

The Next Frontier: A Research Agenda for Exploring Experiential Language Learning in International and Domestic Contexts

Barbara A. Lafford

1. Introduction

Research on the effect of context on second language acquisition (SLA) has suggested that the experiences to which learners are exposed may determine how and to what extent certain elements of second languages are acquired (Magnan & Lafford, 2012). However, an overview of Spanish Study Abroad (SA) research carried out by Lafford (2006), Lafford and Collentine (2006), and Lafford and Uscinski (forthcoming) have shown mixed results regarding the linguistic outcomes acquired by second language (L2) learners in domestic classroom ('at home' AH) vs. SA contexts. For instance, SA contexts have been shown to be more conducive (than AH contexts) to gains in global oral proficiency (Hernández, 2010 a, b; Martinsen, 2010), pronunciation (Díaz-Campos, 2006; Lord, 2006), fluency (D'Amico, 2010; García Amaya, 2009, 2012; Lord, 2009; O'Brien et al., 2007; Segalowitz & Freed, 2004), lexical development (Collentine, 2004; O'Brien et al., 2006), and listening and processing abilities (Cubillos, Chiello, & Fan, 2008; La Brozzi, 2012). Nevertheless, gains in grammatical and pragmatic competence in SA contexts have not been consistently greater than classroom gains, and often depend on the pre-departure proficiency level of the learners (Collentine & Freed, 2004; Lafford, 2006), the motivation of individual second language learners to adopt target language norms that may differ from those in their native language (Bataller, 2010), the presence of instructional intervention (Shively, 2010, 2011), and the extent to which L2 learners integrate themselves into native speaker (NS) social networks in the target culture (Isabelli-García, 2006; Magnan & Back, 2007). One method of facilitating the integration of domestic and SA learners into L2 NS *communities of practice* (Lave & Wenger, 1991) is through learners' participation in *community service learning* (CSL) and *internship* opportunities. The language learning that takes place in these contexts is referred to in this study as *experiential language learning* (EX-LL). This article will explore the benefits and challenges of embarking upon an EX-LL research agenda and will propose various specific avenues of research in that area. The arguments made will draw mostly upon prior SLA research in Spanish in classroom and SA venues.

2. Experiential Language Learning

Experiential language learning is a specialized type of *experiential learning*, which is grounded in the work of Dewey (1938/1988), who believed that all genuine education comes about through experience that is engaging and has continuity with the learner's further experiences. For Kolb (1984), experiential learning is "the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience" (p. 41). Knutson (2003) argues that "Experiential learning as a philosophy is based on the ideals of active and reflective learning, building on previous learning experiences and requiring the personal involvement of the learner" (p. 53). This understanding of experiential learning is reflected in Kolb, Boyatzis, and Mainemelis' (2000) four-stage experiential learning cycle: *Concrete experiences*

* Barbara A. Lafford, Arizona State University. I would like to extend my great appreciation to Gillian Lord for her invaluable feedback and assistance, to the anonymous reviewers for their insightful commentary, and to the Spanish linguistics graduate students at the University of Florida for inviting me to give this plenary talk on October 26, 2012 at the annual meeting of the Hispanic Linguistics Symposium. I would also like to thank my research assistant, Izabela Uscinski, for her help with the preparation of this manuscript.

that lead to *reflection* on those experiences, the construction of *abstract concepts* that tie experiences together, and *active testing* of those concepts through concrete experiences. Therefore, in this study, *experiential language learning* (EX-LL) is understood to not only incorporate language learning that takes place through the real world (and/or classroom) experiences of the learner but must also include reflections on those experiences.

Several scholars have proposed modifications to second language curricula that require students to engage in EX-LL. For example, Knutson (2003) proposed changes to English as a Second Language (ESL) curricula to create project-based communicative-experiential syllabi that would include more ecologically valid and task-based activities and have students reflect on their experiences in classroom settings when working collaboratively on projects. In addition, Kohonen, Jaatinen, Kaikkonen, and Lehtovaara (2001) proposed ways to develop students' *intercultural competence* (Byram, 1997) through EX-LL involving student reflections on learning within school communities to prepare them for the outside world. Burke (2007) described language teaching based on an Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound design that incorporated incrementally more in-depth study of the target language and culture as students advanced through a communicative/task-based high school FL curriculum. In this study, brief mention is made of teacher-led field trips for students to conduct field work in their community. However, there is a need to explore aspects of EX-LL in contexts beyond isolated expeditions from the classroom into the target culture. As Brooks (1991) and Thorne (2011) noted, there is a need to use the world as its own model, and, in the words of Byrnes (2011), "Language learning is no longer to be primarily of and in the classroom alone, but of, with, and for the community" (p. 291).

Learning languages through real world exposure to and interaction with target language communities has been an integral part of the SA experience. EX-LL in SA contexts has been facilitated by homestays, the creation of L2 social networks outside the home, and student reflections on their experiences. However, in most SA programs classroom instruction is still a part of the SA student's overall experience and in the classroom portion of their time abroad, SA learners still have a figure (the instructor), whose role it is to give them feedback on their oral and written linguistic production in settings dedicated to student trial and error (Lafford, 2006). As a result, there is a need to investigate how the L2 learner acquires language in immersion environments with and without classroom instruction at home or abroad. EX-LL experiences of this type can be documented by students participating in CSL or internship programs in which they are required to use their target language to interact with professionals and clients in workplace venues. Opportunities to participate in such programs (at home or abroad) often form part of a Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP) curriculum.

3. Languages for Specific Purposes and Community Service Learning

LSP pedagogy in the U.S. tends to focus on the use of foreign language other than English in workplace settings, as opposed to LSP courses outside of the U.S., which focus on the use of English in different contexts (e.g., English for Specific Purposes [ESP] or English for Academic Purposes [EAP] for academic contexts). However, Räisänen and Fortanet-Gómez's (2008) characterization of the teaching of ESP may be extended to LSP pedagogy in general: "ESP [LSP] teaching uses the methodologies and activities of the various disciplines it is designed to serve, and it focuses on the language, lexis, grammar, discourses and genres of those disciplines rather than using the general grammar, learners' dictionaries and general public genres and discourses" (p. 12). These types of courses often focus on the acquisition and use of specialized language in professional (e.g., medical, legal, business or academic) venues.

The presence of LSP courses at U.S. colleges and universities was examined in a survey conducted by Long and Uscinski (2012), who reported that out of 183 responding institutions 59% have LSP course offerings and they mostly focus on the use of Spanish for Specific Purposes (SSP) in Business, followed by Spanish for Medical Personnel. U.S. programs on LSP focus mostly on Spanish needed for business or translation. Notable U.S. SSP programs include a major with an International Spanish for the Professions (SP) track at the University of Colorado, Boulder (with an optional CSL/internship) and minors in SP (with a required CSL/Internship) at the University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill), Johns Hopkins University, the University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign), and Arizona State University. The University of Alabama (Birmingham), the University of Florida (Gainesville),

and Arizona State University offer certificates in SP (with a required CSL/Internship). Minors/Certificates (MC) for SP are designed to offer students an opportunity to gain advanced proficiency in professional registers of Spanish used in workplace settings. To meet this goal, the Arizona State University (ASU) SPMC curriculum designers collaborate with experts, mostly heritage and native Spanish speakers from different professional fields (e.g., education, legal system, medical fields, journalism, criminology, social work) to provide students with authentic and practical information related to their serving the needs of Spanish-speaking clientele in their communities. These professionals also visit the SPMC classes and often offer to supervise students in the program during their required internship.

In order to ensure that students are prepared for ASU's SPMC curriculum, they are required to have six semesters of college Spanish before entering this 18 credit program. The first course taken is a general introduction to oral and written genres typically found in Spanish-speaking professional venues in the U.S. This is followed by a series of courses (from which students choose four) that focus on written professional communication, interpretation, grammar and stylistics, cultural perspectives, and Spanish linguistic variation in the U.S. The capstone experience of the minor/certificate is a 3 credit (135 contact hours) internship at a professional venue in which students apply their acquired knowledge of Spanish and culture in professional settings either in the U.S. or abroad and reflect on their learning. Although internships in foreign venues are likely to provide students with a great number of opportunities to communicate solely in Spanish, internships in the U.S. pose a challenge in that many professional agencies that serve the Latino community use both English and Spanish in the workplace. Students need to be made aware of this reality throughout their minor/certificate program and minor/certificate internship coordinators should make every effort to locate venues in which students' Spanish language skills can be improved.

Several types of research need to be carried out on the effectiveness of various types of SP programs in order to come up with a list of "best practices" for the creation and maintenance of successful initiatives. For instance, research on linguistic and cultural gains made in various types of internship venues needs would provide a greater understanding of how the affordances of different venues shape the development of learners' communicative and cultural competence. In addition, follow-up career surveys could provide information on the usefulness of different types of SPMCs for obtaining employment and for preparing learners to communicate with Spanish-speaking clients in workplace settings. Research on the efficacy of these SPMCs is crucial, as some scholars are skeptical of the benefits of such programs to students.

The presence of CSL and Internships in LSP degree programs, minors, and certificates in the U.S. is valuable, as pointed out by Lear (2012), in that they dovetail the interests of all LSP stakeholders (e.g., foreign language departments, faculty, local communities, students, and employers). According to Lear (2012) "Community service learning is a type of experiential learning that blends specific course content with real-world applications and ties them together through structured reflection" (p. 158). She stated that students' structured reflection activities during a CSL class should contain *description*, *analysis/explanation*, and *synthesis* of academic and community experiences (Abbott, 2010; Bloom et al., 1956). These reflection activities are used to facilitate students' ultimate attainment of the goals of LSP and EX-LL programs. These goals include the appropriate application of students' knowledge of the target language and culture to professional contexts and the preparation of students for lifelong/experiential learning (Kolb & Fry, 1975). LSP programs with CSL or internships optimize learners' exposure to use of the L2 in the workplace and facilitate their entry into their professional community of practice. Thus, Sánchez-López (2012) proposed that "SSP-related internships and service-learning must become an integral part of SSP course work and of the students' experiential learning component" (p. 11 ms.).

Lear (2012) provided an overview of research on Spanish CSL and described the benefits and challenges inherent in setting up Spanish CSL/internship experiences for university students in local communities. The author noted that early research began with the "how to" stage (best practices in LSP) (Díaz-Barriga, 2003; Julseth, 2003). More recent research on CSL students has focused on student acquisition of intercultural competence (ICC; Bloom, 2008; Coria Sanchez, 2007; Grabois, 2007, 2008) and student gains in the National Standard's (ACTFL, 2006) 5 C's, especially *communities* and *connections* (Lear & Abbott, 2008; Abbott & Lear, 2010) during the real world

experience.¹ However, no qualitative or quantitative research to date has investigated how these CSL/internship (EX-LL) experiences affect student linguistic outcomes or shape the process of learning languages for specific purposes by interns or community service learning volunteers in workplace and other non-classroom settings both at home and abroad. *This is the next frontier!*

4. Benefits and Challenges of Foundational LSP and Experiential Language Learning (EX-LL) Research

In order to understand the development of L2 learners' linguistic and ICC that takes place in learners in professional settings, such as CSL and internships, two types of research are necessary. Foundational LSP research on the norms of the target language use by NSs in workplace venues must take place either prior to or simultaneously with EX-LL research, which gauges learners' acquisition of those norms. Before outlining an agenda for the execution of foundational LSP and EX-LL research in domestic and international settings, the benefits and challenges of such an undertaking will be explored. As a SA experience combines classroom and EX-LL contexts for L2 learning, there are many similarities between a SA research agenda and one for EX-LL. Therefore, throughout this section, I will be briefly noting touchstone works in the Spanish SA literature (mentioned in Lafford & Uscinski, forthcoming) that can serve as a starting point for research on similar topics in EX-LL.

4.1. Benefits of Foundational LSP and EX-LL Research

The benefits of foundational LSP and EX-LL research include a clearer understanding of the interplay of individual learner characteristics and contextual features during the L2 acquisition process, the processes involved in acquiring language in naturalistic (workplace) settings, the acquisition of ICC in professional vs. other (real world and classroom) venues, and the pedagogical applications of insights from this type of research to LSP and regular language classrooms in which learners are prepared for life-long learning of the target (and other) languages. Throughout the rest of this article, I will also illustrate how foundational LSP and EX-LL research can help answer various aspects of Firth and Wagner's (1997) call for a reconceptualized SLA.

EX-LL research will provide more information on how individual characteristics and contextual features shape and facilitate (or hinder) the acquisition of the target language and culture in the workplace. To investigate the role of individual characteristics on SLA in workplace settings, EX-LL researchers could call upon the insights gained from SA researchers who have studied the role of phonological memory capacity on acquisition and fluency (Lord, 2006, 2009; O'Brien et al., 2006) and how personality (Knight & Schmidt-Rinehart, 2002; Stewart, 2010), gender issues (SA: Stewart, 2010; Talburt & Stewart, 1999), and proficiency levels (see Cubillos, Chieffo & Fan, 2008; DeKeyser, 2010; Isabelli, 2004; Lafford, 2006; Marqués-Pascual, 2011 on the *threshold hypothesis*) affect learner outcomes in EX-LL venues.

An examination of the role of Hymes' (1972) contextual features (e.g., setting, participants, end/purpose, norms of interaction/interpretation) on SLA reviewed by Lafford (2006) for SA contexts needs to be part of any EX-LL research agenda. Foundational LSP research on NS (employee)-NS (employee or client) and NS (employee)-non-native speaker (NNS) (intern) interactions related to these contextual features in various workplace settings is crucial to the understanding of the process of learner L2 acquisition in EX-LL settings. Table 1 provides the general characteristics of the feature *setting* (input received in various venues) in three language learning contexts (U.S. domestic classroom, SA, EX-LL [CSL/Internship]).

¹ Magnan's (2008) proposal to prioritize *communities* over the other C's (communication, cultures, comparisons, connections) is consonant with the inclusion of CSL/Internships in SSP programs.

Table 1. Hymes' (1972) Contextual Features: Characteristics of the Setting (input registers, source of input, and input structure) of Three Language Learning Contexts

Hymes' (1972) Contextual Features	U.S. Domestic Classroom (AH)	Study Abroad (SA)	EX-LL CSL/Internship (SA and AH)
Input Registers	Primarily formal academic registers from instructor	<i>SA classroom:</i> formal academic registers (?) ² <i>Outside SA classroom:</i> a wide variety of formal and vernacular registers	<i>SA:</i> Formal professional registers & informal registers in Spanish (?) <i>AH:</i> Formal professional registers & informal registers in Spanish (& English) (?)
Source of Input	Instructor, learner NNS-NNS interactions & pedagogical materials	<i>SA classroom:</i> similar to U.S. domestic language classroom (?) <i>Outside SA classroom:</i> homestays, NS/NNS friends, service encounters	SA and AH: employees at the workplace & clients (?)
Input Structure	Primarily sentence-level input at lower levels	Extended discourse-level input	Potential for extended discourse-level input (?)

As Table 1 indicates, learners in a typical U.S. domestic L2 classroom primarily receive input in the form of formal academic L2 registers from the instructor, NNS interactions with other students, and pedagogical materials. At beginning and intermediate levels, this input may often only be at the sentence level or below due to the focus on form and on the acquisition of Novice and Intermediate level abilities at these lower levels of language study. On the other hand, in SA contexts learners receive different types of input: (1) (presumed) formal academic registers from instructors in their classroom experiences, (2) a wide variety of vernacular NS registers from homestays, media outlets, films, and service encounters, and (3) NS and NNS varieties of the target language spoken by friends and members of their extended social circles. As this input from outside the SA classroom is naturalistic, it may often contain extended discourse-level input. What may separate EX-LL settings from other naturalistic settings in SA environments is the presumed exposure of learners to formal NS professional registers and informal NS registers from employees at the workplace. As in the case with SA settings, EX-LL settings have more potential to provide learners with models of extended discourse-level input and more exposure to professional genres of communication. However, the actual time of exposure to formal registers in workplace settings at home or abroad is often a factor of the number of credit hours the internship/CSL experience is worth. For example, in U.S. domestic internships, learners only have to be at the workplace 9 hours/week (135 hours per semester) before returning home to an environment in which the target language may not be spoken, or only used in informal conversational registers. U.S. domestic internships also often take place in professional

² The question marks (?) in these four tables regarding specific characteristics of the SA classroom and all aspects of the EX-LL environment indicate that these assertions are somewhat speculative, given the lack of SLA research on these areas (compared to a long tradition of L2 AH classroom and general SA research). L2 investigators can thus use these tables as a roadmap to carrying out the research necessary to test the assertions about contextual characteristics marked with the question mark symbol.

venues where both English and Spanish are used for different purposes with different interlocutors, thus reducing the amount of target language input the learners receive. Therefore, international internships may have more potential for the learner to get extensive and consistent exposure to professional L2 workplace registers, especially if their time is not also committed elsewhere (e.g., taking traditional courses as part of their SA program). Foundational LSP and EX-LL research would provide a clearer picture of the types of L2 discourses (input) encountered by the learners, which can then help to explain the types of language that is acquired by learners in workplace vs. other settings.

Table 2 compares the experiences learners have with power and solidarity relations (Brown & Gilman, 1960) as participants in the three language learning contexts under review. These relationships are influenced by the status of the discourse participants (learner and interlocutor), the roles they play in the discourse situation, and the extent and type of social networks (Isabelli-García, 2006) that learners encounter in each venue.

Table 2. Hymes' (1972) Contextual Features: Characteristics of the Participants (status [power and solidarity relations], roles and focus of interaction, social networks) of Three Language Learning Contexts

Hymes' (1972) Contextual Features	U.S. Domestic Classroom (AH)	Study Abroad (SA)	EX-LL CSL/Internship (SA and AH)
Status: Power and solidarity relations	<i>Power relations:</i> Instructor and student <i>Solidarity relations:</i> NNS-NNS learners	<i>SA classroom:</i> similar to U.S. domestic language classroom (?) <i>Outside SA classroom:</i> learners participate in a wide range of power and solidarity relations	Learners participate in a range of power and solidarity relations in the workplace (?) Interlocutors communicate to accomplish real world tasks in SA and AH workplace settings
Roles and focus of interaction	Focus on student learning	<i>SA classroom:</i> similar to U.S. domestic language classroom (?) <i>Outside SA classroom:</i> Vary (focus on accomplishing real world tasks and/or student learning)	Potential for extensive social networks with NSs and NNSs in the workplace culture and beyond (?)
Social networks	Learner NNS-NNS social networks found in the classroom	Potential for extensive social networks with NSs or NNSs in the target culture beyond the classroom	

Table 2 indicates that while the power relations in a typical language classroom are asymmetrical, in that instructors are recognized as having higher status than students, the role of both instructors and learners in the classroom is to focus on student learning. Instructors are expected to listen and give helpful feedback to learners, who, in turn, incorporate instructor feedback to improve their abilities in the target language. Solidarity relations in the classroom are found mostly among the learners themselves, who form social networks with their NNS classmates during the learning process. While the classroom experiences of SA learners may be similar to domestic learners in terms of the type of power and solidarity relations they encounter in the classroom and the roles and focus of interaction, outside the pedagogical setting, learners are exposed to a wide range of power and solidarity relations

in their homestays, service encounters, and other activities in the target culture. In any given conversational encounter outside the classroom, interlocutors' roles may focus on either accomplishing real world tasks or student learning (e.g., in homestays) and the potential for participation in extensive social networks with NSs or NNSs increases. In an EX-LL context, learners are presumably not only exposed to a wide range of power and solidarity relations (as are SA learners), but these relationships may form part of a workplace environment in which the role of interlocutors is to use language to accomplish specific real world tasks. In addition, participants in EX-LL venues have great potential for becoming part of extensive social networks in the target language workplace culture (and beyond, in international internships). Foundational LSP and EX-LL research could shed light on the dynamic of the power and solidarity relations among interns and other people in their workplace venue, the roles and functions of interactions in the workplace, and how all of these help determine language use and the languages used (Spanish and other languages) in professional settings.

Table 3 compares the characteristics of the norms of interaction and interpretation in the three language learning contexts under consideration in light of Batstone's (2002) bifurcation of contexts into those, whose purpose is learning vs. those, which are focused on communicating ideas.

Table 3. Hymes' (1972) Contextual Features: Characteristics of the Norms of Interaction/ Interpretation (based on end/purpose, interlocutor and learner behavior, and language used) of Three Language Learning Contexts

Hymes' (1972) Contextual Features	U.S. Domestic Classroom (AH)	Study Abroad (SA)	EX-LL CSL/Internship (SA and AH)
End/Purpose (focus of the communication on form and/or meaning)	Focus on form and meaning according to learner and interlocutor needs in a given situation	<i>SA classroom:</i> focus on form and meaning (?) <i>Outside SA classroom:</i> focus primarily on meaning in conversations with host family, friends, or in service encounters	Focus primarily on meaning in the workplace to accomplish tasks in SA and AH settings (?)
Interlocutor behavior	Instructor's time is dedicated to learner acquisition of form and meaning; instructors are expected to provide feedback to learners; other NNSs may or may not provide good feedback to learners	<i>SA classroom:</i> similar to U.S. domestic language classroom (?) <i>Homestays:</i> Families may or may not take time to provide adequate feedback <i>Outside of SA classroom and homestays:</i> Interlocutors are not focused on student learning, nor expected to provide feedback to learners	Interlocutors in SA and AH workplace settings are not necessarily focused on student learning, nor expected to provide feedback to learners (?)
Learner behavior	Learners take time to use communicative strategies (CSs) to improve their understanding and	Learners do not always take the time to ask for help, especially from strangers; learner CS use (and feedback) may be	Learners' use of CSs and language learning strategies (LLSs) vary by politeness considerations and the

	production of the target language; politeness strategies to not limit CS use and feedback	limited outside classroom due to politeness considerations and exigencies of the context	relationship of intern to interlocutor (according to the willingness of the interlocutor to provide scaffolding) and by professional context in SA and AH settings (?)
Languages used	The target language and native language	Primarily the target language	The target language and other languages (e.g., English, indigenous languages, according to situational exigencies) (?)

The comparisons in Table 3 show that Batstone's original dichotomy of learning vs. communicative contexts oversimplifies the situations that obtain in all three venues. In each setting learners may at different times focus on form or meaning, depending on the exigencies of the speech situation at hand and the motivation of the students and interlocutors to focus on student learning of the target language. In the classroom setting, while the instructors (the learners' expert interlocutors) dedicate time to helping learners' acquire form and meaning in the target language and provide helpful feedback, the learners' other interlocutors (fellow NNS learners) do not necessarily provide good feedback. Although we assume this to also be the case in language classes in SA settings, no published research to date has reported on norms of interaction in the SA classroom. Outside the classroom, however, SA students may or may not have host families and friends who are willing to scaffold their L2 interactions, due to those interlocutors' focus on meaningful communication instead of student learning. EX-LL learners in both AH and SA contexts may often interact with interlocutors who do not provide feedback due to their presumed focus on meaningful communication and task accomplishment instead of student learning.

Learners in AH (and presumably in SA) classroom settings take time to ask questions and use CSs to improve their ability to communicate in the language being learned. As students understand that classroom learning norms allow them time to do this and that the interlocutor is supposed to take time to help provide feedback and answer questions, learner CS use is usually not limited by politeness considerations in classroom contexts. However, outside classroom contexts, SA learners may hesitate to use CSs to ask for help with NS interlocutors who are not necessarily expected to provide feedback to L2 learners (e.g., service employees, friends acquired through initial social networks). In addition, prior research (Lafford, 2004, 2006) has shown that SA learners may be reluctant to use CSs (e.g., requests for clarification, assistance) with NSs due to politeness considerations and exigencies of the context.

Like SA learners, learners in CSL/Internship contexts at home or abroad may also hesitate to use language learning strategies (LLSs) and CSs with workplace interlocutors, as the use of learner CSs (e.g., requests for clarification, assistance) to help students acquire the target language may not be as welcome by workplace colleagues, whose job is to focus on accomplishing professional tasks (e.g., finishing a company project) rather than serve as language tutors for the NNS interns. This factor may limit the amount of helpful linguistic feedback that EX-LL learners receive. On the other hand, interns may find allies in the workplace who may be willing to provide the necessary scaffolding to overcome communication gaps that the learners experience. In addition, this type of L2 help may be more forthcoming from colleagues in more informal workplace settings (break room conversations) than in formal ones (boardroom interactions).

Research on the type and frequency of CS use by EX-LL learners will clarify how the context of learning within the workplace affects the strategies used by learners to get their meaning across. In addition, foundational LSP and EX-LL research that examines the relative focus on form vs. focus on meaning that takes place in employee-intern interactions during CSL/Internship experiences can help L2 instructors prepare students for their workplace experience by pointing out the type of scaffolding and language assistance they may (or may not) receive in different contexts from other employees and co-workers throughout their time at their workplace venue. This type of research may also help

students realize the need to form social networks within the company/agency at workplace venues in order to establish relationships with people who would potentially be more willing to give them feedback on their language learning during their internship.

Moreover, research on the actual LLSs (Cohen & Shively [2007], e.g., writing down new words, using a dictionary, paying attention to facial expressions and gestures that accompany new items in the input) used by interns who cannot rely consistently on help from co-workers would shed light on how the context of learning might shape EX-LL learners' use of various language learning resources in order to improve their command of the target language. In order to understand what learners do to help themselves acquire the target language, both quantitative research on the use and frequency of various CSs and LLSs and qualitative research on learners' reasons for their strategy choices with various interlocutors in different contexts should be part of the EX-LL research agenda.

The languages used in each setting also vary by function. In the AH classroom the native language may be used to facilitate the acquisition of the target language. In SA settings, the target language is likely to predominate in learner interactions with NSs inside and outside the classroom. However, as mentioned earlier, employees often use more than one language (e.g., Spanish, English, other) in CSL/Internship workplace settings in the U.S. and abroad, which allows EX-LL learners being exposed to variable norms of interaction in several languages. Foundational LSP research on the languages actually used in various CSL/Internship venues will help future interns to understand the strategic use of varieties of both the target language and other languages (e.g., English, indigenous languages) in professional settings. Research on the use of those language varieties by NS employees with their NNS interns, will also help illuminate the social and professional relationships and norms of interaction and interpretation that obtain between employees and interns throughout the EX-LL experience.

Other benefits of EX-LL research include a more in-depth understanding of the L2 acquisition processes taking place and the role of incidental language learning (Ellis, 1994; Hulstijn, forthcoming 2012) in the workplace. Data from EX-LL contexts will allow researchers to continue to test the hypothesis that "going through the language learning process a different way and engaging in different language use, will result in different language abilities" (Goertler, forthcoming, ms. p. 28). In addition, EX-LL researchers can explore the nature and interplay of Type I (learner) and Type II (learner and NS)³ variation (Geeslin et al. 2010, 2012) found in the workplace vs. other venues (classroom vs. SA). There is also a need to understand how learner attitudes/motivation (Hernández, 2010a, b; Isabelli-García, 2006; Smart & Scudder, 2004), the extent of social networks and the use of social capital among NS and NNS speakers (Castañeda & Zirger, 2011; Isabelli-García, 2006), and transformations of identity (SA: Pellegrino-Aveni, 2005; Stewart, 2010) in workplace environments play a role in the acquisition process.

EX-LL research also needs to investigate the acquisition of ICC in the workplace vs. other venues (homestay, friends, service encounters) as learners find the need to enter a "third space" to reflect on engagement with communities beyond their own (Kramsch, 1993). The possession and development of intercultural sensitivity (a component of ICC) by learners in SA contexts have been linked to success in SA settings. For instance, Martinsen (2010) noted that SA pre-departure levels of intercultural sensitivity predicted language gains over time, and Paige, Cohen and Shively (2004) discovered higher levels of intercultural sensitivity in SA learners as they progressed through their program abroad. In addition, Carpenter and García (2012) found improved ICC in nursing students after a SA experience. As Elola and Oscoz (2008) and Lee (2011, 2012) found that reflective blogging helped to develop ICC in SA and AH students, students acquiring languages in experiential contexts may also find this practice helpful to the development of their ICC in workplace venues.

The pedagogical applications of foundational LSP and EX-LL research findings may take various forms. The results of foundational LSP and EX-LL research will help applied linguists and pedagogues to create more ecologically valid LSP and EX-LL pedagogical and assessment materials (e.g., *Comunidades* [Abbott, 2010]), enhance the quality of the CSL/Internship training prior to and during learners' EX-LL experience, make appropriate curricular adjustments, and provide more informed LSP teacher training. For instance, foundational LSP and EX-LL research can inform the creation of a set

³ According to Rehner et al (2003), Type I variation includes structures that vary only in NNS learner language, while Type II variation encompasses structures that vary in the target language used by NSs as well as in learner language (NS/NNS).

of Best Practices for CSL/Internship creation and administration, which would address the type of learner training that should be included in pre-CSL/Internship orientations, the amount, type, and timing of pedagogical interventions, and the creation of appropriate activities and practices to help maximize student outcomes during their internship (e.g., seeking wider social networks, reflective journaling on their experiences, meeting as a group during the internships to compare experiences). Modifications to standard foreign language curricula could take the form of the creation of LSP courses to prepare students for their CSL/Internship experience, the creation of units in regular courses to prepare them for learning outside the classroom, and the application of insights from EX-LL research to the development of linguistic and intercultural competence in the regular L2 classroom. The results of foundational LSP and EX-LL research can also inform creators of LSP teacher training workshops⁴ so that future LSP practitioners understand more fully the complexity of the norms of interaction in professional settings and the types of preparation students will need for communicating effectively in the target language with professionals in the work world.

Research on experiential learning will also help language instructors prepare learners for the EX-LL experience (and for life-long learning) in regular courses, LSP courses, pre-internship orientations, and in meetings during the CSL/internship experience. As prior SA research has demonstrated the efficacy of ongoing pedagogical interventions for SA learners' pragmatic competence (Shively, 2010), CSL/internship coordinators should provide the same kind of consistent guidance to EX-LL learners throughout their workplace experience. Moreover, coursework focusing on grammar taken along with internships can be beneficial, as seen through the analysis of learners' reflective journals, which have demonstrated that they transfer knowledge acquired in their grammar courses to their interactions with NSs in naturalistic settings and to the creation of their journal entries (Stewart, 2010). In addition, Lear (2012) suggested providing CSL/Internship students with explicit training in Language Learning Strategies that can be used in workplace settings over the course of their careers.

EX-LL research is more easily carried out when CSL/Internship programs have good infrastructure and communication among all parties. Although there are no field-wide standards for best practices in CSL, the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse (2011) website has identified factors that correlate with successful community-campus partnerships, including "joint planning, a genuine sense of reciprocity, clear definitions of roles and activities, a comprehensive student orientation and preparation process, and consistent communication with a primary point of contact on each side." When these are not in place, challenges occur for both the CSL/Internship learner as well as for EX-LL researchers trying to collect and analyze data.

4.2. *Challenges to Foundational LSP and EX-LL Research*

Challenges to foundational LSP and EX-LL research include the existence of multiple norms of interaction in workplace settings, challenges to data gathering, lack of appropriate EX-LL assessment instruments, a lack of LSP/EX-LL infrastructure in the U.S., university institutional barriers, and lack of specialized research expertise among current LSP practitioners and investigators.⁵

The existence of multiple norms of interaction that obtain in any naturalistic L2 setting have been attested in the SLA literature (e.g., Canagarajah, 2007; Kramsch & Whiteside, 2007). For instance, Kramsch and Whiteside (2007) demonstrated the use of multiple languages in contingent and strategic ways in real world interactions. The contingent use of more than one language (or more than one variety/style of language) in the workplace complicates (but also potentially enriches) the study of *norms of interaction* in professional settings. Foundational LSP research can explore the contingent use of different language varieties and the varied L2 norms of interaction that exist among different parties in different situations (e.g., doctors conversing with nurses vs. patients vs. office staff vs. intern) in EX-LL settings. Once SLA researchers understand the nature of multiple workplace norms through foundational LSP research, they will be better able to gauge learner progress toward the acquisition of those norms of language use in professional settings. EX-LL researchers working within a reconceptualized SLA framework (balancing cognitive and socially-based approaches) would also be

⁴ LSP teacher training workshops are already provided by Center for International Business Education and Research (CIBER)-funded institutes at the University of South Carolina, University of Pennsylvania (Lauder Center), the University of Memphis, Purdue University, and Florida International University.

⁵ Details of these challenges are elaborated by Lafford (2012) and Grosse and Voght (2012).

“better able to understand and explicate how language is used *as it is being acquired through interaction* and used resourcefully, contingently, and contextually” (Firth & Wagner, 1997, p. 296) in the workplace.

Challenges to data gathering may involve privacy issues and CSL/internship venues that do not accommodate the needs of LSP interns. As CSL/internship opportunities take place in real world settings, ethical concerns about company confidentiality policies and privacy (e.g. HIPAA [(Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act)]) laws prevent foundational LSP or EX-LL researchers from directly gathering (recording) sensitive data in some professional contexts (medical facilities) when professionals or interns are interacting with clients (Bowles, 2012). As a result, learner data needs to be gathered more indirectly and triangulated (e.g., comparing data taken from journals, social network maps and logs, questionnaires, interviews) and interviews and questionnaires with employees at the work site need to be carried out in order to understand the linguistic dynamics that obtain in workplace environments. In addition, special permission may be needed to record NS-NS or NS-NNS interactions (either authentic or simulated situations) in the workplace; these permissions may be easier to obtain when the university-professional venue partnership is ongoing, well-run (mutual expectations are met), and personal relationships and trust among key parties from both entities are continuously strengthened. However, an ideal apprentice-mentor relationship is often non-existent at internship venues. This may result from a lack of willingness of the site to accommodate interns’ needs to model L2 professional language use and respond to their questions about linguistic and cultural issues; in fact, in U.S. domestic CSL experiences or internships, our students may be the L2 “experts” on site and not have professional role models who speak the target language in the workplace. Care must be taken to assure that interns will be exposed to professional registers of the target language by workplace personnel at professional venues in which interns are placed.

Lack of good communication and planning may affect the quality of the CSL/internship learning experience. For instance, problems may arise from misaligned expectations among all participants (Lear & Abbott, 2009), a lack of appropriate set-up (e.g., mismatch of intern’s major and internship venue or inadequate language proficiency on the part of the intern for a particular setting [Zapata, 2011]), and a lack of follow-through on agreements by the parties setting up or hosting internships. Thus, in both domestic and SA settings, local oversight of a Resident Director or university Internship Coordinator is needed throughout the internship to assure the quality of the experience for the intern.

Several scholars (Douglas, 2000; O’Sullivan, 2012) have noted the need to create appropriate assessment instruments for gauging the acquisition of the target language and culture in professional settings. These types of assessments would gauge a learner’s Practical Oral Language Ability (Johnson, 2001) to carry out various functions in a professional role (e.g., a teaching assistant’s need to interact differently with students during office hours vs. during a classroom lecture). Lear (2012) noted the lack of LSP/EX-LL models and standards to serve as assessment benchmarks and (Bygate, Skehan, & Swain, 2001) pointed out the need for more appropriate ecologically valid, task-based instruments to assess skills needed in the workplace (e.g., Madrid Chamber of Commerce tests [e.g., tourism], Listening Public Translation Exam in Spanish. In order to help fill this need for U.S. LSP programs, King and Lafford (2013) reported on the development of such an instrument to gauge the quality of oral and written communication produced by students enrolled in a Spanish SPCM program at ASU. It is clear that the area of LSP assessment is in great need of more empirical research in order to determine the most appropriate instruments for gauging learner progress in EX-LL settings.

Another challenge to carrying out foundational non-English LSP and EX-LL research in the U.S. is the lack of professional infrastructure as there are currently no national professional organizations dedicated to Spanish or non-English LSP and only a few U.S. conferences are dedicated to non-English LSP, e.g., the annual conference of the Center for International Business Education Research, and the First International Symposium on Languages for Specific Purposes (2012) in Birmingham, Alabama. Clearly, foundational LSP and EX-LL researchers would benefit from organizations and conferences devoted to the advancement of the field of non-English LSP in the U.S. Concomitantly, those researchers should create LSP and EX-LL panels and workshops that would give those fields more visibility in established conferences on applied linguistics and language teaching (e.g., American Association of Applied Linguistics, American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese).

Progress in carrying out foundational LSP research may also be hampered by the lack of researchers in languages other than English (LOTEs) with expertise in sociolinguistics, discourse

analysis, conversation analysis, or SLA, who are interested in carrying out research on (non-English) LSP or EX-LL in the U.S. In the field of ESP/EAP around the globe, many practitioners and researchers have been trained to carry out empirical research in the fields of discourse analysis, SLA, and applied linguistics. However, most non-English LSP researchers and practitioners in the U.S. come from the field of literature and are not trained in empirical linguistic methodology (Long & Uscinski, 2012). In order to address this problem, Lafford (2012) suggested incorporating LSP research, LSP teacher training, and opportunities to teach LSP classes into doctoral programs of study in applied linguistics in the U.S.

University institutional barriers to carrying out foundational non-English LSP and EX-LL research also exist: a lack of sustained engagement with local community agencies for CSL/Internship venues, a resistance to interdisciplinary work, a reliance on traditional income-generating models (e.g., lower-division courses, government grants), and a lack of value of LSP work in promotion and tenure cases. Currently, most LSP publications come from scholars at liberal arts colleges, and not primarily from investigators at research universities. This situation has arisen because many liberal arts colleges have CSL included in their mission, while research universities do not consider LSP, community service learning, and internships to be a priority because the criteria that determine graduate rankings do not include measuring those types of programs. As a result, universities do not usually hire track faculty in LSP, do not train faculty to do it, and do not reward faculty for carrying out foundational LSP or EX-LL research. In order to move the field forward and establish LSP/EX-LL as a legitimate members of the academy, Lafford (2012) proposed that language departments recognize the value of LSP courses to innovate and invigorate their language curricula in a changed world (MLA, 2007) and reward trained linguists for carrying out theoretically-grounded empirical research in LSP and EX-LL when they become candidates for promotion and tenure.

Thus, for the most part, current non-English LSP practitioners and researchers in the U.S. lack the professional infrastructure and specialized training (e.g., SLA, conversation analysis, discourse analysis) needed to carry out foundational LSP and EX-LL research. Thus, this article serves as a call to Hispanic linguists of all persuasions (e.g., sociolinguists, discourse analysts/corpus linguists, conversation analysts, SLA researchers, applied linguists) to apply their knowledge and methodological expertise to the exploration of the new frontier of interdisciplinary research into how experiential language learners acquire NS norms of linguistic and cultural interaction in various professional settings at home and abroad.

5. Research Agenda for Foundational LSP and Experiential Language Learning

This section will discuss the research that has already taken place on LSP in a global context and will set out a research agenda for the execution of LSP foundational and EX-LL research.

5.1. Research on Languages for Specific Purposes

The study of EX-LL in domestic and international contexts forms part of a larger LSP agenda. Lafford (2012) reviewed the salient features of LSP research to date in the U.S. and abroad. Outside the U.S., LSP research in Western and Eastern Europe, Asia, and Australasia has utilized theoretical models based on functional approaches to language (e.g., Systemic Functional Linguistics [SFL]; Halliday [1978] and Sydney School) and genre-based discourse analysis research (Bhatia, 2010; Bowles, 2012; Hyland, 2002; Swales, 1990). Most LSP research around the globe has been carried out on ESP and EAP by analyzing corpora of target language authentic written texts in these areas (e.g., Boulton, Carter-Thomas, & Rowley-Jolivet, 2012; see also research published in the journals *English for Specific Purposes* and *Ibérica*). In order to get a better understanding of the use of languages in conversations in LSP settings, Hyland (2002) has called for more LSP research based on oral texts and the acquisition of the target language in LSP classroom or EX-LL settings.

LSP research in the U.S. has taken many forms. That which is based on English (ESP or EAP) has concentrated on the analysis of professional written texts (Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001) and the sociolinguistic analyses of oral interactions (e.g., medical conversations [Hamilton, 1994, 2008]). In contrast, most non-English LSP research in the U.S. to date has focused on praxis and theories of

communicative language teaching (see articles in the journal *Global Business Language*) with a methodological focus related to teaching, not research (Lear, 2012). In addition, Grosse (2002) noted that the Centers for International Business Education and Research (CIBER) Research Priorities Conference suggested more study of the value of foreign language and cultural knowledge to students and business executives, long-term program effectiveness, teacher preparation, and rewards for LSP research and teaching. These laudable goals from a decade ago focused on very real challenges to the teaching of LSP courses. However, more recently, LSP scholars (Doyle, 2012; Fryer, 2012; Lear, 2012) have called for more theoretically-grounded empirical research on LSP in order to move the field forward and tie research to praxis. In addition, the 2012 CIBER conference included a plenary panel and workshop on the need to carry out such research (Lafford et al., 2012a, 2012b).

Although some genre-based (SFL) research has been carried out in the U.S., notably at Georgetown (Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris, 2010) and the Monterey Institute for International Studies (Gueldry, 2010), there is still a general lack of focus on the study of intercultural competence and a dearth of sociolinguistic, discourse, and conversation analyses regarding how target languages are used in professional settings in the U.S. As a result of the lack of this type of foundational LSP research (how NSs of the target language communicate in workplace cultures), many LSP and EX-LL pedagogical materials lack the authenticity they could have if they were informed by these types of investigations. Thus, foundational research in sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, conversational analysis, and intercultural competence on authentic target language use in the workplace needs to be carried out in order to be able to measure the development of linguistic and intercultural competence of EX-LL learners in professional settings.

5.2. *Languages for Specific Purposes Foundational Research Agenda*

LSP foundational research will broaden the research base in the fields of sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, conversation analysis, and intercultural competence by describing oral and written language use in certain professional domains/contexts among speakers of various linguistic backgrounds and interlocutor roles, as well as the cultural norms inherent in specific types of workplace environments (clinics vs. emergency rooms) in domestic and international settings. This type of research will also foster cross-disciplinary dialogue between linguists and scholars in other professional disciplines (e.g., business, medicine) and well as between researchers in sociolinguistics and SLA (Geeslin & Gudmestad, 2011). By understanding the various forms of Type I and Type II variation that are integral to the development of linguistic and intercultural competence in naturalistic and workplace settings, applied linguists and pedagogues can create more authentically-based pedagogical materials for LSP courses and design more effective pedagogical training to prepare students for EX-LL in CSL/internship venues.

The theoretical frameworks for foundational LSP research should include models of language use in context, such as SFL (Halliday, 1978), genre-based discourse analysis (Bhatia, 2010; Bowles, 2012; Hyland, 2002; Swales, 1990), conversational analysis (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), pragmatics (Austin, 1975; Searle, 1976; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Spencer Otay, 2000), sociolinguistic research (e.g., variationist studies (Labov, 1966; Tagliamonte, 2006), code-switching (Auer, 1998; Li Wei, 1994), connectionism/emergentism (Ellis 1998, 2002; Ellis & Larsen-Freeman, 2006), and Intercultural Competence (Byram, 1997).

Methodological characteristics of foundational LSP research would include using (1) data from subjects who are NS and NNS professionals and clients interacting in workplace venues, and (2) data-gathering instruments, such as ethnographic observations (recorded if possible) by interns and internship directors trained in ethnography, as well as interviews, focus groups, questionnaires, and surveys carried out with workplace personnel and clients. Data analyses would consist of mixed-methods quantitative and qualitative analytical approaches, which would incorporate corpus analyses of authentic written texts and (transcribed) oral LSP interactions and variationist analyses (GOLDVARB) that would measure the degree of influence of various independent variables (e.g., sex, age, social class/education, social status or relationship of the interlocutors in the conversation, conversational topic, presence of others in the vicinity of the interaction, speech act, context) on the probability of occurrence of certain forms (e.g., the particular pragmalinguistic variants used to accomplish certain speech acts). In order to set up the variables for a foundational LSP study, researchers will need to carry out preliminary observational research to identify linguistic units that

carry out the same function (e.g., requests) in the workplace and what individual and social factors appear to determine pragmalinguistic usage, specifically, which forms are used with which interlocutors to carry out that function appropriately in different contexts within the workplace (e.g., meeting with the boss, friends at the water cooler, client in a private meeting).

Foundational research topics on LSP in domestic and international settings should include the following:

- (1) Discourse/Conversational Analysis of Genres: What written and oral genres are found frequently in different professional contexts (e.g., pamphlets, reports, letters, medical forms, telephone appointment conversations, discharge instructions with medical clients)? What are the characteristic linguistic features of those genres? How are various lexical items and grammatical structures used to create registers and styles in those genres?
- (2) Pragmatics: What sociopragmatic norms obtain in interactions among various types of healthcare professionals (e.g., doctors, nurses, Physician's Assistants, Certified Nursing Assistants, office staff, patients)? What pragmalinguistic forms are used to carry out different speech acts in professional settings with various interlocutors?
- (3) Language Use by NSs, NNSs, and Heritage Learners (HLs) in the Workplace: Which languages are used by NSs and NNS professionals and clients in workplace interactions (e.g., domestic [English vs. Spanish] vs. international [Spanish vs. indigenous languages] settings)? In code-switching situations, on what does the choice of language(s) used depend? (e.g., topic, language of previous turn, relative proficiency of speaker and interlocutor, social relationships between/among speakers in the same/different social networks)? In what ways do NSs, NNSs, and HLs vary the structures they use? On what factors does this depend?
- (4) Culture: How do target culture workplace norms play a role in linguistic behavior among NS professionals in given domains (e.g., medical vs. legal interpretation)? How does the culture of different workplaces within the same domain (e.g., emergency rooms vs. doctor's offices/clinics) affect linguistic behavior among NS professionals? How does the presence of an intern (NNS learner) (or any outsider) change linguistic or cultural behavior of NSs in professional venues?
- (5) Attitudes: Are interns welcomed into the community of practice at the venue site? What are attitudes of workplace personnel towards interns (lack of patience, lack of interest in training them or interacting with them; lack of interest in answering linguistic questions)? How are the intern's potential social networks affected by these attitudes? What attitudinal factors affect the amount of acculturation or integration into professional communities of practice that interns can achieve at their internship site?

This type of foundational LSP research carried out in workplace venues will make it easier for SLA/EX-LL researchers to gauge the progress of LSP learners as they develop linguistic and intercultural competence during CSL and Internship experience in those professional settings.

5.3. *Experiential Language Learning Research Agenda*

Experiential Language Learning Research will provide insight into "what a learner does in a realistic communicative situation" (Geeslin, 2010, p. 502) and what factors may affect the process of acquiring a professional lexicon and appropriate linguistic variants to carry out different functions in the workplace. This kind of L2 research in the workplace will broaden the SLA research base, which until now has concentrated mostly on L2 acquisition in classroom, immersion, and SA contexts. EX-LL research studies will benefit from the use of a wide variety of theoretical frameworks that ask different questions about the SLA process (Lafford, 2007). For instance, scholars working within cognitive frameworks, such as the Input Interaction Output Model (Gass, 1997; Gass & Selinker, 2008) and Connectionism (Ellis, 1998, 2002) may raise questions regarding the role of individual factors (e.g., working memory [Baddeley, 1986], attitudes/motivation [Hernández, 2010 a, b]), noticing of items and the type and frequency of patterns of collocations in the input, types and amount of interaction (feedback and learner uptake) received from interlocutors during workplace interactions, and the communicative (Lafford, 2004) and language learning strategies (Cohen & Shively, 2007) used by learners in professional vs. non-professional settings.

Socially-focused SLA frameworks (e.g., Sociocultural Theory, Lantolf & Thorne, 2006) lend themselves easily to the analysis of scaffolded interaction, learner progress in the Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978), learner private speech (DiCamilla & Anton, 2004), the acquisition of

L2 gestures (McCafferty & Ahmed, 2000), the formation of social networks (Isabelli García, 2006), identity formation (Stewart, 2010), and the use of target language metaphor, lexis, and narratives as well as their internalization by L2 learners in professional settings. Sociolinguistically-informed SLA theories, such as sociocognitive frameworks (Atkinson, 2002; Preston, 2000; Tarone, 2007), would be useful for understanding the role of the workplace context in the L2 acquisition process, since, as Tarone (2007) argued, “learners’ L2 input and processing of L2 input in social settings are socially mediated; social and linguistic contexts affect linguistic use, choice and development” (p. 845). Recent work by Geeslin (2010), Geeslin et al. (2010, 2012) and Geeslin and Gudmestad (2011) has pointed out the advantage of fostering “cross-disciplinary dialogue between researchers in sociolinguistics and SLA” (Geeslin & Gudmestad, 2011, p. 16). Studies of the linguistic variation found in the oral and written production of both NS employees and NNS interns (Type I and Type II variation) would illuminate the complexities involved in acquiring various types of L2 professional registers in workplace settings. Finally, an ecological approach to the study of SLA in professional contexts would attempt to capture “the *interconnectedness* of psychological, social, and environmental process in SLA” (Lam & Kramsch, 2003, p. 144). This type of “study of the relations between language use and the world within which language is used” (van Lier, 2004, p. 44) would not only fulfill Firth and Wagner’s (1997) call for a reconceptualized SLA that balances cognitive and social approaches and for the study of language use in a wider number of contexts, but it would also engender more dialogue among the sociolinguists and SLA scholars interested in exploring how language is used and acquired in real world settings.

EX-LL methodology could expand the SLA database (Firth & Wagner, 1997) by including data from L2 learners of Spanish (from various L1 backgrounds) participating in CSL/Internships (at home or abroad) as well as from advanced L2 learners conducting research or teaching their native language in the target culture (e.g., Fulbright scholars or Fulbright Language Teaching Assistants). Instruments used in EX-LL research should include ethnographic observations (recorded, if possible) carried out by participant or non-participant observers of NNS or HL interns interacting with NS or NNS co-workers and clients in workplace settings. Data taken from questionnaires, interviews, and focus groups with interns and employees in the workplace will provide insights into the roles and expectations of those interlocutors, the norms of interaction in professional settings, and how those factors may influence the L2 acquisition process. Social network logs and maps can help researchers understand the number and types of social networks in which the L2 learners participated during their EX-LL experience. Finally, entries in reflective journals can provide information on how learners react to their surroundings and their interlocutors, what factors may bring about changes in their motivation and identities over time, and how they view their own progress in the areas of linguistic and intercultural competence during their learning experience. This type of reflection will add to the literature responding to Firth and Wagner’s (1997) call for a more –emic approach to the analysis of SLA data.

In general, analyses of EX-LL data would benefit from a quantitative and qualitative mixed methods approach in order to capture general trends in L2 acquisition and provide in-depth explorations of factors affecting the SLA process in professional settings. Longitudinal studies should be carried out to gauge the impact of EX-LL on learners’ careers and language use and maintenance years after their initial experience (Lear, 2012). In line with the use of a genre-based approach to the analysis of LSP oral and written L1 and L2 texts, the use of discourse-level data (Geeslin & Gudmestad, 2011) analyzed within discourse and conversational analytic frameworks would be appropriate.

Research topics on Experiential Language Learning in LSP contexts in domestic and international settings should include the following:

- (1) Genres: To which types of oral and written genres are NNS/HL interns exposed during CSL/internships in the workplace? To which lexical items and grammatical structures are they most often exposed in each of these genres?
- (2) Communicative and Language Learning Strategies: What communicative and language learning strategies do interns/CSL students use in different contexts (e.g., classroom, workplace, homestays)? What factors determine the choice of language strategy used in a given context? How do students learn language through observation of NS-NS/NNS interaction in the workplace? What do learners notice and look for in the input? What role do gestures play with facilitating memory and recall of items?

- (3) Language Learning Processes: What factors facilitate intake and retention of new forms in EX-LL environments? What kind of linguistic feedback do learners get in interactions with professionals in the workplace? Is it spontaneous or solicited? What kind of learner uptake occurs in experiential vs. classroom language learning after feedback? What role does immediate oral repetition of new words play in retention of new forms in these contexts? What is the role of private speech in experiential language learning? How do the type and quality of interns' reflections on their language learning experiences change during the internship period? What is the role of attention and structured reflection in EX-LL? What is the role of explicit vs. implicit/incidental L2 vocabulary learning in EX-LL? Does the proficiency level of the learner affect language learning processes in EX-LL settings?
- (4) Language Contact: How does the amount of contact with the target language during the CSL/internship experience affect L2 linguistic and cultural outcomes? How varied is the type of contact? Are interns exposed to a wide variety of oral and written text types or is the input restricted to recurring word strings and functions? How does the amount of time spent interacting with NSs at the workplace affect intern learning outcomes? Do male and female interns have the same opportunity for communicative interaction at the internship site? Do Latino/a and non-Latino/a interns have the same opportunity for communicative interaction at the internship site? Do personality factors and motivation determine the amount and type of contact interns have with workplace personnel? Does the proficiency level of the intern affect the type and amount of contact the intern has with personnel at the internship venue?
- (5) Language Use: Which languages are used by NNSs with NS professionals and clients in workplace interactions (domestic vs. international settings)? In code-switching situations, on what does the choice of language(s) used depend? (e.g., topic, language of previous turn, relative proficiency of speaker and interlocutor, social relationships between/among speakers in the same/different social networks)? How do HLs use language(s) (ENG/SPA) in the workplace to perform various functions? How is their use of language(s) in professional settings the same or different from language used at home or with friends? To what extent do HLs follow NS language use patterns (found in international settings) in their use of language(s) in U.S. workplaces?
- (6) Learning outcomes: How successful are interns at acquiring an understanding of and ability to produce the basic elements of oral and written professional genres during an internship? What gains in learning outcomes occur during domestic or international internships in the following areas: pronunciation, intonation, fluency, accuracy/grammatical competence, discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence, pragmatic competence, strategic competence (use of CSs and LLSs), gestures, intercultural competence (in the culture of host country, the professional domain, the particular workplace)? Are these abilities retained over time (after 6 mos. or a year)? How do these retention rates compare to those of students returning from a regular SA experience? How do linguistic and cultural outcomes of EX-LL learners compare in domestic CSL vs. regular SA settings (with and without CSL)? How do linguistic and cultural learning outcomes of EX-LL learners compare in CSL vs. non-CSL LSP courses?
- (7) Learner Variation: How do EX-LL learners vary the structures they use? How does this type of L2 variation by EX-LL learners resemble NS variation of those structures? (Type I vs. Type II variation)?
- (8) Assessment: What types of ecologically-valid assessment tools need to be created for LSP programs, courses and CSL experiences?
- (9) Attitudes: How do attitudes of NNS interns toward the target language and culture develop over time in domestic and international professional settings?
- (10) Social Networks and Identity: What factors promote or inhibit the formation of interns' social networks during an internship experience? How do interns perceive their identities as members of the target community of practice throughout the internship experience?
- (11) Pedagogical Interventions: What is the effect of various types of pedagogical interventions on linguistic and cultural outcomes of interns used before and/or during an internship experience?

6. Conclusions

This article has examined the need to carry out Foundational LSP and EX-LL research in order to answer Firth and Wagner's (1997) call for expanding the SLA database within more emically-based frameworks, and has proposed an agenda for executing this type of scholarly investigation. However, this article will conclude with a larger rationale for executing such research, based on another set of 5 C's (commitments).

6.1. *Commitment to Higher Education*

In its 2007 report, the Modern Language Association pointed out the importance of foreign language curricular innovation to demonstrate the relevance of the humanities and interdisciplinary work in a "changed world" to institutions of higher education as well as to the community at large (who chooses whether or not to support funding for education). For instance, Abbott (2011) described how a course on Spanish and social entrepreneurship that incorporated CSL in nonprofit organizations serving Spanish-speaking immigrants could help innovate foreign language curricula and make the relevance of the humanities more obvious to decision makers within and outside of academe.

6.2. *Commitment to Strengthening Town-Gown Relations*

The establishment of community partnerships to establish CSL and internship venues in which to carry out foundational LSP and EX-LL research can lead to income-generating models for the university (e.g., potential donors to the university may be found through partnerships in workplace venues; see Lear, 2012) and can benefit businesses that receive interns they can eventually hire, which can then lead to lowering the company's total costs of training new employees. The presence of university students as interns in the community also visibly demonstrates academe's interest in community embeddedness, place-based inquiry, use-inspired research, and the transformation of society by serving as a catalyst for social change, as a result of being connected to communities and becoming aware of their needs.⁶

6.3. *Commitment to Society*

Shohamy (2007), Kramsch (2005), Valdés (2005), Byrnes (2011) and Bachman (2009) are among the applied linguistics that have challenged their colleagues to accept their academic social responsibility and to take a more activist stance to improve the lives of their fellow citizens. The establishment of LSP programs and CSL/Internships in Spanish is responding to demographic trends that show that Hispanics will be the largest minority in the U.S. in 2050 (Fry and Lopez [2012], report of the Pew Hispanic Research Center). Hispanics also constitute the largest minority group on U.S. college campuses (Fry & Lopez, 2012) and may be attracted to LSP courses so that they can broaden and utilize their command of both Spanish and English for career enhancement. As 25% of K-12 students in the U.S. is Hispanic (Fry & Lopez, 2012), there is a great need for educators to communicate effectively with Spanish-speaking parents. LSP foundational research can explore the types of parent-teacher Spanish interactions that are most effective in getting parents to understand how they can support their children's navigation of the U.S. educational system. Internship venues in K-12 schools could provide university L2 learners with an opportunity to help in this process (e.g., interpreting at school events, doing intake interviews in Spanish with immigrant parents and students) and EX-LL researchers could gauge the interns' progress in their execution of these types of activities. Real world opportunities to use Spanish in the community will help attract new students (non-majors) to language study and will, therefore, expand the pool of university-level language students to include those who will serve or report on populations in the community, whose first language is not the dominant one in the society in which they live (e.g., educators, medical personnel, criminology majors, journalism students).

⁶ These are some of the design features of a New American University, as envisioned by Arizona State University <http://newamericanuniversity.asu.edu/design-aspirations/>

6.4. Commitment to Strengthen our Disciplines

Foundational LSP research consisting of sociolinguistic, discourse and conversation analyses of interactions in experiential settings can inform (genre-based) theoretical frameworks (e.g., SFL) and can provide applied linguists with models of NS oral and written discourse used in professional settings they can incorporate in LSP curricula and pedagogical materials. SLA researchers can then carry out EX-LL research on learners in LSP classes and in CSL/internship venues to assess L2 learner progress toward the acquisition of linguistic, social and cultural norms of workplace interaction in the target culture. In turn, EX-LL research can then inform SLA theory, LSP curriculum, materials and program design, and provide more information to future experiential language learners regarding the norms of interaction they may find in professional discourses during their CSL/internship experience. This type of place-based approach to language-related research can also inspire foreign language materials creators to carry out similar types of research in venues portrayed in most traditional language course textbooks (e.g., service encounters with NSs in the target culture) in order to help strengthen the ecological validity of materials used in all language courses throughout the curriculum. Thus, EX-LL research can help us answer Firth and Wagner's (1997) call for a reconceptualized SLA that balances cognitive and social theoretical approaches, investigates the contextual and interactional dimensions of language use, adopts more -emic approaches to data analysis, and broadens the database using data from NSs and NNSs in workplace settings.

6.5. Commitment to our Students

Finally, through the use of foundational LSP and EX-LL research and its application to teaching, curricular design and materials creation, we can prepare students for lifelong learning of other languages and cultures by breaking down the walls of academe and giving them the tools and strategies to learn about and improve the human condition. ¡Adelante!

References

- Abbott, Annie R. (2010). *Comunidades: Más allá del aula*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Abbott, Annie R. (2011). Social entrepreneurship and community service learning: Building sustainable non-profits and language programs. In Carmen Pérez-Llantada & Maida Watson (Eds.), *Specialized languages in the global village: A multi-perspective approach* (pp. 27-45). Newcastle on Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Abbott, Annie R., & Lear, Darcy W. (2010). The connections goal area in Spanish community service-learning: Possibilities and limitations. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(2), 231-245.
- Atkinson, Dwight. (2002). Toward a sociocognitive approach to second language acquisition. *Modern Language Journal*, 86 (4), 525-545.
- Auer, Peter. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Austin, John L. (1975). *How to do things with words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bachman, Lyle. (2009). Toward an "activist" applied linguistics. Plenary address given at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Applied Linguistics, Denver, CO.
- Baddeley, Alan D. (1986). *Working memory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bataller, Rebecca. (2010). Making a request for a service in Spanish: Pragmatic development in the study abroad setting. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(1), 160-175.
- Batstone, Robert. (2002). Contexts of engagement: A discourse perspective on 'intake' and 'pushed output.' *System*, 30(1), 1-14.
- Bhatia, Vijay. (2010). Interdiscursivity in professional communication. *Discourse and Communication*, 21(1), 32-50.
- Bloom, Melanie. (2008). From the classroom to the community: Building cultural awareness in first semester Spanish. *Language, Culture & Curriculum*, 21(2) 103-119.
- Bloom, Benjamin S., Englehart, Max D., Furst, Edward J., Hill, Walker H., & Krathwohl, David R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York: Longmans.
- Boulton Alex, Carter-Thomas, Shirley & Rowley-Jovilet, Elizabeth. (2012). *Corpus-informed research and learning in ESP: Issues and applications*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Bowles, Hugo. (2012). Analyzing languages for specific purposes discourse. *Modern Language Journal*, 96(s1), 43-58.
- Brooks, Rodney A. (1991) Intelligence without representation. *Artificial Intelligence*, 47(1-3), 139-59.

- Brown, Penelope, & Levinson, Stephen C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Roger W., & Gilman, Albert. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In Thomas A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 253-276). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Burke, Brigid M. (2007). Creating communicative classrooms with experiential design. *FLANNALS*, 40(3), 441-462.
- Bygate, Martín, Skehan, Peter, & Swain, Merrill. (2001). *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching, and testing*. London: Longman.
- Byram, Michael. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Byrnes, Heidi. (2011). Perspectives. *Modern Language Journal*, 95(2), 291-292.
- Byrnes, Heidi, Maxim, Hiram H., & Norris, John M. (2010). *Realizing advanced foreign language writing development in collegiate education: Curricular design, pedagogy, assessment*. *Modern Language Journal*, 94(s1).
- Canagarajah, Suresh. (2007). Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *Modern Language Journal*, 91(s1), 923-939.
- Carpenter, Linda J., & García, Alexandra A. (2012). Assessing outcomes of a study abroad course for nursing students. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 33(2), 85-89.
- Castañeda, Martha E., & Zirger, Megan L. (2011). Making the most of the “new” study abroad: Social capital and the short-term sojourn. *Foreign Language Annals*, 44(3), 544-64.
- Cohen, Andrew D., & Shively, Rachel L. (2007). Acquisition of requests and apologies in Spanish and French: Impact of study abroad and strategy-building intervention. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91 (2), 189-212.
- Collentine, Joseph G. (2004). The effects of learning contexts on morphosyntactic and lexical development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(2), 227-248.
- Collentine, Joseph, & Freed, Barbara. (2004). Learning context and its effects on second language acquisition: Introduction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(2) 153-172.
- Coria-Sanchez, Carlos M. (2007). Programs abroad and internships for Spanish for business and international business students. *Global Business Languages*, 12. Retrieved from: <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/gbl/vol12/iss1/5>
- Cubillos, Jorge H., Chieffo, Lisa & Fan, Chunbo. (2008). The impact of short-term study abroad programs on L2 listening comprehension skills. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41(1), 157-86.
- D'Amico, Melanie L. (2010). The effects of intensive study abroad and at home language programs on second language acquisition of Spanish. PhD diss., University of Florida.
- DeKeyser, Robert. (2010). Monitoring processes in Spanish as a second language during a study abroad program. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(1), 80-92.
- Dewey, John. (1938/1988). Experience in education. In Jo Ann. Boydston & Barbara Levine (Eds.), *John Dewey: The later works, 1925-1953: Vol. 13. 1938-1939* (pp. 1-62). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Díaz-Barriga, Miguel. (2003). Spanish in the social sciences: Notes on the challenges of service-learning among Mexican migrants in Pennsylvania. In Carol Klein (Series Ed.), Joseph Hellebrandt, Jonathan Arries, & Lucia Varona (Vol. Eds.), *American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese Professional development series handbook, Volume 5. Juntos: Community partnerships in Spanish and Portuguese* (pp. 154-161). Boston, MA: Thompson Heinle.
- Díaz-Campos, Manuel. (2006). The effect of style in second language phonology: An analysis of segmental acquisition in study abroad and regular-classroom students. In Carol A. Klee & Timothy L. Face (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 7th conference on the acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese as first and second languages* (pp. 26-39). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- DiCamilla, Frederick, & Antón, Marta. (2004). Private speech: A study of language for thought in collaborative interaction of language learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14 (1), 36-69.
- Douglas, Dan. (2000). *Assessing language for specific purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Doyle, Mike S. (2012). Business language studies in the United States: On nomenclature, context, theory, and method. *Modern Language Journal*, 96(s1), 105-121.
- Ellis, Nick. (Ed.). (1994). *Implicit and explicit learning of languages*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ellis, Nick. (1998). Emergentism, connectionism and language learning. *Language Learning*, 48(4), 631-664.
- Ellis, Nick. (2002). Frequency effects in language processing: A review with implications for theories of implicit and explicit language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24(2) 143-188.
- Ellis, Nick, & Larsen-Freeman, Diane. (2006). Language emergence: Implications for applied linguistics—Introduction to the special issue. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(4), 558-589.
- Elola, Idoia, & Oskoz, Ana. (2008). Blogging: Fostering intercultural competence development in foreign language and study abroad contexts. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41(3), 454-77.
- Firth, Alan, & Wagner, Johannes. (1997). On discourse, communication and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285-300.

- Flowerdew, John, & Peacock, Matthew. (2001). *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fry, Richard, & Lopez, Mark H. (2012). Hispanic student enrollments reach new highs in 2011. Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved October 16, 2012 from <http://www.pewhispanic.org/2012/08/20/hispanic-student-enrollments-reach-new-highs-in-2011/>
- Fryer, T. Bruce. (2012). Languages for specific purposes business curriculum creation and implementation in the United States. *Modern Language Journal*, 96(s1), 122-139.
- García-Amaya, Lorenzo. (2009). New findings on fluency measures across three different learning contexts. In Joseph Collentine, Maryellen García, Barbara Lafford, & Francisco Marcos-Marín (Eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 11th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 68-80). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- García Amaya, Lorenzo. (2012). Second language fluency and cognition: The study of Spanish second language development in an overseas immersion program and an at-home foreign language classroom. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University.
- Gass, Susan. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gass, Susan, & Selinker, Larry. (2008). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. 3rd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Geeslin, Kimberly. (2010). Beyond 'naturalistic': On the role of task characteristics and the importance of multiple elicitation methods. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics*, 3(2), 501-520.
- Geeslin, Kimberly, García-Amaya, Lorenzo, Hasler-Barker, Maria, Henrikson, Nicholas C., & Killam, Jason. (2010). The SLA of direct object pronouns in an immersion environment where use is variable. In Claudia Borgonovo, Manuel Español-Echevarría, & Philippe Prevost (Eds.), *Refereed proceedings for the 12th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 246-259). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Geeslin, Kimberly, García-Amaya, Lorenzo, Hasler-Barker, Maria, Henrikson, Nicholas C., & Killam, Jason. (2012). The L2 acquisition of variable perfective past time reference in Spanish in an overseas immersion setting. In Kimberly Geeslin & Manuel Díaz-Campos (Eds.), *Refereed proceedings for the 14th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 197-213). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Geeslin, Kimberly, & Gudmestad, Aarnes. (2011). Using sociolinguistic analyses of discourse-level features to expand research on L2 variation in forms of Spanish subject expression. In Luke Plonsky & Maren Schierloh (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 2009 Second Language Research Forum* (pp. 16-30). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Goertler, Senta. (2012). Theoretical and empirical foundations for blended language learning. In Fernando Rubio & Joshua Thoms (Eds.), *Hybrid language teaching and learning: Exploring theoretical, pedagogical, and curricular issues* pp. 27-49). Boston: Cengage/Heinle.
- Grabois, Howard. (2007). Service-learning throughout the Spanish curriculum: An inclusive and *expansive* theory-driven model. In Adrian J. Wurr & Josef Hellebrandt (Eds.) *Learning the language of global citizenship: Service-learning in applied linguistics* (pp. 164-189). Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Grabois, Howard. (2008). Contribution and language learning: Service-learning from a sociocultural perspective. In James P. Lantolf & Matthew E. Poehner (Eds.), *Sociocultural theory and the teaching of second languages* (pp. 380-406). Oakville, CT: Equinox.
- Grosse, Christine U. (2002). Research priorities in languages for specific purposes. *Global Business Languages*, 7(1), 3-33.
- Grosse, Christine U., & Voght, Geoffrey M. (2012). The continuing evolution of languages for specific purposes. *Modern Language Journal*, 96 (s1), 190-202.
- Guldry, Michel. (Ed.). (2010). *How globalizing professions deal with national languages*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hamilton, Heidi E. (1994). Conversations with an Alzheimer's patient: An interactional *sociolinguistic study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hamilton, Heidi E. (2008). Language and dementia: Sociolinguistic aspects. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 28, 91-110
- Hernández, Todd A. (2010a). Promoting speaking proficiency through motivation and interaction: The study abroad and classroom learning contexts. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(4), 650-70.
- Hernández, Todd A. (2010b). The relationship among motivation, interaction, and the development of second language oral proficiency in a study-abroad context. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(4), 600-617.
- Hulstijn, Jan H. (2012). Incidental learning in second language acquisition. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 2565-2569). Boston: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hyland, Ken. (2002). Genre, language, context and literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 113-135.
- Hymes, D. (1972). *Reinventing anthropology*. New York: Random House.
- Isabelli, Casilde A. (2004). The acquisition of the null subject parameter properties in SLA: Some effects of positive evidence in a naturalistic learning context. *Hispania*, 87(1), 150-162.

- Isabelli-García, Christina. (2006). SA social networks, motivation, and attitudes: Implications for SLA. In Margaret A. DuFon & Eton Churchill (Eds.) *Language learners in SA contexts* (pp. 231-258). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Johnson, Marysia. (2001). *The art of non-conversation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Julseth, David C. (2003). The Hispanic achievers program: An interdisciplinary model for service learning. In Carol Klein (Series Ed.), Joseph Hellebrandt, Jonathan Arries, & Lucia Varona (Eds.), American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese Professional development series handbook Volume 5. *Juntos: Community partnerships in Spanish and Portuguese* (pp. 140-153). Boston, MA: Thompson Heinle.
- King de Ramírez, Carmen, & Lafford, Barbara. (2013). Spanish for the professions: Program design and assessment. Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Languages for Specific Purposes, University of Alabama at Birmingham, April 13-14, 2012.
<http://contentdm.mhsl.uab.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/faculty/id/164/rec/13>
- Knight, Susan M., & Schmidt-Rinehart, Barbara C. (2002). Enhancing the homestay: SA from the host family's perspective. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35(2), 190-201.
- Knutson, Sonja. (2003). Experiential learning in second-language classrooms. *TESL Canada Journal/ Revue TESL du Canada*, 20(2), 52-64.
- Kohonen, Viljo, Jaatinen, Riitta, Kaikkonen, Pauli & Lehtovaara, Jorma. (2001). *Experiential learning in foreign language education*. New York: Longman.
- Kolb, David A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kolb, David A., Boyatzis, Richard E., & Mainemelis, Charalampos. (2000). Experiential learning theory: Previous research and new directions. In Robert J. Sternberg & Li-Fang Zhang (Eds.), *Perspectives on thinking, learning, and cognitive styles* (pp. 193-210). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kolb, David A., & Fry, Roger. (1975). Toward an applied theory of experiential learning. In Cary L. Cooper (Ed.), *Theories of Group Process* (pp. 33-57). London: John Wiley.
- Kramsch, Claire. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kramsch, Claire. (2005). Post 9/11: Foreign languages between knowledge and power. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(4), 545-567.
- Kramsch, Claire. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kramsch, Claire, & Whiteside, Anne. (2007). Three fundamental concepts in SLA and their relevance in multilingual contexts. *Modern Language Journal*, 91, 905-920.
- Labov, William. (1966/1982). *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- La Brozzi, Ryan M. (2012). The role of study abroad and inhibitory control on processing redundant cues. In Kimberly Geeslin & Manuel Díaz-Campos (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 14th Hispanic linguistics symposium* (pp. 228-241). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Lafford, Barbara. (2004). The effect of context of learning on the use of communication strategies by learners of Spanish as a second language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(2), 201-226.
- Lafford, Barbara. (2006). The effects of study abroad vs. classroom contexts on Spanish SLA: Old assumptions, new insights and future research directions. In Carol A. Klee & Timothy L. Face (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 7th conference on the acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese as first and second languages* (pp. 1-25). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Lafford, Barbara. (2007). Second language acquisition reconceptualized?: The impact of Firth and Wagner (1997). *The Modern Language Journal*, 91 (s1), 735-756.
- Lafford, Barbara. (2012). Languages for specific purposes in the United States in a global context: Commentary on Grosse and Voght (1991) revisited. *The Modern Language Journal*, 96 (s1), 1-27.
- Lafford, Barbara & Collentine, Joseph. (2006). The effects of study abroad and classroom contexts on the acquisition of Spanish as a second language: From research to application. In Rafael M. Salaberry & Barbara Lafford (Eds.), *The art of teaching Spanish: Second language acquisition from research to praxis* (pp.103-126). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Lafford, Barbara, Collentine, Joseph, Colina, Sonia, & Cortes, Viviana. (2012a). Advancing the field of languages for the professions: How to conduct research and successfully publish in languages for the professions. Workshop given at the CIBER annual conference. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, March, 2012.
- Lafford, Barbara, Collentine, Joseph, Colina, Sonia, & Cortes, Viviana. (2012b). Advancing the field of languages for specific purposes: Insights and models. Panel at CIBER annual conference. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, March, 2012.
- Lafford, Barbara, & Uscinski, Izabela. (forthcoming). Study abroad and second language Spanish. In K. Geeslin (Ed.), *Handbook of second language Spanish* (pp. xxx-xxx). Boston: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lam, Wan S. E., & Kramsch, Claire. (2003). The ecology of an SLA community in a computer-mediated environment. In Jonathan Leather & Jet van Dam (Eds.), *Ecology of language acquisition* (pp. 141-158). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Lantolf, James, & Thorne, Steven. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lave, Jean, & Wenger, Etienne. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lear, Darcy W. (2012). Languages for specific purposes curriculum creation and implementation in service to the community in the United States. *Modern Language Journal*, 96(s1), 158 -172.
- Lear, Darcy W., & Abbott, Annie R. (2008). Foreign language professional standards and CSL: Achieving the 5 Cs. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 14(2), 76-86.
- Lear, Darcy. W., & Abbott, Annie. R. (2009). Aligning expectations for mutually beneficial community service-learning: The case of Spanish language proficiency, cultural knowledge, and professional skills. *Hispania*, 92(2), 312-323.
- Lee, Lina. (2011). Blogging: promoting learner autonomy and intercultural competence through study abroad. *Language Learning & Technology*, 15(3), 87-109.
- Lee, Lina. (2012). Engaging Study Abroad Students in Intercultural Learning through Blogging and Ethnographic Interviews. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(1), 7-21.
- Lewis, Tasha N. (2009). The role of motion event gestures in L2 development in a study abroad context. PhD diss., University of California, Davis.
- Li Wei (1994). *Three generations, two languages, one family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Long, Mary, & Uscinski, Izabela. (2012). Evolution of languages for specific purposes programs in the United States: 1990-2011. *Modern Language Journal*, 96(s1), 190-202.
- Lord, Gillian. (2006). Defining the indefinable: Study abroad and phonological memory abilities. In Carol A. Klee & Timothy L. Face (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 7th conference on the acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese as first and second languages* (pp. 40-46). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Lord, Gillian. (2009). Second-language awareness and development during study abroad: A case study. *Hispania*, 92 (1), 127-141.
- Magnan, Sally. (2008). Reexamining the priorities of the national standards for foreign language education. *Language Teaching*, 41(3), 349-366.
- Magnan, Sally, & Back, Michele. (2007). Social interaction and linguistic gain during SA. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40(1), 43-61.
- Magnan, Sally, & Lafford, Barbara. (2012). Learning through immersion during study abroad. In Susan Gass (Ed.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 525-540). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Marqués-Pascual, Laura. (2011). Study abroad, previous language experience, and Spanish L2 development. *Foreign Language Annals*, 44(3), 565-82.
- Martinsen, Rob A. (2010). Short-term study abroad: Predicting changes in oral skills. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(3), 504-30.
- McCafferty, Steven G., & Ahmed, Mohammed K. (2000). The appropriation of gestures of the abstract by L2 learners. In James L. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural Theory and second language learning* (pp. 199-218). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Modern Language Association. (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. Retrieved August 4, 2011 from <http://www.mla.org/flreport>
- National service-learning clearinghouse: America's most comprehensive service-learning resource. (2011). *Higher education community engagement quality practices*. Retrieved April 11, 2011 from <http://www.servicelearning.org/topic/quality-components-standards/he-community-engagement-quality-practices>.
- O'Brien, Irena, Segalowitz, Norman, Collentine, Joseph, Freed, Barbara. (2006). Phonological memory and lexical, narrative, and grammatical skills in second language oral production by adult learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 27, 377-402.
- O'Brien, Irena, Segalowitz, Norman, Freed, Barbara, & Collentine, Joseph. (2007). Phonological memory predicts second language oral fluency gains in adults. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 29 (2), 557-82.
- O'Sullivan, Barry. (2012). Assessment issues in languages for specific purposes. *Modern Language Journal*, 96(s1), 71-88.
- Paige, R. Michael, Cohen, Andrew. D., & Shively, Rachel L. (2004). Assessing the impact of a strategies-based curriculum on language and culture learning abroad. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 253-76.
- Pellegrino-Aveni, Valerie A. (2005). *SA and second language use: Constructing the self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Preston, Dennis. (2000). Three kinds of sociolinguistics and SLA: A psycholinguistic perspective. In Bonnie Swierzbins, Michael E. Anderson, Carole A. Klee, & Elaine Tarone (Eds.), *Social and cognitive factors in second language acquisition: Selected proceedings of the 1999 Second Language Research Forum* (pp. 3-30). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla.

- Räisänen, Christine A., & Fortanet-Gómez, Inmaculada. (2008). The state of ESP teaching and learning in Western European higher education after Bologna. In Inmaculada Fortanet-Gómez & Christine A. Räisänen (Eds.), *ESP in European higher education* (pp. 11-51). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rehner, Katherine, Mougeon, Raymond, & Nadasdi, Terry. (2003). The learning of sociolinguistic variation by advanced FSL learners: The case of *nous* versus *on* in immersion French. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25(1), 127-156.
- Sacks, Harvey, Schegloff, Emanuel A., & Jefferson, Gail. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735.
- Sánchez-López, L. (2012). Spanish for specific purposes. In C. Chappelle (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 5319-5326). Boston: John Wiley & Sons.
- Searle, John R. (1976). The classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1-24.
- Segalowitz, Norman, & Freed, Barbara F. (2004). Context, contact, and cognition in oral fluency acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26 (2), 173-199.
- Shively, Rachel L. (2010). From the virtual world to the real world: A model of pragmatics instruction for study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(1), 105-37.
- Shively, Rachel L. (2011). L2 pragmatic development in study abroad: A longitudinal study of Spanish service encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(2), 1818-35.
- Shohamy, Elana. (2007). Language tests as language policy tools. *Assessment in Education*, 14(1), 117-130.
- Smartt, Jerry T., & Scudder, Rosalind R. (2004). Immersion study abroad in Mexico: Using repair behaviors to assess proficiency changes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(4), 592-599.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen. (2000). *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures*. London: Continuum.
- Stewart, Julia A. (2010). Using e-journals to assess students' language awareness and social identity during study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42(1), 138-59.
- Swales, John. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tagliamonte, Sali. (2006). *Analyzing sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Talbut, Susan, & Stewart, Melissa A. (1999). What's the subject of SA? Race, gender and "living culture." *Modern Language Journal*, 83(2), 163-175.
- Tarone, Elaine. (2007). Sociolinguistic approaches to second language acquisition research—1997–2007. *Modern Language Journal*, 91(5), 837-48.
- Tarone, Elaine, & Swain, Merrill. (1995). A sociolinguistic perspective on second-language use in immersion classrooms. *Modern Language Journal*, 79(2), 166-178.
- Thorne, Elaine. (2011). Community formation and the world as its own model. *Modern Language Journal*, 95(2), 304-307.
- Valdés, Guadalupe. (2005). Bilingualism, heritage language learners, and SLA research: Opportunities lost or seized? *Modern Language Journal*, 89(3), 410-426.
- van Lier, Leo. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning: A sociocultural perspective*. New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Vygotsky, Lev S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Zapata, Gabriela. (2011). The effects of community service learning projects on L2 learners' cultural understanding. *Hispania*, 94(1), 86-102.

Selected Proceedings of the 16th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium

edited by Jennifer Cabrelli Amaro,
Gillian Lord, Ana de Prada Pérez,
and Jessi Elana Aaron

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2013

Copyright information

Selected Proceedings of the 16th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium
© 2013 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-459-1 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Lafford, Barbara A. 2013. The Next Frontier: A Research Agenda for Exploring Experiential Language Learning in International and Domestic Contexts. In *Selected Proceedings of the 16th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, ed. Jennifer Cabrelli Amaro et al., 80-102. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2927.