KRZYSZTOF PRZYGOŃSKI
Czestochowa University of Technology
k.przygonski@wp.pl
ORCID: 0000-0002-9328-1037

A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE CONSTRUCT OF ATTITUDE IN SOCIOLINGUISTICS: A SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL INSIGHT (PART 1)

Abstract

The present article constitutes the first part of a brief critical analysis of the research on attitude and attitude-(speech) behaviour relations. Its major aim is to show that the contribution from the socio-psychological paradigm can prove relevant and valuable when applied to sociolinguistic research on attitude and attitude-behaviour relations. The author argues that attitudinal investigations in sociolinguistics, despite their popularity and rich history, frequently suffer from a number of methodological and theoretical flaws. The author advances an argument that a reconceptualization of the construct of attitude and certain methodological principles can help refine the whole language attitudes paradigm. Specifically, it is pointed out that a cognitive/information-processing approach to attitude formation, the theory of planned behaviour and other theoretical and methodological insights discussed in this paper can prove immensely rewarding and can give a new impetus for further research.

1. Introduction

As early as in the 1970s of the 20th century Giles and St Clair (1979: 2) argued that the socio-psychological approach to the study of language may "increase the explanatory power of sociolinguistics" and that there is a need for "greater understanding of the dynamics of attitudes, motivations, identities and intentions". More currently, language attitudes research is still regarded as important and some scholars continue

to emphasize its explanatory value – "language attitudes are a key component of sociolinguistic theory-building" (Garrett 2001: 630). The major logic behind embarking on attitudinal research (irrespective of the scholarly discipline) rests on its assumed impact on human behaviours and interactions. In short, the importance of attitudes hinges on their potential influence, whether direct or indirect, on human behaviour. Attitudes, just as social categorizing, stereotyping and impression formation should be considered, thus, to be "functional" in the sense that they do not happen just for the sake of them but as potential and significant predeterminants helping to guide human behaviour and one's functioning in the social world. Without the legitimacy of this assumption, there would be hardly any point in scientific examinations of people's social evaluations and perceptions. In this vein, Giles and Marlow (2011: 162) remark that attitudes are thought to be "central to the human experience and play a pervasive role in everyday interactions (e.g. Fazio, Olson 2003), influencing self-presentations and our interactions with others".

As regards language attitudes, they also seem to be potent triggers of subsequent behaviours.[1] They are thought to have a bearing on the perception of our interlocutors and to guide our own language choices on the basis of both our predictions of other people's reactions to our speech and our intentions to evoke a certain response and achieve a specific goal (cf. Garrett 2010: 21). This is possible as, potentially, any level of language (be it, for instance, pragmatics, semantics or even minor phonetic detail) can evoke evaluative reactions on account of people's tendency to "combine linguistic and descriptive information in constructing their judgment" (Bradac, Wisegarver 1984: 252). Importantly, upon a thorough investigation of numerous studies, Giles and Marlow (2011: 165) have advanced an argument that "[l]anguage attitudes then may profoundly influence the access and opportunities one encounters during home, education, and professional interactions". It is because of language attitudes that some people are more likely to be promoted and accepted whereas others suffer exclusion, lose promotion chances or even experience prejudice. To give an example, it has been found that language attitudes can affect employers' hiring practices (Rey 1977, as quoted by Fasold 1984: 148) and teachers' treatment of pupils (Seligman, Tucker, Lambert 1972; Frender, Lambert 1973; as quoted by Fasold 1984: 148). Halliday himself put forward an even more fundamental argument – "a speaker who is made ashamed of his own language habits suffers a basic injury as a human being" (Halliday 1968: 165, as quoted by Giles, Marlow 2011: 166). In the field of foreign language teaching, in turn, it was noticed as early as in the 1970s that favourable attitudes can contribute to language learners' development of motivation, which further translates into better second language acquisition (Gardner, Smythe 1975, as quoted by Masgoret, Gardner 2003: 176). Furthermore, Fasold (1984: 148–149) points out that there is ample evidence that the course of sound change can be altered on account of its perception by the speech community (Bailey 1973) and that the (perceived) intelligibility of a language is also subject to language attitudes (Wolff 1959). More recently, it has been discovered that even 5-month-old babies

---

[1]   For an overview see, for instance, Giles, Marlow (2011: 165).

are sensitive to dialectal variation and that attitudinal reactions seem to develop alongside one's personal experience (including hereditary factors) and the general process of socialization (Giles, Marlow 2011: 166–167; cf. Garrett 2010: 22).

The major aim of the present paper is to show that the insights from the socio-psychological paradigm (specifically, the theoretical underpinnings and methodological tools of the reasoned action approach and the theory of planned behaviour) can prove highly relevant and valuable if applied to the sociolinguistic research on attitude and attitude-behaviour relations. The author argues that attitudinal investigations in sociolinguistics, despite their popularity and rich history, frequently suffer from a number of methodological and theoretical flaws. This is especially conspicuous in the case of studies probing into the relations between language attitudes and subsequent speech behaviour. This reputedly poor correlation seems to undermine the legitimacy of the whole paradigm and its contribution to socio-linguistics and socio-psychology of language. Nevertheless, the author advances an argument that a reconceptualization of the construct of attitude (together with an application of some additional methodological principles) can help refine the whole paradigm of language attitude research. It is pointed out that a cognitive/information-processing approach to attitude formation, the theory of reasoned action and other theoretical and methodological insights discussed in this paper can prove immensely rewarding and can give a new impetus for further research.

2. A brief overview of the paradigm of language attitudes

One of the most fundamental difficulties in the research on attitudes is of a methodological nature and stems from the hidden (internal) nature of this mental construct making scholars find ways to entice people into externalizing them (cf. Liebscher, Dailey-O'Cain 2017: 2).[2] Systematic studies on attitudes in linguistics goes back to early 1960s when Lambert with associates conducted their first attitudinal investigations (Lambert et al. 1960). Even though one can trace some interest in language and attitudes even well before this period,[3] it was then when the birth of the whole paradigm took place and the fascination with language attitudes began to spread across borders and among scholars from different disciplines. Quite soon the popularity of the new paradigm – with the matched-guise technique as

---

[2]   Today, there exist three major strategies in sociolinguistics to probe into language attitudes: "(1) 'content analysis of societal treatment' (gathering non-elicited evidence on public views regarding language varieties, e.g. through text and media analysis or observation); (2) direct measurement (eliciting people's views by directly asking for them, e.g. in an interview or questionnaire); and (3) indirect measurement (eliciting people's evaluative responses without directly asking for them, via some methodological ingenuity)" (Soukup 2012: 214).

[3]   Bradac (1990: 388) refers, for instance, to Aristotle who himself correlated language use with the perceived credibility of speakers, but also to different investigations from the thirties of the twentieth century (Pear 1931; Taylor 1934; Cantril, Allport 1935). One should also mention here the frequently quoted LaPierre (1934), and a study by Pear 1931 (as quoted by Giles, Billings 2004).

the major method of eliciting attitudes – grew considerably. This experimental technique was usually applied to probe into listeners' evaluations (attributions) of a bilingual (or bidialectal) speaker's personality traits as dependent on two different speech stimuli; i.e. his/her recordings when speaking two different languages or using two different accents (with a native or native-like command of both). Nevertheless, at the very beginning the diversity of themes investigated by linguists was rather limited as the majority of studies simply described either out-groups' or in-groups' attitudes towards different languages and various regional, social or ethnic accents of a given language. Even though this early approach was criticized for collecting descriptive data without much theoretical concern, thanks to this it was possible, among others, to determine general evaluative patterns with respect to different accents and languages (see, for instance, Giles, Marlow 2011: 164, 168–169; Lippi-Green 1997).

In subsequent years, the complexity of research started to grow with scholars examining the correlations between listeners' evaluations and various speech stimuli specifically manipulated to give prominence to single language variables or clusters of variables as combined with each other. A study by Ryan et al. (1977), for instance, focused on the degree of accentedness upon respondents' evaluations of speech samples. Labov (1966), in his well-known New York study, investigated the influence of /r/ (i.e., the frequency of its presence or absence in speakers' speech) on respondents' attitudes and; subsequently, on their attributing the speakers to different posts that they were believed to hold. In some other research projects, an attempt was made at exploring the relationship between powerful vs. powerless styles[4] and listeners' evaluation of them (for an overview see Bradac 1990: 396). An investigation by Giles and Sasson (1983), in turn, aimed at probing into the combined effects of accent and various degrees of lexical diversity on respondents' evaluations of RP and Cockney. Other researchers investigated listeners' evaluations of speakers' lexical diversity, language intensity[5] and rate of speech (i.e. the number of words or syllables uttered per a unit of time; see Brown 1980; Bradac 1990: 398), or speakers' fluency together with verbally aggressive vs. non-aggressive messages[6] (Cargile, Giles 1997). Importantly, there is also a fine-grained approach to attitudes in which the focus is on pointing out which specific language features enable dialect identification and, hence, trigger off attitudinal evaluations. For instance, Purnell et al. (1999) conducted a series of perceptual and phonetic experiments on African American Vernacular English, Chicano English and Standard American English. The researchers wanted to discover whether dialect discrimination could be evoked solely by phonetic cues and determine how specific phonetic information might lead to evaluative reactions. An equally interesting study was conducted by Bay and Zahn (1999), who investigated

---

[4]   These are language variables that refer to the degree to which a speaker uses, for example, hesitation forms, tag questions, polite forms, etc.

[5]   Language intensity refers to "[a] speaker's use of terms such as 'extremely', 'definitely', 'horrible', etc. and his or her use of sex and death metaphors" Bradac (1990: 358).

[6]   Aggressive messages are messages in which the speaker attacks the listener's group membership.

New Zealanders' attitudes towards New Zealand and American English. The researchers focused on pitch as a cue evoking attitudinal reactions.

A different kind of language attitudes research is one in which the focus is on the correlation between speech evaluation and various contextual variables. Specifically, the contextual variables that are correlated with respondents' evaluation of speech stimuli can be grouped into three broad categories: social characteristics of respondents, social characteristics of speakers, and additional contextual information concerning the communicative situation. As regards the last two categories, they may be thought to correspond to Bradac's (1990: 399–403) distinction of, respectively, communicator's role (e.g. communicator's gender or counselor-client role) and communication situation (e.g. communicator's intention or the degree of formality/informality). All of these contextual variables are combined with language variables to discover their combined influence upon respondents' evaluation of voice stimuli. Regarding the correlation between evaluation and the social characteristics of respondents, an interesting study was carried out by Al-Kahtany (1995). The researcher explored ESL students' attitudes towards three varieties of American English by correlating them with the social characteristics of respondents: their age, academic status (undergraduate vs. graduate students), major (science vs. humanities), motivation (integrative vs. instrumental) and marital status.

With respect to the social characteristics of speakers, the information about them can be conveyed to respondents in two ways. Firstly, voice samples themselves can provide research subjects with relevant information about speakers' sex and age.[7] In investigations conducted along these lines, researchers correlate various language variables with the sex of speakers and examine the evaluative reactions of respondents (for a brief overview see Bradac 1990: 395–396). As regards age, it is very frequently correlated by researchers with the rate of speaking. Stewart and Ryan (1982), for instance, found that elderly speakers who speak more slowly are perceived to be even older than they actually are. The second method for providing respondents with information about speakers consists in telling them, prior to their listening to voice samples, about the social characteristics of the speakers. There is empirical evidence that precommunication knowledge can bias perception by creating certain expectations. A study by Ryan and Bulik (1982), for example, focused on the differences in attitudinal reactions of respondents when they were informed that the two accents of English they were to listen to (standard American English vs. German-accented variety of English) belonged to speakers coming from either middle or lower classes.

Additional contextual information refers to the knowledge that respondents acquire, for instance, about speakers' intentions or the context in which a communicative situation takes place. This contextual information is subsequently correlated

---

7   Possibly, these two social characteristics of speakers are the only ones that respondents can take for granted on the basis of speech samples alone. The other information that is provided by voice stimuli refers only to *cues* about social characteristics of speakers and not certain *knowledge* (for example, in New York /r/ could be regarded as a cue indicating the perceived social status of speakers).

with various language variables. To give an example, in a study by Brown et al. (1985), one group of respondents was informed that a speaker's technical talk was delivered to an audience unfamiliar with the topic and the other group was not provided with this piece of information. The speech samples differed also with respect to their speech rates and accents. Afterwards, both groups of research subjects were asked about their evaluation of the voice stimuli. In addition, there were investigations in which respondents were led into believing that communicator's intention was either to appear sociable or authoritative (see, for instance, Bradac, Mulac 1984). More recently, some researchers started to investigate the influence of linguistic landscape upon respondents' attitudes (cf. Dailey et al. 2005). As for the variable itself, linguistic landscape refers to the language or languages that are used in the social milieu of the respondents (the linguistic context of their home area), for example, the language used on road signs, in the media, or in advertising. It is hypothesized that this variable may play a significant role in evoking evaluative reactions towards languages and accents. Dailey et al. (2005), for instance, investigated the role of linguistic landscape in predicting the attitudes of adolescent respondents' towards Hispanic- and Anglo-accented speakers. Yet another variable worth mentioning is the degree of intimacy between listeners and speakers (Bradac 1990: 387). The degree of intimacy may be regarded as a variable that refers to a special context which is created by both speakers and respondents' mutual knowledge of each other. It is rightly argued that the majority of studies carried out to date have examined evaluative reactions of respondents towards speakers who are completely unknown to them. Accordingly, little is known about the influence of the language used by persons who are close acquaintances or relatives to respondents upon the respondents' evaluation of their speech.

3. Language attitudes – (speech) behaviour relations

As compared with the above-mentioned plethora of attitudinal research, there have been relatively few studies that dealt directly with the relations between language attitudes and behaviour. In some studies researchers investigated links between attitude and language-related behaviours while in others the focus was on some more general behavioural patterns (for example, on cooperation or persuasiveness). A study by Fielding and Evered (1980), for instance, belongs to the latter category. The researchers wanted to discover the role of patients' accents (standard and vernacular ones) in physicians' diagnosis, i.e. whether a physician could be led by them into believing that a patient had either a physical or a psychosomatic complaint. In some other research types the focus was on respondents' attitudes towards different accents and their degree of cooperation (e.g. Kristiansen, Giles 1992). The researchers wanted to discover whether people are more likely to cooperate (specifically, follow instructions) with standard- or vernacular-accented speakers. Although interesting, this kind of research gives relatively little insight (or none at all) into the influence of attitudes on *language-related* behaviour. Quite exceptional in this light was the

study conducted more recently by Taylor and Marsden (2014), researchers who aimed at investigating whether negative language attitudes can affect students' foreign language uptake (when FLT is optional) and whether it is possible to change negative attitudes by means of language interventions. Some of the most significant findings were that general positive attitudes were an especially significant predictor of uptake if combined with a higher (perceived) personal relevance of foreign languages and if learning them was thought to be relatively easy (Taylor, Marsden 2014: 912). In addition, it is argued that negative language attitudes can be changed by means of language interventions, especially panel discussions.

Another research approach probing into attitude-behaviour consistency is the one followed by FLT scholars. Frequently, the focus of research is on the correlation between second language learners' attitudes towards the target language and their language proficiency (e.g. Dalton-Puffer et al. 1997). There is a long tradition of applying Gardener's socio-educational model of second language acquisition with Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) as a major tool used to measure, among others, language attitudes towards a foreign language and the context of learning situation (see, for instance, Gardner 1985, 2000). Masgoret and Gardner (2003: 169) point out that "integrativeness and attitudes toward the learning situation are related to achievement in the second language, but that their effect is indirect, acting through motivation." Importantly, after conducting a meta-analysis of the relationship between second language achievement and five attitude/motivation variables, the scholars argue the point that the criticism levelled at this model can be attributed to scholars' different conceptualizations and that all the variables from their model can be used as significant predictors of achievement in a second language (Masgoret, Gardner 2003: 205).

To some extent, one can also feel justified to consider communication accommodation theory (CAT) to be at least partly related to the paradigm of attitudes research. On the one hand, although the theory's primary concern is examining the phenomena of communication convergence and divergence, the processes themselves are regarded as communicative strategies dependent among others on interlocutors' attitudes and identities. Garrett (2010: 105) points out that "[m]aking adaptations as we communicate with others may be (or may be seen as) a behavioural signal of our own attitudes" and that "communication accommodation theory can also be seen as the implementation of attitudes in discourse." On the other hand, interlocutors' communication shifts, either in the direction of reducing the discrepancies in the communication features adopted by them (convergence) or in the direction of accentuating them (divergence), can be subject to evaluative reactions on the part of both the participants in the conversation and other people listening to them (Garrett 2010: 105–106).

A study undertaken by Ladegaard (2000) seems to be a vital project worth a more detailed elaboration here. The scholar investigated the correlation between students' language attitudes towards a vernacular and their subsequent speech behaviour. The research objective was to examine whether adolescents who expressed favourable attitudes towards the vernacular were also more likely to use it in the formal

context of school classes. To specify, Ladegaard focused on the relations between both adolescents' language attitudes explicitly expressed in a questionnaire and implicitly elicited by means of a VG-test[8] and their speech behaviour that was recorded during class discussions and interviews with their teachers (for details, see Ladegaard 2000: 217, 218). Whereas the questionnaire included both closed- and open-questions asking students to account for their own linguistic choices and to describe their language attitudes and preferences, the VG-test aimed at examining students' implicit attitudes towards five female speakers using various non-standard varieties of Danish. Regarding his conclusions, Ladegaard (2000: 222) points to a clear correspondence of the evaluative patterns discovered by him with those found in Britain, i.e. "standard varieties are usually rated high on status and competence but fairly low on social attractiveness and personal integrity" and rural ones are rated low on status and high on social attractiveness. On the basis of his analysis of students' attitudes from the VG experiment and the recording of their speech performance during classes, Ladegaard argues that "there is no relationship between individual subjects' linguistic score [the score of the standardness of their speech samples] and their evaluation of the speaker of the local vernacular" and that "subjects may have positive attitudes towards a particular variety of speech which, for some reason, they choose not to speak, at least in certain contexts" (Ladegaard 2000: 223, 227).

Importantly, one group of adolescents was additionally asked to fill in a questionnaire concerning their own language usage as well as their own attitudes and preferences. Their responses led Ladegaard (2000: 223) to put forward the following hypothesis: "there may still be a relationship between expression of attitude and sociolinguistic behaviour, even though the quantitative analyses could not verify a correlation." By way of concluding his research, he points out that "[i]f we compare the responses from the attitude-questionnaire with the linguistic analysis, there seems to be a clear *relationship* between expressions of attitude and sociolinguistic behaviour" and that "language attitudes are likely to predict broad behavioural patterns of sociolinguistic behaviour" (Ladegaard 2000: 227, 230).

One should discern that the researcher in his important project did not wholly manage to avoid some methodological imperfections (of which he was himself fully aware). First of all, Ladegaard (2000: 229) points to a couple of precautions for further research: (1) a limited number of subjects, (2) a limited linguistic repertoire of recordings and (3) high contextual specificity of the recordings. In addition, he emphasizes the significance of adopted methodologies and the formulations of questions addressed to respondents for the research results (Ladegaard 2000: 227). Emphasizing the complexity of research on attitude-behaviour links, the scholar also makes a call for the implementation of eclectic approaches – both direct and indirect – and applying different methodologies (Ladegaard 2000: 230). He finally draws attention to a more fundamental matter concerning the fact that correlation is obviously not necessarily causation, which should prevent one from drawing hasty and erroneous conclusions (Ladegaard 2000: 228). Importantly, it seems that the

---

8   A verbal-guise test – a refined version of MGT.

majority of the problems identified by Ladegaard could be considerably alleviated or even entirely overcome by means of the research tools and principles discussed in sections 5 and 6 of the present article (Part 2).

4. Some less popular approaches to the study of language attitudes

Bringing this brief overview to a close, it is necessary to mention some less popular approaches to probing into language attitudes, ideologies, and stereotypes. Above all, there is the folk linguistic approach of perceptual dialectology developed most of all by Denis Preston (e.g. Preston 1982). The research focus of this direct approach is on probing into non-linguists' perceptions and, specifically as he himself explains, on the following: "the geographical distribution of speech, beliefs about standard and affectively preferred language varieties, the degree of difference perceived in relation to surrounding varieties, imitations of other varieties, and anecdotal accounts of how such beliefs and strategies develop and persist" (Preston 1989: 4). Attitudes and beliefs are usually examined by means of open-ended questions generating answers in which respondents frequently formulate highly attitudinal labels and descriptions of various language varieties. There are also more ethnographic-oriented approaches referred to as societal treatment studies (Garrett 2010: 142). Scholars applying such methods frequently strive to elicit language attitudes by means of their observations of people's behaviour or analyses of such various written materials as documents, books or letters to editors. Most recently, there seems to be a rising interest in integrated programs of language attitudes research taking advantage of a variety of measurement methods to elicit and examine attitudes (see Garrett 2010: 201).

One path along which the renewal of interest in language attitudes follows is the one set by various constructionist, discursive and interactional approaches (see, for instance, Hyrkstedt, Kalaja 1998; Soukup 2012; Liebscher et al. 2017: 1). Even though they are still not very popular, there seem to be increasingly more scholars pointing to their potential for giving a new impetus to the whole field (cf. Soukup 2012; Liebscher et al. 2017). On the most basic level, this approach should be considered to be in line with the general constructionist epistemology, which has been gaining ground for some time now, especially in social sciences. Importantly, one should discern that the critique on the part of followers of this approach with respect to more traditional paradigms is total, aimed at "fundamental theories, concepts, and premises our research is based on" (Soukup 2012: 221, cf. Liebscher et al. 2017: 4–5). Social psychological experiments are ridiculed and described as "an objective fact-finding mission that uncovers people's 'true' evaluative dispositions" or as "persistence in a quest for people's one 'true' and stable evaluative disposition towards an object" (Soukup 2012: 216, 221). To specify, constructionist approaches point to the following problems of the traditional language attitudes paradigm:
1. the conceptualization of attitude
2. attitude-behaviour relations
3. acontextualization

As regards conceptualization, constructionist approaches attempt to undermine all types of present definitions of attitudes. In this vein, Soukup (2012: 217) points out the following:

> The constructionist alternative is to abandon any notion at all of stable entities or 'true' underlying evaluative states of mind that might be 'discovered' by a researcher. Instead, attitudes are conceptualized as variable constructions that emerge in active, situated 'evaluative practice' (Potter 1998). In other words, the expression of attitudes is seen as just another human meaning-making activity, similar to, for example, the negotiation of relationships in conversational interaction.

Furthermore, it is claimed that attitudes should not be treated as "cohesive, enduring underlying mental entities to be 'uncovered'" but rather as "locally situated evaluative 'practice' or 'activity'" or as "variable constructions that emerge in active, situated 'evaluated practice'"(Soukup 2012: 215, 217). In the same vein, Liebscher et al. (2017) argue that "it is through interaction that attitudes are negotiated, contested, and turned into practice". Because of this, language attitudes are thought to be so changeable that it is natural for them to "be constructed differently on a moment-to-moment basis", which obviously, as a result, points to the futility of any experimentation and requires scholars to analyze them "within their discursive context" (Liebscher et al. 2017: 5, 9). This approach presupposes that attitudes, exactly like identity, ideologies and stances, are only constructed, formulated, contested, and reevaluated during interaction (Liebscher et al. 2017: 4).

As regards attitude-behaviour relations, Soukup (2012: 216) claims that quantitative experimentation in the socio-psychological paradigm provides no evidence in corroboration of attitude-behaviour links. Because of this, arguments are advanced that quantitative approaches are useless in the examination of "*real-life* situations – of *actual* human behaviour" and that matched-guise technique, for instance, should be substituted with discourse analytic approaches as they are believed to provide better insight into the "*interactive meaning-making implicated in language evaluation*" (Soukup 2012: 216, 218; italics mine). To justify this stance, references are usually made to a very old study by LaPierre described in an article from 1934 and, surprisingly, to Ajzen and Fishbein (2005) whose research stance and contribution seem, in fact, to have been largely misunderstood by her.

The final objection concerning more traditional paradigms examining language attitudes is that they are claimed to be far from real-life phenomena (Soukup 2012: 218). First of all, a point is raised that instead of doing language experiments, scholars should qualitatively extract attitudes from, for example, written documents or conversations since they are real-life relevant and allow one to investigate "interactive meaning-making implicated in language evaluation" (Soukup 2012: 216). In this vein, Liebscher et al. (2017: 2) argue that:

> …even the most naturalistic of experimental settings do not give the researcher access to the type of context where attitudes are expressed all the time in the ordinary practices of everyday life: interaction. By contrast, interactional research puts a strong

emphasis on the importance of the context of the interaction, and scholars from this tradition have been using qualitative methods to investigate questions concerned with language attitudes as constructed in the interaction.

Attention is also drawn to the importance of a more general context (e.g. demographic features) and the "immediate local" one, potentially encompassing all types of variables that may impact on the expression of attitudes (Soukup 2012: 218; Liebscher et al. 2017: 2). It is rightly pointed out that most language attitudes experiments fail to take account of the contextual frame (which is especially significant when probing into attitude-behaviour relations); nevertheless, constructionist approaches are neither the only solution nor the best one (see sections 5 and 6 in the second part of the article for an alternative proposal).

References

Ajzen I., Fishbein M. 2005. The influence of attitudes on behavior. – Albarracín D., Johnson B.T., Zanna M.P. (eds.). 2005. *Handbook of attitudes and attitude change: Basic principles.* Mahwah: 1–123.

Al-Kahtany A.H. 1995. Dialectal ethnographic 'cleansing: ESL students' attitudes towards three varieties of English. – *Language & Communication* 15.2: 165–180.

Bailey C.J. 1973. *Variation and linguistic theory.* Washington (DC).

Bay G.B., Zahn C.J. 1999. Language attitudes and speech behavior: New Zealand English and Standard American English. – *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 18.3: 310–319.

Bradac J. 1990. Language attitudes and impression formation. – Giles H., Robinson P. (eds.). *Handbook of language and social psychology.* Chichester: 387–412.

Bradac J., Mulac A. 1984. A molecular view of powerful and powerless speech styles: Attributional consequences of specific language features and communicator intentions. – *Communication Monographs* 51: 307–319.

Bradac J., Wisegarver R. 1984. Ascribed status, lexical diversity, and accent: Determinants of perceived status, solidarity, and control of speech style. – *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 3: 239–255.

Brown B.L. 1980. Effects of speech rate on personality attributions and competency evaluations. – Giles H., Robinson P., Smith P. (eds.). 1980. *Language: Social psychological perspectives.* Oxford: 294–300.

Brown B.L., Giles H., Thackerar J.N. 1985. Speaker evaluations as a function of speech rate, accent, and context. – *Language and Communication* 5: 207–220.

Cantril H., Allport G.W. 1935. *The psychology of radio.* New York.

Cargile A.C., Giles H. 1997. Understanding language attitudes: Exploring listener affect and identity. – *Language and Communication* 17.3: 195–217.

Dalton-Puffer C., Kaltenboeck G., Smit U. 1997. Learner attitudes and L2 pronunciation in Austria. – *World Englishes* 16: 115–128.

Dailey R.M., Giles H., Jansma L.L. 2005. Language attitudes in an Anglo-Hispanic context: The role of the linguistic landscape. – *Language and Communication*: 27–38.

Fasold R. 1984. *The sociolinguistics of society.* Oxford.

Fazio R.H., Olson M.A. 2003. Implicit measures in social cognition research: Their meaning and use. – *Annual Review of Psychology* 54: 297–327.

Fielding G., Evered C. 1980. The influence of patients' speech upon doctors: The diagnostic interview. – St Clair R.N., Giles H. (eds.). *The social and psychological contexts of language*. Hillsdale (NJ): 51–72.

Frender R., Lambert W. 1973. Speech style and scholastic success: The tentative relationships and possible implications for lower social class children. – Shuy R. (ed.). *Georgetown round table on languages and linguistics*. Washington (DC): 237–272.

Gardner R.C. 1985. *The attitude motivation test battery: Technical report.* London (Ontario).

Gardner R.C. 2000. Correlation, causation, motivation, and second language acquisition. – *Canadian Psychology* 41: 10–24.

Gardner R.C., Smythe P.C. 1975. Motivation and second language acquisition. – *Canadian Modern Language Review* 31: 218–230.

Garrett P. 2001. Language attitudes and sociolinguistics. – *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5.4: 626–631.

Garrett P. 2010. *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge.

Giles H., Billings A.C. 2004. Assessing language attitudes: Speaker evaluation studies. – Davies A., Elder C. (eds.). *The handbook of applied linguistics.* Oxford: 187–209.

Giles H., Marlow M.L. 2011. Theorizing language attitudes: Existing frameworks, an integrative model, and new directions. – Salmon C. (ed.). 2011. *Communication yearbook 35.* Thousand Oaks (CA): 161–197.

Giles H., Sasson C. 1983. The effect of speaker's accent, social class background and message style on British listeners' social judgments. – *Language and Communication* 3: 305–313.

Giles H., St Clair R.N. (eds.). 1979. *Language and social psychology.* Oxford.

Halliday M. 1968. The users and uses of language. – Fishman J.A. (ed.). 1968 *Readings in the sociology of language*. The Hague: 160–172.

Hyrkstedt I., Kalaja P. 1998. Attitudes toward English and its functions in Finland: A discourse-analytic study. – *World Englishes* 17.3: 345–357.

Kristiansen T., Giles H. 1992. Complience-gaining as a function of speech: Public requests in varieties of Danish. – *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 2: 17–35.

Labov W. 1966. *The social stratification of English in New York City.* Washington (DC).

Ladegaard H.J. 2000. Language attitudes and sociolinguistic behavior: Exploring attitude-behavior relations in language. – *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4.2: 214–233.

Lambert W.E., Hodgson R.C., Gardner R.C., Fillenbaum S. 1960. Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. – *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 60: 44–51.

LaPierre R.T. 1934. Attitudes vs. actions. – *Social Forces* 13: 230–237.

Liebscher G., Dailey-O'Cain J. 2017. Contextualizing language attitudes: An interactional perspective. – *Lang Linguist Compass*. [https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12250].

Lippi-Green R. 1997. *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. London.

Masgoret A.M., Gardner R.C. 2003. Attitudes, motivation, and second language learning: A meta-analysis of studies conducted by Gardner and associates. – Dorneyi Z. (ed.). *Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research, and applications*. Malden: 167–210.

Pear T.H. 1931. *Voice and personality*. London.

Preston D.R. 1982. Perceptual dialectology: Mental maps of United States dialects from a Hawaiian perspective. – *Working Papers in Linguistics* 14.2: 5–49.

Preston D.R. 1989. *Perceptual dialectology: Non linguists' views of areal linguistics*. Dordrecht.

Purnell T., Idsardi W., Baugh J. 1999. Perceptual and phonetic experiments on American English dialect identification. – *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 18.1: 10–30.

Rey A. 1977. Accent and employability: Language attitudes. – *Language Sciences* 47: 7–12.

Ryan E.B., Bulik M. 1982. Evaluations of middle class speakers of standard American and German-accented English. – *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 1: 51–62.

Ryan E.B., Carranza M., Moffie R.W. 1977. Reactions toward varying degrees of accentedness in the speech of Spanish-English bilinguals. – *Language and Speech* 20: 267–273.

Seligman C.R., Tucker G.R., Lambert W.E. 1972. The effects of speech style and other attributes on teachers' attitudes toward pupils. – *Language in Society* 1.1: 131–142.

Soukup B. 2012. Current issues in the social psychological study of 'language attitudes': Constructionism, context, and the attitude-behavior link. – *Language and Linguistics Compass* 6.4: 212–224.

Stewart M.A., Ryan E.B. 1982. Attitudes toward younger and older adult speakers: Effect of varying speech rates. – *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 1: 91–109.

Taylor H.C. 1934. Social agreements on personality traits as judged from speech. – *The Journal of Social Psychology* 98.4: 902–920.

Taylor F., Marsden E.J. 2014. Perceptions, attitudes, and choosing to study foreign languages in England: An experimental intervention. – *The Modern Language Journal* 98.4: 902–920.

Wolff H. 1959. Intelligibility and inter-ethnic attitudes. – *Anthropological Linguistics* 1: 34–41.