# AAUSC 2018 Volume—Issues in Language Program Direction

# Understanding Vocabulary Learning and Teaching: Implications for Language Program Development

Johanna Watzinger-Tharp
University of Utah

Kate Paesani
University of Minnesota

Series Editors

Peter Ecke
University of Arizona

Susanne Rott
University of Illinois at Chicago

Editors

Australia • Brazil • Mexico • Singapore • United Kingdom • United States

CENGAGE

***AAUSC 2018 Volume: Understanding Vocabulary Learning and Teaching: Implications for Language Program Development***

**Peter Ecke, Susanne Rott, Johanna Watzinger-Tharp and Kate Paesani**

Sr. Product Team Manager: Heather Bradley Cole

Product Assistant: Catherine Bradley

Marketing Manager: Sean Ketchem

Production Service: Lumina Datamatics, Inc.

Senior Designer: Sarah Cole

Manufacturing Planner: Fola Orekoya

© 2020, 2019 Cengage Learning, Inc.

Unless otherwise noted, all content is © Cengage

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. No part of this work covered by the copyright herein may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means, except as permitted by U.S. copyright law, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

For product information and technology assistance, contact us at **Cengage Customer & Sales Support, 1-800-354-9706** or **support.cengage.com.**

For permission to use material from this text or product, submit all requests online at **www.cengage.com/permissions.**

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018953450

Student Edition:
ISBN: 978-0-357-10668-6

**Cengage**
20 Channel Center Street
Boston, MA 02210
USA

Cengage is a leading provider of customized learning solutions with employees residing in nearly 40 different countries and sales in more than 125 countries around the world. Find your local representative at **www.cengage.com**

Cengage products are represented in Canada by Nelson Education, Ltd.

To learn more about Cengage platforms and services, visit **www.cengage.com.**

To register or access your online learning solution or purchase materials for your course, visit **www.cengage.com/student**

Printed in the United States of America
Print Number: 01 Print Year: 2018

# Chapter 9

## The Input-Based Incremental Approach to Vocabulary in Meaning-Oriented Instruction for Language Program Directors and Teachers

Joe Barcroft, Washington University in St. Louis

## Introduction

New research findings and theoretical advances provide us with opportunities to change the way we view different phenomena in the world and alter different types of practice, such as instructional practices, in order to make them more effective. Whereas changes in practice sometimes involve near or complete replacement of previous ones, other times they only call for modifications in order to integrate the practical implications of the new research findings and theoretical developments in question. With this larger picture in mind, this chapter explains how different types of meaning-oriented language instruction can be improved when they are modified to incorporate input-based incremental (IBI) vocabulary instruction (Barcroft, 2012), an evidence-based approach to vocabulary instruction based on research findings and theoretical advances from the past three decades. The chapter is also aimed specifically toward language program directors and teachers with the goal of breaking down how the IBI approach can be assimilated in courses at different levels across an entire language program, including courses focused on specific areas of content such as linguistics or literary and cultural studies.

The chapter is divided into seven main sections. The first section focuses on how meaning-oriented language instruction, including communicative language teaching (CLT) and task-based instruction (TBI), is by nature equipped to provide learners with what they need for successful second language (L2) acquisition (SLA). The second section highlights issues related to what is needed to learn target words and lexical phrases fully, noting how the IBI approach is poised to help each target word satisfy its lexical *wish list* (as explained in this section) on this front. The third section presents the IBI approach itself, including its 10 principles of effective vocabulary instruction and a seven-item checklist for creating IBI lessons. The fourth section reviews examples of some of the key research findings that provide support for the IBI approach, such as the negative effects of different types of

semantic elaboration and forced output without access to meaning during the early stages of word learning and the positive effects of employing increasing acoustic variability in the presentation of target words. The fifth section underscores how the IBI approach is consistent with different varieties of meaning-oriented instruction (MOI), such as TBI, and how it can be seamlessly integrated within them, even when an IBI lesson may involve some explicit discrete-item learning of target vocabulary. The sixth section provides two examples of IBI lessons, illustrating how IBI is consistent with MOI and how it can be incorporated at different proficiency levels. Finally, the seventh section offers a series of recommendations for language program directors and teachers as they work to incorporate the IBI approach.

## Why Meaning-Oriented Instruction?

Because language acquisition is the product of the development of form–meaning connections over time, without the presence of meaning, linguistic forms have nothing to which they can attach themselves. Imagine, for example, that in a first-semester L2 Basque class an instructor presents the novel Basque word *zuhaitz* by pronouncing or writing it on a chalkboard without providing sufficient context (visuals, verbal cues, etc.) to infer its meaning or exemplify its usage. What are the students to do if the meaning of a word is not only underspecified but also highly ambiguous? If the word's form is not similar to a corresponding first language (L1) word form, the students have little to no chance of inferring its meaning and making an appropriate form–meaning connection, which in this case should be between the word form *zuhaitz* and the word meaning expressed by the English word *tree*. Therefore, meaning needs to be present in the *input*—that is, in samples of the target language to which language learners are exposed—so that form–meaning connections can begin and continue to develop over time.

In addition, the meaning-oriented input provided to learners needs to be sufficiently comprehensible because otherwise the linguistic forms in question still have little or no meaning to which to attach themselves. For this reason, the provision of input that is meaning-bearing and sufficiently comprehensible is critical for language development. In the above example, if the instructor were to define the word by saying (in Basque) "A *zuhaitz* is . . . ," the definition itself would also need to be sufficiently comprehensible for the students to understand the meaning of the word. As Krashen (1985) asserted, what drives language acquisition is comprehensible input and, most desirably, input at the level of $i + 1$, or input at a level that is slightly above a learner's current level, because input at such a level provides language learners with something new, a potentially new linguistic element—a word, a new syntactic structure, and so on—that can be acquired. Because meaning-oriented language instruction provides learners with input that is meaning-bearing and (hopefully) sufficiently comprehensible, instruction of this nature is well suited to provide learners with what they need to advance, however gradually, in their acquisition of a target language.

In addition to the need for meaning orientation and sufficiently comprehensible input, learners also need sufficient context for inferring word meaning. Imagine that the instructor in our example were to say (in Basque) "I saw a really pretty *zuhaitz* this morning." Assuming that the learners knew all of the other word families in the sentence (including the verb *see* in Basque), what is the chance that they will correctly infer the meaning of *zuhaitz*? Although not as low as with the no-input case above (around 0%), the chance of inferring word meaning correctly from this sentence may still be very low. Notably, research indicates that in the absence of sufficient context needed to infer novel word meaning, learners still attempt to assign meaning to words. They often do so based on the similarity of the novel word form to other words in the learner's L1 or L2 in the case of (a) cognates (words similar in both form and meaning across different languages, such as *historia*, *storia*, and *histoire* in Spanish, Italian, and French for the English word *history*; see Hall, Newbrand, Ecke, Sperr, & Marchand, 2009, for research in this area) and (b) false cognates (words that may appear to be cognates but are not, such as *carpeta* in Spanish, which means *folder* and not *carpet* in English; see Hall, 2002, for research in this area). When the form of a word bears no similarity to an L1 word form, learners employ other types of "parasitic" processes (in this case non-form-oriented strategies) to infer word meaning (see Hall & Ecke, 2003; Jiang, 2000; and Ecke, 2015, for a review of research on these techniques, which involve searches for translation equivalence), but when meaning is not conveyed, when input is not sufficiently comprehensible, and when context is deficient, these attempts to infer word meaning will always be met with a lack of success or only partial success (e.g., disparities of meaning or syntactic roles between L1 and L2 counterparts). As should become clear in this chapter, the IBI approach helps learners overcome the potentially incorrect assumptions they may make due to lack of meaning orientation, lack of sufficient comprehensibility, lack of sufficient context, or any combination of these.

What are some of the major types of MOI utilized today? As language program directors and teachers will recognize, they include (a) CLT, (b) TBI, and (c) content-based instruction (CBI). In what follows, we consider basic tenets of each of these three varieties of MOI in turn.

## Communicative Language Teaching

CLT is characterized by the following tenets (as summarized by the author):

1. Emphasis on developing communicative competence (see Hymes, 1966, regarding the origin of the term) or multiple types of competence, such as linguistic (phonetic/phonological, lexical, morphological, syntactic, pragmatic), sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence (Savignon, 1972, defined communicative competence as "the ability to function in a truly communicative setting—that is, in a dynamic exchange in which linguistic competence [the ability to use grammar,

vocabulary, etc.] must adapt itself to the total informational input, both linguistic and paralinguistic" [p. 8]).

2. Emphasis on the provision of meaning-bearing comprehensible input and language development as the outcome of processing meaning-bearing comprehensible input over long time.
3. Emphasis on learner centeredness, a situation in which the role of the instructor is that of an architect and a model and in which learners become active participants with greater responsibility for their own learning.
4. Emphasis on "real-life" interactions, meaningful tasks, and content.
5. Emphasis on a low anxiety environment (lowering the learner's "affective filter") so that language acquisition is not impeded by anxiety.

## Task-Based Instruction

Consistent with the general tenets of CLT, TBI emphasizes engaging learners in meaningful tasks with a focus on task completion instead of linguistic accuracy per se. Proponents of TBI include, for example, Long (2015) and Willis and Willis (2007). Other publications on TBI can be found on the publications web page of the International Association for Task-Based Language Teaching at http://www.tblt.org/publications/. Given its focus on meaning and real-life meaningful interactions, TBI may also be considered one variety of CLT. TBI has inspired the development of meaning-oriented course syllabi based on a series of different types of tasks that learners can learn to complete. The tasks in question commonly include some type of "gap" whose resolution learners need to work on together using appropriate linguistic tools. Some tasks involve consolidating two sources of information, such as when one student has access to some pieces of information and another student has access to other pieces of information. Other tasks may involve group decision, such as when a small group of students must make a reasoned decision (e.g., which individuals stay and go, which items are bought and are not bought, and which places are visited or not) by working together and, of course, by using the target language to communicate about considerations related to the task at hand. Lee and VanPatten (2003) provide a range of examples of different types of tasks that learners can perform and advocate incorporating tasks of this nature within CLT.

When it comes to learning novel vocabulary, as with any approach, TBI cannot obviate the reality that vocabulary learning is *input-first*. If a set of novel vocabulary is needed to perform a given task, such as an information-gap or group-decision task, learners will need to be exposed to it in a pretask phase or access it during the actual task phase. In the latter case, learners might use a bilingual dictionary or some other means of gaining access to the vocabulary that they need to complete the task. Because the IBI approach to vocabulary addresses this issue

directly, incorporating this approach within TBI can help learners acquire critical vocabulary effectively and allow them to engage in tasks in a more effective manner by ensuring that they are sufficiently prepared on the lexical front.

## Content-Based Instruction

Another major strand of MOI is CBI (see Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989; Brinton, 2003; Lyster, 2011), which harnesses the learning of content to promote significant language development. The target content that one can learn while developing linguistic skills is virtually limitless. Possible content topics include linguistics, literary and cultural studies, history, anthropology, political science, engineering, mathematics, and so forth. CBI is also tied to courses in learning languages (L2s) for specific purposes, such as for business, social science, and so on. CBI is also consistent with CLT and TBI approaches because content is commonly learned in any one of these three meaning-oriented approaches and learning novel content can greatly motivate and engage students.

Treatment of vocabulary in CBI depends on needs dictated by the content in question: Is there a new concept that needs to be learned? If so, is any of the vocabulary that is required for learning that new concept also novel to the learners? How do the learners ascertain the meaning of new terms while learning the content in question? Questions such as these are vital to successful CBI and, as explained in subsequent sections, are addressed by the IBI approach. Given how IBI vocabulary instruction respects the input-first nature of vocabulary learning, harnesses the value of repetition during the provision of meaningful and sufficiently comprehensible input, and provides guidelines for making the best use of input and tasks, incorporating the IBI approach within a larger program of CBI can improve vocabulary learning on a regular basis and increase the overall effectiveness of CBI.

## "Knowing" Vocabulary: The Lexical *Wish List* of Every Word

Before presenting the 10 principles of the IBI approach, let us first consider some of the key issues involved in learning and eventually "knowing" a word or multiword lexical phrase. Learning a new word or lexical phrase involves (a) word form, (b) word meaning, and (c) mapping between word form and meaning. Beyond these basics, however, every word has what might be called its *wish list*, or all of the meaning- and usage-related properties that a word can have, including its collocations, both primary and secondary. The lexical wish list for the word *glass* in English includes, for example, collocations such as *glass ceiling*, *glass window*, *glass eye*, and *glass-bottom boat*, as well as idiomatic expressions such as *People who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones*. It also includes all possible denotative and connotative meanings of the word *glass* and all syntactic projections

that a word such as *glass* might have. For example, the lexical wish list of the Spanish word *poner* (to put) includes the fact that this verb requires an object: *poner algo en algún lugar* (to put something somewhere) is acceptable, but *poner algo* (to put something) by itself without an object is not. A notable exception to this rule is the case of *poner huevos* (to lay eggs), for which location is only optional (but in which case the meaning of *poner* changes). All of this information, among a variety of other types of information, make up the lexical wish list of the Spanish word *poner*.

Why is the lexical wish list for each word so important? For one reason, it clarifies that discrete-item intentional vocabulary learning alone will never provide learners with all of the information they need to satisfy the lexical wish lists of all the target words they might like to acquire. Discrete-item intentional learning may be useful, such as for acquiring knowledge of the form and the most frequent meanings of a given set of target words, but in no way can this type of learning replace the information provided by discourse-level input that contains multiple meanings of words, shades of meaning, connotative meanings, and various collocational properties of a given target word. To be fluent in any language, a learner needs to develop implicit knowledge of the collocational and semantic (including conceptual) properties of any given word or combination of words. As should become clear in the following section, IBI vocabulary instruction takes these issues into account and works toward satisfying the wish lists of words or lexical phrases, even though this goal is incremental in nature and may involve long periods of time.

## Tenets of the IBI Approach

Input-based incremental (IBI) vocabulary instruction is a meaning-oriented approach that emphasizes the pivotal role of input—in particular, meaning-bearing and sufficiently comprehensible input—as well as the incremental nature of learning multiple aspects of vocabulary knowledge over time. The IBI approach is ambitious in that it targets all L2-specific meanings and uses of words, but it also takes into account the *learning burden* that novel vocabulary implies (Nation, 2001) when selecting the tasks learners should engage in during the early stages of word learning and then gradually over time. The approach also offers suggestions for providing learners with the best type of input possible, including *enhanced input*, for promoting vocabulary learning. Most importantly, the IBI approach is theoretically grounded and based largely on a variety of studies of *lexical input processing* (lex-IP; see Barcroft, 2015), which refers to how learners allocate their limited processing resources when they encounter novel vocabulary (novel words or lexical phrases) in the input, regardless of whether the context of learning is intentional or incidental. This theoretical and evidence-based foundation of the approach is critical to its effectiveness in practice.

The 10 principles of IBI vocabulary instruction appear in Table 9.1. Principle 1 is a logical general principle, but it is one that can be overlooked or forgotten during language program planning. For example, one question faced by language program directors (and textbook authors and publishers) is whether word frequency should be taken into consideration when identifying target vocabulary for a given course or a series of courses within a larger instructional sequence. Should the most frequent 2,000 words of the target language be a particular goal, or should course themes and tasks dictate target vocabulary, given that the most frequent words of any language tend to occur whether or not they are targeted? Other principles are clearly based on research findings, such as Principle 2, which is consistent with the frequency effect in human memory, and Principles 5, 6, and 7, which are based on research on lexical input processing lex-IP, as discussed in the following section.

Table 9.2 presents a seven-point checklist for designing IBI lessons. Note that the checklist items not only emphasize key tenets of the IBI approach but also encourage inclusion of appropriate historical and cultural information when possible. This checklist should be helpful when designing IBI lessons from scratch as well as when designing IBI lessons to complement target vocabulary in existing textbooks.

Table 9.1. Ten Principles of IBI Vocabulary Instruction

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. | Develop and implement a vocabulary acquisition plan. |
| 2. | Present new words frequently and repeatedly in the input. |
| 3. | Promote both intentional and incidental vocabulary learning. |
| 4. | Use meaning-bearing comprehensible input when presenting new words. |
| 5. | Present new words in an enhanced manner. |
| 6. | Limit forced output without access to meaning during the initial stages. |
| 7. | Limit forced semantic elaboration during the initial stages. |
| 8. | Promote learning L2-specific word meanings and usage over time. |
| 9. | Progress from less demanding to more demanding activities over time. |
| 10. | Apply research findings with direct implications for vocabulary instruction. |

Table 9.2. Checklist for Designing IBI Lessons

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ___ | 1. | I defined target vocabulary and materials needed for the activities. |
| ___ | 2. | I designed the activities to be meaningful, educational, and interactive. |
| ___ | 3. | I included cultural and historical information when appropriate. |
| ___ | 4. | I presented target vocabulary repeatedly in the input-first. |
| ___ | 5. | I increased the difficulty of tasks involving target vocabulary gradually over time. |
| ___ | 6. | I incorporated a number of the 10 principles of the IBI approach. |
| ___ | 7. | I included directly applicable research findings. |

## Some Pivotal Research Findings

The reader is referred to two books by Barcroft (2012, 2015) for more detailed information about the research foundations of the IBI approach. In this section, however, we consider some of the key research findings that support different IBI principles. To begin demonstrations of the benefits of repetition are ubiquitous in research on human memory, but studies by Hulstijn and colleagues (Hulstijn, 1992; Hulstijn, Hollander, & Greidanus, 1996) have provided empirical evidence of these benefits for L2 vocabulary learning in particular and, in this case, for *incidental vocabulary learning*, which is when new vocabulary is acquired without consciously intentending to do so. Consistent with these findings, Rott (2007) also provided telling findings regarding the benefits of increased repetition by demonstrating that the inclusion of four repetitions of target words in a text resulted in significantly more word gain than inclusion of only one repetition.

Principles 6 and 7, although perhaps counterintuitive at first glance, are supported by a series of studies of different types of tasks involving *semantic elaboration* (elaborating on the meaning of a word more than would otherwise be the case) and *output without access to meaning* (see Lee & VanPatten, 2003) at the level of individual words. As for Principle 7, Barcroft (2004) assessed the effects on L2 vocabulary learning of having learners write target words in original sentences (seeing each target word and its picture on a screen and then writing the word in an original sentence in the L2—the control condition was to study the words in the same way but without writing anything). In stark contrast to what might be expected with a general extension of the levels-of-processing framework for research on human memory (Craik & Lockhart, 1972; see Morris, Bransford, & Franks, 1977, for a possible alternative interpretation of early and more recent research findings) to the realm of L2 vocabulary, not only did sentence writing fail to facilitate L2 vocabulary learning, it also decreased it by approximately 100%. In another study, Wong and Pyun (2012) found that the negative effects of the same type of sentence-writing task were even more pronounced when the L2 in question was less formally similar to the learners' L1 (the study contrasted English-speaking learners of L2 Korean [less similar] with English-speaking learners of L2 French [more familiar]). Barcroft (2002) also found negative effects of a semantically oriented pleasantness-ratings task on both free and cued recall of target L2 vocabulary. All these findings are consistent with the predictions of the type of processing-resource allocation (TOPRA) model, one of which cautions that increased semantic processing can decrease processing resources available for form processing and thereby diminish word-form learning.

Another finding that supports IBI Principle 6 is that requiring learners to copy target words (by writing them down) does not facilitate L2 vocabulary learning and, in fact, can decrease learning of this nature (Barcroft, 2006). On the other hand, if learners are provided with opportunities to process target

words as input first and then asked to attempt to retrieve the target word forms on their own, their L2 vocabulary learning can be improved, as demonstrated by studies conducted since the 1970s (Barcroft, 2007; McNamara & Healy, 1995; Royer, 1973). These findings on the value of providing learners with opportunities to retrieve target words on their own are consistent with both Principles 6 and 10 because retrieval is not the same as producing output without access to meaning.

Other IBI principles are supported by early (1960s and 1970s) reasoning and theoretical work as related to SLA. Specifically, the proposal of Principle 4 to use meaning-bearing comprehensible input when presenting target words is consistent with Krashen's (1985) input hypothesis and with our understanding of how language acquisition progresses by means of the development of form–meaning connections over time at all levels of linguistic grain.

Lastly, when it comes to L2 vocabulary learning in the spoken mode, studies by Barcroft and Sommers (2005) and Sommers and Barcroft (2007) have demonstrated the benefits of using acoustic variability—specifically, input produced by multiple talkers, input produced by one talker in multiple speaking styles, and input presented at multiple rates—on L2 vocabulary learning. The pedagogical implications of this research are clear: increased acoustic variability can be readily incorporated in online instructional materials as well as in the classroom by individual instructors who understand the value of providing input with variations in, for example, speaking style and speaking rate. The benefits demonstrated in these studies suggest that enhanced spoken input of this nature (note IBI Principle 5) should be of interest to every language program director and L2 teacher. Also intriguing in this area is a study by de Groot (2006), who found that presenting target words while playing classical music in the background led to greater L2 vocabulary learning as compared to when no music was played. Findings such as these can be readily incorporated in L2 instructional programs, not only in one course taught by one instructor but also in all courses at various levels of proficiency and as part of the instructional materials provided by publishers of L2 instructional materials. Language program directors and teachers should insist that publishers make use of evidence-based provisions such as these in designing digital course materials that include spoken input in order to facilitate L2 vocabulary learning on an ongoing basis.

## Sample IBI Lessons

The following sample lessons demonstrate symbiosis between the IBI approach and MOI. The first lesson is focused on clothing and what students would choose to wear in different situations. It is designed for low-intermediate (first-year) students, as reflected by both the target vocabulary items and the degree of difficulty

of different steps in the lesson. The second lesson also concerns clothing but in a substantially different manner. It focuses on the appearance of Gloria Steinem and other key figures during Fashion Week New York City in 2017. The target vocabulary and the nature of the lesson are appropriate for a much higher, upper-intermediate or advanced, level of L2 proficiency. Although presented in English here, the lessons could be adapted to basically any target L2. The communicative focus of Lesson 1 concerns preferences related to clothing. The topic of Lesson 2, on the other hand, concerns current news in the United States. To examine 14 additional sample lessons, the reader is referred to Barcroft's 2012 book on IBI vocabulary instruction.

### Lesson 1: *What are your favorite clothes?*

*Target Vocabulary.* *Clothes, shirt, jeans, pants, shorts, shoes (running, tennis), socks, scarf, beige, pink, purple, blue-green, designer, brand, high-heel, hat, simple, fancy, wear, to wear it well, to make an impression, silk, cotton, comfortable,* and other possible related vocabulary.

*Materials.* Picture file with different types of clothing and outfits and a list of different situations for which people might dress in different ways.

**Step 1.** Use a picture file to show the students in your class different types of clothes. Name each type of clothing as you show the pictures and talk, using sufficiently comprehensible input, about what you think of these different types of clothes. Make sure to present target words *frequently* (within each input segment) and *repeatedly* (across multiple input segments over time). Go through the picture file multiple times and pronounce target vocabulary each time at different speaking rates, one time more slowly and other times more rapidly.

For example: *We're going to have a look at these pictures and see different types of clothing and talk about what you like and don't really like when it comes to different types of clothing.* [Showing first picture] *In this first picture you can see that the man is wearing a red shirt with jeans and tennis shoes. It is a relaxed look. I like it. What do you think? Do you like it? How many of you like the shirt?* [Note student responses.] *The jeans, here are the jeans. How many of you like the jeans?* [Note student responses.] *In this second picture you can see a very different look. This man is wearing shorts* [pointing] *and some very long socks; I think they'd be considered knee-high* [pointing] *socks. He's also wearing what I think are either tennis shoes or running shoes, which I kind of like, but the socks are really long. What do you think? Do you like the long socks* [pointing] *along with the shorts* [pointing]? [Note student responses.] …

**Step 2.** Have students work in small groups. Provide each group with two pictures and ask them to decide which of the two outfits they like the most. After the students have had time to decide on their favorite of the two outfits, call on each

small group and ask them to say which outfit they have chosen. Other students in the class should indicate by raising their hands whether they agree or disagree with each small group's assessment.

**Step 3.** Divide the class into pairs of students. Each student should describe to the other student in the pair what some student in the class is wearing, and the other student should attempt to guess which student is being described. The students in each pair take turns doing this about two or three times each. (*Optional*: After doing descriptions in pairs, the instructor can describe to the class what a few students are wearing and see whether students can correctly identify the students in question.)

**Step 4.** Have students work in groups of two or three. Give them a list of situations in which different types of outfits need to be selected and ask them what they suggest the person(s) in each situation should wear. For each situation, the students should work together to write out the type of clothing they suggest.

**Step 5.** As an extension activity to be completed outside of class, have each student write a brief essay about what the student likes to wear on different occasions. Provide a list of specific occasions to be considered, including, for example, a wedding, a day of hiking near a beach, the first day of the semester at the university, and a weekend night out on the town with friends.

## Commentary

Note how this lesson is *input-first* (or *input-based*) when it comes to presenting target vocabulary and *incremental* when it comes to the use of target vocabulary in multiple contexts (along with providing different collocations for each word), as well as gradually and increasingly demanding when it comes to the types of tasks in which the learners engage. Steps 1–3 involve numerous exposures to target vocabulary in the input: in Step 1 using input presented by the instructor and in Steps 2 and 3 using input provided by fellow students. Note also that the students providing the input are not asked to do so during the initial stages of exposure to the novel target words. In those initial stages, learners are also not required to engage in semantic elaboration, particularly any redundant type of L1-based semantic elaboration, as supported by research demonstrating the negative effects of semantically elaborative tasks such as sentence writing. The learners are also not required to produce forced output without access to meaning (e.g., copying or choral repetition of target words), which is supported by experiments that revealed negative effects of word copying. Speaking-rate variability is also incorporated in Step 1, which is one of several types of acoustic variability that improve L2 vocabulary learning (others include talker and speaking-style variability). Steps 2 and 3 also provide students with opportunities to retrieve target words on their own, which research has found to facilitate vocabulary learning. Steps 4 and 5 increase

demands on the learner while maintaining the focus on meaning, by providing learners with opportunities to express their own opinions about what they would and would not prefer to wear in a series of different situations.

### Lesson 2: *What is Gloria Steinem doing at Fashion Week in New York City?*

*Target Vocabulary.* *Resistance-minded, to lure, runway, twice-yearly, to showcase, platform, advocate, to swap, ribbon, row, body-diverse, to march, to knock off, to covet, flowing, range, to judge, to strut, pavement,* and other possible related vocabulary.

*Materials.* *San Francisco Chronicle* article of September 11, 2017, by Tony Bravo entitled "The resistance-minded designer who lured Gloria Steinem to New York Fashion Week" (available online at http://www.sfchronicle.com/style/article/The-resistance-minded-designer-that-lured-Gloria-12189145.php).

**Step 1.** Let students know that they will be reading and discussing an article related to feminism and the political history of the United States. Ask students what they know about Gloria Steinem and the history of feminism in the United States. Have a brief conversation about this topic.

**Step 2.** Let students know that each student will be assigned to one or two vocabulary items that appear in the article or are related to it. Assign the vocabulary items to the students and instruct them that as an activity to do outside of class, they should define and exemplify the item in question in order to report back to the other students during the next day of class. Also ask them to repeat the item in question multiple times during their minipresentations.

**Step 3.** At the beginning of the next class, ask each student to present, define, and exemplify the terms that were assigned to them. Help to clarify any potential confusions about meanings and, when appropriate, note alternate definitions of the target items. For example, *Yes, to strut means to walk around in the way you just described. Interestingly, it is also a part of a car; it is a rod that forms part of the compression system of a car. Do you think the verb and the noun are kind of related in meaning?*

**Step 4.** Have all students read the news article in question. Additional prereading, during-reading, and postreading activities might be added at this point in order to support reading as a process.

**Step 5.** Have students form small groups. In each group, the students should discuss and write a list of reasons why, based on what they have read, Gloria Steinem attended Fashion Week in New York City in 2017.

**Step 6.** Have each group share their ideas from Step 5 with the rest of the class.

**Step 7.** Have the same groups from Step 5 plan to research (online, elsewhere, or both) the history of the feminist movement in the United States. Ask them to

come up with a list of at least 10 facts about the history of the feminist movement in the United States and, when possible, to include items related to Gloria Steinem.

**Step 8.** At the beginning of the next class, give an unannounced practice quiz on the target vocabulary. Give definitions for target terms, ask students to attempt to retrieve and write the items in question, and then go over the answers to the practice quiz. When appropriate, mention alternative meanings, uses, or both for some of the target items.

**Step 9.** Have the same groups from Steps 5 to 7 share the facts that they have learned about the history of feminism in the United States. Have each group give one fact, and continue going over the facts one by one until no group has any additional fact to share.

**Step 10.** Ask the class what they find most interesting about what they have learned about the history of feminism in the United States and Gloria Steinem. Also ask them if they understand more about why Gloria Steinem might attend Fashion Week in New York City for the first time in 2017.

**Step 11.** Ask each student to write a one-half to one-page essay (to be turned in at the beginning of the next class) on what each student would suggest that Gloria Steinem do next in order to meet her long-term and current goals.

## Commentary

Like Lesson 1, this lesson is also *input-first* and *incremental* in nature. Moreover, the meaning orientation and focus on content—in this case, the history of feminism in the United States and the life and work of Gloria Steinem—are clear and go well beyond preferences about clothing and thoughts about a fashion show in the lesson. Both the target vocabulary and the selected reading in this lesson lead learners toward tasks that require them to reflect upon their ideas about a sociopolitical movement and to learn about the history of feminism in the United States. In addition, on more than one occasion the lesson targets L2-specific meanings and uses of target vocabulary items that go beyond their most canonical and frequent uses, such as in the case of the target word *strut*, which although used as a verb in the reading in this lesson can also be used as a noun to refer to a part of an automobile. In this lesson, learners are also asked whether they can identify any relationship in meaning between the two uses. Finally, as with Lesson 1, this lesson provides learners with opportunities to attempt to retrieve target vocabulary items on their own after they have had substantial opportunity to process them as input. This type of sequencing is effective because it avoids requiring learners to repeat target words in a "parroted" way without access to meaning, as suggested by Principle 6, while instead allowing them to attempt to retrieve target words on their own at an appropriate time.

## The Compatibility of IBI and MOI

As these two sample IBI lessons demonstrate, incorporating IBI vocabulary instruction in MOI allows language program directors and instructors to promote vocabulary acquisition in an effective manner in activities and tasks that are typical of MOI. All activities in Lesson 1 are meaning-oriented. Even when vocabulary learning is largely intentional and direct, such as when using a picture file, it is still meaning oriented because the purpose of conveying the meaning of the L2 word forms is to advance the learners' ability to understand and communicate while focusing on the topic at hand. Consistent with TBI, both lessons include a variety of meaningful tasks, such as selecting clothing for different situations in Lesson 1 and researching the history of feminism in the United States in Lesson 2. To the extent that learners were unfamiliar with the content of the newspaper article and the history of feminism in the United States, Lesson 2 also involves CBI. As can be seen in these examples, the IBI approach improves upon CLT in all of its instantiations, including TBI and CBI, by incorporating effective vocabulary instruction within them.

## The IBI Approach and Language Program Direction: Six Recommendations

For language program directors and instructors interested in using the IBI approach, Table 9.3 provides six suggestions that may be helpful. Regarding the first two recommendations, the reader is referred to two books (Barcroft, 2012, 2015), the former for becoming familiar with all aspects of the approach (as exemplified by 14 sample lessons) and the latter for exploring research and theory related to lex-IP that underlies IBI vocabulary instruction. The third recommendation concerns assessing current instructional materials based on IBI principles, which can include asking questions about the existing instructional materials, such as the following: *In what ways are target words presented in the input? How frequently and repeatedly are target words presented? Are the vocabulary-related activities incremental in nature? Do they provide learners with opportunities to acquire multiple meanings and uses of target words?*

Table 9.3. Recommendations for Incorporating the IBI Approach

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. | Become familiar with all aspects of the approach. |
| 2. | Explore pertinent theory and research. |
| 3. | Assess instructional materials based on IBI principles. |
| 4. | Incorporate the approach across multiple courses. |
| 5. | Make effective vocabulary instruction a team effort. |
| 6. | Stay apprised of pertinent research over time. |

The fourth recommendation affirms that the IBI approach should be included in courses across multiple proficiency levels, including content-focused courses. More effective vocabulary instruction benefits learners regardless of their level. The fifth recommendation is to involve all instructors in the language program when incorporating the approach. The more that everyone is on board and contributing, sharing their ideas, expertise, and experience, the better. The sixth recommendation, as suggested by IBI Principle 10, continuing to stay as informed as possible about new research findings will give language program directors and instructors their best chance of providing the most effective vocabulary instruction possible. This goal can be met as part of the team effort as well, with different individuals sharing information about research findings from various sources, such as academic journals and pertinent presentations at academic conferences.

## Summary and Conclusion

This chapter has highlighted the opportunity for language program directors and teachers to incorporate an evidence-based approach to vocabulary within different varieties of meaning-oriented instruction. It has focused on why meaning orientation is necessary for language acquisition and how communicative language teaching in general and task- and content-based instruction in particular, promote language acquisition. It has presented the 10 principles of IBI vocabulary instruction along with examples of research findings that support these principles. Two sample IBI lessons have also been presented, demonstrating how the IBI approach is consistent with different types of meaning-oriented instruction, along with six recommendations as to how the IBI approach can be incorporated effectively across multiple course levels within a language instruction program. Looking to the future, with reference to Principle 10 in particular, the IBI approach should continue to improve in its effectiveness as new research findings with direct implications for vocabulary instruction become available. These new findings should help language program directors and instructors to provide even more effective language instruction to their students.

### References

Barcroft, J. (2002). Semantic and structural elaboration in L2 lexical acquisition. *Language Learning*, *52*, 323–363.

Barcroft, J. (2004). Effects of sentence writing in L2 lexical acquisition. *Second Language Research*, *20*, 303–334.

Barcroft, J. (2006). Can writing a new word detract from learning it? More negative effects of forced output during vocabulary learning. *Second Language Research*, *22*, 487–497.

Barcroft, J. (2007). Effects of opportunities for word retrieval during second language vocabulary learning. *Language Learning*, *57*, 35–56.

Barcroft, J. (2012). *Input-based incremental vocabulary instruction.* Alexandria, VA: TESOL International.

Barcroft, J. (2015). *Lexical input processing and vocabulary learning.* Amsterdam, Netherlands: Benjamins.

Barcroft, J., & Sommers, M. S. (2005). Effects of acoustic variability on second language vocabulary learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *27*, 387–414.

Brinton, D. (2003). Content-based instruction. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Practical English language teaching* (pp. 199–224). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Brinton, D. M., Snow, M. A., & Wesche, M. B. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*. New York, NY: Newbury.

Craik, F. I. M., & Lockhart, R. S. (1972). Levels of processing: A framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, *11*, 671–684.

De Groot, A. M. B. (2006). Effects of stimulus characteristics and background music on foreign language vocabulary learning and forgetting. *Language Learning*, *56*, 463–506.

Ecke P. (2015). Parasitic vocabulary acquisition, cross-linguistic influence, and lexical retrieval in multilinguals. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *18*, 145–162.

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.

Hall, C. J., & Ecke, P. (2003). Parasitism as a default mechanism in L3 vocabulary acquisition. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen & U. Jessner (Eds.), *The multilingual lexicon* (pp. 71–85). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.

Hall, C. J., Newbrand, D., Ecke, P., Sperr, U., & Marchand, V. (2009). Learners' implicit assumptions about syntactic frames in new L3 words: The role of cognates, typological proximity, and L2 status. *Language Learning*, *59*, 153–202.

Hulstijn, J. H. (1992). Retention of inferred and given word meanings: Experiments in incidental learning. In P. J. L. Arnaud & H. Béjoint (Eds.), *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics* (pp. 113–125). London, UK: Macmillan.

Hulstijn, J. H., Hollander, M., & Greidanus, T. (1996). Incidental vocabulary learning by advanced foreign language students: The influence of marginal glosses, dictionary use, and recurrence of unknown words. *Modern Language Journal*, *80*, 327–339.

Hymes, D. (1966). Two types of linguistic relativity. In Bright, W. (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 114–158). The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Jiang, N. (2000). Lexical representation and development in a second language. *Applied Linguistics*, *21*, 47–77.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications.* New York, NY: Longman.

Lee, J. F., & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Long, M. (2015). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lyster, R. (2011). Content-based second language teaching. In E. Hinkley (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 611–630). New York: Routledge.

McNamara, D. S., & Healy, A. F. (1995). A generation advantage for multiplication skill training and nonword vocabulary acquisition. In A. F. Healy & L. E. Bourne, Jr. (Eds.), *Learning and memory of knowledge and skills: Durability and specificity* (pp. 132–169). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Morris, C. D., Bransford, J. D., & Franks, J. J. (1977). Levels of processing versus transfer appropriate processing. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, *16*, 519–533.

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Rott, S. (2007). The effect of frequency of input-enhancements on word learning and text comprehension. *Language Learning*, *57*, 165–199.

Royer, J. M. (1973). Memory effects for test-like events during acquisition of foreign language vocabulary. *Psychological Reports*, *32*, 195–198.

Savignon, S. J. (1972). *Communicative competence: An experiment in foreign-language teaching*. *Language and the Teacher,* Volume 12 [Series]. Philadelphia, PA: Center for Curriculum Development.

Sommers, M., & Barcroft, J. (2007). An integrated account of the effects of acoustic variability in L1 and L2: Evidence from amplitude, fundamental frequency, and speaking rate variability. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *28*, 231–249.

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). Doing task-based teaching. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Wong, W., & Pyun, D. O. (2012). The effects of sentence writing on L2 French and Korean lexical retention. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *68*, 164–189.