Language Attitudes: An Overview

Dr. Melanie Satraki
Lecturer, Casa College, Nicosia, Cyprus
Corresponding Author: Dr. Melanie Satraki, E-mail: m.satraki@casacollege.ac.cy

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	It was not until 1960 with Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner and Fillebaum that linguists started being scientifically interested in people's views about a language or a dialect and its associations, which were given the name of language attitudes. The present paper addresses this issue by defining language attitudes and why it is important to study how people feel about a linguistic variety and its associations. Reference is made to the several ways of measuring attitudes proposed at times, along with the criticism that has led linguists to support different movements. The main driving force behind this disagreement is based on the question whether attitudes towards a linguistic code lead people to use or abandon it. This overview constitutes an effort to bring the most important matters around language attitudes together and give an impetus to linguists to engage with this field.

1. INTRODUCTION

'Attitude' is an abstract notion of social psychology that has raised doubts over research on it in the field of linguistics and other fields. Such problematic considerations on the issue of attitudes lie in the difficulty of their identification and, consequently, their measurement. Despite all the disagreement on what attitude is and how it can be captured by experimenters, some conclusions have received support. Oppenheim (1992) admits that "most researchers seem to agree that an attitude is a state of readiness, a tendency to respond in a certain manner confronted with certain stimuli" (p. 174). Similarly, Garrett, Coupland and Williams (2006) argue that: "We take it as axiomatic, then, that an attitude is an evaluative orientation to a social object of some sort, but that, being a 'disposition', an attitude is at least potentially an evaluative stance that is sufficiently stable to allow it to be identified and in some sense measured" (p. 3). Then, as for language attitudes, Baker (1992) claims that they constitute views about "language groups, a language itself, its features, uses, cultural associations [and] learning a language" (p. 17).

Throughout the years, the issue of language attitudes has been the topic of many researchers who are concerned with the social psychology of language, since it may affect the behaviour of a speaker, but also their identity. If we accept that language is an 'intimate part' (McGroarty, 1996) or a 'symbol' (Kerswill, 1994) of social identity, then, negative attitudes towards someone's language may make them feel hatred towards it and want to hide or change it. Besides, as Pütz (1995) claims, detesting a language leads to detest all its associations—identity, culture, speakers, etc. Thus, language attitudes can determine the future of that

variety which may be "restoration, preservation, decay or death" (Baker, 1992, p. 9). If people are in favour of a language, they will protect it and pass it from one generation to another. But, if they do not like it, they will let it die.

2. APPROACHING LANGUAGE ATTITUDES
Based on the agreement that an attitude can be measured and, at the same time, being challenged by the difficulty in doing so, researchers from different disciplines have already approached the issue in numerous ways. Each of these has received credit and criticism as well, and they must be studied analytically by a researcher, before making any decisions. Scientists have approached the issue of attitudes in several ways and, from time to time, various distinctions have been made between the different measures. In 1964, Cook and Selltiz referred to five kinds of them: a) 'measures in which inferences are drawn from self-reports of beliefs, feelings, behaviors, etc.', b) 'measures in which inferences are drawn from observation of overt behavior', c) 'measures in which inferences are drawn from the individual's reaction to or interpretation of partially structured stimuli', d) 'measures in which inferences are drawn from performance of 'objective' tasks', and e) 'measures in which inferences are drawn from physiological reactions to the attitudinal object or representations of it'. But, through time, the distinction of approaches to language attitudes that prevailed is the one proposed by Ryan, Giles and Hewstone (1988). According to it, approaches to language attitudes fall into three groups: direct measures, indirect measures and societal treatment. All of them have already been used by linguists all over the world, despite their strengths and weaknesses.

99

2.1 Indirect measures
These are the ones have been mostly employed and criticised. Dawes and Smith (1985) distinguished between three types of indirectly measuring attitudes: a) participants' observation without being aware of it, b) observation of aspects of uncontrolled human behaviour, and c) questioning participants in a deceptive way that does not reveal the true purpose of the study. However, the most widely used method in measuring language attitudes—the matched-guise technique—was introduced in 1960 by Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner and Fillenbaum in an effort to examine attitudes of the community of Montreal towards English and French.

"The matched-guise technique is the use of recorded voices of people speaking first in one dialect or language and then in another; that is, in two 'guises'. [...] The recordings are played to listeners who do not know that the two samples of speech are from the same person and who judge the two guises of the same speaker as though they were judging two separate speakers." (Gaies & Beebe, 1991, p. 157)

Generally, judgments are based on a semantic-differential scale of bipolar adjectives (e.g. friendly/unfriendly, educated/uneducated etc). Adjectives are sometimes collected by conducting a 'pool study' where you choose adjectives from the ones used by previous studies, or a pilot study where participants are asked to give positive or negative qualities regarding a linguistic variety. Paltridge and Giles (1984) came to the conclusion that evaluation traits can come under the categories of 'superiority', 'attractiveness' or 'dynamism' of the linguistic variety(ies) under investigation. On the other hand, Zahn and Hopper (1985) referred to

evaluation in terms of 'speaker status', 'speaker solidarity' (or social attractiveness) and 'speaker integrity'.

An adapted version of the matched-guise technique that has been used to measure children's attitudes was proposed by Rosenthal (1974)—the 'Magic Boxes'—where two disguised 'talking' boxes represented people using different varieties. Schneiderman (1976) preferred a puppet-show version of the technique, where two guised puppets were used as stimuli to assess children's attitudes.

The main reason why a researcher should choose an indirect approach to language attitudes is that since the participants are not aware of the true purpose, they are free—from social stereotypes or inhibitions—to express their true, inner feelings. Prejudices and effects of stereotyping are assessed without destroying their natural form by describing it to the subjects (Ladegaard, 1998). Moreover, a matched-guise experiment takes place in pre-arranged settings, consequently, its results can be comparable with other similar studies. On the other hand, evaluations of set-up events based on given attributes cannot stand as representative of attitudes towards real-life events. Besides, the repetition of the same message may lead the participants to infer the true purpose of the study, or the pre-prepared speeches may not sound authentic, especially if they are presented as monologues (Kramer, 1964). Additionally, the evaluation items may be perceived differently by the judges, but also, there is an ethical consideration behind 'fooling' the participants over the exact target of the experiment. This last limitation can be balanced through

debriefing after the data collection process is completed.

2.2 Direct measures

Direct measures are those that ask people what they believe of a linguistic variety in a straightforward way. Studying the existing literature, one notices that questionnaires, interviews and polls of direct questions have been a common tool for measuring languages attitudes. Except for open-ended, multiple-choice and two-way questions, direct measures make use of two rating scales: Thurstone and Likert. The former one requires from the participants to divide a number of statements collected from a pool study or a pilot study, according to their favourability. In the latter, people are asked to rate the statements, pointing out the degree of their agreement with them (Garrett et al., 2006).

What is also worth-mentioning is that folklinguistics (or perceptual dialectology), with Dennis Preston as the leading figure, has proposed another kind of direct measurement of language attitudes. Unlike other direct measures, folklinguistics emphasises on the presence of context. The context is equally important in other discourse-analytic approaches discussed below. It studies attitudes as represented in language use, variation and articulation of perceived difference between varieties and their geographical distribution, through the use of maps, imitation talk and discourse analysis (Preston, 1993; 1999; Miłobóg & Garrett, 2011; Kraut, 2014). Preston (1999), on investigating attitudes towards U.S. regional varieties, asked people to draw maps, illustrating the different dialect regions of the

United States and to evaluate their degree of 'correctness', 'pleasantness' and 'difference' in relation to their regional variety. Garrett (2009) conducted a study on Chinese and Japanese people's attitudes towards Englishes, asking participants to write down the names of countries where English is a native language and give words that characterise each of these spoken varieties (e.g. fun, intelligent, irritating and snobbish).

Studying closely direct approaches to language attitudes, the advantages of obtrusiveness (the experimenters receive direct answers on the issue, rather than making inferences that may not represent reality), anonymity, uniformity of responses and time flexibility come to the surface. At the same time, with direct evaluations the experimenter runs the risk of getting accounts that do not match people's reality, especially when referring to the behavioural component which is better grasped in actual language use. Asking direct questions, "respondents have an idea of which answers are socially desirable. Not wishing to appear deviant, they hide their true feelings and bend their answers to conform to a model of how they ought to answer" (Henerson et al., 1987, p. 135). Also, the questions are hypothetical, therefore the answers are hypothetical, too. Additionally, in oral surveys, the language of the experimenter or the phenomenon of the Observer's Paradox could be biasing factors in the respondents' answers (Knops & van Hout, 1988; Garrett et al., 2006).

2.3 Societal treatment

Societal treatment entails content analysis of how people treat a linguistic variety along with its associations within society. This can be achieved through observation, ethnographic methods and analysis of public documents concerning language policy, advertisements, literary texts, public signs etc. (Garrett et al., 2006). Although such a kind of approach is found to be quite rare in traditional research of language attitudes, it has started gaining support by new researchers due to its engagement with discourse-analytic methods.

"Discourse analysts do what people in their everyday experience of language do instinctively and largely unconsciously: notice patternings of language in use and the circumstances (participants, situations, purposes, outcomes) with which these are typically associated" (Trappes-Lomax, 2004, p. 133). The importance of context in attitude research has been pointed out very early. Rokeach (1968) claims: "The splitting off of attitude-toward-situation from attitude-toward-object has severely retarded the growth of attitude theory. It has resulted in unsophisticated attempts to predict behavior accurately on the basis of a single attitude-toward-object, ignoring the equally relevant attitude-toward-situation" (p. 119). However, such approaches have not been widely used. This movement (Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Gee, 1992; etc.) has shifted from traditional approaches that offer "a view of language as a direct reflection of what goes on in a person's mind to a means of constructing the social world, or versions of it, in the course of everyday interactions" (Hyrkstedt & Kalaja, 1998, p. 347).

The main benefit of the societal treatment approach lies in that it may offer a more complete picture of the status of the linguistic variety within a community. Moreover, language observations in

real situations give more accurate results, since the data are gathered naturally and not via set-up settings. At the same time, in some cases, the researcher saves time and space. However, problems concerning reliability and validity of the societal treatment prevent linguists from making use of it. The fact that it occurs naturally enables neither the replication of the process nor the exclusion of external variables that could cause troubles to the whole experimental process. Also, discourse analysis is applied qualitatively, giving general information on favourability/ unfavourability of a linguistic code (Hyrkstedt & Kalaja, 1998; Garrett 2010).

3. LANGUAGE ATTITUDES AND LINGUISTIC BEHAVIOUR

The issue of attitudes has given rise to two main movements: the mentalist and the behaviourist. According to the mentalist approach, the attitude includes three components: the cognitive, the affective and the behavioural (Edwards 1982). The cognitive component refers to beliefs or practical functions that are further embraced by an entity, the affective component concerns feelings, and the behavioural component is the part that drives an individual's actions towards a certain direction. On the contrary, behaviourists claim that attitude can be grasped only by observing human behaviour (Fasold 1984). From this model and similar ones proposed (Krathwohl et al., 1964; Kerlinger, 1986), two issues arise. On the one hand, if the attitude has different components, these components are 'distinguishable' (Breckler 1984). On the other hand, while the cognitive and the affective components have received universal acceptance, the behavioural has brought forth the question on

whether attitudes—which are first and foremost feelings, views and beliefs—lead humans to behave accordingly.

While some researchers find that attitudes work as predictors of behaviour and an individual's attitude towards an object matches the way he/she acts towards it, some others disagree. They claim that sometimes people do not act according to their feelings, due to several reasons. They point out that "there is no theoretical reason to expect congruence between words and deeds, and, in fact, every reason to expect discrepancies" (Albrecht & Carpenter, 1976, p. 1). Baker (1992) believes that "attitudes OFTEN manage to summarise, explain and predict behaviour. Knowing someone's attitudes to alcohol, for example, MAY sum up likely behaviour in a range of contexts over time" (p. 11). This happens due to the fact that people 'disguise' their true attitudes intentionally, or attitudes are misleading in depicting a speaker's language use. Garrett (2010) adds that in order to achieve a certain reaction from the interlocutor, people 'fashion' their language "to be seen as friendly, as intelligent, as being a member of a particular community" (p. 21-22).

What is even more interesting about the attitude-behaviour relationship is the fact that it is not one-directional. Mummendey (1983) poses the following question: "Predicting behavior from attitudes, or attitudes from behavior?" (p. 143). According to Mummendey's review, there are a number of studies that tried to investigate people's behaviour in an effort to unfold their attitudes, but very few managed to do it in the end.

3.1 Attitudes and behaviour are related

Faris (1928) says that "an attitude is a tendency to act" (p. 277) and Allport (1967) claims that "an attitude characteristically provokes behavior that is acquisitive or avertive" (p. 8). Moreover, Bain (1930) argues:

> "Certainly, 'attitude' is not more vague and ill-defined than 'trait' [...]. While it must be confessed that most writers use such terms as attitude, trait, opinion, wish, interest, disposition, desire, bias, preference, prejudice, will, sentiment, motive, objective, goal, idea, ideal, emotion, and even instinct and reflex, loosely, indefinitely, and often interchangeably, yet it must also be admitted that there is a core of common meaning in all such usages. These, and other similar terms, refer to acquired and conditioned action-patterns that motivate human social behavior." (p. 356)

As Corey alleges, attitudes—as opinions solely— "are of limited practical value unless they presage behavior" (1937, p. 271). Evidence for the existence of a relationship between attitude and behaviour has been provided by DeFleur and Westie (1958). On dealing with the attitude-behaviour relationship, the researchers distinguished between three dimensions: 'verbal', 'autonomic-physiological' and 'overt'. DeFleur and Westie's work constitutes an effort to develop an instrument to measure "the 'salience' of a person's attitudinal orientations" (p. 667); i.e. a person's readiness to turn their verbal expression of attitude into action. Another study that provided evidence for the proportional relationship between attitudes and behaviour was conducted by Jahn (1999). In examining the Croatian community of Istria (northern Adriatic), it

103

was observed that people's negativity in introducing Croatian as the standard language led to the use of non-standard varieties. Additionally, investigating adolescents' attitudes, Ladegaard (2000) found that people who use the vernacular are those with a positive attitude towards it. Furthermore, Shameem (2004) studied attitudes towards and use of different linguistic varieties spoken in multilingual Fiji (English, Fijian and Hindi). "Language attitudes shape language behaviour" (p. 154) was the researcher's conclusion. Also, García (2005) made research on parents' language attitudes and behaviour living in Paraguay towards Spanish and Guaraní (indigenous variety). The interviews revealed that both varieties are highly estimated and used.

Agreement between attitudes and use was also found in even more recent studies: Loredo Gutiérrez et al. (2007), Mettewie & Janssens (2007), Safont Jordà (2007), Themistocleous (2007), Anderbeck (2010), Chakrani & Huang (2012).

3.2 Attitudes and behaviour are unrelated

LaPiere (1934), in his discussion on attitudes and behaviour, argues that "by derivation social attitudes are seldom more than a verbal response to a symbolic situation" (p. 230). In this manner, he was the first to restrict attitude constituents into feelings, excluding actions. Going a step further, he stated that, in measuring attitudes, people may even report that they behave in a way which, being investigated in actual life, may be non-existent. LaPiere (1934) conducted an experiment by visiting a number of restaurants in the U.S., accompanied by a Chinese couple. Whereas only one of them denied access to the couple, when they were sent a letter

being asked whether they would allow Chinese people entering their restaurant, 90% gave a negative response. Years later, Kutner, Wilkins and Yarrow (1952) conducted a similar testing, avoiding previous pitfalls. The same procedure was followed and the same results were obtained. A few years later, Wicker (1969), taking both views into consideration, came to conclude that "it is considerably more likely that attitudes will be unrelated or only slightly related to overt behavior than that attitudes will be closely related to actions" (p. 65).

Jaspaert and Kroon's work (1988) is one of the studies that observed a mismatch between language attitudes and language use. Correlation analysis of the collected data showed that "attitude explains 18% of the variance in the dependent variable" (p. 160). In addition, Choi (2003) confirmed that Paraguayan adolescents hold positive attitudes towards the non-standard variety, but they do not use it.

In another research, dealing with the relationship between language attitudes and language use, Kuncha and Bathula (2004) examined the issue of language shift within the Telugu (an Indian variety) immigrant community in New Zealand. Generally, two important conclusions were brought to surface: a) 95% of Telugu mothers and children hold favourable attitudes towards their mother tongue, but, b) Telugu is used 85%, at home and undergoes a decline from mother to the first child and then to the second. On the contrary, English is used 100%. Further studies supporting attitude-behaviour mismatch include Irish people's attitudes and use of

English and Irish, where although favourable feelings are held towards Irish, it is not part of people's language use (Ó Laoire, 2007). "This seemingly strong belief, however, may constitute more of a passive stance rather than a proactive attitude. [...] Irish is not considered important when it comes to carrying out the everyday activities" (p. 181).

Trudgill (1972) claimed that the mismatch between how people view a variety and its use has to do with overt and covert prestige. 'Overt prestige' is the value attributed to a variant "that people are highly aware of and which is associated more with the speech of higher-status speakers", being evaluated as better. On the other hand, 'covert prestige' refers to a variant to which people give credit without being aware of that, by using it. This often relates to non-standard varieties (Meyerhoff, 2009, p. 37-38).

3.3 Attitudes and behaviour are negatively related

Except for studies that provided evidence for a match or a mismatch between language attitudes and behaviour, there are cases that brought to the surface a more interesting nature of this relationship. To exemplify, Dede (2004) observed that while the assessment of the affective and the behavioural components showed negative attitudes towards the dialect, the cognitive component showed positive stances. These findings strengthen Breckler's view (1984) that each component is distinguishable from the rest. Even more, Baker (1992) alleges that "the cognitive and affective components of attitude may not always be in harmony" (p. 12). Thus, apart from the possibly existent mismatch between attitude and behaviour

that has received immense attention, there seems to be a mismatch between cognition and affect that brings a dichotomy within the attitude.

3.4 Factors influencing the attitude-behaviour relationship

Within this 'blurry' situation, some researchers ended up supporting the relationship between attitude and behaviour, but drawing attention to other influential factors. Ajzen and Fishbein (1977) stated that attitude may be a crucial factor that determines a person's behaviour (although it is not the only one). Byrne and Kelley (1981) added emotional, informational and imaginative responses, as well as expectancies. Attitudes are important, but they do not always govern people's actions. In this way, an attitude is considered as "evaluation of the entity in question" (Ajzen & Fishbein 1977, p. 889), rather than a disposition to act in a certain way as alleged by the opposing movement.

But, for researchers to be consistent in claiming that attitude and behaviour are related, they must make sure that attitude measurement corresponds to behaviour measurement in terms of action, target, context and time to the greatest extent possible. This view was expressed by Schuman and Johnson (1976) who claimed that "the most generally accepted hypothesis for improving A-B [attitude-behaviour] consistency is that attitudinal and behavioral variables should be measured at the same level of specificity" (p. 170-171). Support to this comes from studies where participants reported positive stances towards a linguistic variety and use of it, but its use is restricted to certain functions associated with it, rather than in all contexts of communication (Shameem, 2004; Gardner-Chloros

105

et al., 2005).

Further, in approaching the issue of attitude-behaviour, scientists supported the interference of other variables in this relationship and proposed several models in approaching the issue. DeFleur and Westie (1958) brought forward the 'contingent consistency' approach. According to this view, constraints imposed by society and the feeling of being under the pressure of the watchful eye of social norms affect a person's expressed attitudes and actual behaviour, and consequently the relationship between the two. After all, attitudes are learned through 'human socialisation' (Garrett et al., 2006), therefore they are always under its control.

Later, Fishbein (1963) introduced the concept of 'behaviour intentions'. According to Fishbein's model, behaviour can be predicted if behavioural intentions are tested too. Behavioural intention involves the attitude towards acting out certain behaviour, norms that are associated with that specific behaviour and the individual's willingness to conform to those imposed beliefs. Albrecht and Carpenter (1976) tried to test the effectiveness of the two models, by measuring attitudes, behavioural intentions, normative beliefs and behaviour, making comparisons. Their experiment indicated that both approaches are useful in drawing interrelations between attitude and behaviour.

Mummendey (1983) refers to four kinds of models: 'simple relation models' (behaviour serves as expression of attitude towards an object and the situation), 'interaction models and models of contingent consistency' (DeFleur and Westie's model), 'the Fishbein model' and 'structural

models' (use path analysis in predicting behaviour). Additionally, in 1981, Jaccard suggested the 'behavioral alternative model', according to which an individual has access to behavioural alternatives and in each case he/she "will choose to perform that [...] toward which the most positive attitude is held" (p. 303). Finally, Fazio (1990), with his MODE model, argued that Motivation and Opportunity are Determinants in people's attitudes leading to overt behaviour.

Linguists investigating language attitudes and language use share the same concerns as the ones already expressed about what people believe of a linguistic variety and whether they make use of it. Since attitude-behaviour relationship constitutes a problem for psychology, why should not this be the case with language attitudes and linguistic behaviour relationship for linguistics? Several studies conducted so far managed first and foremost to bring disagreement among linguists. Whereas in some contexts empirical evidence revealed that favourability towards a code leads people to take supportive actions to it—and unfavourability to its avoidance—in some other cases, the results showed that language attitudes and linguistic behaviour do not match. McGroarty (1996), as support to her view on the interconnection between language attitudes and language use, declares that instances of mismatch between the two appear due to modifications of speech, as a result of social constraints. Modifications of language use refer to 'accommodation theory' (Giles & Clair, 1979). Accommodation can be convergent, which takes place when an individual holds positive attitudes

towards a linguistic variety, or divergent when unfavourable attitudes are held.

Studying the results of all the aforementioned research and much more conducted on the doubtful relationship between attitude and behaviour, "we must conclude that there is no single answer to the question of whether attitudes are related to behavior" (Schuman & Johnson, 1976, p. 170). If inconsistency between expressed attitudes and overt actions is not a matter of unreliable methodology, then the truth is found in one—or both—of the following conclusions. Either "there is a tendency toward such consistency [...] a probabilistic relation between holding certain beliefs and attitudes and manifesting certain behaviours" (Insko & Schopler, 1971, p. 27), or language attitudes better work as "predictors of future behavior", since there will be no current context bias (Baker, 1992, p. 16).

4. LANGUAGE ATTITUDES DURING CHILDHOOD

From a sociolinguistic perspective, "a child must first realize that different languages exist, [and] that the words he uses constitute only one of many different ways of speaking. The second thing he learns is the social implications of speaking a particular language" (Aboud, 1976, p. 15). The ability to differentiate between languages or language varieties signifies that the child has possessed language awareness. Although initial studies on children's language awareness concluded that children acquire this ability not earlier than at the age of five, later studies have shown that children distinguish between different

languages even from the age of three. Garrett, Coupland and Williams (2006) allege that language attitudes, like all other kinds of attitude, are learned through human socialisation and if they are acquired early in someone's life, they are more likely to last longer.

4.1 Onset of language attitudes

Despite being an interesting topic for study, the onset of language attitudes does not seem to have attracted the interest of many linguists. One of the difficulties most likely preventing researchers from being engaged with such an issue is that different age groups need to be studied to find what one looks for. And even more difficult is the fact that children need to be approached in different ways. On the other hand, for years, it was thought that people become sensitive to social aspects of a language (or a dialect) not earlier than at the age of nineteen (Labov, 1966). However, worldwide research conducted later on the issue of children's language attitudes provided evidence that even pre-school children do express attitudes towards linguistic codes (Rosenthal, 1974; Schneiderman, 1976; Mercer, 1977; Cremona & Bates, 1977; Day, 1980).

To begin with, Rosenthal (1974) aimed at finding out when American monolingual children start discriminating between Standard English (SE) and Black English (BE), and expressing preference for the two codes. For this study, children from three to five years old were involved in three tasks. The overall result of this study was that, even at this age, people form attitudes towards linguistic varieties. Rosenthal (1974) found out that children attributed higher socio-economic status to the standard variety. However, in expressing their preference,

black children preferred the BE speaker and white children preferred the SE speaker. A further assumption made in the study is that children's language attitudes are influenced by adults (parents, teachers and television) who "condition young children to regard SE as superior and BE as inferior" (p. 52).

Like Rosenthal (1974), Mercer (1977) aimed at examining children's ability to discriminate between their mother tongue and a foreign language (English/French), between varieties of their language (SE/English with a French accent) and between two foreign languages (French/Greek). Again, the subjects ranged from three to five years old and they were monolingual speakers of English. The results revealed that by the age of three to four, children can differentiate between their mother tongue and a foreign language and, a year later, they can recognise different varieties of the same language. By contrast, discrimination between two foreign languages appears after the age of six.

Day (1980) showed that Honolulu kindergarten and first-grade children also start forming language attitudes early. Younger children prefer the dialect, whereas older children prefer the standard variety. Again, Day (1980) attributes this to adults (parents and teachers), like Rosenthal (1974).

4.2 Development of language attitudes

Rosenthal's study (1974) has been an important piece of work since it constituted the starting point of later researchers. Schneiderman (1976) adopted a puppet-show version of the 'Magic Boxes' technique, where two guised puppets were used as stimuli to assess bilingual Welland French children's ethnic and language attitudes towards

English and French, at the age of three to twelve. What was found out is that "female subjects appear quite stable, preferring the French puppet at all age levels. Boys in nursery school are pro-English [...]. Males begin to favour the French puppet from the grade 1 level on. [...] At the grade 2 level and beyond there is little difference in the degree of French preference exhibited by males and females" (p. 35).

Another piece of research that engaged with the development of children's language attitudes was carried out by Cremona and Bates (1977). The researchers examined southern Italian children's attitudes towards their dialect and Standard Italian. The difference with the previous studies lies in the participants' age which ranged from six to ten years old. Children start forming attitudes towards their languages very early and, by the age of eight, they "reject their local dialect at close to 100% level", which they describe as 'bad' and 'abnormal' (p. 230). Their language production rejects dialect even earlier, although some features never stop being used. Another observation is that boys use dialect more, although they still dislike this code. A similar conclusion was drawn by van Bezooijen (1994), in his study on Dutch children's attitudes at the age of seven to ten. At this age, the standard variety is preferred over regional varieties.

Another more recent study on children's (and parents') attitudes was conducted by Shah and Anwar (2015) in Pakistan. Investigating sixth- to eighth- graders' attitudes towards Punjabi (local variety which is the mother tongue), Urdu (the national variety) and English (the international

language), it was observed that children hold negative attitudes towards the non-standard variety since they regard it as the language of lower-class and uneducated villagers. Instead, these children favour the standard variety as it signifies a high social and educational status and it stands as a symbol of national identity. Similarly, English is perceived as the most superior variety. What is important to add is that parents share these views and they believe that if their children use the local variety, they will not be able to master Urdu and English properly.

5. SHIFT AND CHANGE OF LANGUAGE ATTITUDES

"Attitudes change over time—rarely are they static", Baker (1992) argues. The reasons for that vary from social or psychological to political. The latter justifies why language attitudes sometimes 'should' change; for example, "where a language is fighting for survival, encouraging positive attitudes becomes crucial" (p. 97). Or, as in the case of Namibia, the South African administration did not want the indigenous languages to develop, thus, it cultivated negative feelings towards them (De V. Cluver, 2000).

As for the social and psychological reasons for language attitudes change, Baker (1992) provides four possible driving forces behind language change which correspond to possible functions that attitudes may serve. The first one is when someone gets some kind of reward; the second one is the feeling for the psychological security a language makes you feel; the third one relates to personal values and the extent to which someone associates

language with identity; and the last one is the change of attitude in order to learn more about a language or its culture. Apart from personal motives, people may change their language attitudes due to social reinforcement when supporting a certain code, modelling of attitudes by parents, peers, teachers and media, or for the sake of harmony between perception of a code and its use in practice.

Further on, Baker (1992) comes to discuss in more detail the two most important factors of language attitudes' change: age and personal environment. What is for sure is that attitudes are different at different points of someone's life. Making reference to Celtic languages, Baker claims that teenage speakers have less favourable feelings towards the non-standard variety, whereas around forties they tend to go back to 'past values'. Nonetheless, the shift does not come suddenly, but it evolves "slowly and gradually" (p. 106).

Then, it is interesting to study how people of the immediate environment can influence or cause such a change at these different periods. These people are family (parents and siblings), peers and teachers, but also, institutions and mass media. Among all these, the most crucial effect comes from 'home language'. This concerns mainly children whose attitudes "tend to match, or be similar, to their parents" (Baker, 1992, p. 109). Parents pass attitudes to their children according to their experiences. "Thus parents who believe that they may have been stigmatized because of their own language are particularly eager to have their children acquire a standard language" (McGroarty, 1996, p. 19). The next most important influence comes from peers. This is more obvious at teenage

period, since youth culture, as a current trend of the era we live, affects language issues. Additionally, school can play a crucial role in language attitudes' change at that age, via the language used in the curriculum and by the teachers, as well as by the mass media. At a later point in someone's life, influence may come from the work field or business transactions, and the status a variety appears to have within a community (Baker, 1992).

Linn and Piché (1986) used the matched-guise technique, where two recorded speeches in SE and BE were played to black and white adolescent and pre-adolescent students who evaluated them on a semantic differential scale. What the experimenters found is that while some years ago BE was underestimated, black and white people respect BE now and blacks are proud of their language. Contrarily, Bangeni and Kapp (2007) investigated the language attitudes of black university students during the first two years of their studies. The semi-structured interviews indicated that South Africans' attitudes towards English shift during their studies in an English university environment. "Home discourses make way for the more dominant discourses of the institution which are perceived as being socially advantageous" (p. 266). Also, "English signifies social mobility" (p. 266), "education, culture and modernisation" (p. 254); primary values of people at this age.

6. CONCLUSION
The present paper offers an overview of the important aspects concerning language attitudes through the examination of various studies, theories and views. The purpose is to highlight what needs to be taken into account by language experts

researching this field. From this overview, one can realise that language attitudes towards all linguistic codes around the world are very significant and worth investigating since they determine a variety's future. Different disciplines have proposed a number of ways in approaching this area. Linguists dealing with the issue of language attitudes have already shed light through their work on when people start forming attitudes, how these develop through an individual's life and the factors that influence them. Therefore, the ultimate aim of this overview is to invite sociolinguists to engage with the field further in order to come up with stronger conclusions on language attitudes.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Melanie Satraki holds a BA in English Language and Literature, an MA in Applied Linguistics and a PhD in Linguistics, obtained from the University of Cyprus. She is currently a lecturer in the English Language Department of Casa College, as well as the head of the college publications as the Editor-In-Chief. She has worked for several years as an EFL teacher at the secondary- and tertiary-education level. She has presented papers at conferences both home and abroad, and published articles in the field of sociolinguistics. Her research interests include language attitudes, language use, lexical borrowing, code switching, bi-/multi-dialectism, diglossia and linguistic continua, and how these are related to social factors such as gender, ethnicity and context, or how they appear in areas such as the classroom or the media.

REFERENCES

[1] Aboud, F. E. (1976). Social developmental aspects of language. *Paper in Linguistics*, 9 (3-4). 15-37.

[2] Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude–behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84. 888–918.

[3] Albrecht, S., & Carpenter, K. E. (1976). Attitudes as predictors of behaviors versus behavioral intentions: A convergence of research traditions. *Sociometry*, 39. 1-10.

[4] Allport, G. W. (1967). Attitudes. In M. Fishbein (Ed.), *Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1-13.

[5] Anderbeck, K. L. (2010). *Language Use and Attitudes among the Jambi Malays of Sumatra*. SIL International.

[6] Bain, R. (1930). Theory and measurement of attitudes and opinions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 27. 357-379.

[7] Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

[8] Bangeni, B., & Kapp, R. (2007). Shifting language attitudes in a linguistically diverse learning environment in South Africa. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 28 (4). 253-269.

[9] Breckler, S. J. (1984). Empirical validation of affect, behavior, and cognition as distinct components of attitude. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47 (6). 1191- 1205.

[10] Chakrani, B., & Huang, J. L. (2012). The work of ideology: Examining class, language use, and attitudes among Moroccan university students. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. 1-14.

[11] Choi, J. N. (2003). Language attitudes and the future of bilingualism: The case of Paraguay. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 6 (2). 81-94.

[12] Cook, S. W., & Selltiz, C. (1964). A multiple-indicator approach to attitude measurement. *Psychological Bulletin*, 62. 36-55.

[13] Corey, S. M. (1937). Professed attitudes and actual behavior. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 28. 271–280.

[14] Cremona, C., & Bates, E. (1977). The development of attitudes toward dialect in Italian children. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 6 (3). 223-232.

[15] Dawes, R. M., & Smith, T. (1985). Attitudes and opinion measurement. In G. Lindsey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*. 509-566.

[16] Day, R. R. (1980). The development of linguistic attitudes and preferences. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14 (1). 27-37.

[17] Dede, K. (2004). Language attitudes in Xining, Qinghai. *Language and Linguistics*, 5 (3). 543-557.

[18] Deprez, K., & Persoons, Y. (1987). Attitude. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar & K. J. Mattheier (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 125-132.

[19] De Fleur, M. L., & Westie, F. R. (1958). Verbal attitudes and overt acts: An experiment on the salience of attitudes. *American Sociological Review*, 2. 667–673.

[20] De V. Cluver, A. D. (2000). Changing language attitudes: The stigmatisation of Khoekhoegowap in Namibia. *Language Problems & Language Planning*, 24 (1). 77-100.

[21] Edwards, J. (1982). Language attitudes and their implications among English speakers. In E. Ryan & H. Giles (Eds.), *Attitudes towards Language Variation: Social and Applied Contexts*. London: Edward Arnold, 20-33.

[22] Faris, E. (1928). Attitudes and behavior. *American Journal of Sociology*, 34 (2). 271-281.

[23] Fasold, R. (1984). *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.

[24] Fazio, R. H. (1990). Multiple processes by which attitudes guide behavior: The MODE model as an integrative framework. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. San Diego: Academic Press, 75–109.

[25] Fishbein, M. (1963). An investigation of the relationships between beliefs about an object and the attitude toward that object. In *Human Relations*, 16. 233-240.

[26] Gaies, S., & Beebe, J. D. (1991). The matched-guise technique for measuring attitudes and their implications for language education: A critical assessment. In E. Sadtono (Ed.), *Language Acquisition and the Second/Foreign Classroom*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

[27] García, P. (2005). Case study: Parental language attitudes and practices to socialise children in a diglossic society. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8 (4). 328-344.

[28] Gardner-Chloros, P., McEntee-Atalianis, L., & Finnis, K. (2005). Language attitudes and use in a transplanted setting: Greek Cypriots in London. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 2 (1). 52-80.

[29] Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[30] Garrett, P., Coupland, N., & Williams, A. (2006). *Investigating Language Attitudes*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

[31] Gee, J. P. (1992). *The Social Mind*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

[32] Giles, H., & Clair, S. R. (Eds.) (1979). *Language and Social Psychology*. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.

[33] Henerson, M. E., Morris, L. L., & Fitz-Gibbon, C. T. (1987). *How to Measure Attitudes*. Newbury Park: SAGE Publications.

[34] Hyrkstedt, I., & Kalaja, P. (1998). Attitudes toward English and its function in Finland: A discourse-analytic study. *World Englishes*, 17 (3). 345–357.

[35] Ihemere, K. U. (2006). An integrated approach to language attitudes: The case of the Ikwerre of Port Harcourt City, Nigeria. In O. F. Arasanyin & M. Pemberton (Eds.), *Shifting the Center of Africanism in Language Politics and Economic Globalization*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, 194-207.

[36] Insko, C. A, & Schopler, J. (1971). Triadic consistency: A statement of affective-cognitive-conative consistency. In K. Thomas (Ed.), *Attitudes and Behaviour*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 22-33.

[37] Jaccard, J. (1981). Attitudes and behavior: Implications of attitudes toward behavioural alternatives. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 17. 286-307.

[38] Jaspaert, K., & Kroon, S. (1988). The relationship between language attitudes and language choice. In R. van Hout & V. Knops (Eds.), *Language Attitudes in the Dutch Language Area*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications, 157-171.

[39] Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). *Foundations of Behavioral Research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

[40] Kerswill, P. (1994). *Dialects Converging: Rural Speech in Urban Norway*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

[41] Knops, U., & van Hout, R. (1988). *Language Attitudes in the Dutch Language Area*. Dordrecht: Foris.

[42] Kramer, E. (1964). Personality stereotypes in voice: A reconsideration of the data. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 62. 247-251.

[43] Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masia, B. B. (1964). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Book 2 Affective Domain*. New York: Longman.

[44] Kraut, R. (2014). Origins of language attitudes emerge in the perception of foreign-accented speech. *Journal of Second and Multiple Language Acquisition*, 2 (3). 30-38.

[45] Kuncha, R. M., & Bathula, H. (2004). *The Role of Attitudes in Language Shift and Language Maintenance in a New Immigrant Community: A Case Study*. New Zealand: University of Waikato.

[46] Kutner, B., Wilkins, C., & Yarrow, P. R. (1952). Verbal attitudes and overt behavior involving racial prejudice. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 47. 649–652.

[47] Labov, W. (1966). *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

[48] Ladegaard, H. J. (1998). National stereotypes and language attitudes: The perception of British, American and Australian language and culture in Denmark. *Language & Communication*, 18. 251-274.

[49] Lambert, W., Hodgson, R. C., Gardner, R. C., & Fillenbaum, S. (1960). Evaluational reactions to spoken language. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 60. 44-51.

[50] LaPiere, R. T. (1934). Attitudes vs. actions. *Social Forces*, 13. 230–237.

[51] Linn, M. D., & Piché, G. (1986). Black and white adolescent and preadolescent attitudes toward Black English. In H. B. Allen & M. D. Linn (Eds.), *Dialect and Language Variation*. San Diego: Academic Press, 574-590.

[52] Loredo Gutiérrez, X., Fernández Salgado, A., Suárez Fernández, I., & Casares Berg, H. (2007). Language use and language attitudes in Galicia. In D. Lasagabater & Á. Huguet (Eds.), *Multilingualism in European Bilingual Contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 40-64.

[53] McGroarty, M. (1996). Language attitudes, motivation, and standards. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-36.

[54] Mercer, G. V. (1977). *The Development of Children's Ability to Discriminate between Languages and Varieties of the Same Language*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation. Montreal: McGill University.

[55] Mettewie, L., & Janssens, R. (2007). Language use and language attitudes in Brussels. In D. Lasagabater & Á. Huguet (Eds.), *Multilingualism in European Bilingual Contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 117-143.

[56] Meyerhoff, M. (2009). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. London: Routledge.

[57] Miłobóg, M., & Garrett, P. (2011). Perceptions of and attitudes towards regional varieties of Polish: Views from two Polish provinces. *Language Awareness*, 20 (4). 275-293.

[58] Mummendey, H. D. (1983). Attitudes and behavior. *The German Journal of Psychology*, 7 (2).133-150.

[59] Ó Laoire, M. (2007). Language use and language attitudes in Ireland. In D. Lasagabater & Á. Huguet (Eds.), *Multilingualism in European Bilingual Contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 164-183.

[60] Oppenheim, A. N. (1992). *Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement*. London: Pinter Publishers.

[61] Paltridge, J., & Giles, H. (1984). Attitudes towards speakers of regional accents of French. *Linguistische Berichte*, 90. 71-85.

[62] Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: SAGE.

[63] Preston, D. R. (1993). The uses of folk linguistics. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3 (2). 181-259.

[64] Preston, D. R. (1999). A language attitude approach to the perception of regional variety. In D. R. Preston (Ed.), *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 359-373.

[65] Pütz, M. (1995). Attitudes and language: An empirical investigation into the status and use of English in Namibia. In M. Pütz (Ed.), *Discrimination through Language in Africa?*

Perspectives on Namibian Experience. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 245-273.

[66] Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values: A Theory of Organization and Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

[67] Rosenthal, M. S. (1974). *The Magic Boxes: Children and Black English*. Arlington: ERIC/CLL.

[68] Safont Jordà, M. P. (2007). Language use and language attitudes in the Valencian community. In D. Lasagabater & Á. Huguet (Eds.), *Multilingualism in European Bilingual Contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 90-113.

[69] Saidat, A, M. (2010). Language attitude: The case of Jordan. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 2. 235–243.

[70] Schneiderman, E. (1976). An examination of the ethnic and linguistic attitudes of bilingual children. *ITL (Tijdschrift van het Instituut voor Toegepaste Lingistiek, Leuven. Review of the Institute of Applied Linguistics, Louvain)*, 33. 59-72.

[71] Schuman, H., & Johnson, M. P. (1976). Attitudes and behavior. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2. 161-207.

[72] Shah, S. K., & Anwar, F. (2015). Attitudes of parents and children towards multilingualism in Pakistan. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 8. 22-27.

[73] Shameem, N. (2004). Language attitudes in multilingual primary schools in Fiji. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 17 (2). 154-172.

[74] Themistocleous, C. (2007). Written Cypriot Greek in online chat: Usage and attitudes. *Proceedings of the 17th International Postgraduate Linguistics Conference*. Manchester: Department of Linguistics and English language, 473-488.

[75] Trappes-Lomax, H. (2004). Discourse analysis. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 133–164.

[76] Trudgill, P. (1972). Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in urban British English. *Language in Society*, 1. 179-195.

[77] Van Bezooijen, R. (1994). Aesthetic evaluation of Dutch language varieties. *Language and Communication*, 14. 253-263.

[78] Wicker, A. W. (1969). Attitudes versus actions: The relationship of verbal and overt behavioral responses to attitude objects. *Journal of Social Issues*, 25 (4). 41-78.

[79] Zahn, C., & Hopper, R. (1985). Measuring language attitudes: The speech evaluation instrument. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 4. 113-123.

[80] Zhou, M. (2000). Language attitude of two contrasting ethnic minority nationalities in China: The "model" Koreans and the rebellious "Tibetans". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 146. 1-20.