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Communities

Participate in Multilingual Communities at Home & Around the World

Standard 5.1: Students use the language both within and beyond the school setting

Standard 5.2: Students show evidence of becoming life-long learners by using the language for personal enjoyment and enrichment

- Accessing entertainment and information sources available to speakers of the language
- Traveling to communities and countries where the language is used extensively to further develop their language skills and understanding of the culture

(National Standards, 2006, p. 9)
In 1998, the director for the National Standards in Foreign Language (FL) Education Project reported that the Standards Advisory Board, composed largely of individuals outside the language teaching profession, believed that for the general public, “[P]articipation in multilingual/multicultural communities was the raison d’être for foreign language study” (Phillips, 1998, p. 32). A decade later, a study examining alignment between FL students’ goals and those of the Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century (hereafter referred to as “the Standards”) confirmed the Advisory Board’s claim, reporting that among the five goals areas posited in the Standards, Communities was the one most valued by collegiate FL students (Magnan & Murphy, 2009).

However, several articles that have appeared since the Standards were first published (Bartz & Singer, 1996; Long, 2005; Magnan, 2008a; Osborn & Reagan, 1998; Sarroub & Moeller, 1999) have noted that FL instructors’ and administrators’ vision of the Communities standard may differ from that held by the general public or students. In particular, instructors may perceive that attaining this goal is beyond students’ capabilities given limited resources and relatively short sequences of study (Bartz & Singer, 1996). A further concern is that the FL profession has had a tendency to “portray implementation of the Communities standard as an extra-curricular experience, like a field trip” (Magnan, 2008a, p. 360). As Magnan noted, the Communities standard was the only one of the five standards to which a specific chapter was not dedicated in the ACFTL volume entitled Foreign Language Standards: Linking Research, Theories, and Practice (Phillips & Terry, 1999).

More recently, survey results related to ACTFL’s “A Decade of Foreign Language Standards” project (2011) showed that for 1,299 K–16 instructors, the Communities standard was ranked the lowest of the five standards in terms of planning and learning experiences and, along with the Connections standard, was called the most difficult to teach. The study’s authors concluded that “the majority finds [the Communities] goal area to be nebulous, out of their control, and not assessable” (p. 28).

The question of how the Communities standard might be meaningfully incorporated into postsecondary FL study was addressed by McAlpine (2000), who, rather than articulating its role in classroom instruction, stated that it could be “easily met by students who have a real-life experience in either a domestic or a foreign setting that requires them to use their language and cultural knowledge” (p. 77). This view of immersion experiences such as study abroad as an ideal means of improving students’ linguistic capabilities and integration into target language communities is widely shared within the FL profession. As Kinginger (2008) wrote, [A]mong language educators, an in-country sojourn is often interpreted as the highlight of students’ careers, the ultimate reward for years of hard labor over grammar books and dictionaries, when knowledge of a foreign language becomes immediately relevant and intimately connected to lived experience. Based on their own usually successful, often life-transforming experiences, language professionals tend to greet study abroad with unqualified enthusiasm, as if it were intrinsically superior to classroom learning. (p. 1)

But is this keenness for study abroad justified in terms of reaching the Communities standard? In this position paper, we consider the following questions: Does a study abroad experience facilitate meeting the Communities standard? If so, in what ways? How can U.S. collegiate FL curricula enhance the study abroad experience and fulfillment of the Communities standard? To respond to these questions, we first summarize current trends in study abroad participation by U.S. undergraduates and report key research findings on study abroad...
related to the Communities standard. In the article’s second half, we discuss the pedagogical implications of this research by making concrete recommendations for programmatic courses of action at home and abroad targeting a fuller consideration of the Communities standard in collegiate FL study. Thus, rather than a comprehensive review of research on language learning in the study abroad context (e.g., Kinginger, 2009a), this publication advances research-based arguments for viewing study abroad as an experience that, if carefully integrated within the FL curriculum, can serve as a valuable means of fulfilling the Communities standard.1

Trends in Study Abroad Participation by U.S. Undergraduate Students

According to the U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, “For American students to be competitive in today’s globalized world, international experience is critically important” (Institute of International Education, 2011, n.p.). This argument is certainly consistent with the internationalization of higher education in the U.S., a process that had its roots beginning after World War II but has become an institutional priority since the late 1980s, moving “from the fringe of institutional interest to the very core” since that time (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011, p. 15). At present, U.S. colleges and universities continue to grapple with the role and goals of internationalization and to reconsider how the curriculum, including experiences such as study abroad, can add a meaningful global dimension to the preparation of students (Marmolejo, 2011).

U.S. college students’ own views of the value of study abroad reflect the merit assigned to such experiences by their educational institutions. For example, a 2009 survey of more than 6,000 study abroad alumni found that study abroad was rated the most impactful college experience on participants’ lives, with 83.5% calling its impact “strong,” ranking ahead of friendships, coursework, interactions with faculty, and all other extracurricular activities in which they had been involved (Paige, Fry, Stallman, Josic, & Jon, 2009, p. S36). The continued appeal of study abroad is also evident in enrollment trends: Overall participation by U.S. students has more than tripled over the last two decades, with a total of 270,604 students participating in a for-credit overseas academic program during the 2009–2010 academic year. Approximately 14% of U.S students pursuing bachelor’s degrees study abroad at some point during their undergraduate career. At present, they also study abroad in more diverse destinations than ever before, and among the top 25, 14 are outside Europe and 19 are places where English is not a primary language (Institute of International Education, 2011, n.p.).

Despite these positive trends, other realities of study abroad participation by U.S. undergraduates today are less encouraging for FL educators. Whereas the junior year abroad model dominated by language majors was once the norm, this is no longer the case (see Figure 1). Today, social sciences and business majors account for the highest percentage of U.S. undergraduate study abroad enrollments (21 and 20%, respectively), whereas FL majors comprise just 6% of enrollments (Institute of International Education, 2011, n.p.). The trend away from study abroad as an experience primarily reserved for FL majors can be clearly seen over the past decade as enrollments from arts and humanities and FL majors have dropped (–3.5% and –2.1%) while enrollments from disciplines including social sciences, business, and sciences have remained steady or registered increases. Closer scrutiny of statistics going back to the 1980s reveals more dramatic enrollment drops by FL majors: for example, Kinginger (2009a, n.p., citing Institute of International Education data) reported that between 1985 and 2006, among the total number of U.S. undergraduates studying
abroad, the percentage comprising FL majors decreased from 16.7 to 7.8%.

Simultaneous with shifts in the demographics of the U.S. study abroad population are changes in the duration of sojourns abroad. Among U.S. undergraduates studying abroad, 57% now participate in programs of 8 weeks or less, 39% participate in programs of one quarter to one semester, and just 4% do so for an academic or calendar year. As Figure 2 illustrates, over the past decade, participation in short-term programs has grown while mid-length program participation has remained stagnant and long-term program participation has decreased significantly (Institute of International Education, 2011, n.p.). The rise in participation in short-term study abroad has been attributed to numerous factors, including financial considerations, increasing general studies requirements by home institutions, and the popularity of preprofessional programs that do not encourage study abroad (Lafford & Collentine, 2006). Students taking part in such programs have also described short-term study abroad as the fastest way to meet requirements toward language minors or certificate programs requiring foreign study (Allen, 2010b). A final trend recently noted is students enrolling in a series of short-term study abroad programs, sometimes in different countries, during their undergraduate career. The Institute for International Education does not track these multiple excursions; however, anecdotal evidence exists that they do take place (e.g., Kinzie, 2006).

Keeping in mind the recent trends in study abroad participation by U.S. undergraduates summarized above, what are their consequences for collegiate FL educators? Because the typical American study abroad experience today involves reduced time spent overseas and increased participation by nonlanguage majors, educators are led to question our assumptions about what motivates students to participate in study abroad, whether meaningful contact with target language communities...
abroad occurs for study abroad participants, and whether significant linguistic gain during study abroad is likely. In the next section, we present findings from select research on study abroad (for a categorization of these studies by program length and type, see Appendix A) in relation to the question of whether an experience abroad facilitates meeting the Communities standard.

Meeting the Communities Standard Through Study Abroad

Many scholars (e.g., Magnan, 2008a, 2008b; Thorne, 2010; Thorne, Black, & Sykes, 2009; van Lier, 1996) have acknowledged the valuable role that classroom learning experiences can play in helping FL learners to “expropriate new signifiers for their meanings and potential uses”; however, they have also recognized that “foreign language instruction, due to its isolation from organic contact with the focus language outside of the classroom setting, often provides limited opportunities for committed and consequential communicative engagement” (Thorne, 2010, p. 139). As Saville-Troike (2003) explained, for students learning the FL within the context of their own culture without direct knowledge or experience of the social and cultural organization of communities where the FL is used, language learning is only an academic exercise. Thus, while learners can learn to use the FL through classroom interactions, the meanings and norms of these interactions will be anchored in the learners’ own backgrounds and contexts, essentially reflecting “the monoculture of the students, rather than the foreign cultures they are supposedly learning” (Magnan, 2008b, p. 356). In light of this, Magnan wrote,

The reality of the foreign language learning experience is that instruction does not provide learners an entrance into communities of practice in the target language society. This reality contrasts sharply with the explicit goals of language education: helping learners become sensitive, understanding interactants in other languages and societies. (p. 355)
Therefore, on first consideration, it might seem evident that studying abroad represents the sine qua non for addressing the goal of the Communities standard of “participating in multilingual communities around the world” (National Standards, 2006, p. 9). However, does research support this notion? Below, we address this question, relating our remarks to Standard 5.1 and Standard 5.2.

**Standard 5.1: Students’ Language Use in Host Communities During Study Abroad**

Since the 1960s, numerous quantitative investigations have supported the notion that study abroad is a productive context for language learning. These studies have demonstrated that study abroad participants make significant improvement after a sojourn overseas in oral fluency and proficiency (e.g., Allen & Herron, 2003; Collentine, 2004; Freed, Segalowitz, & Dewey, 2004), pragmatic competence (e.g., Bataller, 2010; Kinginger & Farrell, 2004; Magnan & Back, 2007), and sociolinguistic competence (e.g., Kinginger, 2008; Regan, Howard, & Leme, 2009), particularly in comparison with peers who engage in FL study at home. Although scant, results from empirical studies on listening comprehension (e.g., Cubillos, Chieffo, & Fan, 2008; Kinginger, 2008), reading comprehension (e.g., Dewey, 2007; Kinginger, 2008), and writing development (Freed, So, & Lazar, 2003) have confirmed that study abroad is a productive environment for linguistic gain, in general, and for improving those capacities, in particular. Although these studies offer an encouraging picture of linguistic outcomes, they are also filled with accounts of individual differences within study abroad cohorts, thus revealing that study abroad is far more complex than general trends indicate.

Whereas study abroad is promoted as one of the best opportunities to use the FL beyond the classroom, findings from studies of informal interaction by study abroad participants demonstrate that the extent and quality of this interaction is highly variable, depending both on how students are received in the target community and on their dispositions toward learning and host community members. As Wilkinson (2005) pointed out, in study abroad, “[W]e count on the extracurricular to be curricular,” yet it tends to be “highly unpredictable and serendipitous” as to which students maximize informal interactions in the host community (pp. 46, 47).

In addition, research does not support the common belief that study abroad participants’ interactions beyond the classroom are sustained or lead to the establishment of relationships with host community members. Rather, they often amount to “limited spurts to fulfill very specific functions” with interlocutors such as bus drivers, store clerks, travel agents, and waiters (Mendelson, 2004, p. 51). This notion has been confirmed in studies by Allen (2010a), Kaplan (1989), Pellegrino Aveni (2005), and Kinginger (2008), wherein many study abroad participants reported rare to nonexistent contact with people from the host community and enhanced confidence for FL use based not on prolonged interactions but chance encounters with strangers. Interestingly, these findings seem to hold despite differing sojourn durations, as the studies named above included short-term (Allen, 2010a; Kaplan, 1989), mid-length (Kinginger, 2008; Pellegrino Aveni, 2005), and long-term program participants (Pellegrino Aveni, 2005).

Numerous elements influence students’ ineffective efforts or unwillingness to take full advantage of opportunities for meaningful, sustained FL use abroad. Among them, three have received significant attention in study abroad literature related to the Communities standard: the homestay experience, students’ own notions of linguistic competence and interactional norms, and the use of technological communication tools. In the following pages, answers to key questions related to each of these three areas are summarized based on published research.
Does homestay facilitate language use in host communities?

Homestay has been construed as the most desirable living arrangement for study abroad participants based on its potential to facilitate entrance in communities of practice in the host culture and sustained linguistic and cultural immersion. Brecht, Frank, Keesling, O’Mara, and Walton (1997) supported this notion when they stated:

[Homestay] programs give the student very rich, first-hand experience in living in the target culture and using their language skills with native speakers in circumstances with direct real-world consequences. In these instances, homestay programs are a powerful augmentation to mere instruction or immersion experiences. (p. B-11)

However, two studies (Magnan & Back, 2007; Rivers, 1998) comparing FL gain by study abroad participants living with families versus in residence halls contradicted the assumption of a homestay advantage for linguistic development. In addition, other studies have shown that homestay experiences are highly diverse, even for participants within the same program with similar language-learning histories (Allen, 2010c; Kinginger, 2008; Pellegrino Aveni, 2005; Wilkinson, 1998a).

For example, in Wilkinson’s (1998a) investigation of study abroad participants’ experiences in France, Molise was treated like a member of her homestay family. In a retrospective interview, she credited the family for her strides in learning French through daily oral interactions and the positive manner in which they gave her corrections and encouragement. However, for her peer Ashley, the homestay experience was a highly demotivating one. Recounting it, Ashley explained that when she asked her host mother for clarifications at moments when she could not understand her, the typical response was to say, “Oh never mind. It doesn’t matter,” rather than to negotiate meaning and provide helpful feedback to her (p. 130).

Several studies have also found that the homestay family is not necessarily a gateway to the larger host community (Allen, 2010a; Kaplan, 1989; Tanaka, 2007). In Allen’s study of interactive contact beyond the classroom for summer study abroad participants, most students construed homestay contact as an important source of cultural and/or FL learning, but few had social networks in the host community extending beyond their French family. Furthermore, participants’ comments suggested that merely living in a homestay family did not result in meaningful opportunities for sustained discourse; rather, students’ own intentions and efforts made the difference.

What impact do students’ notions of linguistic competence and discourse norms have on language use in host communities abroad?

Whereas study abroad can provide more intense, varied opportunities for language use than the classroom, students often cling to classroom-based notions of linguistic competence and how to achieve it, and as a result, they disregard potentially fruitful learning situations abroad. In their examination of study abroad participants’ retrospective diaries, Miller and Ginsberg (1995) found that students “have an intricate set of ideas about language and language learning which clearly affects their linguistic behavior, their attention to some communication modalities and neglect of others, and the quality of their interaction with native speakers” (p. 311). Similarly, Wilkinson (1998b), who studied seven undergraduate women participating in a summer program in France, noted that for several students, understanding a language was seen as a linguistic act or a matter of decoding a string of words.

Even when study abroad participants engage in sustained interactions, they may not be as “natural” as assumed, as students have been shown to rely heavily on classroom discourse norms and to cast
interlocutors abroad in an instructor-like role (Allen, 2010b; Siegal, 1996; Wilkinson, 2002). Wilkinson (1998b) remarked, “[N]ot only did the ‘classroom’ seem to follow the participants in the community, they also tended to carry it with them, relying on its discourse norms as viable communication strategies” (p. 26). In a later study, Wilkinson (2001) noted that “students freely transferred instructional gambits like ‘très bien’ and question-answer-feedback sequencing to their out-of-class interactions in ways that gave them a marked ‘discourse accent’ in French,” and that they expected their native-speaking interlocutors to “adopt the teacher’s role” (p. 84). In some cases, native speakers interacting with study abroad participants do appropriate a pedagogical prerogative. However, inappropriate communication behaviors transferred from the classroom (e.g. overuse of ‘très bien’ or ‘je ne comprends pas’) tend to fuel negative appraisals by interlocutors of study abroad participants and by participants themselves of their developing communicative identities, potentially affecting participants’ later attempts to interact with host community members (Kline, 1993). In fact, such a consequence was observed in Levin’s (2001) study of four U.S. undergraduates participating in a yearlong program in France. After being faced with confusing service interactions in the French university’s dining hall, they opted to put together their meals at self-service stores rather than negotiating the culturally and linguistically confusing interactions of the dining hall, demonstrating the lengths to which they went to avoid certain types of interactions with host community members.

How do communication technologies influence involvement in the host community during study abroad?
Although a principal advantage of study abroad is that “it has the power to expand the four walls of the traditional language classroom to include the local streets and people of any given culture” (Mendelson, 2004, p. 44), the influence of readily available communication technologies puts this advantage in question. In essence, cell phones, e-mail, and instant messaging make the ideal of total linguistic and cultural immersion less likely, often functioning as an electronic umbilical cord between students and their home communities and resulting in less inclination by students to invest in host communities (Citron, 2002; Holzmüller, Stöttinger, & Wittkop, 2002; Kinginger, 2008; Ogden, 2006).

Further, easily accessible English-language media, widespread use of English as a lingua mundi, and a desire for competence in English on the part of interlocutors in host communities often lead to study abroad participants encountering settings in which the target language is not the preferred means of communication. For example, Liza, a participant in Kinginger’s (2008) investigation, recounted how difficult it was for her to steer the conversation to French, even when surrounded by native speakers of it:

Sometimes like at night in the bars and social situations there would be French people but … a lot of the time they wanted to practice their English … they would speak English to me and I would speak French to them and it was very interesting. (p. 77)

Staying connected to the French language and the host community in which Liza lived was further challenged by several forces in her life: She spent considerable time traveling, she entertained family members and friends who visited her for long stretches of time, and she spent countless hours in the computer lab exchanging messages with contacts from home. In relation to these not-uncommon habits by study abroad participants today, Kinginger wrote:

Although ease of global communication, travel, and even access to English have their obvious benefits, for
American language learners abroad these changes mean that “immersion” is increasingly a matter of choice, and perhaps in some cases a locus of struggle. Language learning in study‐abroad settings will require a more profound and durable commitment than has been needed in the past. (p. 105)

Students today are faced with many challenges while studying overseas. Whether a true immersion experience occurs is a matter of choice, and the close presence of American peers combined with the omnipresence of Internet communication technologies can easily derail the pursuit of cultural and linguistic immersion in host communities abroad.

Standard 5.2: Evidence of Students as Lifelong Learners: Personal Enjoyment and Enrichment Through Literacy Resources Abroad

Given the focus of Standard 5.2 on students showing evidence of becoming lifelong language learners by traveling to FL communities abroad and accessing entertainment and information resources beyond the classroom, it might be assumed that study abroad participants readily avail themselves of FL music, books, and film for personal enjoyment and enrichment. Although empirical research exploring this notion is quite limited, findings from several studies cast doubt on this assumption.

Kaplan (1989) investigated the nature and extent of students’ French use outside the classroom during short‐term study abroad and found that students rarely engaged in reading fiction or going to the theater or movies. In addition, writing played almost no role outside the classroom. While students viewed access to media as a key dimension of their sojourn abroad, they valued it less than conversation at the dinner table or travel and service encounters. Kaplan conjectured that because these latter activities can be engaged in alone, they may “not provide the same sense of contact with the local culture that interaction provides” (p. 294).

Mendelson (2004) examined out‐of‐class contact, both interactive and noninteractive, among U.S. undergraduates in Spain and determined that speaking and listening in brief exchanges and extended conversations accounted for approximately 70% of students’ Spanish use abroad. Reading and writing played far less important roles and included “reading schedules, announcements, menus and the like in Spanish outside of class,” and “writing homework assignments in Spanish outside of class” (p. 52). Mendelson hypothesized that this inequality could be explained by the fact that reading and writing were perceived primarily as the product of course requirements and assignments, whereas listening and speaking were viewed as naturally occurring outside the classroom.

In their investigation of American students abroad in Russia, Miller and Ginsberg (1995) found that participants devalued activities or experiences wherein they were not producing or using new linguistic items and were not actively speaking. For example, one participant indicated that he did not consider listening to a tour guide speak in Russian a language experience because he “didn’t learn that much about language. I just had practice hearing it” (p. 309). The authors concluded that students’ own views of language use led them to exclude potentially useful learning situations and resources that could further enrich linguistic development abroad.

In a study of literacy development by eight American students abroad in France, Kline (1998) reported that they were often “stymied in encounters with French and academic literacies” (p. 156). For example, whereas their program recommended that students read Le Monde and canonical works of French literature, students discovered that host families tended to read magazines such as Télé 7 Jours. However, when two participants picked up the local newspaper to keep abreast of community events, their
host families suggested it was a poorly written, inappropriate choice for them to read. This admonishment led to students questioning their professors’ and French hosts’ recommendations on the choice of reading materials. Kline also discovered that certain texts did foster interaction between students and their hosts. She explained that a 19th-century novel, which students read as part of coursework and whose film adaptation premiered in a local theater, linked students to host families because the latter were aware of the novel’s presence in their community and students felt confident speaking about it. By the end of the program, some students stated that their homestay family members had begun to discuss course-related readings and recommend books to them over dinner. Kline concluded that her findings “challenge the claim that most students do not like to read, indicating instead that they prefer some texts and some ways of reading to others … based on reasonable assessment of the costs and benefits of displaying one’s literate identity” abroad (p. 158).

In summary, research related to Standard 5.2 and study abroad participants reveals certain commonalities about students’ linguistic behaviors in accessing entertainment and information resources overseas. On the one hand, study abroad participants appear reluctant to engage in activities involving FL reading or writing beyond the classroom based on their beliefs about the limited value of such activities. On the other, studies such as Kline’s (1998) point to the potential for the emergence of new literacy practices and meaningful interactions with host community members about those practices during study abroad as well as the possibility of students’ continued engagement with FL information and entertainment resources following study abroad. Furthermore, Kline’s study also points to the problem that when in-class and out-of-class activities are not intimately connected, learners will often perceive out-of-class activities as “add-ons” and may elect not to engage in them at all.

Taken together, research related to Standards 5.1 and 5.2 synthesized above should motivate FL educators to question the degree to which study abroad affords students meaningful participation in multilingual communities around the world. Although experiences abroad may serve as a potential step to help students come to realize the advantages of communicating in more than one language, this is far from automatic. An important emerging implication is that students’ own intentions and efforts to engage in FL learning abroad matter a great deal, and it is in great part up to them to maximize the benefits of their sojourns abroad (Woolf, 2009). At the same time, if we as FL educators accept this vision of study abroad, i.e., that it is not an osmosis situation, then we should be compelled to maximize students’ preparation for it and commit to support them in the most productive ways possible before, during, and after study abroad. In what follows, we discuss the concrete implications of this stance.

Maximizing Learning Related to the Communities Standard: Programmatic Courses of Action at Home and Abroad

The research findings reported above may seem troubling, as they challenge widespread notions of the inevitability of sustained interactions by study abroad participants within the host community. It may also be tempting to conclude that these findings are due to students’ lack of motivation to integrate into communities abroad. However, we reach a different conclusion: A need exists to examine collegiate FL curricula and pedagogies used before, during, and after study abroad to better understand how they equip students to navigate the linguistic and cultural demands of life abroad. Indeed, Kinginger (2009b) advocated that “[L]anguage educators and study abroad professionals should develop an activist stance” (p. 1), and Miller and Ginsberg (1995) argued that
Changes must be made in all phases of the curriculum—but especially where study abroad is involved—in the way languages as systems are presented and in the way learning is structured … special attention should be given to designing programs which articulate in-class and out-of-class experiences to support the evident comparative advantages of study abroad. (p. 313)

But how can such changes be instantiated? Below, we discuss select examples of a wide range of at-home and overseas interventions (see Appendix B for a more comprehensive list) that we find particularly advantageous for equipping students to navigate the linguistic and cultural demands of life abroad and to achieve the Communities standard. Note also that whereas these interventions are useful means of enhancing the learning of those FL students who participate in study abroad, more globally they represent ways of expanding linguistic and cultural learning beyond traditional approaches and goals for collegiate FL study that are applicable for all learners.

At-Home Interventions

Developing Language Learning Strategies
As previously noted, many study abroad participants’ beliefs about linguistic competence and how it is best developed have led them to ignore potentially useful learning opportunities overseas. Kinginger (2008) recommended that prior to study abroad “an orientation to language learning, including information on the nature of language and on the use of strategic approaches to learning, might [help] students to better apprehend the nature of the task they [set] for themselves” (p. 110). An example of this recommendation can be seen in a study by Paige, Cohen, and Shively (2004), wherein undergraduates read the guide Maximizing Study Abroad (Paige, Cohen, Kappler, Chi, & Lassegard, 2002) and participated in an orientation to the guide itself and the learning of speech acts to prepare for their upcoming sojourn abroad. Paige, Cohen, and Shively reported significant shifts in the frequency with which participants made use of certain strategies, and participants themselves reported that the materials “provided relevant information that helped them to understand, interpret, and engage more actively in their study abroad experiences” (p. 269). By using specific language strategies like writing down new words or focusing on the main idea, students were able to develop their linguistic competence, self-confidence in using the FL outside the classroom, and willingness to join in or start conversations with host community members, thus moving in the direction of achieving Standard 5.1.

Changing Classroom Discourse Patterns
We previously reported that study abroad participants have tended to rely on roles and norms of the FL classroom while abroad, restricting the quantity and quality of interactions and leading to negative appraisals, all obstacles to realizing Standard 5.1. For this reason, it is important to consider how students come to internalize their roles as FL users during classroom study and the consequences of holding onto those roles once abroad. Research on classroom discourse has revealed a direct link between students’ involvement in classroom interaction and communicative development and the dominance of an instructor-led Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) pattern (Donato & Brooks, 2004; Hall, 2001; Mantero, 2002). For example, based on semester-long observations of a Spanish class, Hall found that the pervasive use of IRE “led to mechanical, topically disjointed talk and limited student involvement to recalling, listening, and labeling” and restricted communicative development to “cognitively, linguistically, and socially simple skills in the target language” (p. 82). In other words, when students are only expected to contribute short responses
to their instructor’s questions, communicative development is stunted.

However, in classrooms where FL students are expected to ask questions and elaborate responses to questions and are well supported in efforts to do so, communicative development is promoted. Tharp and Gallimore (1991) provided suggestions for creating richer patterns of classroom interaction called instructional conversations (ICs), which provide content and help students understand how they can use the FL to build knowledge and co-author interpretations (Takahashi, Austin, & Morimoto, 2000). Hall (2001) highlighted several strategies for instructors to promote students’ communicative development in ICs including modeling, feedback, contingency managing, directing, questioning, explaining, and task structuring.

Nonetheless, instructors who rethink classroom discourse patterns alone either during at-home instruction or formal instruction abroad cannot ensure participation in communities of practice abroad. As Magnan (2008b) stated, “The world of the classroom [has] its own unique discourse and its own interactional norms, an authenticity grounded in the worldview of students … conversations in U.S. classrooms and the meanings they generate likely remain essentially American although the words are foreign” (p. 358). Yet could FL instruction be rethought to facilitate learners developing notions of communication consistent with the foreign culture? Magnan argued that this could be done if learning were to be situated “in wider communities so that learners can shape their evolving identities through a co-constructive relationship with others in social groups beyond their own” (2008b, p. 364). Next, we highlight possible pedagogical solutions that situate FL learning in authentic communities of practice wherein learners develop their language abilities and explore their intercultural identities, thus making achieving Standards 5.1 and 5.2 possible.

Enhancing the FL Curriculum

Focusing on the undergraduate curricular sequence, Wilkinson (2005) noted that most first- and second-year courses emphasize skill development and argued that lack of depth in lower-level FL courses promotes “articulation difficulties—both between classroom and immersion settings and between introductory and more advanced courses” (p. 55). She suggested that unifying language and content and providing opportunities for reflection early on would help ease the transition to later FL study both at home and abroad. In the years since Wilkinson highlighted these curricular issues and, most notable, since the publication of the 2007 MLA Report, which proposed integrating the study of language, literature, and culture and moving beyond the traditional language-content dichotomy, a number of collegiate FL programs in the United States have taken up the task of revamping their curricula and have adopted pedagogical approaches and techniques to unify language and content in ways that also facilitate meeting the Communities standard.

Numerous scholars (e.g., Allen & Paesani, 2010; Byrnes, 2006; Byrnes, Crane, Maxim, & Sprang, 2006; Byrnes, Maxim, & Norris, 2010; Crane, 2006; Maxim, 2006; Swaffar & Arens, 2005) have argued in favor of a pedagogy of multiliteracies (Kern, 2000; New London Group, 1996) as one framework to link language and content through texts, add coherence to the undergraduate FL curriculum, and bridge the depth differential that traditionally exists between lower- and advanced-level courses. In addition, literacy-based FL instruction has been posited as a useful framework for pursuing the goals of the Standards (Arens, 2010), including the Communities standard. Various efforts to implement instructional approaches and techniques congruent with such a framework have been documented in the literature; one specific example is described below.

Several scholars have advocated global simulation (Dupuy, 2006; Levine, 2004,
Mills & Péron, 2009) to immerse students “in the symbolic world of speakers of other languages” and allow them to “deeply process the connections between form and symbolic meaning and to imagine themselves and the world differently” (Kearney, 2010, p. 334). Kearney (2008) examined a fifth-semester French class in which students constructed their own historical fictional narrative based on one person’s experiences of World War II and created a cultural world for the character they invented. She reported that the rich textual environment (i.e., written and oral documents, images, and film) not only promoted a sense of immersion in cultural meaning but also prompted students to “call into action the cultural narratives they encountered in class and take up new positions from which to interpret and create meaning” (p. 254). Her findings were consistent with Magnan’s (2008a) suggestion that “imagined communities brought forth through interactions with protagonists in the imagined spaces of novels and other writings or performance” can be useful to bring community members into the classroom and to better prepare learners to enter communities of practice abroad (p. 362). Thus, global simulation can serve as a novel means of apprenticing FL learners into new discourse norms and literacy practices consistent with Standards 5.1 and 5.2.

In our response to the question of whether study abroad facilitates Standard 5.2, we reported that students abroad only reluctantly engage in activities involving reading or writing outside the classroom, a practice encouraged by classroom overemphasis on oral transactional language (Magnan, 2008b). However, by anchoring FL instruction in a multiliteracies approach and using integrated models such as global simulation, students’ confidence and curiosity about texts are primed earlier in the trajectory of language study, resulting in better preparation to adapt to the literate practices of host communities abroad.

Facilitating Relationships With the FL Community Through Telecollaboration

Study abroad participants often find it challenging to develop durable contacts with host community members. To address this challenge, long before study abroad it is essential to promote the notion that FL learning is a joint rather than individual enterprise; in other words, collaboration within a community of practice is critical. Incorporating participation in online digital communities that include members of the community where students may later study is one way to promote readiness and build confidence for such interactions.

A number of telecollaborative projects in which the online environment provides the field for experiential learning and the classroom serves as the context wherein guided reflection takes place have been the subject of research. In Zeiss and Isabelli-García (2005), U.S. students enrolled in an intermediate-level Spanish course participated in computer-mediated communication (CMC) exchanges with counterparts at a Mexican university, reading and responding to one another’s electronic bulletin board postings. As a result, students developed higher intercultural awareness about topics discussed and intercultural communicative competence. Von der Emde, Schneider, and Kötter (2001) described the use of synchronous exchange between American and German college students and demonstrated how a chat room facilitated students playing with language, discussing texts, conducting collaborative research projects, and building a sense of community.

Finally, Furstenberg’s (2010) Cultura project, an inquiry-based, semester-long endeavor, called on two groups of students—one composed of third-semester U.S. students of French and the other graduate students of technology in French—to “compare and analyze a large variety of digital textual and visual materials from their respective cultures and then exchange perspectives about these materials via online discussion forums to collaboratively gain a better understanding of their respective
cultures” (p. 330). Furstenberg noted that in Cultura, all pieces of the project were intimately connected with each other, which made the process akin to that which students may experience when they go abroad by allowing them to participate in an online community of practice.

In each of these projects, bringing students in contact with overseas peers to work together on projects has the potential to help them “cross the cultural bridge” (Zeiss & Isabelli-García, 2005, p. 164). Further, research has shown that students participating in telecollaborative exchange (Belz & Thorne, 2006; Guth & Marini-Maio, 2010; Kinginger, 2004) often develop friendships with overseas peers through the tasks in which they jointly engage. Unknown is whether these online friendships endure beyond the course in which they developed and, if they do last, their role in facilitating students’ development of social networks once abroad.

Closing the loop: What happens at home after study abroad?
Interventions that take place after study abroad are as important, if not more so, than those that occur prior to or during overseas sojourns. As Montrose (2002) noted:

What makes [experiential learning] an educational enterprise is not so much the activity in and of itself, but the analysis of the activity through personal reflection, discussion, writing, or projects that help the learner transition from the experience to integrated meaning and finally subsequent understanding. (p. 6)

Several publications (e.g., de Nooy & Hanna, 2003; Jackson, 2006; Kinginger, 2009b; Shively, 2010) have suggested interventions to help study abroad returnees reflect on their overseas experiences once back at home and maintain linguistic and cultural competence by staying in touch with host community members. Various means to achieve these goals include peer-to-peer mentoring between future and past study abroad participants, continued participation in online digital communities that include members of the host community, project exhibitions by returnees, and revisiting goals previously set for study abroad.

Furthermore, Mendelson (2004) noted that at an institutional level, several colleges and universities have prioritized reintegration efforts by including post-study abroad projects in their curricula (e.g., the Kalamazoo Project for Intercultural Communication; the University of Minnesota’s Maximizing Study Abroad project). In this way, the study abroad experience is not viewed as a separate experience from students’ long-term trajectories of learning but is more tightly woven into the larger undergraduate experience. Remaining to be explored by empirical research are the effects of reintegration interventions. In the future, empirical data that demonstrate the value of student participation in post-study abroad reintegration will be essential to garner institutional support for such efforts.

Overseas Interventions

Linking Classroom Learning and Language Contact in the Community
Although literature on the design of FL-oriented study abroad programs is scant, several publications offer suggestions for better integrating students into the host culture consistent with the Communities standard. Among them, Engle and Engle (1999) developed an experiential program that required 2 hours per week of conversation exchange and volunteer community service as well as student participation in a personal interest component, i.e., pursuit of a personal interest or hobby in the community. In addition, a 2-hour weekly meeting was devoted to reflection and analysis of these experiences. Unlike typical U.S. overseas programs, no group travel was offered, and attendance at program social gatherings was contingent on students bringing at least one local guest.
The authors reported that the deep level of engagement students had in the community translated into infrequent weekend travel and considerable growth in students’ FL competence and cultural learning. Thus, unlike what has been reported regarding infrequent contact with host community members by participants in many traditional study abroad programs, students’ engagement within their host community was a central focus of the program and their learning.

Less extensively documented but still deeply integrative, project-based study abroad activities have also been advocated. Knight and Schmidt-Rinehart (2010) devised a series of tasks to enhance communication between study abroad participants and their host families. Each week, participants received conversation tasks to discuss with host family members. In each, students first jotted down notes to help them complete the interview along with their own view on the topic and interview questions, then recorded the family’s point of view, and finally reflected on their ability to communicate with the family. Participants recognized the value of these tasks in building FL confidence and jumpstarting conversations with their hosts. In a second example, the overseas program examined by Vahlbusch (2003) included a project requiring participants’ community involvement. One task led students to learn about the environmental history of the German region where they were studying through searching library archives, meeting with citizens’ groups and environmentalists, and interviewing government officials and people from a local chemical factory. Students later presented their projects both orally and in writing. To summarize, such projects have the potential for increasing study abroad participants’ engagement with the host community, expanding their social networks beyond the U.S. peer group, and stimulating reflection through journal writing, class discussion, and post-program presentations on the home campus (Shively, 2010). Furthermore, with their emphasis on both language use beyond the classroom and developing new literacy practices, project-based activities address both Standard 5.1 and 5.2.

Service Learning and Internship Opportunities
Internships and service learning are other ways of integrating study abroad participants into the host community. For example, Vahlbusch (2003) explained that service learning “can offer [students] the sort of intimate involvement and investment in their communities abroad and in their target languages that few study-abroad programs can guarantee” (p. 2). In the German overseas program the author described, students undertook 30 hours of community service along with completing written and oral reflections on that experience. In addition, students had the option of extending their sojourn abroad by a month to intern in local businesses. In exit interviews, students indicated that “[T]heir understanding of everyday and professional life in Germany had deepened during the internship and that their German-language abilities had improved significantly during that time” (p. 3). In this regard, service learning and internships offer contexts for learning abroad in which the community functions as a primary site for learning rather than merely as a backdrop in which students socialize and explore on their own once released from formal classroom learning.

Making Purposeful Use of Online Communication
As explained previously, access to technology during study abroad allows participants to easily maintain ties to home and, in some cases, disengage from the host community. In light of this, some programs discourage or forbid e-mail and social media use for students abroad. However, Shively (2010) argued that “rather than discouraging technology use, [study abroad] programs would do better to harness … students’ interest in new technologies as a means to reengage them with language and culture at all stages.
of [study abroad]” (p. 106). As an example of how this might be done, Pertusa-Seva and Stewart (2000) implemented “virtual study abroad” connecting participants overseas with FL students on the home campus. Study abroad participants shared experiences by posting journal entries on a Web site, thus allowing at-home students to participate in the group’s life in and travels around the host country. At-home students commented on the journal entries, made observations using information gathered via Internet research, and asked questions about various aspects of their peers’ experiences abroad. Notable in this example of “virtual study abroad” are the use of the FL beyond the confines of the classroom for both the at-home and abroad students and the way in which technology facilitated a deeper understanding of the host community by both cohorts.

Training Students in Ethnographic Inquiry
Laubscher (1994) reported that for study abroad to result in increased understanding of the host culture and its communicative practices, students need decisive intervention, usually on the part of a key informant, to help them make sense of encounters abroad. Yet in the absence of an insider perspective, study abroad participants tend to “interpret new experience in the light of past experience” (Laubscher, 1994, p. 107). A possible course of action to counter this challenge involves training study abroad participants in ethnographic techniques, an effort successfully implemented in several studies (Jackson, 2006; Knight & Schmidt-Rinehart, 2010; Roberts, Byram, Barro, Jordan, & Street, 2001; Shively, 2010).

In such training, students are introduced to ethnography on the home campus, carry out an ethnographic project abroad, and reflect on the experience once back at home. Jackson (2006) described a program in the English department at the Chinese University of Hong Kong that aimed to prepare students for a 5-week study abroad stay in England by including a predeparture course on the principles and tools of ethnographic research. Once abroad, students were required to collect ethnographic data in the local community and complete a research project. After the program, students took part in a series of debriefing sessions on the project.

Ethnographic inquiry may be a particularly promising means of enhancing sojourns abroad and facilitating the Communities standard, given what Kinginger (2009b) called “the [remarkable] similarity between the goals and methods of an ethnographer and of a language learner abroad” (p. 46). In addition to providing a meaningful language learning experience beyond the classroom, ethnographic projects allow students to develop new insights into the host culture, to get involved in the host community, and to become increasingly flexible in their own thinking as their own value systems are challenged (Jackson, 2006; Jurasek, Lamson, & O’Malley, 1996). As Roberts et al. (2001) concluded in relation to a multiyear ethnographic training and study project, beyond linguistic gain, FL learners as ethnographers are engaged with the “otherness of their new environment [abroad] … as a whole social being who are developing, defining and being defined in terms of their interactions with other social beings” (p. 237). As such, the benefits of engaging in ethnographic inquiry are particularly consistent with the goals of Standard 5.2 in relation to the development of cultural understanding in relation to the host community abroad.

Discussion
The purpose of this article was to address two questions: (1) whether study abroad experiences facilitate the fulfillment of the Communities standard, and (2) how U.S. collegiate FL curricula can enhance learner participation in study abroad through closer integration of the Communities standard before, during, and after sojourns overseas. In response to the first question, we acknowledge both the possibility for study abroad to fulfill the Communities standard
as well as the shortcomings of today’s overseas programs for facilitating FL students’ meaningful participation in communities abroad, particularly in cases where sojourns are short and in programs where engagement with the host community is left to chance.

In response to the second question, we recognize the critical need for FL educators and their academic departments to consider how study abroad experiences are woven into the larger undergraduate FL curriculum and to advocate for best practices in student learning to facilitate the goals of the Communities standard before, during, and after study abroad. Whereas in some institutional contexts a high degree of integration exists between the at-home and abroad FL curricula, in other contexts such integration is nonexistent, leaving decisions regarding how and what students learn abroad in the hands of third parties. One hopes that the limitations of FL learning in the study abroad context relevant to the Communities standard outlined in this article instigate FL educators to take an active role in the design and implementation of the study abroad programs in which their students participate.

In reviewing published research on study abroad that relates to the Communities standard, we identified a number of areas that deserve further attention and empirical study. In reference to the goal of Standard 5.1, “students’ use of the language both within and beyond the school setting,” although this domain has already received its share of attention in the literature, further inquiry is needed. On the subject of language use within the school setting abroad, there have been few inquiries into how different types of programs and pedagogical approaches produce different qualities and types of linguistic and motivational benefits for study abroad participants. A further unexplored area is whether formal instruction abroad facilitates language use beyond the classroom. Although FL educators assume that participation in formal instruction abroad facilitates language use beyond the classroom and integration into host communities, there is little evidence that such a symbiotic relationship exists.

In relation to students’ language use beyond the school setting during study abroad, although homestay is assumed to provide greater opportunities for language use and access to host communities abroad, research findings remain inconclusive. It would be interesting to know how the makeup of the host family, number of students sharing the same native language per homestay family, and interaction patterns with homestay families affect learners’ language use in the host community. Finally, we know very little about the role of Web 2.0 technologies in facilitating or hindering language use and contact with host community members.

The goal of Standard 5.2, “students show evidence of becoming life-long learners by using the language for personal enjoyment and enrichment,” has received significantly less attention from study abroad researchers than Standard 5.1. Unfortunately, this trend seems to parallel results from the “A Decade of Foreign Language Standards” survey (ACTFL, 2011), which demonstrated that the Communities standard was given less emphasis than any other standard in instructors’ professional development, lesson planning, and instruction for the 1,299 K–16 respondents. This seems to represent a vicious circle, in which the Communities standard and, in particular, Standard 5.2, are undervalued by instructors, instructor trainers, and researchers, whereas as Magnan and Murphy’s (2009) survey demonstrated, the Communities standard is the one most valued by collegiate FL students. Should the role of the Communities standard continue to be downplayed in teaching, instructor training, and research, it begs the question as to whether the situation is not destined to repeat itself in the future, despite imperatives to educate for a global citizenry in the 21st century.

Given that existing studies related to Standard 5.2 have tended to use self-report
measures to document students’ language use abroad, future research should incorporate varied forms of data to document what types of FL resources students seek for personal enjoyment and enrichment and to identify the benefits of accessing those resources for cultural and linguistic learning. In general, explorations of how students develop new literacy practices abroad are lacking, and future research should delve deeper into the development of listening, reading, and writing competence and new media literacies. These areas are particularly relevant given the demonstrated limitations of students’ language use abroad and the need to find meaningful contexts for sustained language use with host community members.

Future empirical study related to Standard 5.2 and FL learning abroad should also take a longitudinal approach (e.g., Kinginger, 2004) in examining whether language use for personal enjoyment and enrichment is maintained after sojourns overseas and how such practices can be supported by at-home FL curricula. As Paige, et al. (2009) pointed out, the overwhelming focus of research on study abroad outcomes has been on immediate and short-term rather than near- and long-term impacts, seeming to suggest that “the benefits of study abroad are limited in scope or ‘expire’ after a short time” (p. 32). For this reason, it would be fruitful to pursue a new line of research focused on the consequences of study abroad participation for lifelong language-learning practices. Furthermore, such research would be well served to go beyond simple survey methods to describe and analyze portraits of lifelong language learners and their learning behaviors.

Finally, existing research on FL learning in the study abroad context has investigated various learning outcomes associated with programs of differing lengths or of study abroad versus at-home immersion contexts. In light of the focus of the Communities standard, “students participate[ing] in multilingual communities at home and around the world,” it would be valuable to compare learning outcomes associated with different types of experiences (e.g., study abroad versus at-home service learning and community-based learning) in which FL learning is closely tied to the development of cultural knowledge, intercultural understanding, and engagement in the global community. After all, given that only 14% of U.S students pursuing bachelor’s degrees study abroad during their undergraduate career, educators cannot assume that all FL students desire or are able to take part in a sojourn overseas (Institute of International Education, 2011, n.p.). Thus, better understanding the linguistic and cultural learning outcomes related to different at-home vs. overseas experiences would provide useful information for researchers, FL educators, and students themselves.

To conclude, as Glisan (1999) pointed out, the fundamental nature of the Communities standard is “built on the belief that knowledge of and experience with language, culture, and content help prepare an educated member of a society to function effectively with members of other communities” (p. 77). Although study abroad is a potentially fruitful context for realizing the Communities standard, we should not lose sight of the fact that, as Kinginger cautioned, study abroad “may serve either to raise students’ awareness of language learning as a serious, long-term and admirable accomplishment or it may turn students away from engagement in a pursuit deemed unnecessary” (2008, p. 62). In other words, study abroad does not automatically facilitate students’ becoming lifelong learners, a key element of the Communities standard. Ultimately, students’ readiness to participate in multilingual communities at home and around the world depends on their experiences using and learning the FL in our classrooms from the time that they begin their language learning journey. Thus, as FL educators, we should not discount the critical role we can play in shaping instruction to nurture students’ agency, cultivate their interest in information and
entertainment resources in the FL, and facilitate their participation in face-to-face and online communities composed of users of the FL.
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Note

1. Although the primary focus of this article is on traditional for-credit academic study abroad experiences, it is important to point out that such experiences do not represent the only avenue to facilitate meeting the Communities standard. Among the varied experiences beyond classroom FL learning and study abroad that have been explored in the literature are internships abroad, service and community learning (both at home and abroad), telecollaboration, and digital gaming.
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### Appendix A

Research on Study Abroad and the Communities Standard Categorized by Program Length and Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Program</th>
<th>Type of Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organized/run by U.S. university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen (2010a, 2010b, 2010c)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubillos, Chieffo, &amp; Fan (2008)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson (2006)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaplan (1989)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-length</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bataller (2010)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citron (2002)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collentine (2004)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freed, Segalowitz &amp; Dewey (2004)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freed, So, &amp; Lazar (2003)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurasek, Lamson, &amp; O'Malley (1996)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinginger (2008)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinginger, &amp; Farrell (2004)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnan, &amp; Back (2007)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paige, Cohen, &amp; Shively (2004)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shively (2010)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanaka (2007)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vahlbusch (2003)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewey (2007)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinginger (2004)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kline (1993, 1998)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regan, Howard, &amp; Lemée (2009)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siegal (1996)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-length</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engle &amp; Engle (1999)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight &amp; Schmidt-Rinehart (2010)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laubscher (1994)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendelson (2004)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller &amp; Ginsberg (1995)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pellegrino Aveni (2005)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers (1998)</td>
<td>![checkmark]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B

### Sample Curricular and Pedagogical Interventions to Meet the Communities Standard at Home and Overseas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 5.1: Students use the language both within and beyond the school setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>At-Home</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predeparture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goal is to...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- <strong>Focus on the development of the FL as context-specific rather than generalized and recognize the limitations of textbook language (Swaffar, 2006)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop students' sociolinguistic competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Create opportunities to build strategies on approaching FL learning (Paige, Cohen, &amp; Shively, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop students' pragmatic FL behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Analysis of language use outside the classroom (e.g., film clip, radio interview, chat room conventions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Incorporate participation in online digital communities (tandem partners, gaming communities, social networking sites) that include users of the FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Instructional conversations (Hall, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate students’ communicative development by engaging them in interactions as active interlocutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design instruction and assessment that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- incorporate choice (topic, task, linguistic modality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- require deliberate planning by the student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- include self-evaluation of FL use/ performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Promote the notion of language learning as a joint enterprise by incorporating participation in digital communities (Zeitz &amp; Ishelhi-Gora, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Bring cultural informants into the classroom via telecollaboration (Belé &amp; Thorne, 2006; Kinginger, 2004; Pernusa-Seva &amp; Stewart, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Build connections with FL users on campus, e.g., Office of International Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predeparture Interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Prioritize the development of students’ literacy from the start of the curriculum (Allen &amp; Paesani, 2010; Maxim, 2006; Kern, 2000) through project-based learning or global simulation (Dupuy, 2006; Kearney, 2008; Mills &amp; Péron, 2009)&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>