CHAPTER 1

An Overview of Language for Specific Purposes

Jonathan Trace, Thom Hudson, and James Dean Brown

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

1 What is Language for Specific Purposes?

Norris (2006, p. 577) states that the goals of most foreign language (FL) instruction in higher education within the United States are built around three main components: (a) the acquisition of the knowledge of language skills for general communication use; (b) exposing learners to other cultures and ideas; and (c) fostering an appreciation of differences in cultures and ways of thinking. While each of these are certainly noble outcomes and likely meet the needs of the majority of university level FL learners, they remain quite broad in terms of what it is a learner will actually be able to do with the language once they have left the classroom. This is especially true for those of us faced with learners who have specific and sometimes immediate

language needs that require more than generalized or dispositional knowledge alone. For these learners, *Language for Specific Purposes* courses provide an invaluable alternative or supplement to general language courses.

Language for specific purposes (LSP) courses are those in which the methodology, the content, the objectives, the materials, the teaching, and the assessment practices all stem from specific, target language uses based on an identified set of specialized needs. Common examples of LSP include courses like Japanese for Business, Spanish for Doctors, Mandarin for Tourism, or English for Air-traffic Controllers. In each of these cases, the content and focus of the language instruction is narrowed to a specific context or even a particular subset of tasks and skills. Importantly, the context and the people involved (e.g., learners, professionals in the field) drive LSP curriculum—unlike general purposes language instruction, which is often driven by theory alone (Widdowson, 1983).

LSP does not have an overly long or detailed history in the literature of applied linguistics, and while we can certainly presume that LSP instruction, in some form or other, has existed for as long as language instruction itself, few direct references are made to its practice before Strevens (1977). Even then, much of the research has been solely in the realm of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) instruction (see Johns & Dudley-Evans, 1991). Indeed, the definition of LSP that we favor actually comes from a definition of ESP put forth by Strevens (1988). According to Strevens, the essential characteristics of specific purpose instruction are that it:

Consist of [teaching] which is: designed to meet specified needs of the learner; related in content (i.e., in its themes and topics) to particular disciplines, occupations, and activities; centered on the language appropriate to those activities, in syntax, lexis, discourse, semantics, etc; (1988, pp. 1-2)

In other words, LSP (or ESP) incorporates both linguistics and content area knowledge that is specific to a particular context based on the needs of the learners.

Another way to approach LSP is to contrast it against what it is not; specifically, LSP is often positioned as the opposite of language for general purposes (LGP), or the more ominous Language for no Obvious Purpose (LNOP). Even Strevens' (1988) definition of ESP above notes that specific purpose instruction is distinct in that it is "in contrast with 'General [language]'" (p. 2). While LGP refers to common approaches in higher education FL instruction, particularly in the United States, LNOP is most often associated with traditions in English instruction and the perhaps more familiar acronym of TENOR (Teaching English for no Obvious Purpose, Abbot, 1981). TENOR is well known in the field of curriculum development as a way of describing a still widespread problem in many second or foreign language programs that teach English around the world for no other reason than as a reaction to the elevated status of English as an international or global language. Given the negative connotations attached to both LNOP and TENOR, LSP is often seen as a solution or remedy to ensuring that language instruction has purpose, and therefore value.

Widdowson (1983) reminds us, however, that all language is purposeful, or at least intends to be so, and in considering what it is that makes LSP different from other kinds of language instruction, maybe it will help to think of *purpose* as being on a continuum.[1] Rather than an either/or conceptualization of purpose, if we think about purpose as a continuum, then LSP would be at one end and LNOP or TENOR would fall at the opposite end, with general purpose language somewhere in between. In other words, even LSP is not a single concept, but rather is one that comes in many flavors and has many possible foci, depending on the purpose.

1.1 Differences from ESP

As we have already seen, the similarities between ESP and LSP are numerous enough that it is difficult to talk about one without mentioning the other, and definitions of ESP tend to resemble (or in fact inform) definitions of LSP. ESP certainly seems to be more widely explored than LSP, perhaps because of the dominant role that English plays globally and the relatively large number of second-language users of English around the world compared to other languages. The historical reasons behind this trend have been well documented and are beyond the scope of this volume (for a more detailed account, see Hutchinson & Waters, 1987; Mackay & Mountford, 1978; Johns, 2013), but nevertheless, this rise has placed considerable value on ESP as a field of study, and as such, the majority of research on LSP has been carried out in English learning contexts. For example, there are at least two prominent academic journals devoted to ESP (*English for Specific Purposes* and *The Journal for English for Academic*

---

[1] While Douglas (2000) originally suggested this idea in relationship to assessment and purpose, it applies equally to LSP as a whole.

Purposes), both of which have relatively high impact factors among peer-reviewed academic journals, while the only current journal devoted to LSP appears to be *Iberica,* which is comparatively less well known in the academic community.

ESP as we know it today began in part as a reaction to the notion of TENOR as a way for curriculum developers to respond to the call for English education internationally in a way that was manageable and sensible for learners in EFL/ESL contexts (Abbot, 1981; Carver, 1983). Beyond that, however, many English learners had direct needs for learning English that went beyond the traditional language learning outcomes of general or dispositional knowledge alone, many of which were often high-stakes (e.g., as a requirement to coordinate with international companies, for promotion or advancement purposes, or even for employment in an L1 speaking context). While not all L2 learners of English have such specific needs, and indeed alternative curriculum designs such as English as an International Language (EIL, see Brown, 2012a) have also arisen in part to address this fact, nevertheless, the need for ESP has been undeniable (Mackay & Mountford, 1978).

Within ESP, several branches of study have emerged over the years, the best known and most frequently researched of these are English for Academic Purposes (EAP), English for Science and Technology (EST), and to a lesser extent, English for Occupational Purposes (EOP). While much has been said about EAP and EST in the literature (e.g., Swales, 2000), the focus is often limited to English alone, with very little attention paid to other languages in the realm of academic or science/technology purposes. This is not terribly surprising, given that English is the

de facto language of academia and science. LSP and ESP do seem to come together in the area of language for occupational purposes, though even in this area there appears to be a key difference in focus between English and other languages when they are taught for occupational purposes. EOP seems particularly relevant for international businesses, where English is used as the medium of communication between two different cultures. In FL for occupational purposes contexts, however, the language is used to function within a (mostly) homogenous community, where the language and culture are shared. Because of this, learning the culture as well as the language is often crucial in LSP. This will be explored further in the final chapter, but it is worth considering here as we try to define and identify just what LSP is.

2 What are the Steps to Designing an LSP Course?

It is something of a misconception to view the development of an LSP course as different from the development of any other kind of language course. Certainly there are different challenges and areas of focus, but it is our belief that LSP curriculum development, to a great extent, involves the same kinds of processes as any other language course, in that it should be systematic, justifiable, and begin with an understanding of the needs of those involved with the course. To that end, the proposals included in this collection all follow a model put forth by Brown (1995) in his work on developing curriculum for language teaching.

The approach described in Brown (1995, p. 20) details six core steps in the development of curriculum: (a) needs analysis; (b) goals and objectives; (c) assessment; (d) materials selection and development; (e) teaching; and (f) program evaluation. From this model, each component of

the curriculum is developed in interaction with all other components, creating a fluid, yet systematic design that takes into account the ever-evolving nature of curriculum. In other words, while we might typically begin with a needs analysis as a way of identifying potential objectives, upon which assessments, materials, and teaching practices can be developed, the model also recognizes that this is not a purely linear process, and at any stage in the development of the curriculum, it might be necessary to go back and gather more information, create new objectives, or otherwise revise and adjust. As you will see in the studies included in this book, each of which follows this model, the relationship between every component and the others is apparent and helps to present a clearly interwoven and consistent picture of a complete curriculum. Before that, however, let us explore the idea of needs analysis in greater detail, as this is often the starting point and main component that is directly associated with LSP.

2.1 Needs Analysis

Every LSP course, regardless of language or purpose, begins with a recognition that the curriculum, and indeed the course, is a reflection of some kind of need. This may be a need on the part of the learners, the community, the language program itself, the university, international trends, or any number of other factors, or indeed, a combination thereof. While this may be true (or at least should be true) of any kind of learning, needs and specific purposes seem to go hand in hand, and indeed historically the notion of needs analysis or needs assessment in education has been linked with the very beginnings of LSP (Halliday, McIntosh, & Strevens, 1964).

Brown (1995, p. 36) defines needs analysis in the following way:

The systematic collection and analysis of all subjective and objective information

necessary to define and validate defensible curriculum purposes that satisfy the language

learning requirements of students within the context of particular institutions that

influence the learning and teaching situation.

In more detail this definition means that the process of gathering information about the needs of

a particular program or course requires that this information come from several different sources

and perspectives (e.g., different stakeholders, such as potential or past learners, instructors,

administrators, employers) and that this information should be gathered using a variety of

complementary methods (e.g., interviews, surveys, document analysis, focus groups).

Underlying this information gathering process is the need for the results to be valid and

representative of the actual needs of the program in order to be used to create a defensible and

justifiable curriculum.

The use of needs analysis has been well documented in the literature (e.g., see Brown,

2009; forthcoming). Focusing instead on LSP, Upton (2012, p. 14) describes four important

movements in needs analysis that have arisen in LSP research. Early needs analyses were

primarily interested in *language* needs alone, in terms of the specific, specialized language and

grammar that learners needed to acquire in the particular LSP (Halliday et al., 1964). This

reflected early trends in LSP curriculum where the focus was on teaching structures and

vocabulary alone. Following this, as LSP curriculum turned to more discourse-based approaches,

needs analysis also shifted to focus on identifying the particular reasons why learners needed

LSP as well as on an early version of identifying target language uses (Strevens, 1977). As

genre-based approaches to LSP came into favor (Swales, 1990), needs also shifted to looking both at language uses but also at the learners themselves (Dudley Evans & St. John, 1998), which is where needs analysis remains today.

From needs analysis, the other components of curriculum design tend to fall into place. Once needs are identified, learning outcomes or objectives can be stated to reflect what those needs are and what the learners will be able to do by the end of instruction. In order to measure the degree to which those outcomes are achieved, assessments can be designed, and from those, syllabuses, materials, and teaching methods can be decided that facilitate and prepare students for those assessments. Concurrently with each of these steps and throughout the implementation of the course and beyond, evaluation takes place in the form of gathering information about the effectiveness of the curriculum (e.g., mid-semester conferences, student evaluation surveys, outcomes-assessments, see Brown, 1995; Patton, 2008; Norris, 2006). Again, while needs analysis is found at the beginning of this process, each of these pieces affect one another and will always be, to some degree, a work in progress rather than a completed project.

3 What are some Common Issues or Potential Limitations to LSP?

Several limitations or issues have been recognized in the study and development of LSP curriculum. While the proposals in this collection will discuss in more detail the individual limitations faced by specific authors, it is worthwhile here to consider some of the larger issues currently facing the field of LSP. Recent literature seems to have identified three major areas that need to be addressed moving forward: (a) the level of specificity/specialization of the language

taught; (b) the methods and focus of instruction; and (c) the role of power and values in LSP instruction.

Questions about specificity in LSP are not new by any means. There has been an ongoing debate about the how specific the language instruction should be in LSP for decades (Johns & Dudley-Evans, 1991). The crux of the problem is the degree to which LSP should be restrictive in terms of linguistic features and strategy instruction (Johns & Dudley-Evans, 1991; Upton, 2012; Jordan, 1997). Narrower views of LSP believe that the curriculum should be focused upon a fixed and limited set of language uses and features (Hyland, 2002; Johns & Dudley, 1980), fearing that a wider scope places LSP too close to general purposes curriculum and thus defeats the purpose of qualifying it at specific in the first place. Wider views of LSP believe that narrow views inherently limit the functionality of language and thus demotivate or de-authenticate the language for learners (Hutchinson & Waters, 1980; Spack 1988). This view follows the idea that LSP can utilize a common core of specific language and strategy instruction that can apply to multiple fields while still not being so broad as to be indefinable. This kind of instruction is typically found in EAP contexts, where learners come from a broad spectrum of academic fields, though they are brought together into the same classroom.

Another criticism of specificity is that because LSP curriculum contains both linguistic instruction as well as content instruction, and teachers are rarely experts in both, the level of instruction will ultimately suffer (Anthony, 2011; Huckin, 2003). As is always the case,

however, support for a more moderate position that recognizes the benefits of both narrow and wide views has started to gain support among researchers (see Belcher 2006).

The second issue brought up in regards to LSP is that of methodology, and in particular the relationship between the target language uses and the linguistic content (e.g., materials, tasks) of the course. Over time, the content of LSP (and ESP) has shifted from a primarily language-related focus to language use in context (Swales, 2000; Upton, 2012). Early views of LSP curriculum were centered on linguistic aspects from a more structural and lexical viewpoint (Halliday et al., 1964). This fell out of favor with the introduction of discourse-based approaches (Strevens, 1977), which had a more usage-based, communicative approach, but was limited to rhetorical structures and functions. Discourse-based approaches were later replaced by genre-based approaches (Swales, 2000, 1990), which again prioritized language use as it is situated within different texts. Genre-based approaches remain common, especially in EAP contexts.

In non-English LSP contexts, where international communication is not the focus but rather some form of integration into the L2 context or culture on the part of the learner, more recent developments in LSP curriculum have embraced a stronger view of contextualized language use. This view utilizes task-based, strategy-based, and sociocultural methodologies to account for both linguistic and extra-linguistic needs (Northcott, 2013; Belcher, 2009, 2006). While these methods are certainly also found in ESP contexts, the shift towards a broader integration of both language and content knowledge seems clearly related to the specific needs of LSP.

The final issue raised by some authors in regards to LSP deals with the notion of critical LSP, or rather the apparent lack of critical pedagogy in relation to LSP (Belcher, 2006; Upton, 2012). The main concern from a critical perspective is that the learners and their needs be accurately reflected in a way that empowers learners rather than disenfranchises them. The example used by Tollefson (1991) is whether or not in proposing a course in something like language for use in hospitality services teachers are limiting learners to low-paying service jobs by teaching only what is necessary to succeed at one level, compared to providing them with the tools and skills to advance in their prospective careers. Likewise, in assessment terms, a study by Elias and Lockwood (2014) showed that while an LSP course assisted learners in gaining the skills to pass their interviews and secure employment, it lacked a connection to other tasks in the workplace and thus limited their ability to be successful at their jobs.

These kinds of issues require us to consider curriculum development from a values- and power-based perspective. When conducting a needs analysis or creating objectives, as LSP curriculum designers, we must consider what it is that is being valued and whether or not this is reflecting the needs of the learners as well as the program, administrators, and other stakeholders (Upton, 2012). There is always a question as to the extent to which our learners are reliable or capable enough to define their needs, but as teachers and developers, it is our responsibility to consider this issue during the design phase and take the necessary precautions to ensure that the learners are not, in a sense, forgotten (Benesch, 2001).

4 What Does this Book Contribute to Our Current Knowledge of LSP?

Johns and Dudley (1991) claimed 24 years ago that ESP was the path of the future given the expanding use of English around the world, and certainly the literature has reflected this growth. Unfortunately, this trend has also led to specific purpose instruction in other languages, (especially less commonly taught languages, or LCTL) being overlooked and perhaps even undervalued relative to English and ESP. Yet there are many areas where LSP is needed and valued, especially when we approach more locally defined contexts, such as multicultural neighborhoods where the shared language of the community is perhaps different from the surrounding context.

While the current trend in most fields seems to be moving in an international direction, our view is that this movement should not come at the expense of the local context. Hence, this collection is an attempt to provide teachers and curriculum developers with the necessary information and tools to design and create their own LSP courses by providing examples from a variety of languages, purposes, and contexts. We hope, as well, that this collection of proposals will help to create a space for language teachers interested in LSP to network and expand the existing community. It might also serve as a useful place for materials developers to see what is possible and what has been done before in the area of LSP, where again the amount of published work is considerably limited in comparison to ESP.

5 Overview of Chapters

This collection contains 16 LSP course proposals and two materials proposals spread across a variety of languages and purposes. These projects came out two summer institutes on LSP at the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa (UHM) sponsored by the National Foreign Language Resource Center and the National Resource Center East Asia at UHM. The summer institutes were designed for foreign language instructors from American universities, colleges, and community colleges from both Hawaiʻi and the mainland, with the intention of supporting their work in developing LSP courses for their respective contexts. Through lectures, hands-on activities, and collaborative discussion among the participants and facilitators, the following proposals were created.

5.1 Part 1: Language for Medical Purposes

This section contains four proposals related to language for medical purposes courses. As medical language is typically only found in hospitals, clinics, and doctor's offices—places that are very much tied to their local communities—it should not be surprising that this form of LSP is very aware of the relationship between language and the local context, and indeed these studies exemplify this relationship through their discussion of needs and organization, as well as in their limitations.

In Chapter 2, Wei Lai presents a proposal for a Mandarin Chinese course for nursing students at a community college, designed to address the needs of the local Mandarin-speaking

community. The 16-week course is situated within a highly regarded nursing program in a community college in New York City and developed for low-beginner learners of Mandarin. While Lai comments that there are very clear needs from an institutional and community perspective, because of the community college context, one of the biggest challenges is meeting the varied and changing needs of the students.

Chapter 3 presents a study by Sara Hillman that describes the development and needs analysis of Arabic for Healthcare Professionals situated in Michigan, where there is a large Arabic-speaking community. Designed for in-practice healthcare professionals with no previous knowledge of Arabic, the course is structured to both introduce basic language for nurses and doctors as well as cultural knowledge of Arabic speaking countries, specifically in terms of medical traditions and belief systems. One of the major challenges identified by Hillman is that because of the nature of Arabic as a difficult language for native speakers of English to learn, limited contact hours, low starting proficiency for the learners, and the variety of dialects and variations make this a very difficult course to construct and teach from a linguistic perspective.

In Chapter 4 Anna Szawara presents a study for a Polish for Health Personnel course for university students and in-practice professionals in Chicago. Chicago is host to a large Polish-speaking community, and this class was designed in part to meet the needs of local hospitals and clinics that have a large number of Polish-speaking patients. Because of the mixed population of learners, this course is a good example of the kind of flexibility in scheduling that can be very beneficial for some LSP situations, though the author notes that Polish, like Arabic, is considered

a difficult language for true beginners, and the limited contact hours of instruction will be a challenge in designing the final curriculum and meeting the objectives of the course.

Chapter 5 is one of two ESP proposals (the other is Chapter 8) included in this collection, though unlike many ESP courses, this one is still contextualized within the local community, as a course for home-care workers in Honolulu, Hawai'i. This proposal by Kendi Ho centers around a detailed and thorough needs analysis at an adult community center certification course in Home Care. This study looks in particular at identifying the needs of L2 learners of English participating in the program from the perspectives of the instructors, the L2 learners, and the native speakers of English in the program. Despite the careful planning and use of multiple sources of information, the author reports that gaining access to participants for her needs analysis and balancing different perspectives presented her with an unexpected but very crucial trial to overcome.

5.2 Part 2: Language for Business Purposes

The largest section of this collection is devoted to Language for Business Purposes, with eight individual proposals, all situated within Asian language business contexts. Unlike the previous section, many of the LSP for business studies presented here have more far-reaching contexts, though even in the field of business there are still local applications as seen in Chapters 10 and 11.

The proposal detailed in Chapter 6, by Hee Chung Chun, describes an existing, two-semester Korean for Business Purposes course that is being revised based on Brown's (1995) model of curriculum development, beginning with a detailed needs analysis. The program, located in upstate New York, is primarily for university students interested in someday working for companies associated with or located within Korea. Before this proposal, Chun states that the curriculum was mostly developed based on intuition alone, and so this study presents a more systematic approach to needs, objectives, materials, assessment, and evaluation. The one major limitation Chun notes, however, is that despite the course being offered to intermediate learners of Korean, there are still a wide variety of student backgrounds (e.g., heritage learners) that make identifying a clear set of needs challenging.

Chapter 7 is a proposal by Carolyn Lee that describes a Mandarin course for university students preparing for a study abroad program with a business-oriented university in Mainland China. The course presented is an eight-week intensive Chinese language summer program meant to take learners with low-beginner knowledge of Mandarin to intermediate or higher levels necessary to function in a business university setting in China. This program is unique in that it is an intensive LSP program with a very high-stakes and specific set of objectives. Because of this, however, Lee also notes that one of the biggest challenges for this program is in matching the objectives of the course with the expectations of the target institution in China.

Chapter 8 details an ESP proposal by Youngmi Oh, which looks at the development of an ESP course for Information Technology workers in Korea. Rather than a university context, this

business purpose course is designed to be adopted by businesses in Korea wanting to provide specialized English instruction for their employees. The course itself is designed to be different from other business English courses in that it focuses on a combination of linguistic, content-based, and pragmatic knowledge. While the author acknowledges that these components are likely to be more closely associated with target language uses than typical business English classes, she also recognizes that it may be difficult for learners, who are working professionals, to adjust to a style of learning they are unfamiliar with, and the needs analysis and materials development attempt to take this into consideration.

In Chapter 9, Jia Yu presents a proposal of a Business Chinese course aimed at advanced university learners to address student interest in interning or working for businesses in mainland China. Because the program is located in rural Pennsylvania, however, Yu mentions that one of the major challenges of the program is accessing authentic materials and making the content and instruction relevant outside the classroom, where direct opportunities to use and practice the language are limited.

Chapters 10 and 11 provide a slightly different take on the usual LSP business course in that both are targeted at local business contexts. Chapter 10 presents a study by Mariko Kawaguchi for an online Elementary Business Japanese course for working professionals in the automobile industry in Michigan. Unlike most of the business courses discussed in this section, this course is aimed primarily at working professionals as a way to introduce cross-cultural and language knowledge for people working for local Japanese companies. Interestingly, Kawaguchi

has created the class to function entirely in an online environment in order to meet the restricted time schedules of working professionals. While the online context provides many benefits for this LSP context, Kawaguchi also notes that the design of the website and materials creates several potential limitations and time constraints upon the developer.

In Chapter 11, Chun-Yi Peng describes a Chinese for Business Purposes course that is aimed as Chinese learners working in local Chinese businesses and communities (e.g., Chinatown in New York City), where business language is less formal or situated within a corporate setting and more about daily communication in the workplace. This course is designed to meet the needs of immigrants studying Chinese as a second language at a community college in New York. Peng notes that this class is unique in that it is aimed at both native English speakers as well as L2 speakers of English seeking to learn Chinese. As might be expected, this also makes identifying the varied needs of the learner a challenge.

Lastly, Chapters 12 and 13 are devoted to the creation of materials for Business Chinese courses, specifically the creation of textbooks to be used for intermediate advanced learners (Chapter 12) and a general business reader for multiple levels of proficiency (Chapter 13). Both of these studies utilize needs analysis as a way of setting objectives, structuring the materials, designing assessments, and suggesting evaluations for use in multiple Chinese L2 contexts.

Yi Zhou and Haidan Wang, in Chapter 12, put forth a proposal for a textbook designed for learners interested in working in Chinese business contexts, or those who are already professionals in the field and want to improve their language skills. One of the unique aspects of the proposed materials is that it attempts to present very current trends in business, such as e-commerce and social media, though the authors also bring up concerns about keeping the material relevant given the ever-changing landscape of business.

The text proposed in Chapter 13, by Haidan Wang and Jing Wu, is one that is focused on the skill of reading Chinese for business purposes and is presented as a potential supplemental resource to be used in other Chinese for Business purposes courses. The main goal is to provide a selection of authentic and culturally rich texts for learners in multiple contexts. As with any materials development, however, the authors express concerns about how much content will be needed and how to make it accessible to multiple types of Chinese learners while maintaining its authenticity and value.

5.3 Part 3: Language for Alternative Purposes

The final section details six proposals that range outside the more common topic areas discussed in the above two sections. These include language for diplomacy, indigenous purposes, legal purposes, and hospitality. Unlike language for medical or business purposes, this section provides examples of just how wide-reaching and varied LSP can be, while still having a specific purpose. Because these are some of the first documented proposals of their kind, however, the authors are quick to identify certain challenges in regards to gathering information, finding

materials, and having access to content experts, which is a real concern when trying to develop a new kind of curriculum.

Chapter 14 is a proposal for Korean for Diplomacy Purposes created by Yeonhee Yoon. Designed for university students with intermediate-advanced proficiency in Korean, this course would prepare learners to function in a variety of Foreign Service contexts with materials that incorporate issues related to politics and international relations with Korea. In particular, this study provides a great example of how language and culture can fit together within LSP.

In Chapter 15, 'Iwalani Tasaka presents a similarly unique view of LSP by proposing a Hawaiian for Indigenous Purposes course, which starts from the premise of supporting and sustaining the Hawaiian language and culture for the local community. She states that this course is in part a Hawaiian for Academic Purposes course, though the primary focus is on presenting Hawaiian to community college students through a culturally sensitive lens that allows learners to connect with the rich history of the language.

The studies described in Chapters 16 and 17 both center on LSP in a legal context. Abeer Aloush, in Chapter 16, proposes a Legal Arabic for Courts and Ethics course, which is designed for law students who are also learning Arabic. One of the more interesting components of this course is that it will rely upon the use of recent legal documents and court cases to reflect the current legal and socio-political changes happening in many Arabic speaking countries. In

constrast, Chapter 17 presents a very different legal context in a Russian for Law Enforcement, Intelligence, and Security course by Rachel Stauffer. This course is aimed at university learners interested in pursuing a degree in law enforcement at the local or national levels within the United States. While certainly not a typical kind of LSP course, this proposal reflects many features of the local context, including the learner population and the proximity of the university to several government intelligence agencies in the U.S.

Finally, Chapters 18 and 19 describe two Language for Hospitality/tourism courses, both situated within the context of Honolulu, Hawaiʻi. In Chapter 18, Carl Polley describes a Mandarin for Tourism course, while Chapter 19 presents a proposal by Jason Sung for a Korean for Hospitality purposes course. Both courses are aimed at community college learners or current professionals in Honolulu interested in working within the local hotel or tourism industry. As Hawaiʻi is a major tourism destination for East Asian countries, these courses are responding to a clear need in the local community.

5.4 Conclusion

The final chapter of this collection presents a reflection on the varied proposals presented in this volume and touches on some of the recurring themes that appear throughout and how they contribute to our understanding of LSP moving forward. In particular, the final chapter describes how LSP presents different challenges and viewpoints as compared to ESP and how LSP is in many ways more culturally and contextually sensitive than other forms of language instruction. Learners in LSP are typically not experts in the language already, and, because of this, different

approaches need to be considered in the curriculum development process, especially in terms of balancing linguistic, cultural, and content-area instruction. Ultimately, the argument will be made that all language is indeed purposeful (Widdowson, 1983), but that those purposes can vary and differ greatly depending on the local needs of the program.