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The spread of English

1975
- 300 million ‘Native Speakers’ (NS)
- 300 million ‘Non-Native Speakers’ (NNS) (Strevens, 1980)

1997
- 320 - 380 million NS
- 1 billion NNS (Fiedler, 2010)

2012  ????

74% of all conversations in English are between NNS (Graddol, 2006)

Definitions

**English as a Lingua Franca** has been defined as ‘a contact language between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication’ (Firth, 1996, cited in Seidlhofer, 2004, 211).

**Accentedness** may be defined as the degree to which phonological patterns differ from the listener’s expectation of speech sounds (Lochland, 2011).

**Principal Component Analysis (PCA)** is a mathematical procedure that converts a set of variables (attributes) into a set of values of uncorrelated variables called principal components; the attributes used to describe languages are loaded to one of the categories of attitudes, such as Solidarity or Status (Jolliffe, 1986).

**Perceived Intelligibility** refers to a listener’s subjective measure of word identification.
English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) in the academic domains of an inner circle country

Proportion of overseas students at Australian universities that come from non-English speaking countries:

Deakin University = 17.3%
Monash University = 20.1%
Melbourne University = 21.12%
La Trobe University = 30.6%
Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology = 36%

(Lochland, 2011)

Trends

• Listener identity and (perceived) speaker identity

Jenkins (2007) drew attention to the importance of considering contextual particulars, such as the identity of the listener and linguistic diversity of the speech community, when evaluating emotional attitudes.

For example, Polish immigrants, who identified themselves as NS hold the same stereotypes about Polish-accented English as their NS peer group (Meyerhoff, Schleef & Clark, 2010).

OR

• Irrespective of one’s speech community, are there common trends towards World Englishes?
Dimensions of Attitude

Knowledge & Beliefs

- Language varieties
- Language use in regional, social & educational perspectives
- Own language use

Behavior

- Interlocutor & Auditor
- Situation & Function
- Topic

Emotions & Opinions

- Speech quality
- Speaker
- Own language use (Ladegaard, 2000)

Knowledge & Beliefs

- NNSs prefer Received Pronunciation (RP) more than General American (GA) (Kachru, 1992; McNamara, 2001; Ranta, 2010, cited in Jenkins, 2007, p. 78)

However

- Some Chinese students prefer GA over RP (He & Li, 2009)
- While other Chinese students show ambivalence in their attitudes towards RP or GA (Zhang & Hu, 2008)
- Chinese students, Japanese teachers & Korean students prefer inner circle varieties of English as the model for pronunciation instruction (Butler, 2007; He & Li, 2009; Jin, 2005; Oh, 2011; Tokumoto & Shibata, 2011)
Behaviour

- No correlation between reported attitudes and actual behavior

Nevertheless

Lindemann (2002) examined the relationship between the ability of NSs to successfully complete a communication task with a NNS and their emotional attitudes towards the L2 speech of their interlocutor.

---

Emotional Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech quality</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pleasantness, niceness, eloquence, correctness, naturalness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Articulation, fluency, communicative success, nativeness, intelligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Status &amp;</td>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>Success, wealth, education, socioeconomic class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emotional Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Attractiveness</td>
<td>Reliability, likeability, kindness, enthusiasm, patience, attraction,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Personal</td>
<td>&amp; Personal</td>
<td>responsibility, thoughtfulness, sincerity, diligence, ambition, generosity,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td>friendliness, trustworthy, sense of humour, dynamism, self-confidence, hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>working and honesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility, collegiality, dedication, empathy towards learners, high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expectations of learning outcomes &amp; creativity, education and experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>helpfullness,</td>
<td>Intelligence, flexibility, hard work, participation, cooperation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>follows organization</td>
<td>instruction, leadership, independent and originality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seminal work

Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner & Fillenbaum's (1960) seminal work on attitudes towards spoken language investigated a range of attributes

- Height, good looks, leadership, sense of humor, intelligence, religiousness, self-confidence, dependability, entertainingness, kindness, ambition, sociability, character and general likeability

Over the years, some studies have investigated attributes which may be considered quite peculiar

- Sweet-sour, energetic-lazy and good-bad (Zahn & Hopper, 1985)
Speech quality

NSs have negative attitudes towards foreign-accented speech (Cargile, 1997; Lindemann, 2003; Lippi-Green, 1994; Mulac, Hanley & Prigge, 1974, cited in Hu & Lindemann, 2009, p. 254)

Inner circle

Zhang & Hu (2010) found NNLs don’t rate inner circle accents differently

Rindal (2010) found that European students rate RP higher than GA for the traits of intelligibility and aesthetic quality

Chinese students find speakers of USA varieties more fluent than UK varieties; however, the UK varieties are rated higher for intelligibility (Xu, Wang & Case, 2010)

Paunovic (2009) found that Serbian students rate RP, Australian and GA positively for pleasantness, while Irish and Southern American speakers are evaluated negatively

Outer circle

Cavallaro & Chin (2009) found that Chinese, Indonesian & Malayan students equally rate the fluency of standard and non-standard forms of Singapore English

Expanding circle

Paunovic (2009) also found that Serbian students rate Russian speakers as poorly as the Irish and Southern USA speakers

Japanese rated speakers from Sri Lanka, Hong Kong and Malaysia poorly for intelligibility and eloquence (Chiba, Mastuura & Yamamoto, 1995)
Inner circle

McKenzie (2008a, 2008b) investigated attitudes of Japanese students towards standard and non-standard varieties of UK and USA English = favourable attitudes of status towards USA varieties more so than the UK varieties, however no significant difference between the standard and non-standard forms of each variety were found.

Paunovic (2009) found RP, standard Australian and GA are rated positively, while Irish and Southern American speakers are evaluated negatively

German student identify mostly with GA, followed by ELF and finally RP (Erling & Bartlett, 2006)

Chinese (Dalian city), Pacific Islander and Norwegian students all evaluate RP high for Status, while GA is rated high for solidarity (Evans, 2010; Mugler, 2002; Rindal, 2010)

However, Chinese students (Dalian city) rated USA varieties higher on status than UK varieties (Xu, Wang & Case, 2010)

Research by Hu & Lindemann (2009) suggested that NNLs may negatively rate the pronunciation of a NS (GA) if they are told the speaker is Chinese.

Outer circle

Standard Indian accented speech is rated lower than GA for education and wealth (Renoud, 2007)

Expanding circle

Russian speakers are rated poorly on Status & Solidarity (Paunovic, 2009)
Social attractiveness and Personal integrity

Inner circle

Paunovic (2009) concluded that Australian, RP, GA speech are rated more positively than an Irish speaker

Chiba, Mastuura & Yamamoto (1995) reported that Japanese student find GA to be rated more friendly than RP

Chinese students rate speakers of UK varieties higher than USA varieties (Xu, Wang & Case, 2010)

Outer circle

Cavallaro & Chi (2009) found Chinese, Indonesian and Malayan students rate the standard variety of Singapore English more positively than the non-standard form.

Thai, Korean & Arabic students rate standard Indian lower than GA for attractiveness (Renoud, 2007)

Expanding circle

Paunovic (2009) found Russian speakers receive negative evaluations

Sri Lankan, Chinese and Malaysian speakers to be rated poorly for friendliness by Japanese students (Chiba, Mastuura & Yamamoto, 1995)
Competence: Professionalism

**Inner circle**

NNLs rate NS teachers more positively than NNS teachers (Zhang & Hu, 2008).

Similar to Hu & Lindemann (2009), Kelch & Santana-Williamson (2002) found that NNSs perceived to be a NS (45% accuracy rate) are rated as better teachers.

**Outer circle**

Standard Indian accented speech is rated lower than GA for lecturer desirability and job attainment (Renoud, 2007).

**Expanding circle**

ESL students in the U.S. don’t associate accentedness (both NS and NNS accents) with negative attitudes about professionalism (Liang, 2002).

Academia

**Inner circle**

Chinese students find speakers of UK varieties more intelligent than USA varieties (Xu, Wang & Case, 2010).

**Outer circle**

?

**Expanding circle**

Japanese students find speakers from Sri Lanka, Hong Kong and Malaysia less intelligent than NS (Chiba, Mastuura & Yamamoto, 1995).
Conclusion

• A trend across monolingual EFL speech communities
  – NNL have a more positive attitude about the speech quality of RP
  – NNL RP rated highly for status, while GA rated highly for solidarity
  – Mixed attitudes regarding social attractiveness and personal integrity

• Attitudes of students towards NNS in multilingual ESL settings improves with time

• Gaps in the research
  • Emotional attitudes of NNL towards the English varieties of outer and expanding circles countries
  • Emotional attitudes towards own language after studying in an ESL context
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