Tanulmány

Gyöngyi Püski

Language attitudes in the EFL classroom

Changing learners' attitudes towards non-native-accented English through a teaching experiment

Abstract

While most language attitude studies focus on theoretical insights related to non-native speakers' preference for native accents, the present study aims to contribute to the less widely researched field of utilizing the findings of language attitude studies in the EFL classroom. The main goal of the investigation was to change Hungarian EFL learners' attitudes towards their own and others' non-native accent through a teaching experiment. The participants of the investigation were twelve 10th-grade high school students (ages 15-16, eight female and four male students), and a control group of 10 tenth-grade EFL students from the same year and school (ages 15-16, six female and four male students). The target group took part in a teaching experiment focusing on the formation of more positive attitudes towards other speakers' and their own non-native accent in English through familiarizing students with several native and non-native, dominant and non-dominant, standard and non-standard varieties of English. The 13 classes (comprising 4 introductory and 9 experimental sessions) took place through the course of two and a half months, and involved 60-minute sessions once or twice a week. The participants' responses were collected through a pre- and a post-test to see the potential changes after the teaching experiment, and a delayed post-test three months after the end of the experiment to measure how long-lasting the potential changes are. The questionnaires contained 5-point Likert-type rating scales (and a few open-ended questions, which are beyond the scope of the present paper), and comprised three sections: 'attitudes and motivation', 'perfectionism', and 'willingness to communicate'. While the main aim of the investigation was attitude formation, attitudes might be influenced by the participants' predisposition to perfectionism, driving them to consider only native English as 'perfect', which called for testing the participants' perfectionism, as well. The participants' willingness to communicate was also not directly targeted by the experiment, rather, it was tested as a potential consequence of attitude change. The results show a significant increase in the participants 'attitudes and motivation' scores on both the post-, and the delayed post-test compared to the pre-test, suggesting that the teaching experiment achieved its main goal. However, a significant decrease was shown between the scores of the post- and the delayed post-test, indicating that longer-term results may be reached by expanding the teaching period to last a whole school-year or conducting repeated teaching periods throughout the year. The participants' 'perfectionism' and 'willingness to communicate' scores did not show a significant change after the intervention, but the correlations between the results of the three sections of the questionnaire suggest a relationship between the three areas.
Keywords: language attitudes, non-native accent, EFL learners, motivation, perfectionism, willingness to communicate

1   Introduction

Foreign language anxiety is often a contributor to EFL (English as a foreign language) learners' lack of confidence in their L2 skills, and one of the reasons why they might not be willing to use their L2 orally. A part of their anxiety might stem from the fact that their accent is not native-like. The fear of receiving negative criticism for having a non-native accent, and being worried that their accent might cause disruptions in the transmission of meaning are the two main causes why accent anxiety might lead to a decrease in language learners' willingness to communicate orally in English (Coppinger & Sheridan 2022). In 2006, investigating ESL (English as a second language) learners' language anxiety, Woodrow discovered that "[a]nxiety is clearly an issue in language learning and has a debilitating effect on speaking English for some students" (Woodrow 2006: 323). This anxiety is not exclusive to 'real-life language use', but is experienced also in the foreign language classroom. Baran-Łucarz (2014) found that Polish EFL students who experience a higher level of pronunciation anxiety are less willing to communicate orally in the EFL classroom. The findings of Gregerson and Horowitz's 2002 study show a relationship between language anxiety and perfectionism; therefore, they propose that similar coping methods might help anxious language learners that are effective for helping perfectionists. They also propose that some English language teachers themselves might have a predisposition for perfectionism, which might result in these tendencies' being passed down to their students.

The study reported on in this paper was based on a pilot (Püski 2023a), which tested EFL learners' openness and willingness to engage with teaching materials targeting attitude change towards Hungarian-accented English. As the pilot was concluded with favorable results, it provided methodological insights and theoretical incentive for the present study. The aim of both studies was to help EFL learners develop more positive attitudes towards non-native-accented English, and specifically towards Hungarian-accented English and their own accent, through teaching materials that help them recognize the vast diversity of accents with which English is spoken around the world as an L1 or L2.

The present investigation used various non-native, non-standard and non-dominant accents of English (as well as a comparison of 'standard' British vs. 'standard' American English, which are more familiar to the students), and various related exercises during the course of a teaching experiment to test whether an indirect teaching method that helps EFL learners realize the multiplicity of the accents of English can have a positive impact on their attitudes and language learning motivation, their perfectionism scores and their willingness to communicate orally in English.

While data is yet scarce on the effects of using non-native speech samples in the EFL classroom, the perceived benefits and disadvantages of having native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) vs. non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs) are the topic of an ongoing debate, which can serve as an analogy to the discussion of using native vs. non-native speech samples in class. The origins of the issue go back to Grosjean's 1989 holistic view of bi-and multilingualism, suggesting that a bilingual is not two monolinguals in one body, as they often have complementary repertoires in the two (or more) languages at their disposal, and, therefore, measuring them against monolingual standards is futile.

Still, NESTs are often praised for using 'real' English, being able to provide more culture-specific information and fluency-focused instruction. They are considered to be better at teaching oral skills (e.g., Medgyes 2001, Mahboob 2004, Ayudhya 2021). NNESTs are

507

Gyöngyi Püski:
Language attitudes in the EFL classroom:
Changing learners' attitudes towards non-native-accented English through a teaching experiment
Argumentum 20 (2024), 505–540
Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó
DOI: 10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2024/31

perceived as less skilled in these areas; their strengths lie elsewhere. NNESTs have more metalinguistic awareness and can provide more information about language use. As former L2 learners themselves, they can pinpoint certain difficulties in advance and show more empathy towards their students, and they can also become role models for them. As opposed to fluency-focused instruction expected from NESTs, NNESTs are believed to be better at teaching grammatical accuracy (e.g., Medgyes 1994 and 2001, Ayudhya 2021).

As it can be inferred from the above descriptions, both NESTs and NNESTs have strengths and weaknesses, which is the reason why having both native and non-native English-speaking teachers is proposed as the best option (e.g., Matsuda & Matsuda 2001, Mahboob 2004). In light of these findings, and in line with Murphy's 2014 proposal, using non-native speech samples in the EFL classroom in addition to native samples seems to be a theoretically well-founded practice. (A more detailed discussion of *native speakerism* can be found in the Literature review.)

The above discussion points in two main directions that are important for the purposes of this paper. One is the notion that often only native English is considered "real" English, for which reason accent anxiety can cause learners to avoid using English orally, and the other is the possible role model status of successful non-native speakers. The research questions of the investigation arise from the ideas outlined in the Introduction, and are as follows:

1. What is the relationship between *attitudes and motivation, perfectionism,* and *willingness to communicate*?
2. Can more positive language attitudes and motivational patterns be achieved in EFL learners with regard to their own and others' non-native accent in English through an indirect teaching experiment familiarizing students with several native and non-native varieties of English?
3. Are there changes in the participants' *perfectionism* and *willingness to communicate* after the experiment?

2 Literature review

2.1 Language attitudes, language ideologies and linguistic discrimination

Agheyisi and Fishman (1970) categorize the conceptualizations of attitudes into ones focusing on purely affective features (e.g., Osgood et al. 1957, Fishbein 1965) vs. ones focusing on an interplay between affective, cognitive and behavioral components (e.g., Lambert and Lambert 1964, Rokeach 1968). Agheyisi and Fishman (1970) highlight that there seems to be some agreement across all the theories of attitudes about the idea that attitudes are rather long-lasting (not only temporary) and "learned from previous experience" (Agheyisi & Fishman 1970: 139).

With regard to language attitudes specifically, Edwards (1999) stresses that language attitudes are, in fact, socially constructed and learnt, and are not based on any self-evident and naturally occurring differences between languages or varieties. Instead, the formation of language attitudes is closely linked to people's perceptions of the members of another speech community. His concise definition sheds light on the highly social aspect of attitudes:

> The variation found in speech-evaluation studies reflects social perceptions of the speakers of given varieties and has nothing to say about any intrinsic qualities—logical or aesthetic— of the language or

> dialect itself. Thus, listening to a given variety is generally considered to act as a trigger or stimulus that evokes attitudes (or prejudices, or stereotypes) about the relevant speech community. (Edwards 1999: 102)

When preconceptions about a group of people are held on a societal level, they can be considered social stereotypes, according to Tajfel (1982). He discusses two types of categorization into social groups: an external one, which relies on labels used by in-group and out-group members alike (e.g., job titles), showing that non-members, too, acknowledge the existence of said group, and an internal one (termed *group identification*) characterized by the members' awareness of belonging and a sense of having shared values. Another characteristic of group identification is having some emotional interest in belonging to the group and sharing its values. Intergroup behavior is characterized by an understanding of what constitutes in-group membership and what constitutes out-group membership, while favoring the in-group. Tajfel (1982) agrees with Stallybrass's 1977 definition of stereotypes, which highlights their over-simplified nature, the fact that they are not individualistic but considered to be valid by a great number of people, and often go hand in hand with prejudice against certain groups.

Linguistic discrimination is linked to linguistic profiling, which is derived from the term *racial profiling* (Baugh 2016). While racial profiling and the ensuing racial discrimination happen based on identifying someone visually as a member of a racial group, linguistic profiling and the ensuing linguistic discrimination is linked to auditory cues. Linguistic profiling and discrimination are going to be increasingly relevant issues to consider in the future, and not only in the United States, with large scale immigration happening around the world. Immigrants are often not proficient in the dominant language of the country where they arrive, which might serve as auditory cues for linguistic profiling (Baugh 2016).

To counter linguistic discrimination, Matsuda (1991) provides and immensely powerful explanation of the relevance of linguistic human rights, and the core personal importance of one's accent.

> The way we talk, whether it is a life choice or an immutable characteristic, is akin to other attributes of the self that the law protects. In privacy law, due process law, protection against cruel and unusual punishment, and freedom from inquisition, we say the state cannot intrude upon the core of you, cannot take away your sacred places of the self. A citizen's accent, I would argue, resides in one of those places. (Matsuda 1991: 1391–1392)

Skutnabb-Kangas (1989) adds that causing language-based disadvantage to someone is no different from racism, and it is not only a form of discrimination, but an overarching ideology, termed *linguicism*. When the variety which is idealized at the expense of other varieties is the standard, Milroy (2001) refers to it as the *standard language ideology,* and explains that standard language cultures emphasize 'correctness', the maintenance of which is the moral obligation of the society. According to this view, even L1 speakers are not infallible 'owners' of the language, as 'correctness' can only be achieved through 'proper' formal education. This normative view is further strengthened by the requirements of the national curriculum.

2.2   Preference for native accents and native speakerism

Regarding the first direction pointed out in the Introduction, the question arises whether non-native English is not considered 'real' or legitimate English. Standing in contrast with Cook's 2000 assertion that it was only the people in charge of English-learning programs who believed that native teachers would be more well-received, while students themselves did not have such a strong bias in favor of native teachers, Mahboob's 2004 ESL student respondents indicated that it was native teachers who could provide the right target language models for them to follow.

Part of this preference might be connected to a desire to sound native-like. "What seems to motivate the participant to sound native-like is the symbolic value of native-speaker pronunciation, particularly the prestige associated with it and the recognition that one may gain from other interlocutors in EFL communication" (Sung 2016: 59). Beyond showing a mere preference for native accents, some non-native speakers tend to outright discriminate against non-native accents of English. Native speakers were evaluated as "perfect", "competent", "proficient", "correct", etc. in Jenkins's study (2007: 209) investigating the attitudes of 17 non-native teachers of English, while non-native English received negative and harsh descriptions, such as "incorrect" and "horrible". These negative attitudes towards non-native accents do not foster confidence and willingness to communicate in one's L2.

One of the most illustrative and shocking examples for negative attitudes towards and prejudice against non-native accents comes from Shuck's 2004 study, in which two middle-class, white, L1 English-speaking women rated – in the form of dramatic narratives – the non-native speaker providing the speech sample for the recording as 'incomprehensible' and even 'frightening', and the idea that he might be 'a murderer' also emerged. The women expressed exaggerated difficulty with understanding his speech, claiming that they could not understand anything he said. Shuck's conclusion of these findings is that the ideology of nativeness leads to a sharp division between the raters' in-group, that is, 'us', and the out-group, 'them', who appear as incomprehensible and threatening 'others'. Interestingly, as Lindemann et al. (2014) note, attitudes towards L2 English seem to be more negative than attitudes towards L2 varieties of other languages. Their argument is based on the findings of Drewelow and Theobald's 2007 study, namely, that French native speakers in France did not expect American L2 speakers of French to have a native-like accent in their L2. Therefore, the author of this paper believes that changing English language learners' (and native speakers') attitudes towards non-native English is imperative, and the EFL classroom might be able to become one vehicle for that change.

Cook (1999: 185) argues that "the prominence of the native speaker in language teaching has obscured the distinctive nature of the successful L2 user and created an unattainable goal for L2 learners", and highlights that non-native speakers should be considered as "multicompetent language users rather than as deficient native speakers" (ibid). He calls for a perspective shift in language teaching, namely, that requiring L2 learners to become native-like through language learning is neither desirable nor feasible. "If students and teachers see L2 learning as a battle that they are fated never to win, little wonder they become dispirited and give up. L2 learners' battle to become native speakers is lost before it has begun" (Cook 1999: 204).

Hall (2012: 127) conceptualizes battling *native speakerism* (i.e. the idealization of the native speaker as the 'proper' speaker of a language) as "[m]odeling a role other than being perceived

as a superior source of knowledge" for L1 speakers, which needs to be done locally, keeping the specificities of the language learners' culture in mind. The influence of native-speakerism can be felt strongly among teachers of English, as well, who might face employment difficulties if categorized as a non-native speaker, according to Leonard (2019), who emphasizes "the power of 'native-speakerism', and endorses the need for scholars and teacher educators to continue to challenge its influences in order to establish equality and respect for teachers' contributions to the profession irrespective of their origin" (Leonard 2019: 697). Similarly, Anchimbe (2006: 12) argues that "[c]ompetence or proficiency and not origin must be judged as a prerequisite for especially ELT [English language teaching] positions. Not all native speakers are proficient in their native languages. ELT is not a natural element of native speakers but a profession that requires due training and efficiency".

Relying on Rampton's 1990 critical description of who is typically considered as a native speaker (in which it was suggested that the term *native speaker* itself is flawed, with the three criteria for being considered a native speaker being *language expertise, language affiliation* and *language inheritance*), Mahboob (2005) argues that an L2 user might have more expertise with a language than an L1 user in some cases, and might even consider themselves affiliated with their L2, which leaves only *language inheritance* as a defining criterion for a 'native speaker'.

Following a poststructuralist approach, Aneja (2016) also problematizes the abstract categorization of native vs. non-native speakers. Instead of these commonly used terms, she prefers to use the expression *(non)native speaekered subjectivities,* and she calls the process by which people come to be identified socially as one or the other *(non)native speakering*. The aim of Aneja's 2016 view is to highlight the non-objective and socially constructed nature of such a categorization, which is perpetuated in society by institutions and individuals alike. The reason for using only one term [*(non)native speakering*] instead of two (non-native speakering vs. native speakering) is to emphasize that those who are *non-native speakered* are defined by others' contrasting them with *native speakered subjectivities*. As speakers are constructed and positioned socially as *(non)native speakered subjectivities,* being *(non)native speakered* can be considered a performative, which is carried out either explicitly, e. g. pointing out that someone is a non-native speaker, or implicitly, e.g., by inquiring about how a non-Caucasian person is able to speak English so 'beautifully'. This suggests that being *(non)native speakered* is based on the categorizer's perception of the speaker's (linguistic) behavior rather than the 'natural' characteristics of the categorized (Aneja 2016).

While I am not arguing against the use of the terms *native speaker* and *non-native speaker*, and, for ease of reference and clarity, I use them in this paper, I find the understanding that the dividing line between the two is not absolute and clearly definable, or even meaningful (cf. Rampton 1990, Mahboob 2005, and Aneja 2016 above) essential for promoting the acceptance of non-native accented English. Lee (2005) supports the use of alternative terminology, e.g., *competent language user,* instead of *native* vs. *non-native speaker* (while not completely replacing the two) to emphasize what the speaker knows instead of who they are (following Rampton 1990), and to highlight that the main aim of language teaching is to enable learners to become competent communicators.

The most neutral, and potentially the least complicated and most usable, term for *non-native speakers* seems to be *L2 user,* which is defined as "any person who uses another language than his or her first language (L1), that is to say, the one learnt first as a child" (Cook 2002: 1). This

term and definition is based on the understanding that using a language other than one's first language is "a commonplace activity" (Cook 2002: 2), that is, it is a normal and everyday experience, which, I believe, gives L2 use more legitimacy, while taking away the peculiarity which might be seen as a connotation of being a *non-native speaker*. While the term *non-native* emphasizes the 'lack' of something, *L2 user* does not seem to carry such a value judgement.

Beyond traditional approaches to L2 learning and use, Blommaert (2010) discusses the notion of *super-diversity,* which is the result of globalization and people's increased mobility around the world, involving the layering of new immigrant neighborhoods around older immigrant neighborhoods. *'Truncated' repertoires* can often be observed in new immigrants, which suggests that a new view of multilingualism might be necessary: one which can accommodate the idea of "repertoires composed of specialized but partially and unevenly developed resources" (Blommaert 2010: 23). For this reason, what it means to be a *native speaker*, a *bi-* or *multilingual* or an *L2 user* is expected to keep changing together with the constant social changes in a globalized world.

2.3 Native-likeness vs. intelligibility/comprehensibility

The other trajectory which arose from the issues mentioned in the Introduction is the possibility of setting successful non-native speakers as role models to emulate for language learners. After puberty (Johnson & Newport 1989) or age 20 (Bialystok & Hakuta 1994), depending on which notion of the critical period we regard as more plausible, native-like attainment is considered rare. The older the language learner is, the less likely it is that they acquire native-like proficiency, including a native-like accent (e.g., Birdsong 1992). With age, there is a decline of procedural memory, which results in different cognitive systems being used for language learning in late L2 learners. They need to rely more on explicit learning, which is different from how L1 is acquired in early childhood (Paradis 2004).

Therefore, it seems to be a good idea to set more achievable goals for language learners. Instead of aiming for a native accent and being disappointed when that goal cannot be reached, non-native accent models can be used in language classes in addition to the native speech samples that accompany most course books. There are more studies on the strengths and weaknesses of native vs. non-native teachers of English, but less on teachers' reactions to using non-native audio samples in the EFL classroom. In the existing studies, reactions to non-native audio samples for teaching purposes are not entirely positive. Although pre-service English teachers seemed willing to use non-native English recordings in their classes according to Litzenberg (2014), their comments often indicated that error correction-focused analysis was the first thought that came to mind with regard to using high-intermediate non-native speech samples in class. Even when it came to using advanced samples in class, these were praised for containing 'few mistakes', which highlights the respondents' native-centered approach to teaching English (Litzenberg 2014).

Still, scholars are trying to challenge the hegemony of the native speaker model in L2 English pronunciation teaching. Murphy (2014) encourages the incorporation of intelligible and comprehensible non-native speaker models into ESL/EFL classes. He argues that the two main advantages of such non-native models are that they are more realistic targets for ESL/EFL learners to approximate, and they are also more relevant for learners' pronunciation needs than native models. His study was carried out among 34 specialists in pronunciation teaching, using

questionnaires to elicit their responses. Respondents were asked to rate award winning Spanish actor Javier Bardem's speech from a 2010 interview, and the results showed that they considered Bardem's pronunciation both intelligible and comprehensible. (The distinction between these two terms will be addressed later.) As the actor is also a high achiever, and; therefore, an appropriate model in every respect for non-native speakers, Murphy believes that similar speech samples could be incorporated as supplementary models in English language classrooms. He does not claim that non-native models should completely replace native models – intelligible and comprehensible non-native samples are recommended for classroom use as additional models that are easier to approximate for learners. Murphy rejects the *deficit model* of non-native pronunciation, and foregrounds comprehensibility, that is, the meaningful exchange of ideas and the effective expression of one's thoughts. He does not regard having a non-native accent as a flaw but a natural characteristic of ESL/EFL speech, which does not render the speaker an ineffective user of the language.

Similarly, Lindemann et al. (2014) find accent reduction courses ineffective, and argue that making learners change their accent specifically in order to avoid prejudice is counter-productive. They emphasize that the problem itself, i.e. prejudice, should be targeted and not necessarily non-native accents. Language attitudes tend to be formative in the making of decisions about the present and future of pronunciation teaching, which Lindeman et al. (2014) consider unfortunate, as this way native-speaker privilege is further strengthened. They add that non-native speakers of English are increasingly using English among each other rather than in conversations with native speakers; therefore, English language teaching has to accommodate these needs.

Nevertheless, activities which focus on the imitation of native accent models are still often used in the classroom. Baker (2014) argues that although imitation-based activities have not been favored by scholars since the rise of communicative language teaching, they still tend to be valued by some language teachers, and, in fact, they can contribute to learners' improvement to a certain degree. However, she points out that, as Saito and Lyster (2012) have shown, communicative activities that involve focus on meaning and didactic interaction are able to impact learner uptake to a greater degree than form-focused activities such as drills.

Meaning-focused interaction might even enhance the comprehensibility of L2 learners' accent. Kennedy and Trofimovich (2010) discuss the relationship between L2 learners' language awareness and L2 pronunciation using Benson and Lor's 1999 analytical framework for describing the quality of learners' awareness. Benson and Lor (1999) differentiate between qualitative and quantitative awareness. Their analytical framework defines qualitative awareness as the type of language awareness that those learners have who view language as a meaning carrying entity, as opposed to learners with quantitative awareness, who consider language as a set of concepts, features, and items that have to be memorized. Kennedy and Trofimovich (2010) elicited the 10 participating learners' language awareness through dialogue journal entries, and their pronunciation was assessed with the help of listener-based ratings, mainly focusing on accentedness, comprehensibility and fluency. The main finding of the study is that those students who exhibited qualitative awareness rather than quantitative awareness (as discernible from their journal entries) received higher ratings for their pronunciation. This implies that learners' focus on meaning rather than on form was beneficial for their acquisition of L2 pronunciation. Those students who included more qualitative awareness-related comments in their journal entries were also found to be engaged in more L2 listening outside

the classroom, which might also have contributed to their more comprehensible accent production. Their engagement in L2 listening activities outside the classroom underlines their meaning-focused approach to language learning.

The above descriptions show that the debate between native-likeness vs. intelligibility being the most important goals for language learners is still not completely over. Levis (2005) calls these competing ideas the *nativeness principle* and the *intelligibility principle*. Proponents of the intelligibility principle argue that native-likeness is an unnecessary and unreachable expectation, and conversational intelligibility should be the new target for L2 learners. Isaacs (2018) highlights that, since Krashen's 1981 formative work, new meta-analyses (e.g., Saito 2012) show that explicit pronunciation instruction is beneficial for learners, contrary to previous beliefs. Since the mid-1990s, pronunciation has received an increasing amount of research interest, and *intelligibility* and *comprehensibility* have become the new central concepts. Although these two terms are often used interchangeably, there is a slight difference between their meanings. According to Derwing and Munro's 2015 definitions, *intelligibility* is a more objective phenomenon, and is usually measured by asking listeners to write down what the non-native speaker said in the speech sample. *Comprehensibility,* on the other hand, is less objectively measurable, as it refers to the perceived ease or difficulty of understanding the L2 speaker's utterances.

2.4   The Lingua Franca Core

Jenkins is one of the most well-known supporters of what Levis (2005) termed the *intelligibility principle*. She devised a new syllabus (Jenkins 2002) for teaching pronunciation to learners of English as an international language (EIL) or lingua franca (ELF). Jenkins relies on Crystal's (1997) and Graddol's (1997) understanding, namely, that now there are more non-native users of English than native speakers; therefore, ELF teaching has to take into account the fact that many non-native speakers are more likely to use English among each other than with native speakers. Jenkins (2002) argues that intelligibility for other non-native speakers (and not for native speakers) should be foregrounded. Her revised syllabus is called *Lingua Franca Core,* which was designed with the purpose of creating a more teachable (in comparison with Received Pronunciation and General American), intelligibility-oriented model for ELF pronunciation. The core items are identified as the minimally necessary features that must be acquired in order to preserve intelligibility, while the non-core areas are those sounds and features of English pronunciation that do not tend to cause misunderstandings and disruptions in intelligibility when not produced in a native-like way. Some of the core items are as follows: aspiration of word-initial prevocalic voiceless stops, maintenance of contrast between long and short vowels, appropriate use of contrastive stress, etc. In the description of the core items, acceptable non-native-like forms and other recommendations can also be found, such as the following: some substitutions of /θ/ and /ð/ are acceptable, mixed British and American features are not only acceptable but recommended (e.g., British intervocalic stop [t] instead of the American flap, and rhotic /r/ rather than standard British non-rhoticity). For instance, stress-timed rhythm, weak forms (schwa) and assimilation are listed as non-core items, that is, features that do not interfere with communicative intelligibility, especially among non-native inter-locutors.

Jenkins's 2002 *Lingua Franca Core* is a very appealing and groundbreaking proposal, but it is not without its critics. Isaacs (2018) argues that one cannot adopt the model uncritically, as it was not devised based on a representative study. Furthermore, as the data collection and analysis are not systematically presented, the research is not replicable. Isaacs (2018) further argues (based on, e.g., Dauer 2005) that if the *Lingua Franca Core* implies teaching non-native-like sounds and features deliberately and explicitly to L2 students, then the model might not be a meaningful alternative to previous pronunciation models. Isaacs (2018) also agrees with Hahn's (2004) argument that word stress and timing, for example, do not appear to be completely negligible features.

The problematic nature of using Jenkins's 2002 *Lingua Franca Core* in the classroom suggests that using non-native recordings for teaching purposes might provide a more meaningful and implementable way of foregrounding intelligibility (and/or comprehensibility) and facilitating the formation of more positive language attitudes towards L2 accents of English, and encouraging students to use spoken English without being afraid of being judged for their accent. In the teaching experiment reported on in this paper, non-native and non-standard or non-dominant native accents were used with the specific purpose of attempting to enhance the formation of positive attitudes in EFL learners towards their own accent.

2.5 The influencing factors of attitude formation: The role of motivation, willingness to communicate and perfectionism

Attitude formation can be influenced by various factors, such as people's *behavior,* that is, their actions; *intentions,* i.e. their willingness to do something or behave in a certain way; *goals,* that is, what motivates them to do certain actions; and *beliefs,* which are their prior preconceptions that might influence the formation of new beliefs (Albarracín et al. 2019).

In MacIntyre et al.'s widely accepted 1998 model of willingness to communicate (WTC) in an L2, WTC is defined "as a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using a L2" (MacIntyre et al. 1998: 547). Supporting Albarracín et al.'s 2019 notion of the importance of *intentions* in attitude formation, in this six-layer model, Layer V links the concept of WTC to language attitudes, as this layer consists of *intergroup attitudes,* the *social situation,* and *communicative competence.* The component *intergroup attitudes* can influence *integrativeness,* the *fear of assimilation* and the *motivation to learn the L2.* As MacIntyre et al. (1998: 552) explain, "[t]he desire to be a part of the L2 community is indicative of increased involvement with that community." However, becoming a member of another group can have disadvantages, such as a sense of losing one's original (L1) self, which can lead to fearing intensive contact with the L2 and its speakers. Attitudes can have an impact on the general enjoyment of learning a language, as well. "Enjoyment and satisfaction in learning and using the L2 may encourage the individual to apply a more intense and thorough effort to the learning process" (MacIntyre et al. 1998: 552). This latter idea is closely connected to the present study, one of whose aims was to investigate the relationship between negative attitudes towards non-native accents of English and willingness to communicate in English as a foreign langue.

As MacIntyre et al.'s above described 1998 model suggests, motivation is also considered to be interconnected with language attitudes and willingness to communicate (c.f. Albarracín et al. 2019 above). The *L2 Motivational Self-System* approach to motivation (e.g., Dörnyei

2005, 2009) applied existing terminology of a *self-system* from Markus and Nurius (1986) to language learning motivation, as Dörnyei (2005) explains. Dörnyei (2005: 98) argues that "*possible selves* offer the most powerful, and at the same time the most versatile, motivational self-mechanism, representing the individuals' ideas of what they *might* become, what they *would like* to become, and what they are *afraid of* becoming". Higgins's 1987 concepts of the *ideal self,* the *ought self* and his *self-discrepancy theory* were of utmost importance for the creation of the L2 Motivational Self-System (Dörnyei 2005). The *ideal self* is one kind of possible self, which the individual sees as desirable to achieve. This is what the language learner strives to reach, while the *ought-to self* is defined in negative terms, i.e. what they need to avoid becoming or prevent happening to them as L2 learners (Dörnyei 2005, 2009). Using Higgins's 1987 *self-discrepancy theory* as a base, the L2 Motivational Self-System approach (e.g., Dörnyei 2005, 2009) postulates that the quest to decrease the differences between one's current self and the *ideal self* they would like to reach, as well as to avoid the negative outcomes (as outlined by the *ought-to self*) contributes to language learning motivation. The author of this paper finds it important to note that, if one's ought-to self is not possible to reach (e.g., if native-likeness is considered a necessity by language learners), motivation might decrease after a while, as lots of EFL learners might realize that they cannot avoid having a non-native accent even if they work diligently on their English proficiency.

It has been found that perfectionism can have strong implications for the success of language learning (cf. *beliefs* in Albarracín et al. 2019 above). According to Flett et al. (2016), perfectionism plays a role in the occurrence of language learning anxiety and performance deficits, hence reducing the level of perfectionism in learners is important. Stoeber et al. (2018: 19) recognize that perfectionism can have a twofold impact: it "may energize or paralyze people". Originally, this idea was voiced by Hamachek (1978), and the two types of perfectionism were termed *normal* vs. *neurotic*. Normal perfectionism involves having sensible and feasible expectations towards oneself, which can help one succeed, whereas neurotic perfectionism involves having unrealistic and extreme expectations towards oneself that cannot be reached most of the time and, therefore, might cause anxiety and fear. These were later renamed as *positive* vs. *negative* perfectionism, where the distinction between the two is recognizable from their impact on people's functioning: the type of perfectionism which is associated with the fear of failure, shame or ridicule is termed *negative perfectionism,* while *positive perfectionism* describes people's desire for great achievement (e.g., Terry-Short et al. 1995, Chan 2007). As perfectionism centers around the idea of 'correctness', language learners' predisposition to perfectionism might play a role in whether they accept non-native accented varieties as legitimate. For these reasons, the attitude questionnaire used in this study was complemented with questions related to motivation, positive and negative perfectionism and willingness to communicate.

The efficacy of attitude change depends on multiple factors: the *message,* the *recipient* and the *source* (Albarracín et al. 2019). In the present investigation, the teaching materials specifically designed for the purposes of the study sent a particular indirect message through the source of information, i.e. the teacher (myself). The recipients, that is, the participants were chosen with two characteristics in mind: their English proficiency had to be advanced enough to understand different varieties of English with relative ease, and yet they needed to be young enough to respond to attempts at attitude formation, i.e. not having already fixed and unchangeable preconceptions about EFL use. (This is the reason why 10th-grade high school

516

Gyöngyi Püski:
Language attitudes in the EFL classroom:
Changing learners' attitudes towards non-native-accented English through a teaching experiment
Argumentum 20 (2024), 505–540
Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó
DOI: 10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2024/31

students were selected. Due to the Matura Examinations, which are the compulsory school leaving exams in Hungarian high schools, 11th- and 12th-grade students were deliberately not selected in order not to interfere with their preparations for the exams.)

Since people's need for social acceptability and approval might hinder their attitude change (Albarracín et al. 2019), organizing the experimental class sessions in the official school environment, as a part of the students' compulsory English classes, was an important factor to help foster the legitimacy of non-native accents in an academic setting.

2.6 Beyond the native speaker model

Multiple expressions are used as umbrella terms for the varieties of English spoken around the world: *Global Englishes, Word Englishes, English as a lingua franca (ELF),* and *English as an international language (EIL).* These concepts are explored in this section.

In the glossary to Galloway and Rose's 2015 *Introducing Global Englishes,* the term is defined as the most overarching one among the four concepts mentioned above. They explain that *Global Englishes* is

> [a] paradigm that includes concepts of World Englishes, ELF, and EIL.
> It examines the global consequences of English's use as a world language. In many ways, the scope of Global Englishes extends the lens of World Englishes and ELF to incorporate many peripheral issues associated with the global use of English, such as globalization, linguistic imperialism, education, language policy, and planning. (Galloway and Rose 2015: 254)

Fang and Ren (2018) found that familiarizing learners of English with the concept of Global Englishes can make learners think more critically and re-evaluate the acceptability of native-centered ideologies about the use of English. The participating Chinese university students taking an optional course about Global Englishes were found to be more accepting of 'non-standard' language use after the course, with some of them commenting that learning English as a foreign language often meant following a prescriptive, restrictive, native-centered approach, and, after learning about Global Englishes, they can recognize and respect the diversity of Englishes around the world.

Based on previous GELT (Global Englishes Language Teaching) proposals (e.g., Galloway 2011, Galloway & Rose 2015, Rose & Galloway 2019) urging a change in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages), Rose et al. (2021) call for the incorporation of Global Englishes into language teaching "[t]o bridge the gap between theory and practice" (Rose et al. 2021: 159). According to the proponents of this paradigm shift, English language curricula need to incorporate students' familiarization with Global Englishes and a larger emphasis on lingua-cultural diversity and multilingualism. This way, language teaching would keep up with the advances of SLA (Second Language Acquisition) research, e.g., their increasing focus on multi-lingualism and translanguaging (Rose et al. 2021). *Translanguaging* is a model of "communi-cative malleability" (Nikula & Moore 2016: 238), which is based on the 'one repertoire' view of bi- or multilingualism, and; therefore, the key feature of the model is the proposal that there are no clear dividing lines between the languages at one's disposal (Nikula & Moore 2016). According to Nikula and Moore (2016), the model of translanguaging can be likened, for example, to the model of metrolingualism (Otsuji & Pennycook 2010), polylanguaging (Jørgensen et al. 2011) and supervernaculars (Blommaert 2012), which all have in common the

view that language is not a 'rigid' entity, and multilinguals can engage in language use without observing the 'limits' of a language system.

The term *World Englishes,* which is included within *Global Englishes,* as it was discussed above based on Galloway and Rose (2015), is typically associated with Braj Bihari Kachru's name. Kachru (e.g., 1990, 1992, 1997) divides World Englishes into three concentrical circles: the Inner, Outer and Expanding Circle. Countries categorized as members of the Inner Circle are places where the English language is traditionally spoken as an L1, e.g., the USA, UK and Canada. The Outer Circle comprises countries where English is spoken as a second language (as opposed to a foreign language), as the language has a very important role as the language of education, business and/or trade, often due to the countries' colonial past. Outer Circle countries include e.g., India, Kenya and Nigeria. The Expanding Circle is made up of countries where English is taught as a foreign language, mostly through formal education, but is not used on a societal level as a crucial language of everyday life. China, South Korea and Hungary are among the countries belonging to the Expanding Circle.

Kachru's Three Circles Model (e.g., 1990, 1992, 1997) has great potential to be used for language attitude research, as Monfared and Khatib (2018) have shown. They compared the attitudes of Indian (Outer Circle) and Iranian (Expanding Circle) teachers of English towards their own local variety of English, and found considerable differences between the two groups of respondents. While Indian respondents showed positive attitudes and appreciation towards their own variety (thus exhibiting an endonormative orientation) and evaluated British English higher than American English, Iranian teachers were characterized by an exonormative orientation, i.e. the idealization of the native speaker, especially a speaker of American English. They conclude that "[i]n the EFL situation, teacher participants were more prejudiced against their own variety of English" (Monfared & Khatib 2018: 69). As Hungary is also in the Expanding Circle, a similar rejection of the local variety of English seems plausible.

The notion of *World Englishes* have not always been well received by English language teaching professionals, as Kachru (1997) explains, because it has sometimes been interpreted as having an "'anything goes' attitude with each variety of world Englishes" (Kachru 1997: 71). In order to debunk this misunderstanding, Kachru (1997) refers to the distinctions between *innovations, deviations,* and *mistakes* in local or regional varieties of English. Innovations are novel forms of language use (not only in vocabulary) that are specific to certain varieties. A deviation can be considered to have "a comparative and a contrastive implication" (Kachru 1997: 71) when examined in the light of other Englishes, typically Inner Circle varieties. Mistakes (or errors), as Kachru (1997) calls them, come about as a result of deficient acquisition in non-native speakers' language use. That is, Kachru (1997) differentiates mistakes from variety-specific characteristics of language use. Kachru and Nelson (2006) further emphasize the importance of innovations in Outer Circle varieties, and claim that it would be erroneous to classify them as problematic due to their being different from Inner Circle norms. "To label them deviations, errors, mistakes, fossilizations, pragmatic failure, etc. is to deny the linguistic and cultural experiences that motivate such innovations" (Kachru and Nelson 2006: 89). Based on Shaw (1981) and Sridhar and Sridhar (1992), Kachru and Nelson (2006) argue that instrumental motivation, that is, using English effectively for practical communicative purposes, seems to be more important for speakers of Outer Circle Englishes than integrative motivation.

After the introduction of the concepts of *Global Englishes* and *World Englishes,* the differences between ELF and EIL are explored in the following paragraphs. As explained

above, similarly to World Englishes, both ELF and EIL fall under the umbrella term *Global Englishes* (Galloway and Rose 2015). Regarding English as a lingua franca, Mauranen (2018: 10) explains that "speakers who use ELF as their means of communication speak English that is a product of language contact between their other languages and English". Seidlhofer (2011: 7) defines ELF

> as any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option. Due to the numbers of speakers involved worldwide, this means that ENL [English as a native language] speakers will generally be in a minority, and their English will therefore be less and less likely to constitute the linguistic reference norm. (Seidlhofer 2011: 7, original italics)

As Seidlhofer's 2011 definition shows, communication between non-native speakers is highlighted in the conceptualization of ELF, for which reason, L1 standards might not always apply for ELF speakers. She also argues that 'native' competence might be a reasonable expectation in some ESL contexts, but in EFL and ELF contexts native-like proficiency is not likely to be a relevant and achievable goal. ELF is for the transmission of meaning and effective communication between speakers of different (typically non-English) L1s, for which reason, there seems to be a large discrepancy between what is considered to be relevant in English language teaching and what is relevant for lingua franca communication (Seidlhofer 2011), which is in line with Jenkins and Leung's 2014 claims.

Jenkins (2002) uses a modified version of Bourdieu's 1977 explanation of the required features of taking part in 'legitimate discourse'. While Bourdieu (1977) considered having 'legitimate' pronunciation, that is an accent that native speakers (the target audience) can understand, Jenkins (2002) argues that having an accent in English that is intelligible for international (mostly non-native) users of English is more important in an EIL context. Therefore, using English as an international language "will involve the making of adjustments by NSs [native speakers] as well as NNSs [non-native speakers] of English, towards an agreed international (rather than NS) norm" (Jenkins 2002: 85). She sees it as ironic that native speaker teachers are no longer expected to change their local accent and emulate Received Pronunciation or General American; it is only the non-native speakers who have to face these requirements, perpetuating the *deficit model* of language learning (Jenkins 2002). Instead of following native norms as the ultimate source of knowledge, native varieties can be set as "a point of reference to prevent local non-native varieties from moving too far apart from each other, as well as to promote receptive competence in interaction with native speakers" (Jenkins 1998: 124).

Matsuda and Friedrich (2011) argue for the importance of teaching and improving communicative strategies in users of EIL to help them overcome difficulties in communication which might arise as a result of not yet fully developed linguistic skills. Such strategies include "the ability to derive meaning from context; to paraphrase, engage in circumlocution, and summarize; to inquire and ask for clarification of meaning; to aid verbal communication through non-verbal communication; and to display cultural sensitivity" (Matsuda & Friedrich 2011: 339). Matsuda and Friedrich (2012) find the idea of using McArthur's 1987 proposal of teaching *World Standard English* to international users problematic to implement in practice. Choosing an existing variety for this purpose might strengthen the position of a variety and its speakers at the expense of others, whereas creating a supra-national variety for the purposes of international communication does not seem to be a viable option, as asking all international

users of English to conform to the norms of a single variety is not a realistic expectation. Instead, Matsuda and Friedrich (2012: 25) call for "a complete revision of the entire [English teaching] program, using one's understanding of the use of English in international contexts as a foundation that influences every single aspect of the curriculum", and a complete turn away from (not only some small additions to) the existing British- and American English-centered curriculum.

The above discussed ideas lead to the question of a definition for *EIL,* which is somewhat more difficult to formulate than definitions for *World Englishes* or *ELF*. McKay (2018: 11) argues that "EIL differs from both World Englishes and English as a lingua franca in […] that the use of English for international communication must be based on a set of specific principles". These principles include concentrating on local needs in language teaching, using learners' L1 to aid their L2 learning, improving learners' "strategic intercultural competence" (McKay 2018: 11) and fostering a culturally neutral environment for EIL, that is, the teaching and use of EIL should not be based on any set of vested interests or any hierarchies among varieties (McKay 2018).

The above discussed approaches under the umbrella of *Global Englishes* have increasingly influenced the theories (and, to a somewhat lesser extent, the practice) of English language teaching. However, there might be something beyond *Global Englishes,* a theory of *Teaching English as a Dynamic Language* (TEDL), according to Mahboob (2018). While this approach has not yet been widely studied, Mahboob (2018) argues that there are several advantages to viewing English as a dynamic entity (as opposed to a static one), that is, as a language which shows variability "between and within individual, communities, and contexts" (Mahboob 2018: 53). He claims that "ideas such as interlanguage, fossilization, target language, ultimate attainment etc., are grounded in ideas that learners should achieve 'native'-speaker proficiency in language" (Mahboob 2018: 52), which does not foster the acceptance and celebration of linguistic diversity and local ways of language use. He explains that

> [o]ne consequence of [following the TEDL approach] would be to create space for recognizing, teaching, and celebrating local languages and local ways of meaning making alongside the teaching of more globally oriented languages (and, thus expand people's repertoire of meaning-making resources). Recognizing diversity in language and using it to develop ELT [English language teaching] approaches can help sustain and promote diversity of languages, cultures, and belief systems. (Mahboob 2018: 53)

What all of these approaches to the global uses of English have in common is a set of convincing arguments against the traditional, standard British- and American English-centered language teaching approaches, and measuring language learners against often unreachable native standards. In order to increase the efficiency of non-native English communication without expecting native-like proficiency from learners, pursuing mutual intelligibility among the speakers, fostering the development of communication-aiding strategies, and embracing the diversity of Englishes seem to be the most compelling arguments for a change in focus in language education.

3   Methodology

3.1   Participants

Twelve tenth-grade EFL students from a high school in Szeged, Hungary, took part in the teaching experiment (ages 15-16, eight female and four male students), and another 10 tenth-grade EFL students from the same high school (ages 15-16, six female and four male students) formed the control group for the data collection. The principal of the school and the English teacher of the experimental group gave permission for the teaching experiment to be carried out, and the parents of the students in the experimental group gave their signed consent to their children's taking part in the intervention.

3.2   Method of data collection

Four introductory sessions, the purpose of which was to accustom the students to the teaching style of the new teacher (myself), were followed by nine experimental sessions, the aim of which was to attempt to help students form more positive attitudes towards Hungarian-accented English in general and their own Hungarian-accented English in particular, by letting them encounter numerous native and non-native accents of English and encouraging them to recognize the immense variety of accents with which English is spoken around the world. The 13 classes took place between 22nd September and 8th December 2022, and involved 60-minute sessions once or twice a week. A pre-test, a post-test and a delayed post-test were filled out by the students in Hungarian.

No mention of accent was made in the initial four introductory sessions, and mainly topics recommended by the group's regular English teacher were discussed. The introductory sessions also served the purpose of minimizing the impact of the observer's paradox, as students had already become familiar with me when the experimental sessions started, which helped them not to see me as an outsider. After the introductory classes, as a pre-test, the students filled out an anonymous written questionnaire containing 84 Likert scales and five open-ended questions. The present paper focuses exclusively on the responses to the rating scales; the open-ended questions are beyond the scope of this analysis. (The list of statements for the 84 rating scales can be found in the Appendix in Hungarian and English. Those questions which were based on previous English-medium questionnaires are provided in English preserving the original wording or a wording as close to the original as possible.)

The first section contained statements related to language attitudes and language learning motivation, the second section tested the participants' predisposition for positive and negative perfectionism, and the third section investigated their willingness to communicate orally in English both in everyday contexts and in more specific hypothetical situations.

The questions of the 'attitudes and motivation' part of the questionnaire were influenced by the motivation questionnaire used in the 1993–2004 Hungarian survey project carried out by Dörnyei and his colleagues (e.g., Dörnyei & Csizér 2002, Dörnyei et al. 2006), and the results of the pilot for this study (Püski 2023a). For the section on perfectionism, the Frost Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (Frost & Marten 1990) was used as a base. Relevant items were selected and translated into Hungarian with occasional small modifications (questions 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17 in the 'perfectionism' section), and completed with the author's own additional questions specific to the participants' life experiences (questions 4, 6, 10, 15,

18 in the 'perfectionism' section). The first part of the 'willingness to communicate' section contained questions translated with occasional small modifications from the questionnaire in Khatib and Nourzadeh's 2014 study (questions 2, 3, 4, 5 in the first part of the 'willingness to communicate' section), with some additional questions included (questions 1, 6, 7, 8 in the first part of the 'willingness to communicate' section). The second part of the 'willingness to communicate' section, which describes specific situations in which EFL learners might need to use their L2, was entirely designed by the author of this paper.

Following the pre-test, the experimental class sessions started, which the regular English teacher of the group did not always attend. The classes were not recorded in order to help the students feel at ease and be able to speak English and express their opinions without concerns about their mistakes and opinions being recorded and stored. Instead, written reports were made after each session to document the students' immediate reactions to the class materials and contributions to the pair or group discussions.

The experimental sessions had an indirect approach to changing the participants' attitudes towards Hungarian-accented English. Rather than telling the learners what to think, allowing students to explore native and non-native, standard and non-standard, dominant and non-dominant varieties of English in class was used as a means of encouraging them to realize that accents of English are multiple, and their own accent is just one of the many accents with which their target language is spoken by native and non-native language users. (The indirect nature of the teaching method also contributed to minimizing the observer's paradox, as the research agenda was never stated during the class sessions.) When encountering various accents in the experimental classes, understanding the content was also in focus, as it would have been futile to attempt to help students form positive attitudes towards newly encountered varieties which they could not understand.

According to the group's English teacher, the course books used by the group are typically accompanied by audio recordings of 'standard British' or (slightly less frequently) 'standard American' speakers, that is, speakers whose accents are close to Received Pronunciation or General American. The rationale behind the experimental class sessions was to have the participants experience non-standard, non-native and non-dominant varieties of English being used in the classroom, thus giving legitimacy to their use.

At the end of the last experimental session, students filled out the same questionnaire as for the pre-test, and an additional class evaluation sheet in which they were encouraged to express their opinions about the sessions. The results of the class evaluation sheets were published separately (Püski 2023b). The second questionnaire will be referred to as the post-test.

The respondents then filled out the same questionnaire for a third time, as a delayed post-test, three months after the end of the experimental teaching period, in order for the researcher to be able to check how long-lasting potential changes are once the intervention is over. The control group filled out the same questionnaires (except for the class evaluation sheet) at the same pace, keeping the length of time between the questionnaires the same as in the case of the experimental group, but without receiving any experimental teaching. All the questionnaires were administered in a paper format.

The experimental sessions were held as part of the students' compulsory school schedule, and not as extracurricular activities. Various non-standard and non-dominant native accents and non-native accents were introduced to the students through videos (and a few audio recordings), and related communicative exercises were performed in pairs or in the whole group.

The accents encountered throughout the teaching experiment were the following (in this order): Scottish-accented English from a TED speaker (who is also a coach and author); Scouse accent from Liverpool-born comedian John Bishop; Cockney accent from acclaimed London actor Michael Caine and another (non-famous) Cockney speaker; 'standard' British vs. 'standard' American English (the same excerpt from two audio book versions of Antoine de Saint-Exupéry's *The Little Prince*) from actors Kenneth Branagh and Viggo Mortensen, respectively; and two successful speakers with Hungarian-accented English (one of them a Hungarian-born Canadian doctor and author with a less salient Hungarian accent, and the other a Hungarian-born linguist, who worked in the UK, with a more prominent Hungarian accent). Next, students encountered Chinese-accented English through Jackie Chan's Honorary Academy Award acceptance speech, New Zealand-born actor Russell Crowe's New Zealand–Australian accent, Idris Elba's Hackney and Matthew McConaughey's Texan accent, Antonio Banderas's Spanish-accented English and Chris Hemsworth's Australian accent. Then, students watched Austrian actor Christoph Waltz's two Academy Award acceptance speeches and another Academy Award acceptance speech from Spanish actress Penelope Cruz, listened to Scottish singer Nathan Evans's song titled "Wellerman", watched an interview with Israeli-born actress Gal Gadot, and listened to "The Music of the Night" from the *Phantom of the Opera* performed live at the London Wembley Stadium by Italian singer Andrea Bocelli.

The content of each recording was discussed in order to ensure students' understanding of the newly encountered accents; therefore, new words were learnt in each session. The related exercises were mainly communicative, and when new grammar had to be practiced, its communicative purposes were emphasized instead of providing purely form-focused instruction. The exercises were as follows: learning to ask for clarification (with the help of fixed expressions or conventional indirectness) if they do not understand their interlocutor due to differences in accent, using humor to avoid uncomfortable situations (e.g., when encountering difficulties in English communication, among other situations), using second conditional (i.e. conditional sentences expressing 'imaginary present' situations) to express where they would travel in the world and what they would do there (e.g., communicate with the locals), using passive voice (which can make one's speech sound more advanced without having to sound native-like), discussing varieties of English that they were familiar with (as a student-friendly way of introducing the topic of World Englishes), writing and performing individual acceptance speeches for an imaginary award, and using English to communicate positive experiences, e.g., things that changed their lives for the better or moments they would never forget (with the help of useful expressions and prompts given in advance).

In each session, one or more new accents were introduced followed by communicative exercises, and a summary concluded each class. Recordings from successful non-native speakers of English were selected as samples following Murphy's above described 2014 idea of presenting students with non-native role models to follow. Lesser known native accents were included to show students that a unified 'native accent' cannot be identified.

3.3   Data analysis

For the statistical analysis of the results of the Likert-type rating scale questions, the answers of the paper-based questionnaires were entered into SPSS. Reverse coding was used in some cases to unify the meaning of each number on the rating scales. This way, a higher score in the

'attitudes and motivation' section indicates better acceptance of non-native accented English and less persistence on acquiring a native accent. A higher score in the 'perfectionism' section indicates higher levels of perfectionism, and a higher score for 'willingness to communicate' means that the participant is eager to engage in oral communication in English. (The details of the reverse coding are included in the Appendix.)

The total scores for negative vs. positive perfectionism were counted separately as well. The questions grouped together and labelled as positive perfectionism are questions 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 15 and 18 of the 'perfectionism' section of the questionnaire. The rest of the questions in the 'perfectionism' section, that is, questions 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 17 were grouped together and labelled as questions related to negative perfectionism. The criteria for distinguishing between the two types of perfectionism followed Hamachek's 1978 and Chan's 2007 distinctions described in the Literature review section.

In the Results section of this paper, correlations between the subsections of the questionnaire are presented first, followed by the changes between the scores of the pre-, post- and delayed post-test. In the Discussion section, the results are discussed in light of the existing literature.

4   Results

4.1.   Correlations between attitudes and motivation, perfectionism, and willingness to communicate

The reliability of the three sections of the questionnaire was within a good range: *Cronbach's* α = .742 for the 'attitudes and motivation' section, α = .883 for the 'perfectionism' section and α = .917 for the 'willingness to communicate' section. The total scores of the sections of the questionnaire were counted separately for the correlation analyses. Then, the total scores for negative vs. positive perfectionism were counted separately, as well.

Spearman's correlations were conducted, and four significant correlations were found between the total scores of the pre-test, which can shed light on the connections between attitudes/ motivation, perfectionism and willingness to communicate in EFL. The experimental and the control group were included together, since the pre-test scores were used for the correlation analyses, and at this point neither group had received any intervention ($N = 22$). The reason for working with the pre-test results at this point of the analysis was that I wanted to see the 'default' relationships between these areas, which might inform the development of teaching materials for similar future studies.

The total scores for 'attitudes and motivation' shows a moderate positive correlation with the total scores for 'willingness to communicate', indicating that those who accept Hungarian-accented English and their own accent more are also more willing to use the language for oral communication. This seems to suggest that improved language attitudes have the potential to later go hand in hand with more willingness to communicate [$\rho(20) = .50$, $p = .018$].

Conversely, 'attitude and motivation' scores were found to be in a moderate negative correlation with 'perfectionism' scores (positive and negative combined), meaning that higher levels of perfectionism occurred together with less acceptance of Hungarian-accented English [$\rho(20) = -.52$; $p = .013$]. When total scores for negative vs. positive perfectionism were counted separately, only 'negative perfectionism' showed a statistically significant relationship with 'attitudes and motivation', namely, there was a moderate negative correlation between the two

524

Gyöngyi Püski:
Language attitudes in the EFL classroom:
Changing learners' attitudes towards non-native-accented English through a teaching experiment
Argumentum 20 (2024), 505–540
Debreceni Egyetemi Kiadó
DOI: 10.34103/ARGUMENTUM/2024/31

scores [$\rho(20) = -.47$; $p = .029$]. This seems to suggest that those who have a predisposition for negative perfectionism might accept Hungarian-accented English less readily than those who experience only positive perfectionism or those who cannot be considered perfectionists at all. However, it was also found that there was a moderate positive correlation between positive and negative perfectionism [$\rho(20) = .60$; $p = .003$], meaning that if scores for one increase, so do scores for the other. Therefore, it seems quite unlikely that one has only one type of perfectionism but no traces of the other. The results are also summarized in Table 1.

	Willingness to communicate	Perfectionism	Negative perfectionism
Attitudes & Motivation	.50*	-.52*	-.47*
Positive perfectionism			.60**

Table 1. Significant correlations between the total scores of the (sub)sections of the pre-test, N= 22 (* = p < .05; ** = p < .01)

4.2 Within-group comparisons

Paired samples *t*-tests were carried out in order to compare the results of the three questionnaires within the same group. The total scores of the three sections of the questionnaires were calculated separately, and the mean of the students' total scores is included in the analysis, marked with *M1*, *M2* and *M3* for the first, second and third questionnaire, respectively. (The highest possible (maximum) score for 'attitudes and motivation' was 250 points, 90 points for 'perfectionism', and 65 points for 'willingness to communicate'.)

In the experimental group, significant differences were found between the total scores for the 'attitudes and motivation' section of each round of questionnaires. The total score of the 'attitudes and motivation' section of the post-test showed a significant increase (*M2* = 190.75, *SD* = 20.01) compared to that of the pre-test (*M1* = 169.92; *SD* = 12.22), *t*(11) = -4.86, *p* = .001). This indicates that after the teaching experiment, students were more willing to accept Hungarian-accented English in general and their own accent in particular, as higher scores mean worrying less about not having a native-like accent in English. On the other hand, no significant difference was found between the control groups' responses to the 'attitudes and motivation' section of the first and second questionnaires (*M1* = 171.90; *SD* = 17.84, *M2* = 176.80, *SD* = 20.08), *t*(9) = -1.16, *p* = .276).

The experimental group's scores for the 'attitudes and motivation' section of the delayed post-test still showed a significant increase (*M3* = 183.67, *SD* = 23.92) in comparison with the pre-test (*M1* = 169.92, *SD* = 12.22), *t*(11) = -2.99, *p* = .012, although to a lesser extent. This means that, after the end of the intervention period, the tendency to show more acceptance towards Hungarian-accented English was maintained, but the difference became less pronounced compared to the post-test. In the control group, no significant difference was found between the scores of the 'attitudes and motivation' section of the first and third questionnaires (*M1* = 171.90, *SD* = 17.84, *M3* = 177.30, *SD* = 18.34), *t*(9) = -1.00, *p* = .344).

Following from the results discussed in the previous paragraph, a significant decrease was found between the total scores of the 'attitudes and motivation' section of the post-test (*M2* =

190.75, *SD* = 20.01) and the delayed post-test (*M3* = 183.67, *SD* = 23.92) in the experimental group, *t*(11) = 2.41, *p* = .035. This means that the positive effect achieved by the intervention period was stronger in the immediate post-test, while the delayed post-test showed a weakening of this effect. No significant difference was found between the respective scores of the control group (*M2* = 176.80, *SD* = 20.08, *M3* = 177.30, *SD* = 18.34), *t*(9)= -0.11, *p* = .918). The means of the total scores for the 'attitudes and motivation' section of the three questionnaires are summarized in Table 2 below.

Questionnaire	Group (*n*)	Mean of total scores (*SD*)
Attitudes & motivation 1	Experimental (12)	169.92 (12.22)
	Control (10)	171.90 (17.84)
Attitudes & motivation 2	Experimental (12)	**190.75** (20.01)
	Control (10)	176.80 (20.08)
Attitudes & motivation 3	Experimental (12)	**183.67** (23.92)
	Control (10)	177.30 (18.34)

Table 2. Mean of total scores for the 'attitudes and motivation' section

There was no significant difference between the total scores for perfectionism across the three questionnaires for either the experimental or the control group. The results of the experimental group when the pre-test and the post-test results for the 'perfectionism' section are compared are the following: *M1* = 60.00, *SD* = 13.15, *M2* = 58.67, *SD* = 12.94, *t*(11) = 1.15, *p*= .274. Similarly, no significant difference was found between the corresponding scores of the control group: *M1* = 55.10, *SD* = 9.24, *M2* =54.30, *SD* = 10.54, *t*(9) = 0.18, *p* = .864. When the pre-test and the delayed post-test scores are compared, the results are the following for the experimental group: *M1* = 60.00, *SD* = 13.15, *M3* = 60.08, *SD* = 14.49, *t*(11) = -0.04, *p* = .971; and for the control group: *M1* = 55.10, *SD* = 9.24, *M3* = 52.90, *SD* = 12.36, *t*(9) = 1.09, *p* = .305. The comparison of the post-and delayed post-test scores showed no significant difference, either. The experimental group's scores are as follows: *M2* = 58.67, *SD* = 12.94, *M3* = 60.08, *SD* = 14.49, *t*(11) = -0.51, *p* = .622. The corresponding results of the control group were *M2* = 54.30, *SD* = 10.54, *M3* = 52.90, *SD* = 12.36, *t*(9) = 0.27, *p* = .794.

Participants' predisposition for perfectionism seems to be more difficult to change than their language attitudes and motivation in the course of a few months through teaching. This is not surprising, as a short-term teaching experiment with a very specific focus probably will not be able to change a personality trait, and the teaching experiment did not focus on changing participants' perfectionism. Instead, participants' perfectionism scores might have played a role in the effectiveness of the intervention.

Similarly to perfectionism, the participants' scores for the 'willingness to communicate' section showed no significant differences across the three questionnaires. When the pre- and post-test results are compared, the results for the experimental group are as follows: $M1 = 43.75$, $SD = 11.23$, $M2 = 43.50$, $SD = 12.44$, $t(11) = 0.16$, $p = .877$. The corresponding results for the control group were $M1 = 47.40$, $SD = 10.30$, $M2 = 43.80$, $SD = 11.15$, $t(9) = 1.07$, $p = .312$. Comparing the 'willingness to communicate' scores on the pre- and the delayed post-test yielded the following results for the experimental group: $M1 = 43.75$, $SD = 11.23$, $M3 = 43.25$, $SD = 11.19$, $t(11) = 0.28$, $p = .783$; and for the control group: $M1 = 47.40$, $SD = 10.30$, $M3 = 48.20$, $SD = 6.51$, $t(9) = -0.42$, $p = .685$. Lastly, a comparison between the results of the post- and the delayed post-test was made, but no significant difference was found, as the results of the experimental group ($M2 = 43.50$, $SD = 12.44$, $M3 = 43.25$, $SD = 11.19$, $t(11) = 0.13$, $p = .897$) and the control group ($M2 = 43.80$, $SD = 11.15$, $M3 = 48.20$, $SD = 6.51$, $t(9) = -1.26$, $p = .241$) show.

Therefore, as the above discussion shows, significant differences were found between the total scores for the 'attitudes and motivation' section of each round of questionnaires in the experimental group, but no significant differences were found between the pre-, post-, and delayed post-test scores of the other two sections of the questionnaire, i.e. 'perfectionism' and 'willingness to communicate'.

5 Discussion

The answer to the first research question (What is the relationship between *attitudes and motivation, perfectionism,* and *willingness to communicate*?) indicates that there is a negative correlation between 'attitudes and motivation' and 'perfectionism', meaning that those students who have higher expectations towards themselves in general seem to be less satisfied with Hungarian-accented English and their own accent. For them, 'perfection' seems to be connected to 'native-likeness', similarly to Jenkins's 2007 findings. Also, those students who have more negative views about Hungarian-accented English and their own accent also seem less willing to communicate orally in their target language. This is a considerable problem for EFL teaching and learning in Hungary, as being unwilling to use one's L2 defeats the main purpose of foreign language learning, and, therefore, improving students' attitudes in the classroom seems to be an important task for teachers and designers of the EFL curriculum. The findings are in line with MacIntyre et al.'s 1998 model of willingness to communicate, which suggests a relationship between WTC and language attitudes.

The answer to the second research question, i.e. whether more positive language attitudes and motivational patterns can be achieved in EFL learners with regard to their own and others' non-native accent in English through an indirect teaching experiment familiarizing students with several native and non-native varieties of English, is definitely a positive one. The potential role model status of non-native teachers, that is, successful non-native speakers in the EFL classroom (e.g., Medgyes 1994 and 2001, Ayudhya 2021) seems to be supported by the results in this context, as well, as students started to view Hungarian-accented English and their own accent less negatively after the intervention. This also suggests that Hall's 2012 suggestion, namely, that L1 speakers should not be constructed as the ultimate source of wisdom when it comes to language learning could be achieved through familiarizing students with multiple native and non-native varieties of English. In addition, the inclusion of lesser-known native

accents was also well received by the students. The immediate in-class reactions to these accents (e.g., Scottish, New Zealand, Scouse, Cockney accent, etc.) showed students' surprise at the salient differences between the accents of L1 speakers of English, some of whom they believed were EFL learners due to their accents' being different from the native accents they had been familiar with. The results show that Fang and Ren's 2018 proposal to familiarize learners with Global Englishes to enhance their critical thinking about native-centered ideologies might be a fruitful method to counter native speakerism in the classroom.

Murphy (2014) evaluated Javier Bardem's speech as a good candidate for a non-native speech sample for language learners, as it is not only clearly understandable but also comes from a successful person who can be seen as a role model. The present investigation proves that the list of non-native speech samples from popular and/or successful people can be considerably expanded; and it seems that these samples do provide beneficial input for EFL learners.

The fact that a significant increase is observable in the participants of the experimental group's mean of total scores for the 'attitudes and motivation' questions on both the immediate and the delayed post-test shows that introducing various non-standard and non-native varieties to high school students as part of their English classes can be an indirect method of developing more positive attitudes in the students towards Hungarian-accented English, as well as their own accent in English. This underlines the findings of the pilot study (Püski 2023a), which indicated that the university student respondents would have appreciated if they had been introduced to a larger variety of Englishes during their high school years, as it would have been reassuring for them and could have helped them to have less negative views about their own English. This idea also goes hand in hand with Rose et al.'s 2021 suggestion to incorporate Global Englishes into TESOL in order to help students encounter a more practical and less theoretical approach to learning English.

As Seidlhofer (2011) notes, communication between non-native speakers is highlighted in the conceptualization of ELF (similarly to the overarching Global Englishes approach), which indicates that L1 standards might not always apply for ELF speakers. As in EFL and ELF contexts native-like proficiency is not likely to be a relevant and achievable goal (because ELF is for the transmission of meaning and effective communication between speakers of different L1s), there seems to be a large discrepancy between what is considered to be relevant in English language teaching and what is relevant for lingua franca communication. The findings of this study suggest that this discrepancy between the academic expectations and the practical need that students face can be mitigated by incorporating a larger variety of Englishes into English classes and giving non-native models to the learners to emulate.

The positive impact of the intervention was partially maintained even after the teaching experiment was over, as the delayed post-test, administered three months after the last experimental session, still showed a significant increase in scores for 'attitudes and motivation' compared to the pre-test. However, as there was a significant decrease in scores compared to the second questionnaire, it is also apparent that a relatively short intervention might not be enough to maintain the positive impact of the experimental teaching materials. Incorporating the introduction of a larger variety of Englishes into the EFL curriculum might be more effective, since, that way, learning about the diversity of English would be an everyday practice, that is, a sustained, long term alternative to the experimental teaching period, which might be a good measure against the weakening of positive attitude change.

The third research question, whether changes are observable in the students' *perfectionism* and *willingness to communicate* scores after the experiment, did not yield positive results, as no significant differences were found between the pre-, post-, and delayed post test scores for perfectionism and WTC. Perfectionism can be seen as a feature closer to a personality trait than a perception which can be more easily changed, which is implied by Hamachek (1978), Terry-Short et al. (1995), and Chan (2007) when they describe it as a quality influencing people's daily functioning. Similarly, the unchangeability of WTC in a short period of time is not surprising, considering that this complex concept is made up of social and individual, affective-cognitive, motivational, situational, behavioral intention and communication-related layers, according to MacIntyre et al. (1998). The importance of the 'perfectionism' and 'WTC' rating scales lies more in the discovery of correlations between *attitudes and motivation, perfectionism* and *willingness to communicate* in the Hungarian high school EFL context, which, in the long run, might suggest that changed language attitudes could eventually coexist with changes in one or the other related concept.

6   Conclusion

The results suggest that introducing multiple native and non-native accents to Hungarian EFL students in a classroom setting in high school can have a positive impact on their attitudes towards non-native-accented English. While the positive impact of the teaching experiment on the participants' attitudes was still significant three months after the last experimental session, there was also a significant decrease compared to the post-test results. This suggests that long-term results would be achievable if the experimental materials were included in the EFL classes for the whole school year or the teaching period were repeated multiple times. As EFL teachers might not have the time and resources to look for and include extracurricular teaching materials on their own in their regular 45- or 60-minute class sessions, which are expected to follow a pre-designed schedule, it would be more helpful for teachers and students alike if the EFL curriculum required the inclusion of a larger variety of accent samples, and teaching materials were provided for this purpose.

In further studies, it would be useful to not only test the participants' responses through a written questionnaire, but also investigate whether their actual accent production becomes more comprehensible if a greater emphasis is placed on inclusivity towards non-native accents and the clear transmission of meaning.

References

Agheyisi, R., & Fishman, J. A. (1970): Language attitude studies: A brief survey of methodological approaches. *Anthropological Linguistics 12*.5, 137–157.

Albarracín, D., Sunderrajan A., Lohmann S., Chan, M. S. & Jiang, D. (2019 [2018]): The psychology of attitudes, motivation, and persuasion. In: Albarracín, D. & Johnson, B. T. (eds.): *The handbook of attitudes (2nd edition)*. New York: Routledge, 3–44. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315178103

Anchimbe, E. A. (2006): The native-speaker fever in English language teaching (ELT): Pitting pedagogical competence against historical origin. *Linguistik Online* 26.1, 3–14. https://10.13092/lo.26.618

Aneja, G. A. (2016): Rethinking nativeness: Toward a dynamic paradigm of (non)native speakering. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 13.4, 351–379. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2016.1185373

Ayudhya, P. J. N. (2021): Self-perceptions of non-native students in an undergraduate TESOL program. *English Language Teaching* 14.7, 58–71. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n7p58

Baker, A. (2014): Exploring teachers' knowledge of second language pronunciation techniques: Teacher cognitions, observed classroom practices, and student perceptions. *TESOL Quarterly* 48.1, 136–163. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.99

Baran-Łucarz, M. (2014): Pronunciation anxiety and willingness to communicate in the foreign language classroom. *Concordia Working Papers in Applied Linguistics* 5, 36–49.

Baugh, J. (2016): Linguistic profiling and discrimination. In: García, O., Flores, N. & Spotti, M. (eds.): *The Oxford handbook of language and society.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 349–368. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190212896.013.13

Benson, P. & Lor, W. (1999): Conceptions of language and language learning. *System* 27, 459–472. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00045-7

Bialystok, E. & Hakuta, K. (1994): *In other words: The psychology and science of second language acquisition*. New York: Basic Books. https://doi.org/10.2307/416807

Birdsong, D. (1992): Ultimate attainment in second language acquisition. *Language* 68, 23–52. https://doi.org/10.2307/416851

Blommaert, J. (2010): The sociolinguistics of globalization (Cambridge Approaches to Language Contact). Chapter 1: A critical sociolinguistics of globalization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511845307

Blommaert, J. (2012.) Supervernaculars and their dialects. *Dutch Journal of Applied Linguistics* 1.1, 1–14.

Bourdieu, P. (1977): The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information* 16(6), 645–668. https://doi.org/10.1177/053901847701600601

Chan, D.W. (2007): Positive and negative perfectionism among Chinese gifted students in Hong Kong: Their relationships to general self- efficacy and subjective well-being. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted* 31.1, 77–102. https://doi.org/10.4219/jeg-2007-512

Cook, V. (1999): Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 33.2, 185–209. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587717

Cook, V. (2000): Comments on Vivian Cook's "Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching". The Author Responds**.** *TESOL Quarterly* 34.2, 329–332. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587957

Cook, V. (2002): Background to the L2 user**.** In: Cook, V. (ed.): *Portraits of the L2 User*. Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters, 1– 28. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853595851

Coppinger, L. & Sheridan, S. (2022): Accent anxiety: An exploration of non-native accent as a source of speaking anxiety among English as a foreign language (EFL) students. *Journal for the Psychology of Language Learning* 4.2, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.52598/jpll/4/2/6

Crystal, D. (1997): *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486999

Dauer, R. M. (2005): The Lingua Franca Core: A new model for pronunciation instruction? *TESOL Quarterly* 39, 543–550. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588494

Derwing, T. M. & Munro, M. J. (2015): *Pronunciation fundamentals: Evidence-based perspectives for L2 teaching and research*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/lllt.42

Dörnyei, Z. (2005): *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009): The L2 motivational self system. In: Dörnyei, Z. & Ushioda, M. (eds.): *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters, 9–42. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691293-003

Dörnyei, Z. & Csizér, K. (2002): Some dynamics of language attitudes and motivation: Results of a longitudinal nationwide survey. *Applied Linguistics* 23.4, 421–462. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/23.4.421

Dörnyei, Z., Csizér, K. & Németh, N. (2006): *Motivation, language attitudes and globalisation: A Hungarian perspective*. Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853598876

Drewelow, I. & Theobald, A. (2007): A comparison of the attitudes of learners, instructors, and native French speakers about the pronunciation of French: An exploratory study. *Foreign Language Annals* 40.3, 491–520. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2007.tb02872.x

Edwards, J. (1999): Refining our understanding of language attitudes. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 18.1, 101–110. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X99018001007

Fang, F. (G.) & Ren, W. (2018): Developing students' awareness of Global Englishes, *ELT Journal*, 72.4, 384–394. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy012

Fishbein, M. (1965): A consideration of beliefs, attitudes and their relationships. In: Steiner, I. D. & Fishbein, M. (eds.): *Current studies in social psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 107–120.

Flett, G. L., Hewitt P. L., Su, C. & Flett K. D. (2016): Perfectionism in language learners: Review, conceptualization, and recommendations for teachers and school psychologists. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology* 31.2, 75–101. https://doi.org/10.1177/0829573516638

Frost, R. O. & Marten, P. A. (1990): Perfectionism and evaluative threat. *Cognitive Therapy and Research* 14, 559–572.

Galloway, N. (2011): An investigation of Japanese university students' attitudes towards English (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Southampton.

Galloway, N. & Rose, H. (2015): *Introducing Global Englishes*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315734347

Graddol, D. (1997): *The Future of English?* London: British Council.

Gregersen, T. & Horowitz, E. K. (2002): Language learning and perfectionism: Anxious and non-anxious language learners' reactions to their own oral performance. *The Modern Language Journal* 86.4, 562–570. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00161

Grosjean, F. (1989): Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language* 36.1, 3–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X(89)90048-5

Hahn, L. D. (2004): Primary stress and intelligibility: Research to motivate the teaching of suprasegmentals. *TESOL Quarterly* 38, 201–233. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588378

Hall, S. J. (2012): Deconstructing aspects of native speakerism: Reflections from in-service teacher education. *Journal of Asia TEFL* 9.3, 107–130.

Hamachek, D. E. (1978): Psychodynamics of normal and neurotic perfectionism. *Psychology* 1.5, 27–33.

Higgins, E. T. (1987): Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review* 94, 319–340. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.94.3.319

Isaacs, T. (2018): Shifting sands in second language pronunciation teaching and assessment research and practice. *Language Assessment Quarterly* 15, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2018.1472264

Jenkins, J. (1998): Which pronunciation norms and models for English as an International Language? *ELT Journal* 52.2, 119–126. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/52.2.119

Jenkins, J. (2002): A sociolinguistically based, empirically researched pronunciation syllabus for English as an international language. *Applied Linguistics* 23.1, 83–103. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/23.1.83

Jenkins, J. (2007): *English as a lingua franca: Attitudes and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. & Leung, C. (2014): English as a Lingua Franca. In: Kunnan, A. J. (ed.): *The Companion to Language Assessment*. Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley, 1605–1616. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118411360.wbcla047

Johnson, J. S. & Newport E. L. (1989): Critical period effects in second language learning: The influence of maturational state on the acquisition of English as a second language. *Cognitive Psychology* 21, 60–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(89)90003-0

Jørgensen, J. N., Karrebæk, M. S., Madsen, L. M. & Møller, J. S. (2011): Polylanguaging in superdiversity. *Diversities* 13.2, 23–37.

Kachru, B. B. (1990): World Englishes and applied linguistics. *World Englishes* 9.1, 3–20. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1990.tb00683.x

Kachru, B. B. (1992): World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching* 25.1, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800006583

Kachru, B. B. (1997): World Englishes and English-using communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 17, 66–87. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190500003287

Kachru, Y. & Nelson, C. L. (2006): *World Englishes in Asian Contexts*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Kennedy, S. & Trofimovich, P. (2010): Language awareness and second language pronunciation: A classroom study. *Language Awareness* 19.3, 171–185. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2010.486439

Khatib, M. & Nourzadeh, S. (2014): Development and validation of an instructional willingness to communicate questionnaire. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 36, 266–283. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2014.914523

Krashen, S. (1981): *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Lambert, W. E. & Lambert, W. (1964): *Social Psychology,* Chapter 4. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 49–69.

Lee, J. J. (2005): The Native speaker: An achievable model? *Asian EFL Journal* 7. 2, 152–163.

Leonard, J. (2019): Beyond '(non) native-speakerism': Being or becoming a native-speaker teacher of English. *Applied Linguistics Review* 10.4, 677–703. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2017-0033

Levis, J. M. (2005): Changing contexts and shifting paradigms in pronunciation teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 39.3, 369–377. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588485

Lindemann, S, Litzenberg, J. & Subtileru N. (2014): Problematizing the dependence on L1 norms in pronunciation teaching: Attitudes toward second language accents. In: Levis, J. & Moyer, A. (eds.): *Social dynamics in second language accent.* (Trends in applied linguistics). Boston/Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 171–194. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614511762.171

Litzenberg, J. (2014): Pre-service teacher perspectives towards pedagogical uses of non-native and native speech samples. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 26.2, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12084

MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z. & Noels, K. A. (1998): Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *Modern Language Journal* 82.4, 545–562. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb05543.x

Mahboob, A. (2004): Native or nonnative: What do students enrolled in an intensive English program think? In: Kammhi-Stein, L. (ed.): *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspective on nonnative English speaking professionals.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 121–147. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.9648

Mahboob, A. (2005): Beyond the native speaker in TESOL. Culture, Context, & Communication 30, 60–93.

Mahboob, A. (2018): Beyond Global Englishes: Teaching English as a dynamic language. *RELC Journal* 49.1, 36–57. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688218754944

Markus, H. & Nurius, P. (1986): Possible selves. *American Psychologist* 41.9, 954–969. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.41.9.954

Matsuda, M. J. (1991): Voices of America: Accent, antidiscrimination law, and a jurisprudence for the last reconstruction. *The Yale Law Journal* 100.5, 1329–1407.

Matsuda, A. & Friedrich, P. (2011): English as an international language: A curriculum blueprint. *World Englishes* 30.3, 332–344. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2011.01717.x

Matsuda, A. & Friedrich, P. (2012): Selecting an instructional variety for an EIL curriculum. In: Matsuda, A. (ed.): *Principles and practices of teaching English as an International Language.* Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters, 17–27. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847697042-003

Matsuda, A. & Matsuda, P. K. (2001): Autonomy and collaboration in teacher education: Journal sharing among native and nonnative English-speaking teachers. *CATESOL Journal* 13.1, 109–121.

Mauranen, A. (2018): Conceptualising ELF. In: Jenkins, J., Baker, W., & Dewey, M. (eds.): *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca.* Oxford and New York: Routledge, 7–24.

McArthur T. (1987): The English languages? *English Today* 3.3, 9–13. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078400013511

McKay, S. L. (2018): English as an International Language: What it is and what it means for pedagogy. *RELC Journal* 49.1, 9–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217738817

Medgyes, P. (1994): *The non-native teacher.* London: Macmillian.

Medgyes, P. (2001): When the teacher is a non-native speaker. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* 3, 429–442.

Milroy, J. (2001): Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5.4, 530–555. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00163

Monfared, A. & Khatib, M. (2018): English or Englishes? Outer and Expanding Circle teachers' awareness of and attitudes towards their Own variants of English in ESL/EFL teaching contexts. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* 43.2, 56–75. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n2.4

Murphy, J. M. (2014): Intelligible, comprehensible, non-native models in ESL/EFL pronunciation teaching. *System* 42, 258–269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.12.007

Nikula, T. & Moore, P. (2016): Exploring translanguaging in CLIL. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 22.2, 237–249. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1254151

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J. & Tannenbaum, P. H. (1957): *The Measurement of Meaning.* Urbana: University of Illinois.

Otsuji, E. & Pennycook, A. (2010): Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 7.3, 240–254. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710903414331

Paradis, M. (2004): *A neurolinguistic theory of bilingualism.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/sibil.18

Püski, Gy. (2023a): Az idegen nyelvi kiejtéssel kapcsolatos nyelvtanulói attitűdök és a nyelvi önértékelés: A nyelvtanulói attitűdök tanítás során történő formálhatóságának vizsgálata [Investigating language attitudes towards non-native accents and linguistic self-evaluation in learners of English as a foreign language: The changeability of language learners' attitudes through teaching]. *Alkalmazott Nyelvtudomány Különszám* 2023.2, 81–97. http://dx.doi.org/10.18460/ANY.K.2023.2.005

Püski, Gy. (2023b): Language attitudes in the classroom: Investigating the changeability of Hungarian EFL learners' attitudes towards L2 accents of English through teaching. In: Molnár D. & Molnár, D. (eds.): *XXVI. Tavaszi Szél Konferencia 2023 Tanulmánykötet. II. kötet*, 57–67.

Rampton, M. B. H. (1990): Displacing the 'native speaker': Expertise, affiliation and inheritance. *ELT Journal* 44.2, 97–101. https://doi.org/10.1093/eltj/44.2.97

Rokeach, M. (1968): The nature of attitudes. In: Sills, E. (ed.): International encyclopedia of the social sciences 1. New York: Macmillan, 449–458.

Rose, H. & Galloway, N. (2019): *Global Englishes for language teaching.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, H., McKinley, J. & Galloway, N. (2021): Global Englishes and language teaching: A review of pedagogical research. *Language Teaching* 54.2, 157–189. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000518

Saito, K. (2012): Effects of instruction on L2 pronunciation development: A synthesis of 15 quasi-experimental intervention studies. *TESOL Quarterly* 46, 842–854. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.67

Saito, K. & Lyster, R. (2012): Effects of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback on L2 pronunciation development of /r/ by Japanese learners of English. *Language Learning* 62, 595–683. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00639.x

Seidlhofer, B. (2011): *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Shaw, W. (1981): Asian student attitudes toward English. In: Smith, L. E. (ed.): *English for Cross-Cultural Communication*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 108–22. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-16572-8_8

Shuck, G. (2004): Conversational performance and the poetic construction of an ideology. *Language in Society* 33.2, 195–222. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404504332021

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1989): Multilingualism and the education of minority children. *Estudios Fronterizos* 8.18-19, 36–67. https://doi.org/10.21670/ref.1989.18-19.a02

Sridhar, K. K. & Sridhar, S. N. (1992): Bridging the paradigm gap: Second-language acquisition theory and indigenized varieties of English. In: Kachru, B. B. (ed.): *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 91–107. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1986.tb00636.x

Stallybrass, O. (1977): Stereotype. In: Bullock, A. & Stallybrass, O. (eds.): *The Fontana dictionary of modern thought.* London: Fontana/Collins, 601–687.

Stoeber, J., Damian, L. E. & Madigan, D. J. (2018): Perfectionism: A motivational perspective. In: Stoeber, J. (ed.): *The psychology of perfectionism: Theory, research, applications*. London: Routledge, 19–43.

Sung, C. C. M. (2016): Does accent matter? Investigating the relationship between accent and identity in English as a lingua franca communication. *System* 60, 55–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.06.002

Tajfel, H. (1982): Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology* 33, 1–39. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.33.020182.000245

Terry-Short, L. A., Glynn Owens, R., Slade, P. D. & Dewey, M. E. (1995): Positive and negative perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences* 18.5, 663–668. https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(94)00192-U

Woodrow, L. (2006): Anxiety and speaking English as a second language. *RELC Journal* 37.3, 308–328. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688206071315

Gyöngyi Püski
University of Szeged
Doctoral School in Linguistics
English Applied Linguistics program
H-6722 Szeged
gyongyi.puski@gmail.com

Appendix

For ease of reference, only the list of questions is provided (in both Hungarian and English) in the Appendix, with titles for the sections. These titles were not included in the students' version of the questionnaire. Please see the studies and questionnaires which were used as a basis for the compilation of this questionnaire in the Methodology section.
(The questionnaire also contained open question items, the results of which are beyond the scope of this paper.)

Students needed to mark their answers on 5-point Likert scales, where
1 = *egyáltalán nem gondolom így* "I do not agree at all"
2 = *inkább nem így gondolom* "I mostly do not agree"
3 = *egyet is értek meg nem is* "I somewhat agree, somewhat disagree"
4 = *nagyjából így gondolom* "I mostly agree"
5 = *teljes mértékben így gondolom* "I completely agree"

For Part 2 of the 'willingness to communicate' section, the meanings of the five points on the Likert scales were slightly different, as student had to mark how likely it was that they would behave in certain situations the described way.
1= *egyáltalán nem* "not at all"
2 = *inkább nem* "rather not"
3 = *lehet* "maybe"
4 = *valószínűleg* "probably"
5 = *biztosan* "certainly"

A) Hungarian (original) version[1]

Attitudes and motivation section[2]
1. Anyanyelvi kiejtéssel szeretném beszélni az angolt.
2. Magyar akcentussal beszélek angolul.
3. Fontos nekem, hogy az angol kiejtésemen ne érződjön, hogy magyar vagyok.
4. Úgy gondolom, hogy a magyar akcentussal beszélt angol szép.
5. Biztos vagyok benne, hogy meg fogok tanulni anyanyelvi kiejtéssel beszélni angolul.
6. Szeretem a magyar akcentussal beszélt angolt.
7. A magyar akcentussal beszélt angolt nehéz komolyan venni.
8. Könnyen megértem a magyar akcentussal beszélt angolt.
9. Jelenleg anyanyelvi kiejtéssel beszélek angolul.
10. Szeretek idegen nyelvet tanulni.

---

[1] In the 'attitudes and motivation' section, question 9 (due to participants' misunderstanding), and questions 29 and 30 (due to difficulty of categorization into L1 vs. L2 orientation, i.e. positive or negative opinions about non-native English accents) were eliminated from the final analysis.

[2] In the 'attitudes and motivation' section, reverse coding was used for items indicating L2 orientation, i.e. negative opinions about non-native accents or a strong desire to sound native-like, i.e. questions 1, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 33, 35, 36, 39, 41, 42, 45, 47, 48, 52.

11. A tökéletes idegennyelv-tudáshoz az anyanyelvi kiejtés elsajátítása is hozzátartozik.
12. Elégedett vagyok az angol kiejtésemmel.
13. A magyar akcentussal beszélt angol nevetséges.
14. Félek megszólalni angolul a magyaros kiejtésem miatt.
15. A kiejtésem miatt sosem féltem angolul megszólalni.
16. A magyaros kiejtés megmutatja, hogy az ember honnan származik, és ez jó dolog.
17. Általában félek megszólalni angolul.
18. Nem szívesen beszélek angolul mások előtt.
19. Szeretném amerikai akcentussal beszélni az angolt.
20. Szeretném brit akcentussal beszélni az angolt.
21. Nehéz nyelvnek tartom az angolt.
22. Ha egy nyelvtanuló anyanyelvi kiejtéssel beszél angolul, elveszti az eredeti identitását, önazonosságát.
23. Zavar a saját magyar akcentusom.
24. Zavar, ha mások magyar akcentussal beszélnek angolul.
25. Zavar, ha valakinek a kiejtésén érződik, hogy nem az angol az anyanyelve.
26. Szerintem a különféle akcentusok elfogadhatók.
27. Főként a kiejtésre figyelek, amikor angolul beszélek.
28. Főként az érthetőségre törekszem, amikor angolul beszélek.
29. Főként a nyelvtanra figyelek, amikor angolul beszélek.
30. Főként a szóhasználatra figyelek, amikor angolul beszélek.
31. Az a célom, hogy külföldön tanuljak/dolgozzak felnőttként.
32. Sokszor nézek angolul filmet/sorozatot.
33. Az iskolai angolórákon számomra fontos az angol kiejtésemet az anyanyelvihez közelíteni.
34. Dicsérték már az angol kiejtésemet.
35. Az iskolai angolórákon elvárás, hogy anyanyelvi-szerű kiejtéssel beszéljünk angolul.
36. Kaptam már negatív kritikát az angol kiejtésemmel kapcsolatban.
37. Szeretem az angol nyelvet.
38. Szeretem tanulni az angol nyelvet.
39. Megkritizálom azokat, akik erős magyar akcentussal beszélik az angolt.
40. Ha megértem, mit mond a másik angolul, akkor nem számít, milyen a kiejtése.
41. Nem szeretem, ha mások hallják az angol kiejtésemet, ezért inkább nem beszélek mások előtt angolul.
42. Ha nem anyanyelvi a kiejtésem, akkor nem beszélek jól angolul.
43. Lehet valakinek nagyon magas szintű az angoltudása akkor is, ha nem anyanyelvi a kiejtése.
44. A nem anyanyelvi angoltanárok is lehetnek olyan hatékonyak a nyelvoktatásban, mint az anyanyelviek.
45. Szeretném, hogy ne lehessen hallani, hogy magyar vagyok, amikor angolul beszélek.
46. Szívesen próbálkozom az angol beszéddel, és nem félek attól, hogy rosszul ejtek ki valamit.
47. Szégyellem, ha az angol kiejtésemből rájönnek, hogy nem vagyok anyanyelvi beszélő.
48. Az anyanyelvi beszélők nagyjából egyformán beszélnek angolul.
49. Az angoltanulás egyik legfőbb célja, hogy más nemzetiségűekkel is meg tudjuk értetni magunkat.

50. Fontosabb az, hogy megértsenek, amikor angolul beszélek, mint az, hogy „tökéletes" kiejtésem legyen.
51. Nincs gond azzal, ha valakinek „magyaros" a kiejtése, amikor angolul beszél.
52. Ha jobban hasonlítana az angol kiejtésem az anyanyelvihez, bátrabban megszólalnék.
53. Nem akarok úgy hangozni, mintha az angol lenne az anyanyelvem.

Perfectionism section
1. Fontos számomra, hogy teljes mértékben kompetens, hozzáértő legyek abban, amit csinálok.
2. Jellemző rám, hogy jól szervezett és rendezett vagyok.
3. Felzaklat, ha hibázom.
4. Számomra nagyon fontos, hogy mindig ötöst kapjak.
5. Magasabb elvárásaim vannak önmagammal szemben, mint a legtöbb embernek.
6. Törekszem a tökéletességre a feladataim elvégzésekor.
7. Ha valaki az osztályban jobban csinál meg egy feladatot, mint én, úgy érzem, sikertelen vagyok.
8. Csak a kimagasló eredmény számít elég jónak.
9. Nagyon jó vagyok abban, hogy egy cél érdekében erőfeszítéseket tegyek.
10. Nem elégszem meg a minimummal, az „éppen elégséges" számomra nem megfelelő cél.
11. Még ha nagyon odafigyelve végzek is el egy feladatot, gyakran úgy érzem, hogy nem tökéletes az eredmény.
12. Utálom, ha nem én vagyok a legjobb valamiben.
13. Nagyon magas elvárásaim vannak önmagammal szemben.
14. Ha nem teljesítek jól mindig, akkor az emberek nem fognak tisztelni.
15. Mivel alapos és precíz vagyok, ritkán adok ki hibás munkát a kezemből.
16. Gyakran kételkedem abban, hogy az egyszerű hétköznapi feladataimat jól végzem-e.
17. Minél kevesebbet hibázom, annál többen fognak szeretni engem.
18. Mindig a lehető legjobb eredményre törekszem, és teszek is azért, hogy ezt elérjem.

Willingness to communicate section, Part 1
1. Hajlandó vagyok angolul beszélni órán, akkor is, ha gyakran hibázom.
2. Hajlandó vagyok angolul beszélni órán, akkor is, ha tudom, hogy van a csoportban olyan, aki jobban beszél nálam angolul.
3. Szívesen adok elő vagy beszélek mások előtt angolul.
4. Akkor is hajlandó vagyok angolul beszélni órán, ha a hibáimra gyakran felhívja a figyelmet a tanárom.
5. Szívesen beszélek páros vagy csoportmunkában angolul.
6. Sokszor jelentkezem angolórán, hogy én mondjam meg a választ.
7. Szeretek angolul beszélni.
8. Bátran megszólalok angolul.

Willingness to communicate section, Part 2[3]
1. Ha egy külföldivel találkozom az utcán, megijedek, ha segítséget kér tőlem angolul.
2. Ha egy külföldivel találkozom a boltban, aki láthatóan nem talál valamit, magamtól odamegyek, és angolul megkérdezem, hogy miben segíthetek.
3. Egy angol anyanyelvű diák érkezik az iskolába, aki nem beszél egyáltalán magyarul, és valakinek körbe kell vezetnie. Bártan jelentkezem a feladatra.
4. Amerikai tanár érkezik előadást tartani az iskolába. Kérdéseket lehet feltenni neki. Szeretnék kérdezni, de félek, hogy rossz a kiejtésem, ezért inkább csöndben maradok.
5. Megkérnek, hogy egy, az iskolánkat népszerűsítő videóban olvassak fel egy rövid beszédet angolul. Először örülök a felkérésnek, de nem akarom, hogy az egész iskola meghallja az angol kiejtésemet, ezért inkább nem vállalom el.

B) English version[4]
Attitudes and motivation section[5]
1. I would like to speak English with a native-like accent.
2. I speak English with a Hungarian accent.
3. Making sure that my accent in English does not reveal that I am Hungarian is important to me.
4. I think that Hungarian-accented English is beautiful.
5. I am sure that I will learn to speak English with a native-like accent.
6. I like Hungarian-accented English.
7. Hungarian-accented English is difficult to take seriously.
8. I can understand Hungarian-accented English easily.
9. Currently I speak English with a native-like accent.
10. I like learning foreign languages.
11. The perfect knowledge of a foreign language includes native-like pronunciation, too.
12. I am satisfied with my accent in English.
13. Hungarian-accented English is ridiculous.
14. I am scared to speak English because of my Hungarian accent.
15. I have never been scared to speak English because of my accent.
16. Having a Hungarian accent in English shows where one is from, and that is a good thing.
17. I am usually scared to speak English.
18. I do not like to speak English in front of others.
19. I would like to speak English with an American accent.
20. I would like to speak English with a British accent.
21. I think English is a difficult language.
22. If a language learner speaks English with a native-like accent, they lose their original identity.

---

[3] The responses for three situations in the second part of the 'willingness to communicate' section, questions 1, 4 and 5, were reverse coded.

[4] In the 'attitudes and motivation' section, question 9 (due to participants' misunderstanding), and questions 29 and 30 (due to difficulty of categorization into L1 vs. L2 orientation, i.e. positive or negative opinions about non-native English accents) were eliminated from the final analysis.

[5] In the 'attitudes and motivation' section, reverse coding was used for items indicating L2 orientation, i.e. negative opinions about non-native accents or a strong desire to sound native-like, i.e. questions 1, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 33, 35, 36, 39, 41, 42, 45, 47, 48, 52.

23. My own Hungarian accent bothers me.
24. If others speak English with a Hungarian accent, it bothers me.
25. It bothers me if someone's accent in English reveals that it is not their first language.
26. I think the diversity of accents is acceptable.
27. I mainly focus on pronunciation when I speak English.
28. I mainly focus on intelligibility when I speak English.
29. I mainly focus on grammar when I speak English.
30. I mainly focus on vocabulary when I speak English.
31. My goal is to study/work abroad as an adult.
32. I often watch films/TV series in English.
33. In high school English classes, trying to approximate native pronunciation is important to me.
34. I have been praised for my accent in English.
35. It is a requirement in high school English classes that we have a native-like accent in English.
36. I have been negatively criticized for my accent in English.
37. I like the English language.
38. I like learning English.
39. I criticize those who have a strong Hungarian accent in English.
40. If I can understand what the other person says in English, their pronunciation does not matter.
41. I don't like when others hear my accent in English, so I rather do not speak English in front of others.
42. If my accent is not native-like, I do not speak English well.
43. One can have very advanced level English knowledge even if they do not have a native-like accent.
44. Non-native English-speaking teachers can teach the language as effectively as native English-speaking teachers.
45. I would prefer if others could not tell that I am Hungarian when I speak English.
46. I like trying to speak English and I am not scared of not pronouncing something well.
47. I feel ashamed if people notice, based on my accent, that I am not a native speaker of English.
48. All native speakers speak English roughly the same way.
49. One of the most important goals of learning English is being able to make ourselves understood when we meet people of other nationalities.
50. Others' understanding me when I speak English is more important than having a "perfect" accent.
51. There is no problem with having a Hungarian accent in English.
52. If my accent were more similar to the "native speaker accent", I would be more willing to speak English.
53. I don't want to sound like a native speaker of English.

Perfectionism section
1. It is important to me that I be thoroughly competent in what I do.
2. I am an organized person.

3. I am upset if I make a mistake.
4. Getting a 5 [the best grade in Hungary] all the time is very important to me.
5. I set higher expectations towards myself than most people.
6. I strive for perfection when doing my tasks.
7. If someone does a task in class better than I do, then I feel like a failure.
8. Only outstanding performance is good enough.
9. I am very good at focusing my efforts on attaining a goal.
10. I am not satisfied with the "bare minimum"; what is "minimally satisfactory" is not the right goal for me.
11. Even when I do a task very carefully, I often feel that the result is not perfect.
12. I hate being less than the best at things.
13. I have extremely high expectations towards myself.
14. If I do not do well all the time, people will not respect me.
15. As I am thorough and precise, my finished tasks rarely contain mistakes.
16. I usually have doubts about the simple everyday things that I do.
17. The fewer mistakes I make; the more people will like me.
18. I always strive for the best possible result, and I make an effort to reach this goal.

Willingness to communicate section, Part 1
1. I am willing to speak English even if I often make mistakes.
2. I am willing to speak English in class even if I know that there are students in my English group who are better than me at speaking English.
3. I am willing to give a presentation or speak in front of others in English.
4. I am willing to speak English in class even if my teacher points out my mistakes frequently.
5. I am willing to talk in group- or pair-work English language learning activities.
6. I often volunteer in English class to give the answer [to the teacher's questions].
7. I love speaking English.
8. I am not scared to speak English.

Willingness to communicate section, Part 2[6]
1. If I meet a foreigner on the street, I get scared if they ask for help in English.
2. If I meet a foreigner in a shop and they visibly cannot find something, I take the initiative and go up to them and ask them in English if I can help.
3. A native English-speaking student arrives at our school, who does not speak Hungarian at all. Someone needs to show them around. I confidently volunteer to do so.
4. An American teacher arrives at our school to give a lecture. We can ask questions. I would like to ask a question but I am scared that my pronunciation is bad, so I stay silent.
5. I am asked to read a short speech in a video promoting our school. At first I am happy about the request, but I don't want the whole school to hear my English pronunciation so I rather turn it down.

---

[6] The responses for three situations in the second part of the 'willingness to communicate' section, questions 1, 4 and 5, were reverse coded.