

# 8 Social Context

---

JEFF SIEGEL

## 1 Introduction

This chapter examines the influence of the social context on SLA from four different angles. Section 2 describes the various sociolinguistic settings in which SLA occurs. Here we will see if the type of setting is relevant to the generalizations about SLA that have been made over the years. Section 3 looks at various ways of analysing social context and at SLA studies that take social contextual factors into account. Here we will look at particular sociostructural and interactional factors that are relevant to SLA. Section 4 outlines various types of educational programs. Here we will see how SLA attainment depends on the interaction of the type of program, the sociolinguistic setting, and various sociostructural factors. Section 5 considers the importance of the perceived sociolinguistic relationship between the L1 and L2 and covers the now neglected area of second dialect acquisition (SDA). Here we will explore whether there are significant differences between SDA and SLA. Thus, this chapter focuses on the broader social factors which may affect groups of learners, rather than on the more immediate situational factors which may affect individual learners.<sup>1</sup>

## 2 Sociolinguistic Settings for SLA

Various broad sociolinguistic settings for SLA can be distinguished on the basis of the functional roles and domains of use of the L1 and L2. Factors taken into account are whether the L2 has a widespread or restricted functional role in the society, whether it is spoken as a native language by a significant section of the population, and whether most of the society is monolingual or bilingual. Another significant sociolinguistic factor relevant to all settings is the particular variety of the L2 which provides the input (see table 8.1).

**Table 8.1** Sociolinguistic settings for SLA

<i>Setting</i>	<i>Typical learners</i>	<i>L2</i>	<i>Examples</i>
Dominant L2	Speakers of minority languages (e.g., immigrants, swamped indigenous people)	Dominant or majority language	Turks learning German in Germany; Native Americans learning Spanish in Peru
External L2	Speakers of the dominant language	Foreign or distant language	Japanese learning English in Japan; English speakers in Western Canada learning French
Coexisting L2	Speakers in multilingual environments	Nearby language spoken by a large proportion of the population	German speakers learning French in Switzerland
Institutional L2	Speakers in multilingual environments	Indigenous or imported language with a wide range of official uses	English in India; Swahili in Tanzania; English in Samoa
Minority L2	Speakers of the dominant language	Language of minority group (indigenous or immigrant)	English speakers learning Welsh or Panjabi

In the *dominant L2* setting, the L2 is the native language of the majority of the population and used in all domains in everyday life, including the home, education, government, the legal system, business, and the media. This setting is sometimes called the “majority language context” (Ellis, 1994). It is found in countries such as the USA, Australia, France, and Japan. The L1 speakers are either immigrants, visitors, or indigenous peoples, such as Native Americans or Australian Aborigines, who have been swamped by L2-speaking invaders. They are expected to acquire the dominant language, either inside or outside the classroom, in order to take part in mainstream society.

In the *external L2* setting, a language not generally used for everyday communicative functions within the society is learned in the classroom by usually monolingual L1 speakers. This L2 may be a foreign language (such as Japanese in Australia), a language spoken in a distant part of the same country (such as French in Western Canada), or a world lingua franca (such as English in Korea).

In the third setting, the target is a *coexisting L2*, spoken in the immediate or nearby environment as the native language of a large proportion of the population – for example in border areas or in countries with two or more large language groups, as with French and German in Switzerland, and neighboring group languages in Papua New Guinea. The L1 and L2 are used in similar domains by their respective speakers and have similar status. Studies done in this setting have concentrated almost exclusively on classroom acquisition.

The vast majority of SLA studies have been conducted in these three types of sociolinguistic settings, of which the first two are basically monolingual. Furthermore, SLA research has almost always considered the target to be the standard dialect of the L2 – the variety codified in dictionaries and grammars, normally used in published expository writing, and taught in schools. The study of acquisition where the input includes varieties other than the standard has been neglected, despite the common knowledge that some learners acquire non-standard varieties of the L2 outside the classroom – for example, Caribbean immigrants in London. One exception is the work of Eisenstein (1986), who looked at learners exposed to standard English, New York non-standard English and African-American Vernacular English, and examined their preferences among these varieties and the effects of dialect intelligibility on SLA.

Other sociolinguistic settings exist but have been virtually ignored by SLA research. The first of these is the *institutional L2* setting, where the L2 is widely used in a number of domains and institutions, but for most of the population it is an additional language, rather than a native language. A large proportion of the society is typically bi- or multilingual, maintaining their L1 for use in the home and other domains, such as literature, but also acquiring the L2 for communicating with speakers of the other languages in the society and for official purposes in various institutions of government and education. This is sometimes called the “official language context” (Ellis, 1994). The L2 may be a former colonial language, such as English in Singapore and Fiji, or it may be one of the indigenous languages of the country, such as Bahasa Melayu in Malaysia and Swahili in Tanzania. In some societies, the institutional L2 is used in a more restricted set of domains – for example in official functions, but not for inter-group communication, as with English in Hong Kong, or mainly in education, as with English in Scandinavia and in some Pacific countries, such as Tonga and Samoa.

Research on the acquisition of English illustrates how the field of SLA has been limited to particular sociolinguistic settings. One of the most common classifications of social contexts in SLA is the distinction between the acquisition of English as a second language and as a foreign language, or the ESL/EFL dichotomy. But this classification fails to distinguish between English as second language when it is the dominant language in a basically monolingual setting and when it is an institutional language in a multilingual setting. This has been pointed out by scholars such as Judd (1987) and Nayar (1997), who have proposed alternative taxonomies. Furthermore, almost all studies of the

acquisition of English have concentrated on learners in dominant L2 settings in Britain, the USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. However, there are far more learners of English in institutional L2 settings in India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Singapore, Malaysia, the Philippines, Kenya, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Fiji, and other countries. (See Kachru, 1985.)

This has led to a rather skewed view of the nature of the L2 and its speakers. First, nearly all studies of the acquisition of English have concentrated on the standard varieties spoken in the dominant L2 settings. They have all but ignored the “indigenized varieties” of English (sometimes called “New Englishes”) which have become established with their own norms in most of the institutional L2 settings and are the target languages of hundreds of millions of learners. Second, the benchmark for the acquisition of English is normally considered to be the language of native speakers who in dominant L2 contexts are typically monolingual. Yet the majority of users of English in the world are non-native speakers and bilingual. Sridhar and Sridhar (1986) describe several ways in which acquisition of indigenized varieties of English (IVEs) in institutional L2 settings differs from acquisition in other settings. First, with regard to the target, the goal is to be able to use the L2 effectively with other mostly non-native speakers, not with native speakers. Thus, the target is actually the particular non-native IVE of the country, such as Indian or Singapore English, not a native variety, such as British or American English. Second, most of the input comes from the IVE, not from a native variety, and most of it is obtained in the classroom or in interactions with other non-native speakers, not with native speakers. Third, learners use the English they acquire alongside the other languages of their verbal repertoires which are already used for particular functions. Thus they do not need to acquire English for as wide a range of functions as learners in dominant L2 settings have to.

Because of these factors, Sridhar and Sridhar (1986, p. 12) observe that “SLA theory has been counter-intuitive and limited in explanatory power with regard to a very substantial segment of the second language learner population.” This is especially true with regard to the notions of interlanguage and interference or negative transfer. For example, as Kachru and Nelson (1996) point out, considering the “non-standard” features of indigenized varieties to be the result of L1 interference and fossilized interlanguage (see Selinker, 1972) relies on two assumptions: (i) learners in institutional L2 settings wish to emulate a particular dominant variety of standard English, and (ii) models of this variety are available in the environment. In most cases, however, both of these assumptions are unfounded. Sridhar and Sridhar (1986, p. 10) also emphasize the positive use of transfer in communication in bilingual IVE settings:

Far from impeding intelligibility, transfer acts as the grease to make the wheels of bilingual communication turn smoothly. Given that transfer features are not idiosyncratic to learners but shared by speakers with the same substratal languages, they serve as effective simplification strategies, modes of acculturation

... and as markers of membership in the community of speakers of a given indigenized variety.

With regard to actual research on IVEs, Lowenberg's work on Malaysian English (1986b, 1993) shows that lexical transfer serves not only as a compensatory acquisition strategy but as an enrichment strategy for adapting the language to its new sociocultural surroundings. Examples are the Malay words *gotong-royong* 'a form of communal cooperation' and *adat* 'a body of traditional law,' which are commonly transferred into English to refer to these unique cultural institutions of the Malay-speaking areas of Southeast Asia (1993, p. 44). Lowenberg (1986a) also observes that phonological transfer, especially in stress and intonation patterns, is often associated with group identity. In addition, he illustrates that generalization of rules in IVEs is different from overgeneralization in other SLA contexts in that it is actually an extension of what are extremely productive processes in the native varieties.

In a slightly different vein, Williams (1987) examines common features across a number of IVEs as a potential source of insight into SLA processes. She comes up with the following relevant speaker-oriented processes: economy of production, regularization, selection production of redundant markers, and hyperclarity (reduction of ambiguity and maximization of transparency). Perhaps the most detailed study of the acquisition of an IVE is that of Gupta (1994) on Singapore Colloquial English (SCE). Data come from tape-recordings of children in two families acquiring SCE in multilingual environments. The linguistic feature that she concentrates on, interrogatives, reveals an additive or sequential acquisition of structures in SCE which differs from the developmental patterns described for the acquisition of standard forms of English as a first and second language.

Finally, the other setting for SLA that has rarely been studied is the *minority L2* setting – where speakers of a dominant language learn a minority language, usually in naturalistic rather than classroom contexts (see table 8.1 above). The few studies that have been conducted have provided insights which question some of the assumptions made on the basis of research in other settings. One example is the study by Ben (M. B. H.) Rampton (1991, 1995) of minority language learning and use in England among an adolescent peer group made up of South Asians, Afro-Caribbeans, and White Anglos. He describes (1991, pp. 232–3) the latter two groups learning Panjabi in recreational settings through translation, elicitation, and even practice and revision. Rampton notes (p. 292) that this kind of formal instruction and form-focused activity in such a setting is a phenomenon not reported elsewhere. Rampton (1995, p. 292) also observes that rather than generating "situational anxiety," as L2 learning is assumed to do, the learning of Panjabi was a pleasurable experience for the youths involved.

Another assumption that is questioned by research in minority L2 settings is that SLA learners are stigmatized. While this may be true in dominant L2 settings, Rampton's research, as well Trosset's (1986) study of learning Welsh,

a minority language in Britain, and Woolard's (1989, p. 76) observations on learning Catalan in Spain, reveal that learners of a minority L2 are often accorded prestige by speakers of the language (Rampton, 1995, p. 293). Trosset's (1986) study also highlights several aspects of language learning which are not usually considered in studies in other contexts, such as the importance of native speakers' perceptions of the learner and the learner's roles as both "consciousness raiser" and performer (p. 189).

To sum up, one shortcoming of the field of SLA is that generalizations have been made on the basis of research carried out in only a limited range of sociolinguistic settings and involving only standard varieties of language. The findings of the few studies done in alternative settings and with other varieties question the validity of these generalizations and illustrate the importance of considering sociolinguistic context in SLA.

### **3 Analysis of Social Context in SLA**

Ways of analysing social context generally vary along three parameters: macro vs. micro, structural vs. interactional, and objective vs. subjective. Macro-analysis focuses on society as a whole and the characteristics of the various social groups which comprise it. With regard to SLA, it considers the relative size, status, and power of the L1 and L2 groups and the general domains of use of the L1 and L2. In contrast, micro-analysis pays attention to the behavior of individuals in particular situations which results from broader social factors. With regard to SLA, it examines specific activities involving L2 learning and use, the social relationships between particular L1 and L2 speakers, and the status and power of individual L2 learners and their interlocutors within social interactions.

The structural point of view sees power, prestige, and other specific aspects of social context as given, determined by the structure of the society and by the historical forces that shaped this structure. For example, a person's social identity is the result of the particular social group to which she or he belongs and the position of this group in society. SLA may be affected directly or indirectly by these sociostructural or sociohistorical factors. In contrast, the interactional point of view sees social context not as given, but as created in each specific situation by the interplay of several social factors. According to this view, a person has multiple social identities, and the one that emerges in a particular situation is determined not only by the person's group membership but by the social interaction. Social identities and relationships may be continuously changing and renegotiated as the interaction proceeds. The particular kind of language used both reflects and creates one's social position and identity in the interaction. It affects the interaction and, at the same time, the way the interaction proceeds affects the language that is used. In the same manner, rather than just the social context affecting SLA, there is a "reflexive" relationship between the two (Firth and Wagner, 1997), with second language learning and use also affecting the social context.

Finally, the objective perspective concentrates on the observable aspects of the social context, while the subjective perspective concentrates on individuals' perceptions of these aspects. For example, a person's social identity may be determined objectively by membership in a particular social group or by the characteristics of a particular social interaction, but subjectively by attitudes toward this and other groups or by perceptions of the social interaction. Also, while the objective perspective looks at the institutional associations of particular languages, the subjective perspective looks at symbolic associations.

Of SLA studies that have taken social context into account, the vast majority have involved macro-analysis and the structural point of view, with both objective and subjective perspectives represented. However, more studies using micro-analysis and the interactional approach have recently begun to appear.

We will begin by looking at macro SLA studies which examine the effects of particular sociostructural factors – most commonly the relative size, status, and power of the L1 and L2 groups. With regard to size, Gardner and Clément (1990) observe on the basis of studies with French and English in Canada that the relative proportion of the L2 group in the community is positively related to the extent of L2 acquisition, at least in classroom situations. But of course the presence of L2 speakers is not a necessary condition for SLA, as seen with the success of other Canadian programs (e.g., Genesee, 1987) in which other factors seem to be more important, such as the nature of the course and teacher, support from parents, and learners' attitudes. With regard to the relative political power of the learners' language group and the L2 group, different studies from Canada show that increased power and recognition of a group along with significant numbers affect the extent to which the language will be learned by other groups (Gardner and Clément, 1990).

The problem with considering sociostructural factors as determinants of SLA is that they may be confounded with other factors, such as the amount of contact between the L1 and the L2 group. For example, it seems that a low-status minority group will have more opportunities for contact with a high-status majority group than vice versa. However, as pointed out by Gardner and Clément (1990, p. 507), few researchers examining the minority/majority distinction have controlled systematically for the amount of contact. An exception is a study by Clément and Kruidenier (1983), who found that the variables of the relative status of the L1 and L2 groups and the amount of contact with the L2 have independent effects, at least with regard to *orientation* – that is, the underlying reasons for learning the L2.

This brings us to the social psychological approach and various models (discussed below) which seek to explain the individual characteristics that affect SLA, and sometimes how social context influences these characteristics. Within this approach, there are several perspectives which differ according to the variables they emphasize. These include the affective factors of motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety, as well as the degree of contact or interaction. We will start by looking briefly at motivation. (For more detailed discussion, see Crookes and Schmidt, 1991; Dörnyei, 1994; Dörnyei and Schmidt, 2001; Ellis,

1994, pp. 508–17; Gardner and Tremblay, 1994a, 1994b; Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991, pp. 172–84). In the social psychological literature on SLA, motivation is usually thought of as the inclination to put in effort to achieve a desired goal – namely acquisition of the L2. As with many social psychological constructs, the motivation of subjects is determined by a combination of several factors, measured by using self-report questionnaires. Nearly all social psychological models of SLA distinguish two types of orientation which may affect motivation. *Integrative orientation* relates to the learner's wish to identify with the L2-speaking community, whereas *instrumental orientation* relates to the desire to learn the L2 for a particular purpose, such as getting a job or fulfilling some educational requirement (Belmechri and Hummel, 1998; Clément, Dörnyei, and Noels, 1994; Gardner and Lambert, 1959; Spolsky, 2000). Earlier social psychological research distinguished between two corresponding types of motivation – integrative and instrumental. Motivation is also influenced by the learner's attitudes toward the L2, its speakers and culture, toward the social and practical value of using the L2, and toward his or her own language and culture.

The results of early research on the effects of motivation and attitudes on SLA illustrate the importance of taking social context into account. Mainly on the basis of initial studies with English-speaking (majority) learners of French in Canada, it was claimed that integrative motivation is more important than instrumental motivation in determining L2 achievement (Gardner and Lambert, 1959). However, later studies (Gardner and Lambert, 1972; Lukmani, 1972; Oller, Baca, and Vigil, 1979; Shaw, 1981) found instrumental motivation to be more important for learners from minority language groups in dominant L2 settings (L1 French and Spanish speakers learning English in the USA) and for learners in institutional L2 settings (learners of English in India and the Philippines). Similarly with regard to attitudes, studies in dominant L2 settings in North America showed strong correlations between positive attitudes toward speakers of the L2 (English) and L2 achievement (see Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991, p. 176). However, studies in external L2 settings (L2 English in Israel and Japan) showed weak or non-existent correlations (Chihara and Oller, 1978; Cooper and Fishman, 1977).

Leaving aside the problems of defining and operationalizing the notions of integrative motivation and positive attitudes (see Crookes and Schmidt, 1991; Dörnyei, 1994; Oller, 1981), we can explain these contradictory results by referring to the different functions and statuses of both the L1 and the L2 in the various sociolinguistic settings in which these studies took place. These sociostructural factors influence motivation and attitudes, as well as opportunities for contact between learners and L2 speakers, which, in turn, influence SLA (Clément and Kruidenier, 1983; Gardner, 1980). They also have an effect on other individual characteristics which may influence SLA, such as self-confidence (Clément, 1986).

Now let us turn to various models within the social psychological approach which take sociostructural factors into account (see table 8.2). The *socioeducational*



**Table 8.2** The role of social context in four social psychological models of SLA

<i>Model</i>	<i>Acquisitional context/ sociolinguistic setting</i>	<i>Social contextual factors considered</i>	<i>Factors influenced</i>	<i>Key determinant of SLA</i>
Socioeducational	Classroom/external L2, dominant L2	“Social-cultural milieu” (prevailing attitude toward bilingualism of L2 group)	Integrative orientation; attitudes toward learning situation	Motivation
Acculturation	Naturalistic/ dominant L2	L1 group size, cohesiveness, etc.; L2 group dominance/ status; inter-group attitudes	Social distance, psychological distance	Acculturation (of learner to L2 group)
Social context	Classroom/ dominant L2, coexisting L2	“Social milieu” (relative size of L1 and L2 groups)	Integrativeness, fear of assimilation, self-confidence	Motivation
Inter-group	Naturalistic/ dominant L2	Perceived ethnolinguistic vitality (relative size, status, support of L1 group); identification with L1 group; etc.	Integrative motivation, degree of insecurity	Social interaction

*model* (Gardner, 1983, 1985, 1988) attempts to explain how certain aspects of the social context are related to L2 proficiency through intervening variables such as motivation and anxiety. The model concentrates on L2 learning in the classroom. Although the model does not emphasize sociostructural factors such as size and status of the L1 and L2 groups, it does consider the *social-cultural milieu*, which includes the prevailing attitude toward bilingualism in the community – for example, whether bilingualism is valued, as in Canada, or whether it is considered an undesirable obstacle to assimilation, as in the USA. The social-cultural milieu influences individual factors, such as the degree of integrative orientation and attitudes toward the learning situation, which in turn determine the degree of motivation. This has a more direct relationship to various outcomes in one of two learning contexts – formal, in which case aptitude is also relevant, or informal. The outcomes are both linguistic (relating to the acquisition of L2 proficiency) and non-linguistic (relating to the re-evaluation of one's self-image and the acquisition of new social and cultural ideas). The model has been supported by empirical studies of English speakers in Canada learning French (for example, Gardner, 1985; Gardner, Lalonde, and Pierson, 1983; Gardner, Tremblay and Masgoret, 1997). It has been criticized on several fronts by Au (1988) and Dörnyei (1994), but defended by Gardner (1988) and Gardner and Tremblay (1994b).

Other social psychological models of SLA emphasize objective characteristics of the L1 and L2 social groups, and contact rather than motivation as the determinant of SLA proficiency. The *acculturation model* (Schumann, 1978a, 1978b, 1986) applies to naturalistic rather than classroom SLA in dominant L2 settings. The premise of the model is that the degree of L2 proficiency is proportional to the degree of acculturation by the learner to the L2 group. In other words, the acquisition of a second language is related to a more general modification of attitudes, knowledge, and behavior toward those of the group who speak that language.<sup>2</sup> According to the model, the extent of acculturation depends on the degree of *social distance* and *psychological distance* between learners and the L2 group. The greater the social and psychological distance, the less contact learners will have with the L2 and the less they will be open to the available input – thus, the lower the degree of SLA.

Social distance is determined by a set of factors characterizing the L1 group and the relationships it has with the L2 group. L1 group characteristics are size, cohesiveness, integration pattern, enclosure, and intended length of residence. Social distance will be greater when the L1 group is large and cohesive, wants to preserve its lifestyle and values, does not wish to assimilate, has its own social facilities, and intends to stay for a short time. Inter-group characteristics include social dominance and attitudes. Social distance will be greater when the L2 group is politically dominant and has higher status, and when the two groups have negative attitudes toward each other. Psychological distance is determined by individual factors, such as language and culture shock and motivation. If learners feel anxious, disoriented, and inhibited, and if they are not integratively motivated to learn the L2, then psychological

distance will be greater. Thus, the sum of these social and individual factors indirectly determines the degree to which the L2 is acquired. In spite of being widely referred to in the SLA literature, the acculturation model has received only limited support in empirical studies. (For detailed conceptual and methodological critiques, see Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991, pp. 251–66; McLaughlin, 1987, pp. 109–32.)

A major influence on other SLA models emphasizing social group characteristics has been speech accommodation theory (Beebe, 1988; Giles, 1977; Giles, Taylor, and Bourhis, 1973). According to this theory, people may adjust their speech to either reduce or accentuate linguistic differences with their interlocutors. Adjustment toward others is called *convergence* and away from others *divergence*. Convergence occurs when the speaker wants approval from people with similar beliefs, values, and attitudes. Divergence occurs when the speaker wants to assert distinctiveness from interlocutors from another social group.

Closely associated with speech accommodation is ethnolinguistic identity theory (Bourhis and Giles, 1977; Giles and Johnson, 1981, 1987), which draws on the work of Tajfel (1974, 1978) and considers language to be a salient marker of group membership and thus social identity. The key notion of this theory is *ethnolinguistic vitality* (Giles, Bourhis, and Taylor, 1977). This refers to the combination of factors which make a group behave distinctively and act collectively. The higher a group's ethnolinguistic vitality, the greater the chance of its continued existence as a distinct group. Ethnolinguistic vitality depends on three sets of factors: status (economic power and prestige), demographics (numbers relative to other groups and population trends), and institutional support (representation of members in formal and informal institutions). Clearly, then, this construct is largely determined by the sociostructural factors of size, status, and power.

In the *social context model* of SLA (Clément, 1980), the relative ethnolinguistic vitality of the L1 and L2 groups influences the strength of two opposing forces in the learner: *integrativeness* and *fear of assimilation*. Integrativeness, as we have seen, refers to the desire to become an accepted member of the L2 culture. Fear of assimilation is the fear that learning the second language will result in the loss of the first language and culture. The model distinguishes two different "social milieux": *unicultural*, where one language group is clearly the majority (that is, a dominant L2 setting), and *multicultural*, where the two language groups do not differ greatly in numbers (a coexisting L2 setting). The operation of the two opposing forces, integration and fear of assimilation, is considered to be the "primary motivational process" in the model. In a unicultural milieu, the net result of this process will directly determine the degree of motivation to learn the L2, which in turn determines the extent of the communicative competence acquired. However, in a multicultural milieu, this process is mediated by a "secondary motivational process" associated with self-confidence. More specifically, the balance between integrativeness and fear of assimilation influences the frequency and pleasantness of interaction with

L2 speakers, which affect the learners' confidence in their ability to use the L2. The level of this self-confidence then determines the degree of motivation to acquire the L2. This model has received some support from empirical studies (Clément, 1986; Clément and Kruidenier, 1985).

The *inter-group model* (Giles and Byrne, 1982) also emphasizes social group characteristics, but it focuses on the social identity of the individual members of the group and their subjective perceptions of characteristics such as ethnolinguistic vitality, rather than on any objective measurements. It applies to dominant L2 settings, and while motivation is an important factor, it considers interaction to be the main determinant of SLA proficiency. Giles and Byrne (1982) set out five conditions under which learners from the minority L1 group are most likely to acquire nativelike proficiency in the dominant L2. These are:

- i learners' identification with the L1 group is weak and/or the L1 is not an important marker of group identity;
- ii learners do not often compare themselves with the L2 group;
- iii learners perceive the ethnolinguistic vitality of the L1 group as low;
- iv learners perceive cultural and linguistic boundaries between the L1 and L2 groups as soft and open; and
- v learners identify with and have status in other social groups, based on categories such as occupation, religion, or gender.

These conditions are related to low ethnolinguistic vitality and minimal insecurity, and they are associated with strong integrative motivation. This leads to anxiety-free social interaction and eventually long-term convergence with L2 speakers, resulting in high levels of L2 proficiency. Conversely, if the opposites of the five conditions apply, ethnolinguistic vitality and insecurity will be high, integrative motivation weak, interaction rare, and L2 proficiency low.

The inter-group model has been tested in only a few empirical studies (e.g., Giles and Johnson, 1987; B. J. Hall and Gudykunst, 1986) and these obtained mixed results. Sachdev and Bourhis (1991) emphasize the importance of applying the model to minority groups that have relatively low and subordinate status, as well as being outnumbered by the dominant group. A study of a subordinate minority group in London (Spanish speakers) by Kelly, Sachdev, Kottsieper, and Ingram (1993) found support for some aspects of the model – especially the inverse relationship between the degree of identification with the L1 group and the use or approval of the L2.

The social psychological models in general have been criticized on several fronts. Tollefson (1991, pp. 72–6) points out that these models imply that learners are free to make choices about when they interact with L2 speakers or whether they are motivated to integrate with the L2 culture. Thus, lack of L2 attainment can be blamed on the individual learner. This ignores the historical-structural factors that actually limit the “choices” learners can make and that

determine the meaning of these “choices.” These approaches do not pay enough attention to the sociohistorical factors of power and domination which have shaped factors they do consider, such as language prestige and cultural and linguistic boundaries. J. K. Hall (1995) calls for a sociohistorical approach to the study of SLA which takes into account the “sociocultural and/or sociopolitical authority” attached to conventionalized uses of language and the resources available to various users of the languages (p. 220). She criticizes the notions of interlanguage and fossilization, saying that the movement from the L1 to the L2 is not unilinear and that it depends on historical and sociocultural forces, not merely psychological abilities.

Rampton (1995) agrees that sociohistorical issues of authority and power have to be taken into account, but also points out the importance of a subjective examination of people’s attitudes toward these issues and the symbolic associations of languages. With regard to methodology, Rampton (1991, p. 235) proposes a more “delicate” analysis of second language learning situations and learner statuses than is found in macro-analyses. Rather than using experimental methods and the collection of data prestructured through questionnaires, he advocates more holistic but detailed investigations through participant observation and ethnography (1995, pp. 291–2). Rampton also illustrates the value of the interactional point of view. He notes that the adolescents in his study (mentioned above) seem to be able to “negotiate the relationships between language and group membership” in their interactions (1995, p. 4) and he considers “the ways in which race and ethnicity are asserted, questioned and contested” in the learning and use of Panjabi, as well as Caribbean Creole and stylized South Asian English, in these interactions (p. 19).

Views similar to those of Tollefson, J. K. Hall, and Rampton are found in three recent articles which are specifically on SLA. Peirce (1995) proposes an approach which better integrates the learner and the social context and which takes into account the socially and historically constructed relationships between the learner and the L2. This approach is based on her longitudinal ethnographic study of five immigrant women in a dominant L2 setting (see box 8.1). It suggests that inequitable power relationships, rather than factors such as strong identification with the L1 group or low motivation, may limit opportunities for learners to interact with L2 speakers, and thus to practice the L2 outside the classroom.

Peirce’s approach shifts not only to a micro- rather than macro-analysis of social context but also to an interactional rather than structural perspective. It takes the view that people have multiple and changing social identities, rather than the unitary static social identity of most social psychological models. Furthermore, Peirce introduces the concept of “investment,” based on Bourdieu’s (1977) idea of language as cultural capital, to capture the complex relationship between power, identity, and SLA. According to this concept, learners will invest effort in using and acquiring the L2 because of the returns they receive in resources such as friendship and education, as well as material gains. However, since learners have complex social identities and a variety of

### Box 8.1 Peirce (1995)

*Research questions:* The author's basic research questions were (pp. 13–14):

How are the opportunities for immigrant women in Canada to practice ESL socially structured outside the classroom? How do immigrant women respond to and act upon these social structures to create, use, or resist opportunities to practice English? To what extent should their actions be understood with reference to their investment in English and their changing social identities across time and space?

Underlying this research were the following assumptions:

- i Language is not a neutral medium of communication; rather, it must be understood with reference to its social meaning (p. 13).
- ii Both exposure to and practice in the target language are a necessary condition of SLA (p. 14).

*Methodology:* This qualitative longitudinal study focuses on the naturalistic language learning experiences of five immigrant women in their homes, workplaces, and communities (p. 14). The major source of data was diaries kept by participants for a six-month period, where participants kept records of their interactions with English-speaking Canadians and reflected on their learning experiences. The researcher also met regularly with the participants to share some diary entries and discuss their insights and concerns. Other sources of data were two detailed questionnaires administered before and after the study, personal and group interviews, and home visits (p. 14).

*Findings:* The conclusions of the research were:

- i Affective factors such as motivation, introversion, and inhibition are not static, and may differ over time and space even within the same individual. These factors are socially constructed according to power relationships and other conditions.
- ii Inequitable power relations may limit L2 learners' opportunities to practice the target language outside the classroom. However, "the decision to remain silent or the decision to speak may both constitute forms of resistance to inequitable social forces" (p. 20).
- iii Language learners, like other people, have complex, non-static social identities which depend on both social structures and day-to-day social interaction. The efforts learners are willing to invest in acquiring the L2 are closely bound up with their changing social identities as well as the returns they expect to receive.

desires, the nature of their investment will always be changing. Thus, unlike integrative or instrumental motivation, investment is not a fixed individual attribute. In addition, when learners interact in the L2, they are continually renegotiating their own social identity. Therefore, investing in the L2 also involves investing in one's own constantly changing social identity (Peirce, 1995, pp. 17–18).

McKay and Wong (1996) expand on Peirce's approach, similarly drawing on a longitudinal ethnographic study of immigrants in a dominant L2 setting, but this time of four adolescents involved in classroom instruction. McKay and Wong conceive of the language learner from what they call a "contextualist perspective" – that is, a perspective which highlights the interrelationships between discourse and power in the social context of SLA.

Siegel (1996) examines a conversation between a New Zealand woman studying in Japan and her male Japanese professor. This is part of a larger longitudinal ethnographic study of the acquisition of sociolinguistic competence by several foreign women in Japan, based on language learning journals, interviews, observations, and tape-recorded interactions. The study demonstrates "the dynamic co-construction of identity and sociolinguistic proficiency within conversational interactions" (p. 356). The significant factors are the learner's conceptions of herself and her position in society, her views of the L2 language and culture, the constraints and resources in interactions which affect SLA, and the views of both the learner and the L2 society regarding sociolinguistic competency.

In general, research using micro-analysis and the interactional approach has provided some important insights into the role of social context in SLA. First, the attitudes of L1 speakers toward L2 learners and their proficiency may be just as significant as those of the L2 learners toward the L1 group, as shown by Trosset (1986), Rampton (1995), and Siegel (1996). As Rampton (1995, pp. 293–4) points out, communication difficulties may be caused not only by the learner's lack of L2 proficiency but also by the L1 interlocutor's assumptions about the L2 user's competence.

Second, a variety which differs from that of an idealized native speaker does not necessarily represent deficiency in L2 competence, as we have already seen for speakers of indigenized varieties of English. In addition to expressing a particular identity of the speaker, it may also be used to show solidarity with a peer group or to indicate attitudes toward society in general. For example, stylized South Asian English is used by the adolescents studied by Rampton (1995) not because of any lack of proficiency but for joking and ridiculing racist attitudes. As Firth and Wagner (1997, p. 292) observe, non-nativelike structures may be "deployed resourcefully and strategically to accomplish social and interactional ends." Furthermore, the decision not to use nativelike L2 forms or not to use the L2 at all may represent a form of resistance, which, alongside achievement and avoidance, is another kind of communication strategy (Rampton, 1991, p. 239). It follows, then, that in many situations nativelike proficiency is not the target of language learning. For example, in Rampton's study, Panjabi is a language learner variety for Anglo and Afro-Caribbean adolescents, and it is precisely this status that makes it suited for its use in inter-ethnic jocular abuse (1995, p. 175).

Third, the notions of the native speaker and nativelike proficiency are themselves questionable when one considers multiple and changing social identities and language abilities (Firth and Wagner, 1997; Rampton, 1995).

There are clearly many cases in which non-native speakers have greater proficiency in and allegiance to a language than have native speakers. In fact, Cook (1999) suggests that skilled L2 users, rather than native speakers, should be used as models in second language teaching.

Thus, once again we can see that the deficit view of L2 competence implicit in the notions of interlanguage, fossilization, and non-native speaker holds only in particular social contexts. SLA researchers need to examine both the functions of the L2 in social interaction and its symbolic associations before applying such notions.

## 4 Educational Programs

With regard to classroom SLA, the social context includes the type of educational program. This is the result of language policy decisions about the role of the L1 and L2 as a medium of instruction and subject of study. Programs differ according to whether or not the educational goal is *additive bilingualism* (Lambert, 1974) – where learners become active users of the L2 but also maintain their L1. Programs that do not promote additive bilingualism often result in *subtractive bilingualism* – where learners shift to the L2, which replaces their L1 – or in failure to acquire adequately the L2.

Many typologies of educational programs have been put forward (for example, Cummins, 1988; García, 1997; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1984, 1988). Here we will distinguish between *monolingual programs* – where only one language is used in the school as the medium of instruction – and *bilingual programs* – where two (or sometimes more than two) languages are used for instruction (see table 8.3). We will also consider how these programs correspond to the sociolinguistic settings described above.

Monolingual programs are of two types: L1 and L2. In L1 monolingual programs, the L1 is the medium of instruction and the L2 a subject of classroom study – for example, Australian high-school students learning Japanese. This is typically found in external L2 situations. In L2 monolingual programs, the L2 is the only medium of instruction, as found in *submersion* programs in dominant L2 settings. Children of immigrants or other minorities are placed in schools where the majority language is the language of education and teachers are monolingual in this language. Most submersion programs make no special allowances for the children who do not speak the L2. However, some have “pull-out” classes where children are withdrawn at times from the mainstream classroom for special instruction either in the L2 or in the children’s L1. In other programs, sometimes called *sheltered* or *structured immersion*, L1-speaking children are taught entirely in the L2, but with specially designed materials to help them to learn it. (Such programs are sometimes preceded by a period of intensive instruction in the L2.)

L2 monolingual programs are also found in some *institutional* L2 settings, such as in the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu in the Pacific, where children’s



**Table 8.3** Types of educational programs

<i>Program</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Examples</i>
Monolingual: L1 monolingual	L1 is the only medium of instruction; L2 is taught as subject	English speakers learning German in Australia
L2 monolingual	L2 is the only medium of instruction: Submersion programs (no support for L1 speakers)	Spanish-speaking immigrants learning English in California
	Sheltered or structured immersion programs (some support for L1 speakers)	
	Institutional L2 programs (some support for L1 speakers)	Paamese-speaking students learning English in Vanuatu
Bilingual: Transitional	L1 initial medium of instruction and language of initial literacy; later switch to L2	Fijian-speaking students learning English in Fiji
Immersion	L2 is the medium of instruction for all or most content areas; later switch to both L1 and L2	Some English-speaking students learning French in Canada
Continuing	Both the L1 and L2 are used as language of instruction throughout: Mainstream programs (in coexisting L2 settings)	French and German in Switzerland
	Maintenance programs (for minority students in dominant L2 settings)	
	Dual-language (or two-way) programs (for both majority and minority students in dominant L2 settings)	Both Spanish and English used for instruction of mixed L1 Spanish and L1 English classes in the USA

education is entirely in English or French. However, these programs differ from the submersion programs in dominant L2 settings in three ways. First, the teachers are bi- or multilingual and know the children's L1 or the common language of wider communication (in these cases, Melanesian Pidgin). Second, the content and teaching materials are generally more culturally appropriate for the students. Third, the students are not competing with (or interacting with) native speakers of the L2.

Bilingual programs are of three types: *transitional* (L1 → L2), *immersion* (L2 → L1 + L2), and *continuing* (L1 + L2). In transitional programs, the students' L1 is the medium of instruction for the first few years of school and the language in which children are taught initial literacy. During this period, the L2 is taught as a subject. Eventually there is a changeover to the L2 as the medium of instruction. This may be abrupt, such as between grade 3 and 4, or gradual, with more and more content areas changing each year. Transitional programs are found in both dominant L2 and institutional L2 situations – for example, with Spanish-speaking students in the USA and with Fijian- and Hindi-speaking students learning English in Fiji.

Immersion programs are found in coexisting L2 or external L2 situations. The L2 is used as the medium of instruction for all or most content areas, usually beginning early in primary school. However, teachers are bilingual and the content is modified to make it more understandable to students. After the first few grades, there is a strong emphasis on development of the L1 and instruction is in both languages. The best-known immersion programs are in Canada, with French being used as the initial medium of instruction for English-speaking children. Intermediate or late immersion programs, beginning in grade 4 or 7, also exist, but they are more like transitional programs, except for the sociolinguistic context.

In continuing bilingual programs, both the L1 and L2 are used as the languages of instruction all through the school years. *Mainstream* continuing bilingual programs are found in coexisting L2 settings where the languages have relatively equal status. In dominant L2 settings, there are two types of continuing bilingual programs. *Maintenance* programs are only for minority students, who are separated from majority students. *Dual-language* or *two-way* programs are for both minority and majority students – for example, L1 Spanish minority students in the USA learning English and L1 English majority students learning Spanish. Since both languages are used for instruction, each group experiences some immersion in the L2.

A considerable amount of research has been done on the effectiveness of the various types of educational programs. (For summaries, see Cummins, 1988; García, 1997; Siegel, 1996; Thomas and Collier, 1997; World Bank, 1995.) Basically, the results show that bilingual programs are clearly better than monolingual programs with regard to both L2 attainment and overall academic achievement. In fact, monolingual submersion programs have negative effects on many children (Cummins, 1988, p. 161). The research also refutes the "time-on-task" hypothesis (Cummins, 1993), the belief that the more instructional

time devoted to a language, the greater the achievement in that language. For example, in the Canadian immersion programs, it was feared that students' English would suffer because time was taken away for instruction in French. However, research has shown that these fears were unfounded (Swain and Lapkin, 1982). Also, the extensive research by Thomas and Collier (1997) has demonstrated that schooling in the L1 in continuing bilingual programs clearly reduces the amount of time taken to acquire academic proficiency in the L2, even though these programs take away from instruction time in the L2.

In interpreting these results, it is important to consider the interaction of the type of educational program, the sociolinguistic setting, and the sociostructural factors of size, status, and power of the L1 and L2 groups. For example, as Auerbach (1995, p. 25) has pointed out, L2 immersion programs are effective for learners from dominant, majority language groups, whose L1 is valued and supported at home and by society in general. However, transitional or continuing bilingual programs are more effective for subordinate, minority language groups, whose L1 is seen to be of little value and receives minimal support. Furthermore, the same type of program may lead to different outcomes in different settings. For example, in institutional L2 settings, transitional bilingual programs usually result in additive bilingualism, whereas in dominant L2 situations, they often result in subtractive bilingualism.

Finally, with regard to the policies themselves which determine the education settings for L2 learning, it must be remembered that they have been put in place by those in a position of power. Thus, the wider issues of power differential, racism, "linguicism" (Phillipson, 1988; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1988), and language rights (Hernández-Chávez, 1988) must also be considered when analyzing the results of research on different educational programs.<sup>3</sup>

The large body of research on the various education programs has had very little impact on the field of SLA, even though many of the findings are relevant to various models and theories. One area that has been dealt with is the research on immersion programs in external L2 settings. Long (1983) suggests that the success of these programs, in contrast to traditional foreign language teaching, lies in the fact that they focus on content rather than form – or, as Cummins (1988) points out, that they provide comprehensible L2 input. This supports the various forms of the input hypothesis (for example, Krashen, 1985). Presumably the reason for the lack of success of submersion programs, which also focus on content, is that in such programs the L2 input is not modified to make it comprehensible.

On the other hand, one area that has not been dealt with is the success of transitional and continuing bilingual programs in dominant L2 settings. These findings seem to contradict the predictions of the inter-group model described earlier. One would expect that the use of the L1 in formal education would lead to an increase in the ethnolinguistic vitality of the L1 group and to an increase in learners' identification with this group. According to the model, however, these factors would result in lower rather than higher levels of L2 proficiency.

A challenge to the field of SLA is to understand and explain the positive influence of schooling in the L1 on the acquisition of the L2. There are several possibilities, some of which have been considered, and some which have not. We will briefly consider three areas here: (i) positive influence on affective variables, (ii) the promotion of metalinguistic awareness, and (iii) the learning of relevant skills in L1.

First, most theories of SLA agree that the affective variables of learner motivation, attitudes, self-confidence, and so forth have some effect on L2 attainment. It may be that the use of the L1 in formal education results in positive values to these variables with regard to L2 learning. As Skutnabb-Kangas (1988, p. 29) points out, when the child's mother tongue is valued in the educational setting, it leads to low anxiety, high motivation, and high self-confidence, three factors which are closely related to successful programs. In Clément's social context model, for example, use of the L1 in the schools would be expected to reduce fear of assimilation and thus increase motivation to learn the L2.

Second, it may be that schooling in the L1, especially developing literacy skills, leads to greater metalinguistic awareness, which in turn benefits SLA. Studies of learner strategies and "good" language learners (summarized in Ellis, 1994) show the advantages of metalinguistic skills such as treating language as a system and attending to form.

The third possibility is that specific knowledge and skills learned in L1 schooling have a positive affect on L2 attainment. This is the view of Cummins (1981, 1988). According to his "interdependency principle" (1981) or "common underlying proficiency generalization" (1988), the combination of linguistic knowledge and literacy skills necessary for academic work, which Cummins originally called "cognitive/academic language proficiency" (CALP), is common across languages and once acquired in one language can be transferred to another. The greater attainment of L2 proficiency in bilingual compared to monolingual L2 programs is accounted for by the facts that CALP is easier to acquire in the L1 than in the L2, and that in bilingual programs, students are able to acquire these skills in the L1 and then transfer them to the L2.

## 5 Second Dialect Acquisition

When the sociolinguistic relationship between the L1 and the L2 is such that their speakers consider them to be varieties of the same language, the term "second dialect acquisition" (SDA) is often used, and we can talk of speakers of one dialect (D1) acquiring another dialect (D2). In sociolinguistics, dialects refer to varieties of a language which differ in vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar and which are associated with particular geographic regions or social groups. While SDA most often refers to acquisition of the standard dialect, there are also instances when a non-standardized regional or social dialect is the target. A special case of SDA involves a pidgin or creole language

and its lexifier (the language which provided the bulk of the vocabulary) – for example, Jamaican Creole and English. This occurs in societies where the general view is that the pidgin or creole is just a degenerate form of the lexifier rather than a separate language.

SLA and SDA are distinguished by several social factors, discussed below, and also by an important linguistic factor. The “language distance,” or the degree of typological difference, between the typical L1 and L2 in SLA situations is greater than between the D1 and D2 in SDA situations. This has at least two significant implications for SDA. First, research has shown that the more similar varieties are, the more likely it is that transfer (or interference) will occur (Kellerman, 1977, 1979; Ringbom, 1978, 1987; Wode, 1976). Thus, as Lin points out (1965, p. 8): “The interference between two closely related dialects – such as a nonstandard dialect and standard English – is far greater than between two completely different languages.” Second, because of the general similarities between the D1 and the D2, learners are often unaware of the specific differences between their own variety and the target (Cheshire, 1982, p. 55). Both of these points are quite relevant to SDA methodology, as will be shown later.

The greater similarity between first and second dialects than between first and second languages also poses some controversial questions relevant to acquisition studies. First, there is the question of the relative ease of acquisition. Escure (1997, p. 7) notes the popular consensus that SDA is easier than SLA. But Haugen (1964, p. 125) writes: “Bidialectalism may actually be harder to acquire than bilingualism. All scholars have agreed that it is harder to keep two similar languages apart than two very different ones.” (See also Wolfram and Schilling-Estes, 1998, p. 297.) There have been no empirical studies to indicate which point of view may be correct. Second, because of the closeness of the D1 and D2, there is the psycholinguistic question of whether they are unified, partially overlapping, or separate linguistic systems (Reigel and Freedle, 1976). Although some recent research has been done in this area (e.g., De Bot, 1992; Woutersen, Cox, Weltens, and De Bot, 1994), this question remains unanswered.

The rest of this section discusses SDA, first in naturalistic, informal contexts and then in educational contexts. Since SDA is normally neglected in volumes on SLA, some background information is provided and studies done in the area are described. The main question to be considered is how SDA is similar to and/or different from SLA.

### ***5.1 Studies of SDA in naturalistic contexts***

The small amount of research on SDA in naturalistic contexts has been done almost entirely by sociolinguists and social dialectologists. Three types of SDA have been studied. The first is community dialect acquisition, when people who speak one dialect migrate to a region where another is spoken and acquire the informal dialect of their new community. The second is prestige dialect acquisition, when people acquire the prestige spoken variety of the

language of their wider community in addition to the variety spoken by their own social group. Third is the much rarer situation involving the acquisition of a non-prestigious dialect (or pidgin or creole) by a speaker of a more prestigious dialect from outside the community.

First we will look at the work of three researchers who have dealt with community dialect acquisition. Payne (1980) studied the acquisition of the dialect spoken in a Philadelphia suburb by children whose families had moved there from “out-of-state” – that is, from other dialect areas. Data were obtained by interviewing children in peer pairs. Out of five phonetic variables studied, two were completely or partially acquired by all of the children and the other three by 80 percent or more. The factor that most influenced success of acquisition was age of arrival – those under 8 years old being most successful. Payne concludes that these variants were acquired so successfully because they could be added to the grammar by simple rule addition (p. 153). On the other hand, another variable, the short-*a* pattern, which cannot be incorporated into the grammar by simple rule addition, was not successfully acquired by any of the children born out-of-state. This leads to the conclusion that while children can add lower-level rules to their grammars up to the age of 14, they cannot “freely restructure and/or reorganize their grammars” (p. 175).

Trudgill (1986) uses speech accommodation theory to explain changes in dialects that are in contact with one another, and the formation of new dialects. As mentioned earlier, accommodation (or in particular, convergence) refers to individuals changing their speech (usually accent or some other salient dialectal feature) to become similar to that of their interlocutors in a particular social setting. Thus, it is normally a transitory phenomenon. But according to Trudgill (p. 40), if accommodation occurs frequently enough, the adoption of features from another dialect can become permanent. Thus, it appears that frequent accommodation can lead to second dialect acquisition. Although Trudgill does not deal specifically with SDA, it is clear that in some cases he equates the processes of long-term accommodation with those of dialect acquisition. As Chambers (1992, p. 676) notes, the boundary between long-term accommodation and acquisition is vague.

On the basis of several studies, Trudgill observes that adults first acquire the salient features of the segmental phonology of the target dialect, and follow a fixed “route” of acquisition. This route is determined by a combination of factors, some that delay accommodation of particular features (such as phonotactic constraints and homonymic clash) and others that accelerate it (such as comprehension difficulties and phonological naturalness) (Trudgill, 1986, p. 38). On the other hand, the route of acquisition is not so fixed for young children because they are not subject to the factors that delay accommodation. This conclusion is based on a longitudinal study of 7-year-old twins from England who moved to Australia for a year (Trudgill, 1982, referred to in Trudgill, 1986, pp. 28–31).

In discussing partial accommodation, Trudgill describes several phenomena which have parallels in SLA. First, there is *interdialect*, analogous to

interlanguage, which refers to “situations where contact between two dialects leads to the development of forms that actually originally occurred in neither dialect” (p. 62). Then there is *hyperdialectalism* (p. 66), corresponding to overgeneralization in SLA and hypercorrection in sociolinguistics. Finally, there is *simplification* (pp. 102–7), but here it is more frequently regularization rather than the reduction found in SLA.

Chambers (1992, 1995) did research on second dialect acquisition among six Canadians who moved to Oxfordshire in southern England at ages ranging from 9 to 17. In two sets of interviews two years apart, he studied lexical and pronunciation variants in their speech, using methods from traditional social dialectology (asking subjects to identify objects pictured on cards). On the basis of his research and other studies, Chambers proposes several “principles” of dialect acquisition. The most relevant ones are as follows. First, pronunciation and phonological changes occur at a similar rate in the early stages of acquisition, but at a slower rate than lexical replacements, indicating that these may be separate processes. Second, lexical replacements occur rapidly in the early stages, but later slow down. Third, simple phonological rules are acquired earlier than complex ones. This principle is supported by Chambers’s examination of medial *t*-voicing and vowel backing, by Payne’s (1980) study mentioned above, and by two other studies cited by Chambers (pp. 684–6), one on the acquisition of the Limburg dialect in the Netherlands (Vousten and Bongaerts, 1990) and the other on the acquisition of London English by speakers of Jamaican Creole (Wells, 1973).

With regard to the acquisition of complex rules and new phonemes, Chambers found that two groups could be distinguished: early and later acquirers. Age was clearly a factor, with younger subjects being earlier acquirers. Chambers presents evidence from several studies which shows a sensitive period for the acquisition of complex phonological rules. He concludes: “A person seven or under will almost certainly acquire a new dialect perfectly, and a person 14 or over almost certainly will not. In between those ages, people will vary.” This conclusion corresponds to findings with regard to a sensitive period in SLA (Long, 1990).

Kerswill (1994) studied morpholexical and phonological variables in the speech of adult Norwegian speakers of the rural Stril dialects who migrated to the city of Bergen. Data consisted of tape-recordings of in-depth interviews and conversations. Individual differences in the route of acquisition of the Bergen dialect were examined with regard to several social factors, including social status of the speaker, social integration and social network type, geographic origin, education, attitudes toward the Stril dialects, language use at work, gender, age, age of arrival in Bergen, and duration of stay. Kerswill found that morpholexical acquisition was more affected than phonological acquisition by a range of these factors, and that the patterns of the two types of acquisition differed in other ways as well. With regard to age, older speakers were more successful in acquiring morpholexical features but less so in acquiring phonological features, where the early movers had the higher scores (as in

Chambers's study). Another significant factor was whether similar phonological features existed in the first dialect. If this was the case, acquisition was possible even if speakers moved after the age of 17. Kerswill reports that at least one informant was truly bidialectal, having the two dialects as discrete codes, and being able to switch between them.

Moving on to prestige dialect acquisition, Labov (1964) describes the informal acquisition of the adult norms of standard English. This account is not based on any particular study, and it is not clear whether it should be considered SDA or a continuation of first language development involving the acquisition of additional styles or registers. Nevertheless, Labov outlines six stages: (i) acquisition of the basic grammar (ages 0–5); (ii) acquisition of the local vernacular spoken by the peer group (5–12); (iii) social perception of the significance of different dialect characteristics (early adolescence); (iv) stylistic variation, with some modification of speech toward the standard (first year of high school); (v) consistent use of the standard; and (vi) the full range of appropriate styles. He also mentions several obstacles to acquisition of the standard, including isolation, structural interference from the vernacular, and conflict between value systems of vernacular, and standard speakers.

Two studies focus on the acquisition of non-prestigious varieties.<sup>4</sup> Baugh (1992) analyses the African-American Vernacular English (AAVE) spoken by African-Americans whose first dialect is standard English and approximations of AAVE by some whites. These illustrate the phenomenon of *hypocorrection* – “linguistic over-compensation beyond the nonstandard linguistic target” (p. 317). This is a consequence of the covert prestige (Trudgill, 1983) of AAVE in the African-American community (see below). In SLA terms, this would be considered a form of overgeneralization. Winer (1985) examines her own acquisition of Trinidadian English Creole (TEC) in Trinidad, describing some of the unique characteristics of language learning in this situation. These include disbelief and resentment among some TEC speakers about her desire to learn the language, a lack of any written descriptions of the language, the belief among speakers that no rules exist in their “dialect,” and the deceptive similarity between some features of TEC and English.

Before moving on to classroom SDA, we will look at the research of Escure (1997) on second dialects acquired in both naturalistic and educational contexts. She starts out by examining acrolectal varieties of Belize Creole, which she defines as non-native versions of the standard (in this case English) which are extensions of the speakers' repertoires used in formal contexts (p. 67). Escure believes that instead of acquiring the standard form of the lexifier as a second dialect, speakers have created highly variable acrolects through a complex process of incorporation and reinterpretation of features of both the lexifier language and the basic grammatical system of the creole (the basilect). This process involves the linguistic strategies of frequency variability, structural hypercorrection, and relexification (p. 76). Escure goes on to analyse second dialect texts of Putonghua (standard Beijing Mandarin Chinese) produced by speakers of other varieties of Chinese (Wuhan and Suzhou). Both the acrolects



of Belize Creole and the second dialect versions of Putonghua differ from the first dialect as well as the “target” dialect (the standard) in some aspects of phonology and morphology; however, they do not differ pragmatically in informal discourse structure, using basically the same topic-marking strategies. With regard to persistence of first dialect features in second dialect varieties, Escure observes, like some of the scholars referred to earlier, that the notion of fossilization “fails to capture the dynamic, innovative, and – at least subconsciously – intentional use of old features to preserve a sociolinguistic identity distinct from the majority (usually dominant) group identity” (p. 275).

## **5.2 *Studies of SDA in educational contexts***

In SDA in educational contexts, the D2 is always the standard dialect used in the education system. We will look first at situations where the D1 is one of several regional dialects in the society, each with its own range of varieties, from vernacular to educated. In such situations, only a minority of people are native speakers of varieties close to the standard, and a large proportion of society is bidialectal. An example is in Germany with speakers of the Swabian dialect, spoken around Stuttgart, acquiring High German. Fishman and Lueders-Salmon (1972) describe how children are allowed to speak in the dialect in the classroom and never pushed to speak High German, and how the different functional roles of the two varieties are clearly recognized by teachers. Young-Scholten (1985) studied errors made by first and second grade Swabian-dialect-speaking children in Standard German. She found that 87 percent of phonological errors and 73 percent of morphological errors were interference-based rather than developmental. She attributes these high percentages to the similarity between the two varieties.

A similar situation is found in societies where there is classical diglossia (Ferguson, 1959) – that is, strict functional differentiation of two varieties of the same language in different domains. The D1 is used in informal contexts, such as conversation with family and friends, whereas the D2, which is learned in school, is used in formal domains such as writing and public speaking. Again, a large proportion of society is bidialectal. Stern (1988) describes SDA in such a situation in Switzerland with Swiss German (D1) and High German (D2). He observes that children discover phonological and morphological correspondences between their D1 and the D2 and perform transformations to comprehend and produce D2 forms. With regard to phonology, his observations correspond with the findings of the naturalistic SDA studies referred to above – that low-level rules, such as phonetic substitutions, are acquired easily while high-level rules, such as allophonic variation, are more difficult. Stern also notes that in areas where the D1 and D2 are similar, SDA is like a continuation of first language acquisition, with the development of new registers. But where the D1 and D2 diverge, “we observe typical second language acquisition processes, such as gradual approximation to the target form,

simplification and regularization of irregular target structures and slow progress with large individual variation" (pp. 147–8).

A very different situation exists in societies where the powerful majority speak varieties linguistically very close to the standard and subordinate minorities speak ethnic, social, or regional varieties with marked differences from the standard. An important distinction between this kind of situation and the ones just described in Germany and Switzerland is that the D1 is not viewed as a separate variety, but is stigmatized as a corrupted or careless version of the standard. This dominant D2 setting is found, for example, in the USA with AAVE and in Australia with Aboriginal English. A similar situation exists with pidgins and creoles when the standard form of the lexifier is the language of education and government, even in places where the pidgin or creole is spoken by the majority of the population. This "lexifier L2" situation, as it is called by Craig (1998), is found, for example, in the Caribbean with Jamaican Creole and in Hawai'i with Hawai'i Creole English (HCE).

In contrast to teaching the D2 in places like Germany and Switzerland, teaching the D2 when it is the dominant dialect or lexifier language has traditionally taken place as if the students' D1 did not exist. Speakers of non-standard varieties were considered to be merely poor speakers of the standard language. In the 1960s, however, this began to change, at least in the USA and Britain, in the wake of the advances being made in sociolinguistics and social dialectology. First of all, work on social dialects, especially AAVE, demonstrated that they are legitimate, rule-governed varieties of language which differ in systematic ways from the standard (e.g., Labov, 1969). Second, it was assumed that the disadvantage in education and employment faced by social groups such as African-Americans was to a great extent due to the fact that they spoke a non-standard dialect. What seemed to be the obvious solution, as proposed mainly by sociolinguists, was to concentrate on teaching the standard dialect so that people could become bidialectal. The approach was to affirm the legitimacy of the first dialect while at the same time promoting additive bidialectalism (Alatis, 1973). This idea was soon embraced by the growing field of teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) and came to be known as Standard English as a second dialect (SESD) (Harris, 1973). An extensive literature on SESD and the promotion of bidialectalism appeared in the 1960s and 1970s – for example, in the volumes edited by Aarons (1975); Aarons, Gordon, and Stewart (1969); Alatis (1969); Baratz and Shuy (1969); De Stefano (1973); Fasold and Shuy (1970); Fox (1973); Shuy, Davis, and Hogan (1964); and Stewart (1964a).

Stewart (1964b) used the term "quasi-foreign language" situation to refer to the learning of standard English by speakers of English-based pidgins and creoles and "radically nonstandard" dialects of English. Although these learners have native or near-native command of some aspects of the standard dialect, there are other areas where the learner's first dialect differs markedly from that of the standard, which warrant the use of foreign language teaching (FLT) procedures (Stewart, 1964b, p. 11). For the next 10 years, methodologies

of FLT and later TESOL were advocated for teaching SED (Carroll and Feigenbaum, 1967; Feigenbaum, 1969, 1970; Stewart, 1970). Following the audiolingual approach popular at that time, the emphasis was on habit formation and oral fluency, with teaching focused on particular grammatical structures. Contrastive analysis of the L1 and L2 (in this case D1 and D2) was done to determine which structures should be taught, and pattern practice and drills were used to teach them.

Those interested in SED in the 1960s also looked to bilingual education programs for inspiration. Wolfram and Fasold (1969, p. 144) observed that if the goal of SED was really additive bidialectalism, then the value of the students' first dialect would be affirmed by using it in the educational process – especially in reading materials. Stewart (1964b) also advocated using reading materials written in the students' dialect, pointing to the educational advantages of being able to learn to read in one's mother tongue and then transferring these skills to the target language. Since that time, the notion of "dialect readers" has been extremely controversial, with both educational and social arguments for and against. A reading program for AAVE using dialect readers was published, the *Bridge* series (Simpkins, Holt, and Simpkins, 1977), but it was not promoted because of negative reactions from parents and teachers. The potential benefits of dialect readers are still being discussed, not only for AAVE (Labov, 1995; Rickford and Rickford, 1995) but also for Chicano and Puerto Rican Spanish (Bixler-Márquez, 1988).<sup>5</sup>

Later, however, the problems of the uncritical use of FLT methods for students speaking stigmatized varieties became apparent and were pointed out by scholars, such as Allen (1969), Jagger and Cullinan (1974), Johnson (1969), Politzer (1973), and Shuy (1971). These had to do with both the ineffectiveness of the teaching methods themselves (Kochman, 1969) and significant differences between the SDA and FLT situations (as described below). As Shuy (1969, p. 83) noted, the assumption that FLT or TESOL techniques are valid for learning a second dialect was without any solid proof. Di Pietro (1973, p. 38–9) also noted that teachers should be wary of using such techniques in teaching SED, and that much more research was needed to test their applicability. Such research has never been conducted, on teaching SED or any other standard variety, such as prestige varieties of Spanish (Valdés, 1981, 1997; Valdés-Fallis, 1978). At any rate, as behaviorist views of language acquisition were abandoned in the 1970s, so were most of these FLT teaching methods, for both SDA and SLA. (An exception for SDA is Love, 1991.) Publications on SED and bidialectalism became as rare as behaviorists. At the same time, SLA began to emerge as a distinct field of research, but with a few notable exceptions, namely Edwards and Giles (1984), Politzer (1993), and Sato (1985, 1989), second language researchers have not been concerned with the acquisition of dialects.

Some of the significant differences between the social contexts of learning another language and those of learning another dialect were pointed out by Stewart (1964b). In SLA, two different autonomous linguistic systems are

easily recognized. The learners' first language often has its own dictionaries and grammars, just like the L2. But in SDA, because of similarities with the standard, the learners' first dialect is not recognized as a separate variety of language. This leads to both teachers and students thinking that there is only one legitimate language involved, and that the learners' dialect is just "sloppy speech" (Johnson, 1974, p. 154). Thus, the first dialect, unlike the first language, is almost always socially stigmatized.

On the other hand, the first dialect has its own covert prestige as a marker of the sociocultural group and a part of members' social identity. As Delpit (1990, p. 251) observes, children often have the ability to speak standard English, but choose "to identify with their community rather than with the school." Also, because of the ideology of correctness attached to standard dialects, students may fear that learning the standard means abandoning their dialect and thus risking being ostracized from their social group. (For an illuminating recent analysis, see Fordham, 1999.) Furthermore, a long history of racism and exploitation has led to antagonism between majority standard dialect speakers and minority non-standard dialect speakers. Thus, if a key factor in learning a language is identifying with its speakers, then we would not expect many people from minority groups to have the integrative motivation to learn the standard dialect. Even instrumental motivation would not apply; as Kochman (1969, p. 88) points out: "The Black child knows that he pays the social price for being Black, not because he does or does not speak standard dialect."

Because of these factors, there have been some strong reactions to the notions of teaching SED and bidialectalism (e.g., Sledd, 1969, 1972), portraying them as yet another attempt to dominate and exploit minority groups. (For the opposite point of view, however, see Adler, 1987.) Proposals to use minority dialects in education have also been portrayed as attempts to institutionalize inequities, as reported by Di Pietro (1973, p. 38). This view was still quite evident in the reactions of many African-Americans to the Oakland Board of Education's 1996 resolution to make use of Ebonics (AAVE) to teach standard English. (For discussions of the Ebonics debate, see articles in the *Black Scholar*, 27 [1997]; Long, 1999; McWhorter, 1998; Perry and Delpit, 1998; Rickford, 1999; Rickford and Rickford, 2000) Although there are similar ghettoization arguments against bilingual education (see Snow, 1990), they are not as common as those against bidialectal education.

Other differences between SDA and SLA have been pointed out by Craig (1966, 1976, 1983, 1988) in relation to classroom contexts. In most foreign or second language learning situations, learners have little if any familiarity with the target language. But in situations where the standard dialect is the target, learners already recognize and produce some aspects of it as part of their linguistic repertoires. Also, unlike learners of a separate language, learners of the standard variety have no communicative reason to keep using the target (that is, the standard) in the classroom. It is easy for them to slip back into their own variety and still be understood. In addition, as mentioned above, because of the similarity between the D1 and the D2, the learner might not be

aware of some of the differences that do exist. Thus, as Craig (1966, p. 58) observes, "the learner fails to perceive the new target element in the teaching situation."

But how significant are the differences between the D1 and the D2? Pandey (2000) used the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) to measure the standard English proficiency of pre-college and first-year college students who were raised in the inner city and were basically monodialectal in AAVE. She found that their first-time performance on the TOEFL, particularly in the listening comprehension and grammar sections, was similar to that of low-level ESL/EFL students. According to the author (p. 89), these results support the validity of the Oakland School Board's Ebonics resolution, mentioned above, and the value of using ESL-based methods in teaching standard English to AAVE speakers. On the other hand, McWhorter (2000, p. 191) says that the reason African-American children do poorly in school is not because there is a gap between AAVE and standard English, but "because there is a psychological barrier between them and school in general." A lack of significant difference between the D1 and D2 would bring into question the need for the dialect readers described above. Scholars such as Politzer (1993) point out that differences between AAVE or Chicano Spanish and their respective written standard varieties may not be large enough to warrant the large-scale production of D1 reading materials. Goodman (1969), Venezky and Chapman (1973), and others suggested earlier that using standard dialect reading materials should not cause problems with reading acquisition if children are allowed to read as they speak. (See also Wiley, 1996, pp. 127–31.) However, as Wolfram (1994, p. 75) notes: "At this point, there are no carefully designed experimental studies that have examined this important research question."

Indeed, despite all the rhetoric, there is very little empirical research on the acquisition of dominant standard dialects and lexifiers in educational settings. What has been done focuses almost exclusively on the outcomes of various types of methodologies or programs, which can be divided into two broad areas: those that concentrate on teaching particular structures of the second (standard) dialect, and those that actually use the first dialect in the classroom. The two areas are analogous to the monolingual and bilingual settings of SLA described earlier.

Studies in the first area were done in the 1960s and 1970s when the FLT methods were in vogue, and used either pre-test/post-test or experimental design or both. In terms of the acquisition of particular targeted structures, some modestly successful results were reported – for example, by Hagerman (1970) and Lin (1965) for speakers of AAVE; Ching (1963), Crowley (1968), and Peterson, Chuck, and Coladarci (1969) for Hawai'i Creole English; and Craig (1967) for Jamaican Creole. On the other hand, Torrey (1972) reported only very limited positive results, and as mentioned above, this methodology was abandoned because of overall lack of success.

Studies in the second area are on three types of educational programs in which the first dialect is used in the classroom: instrumental, accommodation,

**Table 8.4** Research on instrumental programs

<i>Type of program</i>	<i>Study</i>	<i>Location [variety]</i>
Bilingual	Murtagh (1982) Ravel and Thomas (1985)	Australia [Kriol] Seychelles [Seselwa]
Initial literacy	Österberg (1961) Bull (1990) Siegel (1997)	Sweden [regional dialect] Norway [regional dialects] Papua New Guinea [Melanesian Pidgin]
“Dialect readers”	Leaverton (1973) Simpkins and Simpkins (1981)  Kephart (1992)	USA [AAVE] USA [AAVE]  Carriacou [Carriacou English Creole]

**Table 8.5** Research on programs with an accommodation component

<i>Level</i>	<i>Study</i>	<i>Location [variety]</i>
Kindergarten-grade 3	Cullinan, Jagger, and Strickland (1974)	New York [AAVE]
Kindergarten-grade 4	Day (1989)	Hawai'i [HCE]
Grade 1	Piestrup (1973)	California [AAVE]
Grade 2	Rynkofs (1993)	Hawai'i [HCE]
High school	Campbell (1994)	USA inner city [AAVE]

and awareness (Siegel, 1999a). The overall aims of all three types of programs are additive bidialectalism and improving students' linguistic self-respect. In *instrumental* programs, the D1 is used as a medium of instruction to teach initial literacy, and content subjects such as mathematics, science, and health, as in transitional bilingual SLA programs (see table 8.4). In *accommodation* programs, the D1 is not a medium of instruction or subject of study, but it is accepted in the classroom; students are allowed and even encouraged to use their home varieties in speaking and sometimes writing (Wiley, 1996, p. 127) (see table 8.5). In *awareness* programs, the D1 is an object of study in the context of discussions about linguistic and cultural diversity and about the use of different varieties in different contexts. An additional goal is to make students aware of the grammatical and pragmatic differences between their own varieties and the standard using a contrastive approach (see table 8.6).

**Table 8.6** Research on programs with an awareness component

<i>Level</i>	<i>Study</i>	<i>Location [variety]</i>
Primary	Actouka and Lai (1989)	Hawai'i [HCE]
	Harris-Wright (1999)	Georgia [AAVE]
High school	Afaga and Lai (1994)	Hawai'i [HCE]
College/university	Taylor (1989)	Illinois [AAVE]
	Hoover (1991)	California [AAVE]
Adult	Scherloh (1991)	Ohio [AAVE]

(See Berry and Hudson, 1997; Delpit, 1988; Rickford, 1999; Wolfram, Christian, and Adger, 1999.)

All the studies listed in tables 8.4–8.6 demonstrate that the use of the students' own varieties of language leads to higher scores in tests measuring reading and writing skills in standard English and to increases in overall academic achievement. (For summaries of these studies, see Siegel, 1999b.) In addition, there are reports of the success of similar programs in the Virgin Islands with Caribbean Creole speakers (Elsasser and Irvine, 1987), in Alaska with Native American speakers of "Village English" (Delpit, 1988), in North Carolina with speakers of Appalachian English and other dialects (Wolfram et al., 1999), and in Los Angeles with AAVE speakers (Los Angeles Unified School District and LeMoine, 1999). These results are thus analogous to those for bilingual programs reported earlier in this chapter.

In addition, two recent experimental studies on the acquisition of standard English by AAVE speakers appear to show some benefits of using the D1 in the classroom, but in two very different ways. Fogel and Ehri (2000) compared the effectiveness of three instructional treatments on improving the standard English writing of groups of AAVE-speaking third- and fourth-grade students, targeting six syntactic features which differ in the two varieties. They found that the most effective treatment was instruction which included guided practice in translating sentences from AAVE into standard English and then providing corrective feedback. Pandey (2000) studied the effectiveness of a six-week program using a "contrastive analysis" approach to teaching standard English as a second dialect (basically an awareness program). The subjects were the group of AAVE-speaking pre-college and first-year college students, mentioned above, whom she initially tested with the TOEFL. Pandey found that the approach led to more relaxed attitudes toward learning, increased bidialectal awareness, and marked improvement in performance on subsequent TOEFL tests.

Another challenge to the field of SLA is to understand and explain the positive influence of using the D1 in educational programs for the acquisition of the D2. The three possibilities discussed earlier to account for the advantages of using the L1 in education may also be relevant to the use of the D1.

However, the development of metalinguistic awareness and the acquisition of CALP would apply only to instrumental programs. On the other hand, the positive influence on affective variables is probably more significant in SDA, where the D1 is usually much more stigmatized than the L1 is in SLA. This would be supported by researchers such as Wolfram and Schilling-Estes (1998), who point out that “there is now some indication that students who feel more confident about their own vernacular dialect are more successful in learning the standard one” (p. 290).

A fourth possibility – one that is much more relevant to SDA than to SLA – is that using the D1 in educational programs makes learners aware of differences between the D2 and the D1 that they may not otherwise notice (see Siegel, 1999b). According to Schmidt’s “noticing hypothesis” (1990, 1993), attention to target language (L2) forms is necessary for acquisition; these forms will not be acquired unless they are noticed. Because of the similarities between the D1 and D2, as discussed above, learners often do not notice differences between their dialect and the standard. However, it may be that looking at features of their own varieties in instrumental or awareness programs helps students to notice features of the standard that are different, which is the first step of acquisition.

As also noted above, because of D1–D2 similarities, interference errors are unlikely to affect communication. According to Politzer (1993, p. 53), such errors are “not likely to disappear without specific instructional effort and without being called to the learner’s attention.” A similar statement is found in the study of errors made by Swabian-dialect-speaking children learning High German, mentioned above (Young-Scholten, 1985, p. 11): “[T]hose errors due to interference from a crucially similar first language will tend to persist if the learner’s attention is not drawn to these errors.”

The awareness programs in particular draw attention to potential errors which may be caused by lack of recognition of differences. The methods they use are analogous to some advocated in the SLA literature. First there is *consciousness raising* (Ellis, 1997), where attention is drawn to particular grammatical features of the target but students are not expected to produce or practice them. Second, as noted by Menacker (1998), there is the *focus on form* approach (Doughty and Williams, 1998). In this approach, noticing particular target structures is induced by “briefly drawing students’ attention to linguistic elements . . . *in context*, as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning, or communication” (Long, 1998, p. 40). An important difference is that in awareness programs the focus on form is part of a lesson on language and dialect diversity, rather than a reaction to students’ comprehension or production problems.

However, the major difference between awareness approaches to SDA and form-focused approaches to SLA is in the role of contrastive activities. While contrastive analysis has been all but abandoned in SLA methodology, it is becoming more common in teaching second dialects, especially in activities where students examine their language variety in order to discover its



rule-governed features, and then compare these features with those of other varieties, including the standard. James (1996, p. 255) calls this activity “interfacing” and describes it as follows: “It involves juxtaposing or confronting D1 and D2 and helping the learner to notice the differences between them, sometimes subtle and sometimes gross. It is a modern development of contrastive analysis . . . which is now done by the learner himself rather than by the teacher.” Of course this is most useful in SDA situations where the D1 and D2 are similar enough so that the differences that do exist do not normally affect communication. But it is interesting to note that the value of what James (1992) calls “contrastive consciousness raising” is also being recognized for the advanced stages of SLA, where the differences between the learner’s interlanguage and the target language are also so small that they cause no communicative difficulty (see Swain, 1998).

To conclude this section, while there are indications of some of the factors that may affect ultimate attainment in a second dialect, very little is known about how second and especially standard dialects are acquired, or how similar the processes of SLA and SDA actually are. Valdés (1997, p. 24) sums up the situation: “Teachers of standard dialects who hoped to be guided by theories of L2 acquisition now have serious doubts about the parallels to be found between these two very different kinds of acquisition.”

## 6 Conclusion

We have seen that different sociolinguistic settings, educational contexts, and relationships between the L1 and L2 may have an effect on SLA. The importance of various concepts developed over the years in SLA – such as interlanguage, fossilization, integrative and instrumental motivation, and the distinction between native and non-native speaker – are not necessarily generalizable to all social contexts. At the same time, other notions which are no longer considered important – such as L1 interference and contrastive language teaching – may have more significance in some contexts. However, of the studies that have taken social context into account, nearly all have examined only ultimate L2 proficiency. More longitudinal studies are needed with closely related as well as distant languages in order to find out about developmental patterns, rate of acquisition, learning strategies, and other aspects of SLA in different contexts.

With regard to the analysis of social context, the factors that affect ultimate L2 proficiency appear to be related to the learner’s opportunities and desire to use the L2 for particular purposes in social interaction. For each situation, then, researchers need to consider the nature of these purposes and the use of the L2 in social interaction, and how these are determined by the structural and historical factors affecting both the L1 and L2 social groups and their languages. Researchers also need to understand the nature of the status, power, and social identity that may be asserted and negotiated by L2 learners in

particular social interactions. Thus, more of the fine-grained ethnographic studies of interactional sociolinguistics and discourse analysis are needed in addition to the survey studies of social psychology and the experimental studies of psycholinguistics.

## NOTES

- 1 Although the difference between naturalistic and classroom contexts of SLA is touched upon here, it is not a focus of the discussion, as it is covered in other chapters.
- 2 Another component of the model is the Pidginization Hypothesis, in which an analogy is made between early naturalistic SLA and pidginization. However, this will not be dealt with here.
- 3 For example, two years after the passing of Proposition 227, which virtually eliminated bilingual programs in California, Noonan (2000) reports "dramatic academic gains" for Spanish-speaking students in second grade. He concludes that this is evidence that "English immersion" (i.e., submersion) works better than bilingual instruction. However, it is well known from more extensive research (e.g., Thomas and Collier, 1997) that the positive effects of bilingual programs are most evident in the later primary years.
- 4 Hewitt (1986) and Rampton (1991, 1995) describe the use of Caribbean Creole by speakers of English in Britain but do not focus on acquisition.
- 5 Studies by Österberg (1961) and Bull (1990) with dialects of Swedish and Norwegian and by Leaverton (1973) and Simpkins and Simpkins (1981) with AAVE all showed positive effects of learning to read in the first dialect. However, in the most recent argument against dialect readers, McWhorter (1998, pp. 220–1) says that the Scandinavian studies are irrelevant to AAVE because the dialects concerned are so different from each other. He points out methodological problems with the Leaverton study, and mentions nine experimental studies which he says show that using dialect reading materials have no positive effect on AAVE students' reading scores. But a close look at these nine studies reveals methodological problems with all of them. Most importantly, the subjects were already used to reading in standard English, and not the dialect; factors of novelty and perceived inappropriateness of the dialect materials were not taken into account.

## REFERENCES

- Aarons, A. C. (ed.) 1975: *Issues in the Teaching of Standard English*. Florida FL Reporter, 12 (1 and 2).
- Aarons, A. C., Gordon, B. Y., and Stewart, W. A. (eds) 1969: *Linguistic-Cultural Differences in*

- American Education. Florida FL Reporter*, 7 (1).
- Actouka, M. and Lai, M. K. 1989: *Project Holopono, Evaluation Report, 1987-1988*. Honolulu: Curriculum Research and Development Group, College of Education, University of Hawai'i.
- Adler, S. 1987: Bidialectalism? Mandatory or elective? *ASHA*, 29 (1), 41-4.
- Afaga, L. B. and Lai, M. K. 1994: *Project Akamai, Evaluation Report, 1992-93, Year Four*. Honolulu: Curriculum Research and Development Group, College of Education, University of Hawai'i.
- Alatis, J. E. (ed.) 1969: *Linguistics and the Teaching of Standard English*. Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics, no. 22. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Alatis, J. E. 1973: Teaching standard English as a second dialect: the unanswered questions, the successes, and the promise. In R. P. Fox (ed.), *Essays on Teaching English as a Second Dialect*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 43-56.
- Allen, V. F. 1969: Teaching standard English as a second dialect. *Florida FL Reporter*, 7 (1), 123-9, 164.
- Au, S. 1988: A critical appraisal of Gardner's social-psychological theory of second language (L2) learning. *Language Learning*, 38, 75-100.
- Auerbach, E. R. 1995: The politics of the ESL classroom: issues of power in pedagogical choices. In J. W. Tollefson (ed.), *Power and Inequality in Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 9-33.
- Baratz, J. C. and Shuy, R. W. (eds) 1969: *Teaching Black Children to Read*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Baugh, J. 1992: Hypocorrection: mistakes in production of vernacular African American English as a second dialect. *Language and Communication*, 12, 317-26.
- Beebe, L. M. 1988: Five sociolinguistic approaches to second language acquisition. In L. M. Beebe (ed.), *Issues in Second Language Acquisition: Multiple Perspectives*. New York: Newbury House, 43-77.
- Belmechri, F. and Hummel, K. M. 1998: Orientations and motivation in the acquisition of English as a second language among high school students in Quebec city. *Language Learning*, 48 (2), 219-44.
- Berry, R. and Hudson, J. 1997: *Making the Jump: A Resource Book for Teachers of Aboriginal Students*. Broome: Catholic Education Office, Kimberley Region.
- Bixler-Márquez, D. J. 1988: Dialects and initial reading options in bilingual education. In D. J. Bixler-Márquez and J. Ornstein-Galicia (eds), *Chicano Speech in the Bilingual Classroom*. New York: Peter Lang, 135-41.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977: The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information*, 16, 645-68.
- Bourhis, R. Y. and Giles, H. 1977: The language of intergroup distinctiveness. In H. Giles (ed.), *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press, 119-36.
- Bull, T. 1990: Teaching school beginners to read and write in the vernacular. In E. H. Jahr and O. Lorentz (eds), *Tromsø Linguistics in the Eighties*. Tromsø Studies in Linguistics 11. Oslo: Novus Press, 69-84.
- Campbell, E. D. 1994: Empowerment through bidialectalism. ERIC document no. ED 386 034.
- Carroll, W. S. and Feigenbaum, I. 1967: Teaching a second dialect and some implications for TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 1, 31-9.
- Chambers, J. K. 1992: Dialect acquisition. *Language*, 68, 673-705.
- Chambers, J. K. 1995: Acquisition of lexical and pronunciation variants. In

- W. Viereck (ed.), *Verbandlungen des Internationalen Dialektologenkongresses Bamberg 1990. Band 4*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 3–19.
- Cheshire, J. 1982: Dialect features and linguistic conflict in schools. *Educational Review*, 14, 53–67.
- Chihara, T. and Oller, J. W. 1978: Attitudes and attained proficiency in EFL: a sociolinguistic study of adult Japanese learners. *Language Learning*, 28, 55–68.
- Ching, D. C. 1963: Effects of a six month remedial English program on oral, writing, and reading skills of third grade Hawaiian bilingual children. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 32 (2), 133–45.
- Clément, R. 1980: Ethnicity, contact and communicative competence in a second language. In H. Giles, W. P. Robinson, and P. M. Smith (eds), *Language: Social Psychological Perspectives*. Oxford: Pergamon, 147–54.
- Clément, R. 1986: Second language proficiency and acculturation: an investigation of the effects of language status and individual characteristics. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 5, 271–90.
- Clément, R. and Kruidenier, B. G. 1983: Orientations in second language acquisition: I. The effects of ethnicity, milieu and target language on their emergence. *Language Learning*, 33, 273–91.
- Clément, R. and Kruidenier, B. G. 1985: Aptitude, attitude and motivation in second language proficiency: a test of Clément's model. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 4, 21–37.
- Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., and Noels, K. A. 1994: Motivation, self-confidence, and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. *Language Learning*, 44 (3), 417–48.
- Cook, V. 1999: Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33 (2), 185–209.
- Cooper, R. L. and Fishman, J. A. 1977: A study of language attitudes. In J. A. Fishman, R. L. Cooper, and A. Conrad (eds), *The Spread of English: The Sociology of English as an Additional Language*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 239–76.
- Craig, D. 1966: Teaching English to Jamaican Creole speakers: a model of a multi-dialect situation. *Language Learning*, 16 (1 and 2), 49–61.
- Craig, D. 1967: Some early indications of learning a second dialect. *Language Learning*, 17 (3 and 4), 133–40.
- Craig, D. 1976: Bidialectal education: Creole and standard in the West Indies. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 8, 93–134.
- Craig, D. 1983: Teaching standard English to nonstandard speakers: some methodological issues. *Journal of Negro Education*, 52 (1), 65–74.
- Craig, D. 1988: Creole English and education in Jamaica. In C. B. Paulston (ed.), *International Handbook of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. New York: Greenwood, 297–312.
- Craig, D. 1998: "Afta yu laan dem fi riid an rait dem Kriiyol, den wa muo?": Creole and the teaching of the lexifier language. Paper presented at the 3rd International Creole Workshop, Miami.
- Crookes, G. and Schmidt, R. W. 1991: Motivation: reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41, 469–512.
- Crowley, D. P. 1968: The Keaukaha model for mainstream dialect instruction. *Language Learning*, 18 (1 and 2), 125–38.
- Cullinan, B. E., Jagger, A. M., and Strickland, D. S. 1974: Language expansion for Black children in the primary grades: a research report. *Young Children*, 24 (2), 98–112.
- Cummins, J. 1981: The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (ed.),

- Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework*. Los Angeles: National Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, 3–49.
- Cummins, J. 1988: Second language acquisition within bilingual education programs. In L. M. Beebe (ed.), *Issues in Second Language Acquisition: Multiple Perspectives*. New York: Newbury House, 145–66.
- Cummins, J. 1993: Bilingualism and second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 51–70.
- Day, R. R. 1989: The acquisition and maintenance of language by minority children. *Language Learning*, 29 (2), 295–303.
- De Bot, K. 1992: A bilingual production model: Levelt's "Speaking" Model adapted. *Applied Linguistics*, 13, 1–24.
- Delpit, L. D. 1988: The silenced dialogue: power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58 (3), 280–98.
- Delpit, L. D. 1990: Language diversity and learning. In S. Hynds and D. L. Rubin (eds), *Perspectives on Talk and Learning*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 247–66.
- De Stefano, J. S. (ed.) 1973: *Language, Society, and Education: A Profile of Black English*. Worthington, OH: Charles A. Jones.
- Di Pietro, R. J. 1973: Bilingualism and bidialectalism. In R. P. Fox (ed.), *Essays on Teaching English as a Second Dialect*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 35–42.
- Dörnyei, Z. 1994: Understanding L2 motivation: on with the challenge. *Modern Language Journal*, 78 (4), 515–23.
- Dörnyei, Z. and Schmidt, R. 2001: *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition*. SLTCC Technical Report no. 23. Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i.
- Doughty, C. and Williams, J. (eds) 1998: *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edwards, J. and Giles, H. 1984: Applications of the social psychology of language: sociolinguistics and education. In P. Trudgill (ed.), *Applied Sociolinguistics*. London: Academic Press, 119–58.
- Eisenstein, M. 1986: Target language variation and second-language acquisition: learning English in New York City. *World Englishes*, 5 (1), 31–46.
- Ellis, R. 1994: *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. 1997: *SLA Research and Language Teaching*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Elsasser, N. and Irvine, P. 1987: English and Creole: the dialectics of choice in a college writing program. In I. Shor (ed.), *Freire for the Classroom: A Sourcebook for Literacy Teaching*. Portsmouth, MA: Boynton/Cook, 129–49.
- Escure, G. 1997: *Creole and Dialect Continua: Standard Acquisition Processes in Belize and China*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fasold, R. W. and Shuy, R. W. (eds) 1970: *Teaching Standard English in the Inner City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Feigenbaum, I. 1969: Using foreign language methodology to teach standard English: evaluation and adaptation. *Florida FL Reporter*, 7 (1), 116–22, 156–7.
- Feigenbaum, I. 1970: The use of nonstandard English in teaching standard: contrast and comparison. In R. W. Fasold and R. W. Shuy (eds), *Teaching Standard English in the Inner City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 87–104.
- Ferguson, C. A. 1959: Diglossia. *Word*, 15, 325–40.

- Firth, A. and Wagner, J. 1997: On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, 81, 285–300.
- Fishman, J. A. and Lueders-Salmon, E. 1972: What has the sociology of language to say to the teacher? On teaching the standard variety to speakers of dialectal or sociolectal varieties. In C. B. Cazden, V. P. John, and D. Hymes (eds), *Functions of Language in the Classroom*. New York: Teachers College, Colombia University, 67–83.
- Fogel, H. and Ehri, L. C. 2000: Teaching elementary students who speak Black English Vernacular to write in standard English: effects of dialect transformation practice. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 212–35.
- Fordham, S. 1999: Dissin' "the Standard": Ebonics and guerrilla warfare at Capital High. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 30 (3), 272–93.
- Fox, R. P. (ed.) 1973: *Essays on Teaching English as a Second Dialect*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- García, O. 1997: Bilingual education. In F. Coulmas (ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 405–20.
- Gardner, R. C. 1980: On the validity of affective variables in second language learning: conceptual, contextual and statistical considerations. *Language Learning*, 30, 255–70.
- Gardner, R. C. 1983: Learning another language: a true social psychological experiment. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 2, 219–40.
- Gardner, R. C. 1985: *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C. 1988: The socio-educational model of second language learning: assumptions, findings and issues. *Language Learning*, 38, 101–26.
- Gardner, R. C. and Clément, R. 1990: Social psychological perspectives on second language acquisition. In H. Giles and W. P. Robinson (eds), *Handbook of Language and Social Psychology*. Chichester: John Wiley, 495–517.
- Gardner, R. C. and Lambert, W. E. 1959: Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13, 266–72.
- Gardner, R. C. and Lambert, W. E. 1972: *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Gardner, R. C. and Tremblay, P. F. 1994a: On motivation: measurement and conceptual considerations. *Modern Language Journal*, 78 (3), 359–68.
- Gardner, R. C. and Tremblay, P. F. 1994b: On motivation, research agendas, and theoretical frameworks. *Modern Language Journal*, 78 (4), 524–7.
- Gardner, R. C., Lalonde, R. M., and Pierson, R. 1983: The socio-educational model of second language acquisition: an investigation using LISREL causal modelling. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 2, 1–15.
- Gardner, R. C., Tremblay, P. F., and Masgoret, A.-M. 1997: Towards a full model of second language learning: an empirical investigation. *Modern Language Journal*, 81 (3), 344–62.
- Genesee, F. 1987: *Learning through Two Languages*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Giles, H. 1977: Social psychology and applied linguistics: towards an integrated approach. *ILT Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 27–42.
- Giles, H. and Byrne, J. L. 1982: An intergroup approach to second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1, 17–40.
- Giles, H. and Johnson, P. 1981: The role of language in ethnic group relations. In J. C. Turner and H. Giles (eds),

- Intergroup Behaviour*. Oxford: Blackwell, 199–243.
- Giles, H. and Johnson, P. 1987: Ethnolinguistic identity theory. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 68, 69–99.
- Giles, H., Bourhis, R. Y., and Taylor, D. M. 1977: Toward a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (ed.), *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*. New York: Academic Press, 307–48.
- Giles, H., Taylor, D., and Bourhis, R. 1973: Towards a theory of interpersonal accommodation through speech: some Canadian data. *Language in Society*, 2, 177–92.
- Goodman, K. S. 1969: Dialect barriers to reading comprehension. In J. C. Baratz and R. W. Shuy (eds), *Teaching Black Children to Read*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 14–28.
- Gupta, A. F. 1994: *The Step-Tongue: Children's English in Singapore*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hagerman, B. P. 1970: *Teaching Standard English as a Second Dialect to Speakers of Nonstandard English in High School Business Education: Final Report*. ERIC document no. ED 038 639. Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research.
- Hall, B. J. and Gudykunst, W. B. 1986: The intergroup theory of second language ability. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 5, 291–302.
- Hall, J. K. 1995: (Re)creating our worlds with words: a sociohistorical perspective of face-to-face interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 16, 206–32.
- Harris, D. P. 1973: The future of ESOL: continuity or generation gap. In R. P. Fox (ed.), *Essays on Teaching English as a Second Dialect*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 67–81.
- Harris-Wright, K. 1999: Enhancing bidialectalism in urban African American students. In C. T. Adger, D. Christian, and O. Taylor (eds), *Making the Connection: Language and Academic Achievement among African American Students: Proceedings of a Conference of the Coalition on Diversity in Education*. McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics/Delta Systems, 53–60.
- Haugen, E. 1964: Bilingualism and bidialectalism. In R. W. Shuy, A. L. Davis, and R. F. Hogan (eds), *Social Dialects and Language Learning*. Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 123–6.
- Hernández-Chávez, E. 1988: Language policy and language rights in the United States: issues in bilingualism. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas and J. Cummins (eds), *Minority Education: From Shame to Struggle*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 45–56.
- Hewitt, R. 1986: *White Talk Black Talk: Inter-Racial Friendships and Communication among Adolescents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoover, M. R. 1991: Using the ethnography of African-American communication in teaching composition to bidialectal students. In M. E. McGroarty and C. J. Faltis (eds), *Languages in School and Society*. Contributions to the Sociology of Language 58. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 465–85.
- Jagger, A. M. and Cullinan, B. E. 1974: Teaching standard English to achieve bidialectalism: problems with current practices. *Florida FL Reporter*, 12 (1 and 2), 63–70.
- James, C. 1992: Awareness, consciousness and language contrast. In C. Mair and M. Markus (eds), *New Departures in Contrastive Linguistics*. Vol. 2. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Anglistische Reihe Band 5. Innsbruck: Institut für Anglistik, Universität Innsbruck, 183–98.

- James, C. 1996: Mother tongue use in bilingual/bidialectal education: implication for Bruneian Duibahasa. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 17, 248–57.
- Johnson, K. R. 1969: Pedagogical problems of using second language techniques for teaching standard English to speakers of nonstandard Negro dialect. *Florida FL Reporter*, 7 (1), 75–8, 154.
- Johnson, K. R. 1974: Teacher's attitude toward the nonstandard Negro dialect – let's change it. In J. S. de Stefano and S. E. Fox (eds), *Language and the Language Arts*. Boston: Little, Brown, 148–58.
- Judd, E. L. 1987: Language policy, curriculum development, and TESOL instruction: a search for compatibility. In M. H. Long and J. C. Richards (eds), *Methodology in TESOL: A Book of Readings*. New York: Newbury House, 3–9.
- Kachru, B. B. 1985: Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk and H. Widdowson (eds), *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 11–30.
- Kachru, B. B. and Nelson, C. L. 1996: World Englishes. In S. L. McKay and N. H. Hornberger (eds), *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 71–102.
- Kellerman, E. 1977: Towards a characterization of the strategies of transfer in second language learning. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 2, 58–145.
- Kellerman, E. 1979: Transfer and non-transfer: where are we now? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 2, 37–57.
- Kelly, C., Sachdev, I., Kottsieper, P. and Ingram, M. 1993: The role of social identity in second-language proficiency and use: testing the Intergroup Model. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 12, 288–301.
- Kephart, R. F. 1992: Reading creole English does not destroy your brain cells! In J. Siegel (ed.), *Pidgins, Creoles and Nonstandard Dialects in Education*. Occasional Paper no. 12. Melbourne: Applied Linguistics Association of Australia, 67–86.
- Kerswill, P. 1994: *Dialects Converging: Rural Speech in Urban Norway*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kochman, T. 1969: Social factors in the consideration of teaching standard English. *Florida FL Reporter*, 7 (1), 87–8, 157.
- Krashen, S. 1985: *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. New York: Longman.
- Labov, W. 1964: Stages in the acquisition of Standard English. In R. W. Shuy, A. L. Davis, and R. F. Hogan (eds), *Social Dialects and Language Learning*. Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 77–103.
- Labov, W. 1969: The logic of nonstandard English. In J. E. Alatis (ed.), *Linguistics and the Teaching of Standard English*. Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics, no. 22. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1–24.
- Labov, W. 1995: Can reading failure be reversed? A linguistic approach to the question. In V. L. Gadsden and D. A. Wagner (eds), *Literacy among African-American Youth*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 39–68.
- Lambert, W. E. 1974: Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In F. Aboud and R. D. Mead (eds), *Cultural Factors in Learning*. Bellingham: Western Washington State College, 105–19.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. and Long, M. H. 1991: *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. London: Longman.



- Leaverton, L. 1973: Dialectal readers: rationale, use and value. In J. L. Laffey and R. Shuy (eds), *Language Differences: Do They Interfere?* Newark, DE: International Reading Association, 114–26.
- Lin, S.-S. C. 1965: *Pattern Practice in the Teaching of Standard English to Students with a Non-Standard Dialect*. New York: Teachers College – Columbia University.
- Long, M. H. 1983: Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation in the second language classroom. In M. A. Clarke and J. Handscombe (eds), *On TESOL '82: Pacific Perspectives in Language Learning and Teaching*. Washington, DC: TESOL, 207–25.
- Long, M. H. 1990: Maturational constraints on language development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 251–85.
- Long, M. H. 1998: Focus on form in task-based language teaching. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in English as a Second Language*, 16 (2), 35–49.
- Long, M. H. 1999: Ebonics, language and power. In F. L. Pincus and H. J. Ehrlich (eds), *Race and Ethnic Conflict: Contending views on Prejudice, Discrimination, and Ethnoviolence*. Second edition. Westview and HarperCollins, 331–45.
- Los Angeles Unified School District and LeMoine, N. 1999: *English for Your Success: Handbook of Successful Strategies for Educators*. Maywood, NJ: Peoples Publishing.
- Love, T. A. 1991: *A Guide for Teaching Standard English to Black Dialect Speakers*. EDRS Document ED 340 248.
- Lowenberg, P. H. 1986a: Non-native varieties of English: nativization, norms, and implications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 8 (1), 1–18.
- Lowenberg, P. H. 1986b: Sociolinguistic context and second-language acquisition: acculturation and creativity in Malaysian English. *World Englishes*, 5 (1), 71–83.
- Lowenberg, P. H. 1993: Language transfer and levels of meaning potential in Malaysian English. In J. E. Alatis (ed.), *Language, Communication and Social Meaning*. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1992. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 41–55.
- Lukmani, Y. M. 1972: Motivation to learn and language proficiency. *Language Learning*, 22, 261–73.
- McKay, S. L. and Wong, S. C. 1996: Multiple discourses, multiple identities: investment and agency in second-language learning among Chinese adolescent immigrant students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66, 577–608.
- McLaughlin, B. 1987: *Theories of Second Language Learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- McWhorter, J. 1998: *The Word on the Street: Fact and Fable about American English*. New York and London: Plenum Trade.
- McWhorter, J. 2000: *Losing the Race: Self-Sabotage in Black America*. New York: Free Press.
- Menacker, T. 1998: Second language acquisition for languages with minimal distance. Ms. Department of English as a Second Language, University of Hawai'i.
- Murtagh, E. J. 1982: Creole and English as languages of instruction in bilingual education with Aboriginal Australians: some research findings. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 36, 15–33.
- Nayar, P. B. 1997: ESL/EFL dichotomy today: language politics or pragmatics? *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 9–37.
- Noonan, K. 2000: Why we were wrong about bilingual education. *Learning English* [supplement to the *Guardian Weekly*], 24 October–1 November, 3.

- Oller, J. W. 1981: Research on the measurement of affective variables: some remaining questions. In R. Andersen (ed.), *New Dimensions in Second Language Acquisition Research*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 14–27.
- Oller, J. W., Baca, L., and Vigil, F. 1979: Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: a sociolinguistic study of Mexican Americans in the Southwest. *TESOL Quarterly*, 11, 173–83.
- Österberg, T. 1961: *Bilingualism and the First School Language: An Educational Problem Illustrated by Results from a Swedish Language Area*. Umeå: Västerbottens Tryckeri.
- Pandey, A. 2000: TOEFL to the test: are monodialectal AAL-speakers similar to ESL students? *World Englishes*, 19 (1), 89–106.
- Payne, A. C. 1980: Factors controlling the acquisition of the Philadelphia dialect by out-of-state children. In W. Labov (ed.), *Locating Language in Time and Space*. New York: Academic Press, 143–78.
- Peirce, B. N. 1995: Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 9–31.
- Perry, T. and Delpit, L. (eds) 1998: *The Real Ebonics Debate: Power, Language, and the Education of African-American Children*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Peterson, R. O., Chuck, H. C., and Coladarsi, A. P. 1969: *Teaching Standard English as a Second Dialect to Primary School Children in Hilo, Hawaii*. Final Report: Project no. 5-0692. Washington, DC: US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research.
- Phillipson, R. 1988: Linguicism: structures and ideologies in linguistic imperialism. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas and J. Cummins (eds), *Minority Education: From Shame to Struggle*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 339–58.
- Piestrup, A. M. 1973: *Black Dialect Interference and Accommodation of Reading Instruction in First Grade*. Monographs of the Language-Behavior Research Laboratory no. 4. Berkeley: University of California.
- Politzer, R. L. 1973: Problems in applying foreign language teaching methods to the teaching of standard English as a second dialect. In J. S. De Stefano (ed.), *Language, Society, and Education: A Profile of Black English*. Worthington, OH: Charles A. Jones, 238–50.
- Politzer, R. L. 1993: A researcher's reflections on bridging dialect and second language learning: discussion of problems and solutions. In B. J. Merino, H. T. Trueba, and F. A. Samaniego (eds), *Language Culture and Learning: Teaching Spanish to Native Speakers of Spanish*. London: Falmer Press, 45–57.
- Rampton, B. 1995: *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Rampton, M. B. H. 1991: Second language learners in a stratified multilingual setting. *Applied Linguistics*, 12, 229–48.
- Ravel, J.-L. and Thomas, P. 1985: *État de la Réforme de l'Enseignement aux Seychelles 1981–1985*. Paris: Ministère des Relations Extérieures, Coopération et Développement.
- Reigel, K. F. and Freedle, R. 1976: What does it take to be bilingual or bidialectal? In D. S. Harrison and T. Trabasso (eds), *Black English: A Seminar*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 25–44.
- Rickford, J. R. 1999: *African American Vernacular English: Features, Evolution, Educational Implications*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rickford, J. R. and Rickford, A. E. 1995: Dialect readers revisited. *Linguistics and Education*, 7, 107–28.

- Rickford, J. R. and Rickford, R. J. 2000: *Spoken Soul: The Story of Black English*. New York: John Wiley.
- Ringbom, H. 1978: The influence of the mother tongue on the translation of lexical items. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 3, 80–101.
- Ringbom, H. 1987: *The Role of the First Language in Foreign Language Learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Rynkof, J. T. 1993: Culturally responsive talk between a second grade teacher and Hawaiian children during writing workshop. Ph.D. dissertation. University of New Hampshire.
- Sachdev, I. and Bourhis, R. Y. 1991: Power and status differentials in minority and majority group relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 21, 1–24.
- Sato, C. J. 1985: Linguistic inequality in Hawaii: the post-creole dilemma. In N. Wolfson and J. Manes (eds), *Language of Inequality*. Berlin: Mouton, 257–72.
- Sato, C. J. 1989: A nonstandard approach to Standard English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 259–82.
- Scherloh, J. M. 1991: Teaching standard English usage: a dialect-based approach. *Adult Learning*, 2 (5), 20–2.
- Schmidt, R. 1990: The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129–58.
- Schmidt, R. 1993: Awareness and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 206–26.
- Schumann, J. H. 1978a: The acculturation model for second language acquisition. In R. Gingras (ed.), *Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching*. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 27–50.
- Schumann, J. H. 1978b: Social and psychological factors in second language acquisition. In J. Richards (ed.), *Understanding Second and Foreign Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 163–78.
- Schumann, J. H. 1986: Research in the acculturation model for second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 7, 379–92.
- Selinker, L. 1972: Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 209–31.
- Shaw, W. D. 1981: Asian student attitudes towards English. In L. E. Smith (ed.), *English for Cross-Cultural Communication*. London: Macmillan, 108–22.
- Shuy, R. W. 1969: Bonnie and Clyde tactics in English teaching. *Florida FL Reporter*, 9 (1), 81–3, 160–1.
- Shuy, R. W. 1971: Social dialects: teaching vs learning. *Florida FL Reporter*, 9 (1 and 2), 28–33, 55.
- Shuy, R. W., Davis, A. L., and Hogan, R. F. (eds) 1964: *Social Dialects and Language Learning*. Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Siegel, M. 1996: The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 356–82.
- Siegel, J. 1996: *Vernacular Education in the South Pacific*. International Development Issues no. 45. Canberra: Australian Agency for International Development.
- Siegel, J. 1997: Using a pidgin language in formal education: help or hindrance? *Applied Linguistics*, 18, 86–100.
- Siegel, J. 1999a: Creole and minority dialects in education: an overview. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 20, 508–31.
- Siegel, J. 1999b: Stigmatized and standardized varieties in the classroom: interference or separation? *TESOL Quarterly*, 33 (4), 701–28.
- Simpkins, G. A. and Simpkins, C. 1981: Cross-cultural approach to curriculum development. In G. Smitherman (ed.),

- Black English and the Education of Black Children and Youth*. Detroit: Center for Black Studies, Wayne State University, 221–40.
- Simpkins, G. A., Holt, G., and Simpkins, C. 1977: *Bridge: A Cross-Cultural Reading Program*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1984: *Bilingualism or Not: The Education of Minorities*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1988: Multilingualism and the education of minority children. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas and J. Cummins (eds), *Minority Education: From Shame to Struggle*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 9–44.
- Sledd, J. 1969: Bi-dialectalism: the linguistics of white supremacy. *English Journal*, 58, 1307–29.
- Sledd, J. 1972: Doublespeak: dialectology in the service of Big Brother. *College English*, 33, 439–56.
- Snow, C. E. 1990: Rationales for native language instruction: evidence from research. In A. M. Padilla, H. H. Fairchild, and C. M. Valdez (eds), *Bilingual Education: Issues and Strategies*. Newbury Park: Sage, 60–74.
- Spolsky, B. 2000: Language motivation revisited. *Applied Linguistics*, 21 (2), 157–69.
- Sridhar, K. K. and Sridhar, S. N. 1986: Bridging the paradigm gap: second language acquisition theory and indigenized varieties of English. *World Englishes*, 5 (1), 3–14.
- Stern, O. 1988: Divergence and convergence of dialects and standard from the perspective of the language learner. In P. Auer and A. di Luzio (eds), *Variation and Convergence: Studies in Social Dialectology*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 134–56.
- Stewart, W. A. (ed.) 1964a: *Non-Standard Speech and the Teaching of English*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Stewart, W. A. 1964b: Urban Negro speech: sociolinguistic factors affecting English teaching. In R. W. Shuy, A. L. Davis, and R. F. Hogan (eds), *Social Dialects and Language Learning*. Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 10–18.
- Stewart, W. A. 1970: Foreign language teaching methods in quasi-foreign language situations. In R. W. Fasold and R. W. Shuy (eds), *Teaching Standard English in the Inner City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1–19.
- Swain, M. 1998: Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty and J. Williams (eds), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 64–81.
- Swain, M. and Lapkin, S. 1982: *Evaluating Bilingual Education: A Canadian Example*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Tajfel, H. 1974: Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Science Information*, 13, 65–93.
- Tajfel, H. (ed.) 1978: *Differentiation between Social Groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Taylor, H. 1989: *Standard English, Black English, and Bidialectalism: A Controversy*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Thomas, W. P. and Collier, V. 1997: *School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Tollefson, J. W. 1991: *Planning Language, Planning Inequality: Language Policy in the Community*. London: Longman.
- Torrey, J. 1972: *The Language of Black Children in the Early Grades*. New London: Connecticut College.
- Trosset, C. S. 1986: The social identity of Welsh learners. *Language in Society*, 15, 165–92.

- Trudgill, P. 1982: Linguistic accommodation: sociolinguistic observations on a sociopsychological theory. In C. Masek, R. Hendrick, and M. Miller (eds), *Papers from the Parasession on Language and Behavior: Chicago Linguistic Society (1981)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 218–37.
- Trudgill, P. 1983: *On Dialect*. New York: New York University Press.
- Trudgill, P. 1986: *Dialects in Contact*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Valdés, G. 1981: Pedagogical implications of teaching Spanish to the Spanish-speaking in the United States. In G. Valdés, A. G. Loranço, and R. García-Moya (eds), *Teaching Spanish to the Hispanic Bilingual: Issues, Aims and Methods*. New York: Teachers College Press, 3–20.
- Valdés, G. 1997: The teaching of Spanish to bilingual Spanish-speaking students. In M. Cecilia and F. Alarcon (eds), *La Enseñanza del Español a Hispanohablantes*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 8–44.
- Valdés-Fallis, G. 1978: A comprehensive approach to the teaching of Spanish to bilingual Spanish-speaking students. *Modern Language Journal*, 43 (3), 101–10.
- Venezky, R. L. and Chapman, R. S. 1973: Is learning to read dialect bound? In J. L. Laffey and R. Shuy (eds), *Language Differences: Do They Interfere?* Newark, DE: International Reading Association, 62–9.
- Vousten, R. and Bongaerts, T. 1990: Acquiring a dialect as L2: the case of the dialect of Venray in the Dutch province of Limburg. Paper presented at the International Congress of Dialectologists, Bamberg, Germany (published in W. Viereck (ed.) 1995, *Verbandlungen des Internationalen Dialektologenkongresses Bamberg 1990. Band 4*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 299–313).
- Wells, J. C. 1973: *Jamaican Pronunciation in London*. Publications of the Philological Society, 25. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wiley, T. G. 1996: *Literacy and Language Diversity in the United States*. Washington, DC, and McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Williams, J. 1987: Non-native varieties of English: a special case of language acquisition. *English World-Wide*, 8 (2), 161–99.
- Winer, L. 1985: Trini Talk: learning an English-Creole as a second language. In I. F. Hancock (ed.), *Diversity and Development in English-Related Creoles*. Ann Arbor: Karoma, 44–67.
- Wode, H. 1976: Developmental sequences in L2 acquisition. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 11, 1–31.
- Wolfram, W. 1994: Bidialectal literacy in the United States. In D. Spener (ed.), *Adult Bilingualism in the United States*. Washington, DC, and McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems, 71–88.
- Wolfram, W. and Fasold, R. W. 1969: Toward reading materials for speakers of Black English: three linguistically appropriate passages. In J. C. Baratz and R. W. Shuy (eds), *Teaching Black Children to Read*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 138–55.
- Wolfram, W. and Schilling-Estes, N. 1998: *American English: Dialects and Variation*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Wolfram, W., Christian, D., and Adger, C. 1999: *Dialects in Schools and Communities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Woolard, K. 1989: *Double Talk: Bilingualism and the Politics of Ethnicity in Catalonia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- World Bank 1995: *The Use of First and Second Languages in Education: A Review of International Experience*.

- Draft for Discussion, February 1995.*  
Pacific Islands Education Study, Basic Studies no. 2. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Woutersen, M., Cox, A., Weltens, B., and De Bot, K. 1994: Lexical aspects of standard dialect bilingualism. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 15, 447–73.
- Young-Scholten, M. 1985: Interference reconsidered: the role of similarity in second language acquisition. *Selecta*, 6, 6–12.