CHAPTER - 4

Status of Vocabulary in ESP, ESL and EFL
Second language acquisition began from the time of Romans. From the early stage to the present day there have been numerous approaches to language teaching and learning. But each approach has a different view on vocabulary. Sometimes vocabulary has been honored in teaching methodologies whereas at other times it has been ignored. There was a general acceptance of grammar which always dominated vocabulary in English Language Teaching.

The teaching and learning of vocabulary has never aroused the same degree of interest within language teaching as have issues such as grammatical competence, contrastive analysis, reading or writing, which have received a considerable attention from both scholars and teachers (Richards, 1976, p.77).

For more than a quarter century (1950 to 1980) lexicologists and language educators remained unsuccessful in bestowing notice to vocabulary. The distinguished cause behind this was the belief among linguists that to know a language only means skills to use its sounds and structures (Tickoo, 2000). Vocabulary teaching remained a neglected area in English Language teaching for number of years. This neglect also affected the linguistic theory. Recently it gained a prominent status in linguistic research and theorizing. Richards (1976) claimed that for years vocabulary remained an area where the:

Link between approach, method and technique has been neglected (Richards, 1976, p.88).
Teaching and learning of vocabulary is in practice since long. The history and development of vocabulary teaching is not an:

Old insight leading to new; it is more of a series of dominating ideologies or fashions that have succeeded one another and which sometimes come as a full circle (Carter and McCarthy, 1988, p.99).

But as time passed on vocabulary teaching gained further progress and it has drawn on advances in descriptive linguistics, psycholinguistics and very recently computational linguistics (Carter & McCarthy, 1988).

It is believed that the 80s have been the period in which the importance of vocabulary instruction was rediscovered. Researchers, materials designers and ESP practitioners have become more interested than ever in questions related to lexis. The rebirth of concern for vocabulary teaching has not been established for long and this is because of the joint contribution of the availability of computerized data based on words (or corpora) and the advancement of modern approaches to language teaching which are basically ‘word centered’ for example ‘lexical approach’ (Thornbury, 2002).

4.2 IMPORTANCE OF VOCABULARY

Vocabulary always remained a neglected aspect of English Language Teaching. It was neither officially included in any of the four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) of language teaching. But it is no less important than grammar or any other language skills. Even the language learners are getting more concerned for vocabulary acquisition as compared to earlier times. Vocabulary teaching and learning is a very wide and most vital area for language learner. A learner cannot be a good
speaker only through learning rules or structures of a language. Rather he can improve language by learning more words and expressions. Vocabulary learning is a very significant issue for a learner while learning a new language. As Thornbury (2000) says a phrase book or a dictionary facilitates more communicative advantages than a grammar book.

Wilkins (1972) while talking about the importance of vocabulary asserted:

Without grammar very little can be conveyed, but without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed (Wilkins, 1972, p.111).

Gaining knowledge of words is a significant issue while learning a language. Word is the basic tool for communication. It is only through words one can express the complete idea while through grammar or sounds it can be expressed in bits or parts.

To quote McCarthy (1990):

No matter how well the student learns grammar, no matter how successfully the sounds of L2 are mastered, without words to express a wider range of meanings, communication in an L2 just cannot happen in any meaningful way (McCarthy, 1990, p.8).

Nattinger (1988) highlighted the importance of vocabulary in language teaching and tried to point out a distinction between comprehension and production. Nattinger (1988) further expressed his view:

Comprehension of vocabulary relies on strategies that permit one to understand words and store them, to commit them to memory that is production is concerned with strategies that activates one’s storage by retrieving these words from
memory and by using them in appropriate situations (Nattinger, 1988, p. 62).

Time and again the importance of vocabulary in second language acquisition is being put forward by various language experts. Though vocabulary is marginalized by grammar and structures, the shine is never left unseen.

To improve second language proficiency a language learner needs to have good command over vocabulary:

At times, not knowing a specific word can severely limit communication; however, in many cases a lexical lapse can actually stop communication completely (Folse, 2008, p. 12).

Vocabulary helps the learner to express, to convey, and to present oneself in different situations. But along with vocabulary knowledge of grammar is also required to communicate correctly or properly. Grammar is rules or codes to arrange words in sentences.

Vocabulary is largely a collection of items, grammar is a system of rules (Thornbury, 2002, p. 14).

Grammar multiplies while vocabulary merely adds. Hence learners along with mastering vocabulary in a target language also need to monitor grammatical rules.

Teaching Approaches such as the Direct Method and Audiolingualism gave greater priority to the teaching of grammatical structures. But lexical syllabus brought up by the science of Corpus Linguistics highlighted the role of vocabulary in language learning and language teaching. The main focus of the above discussion is to draw attention on vocabulary and its importance in English Language Teaching.
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Schmitt (2000) claimed that grammar and vocabulary are fundamentally linked. And it is difficult to think of vocabulary and grammar as separate entities.

4.3 WORD

The linguistic definition of word is "minimum meaningful unit of a language". Vygotsky defined word as "a word is a microcosm of human consciousness" (cited in Thornbury, 2002, p.1).

Knowing a word involves more than knowing its meaning or what it stands for. Knowing a word includes knowing the following things:

i. How often it is used, that is where and when?

ii. How it is spelled and pronounced?

iii. Which part of speech (noun, verb, adjective) it can function as?

iv. What it’s core meaning is?

v. What it’s root form is, what prefixes and suffixes it can take and what derivations can be made from it (e.g. do, does, did, done, doing, undo, redo, doable)?

vi. What grammatical pattern it fits into or what its syntactic behavior is?

vii. What associations (e.g. pleasant or unpleasant, positive or negative) it forms?

viii. What limitations there are to its use (e.g. in what type of situations or structures it can or cannot be used)?

ix. What degree of probability there is of encountering it in speech and in writing (Tickoo, 2003, p. 191)?
4.4 VOCABULARY

While teaching vocabulary and talking of its development it is necessary to know, what is vocabulary? Vocabulary is the knowledge of words and word meanings. It is a set of lexemes, including single words, compound words and idioms. Vocabulary can also be described as word or group of words used by a person in a particular field of knowledge.

The vocabulary of a language includes much more than single words. It includes language forms that are not full words (e.g. un-, il-, -ment) and compound words (escalating cost, counter argument, show business), fixed phrase and idiomatic expressions (e.g. to make up for lost time, to harbor a grudge) (Tickoo, 2003, p.190).

While teaching vocabulary it is necessary to know that words have two different categories.

Structural words – it is also called as function words or grammar words. They are limited in number and possess closed category e.g. they are conjunctions, prepositions, articles and determiners.

Content words – content words bear meanings and they form an open class that is words whose membership keeps changing. They are mainly nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs (Tickoo, 2003).

Vocabulary in ESL and EFL can be divided into four groups. They are:

i. High Frequency Words – High frequency words are:

An essential basis for language use (Flowerdew and Peacock, 2001, p.252).
These are the most frequent 2000 words of English. West (1953) called these words a ‘general service’ vocabulary because they serve any purpose of communication (Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001).

The vocabulary typically covers around 80 percent of running words of academic texts and newspapers and around 90 percent of conversation and novels. It includes virtually all function words of English (around 176 word families) but the majority of high frequency words are content words (Nation, 2001, pp.13-16).


Martin (1976) divided technical vocabulary in three groups:

The research process – the vocabulary is primarily verbs and nouns and is presented in a context which discusses the five steps of research formulating, investigating, analyzing, drawing conclusions and reporting results.

The vocabulary of analysis – it includes high frequency words and two verbs which is required to present any information in an organized and systematic manner. e.g. consist of, group, result from, derive, base on be noted for.

The vocabulary of evaluation: it includes adjectives and adverbs that occur in reviews, critiques and some reports, e.g. exhaustive,
controversial, substantive, objective, subjective, implicit, explicit, inductive-deductive, significant-insignificant.

Cowan explained sub-technical vocabulary as 'context independent words with high frequency across disciplines, e.g. function, influence, isolate, relation, basis, presuppose, stimulate, approximately etc.

The academic vocabulary of texts allows the writer to generalize over complex state of affairs, and to repeat and evaluate linguistic acts and scientific activities (Meyer, 1990, p.9, cited in Flowerdew and Peacock, 2001).

iii –Technical vocabulary:

Technical word is one that is recognizably specific to a particular topic, field or discipline (Flowerdew and Peacock, 2001, p.261).

Technical vocabulary always appears in context of specific discipline and they are very rare in general English communication.

iv - Low Frequency Vocabulary: It includes the words which we very rarely use in our daily communication. For examples words like aired and zone.

4.5 STATUS OF VOCABULARY IN VARIOUS LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODS.

The prime language teaching methodology that began at the early stage of the 19\textsuperscript{th} Century was Grammar-Translation Method. This method deals with few Grammar rules, a list of vocabulary items and some sample practice exercises of translation from L1 to L2. The main focus of this method was accuracy and to learn explicit grammar rules. Grammatical
accuracy is considered to be more important than teaching communicative competence. Vocabulary was on only taught in the form of isolated words.

Here the students were expected to learn themselves the basic vocabulary needed through bilingual word lists or with the help of dictionaries. No proper attention was being paid in learning vocabulary skills.

The main problem with Grammar Translation Method was that it focused on the ability to analyze language and not the ability to use it (Schmitt, 2000, p.12).

The new ideas of user based language gave birth to Direct Method, which arrived by the end of the 19th Century. This method focuses on oral language teaching with listening as the primary skills. Meanings were directly related to the target language without any translation being done. Grammar rules were downplayed. Here in this method there is no proper mode of delivering vocabulary to students, rather it is assumed to be acquired naturally through interaction with texts of lessons. Concrete vocabulary was explained through pictures with initial vocabulary being kept easy and familiar. Only abstract words were presented in a traditional way of being grouped according to topics or association of ideas. Thus Direct method also contributed very little to vocabulary teaching. At the same time in Britain there evolved a new approach called Reading Method. This method resulted due to Micheal West’s concept stressing the need to facilitate reading skills by improving vocabulary learning (Schmitt, 2000,p.13). Reading Method also neglected vocabulary to be learned as an independent skill.

After World War II another approach appeared which is known as Audiolingualism. The main emphasis was on teaching structural patterns. The vocabulary taught seems to be very easy, simple and familiar to
learners. The vocabulary taught seems to be very easy, simple and familiar to the learners. New vocabulary was added only when the drills needed to be kept viable. It is assumed that language through multiple exposure and communication in target situations help developing vocabulary knowledge of a student.

Hence at that time there was no clear cut vocabulary teaching method.

Similar to Audiolingualism, a method appeared in Britain in 1940s and 1960s termed as Situational Approach. The teaching method is very much like Audiolingual method focusing on the lexical and grammatical items according to the required situations. Situational Approach treated vocabulary in a more principled way than Audiolingualism (Schmitt, 2000).

In the late 1950s, the theory of Behaviourism which underpins Audiolingualism was highly criticized by Noam Chomsky. Later Behaviourism was pushed back by the coming up of new ideas governed by cognitive factors which define that language learning is based on some set of abstract rules and those rules are inborn. Based on this new theory Hymes (1972) came up with the new idea of ‘communicative competence’ highlighting the sociolinguistic and pragmatic factors of language. Nunan based on Hymes communicative competence (1972) gave rise to Communicative Language Teaching Method. The main focus of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) method’s is fluency rather than grammatical accuracy. It is a meaning based approach and learners are given exercises on how to interchange information. CLT gives very little emphasis on vocabulary teaching. Vocabulary was shifted to the edge by the “issues of mastering functional language and how language connects together in discourse”. In any meaning based approach it is
expected to give vocabulary a prime place but the case was totally opposite in Communicative Language Teaching. It gives very little directions on how to deal with vocabulary.

Towards the end of 1970 there evolved another approach, termed Natural Approach. Natural Approach emphasizes comprehensible and meaningful input rather than grammatically correct production. Natural Approach considered vocabulary as a bearer of meaning, which is very important in language acquisition process. In Natural Approach mastering knowledge of vocabulary is encouraged by 'comprehensible input' (Carter and McCarthy, 1988).

From the above language discussions it can be inferred that:

Language teaching methodology has moved like a pendulum between language instruction as language analysis and language use. Likewise vocabulary has had differing fortunes in various approaches (Schmitt, 2000, p.15).

Most of the approaches lacked knowledge on how to deal with vocabulary as an independent skill and they depended on bilingual word lists expecting learners to master the vocabulary naturally.

The work on vocabulary started properly by the end of the 19th Century. Major lexical research concerning the patterning of vocabulary in discourse began in 1980s with the advent of computer analysis techniques. The research on lexis was collectively known as Vocabulary Control Movement. There were two major works in this Movement. The first one is of C.K. Ogden and I.A. Richards (1930) ‘Basic English’. In this they limited the vocabulary with only 850 words, claiming it could be learnt quickly and also express the meaning that could be communicated in general English and this was done by paraphrasing the words. Basic English comprised 150 items representing qualities (essentially
adjective), 600 things (nouns) and 100 operations (a mixture of word classes), but Basic English was criticized on various grounds and it laid a very rare impact. First it was promoted as a replacement language for English itself, basic English merely shifted the learning burden to learning many meaning senses. It has been estimated that 850 words of Basic English have 12,425 meanings.

There was another problem also. Firstly teachers needed to be trained for using this language. Secondly it was unsuitable for social interactions. Finally Basic English produced what seemed to be “unnatural” English and many teachers felt that:

If courses were offered which claimed to teach Basic English they should in fact teach basic English (Howatt, 1984, cited in Schmitt, 2000).

The second approach in Vocabulary Control Movement was “to use systematic criteria to select the most useful words for language learning” (Schmitt, 2000, p.16). In the first half of the 20th Century various researchers worked in this area and their result was jointly termed as the Carneige Report (Palmer, West and Faucett, 1936). They developed a vocabulary list which was helpful for the production of simple reading materials. The words in the lists were selected on the basis of their frequency in a target language but there were some drawbacks because apart from word frequency, vocabulary required in any situation depends on the context in which it is used. Hence there were some set criteria to select the words. They are:

i. word frequency.

ii. structural value (all structural words included).

iii. universality (words likely to cause offence locally excluded).
iv. subject range (no specialist items).

v. definition words (for dictionary).

vi. word building capacity.


West (1953) viewed that the list contained 2000 words and was published as General Service List of English Words (GSL). The major feature of this approach is the “use of frequency information” (Schmitt, 2000 p.16).

The practice of listing words on the basis of their frequency has a long history and was attempted previously by other language experts also. In 1864 Thomas Prendergast objected to the archaic wordlists used in Grammar Translation Method, prepared a list of the most frequent words in English relying on his intuition which proved to be accurate (Schmitt, 2000).

In 1980 another modern frequency list compiled of a large number of words, nearly 11 million was created by Kaeding in Prussia (Howatt, 1984, p.257, cited in Schmitt, 2000). But the well known wordlist used in second language acquisition is that of Michael West.

4.6 DEVELOPMENTS IN THE TEACHING OF VOCABULARY

American Linguistics always tried to push vocabulary in a row and gave it a second level importance. This view persisted in the 1940s, 50s and 60s. It is epitomized in its early days by Fries’s Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language (1945). Fries believed that in order to learn a new language the first step is not to learn vocabulary but to master its sound system and its grammatical structure. At the initial stage small
vocabulary (function words, substitute words, words of negative affirmative and content words) should be taken into consideration to make a hold on the structure, then in the later stage vocabulary can be learned for production. This view ruled over English Language Teaching for many years until transformational linguistics emerged in 1960s under Chomsky's banner who reinforced the idea of lexis which was forced to be placed on the margins by the structuralists.

At the same time in Britain, attention was paid towards vocabulary. The period of 1945 to 1970 was a stagnant one, showing no remarkable developments in vocabulary teaching. The only exception during this period was the article by Higa (1965), focusing on the psycholinguistic concept of difficulty in vocabulary learning.

In the 1970s the issue of vocabulary was again brought to the front. It was Wilkins (1972) who has thrown light on the neglect of vocabulary in the audio-lingual years. Wilkins work is significant for bringing the insights of lexical semantics in vocabulary teaching.

Wilkins (1972) further remarked that lexical semantics helps the learner in three different ways:

i. to understand the process of translation.

ii. it enables to organize the lexicon, since words are not learnable as isolates.

iii. the study of sense-relation enables us to bring out the full meanings of words and this is related to complexity of acquisition of meaning, so often travestied in the statement that some have learnt words at a very early stage.
At the same time, Twaddell (1972 and 1973) argued about the massive expansion of learned vocabularies at an intermediate level. He marked a flow in the view that vocabulary teaching was merely a question of selection of items on a criterion such as frequency. It is hard to teach learners all the words. Instead they need to teach learners words they need to know, so it is important to teach them guessing strategies that will enable them to cope with unknown words and lose their reliance on dictionaries. From this point vocabulary learning was viewed as a language skill and the responsibility was shouldered on the learners.

In the 1970s there was further development and the relationship between vocabulary and learning task became the area of concern. Connolly (1973) and Donley (1974) like the other language experts were of the view that reading (extensively) played an important part in vocabulary expansion. The challenge to reinstate vocabulary teaching was issued again by Lord (1974). Lord was with Vygotsky’s view that relationship between thoughts and words is a dynamic one, it is a process not a thing. Lord’s argument represents a further shift from vocabulary control approach to a more concerned one with the acquisition of meaning.

By this time more and more works were appearing, the concern was the semantic structure of lexicon where the focus was on the revival of vocabulary teachings.

Brown (1974) brought collocation to the forefront and offered it as a way of sensitizing learners to contextual redundancy; she also provided practical useable exercises.

Anthony (1975) in his article on structural clustering in the lexicon, discussed the implications of such lexical theory for language pedagogy and Nilsen followed with a strong view of the role of semantics in
vocabulary teaching. For Nilsen the development of the pragmatic approach (examining vocabulary out of context and the contrastive systems) is a prerequisite to the syntagmatic approach (vocabulary in context).

At the end of 1970s more studies were done on the lexicon and the various needs of learners were looked into. In Applied Linguistics various issues like notional or functional, communicative, and specific purposes were dealt with in three years resulting in a new wave of course books and other materials. Directly or indirectly vocabulary teaching was also affected. Interest in the lexicon became more and more attuned to learner's needs.

Martin (1976) while reporting on materials developed at Stanford University isolated common-core academic vocabulary for college students' needs and hints at a discourse 'The Research Process', 'The Vocabulary of Analysis' and 'The Vocabulary of Evaluation'. He further identified useful generalized vocabulary as a strategic resource for target groups of learners (cited in Carter and McCarthy, 1988). In 1978, Judd published an article asserting to give vocabulary the status of a skill in its own right. He favored massive vocabulary instruction as early as possible and stressed the importance of presenting vocabulary in a natural linguistics context. The learner must be allowed to be vague about meaning at first; precision will come later (Judd, 1978, cited in Carter and McCarthy, 1988). These comments of Judd tried to give vocabulary proper status and need to give learners the breadth of resources that the lexicon can offer. Meaningfulness and communicativeness are the two poles of receptive and productive language used in communicative ideology and these aspirations began more and more to influence applied vocabulary studies. Blum and Lavenston (1978) looked at lexical
simplification and saw universal strategies at work. Bailystock and Frohlich (1980) also studied learner strategies during moments of lexical difficulty. Brown (1979) cited examples of native speakers and lexical strategies and concluded that students must learn how to be imprecise, learn to make use of general words, develop the skill of talking around a word. Brown suggests techniques for motivating learners to achieve effective communication, although using general and imprecise lexis.

In USA, by the end of 1970s, the development of Natural Approach stressed on the motivational benefits of an early stage of receptive vocabulary growth encouraged by comprehensible input from teachers.

By the end of 1970s, vocabulary gained a prestigious place within language teaching. Vocabulary teaching was based on lexical semantics, with the learner at the centre and the lexicon was seen as the main source for learners as strategic use for gaining communicative objectives. Developments in teaching of vocabulary doesn’t stop at this juncture. Numerous works are being done and various language experts came up with various issues in relation to vocabulary acquisition and language learning. One of the notable publications was *Guidelines for Vocabulary Teaching* (1980) by Regional English language centre (RELC) in Singapore. Another important evidence is Meara’s (1980) survey of vocabulary acquisition and Nation’s survey of research in vocabulary learning which raises questions concerning the usefulness of word list learning and learning from context.

In 1982 and 1983 there were other significant publications, Wallace (1982), Allen (1983) and Rivers (1983). Wallace tried to emphasize as a remedy meaningful presentation of vocabulary in situations and contexts, the encouragement of influencing, focus attention by the teachers and the
activation of learners background knowledge. Wallace furthermore encourages learners to establish the meaning of words, and relationship between the words they encountered in text. His views correspond to the trend towards individualization and self management in language learning.

Allen (1983) echoes this development by talking of the importance of creating a sense of need for a word and the importance of going from meaning to words. Allen also stressed the introduction of social and cultural context of vocabulary teaching.

Rivers (1983), through her work, meant that vocabulary can be presented and explained but ultimately it is the individual who learns, students must learn how to learn vocabulary and find their own ways of expanding and organizing their word stores.

Wallace, Allen, Rivers did a remarkable job in gearing up the place of vocabulary in language teaching. After them it was Gaims and Redman (1986) who published a handbook for teaching of vocabulary which is very significant in forcing learner’s involvement in vocabulary learning and suggesting various practical techniques for achieving this self motivation, for example peer teaching, group work with interest groups etc. This trend continued further while Nattinger (1980) with his interests in syntagmatic aspects of the lexicon, proposed that vocabulary teaching should shift its ground from words alone to a variety of multiword lexical phenomenon that are a central part of the fabric of everyday communication and which were neglected since they seemed to fit into neither traditional notions of grammar nor of vocabulary.

Paradigmatic aspects of lexis have also found direct applications. Channell (1981) confronts problem of what to do after basic vocabulary
has been mastered and suggests ways of incorporating. Fields and components can be adapted to grids and scales both to illustrate the semantic features of items and their collocability. What the learner needs to know about a word is how it relates to words of similar meaning and which other words it can be used with, which corresponds to the two basic axis (the paradigmatic and syntagmatic) upon which lexicological investigation proceeds.

The development continued with the investigation of strategic and generalizable, for general and for academic purposes. One of the remarkable works is of Carter who discussed core vocabulary. Then we have research in ESP and vocabulary by Hutchinson and Waters (1981).

The other main research on vocabulary teaching that holds an important place is massive corpus assembly of a project such as the Collins Birmingham University COBUILD. Thus the trend of vocabulary teaching continued to develop day by day and is getting more advanced with various researches by different researchers and language experts.

4.7 VOCABULARY IN ESP A KEY ISSUE

English for Specific Purpose (ESP) as per its literature is seen not as any particular language product but as an approach to language teaching which is directed by specific and apparent reasons for learning (Hutchinson and Waters, 1987). ESP focuses on learners and what actually learners need from the particular course designed for them. Vocabulary always remained a neglected aspect in second language acquisition. English became a global language and with the advancement in different professions where English is the central language of communication, one falls short of vocabulary. This lack of word stock on
the part of professionals and learners gave rise to designing of new courses with vocabulary as the prime focus. The neglect suffered by vocabulary in ESP makes the learner say that “I don’t know enough words!” Hence vocabulary is one of the major issues in ESP teaching.

Teaching of vocabulary in ESP follows similar general principles to those in EGP. It is important to distinguish between vocabulary needed for comprehension and that needed for production. In comprehension, however, deducing the meaning of vocabulary from the context and from the structure of the actual word is the most important method of learning (Flowerdew and Peacock, 2001).


Most ESP literature agrees in teaching “semi-technical” vocabulary where the term covers a wide range of items which are neither highly technical nor very general but are specific to a particular field of knowledge.

While talking of teaching of ESP Hutchinson and Waters (1987) mentioned that teaching of technical vocabulary is not the responsibility of the EAP teacher and priority should be given to the teaching of semi technical or core vocabulary.

Hutchinson and Waters (1987) further asserted that what ESP students require is not a corpus of technical language but the ability to mobilize resources of general English in solving of technical problems. The procedural or more general vocabulary helps the learner to get at specific technical vocabulary. While discussing technical vocabulary, it is rather more complicated than a simple notion that the ESP teacher should not touch it. In general we agree that it should not be the responsibility of the
ESP teacher to teach technical vocabulary in certain specific contexts. It may be the duty of the ESP teacher to check whether learners have understood technical vocabulary appearing as a carrier content for an exercise, but it is also necessary to ensure that learners have understood technical vocabulary as presented by a subject specialist or assumed to be known by a subject specialist. In any ESP exercise which exploits a particular context, the context will use certain special vocabulary. It is important that both teachers and learners appreciate that this vocabulary is acting as carrier content for an exercise, and is not the real content of the exercise. However, students usually need to understand the vocabulary in order to do the exercise. In some situations learners starting a new academic course or professional training programme will need technical vocabulary that will be completely new for them. One way to prepare learners for such a situation is for the language teacher and the subject expert to prepare a glossary of new terms with straightforward explanations of the terms.

Thus vocabulary in ESP holds a dominant place with the growing needs of learners. ESP researchers are throwing light on vocabulary through every dimension. Though ignored in ESL, vocabulary is a key issue in ESP. ESP course prepares learners to meet the specific needs in a particular vocation, academic situations and professions. The domain of ESP stretches far beyond EGP and the language learnt in ESP courses is extended to that of General English. Language acquisition is a complex phenomenon involving different aspects of language and each aspect of language is different from the other but related to each other and so vocabulary is a significant aspect of language learning. Learning a foreign language must focus on learning of vocabulary. Wide knowledge of vocabulary is very important. Hence specific vocabulary for special
learners in various fields must be taken care of. This special or technical vocabulary does not fall under frequent general English words because they are typically subject specific. Special learners need proper training on vocabulary acquisition to perform vividly and actively in a specific situation because without special vocabulary knowledge they will fail to communicate precisely in their target situation. ESP targets on examining the special needs of learners and based on these needs language teaching items are also treated as special. So keeping in mind this view of learners and target situation, ESP courses must extend significant place for vocabulary teaching because ESP courses without imparting knowledge of special vocabulary to its students is simply doing injustice to special group of learners. In English for specific purpose, there are certain linguistic differences and the subject specific text highlights such differences on lexical items too but Basic English forms prime features for any special purpose use. So it is sensible to begin the course from basic to special and subject centric. So while seeking knowledge of special technical vocabulary it is also a must to make use of general vocabulary knowledge. Register, lexis for example if a lawyer uses his legal language at home, how are the other members going to know what he actually means. Likewise, how can a waiter of a restaurant differentiate between ‘footage’ and ‘fabliau’, rather it would be better to explain it as a ‘fruit punch’ or a ‘sizzler’ whereas ‘footage’ and ‘fabliau’ will be best tackled by a student of Media. A Media student can explain better what ‘masthead’ or ‘bank’ stands for than a general English student. A Media student must have a knowledge of the borderline cases for example, ‘axe’, ‘ignite’, ‘breaks’ and what these words actually mean when they are used in Electronic and Print Media language. Borderline cases are equally threatening to ESP students as the technical words are.
If a person working in a radio station tells his colleague ‘I will be signing off at ten’, will his mate understand what he wants to imply by the word ‘signing off’, until and unless he is having a proper hold of media jargon, which can only be attained through proper language training. This shows that every area has some specific vocabulary and only the person engaged with that particular area has a better knowledge of lexis that falls within the boundary of that specific subject. Hence vocabulary teaching is a must in ESP courses. Another remarkable point is that words differ in meaning from context to context. For example ‘rap’ means a kind of music and ‘axe’ stands for an instrument to cut things but while used in media English they mean totally different, the former is referred to as criticism and the latter is referred to close or closure of something. The point to be noted is how can a learner differentiate these contextual meanings. In such cases generally, it happens that such words simply run over the head, or it creates misinterpretation and sheer confusion. Finally students fail to cope in this specific situation. So vocabulary is crucial in ESP and the course designed must have authentic materials on specific vocabulary, especially to deal with the register and jargon very carefully and delicately. The course must define proper and effective modes of teaching these jargons to subject specific students. Though there is a preference of special technical vocabulary in ESP courses, still lexis is the centrifugal force which altogether binds the other aspects of language. It can be strongly said that vocabulary teaching is most purposeful for special target group.
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