

WILEY

MLJ

---

Cultural Identification and Second Language Pronunciation of Americans in Norway

Author(s): Karen Lybeck

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 86, No. 2 (Summer, 2002), pp. 174-191

Published by: [Wiley](#) on behalf of the [National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1192920>

Accessed: 23/01/2013 10:45

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Wiley and National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Journal*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

---

# Cultural Identification and Second Language Pronunciation of Americans in Norway

KAREN LYBECK

*Institute of Linguistics, English as a Second Language, & Slavic Languages and Literature*  
215 Nolte Center  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, MN 55455  
Email: lybe0002@tc.umn.edu

---

Schumann's Acculturation Theory as presented in *The Pidginization Process: A Model for Second Language Acquisition* (1978) predicts that the degree of a learner's success in second language (L2) acquisition depends upon the learner's degree of acculturation. Attempts to test this theory have not been particularly fruitful due to the lack of an adequate measure of acculturation and the particular linguistic markers selected to measure success in L2 acquisition. This study proposes to measure sojourners' acculturation in terms of their social exchange networks (Milroy & Wei, 1995). It measures L2 success in terms of pronunciation, which in the view of many scholars (Guiora, Beit-Hallahmi, Brannon, Dull, & Scovel, 1972; Labov, 1972; Scovel, 1988) is the strongest linguistic marker of a speaker's cultural identification. Using this framework, the current study provides strong evidence in support of Schumann's Acculturation Theory. The acculturation experiences and L2 pronunciation of 9 American women residing in Norway are described and the relationship examined. It is concluded that learners who developed positive network connections with native speakers of Norwegian evidenced more native-like pronunciation than those who had greater difficulty establishing such relationships.

---

MUCH HAS BEEN DONE TO IDENTIFY A critical period after which second language (L2) learners no longer are able to achieve native-speaker competence, especially in regard to L2 pronunciation. Though most scholars accept that this period exists, the reason for differences among adult learners remains unclear. Why do some adults achieve native-like pronunciation while others remain far from it? In an attempt to investigate this question, the present study examined the acculturation experiences and L2 speech production of 9 American sojourners in Norway. Although Schumann's acculturation model (1978) has not been a focus for analysis for some time, it was found, with some modification,

to be a useful framework for investigating the effects of social and affective factors in L2 acquisition. The modifications allow for the isolation and measurement of those factors that appeared to present the largest barriers to acculturation in the present context. The results showed that the learners who were most successful at acculturating were also the most accomplished in the production of L2 pronunciation. This article will initially discuss modifications for the use of the acculturation model including the addition of social network theory (Milroy, 1987). A presentation of the data will then be given: first, qualitative data exemplifying by means of network theory the participants' acculturation process, and second, the participants' degree of success in the pronunciation of the L2. These results will then be analyzed together to show the relationship between acculturation and L2 acquisition for these participants.

---

*The Modern Language Journal*, 86, ii, (2002)  
0026-7902/02/174-191 \$1.50/0  
©2002 *The Modern Language Journal*

---

## SCHUMANN'S ACCULTURATION MODEL AND SOCIAL NETWORK THEORY

The premise behind Schumann's model is that L2 acquisition "is one aspect of the general process of acculturation and that L2 learners will succeed in learning the target language to the degree that they acculturate to the target language group" (Stauble, 1980, p. 43). In this model, the main requirement for successful L2 acquisition is identification with the target culture.

The acculturation model is divided into two categories of factors affecting language learning: social and psychological distance. "Social distance pertains to the individual as a member of a social group which is in contact with another social group whose members speak a different language [whereas] psychological distance pertains to the individual as an individual" (Schumann, 1978, p. 77). When defining social groups, Schumann makes it clear that divisions within minority groups may create various acculturation patterns, so group status may not be a simple matter of ethnic or linguistic boundaries. Schumann considers psychological factors to be subordinate to social factors in that acculturation will become dependent on psychological variables when a group is in the middle of the continuum between a high- and low-distanced social situation. He sees distance between speaker and addressee as the cause of restricted linguistic function.

In this study, I adapt Schumann's model in four ways: by eliminating the division between the social and psychological distance, by using the model to predict learner success with pronunciation rather than syntax, by focusing on both the learner and target cultures, and by operationalizing the claims of the model. In this article, I will discuss in particular the multidimensionality of the acculturation process and the operationalization of the claims of the model.

### *Eliminating the Distinction between Social and Psychological Distance*

Schumann defines distance as either social or psychological, with the psychological variables being subordinate to the social. This delineation between the two can be difficult to maintain for two reasons: first, because many of the social variables differ among members of the same group, and second, because many psychological variables can be understood as social constructs. Because the two categories are mutually influential, I suggest consolidating them into one group of

social-affective variables that affect what can be labeled as *cultural distance*, rather than differentiating between the two. This change makes the model more flexible by allowing the most influential variables for a group or individual to come to the forefront in any particular study.

### *Focus on Pronunciation*

The acculturation model has mostly been tested, as far as I can find, to assess the effect of acculturation on a L2 learner's acquisition of morphosyntactic features and communicative competence. These studies have had mixed results (Kelley 1982; Maple, 1982; Schmidt, 1983; Stauble, 1978, 1981; as cited in Schumann, 1986). The model has not been used in studies of the relationship of acculturation to L2 pronunciation. Because the acculturation model is based on learner identity, and Guiora et al. (1972) have argued that learner pronunciation is most closely tied to learner identity, it seems probable that pronunciation is most likely to be affected by acculturation. Notwithstanding the importance of these first two modifications of the model, in this article I focus primarily on the importance of multidimensionality and on operationalizing the model.

### *Bidirectional Analysis of Cultures*

In discussing social distance, Schumann focuses mainly on the learner group, sometimes including the target culture's reactions to the learner group. An aspect that needs to be considered is the impact of these reactions by the target culture on the learner. Acculturation is a two-way street, where the social behaviors of the target culture will be just as influential as those of the learner group. The receiving culture can have a strong influence on the attitudes, motivations, and identities of language learners and, consequently, on their language learning process. The views, desires, and attitudes of each receiving culture group about itself, as well as about the "out-group," will affect the acculturation process of learners. A multidirectional perspective applies to all of the social variables.

The target culture context is very important to the current study in that certain societal constraints may work counter to Norwegians establishing relationships with outsiders. Gullestad (1991), a Norwegian ethnographer, has described Norwegian cultural values and behaviors; I will comment on how, if true, these values and behaviors might affect interactions between Norwegians and foreigners.

According to Gullestad, equality is highly valued in Norwegian society, and by equality Norwegians mean sameness rather than equal opportunity as is the case in the United States (Gullestad, 1991, p. 4). She states that Norwegians "have to be similar in order to feel equal" (p. 9); consequently, they may not feel comfortable establishing relationships with people who are not similar to themselves. Not only does Norwegian society, according to Gullestad, highly value sameness, but it also does not provide rules for establishing relationships between unequals. Gullestad also notes that Norwegians "have a tendency to give better treatment . . . to people who are similar to themselves than to people who are different. The reason is that they understand the former better and that they, in the Norwegian egalitarian context, lack ways of conceptualizing existing social dissimilarities" (p. 6). With Gullestad's generalizations in mind, we might speculate that Norwegians may experience some difficulty becoming friends with foreigners who are inherently quite different from themselves.

Gullestad discusses two different principles of accessibility in human contact. One is termed *distancing*, which is a continuum of various levels of acceptance or rejection. The other is termed *territoriality*, which only includes the extremes of the continuum: one is either accessible or inaccessible to another. She goes on to suggest that territoriality characterizes Norwegian culture, which finds substantial differences between the in-group and others. "Avoiding each other is a typical strategy . . . before . . . sameness is established. This strategy has probably become more common as the number of uncertain situations has increased as a result of extensive social and geographic mobility" (p. 11). If Gullestad's observations of Norwegians among themselves are generally accurate, it should be reasonable to expect that the more Norwegians encounter foreigners with obvious foreigner traits, such as heavy foreign accents, the more they might use the avoidance strategies, making themselves less accessible than they would be to people not exhibiting these characteristically non-Norwegian traits. Limited access will, in turn, slow or even discontinue foreigners' acculturation process.

Finally Gullestad theorizes "that in Norway a lot of communication is implicit," meaning that "in order to establish and develop social contact, it is important to be able to see what goes on from the other participants' perspective and . . . understand the expectations which are not expressed directly" (p. 7). This implicitness could also result in misunderstandings between native Norwe-

gians and L2 learners and perhaps a lack of input due to the learner's inability to interact on this implicit level. As Schumann (1978) points out, if "the domestic community . . . regard[s] the learner with suspicion and hold[s] him outside its communication networks" (p. 87), distance will arise, hindering L2 acquisition. These traits, which Gullestad (1991) claims to be common within the Norwegian target culture, would surely present barriers to the learner acculturation process. As she briefly points out, "from the point of view of the new immigrants, the Norwegian practice of avoiding situations where equality as sameness cannot easily be established is an obstacle for social contact and integration" (p. 12).

#### *Operationalization via Social Network Theory*

The acculturation model provides no way to measure the amount of social or psychological distance between the learner and the target culture. I propose the use of social network theory to operationalize the degree of distance experienced by the learner. Social network theory, originally developed in the field of social anthropology to explain the variable behavior of individuals, has been used to explain variable linguistic behavior. Milroy (1987) is well known for her use of social network theory in studies on dialectal variation and code-switching. She posits that linguistic norms are influenced by the personal relationships an individual shares with others such as relatives, friends, coworkers, and neighbors. Milroy (1992) describes three distinct types of network structures: *exchange* networks made up of ties with family and close friends, *interactive* networks constructed of ties with acquaintances, and *passive* networks that consist of physically distant ties (pp. 138–139). Individuals depend on exchange networks for emotional and material support. Even though individuals may have frequent interaction with interactive networks, they are not dependent upon these ties. Passive ties are valued but absent, which is typical of a sojourner whose close friends and kin remain in the native culture.

Close-knit exchange networks tend to enforce social norms, including linguistic norms. Individuals within exchange networks are likely to use the same linguistic variants as their network members whereas interactive networks are unlikely to enforce norms and are open to variation and change. As an example Milroy (1987, p. 181) cites Blom and Gumperz's (1972) study showing that close-knit networks in the Norwegian community of Hemnes were linked with loyalty to a nonstan-

standard dialect and that as networks broke up, some members began using more standard variants.

The underlying premise for network analysis is stated by Mitchell (1986): "Social actors always create their own limited personal communities which provide them with a meaningful framework within which they can solve the problems of their day to day existence" (p. 74). When this framework dissolves upon moving to a new culture, and the newcomer's former problem-solving strategies do not work in the new culture, the learner experiences culture shock. In order to deal with this situation, Larsen and Smalley (1972) suggest that "what the learner needs is a small community of sympathetic people who will help him in the difficult period when he is a linguistic and cultural child-adult. He needs a new family to help him grow up" (p. 46).

Second language learners who are able to engage in exchange networks with native speakers will experience less distance in Schumann's terms than learners who do not have exchange networks. Learners with exchange networks will thereby improve their L2 learning. Conversely, learners who have native speakers as only part of their interactive networks or who have limited or negative exchange networks will have more cultural distance and experience more difficulty in L2 learning due to the lack of target language norm enforcement in their networks.

Gullestad's (1991) observations would suggest that cohesion is an important acculturation factor affecting the learner's ability to engage in exchange networks in Norway. Though Americans are not likely to be cohesive as a learner group in Norway, they are likely to struggle with target culture cohesiveness. Norwegian social networks are often based on family and are highly cohesive. Generally speaking, Norwegian networks are more cohesive than American networks due to less emphasis on acquaintances and more emphasis on long-term family ties and friendships. Gullestad states: "Norwegian culture can be described as being especially centered around the home" and as highly valuing, among other traits, peace and quiet, stability, wholeness, closeness, security, and sameness (p. 9). These characteristics can be seen as ways of encouraging long-term group memberships and reducing the space for the entrance of outsiders, particularly foreigners.

In sum, the modification of the acculturation model includes a method for measurement through social network theory and allows for the emphasis of those aspects of the target culture that prove most difficult for L2 learners, which in this situation is target-culture cohesion. The re-

sulting framework provides insights into the acculturation process and, thus, into its role in L2 acquisition.

## PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the acquisition of L2 pronunciation and acculturation as operationalized by social network theory. With regard to the cultural setting involved, it was determined that the factor most relevant to social distance in the context of American sojourners in Norway is the cultural cohesion of the target culture and the attitudes of both groups toward each other. In more general terms, the study examined the learners' ability to take on a new identity in the target culture and to integrate into social networks that could nurture their acculturation and ultimately their L2 acquisition process. It was expected that those learners who were successful in finding nurturing networks would have a higher level of native-like pronunciation features than those who did not.

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Three sets of questions are the focus of this study.

1. What are the acculturation patterns of American sojourners who have lived in Norway from 1 to 3 years?
2. How native-like is their Norwegian pronunciation before and after a 6-month interval?
3. Do acculturation patterns correlate with learner success in the acquisition of L2 pronunciation?

The speech data of 9 American sojourners living in Oslo, Norway was collected. Their pronunciation was analyzed for native-like features. During the data collection, the participants were asked about their relationships with Norwegians and their experiences with the culture and language, and these qualitative data were organized to show each participant's engagement in social exchange networks and their difficulties during the acculturation process. The linguistic outcomes are discussed in light of each participant's experience.

## METHODOLOGY

### *Participants*

All 9 participants were women between 30 and 41 years old who had lived in Norway between 11

and 30 months at the beginning of the study. All had a bachelor's degree from an American institution, and several had advanced degrees. Each had been employed professionally in the United States and most had been employed in Norway as well. Eight of the 9 participants were married and 6 of those had one or two children. Five were married to Norwegians and 3 were married to Americans. The 3 participants married to Americans knew they would be leaving Norway at the end of a 3-year residence, whereas the others were planning either to stay or were unsure of their future plans. All participants had had some form of instruction in Norwegian, either by taking a course or working with a tutor. Only 1 of the participants had not previously had a L2 learning experience.

#### *Data Collection and Analysis*

Two semistructured interviews were conducted in Norwegian with each participant by a native speaker of Norwegian and the researcher, who is an American native-like speaker of Norwegian. The participants were asked to speak Norwegian as much as possible, using English only when necessary. Although 7 of the 9 participants were able to maintain Norwegian during most of the first two interviews, some of them infrequently lapsed into English to express complex ideas that were above their proficiency level. The remaining 2 informants frequently used English in both of the interviews conducted in Norwegian.

The interviews were carried out over a 6-month interval for the purpose of collecting linguistic and anecdotal data. Selected questions from the first interview are presented in Appendix A. Questions from the second interview included similar topics, but were tailored to follow-up on the individual situations of each participant. After each session, the interviews were transcribed and the transcriptions were analyzed in order to describe the pronunciation and acculturation patterns of each participant and to compare the outcomes across participants.

Linguistic samples were selected from both interviews with each participant and transcribed. Maria Bonner, a linguist at the University of Luleå, Sweden, also transcribed the samples and a consensus as to an accurate transcription was reached. Two measures of the learners' pronunciation were taken. The first was a global rating of the learners' pronunciation. Each word within each data sample that was considered to be native-like was counted over the total number of words in the sample. This evaluation covered all

features of each word (including the correct use of syllable length, elision, and stress). Any phonetic feature that was not native-like, whether the error was a result of interference, overgeneralization, or any other interlanguage strategy, was noted and the word in which that feature occurred was counted as non-native-like. The second count was the use of Norwegian *r* sounds over the total number of obligatory contexts for *r*. The use of American *r*, as opposed to the Norwegian trill or tap, is typical for American speakers of Norwegian. American *r* is not problematic when it comes to comprehension, but it immediately identifies the speaker as American, and thus was considered a good measure of accent.

During the interviews, the participants were asked several questions about their linguistic and cultural adjustment in the target culture. These questions covered five basic areas: (a) their identification with the target language, (b) native-speaker reactions to their language use, (c) their identification with the target culture, (d) their social contact with Norwegians, and (e) their overall adjustment to or satisfaction with their lives in Norway. These five categories combined to give evidence of each learner's perception of the culture, her perception of native speakers, and her estimation of her own ability to engage in social exchange networks within the target culture. After the two initial data collection sessions were completed, each participant was interviewed for a third time. This interview was conducted in English by the researcher only. The participants were asked to give feedback on their feelings regarding changes in their social and linguistic development over the course of the study. They were also told about the nature and hypothesis of the study and were asked to give their own analysis of their learning process in relation to their acculturation. The qualitative data for this study were gleaned from these three interviews.

The data were analyzed from two perspectives. One was to determine a general picture of the participants' networks.<sup>1</sup> The interviews were analyzed for qualitative information about the participants' relationships with native speakers of Norwegian. Clusters and individual ties consisting of relatives, coworkers, friends, neighbors, or fellow members of an association were identified, as were statements regarding the level of support these clusters and individuals provided to the learners. These clusters or individuals were deemed to be either sufficiently supportive or unsupportive based on anecdotes and direct statements of events that had impact on the participants' lives, such as "When you come [into a group] as a

spouse they want to get to know you because they care about their friend and they know he loves you” or “My in-laws don’t have any idea how to help a person.” The participants signaled this impact by a heightened emotional state and an increased detail in the narrative.

The second area of analysis was regarding information that participants offered about native Norwegians as a whole, including Norwegians who were strangers to them. Even though the interview questions were intended to be neutral with regard to the participants’ experiences, many of the participants’ answers revealed frustrations with native speakers and their own difficulties in accepting Norwegian communication strategies. Examples ranged from reports of being ignored by coworkers, customer service personnel, and strangers, to being informed that one’s opinions on Norwegian matters were not valid and to being told what kind of sandwich children must bring to school. These events were also chosen for study because of the way the participants felt personally impacted by them. The participants’ delivery during these parts of the interview became more intense, and it appeared that they forgot the formality of the interview and were focused on the content and personal feelings involved. A second criterion was to include those incidences that were comparable among participants. Questions that were answered matter-of-factly and without much passion or detail were used only as background information, as were experiences that appeared to be idiosyncratic.

Sample excerpts of the qualitative data, organized according to the five question areas listed above, can be found in Appendix B. The participants are listed in Appendix B in order of their ability to engage in native exchange networks by the end of the study. Some questions elicited comments typical for all of the respondents in the group. These group sentiments were placed first in each category of Appendix B.

## RESULTS

### *Research Question 1*

*What are the acculturation patterns of American sojourners who have lived in Norway from 1 to 3 years?*

Recurring comments by the participants in their interviews about all of their experiences centered around the theme of the cohesive nature of the target culture and the way it appeared to create a barrier that participants found difficult to penetrate. These comments support the

description of Norwegians given by Gullestad (1991). In their interviews, it appeared that the sojourners were trying to understand their host culture by explaining that the “cold” reception they had experienced was due to cultural differences and personality traits common to Norwegians. Their descriptions of their experiences, however, suggested frustration at the difficulty in making contact with Norwegians and with the lack of L2 learning support they received from native-speaking interlocutors.

A second theme that emerged dealt with the participants’ identities in the new culture. Few of the participants were able to engage in supportive native-speaking social exchange networks. Those who did seemed more accepting of the new identity they created in the target culture while those who did not were resistant to identity change. Participants mentioned that identity labels such as “immigrants” or “English speaker” were sometimes placed on them by members of the target culture. They saw this as pigeonholing and believed that it created a barrier to their interaction.

As a result of the qualitative network analysis, the participants were categorized into three groups. Group A consisted of those participants who were able to reduce cultural distance via supportive engagement in exchange networks. Group B included those participants with some success in finding supportive contacts, experiencing moderate cultural distance. Group C was made up of those participants who were unsuccessful in engaging in supportive networks and who experienced a high level of cultural distance. The interview data will be explored here in more detail in light of the themes of cohesion and identity.

*Cohesion.* When discussing cohesion, it is pertinent to recall Gullestad’s (1991) claim that in Norwegian culture sameness must be established before one can be granted access to another individual (in this case, for learners to gain access to native speakers) and to remember that access to native speakers is certainly a prerequisite to building supportive ties to a social network. Every participant mentioned the ideas of sameness and access. Group A consisted of 2 learners who experienced low cultural distance and were very insightful into the ways they had gained access to native speakers in exchange relationships. Both learners related that it had taken a long time to make friends. Initially, they had viewed Norwegians as possibly “snobbish,” but later they believed that the reserved nature of Norwegians created this distance. They mentioned that because

of the time it took to make friends, however, the relationships they eventually formed were "genuine" and "not superficial." They found it difficult to break into a tightly knit network whose members had been friends since early childhood. Both of the participants in Group A gained network access through their spouses. In addition, one of these successful acculturators gained access through a sister who was also married to a Norwegian and was established in the country prior to the participant's arrival. The other participant explained that having a baby and becoming part of a support group for first-time mothers<sup>2</sup> helped her to integrate successfully into a supportive network. Overall, both were satisfied with the relationships they had with Norwegians and looked forward to their becoming stronger over time.

Group B consisted of 2 participants who experienced moderate cultural distance. They could be considered to have been moderately successful in the acculturation process. One of these participants had a very satisfying, small, tightly knit network, whereas the other had a very large network with few connections between her network members. The first stated that she received a great deal of support from all her network members, including her Norwegian in-laws. Although she did not have any Norwegian friends, she stated that she did not want a larger network.

The participant with the large network was single and had lived in two different places in Norway. She felt that it was easier to get to know people in her first town because of its small size. She met her first friend at church there. This Norwegian friend made contact because she wanted the sojourner to become involved in the church. Once the participant made it clear that learning Norwegian was her objective, she was able to establish network connections with members of a Norwegian church cluster. She believed that it was crucial to find a place to meet Norwegians with interests similar to her own.

Group C consisted of 5 participants who fell into the category of experiencing high cultural distance. Two of these women were also married to Norwegians and worked in professional positions in their chosen fields. The other 3 were married to Americans and either worked outside their field or were currently working as home-makers.

The 2 participants who were married to Norwegians complained that their natural ties to exchange networks, namely their in-laws and their coworkers, were unsupportive. They stated that these people were unable or unwilling to help them in language learning. Both of these women

focused on cultural communicative issues that created barriers for them. One complained that Norwegians did not meet her expectations for small talk, which provided her little opportunity to establish common areas of interest with them. Several times during attempts at chatting with Norwegians, she had thought, "What's the use?" By the time of the second interview, she had decided that her time was better spent cultivating relationships with Americans than Norwegians. She perceived Norwegians as unfriendly and critical of American social practices (e.g., she mentioned Norwegians that she knew who accused Americans of being superficial in the way they greet strangers). She also felt that Norwegians were impolite when they refused to acknowledge the people around them and she was discouraged by the fact that people who had worked together closely for many years had never even met each other's families.

The other participant in Group C who was married to a Norwegian understood that Norwegian cultural rules expected newcomers to introduce themselves without first being welcomed. She also confided that it had taken over a year for her Norwegian coworkers to remain relaxed when she approached their lunch table, even though they still did not initiate conversation with her. She felt that she had still not gained access to them.

None of the 3 women married to Americans had automatic inroads to Norwegian exchange networks. They noted that, at times, Norwegians would leave them out of their conversations. They feared that being non-Norwegians meant that they would not be accepted into Norwegian networks. Finding Norwegians who were willing to invest in a friendship was difficult for them. These participants found themselves longing for friendship in the new culture. They had no long-term relationships in the target culture and their passive networks from the United States were drifting.

The Norwegian desire for sameness was a problem for the American women when trying to fit into Norwegian culture. One participant noted that Norwegians try not to stand out, but that Americans purposefully do things to be noticed. In her experience, being noticed in Norway was considered to be bad manners. Another participant was having a hard time with the fact that her son was learning sameness at school. One of the examples that she gave was how the teacher took her aside and asked her to pack a lunch for her son that was similar to that of his peers because the other students found it distracting if he



brought something they were not allowed to have. As an American, she felt that she had been brought up to think independently and not to be like the crowd. She stated that she had even felt a deep, violent objection toward some of the behaviors resulting from the sameness ideal.

This same participant felt that she was better integrated than some of her American peers, however, because her son attended a Norwegian school instead of the international school. In this way, she believed that she understood more about the culture and had developed an interactive network with Norwegian parents. She also had an exchange tie with a Norwegian neighbor who had had American friends or neighbors for many years. This Norwegian neighbor was open to inviting the participant's family to go places with her family, including to their cabin. Despite this relationship, the participant expressed the need for more companionship.

*Identity.* The participants in all groups agreed that they were hindered in speaking Norwegian to some extent by their own American identities. They agreed that their identities as native-English speakers hindered their learning process because, in their experience, most Norwegians preferred to use their own English than to continue speaking with the participants in Norwegian. In cases where the participant persevered in Norwegian, the native speaker often continued to speak English, correct the learner's Norwegian, or act as though there was little that was comprehensible in what the learner had said. The participants realized that once they had started speaking English regularly with a Norwegian, it was too late to switch to Norwegian. They felt that the language of the relationship could not be changed without their feeling as though they were playing a role. They also expressed frustration over a perceived double standard. The same native speakers who forced the use of English early on would at some later time express dissatisfaction with the learner for not becoming more fluent in Norwegian.

The participants in the highly acculturated Group A both stated that if a person lived in a second culture, they were obligated to learn the language. They both identified personally with this goal, stating that one's language reflects what type of person one is in the culture. They described their identity as somewhat different in the new culture and new language, but they were able to accept this new part of themselves. They both felt that many other women were hindered because they could not accept these differences.

The two moderate achievers in Group B

claimed they would like to have native-like pronunciation, but it appeared that identity was a barrier for them. One felt awkward using Norwegian and interacting with strangers. She preferred to stick to English when feeling unsure. Using Norwegian for inclusion only occurred for her with her mother-in-law, who did not understand English. This participant consistently used Norwegian with her mother-in-law and got most of her help from her. She also appeared to be instrumentally motivated when she expressed the need to have a good command of the language in order to get a good job. Although the other participant believed that she was obligated to learn the language of the host culture, she did not seem to view the language as an identity factor, but rather as a tool for inclusion. She found that her Norwegian ancestry helped her to fit into this reserved society. Consistent with Gullestad's (1991) explanation of Norwegians' avoidance of people they do not "fit in with" (p. 8), she felt that Norwegians, at least in urban settings, expected nonnatives to get involved in international groups rather than Norwegian groups, which had caused problems for her in the new city. She was very determined, however, to find an appropriate place to meet native speakers and find acceptance.

The least successful group, Group C, appeared to be made up of women who could not form a new Norwegian identity. They could not identify with Norwegian communication styles and had negative attitudes about perceived expectations placed on them by the target culture without assistance from it. Their perception that their Norwegian interlocutors were unhelpful made them feel isolated and misunderstood. More than one of these women believed she would always have an American accent either because learning Norwegian was not a necessity, because it felt unnatural to mimic native speech, or because of the perceived risk of losing her American identity through the loss of foreign accent. One of these women was even critical of nonnative speakers of Norwegian who sounded native-like. She said that they sounded "fake."

As this anecdotal evidence shows, those who identified themselves with the target culture were able to establish sameness with native speakers, enabling them to beat the cohesion barrier by forging at least two primary connections to supportive exchange-network clusters. These network ties helped the participants reduce their cultural distance and acculturate successfully. The participants who were able to make individual connections and were satisfied with that support or motivated to make new connections were able

to acculturate to a moderate degree, despite some setbacks. The participants who were unable to identify with the Norwegian culture found little common ground between themselves and native Norwegians. They were unable to make connections to Norwegian exchange networks or, if they had automatic connections through their spouse or work, they found these ties to be unsupportive and barrier causing, and ultimately experienced higher cultural distance and lower acculturation than the women in Groups A and B.

### Research Question 2

*How native-like is their Norwegian pronunciation before and after a 6-month interval?*

Tables 1 and 2 show the percentage of native-like features the participants used in the speech samples analyzed. Both tables show how the participants performed at the beginning and end of the study, as well as how their performance changed during the course of the study. Table 1 shows their overall pronunciation performance while Table 2 shows their use of native-like  $r$ .<sup>3</sup> The participants labeled by their group acculturation success (A, B, or C) were ranked individually (1–5) in order of their overall performance during the first interview. Rankings that changed from the first to the second interview are shaded in gray, as are negative percentage changes over time. Two of the participants do not have linguistic data scores because they did not produce enough consecutive Norwegian during either interview to allow an accurate assessment of their pronunciation.

There was a considerable range of nativeness exhibited by the participants, from 44.4% to 83.4% in overall accuracy, and from 0% to nearly 96% in the use of Norwegian  $r$  by the end of the study. The rates of increase over the 6 months of the study range from 1.1% to 13.6% for overall

TABLE 1  
Percentage of Native-Like Words

Participant	Time 1	Increase	Time 2
A1	82.3%	1.1%	83.4%
A2	77.2%	5.6%	82.8%
C1	75.7%	-1.7%	74.0%
B1	65.5%	13.6%	79.1%
B2	60.5%	12.0%	72.5%
C2	50.0%	10.6%	60.6%
C3	34.7%	9.7%	44.4%
C4	—	—	—
C5	—	—	—

TABLE 2  
Percentage of Native-Like  $r$

Participant	Time 1	Increase	Time 2
A1	90.2%	3.4%	93.6%
C1	88.9%	-24.6%	64.3%
A2	88.0%	7.7%	95.7%
B1	80.3%	4.0%	84.3%
B2	39.6%	9.6%	49.2%
C2	0.0%	4.2%	4.2%
C3	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
C4	—	—	—
C5	—	—	—

accuracy with the mid-range speakers making greater gains and the most accomplished speakers making smaller gains. The increases for native-like  $r$  range from 0.0% to 9.6% with not much of a pattern between their initial ranking and their increased performance. Only 1 participant demonstrated decreases in both categories, including an impressive -24.6% in her use of native-like  $r$ . Considering that her overall score, which included the use of  $r$ , was only down 1.7%, it seems clear that she actually made strides in her overall pronunciation. The ranking from interview 1 to interview 2 is left mostly intact with the exception in both categories of participant C1. Participant A2 also moved up in the use of native-like  $r$ , but she is still in close proximity to participant A1.

The patterns that appear in the data led to the following groupings. In terms of overall pronunciation, the participants group something like this:

Good pronunciation, increase	A1 and A2
Good pronunciation, decrease	C1
Fair pronunciation, significant increase	B1 and B2
Poor pronunciation	C2–C5

With regard to the use of native-like  $r$ , the pattern is as follows:

Regular use, some increase	A1 and A2
Regular use, impressive decrease	C1
Frequent use, some increase	B1
Irregular use, significant increase	B2
No use, little or no increase	C2–C5

### Research Question 3

*Do acculturation patterns correlate with learner success in the acquisition of L2 pronunciation?*

What was the relationship between each participant's acculturation process and her overall pro-

nunciation ability? Those participants who showed successful acculturation patterns also had the highest pronunciation accuracy at over 80%. The moderately successful acculturators produced accurate forms between 70% and 80% of the time. Those learners who were frustrated in their acculturation process had more widely scattered linguistic results. Predictable are the 2 participants who did not use enough connected Norwegian to assess their pronunciation accurately. Their perceived lack of access to native speakers correlates not only with nonnative-like pronunciation, but also with an overall lack of L2 use. Participants C2 and C3 managed much better than participants C4 and C5, at about 60% and 45% respectively, improving by about 10% each. Though they were frustrated and disappointed, both did have connections with native speakers, no matter how unsatisfying or tenuous they appeared to be. They were making progress in their pronunciation, though less than the more successful groups, and it is still possible that their connections will become more satisfying in the future. Similarly dissatisfied was participant C1; her overall pronunciation, however, was on par with that of the moderately successful learners. Though she was still at this level of pronunciation by the end of the study, she exhibited a loss rather than a gain in its native-like use, which may relate to her dissatisfaction with her Norwegian exchange ties.

The use of the highly marked American *r* may indicate even more directly which speakers felt left outside the barrier of Norwegian cohesion and cultural identification. Because the use of *r* immediately identifies its speaker, the use of it or the adoption of Norwegian *r* may tell something about the current cultural identification of the speaker. The most successfully acculturating participants used Norwegian *r* almost exclusively, showing identification with (low distance from) Norwegian culture. The scores of participants with moderately successful acculturation were somewhat different. Participant B1 used Norwegian *r* almost 85% of the time by the end of the study. Participant B2, on the other hand, used American *r* and Norwegian *r* interchangeably. She showed more improvement than any other speaker over the 6 months, but her identification with one culture or the other appeared equal at the end of the study. Compared with the less successful group, her ability is much greater and her belief in her ability to establish a supportive network was quite strong.

The low-acculturating participants fell into two categories: (a) those who retained almost exclusive use of American *r*, or (b) those who de-

creased from a nearly 90% usage at the beginning of the study to 65% usage at the end of the study. The 4 participants not using Norwegian *r* appeared to display their American identities, which was predictable from the hypothesis because they clearly felt themselves to be outside of Norwegian circles. Participant C1 was a more interesting case because she appeared to have mastered the Norwegian *r* at the beginning of the study, but by the second interview she had greatly reduced her usage of it. Her backslide here may have been a result of her disappointment with efforts with Norwegians and her decision to continue communicating in an American fashion, both of which contributed to her increased cultural distance.

Even though all of the participants had difficulties adjusting and finding supportive networks in the new culture, those who found inroads into supportive networks also exhibited a higher level of native-like pronunciation. Five of the participants had Norwegian husbands, which allowed them greater access to Norwegian-speaking network members. The 2 highest level achievers had also made individual inroads. They had successfully integrated into at least two Norwegian exchange-network clusters through their spouses and their relationships with other women. Participant B1, who was somewhat less accomplished than the women in group A, had a supportive family network, but no other connections with native speakers. Participant C1, who had a similar overall ability to B1, but who experienced a large drop in the use of *r*, and participant C2, who exhibited fewer overall native-like structures than the other women married to Norwegians and who only used native-like *r* enough to show that she actually could use it, had negative experiences with their native-speaking networks, specifically their in-laws and coworkers.

Participant B2, who was single, and participants C3, C4, and C5, who were married to Americans, had no natural inroads through spouses. Participant B2 found individual supportive network members through her institutional connections and was also able to exhibit native-like features at a mid-range level. Her relocation may have slowed her progress as previous exchange ties became passive and new exchange ties were forged. Participant C3, who was able to make a supportive connection with her neighbor, made overall progress, though less progress than those with family or multiple connections, but rejected Norwegian *r* completely. Participants C4 and C5, who were unable to make significant native-speaking connections

in the target culture, found their Norwegian did not improve over the course of the study.

## CONCLUSION

Those learners who were engaged in supportive exchange networks within the target culture were provided meaningful frameworks within which they could access and acquire both linguistically and culturally appropriate behaviors, effectively reducing their cultural distance, whereas those who were left outside of these networks or whose needs were not met by target-culture networks did not. The findings of this study are consistent with Schumann's acculturation model which equates successful acculturation with successful L2 acquisition. As proposed earlier in this article, the social variable that appears to pose a barrier to the acculturation process in this context is the cohesive nature of Norwegian culture, with regard both to network ties and to communicative norms.

Although there are many additional variables that could be examined in the lives of these women, their social networks clearly affected their gains in L2 pronunciation. Whether they were able to make these connections by perseverance or luck, the fact that they made them and found support within these groups certainly influenced their use of native-like pronunciation features.

---

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> The participants completed network and adjustment questionnaires at each session, which were quantitatively analyzed in detail, but the scope of this article does not allow for the inclusion of that analysis here.

<sup>2</sup> In Norway, women are offered the opportunity to be part of a small group of women who will give birth around the same time and who will be on parental leave for 9 months to a year (both are part of the national family and health benefits available to all parents). This structure helps them to build a support network while they are away from the work place.

<sup>3</sup> I do not differentiate between the possible allophones of *r* in Norwegian, but rather whether the speaker uses the native-like form in any given environment.

---

## REFERENCES

- Blom, J.-P., & Gumperz, J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structure: Code-switching in Norway. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 407-434). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Guiora, A., Beit-Hallahmi, B., Brannon, R., Dull, C., & Scovel, T. (1972). The effects of experimentally induced changes in ego states on pronunciation ability in a second language: An exploratory study. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 13, 421-428.
- Gullestad, M. (1991). The Scandinavian version of egalitarian individualism. *Ethnologia Scandinavica*, 21, 3-18.
- Kelley, P. (1982). *Interlanguage, variation and social/psychological influences within a developmental stage*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Larsen, D. N., & Smalley, W. A. (1972). *Becoming bilingual, a guide to language learning*. New Canaan, CT: Practical Anthropology.
- Maple, R. (1982). *Social distance and the acquisition of English as a second language: A study of Spanish-speaking adult learners*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.
- Milroy, L. (1987). *Language and social networks*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Milroy, L., & Milroy, J. (1992). Social network and social class: Toward an integrated sociolinguistic model. *Language in Society*, 21, 1-26.
- Milroy, L., & Wei, L. (1995). A social network approach to code-switching: The example of a bilingual community in Britain. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 136-157). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mitchell, J. C. (1986). Network procedures. In D. Frick (Ed.), *The quality of urban life* (pp. 73-92). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Schmidt, R. (1983). Interaction, acculturation and the acquisition of communication competence: A case study of an adult. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 137-174). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Schumann, J. H. (1978). *The pidginization process: A model for second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Schumann, J. H. (1986). Research on the acculturation model for second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 7, 379-392.
- Scovel, T. (1988). *A time to speak: Psycholinguistic inquiry into the critical period for human speech*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Stauble, A.-M. (1978). The process of decreolization: A model for second language development. *Language Learning*, 28, 29-54.
- Stauble, A.-M. (1980). Acculturation and second language acquisition. In R. Scarcella & S. Krashen (Eds.), *Research in second language acquisition: Selected papers of the Los Angeles Second Language Acquisition Research Forum* (pp. 43-50). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Stauble, A.-M. (1981). *A comparative study of a Spanish-English and Japanese-English second language contin-*

*uum: Verb phrase morphology*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

## APPENDIX A

### Selected Questions from Interview 1 (translated from the Norwegian)

#### *Cultural and Social Adjustment*

What ideas did you have about Norway before you came?

What was your initial experience in Norway?

What was the biggest adjustment or challenge when you moved here?

How do you get along in Norway now? Tell about your adjustment process.

How do you feel you fit into the Norwegian society? What kind of roles do you have? Do you feel integrated? How do you think Norwegians feel about you (as a foreigner)? What does it feel like to be a foreigner (American) in Norway? Have you experienced discrimination, or negative attitudes towards you? What do you think about Norway and Norwegians in general?

Have you participated in any Norwegian organizations or clubs?

Do you think you have changed because you have lived in Norway?

Tell about the friends you've made in Norway. How have your relationships developed? Do you think it is easy or difficult to come into contact with Norwegians? Are you satisfied with the social network you have now? Do you want to change the situation? How?

What are your feelings about Norwegian culture and behaviors? Have you had someone to help you learn about and understand Norwegian culture?

#### *Language*

Tell me about your experiences using Norwegian with friends and with strangers (i.e., clerks in shops, etc.). How do people react when you speak Norwegian? What kind of comments do you get about your speech? How often do you use Norwegian? In what settings? What do you think about your ability to speak Norwegian? Are you satisfied?

Who has helped you most to learn the language?

Would you like to be taken for a Norwegian?

## APPENDIX B

### Selected Excerpts from the Qualitative Data

The comments in this appendix were taken from all three interviews. The group sentiments are combinations of remarks from several of the participants—originally given in either Norwegian or English.

#### Symbols:

- \* Comments made during unrecorded conversation. These are not exact quotations, but are re-created from notes taken during the conversation and rendered here in English.
- # Comments originally in Norwegian that have been translated into English (correcting any linguistic errors).
- + Comments given in English during an interview conducted in Norwegian.

#### PARTICIPANTS' IDENTIFICATION WITH THE TARGET LANGUAGE

##### Group Sentiments:

It's hard to change a relationship from one language to another. If you start in English you can't just change it to Norwegian. It feels like a game, unnatural, false.

English is everywhere, movies, TV, everyone speaks it. It's easy to rely on.

It's unnatural to draw out long vowels, round my lips. I look and sound like someone else.

Individual Sentiments (Participants listed in order of their ability to engage in native exchange networks by the end of the study):

A1:

"But then you also say, 'What are my goals here? Is it to stay home and take care of children and never learn the language or is it to get a job and do something in my life, prove that I can do it? . . . Get a job and get integrated or do you just want to hang out with people of your own country and your own language for the rest of your life? And would that make you happy?' I think it has a lot to do with your goals."

A2:

\*I'm a different person in Norwegian, but I'm getting more comfortable with it. It comes out even when talking to people I normally speak English to.

\*I live in Norway. I need to speak Norwegian. I have friends who don't feel this way. I think they are embarrassed to make mistakes, but I'm not afraid to try to speak.

B1:

#"[Norwegians] speak Norwegian and I speak English. [My mother-in-law] doesn't know English so I speak only Norwegian . . . at their house." \*My mother-in-law helps me most with Norwegian.

B2:

"I guess I don't look at it in those terms [being native-like]. I'd like to be able to pronounce things correctly and to be understood . . . and I don't necessarily want to be marked as an outsider all the time."

C1:

#"It's very difficult to understand my mother-in-law and family. . . . They speak fast and not so slow that I can [understand]. They understand me, but I can't understand [them]." "I feel like . . . [my in-laws] have no idea how to talk to a foreigner, how to teach, to help them learn. They don't speak slower . . . they don't help you learn in anyway."

"A lot of the people who speak very well, their husbands also speak Norwegian to them at home. [I don't] because I don't want [my son] to start speaking Norwegian to me . . . because it's important for me that he speaks English."

C2:

"A lot of people [think] I should be speaking more Norwegian than I am now, so I start to feel like I'm letting people down by not speaking Norwegian. . . . With my husband's family, the same thing. I feel like they don't understand, like I've disappointed them or something, haven't integrated, that I must not be happy here because I can't speak Norwegian, you know that kind of thing. But I think there's a lot more factors there. I mean I think a lot of people in his family don't know how to help a person. They just expect that I'm gonna all of a sudden start speaking Norwegian. It doesn't work that way."

"It wasn't always me, it was a lot of times it was the other person as well. They had to support and be patient with me . . . the ones that weren't very patient I'd make little comments, not mean or anything but just say, 'Yeah, it takes a lot from you too, you know.' 'I'd appreciate your helping me,' and just make it more of a point. And I saw a couple instances where it helped."

C3:

"I think that I will always speak Norwegian like an American who is trying to speak Norwegian for a hobby because that's what I am."

"At a child's age, they are still very much in their mimicking years. . . . I personally lack mimicking skills and it goes along with that. . . . I've never had this desire for sameness, therefore, it's almost like a mental block for me that when I hear this sound . . . I don't have a desire to copy it. . . . I don't want to sound like that. . . . No, I wouldn't want to maintain [my American accent as a way of showing who I am]. I guess what I'm getting at is that I see [my desire to be different] as my obstacle."

C4:

"I mean, it's probably the music background, because we were harped on so much. . . . They don't care if you know what you're singing . . . but it has to sound right. . . . I think when you've had that background, you really try hard to sound as close as you can get to what it should sound like."

C5:

"Well I guess [using Norwegian] is an ambition but it's sort of latent, it's not actualized, low priority. . . . I would say I have a strong desire but it's not evident by my actions."

"I hear Americans using it . . . I know they're Americans, and to me it sounds almost fake, you know, like they've had

to train themselves to do this. . . . They're good, you know, they can carry on a full conversation, but it just doesn't. . . . I won't get to that point because I'd really have to push myself to do that."

"I don't need [the language] as much you know, maybe to be happy or to adjust, I'm not married to a Norwegian."

#### PERCEPTIONS OF NATIVE-SPEAKER REACTIONS TO L2 USE

##### Group Sentiments:

It's irritating when they can't understand and you really feel like it's pretty close. I don't think they want to understand sometimes. There are so many dialects over here that they can cope with a little American accent.

It pisses me off when I am trying so hard and they don't seem to be. You work so hard and then they don't get it. They try to give you what you want to say and you feel you've just said the same thing.

They aren't very good at asking you "What do you mean?" They just give you the "look."

Sometimes people switch to English or act like "What are you saying?" I don't think they are trying to understand when they do that.

You start speaking Norwegian and then they speak English back to you.

##### Individual Sentiments:

A1:

"It depends on how much you're corrected, you could just go nuts . . . [you feel like saying] 'Ok, can we talk now?'"

A2:

"I get together with a few women who have babies the same age as [mine] now, so we usually speak Norwegian together. There are four Norwegians and I'm the only American so it would be a little impolite if they had to speak English."

"If I call [a realtor on the phone for example] they aren't as serious as with me, but if my husband calls, who is Norwegian, it's a whole other thing. So I don't know . . . I thought maybe it was because you have some racism in Norway too. We have it in every country, but . . . if they knew I was an American, if I met them face to face, it was completely different."

B1:

"Sometimes I'm a little lazy. I speak English almost all the time. I get a little irritated [when they don't understand me] so I just switch to English, because I'm . . . self-conscious. I get a little unsure . . . so I just speak English."

B2:

"What I find really irritating is if you call somebody on the telephone and they don't understand you, they just hang up on you or they put you on hold and never come back."

C1:

"I used to feel more frustrated, because it . . . was like, 'Wait, I'm trying to learn your language!' and . . . you know it wasn't helping any. But now I guess I just don't care as much."

C2:

"When I sit in a meeting, it's a little difficult when everyone speaks Norwegian and when it comes to me and I have to describe something and I speak English . . . I think they want me to try in Norwegian but . . . I can't do it yet."

"At work there's one person [office mate] who no matter what he speaks Norwegian to me, which I think is great. It doesn't matter if I'm speaking English or anything, he just keeps on in Norwegian, it's just great."

C3:

"If [in a store] I always begin with 'I want to try to speak Norwegian' then they speak slowly with me."

"The ones who don't speak such good English are the ones who are the most encouraging."

"Because [my friend who is married to a Norwegian] is not Norwegian she is not accepted into these circles and has a very difficult time of [learning]."

C4:

\*I get corrected a lot. You get left out if you don't speak Norwegian, not part of the group.

C5:

"Most of the time they'll switch over to English. That's fine."

#### PARTICIPANTS' IDENTIFICATION WITH THE TARGET CULTURE

##### Individual Sentiments:

A1:

+ "I think it's a very closed culture in a way and you can see it, I think, in the way people behave and the things people say in general. . . . It's been very isolated from Europe and I think that is a bit difficult for foreigners because they see foreigners as just these strange people they don't really want to have contact with, at least some of them and they're very closed."

# "If you are married to [a Norwegian] it's easier, you enter the culture with him and everything."

A2:

# "It's going much better because, maybe it has something to do with having a baby. Before, I was busy with work . . . after I had [the baby] I was suddenly more interested in having contact with other people" [new mothers group, gym, her shop].

B1:

# "It's difficult to get a good position here when you aren't Norwegian I've noticed. It has a lot to do with the language."

B2:

# "It was after I came here that I found out how much [of me] was Norwegian. Reserved, how people talk . . . so, it is more comfortable [for me] here than for many other foreigners."

# "In Oslo there are so many foreigners that they are set apart, like in church, there is a regular service and a foreigner service, so you can't meet so many [Norwegians]."

+ "If you decide to integrate, people will accept you, and there are good and bad people everywhere. . . . If you concentrate on the bad people, you just find more and make yourself miserable."

"I think that's the other difference between adults and kids too, is kids go into a ready made social setting, they go to school, and then the neighborhood kids are all out playing and so they can integrate like that. But for adults, I think, we sometimes forget how to do those things, and it's not so easy because we're not all out playing in the street after school or at recess."

C1:

# "It wasn't an advantage to be American and not in the [professional] network. Everyone knows who's who, so it's easy to be in the network, but not so easy to be outside [of it]. It's a little Old Boys' club that includes women too."

"You work with somebody for 20 years, or a long time and you're still not invited to their house."

"Norwegians generally don't make small talk . . . I feel like, 'Geez, why am I sitting here?' . . . You try to find common grounds for a discussion and I just find that that doesn't go on. . . . I've had a couple of experiences where I've just felt like, uff, what's the use."

C2:

# "I think that people from Minnesota . . . don't speak as loudly as people from New York. I think a New Yorker would have a [more] difficult time."

C3:

# "I like to live in new places because I can see everything. . . . I can choose for myself what is best."

# "[They are] taught that people should be alike, but because I'm American, I think differently. I've seen many things that have happened at [my son's] school . . . [for example] his teacher told to me what I should pack in his lunch because all the children have to have the same thing. Very Norwegian!"

"I'm so aware of this fixation on sameness and I have examples all the time. [Relates a story]. I mean it stirred me to my core. . . . At that instant, I had this deep violent objection to what she had just said. . . . [Later] it occurred to me,



there it is in a nutshell, the difference between American thinking and Norwegian thinking, as Americans from the day we're born we are taught to use critical thinking for everything around us, why? what are the alternatives? . . . Specifically with a child, that's what violated my sense of right and wrong."

"I think we also grow up with an understanding of the economic factors in our country with in certain eras we accept that it's necessary to move away to work. The same people who made the comments about never having an understanding of what it would be like to move also said 'I never thought I would need to, I grew up knowing I wouldn't have to move away.'"

C4:

+ "I'm sure they just think we're terrible because we're so loud. I saw a *60 Minutes* program on Norway 3 weeks ago. They told how everyone wishes to be sort of the same and they encourage their children not to stick out. They were saying it's different because Americans want to do things to be noticed. Here it's not considered to be really very good manners to be different."

C5:

"Just enjoying the out of doors. . . . Not so much the traditional things, but enjoying the days off. . . . I don't [identify with the culture] in some ways, too, as far as like taking the bus or the train, or something like that. I'm still doing things that are American . . . but the things that they claim are their culture, as far as getting out on the water, or to a [cabin], although I haven't done that, but I'll do it if I have an opportunity."

#### PARTICIPANTS' SOCIAL CONTACT WITH NATIVE SPEAKERS

Group Sentiments:

It's difficult to get to know Norwegians. I don't have many Norwegian friends.

Norwegians are, not exactly cold, but Americans are so much easier to get to know. It takes a long time but after awhile they are friendly, nice.

It's easier to talk to people who have studied abroad, who have lived outside the country.

It's not that they aren't interested. They're reserved, hesitant, introverted, they don't know how to approach foreigners, they're afraid.

A1:

+ "Once they get to know you they are very open . . . but in the beginning people didn't know how to react to me. They didn't know how to talk to me, so I thought, 'Oh, they're just snobbish.' They're not snobbish. They just don't know how to approach a foreigner. #It's so common. Norwegians who don't know each other ask, 'Where are you from?' . . . If you are from [here], they talk to you in that way. If you are from [somewhere up north] they think, 'What should I ask you?'"

# "It's difficult to come into a group that's been together since they were 2 years old . . . but when you come in as a wife . . . it's much easier."

"You need those social contacts for moral support. The happier you are, of course, the more motivated you are."

A2:

# "They are a little more down-to-earth . . . [not] superficial. At first, I thought [it was difficult]. [They're] not cold, but . . . it takes more time, but after awhile it's good, [they're] very nice."

B1:

# "They're not so friendly . . . more reserved and for me it isn't so easy to speak when I always feel self-conscious [about the language and how to behave with them]."

B2:

# "I think it's more difficult in a big city. . . . I understand that my [other] experience was unusual, but it was a smaller town. . . . There are barriers that are difficult to get over. I think it's because there are so many [foreigners] here that we can have groups. . . . Both Norwegians and Americans tell me I should go to American [institutions]."

# "The first woman who befriended me . . . thought I wouldn't stay involved in the [organization] if I didn't have friends. She invited me to go hiking with some of them if I didn't mind their poor English. I was confused because . . . all I thought was that I am in Norway. Why should you speak English? It's me who has to learn Norwegian. So, I

said that to her and because I wanted to learn Norwegian she got more comfortable. In the woods she taught me to speak Norwegian.”

C1:

#“I’d go walking on the mountain path and no one would say ‘hi.’ They weren’t friendly and that was tough. . . . People say, ‘but American people are so superficial,’ but I say, ‘I like [that].’ I have many friends that I met on a plane or a bus, that’s not so superficial.”

“In some ways, I feel that having American friends married to Norwegians or something is the easiest way to have . . . the social support that I need. If, given a limited amount of time and energy, it may be more valuable to focus on Americans.”

C2:

“[An acquaintance] said that in every other culture when a new person comes in it’s polite to go to that person and welcome them, but in Norway it’s the opposite. They wait for you, it’s polite for you to come to them, and if you don’t, they think you’re rude.”

“It’s better in some ways. . . . I mean, you can sit down at the same lunch table with them and they don’t like tense up. They know me well enough that I can just sit and listen and they’re ok, but on the other hand they still don’t initiate conversation with me, but that’s ok. I think I’m more ok with that within the last few weeks than I had been earlier just because like I said, I realize that they don’t like tighten up. They used to be like really just strung out, you could tell they were just nervous, and I’d be like, ok, I won’t sit here any more.”

C3:

#“The most important thing is that our boy goes to Norwegian school. . . . If [Americans] take their children to international school, they only meet English speaking women.”

#“[Our neighbors] often invite us many places. We have visited them at their cabins. I hear from many Americans who have lived here a long time and they have never have been anywhere with Norwegians, so we think we have a very good opportunity. We think that most Americans who live here for a short time won’t have the same opportunity.”

C4:

#“Occasionally Norwegians come up and try to talk to me [at my musical group], but when I can’t understand everything, it’s ‘Good-bye,’ you know, and I don’t see them again.”

“I came back feeling like I knew some people well enough that I could actually say they’re friends.”

#### PARTICIPANTS’ OVERALL ADJUSTMENT TO OR SATISFACTION WITH LIFE IN NORWAY

A1:

“I guess that [answering 5 out of 5 on a Likert scale] was part of the Latin in me and this [answering 4 of 5] is the Norwegian kicking in. Because you are more extreme in my culture. I’ve become less. Norwegians are actually not very expressive, if you know what I mean. . . . I’ve tried to kind of like adjust. Like if you like food. If you really like the food you say it was sooo good. Norwegians say it was good.”

“We were in a meeting in The Haag and I was with a coworker, and we went and spent . . . two and a half days going through this model . . . The [local people] wanted to make it perfect. . . . They asked, ‘What did you think about it?’ and [my Norwegian coworker] said, ‘Not bad.’ And you should have seen their faces! She actually meant ‘very well,’ but she said, ‘not bad’ and these people just went like, ‘This is what we’ve been sitting here working for? All you can say is “not bad”?’ And I said, ‘You’ve got to understand Norwegians.’”

A2:

\*She is satisfied with the number of friends she has. She wants those relationships to develop further, which she thinks they will with time, but she doesn’t really need more friends.

B1:

\*My attitude changes with the weather. Winter is bad, dark, cold, overwhelming, kind of depressing. In the summer I have no complaints. I’m energized by the sun. I feel I have lots of support in Norway.

B2:

“You have to have some institutional way of joining into the community in something that interests you. People don’t understand that.”

C1:

"We had a [work] get-together two weeks ago where everyone could bring their families and I was kind of amazed, 'Oh this is my wife.' [And I was thinking,] 'You haven't met them before?'"

"What makes it the hardest to adapt in Norway, is that I think probably like sense of humor the last thing that comes out in the language and you feel like you're never really yourself unless you can express that, or like irony and sarcasm and things like that."

C2:

"I feel like I'm waiting for life to start again [living here]."

"[My in-laws] tried a little bit more in the beginning and now they're, like I get this feeling that they're disappointed. . . . So, it's like they don't get [that I still need help]. . . . It's fine if they don't think that it's their, part of their family responsibility to help me. I mean, that's fine. I think that they should be helping me, but . . ."

C3:

"I would like to have more companionship to do some of the activities that I enjoy, but I do not want that to be Americans, I don't want to get in that network and its very difficult to find Norwegians that are willing. Either because their schedules don't permit it or it reflects back on that I'm not in their circle, not the same."

C4:

\*I feel better after this tour but I don't have any close friend that I can call to come over.

C5:

"Well I think I am less [satisfied] because I haven't really had time to . . . keep in contact with people back in the States. . . . I would say that's probably the only . . . emotional contacts; long term relationships that I've just sort of lost, but I can adjust."

## AERA Dissertation Award

The Second Language Research Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association honors the writer of an outstanding dissertation completed during each calendar year. The award goes to the dissertation that best meets these criteria: sound theoretical base, sound methodology and data collection, originality, and impact on the field of second language research. The winner is awarded a plaque at the national annual meeting of AERA, receives a year's membership in AERA and the Second Language Research SIG, and is invited to present his or her research at the SIG's session the following year at the annual AERA meeting.

The 2001 outstanding dissertation winner is Dr. David Bryan Smith, a graduate of the University of Arizona. His dissertation was: "Taking Students to Task: Task-Based Computer-Mediated Communication and Negotiated Interaction in the ESL Classroom." The dissertation was directed by Dr. Robert Ariew. Dr. Smith will be invited to present his work at AERA's annual meeting in Chicago (April 21–25, 2003).

Procedures for applying for the 2002 Dissertation Award:

1. Candidates must complete and defend their dissertations between January 1 and December 31, 2002.
2. The candidate, dissertation chair, or member of the candidate's dissertation committee may make the nomination by sending a cover sheet with the candidate's name, address, telephone, and email address, and a 250-word abstract of the dissertation. Nominations must be submitted by August 16, 2002 to: JoAnn Hammadou Sullivan, Department of Languages, Independence Hall, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881 OR joannh@uri.edu.
3. If selected, the candidate will need to submit proof of defending the dissertation successfully by the December 31, 2002 deadline.