Classroom L2 vocabulary acquisition: investigating the role of pedagogical tasks and form-focused instruction

Maria J. de la Fuente   *Vanderbilt University, USA*

Framed under a cognitive approach to task-based L2 learning, this study used a pedagogical approach to investigate the effects of three vocabulary lessons (one traditional and two task-based) on acquisition of basic meanings, forms and morphological aspects of Spanish words. Quantitative analysis performed on the data suggests that the type of pedagogical approach had no impact on immediate retrieval (after treatment) of targeted word forms, but it had an impact on long-term retrieval (one week) of targeted forms. In particular, task-based lessons seemed to be more effective than the Presentation, Practice and Production (PPP) lesson. The analysis also suggests that a task-based lesson with an explicit focus-on-forms component was more effective than a task-based lesson that did not incorporate this component in promoting acquisition of word morphological aspects. The results also indicate that the explicit focus on forms component may be more effective when placed at the end of the lesson, when meaning has been acquired. Results are explained in terms of qualitative differences in amounts of focus on form and meaning, type of form-focused instruction provided, and opportunities for on-line targeted output retrieval. The findings of this study provide evidence for the value of a proactive (Doughty and Williams, 1998a) form-focused approach to Task-Based L2 vocabulary learning, especially structure-based production tasks (Ellis, 2003). Overall, they suggest an important role of pedagogical tasks in teaching L2 vocabulary.

I Introduction

Research on pedagogical tasks aims to inform language teaching as to how tasks can facilitate L2 development (Brown, 1991; Bygate, 1996;

Address for correspondence: Maria J. de la Fuente, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, Vanderbilt University, VU Station B#351617, 2301 Vanderbilt Place, Nashville, TN 37235-6312, USA; email: m.delafuente@vanderbilt.edu

1999; Bygate *et al.*, 2001; Crookes and Gass, 1993; Foster and Skehan, 1996; Robinson, 1995; Skehan and Foster, 1997). There are also many accounts of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in the literature (see Candlin and Murphy, 1987; Ellis, 2003; Nunan, 1989; Skehan, 1996; Willis, 1996). As Ellis (2000) points out, tasks can serve a dual purpose: to activate processes leading to L2 learning (pedagogical), and to investigate those processes (research). However, as Bygate *et al*. (2001) point out, the research perspective and the pedagogical perspective of tasks are often distanced from one another, as is often the case with SLA research and classroom practice.

From a cognitive perspective, tasks are specific language-learning activities that may facilitate optimal conditions for second language learning by triggering processes said to facilitate SLA. In other words, L2 is developed through engaging in the activity (Skehan, 1998), the premise being that the task can be designed in such a way that it can influence how learners process the L2 (Ellis, 2001). Skehan suggests four criteria that define 'task': (1) meaning is primary; (2) there is a goal to be accomplished; (3) the task is outcome evaluated; and (4) there is a real-world relationship (Skehan, 1998: 95). Likewise, Ellis (2003) offers a comprehensive definition of 'task':

> A task is a work plan that requires learners to process language pragmatically in order to achieve an outcome that can be evaluated in terms of whether the correct or appropriate propositional content has been conveyed. To this end, it requires them to give primary attention to meaning and to make use of their own linguistic resources, although the design of the task may predispose them to choose particular forms. A task is intended to result in language use that bears a resemblance, direct or indirect, to the way language is used in the real world. Like other language activities, a task can engage productive or receptive, and oral or written skills, and also various cognitive processes.
>
> (Ellis, 2003: 16)

Although the ability of task design to predict specific language use has been questioned by sociocultural approaches to SLA, research has shown that certain characteristics of tasks may predict specific outcomes (see Bygate *et al*., 2000; Skehan, 1998). According to Foster and Skehan (1996) and Skehan and Foster (1997; 1999), structured tasks that revolve around familiar information lead to both greater fluency and accuracy. Interactive tasks also lead to more accuracy and complexity (Foster and Skehan, 1996; 1999). Research also indicates that planning (as a pre-task stage) promotes complexity and fluency (Foster and Skehan, 1996; 1999; Ortega, 1999). Lastly, task repetition and other types of post-task

conditions also seem to result in more accuracy and more use of the monitor (Bygate, 1996; 1999; 2001; Skehan and Foster, 1997). These task-based research results have relevance to L2 pedagogy.

II Interaction and focus on form

Related to most task-based research are the concepts of *negotiated inter-action* and *focus on form*. The central role of interaction in L2 learning has been underscored by interactionist approaches to SLA, which pro-pose that interaction is a very effective way for learners to obtain data for L2 learning (see Gass, 1997; Hatch, 1978; Long, 1981; 1983; 1996). In his most recent version of the Interaction Hypothesis, Long (1996) claims that interactive tasks that promote learners' negotiation of mean-ing facilitate the development of a second language. However, most researchers agree today that, although meaning processing should be primary to the task, a certain amount of *focus on form* is needed in order to acquire the L2 (Ellis 2001; 2003; Long 1991; 1996; 2000; Norris and Ortega, 2000; Robinson, 2001; Skehan, 1998). A focus on form during interaction causes learners to notice certain input features, and compare them with their own output. Likewise, output production also induces learners to reflect upon language form, and this makes acquisition more likely to occur (Swain, 1985). Swain's theoretical standpoint is that, without pushed output, learners engage in input comprehension (that is, they process meaning), which does not guarantee further processing of linguistic form that leads to acquisition. In sum, tasks that involve nego-tiation of meaning and focus on form (also called *focused tasks*) may encourage noticing of forms and implicit learning (Ellis, 2003).

A focus on form can take place during tasks in many different ways. Ellis (2001: 1–2) defines form-focused instruction as 'any planned or incidental instructional activity that is intended to induce learners to pay attention to linguistic form'. Ellis classifies form-focused instruction under three categories: (1) focus on forms, where primary attention is paid to form (or grammar instruction, both explicit and implicit); (2) planned focus on form, where primary attention is devoted to meaning but tasks are focused on specific L2 forms; and (3) incidental focus on form, where primary attention is also paid to meaning and attention can be placed on a variety of L2 forms. Lightbown (1998) suggests that the integration of form and meaning processing is desirable, but that there

are arguments for separate form-focused instruction in which teachers can provide learners with needed metalinguistic information and explanations. Likewise, Doughty and Williams (1998a) recommend a 'proactive'[1] focus on form in which L2 features that are desired points of focus are predetermined and built into the design of the task (see also Lightbown, 1998; Loschky and Bley-Vroman, 1993; Swain, 1998). In general, most researchers agree that, in the case of classroom L2 teaching, where input is normally impoverished and few opportunities for out-of-the-classroom exposure are available, a more explicit, teacher-generated, planned focus on form may be also needed. Research on the role of implicit and explicit focus on form indicates that explicit learning conditions and classroom-based tasks designed to focus learners' attention on specific forms may be more effective for FL classrooms (see Ellis, 2003).

III Vocabulary tasks and form-focused instruction

It is generally posited in the literature that tasks should be structured in reference to desirable goals. Obviously, the goal of L2 vocabulary tasks should be acquisition of words and expansion of word's knowledge, not only the meanings but also the forms. As Doughty and Williams (1998b) caution, the term *form* must not be limited solely to grammar points, but rather include all aspects of the L2, including vocabulary. According to these researchers, 'it is likely that focus on form can enhance lexical acquisition. And there is mounting evidence that, in the acquisition of lexical items, as with that of grammatical structures, some interaction is helpful' (1998b: 212).

Some of the questions that come to mind on the role of interactive tasks and form-focused instruction on L2 lexical acquisition are as follows: (1) what should the ideal structure and sequencing of the vocabulary task be, and what specific elements should be present so that the conditions said to enhance L2 learning can be best achieved?; (2) should vocabulary tasks include form-focused instruction and, if so, how much and when (before, during, after the meaning-based task?; (3) what type of form-focused instruction should be provided (planned, incidental, focus on forms), and should it be explicit or implicit?; (4) how does task-based vocabulary learning differ from other pedagogical approaches?

As for structure and sequencing, there are compelling arguments to engage students in pre-task activities. For Skehan (1998), these activities can introduce new language forms, increase the chances that restructuring will occur, raise awareness of language structure, and bring to consciousness certain aspects of the L2 that may need to be reactivated. The task itself can have different stages, each of them related to the next, but it is important that all incorporated activities maintain the salience of form–meaning links.[2] Samuda (2001) proposes the following sequence: (a) input data, (b) operations on input and (c) consolidation and reflection. Similarly, Willis's (1996) model includes: (a) a pre-task phase, whose purpose is to introduce learners to the topic and task, and expose them to authentic input data; (b) a task cycle in which learners perform the task, followed by a planning stage where they prepare and draft a public rehearsal (and learners concentrate on both accuracy and fluency); and (c) a language focus phase. These models of extended structure of task implementation seem to be more appropriate for the classroom. The extended sequence has a cumulative effect, and form–meaning connections can be established little by little, rather than all at once.

With respect to the second question, and as mentioned above, most researchers in the task-based tradition agree that some teacher-generated, form-focused intervention during tasks would benefit lexical acquisition. Skehan (1998), however, remarks that it is not advisable to intervene during tasks, as this goes against the tasks' naturalistic principle of focus on meaning. Instead, he proposes the utilization of post-task activities with a focus on form function. These activities are also said to promote reflection and consolidation (restructuring), and 'will make it more likely that form–meaning relationships and pattern identification are not transitory (as is the danger in meaning-oriented work) but are still available for attention and so more likely to be integrated into a growing interlanguage system' (Skehan, 1998: 149). Thus, it seems that any type of teacher-generated focus on form should be included either before or after the task.

With regard to question 3, Willis (1996) proposes no pre-selection of forms during the pre-task or language focus phases; rather, the focus will be on whatever language learners notice and consider relevant (incidental focus on form), and the teacher should address those forms after the task is completed during the language focus phase. This phase should lead to

consolidation and integration of new forms (Willis, 1996). Samuda's 2001 model, in contrast, implies pre-selection of forms (planned focus on form) and a major role for the teacher-generated focus on form.[3] One type of planned, focused task is what Ellis (2003) classifies as 'structure based production task'. This type of task is designed in such a way that the learner needs to *use* specific L2 forms in order to carry out the task. Samuda's (2001) study (on modality and 'there is/there are' forms) showed that these tasks elicited the forms that were built into the input but not without teacher intervention. In addition, de la Fuente (2002), Ellis and He (1999), Ellis *et al*., (1994) and Loschky (1994) are examples of studies on L2 vocabulary acquisition through tasks where production of specific L2 target words was built into the tasks. The findings of these studies suggest that tasks that encourage negotiation of specific L2 lexical forms may benefit productive acquisition 'provided that the students have the opportunity *to use* the items they have begun to acquire and to receive feedback from other speakers' (Ellis *et al*., 1994: 483). These studies also show that interactive tasks where learners are pushed to *produce targeted lexical output* lead to a higher level of oral vocabulary acquisition.

Planned focus on form is different than focus on forms in that the primary attentional focus of the first is meaning, while in the second is form. In other words, focus on forms is a more traditional pedagogical approach, represented by the so-called PPP model (Presentation, Practice and Production). Typically, a PPP lesson would have three stages: (a) the presentation stage, where the targeted forms are presented by the teacher, normally contextualized, in order to clarify their meaning; (b) the practice stage, where students repeat the target items and practice with predetermined, focused structures (pattern drills, matching exercises, completing dialogues, or question–answer format); and (c) the production stage, where students produce the L2 they just learned in an open situation (a role-play, for example). As we can see, this pedagogical approach places great emphasis on focus on forms (usually explicit grammar instruction), and its rationale for introducing language lessons with explicit instruction is the notion that language is learned best when presented as a series of language elements to be acquired sequentially. The vocabulary items are introduced first, their formal characteristics are explained, and then students practise with the new words. However, for Willis, a typical PPP lesson cannot effectively lead to acquisition due to several reasons: (1) the production stage may or may not incorporate the

targeted forms; (2) when it incorporates the targeted forms, it is normally in a very controlled fashion (with an exclusive or main focus on forms); and (3) it gives learners a false sense of L2 acquisition, since they can produce the targeted forms in the classroom but, once they leave, they cannot. Willis (1996) suggests that her TBLT framework 'offers far more opportunities for free language use and the linguistic content of the language focus phase is much richer' (1996: 36). Under a cognitive TBLT framework, the focus would be on meaningful communication, through which acquisition of certain lexical elements would occur via a teacher-generated, pre-planned focus-on-form phase; this phase would raise students' awareness about particular lexical aspects of the L2.

In sum, a PPP lesson assumes that students will explicitly learn the forms and meanings of the L2 lexical items, practice them and ultimately be more accurate when using them at a later point. The TBLT lesson assumes that, at a language focus stage, learners will already be familiar with the meanings of these words, as well as somewhat familiar with the forms they represent. This planned focus on form stage will be an opportunity to further focus on the formal aspects of the words. Other alleged benefits of vocabulary TBLT lessons are that they can include a wider range of language forms, lexical phrases and patterns in addition to targeted ones (if they are pre-planned), present targeted items in context, lead from fluency to accuracy, and can integrate all four skills.

In order to argue in favour of a task-based approach to classroom L2 vocabulary learning and instruction, some evidence is needed regarding the value of this approach when compared to that of a more traditional one. In addition, it is worth examining whether a teacher-generated, explicit focus-on-forms stage is a desirable feature of L2 vocabulary learning tasks.

IV What is L2 word acquisition?

According to Ellis and Beaton (1993) knowledge of a lexical item involves various components (such as its spelling, phonological representation, word class, morphological or syntactic features, basic meaning, derived meaning, to mention some). Lexical acquisition is indeed a very complex issue (see Schmitt, 2000; Nation, 2001) and it cannot be assumed that acquisition of a word's basic meaning will imply acquisition of formal aspects of the words. Most research has measured

L2 word acquisition as acquisition of basic word meanings (normally via learners' recognition of written or oral words). However, this does not mean that word forms were effectively acquired. There is a receptive-productive continuum involved in learning a word, and receptive processing (for comprehension) and productive processing (for production) are said to be two different types of cognitive processes (the first meaning-focused, the second form-focused. These distinctions have important implications when designing L2 vocabulary tasks for research and pedagogical purposes, especially if the tasks intend to foster not only acquisition of meaning and word recognition, but also *productive knowledge* and acquisition of formal aspects.

   In sum, given the scarce research on task-based, L2 vocabulary acquisition and the lack of studies that examine the role of form-focused instruction during tasks with respect to L2 vocabulary learning, this research is certainly warranted. The lack of ecological validity that most studies in this field have exhibited also does not reflect conventional classroom L2 pedagogy. A more natural setting would help better establish the needed connections between research, methodology and classroom, task-based vocabulary instruction. The purpose of this classroom-based, quasi-experimental study was to explore the differential effects of two types of pedagogical approaches (TBLT lessons and PPP lessons) on L2 oral productive vocabulary acquisition of word meanings and forms. It also intended to explore any differential effects of two types of L2 vocabulary task-based lessons: one incorporating a explicit, teacher-generated focus-on-forms component –TBEF-, and the other one without it –TBNEF- on acquisition of L2 word meanings and morphological aspects. The central research questions were as follows: (a) are TBLT lessons more effective than PPP lessons in promoting L2 vocabulary learning and learning of morphological aspects?; and (b) does a explicit, teacher-generated focus-on-forms phase at the end of a task-based lesson positively impact on learning of L2 words morphological aspects?

V Method

1 Learning context and participants

Learners who participated in this study belonged to three different Elementary Spanish sections of a first-semester, task-supported,

communicative Spanish language class. Their distribution was as follows: nine of them had never studied Spanish before, 22 had one year of high school Spanish instruction, and seven had two years of high school Spanish. Students were taking Spanish as part of the institution's language requirement. The treatment (lesson) was carried out during the tenth week of a 15-week semester, after all learners had been exposed to approximately 43 hours of communicative L2 instruction in Spanish. The three intact classes were randomly assigned to the three different conditions. All learners were informed that they were participating in a study, and they signed a release statement. Because of the task-supported nature of the curriculum, students had been engaged in interactive tasks from the beginning of the semester. Students were all developmentally ready to perform the type of activities employed in the treatment, involving very simple uses of Spanish in very familiar tasks. One preliminary test was administered on day one in order to ascertain receptive, written knowledge of an initial group of 19 Spanish words. The goal was to select a group of target words unknown to all partici-pants. Three participants were excluded after this test. All other partici-pants showed no previous knowledge of the final 15 words (see Appendix A). Five additional students were eliminated from the study due to lack of attendance to class or testing sessions. The final number of participants was 30. Each group worked with the same language instructor, in order to avoid teacher bias, which would negatively affect the internal validity of the study.

2 Procedure

All learners in the three groups participated in a preliminary class session on the general topic of foods (the topic of the instructional unit for that period). As usual, they received a vocabulary list for the lesson, but in this instance the list did not contain the target words. The input-based component of the session consisted of listening to a dialogue (provided in writing as well) taking place in a supermarket, and answering comprehension questions. After this, a second dialogue was presented with the purpose of introducing or recycling functional and lexical aspects of the Spanish language for restaurant settings (such as ordering a meal, expressing likes and

	Time	PPP	TB-NEF	TB-EF
D A Y 1	50 min.	1. Input-based lesson: 2 dialogues Goal: task familiarity (40 min.) 2. Pre-test: L2 vocabulary knowledge (10 min.)		
D A Y 2	50 min.	**Presentation** (20 min.) • Student-initiated *focus on meaning* • Teacher-initiated explicit *focus on forms*	**Pre-task** (20 min.) • Student-initiated *focus on meaning*	**Pre-task** (20 min.) • Student-initiated *focus on meaning*
		Practice (20 min.) • Three teacher-initiated *focus on forms* activities	**Task cycle** (25 min.) 1. Task (15 min.): Student-initiated *planned focus on form* and *meaning* (information gap, role-play) 2. Planning and report (10 min.): Student/instructor-initiated *incidental focus on form*	**Task cycle** (25 min.) 1. Task (15 min.): Student-initiated *planned focus on form* and *meaning* (information gap, role-play) 2. Planning and report (10 min.): Student/instructor-initiated *incidental focus on form*
		Production (10 min.) • No teacher-initiated form-focused instruction • Student-initiated *focus on meaning*	**Task repetition** (15 min.) • No teacher-initiated form-focused instruction • Student-initiated *focus on meaning*	**Language focus** (15 min.) • Teacher-initiated *focus on forms* activities • Teacher-initiated explicit *focus on forms*

Figure 1   Lesson sequence and treatment

dislikes, requesting information about ingredients, paying, names of foods and drinks). None of the input dialogues contained the target words. The main purposes of this instructional session were as follows: (a) to attract students' attention to the functional and lexical aspects mentioned above; and (b) to raise students' awareness of certain routines that are pragmatic/cultural in nature. These activities also helped ensure *task familiarity*, so that the next day cognitive efforts could be placed on the target words, not on understanding the task context. After this general session (45 minutes) the pre-test described earlier was administered, lasting approximately five minutes. On the next day, each group was exposed to a different class session (see Figure 1).

3 The PPP lesson

a Presentation stage: Students were given a dialogue that was similar to the ones used the previous day. The script was the same, but in this occasion the target words were embedded and enhanced in the text and appeared in two occasions each. Learners were expected to direct

attention to these items, since the rest of the dialogue had been clarified the previous day (see Appendix B). When learners encountered these words, they asked the instructor to clarify their meanings, and the instructor recurred to translation. After this, the instructor focused on morphological issues, clarifying and writing on the board the singular form of each word, and its correct article, as well as the formation of the plural[4] (i.e. ***el apio, los apios** –celery-; **el champiñón, los** *champiñ**ones*** –mushroom-; *la nuez, **las** nue**ces*** –nut-). Thus, this was a teacher-initiated *focus-on-meaning* activity, followed by a *focus-on-forms* explicit component that lasted approximately 15 minutes.

b Practice stage: Students read the dialogue in pairs (scripted role-play) so they could also read aloud the target forms. After this, they carried out *three explicit focus-on-forms activities*: first, a written, fill-in the blank exercise where images of the targeted items appeared and they had to produce the words in writing (see Appendix C); second, an oral question–answer exercise where they had to use predetermined formats to produce word forms with their article – and with a focus on gender and number (see Appendix D); and third, a written activity where they had to classify the target words in semantic groups by writing each word – singular and plural – with its correct article, applying the correct morphological rules (see Appendix E). Although all activities required form–meaning connections at varied levels, they had a clear primary focus on form and did not resemble real-life communication. These activities took 20 minutes.

c Production stage: Students had to act out a role-play situation in pairs (at the restaurant) during the remaining 15 minutes of the class. This was considered a 'free', output-based, meaning-based activity, in that they could use any language they wanted. They were reminded, as usual, of the importance of using the new words. This was the only activity with a clear focus on meaning, and no teacher-initiated focus on form was provided.

4 The TB-NEF lesson

a Pre-task: The same dialogue was used as input data (see Appendix B) and the instructor quickly clarified meanings of enhanced words.

No form-focused instruction of any type was provided as the focus of this stage was meaning. This stage lasted 10 minutes.

b Task cycle:　(i) Task. This was a one-way, role-play, information-gap task with a planned focus on form and meaning. The task required students to use the target lexical forms while keeping attention to meaning, in order to achieve the goal of ordering food from a restaurant's menu. The task was primarily chosen because of its pedagogical appropriateness (integrated into the course syllabus) and appropriate design for research purposes (it focused on 15 unknown Spanish words). The task had a role-play format and lasted a total of 20 minutes. One of the students was a client in a restaurant in Spain, while the other was a waiter. The student-client had the restaurant's menu with the 15 target words enhanced in bold (see Appendix F). The student-waiter's menu contained, along with the enhanced written representation of each target word, an image representing the word (see Appendix G). Thus, the 'waiter' had immediate access to meaning and form of the target words, while the client had only access to form. Clients were instructed to negotiate the meaning of all the words on the menu that they did not understand, while waiters had to explain in Spanish the meaning of all unknown menu items. The total time on task was 10 minutes. After this, roles were reversed, and each participant, now with a new role, received the same materials, although the order of the items was altered. The same amount of time on task was allowed. During the task all participants had to negotiate lexical meaning in 15 separate instances, first as a result of lack of comprehension, then as a result of his or her interlocutor's request. At the end of the task, each participant had been exposed to all the target words during the same amount of time. There was no teacher-generated focus on form, but rather learner-generated focus on meaning and form was expected because it was built-into the task (textual enhancement and flooding). The design of the task allowed for an effective isolation of the targeted forms and served to focus learners' attention on the targeted items.

(ii) Planning and report. Working in pairs, students had 10 minutes to make decisions about the perfect menu, and then write it. Then they had to report on their menu to the class and explain specifically why they made their selections. This was an output production stage (first written, then oral) in which it was expected that students would *focus on form in*

an incidental manner, while the primary focus would be on meaning. The teacher provided incidental focus on form when needed by the students. There was no teacher-generated, planned focus on form.

c Task repetition: Students in pairs performed free role-plays during the remaining 10 minutes of the 50-minute class. No teacher-generated focus on form was present in the activity, similar in nature to the one performed at the end of the PPP lesson.

5 The TB-EF lesson

This class session had the same first two stages as the TB-NEF lesson: pre-task and task cycle. However, instead of a task repetition, a teacher-generated, explicit focus-on-forms stage was incorporated, similar to Willis's 1996 language focus but with predetermined forms. Students performed two of the focus-on-forms activities done by PPP learners in the practice stage (see Appendixes D and E). The instructor used this time (a more appropriate time, according to Willis's claim that, by now, learners had acquired meaning) to explicitly clarify morphological, phonological and spelling issues. All activities were recorded in order to ensure that groups were performing according to the conditions to which they had been assigned, which guaranteed the integrity of the protocol.

6 Assessments and scoring procedure

Test 1: Immediate vocabulary test. This test was administered after the task, to measure immediate retrieval of the words' forms. In the digital lab, students were exposed to 15 slides, each containing an image of one target word. For each image they were asked to say the word. The test required retrieval of the Spanish word forms without specifications of article and gender or number agreement. All answers were recorded and reviewed for blind scoring purposes. Students scored one point when the correct form was produced, even if the form was pronounced somewhat incorrectly (for example, *melacatón* instead of *melocotón* – peach) but there was good evidence of word acquisition. However, imperfect forms (for example, *almenotas* instead of almendras – almonds) received a zero score because of the partial nature of the acquisition demonstrated.[5]

Test 2: Delayed vocabulary test. This test was administered one week after the treatment, it measured the retention of target words forms and the acquisition of formal aspects (gender and article agreement). The same testing procedure as for test 1 was used, but for each image they had to say the word with its corresponding definite article and provide the plural as well (i.e. *el melocotón*, *los melocotones* –peach-). The blind scoring was tallied according to the number of correct retrievals, and the scoring of gender/number correctness was computed in relation to the number of errors of gender or article–noun agreement. For example, a production such as *el nuce, las nuces*, instead of *la nuez, las nueces* –nut-, was considered correct for the purposes of word acquisition, but was counted as an error in terms of acquisition of correct morphology.

VI Results

1 Effects of task-based instruction on immediate L2 word retrieval

Mean scores and standard deviations for the oral production test for each group are provided in Table 1.

This data was submitted to a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) that showed no significant differences. In other words, all groups performed equally in the immediate world retrieval tests after treatment. These results are reported in Table 2.

Table 1   Means and standard deviations (SD) for immediate L2 word retrieval

Group	n	M	SD
PPP	10	7.800	3.553
TB-NEF	10	7.100	1.524
TB-EF	10	8.700	2.541

Table 2   ANOVA for immediate L2 word retrieval

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between	2	12.867	6.433	0.9019*
Within	27	192.60	7.133	

$*p > 0.05$

2 *Effects of task-based instruction on L2 word retention*

Mean scores and standard deviations for the oral production test for each group are provided in Table 3.

This data was submitted to a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The results of the ANOVA showed a significant effect, $F(2, 27) = 6.027$, $p = 0.00690$. These results are reported in Table 4.

A Bonferroni *post hoc* multiple comparisons test was performed, which revealed a significant overall difference between the PPP group and the TB-NEF group ($p < 0.05$). The test also revealed a significant difference between the PPP group and the TB-EF group ($p < 0.01$). No significant difference was observed between TB-NEF and TB-EF. That is, the TBLT groups outperformed the PPP group, but both TBLT groups performed equally in the delayed production tests. Results are in Table 5.

Table 3 Means and standard deviations (SD) for delayed L2 word retrieval

Group	n	M	SD
PPP	10	4.700	2.751
TB-NEF	10	7.800	2.936
TB-EF	10	8.600	2.221

Table 4 ANOVA for delayed L2 word retrieval

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between	2	84.867	42.433	6.027*
Within	27	190.10	7.041	

*$p < 0.01$

Table 5 Bonferroni *post hoc* comparisons for delayed L2 word retrieval

Comparison	dif.	t
PPP vs. TB-NEF	−3.100*	2.612
PPP vs. TB-EF	−3.900**	3.287
TB-NEF vs. TB-EF	−0.8000	0.6742

*$p < 0.05$
**$p < 0.01$

3 *Effects of task-based instruction on accuracy of L2 word retrieval*

A Barlett's test performed on the descriptive statistics (shown on Table 6) for word form errors (gender/number correctness) suggested that the differences among the standard deviations for the groups were significant. Thus, a non-parametric ANOVA (Kruskal-Wallis test) was performed on the descriptive data shown below in Table 6.

The results of the non-parametric ANOVA showed a significant group effect (KW $= 11.846$, $p = 0.0027$). A Dunn's multiple comparisons test revealed significant differences between PPP and TB-EF (12.100, $p < 0.01$), and significant differences between TB-NEF and TB-EF (11.000, $p < 0.05$). No differences were found between PPP and TB-NEF (1.100, $p > 0.05$). Results are shown in Table 7.

VII Discussion

With respect to the first research question, no significant differences were found between the learners exposed to a PPP lesson and those exposed to task-based lessons. In other words, the ability to retrieve word forms orally after the lesson was the same for all participants. Despite the qualitative differences in terms of (a) exposure to and use of the target words, (b) types and amount of teacher-initiated form-focused

Table 6 Descriptive statistics for delayed L2 word retrieval (errors)

Group	n	median	minimum	maximum
PPP	10	3.500	0.000	9.000
TB-NEF	10	3.500	1.000	6.000
TB-EF	10	1.000	0.000	2.000

Table 7 Dunn's multiple comparisons test for L2 word retrieval (errors)

Comparison	dif.
PPP vs. TB-NEF	1.100
PPP vs. TB-EF	12.100**
TB-NEF vs. TB-EF	11.000*

**$p < 0.01$
*$p < 0.05$

instruction and (c) degrees of focus on form and meaning, all three types of lesson seem to be effective in promoting the immediate retrieval of new L2 vocabulary. It is possible that the amount of form and meaning processing that took place during the various treatments was enough to aid learners to score high on the immediate L2 word production test. None the less, we cannot disregard the possibility that a greater number of participants might have resulted in significant differences, given the higher mean scores for the TBLT groups, and the results of the delayed L2 word retrieval test, in which significant differences were found (see Table 4). These significant differences between groups in delayed retrieval of the target words seem to indicate an effect of the type of lesson.

First, significant differences were observed between the PPP lesson and the task-based lessons. Let us remember that interaction between learners, as well as opportunities for output production (of the target items), were present in all three treatments. However, there were important qualitative and quantitative differences between the interactions taking place in each separate group. In the PPP group, for instance, only one opportunity for oral interaction was provided (during the production stage) – a free role-play activity with no manipulation of input or output. The activity is open and divergent (conversational direction was ultimately decided by the students) and has an emphasis on free use of the L2. Students were not provided pre-designed materials to work with, but rather they were encouraged to use the L2 as freely and naturally as possible. When examining the interactions in this group ($N = 10$), it was observed that the use of target items was scarce. Use of target items was calculated as the occasions when the learner retrieved the word on-line, but not when a learner produced it as a result of repetition. For example, in the excerpt below, Student A shows productive use of a target word, while Student B does not, as he only repeats the word.

Example 1 (PPP group) Pair 3

Student A:	yeah, sí … ¿te tomas gueato?
	Yeah, yes … do you drink gueato (sic)?
Student B:	No
Student A:	No … ¿tú prefieres **melacotón** o manzana?
	Do you prefer a peach or an apple?
Student B:	mmm … **melacotón**, por favor.
	mmm … peach, please.

In general, the free production task, originally intended to promote use of the new words (as in a typical PPP lesson), did not achieve this objective. Of the 10 participants, one used eight target words, another used five, and the remaining students used less than three (the average production was 2.5 words). The lack of a built-in mechanism to direct the students' attention to the target words during production (a task designed to promote *use* of target words, as the one used in the TBLT groups) may be the cause of the absence of target words in the students' production. Even more interestingly, no negotiation of the target items was observed; in other words, not a single instance of learner-generated focus on form of any type was found. It could be argued that, perhaps, there were no unknown words to negotiate, but examples such as the following indicate otherwise.

> Example 2 (PPP group) Pair 2
>
> Student A: después de la cena, ¿te gusta … mantalla … mentallas?
> *after dinner, do you like … **mantalla** (sic) … **mentallas?**)*
> Student B: Sí … ¿cómo tiene la … guisantes?
> *Yes … ¿how (sic) do you have … peas?*

Although it is obvious that student A is trying to produce a form for a meaning that is very clear in his or her mind, the word *mantalla* or *mentallas* does not exist in Spanish, and this production does not reflect an imperfect form of any of the targeted words. Nevertheless, Student B answers 'yes' and then asks about another food, avoiding meaning negotiation. Another instance of such an omission appears in Example 1 above, where the unknown word *gueato* is not negotiated. Since the practice stage allowed learners in the PPP group to produce the target words only in a very restricted manner, we can hypothesize that, although immediate retrieval was not hindered, delayed retrieval was (*M* score for this group went from 7.8 in Test 1 to 4.7 in Test 2). This represents one of the weakest points of the PPP lesson, given that learners can totally avoid using the target forms either because they have not incorporated them into their interlanguage systems, or simply because the exercise does not push them to employ the new material. Neither the presentation phase (with its explicit planned focus on form (input enhancement) and teacher-initiated focus on forms section) nor the practice stage (with its emphasis on form processing) seemed to stimulate the appropriate processes to bring students to the level of freely

producing the words. In contrast, during both task-based lessons, most of the words were negotiated by participants during the task cycle (planned and incidental, student-generated, focus on form). The nature of the task provided for negotiated interaction where both noticing (due to the salience of the words) and focus on meaning was ensured. These negotiations may have given students the opportunity to process meaning in a way that the PPP lesson cannot provide. The following examples illustrate these processes:

Example 3 (TB-EF group) Pair 1

Student B:	¿Qué es **guellatas** dolces de mantequilo?
	What are sweet butter cookies?
Student A:	Sí, el 'cookie monster' come les galletes
	Yes, the cookie monster eats galletes
Student B:	¿Y **melacotón**?
	and peach?
Student A:	Sí, 'Georgia' es la 'state' de melacotón
	Yes, Georgia is the peach state
Student B:	Me gusta, me gusta, quiero melacotón fresco
	I like it, I like it, I want fresh peach

Example 4 (TB-NEF group) Pair 2

Student B:	¿Qué son **almejas**?
	What are clams?
Student A:	Es como los mejilones con un joya
	It is like mussels but with a jewel

Example 5 (TB-NEF group) Pair 4

Student B:	Sí, ¿qué significa **zumo**?
	what does zumo (juice) mean?
Student A:	Zumo es un tipo de jugo, juego, jugo
	Zumo is a type of juice, juice, juice

In Example 3, student A recurs to cultural clues that help student B to process meaning; in Example 4, student A compares the unknown word to another referent from the same semantic family, and also includes a typical imagery clue (the pearl); in Example 5, student B uses a synonym of the word *zumo*: *jugo*. Unlike the PPP role-play productive stage, these task-based negotiations provide learners with plenty of opportunities for retrieval of the target words, which push learners to link form and meaning.

The planning and report stages of the two task-based lessons are also worth exploring. Learners in the TB-EF group averaged nine productive uses of the target words during the planning stage, and learners in the TB-NEF group averaged 6.9. In other words, productive use was high during interactions in the planning stage. The report stage was yet another opportunity to use the target forms in an unrestricted (though planned) mode. Although production was lower due the nature of the report (students had to explain their favourite menu), each menu reported had a minimum of three and a maximum of six words embedded. All this indicates that opportunities for productive use of the words were greater in the task-based lessons, and this feature alone (and the form processing they entail) could account for the differences between the PPP group and the other two groups. Lastly, instances of student-initiated focus on form were much higher in the TBLT lessons due to the design of the task, which seems to emphasize the value of structure-based production tasks (Ellis, 2003; Samuda, 2001).

When involved in free interactive activities, learners tend to avoid use of L2 target forms. It is interesting to note that during the task repetition stage of learners in the TB-NEF group (very similar to the production stage for the PPP group) the same behaviour was observed; that is, target words were used infrequently by learners in the TB-NEF due to the free nature of the task (an average of 3.1 productive uses). This avoidance during the free task may constitute yet another indication that pre-planned, well-focused productive tasks can better promote the pushed output said to enhance form processing and further acquisition of words.

The differences between the PPP group and the task-based groups can be explained then in terms of the differential nature of the lessons (PPP versus TBLT). Primarily, it is possible that the planned TBLT lessons allow for deeper processing of the L2 words by helping learners to establish more productive meaning–form connections through multiple opportunities for output production (of target words) during negotiation. Such processing may have facilitated word acquisition. These results are in accordance with those obtained by de la Fuente (2002) and Ellis and He (1999) on the acquisition of L2 vocabulary and the role of pushed output. Current processing theories of SLA (Johnson, 1996; Skehan, 1998) emphasize the greater cognitive demands of developing productive knowledge of the L2 (as opposed to receptive knowledge). PPP activities (such as retrieving written forms or repeating them during

controlled exchanges), do not entail word retrieval on-line, which may have promoted a shallow processing of the target words.[6] In contrast, the nature of the tasks in the TBLT groups (information-gap) enhanced productive on-line retrieval by making available to students either the form or the meaning during task (depending on the student's role as waiter or client). The 'practice' activities based on a PPP model, however, do not encourage retrieval, but repetition. Students use practical, rather than cognitive, strategies to complete these type of exercises. This can be observed in the excerpt from the practice stage shown in Example 6.

Example 6 (PPP group) Pair 3

Student A:	Champiñones es veduras
	Mushrooms are vegetables
Student B:	Sí … cerezas es un fruta …
	Yes, cherries are fruit
Student A:	Tener es … tenera es un carne … ¿otros?
	Beef is … beef is meat … ¿others?
Student B:	Sí … el ciruezas es un fruta…
	Yes … the plum is a fruit …
Student A:	Sí …
	Yes
Student B:	Galletas, ¿un otro?
	Cookies, another one?
Student A:	Nueces es un nueces, y apio es un verdura … apio
	Walnut is a nut, and celery is a vegetable … celery

In this excerpt, students are going through the items, available to them in written and image form, in order to classify them in different categories or semantic fields. This practical procedure, although of value in terms of form processing, does not encourage retrieval, because both form and meaning of the words are presented simultaneously to students. In sum, even though the inherent qualities of the two types of lessons may not have had an impact in the short term (as shown by Test 1) they seem to have affected delayed (one week) oral retention.

   The second research question addressed the relative effect of the type of pedagogical approach of the lesson on the accuracy of the newly acquired Spanish words, particularly the acquisition of phonological representation and gender/number aspects. This question relates to the explicit focus on forms component incorporated both in the PPP lesson and in the TB-EF lesson. Despite the lack of differences between the two TBLT groups in terms of acquisition of the targeted words, a much

greater number of formal errors were found in the oral production test (Test 2) of the TB-NEF group. For example, the word *melocotón* (peach) (a difficult word in terms of spelling and gender) had a high rate of acquisition in both groups, but it was considered feminine in four instances in the TB-NEF group (i.e. *la melocotón, las melocotones/as*). The same pattern was observed for the word *champiñón* (mushroom) which was produced as *la champiñón, las champiñonas* in five instances. Similarly, the word *nuez* (nut) was recurrently produced as masculine instead of feminine (i.e. *el nuece, los nueces*), and its ending was incorrectly produced (i.e. *nuece* instead of *nuez*) in five instances. Less differential patterns were observed in words with regular article agreement (like **el** api**o** –celery-). Overall, learners in the TB-EF group made fewer phonological and morphological mistakes than those in the other two groups (M = 1.00). These differences proved to be significant; in other words, the TB-EF group performed significantly better than both the PPP and the TB-NEF group. The differences between both TBLT groups may be explained by the language focus component present only in the TB-EF group. This phase of the task cycle may have given these learners an opportunity to concentrate on formal aspects that are very difficult to acquire in an incidental manner, especially during TBLT lesson, with their overt emphasis on meaning and communication. Let us remember that these formal aspects, not being essential for fluent communication, may easily go unnoticed and ignored by learners. In fact, in contrast with the abundant cases of meaning negotiation found in the transcripts, very few cases of incidental negotiation of form of this type (gender, number, word form …) were observed. A few examples were found of *implicit negative feedback* (see Examples 7 and 8 below), some of which did not seem to have an effect on the interlocutors (see Example 8).

Example 7 (TB-NEF) Pair 5

Student B: Para los postres ¿qué significa **cerizas**?
             For dessert, what do cherries mean?
Student A: Las **cerezas** son frutas, son roja, rojas
             cherries are fruits, they are red, red

Example 8 (TB-EF) Pair 2

Student B: Yo conoce, yo conoce, y ¿qué significa el **guesantes** con jamón?
             I know, I know, and what does peas with ham mean?
Student A: **Guisantes** son verduras muy pequeñas y son verde …
             peas are very small vegetables and they are green …

Student B: Yo quiero uno de los **guesantes** com jamón para mi primer plato
I want one of the peas with ham for my first entrée

In addition, very few attempts at self-correction were observed, a clear indication of the *meaning* processing (not form) taking place in the interactions (but see Example 9 below for an exception).

Example 9 (TB-EF) Pair 2

Student B: So . . . me gusta mejilanes y **almejos**, **almejas** y, para la segundo plato . . .
So . . . I like mussels and clams, clams, and for the second entrée . . .

As a consequence of these patterns, repetition of incorrect forms abounded (see Examples 10 and 11), as did the reiteration of such errors even following a partner's correct production (see Example 12).

Example 10 (PPP group) Pair 2

Student A: Bien, ¿te gusta **alemanis**?
OK, do you like almonds?
Student B: No, no me gusta **alemanis**, yo quiero comer un carne
No, I do not like almonds, I want to eat meat

Example 11 (TB-NF group) Pair 2

Student A: Comprendo el ménu, ¿qué significa **millones** y **alamejas**?
What does mussels and clams mean?
Student B: **Millones** y **alamejas** está en el mar y . . .
Mussels and clams are in the sea and . . .

Example 12 (TB-NEF) Pair 5

Student A: Sí, ¿y **melocotón**?
Yes, and peach?
Student B: **Melicotons** son naranja, es un fruta, es de Georgia . . .
Peaches are orange, it is a fruit, it is from Georgia . . .

Explicit corrective feedback was observed in very few instances, and conscious attempts to learn formal aspects of the words seemed almost completely absent, with one exception (see Example 13 below).

Example 13 (TB-EF) Pair 4

Student B: ¿Qué signífica **cereleas**?
What does it mean plums?
Student A: ¿Qué?
What?
Student B: c-i-r . . . l-a-s
(spelling)

Student A:	¿Cicuellas? ¿Cicuellas?
	(incorrect pronunciation)
Student B:	Sí
	(Yes)
Student A:	Sí, ceruelas … c-e-r-u-e-l-a-s…
	(working on pronunciation)

Examples 7 to 12 clearly indicate that attention is directed to meaning, and not to form processing, which suggests a need for a built-in focus-on-forms component in the tasks. Additionally, with the exception of two occasions in which students inquired about the right pronunciation (phonological representation) of a target word, learner-initiated focus on form was scarcely observed. This is another indication that incidental focus on form should not be expected from these types of tasks – findings that support the idea that explicit learning conditions with primary attention to form may be more effective for formal aspects of vocabulary acquisition. This component might allow for reflection and consolidation of form–meaning relationships, providing a more permanent connection.

As for the differences between the PPP and TB-EF groups, we can hypothesize that they are attributable to the different placement of the focus-on-forms component during the lesson. At the beginning of the PPP lesson, learners were not yet familiar with the meanings that the target words represented, as they were not given the time to process these meanings beforehand. It is suggested here that form processing before meaning processing may have negatively impacted the further acquisition of formal aspects of the L2 words. It follows that the effect of an explicit focus-on-forms phase at the end of a task is that of drawing attention to the forms associated with the meanings already acquired, strengthening form–meaning connections for posterior uses of the target words.

VIII Conclusions, limitations and future research

This study suggests that the type of pedagogical approach of the L2 vocabulary lesson may have an impact on retention of new L2 words. Task-based lessons with a built-in, planned focus on form seem to be more effective than PPP lessons, due to the fewer opportunities for targeted output production and retrieval that PPP lessons offer, and to its inability to effectively focus students' attention on targeted forms. TBLT

lessons designed this way can provide more opportunities for negotiation of meaning and output production (allowing focus on form), and allow for on-line retrieval of target words. The results also suggest that task-based vocabulary lessons benefit from an explicit focus-on-forms component when we want to foster not only acquisition of the words' basic meaning, but also of important formal/morphological aspects of words. This focus-on-forms component allows for noticing of such aspects, and it seems to be more effective when meaning acquisition has taken place (at the end of the task cycle).

The importance of structure-based, information-gap tasks for L2 vocabulary acquisition should also be underscored. By making the processing of word meaning obligatory, these tasks promote attention to form and meaning. In particular, one-way tasks that are manipulated so that output production is warranted seem to be sound pedagogical tools for acquisition of L2 vocabulary items from a TBLT approach. More studies examining the value of these tasks for L2 word acquisition should be conducted, as well as studies comparing different types of tasks.

There are certain limitations of this study that need to be underscored: first, the number of participants was not very high, which posits limitations to the generalization of these results. In addition, it would have been more valid to test acquisition by involving students in the same type of task (role play), instead of testing in a discrete-point fashion. Lastly, longitudinal studies that examine the value of TBLT within specific curricular contexts need to be conducted, so the developmental aspect of vocabulary acquisition within the TBLT approach can be examined. In particular, the value of TBLT in foreign language programmes needs to be explored. This importance of specific curricular contexts has been underscored in the literature,[7] as well as the need for more ethnographical studies, in order to strengthen the link between research and pedagogy. With respect to L2 vocabulary learning, TBLT presents a promising approach to both the research and the pedagogical perspectives of the matter worth pursuing.

Notes

[1] Long (2000) defines focus on form as any incidental attempt to direct learners' attention to any L2 form in context. This incidental focus on form is called '*reactive*' by Doughty and Williams (1998a). They use the term '*proactive*' *focus on form* to refer to planned interventions (not incidental) to provide focus on form during task.

[2]   Samuda (2001) mentions that it is possible to move either from meaning to form or from form to meaning, but in both cases, it must be ensured that learners successfully establish form–meaning connections.

[3]   See also Mackey *et al*. (2004) on the relevance of teacher-generated incidental focus on form.

[4]   This is important in that not all words in Spanish follow the regular pattern of *el + -o* (masculine), and *la + -a* (feminine), so learners need to learn both regular and irregular patterns (like *el guisante, los guisantes* – pea-).

[5]   However, as noted by an anonymous reviewer, the scoring system of 0 or 1 may have provided the researcher with a less precise measure of the learners' actual degree of word form knowledge.

[6]   Frequency of target word occurrence may also have influenced the results. Multiple processings of a given a word lead to what N. Ellis (2002) calls a 'practice increment effect'. The higher number of opportunities for word use provided by the task lessons may help explain the apparent superiority of these lessons.

[7]   See Byrnes (2002), Doughty and Williams (1998a), or Robinson (2001).

XI References

Brown, R. 1991: Group work, task difference, and second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics* 11: 1–12.

Bygate, M. 1996: Effects of task repetition: appraising the developing language of learners. In Willis, J. and Willis, D., editors, *Challenge and change in language teaching*. Heinemann, 136–46.

—— 1999: Task as context for the framing, re-framing, and un-framing of language. *System* 27: 33–48.

—— 2001: Effects of task repetition on the structure and control of oral language. In Bygate, M., Skehan, P. and Swain, M., editors, *Researching pedagogic tasks*. Pearson Education, 23–48.

Bygate, M., Skehan, P. and **Swain, M.** 2001: *Researching pedagogic tasks*. Pearson Education.

Candlin C. and **Murphy, D.**, editors, 1987: *Language learning tasks*. Prentice Hall.

Crookes, G. and **Gass, S.**, editors, 1993: *Tasks and language learning: integrating theory and practice*. Multilingual Matters.

de la Fuente, M.J., 2002: Negotiation and oral acquisition of Spanish L2 vocabulary: the roles of input and output in the receptive and productive acquisition of words. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24: 81–112.

Doughty, C. and **Williams, J.**, editors, 1998a: *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.

—— 1998b: Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In Doughty, C. and Williams, J., editors, *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press, 197–262.

Ellis, N. 2002: Frequency effects in language processing: a review with implications for theories of implicit and explicit language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24: 143–88.

Ellis, N. and **Beaton, A.** 1993: Psycholinguistic determinants of foreign language vocabulary. *Language Learning* 43: 559–617.

Ellis, R. 2000: Task-based research and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research* 4: 193–220.

—— 2001: Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning* 51 (supplement 1): 1–46.

—— 2003: *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. and **He, X.** 1999: The roles of modified input and output in the incidental acquisition of word meanings. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 21: 285–301.

Ellis, R., Tanaka, Y. and **Yamakazi, A.** 1994: Classroom interaction, comprehension and L2 vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning* 44: 449–91.

Foster, P. and **Skehan, P.** 1996: The influence of planning on performance in task-based learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18: 299–324.

—— 1999: The influence of planning and focus on planning on task-based performance. *Language Teaching Research* 3: 215–47.

Gass, S. 1997: *Input, interaction and the second language learner*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hatch, E. 1978: *Second language acquisition: a book of readings*. Newbury House.

Johnson, K. 1996: *Language teaching and skill learning*. Blackwell.

Lightbown, P. 1998: The importance of timing in focus on form. In Doughty, C. and Williams, J., editors, *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press, 177–96.

Long, M. 1981: Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. In Winitz, H., editor, *Native language and foreign language acquisition.* New York Academy of Sciences, 379.

—— 1983: Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics* 4: 126–41.

—— 1991: Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In de Bot, K., Ginsberg, R.B. and Kramsch, C., editors, *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective*. John Benjamins, 39–52.

—— 1996: The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In Ritchie, W.C. and Bathia, T.K., editors, *Handbook of second language acquisition*. Academic Press, 413–68.

—— 2000: Focus on form in task-based language teaching. In Lambert, R.L. and Shohamy, E., editors, *Language policy and pedagogy*. John Benjamins, 179–92.

Loschky, L. 1994: Comprehensible input and second language acquisition: what is the relationship? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 16: 303–24.

Loschky, L. and **Bley-Vroman, R.** 1993: Grammar and task-based methodology. In Crookes, G. and Gass, S., editors, *Tasks and language learning: integrating theory and practice*. Multilingual Matters, 123–67.

Mackey, A., Polio, C. and **McDonough, K.** 2004: The relationship between experience, education and teachers' use of incidental focus-on-form techniques. *Language Teaching Research* 8(3): 301–27.

Muranoi, H. 2000: Focus on form through interaction enhancement: integrating formal instruction into a communicative task in EFL classroom. *Language Learning* 50: 617–73.

Nation, P. 2001: *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.

Norris, J. and **Ortega, L.** 2000: Effectiveness of L2 instruction: a research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning* 50: 417–528.

Nunan, D. 1989: *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge University Press.

Ortega, L. 1999: Planning and focus on form in L2 oral performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 21: 108–48.

Robinson, P. 1995: Task complexity and second language narrative discourse. *Language Learning* 45: 99–140.

—— 2001: *Cognition and second language instruction*. Cambridge University Press.

Samuda, V. 2001: Guiding relationships between form and meaning during task performance: the role of the teacher. In Bygate, M. *et al*., editors, *Researching pedagogic tasks*. Pearson Education, 119–40.

Schmitt, N. 2000: *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Skehan, P. 1996: A framework for the implementation of task based instruction. *Applied Linguistics* 17: 38–62.

—— 1998: *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.

Skehan, P. and **Foster, P.** 1997: The influence of planning and post-task activities on accuracy and complexity in task-based learning. *Language Teaching Research* 1: 3.

—— 1999: The influence of task structure and processing conditions on narrative retellings. *Language Learning* 49: 93–120.

Swain, M. 1985: Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Gass, S. and Madden, C., editors, *Input in second language acquisition*. Newbury House, 235–53.

—— 1998: Focus on form through conscious reflection. In Doughty, C. and Williams, J., editors, *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press, 64–81.

Swain, M. and **Lapkin, S.** 2001: Focus on form through collaborative dialogue: exploring task effects. In Bygate, M. *et al*., editors, *Researching pedagogic tasks*. Pearson Education, 99–118.

Willis, J. 1996: *A framework for task-based learning*. Longman.

Appendix A: Target words

Ajo (el):	(garlic)
Ciruela (la):	(plum)
Galleta (la):	(cookie)
Guisante (el):	(pea)
Mejillón (el):	(mussel)
Apio (el):	(celery)
Almeja (la):	(clam)
Cereza (la):	(cherry)
Melocotón (el):	(peach)
Almendra (la):	(almond)
Champiñón (el):	(mushroom)
Gamba (la):	(shrimp)
Nuez (la):	(nut)
Ternera (la):	(beef)
Zumo (el):	(juice)

Appendix B: Dialogue for treatment lesson (all groups)

EN EL RESTAURANTE

[…]

CAMARERO: Aquí tienen. Dos menús. ¿Desean algo para beber? ¿Un vinito, un **zumo**?

MUJER: Mmmmm … a ver … ¿tienen de naranja?

CAMARERO: ¡Cómo no!. de naranja, de limón, de **melocotón** … También Cocacola, Mirinda …

MUJER: ¿Cuánto cuesta?

CAMARERO: 1 euro.

MUJER: Vale, a mí me trae un refresco de limón, me da igual la marca.

CAMARERO: ¿Y usted, señor? ¿Qué va a tomar?

HOMBRE: Yo un **zumo** de **melocotón.**
CAMARERO: Estupendo. Vengo enseguida.
…
MUJER: A ver, a ver … Mira, tienen buenos mariscos … **gambas**, **mejillones**, **almejas** …
HOMBRE: Sí, ya veo, pero carísimo. ¿Qué tal la carne?
MUJER: Yo prefiero marisco. De primero una sopa de marisco, y de segundo una tortilla de **champiñones**

Appendix C: Practice stage activity 1. Focus-on-forms activity (sample)

Completa el diálogo. Escribe la palabra en español para cada imagen.

CAMARERO: Aquí tienen. Dos menús. ¿Desean algo para beber? ¿Un vinito, un refresco?
MUJER: Sí, a mí me trae un refresco de limón
CAMARERO: ¿Y usted, señor? ¿Qué va a tomar?

HOMBRE: Yo un de naranja.
CAMARERO: Estupendo.

MUJER: Mira, tienen mariscos … , ,   Yo prefiero marisco, y de segundo una tortilla de
HOMBRE: Pues yo de primero una sopa, y de segundo un bistec … de .
MUJER: Yo de [… etc]

Appendix D: Practice stage activity 2. Focus-on-forms activity

Practica con tu compañero. Haz siete preguntas a tu compañero que incluyan el vocabulario aprendido hoy. Tu compañero te hará luego siete preguntas a ti. Pon atención al artículo determinado y a la concordancia con el nombre. Practica las formas del singular y del plural como muestra el modelo.

Ejemplo:

- Tú: ¿Te gusta el melocotón?
- Tu compañero/a: Sí, me gusta mucho el melocotón.
- Tú: ¿Te gustan los melocotones?
- Tu compañero/a: Sí, me gustan los melocotones.

(Translation)

Practice with a classmate. Ask seven questions that include seven of the words learned today. Then your classmate will ask you seven questions as well. Pay attention to determinate articles and article-noun agreement. Practice singular and plural variations, as shown in the model.

Appendix E: Practice stage activity 3.
Focus-on-forms activity

Clasifica el vocabulario de la lección de hoy en grupos. Escribe cada palabra con su artículo correcto (masculino o femenino) y también el plural.

(Translation)
Classify the vocabulary of the lesson in groups. Write each word with the correct gender article (masculine of feminine) and also the plural forms.

Appendix F: Task for TB-NEF and TB-EF groups (role A)

En el restaurante (A)

You are visiting Spain, and decide to go to a restaurant. Once in the restaurant, you are looking at the menu. You do not understand many of the words in the menu, so it is hard to order anything. Ask the waiter about **the meanings of all the words you do not know** (**they are marked in black**). **Do not use English** for this interaction, only Spanish.

Restaurante *El Español* (A)
Menú del día
Un primer plato, + un segundo plato + postre + bebida = 20 euros
PRIMER PLATO

1.   Sopa de **mejillones** y **almejas**
2.   Sopa de **ajo**
3.   Sopa de verduras (lleva zanahorias, **apio** y maiz)
4.   **Guisantes** con jamón

[. . . etc.]

Appendix G: Task for TB-NEF and TB-EF groups (role B)

En el restaurante (B)

You are working in Spain as a waiter. A client sitting on a table is looking at the menu. The client does not understand many of the words, so s/he is going to ask you questions about **the meanings of all the words**

s/he does not know. Please answer all the questions using only Spanish for the interaction. **Do not use English**.

Restaurante *El Español* (B)
Menú del día
Un primer plato, + un segundo plato + postre + bebida = 20 euros
PRIMER PLATO

1. Sopa de **mejillones**   y **almejas**

2. Sopa de **ajo**

3. Sopa de verduras: zanahorias, **apio**   y maiz
4. [... etc.]