‘I Do Think It Does Not Make Sense for Me to Try to Speak British English… But I Still Prefer It:’
Finnish university students’ attitude towards English
Linguistic attitude is one of the important factors that could influence the development of a language or a language variety in defining its status, role, and function(s) within a speech community; attitudes are shaped by perceptions. This study explores Finnish university students’ English language preference, and their perceptions on the use of English as a global *lingua franca*.

A survey was conducted among 358 Finnish (English-major) university students across Finland to investigate which English variety they prefer to learn, and the reasons for their preference. The results reveal that despite the seeming proliferation of the American English variety in Finland, ubiquitous through various forms of media, the British English variant is still preferred by the student majority primarily due to its perceived notion of aesthetic and ‘cultured’ features, and the students’ familiarity with the variety as a pedagogical model. Moreover, the majority of the participants believe that a native speaker accent should neither be imposed nor required from non-native English speakers; but these students nevertheless wish to acquire a native speech. This result is also found in other similar attitudinal studies; that is, on a macro level, students in this particular context are aware of the plurality of English and its status as a global language; on a micro level, however, these learners wish to learn the ‘standard’ English that they have been quite familiar with, through years of formal language education.

This study yields remarkable insights into the students’ views of the English language that is being taught/learned in Finnish schools/universities, and how their attitudes towards English affect their second-language goals and practices. It presents a sociolinguistic view of English, and how the standard language ideology tradition affects language attitude/preference. The findings contribute to enhance our knowledge and understanding on relevant sociolinguistic concerns in this context, and present a challenge for (current/future) language educators to critically evaluate the linguistic model/teaching materials they adopt, and encourage an unbiased and genuine appreciation for the English language and its diversity in their language classrooms.
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1 Introduction

“England and America are two countries divided by a common language.” This quotation\(^1\), believed to have been made famous by the Irish playwright, George Bernard Shaw, could not have been more relevant and thought-provoking, particularly in the field of linguistics. The American English (AmE) and the British English (BrE), similar, yet not identical English variants, are the two most widely spoken varieties by people who speak English as their mother tongue (Crystal 2004). They are the two most common variants encountered by English learners, despite the numerous English varieties that are currently used and spoken around the world (Crystal 2004; Graddol 1997, 2006; Kachru 1982, 1986).

To date, the English language has achieved a global status not solely for the large population of its ‘mother tongue’ speakers, but because English speakers of other languages have used and adapted it into their own local speech communities (Crystal 2004, Schneider 2011). Moreover, the impact of globalization and internationalization brought on an unparalleled demand for the use of English as an international language. In many countries around the world, English is used not only as a channel for international communications but also as an additional language that is mixed/alternated with a country’s native/official language(s). In Finland, for example, some English words are intermixed and used alternately with Finnish/Swedish words/phrases, particularly by the younger generation (Leppänen et al. 2011).

Due to the widespread use and diversification of English, an apparent linguistic shift has taken place: the English ‘mother tongue’ speakers are now dramatically outnumbered by English speakers who have different native languages. This shift gave rise to the developing needs and learning orientation of English language learners worldwide, and so, too, has prompted arguments and debates within the field of English Language Teaching (ELT), revisiting the current use of ‘standard’ English, which at present is the basis or model for general ELT.

Within the Finnish context, British English dominates the ELT landscape, and as such, is considered the default model for the general teaching of English (Ranta 2010). In the

\(^{1}\) Quotation’s online source: http://www.oxfordreference.com.
academic environment, BrE is noticeable through the pronunciation and writing conventions used by both teachers and students alike. Through my years of study at a Finnish university, I noticed that within the Arts Department, a number of Finnish (English-major) students normally keep a fairly distinct BrE accent\(^2\) or Received Pronunciation (RP) when using English. However, despite the students’ familiarity with BrE (obtained through years of language education from basic to secondary education)\(^3\), there are still quite a number of students who do not keep a native speech, but rather prefer to use a more ‘neutral’ accent.

This linguistic scenario caught my attention: it prompted me to investigate whether the students aspire for a native accent (BrE or otherwise), and if so, which variety they wish to keep; but perhaps even more important, I wanted to know why. What with the period of globalization that greatly contributes to the international/global use of English — not to mention the ubiquitous presence, dominance, and influence of AmE all over Europe through world media (Barber 2003: 9, Phillipson 2003: 72) — the present linguistic climate in Finland provides an excellent ground to explore the developing role and function of English in this context. It raises the question of how the phenomenal growth of English has influenced the language attitude, or effected a change in the way English and its varieties are being used and perceived in the country, specifically by the university students (some of whom will take on the roles of English language educators in the near future). This same linguistic query led to the formulation of the following research questions:

1. Do Finnish (English-major) university students aspire for a native-speaker accent?
2. In the general learning/teaching of English, which variety do they prefer?
3. What are the reasons behind their preference?

The first objective is to investigate if this particular group of students aspires to acquire a native-speaker accent; the second is to find out which of the two native English varieties

\(^2\) In this paper, *accent* is defined according to Wells’ (1982a) description as “a pattern of pronunciation used by a speaker for whom English is the native language, or more generally, by the community or social grouping to which he or she belongs.” A *foreign accent* is described as the pronunciation pattern of a person whose native tongue is not English, and that which reflects the phonological and phonetic features of his/her native language (ibid.).

\(^3\) English is one of the mandatory subject/courses in Finnish primary/secondary education since 1970 (Ranta 2010: 159).
(AmE or BrE) they prefer to learn, and why. An online survey was conducted to elicit the participants’ linguistic goals, their second language (L2) preference and more importantly, the motivations behind their target language (TL) choice. The plan is to analyze the participants’ general evaluation of the major English varieties, and examine if their evaluative responses express attitudinal characteristics. Previous studies conducted on English learners have shown that having positive attitude and language experience/exposure towards the target language not only facilitate learning (Gardner 1985, 2010) but also influence the learners’ language preferences (Dalton-Puffer et al. 1997, Rindal 2014). Lastly, this investigation will explore how the students’ general view or attitude towards a variety might impact their L2 choice, accent goals, and language use.

The primary aim of this study is to understand how Finnish university students view native English varieties, and show the possible influences that affect their language use and attitudes towards English. It presents a snapshot of how English is developing in Finland from the perspectives of Finnish university students — how they use and perceive English as a linguistic medium for intra-national and intercultural communication. The exceptional spread of English has produced many different varieties — and the “virtues” of these varieties, according to Fishman (1971: 24), “are in the eyes (or ears) of their beholders.” Simply put, the language users/speakers are the ones that could influence and decide the function, form, and fundamentally, the status of a language variety. Additionally, there is a dearth of diachronic attitudinal studies comparing learners from different levels of education; ergo, this study also aims to investigate if there will be a notable difference between the Bachelor of Arts (BA) students and the Master of Arts (MA) group’s responses.

In this paper, I will first discuss some of the concepts related to this study such as the current status, function and role of English, the concept of attitude as it applies to language education, and an overview of empirical researches on learner attitudes towards English varieties. Subsequent sections will introduce the methodology and the materials used. The latter part presents the results and analysis, followed by a summative discussion of salient findings and conclusion.
2 Theoretical considerations

2.1 English and its expanding circle

As a linguistic consequence of internationalization and globalization, English has now reached the status of a global language used and spoken by billions of people around the world (Crystal 2004: 3). It is now considered an international language that holds a recognized role and function(s) in various countries (Kachru 1986). An extensive selection of scholarly publications and literature describes the spread and current functions/roles of English (e.g., Crystal 2004, Modiano 2009, Schneider 2011), but I find Kachru's (1985: 12) categorization of World Englishes quite accessible, if not the most exhaustive/authoritative in the field of sociolinguistics (see Appendix 1 for a replicated illustration of the model). Kachru’s concentric theory describes the distribution of English, on the basis of language promulgation, acquisition, and the roles/functions it plays in various cultural contexts; it consists of the Inner Circle, the Outer Circle, and the Expanding Circle (Kachru 1985, 2006).

The **Inner Circle** is made up of countries where English is spoken as a native language by the majority, and used in all public and private domains (e.g., Australia, Canada, New Zealand, USA, UK, etc.) (Kachru 1986). Countries belonging to the **Outer Circle** have undergone either the British or the United States (US) colonization (e.g., Hong Kong, India, Kenya, etc.); English in these regions is used/spoken as a second language in addition to their native language(s), and often functions as an official language; widely used in public (e.g., education, government, businesses, etc.) and private/social domain (ibid.).

The **Expanding Circle** includes countries where English is used/spoken as a foreign language (e.g., Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, Italy, Spain, Uruguay, etc.); this comprises the burgeoning number of foreign-language English speakers; primarily, English here functions as a vehicle for international/intercultural communication (tourism, business, etc.) by interlocutors with different native languages (ibid.).

---

*Global English* is the English language spoken around the globe (e.g., in international business, diplomacy, media, education, etc.); *International English* is the language that has expanded to various world Englishes (Halliday 2006: 363, Kachru 1986).
The concentric circle model, however, has not gone uncontested. One perspective emphasizes the dynamic quality of English — a living language that is characterized by constant change, transformation, and steady evolution. This is reflected in the way it is utilized by its speakers. Modiano (2009: 39) argues that English use has generally increased due to globalization, and this presents a challenge in distinguishing which speech communities are using English as second or foreign languages. The European Union (EU) is one example where English is used as an *intra-national* lingua franca, and to date, it has been consistently developing as a second language in many European countries (Modiano 2009; cf. Taavitsainen & Pahta 2003).

Modiano expresses a valid point. The extent and function of English within the *Expanding Circle* becomes debatable specifically if we consider its official language status in numerous international organizations (cf. Hoffmann 1996). However, despite the compelling arguments discussed above, I will use Kachru’s concentric circle model throughout the discussion, for its clear and simple classification, and as such, will regard Finland as one of the regions that belong to the *Expanding Circle*.

### 2.2 The spread of English and the ELT model debate

There are currently more than one billion English speakers worldwide, and less than half of them are *native speakers* (Kachru 1986; Modiano 2009). This statistics carries a considerable significance within the context of second language pedagogy. It prompts language educators and linguistic scholars alike to re-evaluate and debate the effectiveness of standard English norms which, thus far, form the basis of English language teaching. The relative usefulness of normative English varieties (e.g., AmE and BrE) comes into question specifically for English learners who speaks English as a second language or as a foreign language (FL). English has become both international and intercultural such that speakers whose primary language is English, are currently outnumbered by their second-language and

---

5 Throughout the study, I will refer to Kachru's (1986: 19) distinction of English users, as follows: (i) the *native users* – or the English users/speakers who use English as their first language/native language; and (ii) the *non-native users* are the people who use English either as a foreign language (where English use is limited to certain functions/domains), or as a second language in educational, professional/occupational, and in other public (e.g. government, diplomacy, etc.) and private domains. Note that the more controversial definition of the construct “native speaker,” which refers to its implicit status as the ‘model speaker’ in the context of language teaching, is not elaborated in this paper due to space constraint; cf. Cook (1999), Davies (2003, 2004), Holliday (2006), Paikeday (1985), for a more comprehensive explanation/information on the “native speaker” as a construct within the context of ELT/Second Language Acquisition research.
foreign-language counterparts. Due to this shift in the current linguistic climate, thought-provoking arguments and debates questioning which ELT model to follow continue.

On the one hand, linguistic scholars advocate that this current development should translate to the realities of how English has spread globally, and how it should complement the way it is utilized by the L2/FL users/speakers (Graddol 2006; Jenkins 2002, 2006; Kachru 1986; Modiano 2009). One example is the use of English in the international context by a growing number of non-native speakers (NNSs), specifically, English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) — a specific context where English is used as a common medium of communication among speakers whose mother tongue/L1 may or may not be English. ELF researchers argue that this major shift positions the L2/FL users in the middle of this pedagogical conundrum, often citing that ELT should promote not only intelligibility among international interlocutors (NSs-NNSs interactions) but also ‘regional appropriateness,’ wherein NNSs are given the right to express their L1 group identity through their foreign/L1-accented English (Jenkins 2002: 83).

In a study conducted among Chinese learners, Bian (2009) finds that most of his subjects wish for a ‘standard’ pronunciation despite a feeling of uncertainty about their linguistic capability of acquiring a near-native speech, let alone a native-speaker accent; but for some students, to be able to communicate intelligibly in a given English interaction is sufficient; for them, English is primarily, and only, a ‘tool for communication.’ For this same reason, some of these learners believe that keeping a Chinese-accented English (ChE) helps establish their cultural identities, thus, their accented-English should be deemed ‘acceptable’ as long as it is comprehensible and clear (cf. Bian 2009: 70, also Xu et al. 2010: 257). In this specific linguistic situation, it is only logical to question the need for what is ‘ideal’ speech (native speech or an approximation thereof) and what is ‘acceptable’ English (clear, comprehensible) based on the linguistic requirements of the students.

On the other hand, however, the majority of ELT materials are still based on the codified standardized English varieties (e.g., standard AmE/BrE), which are generally concerned with linguistic consistency, conformity, regularity — emphasizing accuracy and correctness (Crystal 2004, Garrett 2010, Honey 1991, Wells 1982a). A standard language serves as a
reference for English learners and language educators alike (Crystal 2004); a guide for
teaching/learning that could equip learners with the linguistic competence needed for any
intelligible/comprehensible communication (Trudgill & Hannah 2002). Naturally, the concept
of a ‘standard language’ has also become an issue for lively debates among language scholars
and educators, particularly the concept of what ‘standard [spoken] English’ truly means.

2.2.1 A penchant for the ‘standard’ variety

Ironically, in the middle of these controversial debates and quest for the most suitable
linguistic model for general ELT, a plethora of researches predictably reveal learner
preference for ‘standard’ English varieties. Compelling arguments on the use of ‘standard’
English model, a re-evaluation of language assessment practices, and pedagogic consideration
of a proposed alternative ‘norm’ for ELT (see, for example, Jenkins’ Lingua Franca Core,
2002, 2006) have brought forth numerous publications/studies on non-native learner
preferences and attitude towards different English varieties (see, for example, works of

However, the recurrent pattern of these study results can be disputed for several reasons: e.g.,
the respondents’ lack of awareness on important sociolinguistic issues such as the pedagogical
wrangle on the subject of NS norms and its role in the teaching/use of English as a global
language; the learners’ increased exposure to NS speech via education which could influence
strict adherence to NS norms; and in some cases, a probable oversight within the methods
used in a particular study (Subtirelu 2013: 275). Another reason cited is the learner’s possible
‘idealization’ of the ‘standard’ variety as the only ‘correct’ form of English, coupled with a
misrepresentation of authentic NS speech in many language classrooms (ibid.). The latter
argument bears weight in the following discussion about ‘standard’ English varieties.

2.2.2 Why accent matters

People are judged, to some degree, by the way they speak. This applies to both NSs and NNSs
of English. Even in countries where English is used as a native language, English users/
speakers are surreptitiously assessed based on their speech, and in some cases, are generally prejudged, which often implicates education and/or social class, for keeping a strong regional accent (Honey 1991, Kachru 1986: 140, Lippi-Green 2012, Schneider 2011, Wells 1982b). An accent is discernible through one’s pronunciation; it often reveals a person’s geographical link and affiliation within a social class/group; a dialect, however, is recognizable through one’s accent and from his/her colloquial use of lexis/grammar and their relative difference in contrast with a suggested/existing language norm (Modiano 2009: 9). For example, the development and spread of RP in Great Britain is implicitly associated with ‘educatedness’ and social acceptability or ‘prestige’ (Crystal 2004, Honey 1991, Mugglestone 2003, Wells 1982b). These are social associations and stereotypes that identify the accent with the British ‘lifestyle’ — a life of “dignity, tradition, culture, etiquette” (Stewart et al. 1985).

Similarly, NNSs are evaluated through their L2 pronunciation; and while fluency factors in L2 speech, keeping a ‘foreign accent’ is still generally judged as less acceptable (Dalton-Puffer et al. 1997, Jenkins 2006). This is explicitly manifested through the Common European Framework of Reference for languages’ (CEFR) international standard description of language proficiency levels, which primarily promotes ‘native-like’ speech competence. Presented below (Table 1.0) is a short extract based on the CEFR language proficiency scale assessing the phonological competence as one part of the general evaluation of learner’s linguistic competence (CEFR for languages: learning, teaching, assessment, Version. 5).

As one of the overriding themes in this investigation revolves around L2 pronunciation, it is vital to explore its universal importance to non-native speakers of English. The spoken aspect of the target language (TL) being learned is more often than not, an overt measure of a second/foreign language learner’s language competence (Dalton-Puffer et al. 1997: 115). Additionally, the fact that English is currently used in education, international business and media, and for social communication worldwide, the pursuit of ‘native-like’ or a ‘standard’ pronunciation or an approximation thereof, may not be merely an issue of aesthetics, but rather of necessity — a sine qua non not only to foster intelligibility, but also to enhance message clarity and comprehension in any spoken English communication.

---

6 Linguistic competence refers to the lexical, grammatical, semantic, phonological, orthographic and orthoepic competence (CEFR v. 5).
Table 1.0. CEFR Language Proficiency Scale: phonological competence assessment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description (phonological control)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some words/phrases are purposely highlighted in **bold** for emphasis.

**2.3 Standard English vs. ‘standard’ English**

In applied linguistics, discussing the concept of **Standard Language** (SL) is like skating on fine ice; extreme caution is advised on such a highly controversial topic. Numerous arguments surround the construct, particularly, the notion of **Standard English** (SE). At the one end of this linguistic quandary are language scholars and educators who acknowledge the utilitarian function of a **Standard English** — a variant that serves as a general guide; a standard reference for the study of the English language.

On the opposite end, however, some scholars and educators refuse to support its conception and choose to ignore its objective reality for reasons that: (i) acquiescence to the existence of a **Standard English** is synonymous to condoning the notion that other English varieties are non-standard; and assuming a ‘standard’ variety is considered the ‘model’ or the ‘appropriate’ linguistic model, it only follows that other varieties are sub-standard, or less credible in terms of ‘correctness’ or ‘appropriateness;’ and (ii) in the pedagogical world, “the mantle of the standard language places them [the learners] in a permanent crisis of identity” (Davis 1994: 70). The fact is, many L2/FL learners have invested time and great effort into learning the ‘standard’ — and such investment compels them to acquire the TL (e.g., an NS accent), and in
essence, the ‘linguistic identity’ of its speakers. As Norton (1997: 410) explains, learners’ who are using an L2 is not merely exchanging information with other interlocutors; the process involves a constant “organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world” (cf. Rindal 2010). Thus, ELT’s promotion of a native speech acquisition, or a native-like approximation, could, to some extent, create this language identity ‘crisis.’

However, the fact that the term ‘standard’ per se is incontrovertibly vague, conceptual confusion is bound to exist; but Crystal (1994), taking into account the current spread/global function of English, recommends that we view SE from different perspectives: i.e., from the national and international level — where the former seeks to recommend an ‘acceptable’ language curriculum, and the latter works to promote an adequate national ‘standard’ for general ELT. These views establish the distinction between the ‘standard’ English variety used within a country (e.g., standard BrE/RP), and the Standard English used as the pedagogical model throughout the international/global English-speaking community.

Further, SE may be characterized as follows: first, its linguistic features are generally concerned with grammar structures, vocabulary, and orthography — although speech accents that are used may vary (Crystal 2004, Trudgill & Hannah 2002). Second, SE is an English variety that has no particular ‘local’ base (Crystal 2004). Incidentally, RP is singled out as a ‘standard’ for its social ‘prestige.’ It is a considered a regionless, ‘non-localizable’ accent; not associated with any marked/regional dialect (Honey 1991, Wells 1982b). But unlike the ascension of RP, General American (GenAm) reached its ‘standard’ status for its use as a ‘leveled-out,’ ‘reference’ accent (Wells 1982c).

Third, SE is fundamentally grounded on writings/print; even though the authentic spoken form of SE (formal/informal form) is familiar, and understood by learners, it is not frequently heard/produced in many ELT materials (cf. works of Crystal 2004, Davis 1994, Edwards 2006, Lippi-Green 2012). Carter (1994) explains that grammar and writing primarily account for SE, and “our view of grammar is bound up with the written language to the extent that

---

7 The General American accent is neither eastern-, nor southern-sounding; it simply corresponds to the non-linguist view of an AmE accent without a noticeable/pronounced regional characteristic; it is also referred to as Standard American English (SAE), CNN English, or ‘Network English;’ a variety that is acceptable in the media/national television networks (Wells 1982c: 470; boldface in the original).
Grammar may be best defined as grammar of written English” (italics in the original). The reasons cited for this emphasis are: (i) earlier researches focused more on the written language form for lack of authentic spoken materials; and (ii) written language is deemed more prestigious because it evinces education and literacy (ibid.). Moreover, SE also undergoes variation and change, both in written and spoken forms. As Crystal (2004: 7-8) explains, the intrinsic properties of a standard language are not consistent. However, people tend to believe that consistency, or ‘ever-lasting uniformity,’ exists due to the ubiquity of written materials that are formal in nature, when in reality, it is merely ‘English at its best’ (Crystal 2004), or a dialect in “a fancy uniform” (Halliday 2006).

Last, the SE used/spoken within a country is typically the speech used by the powerful elite (e.g., the upper/educated class), which consequently becomes the communication norm in public domains and media, and eventually recommended as the target linguistic goal in language education. Honey (1991: 15-7) explains that during the sixteenth century⁸, RP was deemed to be the “property of a limited social group… the highest social classes… [and] prestige is associated with certain groups which thereby became the subject of imitation by others.” Further, he believes that it was most likely “the emergence of an educated class that gave impetus to the development and spread of a standard accent” (ibid).

Thus far, it is apparent that a standard language could plausibly evolve in some languages; and like any living language, it is subject to variations and change not only based on the communicative needs of the speech community who uses it (Crystal 2004) but also on the political, economic, and social condition within a specific time period. A standard language is a socially sanctioned construct, in that its speakers evaluate, judge, and eventually promote it as the ‘standard.’ In the case of SE, there is no legal governing body that is responsible for its regulatory use; no “official academy” that prescribe/proscribe etiquette in any English communication (Kachru 1986: 140). Standard forms, however, continue to develop.

---

⁸ During this period, London was thought to be the literary/economic center; the ‘educated’ upper-class accent was the linguistic target. Cambridge and Oxford promoted the RP accent/grammar; private schools/elementary/teacher-training colleges followed (Honey 1991).
2.3.1 Standardization, prescription, and language ideology

According to Milroy & Milroy (1985: 52), *standardization* is a process which “encourages *Prescription* in language — dedicated to the principle that there must be one, and only one, correct way of using a linguistic item.” This practice is unquestionably a social design; it is regarded as an *ideology*, or a set of beliefs and manner of thinking that some language forms are ‘correct,’ which logically establishes the other variants as ‘incorrect.’ This *standard language ideology* (SLI) construct is further compounded by the ideals that the ‘correct’ [language] form should be followed as recommended. This idealization of a certain variety, generally believed to be superior, is imposed by the most powerful and influential groups within the society (Garrett 2010). Lippi-Green (2012: 67-8) concurs, stating that this ideology is clearly a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, homogenous spoken language which is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions and which names as its model the written language, but which is drawn primarily from the spoken language of the upper class... [and it] proposes that an idealized nation-state has one perfect homogenous language.

There is no physical agency which has the sole power to prescribe a ‘standard,’ or norms for the use of English as a second/foreign language; it is more likely a preference dictated by the speakers who have influential power, exposure to a specific model (via political/economic history) (Honey 1991), geographical proximity (Kachru 1986), and general attitude towards the language variety. Despite this fact, standard BrE/RP and standard AmE/GA, being the most recognized varieties widely endorsed/promulgated in general ELT, are likewise thought to be the most ‘correct’ forms of English due to this exact ideology (Milroy & Milroy 1985). The rest are simply substandard, non-standard varieties. However, if all languages are equal in terms of their intrinsic qualities (language system), then, this standard/non-standard distinction

---

9 The development phases of *standardization* involves the selection, acceptance, diffusion of a variety (also elaboration of function: geographically, via local/official journals, education system, etc.; and socially, via society’s construction/practice of variety distinctions/social bias between speakers of ‘standard/non-standard’ languages). When a linguistic model is recognized as ‘standard,’ it is used as a reference for language ‘etiquette’ or convention (*codification*), e.g., grammar books/dictionaries are created and eventually regarded as authoritative references for ‘correct/proper’ language. The ‘status’ of the standard language also needs to be preserved (*maintenance*), hence, the ‘imposition’ of ‘standard’ norms — or explicit recommendation/implicit demand for adherence to ‘standard’ writing norms; this, unfortunately, often trivializes the actuality/importance of genuine speech forms (Milroy & Milroy 1985: 27).
proves that language are in fact, unequal in terms of how they are used/viewed by different speaking societies (language use) (ibid.).

In a similar vein, Edwards (2006: 324) clarifies that the use of ‘non-standard’ term should not be perceived as demeaning “in any technical linguistic sense,” because its ‘standard’ assignation has never been based on its linguistic features; albeit, standard languages are promoted (i) primarily on the basis of the collective society’s perception of the speakers of the language/variety/dialect and (ii) on the historical development of the language (e.g., the choice of ‘standard’ form during the fifteenth century was primarily decided on the basis of economic and political prominence of a certain province, cf. Milroy & Milroy 1985). It is not the intrinsic qualities of the language, but the “arbitrary attitude adopted towards it by society, and reflecting the attitude the community implicitly (and even explicitly) holds towards its speakers” (Wells 1982b). The phonetic qualities of a certain language may well be considered the finest ‘obsession’ at one time, and a ghastly ‘stigma’ the next, or vice versa (ibid). Coupland (2008: 31) agrees that the labelling of languages (standard vs. non-standard) are “ideological value-attributions,” and that it is not possible to define ‘standard’ language without referring to the social judgements made to the language per se and its speakers. He further stresses that:

> in most sociolinguistics, [SE] is taken to be a linguistic reflex of high social class: the assumption is that ‘standard language’ is what ‘educated people’ use when they write (in accordance with grammatical, lexical and orthographic norms), and in a different sense what people at the top of the social hierarchy use when they speak…

Milroy & Milroy (1985) see the social benefit of SE, and acknowledge that “[s]tandard varieties are comprehensible much more widely than localised dialects are… [and] can be used in a wide variety of different spheres of activities.” However, there exist as well those “restrictive, judgmental, and discriminatory aspects” of SLI which operates in “standard language cultures”— e.g., in Britain, where the majority accedes to the ideology of standard language, subscribing to the idea that there are ‘correct/incorrect’ varieties, and on a greater likelihood that the speakers of non-standard language forms are often the members of a lower
So far, it has been established that: (i) standard language is an abstract concept of an ideal or model variety chosen by its influential speakers as being the ‘standard’ for its social qualities and use; and (ii) the ideology of standard language is incontrovertibly unacceptable, and that having a standard language which functions as a reference for teaching/learning is not necessarily the issue; the conceptual confusion lies on the idealized belief in ‘uniformity’ or homogeneity that a standard language represents through various means, such as prescription and strict imposition of suggested ‘standard’ linguistic norms/speech. Clearly, the notions of standard language and ideology of standard language are social-based constructs that originate from the speakers’ perception and attitude towards a certain language/variety. The formation of these perceptions and attitudes are discussed in the next subsection.

2.4 Perception, affection, action: what shapes our attitude to language

As discussed above, assignation of linguistic qualities such as those considered ‘standard’ is merely an attribute based on language use (social), and not on the linguistic system (language) per se. If a standard language is based on a society’s selection, perpetuation and maintenance, it is therefore considered a social design, a social construct. According to Edwards (2006: 324), these social constructions are primarily based on our perceptions; however, we do not respond to an input based on what we perceive; we respond based on how we understand/perceive what that input means. As Garrett (2010) explains, language varieties convey social meanings; and social preferences/bias towards varieties permeate because our perceptions of a certain language is consistent with our views towards its speakers, eliciting social bias or stereotypes that is beyond the internal features of the language itself (Edwards 2006: 324).

For example, when we hear a language spoken (or a foreign-accented language for that matter), we hear and evaluate not only the language per se (the way it sounds, or how simple/complex the sentences are), but also the social reality of that language — where it comes from (the country’s economic/political situation of the interlocutor), who and what kind of people
are its ‘speakers’ (their culture, tradition, habits, beliefs, politics, etc.), what kind of person is the speaker (the manner of speech, accent, etc.). These associations are embedded in the language, and our prior knowledge influences our perception, judgment, and attitude towards the language. Within the context of linguistics, the attitude construct is important because the speakers’ attitude and perception towards a language could actually define its function(s) and role in a society (cf. Evans 2010, and Evans & Imai 2011).

2.4.1 The attitude construct

The concept of attitude is considered to be “the most distinctive and indispensable construct in the field of social psychology” (Aiken 2002; Allport 1968, cited by Fishbein & Ajzen 1975; Garret et al. 2003). One common assumption is that understanding what attitude is (how it is formed/how it can be explained), we might be able to feasibly effect a change, influence and/or predict an individual’s ensuing behavior/action. It has considerable uses in behavioral science, education/business (advertising/marketing), media, government, etc. (Aiken 2002).

Defining attitude is difficult not only for its covert nature, but also for its relative association with other psychological constructs such as opinion (an often expressed evaluation of an object concerning its worth/character) and belief (something that one accepts as the ‘truth’ based on one’s existing knowledge about and/or prior experience with the object) — e.g., a stereotype, or a belief in a popular idea/image attributed to a particular person/group (Aiken 2002: 5, Garrett 2010: 32). In addition, attitude involves a psychological process of evaluating objects/events based on one’s existing knowledge/experience (with the object), and generally, it cannot be observed directly, but can be inferred from behavior; and unlike opinions and beliefs that are often more openly expressed, attitude it is not easily perceived.

This same dilemma has contributed to diverse definitions of the construct; but a principal description seems to surface: e.g., Eagly and Chaiken (1993: 155, cited in Aiken 2002) regard attitude as “tendencies to evaluate an entity with some degree of favour or disfavour, ordinarily expressed in cognitive, affective, and behavioural responses;” and Sarnoff (1970: 279, cited in Garrett 2010: 20) refers to it as “a disposition to react favourably or
unfavourably to a class of objects.” Both definitions characterize attitude as a tendency or a disposition that involves a tripartite classification of cognition, feelings or affect, and behavior. Aiken (2002: 3) supports this conceptual definition and further describes the attitude components as follows: “cognitive (beliefs, knowledge, expectations, or perceived associations between attitude objects and attributes), affective (feelings, moods, motives, and emotions and associated physiological changes), and performance (behavioral or action, both intended and actual).”

But despite the latent nature of attitude which makes it harder to discern, it can still be inferred from observable behavior. It is a predisposition which can be scientifically observed/measured with the use of methods that elicit attitudinal responses (via verbal/non-verbal means) (Aiken 2002: 4, Garrett 2010). Briefly, some of the main methods used in attitude research are: (i) direct (overt) methods which is a direct form of observing how an individual behaves toward an object; (ii) indirect (covert) methods are disguised forms of eliciting attitude by asking respondents to evaluate an object by supplying them a list of words/phrases (e.g., evaluative adjectives) that they can ascribe to evaluated object; (iii) traditional attitude-scaling procedure/methods such as attitude scales forms consisting of statements that conveys positive/negative feelings towards an object, a concept, people, a group, etc. (ibid.). These methods are also widely used in linguistic researches, as discussed below.

2.4.2 Language attitude and its role in linguistics

As noted above, attitude is a predisposition to evaluate an object based on its favorability trait; its structure is composed of cognitive (our beliefs/judgments), affective (the reactive feeling of approval/disapproval), and behavior (the disposition to act based on what we think/how we feel) (Garrett 2010). Attitude to languages are commonplace and primarily based on language use (Milroy & Milroy 1985), and the value judgments people ascribe to languages stem from social evaluation (Ladegaard 1998: 267), in other words, social perception.

Edwards (2006) posits three possible rationale in the formation of language attitude: one is (i) intrinsic difference, which refers to the quality of the language system per se (e.g., superiority/
inferiority, prestige/stigma); the second is (ii) aesthetic difference, focusing on elements perceived by our senses (e.g., beauty/pleasantness in terms of sounds, etc.); and since the two reasonings mentioned above do not sustain logical explanations, the third is considered the most plausible basis for language/judgments, i.e., (iii) social perception — the evaluation based on how we perceive the speakers of the language/variety. He maintains that any qualities — ‘logical’ or aesthetic — of the varieties themselves are, at best, of very secondary importance. Thus, listening to a given variety acts as a trigger or a stimulus that evokes attitudes (or prejudices, or stereotypes) about the community to which the speaker is thought to belong… [and] when social stratification is associated with linguistic variation, the variety used by those with social clout will commonly be perceived as (grammatically, lexically, or phonologically) superior to nonstandard forms (ibid; quotes in original).

In language education, favorable attitudes to a language can be a motivating factor to achieve success in L2 learning (Gardner 1985, 2006); inversely, successful learning can foster favorable attitude towards the TL learned (Garrett 2010). How attitude factors in linguistic research is further discussed in the following section.

### 2.5 Related studies

In language attitude studies, three main approaches are commonly used: (i) the content analysis, wherein the primary data are gathered/obtained from various public texts, e.g., media, advertisements, policies, etc.; (ii) the direct approach uses methods that directly ask respondents to elicit views on various phenomena via survey or interview; and (iii) the indirect approach draws data from respondents using a more understated technique, e.g., a matched-guise technique\(^\text{10}\) (MGT) or verbal-guise technique (VGT) (Garrett 2010: 37). Attitude researches shed light into some of the most significant sociolinguistics issues (e.g., factors that pertain to differences between regional/class dialects, gender and bilingualism, etc.); from Labov’s (1966, cited in Garrett 2003) pivotal research on the relationship between language variation/change and social classification, to the more current studies on language

---

\(^{10}\) A research method where subjects are asked to listen to speakers with different accents; the subjects will then be given a form with a prescribed set of evaluative adjectives, and based on this list, subjects will indicate their views towards the speakers’ accent (Garrett 2010).
preferences. Exploring different views on language varieties likewise provide insights into the present sociolinguistic situation of English by looking at the attitude towards native/non-native English varieties of both the NSs and L2/FL users of English (Kachru 1986).

### 2.5.1 Language attitude and the *Inner Circle* speakers

From previous language attitude researches conducted among *Inner Circle* speakers (see Appendix 2 for a summary list), two major, albeit contradictory, findings emerge. A greater number of these *Inner Circle* studies reveal a stereotypical pattern where the BrE variety (in comparison with other native English varieties) is consistently ranked highest in terms of ‘status,’ (e.g., intelligence, competence, social standing, etc.) dimension in speech/accent evaluation researches (cf. Ball 1983, Evans 2005, Garrett et al. 2005, Huygens & Vaughan 1983). Conversely, the other major finding reveals that due to the AmE-dominated ‘global media,’ the AmE variety is already replacing the BrE variant on ‘status’ scale, with a further claim that the future of international English could possibly be American-accented (Bayard et al., 2001, Bayard & Green 2006).

The first study conducted by Bayard and his colleagues (2001) investigates how NS students view their own varieties against English English (EE). The result reflects an attitudinal change towards English — with a preference for North American (NAm) accent over EE accent. The researchers believe that the high vitality of the United States, widely promoted through global media, may have influenced this attitudinal shift. In their conclusion, they claim that the NAm accent is well on its way to replacing the EE accent. Since this finding is not typical compared with the other accent evaluation studies, Garrett and his colleagues (2005) carried out a comparable investigation utilizing a *folklinguistic approach*. NS students were asked to evaluate similar English varieties. But in contrast, their study yields an overall negative evaluation for US English. They conclude that the subjects seem to perceive EE as the standard language of ‘tradition, history, authenticity.’ It was also suggested that the difference

---

11 Please note that this particular study was conducted among both NS/NNS of English, see attached Appendix 2, for reference.

12 *Folklinguistic approach* is a direct method used in language attitude research wherein subjects are asked to identify any English-speaking countries they know, and to write down their personal views on the language/variety spoken in the countries identified (Garrett 2005).
in the methods used (cf. Bayard et al. 2001) might have had impact in the result. Evans (2005) performed a similar study which corroborates the findings of Garrett et al. (2005). She finds out that the linguistic ‘status’ of UK English is unchallenged, further suggesting that her NS subjects seem to evaluate/view the varieties on the basis of linguistic ‘correctness.’

Bayard, naturally, came up with another proof confirming his previous hypothesis: and this time, a study was conducted in 19 different countries (among both NSs/NNSs) (Bayard & Green 2006). Once again, the study reveals that the NAm accent is viewed most positively particularly in the dimension of ‘solidarity.’ They conclude that the notion of RP as the ‘prestige’ variety is diminishing, further suggesting that the future of ‘international English’ could be American-accented. This finding supports other scholars’ claims as well. While Barber (2003: 84) believes that ‘the global culture speaks English—or, better, American,’ Phillipson (2003: 165) maintains that due to this ‘global media influence,’ there is a distinct possibility that the NAm [English] will be the ‘single standard for the spoken language.’

The researches cited above obviously differ in methodology, and therefore, results could have been influenced by the approaches used. Timeline must have also factored in because social evaluations towards languages are also based on the political, cultural, and economic condition of the speakers, hence, the disparity in research findings. However, if we consider the findings from the majority of the studies performed, one thing is certain: RP is still the predominant variety when it comes to ‘prestige/status’ dimension that even among the native speakers themselves, the ideology of ‘correctness’ and ‘educatedness,’ of ‘class’ and ‘prestige’ has great bearing and influence within the NS speech communities. Naturally, these studies prompted many others, as presented in the following sections.

2.5.2 Language attitude studies among Expanding Circle speakers

Similar to the Inner Circle studies, the majority of the previous researches conducted among Expanding Circle learners show preference for the BrE over the AmE variety, primarily on ‘prestige/status’ dimension, with AmE leading the ‘social attractiveness’ (e.g., kindness, solidarity, friendliness, etc.) linguistic scale. While many of these researches utilized indirect
method (VGT/MGT), there are also a number that employed direct method (survey/interview) (cf. Appendix 3a/3b for a tabular summary of the studies); the most notable results/conclusions are discussed below.

**Attitude and pedagogical influences**

In a language attitude study carried out by Queiroz de Barros (2009) among Portuguese students/professionals, a stereotypical result shows a majority preference for BrE over AmE; and in spite of various student comments that the AmE accent is ‘easier to learn/copy,’ it is still considered as less correct/less beautiful/less suitable to emulate. Her result also shows how pedagogical practices play a prominent role in the formation of language attitudes, particularly because the subjects view BrE from the perspective of language ‘prestige/correctness.’ Utilizing an indirect method, Carrie (2016) conducted a speech evaluation among Spanish students. Similarly, her findings reveal that although the students’ own speech match the General American (GenAm) accent more, they still aim for the RP accent (despite a general evaluation that RP is more complex phonologically, in comparison with GenAm). In a study conducted among students in Spain, González Cruz et al. (2007/2008) examined the reasons behind the subjects’ preferred variety (i.e., BrE). They argue that due to the current international language status of English, it is important to educate/teach the students about English and its diverse variants, and not confine language education within one variety.

Another example of pedagogical enforcement influencing learner preference appears in the study findings of Evans & Imai (2011), where they explore Japanese students’ attitudes towards *Inner/Outer Circle* English varieties. In contrast with the results of above studies, this one reveals the UK English (UKE) is found to be ‘most attractive,’ while the US English (USE) regarded as ‘most correct,’ and the ‘standard’ variety. They conclude that the result could have been influenced by the current economic/political ties between countries, and the effect of language education policy reform (i.e., the shift from UKE to USE as the ELT model). McKenzie (2008) also maintains that preference for USE and other native English varieties by the Japanese students in his study, may be linked to the use of USE as the country’s pedagogic model, and that the low competence rating for Japanese English may be
due to popular Japanese media/classroom stereotypes (e.g., the ‘low status’ view given to Japanese-accented English; association of prestige with native English varieties) (cf. study of Matsuura et al. 1994). These studies show how history, political/economic ties, and education can influence/impact learners’ language perceptions/preferences.

Rindal (2010) likewise examined the L2 pronunciation and language attitudes of Norwegian students towards AmE/BrE. He discovers that the participants’ attitude towards (their) preferred model of pronunciation (i.e., BrE) influences their pronunciation goals. However, despite their preference for BrE/RP as an accent model and the accent to aim for, their own L2 pronunciation is predominately AmE-accented. He argues that such result implies deviation from language education targets which challenges the function of normative ‘standard’ as the basis for ELT. On a more current study carried out among Norwegian students, Rindal (2014) finds out that BrE is viewed as ‘most prestigious;’ however, the AmE variety (viewed as more ‘accessible’ and less marked than BrE) is the accent they aim for because it is closer to the way they speak. Additionally, many students choose to keep their ‘own accent’ to sound ‘authentic’ and to show their national identity. Rindal believes that this linguistic situation once again, questions the value of BrE as the normative model and puts forward a challenge for educators to provide methods that can measure up to the current linguistic needs of English learners.

Positive attitude and exposure to English varieties

In a study conducted by Dalton-Puffer and her colleagues (Dalton-Puffer et al. 1997) among Austrian students, they find out that RP is the preferred accent. However, they argue that the ones who prefer General American (GA) might have chosen the variety based on their personal experience with the language (e.g., visit/stay in the US). Further, the students’ degree of personal contact/exposure to their preferred variety relates with their distinct (positive) attitude towards the variant. Subjects who prefer GA showed more positive attitude towards non-native accents/RP, ergo, subjects with experience in Anglophone countries displayed less ‘stereotypical' language attitude. (cf. studies of Matsuura et al. 1994, Xu et al. 2010).
Ladegaard (1998), in a study conducted among Danish students, presents a stereotypical finding: RP ranks highest on linguistic dimensions of ‘status’ and ‘prestige;’ and while his subjects hold positive regard/evaluation for the American culture, this sentiment does not prove to be a strong motivating factor to choose the AmE variety over BrE. Further, he suggests that the teachers’ preference for the RP accent may be related to the students’ leaning towards RP as the ‘standard’ and the ‘correct’ form of English.

In a subsequent study, Ladegaard & Sachdev (2006) discover that Danish students perceive RP as the most attractive model in comparison with the other English varieties. Despite the subjects’ positive attitude towards various aspects of American culture/people and extensive exposure to AmE (via media), they still prefer BrE as the model for ELT and even aim for an RP accent. Comparably, Evans (2010) finds out that in spite of her Chinese subjects’ familiarity with American culture through its dominance in global media, they still attribute linguistic ‘status’ dimension to the UK English variety. These studies imply that in these specific contexts, despite the hegemonic culture of the USA and the ubiquity/dominance of AmE via international media, there is still more preference for BrE as the model/accent goal.

In a nutshell, in both NS/NNS studies, the BrE reigns in ‘status/prestige’ dimension against other native varieties. AmE however, tops the linguistic scale on ‘social attractiveness,’ which translates to friendliness and social accessibility. BrE is preferred due to the ideology that it is the ‘correct’ form and its association with education, despite the (i) accessibility/easier-to-understand phonological features of AmE, (ii) respondents’ pronunciation being closer to AmE (where the learner keeps AmE, but still aims for BrE accent), (iii) the ubiquity of AmE particularly in media and the cultural hegemony of the US (pop culture). Further, the findings of Bayard and his colleagues (Bayard et al. 2001, Bayard & Green 2006) demonstrate that AmE is gaining linguistic prominence, not only among NSs (cf. Bayard studies) but also with NNSs (cf. Evans & Imai 2011, Matsuura et al. 1994, McKenzie 2008). The arguments presented in the latter studies are premised on geographical proximity, the political/economic connection between the two countries, and for Matsuura et al.’s (1994) subjects — learner
linguistic goals that are not hinged on an ideological view of ‘correct’ or ‘standard’ English. Their goals are based, rather, on the idea of a linguistic target that is acceptable: one that adequately meets the demand to conduct a comprehensible and clear communication with other English interlocutors (cf. Bian 2009, Xu et al. 2010).

The studies shown above reveal a consistently changing linguistic climate, not only between native English-speaking countries but also in regions where English is used as a second- and/or a foreign-language. They provide insights on how English has been developing as a global language in different contexts; and if the English users’ attitude influences the ‘status’ given to a language/variety, these investigations provide a preview of how the continually growing number of non-native English learners/users might eventually define the function, role, and status of global English and its diverse varieties (cf. Evans & Imai 2011).

### 2.5.3 English in Finland

The spread of English within Europe came about after the second World War (WWII), when a shift in the political, economic, social and cultural state in many countries took place; this inevitably changed the continent’s linguistic climate (Hoffmann, 2000). The influence of Western politics, culture and lifestyle was felt all around Europe. Naturally, globalization/internationalization ensued which resulted in increased migration/mobility, thus, creating a distinct function/role\(^\text{13}\) for the English language which serves as a lingua franca, a means of communication adopted by people whose first/native languages are different. Multilingualism has become commonplace, affecting not only language education but also how people view languages (Hoffmann 2000). Finland was not immune to this change. Post WWII, identification with Western culture and its lifestyle was perceptible through its appreciation/interest in the English language/culture (Leppänen 2007). Development within the Finnish society in terms of politics, growing economy and advances in technology, increased immigration and Western culture influences, has created a major impact on the current status, growth, and function of English (Jaatinen & Saarivirta 2014:41, Leppänen & Nikula 2007).

\(^{13}\) Within Europe, global English has primacy in current innovations, various institutional functions (e.g., advertisements, music, social media, education, official language for international organizations, etc.) and use for interpersonal/instrumental purposes (Berns 2009).
In many Nordic countries, the use of English has been consistently shifting from EFL to ESL (Taavitsainen & Pahta 2003: 3). The linguistic landscape in Finland has also been changing; visible English-language signage can be seen from food establishments to popular tourist places, to public transport areas (e.g., metro, buses, etc.). There has been a considerable growth in the use of English as a lingua franca — manifested in education, research, business (ibid.), as well as an intra-national language used by the younger generation (e.g., among speakers whose L1s are different [Finnish/Swedish] and those who share common interests in Anglo-American music/computer gaming/sports/etc. (Leppänen 2007: 149).

This development brought changes/reform within the Finnish education system; language pedagogy, for example, has been adapting more current teaching approaches, designed to equip learners with communicative/intercultural/plurilingual-pluricultural competence in foreign language learning for use in a constantly developing society (Jaatinen & Saarivirta 2014). Ranta (2010) explains that from the creation of the Finnish National Core Curriculum (NCC), the focus of ELT has always been ‘on the native-speaker ideal;’ and despite the formal acceptance of AmE as an alternative ELT model in the 1980s, BrE – with its long-standing tradition in Finland, is still seemingly the preferred variety by the majority of educators.

Further, BrE and AmE are the most referenced varieties in major language teaching textbook for basic education; and although the latest NCC guidelines stress the inclusion of other English variants for ELT, the RP accent is still used as the pronunciation norm (Aimonaho 2016: 56). Also, while the updated Finnish NCC (for Basic Education 2014) acknowledges the continually developing function of English as a global language and widely supports and endorses the concept, its guidelines on language proficiency assessment is still grounded on the international standard of foreign language(s) proficiency assessment (cf. CEFR, section 2.2.2 above); one can only surmise here that either BrE or AmE still functions as the ELT model in the country, and as such, will be the yardstick of phonological assessment.

But the current dominance of AmE through media pervades Europe. Kahane (1982: 232) explains that the “internationally dominant position of a culture results in a forceful expansion
of its language.” He believes that AmE is the “prestige language of today’s world” not only for its dynamic culture; what contributes to its ascension is the country’s political/economic primacy, advances in science/technology, and its involvement in general language education of English (alongside UK) worldwide (ibid.). American culture is widespread through various forms of media: the Internet, world news broadcasts, educational literature/materials, electronic games, and in extensive forms of entertainment¹⁴: from music, to television series, to international movies, etc. (Barber 2003, Kahane 1982: 233, Phillipson 2003). This linguistic situation challenges the BrE variety which has been quite predominant in Europe.

A countrywide survey was conducted by Leppänen et al. (2011) among Finnish residents; and one of the findings reveal that BrE is favored by less than half (40%) of the respondents, with AmE chosen by about a third (36%). They believe these English varieties are most popular due to familiarity through education. Incidentally, Finnish English is found to be the ‘second least appealing’ variety; and interestingly, with the education level factor considered, it is found to be most appealing by subjects with the least education, and BrE is observed to be the most popular choice among the subjects with the most education.

In one survey conducted among upper-secondary Finnish students, Ranta’s (2010) findings show that the English education the subjects receive from school is viewed positively. The results also reveal that the majority (70%) of the students keep neither the AmE nor the BrE accent for their own use; instead, they wish to use English however way it suits them, irrespective of the NS accent model that is widely taught at schools. This suggests that there is a still a preference for the standard model, albeit, an awareness of the difference between the ‘school English’ and English spoken/used in the ‘real world.’ This current study complements Ranta’s research by looking at the higher level instruction, namely, English philology university students, and explore their attitude to English, specifically, the AmE/BrE varieties.

¹⁴ In Europe, the current entertainment media is US-dominated (Barber 2003: 9, Phillipson 2003: 72).
3 Materials and methods

3.1 Research method

In this current research climate, integrated research methods are commonly used due to its wider scope in terms of evaluating theoretical transcendences from both micro- and macro-level perspectives (Dörnyei 2007). The approach used for this study is a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. The quantitative design outlines the questionnaire used to elicit the general tendencies of students towards English learning and its current function. The qualitative component relies on the more specific open-ended questions which detail the participants’ personal views, attitude, and awareness of the varieties of English. Through the QUAN—qual model, the qualitative element can complement the quantitative component (ibid.); it provides an opportunity for the respondents to give additional input (explanations), and therefore, allows for better evaluation and assessment of the numerical data, which could occasionally lack the details useful for analysis, and produce a more accurate generalization. Simply put, the combined methods provide for a more descriptive, richer picture and fuller understanding of the study focus.

3.2 Participant selection

The target population are Finnish university students from the Faculty of Arts, English program; currently registered at various universities in different cities across Finland. English-major students are selected primarily due to the frequency of language use (assumed language use for university courses/workload) and their (presumed) familiarity with two native English variants — i.e. the ‘standard’ English spoken in the USA (General American, Standard American English) and in the UK (Received Pronunciation, Standard Spoken British English). It is also hoped that the target participants being English-major students are well-informed, and to a certain extent, are aware of the linguistic issues detailed in the survey questions, and therefore, would be more thoughtful, reflective, and willing to get involved by contributing their personal views on the chosen study topic.
Aiming for a sample size of 300 participants, the email list of confirmed registered English-major students was first solicited, and later obtained from seven different student organizations from selected Finnish universities. The university selection is contingent upon the offered academic programs by the institution (for this study, an English program). The student organizations are as follows: *Echo ry, Sub-ry, Magna Carta, Verba ry, SAS (English) via Lexica ry, Anglica, and Britannica.* An email survey request was then sent out to potential participants by using the students’ mailing list obtained, and through their web facilitator. The request briefly explains the scope/objective of the project, survey anonymity/confidentiality, and how the collected data will be utilized (a copy of the email is attached as Appendix 4).

### 3.3 Survey instrument

This current study inquires into the language perspectives of students from different education levels, specifically, the undergraduate and graduate students. Accordingly, a nationwide online survey was carried out in seven universities across Finland. For this investigation, I have chosen to make use of the E-Lomake platform, an online software application provided by the University of Helsinki, where (survey) forms can be designed, created, and sent out to individual (target) recipients. Once completed, the survey forms which were sent out can be submitted back to the sender (a.k.a., the creator of the form, within the same platform). Upon submission, the data (i.e., the completed survey forms) are then automatically collected, stored, and statistically analyzed. Administering this type of survey is both practical and flexible — thus, enabling the researcher to reach a large number of target recipients throughout the country in an efficient, cost-effective method, and within a relatively short amount of time. Additionally, to ensure that enough time is given for respondents to answer and complete the questionnaire, the survey was administered for eight consecutive weeks (i.e., from 25th January until 23rd March, 2016).

Data collection is a complex undertaking which usually necessitates an exceptionally structured instrument. In this study, a survey instrument plays a crucial role in the data collection process — from drawing up the (survey) questionnaire, to piloting and administering the survey *per se.* The questionnaire, according to Dörnyei (2007) must be clear
in terms of what it tries to measure (e.g., attitude, beliefs, behavior), unambiguous and carefully worded, and must have a logical structure and ‘internal consistency’ which can provide reliable result that allows for straightforward analysis, interpretation, and confident generalization.

As this study involves English-major university students’ language preference and personal views on the English language and its use as a lingua franca, I decided to utilize a research instrument that was designed and used by Xu & Van de Poel (2011) on their previous research conducted among Belgian (English-major) undergraduate students. The survey questionnaire they created allows for examining the language use/attitudes of English-major students towards the English language. The survey questions are carefully worded, well-designed to assess the target linguistic areas that are similar to this present study, and was already conveniently piloted (and used successfully on their ELF research) on students who have the same characteristics as my target population. Employing this survey instrument not only reduced the time and effort of designing a new set of questionnaire, but also, and more importantly, raises the chances of obtaining reliable primary materials that allows for a better confidence in both data interpretation and generalization.

The survey instrument is a self-administered questionnaire comprising of 18 multiple-choice items in the form of Likert scale statements, and 3 open-ended items, one of which is non-obligatory (cf. Appendix 5 for a copy of the survey questionnaire). It has two subsections: the first section details the participants’ profile and language learning background; the second section collects data on students’ views toward language learning/use/teaching. I have slightly modified the questionnaire by adding a few more statements and a number of open-ended questions to be able to elicit a more specific answer relevant to the linguistic areas investigated in this study.

3.3.1 Likert questions

As previously mentioned, the items included in the Likert questions are primarily modeled after the survey instrument created by Xu and Van de Poel (2011) from a previous study. The
questions are organized thematically, and divided into different sections. Note that some statements had been slightly modified to fit the requirement of this study. Employing additional set of questionnaire is done for the purpose of gathering additional material about the participants’ language learning background which I hope will provide for a more meaningful discussion for this thesis.

The first section elicits students’ personal thoughts on what motivates them to learn English. The Likert statements (numbers 1-4) are examples of the types of inherent motivation that Gardner (1985) explains can be ‘integrative’ and/or ‘instrumental.’ The participants’ responses will reveal not only their purpose for learning the language, but also their attitudes towards English, and its pragmatic purpose and function. The second section is concerned with learner orientation/learning goals and language preference(s) in relation to the ‘standard’ varieties of English. The third question category obtains the participants’ views on their experiences and use of language with other English speakers (both with NS/NNS), and the last category details their opinions on what/where the focus of language teaching should be.

3.3.2 Open-ended questions

Likert-scale question items enable researchers to obtain data that are quantifiable which makes it possible to analyze or examine emerging patterns found in the data for later interpretation. However, additional open-ended questions could incorporate that missing qualitative component to the study. It enables the respondents to freely explain their views in a more meaningful manner, giving us a more detailed picture, hence, a broader picture and a richer background story. This, according to Dörnyei (2007:171), complements and completes the quantitative section of the study as it “adds flesh to the bones.” Nicholas Subtirelu (2013) likewise utilized a survey instrument which had been used in a previous research (cf. Timmis 2002), and combined the direct survey method with follow-up interviews to gather a more substantive data. However, the idea of carrying out interviews in addition to the survey do not seem feasible for this investigation; ergo, I have decided to simply incorporate a number of open-ended questions into the survey questionnaire, to both supplement and complement my study objectives; the added questions are as follows:
1. Under the learning motivation theme (questions 1-5), I included a non-obligatory question (no. 5), ‘Please specify other learning motivation(s) you might have,’ which allows for a more specific answer, i.e., if the selection of statements (nos. 1-4) in the survey questionnaire did not include the student’s particular motive for learning.

2. On language preference theme (question 10), respondents are asked to state their preferred variety and the reason for their preference to elicit a more precise view toward their chosen variety and other English varieties in general.

3. Another obligatory open-ended question (no. 16) ascertains their preference between the use of English and Finnish in classroom settings. Results from this question could provide information on the current needs of students in terms of language practice which might prove important to developing the English department’s teaching curriculum.

3.4 Data Analysis

3.4.1 Form of analysis for Likert items

The survey instrument contains a set of questionnaire consisting of statements with which respondents indicate the level/extent to which they agree or disagree by marking their chosen response. The format provides five response options that range from ‘strongly agree,’ ‘agree,’ ‘undecided,’ ‘disagree,’ to ‘strongly disagree’ (Dörnyei 2007). For scoring purposes, I have assigned a number for each individual responses: e.g., ‘strongly agree’ = 5, ‘agree’ = 4, ‘undecided’ = 3, ‘disagree’ = 2, and ‘strongly disagree’ = 1. The raw data obtained from the respondents’ completed and submitted survey forms are automatically encoded and processed within the system of E-lomake online software application, a virtual program which also conveniently performs the task of generating, processing, and producing statistical data based on all collected material (here, the submitted completed forms). It generates statistical information such as the average value, median, standard deviation, absolute/relative distribution of the responses, and so on.
For the most part of the analyses, I will make use of descriptive statistics (cf. Xu and Van de Poel, 2011: 265) and highlight the most distinctive response that represents the participant’s answers. This type of statistical analysis reveals the general trend or pattern based on the data collected which allows for drawing up a summary of the essential points. Thus, the tables presented in this chapter will show different information such as the: **Mean**, which is the average of the total scores for each question item; **Median**, also known as the ‘fiftieth percentile’ or the value right at the middle point of the frequency distribution of scores; and last but also as important, the **Standard Deviation (SD)**, which indicates the distance of the individual scores from the **Mean**, or the dispersion of the scores. Also, to facilitate data interpretation, I will refer to the **Most prominent percentage**, which in this study, represents the highest number of respondents that selected the same response option for each question item (ibid.).

### 3.4.2 Form of analysis for open-ended questions

The open-ended question items have produced varied types and lengthy responses from the participants, and therefore, necessitated a more comprehensive analysis which involves both objective and a somewhat subjective interpretation. The goal is to condense the different responses into a number of discrete categories, i.e., answers that are similar are placed into one category, while responses which are similar but not necessarily identical are placed into separate categories. Once categorized, textual answers are coded and converted into numerical responses for data processing.

Attitudinal researches using direct methods in the form of survey questionnaire have been used by a number of linguistic scholars (see for example, Evans & Imai 2011, González Cruz et al. 2007/2008, Rindal 2014, etc.). However, among the various studies on *Inner Circle* varieties of English (see for example Garrett et al. 2005, Bayard et al. 2001, Bayard et al. 2006, Bayard & Sullivan 2000, etc.), I find the research conducted by Garrett et al. (2005) having the most flexible and comprehensive approach that resembles the type of analysis that this current study requires.
Hence, drawing on the study of Garrett et al. (2005), I will categorize the participants’ responses thematically, and look for distinctive ‘keywords’ that will fit into discrete categories by examining the content and form of evaluation of each individual responses (ibid.). This approach, according to Dörnyei (2007: 250), involves an iterative process of analysis, wherein a researcher familiarizes herself with the data by reading and re-reading it several times, reflecting on and carefully examining each word/statement, and perform data coding/recoding more than a couple of times to ensure that the item/text being analyzed fits as accurately as possible and corresponds to each distinct pre-categorized theme. Again, employing the approach used by Garrett and his colleagues (Garrett et al. 2005), the individual responses are then grouped (based on keywords) into the following discrete categories:

1. *Linguistic features.* This category contains answers that range from technical to non-technical descriptions of the attributes and characteristics of the participants’ preferred English variety; for example: *it’s rhotic; I like the spelling conventions; British dialects... tend to be more distinctive; [has] regional accents which bring... variety.*

2. *Affective.* Any response that conveys emotions or is indicative of a low or high level of emotional condition; this category is further divided into two main types:

(a) *Affective Positive,* for statements which express a general liking; this pertains to accessibility of the variety, e.g., *it suits my personality; feels more familiar/natural; aesthetics e.g., pleasing to the ear; the most beautiful variety; authenticity, e.g., closer to what I sound like; it’s more “me;” it feels closer to myself personally; a ‘European’ variety* (primarily due to geographical proximity), fostering a sense of ‘unity’ or oneness; *sense of identification, connection, or interest* with the TL culture; and social attractiveness, e.g., *intriguing and fascinating; laid-back; exciting; neutral enough.*

(b) *Affective Negative,* for responses that seem to communicate a certain level or degree of dislike or discomfort; referring to similar subcategories cited above, these are matters of aesthetics: e.g., *I just hate the sound of American accent; sounds uglier; sounds*
harsh, loud and aggravating; **access** e.g., I find the use of rhotic r's... too challenging to emulate; I do find it much more difficult to speak in an RP accent; **authenticity** e.g., British English... sounds a bit pretentious (at least if I'd try to speak it); A fake British accent sounds too fake; Speaking in British accent would feel like faking it; I feel it would be forcing and "fake" if I tried to change to BE; and **social attractiveness** e.g., dead and snotty; [it's] overwhelming; too elegant and too posh; too mainstream nowadays.

3. **Status and social norms.** This category includes responses that has association with concepts of conventions or **correctness**, and of **education** level and **social standing**; also classified into two subgroups:

   (a) **Cultured Positive**, for responses that are considered favorable and approving; e.g., the best one to use on an international level; spoken in fields such as economy [sic]; [its] accent brings prestige; it sounds sophisticated; it has more character; more authentic; the "original" form of English; more authentic; it's the correct form of English.

   (b) **Cultured Negative**, refers to replies that displays unsympathetic, disapproving and negative remarks; for example: [their] sitcoms are unbearably dull and shallow to me so I associate those accents with simpleness of the mind.

To be able to situate my analysis with previous similar researches, I also referred to and used as an additional guide, the approaches employed by Ulrikke Rindal on categorization of reasons/motivations of Norwegian learners for L2 accent choice (see Rindal 2014: 326).

Further, due to the copious amount of data obtained, there are other response items that do not seem to belong to any of the group classification mentioned above. The quantity of such responses merit a proper discussion, hence, they needed to be categorized as follows:

4. **Language exposure.** This theme includes comments that are more factual than attitudinal; this category is sectioned off into three different subcategories:
(a) *Exposure through education*, or any references to language learning experiences such as courses taken, course books used at school, and allusions to previous language teachers/educators.

(b) *Exposure through media*, where students’ familiarity with English is brought on by their interest or some form of connection (experience) through different forms of media — via Internet, music, video games, films, TV, etc.

(c) *Exposure with other English speakers* (affiliation and/or positive experiences with NSs or NNSs who speak the student’s particular variety of choice; also includes experiences living abroad or visits to TL countries, e.g., Australia, Canada, USA, etc.

The next step is data processing which will be done through coding (i.e., a process that converts text material into numerical data), and calculating for the frequency distribution of keyword items using descriptive statistics. Since I will be presenting the results according to participants’ universities, I will compute for the relative distribution by adding up all the number of keywords in each categories (i.e., *linguistic features, affective, cultured*, etc.) which will then be calculated against the total number of all items obtained from a single university. For the tabulated summary, the total number of keywords in each category will be calculated against the combined total number of keywords items obtained from all seven universities. The last step is to analyze the overall result to look for a general trend/pattern based on the numerical evidence produced.
4 Results and analysis

The first section of this chapter details the demographic profile of the participants. The second section presents the results of the main components of this study — the students’ learning goals, language preference, and reasons behind the preference. Accordingly, results from thematically grouped questionnaire included in the survey will be incorporated into the general discussion (a copy of the survey instrument is attached as Appendix 5, for reference).

4.1 Respondents’ profile

In research, a homogenous sample group makes up for an excellent representative of the target population under study (Dörnyei 2007, Graziano & Raulin 2010). The sample population consists of registered (as of January 2016) Finnish students in the English program, from a Finnish university. To make the subjects comparable as possible, parameters for the selection of participants are established and limited to Finnish nationals whose native/first language is Finnish (where English is used/spoken as a foreign/second language). Finnish bilinguals, or Finnish who speaks two different first languages are also included. However, bilinguals whose other first language is English are excluded from the study; these group of respondents are considered native English speakers, and therefore, do not meet the criteria of the sample group/participant selection.

Within a period of eight weeks, the online survey yielded a total of 382 unexpurgated/unscreened submissions from target participants. All submitted responses were assessed individually for its suitability based on the criteria mentioned above. From the total number of 382 submissions, 24 responses were found ineligible, hence, they were excluded from the study. Ultimately, the process produced 358 valid responses, comprising of 60% students from the bachelor’s level (BA students), and 40% from the master’s degree program (MA students).

The sample group is made up of Finnish students who are currently under the BA and/or MA English program from different universities located in the main cities across Finland — namely, the Åbo Akademi, University of Eastern Finland, University of Helsinki, University
of Jyväskylä, University of Oulu, University of Tampere, and University of Turku. Table 2.0 below represents the absolute number of participants from each university with the corresponding percentage based on the total number of responses. An outline map of Finland showing the approximate location of the universities is attached as Appendix 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the university</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>In percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Åbo Akademi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Eastern Finland</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Helsinki</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Jyväskylä</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oulu</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tampere</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Turku</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1 The participants

The respondents are degree students with age ranging from 18 to 53 years of age. The 21-25 years old group represents about more than half (55%) of the total participants. Indicating a common trend in language education, the majority (78%) of the participants are Female; with only about a fifth (20%) accounts for the Male respondents, and eight participants (2%) are non-binary. As earlier mentioned, more than half (60%) of the participants are students from the BA level, and the rest (40%) are currently enrolled in the MA program. Three participants possess dual nationalities, i.e., Finnish-Hungarian, Finnish-Russian, and Finnish-Spanish; the rest are Finnish nationals. All students in this study speak Finnish as their mother tongue. Bilinguals account for a very small percentage (3%)— with the Finnish/Swedish bilinguals making up two per cent of the group, and the remaining one per cent is composed of Finnish/Hungarian, Finnish/Russian, and Finnish/Spanish L1 speakers.
Reflecting the typical language learning and teaching practice in Finland where students are given the possibility to study two mandatory and one to two (or even more) non-mandatory languages, the participants in this study listed down the languages (other than Finnish) they can speak either as L2 or FL. However, note that the survey question did not provide for responses that determine the participant’s level of language proficiency; hence, it is assumed for the purpose of this analysis that responses to the ‘other languages spoken’ ultimately refer to the actual languages that the respondents are able to speak (and/or perhaps learned) throughout the course of their studies from comprehensive school up to the university level. The majority (85%) of the participants responded to this specific non-obligatory question, while the others (15%) preferred not to comment.

Based on the result, the other languages spoken/learned averages to three (3). These 3-language speakers got the highest number (32% of the group), followed by students who speak four different languages which makes up less than a quarter (20%). The 2-language speakers forms almost a fifth of the respondents (17%). The 1-language speakers who chose English as the only other language spoken constitute the lowest number (8% total). The rest of the participants (23%) listed 5 or more languages learned/spoken. This data illustrates not only the participants’ considerable interest in foreign language learning and their wide linguistic range, but also how the Finnish foreign language education policy influences the study choices of Finnish students.

The results also show that all 303 participants listed English as one of the languages they speak, which is not surprising since they are all English-major students. English is followed closely by Swedish (87%), being one of the mandatory languages taught in Finnish schools. It is interesting to note that there is a higher number of English speakers among the respondents in comparison with Swedish speakers, considering the latter is the second official language in the country. This is probably due to the nature of their studies which allows for greater opportunity to practice English in their academic, and conceivably, social life.

Other notable results show that romance languages are quite popular; a number of students speak German (35%), French (26%), and Spanish (21%). Other European languages are
Russian (8%), Italian (4%), Estonian (4%), Latin (2%); the rest are spoken by less than one percent — namely, Dutch, Norwegian, Portuguese, Croatian, Czech, Danish, Esperanto, the Finnish Sign Language, Hungarian, Irish, Polish, Romanian, Sami, and Turkish. Naturally, the languages spoken/learned are not limited to European varieties. There is a clear interest in learning Asian languages as well, e.g., Japanese is spoken by 6% of the students from this group, followed by Chinese (2%) and Korean (1%). Figure 1.0 below illustrates the list of the languages spoken (other than Finnish) by student participants (in percentages).

The average years of learning English at school (formal classroom education) is about 10 years (45% of the respondents), once again indicating the traditional language education in Finland when students start learning the English language in a formal classroom around the age of 9 (i.e., from grade 3 of comprehensive school until grade 12 of upper secondary school); other notable answers based on the descending order of percentages are 9 years (15%), 12 years (14%), and 11 years (8%).
4.2 Survey result: presentation and analysis

This section presents the main findings of this study — i.e., the participants’ (i) learning goals, (ii) language preference(s) and (iii) the reasons for their preference. Integrated are results from the themed sets of questionnaire. To reiterate, the themes are: the student’s learning motivation; personal goals and learning orientation; impressions on their use of English as they interact with other English speakers; and lastly, their views on the focus of language teaching. Moreover, other question items are discussed as deemed relevant (e.g., question statements 14-16); (cf. Appendix 7 for reference/complete tabulation of results on question statements 1-20). Before presenting the results for respondents’ language preference, I will first discuss where it all started — that is, the participants’ motivation for learning English. Consecutively, I will detail their views on spoken English: their perspectives on learning goals in general, their use of English and the focus of ELT, and other issues related to the students’ personal linguistic goals.

4.2.1 Learning goals: In pursuit of a ‘native’ accent

On learning motivation: integrative, instrumental… or both?

This topic is not core to this investigation, but the subjects’ learning motivation creates an important backdrop for this discussion. According to Gardner (1985), positive attitude towards a TL facilitates openness; negative attitude impedes it, which could lead to language bias. Motivation is a ‘goal-directed behavior’ manifested in a learner’s desire to learn; it directly involves attitude to the TL and the degree/level of commitment to learning the TL; an integrative motivation shows a purpose to learn the TL and identify with the native speakers and their culture; an instrumental motivation implies a utilitarian purpose in learning the TL, e.g., university entrance exam, work requirement, etc. (ibid.). It is interesting to investigate if the current spread and global use of English impacts the participants’ motivation for learning the language. Likewise, this query provides the possibility to explore the subjects’ learning motivations and how these might relate to the their linguistic goals and language preference.

15 Within the context of this study, ‘motivation’ refers to the participants’ overall purpose of learning English.
Based on the survey results, more than half (56% *Strongly Agree*, 36% *Agree*) of the participants are well motivated to learn English because it allows them the possibility to communicate and connect with its native speakers, as well as learn their culture (cf. Q1 on attached Appendix 7). In light of the second item which refers to appreciation of the ‘beauty’ of the language, the majority of the participants (41% *Agree*, 35% *Strongly Agree*) agree with the statement; i.e., they ‘love the beauty of the English language’ (cf. Q2). Although the rest of the respondents appear to be undecided, and a few totally disagrees with the statement.

Moreover, a greater number of students strongly agree with the last two statements which carry elemental features that are associated with *instrumental orientation* which, according to Gardner (1985), is that type of motivation that propels a language learner to acquire the TL primarily for its functionality. The result suggests that almost all of the participants (80% *Strongly Agree*, 18% *Agree*) are of the same opinion that one of the purposes of learning English is to establish connection and to foster communication with people from various linguistic/cultural background (cf. Q3); moreover, most of the participants (75% *Strongly Agree*, 22% *Agree*) would like to learn English because it is currently the language that is widely used/spoken in international community (cf. Q4). Some of these sentiments are expressed below (note that these are extracts from the open question on learning motivation (cf. Q5); also, the participants’ personal comments have been numbered, for reference)\(^\text{16}\):

1. To be able to communicate with people who have different language backgrounds \[48]\(^\text{17}\)
2. it gives me a chance to enter a different culture and mindset, a different way of looking at the world, from within rather than looking at them from the outside as a “tourist”. \[377]\]
3. English is the language of both business and academia these days and a great part of the entertainment in the country is in English, so learning it is a major advantage if not a necessity in many fields of life. \[236]\]

\(^{16}\) All participant comments are kept in original, unexpurgated form (verbatim); however, extraneous and expendable words/phrases were purposely deleted by the author for conciseness (here, replaced by ellipses) due to insufficient space.

\(^{17}\) Respondent’s submission [ID] number as recorded in the E-lomake database.
Thus far, it can be stated that the majority of the respondents are both instrumentally (i.e., to learn English for utilitarian purposes/practical use), and integratively motivated (e.g., they appreciate the ‘beauty’ of the English language *per se*). This integrative motivation somewhat supports the findings of the keyword results (further discussed below) where the affective components show through their positive views towards their preferred L2 variety. Some of their own statements are conveyed as:

(4) I am endlessly fascinated with all sides of English. [278]
(5) Finnish is rather straight-forward: normally you have only one phrase to refer to the phenomenon, thing etc. while English allows multiple ways of expressing oneself. Those little nuances make the language rich and versatile. [367]
(6) Personal aptitude and regard for the history and culture of Britain gained by the life-long interest in British literature and film. [272]

Moreover, in an open-ended question under ‘learning motivation’ theme (cf. Q5), the subjects are asked to provide other/additional factors that may have motivated and/or influenced them to learn English. Less than half (41%) from the total number of participants provided personal comments on this non-obligatory open-ended question. From this group of participants who have responded, it was surprising to see that very few responses (2%) show an integrative orientation: these motivations range from fascination with the English language (and interest in English history/culture), to admiration for its linguistic richness and versatility. Curiously, a shift in motivation, from integrative to that of instrumental, is clearly expressed in one of the responses:

(7) My motivation has changed from being initially driven by an active interest in the language and culture of the English speaking countries to being now based more on the practical usability of English in intercultural contexts. [292]

It would be interesting to find out what factors caused such a change in this particular student’s linguistic orientation; but this is not of primacy for this study. However, this investigation delivers some insights into the underlying factors that motivate this particular group of students to learn English, and evidently, the majority (84%) of the subjects who have
responded to this query express an instrumental motivation, i.e., they wish to learn English (and/or improve their English communication skills) to be able to achieve other goals.

Moreover, these student comments can be catalogued as follows: (i) foremost, to obtain a degree in English; (ii) fluency in English is a major advantage for future career plans in education/translation/international career; (iii) to understand English language materials that are featured in entertainment (films/TV/music), video games, literature, educational materials, etc.; (iv) to access information in English: world news, the Internet, etc.; (v) to establish a connection to international community (this includes personal connection/association with NSs/English users/speakers of other languages); and (vi) for international travel plans. Again, these findings suggest that subjects’ purpose for learning English is grounded on utilitarian purposes, i.e., to use that language as a vehicle to accomplish/achieve other objective(s).

Incidentally, the remaining participants (16%) express uncategorized reasons, such as a general love for learning (any) foreign languages, or they find the English language ‘easy to learn,’ and/or, that they are just ‘simply good at it.’ Some of them have expressed that these same reasons serve as an excellent motivation that provide them a boost of self-confidence — a satisfaction and/or a sense of achievement in learning, acquiring, and being able to communicate fluently in a foreign/second language.

Clearly, the global use of English as a tool for international communication is reflected on the participants’ purposes for learning the language, with some students candidly stating a shift from an integrative motivation to an instrumental purpose. But in the next subsections, it is possible to see whether these motivations shed some influence on the subjects’ learning goals (their L2 accent, in particular) and in their preference for an L2 variety.

On non-native English speakers and native English speaker accent

This section queries the respondents’ views on NNS language goals, in general. The results (see Table 3.0 below) reveal a striking consensus (78% Strongly Agree; 18% Agree): speaking articulately rather than producing a native accent is considered to be more valuable in any
English communication (cf. Q9). More than half (51% *Strongly Agree*; 30% *Agree*) are of the same opinion that a native-speaker accent is more of an option rather than a mandate; that is, it is not necessary for non-native English speakers/users to speak as native speakers do (cf. Q8). The majority (43% *Disagree*; 28% *Strongly disagree*) of the participants also disagree with the idea that NNSs should speak as close to AmE or BrE accent as possible (cf. Q7).

Table 3.0. Participants' learning goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language learning goals</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Most Prominent Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6. My personal goal is to be able to pronounce English as British or American people do.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>37% <em>Agree</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Non-native speakers of English should learn to speak as closely to British or American accent as possible.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>43% <em>Disagree</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. For non-native speakers of English, it is not necessary to speak like Brits or Americans.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>51% <em>Strongly Agree</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. In general, it is more important to be able to speak fluently than to sound native-like.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>78% <em>Strongly Agree</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the majority of the student comments stress the idea that intelligible communication (achieved through fluency) takes precedence over pronunciation. This was also pointed out by participants of similar studies who questions what acceptable English should be; they believe that comprehensibility and clarity of message, rather than the ‘ideal’ native speech or a close approximation thereof should be considered the standard for language learning (cf. studies of Bian 2009, Xu et al. 2010). One of the respondents from this current study mentions that ELT in Finland would benefit from a teaching approach that emphasizes speaking without the looming pressure of a native model pronunciation target. This issue may be associated with the current pedagogical model/’standard' English which promotes, if not imposes, strict adherence to the *writing form*, while crucially neglecting the distinctiveness of *speech forms* that do not necessarily follow the same discourse rules/conventions (cf. Carter 1994). These views are expressed in the following comments:

(8) I lived and went to a local public school in the States for several years… as a kid, my goal obviously was to fit in = pronounce English like everyone else did, but now I think being able to communicate is much more important than pronunciation. [120]
(9) … there should be more diversity in the accents heard in teaching English… the aim shouldn't be
native-like proficiency which just might not be realistic and be quite discouraging… there should be
more emphasis on getting Finnish pupils more confident in speaking English, no matter in what kind
of accent. [182]

(10) I have discussed this subject with my friends who are also English majors and all of them have been
confused and unhappy with our professors’ instructions to try to copy a native accent. [263]

Clearly, the predominant view here is that the ability to carry out intelligible spoken
communication in English is more important than the possession of a ‘native’ speech. The
results in students’ personal learning goal as related to the native-speaker model, however,
tells a different story.

*On personal language learning goals: accent matters*

Despite the students’ expressed views above, the majority of the participants (297 out of 358
respondents) surveyed in this study aspire for a native accent (37% *Agree*; 32% *Strongly
Agree*) (Q6, cf. Table 3.0 above). The most plausible reason for this choice is the fact that
these participants are English-major students, and in contrast with other university students
from different academic fields, this particular group would essentially have goals, aspirations,
and expectations to master the major aspects of the English language that are taught in schools
(cf. study of Dalton-Puffer et al. 1997). Moreover, the following student comment deserves
further scrutiny; it not only describes an adherence to a ‘NS speech’ goal, but it also shows
how these ideals impact the learner’s learning confidence; curiously, it also reveals a
developing linguistic awareness/identity:

(11) Of course I would like to sound more like a native speaker since that's what the study program
"aims" at (and it sounds more professional) and speaking with native speakers makes me become
super aware of my poor pronunciation, but I've been starting to be increasingly comfortable with my
Finnish pronunciation too, because Finns are not British and we shouldn't be. [203]

The quotation above seems to suggest that the current pedagogical model influences the
learner’s accent goal, yet, being assessed against the NS ‘model’ makes the learner feel that
his/her accent does not measure up (cf. Dalton-Puffer et al. 1997, Jenkins 2006). On the other hand, the developing language awareness begins to surface through an acknowledgement, or better yet, ownership of a Finnish-accented English, and in some sense, by taking pride in showing his/her regional identity through the use of English (cf. Jenkins 2002). However, this particular situation poses a challenge on the teaching of pronunciation/speech assessment that is based on an NS model (cf. Rindal 2010, 2014).

Further, some of the findings here have similarity with the results of a speech study conducted among English-major students from Austria, where the students evaluated/ranked Austrian-accented English negatively in contrast with AmE/BrE (Dalton-Puffer et al. 1997). Similarly, the results suggest a sense of negative attitude towards the Finnish-accented English — in that when interacting with other English interlocutors (NSs/NNSs), the overwhelming majority of the respondents (33% Disagree; 41% Strongly Disagree) are opposed to keeping a Finnish-accented English (cf. Appendix 7 for reference). Some of the responses below are lifted from question fourteen (cf. Q14) which asks the students if they prefer to use Finnish or English in formal classroom discourse/interactions; some answers are indicative of the negative association attached to a foreign-accented English, as follows:

(12) While I don’t condemn accents in general, I am not very fond of the typical Finnish accent or the way I speak English. [33]

(13) It [English] is a much more verbal language with lots of twists and frases for signposting, which make it preferable to speak and listen to. Also it has an intonation unlike Finnish… [134]

There are, of course, a few number of students (5%) who wish to keep a Finnish accent; one student considers it ‘cute;’ another maintains that a Finnish accent adds ‘richness’ to any English variety used, and as such, should not be regarded as a ‘nuisance.’ Also, there are students who purposely keep, and are proud to speak a Finnish-accented English because the distinct accent conveys their national and cultural identity:

(14) … [I] would rather not be mistaken for coming from any specific region… I would not want to come across as someone pretending to be something I was not… I’d still rather be perceived as a Finn, as it is my nationality and cultural background. [199]
I do not understand why it would be important for me to try to mimic accent and hide my nationality. While I think that one should try to sound fluent when speaking English, faking an accent feels ridiculous to me. Why should I feel embarrassed to be a non-native English speaker? [263]

Additionally, there is only a slight difference found on intergroup response, namely the BA students and the MA students. Figure 2.0 below charts the intergroup response, specifically for question statement number six (Q6) which relates to their personal learning goals. This result may suggest that students’ learning goals do not change over a short period of time, or in this context, within the estimated learning course of 5 to 7 years.

One of the aims of this study is to investigate whether the numerical results will produce a notable difference between the two groups based on the students’ education (degree) level. Interestingly, after comparing the collective answers of both groups (BA and MA) using descriptive statistics, the numerical data did not yield any notable difference as shown in the figures above.

On the use of English with other interlocutors

Thus far, it is noted that that there is a clear solidarity among students who believe that an NS accent should neither be imposed nor expected from other non-native English learners.

---

18 In many Finnish universities, 5 years is the study time earmarked for students to complete their BA/MA degree. If necessary, study time extension for one year is allowed for students targeting to graduate from bachelor’s level, and a two-year extension period for master’s level.
speakers (cf. Q7, Table 3.0 on ‘language learning goals’ above). However, some students have been fairly candid in articulating their opinions — that is, they assume and expect their English-major counterparts to demonstrate a certain degree of English proficiency within the range of educated ‘standard’ English. Note that emphasis has been placed on producing a ‘better pronunciation,’ perhaps, primarily for the reason of message clarity/comprehensibility, and not necessarily on keeping a ‘native accent.’ As might be expected, this view is not entirely unfounded in this context; it can be argued that all the participants in this study are studying English in a higher level instruction, and therefore, are somewhat expected to have reached some level of academic language proficiency. Likewise, for other respondents, the ability to speak “in a clear and comprehensible way” (cf. studies of Bian 2009, Xu et al. 2010) is still viewed as the goal in achieving a meaningful and efficient communication between interlocutors. These student views are clearly conveyed in the statements listed:

(16) I feel bothered if I know that the person has studied as long as I have and should be on the same level, and does not even try to pronounce and articulate well. [279]
(17) … my experiences of speaking English with non-native speakers is limited mainly to tourism. In those situations speaking English is anything but enjoyable, because - in my experience - it can be extremely difficult to communicate with people who have strong, foreign accents. [78]
(18) … the only situations where I'm bothered by other speakers' pronunciation and poor grammar is when they render communication impossible. [187]

Furthermore, based on the tabulated results (see Appendix 7 for reference) from question statements concerning the use of English with other interlocutors, the findings suggest that the majority (44% Strongly Agree, 35% Agree) of the students feel at ease/comfortable when interacting with English NSs. They likewise enjoy speaking with NNSs (53% Strongly Agree, 35% Agree). There is only a difference of less than ten per cent of students who prefer interacting with NNSs, rather than with NSs (e.g., only 79% collectively agrees to NS interactions, and about 88% for NNS interactions), but it still proves that there are more participants who feel quite relaxed with the NNS, and perhaps less intimidated. The results also show that more students disagree with the notion that “there is no difference when speaking with either NS or NNS” (129% Disagree, 17% Strongly disagree). These sentiments
are articulated in the following student comments (comments are extracted from Q16 responses, cf. Appendix 7):

(19) I would speak Finnish, especially if there are native speakers of English around, because I have a feeling they might judge me and my message based on my non-native English. [28]

(20) Especially with non-native speakers, I feel more confident about my English skills, so my communication is more fluent. [248]

(21) I'm quicker in Finnish and I don't have to worry about my pronunciation all the time… wondering if the teacher understands me, or my points. The presence of the native speaker in a classroom is somewhat close to claustrophobia. [291]

Preferred language in the classroom: English or Finnish?

This question statement is used to elicit responses that will further substantiate the students’ comfort level in speaking English in a classroom environment where they have opportunities to speak/use the language among NNS/NS peers, teachers, etc. When asked about their language preference between Finnish and English during classroom interactions (e.g., in class/group discussion and presentation, etc.), about a third (31%) of the subjects would rather speak Finnish whenever possible (i.e., with Finnish-speaking students/teachers). The most common reasons are: (i) speaking/using English (or any foreign language other than their L1) among their peers sounds fake and feels pretentious and awkward; (ii) they feel that their English pronunciation/grammar is not good enough and that they are afraid to make mistakes; and (iii) they feel that the students, teacher, or a ‘native speaker’ will judge them based on their speech. Of course, these reasons are given alongside the obvious fact that for those whose L1 is Finnish, it is simply the most natural, the clearest, easiest, and most practical way to effectively communicate. These are expressed in the comments below:

(22) … I’ve always found it a bit weird talking in English when all the participants are native Finnish speakers. [74]

(23) Despite being an English major, I still think my speaking skills are not that fluent and feel slightly insecure when speaking in front of other students.[112]
(24) Using Finnish is easier and I feel less nervous about speaking Finnish in classroom situations… It depends on the class, too… what the subject of the class is, what the teacher is like and whether the other students are nice and don't judge others if they make mistakes. [79]

Some remarks here (e.g., student comment 22) are not uncommon, particularly in keeping an RP accent which has a very distinct pronunciation/accent. In Rindal’s (2014) study, some of the participants also find that speaking/trying to speak with a ‘British accent’ makes them sound less ‘authentic.’

However, about a third (30%) of the respondents prefer to use English as well; with various reasons ranging from ‘practice makes perfect,’ more comfortable using it, or they simply like the language per se. Many students seem uncertain, though: on the one hand, Finnish language provides that certain ease in communication; but on the other hand, using English challenges them, not to mention improves their speaking skills. But upon closer evaluation, the primary reasons found among the responses are: (i) English is generally used in the classroom (from lecture topics, to definition of concepts, etc.), hence, the use of Finnish may provide difficulty particularly with English terminologies/linguistic jargons that are not easily translated into Finnish; (ii) it is a good opportunity to use/practice English particularly its spoken form; and (iii) being able to participate in class/group discussion and/or conduct a class presentation in English provides a boost in their self-confidence. The following comments demonstrate these sentiments:

(25) … English is easier to use for example when there is a lot of specific terms and vocabulary that have been studied only in English so they are "stored in one's mind in English" [135]
(26) I prefer English. The first reason is that the changes to speak English in Finland can be scarce and therefore I speak it at every opportunity. [283]
(27) …there’s something exciting when talking in a foreign language - it makes you feel powerful, like you’ve achieved something great. (Which you have for learning a language isn't easy) [101]

The largest group (37%) of respondents feel that this language choice is context-dependent: i.e., they will use Finnish with Finns (all students/teacher), and English when there are non-Finnish speakers (among students/teachers). This includes a small number of students who
prefer to use either Finnish or English, since they are quite proficient with both languages. For some, they choose both because Finnish is better for a more intelligible/effective group discussion among other Finnish speakers, but they will also take advantage of the opportunity to use English particularly during class discussion/presentation. The rest (1%) of the subjects choose not to comment, and other responses are too ambiguous to be categorized (1%).

Gender-wise, there is a slight difference among female, male, and non-binary results: almost a third (29%) of the Female respondents opt for Finnish, and equally, about a third (29%) of them prefer English, with the majority (39%) of the students choosing both/context-dependent responses. With Male participants, however, more than a third clearly express their preference to speak Finnish (38%), but with a third opting for English (35%), and only close to a fourth (23%) who opt for both languages. A quarter (25%) of the Non-binary subjects choose Finnish, one student prefers English, and more than half (63%) prefer both Finnish/English. Based on the education level, the BA students (34%-Finnish, 32%-English, Both-30%) seem to prefer to use Finnish more than the MA students (26%-Finnish, 25%-English, Both-46%); although the use of both languages appear to be more popular among the graduate students.

So far, the findings reveal that: (i) there is a consensus among the respondents that in spoken communication, fluency is more important than pronunciation; nonetheless, (ii) as English-major students, the majority aspire for a native speech. The ideal NS pronunciation promoted in language pedagogy may have contributed to some manifestations of negative attitude towards Finnish-accented English (e.g., views that the native model is the only ‘correct’ form of English, and therefore, any foreign-accented English sounds ‘incorrect’) which likewise, affect their confidence level in speaking English, in general. So, too, perhaps, an accented-English implies ‘less education’ (cf. et al. 2011). The students’ learning goals in relation with the NS model is further explored in the succeeding presentations.

4.2.2 The verdict: American, British … Other English?

In Question item 10 (Q10), the respondents are asked which variety of English they prefer to learn. The collective result is shown in Figure 3.0 below. More than half of the participants
(61%) prefer the British English variety, and about a third (34%) of the respondents choose the American English variant. This is a stereotypical result, comparable with the many previous studies conducted among *Expanding Circle* EFL learners cited above (cf. studies of Evans 2010, Queiroz de Barros 2009, González Cruz et al. 2007/2008, etc.).
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The rest (5%) of the participants prefer the ‘Other varieties’ category; presented here with the absolute number of student(s) who prefer other English variants: e.g., Australian English (n=5); Canadian English (3); Irish and Irish/Hiberno (2); and Scottish (1). Seven students did not state any variety. Below are some of the reasons cited for these L2 choices:

(28) Irish English/Hiberno English, I have lived there the longest. It's me second home. [24]

(29) Other, because all varieties are equally good… [119]

(30) Positive personal experiences with the Canadian culture and people. [161]

The results in this study suggest that from the participants’ perspective, BrE is the standard ‘model’ for learning. This outcome is not surprising because BrE has always been the predominant variant that is spoken/used within the country, not only because it is implicitly endorsed by the National Board of Education (cf. Ranta 2010), but perhaps, also for its geographical proximity to the UK which provides more possibilities and opportunities for economic, political, and cultural relations between the two countries. As with many other studies, such factors are also bound to influence the language preference (cf. studies of Evans & Imai 2011, González Cruz et al. 2007/2008, McKenzie 2008, Quieroz de Barros 2009, etc.).
AmE on the other hand, seems to have been gaining ground in Finland, perhaps, through its acceptance (since the 1980s) as an alternative English variety alongside BrE, for general language education (Ranta 2010). In the same vein, the popularity of the AmE variety among Japanese students is assumed to have been triggered not only by the political and economic relations between Japan and the US, but also by the decision of the language education board to change the ELT model from BrE to the AmE variety (cf. studies of Evans & Imai 2011, Matsuura et al. 1994, McKenzie 2008). Additionally, and as already cited above, the AmE’s predominance in world media, particularly in the entertainment industry and the American popular culture that is also promulgated through their ‘unceasing global media onslaught’ (Bayard et al. 2001), have been some of the major influences in the use of, and preference for AmE. Before I discuss the participants’ specific reasons for their L2 choice, I will first present the results on their L2 preference based on gender.

What women/men/others want: results on the gender factor

Examining the distribution of the respondents’ preferred variety based on gender, Figure 3.1 below shows that Male participants, comprising about a fifth of the sample group (20%), are almost equally divided in their language choice, i.e., with less than half (42%) selecting AmE and almost half (49%) choosing BrE. In contrast, Female respondents which makes up the majority of the subjects (78%), unquestionably prefer BrE, casting almost twice as high (63%) number of votes for the BrE and only about a third (32%) for the AmE variety. Most of the Non-binary participants (2% of the group) prefer BrE over AmE.
These results may suggest that male students are either more ambivalent in their attitude towards different English varieties, or are plainly less concerned about the aesthetic features of the language. If the proportion of male/female participants is taken into account in another similar study, the investigation could, ceteris paribus, yield a totally different result.

4.2.3 Reasons for language preference: An overview

As earlier stated, the respondents have come from seven different universities across Finland. A general overview of the reasons for the students’ language preference are discussed below, presented according to their respective universities. The figures in the graph below (Figure 3.2) show that the majority of the subjects prefer BrE despite the seeming predominance of AmE through different forms of media within the country.

Åbo Akademi. More than half (67%) of the respondents from this academy prefer BrE for different reasons, such as: familiarity through education, to foster a sense of solidarity (i.e., of BrE being a ‘European’ variety), a fondness for British culture, etc. AmE, on the other hand, is selected by merely a third (33%) of the participants, primarily because it is the variety that they have been exposed to, hence, it sounds more familiar for them, and ‘natural’ when they use it. Some interesting statements express their sentiments:

(31) [BrE] I haven't really thought about it. AmE is much more common, and it's the variety most students are more familiar with, so maybe that should be the standard? [310]
It has never been a conscious choice to choose a variety of English. My teachers have spoken BrE and most of the audio material was recorded with a BrE accent.

American English is just the variety I’ve grown up using and listening to. I wouldn’t really dare to force a British accent, people could hardly take me seriously if I were to do that.

University of Eastern Finland (UEF). Survey results from the participants from this university in the eastern part of the country show an almost equal amount of votes for both varieties: half of the UEF respondents (50%) prefer BrE, with just slightly less than half (48%) show preference for AmE. One respondent (2%) has no preference. A little more than half of the students who opt for BrE have expressed reasons that are based purely on the aesthetic quality of the variety (e.g., it sounds pretty, sophisticated, etc.); about a third of the students say its ‘familiarity’ through years of education, often quoting that it is the ‘correct/original’ form; while for the rest of the students, it is the culture that the BrE language represents. On the other hand, the reasons given by the majority of the subjects who prefer AmE is their constant exposure to the variety through various forms of media (entertainment, in particular). Many students also expressed that AmE feels more ‘natural,’ and closer to what they normally ‘sound like.’ Some comments specific to these findings are listed below:

University of Helsinki. Just a little over half (55%) of the participants from this southern university prefer the BrE variety. Primarily, the reasons are: aesthetics, followed closely by familiarity via education, and a general liking for the British culture; the rest of the
respondents state that connection with BrE speakers/users (both native and non-native speakers) have influenced their L2 choice, as well as the geographical proximity of Finland to the UK. Moreover, more than a third (39%) of the respondents prefer AmE as their model for language learning. These students predominantly think that AmE is fairly accessible (i.e., AmE is easier to understand and pronounce in contrast with BrE) and it also sounds very natural when they use/speak English with other interlocutors; some even assert that an AmE accent seems ‘closer to a global standard’ which makes it ‘more widely accepted.’

Further, there are also a number of students who speculate that the manner with which they have acquired an AmE pronunciation despite the BrE taught at school, could have been, to a large extent, due to their constant exposure to the variety through different forms of media. For the other students, having visited/resided in the US and/or just having connections with AmE native speakers made the variety more familiar, and some have even grown to ‘like it.’ The remaining five participants (6%) prefer different varieties such as Australian English, Canadian English, and Irish English. The most common reason behind the choice is their connection and association with the language’s native speakers (e.g., lived/visited/connected with the country [and its NSs]). Below are some notable student comments:

(37) [BrE] British English is "the original" English. I also happen to think that most British accents sound a lot better than most American accents… [379]

(38) [AmE] I was taught to use British English in school but in my personal life I was more exposed to the American variety and it felt more natural so I started using it instead. [34]

(39) [CanE] Positive personal experiences with the Canadian culture and people. [161]

University of Jyväskylä. Comparable with the findings above, more than half (59%) of the participants from this university in the central part of Finland prefer BrE more in contrast with AmE; unsurprisingly, the most common reason is aesthetics-related, i.e., ‘it simply sounds the best… beautiful and elegant.’ Likewise, some students claim that it is the ‘correct, original, and authentic’ English. In the case of AmE, however, less than half (38%) prefer the variety; and in contrast with BrE, AmE is seemingly more approachable (i.e., easier to understand/pronounce) and more natural (e.g., does not sound fake when the participants use it, unlike the distinctive accent of BrE/RP); it is also quite a familiar variety — for some, through its
ubiquity in the entertainment media, while for others, through exposure with AmE native speakers (note that one participant [3%] does not seem to prefer any variety, hence, did not give out any response). Some of the students views are conveyed as:

(40) [BrE] I love the sound of British English! I have been watching a lot of series and movies with this accent, and definitely would want to sound like this rather than speak the american accent. [9]

(41) [AmE] The reason I chose AmE is because I personally feel like I'm 'faking it' when I try to sound British, RP or regional variation (these I cannot do). [72]

(42) [AmE] I have grown up hearing American English through television, films etc. and it feels natural. E.g. a British accent would sound a lot more forced. [92]

**University of Oulu.** From this northern university comes the highest number of respondents who prefer BrE as their model for language learning. About three quarters (76%) from the total number of participants prefer BrE primarily because: (i) it is aesthetically ‘pleasing to the ear,’ (ii) it is most familiar due to school/years of language education, and (iii) the students consider it as the ‘original’ form of English — associating the variety with educatedness, correctness, standard. In contrast, one in every five students (20%) prefers AmE; and from this group, the most common reason is the influence of constant exposure to AmE-dominated media. Moreover, two respondents (4%) state that a brief residence in Ireland, and close association with a native speaker swayed their choice of L2 preference for Irish/Hiberno English and Canadian English, respectively. Some of their comments are listed below:

(43) [BrE] I have always found British English or RP very pleasing to the ear and I would very much like to be able to sound like that myself. However, I do find it much more difficult to speak in an RP accent, so I've been wondering if I should just switch to American English. [85]

(44) [BrE] British English is the standard for Europe and should thus be taught in Finnish schools, as it is. Even though I personally prefer the American way. [153]

(45) [AmE] American English is the one that I've always spoken and it comes really naturally to me, probably because of all the American TV that I've watched ever since I was pretty young…When I speak British English it sounds very forced and too posh. [53]
University of Tampere. Located in an urban center outside greater Helsinki area, this university has the highest number of respondents (n=89). Similar to the findings above, the majority (64%) of the students in this group also prefer BrE as the ELT model. Their reasons range from BrE being a ‘European’ variety,’ to fondness for its group of speakers, culture, history, country, etc. But the primary rationale behind their choices are: (i) foremost, BrE is an ‘elegant, sophisticated, beautiful,’ pleasant-sounding variety; (ii) second, it is what has been taught at school, hence, they are either familiar with the variety, and/or have kept and embraced it by habit and/or by choice; and third, (iii) BrE is the ‘pure, correct, original,’ and the ‘oldest version’ form of English. For some students, though, the NS speech model promoted through language education clearly influences their L2 choice; but at the same time, they acknowledge the fact that accents are commonplace, the NS speech included; this sentiment is clearly expressed below:

(46) [BrE] I had teachers at school who preferred British to American English. I therefore imposed a type of British pronunciation on myself. I would like to state here that I find it terrible that someone can get ridiculed if they are non-native speakers of English with an accent. Having an accent is natural and even native speakers do not always pronounce certain words in the same way every time. [254]

Further, almost a third (29%) of the participants prefer AmE; a couple of respondents consider it the most widely used variety and the ‘de facto lingua franca,’ while the others are influenced by their prior stay/visit in the US. But in this group, many students affirm that the AmE-dominated media not only helps them learn but it also makes them realize that AmE is easier and sounds more ‘natural’ to actually use; the AmE accent is more ‘international’ and not as distinctive as RP, and therefore, if and when they use English, their speech accent sounds more ‘natural,’ rather than ‘fake.’ One respondent suggests that if Finnish students are constantly exposed to AmE through its ubiquity in the media, then, language pedagogy should promote BrE so that learners could develop a ‘mixture of English skills that are easily applicable in an international context’ [ID 92]. For the remaining participants (7%), one prefers Canadian English; the other Scottish English. Four students do not wish to state any preference. Below are some student responses that substantiate the results mentioned here:
(47) [BrE] In my opinion, British English is the most beautiful variety of the English language. I also see as the original variety, as the purest one. It also sounds more sophisticated than other varieties. [375]

(48) [BrE] In school I was taught the British accent, which is why I used to try and sound as British as possible, but nowadays my English pronunciation is affected so much by American movies etc that I only want to be understood. [241]

(49) [AmE] American accent might be easier to learn than the British accent. Or maybe it is because we learn the accent mostly from TV and movies. [304]

University of Turku. More than half (59%) of the respondents from this southern university have preference for BrE; the major reason is aesthetics: BrE sounds ‘elegant,’ ‘beautiful,’ ‘sophisticated,’ and ‘pleasing’ to listen to. Others also specify that through their language education experience, BrE has become more natural, familiar and easier to use. For some, their reasons express a clear association between the language varieties and their speakers: e.g., one student mentions that it is easier to ‘take British English speakers seriously’ compared with other English interlocutors; for others, a mere general liking/preference for the British culture as opposed to the American’s, seems to be the deciding factor.

In the case of AmE variety which is selected by over a third (35%) of the participants, the most common reason given is the simplicity of the accent (in contrast with BrE’s fairly distinctive accent), and how natural and similar the AmE accent is compared with the students’ own speech. The subjects seem to agree that the primary reason is the AmE-saturated entertainment media that they are constantly exposed to, and familiarity with the variety makes it easier for them to understand, listen to, and even produce AmE. For the rest of the participants (6%), two students opt for Australian English: one has close relationship with Australian speaker(s), and the other used to live in Australia. The responses below clearly express the views by some of the students from this group:

(50) [BrE] In the beginning of our studies, the students are divided in British and American speakers after the diagnostic tests. Personally I do not appreciate the division, since I do not feel like Finnish people should sound like British speakers. However, I was chosen in the British group but in reality I'm using a mixture of British English-major, American English and rallienglanti. [203]
(51) [BrE] British English sounds more beautiful than the American but since I hear the American more often, it comes out more naturally in communicative situations. But I still keep trying to speak in British accent. I mix them up a lot... [313]

(52) [AmE] For me, American English is a more neutral variety compared to British English which sounds a bit pretentious (at least if I'd try to speak it). Also, I've probably been exposed more to American popular culture (tv shows and music) than to other varieties. I prefer American English also because I somehow consider it as cool, in comparison with British English which I see as (too) fancy or sophisticated or elegant. [174]

Interestingly, the three most common factors for choosing the BrE variety are related to aesthetic attributes, exposure through education, and a stereotypical feature of ‘cultured’ variety (e.g., BrE being the original/pure/correct language). For the AmE variant however, the top reason revealed is familiarity via exposure through media, and the ‘naturalness’ of the accent (of the L2 variety, here AmE) which most students consider to be seemingly ‘closer’ to their own speech. Moreover, after reviewing all the student statements, it is noticeable that only a number of the reasons cited pertains to the internal language features: one student prefers the rhotic r, ergo, opts for AmE; the other three prefer the writing conventions of BrE (mainly, the spelling of certain words with s rather than z, e.g., BrE’s organise, as opposed to AmE’s organize). The majority of the reasons expressed have attitudinal elements. In the succeeding sections, I will present the next set of results through an in-depth analysis of keywords obtained from the participants’ evaluative responses.

**Respondent’s attitude towards the English varieties: Keyword analysis**

As previously mentioned in the methods section (cf. section 3.4.2), the respondents’ personal comments are classified into distinct categories; i.e., (i) **linguistic features**, (ii) **affective positive/negative**, (iii) **cultured positive/negative** (status and social norms), and (iv) **language exposure (via education, media, and with NSs of English)**. This classification is based on the number of keyword items found from each participant’s evaluative response. The items convey both attitudinal (emotional reactions) and non-attitudinal responses that were foremost in the mind of the subjects at the time of answering the survey.
This subsection presents keyword findings according to different L2 varieties — the American English, the British English, and other preferred English varieties (Australian, Canadian, Hiberno/Irish, and Scottish English). The graph presented above (Figure 4.0) shows a summary of the keyword responses, grouped into discrete categories.

**American English.** As mentioned above, more than a third (34%) of the subjects prefer the AmE variety. There are 229 total number of keywords categorized under this variant, 88 of which fall under the Affective Positive (38%) category, i.e., a general liking towards the variety. The findings reveal that the subjects prefer AmE because: (i) the students find it ‘easier’ to pronounce (in contrast with that of BrE); (ii) its ‘natural’ sound fits (and somewhat ‘similar’ to) the students’ own speech; (iii) the variety is socially attractive (e.g. ‘exciting, laid-back, approachable, relaxed, informal, neutral, cool’). Interestingly, Exposure through Media (27%) does not only influence the students’ preference; for some of the participants, constant exposure to the variety helps them learn and makes them more familiar/used to a different English variety (other than BrE). Although in some cases, the process leaves some individuals ‘confused’ and uncertain of their L2 choice (e.g., student comments 36 & 43), whether to use the education-endorsed BrE, or the more ‘natural’ AmE (cf. Rindal 2014).

There are also a few number of keywords that fall under Affective Negative (10%) (or a general dislike for the variety) which are predominantly remarks concerning aesthetics (e.g., ‘uglier, nasal, harsh, loud, aggravating, annoying’). The category Exposure with NS/NNS
(9%) shows connection or association with English speakers who have somewhat influenced the students’ preference. Clearly, experiences such as having visited/studied/lived in the US have produced an impact on learner’s acceptance and appreciation towards a different variety (cf. Dalton-Puffer et al. study 1997). For the Linguistic Features (9%) category, students primarily comment on the phonology of the language — AmE being ‘rhotic’ makes it ‘easier to understand/learn/mimic,’ and seems much ‘simpler’ than BrE.

Moreover, Exposure through Education (2%) has one of the lowest keyword listing, perhaps due to the implicit endorsement of BrE within the Finnish education system. While some students believe that AmE is the ‘de facto lingua franca’ due to its ‘international, influential’ status particularly in ‘world economy,’ (comments here fall under Cultured Positive, [4%]), the others relate the variety with American ‘reality TV’ shows and ‘stupid sitcoms,’ further describing the variety as ‘uneducated,’ ‘superficial,’ ‘unbearably dull and shallow,’ and somehow associated with ‘simplesness of the mind’ (keywords under Cultured Negative, [1%]). Again, this is a typical illustration of language perceptions that are based on association between the language and its speakers and their culture.

**British English.** Just to reiterate, more than half (61%) of the respondents prefer this popular variety. From a total number of 384 categorized keywords, about 201 keyword items belong to Affective Positive (52%) component — (i) primarily for its perceived aesthetic quality: ‘lovely, sophisticated, pleasing, elegant, most beautiful, intriguing, fancier, more distinctive, fascinating, pretty;’ (ii) students identify with ‘British culture,’ the ‘UK,’ ‘British way of life;’ (iii) it feels ‘natural,’ ‘more “me”’ and ‘easier to speak’ — which is obviously related to the next top category. The Exposure through Education (15%) category reveals a seeming connection with the students’ decision to keep BrE simply because it is the variety they have gotten used to, and as such, the accent they wish to keep if only to be to be linguistically ‘consistent.’ The participants explain that it is the ‘most natural’ accent to use since they have been studying it from a very young age.

Another prominent category is Cultured Positive (15%) which has to do with the prestige, education, and social status of the language. Keywords such as: the ‘standard variant,
“original,” formal, prestigious, more acceptable, intelligence, historical prestige, “pure,” standard accent, educated, correct, “polished,” classic,’ and the ‘oldest version of English’ are just some of the words the students associate with the variety. Comments that fall under Linguistic Features (6%) component are somewhat related to BrE being the standard variety — i.e., ‘the structure being the standard’ or the ‘most standardized accent (pronunciation),’ and some prefer it simply for its ‘spelling and vocabulary.’

Compared with the findings for AmE above, the BrE result has considerably less Affective Negative (6%) views; although, there are some negative evaluation about BrE being ‘too posh/fancy/elegant/colonialist,’ and also, ‘dead, snotty, too old-fashioned.’ Further, the following sentiments describe how they feel and/or how other people might see them when they adopt BrE/RP accent in their speech — with expressive comments such as: ‘extremely pretentious, sounds too fake, seem/more forced, ‘faking’ it, fake, sound ridiculous, a bit pretentious,’ and for some, they feel that listeners would ‘hardly take [them] seriously.’ However, in comparison with the AmE result, BrE did not get a single negative evaluation under the prestige, educatedness, and social status dimension (Cultured Negative, 0%).

Additionally, the categories Exposure with NS/NNS (4%) and Exposure through Media (2%) seemed to have a much lower number of keyword inventory in contrast with AmE variety. The former refers to traveling, family connection, NS friends, NNS teachers [who keep BrE] as the primary influence for L2 choice; the latter describes the students’ exposure through media via British television series, films, music, etc.

**Australian, Canadian, Hiberno/Trish, and Scottish English.** These English variants are chosen by the rest (5%) of the respondents. A total of 18 keyword items are found under three distinct categories; half of these keyword inventory are categorized under Exposure with NS/NNS (50%). Keywords found in this category express the students’ ‘positive personal experience(s)’ and/or relations either with NSs or NNSs who speak/keep the participant’s L2 choice, and/or having lived/stayed/studied in the country where the variety is spoken. Other notable keywords are classified under Affective Positive (39%) and Linguistic Features (11%) — with comments for Canadian English as sounding ‘natural’ or seemingly ‘neutral’ like the
AmE variety, or the ‘beautiful’ sound of Scottish English, or ‘feels like home’ for one respondent who has lived in Ireland. Under Linguistic Features, some students cite preference for the rhotic quality of the Irish English, and for its ‘clear vowel(s) sound/pronunciation.’

Summing up, from the total number of 641 keyword items categorized into different distinct groups, the category with the greatest number (290) of keywords is Affective Positive (45%), and an overwhelming majority of these attributes are related with the aesthetic quality of the BrE variety, and for the ‘natural’ and ‘approachable’ characteristic of the AmE variant. The others that come in second and third are Cultured Positive (12%) for BrE, commonly citing its popular social evaluation of being the ‘original, pure, and prestigious’ variety, and for AmE — Exposure through Media (11%), for its ubiquity and global media presence. The remaining categories individually comprise of less than a tenth of the total keyword inventory, namely, the Exposure through Education (9%) which is mainly allocated to BrE, Linguistic Features category (8%), Affective Negative (7%) is tied with Exposure with NS/NNS category (7%), nil for Cultured Negative category.

This summative finding suggests that the majority of the responses reveal keywords that are associated with language attitude, taking into account that the Affective and Cultured categories (which in total, comprises the majority [64%] of the responses) are primarily based on how the participants view/perceive not only the structure of the variety but what is associated with the specific variety — chiefly its speakers, culture, country, country’s economy/politics, etc. (cf. Edwards 2006, Garrett 2010). These are constructions that are primarily based on their social knowledge, impressions from their personal language experiences to their own group’s social/cultural perspectives, stereotypes encountered, and unconsciously learned/handed-down ideologies (Garrett 2010, Milroy & Milroy 1985).

Their most notable keywords: the English-major students speak

The two illustrations below are keyword result summaries, presented according to the respondents’ universities (see Appendix 8 for the tabulated summary of keyword item results). Based on the statistics below (Figure 4.1) the keywords attributed towards the American
English variety are primarily under the categories of Affective Positive, Exposure via Media, and Exposure with NSs. While Affective Positive items reveal a positive view/general liking for the variety, it nevertheless receives negative evaluations (Affective/Cultured Negative).

From the graph below (Figure 4.2), the British English variety are overwhelmingly assigned evaluations for Affective Positive; this is followed by attributes concerning Cultured Positive, and Exposure through Education. This likewise suggests a strong liking for the variety, in general; but in contrast with the AmE variety, BrE is given less negative evaluation. It also has a much less keyword inventory on Exposure via Media category in contrast with AmE.

This section summarizes the most prominent categories of notable keyword items identified (keywords are highlighted in bold), and presented according to the participants’ respective university (cf. section 3.4.2 for explanation on open-ended question analysis).
Åbo Akademi. The most prominent category from this group is *Affective Positive* (100%, 43%, respectively), for both AmE and BrE variants; however, the responses expressed are not based on the aesthetics, but rather on an overall ‘liking;’ as revealed in the comments below:

(53) I'm more *fond of the British culture* in general, so that's why I *like* the British accent as well. [339]
(54) Because it's [AmE] *easier* for me. When I started studying, I wanted to use the British pronunciation, but it just didn't *suit me* as *well* as the American one. [322]

University of Eastern Finland. With an almost equal result in L2 choice, this group of students likewise express a generally affective view for the American English variety: *Affective Positive* (40%), followed by *Exposure through Media* (36%); and for the British English variant: the most notable keywords are associated with *Affective Positive* (53%) and *Cultured Positive* (18%). These are conveyed in the following student remarks:

(55) Preferring AE is probably caused by *media influence* (movies, TV shows, video games) and it feels more *natural* as a result. Trying to speak BE makes myself feel extremely pretentious. [331]
(56) I find British English somehow more *authentic* and *beautiful*, it *has character*. American English sounds too plain to me. [350]

University of Helsinki. Similar to the findings mentioned above, the predominant categories for the American English variety are *Affective Positive* (41%) and *Exposure through Media* (20%); with the most notable keywords for the British English variety categorized under *Affective Positive* (41%), followed by *Cultured Positive* (18%). However, while a number of keywords for AmE appear under *Exposure with NS/NNS* (15%), the BrE variety keyword items fall more on *Exposure through Education* (16%). Moreover, half of the keywords found for other English varieties (namely, Australian, Canadian, and Irish English) fall under *Exposure with NS/NNS* (50%). The statements below further illustrate these findings:

(57) It feels most *natural* after watching so much *movies* and *TV*. It also sounds more general than British accent somehow, not so distinct. Speaking in a British accent would feel like faking it. [195]
(58) I find it that "English English" is the *easiest to pronounce*. It also sounds *classy* and *sophisticated*. If I try to imitate General American I end up sounding like a pirate. [91]
University of Jyväskylä. An uncanny similarity with the findings from the two previously mentioned universities, from this group of participants, the prominent categories for the American English variety are also Affective Positive (46%) and Exposure through Media (33%). For the British English variety, the most notable keyword items listed under Affective Positive (54%) and Cultured Positive (15%). Interestingly, many keyword items fall under Exposure with NS/NNS (17%) for the AmE variant, whereas with the BrE variety, some keywords appear under Affective Negative (12%). The comments below support these results:

(60) I am more connected to the US culture through television, movies etc. so it seems more "natural" to me. Speaking in a British accent would seem rather forced. [56]

(61) For some reason, British English has always been easier to pronounce to me. I think this has to do with the fact that my teachers spoke BrE in school and that I have always consumed more art and other cultural products in BrE than AmE, for example. [29]

University of Oulu. Unlike the other group of respondents, the results from this university reveal that there are almost as many Affective Positive (37%) as there are Affective Negative (33%) keywords attributed to the American English variety; with Exposure via Media (20%) ranking third. Unsurprisingly however, perceived qualities for the British English varieties are categorized accordingly, with aesthetic-based keywords dominating the list, as follows: Affective Positive (48%), Cultured Positive (20%), and Exposure through Education (18%). Other English varieties such as Canadian and Irish English have keywords under Exposure with NS/NNS (100%) category. Some of the participants’ fairly candid views are conveyed as:

(62) American English is more relaxed and informal. RP is dead and snotty. [51]

(63) To me, British English sound educated and correct, whereas American English has more uneducated connotations. [54]

University of Tampere. The highest number of respondents come from this university. And for once, Exposure through Media (30%) seems to have topped this keyword list for the American English variety, followed closely by the Affective Positive (27%) category.
Likewise, there are Affective Negative (16%) keywords found under this variety. For the British English variant, however, the result is comparable with the findings above: Affective Positive (47%) tops the keyword chart, followed by Cultured Positive (20%), and Exposure through Education (11%). The other varieties chosen such as Scottish and Canadian English varieties have been mainly given aesthetic attributes, and both fall under Affective Positive (100%). Shown here are some of the respondents’ comments:

(64) American English has been easier to adapt to, due to all the influence from tv and films etc. [230]
(65) It's more pleasing for me to use the British pronunciations, as to me they're simpler to produce and sound clearer… there are plenty of American accents I find annoying. Looking at it objectively, I think I associate the standard British with intelligence… most American sitcoms are unbearably dull and shallow to me so I associate those accents with simpleness of the mind… [277]

University of Turku. Similar to the findings revealed above, the categories that predominate this group’s responses are ranked as follows: for the American English variety, they are Affective Positive (44%), Exposure through Media (22%), and Exposure with NS/NNS (14%). For the British English variety, however, an overwhelming number of keywords fall under Affective Positive (61%); there are also a number of items under Exposure through Education (18%), and some negative evaluations that fall under Affective Negative (10%). Australian English has keywords that are categorized under Exposure with NS/NNS (75%). Some of the interesting student quotes are listed below:

(66) American English has always sounded 'prettier' to me than other varieties, and I think that is because I have watched so many American tv shows and movies growing up. [163]
(67) It [BrE] sounds more beautiful and sophisticated. I think it's somehow easier to take British English speakers seriously than people who speak other varieties of the language. [141]

It is fairly easy to state here that the majority of the university results reveal similar findings: positive views are associated with both varieties, with the BrE variety given more attributes that are related to its aesthetic qualities, and the AmE variety viewed as more ‘natural’ sounding and the ‘easier’ English variety in general, in terms of reception, but more so in production (e.g., easier to imitate/speak/copy). Likewise, characteristics that pertain to the
BrE variety being ‘cultured’ manifest in many responses/keywords. Interestingly, exposure through the various forms of media seems predominant for the AmE variety, whereas exposure through education is more prominent in BrE.

Moreover, the results seem to suggest that negative perceptions (33%) for a variety (here, AmE) are more prevalent when there is zero exposure through education and nil exposure with NS/NNS (e.g., findings from University of Oulu). Although comparable with the results from the University of Tampere, which also presents a high number of negative views (16%) for AmE and zero exposure through education, the participants’ exposure with NS/NNS (7%) must have carried some weight for the lower number of negative perceptions/views. Other zero education exposure cases are Jyväskylä and Turku university, respectively; but their results also reveal that the participants from both universities have higher instances of exposure with NS/NNS (17% and 14%, accordingly), and they also seem to have a higher media exposure (33% and 22% respectively) compared with Oulu students’ general exposure through media (20%).

Obviously, the analysis here is performed by examining/evaluating the data obtained with the use of descriptive statistics; note that this current study is exploratory in nature, ergo, it does not aim to provide any statistically correlated evidences. However, through this keyword technique, this investigation has gone deeper into what influences the participants’ language preference(s) by eliciting what is foremost in the minds of the learners on relevant linguistic issues. The benefit of this approach lies on the subjects’ option to describe how they feel about a variety, and their personal impressions described in their own words, rather than having to choose from a prescribed set of evaluative adjectives (as is the case with other research methods, e.g., VGT). This technique undoubtedly strengthens the findings in this study.

4.3 What Finnish university students want: a recap

This whole investigation provides insights into what students want in terms of language learning/teaching, particularly on the aspect of spoken English. This summary briefly answers the research questions previously raised. First, do Finnish (English-major) university students...
aspire for a native-speaker accent? There is a general consensus among the participants that in NNS spoken communication, fluency takes precedence over native or native-like speech; ergo, in the grand scheme of things, they are aware of the plurality of English and respect/acknowledge the differences between the varieties (cf. Matsuura et al. 1994, Ranta 2010). However, on a personal level, the majority of the subjects still aspire for a native speech. The rationale behind this is clear; their current study and present work/future career plans hinge on acquiring proficiency in English, if not a complete ‘mastery’ of the language; this includes the NS speech which is the target goal of general language education. Similar results are found in other related studies (cf. studies of Dalton-Puffer et al. 1997, González Cruz et al. 2007/2008, Quieroz de Barros 2009, Xu & Van de Poel 2011).

For the second/third research questions: in the general learning/teaching of English, which variety do they [university students] prefer? What are the reasons behind their preference? This investigation reveals a stereotypical result that is found in the majority of the studies conducted among Expanding Circle English learners. British English is the preferred variety by most students primarily due to its perceived aesthetic qualities such as the ‘pleasantness’ of the way it sounds, its consistent association with formal education (cf. González Cruz et al. 2007/2008, Quieroz de Barros 2009), and regard for its ‘cultured’ attributes which translate to ‘authenticity,’ the most ‘correct/educated form’ of English, ‘original,’ etc (cf. Carrie 2016). In this study, the latter attributes also seem to have been influenced by language education since BrE is, to a large extent, the current pedagogic model for ELT.

Moreover, the ‘cultured positive’ association is seemingly connected with the tradition of standard language ideology which could have been brought about by years of language education, or perhaps, handed-down to learners by older generations (e.g., school teachers) who believe in an ideology of having ‘one correct form’ of language/speech (Garrett 2010, Lippi-Green 2012, Milroy & Milroy 1985; also, see studies of Evans 2005, Garrett 2005). This ideology is somewhat manifested in this study: for example, for many participants, there is a seeming lack of self-confidence because they measure their own speech against the illusory ‘perfect’ NS speech (cf. student comments 19, 21, 23). Additionally, AmE is viewed as more accessible and easier to understand compared to BrE, but the imposition of the latter
through pedagogical practices compels learners to choose BrE as the variety for ELT and the ‘ideal’ accent to emulate (cf. Carrie 2016, González Cruz et al. 2007/2008, Queiroz de Barros 2009, Rindal 2010). This creates ambivalence among learners’ speech: will it be the educated BrE, or the more accessible AmE (cf. student comments 31, 36, 43). This language situation also raises the question of linguistic identity construction that naturally manifests in L2 learner speech (see student comments 11, 14, 15, 50) (cf. also with studies of Norton 1997, Rindal 2010). Within the context of ELT, this necessitates an evaluation of the value of the current linguistic model and existing pedagogical practices, particularly, the area of spoken language assessment (cf. Jenkins 2002, Norton 1997, Rindal 2014).

Moreover, this study does not corroborate the research of Bayard and his colleagues (Bayard et al. 2001, Bayard & Green 2006). Their findings show that AmE is preferred over BrE by NS university students, and the researchers consider that the AmE-dominated global media may have influenced this change. For some Finnish students in this study, however, a number of comments show ambivalence; although they are taught to speak BrE, they still keep AmE due to the influence of AmE-dominated media (cf. student comments 38, 44, 48). Unfortunately, a statistical correlation between L2 choice/accent and the role of media (exposure/influence) cannot be established here since this is merely an exploratory study; perhaps, future studies could be conducted to investigate if any significant relationship exists.

As stated earlier, the reasons for AmE preference is primarily due to its ‘naturalness’ and simplicity, in phonological terms — i.e., it is easier to understand and easier to produce (see for example student comments 33, 41, 42, 45, 54); perhaps some of these are due to their constant exposure through the AmE-saturated media. Another major reason is exposure with NS/NNS which seems to create a number of positive evaluation and less negative comments. One university seem to stand out for giving most negative evaluation for AmE in contrast with the rest; this university also happens to have zero exposure/connection with NSs or NNSs who keeps the AmE variety, and nil exposure through education. Again, it would be unwise to make any generalization based on these results due to different confounding variables that were not taken into consideration in this study. However, this finding nonetheless shows that perhaps, the more exposure to different English varieties the students
get, the less negative impressions/evaluations they give; as previous studies have proven, familiarity with varieties could lead to language preference either through education exposure (cf., Evans & Imai 2011, Matsuura et al. 1994, McKenzie 2008), or exposure with NSs/NS countries, and positive experience(s) with the target language (cf. Dalton-Puffer et al. 1997).

In this survey, an option was given to all participants to freely choose any English variety for ELT; yet, only a few number of respondents opted for a different variety other than the AmE and the BrE variants. This could suggest that the students’ familiarity with the status of both varieties as the ‘standard’ model may have limited their linguistic selection as well; this further illustrates the impact that language pedagogy has on one’s perception/attitude to language.

4.4 Study limitations and ideas for further research

If replicated, there are many factors that could be improved from this study. Firstly, because this investigation is essentially exploratory, no correlational analyses were made/presented which makes it difficult, if not impossible, to generalize any findings discovered; but future researches may confirm/qualify the results by employing, perhaps, a combination of direct/indirect approaches, and by utilizing a more comprehensive [inferential] statistical method. Example of future researches could be a correlational study on the influence of media and learners’ L2 pronunciation/preference, or between learners’ L2 preference/L2 pronunciation.

Secondly, there are many confounding variables that were not taken into account in the participant selection process, for example: the level of learner’s linguistic awareness (e.g., current issues on sociolinguistics — ELF vs. normative models, idealized NS speech, SLI, etc.), the students’ socio economic status, and their experience in the use of English (e.g., extent of social/media exposure to English, extent of experience/social encounters with native speakers, etc.), just to mention a few. These factors could very well influence the subjects’ attitude/preference towards a variety. So, too, is the proportion of the participants (gender-wise); Female subjects significantly outnumber the males/others (although in this particular context, there are actually more female enrolled in university English programs, in general). It
is good to note, however, that in the case of UEF (where the participants’ Male/Female ratio is more comparable compared with other universities), the findings on language preference section revealed an almost equal choice between AmE/BrE. It would be interesting if future studies could focus on gender difference to see if there will be any significant difference between the results. Also, a similar study conducted among university students from various academic fields may also provide an interesting comparison, as well as obtain insights from the perspective of students whose linguistic needs (may) vary from the English-major ones.

Additionally, due of the varied sample sizes of the group of participants that represent each university (e.g., some universities are grossly underrepresented), it would be unwise to make any generalization on the attitudes of the whole English-major student population in Finland, nor the population of English-major students/participants from each of the seven universities included in this study. However, the findings here should be considered valid because administering the same survey questionnaire to all participants from different universities allows for a comparison between the groups, as opposed to comparing it with other researches that utilized a different approach/research method.
5 Conclusion

This study was an exploration of the Finnish university students’ language preference and their perceptions on the current use/spread of English as a global language. The findings here revealed that despite the proliferation of the AmE variety through many forms of media, the BrE variety is still preferred by the majority primarily due to its perceived notion of aesthetics and ‘cultured’ features, and its current status as a pedagogical model. Further, there seemed to be an overall awareness of the plurality of English — of its diversity and functions as a global lingua franca (cf. Ranta 2010); that on a general level, the students believe that in spoken communication among NNSs, fluency takes precedence over native speech; conversely, on a personal level (and being English-major students), they still wish to acquire a native speech.

Additionally, the findings here revealed how the developing function of English as a global language affects the practices of the students within this context; some of the participants manifested: (i) how learning motivations undergo a constant restructuring; (ii) an evolving linguistic awareness that challenges the notion of ‘ideal’ NS speech; (iii) an increasing acceptance of varieties other than the one traditionally prescribed; (iv) an acknowledgement and pride for their own linguistic identity, i.e., in appreciating the value that regional/national differences provide. Again, it would be absurd to infer that the findings just cited apply to all the study participants. But the aim of this study was to gain insights into the students’ attitude towards English and how it affects their L2 goals/practices; and this is what this investigation had accomplished. The students’ perceptions not only revealed the social and cultural values/meanings they associate/attach with the different English varieties, but also the various ways in which they evaluate, assess, and judge a variety against the existing ELT ‘norm.’ It presents a sociolinguistic view of English, demonstrating how perceptions and attitudes can be shaped/influenced by various social factors, including an ideology to standard language (Milroy & Milroy 1985).

I wish to emphasize that the intention for this project had gone beyond investigating which native English variety is most dominant, nor the variant most preferred. The ultimate aim was to explore the student’s attitude towards English, to gain insights that will help us understand
how the global use of English influences their L2 practices, and in turn, how such practices affect the development and the teaching of English in the Finnish context. This study is a contribution to the growing list of researches on linguistic attitude, language preference, and the use of global English. The insights provided not only enhance our knowledge and understanding on current sociolinguistics issues that are central and relevant to this specific context, but they also challenge and encourage current/future language educators to critically evaluate/interrogate the learning materials they adopt, to foster and encourage an unbiased appreciation for the English language and its diversity within the classroom, and to instill a well-grounded language awareness in their students.

Wells (1982a) maintains that a promoted ‘standard’ variety may very well be the fixation at a certain period; but such variety could lose its ‘charm’ depending on the linguistic attitude and behavior of the society — because the promotion of any variety to a ‘standard’ status is not based on the intrinsic feature of the language, but rather on the attitude and social judgements of the users towards the language and its speakers (Coupland 2008, Edwards 2006). Within the context of linguistics, attitude is an important construct; because at the end of the day, the speakers’ attitudes and perceptions towards a language could very well define its status, role, and functions within a society (Evans 2010, Evans & Imai 2011).
Acknowledgements

I gratefully acknowledge the student organizations from various Finnish universities across the country — viz. the Anglica, Britannica, Echo ry, Magna Carta, SAS (English) via Lexica ry, Sub-ry, and Verba ry — for the very kind assistance they extended for this research project.

And to the Finnish university students who have shared their views, and spared valuable time to participate in this ambitious academic project — I am forever grateful for their invaluable contributions. This research would not have come to fruition without their kindness, solidarity, and generous support.
**Glossary**

AmE  American English  
AuE  Australian English  
BrE  British English  
CanE  Canadian English  
CEFR  Common European Framework of Reference for languages — an international standard guideline describing the different levels of learners’ language proficiency  
EE  English English  
EFL  English as a foreign language  
ELF  English as a lingua franca  
ELT  English language teaching  
ENL  English as a native language  
ESL  English as a second language  
FL  foreign language  
GA  General American (also GenAm)  
IrE  Irish English  
L1  the *first language* learned from early childhood; in this study, a *bilingual* is defined as a speaker who uses two languages that function as their L1  
L2  the *second language*, either learned as a second language or foreign language  
NAm  North American  
NZE  New Zealand English  
RP  Received Pronunciation  
ScE  Scottish English  
SE  Standard English  
SLI  Standard Language Ideology  
SSBE  Standard Southern British English  
TL  target language  
UEF  University of Eastern Finland  
UK  United Kingdom  
UKE  United Kingdom English  
USA  United States of America  
USE  United States English
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Appendix 1. Three concentric circles of world Englishes (adapted from Kachru 1985, 2006)

Expanding circle: EFL (English is learnt/used as a foreign language)

Outer circle: ESL variety (English is learnt/used as a second language)

Inner circle: ENL/L1 variety (English is learnt/used as a native language)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inner Circle (est. population/in million)</th>
<th>Outer Circle (est. population/in million)</th>
<th>L1/L2 English Users (approx. total/in million)</th>
<th>Expanding Circle (est. population/in million)</th>
<th>L1/L2 English Users (approx. total/in million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States 293</td>
<td>India 1000</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>China 130</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom 59</td>
<td>Philippines 86</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Japan 127</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada 32</td>
<td>Pakistan 159</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Indonesia 238</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia 20</td>
<td>Malaysia 24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Thailand 60</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand 4</td>
<td>Bangladesh 141</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>South Korea 49</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kong 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vietnam 83</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singapore 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Myanmar 43</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Lanka 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Taiwan 22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cambodia 13</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laos 6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three circles represent the English language diffusion, acquisition patterns, and its function(s) in various domains of each region; the table above shows a list of different regions that categorically belong to each circle, based on their English language users/speakers; note that the Expanding Circle also includes regions from the Middle East (e.g., Cyprus, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, etc.), Europe (e.g., Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Sweden, Switzerland, Albania, Italy, Spain, Bulgaria, Hungary, etc.), and Latin America (Brazil, Argentina, etc.) (Berns 2005); Outer Circle includes regions from Africa, the Pacific, and some other parts of Asia (Kachru 1985, 2006).
### Summary list of studies on language attitudes conducted among *Inner Circle* speakers.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Study focus</th>
<th>Hypothesis/ Theoretical framework</th>
<th>Method/Participants</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Ball (1983)</td>
<td>sociolinguistics attitude towards native/non-native English accents, viz. General Australian, RP, Liverpool English, Glasgow Scottish, French/-German/Italian-accented English, East Coast AmE</td>
<td>* RP is rated highest in terms of Competence dimension, but lower in Social Attractiveness</td>
<td>four different experiments using MST</td>
<td>* RP rates highest on Competence, low on Social Dimension non-standard accents/non-Anglophone accents are rated lower on Competence, but more attractive/ sociable compared to RP/AmE accent</td>
<td>association with social and socioeconomic hierarchy may have influenced the subjects' assignment of ratings for foreign accented-Englishs generally, non-standard and English with foreign accents are viewed negatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Huigens and Vaughan (1983)</td>
<td>attitude towards English, ethnicity, and social class</td>
<td>* lower Prestige and its association with regional accents in UK is not likely in NZ</td>
<td>higher Prestige given to RP; NZs aspire for RP accent for elevated 'status'</td>
<td>* the majority of the subjects identify the speakers' ethnicity rating for Prestige dimension is highest for English (RP) and for 'RP'-approximate</td>
<td>* RP and near-RP accent of Pakeha speakers are both highly rated on prestige; suggests that acquisition of RP accent can enhance one's status (in this context) stereotypes are assigned to speakers' accent via their ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia, New Zealand, USA</td>
<td>Bayard, Weatherall, Gallois, and Pittam (2001)</td>
<td>perception of native English accents AuE, NZE, AmE among NS students</td>
<td>* Linguistic deference vis-a-vis linguistic imperialism might influence accent ratings by subjects (Antipodes)</td>
<td>accent ratings will reflect the changing attitudes brought on by globalization</td>
<td>* RP accent will rank highest in Power/Status dimension, a stereotype findings in prior attitude studies</td>
<td>evaluation ratings reflect attitude change towards English — with AmE rated higher than BrE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US, UK, New Zealand, Australia</td>
<td>Evans (2005)</td>
<td>attitudes of US, UK, NZ, Australian students towards native English varieties</td>
<td>* English English is declining in terms of prestige against NAm English</td>
<td>a possible link between globalization and the rise of NAm and/or the decline of EE</td>
<td>* VGT to evaluate/rate accents of Australian, English (British), New Zealand, NAm English over twenty (20) academic participants from 19 different countries</td>
<td>results show high vitality of America brought on by its 'global media onslaught'; AmE is replacing BrE in terms of Status/Power dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ, Australia, USA</td>
<td>Garrett, Williams, and Evans (2005)</td>
<td>NS’s attitude towards native Englishes — primarily AuE, EE, NZE, US Eng</td>
<td>* follows up study on accent evaluation/ findings by Bayard et al. (2001) re dominance of US English</td>
<td>* folklinguistic approach (identity English-speaking countries they know/react to English spoken in each country listed)</td>
<td>* NAm accent dominance on Personality/Solidarity traits amongst NS/NNS subjects</td>
<td>* NAm is evaluated positively particularly in Social dimension; RP accent as ‘prestige’ variety is diminishing in contrast with other similar studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*With the exception of Bayard & Green (2005) study which is conducted among native/non-native speakers of English (Asia, Europe, North/South America, and The Pacific).
### Appendix 3a. Studies on language attitudes conducted among Expanding Circle speakers (Europe).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Study focus</th>
<th>Hypothesis/ Theoretical framework</th>
<th>Method/Participants</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Carrie (2016)</td>
<td>attitudes of Spanish EFL learners towards BrE/GenAm accents</td>
<td>* near -standard* accents are rated more positively for competence; <em>non-standard</em> for solidarity or social attractiveness</td>
<td>VGT method (re attitude towards BrE/GenAm, questionnaire/ interview combination) 71 Spanish nationals, undergraduate English Philology/ Translation students (27% males/73% females)</td>
<td>* RP is thought as formal/functional; GenAm is more informal/interpersonal * fascination with British culture, but others are fascinated with US cultural products * RP is more complex (phonology) than GenAm; but still aims for the accent</td>
<td>* accent goals suggests the participants are motivated by social/culture, than language per se * RP is chosen for status/more suitable model; GenAm is socially attractive, positive feel to its speakers, and more matched to participant’s speech * EFL learners may use RP as learning accent in classroom; but use GenAm to optimize such learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Rindal (2014)</td>
<td>language attitudes of Norwegian EFL learners towards native English varieties: Standard Southern British English (SSBE), General American (GenAm), Scottish English (ScE), Leads English</td>
<td>* speaker evaluation approach used by Rindal (2010) * “standard” English as defined by Wells (1982) and IPA (1999) * standard language ideology accorded to native English varieties, as perceived in Norway (Cf. Rindal, 2010)</td>
<td>VGT attitude towards SSBE/PP, ScE, Leaders English, GenAm)</td>
<td>* BrE is chosen to be the “most respectable” based on VGT results, but the majority prefer AmE accent because it is “most acceptable,”</td>
<td>* BrE is regarded as more ambiguous and marked, AmE is preferred by some as L2 accent * AmE is accessible; making it the preferred accent in challenged role of ‘standard language’ reflected in L2 accent choice among subjects (consider SSBE as ELT standard, but not an accent to aim for)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Ranta (2010)</td>
<td>views of upper secondary school students on their current use of English in/outside the school environment: attitudes towards NSs/NNSs; L2 accent kept; etc.</td>
<td>* the debate on the reliance on native English varieties as sole model for language teaching/assessment ensues from the changing role of English worldwide * the use of English as a lingua franca (ELF)</td>
<td>survey questionnaire (to obtain views towards English accents, own use of English) 108 upper secondary school students; 34 Finnish-speaking teachers</td>
<td>* 70% of students do not keep a particular variety; 23% keep AmE; 7% keep BrE * 85% of teachers keep BrE; 15% keep AmE — but 79% are opposed to using only one variety for teaching, 15% prefers BrE as ELT model, 6% agrees to one variety</td>
<td>* subjects are aware of the difference between English that is learned/used in school environment and that of English used in the “real world” * Finnish students/younger generation teachers are more open to/tolerant of linguistic diversity * teaching practice follows the demand of language teaching curriculum/testing in Finland, binding teachers to strictly adhere to current ELT approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Rindal (2010)</td>
<td>L2 pronunciation of Norwegian English learners and their attitudes towards AmE/BrE</td>
<td>* BrE is superseded by AmE due to the latter’s current cultural hegemony/global linguistic presence * language attitude motivates L2 pronunciation * L2 pronunciation and language attitude somewhat relates to construction of L2 identity</td>
<td>pronunciation tests (AmE/BrE); MGT/ pronunciation tests: to investigate speech style/practice of L2 learners 23 Norwegian upper secondary students of English</td>
<td>* BrE is evaluated as most prestigious in terms of pronunciation * association of AmE pronunciation to that of ‘informality’</td>
<td>* learners’ attitudes towards English influence their pronunciation goal * students use/blend different varieties for their own use (e.g. in the choice of formal/informal) * BrE is preferred as a pronunciation ELT model; however, AmE is their dominant L2 accent aim (less marked)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Queiroz de Barros, (2009)</td>
<td>language evaluation and preference (AmE/BrE) in Portugal</td>
<td>* the rise of Mid-Atlantic English, a European English (Modiano 1997) * differing patterns/finding in attitudinal studies toward AmE/BrE * decreasing association of English with its native varieties/culture</td>
<td>2 sets of questionnaire; English variety assessment and evaluation of AmE/BrE varieties; 18 Portuguese users of English comprising of undergraduate students and professionals (19-44 years old)</td>
<td>* English users are able to recognize both varieties by accent, but not the other linguistic particularities * BrE is preferred over AmE; 56% prefer BrE as opposed to professionals (14%)</td>
<td>* Portuguese users of English in the study are able to identify accent between AmE/BrE, but not vocabulary, grammar, spelling; this suggests use of mid-Atlantic lexicon * attitudes to BrE associated with correctness/prestige — a result of pedagogical imposition/practice * AmE is easier to learn * users do not want to choose between AmE/BrE * there is strong association of English language to NSs, even if it considered as an international language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Studies on Language Attitudes Conducted among Expanding Circle Speakers (Europe) (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Study Focus</th>
<th>Hypothesis/Theoretical Framework</th>
<th>Method/Participants</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Gonzales Cruz and Vera Cazorla  (2008)</td>
<td>attitude of Spanish students towards American/British English</td>
<td><em>attitude towards BrE is more positive compared to AmE due to pedagogical practices, as influenced by teaching trend, geography, historical/cultural relations between Canary Islands and the UK</em></td>
<td><em>questionnaire (to obtain students' views on American/British language, culture, people, ideology)</em></td>
<td><em>BrE gets more positive adjective association than negative ones, but language preference is not clear; AmE is considered informal/fast but pleasant/sociable</em></td>
<td><em>due to lack of opportunity for language contact with other English varieties, students still consider BrE as the model variant</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Ladegaard and Sachdev (2006)</td>
<td>attitudes and views of EFL Danish learners towards AmE/BrE</td>
<td><em>In Scandinavia, the high vitality of American culture will extend to a more positive perception and learner preference towards AmE, i.e., compared to BrE (Cf. Bradac and Giles' hypothesis, 1991)</em></td>
<td><em>VGT to rate different English accents (AmE/AuE/RP/SxE/Cockney)</em>, questionnaire, re views on AmE/BrE language/culture incl. language pref.; performance test, to obtain L2 pronunciation*</td>
<td><em>BrE accent got the most positive reaction with RP speaker's variant rated as superior on each key dimension and most suitable pronunciation model</em></td>
<td><em>Contrary to Bradac and Giles' hypothesis, BrE is perceived as more socially attractive/with personal integrity</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Ladegaard (1998)</td>
<td>Danish students' views/attitude on American/British/Australian language and culture (stereotypes and language attitude)</td>
<td><em>language studies reveal linguistic-based stereotypes; similar evaluation patterns found in other studies: standard English is high on status/competence; low on personal integrity/social attractiveness; perceptions that are based on linguistic preference/social convention</em></td>
<td><em>VGT, questionnaire on language attitude; language performance test 96 students (73 upper secondary students, 23 university students)</em></td>
<td><em>AmE is the only easily identified accent</em></td>
<td><em>same stereotypes emerge in Denmark compared with English-speaking countries studies: RP rated high on key dimensions—contradicts Bradac and Giles' hypothesis—positive evaluation for Am culture is not a motivating factor for AmE preference among subjects (Cf. Bradac and Giles, 1991); RP is still the preferred pronunciation model</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Dalton-Puffer, Kaltenboeck, and Simit (1997)</td>
<td>attitudes of Austrian university students towards RP, GA, and Austrian-accented English</td>
<td><em>In studies conducted among non-native speakers, GA/RP are the most preferred accent, and foreign-accented English receive negative attitude (a language-based stereotype reflection)</em></td>
<td><em>matched-guise test: to compare accent preference with subjects' personal experience in Anglophone environment</em></td>
<td><em>the majority of the students gave RP the most positive evaluation due to familiarity (history/politics)</em></td>
<td><em>the students' degree of personal contact/exposure to preferred variety relates to their distinct (positive) attitude towards that variant; students who prefer GA show more positive attitude towards non-native accents/RP subjects with experience in Anglophone countries (personal contact with TL speakers) showed less 'stereotypical' language attitude</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3b. Summary list of studies on language attitudes conducted among Expanding Circle speakers (Asia).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Study focus</th>
<th>Hypothesis/Theoretical framework</th>
<th>Method/Participants</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Evans and Imai (2011)</td>
<td>perceptions of Japanese student towards different varieties of Inner/Outer Circle Englishes</td>
<td>- UK English to receive the highest status; most correct form of English</td>
<td>- open-end questionnaire: to name and indicate first impressions of different English varieties&lt;br&gt;- 101 Japanese university students</td>
<td>- UK Eng is most attractive&lt;br&gt;- US Eng is most correct&lt;br&gt;- Can Eng is either similar/different compared to UKE/USE&lt;br&gt;- Aus Eng is accepted</td>
<td>- US Eng was given the status of ‘standard’ variety&lt;br&gt;- the result could reflect the political/economic relations between Japan/USA, and the effect of language education policy (US model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Evans (2010)</td>
<td>Chinese university students' views towards different native varieties of English</td>
<td>- the cultural hegemony of USA will influence the Chinese students' English language attitude/preference</td>
<td>- open-end questionnaire: name/indicate impression of native English varieties&lt;br&gt;- 247 Chinese university students (144 females, 97 males)</td>
<td>- majority of the respondents have positive view towards UKE&lt;br&gt;- casualness and modernism is attributed to USE</td>
<td>- similar with other studies, status is tied to the use of USE, as social attractiveness is to USE&lt;br&gt;- there are not as many negative evaluative comments as there are positive respondents&lt;br&gt;- respondents appreciate one variety from the other for different characteristics&lt;br&gt;- results challenge the belief that USE cultural hegemony influences the learners' choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Matsaura, Chiba, and Yamamoto (1994)</td>
<td>Japanese students attitude to non-native English varieties</td>
<td>- AmE will be viewed more positively compared to other English varieties&lt;br&gt;- attitude towards a variety does not equate to higher proficiency level&lt;br&gt;- motivational factors affect the attitudes of subjects towards the L2 Eng varieties&lt;br&gt;- students who view Eng as an international language will be less biased towards L2 Eng varieties</td>
<td>- MGT, to evaluate various speech varieties/speakers from Malay, Chinese Malay, Bangladeshi, Micronesian, Hong Kongese, Sri Lankan, and American Englishes added questionnaire that asks subjects' views re FLs and other English-speaking countries&lt;br&gt;- 92 Japanese students: 53 English-major/39 int. business-major</td>
<td>- AmE obtained more positive evaluation&lt;br&gt;- pos./neg. language attitude and subjects’ English proficiency do not correlate&lt;br&gt;- subjects' language preference (AmE/BHE) is related to their speech preference (AmE)</td>
<td>- subjects' preference for native accent is due to familiarity with AmE variety as pedagogical model&lt;br&gt;- attitude to language does not significantly correlate with proficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4. Copy of email survey request.

Date: 25.01.2016

Subject: Survey of Spoken English

Hello!

I am a graduate student at Helsinki University, currently writing my master’s thesis on Spoken English in Finland. I am investigating the linguistic preferences of university students across the country, and development in the use of Spoken English within higher level instruction.

As a student in an English programme, I invite you to participate in this nationwide study by promptly completing a short online survey (link below). The survey consists of 18 multiple-choice questions (plus 2 optional open-ends), and takes about 10 minutes to complete. All data collected will be used exclusively for statistical purposes, and will remain anonymous and confidential.

I do hope you’ll find time to participate in this ambitious project. Please email me if you need additional information. Thank you, in advance, for your valuable input, and for your support in my academic endeavours.

Good luck with your studies, and have a great spring term!

Best,
May Koskela
may.koskela@helsinki.fi

Please click this link to access the survey form:
https://elomake.helsinki.fi/lomakkeet/67464/lomake.html

NB. If the link above doesn’t work, please copy and paste the URL into a browser.
**Appendix 5.** Copy of the survey instrument (Survey of Spoken English).

This is a national survey on linguistic attitude, language use and preferences of Finnish university students. Your careful consideration and candid answers to the following questions are highly appreciated.

**Part I. RESPONDENT’S PROFILE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (optional):</th>
<th>__________________________________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td>__________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>[ ] Male       [ ] Female   [ ] Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programme</td>
<td>[ ] BA (Bachelor of Arts) [ ] MA (Master of Arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the university</td>
<td>_________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality:</td>
<td>__________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native language:</td>
<td>__________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other languages spoken:</td>
<td>_________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Years of learning English (from primary to upper secondary school): | ____________________ |
| Language(s) of education (from primary to upper secondary school): | ____________________ |

**Part II. SURVEY QUESTIONS**

Please circle a number that indicates to what extent you agree with the following statements:

5 = STRONGLY AGREE  4 = AGREE  3 = UNDECIDED  2 = DISAGREE  1 = STRONGLY DISAGREE

1. I like learning English because it allows me to connect with native English speakers and their cultures.
   5  4  3  2  1

2. I like learning English because I love the beauty of the English language (i.e., it is pleasing to the aesthetic senses).
   5  4  3  2  1

3. We learn English to communicate with people from a wide range of linguistic and cultural backgrounds, including both native and non-native speakers of English.
   5  4  3  2  1

4. I like learning English because it is widely used in the international community.
   5  4  3  2  1

5. Please specify other learning motivation(s) you might have:
   __________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________

6. My personal goal is to be able to pronounce English as British or American people do.
   5  4  3  2  1

7. Non-native speakers of English should learn to speak as closely to British or American accent as possible.
   5  4  3  2  1

8. For non-native speakers of English, it is not necessary to speak like Brits or Americans.
   5  4  3  2  1
9. In general, it is more important to be able to speak fluently than to sound native-like.
   5 4 3 2 1

10. In learning standard English, which native variety do you prefer
    ( ) British English  ( ) American English  ( ) Other native variety (please specify)
    Please state your reason(s) for the language preference (AmE, BrE, Other).

11. I feel comfortable speaking English with native speakers.
    5 4 3 2 1

12. I enjoy speaking English with non-native speakers of English in multilingual environments.
    5 4 3 2 1

13. There is no difference to me speaking English with either native or non-native speakers.
    5 4 3 2 1

    5 4 3 2 1

15. I would like to be identified as a non-native speaker of English.
    5 4 3 2 1

16. Given the option to speak either in English or Finnish in various classroom situations (e.g., in a class presentation, group discussion, etc.), which language would you prefer to use?
    Please state your reason(s).

17. I tend to pay a lot of attention to linguistic correctness and precision in using English for spoken communication.
    5 4 3 2 1

18. I feel very strongly about what is ‘correct’ English in spoken communication.
    5 4 3 2 1

19. When speaking with fellow non-native speakers, I feel bothered by their linguistic errors and the varying levels of proficiency.
    5 4 3 2 1

20. The focus of the teaching of English should be on developing communicative effectiveness across international context.
    5 4 3 2 1

Please feel free to leave a comment (if any) about this survey: ________________________________

Thank you for your time!
Appendix 6. Outline map of Finland illustrating regional boundary lines, its main cities, and the location of seven universities presented in the study.
Appendix 7. Complete tabulation of results: themed questionnaire (where n=number of respondents; % = percentage, based on the total number of 358 respondents).

Question statements on language learning motivation:

Q1: I like learning English because it allows me to connect with native English speakers and their cultures.
Q2: I like learning English because I love the beauty of the English language (i.e., it is pleasing to the aesthetic senses).
Q3: We learn English to communicate with people from a wide range of linguistic and cultural backgrounds including both native and non-native speakers of English.
Q4: I like learning English because it is widely used in the international community.

Combined results (n=358) for questions 1-4. The most prominent percentage is in written bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>5-Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
<th>4-Agree n (%)</th>
<th>3-Undecided n (%)</th>
<th>2-Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>1-Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Mean (score)</th>
<th>Median (score)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Most Prominent Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200 (56%)</td>
<td>129 (36%)</td>
<td>20 (5%)</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>56% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>124 (35%)</td>
<td>147 (41%)</td>
<td>57 (16%)</td>
<td>27 (7%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>41% Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>286 (80%)</td>
<td>65 (18%)</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>80% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>267 (75%)</td>
<td>77 (22%)</td>
<td>9 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>75% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BA (n=216) vs. MA (n=142) group results (Questions 1-4). The most prominent percentage is written in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>5-Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
<th>4-Agree n (%)</th>
<th>3-Undecided n (%)</th>
<th>2-Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>1-Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>5-Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
<th>4-Agree n (%)</th>
<th>3-Undecided n (%)</th>
<th>2-Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>1-Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121 (56%)</td>
<td>78 (36%)</td>
<td>11 (5%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>79 (56%)</td>
<td>51 (36%)</td>
<td>9 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>81 (37%)</td>
<td>86 (40%)</td>
<td>30 (14%)</td>
<td>17 (8%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>43 (30%)</td>
<td>61 (43%)</td>
<td>27 (19%)</td>
<td>10 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>170 (79%)</td>
<td>43 (20%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>116 (82%)</td>
<td>22 (15%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>159 (74%)</td>
<td>50 (23%)</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>108 (76%)</td>
<td>27 (19%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question statements on participant’s language learning goals:

Q6: My personal goal is to be able to pronounce English as British or American people do.
Q7: Non-native speakers of English should learn to speak as closely to British or American accent as possible.
Q8: For non-native speakers of English, it is not necessary to speak like Brits or Americans.
Q9: In general, it is more important to be able to speak fluently than to sound native-like.

Combined results (n=358) for questions 6-9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>5-Strongly Agree</th>
<th>4-Agree</th>
<th>3-Undecided</th>
<th>2-Disagree</th>
<th>1-Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Mean (score)</th>
<th>Median (score)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Most Prominent Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>116 (32%)</td>
<td>131 (37%)</td>
<td>58 (16%)</td>
<td>40 (11%)</td>
<td>13 (4%)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>37% Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>9 (3%)</td>
<td>23 (6%)</td>
<td>70 (20%)</td>
<td>155 (43%)</td>
<td>101 (28%)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>43% Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>184 (51%)</td>
<td>108 (30%)</td>
<td>33 (9%)</td>
<td>17 (5%)</td>
<td>16 (5%)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>51% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>278 (78%)</td>
<td>66 (18%)</td>
<td>11 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (0%)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>78% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BA (n=216) vs. MA (n=142) group results (Questions 6-9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>5-Strongly Agree</th>
<th>4-Agree</th>
<th>3-Undecided</th>
<th>2-Disagree</th>
<th>1-Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Mean (score)</th>
<th>Median (score)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Most Prominent Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>74 (34%)</td>
<td>82 (38%)</td>
<td>36 (17%)</td>
<td>18 (8%)</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
<td>42 (30%)</td>
<td>49 (35%)</td>
<td>22 (15%)</td>
<td>22 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
<td>25 (21%)</td>
<td>56 (46%)</td>
<td>52 (22%)</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
<td>17 (4%)</td>
<td>45 (18%)</td>
<td>49 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>103(48%)</td>
<td>69(32%)</td>
<td>22(10%)</td>
<td>13(6%)</td>
<td>9(4%)</td>
<td>81(57%)</td>
<td>39(27%)</td>
<td>11(8%)</td>
<td>4(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>170 (79%)</td>
<td>36 (17%)</td>
<td>9 (4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (0%)</td>
<td>108 (76%)</td>
<td>30 (22%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question statements on ‘language preference:’

Q10: In learning standard English, which native variety do you prefer? AmE, BrE, other variety? (Please state your reason for the language preference.)

BA (n=216); MA (n=142); Combined (n=358).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>BA n</th>
<th>BA %</th>
<th>MA n</th>
<th>MA %</th>
<th>Combined n</th>
<th>Combined %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American English</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British English</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other English variety</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question statements on ‘speaking with other English interlocutors:’

Q11: I feel comfortable speaking English with native speakers.
Q12: I enjoy speaking English with non-native speakers of English in multilingual environments.
Q13: There is no difference to me speaking English with either native or non-native speakers.
Q14: I like having a Finnish accent when speaking English with native/non-native English speakers.
Q15: I like to be identified as a non-native speaker of English.

Combined results (n=358) for questions 11-15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5-Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
<th>4-Agree n (%)</th>
<th>3-Undecided n (%)</th>
<th>2-Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>1-Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Mean (score)</th>
<th>Median (score)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Most Prominent Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>157 (44%)</td>
<td>127 (35%)</td>
<td>45 (13%)</td>
<td>28 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (0%)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>44% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>189 (53%)</td>
<td>125 (35%)</td>
<td>32 (9%)</td>
<td>12 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>53% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>54 (15%)</td>
<td>77 (21%)</td>
<td>73 (20%)</td>
<td>25 (7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>36% Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
<td>15 (4%)</td>
<td>76 (21%)</td>
<td>116 (33%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>41% Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>13 (4%)</td>
<td>52 (14%)</td>
<td>139 (39%)</td>
<td>90 (25%)</td>
<td>64 (18%)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>39% Undecided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BA (n=216) vs. MA (n=142) group results (Questions 11-15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5-Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
<th>4-Agree n (%)</th>
<th>3-Undecided n (%)</th>
<th>2-Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>1-Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Mean (score)</th>
<th>Median (score)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Most Prominent Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>86 (40%)</td>
<td>81 (38%)</td>
<td>23 (13%)</td>
<td>20 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (0%)</td>
<td>71 (50%)</td>
<td>46 (32%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>111 (52%)</td>
<td>76 (35%)</td>
<td>20 (9%)</td>
<td>9 (4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>78 (55%)</td>
<td>49 (35%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>26 (12%)</td>
<td>49 (23%)</td>
<td>47 (22%)</td>
<td>77 (35%)</td>
<td>17 (8%)</td>
<td>28 (20%)</td>
<td>28 (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
<td>44 (20%)</td>
<td>68 (31%)</td>
<td>92 (43%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
<td>29 (13%)</td>
<td>82 (38%)</td>
<td>58 (27%)</td>
<td>39 (18%)</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
<td>23 (16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question statement on ‘language preference in classroom situations:’**

Q16: Given the option to speak either in English or Finnish in various classroom situations (e.g., in a class presentation, group discussion, etc.), which language would you prefer to use? Please state your reason(s).

**Question statements re ‘focus of learning/teaching of English:’**

Q17: I tend to pay a lot of attention to linguistic correctness and precision in using English for spoken communication.

Q18: I feel very strongly about what is ‘correct’ English in spoken communication.

Q19: When speaking with fellow non-native speakers, I feel bothered by their linguistic errors and the varying levels of proficiency.

Q20: The focus of the teaching of English should be on developing communicative effectiveness across international context.

Combined results (n=358) for questions 17-20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>5-Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
<th>4-Agree n (%)</th>
<th>3-Undecided n (%)</th>
<th>2-Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>1-Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>Mean (score)</th>
<th>Median (score)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Most Prominent Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>94 (26%)</td>
<td>170 (47%)</td>
<td>63 (18%)</td>
<td>24 (7%)</td>
<td>7 (2%)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>47% Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>20 (6%)</td>
<td>82 (23%)</td>
<td>112 (31%)</td>
<td>112 (31%)</td>
<td>32 (9%)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>31% Undecided; 31% Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>23 (6%)</td>
<td>82 (23%)</td>
<td>83 (23%)</td>
<td>125 (35%)</td>
<td>45 (13%)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>35% Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>162 (45%)</td>
<td>162 (45%)</td>
<td>32 (9%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>45% Agree; 45% Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BA (n=216) vs. MA (n=142) group results (Questions 17-20)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>5-Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
<th>4-Agree n (%)</th>
<th>3-Undecided n (%)</th>
<th>2-Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>1-Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>5-Strongly Agree n (%)</th>
<th>4-Agree n (%)</th>
<th>3-Undecided n (%)</th>
<th>2-Disagree n (%)</th>
<th>1-Strongly Disagree n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>55 (20%)</td>
<td>104 (48%)</td>
<td>37 (17%)</td>
<td>17 (8%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>39 (27%)</td>
<td>68 (47%)</td>
<td>26 (18%)</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>12 (6%)</td>
<td>47 (22%)</td>
<td>70 (32%)</td>
<td>68 (31%)</td>
<td>19 (9%)</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
<td>35 (25%)</td>
<td>42 (29%)</td>
<td>44 (31%)</td>
<td>13 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>16 (7%)</td>
<td>53 (25%)</td>
<td>52 (24%)</td>
<td>74 (34%)</td>
<td>21 (10%)</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
<td>29 (20%)</td>
<td>31 (22%)</td>
<td>51 (36%)</td>
<td>24 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>89 (41%)</td>
<td>106 (49%)</td>
<td>20 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>73 (51%)</td>
<td>56 (39%)</td>
<td>12 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8. Tabulated result of categorized keyword items identified in the list of participant responses with reference to question statements: (1) student’s language preference; and (2) reason(s) for the language preference (cf. question statement no. 10 above/Appendix 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total keyword items:</th>
<th>American English</th>
<th>British English</th>
<th>Other (Australian, Canadian, Irish, Scottish)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abo Akademi (n = 6)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>items = 3</td>
<td>items = 7</td>
<td>items = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective +</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective -</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultured +</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultured -</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0% Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language exposure</td>
<td>0% Education</td>
<td>14% Education</td>
<td>0% Media</td>
<td>14% with NS/NNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% Media</td>
<td>0% Media</td>
<td>14% with NS/NNS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% with NS/NNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Eastern Finland (n = 44)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>items = 45</td>
<td>items = 40</td>
<td>items = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective +</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective -</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultured +</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultured -</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language exposure</td>
<td>0% Education</td>
<td>13% Education</td>
<td>3% Media</td>
<td>3% with NS/NNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36% Media</td>
<td>11% Education</td>
<td>3% Media</td>
<td>3% with NS/NNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2% with NS/NNS</td>
<td></td>
<td>9% with NS/NNS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Helsinki (n = 85)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>items = 54</td>
<td>items = 68</td>
<td>items = 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective +</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25% Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective -</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultured +</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultured -</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0% Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language exposure</td>
<td>6% Education</td>
<td>16% Education</td>
<td>7% Media</td>
<td>3% with NS/NNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20% Media</td>
<td>1% Media</td>
<td>9% with NS/NNS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15% with NS/NNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Jyväskylä (n = 32)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>items = 24</td>
<td>items = 41</td>
<td>items = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective +</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective -</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultured +</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3% Media</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultured -</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>% Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language exposure</td>
<td>0% Education</td>
<td>10% Education</td>
<td>5% Media</td>
<td>% with NS/NNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33% Media</td>
<td>2% Education</td>
<td>2% with NS/NNS</td>
<td>% with NS/NNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17% with NS/NNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oulu (n = 51)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>items = 30</td>
<td>items = 65</td>
<td>items = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective +</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective -</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultured +</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0% Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultured -</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0% Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language exposure</td>
<td>0% Education</td>
<td>18% Education</td>
<td>0% Media</td>
<td>100% with NS/NNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20% Media</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0% with NS/NNS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tampere (n = 89)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>items = 44</td>
<td>items = 115</td>
<td>items = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective +</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective -</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultured +</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultured -</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0% Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language exposure</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11% Education</td>
<td>2% Media</td>
<td>0% with NS/NNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% Media</td>
<td>1% Education</td>
<td>2% with NS/NNS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7% with NS/NNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Turku (n = 51)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>items = 36</td>
<td>items = 51</td>
<td>items = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective +</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective -</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultured +</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultured -</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0% Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language exposure</td>
<td>0% Education</td>
<td>18% Education</td>
<td>2% Media</td>
<td>0% with NS/NNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22% Media</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0% with NS/NNS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14% with NS/NNS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>