Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics 45(4), 2009, pp. 511–533

doi:10.2478/v10010-009-0027-1

PLUS ÇA CHANGE... SERBIAN EFL STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS VARIETIES OF ENGLISH

TATJANA PAUNOVIĆ
University of Niš
newpaun@filfak.ni.ac.rs

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the findings of a sociolinguistic study investigating the attitudes of adult Serbian EFL students (N=114), trained as future EFL teachers, to 8 regional and 2 EFL varieties of English, relative to accent identification. A modified verbal-guise technique, based on semantic differential scales for 15 traits in the dimensions of social prestige, social closeness, and personal integrity, was combined with a direct-method questionnaire. The findings show that the participants were not familiar enough with different regional accents, but, rather, that they relied on broad constructs such as "British" or "American" English. They expressed conservative attitudes, rating most favourably the varieties they associated with the notions of "standard" and "correct", and least favourably those associated with common negative stereotypes or "foreign" accents. In the light of the participants' meagre results in accent recognition, we argue that further language attitude research is needed in the EFL context, where attitudes to varieties gain even more weight with the shift towards education for intercultural communication.

KEYWORDS: Language attitudes; English varieties; verbal guise; semantic differential scales; accent identification.

1. Introduction[1]

A long (and winding) line of research through the fields of social psychology, sociolinguistics, sociophonetics, applied linguistics and discourse analysis has shown that language attitudes play an important role in the construction of linguistic, cultural and social identities, as an unavoidable factor in interpersonal, intra-group, and inter-group communication (Stainton Rogers 2003: 176). Whether aware of them or not, whether willing to admit them or not, and whether acting upon them or not, speakers hold certain attitudes – sometimes even very intense – towards other languages and varieties.

[1] The study presented here was part of our research within the Serbian Ministry of Science and Ecology project No. 148024D.

Notwithstanding the serious criticism addressed to the "mainstream" experimental and mainly quantitative research from the positions of social constructivism, discursive psychology and discourse analysis, arguing that attitudes are dynamic rather than stable, "negotiable" in the process of communication rather than merely "expressed" (e.g. Hyrkstedt and Kalaja 1998: 346), research has confirmed that language attitudes indeed "filter" or "colour" our speech perception (Lippi-Green 1997; Niedzielski 1999; Hay and Drager 2007; Bradlow and Bent 2007). They can be triggered by the smallest phonetic details (Edwards 1999: 109; Baker et al. 2007: 4; Walker 2007; also cf. Bradlow and Bent 2000; Clopper 2000; Clopper and Pisoni 2004a, 2006), but also by variety labels alone (Giles 1970; Garrett et al. 2005; Coupland and Bishop 2007), or even by various perceived non-linguistic cues (Preston 1999, 2004), due to intimate links between attitudes, stereotypes and language ideologies (Coupland and Bishop 2007). Thus, whether seen as stable or dynamic, language attitudes act as an important factor in any given communicative context.

The context in which attitudes are especially important today is studying and teaching English as a foreign language (EFL), where the focus has shifted towards education for intercultural communication (Sercu 2006), and building intercultural communicative competence (Byram 1997: 3, 2008). To deal with their students' (and their own) development as competent communicators in various intercultural contexts, EFL teachers need a raised awareness about the "social diversity in the attribution of social meaning to speech varieties" (Coupland and Bishop 2007: 76), and about language attitudes – how they operate, how they are formed and changed, and how they influence our communication in many subtle ways. Therefore, attitude research is particularly important from the EFL standpoint, especially "taking account of interpersonal, intergroup, and contextual factors" (Gallois et al. 2007: 612).

2. Previous research

Attitudes to varieties of English have been widely researched, in both naturalistic and EFL contexts. As for the former, attitude studies in the UK were conducted, e.g. by Coupland (2000), Garrett et al. (2003), or Hiraga (2005) and Coupland and Bishop (2007); in Canada by Derwing (2003); in Australia and New Zealand e.g. by Ray and Zahn (1999), Bayard et al. (2001), Garrett et al. (2005); in the USA by Lippi-Green (1997), or more recently Moyer (2007), Bucholtz et al. (2008), and many more. EFL speakers' attitudes to "English with an accent" – to use Lippi-Green's (1997) expression – are also researched intensively, using various methods and techniques. For instance, such studies have been reported for Poland (Janicka et al. 2005; Dziubalska-Kołaczyk et al. 2006; Weckwerth 2007), Malta (Micheli 2001), Macao (Young 2006), and Germany (Hilgendorf 2007), to mention but a few.

These studies are too numerous and too diverse in terms of methods, participants and general design to be presented and compared here, but some are relevant for either

our methodology or our findings. For instance, Coupland and Bishop's (2007) study, although methodologically different from ours, reports findings very significant for our research. It was based on an online survey involving 5,010 UK informants, asking them to evaluate English varieties on the basis of variety names, i.e. "conceptual labels" (Coupland and Bishop 2007: 76). The study revealed that accent types associated with "standard" speech were favoured on both prestige and social attractiveness, while several urban varieties were downgraded (Birmingham, Liverpool, Glasgow, but also Leeds, Manchester and Bristol; Coupland and Bishop 2007: 80), in line with Hiraga's findings, too (Hiraga 2005: 290). Most importantly, the authors highlight the weight of language ideologies in accent evaluation, and the slow and difficult ways in which they can be "reconstituted".

Similarly, although focused on EFL learners' and not native speakers' attitudes, McKenzie's research (2008), which combined verbal-guise, questionnaire, and dialect mapping, showed that Japanese EFL students (N=558) evaluated standard varieties more favourably on status, whereas non-standard speech was rated more highly on solidarity; generally, USA speakers were ranked the most favourably. The study by Dalton-Puffer et al. (1997) showed that Austrian EFL students (N=132), asked to evaluate General American, RP, near-RP and Austrian EFL speech in a modified matched-guise experiment, systematically ranked native accents more favourably than non-native ones in terms of prestige, while familiarity, too, played a role in accent rating.

Bayard et al. (2001) used a modified verbal-guise technique to investigate the attitudes of Australian, American and New Zealand university students (N=400). Their study showed that the RP variety was not ranked higher than Australian and New Zealand English in power/status, and that American English was gaining in prestige (Bayard et al. 2001: 22). Garrett et al. (2005) targeted the same varieties, but used a different methodology: open-ended questionnaires based on variety labels, i.e. the folk-linguistic approach and conceptual mode of presentation (Garrett et al. 2005: 216). In difference to Bayard et al. (2001), their participants, university students in the USA, UK, Australia and New Zealand (N=517), showed very negative "affective associations" for USA English, and a less negative "affective profile" of England English.

Danish EFL students' attitudes towards several English varieties were studied by Ladegaard (1998), Jarvella et al. (2001), and Ladegaard and Sachdev (2006), all based on the modified matched-/verbal-guise technique and the dimensions of status, closeness, and "linguistic attractiveness". Jarvella et al. (2001) found that, although familiarity influenced accent identification (speakers from England and the USA were identified more accurately than those from Ireland and Scotland), American English was ranked least favourably. Similarly, in Ladegaard's study (1998), the American variety was ranked less favourably than Australian and Scottish varieties, while RP was ranked as the most prestigious and attractive one. In Ladegaard and Sachdev (2006), the participants (N=96) rated American, Australian, RP, Scottish and Cockney English, and the highest prestige was associated with varieties closest to RP/"standard British". All these studies suggest that stereotypes and language ideologies influence variety evaluation (e.g. Jarvella et al. 2001: 50).

In the Serbian educational context, however, there are only a few studies focusing on EFL learners' attitudes to English varieties (e.g. Vasić 1994; Kovačević 2005; Cvetičanin and Paunović 2007). In this sense, although it continues the line of research we have pursued for some time (Paunović 2007, 2008, 2009, forthcoming), the study we present here should still be considered exploratory in many ways.

3. Present study

3.1. Population

The participants in this study were 114 students at the English Department of the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš (24 male, 90 female, average age 20.7). This was a convenience sample, but it can be taken to reflect the usual population of the Department. One group of participants were first-year students (N=64; 15 male, 49 female, ages 19–24, average age 19.9), while the others were third-year students (N=50; 9 male, 41 female, ages 21–26, average age 21.7). The students were exposed to both British and American English at the Department, but we could not estimate their exposure to different varieties outside the classroom. This kind of population was chosen because these students are trained as future EFL teachers, so studying their attitudes is particularly important in today's circumstances.

3.2. Research questions

The study focused on the following research questions:

(1) What are the participants' attitudes towards regional varieties of English? Do they differ in the dimensions of prestige, social closeness, and, possibly "linguistic attractiveness" (Ladegaard 1998; Ladegaard and Sachdev 2006) or some other dimensions (Garrett 2001; Garrett et al. 2003; 2005)?
(2) How well can the students identify regional accents of English? Is the correct identification related to the kind of attitudes expressed?

3.3. Methodology and procedures

The study was based on the modified verbal-guise technique – listening to 10 speakers reading out the same passage, a 69-word paragraph (*Please, call Stella...*). The recordings were downloaded from the Speech Accent Archive, courtesy of the Department of English, George Mason University.[2]

[2] Under the Creative Commons License, <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>.

The research instrument we used consisted of two parts. The first one involved listening to the 10 recordings and rating the speakers on 15 traits, on five-point semantic differential scales. The scales were randomised for ordering effects, and randomly reversed to minimise position bias and acquiescence. The participants were instructed to respond quickly and record their first impressions. Then, the participants were asked to state, on a 5-point Likert scale, how suitable they thought the given speaker would be as an EFL teacher. This was followed by an open-ended item in which the participants could explain their choice. These two items were included, first, to provide a specific real-life social context that would have immediate significance for our participants (Coupland 2007; Hay and Drager 2007), and, second, to ensure the focus on the EFL teaching perspective which was central to our investigation. This also enabled us to compare the participants' attitudes expressed through semantic differential scales to their choice of varieties considered appropriate for EFL teaching, and thus pinpoint their idea of what the EFL teacher "should sound like".

The second part of the instrument focused on variety recognition. The participants listened to the recordings once again, in the same order, and were asked where the speaker came from. We opted for a forced-choice categorisation task (Clopper and Pisoni 2004a, 2006), but offered 16 alternatives for 10 speakers, i.e. included the names of the regions which were not represented by any speaker (e.g. Wales, New York, EFL Asian etc.). While the participants were instructed to respond quickly during the first listening and variety rating, they were instructed to take their time during the variety recognition task, and to think about the speech properties that might help them identify the speaker's place of origin.

The next item was an open-ended question that asked the participants to use an adjective or a phrase to describe the way the speaker sounded to them. This trait-eliciting item was included as a precaution, in case we had overlooked some traits or dimensions that might be relevant for our students in this social context.

The last part of the questionnaire asked the students to provide information about their gender and age, and to answer two open-ended questions – how they would describe their own accent, and what kind of accent they would like to have, and why. These questions were left to the very end of the questionnaire to minimize their possible influence on the participants' choices in variety rating and recognition.[3]

The experiment took about 25 minutes to complete, and was organised for five groups of students. We did not notice serious traces of fatigue or lack of concentration that might influence the results. It was ensured that the participants understood the tasks, and all their questions were answered before the recordings were played. Finally, it should be noted that we could not completely avoid the risk of researcher bias and social desirability bias, because the participants were our students and were informed

[3] Further details, as well as the original questionnaire, can be obtained from the author.

about the research. On the other hand, the questionnaire ensured absolute anonymity, so we hope the results show students' attitudes reasonably faithfully.[4]

3.3.1. Choice of traits

The following 15 traits were chosen for the semantic differential scales, to capture the dimensions of social status or prestige and social closeness or solidarity, but also a third dimension we provisionally defined as "linguistic attractiveness" (Ladegaard 1998; Ladegaard and Sachdev 2006):

- educated, sophisticated, elegant, intelligent/smart, reliable, successful, and respected;
- friendly, honest, ready to help, interesting company, witty/a good sense of humour;
- communicative, pleasant to listen to, eloquent, and skilful.

We selected only the traits we considered currently and locally relevant (Mugglestone 1995: 292; McKenzie 2007; Hay and Drager 2007: 93), and unambiguously positive or negative in the Serbian cultural and social context. That is why we did not include some traits used in previous research, e.g. "ambitious", "assertive" and "controlling" (Bayard et al. 2001). Taking into account the Serbian social and cultural context, we provided longer labels for some traits, e.g. "successful and respected", to capture precisely the trait we targeted. The attribute "correct" (Preston 1996: 54 in Garrett 2001; Niedzielski and Preston 2003: 63) was deliberately excluded; however, as will be seen below, it surfaced anyway in students' responses to open-ended questions.

3.3.2. Choice of varieties

Ten varieties of English were chosen; the choice was based on our previous research, on the availability of samples in the Speech Accent Archive, on our expectations about the effect of the participants' familiarity with certain accents (Bradlow and Bent 2003; Clopper and Pisoni 2004b; Kraljic and Samuel 2006; Baker et al. 2007; Clopper and Bradlow 2008), and on the common stereotypes linked to certain accents (cf. Lippi-Green 1997: 215; Thomas 2004: 202). The label "RP" was not associated with any of the recordings. The varieties we chose were represented by speakers from: Southern

[4] The research instrument was too complex to perform a reliability (internal consistency) analysis for it as a whole, but we did analyse one part – the items related to variety rating and the semantic differential scales. The total Cronbach's Alpha for this part of the questionnaire was very satisfactory – α=.851 (based on standardised items, α= .962). "Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted" was lower for all the items included in the reliability analysis.

England (St Albans, Hertfordshire, near London); Northern Ireland (Strabane, near Londonderry); Scotland (Edinburgh); Southern USA (Atlanta, Georgia); California (Oakland, San Francisco area); North-Midland USA[5] (Kansas City, Missouri); Australia (Launceston, Tasmania); and South Africa (Port Elizabeth). In addition, there was an EFL speaker from Russia (Pskov; Slavic L1, like the participants'), and an EFL speaker from Greece (Ioannina; non-Slavic L1, different from the participants').[6]

The relevant phonological and phonetic properties that provided points of difference for the varieties included the following:[7]

- Vowels: /ɑː/ vs. /æ/; /ɒ/ – openness, lip-rounding; front vowel openness /æ/, /e/, /iː/; back vowel backness; diphthong quality, esp. /aɪ/, /ɔɪ/, /aʊ/; /əʊ/ vs. /ɔʊ/; diphthongization of long monophthongs; monophthongization of diphthongs; centralized vowels /ɪ/, /ʊ/ (for the EFL speakers); pre-fortis clipping;
- Consonants: postvocalic /r/ (rhotic vs. non-rhotic); /r/-quality; /t/ quality, e.g. flapped inter-vocalic, final /t/ glottalization; /θ/, /ð/ (EFL speakers); /v – w/ (EFL speakers);
- Suprasegmentals (cf. Hay and Drager 2007: 98): stress and rhythm; weakening of unstressed syllables; elision and vowel obscuration in weak forms; prosodic vowel lengthening; tone unit boundary tones (e.g. falling or rising final tones for statements); declension and resetting as discourse prosodic cues.

3.3.3. Choice of speakers

Taking into account the weaknesses pointed out by previous researchers (e.g. those pointed out by Milroy and Preston 1999; Bayard et al. 2001), we based our choice of the recordings on the following criteria. First, we chose to present only male voices, since in the available archive they showed less variance and comparable voice qualities could be found more easily. Second, we chose only speakers who did not change their place of residence, to avoid different accent influences (cf. Clopper and Pisoni 2006; Evans and Iverson 2007). The EFL speakers have acquired English only in academic settings; all the other speakers acquired English in naturalistic settings. Third, the speakers' age was also carefully considered (cf. Garrett et al. 2005). The chosen speakers were aged 32–38 (average 34.6). We took care not to include speakers with striking individual phonetic features, or exaggerated regional/EFL features, to minimise the effect of stereotyping.

---

[5] As close to the "unmarked" American dialect as possible, relying on Labov et al. (1997, 2006).

[6] The varieties were presented to the listeners in a randomized order to avoid ordering effects, but the Slavic EFL speaker was neither the first nor the last one.

[7] We relied on auditory judgements (cf. Hay and Drager 2007: 96), and on the phonetic transcriptions and comments provided in the Speech Accent Archive (where available).

External triangulation of the listening materials was provided, too: three senior lectors from the Department were asked to assess 20 shortlisted candidate speakers for tempo, fluency, naturalness, overall pitch level, and the estimated age of the speaker. Only the best-assessed 10 speakers were chosen, whose average score by the three assessors was 8.8–10 (on a 1–10 scale). All the selected speakers were judged as having "average male voice height", and as speaking at a "normal" pitch level, "normal" tempo and "pretty naturally".

3.4. Research results and discussion

3.4.1. Factor analysis

Principal component analysis was the first step we took to check whether the traits used could be collapsed into three broader dimensions. The results, shown in Table 1, differed somewhat from our initial assumptions. Namely, whereas the traits *educated*, *sophisticated*, *elegant*, *respected* and *intelligent* were unambiguously loaded on the first component, related to the dimension of social status and prestige, and the traits *interesting*/*good company*, *witty*, *friendly* were, as expected, heavily loaded on the second component, related to social closeness, the traits we expected to be grouped together for "linguistic attractiveness" emerged as loaded differently (e.g. *pleasant to listen to* loaded on component 2) or somewhat ambiguously (e.g. *eloquent* and *communicative*). A detailed statistical analysis of our data, especially the mean differences, correlations, tests of distribution normality, and principal component analyses speaker by speaker, showed that the traits loaded most heavily on component 3 – *honest*, *communicative*, *helpful*, and *reliable* – indeed represented a separate dimension for our participants: the dimension of "personal core values" or "personal integrity" (Lambert 1967 in Preston 2004: 41).

This third dimension proved to be the least susceptible to variation in speaker rating. For instance, considering attitude intensity, the average scores (on the scale oriented 1=high, 5=low) were 2.95 for prestige, 2.89 for social closeness, and 2.74 for personal values, showing that the participants judged all the speakers most benevolently on the personal integrity dimension, and most strictly on the "prestige" dimension (cf. Jarvella et al. 2001).

3.4.2. Attitudes to varieties

In the three dimensions, our participants expressed attitudes of different kinds and different intensity. Table 2 shows the ranking of varieties by the mean scores for each of the dimensions.

Table 1: Rotated Component Matrix(a) of the traits used in semantic differential scales.

	Raw			Rescaled		
	Component			Component		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
educated	.297	.003	.068	.848	.009	.196
sophisticated	.285	.038	.044	.816	.109	.127
elegant	.291	.109	−.012	.779	.291	−.033
successful and respected	.239	.049	.033	.765	.158	.107
intelligent	.211	.104	.030	.707	.349	.102
interesting/ good company	−.002	.389	.063	−.003	.838	.135
witty/ sense of humour	.041	.280	.015	.113	.774	.042
pleasant to listen to	.168	.289	.046	.419	.722	.115
friendly	.116	.211	.141	.305	.556	.373
eloquent	.153	.194	.116	.398	.507	.303
skilful	.141	.169	.092	.410	.493	.270
honest	−.037	−.002	.510	−.070	−.005	.953
communicative	.055	.182	.214	.134	.447	.528
helpful	.119	.089	.164	.355	.265	.489
reliable	.137	.114	.162	.380	.317	.451

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. a Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

Table 2. Varieties ranked by mean scores
in the dimensions of prestige, social closeness, and personal values (integrity).

Prestige		Closeness		Personal integrity	
S. England UK	1.94	Australia	1.84	Australia	1.97
South Africa	2.16	S. England UK	2.21	S. England UK	2.26
Australia	2.18	N. Midland USA	2.29	N. Midland USA	2.38
N. Midland USA	2.31	California USA	2.67	Scotland, UK	2.58
California USA	2.82	Scotland, UK	2.71	California USA	2.64
EFL Greek	3.02	South Africa	2.74	South Africa	2.69
Scotland, UK	3.55	EFL Greek	3.26	EFL Greek	2.93
N. Ireland, UK	3.72	Southern USA	3.38	Southern USA	3.11
EFL Russian	3.77	N. Ireland, UK	3.71	EFL Russian	3.35
Southern USA	4.07	EFL Russian	3.75	N. Ireland, UK	3.40

The strongest attitudes, positive and negative, were expressed in the domain of **social status/prestige**, as obvious from the span between the most highly ranked Southern England speaker's mean score and the most unfavourably ranked Southern USA speaker's. Positive attitudes (mean=1.0–2.5) were expressed towards the speakers from Southern England, South Africa, Australia and North-Midland USA. Negative attitudes

(mean=3.5–5.0) were expressed towards the speakers from Northern Ireland, Russia (EFL), and Southern USA.

Bearing in mind previous research findings with European EFL learners, and the traditional educational context in Serbia, the highest social status ascribed to the accent closest to standard southern English[8] was not surprising (cf. Ladegaard 1998: 258; Ray and Zahn 1999; Jarvella et al. 2001: 50; Evans 2005: 243; Ladegaard and Sachdev 2006), and neither were the mildly positive to neutral ratings of the North-Midland and Californian USA speakers (cf. e.g. Dalton-Puffer et al. 1997; Ladegaard 1998; McKenzie 2007, 2008). Of the two EFL speakers, the one whose accent was more similar to "standard southern English" (although it did show some EFL features) was ranked much more favourably on prestige. The high positive rating of the Australian speaker in the dimension of prestige, although admittedly not expected in our population, also falls in line with the findings of some recent research (Bayard et al. 2001; Garrett et al. 2005).

Echoing numerous previous findings, for instance, Lippi-Green's (1997) or Soukup's (2001), that "Southern accent is considered low-status and non-standard" (Soukup 2001: 67), in our population, too, the lowest prestige was associated with Southern USA speech, although the speakers from Scotland and Northern Ireland were rated relatively negatively in this dimension as well.

The attitudes in the dimension of **social closeness** were of almost equal intensity as those in the dimension of status for positive identification (e.g. Australian mean=1.84), but relatively more moderate for negative identification (mean=4.07 for status vs. mean=3.75 for closeness). The participants judged the speakers from Australia, southern England, and North-Midland USA favourably, while those from Northern Ireland and Russia (EFL) were rated negatively.

As can be seen from Table 2, the scores for the third dimension, **personal core values** or personal integrity, were the most favourable. Three speakers – Australian, Southern English, and Northern USA – evoked positive attitudes, while all the rest, though ranked differently, were in fact all rated neutrally (mean=2.5–3.5).

A closer comparison of individual variety rankings in the three dimensions, shown in Table 3, reveals that only three varieties were ranked more favourably on status than they were on social closeness, but with varying degrees of variance (cf. skewness and standard deviation values in Table 3): Southern England, South African, and EFL Greek. These three varieties, as pointed out above, were the closest in their phonetic properties to "standard southern English". All the other speakers were rated more favourably on social closeness and personal integrity than on prestige, with varying degrees of variance (skewness and standard deviation). The most striking difference between their rankings on social status and social closeness occurred with the speakers from Scotland (mean difference=0.84) and Southern USA (mean difference=0.69), both judged much more favourably on personal values and social closeness than on prestige.

[8] We avoid using the term "RP" because the speaker himself did not describe his accent in that way, although his speech indeed shows mostly standard features.

Table 3. Central tendency (means) and variability (standard deviation [SD] and skewness) measures for the 10 speakers ranked by the mean scores for the dimension of status.

	Status			Closeness			Personal integrity		
	Mean	SD	Skewness	Mean	SD	Skewness	Mean	SD	Skewness
S. England	1.94	.576	.210	2.21	.611	.448	2.26	.649	.169
South Africa	2.16	.877	.774	2.74	.657	.184	2.69	.703	−.103
Australia	2.18	.833	.396	1.84	.635	.705	1.97	.688	.583
N. Midland USA	2.31	.782	.352	2.29	.704	.284	2.38	.695	.242
California USA	2.82	.783	−.141	2.67	.736	.105	2.64	.676	.045
EFL Greek	3.02	.748	−.210	3.26	.714	−.305	2.93	.682	.289
Scotland	3.55	.704	−.164	2.71	.946	.117	2.58	.883	.222
Northern Ireland	3.72	.642	−.395	3.71	.611	−.255	3.40	.650	−.056
EFL Russian	3.77	.668	−.564	3.75	.673	−.910	3.35	.650	−.244
Southern USA	4.07	.614	−.312	3.38	.809	−.334	3.11	.759	.121

In this respect, our results do fall in line with some previous findings (cf. Garrett et al. 2005: 212; Bayard et al. 2001; Coupland and Bishop 2007), but not completely. Namely, it is often pointed out that the varieties ranked high on social prestige tend to be rated rather low on social closeness and attractiveness, and vice versa. For instance, in Ladegaard's (1998) study the RP speaker was rated the highest on prestige and the lowest on social attractiveness by the Danish participants. In our study, there were observable differences in the rating of varieties for status and for solidarity, and, as expected, the three varieties associated with "southern England speech", ranked the highest on prestige, were indeed rated less favourably on social closeness. Still, we cannot say that the ranking of varieties in the prestige dimension was the mirror image of the ranking on social closeness. Rather, although the dimensions of prestige and closeness indeed proved to represent a real distinction for our participants, the varieties were ranked in a parallel way – favourably (or not) in both dimensions. This is obvious, for instance, in Table 2, where the "upper-part" varieties in one dimension do change places in the other dimension, but in most cases they remain "upper-part" varieties, while the "lower-part" varieties remain such, only with slightly different scores and ranking. This could be interpreted by the social context of the study – we can assume that, for our participants, both the dimension of status and that of social closeness were deemed important in this particular context.[9]

[9] It should be noted here that statistically significant differences between the first-year and third-year students were observed in the dimensions of social status and social closeness (but not personal core values) only for two varieties – the EFL Russian (.000) and Southern USA (.05) varieties, and, in the dimension of social closeness, for the EFL Greek variety (.05). Since the evaluations by first-year students were notably

These observations are further supported by the comparison of these results with our participants' responses to the questionnaire item which asked them to describe their own accent and state what kind of accent they would like to have, and why. Most participants (45.6%) described their own accent as "American", 24.6% as "neutral", only 14.9% as "British", and as many (14.9%) as "Serbian English". A statistically significant difference (ANOVA, $F=4.12$, $p<.05$) was observed here, because 50% of first-year students described their accent as "Serbian" or "neutral", while such descriptions were obtained from only 26% third-year students. However, the answers to the question "What kind of accent would you *like* to have?" were notably more uniform: most participants (50.0%) opted for the "British" accent, and 41.2% for the "American" accent, while only 7% stated they would like to retain a "neutral" accent, and only 2 students (1.8%) opted for "Australian", with no significant differences between first- and third-year students.

Both these parts of the study indicate that, as much as they may appreciate other varieties, especially in terms of social closeness and personal core values, our students still feel that "British English" represents a high (unattainable but desirable) "standard", in line, for instance, with the findings of Ladegaard and Sachdev (2006).

The students' elaborations on why they would like to have such an accent further support this interpretation. Irrespective of the chosen variety, the most frequent answer was "I just like it" (31.6%), while the rest of the answers were almost uniformly distributed over aesthetic reasons ("it's beautiful", 21.9%), status reasons ("it's sophisticated", 21.1 %) and closeness reasons ("it's natural", 19.3%). A closer look, however, reveals that the reasons offered for preferring "British" and opting for "American" were quite different. As shown in Table 4, "I just like it" was a much more frequent explanation for the choice of the "American" accent, while aesthetic reasons were much more common for the choice of the "British" accent. Moreover, "sophisticated" occurred exclusively with the "British" accent, whereas "natural" occurred with "American" and "neutral" accents, much in accordance with some of our previous findings (Paunović 2009).

However, no statistically significant correlations were observed between the participants' desired accent and the rating of the 10 speakers, except in the dimension of prestige for the Southern USA and EFL Greek speakers ($p<.05$). This also supports the interpretation that the "British" accent holds a special, high-prestige status in our population, irrespective of the participants' personal preferences.

These findings are also congruous with the ones obtained through the descriptor-eliciting item in the second part of the study. Table 5 shows the elicited descriptors, grouped into six categories: "pleasantness", "correctness", "negative, neutral and positive descriptors", which included aesthetic, affective and social properties, and, finally, "negative status" (cf. Garrett et al. 2003; Evans 2005).

---

harsher, this might indicate that students' attitudes towards "EFL speech" indeed change in the course of their studies, together with their readiness to identify with "accented" speech, but this analysis alone is inconclusive.

Table 4. Frequency of answers to the question "Why would you like to have such an accent?"

	What kind of accent would you like to have?											
	Neutral			American			British			Australian		
	N	Row %	Col. %	N	Row %	Col. %	N	Row %	Col. %	N	Row %	Col. %
missing				2	50.0	4.3	2	50.0	3.5			
I just like it	1	2.8	12.5	26	72.2	55.3	8	22.2	14.0	1	2.8	50.0
natural	7	31.8	87.5	15	68.2	31.9						
useful				1	33.3	2.1	2	66.7	3.5			
beautiful				3	12.0	6.4	21	84.0	36.8	1	4.0	50.0
sophisticated							24	100	42.1			

Table 5. Elicited descriptors for the ten speech samples grouped by variety (columns) and by meaning (rows) – "pleasantness", "correctness", negative, neutral, positive, and "negative status".

	NI	SE	S USA	S	Cal.	Sc	R EFL	G EFL	NM	Aus
missing	29	31	27	39	47	36	26	56	37	36
pleasant		33	1	13	18	10		7	36	33
unpleasant	21		25	4	12	13	28	14	3	4
correct		5		3						
incorrect			1			1	1			
foreign	1			3		9	10	5		
funny	3	1	27			19		1		4
dull	13		9	3	2	1	14	11	4	
boring	20		1	4	1		8	8		
unsophisticated	2		2				1			
lowly, coarse	1		13			6	2			
awful	2		1		1	3	3			
terrible	1		1				5			
unintelligible	17		2		2	2	7	1		
monotonous	2	1		5	3		3	2		
average	1	1		2	6		1	3	2	
normal		2			7		3	1	9	
OK		2			7				4	3
fine		8		7					3	3
interesting	1	4	3		2	13			2	17
colourful						1				5
clever, smart		2		4	1		1		4	2
articulate		12	1	7	3			1	8	
elegant		4		11	1			3		3
polite		2							1	
serious		1		4	1					1
conceited				1			1	1		3
arrogant		3		1					1	
posh		2		3						
Total	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114

NI = Northern Ireland; SE = Southern England; S USA = Southern USA; SA = South Africa; Cal. = California, USA; Sc = Scotland; R EFL = Russian EFL; G EFL = Greek EFL; NM = North Midland USA; Aus = Australia.

The three varieties ranked the highest in the three dimensions were described as "pleasant" (Northern USA, Southern England, Australia), while the descriptor "unpleasant" was used most frequently for the EFL Russian, Southern USA and Northern Ireland samples, ranked the lowest in variety rating, too. The varieties that elicited the most "neutral" descriptors were Californian and Northern American, again in accordance with their general ranking in the first part of the study.

Conspicuously, the Southern England speaker elicited very few negative descriptors, and the speakers from Australia and Northern USA only a few, while the speaker from South Africa was negatively described mostly in terms of his reading performance and not his accent ("dull", "boring", "monotonous"). Conversely, the EFL Russian, Southern USA, and Northern Ireland varieties elicited the greatest number and the widest array of negative descriptors. Particularly, "unintelligible" was the descriptor most often used for the Northern Ireland and EFL Russian speakers. Interestingly, although "standard" or "correct" were not used as traits for speaker rating, these descriptors did emerge here: "correct" for the Southern England and South African varieties, and "incorrect" for the varieties of Scotland, Southern USA, and Russia (EFL). Moreover, some participants used the descriptor "foreign" to describe not only the two EFL speakers, but also those from Scotland and South Africa.

However, Southern England and South African varieties also attracted the most descriptors for "negative status" – "arrogant", "posh", and "conceited" (cf. Evans 2005: 243–244, and the descriptors provided by her participants – "snobbish", "prissy", "stuck up"), adding support to the above interpretation that "British English" holds a special status in our population as the high-status, "standard" variety.

More importantly, all these findings point to yet another observation, namely, that, after they had listened to and thought about ten different *regional* varieties of English, "native" as well as "non-native", in the latter two tasks our participants fell back on using broad general constructs of "British" and "American" English (Clopper 2000; Preston 2004: 40).

The final task in this part of the study asked for the participants' opinion, on a 5-point Likert scale, about how suitable the given speaker would be as an EFL teacher. Table 6 shows the ranking of speakers by the mean scores, which, at a closer inspection, proves to match fairly closely the ranking in the dimension of prestige. For instance, although rated neutrally and ranked rather high for social closeness and personal integrity, the speaker from Scotland was rated very harshly on this item, and so was the EFL Greek speaker. The lowest-ranked EFL Russian speaker was rated with the lowest mean score (=4.17) on this item, too. These scores suggest that for our participants 'foreign accent' is unacceptable in the EFL teaching context.

Moreover, our participants rated the speakers much more harshly on this item than on any of the dimensions: only the three speakers ranked the highest in all the three dimensions were rated positively as EFL teachers, but with obviously lower scores than above (e.g. Southern England mean score=1.94 on prestige, mean score=2.09 here). Further, the South African variety, ranked very high in terms of prestige, was still

Table 6. Speakers ranked by the mean score for suitability as EFL teacher.

	Mean	Stand. Dev.	Skewness
Australia	2.03	.999	.812
Southern England	2.09	.747	.632
North-Midland USA	2.19	.986	.506
South Africa	2.69	.988	.316
California USA	2.84	.937	−.138
EFL Greek	3.56	1.013	−.637
Scotland	3.88	1.014	−.888
Northern Ireland	4.07	.773	−.708
Southern USA	4.15	.952	−1.557
EFL Russian	4.17	.977	−1.560

ranked rather unfavourably as a possible EFL model (mean score=2.69). As many as five speakers were rated negatively on this item – three of them being *native* speakers of regional accents. This shows clearly that our participants' notion of what an EFL teacher should "sound like" relies heavily on their idea of "prestigious" speech, which seems to be closely related to the notions of "standard" and "correct", and not only "native".

That the dimension of status plays an important role is further supported by the statistically significant inter-group differences (.000 level) and correlations between the ranking of speakers on this item and on the dimension of status: $p<.000$ correlations were observed for the speakers from Northern Ireland, Southern USA, Northern USA, South Africa, and the two EFL speakers; $p<.05$ correlations for all the other samples. Social closeness also plays a role, judging by the fact that $p<.000$ correlations were observed for the speakers from Southern England, South Africa, Scotland, Northern USA and the EFL Greek speaker, and $p<.05$ correlations for all the others. Statistically significant differences between the first- and third-year students occurred only with respect to the speaker from Southern USA ($p<.05$) and the EFL Russian speaker ($p<.000$), judged more harshly by the third-year students.

The participants were also asked to explain why they deemed a given speaker suitable or not as an EFL teacher. For the Northern Ireland speaker, 10 participants (9%) stated he was unsuitable "because of his accent", and 11 (10%) "because he can't be understood". For the speaker from Southern England, the explanations offered by those who rated him positively were "intelligibility", aesthetic reasons ("sounds nice", "sounds interesting"), but most frequently (N=16; 14%) "because of his accent". The participants who judged the Southern USA speaker as a suitable EFL teacher explained that he "sounds interesting", "sounds fun" (N=2; 2%), while the most frequent reason for rating him negatively here was "because of his accent" (N=27; 24%). This suggests that in our participants' notion of what an EFL teacher should be like the concept of "accent" plays a very significant role, in the positive as well as the negative sense. This echoes Soukup's conclusion that "*standardness* in the U.S. is not perceived as an emu-

lation of one particular language variety or form of speech, but as the avoidance of regional features (such as speaking Southern)" (Soukup 2001: 66). "Standardness" in this sense, as the absence of regional features, seems to be crucial for our participants' idea of the EFL teacher's speech.

3.4.3. Variety recognition

In variety identification, our participants showed meagre, if not downright poor results. Following Jarvella et al. (2001: 47), we show the correct and incorrect identifications in a "confusion matrix" (Table 7), since misidentifications are more revealing than correct identifications, raising important questions about the possible influence of stereotypes and language ideologies in variety rating tasks (cf. Jarvella et al. 2001: 50; Bayard et al. 2001: 41; Preston 2004). In Table 7, the dark boxes present the correct identifications for each variety (the number of cases), and the columns show the misidentifications. The rows (light grey) in the lower part of the table show the counts for the six offered variety labels not represented by any of the speakers in the samples.

Table 7. Variety identification – Columns: the varieties represented by the samples; rows: how they were identified/misidentified by the participants (simple counts).

	S USA	SE	Sc	R EFL	Aus	N USA	Cal.	G EFL	SA	NI
South. USA	88	2	2	2	3	2	4	2	3	16
South. Eng.	1	60			17	1	1	1	18	3
Scotland	2	2	55	1	2	1	5	2	9	9
EFL Russ.	2		9	50	1	4	1	12	6	5
Australia	4	2		4	35	4	6	7	3	7
N-Midl. USA	6	1		6	8	31	46	3	3	11
Cal. USA	1			4	9	61	28	3	2	3
EFL Greek								20		
S. Africa			2	1	1			5	12	5
Nor. Ireland	3		9	1	6	1			2	10
N. England	2	40			18	2	4	4	23	11
Wales		2	1	6	5		4	3	6	5
Jamaica			3	1		1		2	1	2
EFL Asian	2		7	12				19	2	3
EFL African	1		1		2			6	4	4
L2 India			21	2			2	2	4	1
"I can't tell"	2	4	4	24	7	6	13	23	16	19

NI = Northern Ireland; SE = Southern England; S USA = Southern USA; SA = South Africa; Cal. = California, USA; Sc = Scotland; R EFL = Russian EFL; G EFL = Greek EFL; NM = North Midland USA; Aus = Australia.

The best-recognized variety was the Southern USA one (77%). Apart from that, only the speaker from Southern England was recognized correctly by more than half our participants (52.6%). About half the participants correctly identified the speaker from Scotland (48.2%) and the EFL speaker of Slavic background (44%). As many as six varieties were very poorly identified, and the most incorrectly placed speakers were from Northern Ireland (8.8%), South Africa (10.5%), and Greece (EFL) (17.5%).[10]

Such findings pose an important question: If a given variety was misidentified by a participant, what was his/her rating of that variety based on – the sound of speech itself or the stereotypes and language ideologies associated with certain variety *labels*? The analysis of misidentifications, therefore, threw a new light on the variety rating and expressed attitudes.

First, it supported the observation that our participants operated with broad general constructs of "British" and "American" English, and were not familiar with regional accent differences. For instance, the North-Midland speaker (correctly identified by 27.2% participants) and the Californian speaker (correct 24.6%) were most often mistaken for each other. Therefore, both these speakers were correctly identified as "American" (North-Midland = 80.7%, Californian = 62.3%), since our participants were not familiar with American regional differences beyond the constructed distinction between "southern American" and "general American" speech (cf. Clopper 2000; Soukup 2001; Preston 2004: 40). Similarly, the Southern England speaker was most often mistaken for a speaker from Northern England (by 35.1% of the participants). When this is taken into account, it can be said that the participants correctly identified the accent they construed as "British English" in 87.7% cases, and that they were not aware of the ideologies and negative stereotypes commonly associated with "Northern England" speech (Hiraga 2005: 290; McKenzie 2008: 65; Coupland and Bishop 2007: 79).

Second, along the same line of reasoning, we cannot but ask whether the fact that the South African speaker was mistaken for a "British" speaker by as many as 36% of the participants (15.8% as Southern England, 20.2% as Northern England), in fact, accounts for the high ranking of this variety in the dimension of prestige. This would, then, be a result of the misidentification, and not a reflection of our participants' actual attitude towards this variety. Or, conversely, taking into account the observed negative attitude our participants expressed towards 'accented speech' and 'foreign accents', the

[10] It is important to note that significant differences in variety identification between the 1st and 3rd year students were observed for many samples (N. Ireland $p<.000$; S. Africa $p<.05$; Scotland $p=.052$; EFL Slavic $p=.000$, EFL non-Slavic $p<.05$, Australia $p<.05$). However, unexpectedly, a comparison of scores speaker by speaker revealed that 1st year students were markedly more accurate in accent identification than 3rd year students: N. Ireland: 1st = 14% correct identification, 3rd = 2%; S. England: 1st = 54% correct 3rd = 50%; South USA: 1st = 78% correct, 3rd = 74%; Scotland: 1st = 59%, 3rd = 34%; EFL Slavic: 1st = 54%, 3rd = 30%; EFL non-Slavic: 1st = 19%, 3rd = 16%. Only the speakers from South Africa (1st = 8% correct, 3rd = 14%), California (1st = 14%, 3rd = 38%) and Northern USA (1st = 23%, 3rd = 32%) were recognized more accurately by the 3rd year students. This unexpected finding might be explained by the fact that the 1st year students had just had their English phonetics and phonology course at the time of the study, and were focused on the issues of pronunciation and accent.

fact that the Scottish speaker was mostly mistaken for an EFL speaker should be taken into consideration when observing the rather low ranking of this variety in the dimension of prestige. Similarly, the speaker from Northern Ireland was very difficult for our participants to place, and was misidentified as a speaker of the widest range of varieties – practically all of the offered options. This fact could account, at least partly, for the negative rating of this speaker for both the prestige and social closeness traits.

A closer inspection of the misidentifications adds new details to the picture, revealing an even more obvious influence of stereotypes and language ideologies. First, unexpectedly, statistically significant differences in speaker rating between the participants who identified them correctly and those who did not were not established for all speakers, probably due to a great number of various misidentifications. Second, when we observe the variety rating means as relative to the *supposed* place of the speaker's origin, a pattern of stereotypical rating emerges.

For instance, for the Southern England speaker significant differences were established between the participants who identified him correctly and those who did not (on closeness F=2.20, p=.033; on status F=3.15, p=.003; on personal integrity F=2.17, p=.035). But more importantly, a mean scores comparison reveals that this speaker was rated more harshly on both prestige and closeness when mistaken for a Californian or Australian speaker.

Similarly, a comparison of the rating scores place by place for the Southern USA speaker showed that he was rated more harshly by those participants who mistook him for a Scottish speaker or an EFL African speaker, but notably more favourably by those who mistook him for a speaker from California (correlations p=.000).

In the same vein, concerning the Scottish speaker, significant correlations were established between speaker identification and the rating in the dimensions of personal values (.000) and closeness (.003) (significant inter-group differences only for personal core values F=2.56, p=.008). More importantly, this speaker, too, was rated markedly unfavourably in the dimensions of closeness and, particularly, status, when mistaken for a Jamaican, Indian, African, or an Asian or Slavic EFL speaker.

Finally, the most striking findings concerned the Australian variety. A statistically significant correlation was observed between speaker identification and rating him in the dimension of prestige (p=.035); he was slightly more favourably rated on closeness when taken to be from California or Wales. Most importantly, this speaker was more favourably rated on prestige by almost all the participants who *misidentified* him than by those (24%) who identified him correctly.

Even where no statistically significant differences and correlations were observed, the comparison of the mean rating scores for different supposed places of origin was very suggestive. For instance, the speaker from South Africa, accurately placed by very few participants, was judged much more favourably on closeness when mistaken for a Californian speaker, and more harshly when misidentified as an ELF Asian or Indian speaker – in the dimension of prestige, he was twice as favourably rated when mistaken for a speaker from England or Wales, but much more harshly when mistaken for a

speaker from Northern Ireland, an L2 Asian or an L2 Indian speaker. The EFL Greek speaker was rated twice as favourably in terms of both closeness and status when mistaken for a speaker from Southern England, and observably more harshly when mistaken for a Scottish speaker.

These findings shed a different light on the rating of the varieties in terms of status and social closeness, highlighting the influence of stereotypes and language ideologies on attitudes to English varieties. They raise an important question – Would the attitudes have been different had the participants identified the speakers more accurately?

Our study does not offer any definite answers to this question. However, previous research has shown that attitudes (and stereotypes about language varieties) can be triggered indirectly, by the sound of speech or the variety label, through a conscious association between the phonetic cues and the variety label. But they can also be triggered directly, even when the phonetic cues are not consciously linked to the variety label (Milroy and McClenaghan 1977; Irvine 1996 in Preston 2004: 42). It is possible that our participants' expressed attitudes could be explained by this latter option, but for more definite conclusions much more research is necessary, using various techniques within both quantitative and qualitative approaches. What we can state with more certainty, though, is that our analysis of specific misidentification–rating correspondences indeed indicated that stereotypes and language ideologies did play a role in our participants' rating of different English varieties.

4. Conclusion

This study, limited in many ways – from the number of participants to applying mostly quantitative methods – showed clearly that students' attitudes to different varieties play a role in defining their "profile" of an EFL teacher, and that attitudes can indeed filter their perception of varieties.

In line with Coupland and Bishop (2007: 85), our participants can be said to have shown "disappointingly familiar conservative tendencies in the general rankings of the accents", assigning the highest prestige to Southern England and "general American" speech and the varieties judged similar to these. At the same time, much like Garrett and colleagues (2005), we can conclude that the issue of attitudes to regional varieties of English is very complex when EFL students and teachers are concerned, and that our study, too, revealed "a mosaic of overlapping and differentiating values" (Garrett et al. 2005: 232), because the participants' notion of the EFL teacher is shaped in the complex interplay of social status and social closeness. Familiarity, too, seems to play a role in shaping students' attitudes, judging by the fact that the most misidentified varieties were also the most unfavourably rated ones. Unfortunately, though, the example of the very well recognized but notably unfavourably rated Southern USA variety shows that a significant role is also played by stereotypes and ideologies.

The crucial distinction, however, seems to be the one between "foreign" and "standard" or "correct" speech (cf. Coupland and Bishop 2007; Coupland 2007; also Preston 2004: 64) – negative attitudes are expressed towards heavily stereotyped varieties and those that sound "foreign". Even native speakers are dismissed as "foreign" if they sound markedly regional, i.e. different from the "standard" (Soukup 2001: 66).

Relying heavily on the broad constructs of "American" and "British" English and disregarding specific regional differences, our participants seem to support Preston's "folk theory of language", that is, to operate with a "Platonic, extra-cognitive reality" of "British" and "American" as "real" varieties (Preston 2004: 64). And for our participants these constructs seem to equal the notions of "standard" and "correct" English.

Therefore, we believe that our findings imply that EFL students' experience with regional varieties should go beyond familiarity and intelligibility, towards developing a sensibility for social and contextual *appropriateness* of specific varieties, as a crucial part of intercultural communicative competence. As our findings indicate, in accordance with Preston's notion of "correctness" (Preston 2004), this cannot be done by replacing the concepts of "standard" and "correct", since they seem to be essential to our students' concept of EFL teaching, but, rather, by building *upon* and *beyond* them – through awareness-raising about sociophonetic variation, through promoting positive attitudes to language varieties, and through adding a "socio-cultural" (Coupland 2007) component to teacher education.

REFERENCES

Baker, W., D. Eddington and L. Nay. 2007. "Dialect identification: The effect of region of origin and amount of experience". *American Speech* 84(1). 48–71.

Bayard, D., A. Weatherall, C. Gallois and J. Pittam. 2001. "*Pax Americana*? Accent attitudinal evaluations in New Zealand, Australia, and America". *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5(1). 22–49.

Bradlow, A.R. and T. Bent. 2003. "Listener adaptation to foreign-accented English". *Proceedings of the 15th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*, Barcelona. 2881–2884.

Bradlow, A.R. and T. Bent. 2007. "Perceptual adaptation to non-native speech". *Cognition* 106(2). 707–719.

Bucholtz, M., N. Bermudez, V. Fung, R. Vargas and L. Edwards. 2008. "The normative North and the stigmatized South: Ideology and methodology in the perceptual dialectology of California". *Journal of English Linguistics* 36. 62–87.

Byram, M. 1997. *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M. 2008. *From foreign language education to education for intercultural citizenship. Essays and reflections.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Clopper, C.G. 2000. "Some acoustic cues for categorizing American English regional dialects: An initial report on dialect variation in production and perception". *Research on Spoken Language Processing. Progress Report No. 24 (2000)*. Indiana University Press. 43–65.

Clopper, C.G. and A.R. Bradlow. 2008. "Perception of dialect variation in noise: Intelligibility and classification". *Language and speech* 51. 175–198.

Clopper, C.G. and D.B. Pisoni. 2004a. "Effects of talker variability on perceptual learning of dialects". *Language and Speech* 47 (3). 207–239.
Clopper, C.G. and D.B. Pisoni. 2004b. "Homebodies and army brats: Some effects of early linguistic experience and residential history on dialect categorization". *Language Variation and Change* 16. 31–48.
Clopper, C.G. and D.B. Pisoni. 2006. "Effects of region of origin and geographic mobility on perceptual dialect categorization". *Language Variation and Change* 18(2). 193–221.
Coupland, N. 2000. "Sociolinguistic prevarication about 'standard English'". *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4(4). 622–634.
Coupland, N. 2007. *Style: Language variation and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Coupland, N. and H. Bishop. 2007. "Ideologised values for British accents". *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 11(1). 74–93.
Cvetičanin, P. and T. Paunović. 2007. "How would you say it in Serbian, Professor Higgins?" Paper presented at the 8th European Sociological Association Conference: Conflict, Citizenship and Civil Society, Glasgow, UK.
Dalton-Puffer, C., G. Kaltenboeck and U. Smit. 1997. "Learner attitudes and L2 pronunciation in Austria". *World Englishes* 16(1). 115–128.
Derwing, T.M. 2003. "What do ESL students say about their accents?". *Canadian Modern Language Review* 59(4). 547–567.
Dziubalska-Kołaczyk, K., K. Janicka, M. Kul, S. Scheuer, J. Weckwerth and D. Wolfram-Romanowska. 2006. "Native standards or non-native ELF: Which English to teach in the 21st century?" In: Dziubalska-Kołaczyk, K. (ed.), *IFAtuation: A life in IFA. A festschrift for professor Jacek Fisiak on the occasion of his 70th birthday*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM. 235–259.
Edwards, J. 1999. "Refining our understanding of language attitudes". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 18. 101–110.
Evans, B.G. 2005. "'The grand daddy of English': US, UK, New Zealand and Australian students' attitudes towards varieties of English". In: Langer, N. and W.V. Davies (eds.), *Linguistic purism in the Germanic languages*. (*Studia linguistica Germanica* 75.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 240–251.
Evans, B.G. and P. Iverson. 2007. "Plasticity in vowel perception and production: A study of accent change in young adults". *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 121(6). 3814–3826.
Gallois, C., B. Watson and M. Brabant. 2007. "Attitudes to language and communication". In: Knapp, K. and G. Antos (eds.), *Handbook of applied linguistics, communication competence, language and communication problems, practical solutions*. (Vol. 9.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 595–618.
Garrett, P. 2001. "Language attitudes and sociolinguistics". *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5(4). 626–631.
Garrett, P., N. Coupland and A. Williams. 2003. *Investigating language attitudes: Social meanings of dialect, ethnicity and performance*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
Garrett, P., A. Williams and B. Evans. 2005. "Attitudinal data from New Zealand, Australia, the USA and UK about each other's Englishes: Recent changes or consequences of methodologies?" *Multilingua* 24. 211–235.
Giles, H. 1970. "Evaluative reactions to accents". *Educational Review* 22. 211–227.
Hay, J. and K. Drager. 2007. "Sociophonetics". *Annual Review of Anthropology* 36. 89–103.
Hilgendorf, S.K. 2007. "English in Germany: Contact, spread and attitudes". *World Englishes* 26(2). 131–148.
Hiraga, Y. 2005. "British attitudes towards six varieties of English in the USA and Britain". *World Englishes* 24(3). 289–308.

Hyrkstedt, I. and P. Kalaja. 1998. "Attitudes toward English and its functions in Finland: A discourse-analytic study". *World Englishes* 17(3). 345–357.
Irvine, J.T. 1996. "'Style' as distinctiveness: The culture and ideology of linguistic differentiation". Paper presented to the NSF Workshop on 'Style', Stanford University, February 1996.
Janicka, K., M. Kul and J. Weckwerth. 2005. "Polish students' attitudes to native English accents as models for ESL pronunciation". In: Dziubalska-Kołaczyk, K. and J. Przedlacka (eds.), *Pronunciation models: A changing scene?* Frankfurt an Main: Peter Lang Verlag. 251–292.
Jarvella, R.J., E. Bang, A.L. Jakobsen and I.M. Mees. 2001. "Of mouths and men: Non-native listeners' identification and evaluation of varieties of English". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11(1). 37–56.
Kovačević, B. 2005. "Stavovi govornika srpskog jezika prema stranim jezicima". *Srpski jezik* 10(1–2). 501–518.
Kraljic, T. and A.G. Samuel. 2006. "Generalization in perceptual learning for speech". *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 13(2). 262–268.
Labov, W., S. Ash and C. Boberg. 1997. A national map of the regional dialects of American English. (TELSUR project.) Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania. <http://www.ling.upenn.edu/phono_atlas>
Labov, W., S. Ash and C. Boberg . 2006 *The atlas of North American English. Phonetics, phonology and sound change*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Ladegaard, H.J. 1998. "National stereotypes and language attitudes: The perception of British, American and Australian language and culture in Denmark. *Language and Communication* 18. 251–274.
Ladegaard, H.J. and I. Sachdev. 2006. "'I like the Americans... But i certainly don't aim for an American accent': Language attitudes, vitality and foreign language learning in Denmark". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 27(2). 91–108.
Lambert, W.E. 1967. "A social psychology of bilingualism". *Journal of Social Issues* 23. 91–109.
Lippi-Green, R. 1997. *English with an accent: Language, ideology and discrimination in the United States*. London: Routledge.
McKenzie, R.M. 2007. A quantitative study of the attitudes of Japanese learners towards varieties of English speech: Aspects of the sociolinguistics of English in Japan. (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh.)
McKenzie, R.M. 2008. "Social factors and non-native attitudes towards varieties of spoken English: A Japanese case study". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 18(1). 63–88.
Micheli, S.M. 2001. "Language attitudes of the young generation in Malta". *Vienna English Working Papers* 10(2). 30–55.
Milroy, L. and D. Preston. 1999. "Introduction". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 18. 4–9.
Milroy, L. and P. McClenaghan. 1977. "Stereotyped reactions to four educated accents in Ulster". *Belfast Working Papers in Language and Linguistics* 2. 1–11.
Moyer, A. 2007. "Do language attitudes determine accent? A study of bilinguals in the USA". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 28(6). 502–518.
Mugglestone, L. 1995. *'Talking proper'. The rise of accent as social symbol*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Niedzielski, N. 1999. "The effect of social information on the perception of sociolinguistic variables". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 18. 62–85.
Niedzielski, N. and D. Preston. 2003. *Folk linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Paunović, T. 2007. "Jezik i identitet: Život između dva jezika" [Language and identity. Life between two languages]. *Zbornik radova Anglistika danas, Interkatedarska konferencija Departmana za anglistiku, Niš, 03-04.11.2006.* Niš: Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Nišu. 21–37.

Paunović, T. 2008. "Globalization on the tip of my (mother) tongue". *Proceedings of the International Conference Language, Literature, Globalization*, University of Niš, April 2008. 43–66.
Paunović, T. 2009. "Pronunciation in EFL: Speaking 'with an accent'". In: Čubrović, B. and T. Paunović (eds.), *Ta(l)king English phonetics across frontiers.* Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 143–164.
Paunović, T. Forthcoming. "Sociolingvistički pogled u susedovo dvorište: Stavovi prema jezičkim varijetetima" [A sociolinguistic peak into the neighbour's back yard: Attitudes towards language varieties]. *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Istočnom Sarajevu* 11(1).
Preston, D.R. 1996. "Whaddayaknow: The modes of folk linguistic awareness". *Language Awareness* 5(1). 40–74.
Preston, D.R. 1999. "A language attitude approach to the perception of regional variety". In: Preston, D.R. (ed.), *Handbook of perceptual dialectology*. (Vol. 1.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 359–374.
Preston, D.R. 2004. "Language with an attitude". In: Chambers, J.K., P. Trudgill and N. Schilling-Estes (eds.), *The handbook of language variation and change*. Oxford: Blackwell. 40–67.
Ray, G.B. and C.J. Zahn. 1999. "Language attitudes and speech behavior: New Zealand English and Standard American English". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 18. 310–319.
Sercu, L. 2006. "The foreign language and intercultural competence teacher: The acquisition of a new professional identity". *Intercultural Education* 17(1). 55–72.
Soukup, B. 2001. "'Y'all come back now, y'hear!?' Language attitudes in the United States towards Southern American English". *Vienna English Working Papers* 10(2). 56–68.
Stainton Rogers, W. 2003. *Social psychology: Experimental and critical approaches*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
Thomas, L. 2004. "Attitudes to language". In: Thomas, L., S. Wareing, I. Singh, J. Stilwell Peccei, J. Thornborrow and J. Jones (eds.), *Language, society and power: An introduction*. London: Routledge. 194–210.
Vasić, V. 1994. "Stavovi prema jeziku u gramatičkim priručnicima srpskohrvatskog jezika". *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku* 37. 109–118.
Walker, A. 2007. "The effect of phonetic detail on perceived speaker age and social class". Proceedings of the 16th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, Saarbrücken. 1453–1456. <www.icphs2007.de>
Weckwerth J. 2007. "Accent attitudes in an EFL context: The role of distance from the model accent". Paper presented at the International Conference Accents 2007, 3–5 December 2007, Łódź, Poland.
Young, C. and M. Yee. 2006. "Macao students' attitudes toward English: A post-1999 survey". *World Englishes* 25(3–4). 479–490.

Address correspondence to:
Tatjana Paunović
English Department
Faculty of Philosophy
University of Niš
Ćirila i Metodija 2
Niš
Serbia
newpaun@filfak.ni.ac.rs