all, i think that wealthy nations are not responsible for looking after poorer nations, because the governments are independent and presidents or chiefs have the mission of improve the development of a nation. This is like a family, in which problems are solved within the constituents of it and their neighbours have nothing to do or to say about ir, because it is not their problem, and each family head has to worry about their own problems.

The problem is when a nation does not have the means for enhance its development and growth and need some support. If a nation does not have international relationships with any other nation, it would be lost in its search for some support. But also, international relationships do not asure a nation that they will be supported. I think that, even though nations are "independent", wealthy nations might create a system by which they can help poorer nations in order to teach citizens how to grow vegetables or how to exploit their natural resources; or to send qualified professionals in order to develop some areas such health, education, etc. I believe they should do something not for their own purpose but to help building a better world.

Test 42

We must see the issue of wealth of nations in a macro level and micro level. In other words, worldly and inside nations. Then, we first have to think on how different and how far are some countries of one another in matter of wealth. Interactions beween countrys according to their needs are pretty few. Each country has to deal with their economic problems by themselves, and we know that there are regions in which help is needed for their country to prosper, but no help exists. There are very rich countries, as E.E.U.U. and Japan, that could help a lot to some poor countries as we found in Africa and the Americas, with just a very small percentage of their incomes. The gap we can find between the wealthiest and the poorer countr is normous, and there is just no reason to let it be so when resources actually exists.

Secondly, we must contemplate this issue inside every covernment of any state. It is the duty of the aouthorities to look for equality in their citizens. It is the same view we used according to states. We find great differences between social classes in some countries. For example in Chile, the social gap is enormous, and we find that rich people have the opportunities, in matter of education and health especially, that the rest do not have, not to mention that big enterprises have great facilities in terms of taxes and rights, particularly the mining business. All these factors affect the low and middle classes, and their lives become quite difficult. So, again we find that resources exists, but they are found in a greater amount just in some fews.

Therefore, the government of each state shoul care of the equality of each countrie's citizens.

Test 56

Wealthy nations must help poor nations, because the first reasin is that they are mainly poor because it is combiniate for some countries. Its good for United State that South America didn't grow up in technology or in develop industry just because they lose money and the most important, they lose power. When we have educated people its easy for a nation develop it by istelf, but its difficult without a little help. Nowadays globalization means almost everything for develop countries that means that there is a huge gap between develop countries and the por ones. So for eliminate this gap or at least make it shorter, we need to rescue in economic terms some countries. Like european union with Grecia or like United State with juwish people.
Some countries give support in different ways, they should provide education and food in Africa for example, but in the other hand they should provide security and stavility. The cost of this are really bug, but the cost don0t have the same price of all the damage and harm that develop countries have caused to this nation. I don't have to provide an example of this damage because we can see it every day in news when some countries are looking for biologic weapons in poor countries with the only reason to take control of this nation because they have oil, gas or petrol.
Second and the most important, people are dying of starbation, children in the are dying are dying of ilness in a non religios way just in the basic level of human being we need to help them, we need to make sure that every kid will have education and food, there are basic rights for every human being. Wealthy nation must provide all this becaue they own it to them.

Appendix C: **Tests prepared for lextutor**

Test 1

there seems to be a quite complicated relationship among wealthy and poorer nations as it is difficult to establish boundaries related to individual and shared responsabilities considering the historical context is colonialism guilty of the current socieconomic situation in if so should the british government take responsibility for poverty it is easy to fall under the guiltiness logic and find where there may be non current governments are not guilty of things that a previous government did especially when the fault ocurred several years before this conviction
i do not think that wealthy nations should take responsibility for poorer nations citizens for several reasons it is not their fault that a country has less resources or wealth they should not interfere with other cultures lifestyles which is bound to happen when you provide something for other the first approach would be to do it as i think is best and not the way other people with different cultural background need and it does not create an opportunity for wealthier countries to take advantage of a poorer more vulnerable nation in any way

 there is however a certain shared responsability among all nations to do whatever possible to help those in need not for religious moral reasons but simply because I recognise the others as my equals as human beings just like me but this help should be limited to humanitarian reasons wealthier countries should help vulnerable nations with first aid supplies political refuge and advice poorer countries need to learn how to solve their own problems so they will not be in debt to anybody else and to be able to resolve problems that may appear in the future

Test 6

unfortunately there are many economical differences among countries in the world that is there are countries extremely rich and countries extremely poor now the question is should those rich countries help the poorest ones i think it is not easy to answer such a question because there are many issues to consider personally i think that many people might believe that poverty should be managed by the countries themselves but i think it is not that easy if those countries do not have the resources to do it i am not talking about the countries in the middle of the situation that is neither rich nor poor but about african countries for example in which there is extreme poverty from several perspectives

in those cases i think the richest countries should give a hand to the poorest basically because if they are able to provide weapons for the war they might be able to invest that money in better things such as food and education for the population the best and clearest example is the a powerful and rich country that has invested an important amount of money to provide weapons perhaps it is not the best solution to donate food or money for education because it is not a responsibility of other countries however they might help with their resources to improve the quality of life of the poorest countries by teaching them how to produce their own food how to manage their countries better politicaly and economically in brief they should help the poorest countries for them to improve their situation but not depending on other nations on themselves

first of all we have to define what is considered a poor nation and why it should be helped by other nations a poor nation can be considered either as a nation with poor inhabitants but a wealthy state or a nation with both poor inhabitants and a state considering that distinction we will be able to analise both cases in order to give an answer to the question giving the first case where the inhabitants of a nation are considered poor but the nation possesses a wealthy state and government we should say that the responsability must rely on the government without any help of foreign nations government should fix the problem because there are other issues that not fall upon the amount of money that the nations possess but in the distribution of the money among the population of the country

as examples of this situation we have several countries in the middle east or here in like wich is considered a wealthy country but it has a very high percentage of the population living in poverty without any further we have the case of where the distribution of money is a big issue we have just the five percent of the nation considered as rich having the rest a big mass of people considered medium class on the other hand we have nations where the distribution is not a problem but the money that the nation as a complete entity composed by the population and government possesses for instance we have the problems that has had in the last time because of its problem about the earthquake was never a rich country and considering the situation the issue got worse however was helped by several other nations and organisations including in conclusion a wealthy government must help its inhabitants providing food education and health and a poor nation with both poor government and population should be helped by other wealthy countries and organisations

wealthy nations should be required to provide help to poorer countries in many cases as in nations of such as or we are witnesses of the high standards of life and production that exist among people and at the same time it is almost unbelievable to even think about the high levels of poverty and unemployment which still persist in nation of not to tell almost the entire continent of

it seems that wealthy nations are getting wealthier and poor countries are getting poorer if you are born in a family with no resources it is nearly obvious that your future is not going to be much different than your parents

governments of poor nations have the responsibility of giving a better life to their people but most of the times that is not possible foreign debt few natural resources which are mostly managed by rich countries and deficient educational and health care systems make it seem as there is no way out

however there is by debt relief forgiveness of partial or total external debt poorer countries could use that money to improve their economy and sustain their projects supported by experts in addition wealthy nations should expand their educational systems to places where is clear that there are enormous differences in the matter this way a better education and economy would provide a better future for these nations and eventually standards of life and governments themselves would be strong enough to sustain the countries on their own

even though it is a long way to go and it requires a lot of work from both wealthy and poorer nations and their citizens it can be done and it would not only improve peoples lives but also politics external relations and the environment itself

wealthy nations should be required to share their wealth among poorer nations because in many cases they are at least at same level responsible for the situation of poorer countries if we analize for instance the case of many african countries and make a contrast between their reality and that of the european nations we will see that those richer nations have improved their situation by using the natural resources from these poorer nations for their own benefit devastating natural areas and leaving those nations sunk in poverty defenseless and with no right to complain

his is also the case of our own country through the last decades it has become quite common to see how transnational corporations have acquired the monopoly over our natural resources such as electricity and gas however this is not just an exclusive responsability of those foreign corporations but also from a very poor knowledge of which would be the best ways for managing the country resources the same happens with mineral resources such as copper one of the most important exportations of that in great part is under international control as seen above those more powerful nations seem to have the right of taking off the resources from these poorer nations as they please increasing their power and richness by impoverishing others

the less they should do is to share that wealth with vulnerable countries and help them to develop an appropriate educational and health system richer nations have earn power and stability by using other nations resources then why not help them with a fair reward

Test 9

the solution for poorer nations is not in receiving food or education from wealthy nation but in to get their help for getting out from poverty situation t is the same situation when a child is growing up his parents teach him how to do his bed but after a while he is able to do it by himself

as parents teach a child the wealthy nations have to teach poorer nations to take the best system for their economy showing the disadvantages of their actual system or what thing should improve or change for developing their capacity of growth

for example in we have a wide source of natural resources but we do not take the necessary benefit from them because we do not have the support of the wealthy nations for the and for new technology they prefer to come here and to get our resources the international

but poorest nations have to have the disposition to be helped by wealthy nations taking away personal benefits as well as wealthy nations have to try to do not take benefits of them and both look for a solution for people

we can talk about generous people in a common situation and using our common sense and to look like better person but in a political matter this situation is more complex because to share wealth among poorer nations require support from the citizens and the government in that sense i agree with to share wealth in a intelligent way for instance trying to establish to finance educational institutions to give economic instruction to the people but the most important agree is to leave those poorer nations like a independent nation and trying to empower the autonomy of them

If we think about those kind of solutions we do not any model nation to follow and that is obvious because each nation has responsabilities with his poorer citizens so they do not have interest or inmediate privileges about it but for future that kind of measures will be a reality because we are in a stage near to the collapse of capitalism every nation is trying to avoid this break slowly but in our minds we can expect a little difference we know that it would be sound incredible but we do not have to wait more time because every day in a lot of countries there are people waiting for a change

Test 28

first of all i think that wealthy nations are not responsible for looking after poorer
nations because the governments are independent and presidents or chiefs have
the mission of improve the development of a nation this is like a family in which
problems are solved within the constituents of it and their neighbours have nothing
to do or to say about it because it is not their problem and each family head has to
worry about their own problems
the problem is when a nation does not have the means for enhance its development
and growth and need some support if a nation does not have international
relationships with any other nation it would be lost in its search for some support but
also international relationships do not assure a nation that they will be supported
i think that even though nations are independent wealthy nations might create a
system by which they can help poorer nations in order to teach citizens how to grow
vegetables or how to exploit their natural resources or to send qualified
professionals in order to develop some areas such health education i believe they
should do something not for their own purpose but to help building a better world

we must see the issue of wealth of nations in a macro level and micro level in other words worldly and inside nations then we first have to think on how different and how far are some countries of one another in matter of wealth interactions beween countrys according to their needs are pretty few each country has to deal with their economic problems by themselves and we know that there are regions in which help is needed for their country to prosper but no help exists there are very rich countries as and that could help a lot to some poor countries as we found in and the with just a very small percentage of their incomes the gap we can find between the wealthiest and the poorer countries is enormous and there is just no reason to let it be so when resources actually exists

secondly we must contemplate this issue inside every government of any state it is the duty of the authorities to look for equality in their citizens it is the same view we used according to states we find great differences between social classes in some countries for example in the social gap is enormous and we find that rich people have the opportunities in matter of education and health especially that the rest do not have not to mention that big enterprises have great in terms of taxes and rights particularly the mining business all these factors affect the low and middle classes and their lives become quite difficult so again we find that resources exists but they are found in a greater amount just in some fews therefore the government of each state should care of the equality of each country citizens

wealthy nations must help poor nations because the first reason is that they are mainly poor because it is for some countries its good for that did not grow up in technology or in develop industry just because they lose money and the most important they lose power when we have educated people its easy for a nation develop it by itself but its difficult without a little help nowadays globalization means almost everything for develop countries that means that there is a huge gap between develop countries and the ones so eliminate this gap or at least make it shorter we need to rescue in economic terms some countries like european union with or like with people

some countries give support in different ways they should provide education and food in for example but in the other hand they should provide security and stability the cost of this are really big but the cost do not have the same price of all the damage and harm that develop countries have caused to this nation i do not have to provide an example of this damage because we can see it every day in news when some countries are looking for biologic weapons in poor countries with the only reason to take control of this nation because they have oil gas or second and the most important people are dying of children in the are dying are dying of ilness in a non religious way just in the basic level of human being we need to help them we need to make sure that every kid will have education and food there are basic rights for every human being wealthy nation must provide all this because they it to them

Appendix D: **Tests prepared for cohmetrix 3.0**

Test 1

there seem to be a quite complicate relationship among wealth and poor nation as it is difficult to establish boundary related to individual and share responsability consider the historical context is colonialism guilty of the current socieconomic situation in if so should the british government take responsibility for poverty it is easy to fall under the guiltiness logic and find where there may be non current government are not guilty of thing that a previous government did especial when the fault ocurr several year before this conviction
i do not think that wealth nation should take responsibility for poor nation citizen for several reason it is not their fault that a country has less resource or wealth they should not interfere with other culture lifestyle which is bound to happen when you provide something for other the first approach would be to do it as i think is best and not the way other people with different cultural background need and it does not create an opportunity for wealthy country to take advantage of a poor more vulnerable nation in any way

 there is however a certain share responsability among all nation to do whatever possible to help those in need not for religious moral reason but simply because I recognise the other as my equal as human being just like me but this help should be limited to humanitarian reason wealthy country should help vulnerable nations with first aid supply politic refuge and advice poor country need to learn how to solve their own problem so they will not be in debt to anybody else and to be able to resolve problem that may appear in the future

unfortunate there are many economic difference among country in the world that is there are country extreme rich and country extreme poor now the question is should those rich country help the poor one i think it is not easy to answer such a question because there are many issue to consider personally i think that many people might believe that poverty should be managed by the country themselve but i think it is not that easy if those country do not have the resources to do it i am not talk about the country in the middle of the situation that is neither rich nor poor but about african country for example in which there is extreme poverty from several perspective
in those case i think the rich country should give a hand to the poor basic because if they are able to provide weapons for the war they might be able to invest that money in better things such as food and education for the population the best and clear example is the a powerful and rich country that has invested an important amount of money to provide weapon perhaps it is not the best solution to donate food or money for education because it is not a responsibility of other country however they might help with their resource to improve the quality of life of the poor country by teach them how to produce their own food how to manage their country better political and economical in brief they should help the poor country for them to improve their situation but not depend on other nation on themselve

first of all we have to define what is consider a poor nation and why it should be help by other nation a poor nation can be consider either as a nation with poor inhabitant but a wealth state or a nation with both poor inhabitant and a state consider that distinct we will be able to analise both case in order to give an answer to the question give the first case where the inhabitants of a nation are consider poor but the nation possess a wealth state and government we should say that the responsability must rely on the government without any help of foreign nation government should fix the problem because there are other issue that not fall upon the amount of money that the nation possess but in the distribution of the money among the population of the country

as example of this situation we have several country in the middle east or here in like wich is considered a wealth country but it has a very high percentage of the population living in poverty without any further we have the case of where the distribution of money is a big issue we have just the five percent of the nation consider as rich have the rest a big mass of people consider medium class on the other hand we have nation where the distribution is not a problem but the money that the nation as a complete entity composed by the population and government possess for instance we have the problem that has had in the last time because of it problem about the earthquake was never a rich country and consider the situation the issue got worse however was help by several other nation and organisation include in conclusion a wealth government must help its inhabitant provide food education and health and a poor nation with both poor government and population should be help by other wealthcountry and organisation

wealth nation should be require to provide help to poor country in many case as in nation of such as or we are witness of the high standard of life and production that exist among people and at the same time it is almost unbelievable to even think about the high level of poverty and unemployment which still persist in nation of not to tell almost the entire continent of

it seem that wealth nation are get wealth and poor country are get poor if you are born in a family with no resource it is near obvious that your future is not go to be much different than your parent

government of poor nations have the responsibility of give a better life to their people but most of the time that is not possible foreign debt few natural resource which are mostly manage by rich country and deficient education and health care system make it seem as there is no way out

however there is by debt relief forgive of partial or total external debt poor country could use that money to improve their economy and sustain their project support by expert in addition wealth nation should expand their education system to place

where is clear that there are enormous difference in the matter this way a better education and economy would provide a better future for these nation and eventually standard of life and government themselve would be strong enough to sustain the countries on their own

even though it is a long way to go and it require a lot of work from both wealth and poor nation and their citizen it can be done and it would not only improve people live but also politic external relation and the environment itself

wealth nation should be require to share their wealth among poor nation because in many case they are at least at same level responsible for the situation of poor country if we analize for instance the case of many african country and make a contrast between their reality and that of the european nation we will see that those rich nation have improve their situation by use the natural resource from these poor nation for their own benefit devastate natural area and leave those nation sunk in poverty defenseless and with no right to complain

his is also the case of our own country through the last decade it has become quite common to see how transnational corporation have acquire the monopoly over our natural resource such as electricity and gas however this is not just an exclusive responsability of those foreign corporations but also from a very poor knowledge of which would be the best ways for manage the country resource the same happen with mineral resource such as copper one of the most important exportation of that in great part is under international control as seen above those more powerful nation seem to have the right of take off the resource from these poor nation as they please increase their power and richness by impoverish other

the less they should do is to share that wealth with vulnerable country and help them to develop an appropriate education and health system rich nation have earn power and stability by use other nation resource then why not help them with a fair reward

the solution for poor nation is not in receive food or education from wealth nation but in to get their help getting out from poverty situation it is the same situation when a child is grow up his parent teach him how to do his bed but after a while he is able to do it by himself

as parent teach a child the wealth nation have to teach poor nation to take the best system for their economy show the disadvantage of their actual system or what thing should improve or change for develop their capacity of growth

for example in we have a wide source of natural resources but we do not take the necessary benefit from them because we do not have the support of the wealth nations for the and for new technology they prefer to come here and to get our resources the international

but poor nation have to have the disposition to be help by wealth nation take away personal benefit as well as wealth nation have to try to do not take benefit of them and both look for a solution for people

we can talk about generous people in a common situation and use our common sense and to look like better person but in a politic matter this situation is more complex because to share wealth among poor nation require support from the citizen and the government in that sense i agree with to share wealth in a intelligent way for instance try to establish to finance educational institutions to give economic instruction to the people but the most important agree is to leave those poor nation like a independent nation and try to empower the autonomy of them
If we think about those kind of solution we do not any model nation to follow and that is obvious because each nation has responsability with his poor citizen so they do not have interest or inmediate privilege about it but for future that kind of measure will be a reality because we are in a stage near to the collapse of capitalism every nation is try to avoid this break slowly but in our mind we can expect a little difference we know that it would be sound incredible but we do not have to wait more time because every day in a lot of country there are people wait for a change

Test 28

first of all i think that wealth nation are not responsible for looking after poor nation
because the government are independent and president or chief have the mission of
improve the development of a nation this is like a family in which problem are solve
within the constituent of it and their neighbour have nothing to do or to say about it
because it is not their problem and each family head has to worry about their own
problem

the problem is when a nation does not have the means for enhance it development
and growth and need some support if a nation does not have international
relationship with any other nation it would be lost in its search for some support but
also international relationship do not assure a nation that they will be support

i think that even though nation are independent wealth nation might create a system
by which they can help poor nation in order to teach citizen how to grow vegetable or
how to exploit their natural resource or to send qualify professional in order to
develop some area such health education i believe they should do something not for
their own purpose but to help building a better world

Test 42

we must see the issue of wealth of nation in a macro level and micro level in other word world and inside nationthen we first have to think on how different and how far are some country of one another in matter of wealth interaction between country according to their need are pretty few each country has to deal with their economic problem by themselves and we know that there are region in which help is needed for their country to prosper but no help exist there are very rich country as and that could help a lot to some poor country as we found in and the with just a very small percentage of their income the gap we can find between the wealth and the poor countries is enormous and there is just no reason to let it be so when resourcesactual exist

second we must contemplate this issue inside every government of any state it is the duty of the authority to look for equality in their citizen it is the same view we use according to state we find great difference between social class in some country for example in the social gap is enormous and we find that rich people have the opportunity in matter of education and health especial that the rest do not have not to mention that big enterprise have great in term of tax and right particular the mine business all these factor affect the low and middle class and their live become quite difficult so again we find that resource exist but they are find in a great amount just in some few therefore the government of each state should care of the equality of each country citizen

wealthy nations must help poor nations because the first reason is that they are mainly poor because it is for some countries its good for that did not grow up in technology or in develop industry just because they lose money and the most important they lose power when we have educated people its easy for a nation develop it by istelf but its difficult without a little help nowadays globalization means almost everything for develop countries that means that there is a huge gap between develop countries and the poor ones so eliminate this gap or at least make it shorter we need to rescue in economic terms some countries like european union with or like with people

some countries give support in different ways they should provide education and food in for example but the other hand they should provide security and stability the cost of this are really big but the cost do not have the same price of all the damage and harm that develop countries have caused to this nation i do not have to provide an example of this damage because we can see it every day in news when some countries are looking for biologic weapons in poor countries with the only reason to take control of this nation because they have oil gas or second and the most important people are dying of starvation children in the are dying are dying of illness in a non religious way just in the basic level of human being we need to help them we need to make sure that every kid will have education and food there are basic rights for every human being wealthy nation must provide all this becaue they own it to them

Appendix E: **Transcribed teachers' interviews**

First Interview. Teacher 01

Entrevistador:Estoy grabando

Teacher 01:Ya... Ehm...A ver, yo creo que acá un criterio importante a considerar es el del contexto. Por ejemplo, si ustedes como estudiantes son capaces de establecer contextualmente, eh... términos o conceptos que sean pertinentes a un campo de estudio, o a un tópico, o a un tema, eso yo lo considero correcto. Eso es lo que idealmente, eh, ustedes como estudiantes deberían lograr en el contexto de pruebas escritas, por ejemplo, o trabajos de investigación, ¿ya?; utilizar conceptos y términos pero aplicados en determinados contextos. Eh... Claro, porque yo creo que los contextos son lo que finalmente van a determinar la eficacia del término, del concepto. Yo creo que... no es algo que crea yo personalmente, pero es algo que leí yo anteriormente, y es la siguiente idea: no existen términos buenos ni malos, lo que existen son contextos. Entonces yo privilegio el contexto, en ese sentido. Comentemos sobre el texto más extenso, porque aquí hay dos textos (ininteligible) no se si los vamos a identificar. El más extenso y el breve. Entonces, el más extenso, en cuanto a uso de conceptos, por ejemplo, o uso de vocabulario... eh... me queda clara cuál es la idea principal que el autor del texto quiere comunicar. Pero yo creo que esa idea principal hubiese sido mucho más eficiente en su formulación si el escritor/autor de este texto no hubiese sido tan redundante ni tan repetitivo con el concepto "nación". Lo repite constantemente; y no solamente lo repite constantemente, ese tal vez no sería un problema tan importante, el problema es que no da una buena definición de lo que entenderemos por el concepto de "nación" en el desarrollo del escrito particular. Claro, porque hay una diferencia sustancial entre el concepto "nation" y "country"; no son lo mismo; entonces acá, de momentos, también se confunden los dos conceptos y se usan como sinónimos. Hasta donde yo se, no son sinónimos. Eso. Y sobre el texto más breve, eh... a ver, lo... Mmm... La falta que encontré yo acá es lo siguiente: constantemente el autor localiza en entrecomillado una serie de términos que son, por ejemplo, "generous people", "common sense", "model nation", y se supone que uno utiliza el entrecomillado porque uno quiere enfatizar un aspecto, o porque uno está utilizando el concepto bajo una perspectiva, por ejemplo irónica o con otra tonalidad; pero acá no queda claro porque esta persona optó por entrecomillar estos conceptos.Eso es lo que te podría decir, Rodrigo, sobre el texto breve y el texto extenso, por decirlo así.

Entrevistador: Eh... ¿Algún comentario acerca de eso?

Teacher 01: Sobre el primero, sobre el texto más extenso, me da la impresión de que el intento que hay por definir lo que sería una nación pobre, es un intento que se resuelve principalmente a través de ejemplos, pero no se resuelve conceptualmente. Da ejemplos de países pobre pero no aborda conceptualmente o terminológicamente qué se entiende por ejemplo en política, o en políticas de estado el que una nación sea pobre o de bajos ingresos, por ejemplo. Eso

Second interview. Teacher 02

Entrevistadora: Miss , le queremos pedir, por favor, que nos señale a grandes rasgos lo que usted considera como un buen uso de vocabulario escrito en inglés para nuestros estudiantes de pregrado, por favor.

Teacher 02: Yo en principio creo... a ver, ¿hay alguna especificación de año o a lo largo de... de primero a cuarto?

Entrevistadora: En general.

Teacher 02: Yo creo que hay que entenderlo como un proceso; de manera que las expectativas ciertamente van cambiando y van incrementándose los objetivos año tras año, pero en principio, y dada la naturaleza del programa de nosotros, en lo personal, considerando además que yo trabajo en discurso escrito, pero académico, a mi lo que me interesa es que ciertamente... primero, la verdad es que yo no hago clases; en segundo y en tercero si, porque en cuarto se lo que quiero que estén haciendo. Entonces si bien al principio ciertamente hay que expandir esta base léxica, la idea es que progresivamente la vayan expandiendo y ajustando, y precisando para alcanzar niveles comunicativos lo más específicos posibles, idealmente en el mundo académico. Cierto, lo que a mi me interesa en particular es que ustedes sean capaces, tanto oralmente como por escrito, de defender ideas en contextos académicos. Eso para mi es (ininteligible).

Entrevistadora: ¿Podría señalarnos las características específicas de estas pruebas que contienen lo que usted consideró como buen uso de vocabulario?

Teacher 02: Ya, la verdad es que... me cuesta un poco saber qué puede ser bueno y malo, insisto, sin conocer el nivel, porque en la medida que como, de hecho, yo, repito, sigo entendiendo esto es un proceso, de manera que ciertas cosas que en niveles avanzados llaman mucho la atención, en niveles más básicos probablemente hablen de un seguimiento adecuado de las distintas etapas. Sin considerar, entonces, eso, ninguno de los dos me impresiona muchísimo. Sí el segundo texto, aquel que es más largo, tiene algún nivel más de especificidad, que para mi es muy importante. Yo creo que la especificidad léxica y la precisión léxica están al servicio de la comprensión, sobre todo de... a ver, en escritura académica, más de conceptos más complejos. Acá en realidad no están viendo ningún concepto particularmente complejo. Yo creo que las preguntas tienen que ver con "los países ricos deberían o no ayudar a los países más pobres", de manera que ahí, ciertamente, no se está demandando ningún nivel, ni siquiera de entrada, que requiera una elaboración particularmente sofisticada. Sin embargo, considero que aquel que es un poco más largo sí tiene más especificidad y más precisión. El primer texto encuentro que tiene algunos problemas bastante simples, bastante clásicos, como en el segundo tercer año incluso, que es un poco el abuso de las comillas para querer dar cuenta de la especificidad de un concepto para el cual no se maneja la palabra, ¿no es cierto?; entonces la utilización de comillas para resaltar que algo es eso, pero no exactamente: "esa es mi idea, pero esta tal vez no sea la palabra adecuada". A mi me hace mucho ruido porque lo que yo espero en esas circunstancias es la palabra específica, sin mayores aditamentos, en este caso, de diacríticos, ni hacer así (¿comillas con los dedos?) en el discurso oral, ni nada. O sea, si estamos buscando un concepto, cuál es la palabra para ese concepto. Para mi eso, entonces, es... no diría yo un error, pero si una estrategia que de alguna manera revela pobreza léxica. Entonces eso en relación a, fundamentalmente, lo más malo de este primer texto. Creo que hay hartas de las imprecisiones, en

particular, que tienen que ver... bueno, sin entrar en la dimensión más morfológica, que tiene que ver con las inflexiones que hacen ruido a la hora de decodificar inclusive las palabras individuales; pero además hay ciertas palabras que esto tiene que ver harto con lo que, ustedes saben, son las palabras gramaticales, que por lo tanto están un poquito en la gramática y un poquito en el vocabulario, donde nuevamente hace ruido encontrar, por ejemplo, un "his" en donde debería haber un "its", ¿no cierto?. Entonces, ya... son palabras, están cumpliendo una función gramatical, pero igual deben ser consideradas en la dimensión léxica en tanto impiden una lectura precisa, fluida, y una transmisión clara de aquello que se quiere decir; sobre todo, insisto, considerando que nada de esto demanda mayor elaboración intelectual, si se quiere. Son temas más o menos generales frente a los cuales uno tiene un posición previa, digamos, alguna vez uno lo ha pensado. Sí me gusta más, ciertamente, el segundo texto porque muestra algunas cosas que hablan un poco más, si se quiere, de sofisticación en la precisión. Em... bueno, desde ya no hay... no se abusa de las comillas, ¿no es cierto?, para transmitir la especificidad que de otra manera no estaría. Pero, en términos de... no me impresiona mucho realmente... ninguno, positivamente. Sí en este, el segundo texto, en aquel que es más largo, hay algún manejo más adecuado de preposiciones más infrecuentes; nuevamente, estas palabras gramaticales. Porque yo creo que esa es una distinción relativamente importante... yo creo, de hecho, que es bastante importante, porque... a ver, hay modelos que abordan el tema de la lexicogramaticalidad un poco como un contínuo, donde cercenar es una decisión más o menos arbitraria. En el caso de las palabras gramaticales yo creo que sí es verdad que dan... no se sea muy adecuado decirlo así (frase en inglés) pero como que le suben el pelo a un texto. La preposición como bien específica, me encanta ver un "upon", me encanta ver un "either/or", que por acá no está. Dos cosas puntuales: me molesta un poco a mi como lectora la utilización de las comillas para transmitir especificidad que no está; y valoro mucho la precisión en las palabras gramaticales, en particular en este caso, en las preposiciones, porque creo que si dan cuenta de una esquematización un poquito más compleja, que la pueden transmitir con más facilidad para el que está leyendo; uno cuando escribe, uno no escribe para uno, uno escribe para el otro. De ahí que la precisión en el vocabulario sea super importante. Yo creo que están los dos en niveles de generalidad probablemente aceptables para un segundo año, de repente un primero, pero ciertamente no para un tercero, creo yo, en el entendido de este proceso y conociendo el programa como lo conozco. Pero de impresionarme mucho, ninguno me impresiona muchísimo. Ahora, también es verdad que por alguna razón, lo hemos comentado, por ejemplo, con el profesor Espinoza, con quien hacemos lengua III, que algo pasa con la dimensión léxica que, a pesar de que haya harta instrucción inclusive desde primero, es yo creo que una de las... digámoslo, actividades curriculares que tienen menor desarrollo o desarrollo menos visible de primero a cuarto. Por ejemplo, ustedes saben que yo hago estas cosas de las pruebas de vocabulario académico, que sé que son inmensamente impopulares, pero el problema es que más allá de que ustedes lean un montón de papers, más allá de que ustedes escriban un montón de cosas, más allá de que ustedes tienen instrucción específica (las pruebas de vocabulario académico; en primero, las pruebas de vocabulario concatenado), el hecho es que, por ejemplo, los últimos orales de tercero sigue faltando la palabra precisa en los (ininteligible), ¿no es cierto?, falta, falta, así como cuando se dan

28.000 vueltas y... una expresión sintáctica cuando de alguna manera es la léxica, hay un concepto para eso, existe, usted lo conoce, usted lo ha visto, lo ha visto mil veces. Entonces sí nosotros ya estamos sospechando, de alguna manera, que ese es un bonito problema de investigación, ¿no es verdad?, por qué a pesar de que hay instrucción, a pesar de que hay exposición, a pesar de que hay interacción... que es lo más importante, o sea, uno lee y uno escribe, uno habla y uno escucha, esa es la dimensión... la gramática mejora, pero la precisión y la especificidad como que falla. Uno tiene, de alguna manera, las expectativas un poco más altas respecto de eso. Y, así como lo vemos en los orales, también lo veo en estos dos textos.

Entrevistadora: Muchas gracias miss por su colaboración

Teacher 02: Ya poh, esto es suyo, me lo guardo como souvenir…

Third Interview. Teacher 03

Entrevistador: Eh… le voy a pedir por favor que me señale a grandes rasgos lo que usted considera como un buen uso de vocabulario escrito en inglés para nuestros estudiantes de pregrado.

Teacher 03: Ehm… pienso que tiene que ser… ehm… a ver, amplio, pertinente, que tiene que estar relacionado con depth y breadth, o sea, el número de palabras, que tipo de colocaciones van a tener, cómo las van a usar. Porque esto no es solo si saben muchas palabras, si no que si las pueden poner el contexto correcto, o sea, (termino en inglés), form, meaning and use; entonces si son pragmáticamente apropiados; si tienen el concepto intercultural de que hay palabras que efectivamente no se pueden traducir directamente, por lo tanto tendrían que explicar el concepto, o incluir explicaciones que indiquen cómo el lector podría vincularse mejor con los conceptos que están expresando. Entonces esto es una cuestión progresiva, eh… que debe estar relacionada con primero un uso básico para la comunicación, y luego… para la comunicación tanto académica como social, que les permita… el vocabulario… no solo comunicar a un nivel superficial, sino que también transmitir otro tipo de aspectos, como… la personalidad. O sea si un alumno es gracioso en español, debería ser capaz de comprender ciertos aspectos que hacen… que lo podrían hacer gracioso en inglés; de eso también depende un poco cuál es la profundidad del conocimiento de vocabulario que pueda tener, y junto con el vocabulario, la cultura.

Entrevistador: Ok. Lo que usted considero como un buen uso de vocabulario.

Teacher 03: Each of….. upon the, on the other hand, without going any further…aquí se equivocó en gramática pero es un detalle. Percentage, a very high percentage of the population, eso puede ser considerado casi un (initelgible) Una serie de colocaciones mucho mayor que esta otra persona que hacía uso de un vocabulario de un poco más alta, eh… de más baja frecuencia, o sea, palabras más elabo… sí, palabras de más baja frecuencia. Entonces el vocabulario es un poco más difícil de (trackar?). Si bien es cierto aquí también hay repetición de palabras claves, eh… pero cuando pensamos en el campo semántico al que está apelando, me da la impresión de que el campo semántico es un poco más amplio que el campo semántico que se plantea aquí, porque aquí solo habla de… yo imagino que el campo semántico está relacionado con politics y nation; aquí se habla de nations, pero habla de state, a wealthy state; habla de population pero habla de inhabitants. En general, los errores de gramática no influyen demasiado, tampoco a nivel de conocimiento morfológico del alumno. Eh, me parece que aquí hay… no podría ver demasiado si hay una conciencia morfológica muy amplia porque no hay mucho más de donde investigar. Ahora, dentro de esto mismo me parece que el alumno todavía no tiene claro, en este texto que no es tan bueno, que es lo que significa el uso de las comillas y por lo mismo, cuales son las connotaciones de las palabras. Entonces, en realidad el uso incorrecto de la comilla me dice que… esto lo está tomando como algo que lo está inventando por primera vez; tal vez lo quiere destacar pero no sabe cómo. En este caso no hay ese uso, y me parece que está bastante claro como está planteado el tema.

Entrevistador: ¿Algún otro comentario que… en general?

Teacher 03: No, yo imagino que… el primer texto, este texto más corto está escrito por alguien que conoce mucho menos inglés que la segunda persona. Ehm… eso

Entrevistador: Ya.

Teacher 03: Además que la connotación está mucho más sólida en la segunda persona. Esas son cosas que tu no puedes evitar considerar igual.

Fourth interview. Part 01. Teacher 04

Entrevistadora: Ok, the first question… señale a grandes rasgos lo que usted considera como un buen uso de vocabulario escrito en inglés para nuestros estudiantes de pregrado.
Teacher 04: ¿Un qué?
Entrevistadora: Un buen uso… a good use, or proficient use of English vocabulary in written texts by our students.
Teacher 04: So… I have to ask you this question, so basically you're asking me what would I consider a good use of vocabulary in students…
Entrevistadora: in writing.
Teacher 04: In writing… in student's writing… what would be a good… so, I mean, it depends on what kind of writing it is: if it is an academic writing, if I ask them to write an essay; if I ask them to write a story. All this kinds of thing will vary the kinds of vocabulary that are required for that text, basically, right? But, let's say in general, I would probably prefer the kind of vocabulary that is very descriptive. So, which vocabulary? Descriptive vocabulary, avoiding general adjectives such as "good", "bad", but more vocabularies that are… like I said, that reach and explain the intent of the author, basically. That.
Entrevistadora: Ok. Other variables, factors…
Teacher 04: Only vocabulary, right? Good use of vocabulary… Also, basically, depends on the category of the vocabulary. So basically, like I said, in terms of adjectives and nouns, it should be descriptive. In terms of, let's say, connectors and discourse markers, so… appropriate use of those in the places they should be. Also making use of words that create transitions from one sentence to another, or from paragraph to another paragraph. Ehm… and also, I know that very often, the second language learners have problems with prepositions. So, although they are not content vocabularies, but still, you know, something that I would pay attention and provide feedback for my students.
Entrevistadora: Ok, well… eh… here, necesito que subraye o encierre en un círculo ejemplos de lo que usted considera un buen uso o un mal… si poh, un buen uso del vocabulario.
Teacher 04: Ambos…círcula o… subrayo…
Entrevistadora: Circle or… yeah…
Teacher 04: ¿Cualquier método que yo quiero?
Entrevistadora: Yes

Fourth interview. Part 02. Teacher 04

Entrevistadora: Finally, señale las características específicas de estas pruebas que usted consideró como buen uso del vocabulario.
Teacher 04: Ehm… it seems, Daniela… Ok, in the same one that I did, right?
Entrevistadora: Yes, specific characteristics… that you consider a good use…
Teacher 04: Ok, so… which one?
Entrevistaadora: Both
Teacher 04: But both are from the same person?
Entrevistadora: No

Teacher 04: Ok. So, what are the good characteristics of the use of… the good use of words in these papers. Basically, what I see is that, again… there… some of them have spelling problems, but if we forget about those… And basically, I can see that the student is using very complex vocabulary, in the right situation. Ehm… also… so he or she has the knowledge… has a big pool of vocabulary to use in different places. Also, I see that he or she is able to kind of effectively use… make transitions between sentences, or contrast one argument with another argument, so like the use of "but", or things like that. Or also, to provide some sort of a… so, use words that create… ahm… How would I call it, like, ahm… stages. For instance he or she says something like "first", "second", "finally", "in conclusion". It creates certain… precisure, and so be able to use those kinds of words, basically. And… yeah! This is what I see.
Entrevistadora: In both texts you saw these characteristics…
Teacher 04: yeah… yeah… pretty much the same, I would say… yeah…
Entrevistadora: Ok, thanks.
Teacher 04: That's it?
Entrevistadora: Yes.

Appendix F: **Lextutor results**

Test 1

Words recategorized by user as 1k items (proper nouns etc): NONE (total 0 tokens)

	Families	Types	Tokens	Percent
K1 Words (1-1000):	99	116	**234**	**83.87%**
Function:	...	...	(142)	(50.90%)
Content:	...	...	(92)	(32.97%)
> Anglo-Sax				
=Not Greco-Lat/Fr Cog:	...	...	(46)	(16.49%)
K2 Words (1001-2000):	12	13	**17**	**6.09%**
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	(5)	(1.79%)
1k+2k		...	...	(89.96%)
AWL Words (academic):	11	12	**12**	**4.30%**
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	()	(0.00%)

Current profile	
%	Cumul.
83.87	83.87
6.09	89.96
4.30	94.26
5.73	100.00

Words in text (tokens):	279
Different words (types):	155
Type-token ratio:	0.56
Tokens per type:	1.80
Lex density (content words/total)	0.49

Pertaining to onlist only

Tokens:	263
Types:	141
Families:	122
Tokens per family:	2.16
Types per family:	1.16
Anglo-Sax Index: (A-Sax tokens + functors / onlist tokens)	73.38%

Test 6

	Families	Types	Tokens	Percent
K1 Words (1-1000):	84	97	**246**	90.77%
Function:	...	...	(150)	(55.35%)
Content:	...	...	(96)	(35.42%)
> Anglo-Sax				
=Not Greco-Lat/Fr Cog:	...	...	(58)	(21.40%)
K2 Words (1001-2000):	7	9	**13**	4.80%
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	(4)	(1.48%)
1k+2k		...	...	(95.57%)
AWL Words (academic):	6	8	**9**	3.32%
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	()	(0.00%)
Off-List Words:	?	3	**3**	1.11%
	97+?	117	271	100%

Current profile	
%	Cumul.
90.77	90.77
4.80	95.57
3.32	98.89
1.11	100.00

Words in text (tokens):	271
Different words (types):	117
Type-token ratio:	0.43
Tokens per type:	2.32
Lex density (content words/total)	0.45

Pertaining to onlist only

Tokens:	268
Types:	114
Families:	97
Tokens per family:	2.76
Types per family:	1.18
Anglo-Sax Index: (A-Sax tokens + functors / onlist tokens)	79.10%
Greco-Lat/Fr-Cognate Index: (Inverse of above)	20.90%

Test 7

Words recategorized by user as 1k items (proper nouns etc): NONE (total 0 tokens)

	Families	Types	Tokens	Percent
K1 Words (1-1000):	92	109	294	90.18%
Function:	...	...	(170)	(52.15%)
Content:	...	...	(124)	(38.04%)
> Anglo-Sax				
=Not Greco-Lat/Fr Cog:	...	...	(53)	(16.26%)
K2 Words (1001-2000):	5	5	10	3.07%
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	(2)	(0.61%)
1k+2k			...	(93.25%)
AWL Words (academic):	10	12	15	4.60%
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	()	(0.00%)
Off-List Words:	?	4	7	2.15%
	107+?	130	326	100%

Current profile	
%	Cumul.
90.18	90.18
3.07	93.25
4.60	97.85
2.15	100.00

Words in text (tokens):	326
Different words (types):	130
Type-token ratio:	0.40
Tokens per type:	2.51
Lex density (content words/total)	0.48
Pertaining to onlist only	
Tokens:	319
Types:	126
Families:	107
Tokens per family:	2.98
Types per family:	1.18
Anglo-Sax Index: (A-Sax tokens + functors / onlist tokens)	70.53%
Greco-Lat/Fr-Cognate Index: (inverse of above)	29.47%

Test 16

	Families	Types	Tokens	Percent
K1 Words (1-1000):	106	121	**254**	**86.10%**
Function:	...	...	(147)	(49.83%)
Content:	...	...	(107)	(36.27%)
> Anglo-Sax				
=Not Greco-Lat/Fr Cog:	...	...	(61)	(20.68%)
K2 Words (1001-2000):	12	13	**18**	**6.10%**
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	(5)	(1.69%)
1k+2k		...	...	(92.20%)
AWL Words (academic):	13	14	**18**	**6.10%**
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	(1)	(0.34%)
Off-List Words:	?	5	**5**	**1.69%**
	131+?	153	295	100%

Current profile	
%	Cumul.
86.10	86.10
6.10	92.20
6.10	98.30
1.69	100.00

Words in text (tokens):	295
Different words (types):	153
Type-token ratio:	0.52
Tokens per type:	1.93
Lex density (content words/total)	0.50

Pertaining to onlist only

Tokens:	290
Types:	148
Families:	131
Tokens per family:	2.21
Types per family:	1.13
Anglo-Sax Index: (A-Sax tokens + functors / onlist tokens)	73.79%
Greco-Lat/Fr-Cognate Index: (Inverse of above)	26.21%

Test 39

	Families	Types	Tokens	Percent
K1 Words (1-1000):	92	111	**221**	**84.03%**
Function:	...	...	(129)	(49.05%)
Content:	...	...	(92)	(34.98%)
> Anglo-Sax				
=Not Greco-Lat/Fr Cog:	...	...	(52)	(19.77%)
K2 Words (1001-2000):	13	13	**13**	**4.94%**
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	(5)	(1.90%)
1k+2k		...	...	(88.97%)
AWL Words (academic):	12	12	**18**	**6.84%**
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	()	(0.00%)
Off-List Words:	?	11	**11**	**4.18%**
	117+?	147	263	100%

Current profile	
%	Cumul.
84.03	84.03
4.94	88.97
6.84	95.81
4.18	100.00

Words in text (tokens):	263
Different words (types):	147
Type-token ratio:	0.56
Tokens per type:	1.79
Lex density (content words/total)	0.51

Pertaining to onlist only

Tokens:	252
Types:	136
Families:	117
Tokens per family:	2.15
Types per family:	1.16
Anglo-Sax Index: (A-Sax tokens + functors / onlist tokens)	73.81%
Greco-Lat/Fr-Cognate Index: (Inverse of above)	26.19%

Test 9

	Families	Types	Tokens	Percent
K1 Words (1-1000):	68	81	**172**	**90.53%**
Function:	...	...	(108)	(56.84%)
Content:	...	...	(64)	(33.68%)
> Anglo-Sax =Not Greco-Lat/Fr Cog:	...	...	(34)	(17.89%)
K2 Words (1001-2000):	6	6	8	4.21%
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	(1)	(0.53%)
1k+2k		...	...	**(94.74%)**
AWL Words (academic):	6	7	9	4.74%
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	()	(0.00%)
Off-List Words:	?	1	1	0.53%
	80+?	95	190	100%

Current profile	
%	Cumul.
90.53	90.53
4.21	94.74
4.74	99.48
0.53	100.00

Words in text (tokens):	190
Different words (types):	95
Type-token ratio:	0.50
Tokens per type:	2.00
Lex density (content words/total)	0.43
Pertaining to onlist only	
Tokens:	189
Types:	94
Families:	80
Tokens per family:	2.36
Types per family:	1.18
Anglo-Sax Index: (A-Sax tokens + functors / onlist tokens)	75.66%
Greco-Lat/Fr-Cognate Index: (Inverse of above)	24.34%

Test 10

	Families	Types	Tokens	Percent
K1 Words (1-1000):	81	90	**186**	**87.74%**
Function:	...	...	(115)	(54.25%)
Content:	...	...	(71)	(33.49%)
> Anglo-Sax =Not Greco Lat/Fr Cog:	...	...	(36)	(16.98%)
K2 Words (1001-2000):	8	8	**8**	**3.77%**
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	(2)	(0.94%)
1k+2k		...	...	(91.51%)
AWL Words (academic):	11	11	**11**	**5.19%**
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	(1)	(0.47%)
Off-LIst Words:	?	7	**7**	**3.30%**
	100+?	116	212	100%

Current profile	
%	Cumul.
87.74	87.74
3.77	91.51
5.19	96.70
3.30	100.00

Words in text (tokens):	212
Different words (types):	116
Type-token ratio:	0.55
Tokens per type:	1.83
Lex density (content words/total)	0.46

Pertaining to onlist only	
Tokens:	205
Types:	109
Families:	100
Tokens per family:	2.05
Types per family:	1.09
Anglo-Sax Index: (A-Sax tokens + functors / onlist tokens)	75.12%
Greco-Lat/Fr-Cognate Index: (Inverse of above)	24.88%

Test 28

	Families	Types	Tokens	Percent
K1 Words (1-1000):	77	90	**184**	**89.76%**
Function:	...	...	(115)	(56.10%)
Content:	...	...	(69)	(33.66%)
> Anglo-Sax =Not Greco-Lat/Fr Cog:	...	...	(33)	(16.10%)
K2 Words (1001-2000):	10	10	**11**	**5.37%**
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	(3)	(1.46%)
1k+2k		...	...	(95.13%)
AWL Words (academic):	8	8	**8**	**3.90%**
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	(1)	(0.49%)
Off-List Words:	?	2	**2**	**0.98%**
	95+?	110	205	100%

Current profile	
%	Cumul.
89.76	89.76
5.37	95.13
3.90	99.03
0.98	100.00

Words in text (tokens):	205
Different words (types):	110
Type-token ratio:	0.54
Tokens per type:	1.86
Lex density (content words/total)	0.44
Pertaining to onlist only	
Tokens:	203
Types:	108
Families:	95
Tokens per family:	2.14
Types per family:	1.14
Anglo-Sax Index: (A-Sax tokens + functors / onlist tokens)	74.88%
Greco-Lat/Fr-Cognate Index: (Inverse of above)	25.12%

127

Test 42

	Families	Types	Tokens	Percent
K1 Words (1-1000):	103	117	**256**	**88.28%**
Function:	...	...	(152)	(52.41%)
Content:	...	...	(104)	(35.86%)
> Anglo-Sax				
=Not Greco-Lat/Fr Cog:	...	...	(57)	(19.66%)
K2 Words (1001-2000):	7	7	**10**	**3.45%**
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	(4)	(1.38%)
1k+2k		...	...	(91.73%)
AWL Words (academic):	11	11	**14**	**4.83%**
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	()	(0.00%)
Off-List Words:	?	10	**10**	**3.45%**
	121+?	145	290	100%

Current profile

%	Cumul.
88.28	88.28
3.45	91.73
4.83	96.56
3.45	100.00

Words in text (tokens):	290
Different words (types):	145
Type-token ratio:	0.50
Tokens per type:	2.00
Lex density (content words/total)	0.48

Pertaining to onlist only

Tokens:	280
Types:	135
Families:	121
Tokens per family:	2.31
Types per family:	1.12
Anglo-Sax Index: (A-Sax tokens + functors / onlist tokens)	76.07%
Greco-Lat/Fr-Cognate Index: (Inverse of above)	23.93%

	Families	Types	Tokens	Percent
K1 Words (1-1000):	101	112	**268**	92.41%
Function:	...	...	(152)	(52.41%)
Content:	...	...	(116)	(40.00%)
> Anglo-Sax				
=Not Greco-Lat/Fr Cog:	...	...	(61)	(21.03%)
K2 Words (1001-2000):	6	7	10	3.45%
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	(4)	(1.38%)
1k+2k		...	...	(95.86%)
AWL Words (academic):	6	6	6	2.07%
> Anglo-Sax:	...	...	()	(0.00%)
Off-List Words:	?	6	6	2.07%
	113+?	131	290	100%

Current profile

%	Cumul.
92.41	92.41
3.45	95.86
2.07	97.93
2.07	100.00

Words in text (tokens):	290
Different words (types):	131
Type-token ratio:	0.45
Tokens per type:	2.21
Lex density (content words/total)	0.48

Pertaining to onlist only

Tokens:	284
Types:	125
Families:	113
Tokens per family:	2.51
Types per family:	1.11
Anglo-Sax Index: (A-Sax tokens + functors / onlist tokens)	76.41%
Greco-Lat/Fr-Cognate Index: (Inverse of above)	23.59%

Appendix G: Topic appropriateness results

Top

	Text 1	Text 6	Text 7	Text 16	Text 39
Topic appropriate words	Wealth	Economical	Poor	Wealth	Wealth
	Poor	Rich	Nation	Nation	Nations
	Colonialism	Poor	Inhabitants	Poor	Poor
	Socieconomic	Invest	Wealth	Standards	Rich
	Government	Population	State	Production	Defenseless
	Nations	Donate	Government	Unemployment	Corporations
	Citizens	Resources	Foreign	Continent	Monopoly
	Resources	Political	Population	Resource	Resources
	Culture		Distribution	Foreign	Managing
	Supplies			Debt	Exportations
	Political			Manage	Impoverish
	Refuge			Economy	Develop
				Citizen	Stability
				Politic	
				Health-care	
				Relief	

Botttom

	Text 9	Text 10	Text 28	Text 42	Text 56
Topic appropriate words	Nation	Political	Nation	Wealth	Wealth
	Wealth	Wealth	Poor	Nation	Nation
	Poverty	Nation	Government	Worldly	Poor
	Economy	Citizen	Independent	Economic	Technology
	Growth	Government	President	Prosper	Industry
	Resources	Finance	Chief	Rich	Globalization
	Technology	Autonomy	Relationships	Poor	Security
		Capitalism	Wealth	Income	Stability
		Poor	Citizen	Government	
			Export	State	
			Growth	Citizen	
				Enterprise	
				Taxes	
				Rights	
				Business	
				Resources	