

Overcoming Obstacles: Teaching Language Majors in Response to Professional and Social Needs

Dr. Juanita Villena-Alvarez

Professor

Humanities and Fine Arts Department

University of South Carolina Beaufort

801 Carteret Street, Beaufort, SC 29902

One University Boulevard, Bluffton, SC 29909

USA

Abstract

*The article delves into the status of the teaching of Language for Specific Purposes(LSP), in multiple university programs with particular emphasis on the social and professional aspect, and then proposes practical steps and measures to counteract the myriad obstacles to the expansion of LSP. In the section “Manpower: Sharing the Burden and the Rewards” the article provides details on the expansion of programs in eight aspects: management plan and timelines; partnerships with a senior or junior faculty; benefits toward promotion and tenure; institutional benefits; marketing the results; employment for students; community benefits; and tracking the alumni. This work demonstrates how extending the programs in the humanities can reach out to other academic areas in the professional schools through vital language learner needs surveys and analyses. The article concludes with a home-grown solution borrowed from Voltaire’s *Candide*: “Il faut cultiver notre jardin” (“We must cultivate our own garden”).*

Keywords: Language teaching, Language for Specific Purposes (LSP), Spanish for the Profession, foreign language student needs, language learner needs analysis

It is essential to note that various degrees in the Humanities are affected by the study of languages and cultures. The proposals and topics discussed within this study reflects languages’ role in various degrees—English, Spanish, French, German, International Studies, Linguistics, Literary Studies, Cultural Studies, Latin American Studies, Minority Studies, Business Administration, Education, Nursing, etc. For the purposes of this research work, the term “language learning” will encompass the myriad degrees in the Humanities as well as in professional schools that are greatly influenced by the Humanities. The past five years have been very productive for the teaching of Language for Specific Purposes (LSP), particularly Spanish in the United States. In April 2014, 2013, and 2012 the U.S. Department of Education funded conferences hosted by Centers for International Business Education and Research (CIBER) institutions on the teaching of languages for professional and social needs. Through differing yearly emphasis, these conferences bring together the stakeholders in the teaching of LSP: In April 2014 “Embracing a New Era for Business, Language, and Culture” was hosted by Brigham Young University in Park City Utah; in April 2013 “The Business of Language: Educating the Next Generation of Global Professionals” was held at Indiana University; and in April 2012, “Building Bridges from Business Languages to Business Communities” was held at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. These events are co-hosted by other CIBERs from about 34 universities in the United States (<http://www.ciber.unc.edu/cblc/sponsors.html>). In January 2012, the *Modern Language Journal (MLJ)* published a much needed and welcomed special focus issue entitled “Languages for Specific Purposes in the United States in a Global Context: Update on Grosse and Voght (1991)” with twelve (12) articles that provide an important reference for any faculty teaching in this type of special studies. In April 2014 and 2012, the International Symposium on Language for Specific Purposes was hosted by the University of Colorado Boulder (2014)(<http://altec.colorado.edu/lsp/>) and the University of Alabama at Birmingham (2012)(<http://www.uab.edu/languages/symposium>), with more than 130 participants. After these professional gatherings of LSP focused minds, the symposium published eleven (11) articles in a volume entitled *Scholarship and Teaching on Language for Specific Purposes* (2013).

In this current economic and budgetary climate we find ourselves in, with the CIBER federal funding always in question depending on the direction of the current administration, the International Symposium on Language for Specific Purposes will hopefully provide an added future venue for LSP professional exchange and their publication, plus the *MLJ* focus issue will have generated additional credibility to the teaching of LSP. Language for Specific Purposes is a type of learning that has historically been pitted against language learning through literature (Modern Language Association [MLA], 2007). This much is evident in various articles published in the *MLJ* focus issue (volume 96.1) on LSP published in 2012. LSP is a mélange of professional and need-based language learning that can also include linguistics, translation, cultural, and even literary studies. LSP binds these various studies together to respond to what the 2009 MLA White Paper, or the TEAGLE Foundation reports as the “first and foremost” mission of language departments: “the needs of the students” (MLA, 2009, p.6). The report does not specify who determines these “needs” of students—is it the faculty? the administration? the employers? the civic leaders and local government? or the students themselves? LSP is an ideal response to the Teagle Report’s call for “The Integrative Major” (p. 5) or the 2007 MLA’s Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages report entitled “Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structure for a Changed World” that discusses “An Integrative Approach with Multiple Paths to the Major.” This present study attempts to frame the arguments for a more expanded academic acceptance of LSP through a description of the research that has been published, particularly pertaining to the more popular programs with students such as business and professional language use. It continues with a discussion of the obstacles and the challenges that face not just LSP, but the research and productivity of LSP faculty. For example, much has been said about how well-established organizations such as the MLA, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), etc. have traditionally relegated LSP to the back burner, but now that the MLA and others (as attested by the *MLJ* focus issue) are starting to direct more serious attention to LSP, perhaps it is time for LSP faculty to turn to the MLA, et al. and harness this recent attention. A second obstacle to be discussed in this paper pertains to the reference of the MLA White Paper on the “needs of the students.” Other than institution-specific research, there have not been many nor significant official reports that have surveyed or studied this issue that is supposed to be the “first and foremost” mission of language departments. And when doing this study, the specific perspective should be decided on for primary considerations: the administration, the students’, the faculty or the employers? Third comes the issue of the economy and budget. What will happen if the funding source for all the CIBERs (CIBERs have hosted LSP conferences and a few publications for over ten years) dries up? How will this affect the teaching and expansion of LSP? The article concludes with an urgent call to revise and review priorities.

1. Discussion of Important Literature and Research on LSP

1.1. The 2007 MLA Ad Hoc Committee Report- “Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structure for a Changed World.”

This perspective-swiveling report discussed “the nation’s language deficit” (p. 1) and the existence of a dismal gap (more like chasm) between some institutions’ Instrumentalist view of language (where language is principally used “for communicating thought and information”) versus other institutions’ Constitutive view of languages (where language is considered an “essential element of a human being’s thought processes, perceptions, and self-expressions” p. 2). In many situations, these chasms of *différence* occur across the hallways, with the majority of those who wield power and position taking the Constitutive view while the other view is usually held by untenured, part-time, and year-to-year contract faculty who may not be expected to do research and scholarship. This 2007 report is quite direct about the challenges that LSP has encountered in academia and talks about the “division between the language curriculum and the literature curriculum, and between tenure-track literature professors and the language instructors in non-tenure track positions” where among faculty “at doctorate-granting institutions, cooperation or even exchange between the two groups is usually minimal and nonexistent.” The article continues by stating that this rigid relationship devalues learning and impedes development. Further, the article asks for collaboration and governance in confronting the “nation’s language deficit” (p. 2). What this report does not specify is that a strong possible reason for the waning interest in language studies could be because only 6.1% of college graduates whose first major is in a foreign language (FL) go for a Ph.D., the area where literary studies becomes all important (p. 6). Clearly, the great majority of the FL majors pursue a career that does not centralize literary studies.

1.2. The 2009 MLA White Paper: Report to the Teagle Foundation on the Undergraduate Major in Language and Literature

This paper is an extensive 33-page report that has two primary goals: to study new ways of organizing language programs and to strengthen majors and attract new students (p. 1). In a way, this report echoes what had been previously discussed by the MLA Ad Hoc Committee in 2007, but expands on it with 20 pages of supporting statistics and data to justify the recommendations being set forth. After about 18 months of meetings and deliberations, the group submitting this report, made up of several college presidents, deans, representatives from the health care and legal professions and the MLA, has agreed that in deliberating the organization of the curriculum of the language major, the “first and foremost” . . . must be to include the “needs of the students” (p. 6). The language department must meet two goals—the educational experience of students who go to the workplace (LSP) and those who go on to graduate school (literature). The report concludes with a mandate for the future: “to evolve” the programs (p. 11). This present research work discusses this mandate “to evolve” in sections 2 and 3 below.

1.2.1. The 2012 *Modern Language Journal* Focus Issue: Languages for Specific Purposes in the United States in a Global Context: Update on Grosse and Voght(1991)

The special issue is, in a manner of speaking, a response to the demands of the discipline and to the two previously outlined reports: the 2007 MLA Ad Hoc Committee Report as well as the 2009 MLA White Paper/Teagle Report. The entire focus edition is available online at this [link](#). For the purpose of this study on the professional use of LSP, six articles from this publication are summarized below to support the case being presented.

1.3.1. Christine Uber Grosse and Geoffery M. Voght

Prior to 1991, Grosse and Voght have published, separately and together on numerous occasions pertaining to LSP that supports their 1991 *MLJ* article entitled “The Evolution of Languages for Specific Purposes in the United States.” This publication defined the nature of LSP in the United States, presented its curriculum and the rationale for teaching LSP, assessed the research base and provided a list of future research agenda. At that time, this extensive research work provided a comprehensive review of LSP background and history, with more than 200 works listed in the references, as well as 21 reports that advocate for international education. Since then, this work has been cited by many scholars also conducting research on LSP.

1.3.2. Barbara Lafford, “Languages for Specific Purposes in the United States in a Global Context: Commentary on Grosse and Voght (1991) Revisited.”

Lafford provides the introductory article and rationale for the focus issue and the reprint of the 1991 *MLJ* article, with a 20-year perspective, given the data gathered from 2011. Her commentary on Grosse and Voght’s importance is primary since the article reiterates the significance of LSP. She discusses the resistance that others in the LSP group have voiced out in the past. She has added two additional perspectives to the 1991 article: a global perspective (the focus issue includes articles that discuss LSP in Europe and Australia) and a theoretical foundation for this type of studies (hence the inclusion of Second Language Acquisition [SLA], a topic not mentioned in the 1991 article). The inclusion of these two serves to enhance and strengthen the rationale for the acceptance of LSP. Lafford continues with a description and summary of the articles included in the focus issue with a discussion of the challenges and the direction to take to move the discipline forward. In her concluding remarks, Lafford advocates for a practically oriented language studies and the need to make LSP a permanent part of foreign language departments.

1.3.3. Michael Scott Doyle, “Business Language Studies in the United States: On Nomenclature, Context, Theory, and Method.”

Here is an article that proposes to solidify/concretize an aspect of LSP by providing it with a name: the Business Language Studies (BLS) (p. 105). This article pertinently discusses past practices, history, research, and publications to validate the proposal of naming BLS. But more significantly, it provides the strong justification that by naming this branch of FL teaching, the name would pave the way for acceptance of this branch as a legitimate aspect of FL teaching in terms of publication/research value, in curricular offerings, and in tenure and promotion considerations (p. 107). Doyle further points to the fact that BLS has been accepted by organizations such as the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP), AATF (French), AATG (German) since these organizations have published numerous editions on language-specific BLS (p. 107).

Another essential contribution of this publication is the laying of the foundation for theoretical studies in BLS, using previous research on Translation Studies as a form of basis and foundation. This is in response to Lafford's having pointed out the weakness in the past publication areas of LSP. It is projected that this article will have a major impact on the teaching of LSP, and BLS to be more specific and gives a strong validation to the acceptance of an undervalued branch of FL teaching.

1.3.4. T. Bruce Fryer, "Languages for Specific Purposes Business Curriculum Creation and Implementation in the United States."

This comprehensive article provides a historical and contemporary framework for how "BLS" started, flourished and continues to flourish here in the United States. It traces the roots of BLS from 1946 at the American Institute for Trade, now known as Thunderbird in Glendale, Arizona. The article outlines the publications (*Journal of Language for Business [JOLIB]*, *Global Business Language*, AATF, AATG, AATSP, and the California Language Teachers' Association [CLTA]) and conferences (Eastern Michigan University's [EMU] Business Language Conferences [1981 to 1997] and the continuation of this through the various university CIBERs) that have served the LSP faculty and stakeholders over the years (1p. 23). The article continues with a description of the relationship of LSP/BLS to the CIBERs, Title VI, The Language Flagships, and country-sponsored organizations like the Cervantes Institute of Spain, the Alliance Française, the British Council, the Goethe Institute of Germany, the Instituto Camões of Portugal, Italy's Societa Dante Alighieri, the Confucius Institute, and the Japan Foundation (p. 124). The study further expands on the LSP graduate programs at certain institutions: Thunderbird, USC Columbia (International Business), the Lauder Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, and how the current lamentable trend of late in two instances, USC, and Thunderbird, is to outsource the foreign language instruction (p. 125). With regards to the curriculum, Fryer discusses the five C's of ACTFL pertaining to the National Standards for Foreign Language Education (2006): Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, Communities, and suggests a 6th additional "C"—Contemplation.

This critical element could be described as follows.

Contemplation. Student learning needs to be maximized so as to involve them in experiences which increase their learning via the resultant curricula and content from all Five C's of Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities. This evaluation of learner outcomes requires contemplation, that is, careful research, inquiry, observation, comparison, analysis, deliberation, meditation, reflection, and examination(p. 128).

Fryer continues with a discussion on the need to broaden the LSP research base and talks about the publication venues such as the *Global Business Language*, first appeared in 1996 and is published until today (130). The *Journal of Language for International Business* (1984-2003) used to be published by Thunderbird until 2003. He also provides details on the role of Berlitz in LSP as well as the K-12 aspect of LSP teaching, with an emphasis on Florida International University and the UNC-Chapel Hill Kenan-Flagler Institute programs. Fryer provides an essential discourse on what may be one of the most crucial aspects of LSP that needs future attention: "a needs analysis" (p. 131). This section is somewhat limited because an extensive needs analysis has not been undertaken for BLS and LSP. There is additional discussion on alternatives to the teaching of LSP: language institutes and intensive summer programs, tutorial based programs through the National Association of Self-Instructional Language Programs (NASILP), video clips through Culture Talk at the Five Colleges Center for World Languages, and web-based teaching through the University of Texas-Austin (p.133). Further on, the paper presents a comprehensive listing of about seven challenges: a. Identity and name; b. Tenure and promotion of some stakeholders; c. Slow to adopt and adapt graduate programs; d. Lack of further training; e. Lack of materials; f. Stronger, more consistent and constant support from national organizations; g. Constant adjustments needed with new millennial learners—the Net-Gen, Gen Y, or digital natives (p. 133).

1.3.5. Mary K. Long and Izabela Uscinski, "Evolution of Languages for Specific Purposes Programs in the United States: 1991-2011."

This study is based on a national survey of LSP offerings in U.S. higher education that was conducted in 2011 and is an update of a previous survey in 1990 by Grosse and Voght. There are some differences between the 1990 survey and the current one in order to improve on the results and the use of the results. The recent survey instrument had 53 questions as compared to 27 in the 1990 version p. 175). An online method was used as compared to a paper survey in 1990, and these two could have contributed to nature or change in the nature of the results (p.175).

The survey was sent to 790 department chairs from the ADFL listserv, and some 645 were randomly chosen from the MLA department chair listing (p. 174). Three important pieces of information surfaced from this most recent study:

- Type of LSP. Among the ten (10) different types of LSP listed in the survey (Business, Medicine, Education, Nursing, Translation, Engineering, Law, Public Programs, Technology and Other) there was a significant decrease in the Business type (from 73% in 1990 to 44% in 2011) and the combination of medicine and nursing (for health care) has increased exponentially from 7% in 1990 to a combined 18% in 2011 (175-6). The “Other” category has increased as well and this pertains to such specialized areas as Spanish for Hotel, Tourism and Restaurant Management, Spanish for Criminal Justice, and Japanese for Education (p. 176).
- Perspective on the lack of professional rewards. The survey included questions pertaining to the status of the faculty teaching the LSP courses (tenured/tenure track versus non-tenure track or a combination of both), their area of specialization (primarily literature) and the reasons for including or discontinuing LSP (1p. 82-185). These types of questions were not included in the 1990 survey. This section was followed by a discussion on the reasons for including and discontinuing LSP courses to the department curriculum and found that:

The two least common responses regarding reasons for not offering LSP courses were “language faculty not interested” and “lack of professional rewards.” It is important to make a distinction here between the challenges that exist to offering LSP courses versus the challenges that exist to pursuing LSP research. Other authors in this focus issue have noted that the lack of professional rewards is a challenge to the production of LSP research (see discussion in Grosse & Voght, this issue) (p. 185). It is highly important to point out that these surveys were completed by department chairs, who serve as part administrators, and not by the actual faculty that teaches the LSP courses. It is possible that if the actual faculty teaching the LSP courses were surveyed, a very different result might come to light.

- Student Demand. This survey study has also realized the same point that the 2007 MLA Ad Hoc Committee report alluded to (p. 5) and that the 2009 MLA White Paper has pointed out regarding the high importance of responding to student needs (p. 6). This is evident in the 2011 survey study in the lines that state: “further research is needed to investigate what elements contribute to high and low student demand between institutions” (p. 185).

The article ends by concluding the same conclusion that Grosse and Voght reached in 1990—that LSP is a permanent aspect of the foreign language curriculum in US higher education” (p. 187).

1.3.6. Darcy Lear, “Languages for Specific Purposes Curriculum Creation and Implementation in Service to the U.S. Community.”

Lear’s article is a blending of LSP and Community Service Learning (CSL) and can be described more as CSL in LSP rather than LSP in CSL. The article starts with a summary of the research on the pedagogy of CSL as it pertains to LSP, then continues with a discussion of the three major textbooks in the US that teach Spanish through a CSL perspective: *Comunidades* (Abbott 2010), *Temas* (Cubillos and Lamboy, 2007), and *Encomunidad* (Nichols, et al, 2009). After a discussion of these texts, the article cites the 2010 work of Mary K. Long that profiles five American LSP programs that include experiential education: Spanish for the Professions minor at Johns Hopkins University, the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, and Arizona State University, the minor in Spanish for Professional Development and Community Engagement at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, and the Spanish major that has a Community and Culture track with a service learning course (p. 161). Lear then structures the article by discussing four groups of stakeholders involved—faculty/department, local communities, students/employers, colleges/universities (p. 162-5), explains the three big challenges facing these stakeholders—resistance, finances, sustaining the programs (165-6), presents these stakeholders with a comprehensive lists of five needs and priorities for CSL in LSP—standards, dissemination, training, advancement, generating income(p.166-8), and provides them with an outlook to research--assessment, consistency and nomenclature, longitudinal effectiveness (p. 168-9). Lear concludes by saying that this is an untapped area that has much potential for LSP.

This long introduction to the topic (all these articles echo what has been going on and discussed between conference sessions for the past 13 years of CIBER conferences) provides a very solid groundwork for the topic of overcoming obstacles for LSP, not just at the institutional level but also in the discipline level per the articles mentioned earlier.

2. Additional Obstacles and Challenges

Some of these obstacles that are to be discussed below may have been, in part, discussed by the articles mentioned above, but they are mentioned here from a different perspective that may help stakeholders move forward with LSP.

2.1. LSP Faculty's Lack of Interest in the MLA

Many have decried the MLA's historical lack of interest in LSP that went on for a long period of time. In the 2007 and 2009 reports mentioned in this article, it is now obvious that the MLA has had a change of direction and is now more open to LSP, even though there has not been much emphasis on the BLS side of LSP. In a quick study of the 2012 articles published in the *PMLA*, only about three or so refer to topics that are more closely related to LSP. The November 2012 published program for the 128th MLA Annual Convention in Boston held January 2013, one session reflected LSP, a special session entitled "Marketing Your PhD in Literature and Languages: Languages for Special Purposes," with three papers. Could these low numbers be because of the MLA disinterest with LSP (which goes against their own reports back in 2007 and 2009) or could it be because of the disinterest of the LSP stakeholders in the MLA scholarly venue? Perhaps it is time for LSP to focus their attentions on the MLA and submit articles to MLA publications (*ADFL Bulletin*, *PMLA*, etc.), regional conferences and conventions, given that the organization's membership of about 30,000 will give wider range of attention. Furthermore, of the 42 speakers at the CIBER 2013 conference at Indiana University, a quick check in the MLA Directory shows that only six (6) are current MLA members—that is about 14.3 %. If the LSP stakeholders are aiming for a widespread acceptance of LSP, then perhaps this issue needs to be revisited, and a more concerted effort needs to be orchestrated.

2.2. Lack of an Organized Study to Respond to What the MLA White Paper Says as the First and Foremost Need: Student Needs in FL

It has been stated very clearly and intentionally by the MLA White Paper that the most important, the first and foremost need is that of the students and yet, the most significant study of LSP student need goes back to 15 years ago with Maria Antonia Cowles. Cited as well by the article of Fryer, Cowles published an article that discussed the University of Pennsylvania's needs for assessment of student needs in LSP and included a copy of the assessment instrument. Unfortunately, this article provides only a discussion of needs assessment and samples of instruments and materials for gathering data but does not provide any information on data gathered and their results. Other publications such as the *ADFL Bulletin*, the *PMLA* have few articles pertaining to studies or surveys of the needs of FL students, either in FL in general or in LSP. Another point that needs to be considered regarding this issue is the perspective of the student needs. Of all the stakeholders, who needs to be surveyed to serve as the best judges for what student needs are in FL and LSP? Here are some options: a) the faculty—all faculty; b) all faculty who teach FL—literature and non-literature (LSP) FL faculty; c) the faculty who teach FL—LSP; d) the department chairs; e) the university administration—college level or university level of both or random selection?; f) the employers and businesses—general selection; g) the employers and businesses that need FL—speaking workers; h) the community stakeholders—local officials, community organizations, etc.; i) the college students—freshmen, sophomore, junior or seniors or all, or random selection?; j) the college FL students—freshmen, sophomore, junior or seniors or all, or a random selection?; k) the high school students—freshmen, sophomore, junior or seniors or all, or random selection?; l) the high school FL students—freshmen, sophomore, junior or seniors or all, or a random selection?; m) and if we are talking about high school students, what about the parents?; or n) the college graduates and alumni. Clearly, someone from the current group participating in LSP or BLS research and conferences must need to forge ahead and do this future study.

2.3. Retirement and "Retirement" of Leadership.

Fryer has discussed this topic in his article. In this paper, I am referring to "retirement" in the literal and the "figurative" sense of the word. What Fryer has not mentioned is the alarming rate of decline in the participation level. There is no data published (that the author is aware of) on the level of participation in the EMU BLS conferences from 1981 to 1997.

The first CIBER sponsored Business Language Conference was in 1999 at San Diego State University, and there were well over 100 speakers during that conference. The following year it was held at Thunderbird again with over 100 participants. From then on the participation rate has started to diminish. In 2013, there were 44 presenters at the CIBER conference hosted by Indiana University. Why the decline? Particularly now that the traditional organizations like MLA have started to focus their attention on LSP? It seems to go against the trend that the discipline is taking. Will it be because of what other authors have alluded to—the lack of rewards (tenureship) for those who participated and published in this area previously, that has them “retiring” from LSP participation? Is it the economic and financial difficulty most universities are experiencing that has lowered the participation level? This may be a gray area and difficult to discern but what is clear is the rapid rate of decline in participation that needs to be countered.

2.4. Past and Existing Federal Funding Uncertainty for CIBER and Title VI.

The United States Department of Education IFLE is the office that handles funding pertaining to foreign language education and research. The official website of IFLE lists 18 programs (10 under Title VI, four under Title VII and another four under Fulbright-Hays) that institutions can vie for funding. On March 13, 2013, the United States Department of Education—IFLE officesent an emailed newsletter regarding the status of federal funding as a result of budget cuts and the infamous 2013 federal sequestration. Even before the sequestration, programs have already been cut. This information can be found when one clicks the section on Applicant Information on the various programs at IFLE <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/iegps/index.html>. Of the 18 programs listed, only five (5) were awarded for the fiscal year 2012 cycle, and there were statements of withdrawal of notices for application invitations. Additionally no announcement has been made (as of the time of this research) for any time of competition for the year 2013 (*note that the only 2013 opened competition—the Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation and Seminars Abroad—had their deadlines in December 2012).

2.5. The Demise of Training for LSP

2.5.1.) Training provided outside the institution—CIBER sponsored faculty development programs may not have funds for the future. Several of the articles mentioned in the introduction discusses faculty training (Fryer, Long, Lafford) and also mentions how federal funds from the CIBERs have funded these faculty development activities. With the cut in the funds just discussed, there is very much a need for a formal discussion of how to continue the faculty development, the conferences and the publication venues that help with faculty training. There are various options for resolving this. One would be to try and replicate what the University of Alabama at Birmingham did in 2012—to hold a university-backed conference on LSP. Another option would be to approach the big organizations (MLA, etc.) to try and find out how incorporating the type of sessions held at the CIBER Conferences could be included in their conferences. A third option is to approach private foundations and entities who may be encouraged to take up the cause of LSP teaching.

2.5.2.) Training provided inside the institutions as part of a doctoral language program that offer graduate level LSP and LSP methodologies as part of their curriculum. LSP training could also be done the traditional way, through graduate courses in LSP and LSP teaching methodologies, but this would mean a buy-in from the doctoral degree-granting institutions.

2.6. Lack of Job Security for LSP Faculty

This topic has been argued on by many of the authors mentioned earlier, but there has not been a formal survey/study of LSP teaching faculty for their perspective to be concretized. The past studies and surveys have been completed by department chairs, administrators, whose points of views may be different from those of actual faculty teaching. A way to ease through these six obstacles and challenges will be for LSP faculty to solve some of these “from within” their institution. What has resonated lately and worried the MLA is the number of students. A decline in enrollments has caused alarm and reactions with forceful statements such as the country’s “language deficit,” but an increase in enrollments will generally bring positive energy that can be tapped multiple ways. The domino effect may work if LSP-teaching faculty members work hard **within their own institutions to grow enrollments in LSP courses**. In many institutions, the administration usually pays close attention to the “cash cows” or the courses that bring massive students enrollment numbers. LSP faculty and stakeholders need to convert their courses into these “cash cows” of their departments.

Here are some suggested ways that this can be accomplished:

2.6.1.) Make the LSP courses visible on campus through activities that generate “buzz” and appeal.

Students who are passionate about what they are doing and are enjoying their college experiences tend to attract attention.

2.6.2.) Communicate directly with the academic advisors about the existence of LSP courses

It is curious how the LSP course can seem somewhat non-existent when it is just one course from among a list of many other courses, but going directly to the academic advisors with a “did you know *communiqué*” can make a big difference in enrollment. Additionally, an investment of 10 minutes of face-to-face time with specific academic advisors—in the college of business, nursing, hospitality management, etc. can have a greater impact, be more significant, and be remembered longer by the academic advisor who speaks directly to students. It is important to convince the advisor of the importance of this training for future student *employability*. Furthermore, a distinctive positive impression left with the advisor can be very beneficial (box of chocolates?).

2.6.3.) Create the LSP program

Once the university has a core group of students taking LSP courses, a minor or certificate program can be then be developed within the department, and with the critical mass of students, adding one or more literature courses to this certificate/minor program would mean having the literature faculty in the department support the creation of the new program as well. Incidentally, literature does have a strong positive impact on LSP, something that has been published on before.

2.6.4.) Network it

Both literally and technologically. Include such groups as students groups and clubs, faculty, academic advisors, businesses and the community. All stakeholders must be included. Information must also be made available and easy to access through the university website.

2.6.5.) Market the LSP program on campus.

Once a program is in place, it is back to letter a) “generating buzz” by going across campus to speak with staff and faculties in other departments and colleges, b) communicating with academic advisors about the program, c) further on, converting the certificate/minor into a “concentration” or “major”, then networking. If many institutions in the country work this way, it may even be possible to talk about doctoral programs in LSP, perhaps in 10 years or so.

One of the biggest hurdles to the creation or expansion of an FL program is funding. This can be handled in five ways:

- start small (one course) and identify low-hanging fruit possibilities on campus;
- establish joint programs and articulation agreements within the institution and with other institutions;
- identify funding from institutional, local, regional, state, national, private, and federal sources;
- maintain grant funding resources and sources;
- seek samples of previously funded grants—no need to reinvent the wheel; f) no funding? How about a course release instead?

3. “Manpower: Sharing the Burden and the Rewards.”

Finally, it is down to the nitty-gritty work. There are eight steps that need to be included for the success of LSP expansion and for maximizing LSP programs on campus:

3.1) Have a “management” plan and timelines—who is doing what and when; 3.2) Establish a partnership with a senior or junior faculty; 3.3) Know and capitalize on the benefits of the activities toward promotion and tenure—ensure that the activities that result from this work will be acceptable for tenure and promotion considerations at the institution; 3.4) Emphasize on the institutional benefits—increased student enrollment; 3.5) Market the results—to the stakeholders; 3.6) Communicate employability for students—this will add to the appeal of the program, so networking with business and the community is paramount; 3.7) Publicize the community benefits—community service learning will create positive energy; 8) Track the alumni—for data collection and to share student/faculty experiences with current and future students.

Conclusion

As the *MLJ* focus issue concluded: LSP is here to stay. And as the myriad articles in that issue presented, there are multiple needs and even more obstacles and challenges to be met. This paper's prescribed solution is to grow your own programs in your own institutions—have “critical mass” and more to become the moneymaker or the money-spinner within the department and the university. In other words: “*Il faut cultiver notre jardin*” (“It is necessary to cultivate our garden” or “We must cultivate our own garden”) as Voltaire has prescribed in *Candide, ou l'Optimisme*.

References

- Cowles, M. A. (1998). Needs analysis in program development. Spanish and Portuguese for business and the professions. Eds. T. B. Fryer & G. Guntermann. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co. & AATSP. 23-38.
- Doyle, M. S. (2012). Business language studies in the United States: On nomenclature, context, theory, and method. *Modern Language Journal*, 96.1, 105-121.
- Fryer, T. B. (2012). Languages for specific purposes business curriculum creation and Implementation in the United States. *Modern Language Journal*, 96.1, 122-139.
- Grosse, C, and Voght, G. (2012). The evolution of languages for specific purposes in the United States. *Modern Language Journal*, 75, 181-95.
- Grosse, C, and Voght, G. (2012). The continuing evolution of languages for specific purposes. *Modern Language Journal*, 96.1, 190-202.
- Lear, D. (2012). Languages for specific purposes curriculum creation and implementation in service to the community in the United States. *Modern Language Journal*, 96.1, 158-172.
- Long, M. K., and Uscinski, I. (2012). Evolution of languages for specific purposes programs in the United States: 1990–2011. *Modern Language Journal*, 96.1, 173–89.
- Long, M. (2010). Spanish for the professions degree programs in the United States: History and Current practice.” How globalizing professions deal with national languages: Studies in cultural conflict and cooperation. Ed. Michel Gueldry. Lewiston, NY: Mellen Press. 29-53.
- Modern Language Association. (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. [Online] Available: <http://www.mla.org/flreport> (July 7, 2015).
- Modern Language Association. (2009). Report to the Teagle Foundation on the undergraduate major in language and literature. [Online] Available: http://www.mla.org/pdf/2008_mla_whitepaper.pdf (July 6, 2015).
- Sánchez-López, L. (Ed.). (2013). Scholarship and teaching on Language for Specific Purposes. Birmingham, AL: U of Alabama Library.
- University of Alabama. (2012). First international symposium on Languages for Specific Purposes (LSP). [Online] Available: <http://www.uab.edu/languages/symposium> (March 14, 2014).
- University of Colorado. (2013). The second international symposium on Languages for Specific Purposes. [Online] Available: <http://altec.colorado.edu/lsp/> (March 18, 2014).
- U. S. Department of Education. (2013). International Foreign Language Education Programs. [Online] Available: <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/iegps/index.html> (March 2, 2013).
- Voltaire. (2003). *Candide ou L'Optimisme*. Paris: Gallimard.