The Effects of Study Abroad and Classroom Contexts on the Acquisition of Spanish as a Second Language

From Research to Application

Barbara Lafford *Arizona State University*
Joseph Collentine *Northern Arizona University*

Study-abroad (SA) contexts have traditionally been assumed by language professionals, school administrators, and students (and their parents) to be the best environments in which to acquire a foreign language and understand its culture. In the United Kingdom the "year abroad" had its origin in the "grand tour" of Europe by aristocratic children of means, who spent time abroad to attain the level of cultural knowledge (of Western civilization) that their status required. For many years American university administrators and foreign language instructors believed that a "junior year abroad" experience living with host families from the target culture would help students broaden their cultural horizons and become "fluent" speakers of the target language (L2), with more improved L2 pronunciation, grammar (morphosyntactic) usage, vocabulary knowledge, and discursive abilities than those possessed by learners who acquired the target language in the classroom at home.[1]

These assumptions were substantiated by Carroll's (1967) widely cited study, which looked at the language skills of 2,782 college seniors who went abroad. Carroll found that even a short duration abroad (touring or summer) had a positive effect on foreign language (FL) proficiency. Today, study-abroad experiences are still encouraged in the United States, as evidenced by the fact that 160,920 students went abroad in 2003 (NAFSA 2003). Moreover, in the United Kingdom a study-abroad experience has been obligatory for language majors for the last thirty years.

Recently, assumptions about the benefits of an SA experience have been challenged by Meara (1994) and Coleman (1996), who noted weaknesses in SA research in the 1960s to 1980s. Freed (1995a) also noted methodological shortcomings of empirical studies on study abroad during the same period: small size (N) of informant pool or short duration of treatment period, the lack of a control group, and extensive use of only test scores to measure gains. More controlled empirical studies on the effects of the SA experience on the development of learners' interlanguage systems appeared in earnest in the 1990s. Freed (1995a, 1998) noted that most research carried out on SA data from several languages (French, Spanish, Russian, Japanese) still confirmed old assumptions about the benefit of study-abroad experiences on the SLA process; however, some "surprising results" also came out of this research, especially regarding the lack of gain on measures of grammatical competence in learners who had studied abroad (see Collentine and Freed 2004).

This chapter critically examines the research on the development of interlanguage systems of learners of Spanish as a second language (SSL) in study-abroad and class-

room ("at-home," or AH), contexts. Even though, as Freed has noted in various forums (1995a, 1998), it is generally assumed in educational circles that some sort of immersion setting—be it intensive domestic immersion (IDI) or study abroad—offers superior learning conditions over the domestic, at-home learning environment, the research on Spanish SLA to date has shown advantages for SA contexts on some measures (e.g., oral proficiency, fluency, pronunciation, lexical acquisition, narrative and discursive abilities) while finding that learners in AH contexts are either equal or superior to their SA counterparts in other areas (e.g., grammatical and pragmatic abilities).

In order to explore how the results of this research could be applied to the teaching of Spanish as a second/foreign language in SA and AH contexts and to the improvement of various aspects of study-abroad programs, we first review research that has been carried out on the acquisition of Spanish in study-abroad and classroom contexts and then comment on methodological factors that could affect and/or limit the generalizability of the findings of these studies. We conclude with thoughts about possible programmatic and classroom applications of this research and suggestions for future avenues of inquiry on this topic.

1.0 Review of SA Research

The study-abroad literature on the acquisition of Spanish is, in large part, reflective of the general findings on the efficacy of study abroad to date in the SLA literature (see Freed 1995a, 1998; Collentine and Freed 2004).[2] It is also reflective of this literature in terms of its methodological shortcomings. Collentine and Freed (2004), who examine the literature on SLA in study-abroad, intensive-domestic-immersion and at-home settings, surmise that, while the data presented to date are scant in comparison to the corpus available on SLA as a whole, learners studying abroad develop enhanced fluency, lexical abilities, and sociolinguistic awareness, but their grammatical development is slow to develop. Nonetheless, the findings in general show that the aspects of language learning that are traditionally the focus of research (e.g., lexical and grammatical development) are difficult to develop quickly in the study-abroad context (Collentine and Freed 2004).

This is interesting upon examination of the fact that, although the study-abroad data are scant, the "treatment periods" of such studies almost always qualify them as longitudinal studies (most are a semester long). This begs the question of whether study abroad is less beneficial than other learning contexts (in these traditionally studied realms) and/or whether the short-term learning conditions that are the focus of SLA research may not have the long-term effects that their results would suggest (see Norris and Ortega 2001). In other words, is SLA under any conditions a long, protracted process that progresses more in geological-like terms than during the course of a few "semesters"?

1.1 Research on the Effects of Spanish Study Abroad

The results discussed in this paper on empirical Spanish study abroad research were initially reported in sections 4.1–4.6 of Lafford (2006).

1.1.1 Global Oral Proficiency

Improvements in global oral proficiency (as measured by the Oral Proficiency Interview, or OPI) in AH and SA learners were investigated by Segalowitz and Freed (2004).[3] First a Mann-Whitney U test comparing OPI ratings of the two groups revealed no significant difference in the pretest scores (median rating for both groups was Intermediate-Low). However, the SA group showed significant improvement from the pretest to the posttest (n = 22; 12 students improved, 10 did not, $p < .001$), whereas the AH group showed no significant improvement (n = 18; 5 students improved, 13 did not; $p > .2$, *n.s.*). Students who did make gains only increased one level of proficiency (e.g., Intermediate-Low to Intermediate-Mid).

Studies without a control group have also noted global oral profiency gains abroad. For instance, Guntermann's (1992a, 1992b) studies of Peace Corps workers during their initial training and time abroad in Latin America showed that after four months of immersion, these learners had achieved an Intermediate-High ranking (on the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, or ACTFL, scale) on the OPI. After a year abroad, these workers had attained an Advanced/Advanced High rating.

It is important to note, nevertheless, that similar to Díaz-Campos (2004), Segalowitz and Freed (2004) emphasize that predicting success abroad is complex since not only does oral proficiency interact with development but also with cognitive abilities and with the amount of contact learners have with the target language.

1.1.2 Pronunciation

The development of phonetic and phonological abilities have been studied by Simões (1996), Stevens (2001), Díaz-Campos (2004), and Díaz-Campos (2006). In an acoustic analysis without a classroom control group, Simões (1996) found that learners improved their vowel quality during their five weeks abroad. Both Stevens (2001) and Díaz-Campos, Collentine, and Lazar (2004) report better phonological abilities in SA than in AH learners, yet Díaz-Campos (2004) was not able to completely confirm this finding. These results may be due, in part, to the fact that both Stevens (2001) and Díaz-Campos, Collentine, and Lazar (2004) used conversational data as part of their studies, whereas Díaz-Campos (2004) used only a reading task. However, Stevens (2001) and Díaz-Campos (2004) did find some advantage for the study-abroad group on the loss of aspiration with unvoiced stops.

Interestingly, in the Díaz-Campos, Collentine, and Lazar (2004) study, whether a student was abroad or at home, the number of years one had studied Spanish was the best predictor of phonological gains; this is even more robust of a predictor than the use of Spanish outside of the classroom (at least in the pronunciation of consonants).

1.1.3 Grammatical Abilities

Several studies examined the development of global grammatical abilities by looking at learners' progress via a variety of grammatical data points (SA vs. AH: DeKeyser 1986, 1990, 1991; Collentine 2004; SA alone: Guntermann 1992a, 1992b; Ryan and Lafford 1992; Lafford and Ryan 1995; Schell 2001; Isabelli 2001).

Some of the studies without a control group focused on examining the developmental stages of the acquisition of grammatical and lexical phenomena in learners' interlanguages during their time abroad. For instance, Schell (2001) examines the acquisition of the preterit/imperfect distinction by attempting to determine whether the (inherent) lexical aspect of a predicate affects an SA learner's choice of grammatical aspect (preterite or imperfect forms) (e.g., *romper* is a punctual verb and "tends" to occur in the preterit in the input that learners receive whereas statives such as *necesitar* are imperfective and appear often in the imperfect). Schell found that the lexical aspect hypothesis does not predict patterns of acquisition at the earliest developmental stages.[4]

Using SA data, Ryan and Lafford (1992) replicated VanPatten's (1987) classroom research on the order of acquisition of *ser* and *estar* vis-à-vis various syntactic collocations (e.g., conditional adjectives, present participles) and found basically the same order of acquisition as did VanPatten (1987) for the copulas *ser* and *estar*. However, unlike the classroom learners in VanPatten (1987), the SA learners in Ryan and Lafford's (1992) study experienced an extended period of zero copula and in conditional adjective contexts they tended to use the more unmarked form *ser* (e.g., *Mi hermana *es enferma hoy*).

Studies also investigated grammatical progress in the interlanguage of SA learners during their time abroad. For example, Guntermann (1992a, 1992b) concentrated on the benefits of the Peace Corps experience, showing that these learners improved significantly on their copula (*ser/estar*) and prepositional abilities (i.e., *por/para*). Lafford and Ryan (1995) also found evidence for the improvement of the use of the prepositions *por/para* in various linguistic contexts by learners in an SA context.

In addition, Isabelli (2001) studied the progress of five L2 intermediate learners of Spanish over a twenty-week period in an SA setting. Data on the learners was gathered through the use of OPI and SOPI (Simulated Oral Proficiency Interview) exams administered as pretests and posttests. The results showed improvement in the grammatical abilities of these learners over the five-month period abroad. However, since none of the aforementioned studies of global grammatical studies contained an AH control group, one can draw few generalizations from their findings.

In fact, in studies in which an AH control group was used, the positive effects of an SA context on grammatical development found in the studies without a control group are called into question. For instance, DeKeyser (1986, 1990, 1991) found that residence abroad had little impact on the development of overall grammatical abilities and that SA learners were equal to or inferior to their AH counterparts in their use of grammar. Collentine (2004) gauged study-abroad learners' acquisition of a variety of morphosyntactic features, showing that they do not make as much progress as AH learners on precisely those grammatical aspects that Spanish formal instruction emphasizes, namely, verbs and subordinate conjunctions (which are treated with some degree of detail when attention turns to the subjunctive; cf. Collentine 2003).

Four research studies on Spanish acquired in an SA context have examined the acquisition of syntax and morphosyntax (López-Ortega 2003; Torres 2003; Isabelli 2004; Isabelli and Nishida 2005).

López-Ortega (2003) studied SA learners' acquisition of the Spanish subject pronouns (for instance, null subjects vs. overt pronominal subjects). She found that while intermediate level learners acquire nativelike behaviors in general (e.g., proper use of null subjects), discourse factors such as speaker's identity and topic involvement, semantic features of the referents, interlinguistic narrative structures, type of verb, and conjunctions/adverbials also influence the presence or absence of a null subject.

Isabelli (2004) also studied the acquisition of Spanish null subjects by SA learners by examining the structural effects/ramifications of the null subject parameter. With this in mind she found that learners do exhibit nativelike null-subject behaviors as well as subject-verb inversions in embedded clauses (e.g., *Creen que vienen los muchachos mañana* 'They believe that the boys are coming tomorrow'). Even advanced learners do not, however, evidence more sophisticated behaviors, such as recognizing that "that-trace" effects are treated differently in Spanish (e.g., **¿Quién dice el FBI asesinó al presidente?* 'Who says the FBI assassinated the president?').

Torres (2003) examined the development of clitic accuracy, finding that study abroad does not appear to be more beneficial than classroom learning. In the initial stages, study-abroad learners use much ellipsis and formulaic dative experiencers. Afterward, learners tend to assign the preverbal position only to first person because third-person clitics are multifunctional, that is, the same clitic can refer to several different people in different roles (e.g., *le* can refer to second-person [*Ud.*] or third-person [*él, ella*] indirect or direct [in Spain] objects) and lack the one-to-one correspondence between referent and linguistic sign present in the first-person clitic "me" (only refers to the speaker).

Finally, Isabelli and Nishida (2005) studied the acquisition of the Spanish subjunctive in complement clauses by both study-abroad and classroom advanced learners. In comparing the two groups, they found that the at-home students did not progress noticeably either in their subjunctive abilities or in their abilities to produce complex syntax over the course of nine months, whereas the study-abroad group did.

In sum, these studies indicate that the appreciable development of general grammatical abilities and morphosyntax is not robust, at least within the timeframe of a semester to a year abroad. Indeed, two of these studies (DeKeyser 1986; Collentine 2004) suggest that the at-home experience affords certain advantages as regard overall grammatical development for intermediate learners. The notable exception is Isabelli and Nishida's (2005) study, which revealed a significant advantage for study abroad with respect to subjunctive development. However, the fact that Isabelli and Nishida (2005) used subjunctive data from Advanced learners with more developed syntactic abilities (rather than from Intermediate learners, who may still be at the presyntactic stage; see Collentine 1995) may account in part for these findings.

1.1.4 Pragmatic and Communicative Abilities

Four studies concentrated on the development of pragmatic and communicative abilities abroad (DeKeyser 1991; Lafford 1995; Rodríguez 2001; Lafford 2004). The use of

communication strategies by learners in both SA and AH contexts was investigated by DeKeyser (1991), who found no statistically significant difference in the number and type of CSs in the two groups for the picture description and interview tasks. DeKeyser admits that the small sample size (SA = 7; AH = 5) could have contributed to these results.

Lafford (1995, 2004) examined the effects of SA contexts on learners' use of communication strategies, or conscious learner strategies that bridge a perceived communication gap from a lack of L2 knowledge, performance problems, or interactional problems. In both studies she presents data indicating that communication strategies may become less important to learners as they gain greater access to opportunities to use the L2 for communicative purposes. Interestingly, her research suggests that the AH experience promotes significantly more extensive use of these strategies due to the fact that pragmatic constraints presented by the SA environment may discourage their use (see Lafford 2004, 2006). In the 1995 study, Lafford found that SA learners possessed a wider range of conversational management strategies than the AH group. Rodríguez (2001) tracked the development of learners' pragmatic abilities to recognize and use request formulas, such as negative interrogatives (e.g., *¿No puedes traerme un vaso de agua?* 'Could you bring me a glass of water?'), finding no advantage for the study-abroad group over classroom learners.

1.1.5 Narrative Abilities

What is notable about the study of narrative abilities is that we find evidence that phenomena on which the typical classroom (be it at home or abroad) places little or no organized emphasis (i.e., an ad hoc process at best) do indeed develop nicely abroad. To be sure, Isabelli (2001) (no control group) and Collentine (2004) (SA vs. AH groups) both present evidence that students' narrative abilities develop significantly in an abroad context. Collentine (2004) demonstrated that the narrative abilities of SA learners surpassed those of AH learners. The suggestion here is, as Collentine and Freed (2004) note, that what is important to the typical second language syllabus may not be so important to the learner abroad (or at least in the same proportion). For instance, while vocabulary is an important aspect of any curriculum, there is really no systematic treatment or guidance for teaching it in materials for classroom teachers; the same can be said about the (perhaps) nebulous realms of fluency and sociolinguistics.

1.1.6 Lexical Development

DeKeyser (1986) showed increases in vocabulary development by learners in a study-abroad context. Nevertheless, Collentine (2004) presents scaled data (normed over 1,000 words) that suggests that the SA experience does not promote significantly higher levels of acquisition of semantically dense words (such as nouns and adjectives) than those found in the classroom group. Indeed, the two groups only differed significantly in their use of adjectives (the AH group produced proportionally more unique adjectives than the SA group after the treatment). When he used nonscaled

data, Collentine (2004) showed that the SA group generated many more semantically dense utterances. This may be partially due to the fact that the SA students were more fluent (produced more words per syntactic unit at a greater speed with fewer pauses) than the classroom group.

Ife, Vives Boix, and Meara (2000) found that learners who stayed abroad for an entire academic year improved their vocabulary abilities more than those who only stayed for one semester. In addition, this study found that intermediate learners improved their acquisition of discrete vocabulary items while advanced learners enhanced their ability to make meaningful associations among Spanish words.

1.1.7 Fluency

De Keyser (1986), C. L. Isabelli (2001), and Segalowitz and Freed (2004) demonstrate that the most powerful advantage that the study abroad experience provides students is improvement in their L2 fluency (e.g., words per syntactic unit, speed, segments without pauses/hesitations).

1.1.8 Sociolinguistic Variables

What are wholly understudied in SA-versus-AH Spanish contexts are sociolinguistic variables. The only study in this regard is Talburt and Stewart (1999), and their data begs one to wonder whether the observed lack of overall advantage for the study-abroad experience is due to the day-to-day interpersonal experiences that various individual students have. They present a compelling case that affective variables abroad, such as race and gender issues that students may experience, can have deleterious effects on acquisition. As Kramsch (2000) and Collentine and Freed (2004) note, when the context of learning is expanded beyond the typical classroom, there may be unexpected results. Most likely this is due to the fact that immersed settings often show the student that what was on the radar screen of the teacher/student in the typical classroom (e.g., grammatical accuracy) is not the same as what comes on the learner's radar screen when the learner is confronted with the interpersonal dynamics of the target culture (e.g., pragmatic constraints on the use of language) (cf. Lafford 2004, 2006).

1.1.9 Cognitive Abilities

Another area that needs future research attention is the role that working memory plays in the development of interlanguages in SA and AH contexts. According to Harrington and Sawyer (1990), working memory is the space where learners process and store input in real time. As learners advance and automatize some processes, more space is freed up for controlled processing and conversion of new input forms (even redundant grammatical forms with low communicative value) into intake and for storage of these new forms, which are then available for integration into the learner's interlanguage system. One study that has begun to look at this issue in SA contexts is Lord (2006). The results of her research show increased working memory capacity (as measured by their ability to imitate L2 strings) in SA Spanish learners who participated in a summer study-abroad program.

1.2 Methodological and Experimental Design Issues

It may be interesting to note that the majority of the studies reviewed above have been authored quite recently (1999–2004). This is not unusual, since the importance of study abroad only came into its own right upon the publication of Freed's 1995 initial, comprehensive volume on the "state of the art" in this field of research. Most new fields of study emerge from small, loosely controlled, and exploratory studies.

In the following section, we critique the methodologies and the experimental design of the studies reviewed above with the goal of providing future researchers with important "lessons learned" so that the internal and external validity of study-abroad research might improve. All in all, sweeping generalizations stemming from this research must be tempered by the fact that certain design features of these studies could be greatly improved (e.g., experimental controls on the specific types of learning conditions and their contextualization and the ecological validity of the testing instruments).[5]

Future researchers will do well to consider the following factors concerning experimental controls on learning contextualization and conditions: duration and seat hours, type of instruction, living conditions, treatment design, sample (types and size), testing instruments, and preexperimental proficiency levels.

1.2.1 Duration and Seat Hours

More than half of the studies examined study-abroad gains during the course of one semester, approximately sixteen weeks (DeKeyser 1986, 1990, 1991; Rodríguez 2001; Schell 2001; Stevens 2001; Ryan and Lafford 1992; Lafford and Ryan 1995; Torres 2003; López-Ortega 2003; Segalowitz and Freed 2004; Lafford 2004; Díaz-Campos 2004; Díaz-Campos, Collentine, and Lazar 2004; Collentine 2004). All things considered, a semester is a sizable amount of time for a treatment period within the field of SLA. Five studies went beyond the typical semester time period (Guntermann 1995; Ife, Vives Boix, and Meara 2000; Isabelli 2001; Isabelli 2004; Isabelli and Nishida 2005), and four studies (Simões 1996; Talburt and Stewart 1999; Hokanson 2000; Lord 2004) used subjects on short-duration (five- to seven-week) programs.

Ife, Vives Boix, and Meara (2000) on vocabulary acquisition by SA learners was the only study that systematically investigated the effect of more time spent abroad (two vs. one semester).[6] In addition, the only comparative study that showed better grammatical (subjunctive) abilities in SA over AH learners was Isabelli and Nishida (2005), whose advanced subjects stayed in-country for nine months instead of just a semester (the usual treatment period for SA vs. AH grammatical studies). Clearly, more comparative studies of programs of differing lengths are called for in order to understand the effect of the duration of the SA program on SLA development.

The varying length of the SA programs in these studies makes more difficult the comparison and generalizability of their results. Considering the fact that there is a documented trend toward shorter programs abroad, as evidenced in the open doors report from NAFSA (2003), research on what learners can (or cannot) accomplish in short-term programs is valuable to SLA researchers, pedagogues, and program administrators alike.

In general, students in all of the studies are enrolled in university courses, taking a combination of "language" courses and direct enrollment (e.g., business, anthropology, sociology) courses. The seat hours, which are not always reported nor in a consistent format, appear to emulate American university "full loads" (twelve to fifteen contact hours per week).

1.2.2 Type of Instruction

The lack of information on the type of instruction that takes place in the SA contexts constitutes the weakest aspect of the study of study-abroad research. For the most part, researchers have not examined the effects of different types of teaching methodologies on acquisition abroad; this is an area ripe for future research. As Huebner (1998) noted, very little is known about the type of language instruction taking place in SA language and content-based (literature, history, art) classrooms (e.g., course design features such as syllabus and resources, focus on form vs. focus on meaning, type of oral and written feedback provided by instructor, pragmatics, and type of evaluation). Consequently, the effects of different types of instruction on student outcomes and the various types of input and feedback provided to students in both AH and SA contexts need to be investigated.

In addition, Brecht and Robinson (1995) showed that some SA learners try to apply what they learn in class; others do not see a connection between what they are taught in class and the reality of the target culture. This condition makes it difficult to judge the effect that such instruction has on the development of learners' interlanguage systems in SA contexts.

1.2.3 Living Conditions

With the exception of C. L. Isabelli (2001), C. A. Isabelli (2004), and Isabelli and Nishida (2005), study-abroad learners in these studies have lived with host families. Researchers such as Díaz-Campos (2004), Lazar (2004), and Segalowitz and Freed (2004) observe that the actual amount of time that learners spend with their host families varies in quantity and quality, and these interactions have an appreciable effect on acquisition in general.[7]

Lafford (2004) found a significant negative correlation between the amount of time spent talking with host families and the use of communication strategies to bridge communication gaps. Similar to the above observations on type of instruction, the host family as a standard "methodological" modus operandi of the study-abroad condition deserves closer attention in the future.

1.2.4 Treatment Design

Most of the studies employed a pretest-posttest design (DeKeyser 1986, 1990, 1991; Ryan and Lafford 1992; Guntermann 1995; Lafford and Ryan 1995; Simões 1996; Hokanson 2000; Ife, Vives Boix, and Meara 2000; Rodríguez 2001; Isabelli 2001; Stevens 2001; López-Ortega 2003; Torres 2003; Isabelli 2004; Collentine 2004; Díaz-Campos 2004; Lafford 2004; Segalowitz and Freed 2004; Lord 2004). However, no studies were carried out that contained several posttests over the

course of several months or years. Freed (1998) contends that future research would need to gather this type of data in order to study the long-term effects of an SA experience.

Only about half of these studies (DeKeyser 1986, 1990, 1991; Lafford 1995; Rodríguez 2001; Stevens 2001; Torres 2003; Díaz-Campos 2004; Díaz-Campos, Collentine, and Lazar 2004; Collentine 2004; Lafford 2004; Segalowitz and Freed 2004; Isabelli and Nishida 2005) contrasted study-abroad findings to a comparable AH group using a quasi-experimental design. Therefore, for those studies lacking an AH control group it is difficult to contribute any observable gains (or lack thereof) to the learning condition(s) of the SA experience itself. At best, the SA investigations lacking an AH group (see table 6.1) comment on the learning that takes place while students "happen to be abroad"; these studies cannot comment on the uniqueness of the SA experience from an experimental design perspective. Indeed, to qualify study abroad as a unique experience implies that it is not the same as (and it is usually assumed to be more beneficial than) the typical classroom experience. Thus studies examining SA's effects in isolation lack an important contextualization for SLA research as a whole.

1.2.5 Sample

All of the Spanish L2 study-abroad and comparative SA-versus-AH studies carried out to date used subjects whose native language was English. It is quite possible that the use of subjects with other L1s (primary languages) would have resulted in different learner outcomes.

Regarding group size, the studies that had no AH group tended to use small samples (fewer than 10 informants) and qualify more as case studies than the quasi-experimental designs typical of many of the SA-versus-AH studies. The notable exceptions here are Hokanson (2000) (N = 27); Ife, Vives Boix, and Meara (2000) (N = 36); Isabelli (2004) (N = 31), Lord (2004) (N = 22) and Ryan and Lafford (1992) (N = 16).[8] Most (eight out of thirteen) of the studies employing both SA and AH groups were rather robust in size as SLA research goes, with 11 to 32 participants in the AH condition and 11 to 29 in the SA group.

A consideration for future researchers is that, as Mellow, Reeder, and Forster (1996) note, SLA research using small samples would achieve much greater validity (and statistical power) with repeated sampling "bootstrapping" techniques, such as time series experimental designs, as opposed to the typical pretest-posttest comparison.[9] This seems an especially critical consideration given that there appear to be a variety of unforeseen factors that influence study-abroad results.

1.2.6 Testing Instruments

For the most part, the testing procedures for about one-third of the studies reflect those employed in SLA research today (DeKeyser 1986, 1990, 1991; Hokanson 2000; Ife, Vives Boix, and Meara 2000; Schell 2001; Stevens 2001; Isabelli 2004; Díaz-Campos 2004; Segalowitz and Freed 2004; Lord 2004; Isabelli and Nishida 2005),

Table 6.1 Spanish study abroad research

SA vs. AH	Number of Subjects	Duration	Instrument	Preexperimental Level	Results
Collentine (2004)	AH = 20; SA = 26	16 weeks	OPI	3rd semester	SA > AH narrative abilities and lexical density; SA = AH or AH > SA in grammar abilities
DeKeyser (1986)	AH = 5; SA = 7	16 weeks	Grammar test; interview; picture description; recall	Intermediate SA > AH in fluency	SA = AH in grammar and CS;
DeKeyser (1990)	AH = 5; SA = 7	16 weeks	Grammar test; interview; picture description; recall	Intermediate	SA = AH monitoring grammar
DeKeyser (1991)	AH = 5; SA = 7	16 weeks	Grammar test; interview; picture description; recall	Intermediate	SA = AH in grammar and CS
Díaz-Campos (2004)	AH = 20; SA = 26	16 weeks	OPI	3rd. semester	SA = AH in pronunciation (reading task)
Díaz-Campos (2006)	AH = 20; SA = 26	16 weeks	OPI	3rd semester	SA > AH in pronunciation (conversational task)
Isabelli and Nishida (2005)	AH = 32; SA = 29	9 months	SOPI; questions involving hypothesizing, beliefs, etc.	3rd year	SA > AH in grammar (subjunctive)
Lafford (1995)	AH = 13; SA = 28	N/A	OPI (at end of 4th semester)	N/A	SA > AH in repertoire of CS and conversational management strategies
Lafford (2004, 2006)	AH = 20; SA = 26	16 weeks	OPI	3rd semester	SA < AH in frequency of CS use
Rodríguez (2001)	AH = 11; SA = 11	16 weeks	Judgment task; recall	1st or 2nd year	SA = AH in pragmatics (perception of requests); both groups improved over time
Segalowitz and and Freed (2004)	AH = 18; SA = 22	16 weeks	OPI; various cognitive	3rd semester	SA > AH in fluency and proficiency level
Stevens (2001)	AH = 13; SA = 9	16 weeks, 7 weeks	Reading task and storytelling task	1st or 2nd year	SA > AH in pronunciation
Torres (2003)	AH = 5; SA = 10	16 weeks	OPI	Intermediate	SA = AH in use of clitics
SA (no control group)					
Isabelli (2004)	SA = 31	1 year	GJ & oral interview	Intermediate	Learners improved null-subject behaviors and subject-verb inversions in embedded clauses
Isabelli (2001)	SA = 5	20 weeks	OPI; SOPI	Intermediate	Learners improved in fluency and ingrammatical abilities
Guntermann (1992a, 1992b)	SA = 9	1 year, 12 weeks	OPI	Novice	Learners improved in overall proficiency and in use of copulas and *por/para*
Ife, Vives Boix, and Meara (2000)	SA = 36	1 and 2 semesters	Vocabulary and translation tests	Intermediate = 21 Advanced = 15	Learners with more time abroad improved more in vocabulary abilities; both groups improved = Intermediate: discrete items; Advanced: vocabulary associations
Lafford and Ryan (1995)	SA = 9	16 weeks	OPI	Novice	Examined stages of *por/para*

(continued on next page)

Table 6.1 *(continued)*

	Number of Subjects	Duration	Instrument	Preexperimental Level	Results
López Ortega (2003)	SA = 4	16 weeks	OPI	4th semester	Learners acquire proper use of null subjects; discourse factors at play
Lord (2006)	SA = 22	7 weeks	Mimicry test	3rd year	Learners improved ability to imitate longer strings of L2
Ryan and Lafford (1992)	SA = 16	16 weeks	OPI	Novice	Examined stages of *ser/estar*
Schell (2001)	SA = 5	16 weeks	Cloze-like tests (with infinitive prompts)	2nd year at university and 3rd year at university	Found evidence against lexical aspect hypothesis in early developmental stages
Simões (1996)	SA = 5	5 weeks	OPI	Intermediate Low to Advanced	Learners improved pronunciation abroad
Talburt and Stewart (1999)	SA = 6	5 weeks	Ethnographic interviews	4th semester	Affective variables (race and gender issues) that students experience can have deleterious effects on acquisition

entailing grammaticality judgments, translations, cloze tests, picture description, recall tasks, reading tasks, storytelling, vocabulary tests, domain specific production/recognition tests (e.g., mimicry tasks [for working memory], a read-aloud task), tests of various cognitive measures, measures of cognitive syle preferences; standardized tests of listening and reading (American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese National Exam–Level II), discrete point grammar exams, short essays, ethnographic interviews, and observations of students' oral performance and behavior. The great variety of instruments used by various investigators in this body of research makes it difficult to compare results across studies.

Half of the research to date has depended on the OPI interview as either a database for a corpus study of sorts or a measure of proficiency level (to gauge improvement). Most of the OPI studies were corpus-based to one extent or another, in which the researchers used the transcribed interview data as a source for linguistic analysis of more specific phenomena (e.g., grammar, fluency). Thus even though a large number of these studies depend on the OPI interview as their most important data-collection instrument, the OPI scale (Novice to Advanced) is a measure of global proficiency and is not fine-grained enough to measure progress on specific items within a semester's time or to measure gains by advanced learners In addition, the OPI interview format does not allow for natural interaction between interlocutors (e.g., the interviewer is not permitted to provide direct help to learner), so that generalizations about learner interactions and linguistic behavior must be restricted to interview settings.

In order to understand factors that affect the dynamics of interlanguage production, there need to be more studies that utilize qualitative methods of data analysis, such as ethnographic interviews and recall protocols; examples of studies that have implemented these assessment measures include DeKeyser (1986, 1990, 1991), Talburt and Stewart (1999), and Rodríguez (2001).

1.2.7 Preexperimental Proficiency Levels

The results of various Spanish SA studies are hard to compare since preexperimental proficiency levels vary among studies (Novice to Advanced on the ACTFL scale). All in all, subjects range from first year to fourth before their sojourn abroad; yet when there was a comparable AH treatment group, the experiments tended to examine learners at the Novice or Intermediate level in their first or second year of university study of Spanish (DeKeyser 1986, 1990, 1991; Lafford 1995; Rodríguez 2001; Stevens 2001; Torres 2003; Díaz-Campos 2004; Díaz-Campos, Collentine, and Lazar 2004; Collentine 2004; Lafford 2004; Segalowitz and Freed 2004). This fact limits the generalizability of the results of these comparative SA–AH studies and does not permit scholars to extend these conclusions to studies of advanced learners.

Ife, Vives Boix, and Meara (2000) found that preexperimental proficiency levels may affect vocabulary acquisition. The authors show that both intermediate and advanced groups improve equally in SA contexts; however, more gains are made in associative vocabulary knowledge by advanced learners and more gains in discrete items are seen in intermediate learners. Lantolf (1999) suggests that L2 conceptual restructuring toward native speaker (NS) norms only takes place after extended periods abroad.

The research of Isabelli and Nishida (2005) also suggests that preexperimental proficiency levels may affect grammatical acquisition. These authors showed that Advanced learners who studied abroad possessed better grammatical (subjunctive) abilities than AH learners at the same level. This contradicts all other SA-versus-AH grammatical studies using Novice-Intermediate subjects, which found classroom learners to be equal or superior to SA learners in grammatical abilities.

2.0 Discussion

The preceding critical analysis of the research done to date on the acquisition of Spanish in SA and AH environments opens several avenues of fruitful discussion and thoughts about the need for future research in certain areas. Factors that seem to have significant effects on the development of learners' interlanguage in SA contexts include the length of the SA program, the living conditions abroad, and the preproficiency level of the students. The only study discussed above that compared student outcomes from programs of different lengths (Ife, Vives Boix, and Meara 2000) found that both Intermediate and Advanced learners who spent two semesters abroad improved in vocabulary abilities more than those that only stayed for one semester. What is needed is more research on progress in several areas (pronunciation, morphosyntax, lexical development, and pragmatics, for instance) among similar groups of students who go abroad to the same destination under the same living conditions, but for various lengths of time.

It is important to note that the average time spent on study-abroad programs has been steadily reduced during the last century; what was the original "junior year abroad" is now normally the "semester abroad," with summer programs gaining in popularity. This trend toward shorter SA programs, especially in the last two decades, may be due to several factors: learners' financial considerations, increasing general studies

requirements, the rise in popularity of professional programs that do not encourage study abroad, equivalencies issues, and the financial benefit of short-term programs.

Despite the surface attractiveness of shorter programs abroad for students and their educational institutions, Lantolf (1999) has suggested that in order for foreign/second language students to structure their L2 interlanguage system along NS lines (see Furstenberg et al. 2001), they need to spend extended periods abroad in the target culture. As mentioned earlier, Ife, Vives Boix, and Meara (2001) found more examples of nativelike lexical restructuring by advanced students abroad than by their intermediate SA counterparts, suggesting that daily exposure to the perspectives, practices, and products of the target culture allow more advanced students to restructure their cognitive associations (lexical schemata) as native speakers do; consequently, these students begin to "think like a native" and even dream in the target language, especially after spending at least a semester or year abroad.

Since most of the SA studies reviewed above used data collected from semester-long programs, little is known about the developmental effects of year-long or short-term SA programs. Until data are gathered from learners from SA programs of differing lengths, the effects of various types of SA experiences on Spanish L2 learners cannot truly be understood or appreciated.

Learners' living conditions abroad may also prove to be a crucial factor in the development of their interlanguage systems. Most of the students in the aforementioned studies lived with host families during their time abroad. Díaz-Campos (2004), Lazar (2004), and Segalowitz and Freed (2004) found that although the actual amount of time learners spend in conversation with their host families varies in quantity and quality, these interactions were found to have a positive effect on acquisition in general. Lafford (2004) also found a significant negative correlation between the amount of time spent talking with host families and the use of communication strategies to bridge communication gaps.

In light of the Wilkinson (2002) study of SA learners of French, in which she notes a great deal of variation in the qualitative interaction taking place among learners and their host families, similar research needs to be carried out on learners of Spanish in SA contexts in order to understand the dynamics behind this factor on interlanguage development. Research such as that carried out by Brecht, Davidson, and Ginsberg (1995) on the effects of homestays versus other environments in Russia should be undertaken on Spanish SA learners. These findings would provide more insight into the types of interactions that promote the attainment of a higher level of target-language proficiency abroad.

Another important factor affecting student outcomes on Spanish SA programs is the predeparture proficiency level of the subjects. As mentioned earlier, although proficiency levels in Spanish SA studies varied widely (from Novice to Advanced) over the entire array of investigations (table 6.1), most of the comparative SA–AH Spanish studies used data from intermediate learners. These studies showed that Intermediate classroom (AH) learners evidence grammatical abilities equal to or superior to their SA counterparts. Although grammatical L2 data from Advanced Spanish SA and AH learners was

not extensively gathered or studied, the one study that did find a grammatical advantage for SA learners (Isabelli and Nashida 2005) was based on data from Advanced speakers. The question then arises: Is there a threshold level of grammatical or cognitive abilities that facilitates second language acquisition in a study-abroad context?

The need of a threshold level of grammatical competence before going abroad was first addressed by the pioneering work of Brecht, Davidson, and Ginsberg (1995), who studied the effects of SA contexts on the acquisition of Russian and found that grammatical and reading scores were the best predictors of proficiency gains in the SA context. In addition, the idea of a cognitive threshold for effective SLA was proposed by Segalowitz and Freed (2004) and Segalowitz et al. (2004). These studies of Spanish L2 learners found that an initial threshold level of basic word recognition and lexical access processing abilities may be necessary for oral proficiency and fluency to develop. Moreover, Hulstijn and Bossers (1992) found that more advanced learners have developed a larger working memory capacity, due in part to their having automatized a great deal of lexical retrieval. This capacity to retain material can prove to be a valuable resource in the acquisition process that allows learners to process longer segments of input and hold longer strings in their heads for incipient output (Payne and Whitney 2002).

Thus, intermediate learners who lack a well-developed lexical and grammatical base may also have less working memory capacity with which to process both content and grammatical form. These learners, having more of a burden placed on their phonological loop (Levelt 1989), are unable to hold long strings of new input or output in working memory, and so less information (input) can be converted to intake. Out of frustration caused by their limited working memory capacity, and perhaps other pragmatic factors (see Lafford 2004, 2006), these intermediate learners in an SA environment may choose to focus on meaning over form and, therefore, may neglect to work on acquiring redundant target language grammatical markers (which do not contain as much communicative value in the input). According to VanPatten's (1996) principles for input processing, learners process input for meaning before form and forms with low communicative value are processed only after the learner's processing of the input for comprehension has been automatized and has left space in working memory to process redundant grammatical markers. Therefore, more advanced SA learners, who possess a better cognitive, lexical, and grammatical base (threshold), may not experience this type of frustration when having to attend to new forms and meanings at the same time, since they have more cognitive resources to focus on and acquire redundant grammatical markers.

Thus we could tentatively propose a kind of "threshold hypothesis" for students studying abroad: those students with a well-developed cognitive, lexical, and grammatical base will be more able to process and produce grammatical forms more accurately after their experience in an SA context.[10] This hypothesis would help explain why Isabelli and Nishida's (2005) study found positive results for grammatical (subjunctive) improvement among Advanced learners while SA–AH studies using data from Intermediate learners did not find such an advantage for the SA group.

As a result of the relative lack of data on more advanced learners and comparative intermediate-advanced level studies, the results of the SA–AH Spanish studies cannot be generalized to all learners in these two contexts. Thus, Freed's (1995a) questions regarding the efficacy of study abroad experiences for beginning and intermediate (not advanced) learners cannot be answered without testing the "threshold hypothesis" test with further comparative SA–AH studies on learners at different pre-experimental levels of proficiency.

In addition to the aforementioned suggestions for directions for future research, scholars should also investigate the potential effects of other factors on student outcomes abroad: learners' type of home institution (large public vs. small private school), demographic profile, native language, prior experience abroad, individual factors (e.g., personality, learning styles), field of study, and the type of instruction s/he received in the SA setting.

Furthermore, despite the attention given to case studies of individual differences in SA studies involving learners of other languages (e.g., Russian [Brecht and Robinson 1995; Pellegrino 1997), Japanese [Siegal 1995; Marriot 1995; Dewey 2002], and French [Regan 1995; Freed 1995b; Wilkinson 1998, 2002]), only DeKeyser (1986, 1990, 1991) investigated the contribution of those differences to Spanish L2 learner outcomes in SA or SA versus AH environments. In addition, Hokanson (2000) showed that learners gravitated toward activities associated with their cognitive style (extroverts, for example, sought out communicative interaction with NSs). Interestingly, similar oral and written gains were found among students with different cognitive styles (extroverts vs. introverts, intuitives, and sensers). Hokanson proposes that the flexibility of the study abroad program that encouraged students to participate in activities of their own choice outside the SA classroom may explain the lack of difference in gains by students with different cognitive styles.

Thus, in order to investigate the effects of a SA or AH context on different types of Spanish learners, future qualitative and quantitative research should take individual factors (e.g., personality, cognitive styles, learning styles) and differences among learners into account. In addition to standardized tests to evaluate personality, learning styles, language learning strategies, and motivation, the use of attitude and demographic questionnaires, retrospective protocols, and participant observation notes would prove to be valuable instruments for gathering data on individual differences among learners.[11]

Finally, in order to get an in-depth understanding of the linguistic progress learners make in SA and AH environments, the types of instruments used to gauge linguistic abilities in SA and AH contexts also need to be reassessed. The reevaluation of the instruments used in Spanish SA–AH studies also needs to take into account what constitutes communicative "success" in classroom and study-abroad contexts. In other words, should we be measuring the same type of linguistic development in both contexts, or should we recognize that the types of improvement that SA learners make at different levels of proficiency abroad may differ from the types of gains normally

seen in classroom contexts during the same period of time? As Collentine and Freed (2004) point out, what is on the "radar screen" of most classroom students and instructors (e.g., focus on grammatical forms) is often not given as much importance by learners in their daily communication in SA contexts.

In fact, the abilities that constitute true "communicative competence" abroad (understanding of the appropriate pragmatic uses of language, routine formulas, courteous ways of performing everyday linguistic functions with different interlocutors, fluency, vocabulary, etc.) have often not been the type of data (e.g., mophosyntactic and grammatical abilities, pronunciation) measured by the instruments used to date in SA–AH studies. Future research should include studies that gather both oral and written data to measure pragmatic abilities, use both multiple tasks and fine-grained assessment measures, use videotaped sessions of learners interacting with nonnative speaker (NNS) and NS interlocutors in various contexts, and multiple posttests to measure long-term effects of SA and AH environments on interlanguage development. Finally, qualitative analyses (e.g., introspective diary studies, interviews, retrospective protocols) should be used to complement quantitative studies on the effect of context on Spanish SLA.

3.0 Conclusion

We hope that the preceding critical review of research on the acquisition of Spanish in study-abroad and classroom contexts has served to raise awareness of the need to carry out more empirical studies on this topic in order to more fully inform administrative decision makers and instructors who wish to understand the programmatic and pedagogical implications of this research. In this final section, we propose some tentative suggestions for programmatic and pedagogical reform in these two environments based on the research reviewed above.

A simplistic reading of much of the aforementioned research might lead instructors to suggest the following to prospective study-abroad students: Go later! Stay longer! Live with a family! However, without also asking a student about his or her goals for the study-abroad experience (e.g., really improving grammar, vocabulary, and fluency in the target language and acquiring a deep understanding of the target culture or just absorbing some cultural knowledge and picking up a few phrases for communicative purposes) and for what purpose he or she intends (or not) to use the target language or knowledge of the target culture in the future, one cannot truly provide useful advice to students at different levels of proficiency about the length and type of SA program best suited to their needs and what linguistic outcomes he or she might expect from participating in SA programs of varying duration and living conditions. Nevertheless, we can use the results of some of the general study-abroad research already carried out to more intelligently inform prospective SA students about the best way to make the most of their experience in the target culture.

A new volume by Paige et al. (2003), *Maximizing Study Abroad,* bases its information and suggestions on research in the field of SLA and cultural studies. This book contains predeparture, in-country, and post-SA units on culture- and language-learning

strategies. This volume could be used by the student in predeparture orientation sessions, in-country awareness meetings held by the resident director abroad, and post-SA reflective sessions. This book could also be supplemented by country- or region-specific units on appropriate pragmatic courtesy formulas to be used with various types of people in the target culture (e.g., host families, friends, instructors, strangers) and information regarding what kind of linguistic assistance they should or should not expect from their instructors in language and content courses abroad and from their host families.

In addition to providing predeparture orientations for students, prospective resident directors (or NS on-site instructors), who are often not SLA researchers, could be trained to give good target language feedback to the SA students in conversations or tutoring sessions in which they require students to negotiate meaning, rather than just providing them with target language forms. It might also be possible to have a short training session for host families to heighten their awareness of the need to focus on form as well as content when giving feedback to the students living with them. The families could also be made aware of communication strategies they can use with the SA students to help them develop their language skills (e.g., circumlocution, clarification requests, comprehension checks).

Another issue in need of mention is the possible pedagogical application of some of the insights gained from the Spanish SA and SA–AH research reviewed above to the assessment of linguistic progress in the two environments. For years we have been assessing SA students using instruments that measure what is important in an AH context (e.g., grammar and pronunciation). It is time to use more assessment instruments that measure the kinds of gains made by learners in an SA context (e.g., pragmatic ability, vocabulary associations, fluency). However, until more is known about the nature of the SA classroom—type of interaction, focus on form(s), and so on—no suggestions for pedagogical reform in the SA context would be appropriate.

After reviewing the aforementioned research, one might also ask, What insights from the Spanish SA and SA–AH research could also be applied to the classroom context? One of the distinguishing positive features of the SA context is the copious amount of target language input and the opportunities for interaction with L2 native speakers of various ages, socioeconomic conditions, professions, and so on. It is through these interactions that SA learners become aware of appropriate ways to communicate with various members of the target culture.

In order to provide more of these types of communicative opportunities for classroom learners, instructors could make efforts to find ways to bring students into contact with various L2 native speakers. For instance, language houses, language clubs, and honorary societies (such as Sigma Delta Pi) can provide other venues for authentic language practice. Frequently inviting native speakers to the classroom to interact with students and helping to set up conversation partners between Spanish and English L2 students on campus provide additional opportunities for interaction. Internships and service-learning opportunities in the community at large, in which students need to interact with monolingual Spanish speakers, can also be advantageous. Establishing controlled chatrooms in which English-speaking Spanish L2 speakers communicate

with Spanish-speaking English L2 speakers living in target culture settings (Spain and Latin America) may also help to improve students' oral ability and cultural awareness.

The more AH students interact with native speakers of the target language, the more they become sensitive to pragmatic exigencies of the context that discourage learners from imposing on their interlocutor for corrective feedback or from stopping the flow of conversation to self-correct (see Lafford 2004, 2006); these pragmatic pressures (based on Grice's [1975] cooperative principle and maxim of manner and Brown and Levinson's [1987] concept of negative "face") to focus on meaning over form, that is, to "keep the conversation going" at the expense of grammatical accuracy, is something that SA learners frequently experience. However, both SA and AH learners should be made aware of the need to overcome these pragmatic pressures and notice the errors in their output, use communication strategies to negotiate meaning and to focus on form in order to polish their grammatical abilities and restructure their interlanguage system along NS lines.

More interaction with different types of native speakers of Spanish would also allow classroom learners the chance to acquire pragmatic awareness and become more proficient at using language appropriately in different communicative contexts. The use of target language authentic video materials, films or television, or live or taped role plays between native speakers of the target language in the classroom can serve to illustrate how natives use pragmalinguistic elements to perform various linguistic functions (e.g., inviting and apologizing).[12] While SA learners are exposed to this type of interaction on a daily basis, classroom instructors need to deliberately provide NS models of this kind of NS-NS interaction for AH learners in order for them to acquire these abilities. Production activities that follow these NS models of interaction should be task-based, in that they should mirror real-world activities in which NSs are often engaged (Doughty and Long 2003). In this way, learners engage in situated cognition (Brown, Collins, and Duguid 1989) and acquire certain linguistic forms in situations that simulate the social contexts in which those forms are normally utilized in the target culture. This type of task-based classroom activity will better prepare AH learners to converse with NSs at home or, if they have the chance to go abroad, at a later time.

One last pedagogical application of the SA research to be discussed is the need for AH learners to engage in activities that will help them restructure their interlanguage L2 word associations to more closely resemble the target language system. Ife, Vives Boix, and Meara (2000) found that advanced SA learners were able to readjust their schemata to conform to NS lexical association patterns after a semester or year abroad. This type of attention to L2 word associations rarely forms a part of foreign language classroom instruction, and yet it is precisely the development of these L2 associations and pragmatic abilities that allows L2 learners to attain advanced levels of proficiency and to begin to think like native speakers of the target language (Lantolf 1999). Authentic oral and written materials can be used in AH contexts to make learners aware of L2 word associations within semantic fields and of target language collocations (words that "go together," e.g., *carne y hueso*).[13]

In conclusion, after critically reviewing the extant research on Spanish SLA in study-abroad and classroom contexts, we propose that the research on the acquisition of Spanish in study-abroad and classroom contexts needs to be expanded along the lines suggested above in order for scholars to understand more fully the interaction of contextual and cognitive factors in the process of acquiring the target language and how those insights can be applied to improve study-abroad programs and pedagogical practices in the foreign language classroom.

Notes

1. This assertion is based on the reports on study-abroad programs from the 1920s to the 1970s by Hullihen (1928), Smith (1930), Diez (1946), Dougherty (1950), Graham (1962), and Berg, Cholakian, and Conroy (1975). These traditional views of the purpose and expectations of study-abroad programs were corroborated by Prof. William Davey, director of the Office of International Programs at Arizona State University.
2. All known Spanish SA or SA-versus-AH studies have been included in this reveiw.
3. See Lafford (2006) for an exploration of the social and cognitive factors that may account for the results of the studies on the effects of SA and AH contexts on student outcomes.
4. Andersen's (1986, 1991) lexical aspect hypothesis states that there is a relationship between the grammatical aspectual category (preterite/imperfect) of a verb chosen by the L2 speaker and the lexical aspect (e.g., states, activities, accomplishments, achievements) of the verb itself. In Andersen's (1986, 1991) data, the imperfect appears first in states, then in activities, accomplishments, and achievements, whereas the preterite is first acquired in achievements, then accomplishments and activities, and lastly in states.
5. See Lazar (2004) for an expanded discussion on this topic with respect to monitoring learning in different contexts of learning.
6. The positive effects of length of stay on linguistic gains have recently been attested by Davidson (2005).
7. Wilkinson (2002) found that although French SA learners have more exposure to the target language, host families vary in type of feedback given to learners.
8. Isabelli (2004) also made use of a sizable NS baseline group for the grammaticality judgment tasks she employed.
9. See Lazar (2004) for an extensive discussion of this bootstrapping in the study-abroad context.
10. This threshold hypothesis corresponds to what has been found for AH postsecondary immersion (Klee and Tedick 1997; Lynch, Klee, and Tedick 2001).
11. See Lafford (2006) for a more in-depth discussion of the importance of studying individual differences in SA and AH contexts.
12. See Olshtain and Cohen (1991) for ideas on how to teach pragmatic competence to L2 learners. See also the website "Dancing with Words: Strategies for Learning Pragmatics in Spanish" created by Julie Sykes and Andrew Cohen at the University of Minnesota. http://www.carla.umn.edu/speechacts/sp_pragmatics/home.html
13. See Batstone (2002) for ideas on how to incorporate more communicative activities into classroom (learning) environments.

References

Andersen, R. 1986. El desarrollo de la morfología verbal en el español como segundo idioma. In *Adquisición del lenguaje—Aquisição da linguagem*, ed. J. Meisel, 115–38. Frankfurt: Klaus-Dieter Vervuert Verlag.

———. 1991. Developmental sequences: The emergence of aspect marking in second language acquisition. In *Crosscurrents in second language acquisition and linguistic theories*, ed. T. Huebner and C. A. Ferguson, 305–24. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Batstone, R. 2002. Contexts of engagement: A discourse perspective on "intake" and "pushed output." *System* 30:1–14.

Berg, W. J., R. Cholakian, and P. V. Conroy. 1975. The year abroad in France: An inside look. *French Review* 48 (5): 819–35.

Brecht, R. D., D. E. Davidson, and R. B. Ginsberg. 1995. Predictors of foreign language gain during study abroad. In*Second language acquisition in a study abroad context*, ed. B. Freed, 37–66. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Brecht, R. D., and J. L. Robinson. 1995. On the value of formal instruction in study abroad: Student reactions in context. In *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context*, ed. B. Freed, 317–34. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Brown, J. S., A. Collins, and P. Duguid. 1989. Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher* 18 (1): 32–42.

Brown, P., and S. C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carroll, J. B. 1967. Foreign language proficiency levels attained by language majors near graduation from college. *Foreign Language Annals* 1:131–51.

Coleman, J. 1996. *Studying languages: A survey of British and European students*. London: CILT.

Collentine, J. 1995. The development of complex syntax and mood-selection abilities by intermediate-level learners of Spanish. *Hispania* 78:122–35.

———. 2003. The development of subjunctive and complex-syntactic abilities among FL Spanish learners. In *Studies in Spanish second language acquisition: The state of the science*, ed. B. Lafford and R. Salaberry, 74–97. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

———. 2004. The effects of learning contexts on morphosyntactic and lexical development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 26 (2): 227–48.

Collentine, J., and B. Freed. 2004. Learning context and its effects on second language acquisition: Introduction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 26 (2): 153–72.

Davidson, D. 2005. L-2 gain in the study abroad context: Examining the roles of pre-program proficiency, duration of immersion, and individual learner differences. Paper presented at the Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics. March.

DeKeyser, R. 1986. From learning to acquisition? Foreign language development in a U.S. classroom and during a semester abroad. Ph.D. diss., Stanford University.

———. 1990. From learning to acquisition? Monitoring in the classroom and abroad. *Hispania* 73:238–47.

———. 1991. Foreign language development during a semester abroad. In *Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom*, ed. B. Freed, 104–19. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Dewey, D. 2002. The effects of study context and environment on the acquisition of reading by students of Japanese as a second language during study-abroad and intensive domestic immersion. Ph.D. diss., Carnegie Mellon University.

Díaz-Campos, M. 2004. Context of learning in the acquisition of Spanish second language phonology. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 26 (2): 249–73.

———. 2006. The effect of style in second language phonology: An analysis of segmental acquisition in study abroad and regular-classroom students. *In Selected proceedings of the 7th conference on the acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese as first and second languages*, eds. C. A. Klee and T. L. Face, 26–39. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Diez, M. 1946. A junior year in Zurich for 1946–47. *German Quarterly* 19 (2): 152–56.

Dougherty, D. M. 1950. The value of a year of study in France for undergraduates. *French Review* 23 (4): 304–7.

Doughty, C., and M. Long. 2003. Optimal psycholinguistic environments for distance foreign language learning. *Language Learning and Technology* 7 (3): 50–80.

Freed, B. 1995a. Introduction. In *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context,* ed. B. Freed, 3–34. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

———. 1995b. What makes us think that students who study abroad become fluent? In *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context,* ed. B. Freed, 123–48. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

———. 1998. An overview of issues and research in language learning in a study abroad setting. *Frontiers. Special Issue: Language Learning in a Study Abroad Context* 4:31–60.

Furstenberg, G., S. Levet, K. English, and K. Maillet. 2001. Giving a virtual voice to the silent language of culture. *Language Learning and Technology* 5 (1): 55–102.

Graham, P. G. 1962. Why an undergraduate year abroad is so worthwhile—a reply. *German Quarterly* 35 (1): 1–4.

Grice, H. P. 1975. Logic and communication. In *Syntax and semantics.* Vol. 3, *Speech acts,* ed. P. Cole and J. L. Morgan, 41–58. New York: Academic Press.

Guntermann, G. 1992a. An analysis of interlanguage development over time: Part I, *por* and *para. Hispania* 75:177–87.

———. 1992b. An analysis of interlanguage development over time: Part II, *ser and estar. Hispania* 75:1294–1303.

Guntermann, Gail. 1995. The Peace Corps experience: Second language acquisition in a study-abroad context. In *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context,* ed. B. Freed, 149–69. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Harrington, M., and M. Sawyer. 1990. Working memory in L2 reading: Does capacity predict performance? In *Variability in second language acquisition: Proceedings of the tenth meeting of the second language research forum,* ed. H. Burmeister and P. L. Rounds, 365–79. Eugene: University of Oregon.

Hokanson, Sonja. 2000. Foreign language immersion homestays: Maximizing the accommodation of cognitive styles. *Applied Language Learning* 11:239–64.

Huebner, T. 1998. Methodological considerations in data collection for language learning in a study abroad context. *Frontiers. Special Issue: Language Learning in a Study Abroad Context* 4:1–30.

Hullihen, W. 1928. Present status of the "junior year" abroad. *French Review* 1 (2): 25–37.

Hulstijn, J. H., and B. Bossers. 1992. Individual differences in L2 proficiency as a function of L1 proficiency. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology* 4 (4): 341–53.

Ife, A., G. Vives Boix, and P. Meara. 2000. The impact of study abroad on the vocabulary development of different proficiency groups. *Spanish Applied Linguistics* 4 (1): 55–84.

Isabelli, C. A. 2004. The acquisition of null subject parameter properties in SLA: Some effects of positive evidence in a natural learning context. *Hispania* 87 (1): 150–62.

Isabelli, C. A., and C. Nishida. 2005. Development of Spanish subjunctive in a nine-month study-abroad setting. In *Selected proceedings of the 6th conference on the acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese as first and second languages,* ed. D. Eddington, 78–91. Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla.

Isabelli, C. L. 2001. Motivation and extended interaction in the study abroad context: Factors in the development of Spanish language accuracy and communication skills. Ph.D. diss., University of Texas at Austin.

Klee, C. A., and D. J. Tedick. 1997. The undergraduate foreign language immersion program in Spanish at the University of Minnesota. In *Content-based instruction in the foreign language classroom,* ed. S. Stryker and B. L Leaver, 140–73. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Kramsch, C. 2000. Social discursive constructions of self in L2 learning. In *Sociocultural theory and second language learning,* ed. J. Lantolf, 133–53. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lafford, B. A. 1995. Getting into, through and out of a survival situation: A comparison of communicative strategies used by students studying Spanish abroad and "at home." In *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context,* ed. B. Freed, 97–121. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

———. 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): 201–26.

———. 2006. The effects of study abroad vs. classroom contexts on Spanish SLA: Old assumptions, new insights and future research directions. In *Selected proceedings of the 7th conference on the acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese as first and second languages,* ed. C. A. Klee and T. L. Face, 1–25. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Lafford, B., and J. Ryan. 1995. The acquisition of lexical meaning in a study abroad context: The Spanish prepositions POR and PARA. *Hispania* 75 (3): 528–47.

Lantolf, J. P. 1999. Second culture acquisition: Cognitive considerations. In *Culture in second language teaching and learning,* ed. E. Hinkel, 28–46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lazar, N. 2004. A short survey on causal inference, with implications for context of learning studies of second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 26 (2): 329–48.

Levelt, W. J. M. 1989. *Speaking: From intention to articulation.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

López-Ortega, N. 2003. The development of discourse competence in study abroad learners: A study of subject expression in Spanish as a second language. Ph.D. diss., Cornell University.

Lord, G. 2006. Defining the Indefinable: Study Abroad and Phonological Memory Abilities. In *Selected proceedings of the 7th conference on the acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese as first and second languages,* eds. C. A. Klee and T. L. Face, 40–46. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Lynch, A., C. A. Klee, and D. Tedick. 2001. Social factors and language proficiency in postsecondary Spanish immersion: Issues and implications. *Hispania* 84:510–25.

Marriot, H. 1995. The acquisition of politeness patterns by exchange students in Japan. In *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context,* ed. B. Freed, 197–224. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Meara, P. 1994. The year abroad and its effects. *Language Learning Journal* 10:32–38.

Mellow, J. D., K. Reeder, and E. Forster. 1996. Using the time-series design to investigate the effects of pedagogic intervention on SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18 (3): 325–50.

National Association of Foreign Student Advisors (NAFSA). 2003. Open doors online: Report on international educational exchange. http://opendoors.iienetwork.org (May 15, 2006).

Norris, J. M., and L. Ortega. 2001. Does type of instruction make a difference? Substantive findings from a meta-analytic review. *Language Learning* 51:157–213.

Olshtain, E., and A. D. Cohen. 1991. Teaching speech act behavior to nonnative speakers. In *Teaching English as a second or foreign language,* ed. M. Celce-Murcia, 154–65. New York: Newbury House.

Paige, R. M., A. D. Cohen, B. Kappler, J. D. Chi, and J. P. Lassegard. 2003. *Maximizing study abroad: A students' guide to strategies for language and culture learning and use.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA).

Payne, S., and P. J. Whitney. 2002. Developing L2 oral proficiency through synchronous CMC: Output, working memory and interlanguage development. *CALICO Journal* 20 (1): 7–32.

Pellegrino, V. 1997. Social and psychological factors affecting spontaneous second language use during study abroad: A qualitative study. Ph.D diss., Bryn Mawr College.

Regan, V. 1995. The acquisition of sociolinguistic native speech norms: Effects of a year abroad on second language learners of French. In *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context,* ed. B. Freed, 245–67. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Rodríguez, S. 2001. The perception of requests in Spanish by instructed learners of Spanish in the second- and foreign-language contexts: A longitudinal study of acquisition patterns. Ph.D. diss., Indiana University.

Ryan, J., and B. Lafford. 1992. Acquisition of lexical meaning in a study abroad environment: *Ser* and *estar* and the Granada experience. *Hispania* 75:714–22.

Segalowitz, N., and B. Freed. 2004. Context, contact, and cognition in oral fluency acquisition: Learning Spanish in at home and study abroad contexts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 26 (2): 173–99.

Segalowitz, N., B. Freed, J. Collentine, B. Lafford, N. Lazar, and M. Díaz-Campos. 2004. A comparison of Spanish second language acquisition in two different learning contexts: Study abroad and the domestic classroom. *Frontiers* 10 (4): 21–38.

Schell, K. 2001. *Functional categories and the acquisition of aspect in L2 Spanish: A longitudinal study.* Ph.D.diss., University of Washington, Seattle.

Siegal, M. 1995. Individual differences and study abroad: Women learning Japanese in Japan. In *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context,* ed. B. Freed, 225–44. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Simões, A. 1996. Phonetics in second language acquisition: An acoustic study of fluency in adult learners of Spanish. *Hispania* 79 (1): 87–95.

Smith, H. 1930. The junior year in France. *French Review* 4 (1): 41–48.

Stevens, J. J. 2001. The acquisition of L2 Spanish pronunciation in a study abroad context. Ph.D. diss., University of Southern California.

Talburt, S., and M. Stewart. 1999. What's the subject of study abroad? Race, gender, and "living culture." *Modern Language Journal* 83 (2): 163–75.

Torres, Jenna. 2003. A cognitive approach to the acquisition of clitics in L2 Spanish: Insights from study abroad and classroom learners. Ph.D. diss., Cornell University.

VanPatten, B. 1987. The acquisition of *ser* and *estar*: Accounting for developmental patterns. In *Foreign language learning: A research perspective,* ed. B. VanPatten, T. Dvorak, and J. Lee, 61–75. New York: Newbury House.

———. 1996. *Input processing and grammar instruction.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Wilkinson, S. 1998. Study abroad from the participant's perspective: A challenge to common beliefs. *Foreign Language Annals* 31 (1): 23–39.

———. 2002. The omnipresent classroom during summer study abroad: American students in conversation with their French hosts. *Modern Language Journal* 86 (2): 157–73.