INTRODUCTION

This paper is an attempt to formulate a model of second-language acquisition based on the social-psychology of acculturation. The model presented is by no means final and therefore the reader is advised that the final section of the paper, "Problems with this Perspective," is as important as the major part of the text.

In the past several years, researchers in second-language acquisition (SLA) have been attempting to determine what factors are involved in the second-language learning process. Table 1 on the following page attempts to provide an up-to-date taxonomy of the factors which researchers currently believe to be important in the process of becoming bilingual.

The development of such taxonomies is important and must continue, but at the same time it is necessary to attempt to determine which factor or set of factors are more important in that they cause second-language acquisition to occur and which factors are less important in that they are intervening variables which simply serve to moderate the effects of the causal variable(s).*

CAUSAL VARIABLES

As an operating strategy I propose that in attempting to identify the causal variable(s) in SLA we do so within the context of natural SLA, i.e. learning language without instruction and in the environment where it is spoken. There are at least two reasons for adopting this strategy. First, unlike other

* The search for causal variables in second language acquisition was suggested to me by the work of Paulston (1975, 1977) in bilingual education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxonomy of Factors Influencing Second-Language Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Factors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance; Nondominance; Subordination; Assimilation; Acculturation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation; Enclosure; Cohesiveness; Size; Congruence; Attitude;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended Length of Residence in TL Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective Factors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Shock; Cultural Shock; Motivation; Ego-permeability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality Factors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance for Ambiguity; Sensitivity to Rejection; Introversion/Extro-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>version; Self-esteem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive Factors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Development; Cognitive Processes: imitation, analogy,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generalization, rote memorization; Cognitive Style: field dependence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>category width, cognitive interference, monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Factors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateralization; Transfer; Infrasystems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aptitude Factors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Language Aptitude; IQ; Sterphosymbolia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Factors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesting Patterns; Transition Anxiety; Reaction to Teaching Methods;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of Learning Strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input Factors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency; Salience; Complexity; Type of Interlocutor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Factors:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals; Teacher; Method; Text; Duration; Intensity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
subjects such as history and mathematics, languages can be and are mastered without study and without instruction. Second, it is probable that in the history of mankind more people have become bilingual without study or instruction than with them. Therefore, it would seem logical to begin the search for the causal variable(s) in SLA by viewing this process in its natural setting.

Acculturation

From the taxonomy in Table 1, I would like to argue that two groups of variables—social factors and affective factors—cluster into a single variable which is the major causal variable in SLA. I propose that we call this variable *acculturation*. By acculturation I mean the social and psychological integration of the learner with the target language (TL) group. I also propose that any learner can be placed on a continuum that ranges from social and psychological distance to social and psychological proximity with speakers of the TL, and that the learner will acquire the second language only to the degree that he acculturates. It is necessary, however, to distinguish between two types of acculturation. In type one acculturation, the learner is socially integrated with the TL group and, as a result, develops sufficient contacts with TL speakers to enable him to acquire the TL. In addition, he is psychologically open to the TL such that input to which he is exposed becomes intake. Type two acculturation has all the characteristics of type one, but in this case the learner regards the TL speakers as a reference group whose life style and values he consciously or unconsciously desires to adopt. Both types of acculturation are sufficient to cause acquisition of the TL, but the distinction is made in order to stress that social and psychological contact with the TL group is the essential component in acculturation (as it relates to SLA) and that adoption of the life style and values of the TL group (characteristics traditionally associated with the notion of acculturation) is not necessary for successful acquisition of the TL.

Now let's examine the social and psychological factors that constitute acculturation.

Social Variables

When we examine social variables (Schumann, 1976a, 1976b, 1978a, 1978b) involved in acculturation and thus SLA, we are concerned with variables which involve the relationship between two social groups who are in a contact situation, but who speak different languages. One group is considered the second-language learning (2LL) group and the other the target language (TL) group. Certain social factors can either promote or inhibit contact between the two groups and thus affect the degree to which the 2LL group acculturates which in turn affects the degree
to which that group will acquire the target language.

The first such factor involves social dominance patterns. If the 2LL group is politically, culturally, technically or economically superior (dominant) to the TL group then it will tend not to learn the target language. For example, French colonists in Tunisia were potential learners of Arabic. But the French, as a group, because of their political, cultural, technical and economic dominance, were socially distant from the Tunisians and felt very little need to acquire Arabic. If the 2LL group is inferior (subordinate) to the TL group then there will also be social distance between the two groups, and the 2LL group will tend to resist learning the target language. For example, American Indians living in the Southwest have traditionally been subordinate to the dominant Anglo group and have also resisted acculturation and the acquisition of English. This situation is compounded by issues of enclosure, congruence and attitude which will be mentioned below. If the 2LL group and the TL group are roughly equal in terms of political, cultural, technical and economic status, then contact between the two groups is likely to be more extensive and the acquisition of the target language by the 2LL group will be enhanced.

The second social factor affecting second language learning involves three integration strategies: assimilation, preservation and adaptation.* If the 2LL group assimilates then it gives up its own life style and values and adopts those of the target language group. This strategy maximizes contact between the two groups and enhances acquisition of the target language. If the 2LL group chooses preservation as its integration strategy then it maintains its own life style and values and rejects those of the TL group. This situation creates social distance between the two groups and makes it unlikely that the 2LL group will acquire the TL group's language. If the 2LL group chooses adaptation as its integration strategy then it adapts to the life style and values of the TL group, but maintains its own life style and values for intragroup use. This particular integration strategy yields varying degrees of contact between the two groups and thus varying degrees of acquisition of the target language.

Enclosure is the third social factor that affects second language learning. Enclosure refers to the degree to which the 2LL group and the TL group share the same churches, schools, clubs, recreational facilities, crafts, professions and trades. If the two groups share these social constructs then enclosure is said to be low, contact between the two groups is enhanced and acquisition of the target language by the 2LL group is

* Schumann (1976a, 1976b, 1978a, 1978b) used the term acculturation instead of adaptation. However, in this paper adaptation is used to refer to the integration strategy and acculturation is used in the broader sense to refer to social and psychological contact with speakers of the TL.
facilitated. However, if the two groups have different churches, schools, clubs, recreational facilities, crafts, professions and trades then enclosure is said to be high, contact between the two groups is limited and opportunities for acquisition of the target language are reduced.

*Cohesiveness* and *size* are related social factors that also affect second-language learning. If the 2LL group is cohesive, then its members will tend to remain separate from the TL group, and if the 2LL group is large, the intragroup contact will be more frequent than intergroup contact. Both these situations will reduce the opportunities for acquisition of the target language.

*Congruence* or similarity between the culture of the TL group and that of the 2LL group also affects the degree of contact between the two groups. If the two cultures are similar then social contact is more likely and second-language learning will be facilitated.

*Attitude* is another important social factor involved in second-language learning. If the 2LL group and the TL group have positive attitudes toward each other, second-language learning is more likely to occur than if they view each other negatively.

The final social factor to be considered is the 2LL group's intended length of residence in the target language area. If the 2LL group intends to remain for a long time in the target language area, it is likely to develop more extensive contacts with the TL group. Therefore, an intended lengthy residence in the target language area would tend to promote second-language learning.

**Affective Variables**

When discussing social variables we are concerned with language learning by groups of people. However, affective variables (Schumann, 1975, 1976b, 1978a, 1978b) relate to language learning by individuals. An individual may learn under social conditions which are not favorable for SLA and may not learn under social conditions which appear to be favorable. The psychological variables influencing acculturation and hence SLA are affective in nature and include language shock, cultural shock, motivation and ego permeability.

*Language Shock.* In discussing what can be called language shock, Stengal (1939) points out that when learners attempt to speak a second language they often fear that they will appear comic. He compares the use of a second language with wearing fancy clothes. The adult learner may want to wear his fancy clothes, but he also fears criticism and ridicule. The child, however, sees language as a method of play and finds communication a source of pleasure. Thus, he doesn't fear his fancy clothes; he enjoys wearing them. Stengal states, "the adult will learn the new language the more easily, the more of these
infantile characteristics he has preserved." He also points out that adults speaking a second language are often haunted by doubts as to whether their words actually reflect their ideas. Children, he says, are less worried about this. The child is willing to use a word incorrectly and to form new words if necessary. Finally, learners often get a good deal of narcissistic gratification from their use of their native language, and in many cases, they use language to attract attention and praise. When speaking a second language in which they are much less proficient, they lose an important source of narcissistic gratification.

Cultural Shock. Cultural shock can be defined as anxiety resulting from the disorientation encountered upon entering a new culture. When moving into a new culture, the learner finds himself in a dependent state. The coping and problem-solving mechanisms that he has at his disposal often do not work. As a result, activities which were routine in his native country require a great deal of energy in the new environment. This situation can cause disorientation, stress, anxiety and fear. The resulting mental state can produce a powerful syndrome of rejection which diverts energy and attention from second-language learning. The learner, in attempting to find a cause for his disorientation, may reject himself, his own culture, the organization for which he is working and the people of the host country. Under such conditions the learner is unlikely to make the effort necessary to become bilingual.

Motivation. Motivation, the third affective factor, involves the learner's reasons for attempting to acquire the second language. Researchers (Gardner and Lambert, 1972) have identified two motivational orientations for second-language learning— an integrative motivation and an instrumental motivation. An integratively-oriented learner wants to learn the second language in order to meet with, talk to, find out about and, perhaps, become like speakers of the target language whom he both values and admires. An instrumentally-oriented learner is one who has little interest in the people who speak the target language, but wants to learn the language for more utilitarian reasons such as getting ahead in his occupation or gaining recognition from his own membership group. It has generally been thought that integrative motivation is the more powerful of the two because it implies a desire to integrate with speakers of the target language. A learner with an instrumental motivation would be expected to integrate, and hence acquire the second language, only to the point where his instrumental goals were satisfied. If the learner merely wanted to be able to buy food and take public transportation, he could achieve these goals with a very low level of proficiency in the second language. If the learner had to use the target language in his professional life then his level of learning would be much higher.

Recent research, however, seems to indicate that the moti-
vational orientation that is associated with proficiency in the second language seems to vary according to setting. An integrative motivation appears to be more effective in settings where it is neither necessary nor an accepted fact of life that the second language be acquired. Such conditions obtain in the United States with regard to learning languages such as French, German or Italian. On the other hand, in settings such as Iran and Saudi Arabia there may be no integrative motivation to acquire English, but a great deal of instrumental motivation in order to deal with English speaking technical advisors, educators and businessmen. Oller, Baca and Vigil (1977) have even found that with colonized populations such as Mexican-Americans in the Southwest, proficiency in the second language (in this case English) is associated with an anti-integrative motivation. So, while instrumental and integrative motivations are useful ways to think about success in second-language learning, they are complex constructs that interact both with the social variables discussed earlier and the other variables listed in Table 1.

Ego-Permeability. Guiora (1972), in attempting to explain the ability of some people to acquire native-like pronunciation in a second language, developed the notion of "language ego." He sees language ego as parallel to the Freudian construct, body ego. In the course of general ego development the child acquires body ego by which he becomes aware of the limits of his physical being and learns to distinguish himself from the object world around him. In a similar fashion, in the course of general ego development, the child acquires a sense of the boundaries of his language. The sounds, words, syntax and morphology of his language become objectified and develop firm outlines and boundaries. In the early stages of development, language ego boundaries are permeable, but later they become fixed and rigid.

Guiora, Beit-Hallahmi, Brannon, Dull and Scovel (1972) equated rigidity of ego boundaries with heightened levels of inhibition. They reasoned that if inhibition level could be lowered, ego rigidity would be reduced and ego-permeability would be enhanced. To test this idea, they conducted an experiment in which they gave subjects varying amounts of alcohol (0, 1, 1.5, 2 or 3 ounces of 90-proof liquor) and then tested their pronunciation in a second language. It was found that with the ingestion of one to one-and-a-half ounces of alcohol, pronunciation was better than in either the no alcohol or the two-or three-ounce conditions. This experiment suggests that ego-permeability is inducible and that perhaps the successful adult second-language learner is an individual who has access to more child-like ego states in which greater ego-permeability exists.

In a related experiment, Schumann, Holroyd, Campbell and Ward (1978) attempted to use hypnotism to improve pronunciation in a second language. They found evidence that the pronunciation of subjects who were deeply hypnotised improved to a greater degree than that of subjects who were less deeply hypnotised. If hypnotism is viewed as a disinhibitor, the observed improve-
ment in pronunciation may have resulted from heightened ego-permeability fostered by lowered inhibitions. From this point of view, both alcohol and hypnotism functioned in the same way in promoting more authentic pronunciation of a second language.*

In sum, if language shock and cultural shock are not overcome and if the learner does not have sufficient and appropriate motivation and ego-permeability, then he will not fully acculturate and hence will not acquire the second language fully.

SLA AND ACCULTURATION

This discussion of social and affective factors leads to the major hypothesis of this paper which is that SLA is just one aspect of acculturation and the degree to which a learner acculturates to the TL group will control the degree to which he acquires the second language. An idealized schema of this relationship is presented in Figure 1.

FIGURE 1

This Figure indicates that for each degree of acculturation there is an equal degree of SLA. The real situation is certainly not so neat; there is probably no one-to-one relationship between acculturation and SLA. Nevertheless, evidence presented by Schumann (1975, 1976b, 1978a, 1978b), Staubie (1978) and the Heidelberg Project (1976) argues for a causal link between acculturation and SLA.

Schumann (1976b, 1978a, 1978b) compared the degree of SLA among six learners (two children, two adolescents and two adults) and found that the subject who acquired the least amount of English was the one who was the most socially and psychologically distant from the TL group. This learner was a 33-year-old Costa

* Another possible interpretation of this experiment is that the pronunciation improvement seen in the deeply hypnotised subjects could be the result of regression to the mean.
Rican named Alberto who could be regarded as belonging to a social
group designated as lower-class Latin American worker immigrants.
To account for his lack of acculturation, Schumann compared him
to four of the other subjects who were classified as children of
upper-middle-class Latin American professional immigrants.

Latin American worker immigrants are subordinate in relation
to Americans since they represent an unskilled labor group whose
model socio-economic status is lower than that of Americans in
general. This view is probably shared by both the worker immi-
grants and the Americans. The worker immigrants probably fall
somewhere between preservation and adaptation with regard to
their desired integration into American society. In terms of
enclosure the Latin American workers have access to American
institutions, but generally live in immigrant neighborhoods
where they share schools, churches and associations with other
immigrants having the same socio-economic status and usually
having the same language and culture. This enclosure by neigh-
borhood fosters cohesiveness, particularly in Alberto's case
where Costa Rican immigrants are a small minority within a Portu-
guese minority area. The culture of the Latin American worker
immigrants is relatively congruent to that of the Americans
(both being Western and Christian), but since the Latin American
workers may represent the "culture of poverty" more than does
the model American culture, there may also be an element of
incongruence between the two cultures. The attitudes of the two
groups toward each other would have to be measured before accu-
rate judgments could be made. It is also difficult to assess
the intended length of stay in the United States by Latin Ameri-
can workers.

Upper-middle-class Latin American professional immigrants
are probably viewed by Americans and also view themselves as
nondominant in relation to the English speaking TL group because
their educational background and socio-economic status more
closely match that of Americans in general. The Latin American
professionals are solidly adaptive in their integration pattern.
They have to be able to demonstrate culturally appropriate
behavior in their relationships with American colleagues and
therefore must adapt to American life styles and values. But
since their length of residence in the United States is often
confined to a period of postgraduate education, they generally
do not choose to assimilate. The professionals are generally
integrated into the university and professional communities and
do not live in immigrant neighborhoods. Therefore, their
enclosure is low and they are less cohesive than the worker
immigrant. The size of the professional group is likely to be
smaller than that of workers, and the congruity of their cultures
with that of the United States in general is relatively high.
Once again attitudinal orientations would have to be empirically
assessed in order to be correctly classified.

When both profiles are considered we find that the Latin
American worker immigrant group is at a considerably greater
social distance from Americans than are the professionals. Hence, we can say that Alberto was socially distant from Americans.

In order to get some assessment of Alberto's psychological distance from English speakers, at the end of the study he was asked to fill out a short questionnaire which elicited information concerning his attitude and motivation. In terms of this questionnaire, he seemed to have a positive attitude and good motivation, and hence little psychological distance. However, there is some question as to whether he was entirely candid in his answers. Alberto tended not to like to displease and therefore his answers may reflect what he thought the experimenter wanted to hear.

There are several aspects of Alberto's life style that appear to contradict the positive attitude and motivation expressed in his questionnaire. He made very little effort to get to know English speaking people. In Cambridge he stuck quite close to a small group of Spanish speaking friends. He did not own a television and expressed disinterest in it because he could not understand English. On the other hand, he purchased an expensive stereo set and tape deck on which he played mostly Spanish music. Also, he chose to work at night (as well as in the day) rather than attend English classes which were available in Cambridge.

The other subjects were not given the attitude and motivation questionnaire, but in general they seemed to be psychologically much closer to Americans. All their children attended American schools and had American friends. The second adult baby-sat for American children, studied English on her own and tried to get to know and speak with Americans.

Since performance on a Piagetian test of adaptive intelligence (Feldman et al, 1974) indicated that Alberto had no gross cognitive deficits that would have prevented him from acquiring English more fully, and since there is no substantially clear age-related biological or neurological explanation for his low level of development in English, Alberto's lack of acculturation toward the TL group stands as the best argument for his minimal acquisition of English.

Stauble (1978) showed how social distance, but more especially psychological distance, accounted for the degree of acculturation and hence the degree of development of negation in three second-language learners. First she made a detailed analysis of the acquisition of English negation by two second-language learners who acculturated well and thus acquired English negation virtually completely. The analysis delineated the steps a Spanish speaker (all five learners were native Spanish speakers) goes through in acquiring English negation.

Next Stauble gathered English speech samples from three Spanish speakers who had been living in the United States for over 10 years and who had achieved varying levels of proficiency in English. Because of their particular life styles and their
lengthy residence in this country, it was judged that their language acquisition had either stopped or had slowed down to such an extent that their interlanguages could be considered fossilized. Stauble analyzed these learners' English negation and then attempted to account for the learners' varying degrees of development by administering a questionnaire which was designed to assess their degree of acculturation by eliciting information about their life styles and their attitudes toward life in the United States.

The questionnaire revealed that Xavier had the greatest amount of psychological distance (62.5%) and the least amount of social distance (12.5%). María and Paz had the same amount of psychological distance (21%), but differed by a little more than 10 percentage points in terms of social distance (56% and 67%, respectively). The fact that Xavier had evidenced very little development in the negative and at the same time had the greatest amount of psychological distance and least social distance led Stauble to suggest that psychological distance may be more important in acculturation than social distance.

Paz exceeded María in negation development even though her social distance was greater than María's and their psychological distances were equal. This result led Stauble to speculate that the two subjects may have differed in the nature of their psychological distance profiles. An examination of the questionnaire data revealed that, although these two subjects had equal total psychological distance scores, in the area of motivation, Paz scored higher than María. Thus, Stauble suggested that in the acculturation there may be a hierarchy in which psychological distance is more important than social distance and motivation is the most important aspect of psychological distance. Stauble cautions, however, that the questionnaire used in her study was a pilot instrument, the validity and reliability of which have not been tested. Therefore, she warns that the results should be considered speculative. With this warning in mind, we can conclude that her findings are at least consistent with the hypothesis that acculturation controls second-language development.

The Heidelberg Research Project (1976) examined the acquisition of German by 48 immigrant workers. Half of the subjects were Italian and half were Spanish. The researchers developed an index of syntactic development and then related the learners' scores on that index to several social factors: leisure contact with Germans, age upon entering Germany, contact with Germans at work, length of education, sex and mother tongue (Spanish or Italian). The following correlations were observed:* leisure

---

* The researchers do not provide information concerning the statistical significance of these correlations. Because of the preliminary nature of their work they prefer to describe basic generalities through descriptive statistics rather than inferential statistics (Heidelberg Project, 1976).
contact with Germans: .64; age upon entering Germany: -.57; contact with Germans at work: .53; length of education: .33; mother tongue (Spanish or Italian): .13; sex: .12. In performing the analysis, the researchers separated the 48 subjects into three groups (16 each) according to their degree of syntactic development. Group A was the lowest level of syntactic development, Group B was the middle level and Group C was the highest level.

To see how the above correlations relate to the social distance aspect of acculturation it will be useful to examine each social variable in detail.

Leisure Contact with Germans. None of the subjects in the lowest syntactic group had a high amount of leisure contact with Germans. Of those workers who had the highest degree of syntactic development, six had low leisure contact with Germans, five had medium contact and five had high contact. It is interesting to note that the workers with the highest amount of contact were persons who lived with German partners. This situation seems to guarantee a high level of learning because it results not only in extensive interaction with the German roommate, but also leads to considerable contact with other Germans. In addition, the researchers speculate that having a German partner may increase the prestige of the foreigner, thus enhancing his opportunities to gain access to other Germans. One of the five "high contact" subjects was married to a German and lived with his in-laws. This man had almost total integration with the community; he belonged to card clubs, played soccer and sat with the "regulars" at the neighborhood bar. With the other four learners the degree of integration was not as complete, but it was similar in nature.

The speakers in the "middle contact" group associated with German neighbors and mixed with Germans in bars. Of the 16 people in this group only four had German friends. In relation to the issue of age upon arrival in Germany, it is interesting to note that these four came to Germany before the age of 22.

The subjects in the "low contact" group only exchanged greetings with neighbors and had brief conversations with Germans in shops. The people in this group lived in the dormitories which factories maintain for immigrant workers. There the isolation is extreme.

Age upon Entering Germany. This variable had an inverse relation with the language acquisition, i.e. with increasing age the index of syntax development was lower. The 10 speakers with the highest syntactic level entered Germany about the age of 20. All the worker immigrants who arrived after 40 years-of-age were in the lowest syntactic group. Those who arrived between the ages of 25 and 35 were generally in the middle syntactic group.

The researchers caution that one must not hasten to ascribe a neurological or cognitive cause to these age-related results. They believe that social factors may be responsible, and in this regard they point out that the correlation between age at entry and the two contact variables (leisure contact and work contact)
is .32 and that none of the subjects who entered at an early age had little contact with Germans.

There was, however, one bit of evidence that the ability to learn a second language decreases with age. One subject was 53 upon entering Germany. Although his situation would seem to give him contact with Germans, his syntax level placed him in the lowest group. Subjects with a similar social profile and a younger entry age did much better on the syntax scale.

Contact with Germans at Work. This was the third most important factor in the acquisition of German by immigrant workers. The researchers noted that learners whose work required communication with co-workers did better in German than workers who provided services (hairdresser, kitchen help, etc.). Also learners who worked in an environment which was noisy or which constrained movement were at a disadvantage. In addition, if the worker's position demanded that he control and understand the work process as a whole, he tended to have a better grasp of German.

It also appeared that language learning was enhanced when the particular work force consisted of Germans with immigrant workers of many different nationalities. Where the immigrant workers were largely of the same nationality they tended to communicate in their own language. The number of Germans in the work force was also an important factor.

An examination of both of the contact variables together reveals that among the best speakers, those who had little leisure contact with Germans all had considerable work contact.

Length of Education. In general, the syntax index increases with level of education the worker received in his native country. Indeed all speakers with less than five years of formal education were in the lowest syntax group. Length of education correlated .33 with the syntax index, but when that variable was further refined to reflect amount of vocational education acquired in the worker's home country, the correlation increased to .42. Almost two-thirds of the subjects were unskilled or semi-skilled workers. Both these groups of workers scored below the average syntax index. However, the skilled workers (journeymen) were at a much higher level. Of the 11 journeymen workers, nine were at the highest syntax level. One could hypothesize that these workers by virtue of their education and experience were non-dominant or approximately equal to their German counterparts in terms of education, technical skill and economic status and, therefore, integrated with them relatively easily.

Length of Stay. The researchers had initially predicted that this would be a major factor in the acquisition of German. However, there turned out to be no strong relationship between the two variables. It appears that in the first two or three years all the subjects are acquiring syntax, but that after this initial phase, the development of syntax is determined by the other social variables discussed above.

Using these four social variables plus two additional variables (sex and native language), the researchers developed an
overall social index. This measure correlated with the syntax index at .82 which was higher than any individual social variable. Thus, the Heidelberg Project offers substantial evidence that acculturation may be the major causal variable in SLA.

Ancillary evidence for the importance of acculturation derives from the phenomena of pidginization and decreolization. Pidginization occurs when speakers of different languages come into limited contact and an auxiliary vehicle of communication develops to facilitate interaction between them. There are two types of pidginization: secondary hybridization and tertiary hybridization (Whinnom, 1971). Secondary hybridization is represented by the reduced and simplified speech of second-language learners which develops initially due to cognitive constraints, but which persists if the learner(s) is socially and/or psychologically distant from the target language group. Tertiary hybridization is really secondary hybridization with two added conditions: (a) the target language is no longer available as a norm to which speakers assimilate and (b) the hybrid becomes a vehicle of communication among speakers with different native languages.

Secondary hybridization produces a pidginized interlanguage which is characterized by simplifications such as the loss of inflectional morphology, and the elimination of certain grammatical transformations. The pidginization resulting from tertiary hybridization is characterized by similar simplifications, but due to the facts that the pidgin is used as a vehicle of communication among speakers of different native languages and that the target language is not available as a model of approximation, the interlanguage in this case undergoes more independent development and is characterized, not only by simplification, but also by admixture of the several languages involved and by linguistic innovations which might best be described as language "creation."

Both secondary and tertiary hybridization constitute pidginization, but it is generally agreed that only tertiary hybridization results in the development of a true pidgin language. In addition, the pidginization that occurs in certain SLA situations represents only secondary hybridization. However, what is important for our discussion here is that both forms of hybridization are the consequence of second-language development under conditions of limited acculturation. In the study by Schumann (1976b, 1978a, 1978b) referred to above, Alberto's lack of acculturation to the English speaking target language group resulted in secondary hybridization and thus a pidginized form of English in which the uniform negative "no" was used for most negative utterances, questions were uninverted, auxiliaries were lacking, possessives were uninflected, verbs were not marked for tense and subject pronouns were often deleted. No claim is made that Alberto's interlanguage constituted a pidgin, but only that lack of acculturation caused it to be pidginized.

When a pidgin becomes the native language of a group of
speakers it is called a creole. In the process of creolization the former pidgin complicates and expands so that it can function not just as an auxiliary vehicle of communication, but as genuine native language of a particular group. However, the complication and expansion that takes place in creolization is not goal directed. In other words, the linguistic features that a creole develops during the process of complication and expansion are not derived from any target language which serves as a model of approximation. In essence, the creole creates itself, acquiring features through processes of natural language development. Therefore, since creolization is language creation and not language acculturation it does not fit into the acculturation model of SLA. Decreolization, on the other hand, is a form of language acculturation and does fit the model.

Decreolization is a process in which social stratification breaks down and the creole speakers gain varying degrees of contact with the group which speaks the base language of the creole. An example would be the speakers of Guyanese Creole coming into varying degrees of contact with speakers of standard English. When this happens a series of lects ranging from the Creole to the standard language develops. The lect closest to the creole is called the basilect, the one closest to the standard language is called acrolect and those in the middle are referred to as the mesolect. The degree to which the individual has contact with the standard speakers will determine which lect he speaks. Hence, varying degrees of acculturation to the standard language group produces the continuum of lects.

Bickerton (1975) suggested that the developing stages of SLA from native language (NL) through the TL may parallel the decreolization continuum. Movement along the continuum in both cases is motivated by the degree of contact the learner has with the TL group. Stauble (1978) tested this hypothesis in the study discussed earlier. It will be recalled that she made a detailed analysis of the acquisition of English negation by two second-language learners who acculturated well and thus acquired English negation virtually completely. She then compared that analysis with Bickerton's description of the decreolization of Guyanese negation. She found that the development of negation in both cases was characterized by two processes: replacement and restructuring. In replacement, nonstandard morphemes are replaced by morphemes which on the surface resemble those of standard English. For example, in the decreolization of Guyanese, the basilect negator na is replaced in the mesolect by various negators—doon(t)=don't dozn(t)=doesn't di(d)n(t)=didn't—which are modeled on the standard forms. However, these negators are monomorphic forms that simply negate; they are not carriers of tense.

**Basilect:**

Yu na taak tu di man nek de?  
*(Didn't you talk to the man the next day?)*

**Mesolect:**

We *don't* understand it  
*(We *didn't* understand it)*

But you *didn't* had it  
*(But you *didn't* have it)*
Among the Spanish speakers acquiring English as a second language, the same phenomenon is evident. The negator no which is used in the early stages gradually is replaced by don't in the intermediate stages: No saw him = I didn't see him; I don't saw him = I didn't see him. Here don't is an unanalyzed form; it does not consist of do and negator and is not a carrier of tense.

In the process of restructuring, the forms which had been incorporated with only surface similarities to the standard get analyzed into the grammatical categories of the model language. In negation, this process is realized when a monomorphemic negator such as don't becomes a carrier of tense as well as negation such that didn't is used only for past reference and don't and doesn't are restricted to nonpast reference. In the decroelization of Guyanese this occurs in the development from mesolect to acrolect, and in the acquisition of English by Spanish speakers it occurs in the development from the intermediate to later stages of learning.

The processes of replacement and restructuring in the acquisition of English negation by Spanish speakers produces a continuum of developmental stages that parallels quite closely the Guyanese decroelization continuum. Table 2 on the following page presents Stauble's analysis of the SLA continuum and labels the stages: basilang, mesolang and acrolang.

After establishing this continuum Stauble, as was discussed earlier, gathered English speech samples from three Spanish speakers whose interlanguages had fossilized. She found that one subject had lower mesolang negation, another was at the mid-mesolang period and the third had fossilized at the upper-mesolang stage. Then, to account for the learner's varying degrees of development, Stauble administered a questionnaire which was designed to assess their degree of acculturation. She concluded that there was a definite relationship between the subject's degree of acculturation and the degree of linguistic development they exhibited in English negation.

Stauble's work suggests that the analogy between decroelization and SLA is valid since in both cases linguistic development is accomplished through the process of replacement and restructuring both of which are in turn fostered by acculturation to the TL group. This analogy is depicted in Figure 2.

**FIGURE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decroelization</th>
<th>Basilact</th>
<th>Mesolect</th>
<th>Acrolect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA Continuum</td>
<td>Basilang</td>
<td>Mesolang</td>
<td>Acrolang</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, there is one problem with this formulation: the basilect and the basilang are not really analogous because basilect is a native language and the basilang is not. The basilect speaker acquires this lect by being born into a community for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Stauble's Analysis of the Sequence of Acquisition of English Negation by Native Speakers of Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basilang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preverbal negation rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. No + verb constructions: No saw him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No + phrase constructions: No in Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Some don't + verb constructions: Don't like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lower Mesolang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preverbal and post auxiliary negation rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Dominant use of unanalyzed don't + verb constructions: I don't saw him (= didn't)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Some cop/aux + negator constructions: The dog can't bark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. No/not + phrase constructions in variation: No this week, Not today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mid-Mesolang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preverbal and post auxiliary negation rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Decline of no + verb constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Expansion of cop/aux + negator constructions: I'm not old enough, I will don't see you tomorrow (= will not)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Increase of not + phrase constructions over no + phrase constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Upper Mesolang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of preverbal negation and establishment of English post-auxiliary negation rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Innovation of past/present distinction among negative forms (i.e., the use of past tense cop, aux and do); He wasn't talking to the teacher, I didn't went to Costa Rica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Elimination of nonstandard negative forms (i.e., no + phrases and preverbal negation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Restructuring of analyzed don't (i.e., the appearance of didn't, doesn't, do not, etc.) such that do is used as carrier of both negation and tense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Acrolang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final elimination of all nonstandard interlingual forms and the establishment of standard English negation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
whom the lect is the native language. The basilang speaker, on the other hand, acquires this lect through a process of reduction and simplification of a second language to which he is exposed. Thus the basilang is more analogous to pidginization than it is to decreolization. However, if the basilang speaker acculturates and establishes increasing degrees of social and psychological contact with the TL group, then his pidginized basilang will complicate and expand to eventual conformity with the TL. Thus it is at the mesolang and acrolang stages that the SLA continuum parallels decreolization. The foregoing discussion on the relationship of pidginization, creolization and decreolization to SLA is summarized in Figure 3 on page 45. Here we see that early pidginization (secondary hybridization) is parallel to the basilang of SLA. Late pidginization (tertiary hybridization), creolization and the basilang phase of decreolization do not parallel SLA. And finally the mesolect and acrolact phases of decreolization parallel the mesolang and acrolang of SLA. In addition, both early pidginization and the basilang result from a language contact situation in which there is minimal acculturation. Decreolization, from mesolect through acrolact, and SLA, from mesolang through acrolang, result from language contact situations where there is progressive acculturation leading to ultimate conformity with the TL norm. All this motivates a model of SLA in which degree of acculturation (social and psychological contact) with the TL group is a causal variable in the language acquisition process.

ACCULTURATION VS. INSTRUCTION

A corollary to the hypothesis that acculturation (social and affective factors) is the major causal variable in SLA is that all the other factors listed in Table 1 are less important intervening variables or simply minor variables. However, Figure 4 depicts a situation which appears to contradict this
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assertion. Here we see minimal acculturation, but considerable language acquisition. This result can be achieved through instruction (which I consider to be a minor intervening variable), but only instruction of a very special kind.

Results of the sort depicted in Figure 4 have been achieved to some extent by the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) and the Army language schools. But in both these situations radical steps have been taken to pump up the instructional variable to make it a causal variable. This is accomplished by selecting only candidates with high language learning aptitude and providing them with intensive instruction (often five hours per day or more) over an extended period of time (often a year or more). In addition, these instructional programs have very small classes (five or six students), well-trained teachers, specially prepared materials and a washout system whereby learners who fail to keep pace are dropped from the program. Often the career advancement of the participants in these programs depends on how well they acquire the second language; thus, the learners generally have high instrumental motivation.

It is only by taking such radical steps that SLA, which by its nature is a by-product of acculturation, can occur with any guarantee of success in an instructional setting. But even with all these special instructional considerations, the programs described above still do not ignore acculturation. Foreign service officers frequently receive some portion of their training in a country where the language they are studying is spoken, and in the Army language programs, learners are required to interact during meals and recreation periods with native speakers of the target language.

If we examine the instructional factors in Table 1 (teacher, method, text, intensity and duration) we see that in foreign language programs in our schools, the only variables that can be manipulated are teacher, method and text. Intensity is limited by the fact that our students must also study other subjects and by the fact that institutional regulations allow only a certain number of contact hours per credit unit. Except where bound by an institutional requirement (usually not more than two years), duration is entirely in the hands of the learner; he can drop out at anytime, and if he expects to learn the language well, he must be prepared to continue with instruction for an extremely lengthy period (often six or more years). Further, educational institutions have much more liberal washout criteria. In schools, a student can continue foreign language study with C's and D's (where little learning is probably taking place), whereas the FSI and Army language programs can, if they wish, drop learners anytime they fall below the A level. In addition, the FSI and Army programs are free to manipulate the aptitude variable whereas schools generally cannot select only language students with high language learning ability.

Thus as mentioned above, educational institutions are really only free to manipulate teacher, method and text variables.
I believe that these variables are so weak in terms of the total language learning situation that no matter how much we attempt to change them we will never achieve much more success than we are achieving now.

Many scholars have noted how the history of language teaching methods has been characterized by the pendulum effect. At one period speaking is stressed, at another period reading and grammatical analysis are stressed and in the third period speaking is again stressed. No cumulative progress seems to be made. The field simply bounces back and forth. It is my opinion that whether we use the audio-lingual method, the cognitive code method, the Gattegno method, the Asher method, the Curran method, the suggestopedic method or an individualized method, we will achieve equally unsatisfactory results in the long run because language learning is not a matter of method, but is a matter of acculturation, and where acculturation cannot take place and where we do not have the freedom to manipulate other aspects of the instructional component such as is done by the FSI and the U.S. Army, we cannot expect to achieve much more than we are now in our foreign language programs.

For some people this is a very pessimistic conclusion, but for the applied linguist interested in SLA research it needn't be. SLA research will have made a major contribution if it eventually leads to clear understanding of what it takes to learn a second language, even if it can't come up with methodology which will produce bilinguals quickly and efficiently.

PROBLEMS WITH THIS PERSPECTIVE

1. This model accounts for second-language acquisition under conditions of immigration or an extended sojourn in the TL area. Thus, it accounts for SLA by American Peace Corps volunteers overseas and immigrants to the United States. It will account for the acquisition of French and/or Arabic by sojourners in Tunisia, but will not account for the acquisition of French by Tunisians. It will account for the acquisition of Hebrew by immigrants to Israel, but it will not account for the acquisition of English by Israelis in Israel. It accounts for the acquisition of Swedish by a German sojourner in Sweden and the acquisition of German by a Swedish sojourner in Germany, but it does not account for the SLA by elite Europeans acquiring English in their respective countries.

In each of the cases mentioned above where the acculturation model does not apply, another process may be at work. Tunisians acquire French as part of becoming educated Tunisians. Israelis living in Israel acquire English to be marked as members of an elite class of Israeli professionals who are capable of communicating with English speaking professionals outside of Israel. The same motivation exists for European elite professionals who acquire English in their own countries. The process which may account for SLA in these cases and which contrasts
with acculturation might be designated as enculturation—the process by which an individual assimilates to his own culture or to some segment of it. Future papers will explore the nature of this SLA mode.

2. Another question that would probably be raised about the point of view taken in this paper is whether or not acculturation is, in fact, the causal variable in SLA. Researchers who take a more cognitive approach to language acquisition might argue that the causal variables are the cognitive processes and strategies that the learner uses to create input and to process that input so that it becomes intake. This argument seems more reasonable from the point of view of explaining good or successful language acquisition. But it is much less satisfactory in accounting for unsuccessful learning. If there are five cognitive processes and five strategies that are used in successful SLA, what good does it do to point out that a learner was unsuccessful because he only used two of them? The question would immediately become why did he use only two. This query would send us in search of other causes (social factors, affective factors, biological factors, aptitude factors, etc.)

Perhaps then we should think in terms of chains of causality where the remote cause would be seen as social and psychological integration with the TL group, the proximate cause would be acculturation and immediate cause would be the cognitive processes and strategies the learner employs in dealing with the input.

Another approach, suggested by Joan Rubin (personal communication), would be to distinguish between preconditions and causes. From her point of view, acculturation would be seen as a precondition and the cognitive operations referred to above would be considered causes. However the ultimate solution is formulated, it is important that the causal role of acculturation be recognized.

3. The model proposed above argues for acculturation and against instruction. It can also be seen to argue indirectly against aptitude because that factor is more associated with rate of acquisition in an instructional setting than with degree of acquisition in the environment where the TL is spoken. But how does the model handle personality, cognitive style, biological and personal factors? At this point there has been too little research (or even speculation) on the relationship of these factors to SLA to build an argument either for or against them as causal variables in the language learning process. My personal feeling is that personality and cognitive style will interact with acculturation, but will not dominate it. Biological factors will only become meaningfully causal if it is found that certain kinds of neurological development cause language learning mechanisms to atrophy and others do not. Current research (Krashen, 1973; Lamendella, 1977; Walsh and Diller, 1977; Scovel, 1977)
does not seem to be leading in that direction. Personal factors are a conglomerate of variables, many of which may overlap with the social and affective factors involved in acculturation. In addition, personal factors may also be related to personality and cognitive style variables in ways that are not yet evident. Therefore, it would be premature to argue for or against their causal role in SLA.

4. It might also be objected that students in the immersion programs in Canada and Culver City are acquiring second languages without acculturation. In general, in these programs Anglophone children pursue a substantial portion of the school curriculum in the second language without significant contact with speakers of the TL. However, because of the enormous parental support which generated and which continues to maintain these programs and because of the urgency that exists to acquire French in Canada, I would also consider second-language acquisition in these immersion contexts to be a product of enculturation. In fact, reports emerging from the immersion programs indicate that there may be a level at which students cannot develop further without contact with speakers of the TL (Harley and Swain, 1978). Thus, acculturation may be necessary to complete the learning process begun in the immersion programs.

5. The following hypothetical anecdote might be offered as evidence against the acculturation model: "In 1959 I met a fourth-year student at the University of Isfahan who had had virtually no contact with native English speakers, but who spoke English extremely well." I would argue that this case could be explained by two factors: (a) duration of instruction and (b) aptitude. I suspect that if we dug a little deeper we would find that this student had been studying for a very long time—perhaps six years in junior and senior high school and four years in college. Since Peace Corps experience has shown that in acculturation settings a person can become very proficient (e.g., four on the FSI scale of zero-to-five) in two or three years, it seems that in the absence of social and psychological integration with the TL groups, similar proficiency can only be achieved in a period three to five times as long. Also, the person making the observation refers to only one student. Once again, I suspect if we were to dig deeper we would find that this particular language learner is quite unusual. There may be no other fourth-year students at the University of Isfahan with his degree of proficiency in English. Therefore, I suspect that if we could measure it, we would find that he had very high language learning aptitude. Thus, this counter example can be explained by factors similar to those that produce success in the Army language schools. In the Army we see intensity of instruction and aptitude pumped up to such an extent that they become causal variables, and with the student in Isfahan we see duration of instruction and aptitude doing the same thing.
6. In acculturation settings we often see people not only 
acquiring the TL through informal interaction with TL speakers, 
but also through formal instruction (classes, tutors, self-study). 
If acculturation is the causal variable in SLA, what do such 
learners gain by formal instruction? Instruction may facilitate 
aquisition in several ways: (a) It may simply provide more 
input through dialogues, example sentences and exercises. (b) 
It may help the learner isolate grammatical and lexical elements 
and thus make them more salient and easier to identify in 
informal interaction. (c) It may provide the learner with a 
conscious monitor which can be used to modify his speech in 
informal interaction.

Perhaps the best way to examine this question would be to 
have learners keep journals while receiving instruction in an 
acculturation setting and in those documents address the ques-
tion of how instruction helps (if it does).

CONCLUSION

As stated in the beginning of this paper, the acculturation 
model is an attempt to provide a social and psychological per-
spective on second-language acquisition. The model seems partic-
ularly applicable to SLA under conditions of immigration to or 
extended sojourn in the TL area. However, under other conditions, 
different models may be necessary. It was suggested that encul-
turation may be the SLA mode among populations such as elite 
European professional bilinguals and Tunisians acquiring French. 
Perhaps additional modes are also operating in other SLA settings. 
Future research will have to attempt to identify these modes to 
provide a more complete picture motivating forces underlying 
successful second-language acquisition.