

LANGUAGE ATTITUDE RESEARCH: WHAT, HOW AND WHY

MICHAŁ REMISZEWSKI

Introduction

The present paper deals with the socio-psychological perspective in language attitude research. An attempt will be made to fulfil three specific aims. Some earlier evaluative approaches toward language will be presented first, as it appears that the road toward recognizing the socio-psychological aspects as decisive in language attitudes was a long one. Next, a short discussion will follow of methodology in language attitude research, which basically amounts to the “matched-guise technique” and its modifications. With regard to current knowledge, it will be suggested that after the enthusiasm following the initial wave of studies, resulting in the belief in a high regularity pattern in people’s attitudes toward languages, researchers are now at the point of admitting that the complexity of the overall picture of language evaluation seems much more intricate than it originally appeared. On this basis, areas featuring the most unresolved issues will be suggested as the primary domain of further research. Also the so-called “fine-grained” approach, as coined by Edwards (1999), will be discussed, as one of the most intriguing new trends in current language attitude research. In the light of this new approach it will be shown how language attitude researchers are closing ranks with sociolinguists. Paradoxically, the emergence of Social Psychology of Language, the mother discipline of language attitude studies, was postulated as a reaction to complete negligence of socio-psychological factors in sociolinguistic research (Giles, 1979; Smith et al., 1980; Fraser and Scherer, 1982). Now it seems that the relationship between Sociolinguistics and Social Psychology of Language is one of close collaboration. Finally, some comments will be made regarding the rationale behind, and the applicability of, language attitude research.

Earlier studies on language evaluation

Language attitude studies conducted within the socio-psychological framework were introduced into social research in the 1960s. Of course evaluative aspects in language studies are of a longer pedigree and can be traced back to at least as early as the turn of the 19th century when Herder formed the theory of language as the manifestation of the people who speak it, and in this way reflecting their attributes or even national character. Obviously this perspective left a great deal of room for forming various biased assessments concerning different languages. Following Herder's ideas, Wilhelm von Humboldt claimed that some languages exhibit greater sophistication than others, thus indicating greater advancement as instruments of thought. Thus von Humboldt represented the ethnocentricity of the Eurocentric evolutionist model (cf. Williams, 1992). Other attempts to bring evaluative aspects into language studies concerned such dimensions of language as correctness, adequacy and aesthetics. Within the approach based on correctness, it is assumed that certain language varieties are simply wrong while others are correct. That way of reasoning is still occasionally employed, especially in reference to non-standard dialects and low-status accents. However, as a result of research into non-standard dialects and, commonly regarded incorrect grammatical forms (cf. Labov et al., 1968; Labov, 1976) such as double negation, lack of the -s marker on third-person singular present tense verb forms, etc., it has been demonstrated that "Grammatical forms which are most typical of working-class dialects have low status, because of their association with groups who have low prestige in our society. This low status leads to the belief that these forms are 'bad' and they are therefore judged to be 'wrong'" (Trudgill and Giles, 1976: 4). Consequently, it has been accepted, at least by linguists, that labeling of language varieties as "right" and "wrong" has little to do with their actual linguistic values, but instead is based on purely social judgements.

Another, once common, form of language evaluation is based on the assumption that certain languages are better or more adequate than others to be used for specific purposes. This view was demonstrated most frequently in relation to Creole languages and pidgins. However, according to the existing evidence, processes of creolisation include other linguistic processes, allowing the language to fit the needs of its speakers, thus making it fully adequate to be used for whatever needs might arise. Yet another theory suggesting superiority and inferiority of some languages over others concerned aesthetic issues. In this vein the so-called "intrinsic value" hypothesis was proposed, according to which languages and dialects possessed aesthetic values which were intrinsic in them, and it was those values that were supposed to determine their eventual position and status in the society. Like Herder's theories, the "intrinsic value" hypothesis was ultimately rejected. A number of studies demonstrated, that to a sample of hearers possessing no knowledge of the two competing dialects, neither one sounded definitely more aesthetic or prestigious than the other (Edwards, 1995). However, rejecting the "intrinsic value" hypothesis led researchers to a new, very important conclusion. Namely, having rejected the above mentioned aspects of language as determinants of language or dialect status, scholars began to hypothesize that it is only through the social knowledge of a language group that our subjective evaluations of that language are

shaped. This contention was best manifested in the so-called "imposed norm" hypothesis and gave powerful impetus to research in the area of language attitudes as we know it today.

Language Attitude Research – the socio-psychological approach

It was precisely this assumption on which Wallace Lambert based his classic study of language attitudes in Montreal (1967). Lambert predicted that upon mere hearing somebody speaking a given language or dialect, people would be likely to assign to that person the whole set of social stereotypes of the group whose language or dialect this person uses. Lambert's Montreal study investigated the reactions of French-speaking Canadians and their English-speaking compatriots to speech samples in French and English. Lambert devised an ingenious experimental method known as "matched-guise technique" (hence MGT), which, though modified (Fasold, 1984), remains a standard procedure in language attitude research today. In its original form, MGT was designed to eliminate from the experiment the interference of all variables except language. In Lambert's experiment a number of bilingual speakers were asked to read a text twice: once they read the text in one language, then they read its translation in the other. Those readings were then recorded and arranged on tape in a haphazard way, so that two samples from the same person did not occur one after the other; instead, they were interspersed which was supposed to create in the subjects (listeners, or as they are often called – "judges") an illusion that each of the consecutive speech samples comes from a different speaker. Consequently, a subject listening to, for example ten samples, would likely assume that ten different people were taped, whereas, of course, the real number of speakers was five. Once the randomly ordered samples were on tape, a number of bilingual judges from the Montreal community, including Anglo- and Frankophones, were asked to listen to the recordings and rate the readers on a number of different features, such as social status, friendliness, intelligence, etc. If the same reader received different ratings in different language samples, the conclusion would be that the main determinant was the difference in language. In this way Lambert sought to check the degree to which subjects evaluated readers depending exclusively on the variable of language. Lambert employed the MGT to measure evaluational reactions to French and English in the bilingual community of Montreal. It turned out that the ratings which the speakers received in their English guises were different from those which they obtained in French readings. Another fundamental finding was that while the English guises were regularly rated higher on some traits, there was a consistency in how they were downgraded on others – the difference occurred on the same traits in all speakers. Further research conducted by Lambert and his associates led him to group the traits into three general categories, or dimensions: *competence*, *integrity* and *social attractiveness* – recently the latter two have been put under one category of *solidarity*. The rationale behind this classification lay in the fact that in a number of experiments, those accents which scored high on such traits as intelligence, education or industriousness (*competence*) were consistently perceived less favorably on such traits as friendliness, honesty and general likeability (*solidarity*). MGT remains a standard tool for researchers

today, although a number of modifications have been introduced to its original form in order to fit the specific needs resulting from different experimental contexts, or different research purposes. It is common now, for example, to have only one guiser (bilingual reader) to produce different accent performances, which are then played to two or more separate subject groups. It also must be noted that apart from MGT in its original and modified forms, a number of other, no less ingenious techniques have been invented to elicit language attitudes. One of the most spectacular is also the most indirect and the least self-conscious. In it the response toward a request or instruction is measured to see how it depends on the language in which the request or instruction has been made. The procedure is very naturalistic and the subjects are not aware of being involved in an experiment. In a study by Bourhis and Giles (1976) the experiment was conducted on several groups of movie theatergoers – each of a number of audiences, before seeing the film heard an announcement in which they were asked to participate in a poll concerning their preferences and habits as moviegoers. More specifically, they were asked to pick up and fill out questionnaires that would be waiting for them in the foyer, after the film has ended. The announcements were made in four different language varieties used in the community where the experiment was conducted. The power of response to the announcements was measured by the number of submitted questionnaires. As a result, it turned out that the choice of language of request had a significant impact on how its recipients responded to it. However, it must be admitted that although very subtle and naturalistic, this method is very seldom used; an overwhelming majority of studies still employ MGT-based methodology.

As was already mentioned, Lambert discovered a regularity in the evaluation of particular personality traits which are now usually grouped into two separate categories – competence and solidarity. Over time, as the body of data from language attitude research was growing, it became apparent that there exists another consistency – a general pattern along which reactions to languages seemed to follow. According to this pattern, standard varieties of a given language, i.e. those possessing greater prestige, or those spoken by the majority, normally surpass non-standard varieties (e.g. regional dialects) in terms of competence ratings; on the other hand, the non-standard dialects, or rather their speakers, receive higher ratings on the solidarity dimension. Initially, most interest in the study of language attitudes was exhibited in Britain, Canada and the United States, where social variation of language and its role in the formation of evaluative reactions was a socially relevant phenomenon. Results of most British studies concerned with RP and regional accents have been in line with the mentioned pattern; relative to speakers of various regional dialects, RP speakers consistently received higher ratings on competence, but lower on solidarity traits (for overview see Giles and Powesland, 1975). Similarly, in the United States, Standard American English has been typically associated with status and competence but received less favorable evaluations than regional accents on solidarity (e.g. Luhman, 1990). It must be noted at this point that in the United States most research has been devoted to the language of ethnic minorities, mainly Black and Mexican Americans, rather than to regional accents. Nevertheless also in these contexts, findings have been mostly consistent with results of British research – minority language varieties are

downgraded on competence but upgraded on solidarity (e.g. Carranza and Ryan, 1975).

This consistency in evaluative reactions toward language encouraged a tendency to see such pattern of reactions to language as a phenomenon of a totally universal nature. This view is presented in most introductory sociolinguistic textbooks in their sections devoted to language attitudes. However, as language attitudes researchers continued their experimental work and new data were coming in, it became more and more apparent that in some geographical and social contexts, the language attitude reaction pattern was reverse to what was expected given results from earlier work. For example, it was discovered that the French speaking minority in Maine valued their speech no less (on any dimension) than English – the standard language, used by the majority group. Also, further investigation of reactions to foreign-accented English in the US demonstrated that, while non-standard accents are indeed downgraded relative to Standard American English (SAE), especially on competence traits, some accents evoke quite reverse evaluations. Namely speakers of British-accented English, as well as those speaking with a Japanese accent are rated higher in terms of competence and lower on solidarity than speakers of SAE. Although these, seemingly isolated, exceptions to the rule appear easy to be accounted for in terms of the high status and respect for the civilizational advancement of Britain and Japan, further exploration of the nature of language attitudes has shown that obtaining a full understanding of how language attitudes work is more challenging than it had seemed.

Compounding factors

Indeed, the pattern of evaluational reactions to language varies not only depending on what accent is being assessed, but also *when*, i.e. in what context it is used. The existence of a relation between context in which language is spoken and its social evaluation was signaled by Giles and Powesland (1975) where they reported a number of studies in which the favorableness of reactions toward languages or accents largely depended on the social context in which they were used. More recently, Cargile (1997) discovered that, contrary to what could be expected (given results of studies devoted to other Asian accents in English), in different contexts the same Chinese-accented speaker of English is evaluated differently on both competence and solidarity. More specifically, in Cargile's experiment the two contexts were a job interview, in which the speaker was introduced to the judges as job applicant, and a classroom situation in which the speaker was introduced as professor reading an excerpt from a student's essay. While the speaker was rated as more attractive and more competent in the interview context, he was downgraded on these dimensions in the classroom situation.

Although it has been attempted to account for the role of social context in language attitudes, and more work is being done in this area, the existing theorizing in this matter is still inadequate and fails to explain results of studies like Cargile's.

Another compounding factor in the explanation of variability of language attitudes is the role played by paralinguistic factors, mainly the speech rate and age of the speaker.

This new approach emerged from the observation that all previous studies of reactions to RP speech had been based purely on young adult voices. Giles et al. (1990) conducted an experiment adding to the traditional variable of the dialect, two more: speech rate and the age of the speaker. Indeed, the results demonstrated that age and speech rate can in fact, to some extent, affect judgements of the personality of the speaker. However any solid theory accounting for the way in which such factors influence people's language attitudes has not yet emerged. Given the increasing number of unanswered questions, one sees how far we still are from obtaining a full picture of how language attitudes really work. Since the enthusiastic generalizations of early experimental results stemming from the belief in the "standard – competence/ non-standard-solidarity" pattern, enough has been done to make us aware that much more progress needs to be made before we fully discover and comprehend the complex socio-psychological mechanisms behind social evaluation of language.

The "fine-grained" approach

One of the most interesting recent trends in language attitude research has to do with the role played by particular speech attributes in language evaluation. As was already mentioned here earlier, for the most part, language attitudes researchers have been concerned with evaluations triggered by speech samples. Judges are typically asked to give their reactions to a recording of a passage or an interview. Obviously, such samples contain a whole range of linguistic features making it possible for the listener to identify the variety as language/dialect X or Y. Only after this identification has been completed is it possible for the listener to react to the sample as coming from a member of language/dialect group X or Y, and assign to the speaker the traits stereotypically associated with this group. The new trend, in turn, on one hand continues along this line of previous, traditional research, but on the other takes a more "fine-grained" approach towards evaluative reactions to language (Edwards, 1999). Namely, the scope of the study is being shifted to the social meaning of, or evaluations triggered by, particular speech attributes – chiefly phonetic features. The work in this precisely focused perspective directly approaches, in its scope, research conducted earlier in variationist sociolinguistics. Indeed, the pioneering work on social dimension of language at its microlinguistic level has been conducted in such studies as Labov's (1972) classic now investigation of the social stratification of (r) in New York City, or Trudgill's (1974) study of English spoken in Norwich. However, much as those valuable studies have contributed to our understanding of the distribution of specific linguistic features across social groups, they did not extensively cover attitudinal aspects involved in the phenomena discussed. Over time, however, it became apparent that certain aspects of linguistic variation cannot be fully understood with the exclusion of psychological factors intrinsic in them. Heralding a new trend, Trudgill (1983) studied the use of

typically American phonetic features by British pop singers and rock bands. After a careful analysis of the pronunciation in songs of some of the most successful British pop and rock performers Trudgill selected the most typical American phonetic features present in it and analyzed their frequency of occurrence. It turned out that there was a marked tendency among British singers toward American pronunciation. In an attempt to explain the popularity of American pronunciation in British pop and rock singing, Trudgill suggested the effect of psychological processes, mainly those earlier covered by Le Page and Giles in their socio-psychological works. Trudgill's study is not only highly interesting but also valuable in that it recognized the increasing need of incorporating psychological knowledge into the sociolinguistic inquiry. It appeared that only in this way could researchers get closer to understanding language in its relation to social issues. Today, study devoted to the social dimension of particular speech attributes is rapidly developing, thus also attracting more and more interest to the attitudinal and evaluational aspects of the issue. In Cunningham-Anderson's (1994) study of native speaker reactions to non-native Swedish speech it was hypothesized that different phonetic features of a given non-native accent trigger different reactions from native speakers, in that they would react positively to one feature and negatively to another feature of the same accent. It turned out that certain non-native pronunciations were more stigmatized than others, and caused the judges to respond to them negatively, especially in terms of intelligence of the speaker.

Just as some phonetic features may be more stigmatized than others, in some contexts a single vowel may add, at least in the minds of the speakers, to the prestige of their speech. That was suggested in Boberg's (1999) study of the patterns in American English foreign (a) nativization. When foreign words spelled containing letter <a> (e.g., llama, Mazda) are phonologically nativized in today's English, the foreign vowel [a] is pronounced as either short /æ/ (as in fat) or long /ɑ:/ (as in father). British and American English exhibit different nativization patterns. Namely, when British nativization is a phonological process with /æ/ being a default form, American English shows an increasing tendency toward adopting /ɑ:/ – type of realization that "...cannot be explained entirely in phonological terms" (Boberg, 1999: 49).

To account for this preference, Boberg suggests an attitudinal explanation as the most probable. Namely, according to Boberg, it is possible that Americans (p. 57): "invest this use of /ɑ:/ with the stereotypical social attributes of the speakers of dialects in which it does occur, most notably British Received Pronunciation and the speech of Boston 'Brahmins'." Therefore, the explanation suggests the attractiveness of /ɑ:/ as a feature perceived as typically British, and automatically adding prestige or, at least correctness to one's speech.

The increasing interest of researchers in the role of attitudinal factors at a microlinguistic level provides more and more pieces to the puzzle of how attitudes work not only in the choice of single phonetic features (Boberg), but also in their perception. More precisely, there is a question of how social information about the speaker affects the perception of linguistic variables in their speech. A study devoted to the American-Canadian context of speech perception in the Detroit area (Niedzielski, 1999) showed that when subjects are exposed to the same speech sample, the only independent variable

being information about the speaker's nationality (Canadian or American), they perceive the same phonetic feature differently. Although residents of Detroit possess in their speech a feature called CR (Canadian Raising), they tend not to hear it in their own speech. Moreover, the very same feature constitutes one of the most stereotypical pronunciation characteristics associated by Detroiters with Canadian English. In Niedzielski's experiment a group of respondents, residents of Detroit, took perceptual tests in which they were asked to choose from a set of computer-resynthesized vowels that they felt corresponded to the vowels they heard in a speech sample from a fellow Detroiters. Each informant listened to 50 sentences recorded on tape and was asked to pay special attention to the vowel they heard in a particular word in each sentence. After this, respondents were asked to choose from six computer resynthesized vowels the one which best matched the one they heard on tape. The deception in this experiment was in that half of the respondents were told that the speaker was from Detroit, and the other half were told that the speaker was from Windsor, Ontario in Canada, a town directly across the Detroit River from Detroit. "They each heard the same speaker, and because this was the only difference in the two sets of respondents, any differences in the answers from these two sets must be attributed to the expectations that the respondents had based on these two labels" (Niedzielski, 1999: 63). Results demonstrated that labels given to the speakers heavily influenced the perception of certain vowels by the respondents. The pattern of this influence showed that: "... CR (Canadian Raising) is a Canadian stereotype for Detroit residents, while remaining a virtually unnoticed feature of their own dialect" (p. 64).

With the recent interest of language attitude research in microlinguistic features and their social perception, it becomes visible that Social Psychology of Language, at least in one of its areas, is tightening its bonds with Sociolinguistics. Paradoxically, at the turn of the 1980s, the main reason for postulating the need to start a new discipline of socio-psycholinguistic character was, among others, the negligent attitude that traditional sociolinguistics demonstrated toward the socio-psychological aspects of issues described by it. It must be admitted that although seen as a sub-branch of linguistics (Trudgill, 1974b) the influence of such disciplines as sociology, anthropology and education on sociolinguistics was undisputed. However the scale of impact of social psychology on sociolinguistics remained minimal. "One discipline conspicuous perhaps by its absence (...) is that of social psychology" (Giles 1979:1). That state of affairs appeared unjustifiable, especially to a group of social psychologists who well recognized the tremendous role of socio-psychological processes in language use. Much as they respected the primary concern of sociolinguistics, i.e. description and taxonomy, they advised the incorporation in it of what Giles called the "why" of sociolinguistic behavior: "...one begins to feel a little uneasy when few attempts have been made to move us from the what, when and where to the why of socio-linguistic phenomena. Hence, if we are going to understand why individuals acquire, use and react to language and its varieties in the way they do, we require a greater understanding of the dynamics of attitudes, motivations, identities and intentions, that is, social psychological phenomena" (Giles, 1979: 2). Such claims gave impetus for the development of the socio-psychological perspective within language studies (Smith, Giles and Hewstone,

1980) which became known as Social Psychology of Language (Fraser and Scherer, 1982). Although this new field of study is still mostly regarded as a sub-branch of sociolinguistics (Quasthoff, 1987), its rapid development and can be perceived as the beginning of a new independent discipline (Giles and Wieman, 1993). It remains to be seen when, if at all, we will see Social Psychology of Language as a fully autonomous endeavor. However, given the recent interest of researchers in the social meaning of linguistic features at a micro-level, one cannot escape the impression that, at least in some of its areas, socio-psycholinguistic inquiry, rather than diverging from sociolinguistics, is tightening cooperation with it. As Edwards (1999) puts it in his comments on this new trend: "In general the argument is for a more linguistically aware social psychology or a more psychologically aware sociolinguistics" (p.108).

Why do language attitude research?

As was said earlier, language attitude studies have become most popular in the multilingual contexts of such countries as Britain, the USA and Canada. Nevertheless, there has also been much interest in it in other multilingual places like Switzerland (Weil and Schneider, 1993) as well as in monolingual countries with some dialectal variation, like Denmark (Ladegaard, 1998). That language attitude studies prove useful in such areas as language policy and education has been recognized quite widely (Richards et al., 1996). However it still seems justified to pose the question of language attitude studies in monolingual and monodialectal contexts. What is the rationale behind investigating language attitudes across national and state borders? It seems that the reason for continuing such research even in those place where language attitudes seemingly remain a socially irrelevant question is twofold. First of all language attitude research, as it has been developed within the socio-psychological framework, provides us with extremely valuable insight in some of the most crucial areas of social interaction – stereotypes. It must be remembered that one of Lambert's main goals in designing MGT, as an indirect procedure of attitude elicitation, was the assumption that the so-called social stereotypes might be independent from, or at least might not reflect personal attitudes held about the object of stereotyping. In other words, methodology developed in language attitude research made it possible to look deeper into, and get closer to an understanding of the division between what is sometimes referred to as "overt" and "covert" stereotypes. What it means in an experimental context was demonstrated in Denmark where Ladegaard (1998) employed the matched-guise technique to test the popular notion of Denmark as being a society where class-consciousness is virtually non-existent. Indeed, as Ladegaard notes, Denmark is commonly presented as the exact opposite of the highly social-class-conscious Britain. To illustrate this point, Ladegaard quotes Fivelsdal and Schramm-Nielsen (1993: 29): "most people make a point of paying as little attention as possible to rank and status." The results of Ladegaard's experiment, however, show that this stereotypical view of Denmark is not quite reflected in its social reality. The MGT procedure revealed that different dialects spoken in Denmark did actually affect the social perception of their

speakers, to the point of judging the speaker as less intelligent when he spoke one dialect and more intelligent when he used another one. In this way a language attitude study contributed to a better understanding of regional intergroup relations in a country where traditional open-ended questionnaire opinion polls managed only to elicit overt attitudes or stereotypes based more on political correctness than actual personal attitudes of respondents. Similarly, studies conducted in New Zealand discovered a gap between overt attitudes of native speakers of New Zealand English toward American English and Australian English (Bayard, 2000). Overtly, they are seen as unattractive and "ugly", but covertly, respondent New Zealanders exhibit more solidarity feelings toward those non-native accents than to their own. Here, what seems to be the main benefit of language attitude research is the possibility of getting to know such phenomena as group low self-esteem or national inferiority feelings, which are extremely difficult to elicit through methods based on traditional open-ended questionnaires.

Secondly, language attitude research can and most definitely should be used in language teaching. Although this avenue for the application of language attitude data has already been mentioned as commonly recognized and accepted, recent studies provide a whole new benefit for language teachers. Cunningham-Anderson's (1994) study reported above is a perfect example that it is possible to identify and select single linguistic features, mainly phonological, which attract most social stigmatization. If efforts are continued, both in the refinement and introduction of this methodology in different language and national contexts, we may soon see language teaching, in specific contexts, address the elimination from learners' speech of those features, which are most likely to negatively influence the learner's social interaction with members of the foreign language group. This type of application of data, of course, will be most useful in teaching immigrants, but, if shown to be successful, is likely to affect aspects of foreign language teaching in other contexts.

Conclusion

Language attitude research in its present socio-psychological incarnation has emerged as a response to the lack of interest of sociolinguistics in the psychological elements of sociolinguistic problems. Although the relevance of socio-psychological factors for the understanding of language in a social context seems never to have been questioned, for long they remained outside the scope of not only sociolinguistics but also psycholinguistics. The beginnings of a sustained interest in socio-psychological aspects of language use coincided with the moment when research into the nature of linguistic prestige and language status was entering a new stage. Until then it had been assumed that responsibility for the status of linguistic varieties rests not with aesthetic values inherent in them, but is rather determined by social status of its speakers. As a dynamic new field of study – Social Psychology of Language has provided favorable conditions for further studies and language attitudes have become a central concept in socio-psycholinguistic inquiry. Extensive research devoted to the clarification of the nature of language attitudes has provided us with knowledge of certain patterns governing them.

However, as this work proceeds, more and more questions emerge indicating the complexity of the language attitude phenomenon. Although far from providing answers to many questions, language attitude researchers have outlined a methodology allowing us to better understand certain aspects of social behavior. Also, growing in popularity, linguistic orientation within language attitude research ("fine-grained" approach) increases its contribution to language teaching, making it possible to create a socially relevant hierarchy of goals in such areas as second language pronunciation.

In the light of the above discussion, language attitude research emerges as a fully legitimate multidisciplinary inquiry. By investigating such phenomena as evaluative perception of language, language status and linguistic prestige, researchers are addressing some of the most relevant issues of language use in a broad social context. While data coming from language attitude research proves of great value within applied linguistics, they also contribute to the clarification of a more general picture of relations among social groups. Given these merits, language attitude research emerges as an inquiry of further dynamic development.

Bibliography

- Ammon, D., Dittmar, N. and K.J. Mattheier. (eds.). 1987. *Sociolinguistics. Soziolinguistik. An international handbook of the science of language and society*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bayard, D. 2000. "The cultural cringe revisited: Changes through time in Kiwi attitudes toward accents". In Bell A. and K. Kuiper. (eds.). 297–322.
- Bell A. and K. Kuiper. (eds.). 2000. *New Zealand English*. Amsterdam/Wellington: John Benjamins/Victoria University Press.
- Boberg, C. 1999. "The attitudinal component of variation in American English foreign (a) nativization". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 18. 49-62.
- Bourhis, R.Y. and H. Giles. 1976. "The language of cooperation in Wales: a field study". *Language Sciences* 42. 13-16.
- Cargile, A.C. 1997. "Attitudes toward Chinese-accented speech: an investigation in two contexts". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 16. 434-443.
- Carranza, M. and E. Ryan. 1975. "Evaluation reactions of bilingual Anglo and Mexican American adolescents toward speakers of English and Spanish". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 6. 83-104.
- Cunningham-Anderson, U. 1996. "Native speaker reactions to non-native speech". In James, A. and J. Leather. (eds.). 133-144.
- Edwards, J. 1995. *Multilingualism*. London: Penguin Books.
- Edwards, J. 1999. "Refining our understanding of language attitudes". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 18. 101-110.
- Fasold, R. 1984. *The sociolinguistics of society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fivelsdal, E. and I. Schramm-Nielsen. 1993. "Egalitarianism at work: management in Denmark". In Hickson, D.J. (ed.). 27-45.
- Fraser, C. and K.R. Scherer. 1982. (eds.). *Advances in the social psychology of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Giles, H and R. St. Clair. (eds.). 1979. *Language and social psychology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Giles, H. 1979. "Sociolinguistics and social psychology: an introductory essay". In Giles, H and R. St. Clair. (eds.). 1-20.
- Giles, H. and J.M. Wiemann. 1993. "Social psychological studies of language". *American Behavioral Scientist* 36. 262-270.
- Giles, H. and P. Powesland, 1975. *Speech style and social evaluation*. London: Academic Press.

- Giles, H., Coupland, N., Henwood, K., Harriman, J., and J. Coupland. 1990. "The social meaning of RP: an intergenerational perspective". In Ramsaran, S. (ed.). 191-211.
- Hickson, D.J. (ed.). 1993. *Management in Western Europe. Society, culture and organization in twelve nations*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- James, A. and J. Leather. (eds.). 1996. *Studies on language acquisition*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Labov, W. 1976. *Language in the inner city*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W., Cohen, P., Robins, C. and J. Lewis. 1968. *A Study of the non-standard English of Negro and Puerto Rican speakers in New York City*. Philadelphia: U.S. Regional Survey.
- Labov, W. 1972. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Ladegaard, H.J. 1998. "Assessing national stereotypes in language attitude studies: the case of class-consciousness in Denmark". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 19.182-198.
- Lambert, W., Hodgson, R., Gardner, R. and S. Fillenbaum. 1960. "Evaluative reactions to spoken language". *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 60. 44-51.
- Luhman, R. 1990. "Appalachian English stereotypes: language attitudes in Kentucky". *Language in Society*. 19. 331-348.
- Niedzielski, N. 1999. "The effect of social information on the perception of sociolinguistic variables". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. 18. 62-86.
- Putz, M. (ed.). 1997. *Language choices. Conditions, constraints and consequences*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Quasthoff, U. 1987. "Language and identity". In Ammon, D. et al. (eds.). 780-799.
- Ramsaran, S. (ed.). 1990. *Studies in the pronunciation of English*. London: Routledge.
- Richards, J.C., Platt, J., and H. Platt. 1992. *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Harlow: Longman.
- Smith, P.M., Giles, H. and M. Hewstone. 1980. "Sociolinguistics: a social psychological perspective". In St Clair, R. and H. Giles. (eds.). 283-298.
- St Clair, R. and H. Giles. (eds.). 1980. *The social and psychological contexts of language*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Trudgill, P. 1974a. *The social differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trudgill, P. 1974b. *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.
- Trudgill, P. 1983. *On dialect: social and geographical perspectives*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Trudgill, P. and H. Giles. 1976. *Sociolinguistics and linguistic value judgements: correctness, adequacy and aesthetics*. Trier: Linguistic Agency University of Trier.
- Weil, S and H. Schneider, 1997. "Language attitudes in Switzerland: French and German along the language border". In Putz, M. (ed.). 287-304.
- Williams, G. 1992. *Sociolinguistics. A sociological critique*. London: Routledge.