371.3::811.111
Прегледни рад

Наслеђе 28 • 2014 • 79-94

Маја Р. Луковић[1]
Економски факултет
Универзитет у Крагујевцу

AN AGENDA FOR THE RESEARCH OF ESP VOCABULARY ACQUISITION

Searching for the best approaches in teaching and learning English for Specific Purposes (ESP), particularly ESP vocabulary, and examining the most efficient methods, strategies and activities to promote effective vocabulary acquisition has been a noteworthy line of research in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), but not as much in the field of ESP vocabulary acquisition, especially in the field of Business English for Economists. Increased interest in communicative and interactive approaches to ESP language learning has led to creating this article as a form of (pre)modified input for a research planned to be carried out at the Faculty of Economics, University of Kragujevac during the winter semester of the academic year 2014. Despite the fact that this article will be descriptive in its nature, it represents the research agenda for the future planned investigation that will provide empirical evidence of influence of (pre)modified input and (pre)modified output on ESP vocabulary acquisition focusing on Task Based Learning (TBL) and experiential teaching and learning methods for ESP tertiary students.

Keywords: ESP vocabulary, acquisition, input, output, simulation

Introduction

In the course of my experience as a language teacher of Business English for Economists, I have noticed that (pre)modified input creates only passive knowledge which does not affect students' inter-language but only constitutes language knowledge plateau stage that has to be "pushed out" in order to be retained in students' memory. (Pre)modified input is an inevitable first step in the process of language/vocabulary acquisition but not the only one. In order to maximize ESP language/vocabulary knowledge retention it is necessary to apply TBL methods in combination with experiential learning activities with the principal focus on profession-related activities not only on language for professional purposes. ESP tertiary students are practically always highly motivated to everything that is closely related to their future professional activities. My suggestion is/will be that by rethinking TBL approach to language/vocabulary acquisition as well as experiential activities and methods of language for specific purposes, that is ‚Business English, within the framework of (pre) modified input and (pre) modified output theories with the specific em-

1 mmilutinovic@kg.ac.rs

phasis on ESP vocabulary acquisition, we/ teachers of ESP might get a deeper insight into the possibilities of improving existing approaches to teaching methods and techniques in the field of ESP.

Task-based learning approach

Task-based language learning (TBL) refers to the process of language acquisition in which learners concentrate on meaning rather than form. Task-based language learning, based on constructivist theory of learning and communicative language teaching methodology, evolved to some limitations of the traditional PPP approach which only creates the illusion of learning because for any lasting learning to occur learners need much more communicative experience. Contrary to PPP approach, represented by the procedure of presentation, practice and performance, TBL is a developmental process promoting communication and social interaction and "push" learners to learn the target language more effectively because they are naturally exposed to meaningful task-based activities. As Brown suggests:

> "Task-based learning is not a new method. Rather, it simple puts task at the center of one's methodological focus. It views the learning process as a set of communicative tasks that are directly linked to the curricular goals they serve, and the purposes of which extend beyond the practice of language for its own sake. Research on task-based learning attempts to identify types of tasks that enhance learning (for example, open-ended, structured, teacher-fronted, small group, pair work) and to define task-specific learner factors (roles, proficiency levels, styles), teacher roles, and other variables that contribute to a successful achievement of goals"(Brown 2000: 83)

In the framework of TBL we should pay close attention to the notion of communicative task. According to Willis the term task indicates those "activities where the target language is used by the learner for a communicative purpose (goal) in order to achieve an outcome."(Willis 1996:28) Thus, teaching through tasks creates favorable learning conditions for students who study ESP at tertiary level. TBL involves students in performing tasks relevant to their future professions, increases their motivation and does not emphasize linguistic items in the primary stages. Furthermore, in order to achieve the objectives of TBL task in an English for Specific Purposes (ESP) context a task should reflect what learners need to do in real-life situations at the future work place. Also, tasks must be based on authentic materials obtained from written or oral texts which have not been adapted to simplify their level of difficulty. Willis has also pointed out that teachers should prepare communicative activities with "suitable degree of intellectual and linguistic challenge and promote learners' language development as efficiently as possible" (Willis 1996: 23)

When designing a task-based activity, its stages must be taken into consideration since they are the ones that lead students to be able to do the main task of the activity. Ellis (2003) proposes three stages or phases in the process of language learning activities: pre-task, during task and post-task. The first

phase, pre-task phase, includes various activities that teacher and students can undertake before beginning the task. This phase has two basic functions, according to Ellis (2003).First one is to introduce and create an interest in doing a task on the chosen topic and the second one is to activate topic-related words, phrases and target sentences that will be useful in carrying out the task and in the real world communication. In the next phase, during task phase, students can work in pairs or groups and they use whatever linguistic resources they possess or obtain in the previous phase to achieve the goal/goals of the task. The final phase, post-task phase involves procedures for following-up on the task performance, that is, output analysis and teacher's corrections or students' self-repair.

Willis (1996) outlines another model for TBL which refers to three stages: the pre-task, the task cycle and language focus stage. In the pre-task stage, the topic is introduced and defined and essential vocabulary is highlighted by the teacher. The task cycle provides students with an opportunity to do the task in pairs or small groups while the teacher monitors from a distance encouraging all attempts in communication without correcting any mistakes. Students prepare to report (orally or in writing) how they achieved the goal of the task and what they discovered. Students' reports are public so the teacher should act as facilitator commenting only the content of reports. Finally, in the language focus or post-task stage students analyze specific language features and only after their attempt to infer the knowledge of the unknown language features by themselves, the teacher starts to conduct practice of new words, phrases and patterns occurring in the data.

It should be emphasized that having finished a secondary school, students, who are non-native speakers of English, are expected to have mastered either the highest C2 or slightly lower C1 level. In the course of my teaching experience I noticed that, on average, school leavers usually reached either B1 or B2 level. However, at tertiary level, the objectives of ESP course are to ensure the mastering of the usage of professional language in spite of the lack in proficiency in General English. On the other hand, a curriculum of ESP courses is usually designed according to the learners' needs and in accordance with the institutional requirements. Applying TBL in combination with experiential learning and teaching can assist in providing universities with an opportunity to offer a better "product" that students will appreciate as a payoff for their learning investment. Because of the fact that very often students' previous secondary education did not sufficiently prepare them to practically utilize their language capabilities to succeed in their tertiary ESP environments, it is necessary to organize ESP educational programs which combine and integrate learning and its future academic or professional application, regardless of whether this integration is real or simulated. Therefore, mastering ESP encompasses necessity for students to acquire a number of grammatical/vocabulary items which can be provided by applying of TBL and experiential teaching methods.

The Output Hypothesis

This article as a form of (pre)modified agenda for the future empirically proved research theoretically investigates what effects different oral interactions may have on the comprehension, receptive acquisition and productive acquisition of ESP vocabulary items. It also focuses on the effect of productive use of lexical items (elicited by feedback from students, teacher) on the receptive and productive acquisition and retention of words, along the lines of Swain's Output Hypothesisand Van den Branden's study of negotiation.

Swain (1985), in her seminal article, emphasizes that comprehensible input is not sufficient for successful SLA and that opportunities for non-native speakers (NNSs) to produce Comprehensible Output (CO) are necessary. She basis her conclusions on findings from studies she conducted in immersion contexts in Canada. Swain(1985) found that although immersion students were provided with a rich source of comprehensible input over a period of 8 years, their inter-language (IL) performance was still off-target. The same author (1985) argues that IL performance of these students was still off-target because they lacked opportunities for output in two ways. "First, the students are simply not given (…) adequate opportunities, to use the target language in the classroom context. Second, "they are not being "pushed" in their output."(Swain1985: 249) She (1985) goes on to say that "there appears to be little social or cognitive pressure to produce language that reflects more appropriately or precisely their intended meaning: there is no push to be more comprehensible than they already are." (Swain 1985: 249) Thus, the author points out that learners must be given the opportunity to produce target language instead of only being given comprehensible input in order to be accurate and fluent in the target language. Therefore, she doubts that interactions and comprehensible input are sufficient for SLA:

> "Conversational exchanges (…) are not themselves the source of acquisition derived from comprehensible input. Rather they are the source of acquisition derived from comprehensible output: output that extends the linguistic repertoire of the learner as he or she attempts to create precisely and appropriately the meaning desired." (Swain 1985: 252)

Swain (1985) proposes the hypothesis, which she terms the "comprehensible output hypothesis" (Swain 1985: 249) for SLA. The basic premise of the CO hypothesis postulates that producing the L2, especially when learners experience difficulties in communicating their intended message successfully, "pushes" learners to make their output more precise and appropriate and that this process contributes to SLA. She (1985) also points out that output "may be the trigger to pay attention to the means of expression needed in order to successfully convey his or her own intended meaning". (Swain 1985: 249) Although she admits the necessity of comprehensible input in SLA, she emphasizes the role of CO because it aids SLA in many ways:

> "Its role is, at maximum, to provide opportunities or contextualized, meaningful use, to test out hypotheses about the target language, and to move the learner

> from a purely semantic analysis of the language to a syntactic analysis of it." (Swain 1985: 252)

Swain (1995) outlines three functions of output in second language learning: the noticing/triggering function, the hypothesis-testing function and the meta-linguistic (reflective) function. While attempting to produce the target language, learners may notice linguistic problems. "This awareness triggers cognitive processes that have been implicated in second language learning-ones in which learners generate linguistic knowledge that is new for them, or that consolidate their current existing knowledge."(Swain 2005: 474)

Similar to the Swain's explanation of noticing/triggering function of output is Izumi's research (2002) of input in the frame of depth of processing that highlights the fact that the quantity of attention is less important than the quality of it. Izumi (2002) suggests that within this framework "input enhancement may have caused mere recirculation or rehearsal at the same, relatively shallow processing level, which led to the learners to experience only a short-term retention of the attended form. On the other hand, the greater learning evidenced by the output subjects suggests that output triggered deeper and more elaborate processing of the form, which led them to establish a more durable memory trace"(Izumi 2002: 570) According to Izumi's research

> "Output processing (…) pushed(…) learners further in their cognitive processing and prompted them to perceive or conceive the unitized structure. This occurs by virtue of the grammatical encoding operations performed during production. As a consequence, the output task served effectively both as the stimulator of integrative processing and as the glue to connect individual form, elements, which (…) were only vaguely related to one another during the comprehension process." (Izumi 2002: 571)

While explaining the hypothesis testing function Swain (2005) insists on the necessity for learners to test their hypotheses in order to change their output followed by feedback. She gives an example of Pica et. al. (1989) findings "that over one third of learner's utterances were modified either semantically or morphosyntactically in response to the feedback moves of clarification and confirmation requests." (Swain 2005: 476) Another example, that Swain in her article provides is Loewen (2002) finding that in communicatively oriented second language classroom settings, almost three quarters of learners' utterances were modified in response to teachers' incidental feedback. All these findings support the assumption that "the processes in which learners engage to modify their output in response to feedback are part of the second language learning process." (Swain 2005: 476) In addition, Swain (2005) states that output is not only modified in response to various feedback but that production of modified output facilitates L2 learning.

Swain (2005) states that speaking is an exterior source of physical and mental regulation for an individual because through speaking/output others regulate an individual's physical and cognitive behavior. Thus, over time, the individual internalizes the regulatory actions of others. This means that learners who participate in dialogues with others operating on linguistic data,

internalize the linguistic data to the extent that it becomes part of their own mental activity. In dialogues with each other, or with a teacher, they are engaged in linguistic problem solving and knowledge building. Swain and Lapkin (1998) have called this joint problem-solving dialogue "collaborative dialogue". Swain (2005) have experimented with tasks that encourage students to engage in collaborative dialogues and found "that tasks where students are asked to write something together tend to elicit collaborative dialogue as the students discuss how best to represent their intended meaning. Furthermore, they have shown through the use of post test items based on the students' collaborative dialogues that the collaborative dialogues were a source of language learning." (Swain 2005:478)

Swain (2005) also notes that three functions of output in SLA represent a cognitive activity, that is, the cognitive activity of identifying knowledge gaps, the cognitive activity of generating and testing hypotheses and the cognitive activity of solving problems. The dialogue, which she terms "collaborative" can sometimes be the source of these activities "(…)because it creates a context that enables learners to identify knowledge gaps in their IL performance, to verbalize and explicitly test their hypotheses about the TL, and to solve linguistic problems jointly by negotiating about TL forms (…)" (Swain 1997: 118-119)

Negotiation and vocabulary acquisition

This detailed theoretical/descriptive analysis of Swain's OutputHypothesis creates the framework for one form of modification and information restructuring that takes place when learners in the input or in the process of "pushed" output experience difficulty in understanding messages. Namely, acquiring productive knowledge of a word is a more complex task than acquiring a receptive or passive knowledge of it (e.g., Laufer, 1998; Nation, 1990). Laufer (1998) observed in his quantitative, longitudinal study on L2 vocabulary acquisition that learners' passive vocabulary developed to a higher extent than did their active use of new words. This so-called plateau stage was attributed to the lack of exercises and tasks that elicit the new vocabulary taught, preventing learners from incorporating this vocabulary into free production. Negotiation may benefit productive acquisition of new words, provided that the students have the opportunity to use items they have begun to acquire and to receive feedback from other speakers. Thus, this is one more confirmation of Swain's notion of "pushed" output, that is, "what goes on between the original output and its reprocessed form (…) is a part of the process of second language learning." (Swain 1997: 119)

Kris Van den Branden (1997) notes in his study of *Effects of Negotiation on Language Learner's Output* that there is a clear distinction between negotiation of meaning and negotiation of form. Negotiation of meaning is to restore and/or maintain mutual understanding and "routines of negotiation of meaning are side-sequences to the main flow of conversation, during which the interlocutors make joint efforts to deal with problems of message comprehensibility." (Branden 1997: 591-592) On the other hand, form negotiations are

not primarily meaning-focused, and the task of interlocutor/teacher is to try to "push" the other towards producing formally more correct and/or appropriate utterances. According to Van den Branden, these both forms of negotiation encourage learners to self-repair or to acknowledge the solution for the problem that may appear in their inter-language. They differ from other types of negative feedback, such as overt corrections and recasts because they encourage learners to actively participate in the process of their output modifications. "Pushing" language learners to modify their output through negotiation of meaning and form promotes language acquisition in a number of ways. Wells (1985) has emphasized motivational aspect of negotiations. First, interlocutor/teacher shows interest in learner's output which may encourage the learners to question the language they produce and reconstruct the inter-language hypotheses that underlie their output. In discourse contexts " where learners need to produce output that their current Il system cannot handle, they may be expected to pay close attention to the interactional help offered : a learner in search of the right word or structure is a learner who is open to noticing such things in the input(…)" (Branden 1997: 596) When learners receive the feedback from an interlocutor/teacher, they incorporate it and use it to modify their output in the conversation or during subsequent conversations.

One of negative aspects of negotiation in the language classroom, as Van den Branden (1997) points out, is minimal output opportunity for less confident and less proficient learners who receive a limited number of speaking turns. Also, in a lot of situations when a student does not succeed to provide a correct answer within a few seconds, or gives an incorrect or incomprehensible answer, teachers instead of being learning facilitators become discourse context dictators. They do not "push" students to produce comprehensible or accurate output but more likely switch to another student, or simply provide the correct answer. In order to move on with the lesson, to save the students' face, many teachers view negotiating process on learners' output as time-consuming, embarrassing (for the student), inappropriate and instead of pushing learners to self-modify their output they often provide a rich interpretation of what the learner tried to say. Shehadeh (2002)in his research found "that the NNSs who participated in his study produced an average of 1 MO instance per minute in response to other-initiation and 2.5 in response to self-initiation. In other words, instances of MO resulting from self-initiation were two-and-a-half times more frequent than those resulting from other-initiation." (Shehadeh 2002: 623) The implication of this research is that learners need to be given both time and opportunity to achieve self-initiated, self-completed repair of their inter-language. Some studies (e.g., McHoul, 1978, 1990) observe that learners are not given sufficient time or opportunity to self-repair-self/correct. For instance, McHoul (1990) indicates that teachers' initiated corrections "either (a) immediately a trouble-source is over, with usually no gap occurring or (b) immediately the repairable {i. e., the trouble- source itself is spoken/heard" (McHoul 1990: 375). He also point out that "the latter cases of other-initiations either (i) overlap the trouble-source turn or (ii) interrupt it.

In instances of (i), teacher and student can both be heard to be speaking, albeit briefly, at the same time. In instances of (ii), the student immediately yields the floor to the teacher" (McHoul 1990: 375). "Musumeci (1996) has vividly illustrated teachers' strong ability and preparedness to derive meaning from whatever the student try to say, sometimes even before the latter have uttered one single word."(Branden 1997: 599) For more "pushing" output to appear in the classroom, Van den Branden concludes that it is vitally for both teachers and students to interpret negotiation as a "tool" for constructing modified inter-language in the global process of language acquisition.

Continuous simulation

Rod Ellis (2005) in his article *Instructed language learning and Task-Based Teaching* notes some task-based researches which aim to identify "psycholinguistically motivated" tasks which are relevant to second language processing and learning. "Researchers have investigated a variety of task variables and have been able to show that tasks that are two-way as opposed to one-way (Pica & Doughty, 1985), that have split rather than shared input (Newton,1991), and where the outcome of a task is closed rather than open (Crookes & Rulon, 1985) and divergent rather than convergent (Duff, 1986) result in higher levels of meaning negotiation. "(Ellis 2005: 722) Thus, this agenda for the future planned research on ESP vocabulary acquisition will focus on continuous simulation as one of the tasks that includes Ellis research proposals and that provide "focus-on-form" not only "focus-on-forms" (Long, 1991), directed at specific linguistic items (words) induced proactively into a task performance by means of negotiation of meaning. Traditional simulations, according to Tornpolsky (2012), as learning activities/tasks, are similar to role plays in the way that students also play roles while they are engaged in extra-linguistic activities in which communication is held in the target language. However, the main focus in simulations is function of the activity, professional activity, not only modeling a real-life situation as it is the case with role plays. Furthermore, the main focus in role plays is the conflict of interest whether in simulations it is the conflict of opinions because all participants in simulations strive to attain the same goal and only contradiction is how to achieve the goal. These traditional simulations are not completely adequate for the future research on vocabulary acquisition and retention in Business English context because they are disconnected episodes in the learning/teaching process. "Continuous simulation is a specific organization of a Business English (…)course when learning develops as continuous modeling and enacting of business activities and communication in class. The enactment is done in the framework of almost life-sized functioning of an imaginary company." (Tornpolsky 2012: 40) Every stage in the continuum of simulations is followed by produced output, whether it is (pre)modified through negotiation or through overt corrections and recasts, that is, learners are in every stage exposed to modification of their inter-language that may be used in the following stage/simulation. Therefore, continuous simulation provides ideal framework for the following research to

empirically investigate how : a) learners exposed to non-negotiated , (pre)modified input, that is, exposure to meaning of the target words with production of output modified through overt corrections and recasts, b)learners exposed to interactionally modified input through negotiation with a teacher as facilitator and with production of output modified through overt corrections and recasts ,and c) learners exposed to interactionally modified input through negotiation with each other with production of interactionally modified output through negotiation with a teacher as facilitator, benefit ESP vocabulary acquisition.

Each phase, each simulation in the process of continuous simulation as a task-based activity, according to Willis (1996) and Ellis (2003), should include three stages:

The pre-task stage (Willis, 1996)/ "pre-task" phase (Ellis, 2003): in this phase a teacher should obtain the proper material and decide what professional situation will be simulated, and whether the students' level of language proficiency is sufficient for such a simulation. Furthermore, a teacher should describe the situation that will be simulated and set the goals if they need to be set. This phase also include students' initial preparation, that is, reading, or listening, or watching a video before starting simulation in order to obtain some information required for the simulation. For the purpose of the future research after learners' initial preparation, teacher decide whether the new vocabulary will be analyzed through interactionally modified input through negotiation of meaning with him/her as facilitator or students' will negotiate with each other, or through(pre)modified input treatment, that is, exposure to meaning of the target words.

The task cycle (Willis, 1996)/ during task (Ellis, 2003)/ simulation itself: in this stage students work in groups, in the course of the following research groups will be formed of four students, using whatever linguistic resources they possess or obtain in the previous phase to achieve the goal of the task. Teacher monitors from a distance facilitating communication if necessary but without correcting any mistakes.

The final phase/ language focus stage (Willis, 1996)/post task (Ellis, 2003)/ debriefing: commenting on the results of finished simulation phase and linguistic output analyses through overt corrections, recasts provided by a teacher or negotiation of meaning with a teacher as facilitator and possibility for students to self-repair their inter-language preparing for the next simulation.

Planned research questions and hypotheses

The future study will investigate the effects of different approaches to the same task-based activity/simulation/continuous simulation on the comprehension, receptive acquisition and productive acquisition of new ESP vocabulary. It will also examine the effect of productive use of lexical items on the receptive and productive acquisition and retention of words in the framework of Swain's (1997, 2005) output hypothesis. The research questions and hypotheses will be the following:

Does negotiated interaction benefit ESP vocabulary comprehension?

Hypothesis 1: Learners exposed to input(new ESP vocabulary) during negotiation interaction with production of output will attain higher levels of input comprehension than learners exposed to non-negotiated, (pre)modified input with production of output.

What is the relative effect of type of interaction on ESP receptive vocabulary acquisition? If there is an effect, how does it influence retention of acquired ESP vocabulary?

Hypothesis 2a: Learners exposed to interactionally modified input through negotiation with production of output modified through overt corrections and recasts will attain higher level of ESP receptive vocabulary acquisition than learners exposed to non-negotiated, (pre)modified input with production of output modified through overt corrections and recasts.

Hypothesis 2b: Learners exposed to interactionally modified input through negotiation with each other and with production of output interactionally modified with a teacher/facilitator will attain higher levels of ESP receptive vocabulary acquisition than learners exposed to interactionally modified input through negotiation with a teacher/facilitator and with production of output modified through overt corrections and recasts.

What is the relative effect of type of interaction on ESP productive vocabulary acquisition? If there is an effect, how does it influence retention of acquired vocabulary?

Hypothesis 3a: Learners exposed to interactionally modified input through negotiation whether with each other or with a teacher/facilitator with production of output will attain higher levels of ESP productive vocabulary acquisition than learners exposed to non-negotiated, (pre)modified input with production of output.

Hypothesis 3b: Learners exposed to interactionally modified input through negotiation with each other with produced output modified through negotiation with a teacher/facilitator will attain higher levels of ESP productive vocabulary acquisition than learners exposed to interactionally modified input through negotiation with a teacher/facilitator with produced output modified through overt corrections and recasts.

Method

Participants

A total of 60 second-year volunteer students will participate in the research. They will be randomly assigned to one of three experimental groups: 1) non-negotiated, (pre)modified input with produced output modified through recasts and overt corrections, 2) interactionally modified input through negotiation with a teacher/facilitator with produced output modified through recasts and overt corrections, 3) interactionally modified input through negotiation with each other with produced output modified through negotiation with teacher/facilitator.

Procedure

Pre-task phase/stage

The continuous simulation will be designed as a series of logically interconnected episodes/assignments for students that outline the development and functioning of the imaginary company. Imaginary continuum of "business activities" will be ensured by exposing students to permanently simulate "business activities" and business communication in the course of six exercise sessions, one per week. During each session, each group will be exposed to reading, or listening, or watching a video as the preparation for each simulation in the process of six continuous simulations. Tasks will be carried out on these sessions that will last up to two hours each and in which participants will be engaged in the same activities that will vary depending on the group students belong.

The first group will be exposed to non-negotiated/(pre)modified input, that is, to meaning of the target words/new ESP vocabulary (up to 30 minutes),after reading, or listening, or watching a video.

The second group will be exposed to interactionally modified input through negotiation with a teacher/ facilitator in the process of inferring the meaning of new ESP vocabulary from the given context(up to 30 minutes), after reading, or listening, or watching a video.

The third group will be exposed to interactioanally modified input through negotiation with each other in the process of inferring the meaning of new ESP vocabulary from the given context (up to 30 minutes), after reading, or listening, or watching a video.

Task cycle/during task/simulation

After exposure to input, all the students will be "pushed" in the simulation with a teacher monitoring them from a distance and facilitating communication if necessary but without correcting any mistakes. The simulation may last up to one hour.

Language focus stage/post task/ debriefing

In this final stage, which may last up to half an hour, students will be given the opportunity to comment on the results of finished simulation and analyze linguistic problems primarily meaning of new ESP vocabulary with a teacher:

First and second group: by exposure to feedback in the form of overt corrections and recasts;

Third group: by exposure to negotiation with a teacher;

According to Swain and Lapkin (1998) the function of the task cycle/ during task/produced output in vocabulary acquisition is to play a role of a triggering process and to serve as a tool for meta-linguistic talk, for noticing and focusing learners' attention on subsequent input, for hypothesis test-

ing. The verbalization in produced output helps students to solve linguistic problems through reflection on them, or meta-linguistic talk. For example, in Swain's (1997) study, production enabled learners to notice problems in their inter-language system, prompting them to reflect consciously on the language they were producing and to negotiate collaboratively about target language forms and structures until a satisfactory resolution was reached.

Testing instruments

I) Three post-treatment tests will be administered to measure the immediate and delayed effects of the treatment. The first test will be carried out immediately after the task cycle of three simulations, the second after another cycle of other three simulations. The third test will be administered three weeks after finishing the planned process of six continuous simulations.

In order to be measured receptive and productive acquisition of ESP vocabulary, the Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS), developed by Paribakht and Wesche (1997), will be adapted for both the immediate post-tests and the delayed post-test. This scale will be used because it primarily examines learners' word knowledge by measuring their familiarity of vocabulary meaning. As shown in Table 1, Paribakht and Wesche (1997) proposes five point scale which combines self-report and performance items to elicit self-perceived and produced knowledge of specific words in written form.

TABLE 1
Self-Report Categories for the Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS) (Adapted from Paribakht & Wesche, 1997)

Category	Description
I	I don't remember having seen this word before.
II	I have seen this word before, but I don't know what it means.
III	I have seen this word before, and I think it means _____. (Write explanation or a synonym, which is a word that has a similar meaning.)
IV	I know this word. It [RF1] means _____. (Write explanation or a synonym, which is a word that has a similar meaning.)
V	I can use this word in a sentence: (write a sentence that includes the word). e.g.,:_____ _____ **(If you do this section, please also do Section IV.)**

As presented in Figure 1, according to Paribakht and Wesche (1997), self-reported word knowledge of categories I and II will receive scores of 1 and 2, and students' demonstration of vocabulary knowledge (e.g., at least the definition of vocabulary) will be rewarded higher scores. Incorrect responses

in self-report categories III, IV and V will be given a score of 2. A score of 3 will be given if an appropriate synonym or translation will be provided for self-repair categories III or IV. A score 4 will indicate that the learners use the word in a sentence demonstrating their knowledge of its meaning in context but with inaccurate grammar. A score of 5 will indicate correct use of the target word in a sentence both semantically and grammatically.

FIGURE 1
Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS) Scoring Categories (Adapted from Paribakht & Wesche, 1997)

Self-Report Categories	Possible Scores	Meaning of Scores
I	1	The word is not familiar at all.
II	2	The word is familiar but its meaning is not known.
III	3	A correct synonym or translation is given.
IV	4	The word is used with semantic appropriateness in a sentence.
V	5	The word is used with semantic appropriateness and grammatical accuracy in a sentence.

II) Another test instrument will be to trace language learning process and measure acquisition by tailoring items on post-tests. Swain and Lapkin (1998) suggest that the best way for language acquisition analysis is to combine an analysis of students' collaborative dialogue with follow-up post-test interviews with a teacher "in other to derive a more fine-grained understanding of the mental process" (Swain and Lapkin 1998: 333) activated in these dialogues. This test treatment will be administered with a teacher, individually, following the same time schedule as post-tests planned to be carried out in written form.

Conclusion instead of a discussion

Instead of a discussion that empirically supports or not the proposed hypotheses and contributes or not more evidence in favor of pushed output and its effects on ESP vocabulary receptive and productive acquisition, previously proposed agenda for the future research, in the course of the article, will be concluded in the form of "pushed" output as a "tool" for triggering process and meta-linguistic talk. It cannot be concluded in the form of hypotheses testing because the previously described agenda has been only hypothesized. Artificial nature of this descriptively created agenda leads to many questions that in future may be provided with empirically confirmed answers. Does negotiation may benefit of ESP vocabulary acquisition? Which processes account for the conversion of intake into production, or how should we investigate whether the modifications students make to their output can be a source of competence of ESP vocabulary items? How the solutions reached during collaborative dialogues are retained in the students' inter-language?

Further, how do we construct tasks as well as tests and post-tests that force students to use a particular aspect of language so that we, the researchers, can confirm that it has been acquired? Whether "pushing" learners beyond their performance level can lead to the internalization of new linguistic knowledge, or the consolidation of existing one?

> "Nevertheless, any attempt to isolate and examine the proportion of comprehensible but incorrect/less accurate output versus correct/more accurate but less comprehensible output and the proportion of output that is less target-like is a worthy task for future research in which a more detailed, longitudinal analysis of NNSs MO is carried out and which may reveal whether learning has occurred and in what way the specific type of modification (comprehensible, correct/accurate, target-like) affects language development." (Shehadeh 2002: 619)

This hypothesized agenda can be also considered as an empirical baseline for broader and larger future researches. It can be replicated by research undertaking a larger sample size and examining different ESP linguistic structures. In its broader and larger form it can also show whether the frequency of modifications (because of the type of task, that is, continuous simulation) require frequency of output, affects the rate of acquisition and impacts of ESP language development. Furthermore, it may obtain information whether those tasks that provide significantly more opportunities for output modification are more likely to obtain ESP language acquisition than other tasks that provide fewer opportunities, or whether it is the type rather than number of modifications that really matters.

References:

Brown 2000, H. D. Brown, *Principle of language learning and teaching*, New York: Pearson Education.

de la Fuente 2002: M. J. de la Fluente, Negotiation and oral acquisition of L2 vocabulary, Cambridge: *SSLA,* Cambridge University Press, 81-112.

Doughty 2001: C.Doughty, Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.). *Cognition and second language acquisition, (pp. 206-257).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis 2003: R. Ellis, Designing a task-based syllabus, Oxford: *RELC Journal*, 34, 664-681.

Ellis 2003: R. Ellis, *Task-Based Learning and Teaching*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Ellis 2004: R. Ellis, The definition and measurement of explicit knowledge, Oxford: *Language learning,* 54, 227-275.

Ellis 2005: R. Ellis, *Instructed second language acquisition: a literature review*, New Zealand: Ministry of Education, 722.

Ellis 2005: R. Ellis, Instructed Language Learning and Task-Based Teaching. In E. Hinkel, *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning.* (pp. 713-728). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.

Ellis 2002: R. Ellis, Does form-focused instruction affect the acquisition of implicit knowledge? A review of the research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 24, 223-236.

Harmer 2001: J. Harmer, *The Practice of English Language Teaching.* London: Longman. Pearson Education Limited.

Izumi 2002: S. Izumi, Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis:*Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 24, 541-577.

Hinkel 2005: E. Hinkel, *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.

Laufer 1998: B. Laufer, The development of passive and active vocabulary in second language: Same or different? *Applied Linguistics,* 19, 255-271.

Long 1985: M. Laufer, A role for instruction in second language acquisition: Task-based language teaching. In K. Hyltenstam & M. Pienemann (Eds.), *Modelling and assessing second language acquisition*, 377-393.

Long 1985: M. Long, Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective*, 39-52. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

McHoul 1978: A. McHoul, The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society, 7,* 182–213.

McHoul 1990: A. McHoul, The organization of repair in classroom talk. *Language in Society, 19,* 349–377.

Nation 1990: P. Nation, *Teaching and learning vocabulary,* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Paribakht, T. S., & Wesche, M. (1997), Vocabulary enhancement activities and reading for meaning in second language vocabulary acquisition. In J. Coady & T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy* (pp. 174–200). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sarani, Abdullah & Sahebi, Leila Farzaneh.(2012), The Impact of Task-based Approach on Vocabulary Learning in ESP Courses. *English language teaching*, 5(10), 118-128. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n10p118. doi:10.5539/elt.v5n10p118

Shehadeh 1999a: A. Shehadeh, Non-native speakers' production of modified comprehensible output and second language learning. *Language Learning, 49*(4), 627–675.

Shehadeh 2002: A.Shehadeh , Comprehensible Output, From Occurrence to Acquisition: An Agenda for Acquisitional Research.*Language learning*, 52(3), 597-647.

Skehan 1998: P. Skehan, *A cognitive approach to language learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain 1985: M. Swain, Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain 1997: M. Swain, Collaborative dialogue: Its contribution to second language learning. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses, 34,* 115–132.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal, 82*(3), 320–337.

Tornopolsky 2012: O. Tornpolsky, *Constructivist Blended Learning Approach to Teaching English for Specific Purposes.* London: Versita, Versita Ltd.

Van den Branden 1997: K. Van den Branden, Effects of Negotiation on Language Learners. Output. *Language learning, 47(4)*, 589-636.
Wells 1985: G. Wells, *Language development in the pre-school years,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Willis 1996: J. Willis, *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*, London: Longman. Pearson Education Limited.

Маја Р. Луковић

План истраживања о усвајању вокабулара језика струке

Резиме

Који је најбољи приступ у подучавању и учењу енглеског језика струке, посебно вокабулара везаног за енглески језик струке, и које су најефикасније методе, стратегије и активности које у највећој мери доприносе усвајању ове врсте вокабулара представља област која се изучава у главному оквиру усвајања вокабулара енглеског језика као страног/другог, али не и у толикој мери у оквиру области усвајања вокабулара језика струке, посебно не у области пословног енглеског језика за студенте економских факултета. Све веће интересовање за комуникативне и интерактивне приступе подучавању и учењу језика струке утицало је на стварање овог рада као форме модификованог инпута за будуће истраживање које је планирано да се спроведе током зимског семестра академске 2014. године на Економском факултету Универзитета у Крагујевцу. Рад представља дескриптивни план за будуће истраживање које ће пружити емпиријске доказе о утицајима модификованог инпута и аутпута на усвајање вокабулара језика струке, посебно се фокусирајући на методе подучавања и учења засноване на задацима и искуству за универзитетске студенте који похађају наставу из језика струке.

Кључне речи: вокабулар језика струке, усвајање, инпут, аутпут, симулација

Примљен у марту 2014.
Прихваћен у априлу 2014.