universität wien

DIPLOMARBEIT / DIPLOMA THESIS

Titel der Diplomarbeit / Title of the Diploma Thesis

„Motivation and Achievement in Advanced EFL Pronunciation Learning“

verfasst von / submitted by

Christina Pöcksteiner

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Magistra der Philosophie (Mag. phil.)

Wien, 2019 / Vienna, 2019

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt / Degree programme code as it appears on the student record sheet:	A 190 344 299
Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt / Degree programme as it appears on the record sheet:	Lehramtstudium UF Englisch UF Psychologie und Philosophie
Betreut von / Supervisor:	Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Christiane Dalton-Puffer

Acknowledgements

For the past year, “I’ll be working on my thesis” was my standard answer to someone asking how I was going to spend my weekend. Moving away from Vienna to gain a second degree, before having even finished my first, turned writing this thesis into an extremely challenging project. I would like to thank all the people without whom I would not have come as far as I have.

First and foremost, I wish to express my warmest thanks to my supervisor Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Christiane Dalton-Puffer, for providing me with valuable feedback, replying to my e-mails before I even sent them and being incredibly patient.

I would also like to thank everyone who participated in the empirical study. Without you, completing this project would not have been possible.

I am grateful to all my friends who never stop encouraging me. I am incredibly fortunate to have all of you in my life.

Thank you to my family, for being the pillars of my strength. Thank you, Dad, for having taught me to never forget ‘third person -s’ by bribing me with gummy bears. Thank you, Mom, for always hugging me back and spoiling me whenever I come home. Thank you Lisi, Martin and Thomas, for having taken on the burden of being my older siblings.

My last words of thanks go to Anna. For being the literature to my linguistics. For many shared pots of tea. For organising my life. For being my best friend.

Table of contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

EFL	English as a foreign language
L1	Native language
L2	Second or foreign language
NS	Native speaker
NNS	Non-native speaker
RP	Received pronunciation, a standard British accent
GA	General American English, a standard American accent
SL	Successful pronunciation learners (“Sehr Gut”, “Gut”)
LSL	Less successful pronunciation learners (“Befriedigend”, “Genügend”, “Nicht Genügend”)
wr	When item was reversed

1. Introduction

A recurring issue in research on second and foreign language acquisition is discussing the question as to what contributes to a learner's language development and eventually determines his or her ultimate learning success. While years of discussion have led to a general consensus among scholars that motivation plays a key role in the language learning process, the exact nature of this role remains a matter of debate. Most of the available literature focuses on the interplay of motivation and the development of the four traditional language skills, namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing. According to Weinziger (2015: 28), pronunciation is an important sub-skill in the speaking dimension. Nikhbakht (2010: n.p.) explains that "with good pronunciation, a speaker is intelligible despite other errors", whereas "with poor pronunciation, a speaker can be very difficult to understand despite accuracy in other areas. Pronunciation is the aspect that most affects how the speaker is judged by others, and how they are formally assessed in other skills". Some researchers even go as far as arguing that pronunciation could and should be regarded as a separate, fifth language skill (Smit & Dalton 2000: 230f.). Nevertheless, pronunciation is a skill that tends to be neglected by teachers (Üstünbaş 2018: 71). This observation goes hand in hand with the impression that literature on the relationship between motivation and phonological learning is rather scarce. The literature which is available lends strong support to the assumption that in this area motivation plays an especially relevant role. Therefore, the aim of this thesis is to take a closer look at the influence of motivation on achievement in advanced phonological learning. For the purpose of exploring this relationship, a questionnaire was constructed and administered to students who had taken part in a pronunciation module offered at the English Department of the University of Vienna.

As far as the general structure is concerned, the present work consists of two parts. The first one is theoretical and can be divided into four main chapters (2-5). Chapter 2 provides the reader with basic knowledge necessary for comprehending a discussion of the relationship between motivation and achievement in pronunciation learning, as it addresses the concept which underlies all judgement concerning phonological achievement in an individual learner: accent. First, 'accent' will be defined, before attempting to answer questions such as how strong an accent may be before it impedes successful communication, which consequences a

foreign accent may trigger, and which accent should be taught to learners of English as a foreign language. Chapter 3 will inform the reader about an English pronunciation course offered at the University of Vienna, with a special focus on the module's goals and pedagogy, as well as on the controversy surrounding this course. This is relevant as the course forms the context of the empirical study discussed later in this thesis. Chapter 4 will briefly touch upon the challenges learners of English might face when attempting to lose their foreign accents, which is expected from them in the previously mentioned course. Subsequently, the chapter will address the question as to which factors affect overcoming these challenges and the acquisition of a native-like accent in English. The reader should be aware that motivation can be found among those factors. However, the discussion of motivation as an influencing factor is postponed until Chapter 5, as it forms the centre of the present work and thus deserves to be treated separately and in much detail. Literature on motivational factors, i.e. factors contributing to the emergence and upholding of motivation, and their relevance for language learning will be reviewed.

The second part of this thesis is empirical and consists of two chapters (6 & 7). In Chapter 6, readers will gain an understanding of the study's background, i.e. its participants and research questions. They will also be familiarised with the study's methodology and receive information concerning the construction, design and administration of the questionnaire used for exploring the research questions. In Chapter 7, the research questions will be answered by presenting and discussing the data obtained through the questionnaire. There will be a focus on the question as to whether successful learners differ from less successful ones with regard to selected motivational variables which they bring to the phonological learning process.

2. Foreign Accent: perspectives and attitudes

In their article on the relationship between accent and credibility, Lev-Ari and Keysar note that "[m]ost non-native speakers have an accent" (2010: 1093). While one might be tempted to intuitively nod in agreement, a closer look debunks the statement as problematic because of its restrictive nature. It proposes the existence of at least two groups among non-native language users, one consisting of those whose language use is accented and the other one of those who speak the second or foreign language without an accent. It seems to suggest that 'accent' is something that characterises the speech of only some people, and also that those people belong to the group of non-native speakers of a given language. As Gluszek and Dovidio rightly point out, however, it is not only some people who have an accent but everyone - non-natives as well as natives (2010: 215), "sometimes by design and sometimes whether we like it or not" (Brown & Levinson 1979: 300). The speech of both non-native and native speakers of a given language is accented (Gluszek & Dovidio 2010: 215; Moyer 2013: 12); the difference lies in the type of the accent (regional, foreign) and "the degree of strength of their accents" (Gluszek & Dovidio 2010: 215).

Gluszek and Dovidio (2010: 15) define accent as "a manner of pronunciation with other linguistic levels of analysis (grammatical, syntactical, morphological, and lexical) more or less comparable with the standard language". The mention of other levels of analysis in this definition captures the difference between accent and dialect. Neuliep and Speten-Hansen (2013: 167) explain that dialect "refers to differences in grammar and vocabulary among different versions of the same language". Moyer (2013: 10) expands this definition by arguing that dialect is "a fully functioning language variety with its own vocabulary and grammar, as well as discursive style, in addition to a distinct accent". The term 'accent', on the other hand, solely refers to the sound of a given language. It is the "paralinguistic component including the phonological and intonation features of the spoken word" (Neuliep & Speten-Hansen 2013: 167). In short, speakers may be members of the same dialect community, meaning that they use the same grammatical and syntactic structures as well as lexical items, but may still differ in their accent, which means that they "sound very different in their usage" (Neuliep & Speten-Hansen 2013: 167).

The accent a person has is a valuable source of information. The way we sound provides our interlocutors not only with information about ourselves, like gender and age, or social, regional and educational background, but also with clues about situational and communicative circumstances and intentions, as we "continually adjust our pronunciation and alter our prosody to clarify meaning, punctuate important points, and signal distance vs. affiliation" (Moyer 2013: 10).

To summarise, the term 'accent' is narrower than the term 'dialect' and can be defined as "a set of dynamic segmental *and* suprasegmental habits that convey linguistic meaning along with social and situational affiliation" [my emphasis] (Moyer 2013: 11). Accent is something which we can find in each and every person, regardless of whether that person is a native or a non-native speaker of a given language. The subsequent chapter will explore which role accent plays in the context of learning a foreign language and which consequences the attainment and use of a certain accent may have for a learner.

2.1. Accentedness, intelligibility, comprehensibility

The rather outdated view that the goal of L2 learners should be reaching native-like pronunciation and that native-like pronunciation equals successful learning in L2 contexts is opposed by an alternative, albeit problematic, belief, which stresses that intelligibility and comprehensibility form the basis of successful communication (cf. Munro & Derwing 2011) and that it is those concepts – rather than a native accent – which determine whether a learner of a language can be considered successful or not. An argument in favour of the former principle, i.e. the nativeness one, is related to the term 'accentedness', which has been defined as the listener's perceived degree of difference between the speaker's accent and the accent spoken in the listener's community or by him- or herself (Yazan 2015: 202). If the speech of a person is characterised by strong accentedness, this might impede successful communication. This would support the belief that learners should acquire native-like pronunciation in their additional languages - given that communication takes place between native and non-native speakers. However, Levis draws attention to the fact that "communication can [also] be remarkably successful when foreign accents are noticeable or even strong" (2005: 370). Moyer seems to agree with Levis when she observes that whether

or not a person speaks with a foreign accent is irrelevant for successful communication as long as "the intended message is clear" (2013: 92), thereby supporting the view that it is the level of an utterance's intelligibility and comprehensibility which determines whether or not communication is successful. As straightforward as this may sound, implementing this view in the everyday classroom requires overcoming one major obstacle. Defining 'intelligibility' and 'comprehensibility' is a task researchers continue to struggle with as the concepts are difficult to pin down. While the notions are sometimes treated as interchangeable concepts (Thir 2014: 55), they have also been defined as being different from each other, yet related (cf. Munro & Derwing 1995; Moyer 2013). Munro and Derwing have defined comprehensibility as "the listener's perception of difficulty in understanding particular utterances" and intelligibility as "the extent to which an utterance is actually understood" (1995: 291). It is not quite clear whether the word "understood" used in their definition of intelligibility solely refers to recognising "the acoustic make-up of words and phrases (such as their segments and their stress and intonation pattern) that will make it possible for the listener to identify them as discrete, meaningful units in the stream of speech" (Thir 2014: 56) or whether intelligibility also depends on understanding the semantic content carried by a word or phrase. Thus, it is debatable whether Munro and Derwing's definition matches Moyer's, who operationalises intelligibility as "the extent to which a word or utterance is recognized at the level of finer acoustic-phonetic detail" (2013: 93). Moyer's definition of intelligibility appears to match Smith's equation of intelligibility with "the ability to recognise words and utterances" (Smith 1992, referred to in Thir 2014: 55). The former's understanding of comprehensibility as the perceived ease of understanding does not differ from Munro and Derwing's. Smith, however, explains the notion of comprehensibility differently than Munro and Derwing and Moyer, and argues that comprehensibility is "the ability to understand the meaning of words and utterances" (ibid.).

The vagueness of some explanations and the differences and partial overlaps between definitions do not only illustrate the academic dispute concerning the question as to how those concepts should be understood but should also cast serious doubt on the endeavour to dismiss the nativeness-principle and to implement intelligibility (which, from now on, will be treated synonymously with comprehensibility in the present thesis) as the primary goal in foreign and second language education.

2.2. Impact of a non-native accent on perceptions by others

Thir (2014: 56) argues that intelligibility is of relative nature, meaning that the judgement of its degree will always depend on the listener. Gluszek and Dovidio seem to agree, when they write that there is "a lack of objective criteria for assessing accents' impediments" (2010: 218). Moyer stresses the same point when she points out that "*intelligibility* and *comprehensibility* are highly subjective judgements that bring to bear many factors; some intrinsic to the listener" [original emphasis] (2013: 93). All of these scholars agree that it is not only the speaker who determines if an utterance can be considered intelligible, but that several factors are involved in the process of successful communication: linguistic as well as external factors (Thir 2014: 56; Moyer 2013: 92f.), such as how familiar the interlocutors are with the topic and each other's culture, background noise, the attitude a listener has towards another speaker's accent, etc. In other words, the degree of an utterance's intelligibility and comprehensibility depend not only on the speaker and his or her linguistic skills but on various other factors as well, some of which are not linguistic at all. One of those non-linguistic factors is attitude, which Garret defines as an "evaluative orientation to a social object" (2010: 20). Major et al. (2002: 187) speculate that a positive attitude towards a certain accent aids comprehensibility, whereas a negative attitude leads to decreased comprehensibility. As Moyer (2013: 121-123) could observe, however, attitudes towards different accents may also influence other areas of perception, such as credibility, desire to interact, chances of employment, etc. The present sub-chapter aims at giving a brief overview of assumptions and findings in this field.

As was pointed out earlier, accent is a source of information. Be it consciously or unconsciously, we often use a person's accent as an indicator for other traits. Those traits are either valued, condemned or viewed as irrelevant. In other words, people hold positive, neutral or negative attitudes towards traits which a person is assumed to have because of his or her accent. One should note, however, that this attribution of traits is not necessarily the result of the accent itself, but that people sometimes make arbitrary connections between accents and certain characteristics because of previous experiences with people who happened to have certain traits *as well as* a specific accent. Regardless of the reasons we have for connecting a specific accent with particular characteristics, how we see a person may

partly be influenced by their accent. Moyer assumes that "the salience of accent is immediate and perhaps even greater than other signals of 'in-group' vs. 'out-group' status, including physical appearance" (2013: 171). This has important implications for foreign language learning, since finding an answer to the question as to which accent a learner should aim to acquire requires careful consideration of the possible attitudes a certain accent may trigger and how far-reaching those attitudes can be.

Most of the research probing attitudes towards foreign accents has taken interactions between native speakers and non-native speakers as a starting point for analysis. Also, it has mainly focused on native listeners' reactions. Today, as mobility continues to increase, and non-native speakers of English outnumber native speakers by far (Munro & Derwing 2015: 142), most learners of English will be more likely to use the language with other non-native speakers rather than with native speakers of English (Thir 2014: 10). Thus, it is of relevance to explore whether foreign accents perpetuate similar reactions in non-native listeners. While research in such contexts appears to be rather scarce, Gluszek and Dovidio (2010: 214), drawing on results obtained in countries in which English is not the native language, could show that "those who speak nonnatively accented language *in general* are perceived more negatively than are speakers with native accents" [my emphasis]. Thus, a brief review of the findings in attitudinal studies seems interesting.

Moyer argues that people might judge a person's level of competence in a language on the basis of his or her accent (2013: 12). While a strong foreign accent does indeed sometimes coincide with low language competence, Gluszek and Dovidio hint that drawing such a conclusion is often unwarranted, when they write that accent "serves as a cue […] that one does not wield the language fluently, *regardless of one's actual competence*" [my emphasis] (2010: 214). The researchers later remind us that "[a]ccent strength is conceptionally distinct from language competence, which represents how well one knows the language" (2010: 215). Unawareness of this distinctness clearly entails negative consequences for the nonnatively accented speaker.

Bouchard Ryan, Carranza and Moffie could observe that speakers with a strong foreign accent were evaluated as less solidary than those with a milder non-native accent (1977: 271). Several other studies have similarly indicated negative attitudes towards foreign accents (Gluszek & Dovidio 2010: 217), in so far as heavily accented speakers were evaluated more

negatively with regard to intelligence, competence, proficiency, loyalty and credibility (cf. Munro & Derwing 2015: 135; Gluszek & Dovidio 2010: 217; Lev-Ari & Keysar 2010). Evaluations such as those just mentioned may not only result in a negative perception of a person, which is bad enough, but also in negative treatment and discrimination. Lindemann (2002: 437) suggests that a negative attitude towards a nonnatively accented speaker can motivate a listener to display avoidance behaviour, which manifests itself in strategies that hamper successful communication. Munro and Derwing (2015: 135) furthermore argue that a non-native accent might put a person at a disadvantage in the job market, lessening his or her chances of getting hired. They draw the reader's attention to the fact that "[a]ccent discrimination […] occurs in many forms of employment […] but is especially apparent in the field of language teaching" (2015: 137). To back up their observation, they adduce the example of employment ads for teachers, particularly English teachers, which frequently and explicitly ask for submissions of applications of native speakers only (2015:137). Hadar Shemesh, whose native language is Hebrew and who works as a speaking coach for English, explains that working as an English teacher as a non-native is often eyed critically, not only by natives but also by non-natives:

> So, I started teaching, but, at first, I was really embarrassed to admit that I'm not a native English speaker. I would even try to hide it, because, after all, there are so many amazing speech coaches out there, who *are* native speakers, and what do I have to contribute? How can I possibly reach their level? But as I got better at what I do, and I saw the results in, you know, my students, I realised that, what I believed to be my disadvantage turned out to be my biggest strength. Because of my background and training and history, I know the way non-native speakers think while trying to process the sounds and intonational patterns of English. I know that because I'm one of them. And because I've been there myself, I know what to say and how to explain it, to make it specific and clear. So, I realised that this is something that is unique to me, and only I can deliver it that way. And my otherness, something that I wanted to hide in the past, has become the thing I'm proud of the most. (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=shTGQXrI4sQ, 25.5.2017)

While Shemesh is an advocate of attaining a native-like accent as a learner of English and doubted her ability to teach because of her non-native background, despite the fact that she had managed to attain a native-like accent in English, she has come to realise that being a non-native teacher must not necessarily be a disadvantage. Thereby, she demonstrates that the assumption that native speakers necessarily must be better suited for the job of teaching

than non-natives simply because of their nativeness is unwarranted. Jenkins voices similar thoughts when she writes that being a native speaker does not mean that one is

> necessarily better placed to instruct learners in how to acquire [NS] accents, particularly for productive (as opposed to receptive) use. Unless 'NS' teachers have sufficient familiarity with their learners' L2 pronunciation systems as well as a sound knowledge of articulatory phonetics (and although some do, the majority do not), they will be able to inform but not instruct: to do little more than model their own accent and hope that acquisition will follow by some mysterious magic process (Jenkins 2000: 221).

Thir also touches upon this issue when she writes that

> [i]n the domain of language teaching, […] the hierarchical dichotomy between non-native and native speakers seems to be particularly strong, with 'native-like' language proficiency generally being valued over the special qualities of NNS teachers" (Thir 2014: 83).

In contrast to Shemesh and Jenkins, Thir does not only refer to pronunciation teaching specifically, but to language teaching generally. This seems to be of special relevance in this thesis, as I will later explore achievement in pronunciation learning in learners of English, the majority of whom want to earn a teaching degree. While in Austria, not being capable of or not wanting to speak with a native-like accent in English may not keep teacher candidates from being hired - judging from my own experience in school and considering the arguments brought forward by Munro and Derwing, Gluszek and Dovidio, and Lev-Ari and Keysar - the chances are their foreign accents will affect realms which are not irrelevant to a teacher's reputation and career, such as their credibility, perceived proficiency and competence, to name but a few.

The present sub-chapter aimed at demonstrating that speaking with a foreign accent may entail serious negative consequences for a learner. One has to be aware, however, that some accents, regardless of whether they are regional or non-native, enjoy higher status than others (Moyer 2013: 90), depending on the listener, but also on the context in which a certain accent is encountered. It has been observed that a foreign accent is evaluated less negatively when the listener is familiar with that accent (cf. Dailey et al. 2005). Regarding the context, the same could be shown for informal contexts as opposed to more formal ones (cf. Cukor-Avila 1988; Callan et al. 1983; Bresnahan et al. 2002).

2.3. Which accent should we teach

When considering the question as to whether or not a learner's goal should be the acquisition of a native-like accent, it should be mentioned that, despite the negative consequences keeping one's foreign accent can have, not every learner of English shares Hadar Shemesh's enthusiasm concerning the attainment of a native-like accent. In this regard, Scales et al. (2006: 717) argue that "users' goals for English use are extremely varied" and may not include the attainment of a native-like accent. However, it has also been pointed out that, "in the case of the English language, speech of native speakers is often perceived as prestigious, pleasant, and friendly […], even by nonnative speakers of English" (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010: 228) and that the desire to eliminate one's foreign accent and instead acquire a native-like one is shared by many learners, "whether or not that is seen as reasonable or laudable" (Moyer 2013: 121). Thir argues that the preference of many learners of English for native accents may be "largely due to stereotypical and native-speakerist ideas transmitted to [the students] through their English lessons at school rather than through genuine identification with the different types of speakers presented to them" (2014: 84), and Scales et al. (2006: 717) point out that the attainment of a native-like accent is considered an unattainable goal for learners by many researchers. Several scholars have thus argued that, instead of aiming for a native-like accent, a change of attitudes towards foreign accents should be encouraged (Gluszek & Dovidio 2010: 229), thereby reducing the pressure to attain a native-like accent.

A different solution has been put forward by Jenkins (2002), who suggests the implementation of a 'lingua franca core', which promotes intelligibility, instead of teaching pronunciation based on standard native accents like Received Pronunciation and General American English. We have seen previously, however, that intelligibility is a rather problematic issue, with regard to its definition as well as factors involved, and Jenkins' proposal has been criticised by researchers (Munro & Derwing 2015; Szpyra-Kozłowka 2015) in so far as "on the surface the lingua franca core has appeal [but] at the level of implementation, many dilemmas become evident" and that more research is needed before it can be used for assessment (Munro & Derwing 2015: 144; for an outline of the identified dilemmas consult ibid.). Munro and Derwing (2011: 317) rightfully argue that "it is not possible to teach intelligibility without a clear understanding of what it is and how it can be achieved". Thir observes that "if […] English

pronunciation teaching should essentially aim at making learners intelligible, the question remains which type of speaker should be taken as a reference point for intelligibility" (2014: 56). With such issues still unresolved, dismissing native speaker-models would be premature. Moyer seems to agree when specifically addressing Thir's question by writing that "[f]rom the standpoint of communication, a native ideal can serve as a baseline for mutual comprehensibility in native/non-native interactions (as for non-native/non-native ones). American and British English standards may [thus] retain their preferred status in this regard, at least for now" (Moyer 2013: 171).

The present sub-chapter has attempted to shed light on why, in courses focusing on pronunciation as well as in general learning contexts, teaching a standard native accent of English is often preferred to introducing the vague concept of intelligibility. The following chapter will inform the reader about a pronunciation course which focuses on helping foreign language learners to acquire a native English accent. This is important for understanding the context of the empirical study presented later in this thesis.

3. 'Practical Phonetics and Oral Communication Skills 1' – a pronunciation course at the University of Vienna

3.1. Goal and pedagogy

Dalton-Puffer, Kaltenböck and Smit (1997: 115) consider pronunciation teaching, especially at university level, crucial. Müller seems to agree when he writes that "good pronunciation skills are an indispensable qualification for future language experts" (2012: 45). At the University of Vienna, all students studying at the Department of English and American Studies are required to attend and pass the compulsory pronunciation class 'Practical Phonetics and Oral Communication Skills 1', commonly referred to as PPOCS1, in order to be allowed to proceed with their studies. Passing the lecture exam "Introduction to the study of language 1", or "Introduction to English Linguistics" respectively (depending on the programme a student is enrolled in), is one of the prerequisites students need for being allowed to take the course,

since a basic understanding of English phonetics and phonology, as well as one of the standard varieties of English, i.e. Received Pronunciation and General American English, is necessary.

The course PPOCS1, formerly known as 'Sprechpraktikum', has its origins in the late 1960s, but, according to Thir, its structure and goal have undergone only minor changes since then (2014: 65). As stated in the online course catalogue of the 2018 summer term, the current aims of the PPOCS1 course are:

- to improve students' pronunciation
- to improve students' oral presentation and reading skills
- to improve students' communication skills
- to reinforce students' theoretical background in practical phonetics (including transcription)
  (https://ufind.univie.ac.at/de/course.html?lv=121192&semester=2018S, 15.07.2018)

In this context, "to improve" refers to encouraging and helping the students to modify their current accents in the form of losing their foreign accents and acquiring one that recognisably approximates the model accent chosen by the individual student, which is either Received Pronunciation or General American English (PPOCS curriculum 2013: 2, referred to in Thir 2014: 66). In the course, students work on segmental features, i.e. individual sounds, as well as suprasegmental ones, such as stress, rhythm, intonation and phenomena of connected speech.

PPOCS1 comprises a weekly two-hour class, in each of which students focus on one or more features of the chosen accent, and an additional, but obligatory language-lab session, which is held by a student tutor and provides students with further practice opportunities. The table on the next page shows the schedule taken from the Moodle platform of the PPOCS1 class which I attended in 2015 and the focus of which lay on the acquisition of a standard British accent.

Table 1: Contents covered in PPOCS1 - British English

Session	Content covered
1	Introduction Spelling vs. sounds Silent /r/
2	Characteristics of an Austrian/German accent Major pitfalls by Austrian/German learners of English
3	/ɒ/-/ɔː/-/əʊ/ /t/-/d/-/ð/
4	/s/-/z/ Fortis-lenis distinction Vowel length Inflectional endings
5	/ɜː/-/ə/ /p/-/b/ /k/-/g/ Word stress Weak syllables
6	/e/-/æ/ /ʌ/-/ɑː/ Sentence stress Weak forms
7	/iː/-/ɪ/ /uː/-/ʊ/ Tone units Prominence
8	/l/-/ɬ/ Intonation
9	/aʊ/-/aɪ/ Linking
10	/ɪə/-/eə/ Assimilation
11	Elision
12	Repetition and practice
13	Repetition and practice

Early in the semester, initial check-ups are held in which each student's accent is analysed and individual problem areas are identified. Students undergo a second check-up in the middle of the semester, which should give them an indication as to how well they are progressing. When I attended PPOCS1, I was lucky enough to have a lecturer who offered weekly feedback

sessions in which we listened to and analysed the recordings we had to hand in every week. However, not all of my colleagues who were taught by different lecturers were given this – considering the course's ambitious aim, highly valuable - opportunity.

While the students' theoretical knowledge is assessed by the completion of a portfolio on practical phonetics and a theory test, both of which – taken together – contribute 25% to the final grade, the degree of their oral proficiency will be determined by two PPOCS1 teachers in an oral exam at the end of term, which lasts about 10 to 15 minutes and includes a short presentation, the reading of a book passage and a free speaking exercise. The student's performance in this oral exam is mainly responsible for the final grade, as it is worth 75%.

The pronunciation class offered at the University of Vienna is unique in so far as pronunciation training does not enjoy as much attention at any other Austrian university. While the University of Graz requires students to pass a pronunciation class, the students must do so in the first semester of their studies, which means that they have not gathered any background knowledge of English phonetics and phonology. Also, it only comprises a one-hour session per week. The University of Salzburg also offers a pronunciation class; however, it is not compulsory. In Innsbruck, the topic of pronunciation is solely touched upon in other language competence courses. Students enrolled at the University of Klagenfurt must take a course focusing on pronunciation, but it does not include the additional language-lab component that can be found in the curriculum of the Vienna English Department (cf. course catalogues of the mentioned universities; Müller 2012).

PPOCS1 has been at the centre of heated discussions, because of the course's extremely ambitious goal, which is, according to Scales et al. (2006: 717), considered unattainable by many researchers, especially if we consider the very short time-span (i.e. four months) in which this course is attended and completed. Thir (2014: 71) speculates that the final oral exam further contributes to the tension experienced by most PPOCS1 students. These factors are, among others, responsible for the undeniable controversy that surrounds the PPOCS1 course. It will be discussed briefly in the following sub-chapter.

3.2. Controversy

While I class myself among those students who enjoyed working on their pronunciation in PPOCS1 – and even those who looked forward to this course ever since they began with their studies –, I dare say that PPOCS1 is experienced in a much different way by a vast number of students. I myself have participated in numerous informal discussions addressing the conflict of opinions concerning this course, but there has also been an academic and formal exchange concerning this issue between Spichtinger, who views the aim of PPOCS1 as "unclear, unrealistic, unnecessary and psychologically damaging" (Spichtinger 2000: 71) and Hüttner and Kidd (2000), who defensively responded to Spichtinger's accusations. While one might argue that this exchange took place 18 years ago and is thus outdated, it continues to be relevant today, as Thir (2014: 70) argues that "the primary objective of the course [which lies at the heart of this discussion] still is the acquisition of a near-native accent in English and the 'elimination' of students' L2 accents". It should be mentioned at this point that although PPOCS1 still aims at helping students to acquire a native-like accent in English, the acquisition of a certain skill does not necessarily lead to the elimination of another – students will simply add another accent to their repertoires and are free to choose the accent they feel most comfortable with after completing the course. Spichtinger argued that – in light of the rise of English as a lingua franca, a global language - the goal of PPOCS1 is

> unclear because it is not elaborated […] what 'as native-like as possible' actually means. It is unrealistic because with the time and resources available only very limited progress can be made. It is unnecessary because the ability to ape a native speaker seems a doubtful achievement at best. Should students not rather be encouraged to find their own identity in English? The current practice may be psychologically damaging to students because of the sense of insecurity or even failure it breeds. (Spichtinger 2000: 71)

Spichtinger desired a reconstruction of the course curriculum and argued that, instead of asking students to acquire a near-native like accent, dealing with prestige and standard varieties of English, i.e. Received Pronunciation and General American, should be supplemented by a presentation of other native as well as non-native accents of English (Spichtinger 2000: 71). Hüttner and Kidd (2000: 75-77) responded by pointing out that, while such a presentation would undoubtedly be captivating from a theoretical point of view, it would not improve students' practical pronunciation skills, and that, since "the model of

native speaker English persists in the current [Austrian] school curricula", it would be "irresponsible to teach our students according to different models of pronunciation". They furthermore stress that students "*are* encouraged to find their own English accent in the course of their studies – ideally by spending a longer period of time in an English-speaking country" [my emphasis] (Hüttner & Kidd 2000: 76). Concerning the latter, however, Thir notes that "rather than encouraging students to 'find their own accent in English' PPOCS1 actively discourages students from doing so, as any deviation from either the RP or the GA norm is usually penalized for being an 'error' […] especially if the latter occurs in the form of L1 transfer" (Thir 2014: 75). She also seems to side with Spichtinger when she revises his call for the presentation and analysis of more than two accents and asks for

> a more critical and reflective approach to English pronunciation teaching rather than the current, fairly prescriptive approach adopted in PPOCS1, which requires students to unreflectingly attempt to modify their accents towards one of the 'main varieties' of English as far as possible. (2014: 68)

The argument Hüttner and Kidd seem to have been bothered by the most was Spichtinger's accusation of the course being psychologically damaging because of the immense pressure which is put on the students by the highly ambitious, and as Spichtinger claims, unrealistic, goal. Hüttner and Kidd object by presenting percentage rates displaying the failure rates[1] of the course, which indicate that the goal is not an unrealistic one (cf. Hüttner & Kid 2000: 77). Thir, however, points out that failure rates are no indication of the students' actual experience of the course. She provides several examples illustrating the "clear mismatch between the attainability of the course aim and the level of confidence which students displayed towards the latter" (cf. Thir 2014: 72). While Thir admits that Spichtinger's wording might be a bit exaggerated, she argues that "pronunciation is closely bound up with a person's self-image, and that a feeling of inadequacy with regard to this linguistic area is therefore inevitably going to be more painful than with regard to other areas of language" (2014: 74). She adds that "if the only feedback with academic authority which a student has and probably ever will receive on their pronunciation is of a fairly negative nature, their self-confidence is likely to be considerably damaged" (2014: 74f.).

[1] Hüttner and Kidd (2000: 77) report that in the summer term of 2000, 70% of the PPOCS1 students (a clear majority) passed the course. According to Thir (2014: 72), the failure rate has considerably decreased since then.

The present sub-chapter aimed at giving a brief overview of the discussion concerning the pronunciation class at the University of Vienna, which has been going on for two decades. Teachers and students satisfied with the current course structure as well as those who strongly argue for a modification of the module's goals bring forward valid arguments supporting their respective opinions. It seems clear that a change with regard to the pressure experienced by many students is necessary. However, when considering the arguments raised in Chapter 2, a decision to dismiss the course's current goal should not be rushed. We will now turn to exploring the question as to what is necessary for a person to achieve the current ambitious course aim. The following chapter will deal with the challenges an L2 user has to deal with when the goal is to acquire a native-like accent in English, as well as factors that play a role and need to be taken into account when discussing the limits of ultimate attainment in L2 phonology.

4. The acquisition of a (near-)native-like accent

Learning a foreign language is not an easy task, especially when the area of phonological acquisition is concerned. This chapter aims at expanding on the reasons for this being the case, as well as the challenges a person wishing to acquire a native-like accent in another language later in life has to overcome. Furthermore, factors which are assumed to influence the phonological acquisition process will be addressed.

4.1. Challenges for the learner

Moyer (2013: 12) points out that a person acquires and consolidates his or her mother tongue's phonology extremely early in life. This considerably impacts the learning of any languages a person starts to acquire at a later age, as the mother tongue phonology serves as the basis on which metalinguistic awareness (i.e. "the ability to attend to and reflect upon the properties of language" (Alipour 2014: 2640)) is built. It may also be the source of language interference. Escudero (2007: 121) writes that "the existence of an L1 language-specific […] filter will make learning an L2 difficult because later learning is constrained by the initial

mental mappings that have shaped neural structure". According to her, the reasons for L2 learners sounding different than native speakers of the target language is that the former associate and assimilate new sounds to the ones they already know from their native languages (Escudero 2007: 112, 120). Moyer (2013: 15) similarly argues that because the system of one's native language frames the acquisition of a foreign language, "the ability to learn new sound categories and sound patterns" is constrained.

Phonological errors made by learners may stem from difficulties concerning production or perception (Moyer 2013: 15) of unfamiliar sounds. Concerning production, a learner may experience difficulties when articulating a certain sound. This can have various reasons. For example, in the learner's mother tongue, an L2 sound might not be used in a certain sound environment or it might not exist altogether. With regard to perception, phonemes and phonetic contrasts might be misperceived or not noticed at all, which will in turn affect production. Major (2001: 12-19) discusses potential challenges older learners of a foreign language face when phonological aspects of that language are concerned. Moyer (2013: 16-18) bases her catalogue of difficulties on his list. A summary with examples will be given in the following. Most of the examples used aim at illustrating difficulties of L1 German speaking learners of English, as those make up the majority of PPOCS1 students with whom the study presented later is concerned.

First of all, difficulties can arise on the segmental level. Minimal differences in the placement of the tongue, the movements of the lips, the degree of aspiration or the voice onset times can already reveal a learner's non-native background. For example, in the English word *two*, the initial consonant is aspirated. An Austrian learner of English may have difficulties in aspirating the /t/. One reason for this could be that in some Austrian accents, no difference is made between /d/ and /t/ (hence, when spelling out words, Austrians often differentiate between 'hartes d' /t/ and 'weiches d' /d/). Another sound German learners of English often struggle with is /æ/, a sound that does not exist in German. A further challenge which is also situated on the segmental level results from differences in syllable structure. In German, final stop consonants are never voiced, which is referred to as 'final devoicing'. In English, however, voicing final stop consonants is possible. It may even distinguish a certain word from another one. Thus, a learner whose native language is (a variety of) German needs to learn to make a difference between words such as *cab* and *cap*, for instance.

In addition to that, mastering suprasegmental features might be a challenge. Firstly, correct stress placement can be an issue. An example would be mispronouncing the word *argument* by putting the stress on the third syllable (*/ɑːgjuˈmənt/or */ɑːrgjuˈmənt/), because it is pronounced that way in German. Furthermore, learners may not be aware of the rules governing segment length in English, which changes in different environments. Additionally, rhythm and timing also fall into the group of suprasegmentals. English is a stress-timed language, which means that stress groups recur at regular intervals. For most students at the English department in Vienna this should be less of a problem as German is a stress-timed language, too. However, there are students whose native language is not German. Thus, mentioning the possibility of struggling with mastering rhythm and timing in English seems relevant. Finally, adequate speech rate plays a role. It goes without saying that speaking a foreign language most often goes hand in hand with reducing one's speech tempo, which, if the context does not require reduced speech rate, could indicate a speaker's non-native background.

It should also be mentioned that "the ability to flexibly apply and adjust [phonological] features for contextual effect" (Moyer 2013: 13), which is known under the term 'style-shifting', comes naturally to native-speakers of a language - although, of course, there is variability even among native speakers with regard to the adeptness and ease with which they are able to do that. This, however, is much more difficult for non-native speakers. According to Moyer (2013: 13), this ability cannot be acquired in the classroom. In order to develop it, a social network is needed and building one requires time. What complicates things is the circularity of the relationship between language skills and the establishment of membership in a social group. "L2 fluency may not only stem from, but also enhance, contact with the target language community and its speakers" (Moyer 2004: 38). Therefore, limited language skills will keep adult learners from building a social network, but it is exactly this network which aids the development of (phonological) fluency.

One should keep in mind that the above summary of potential difficulties is by no means exhaustive but aimed at providing the reader with a quick overview of the challenges a German L1 learner of a foreign language, in this case English, might come across in the phonological learning process.

4.2. Possible factors influencing the acquisition of a (near-)native like accent

In the following, a number of factors which researchers consider to play a role in phonological learning will be presented. For the sake of clarity, they were grouped into cognitive and intrinsic, and experiential and socio-psychological factors. The reader should be reminded at this point that although motivation can be found among the socio-psychological factors it will not be discussed in the present chapter. As motivation is the main focus of this thesis, it deserves to be discussed separately in Chapter 5.

4.2.1 Cognitive and intrinsic factors

The first factor which will be elaborated on here, and which has been assumed to play a role in phonological learning, is the age of the learner. Numerous scholars support the hypothesis of a critical period (cf. Bongaerts 2005), which suggests that native-like attainment in a (foreign) language past a certain age is impossible. At first glance, Marinova-Todd, Marshall and Snow appear to fall into this group as well, as they stress that "[n]either researchers nor others can ignore the overwhelming evidence that adult L2 learners, on average, achieve lower levels of proficiency than younger L2 learners do" (2000: 11). However, they continue by warning readers not to interpret these results as evidence for the existence of a critical period, or put differently, for age being a decisive factor. Admittedly, it has been found that older learners appear to be at an advantage at the start of the phonological acquisition process (Rivera 1998, referred to in Marinova-Todd 2000:12) and that this advantage transforms into an "*ultimate attainment* advantage of younger starters over older starters" [my emphasis] (Munoz 2008: 579). Nevertheless, in contrast to the long-held view that this transformation is caused by a decline in the neurobiological or cognitive domain, Moyer argues that the eventual learning outcome is owed to a multiplicity of determinants, pointing out that "[o]lder learners typically have less consistent and complete input, but where input is in fact sufficient, they can excel compared to younger learners" (2013: 47). Therefore, the assumption that age is a determinant for ultimate attainment in phonological learning and that only very young learners will succeed at sounding native-like in a foreign language must be treated with caution. Moreover, it is safe to say that age is not a factor setting successful PPOCS1 learners

apart from less successful ones as most of the students are in their twenties and thus of similar age but still differ with regard to ultimate attainment in this course.

Apart from age being a factor potentially influencing phonological learning, albeit not in the context of PPOCS1, the idea of a 'pronunciation talent' also circulates among researchers. In the context of phonological acquisition, a talented learner finds it easy to imitate utterances prompted by a native speaker, does not differ from native speakers when perception of unfamiliar sound categories is concerned and performs equally well at reading out passages as native speakers (Moyer 2013: 53). It was found that

> [t]he main difference between good and poor language 'imitators' seems to lie in the way how they employ their articulation-relevant areas. […] [I]ndividuals with good pronunciation skills ('pronunciation talents') focus more precisely on the areas classically known as relevant for production and articulation […], whilst the poorer pronouncers activate the same brain regions, but more intensely and rely on more extended networks involved in speech production (Reiterer et al. 2009: 118)

Reiterer (2009: 176) therefore assumes that learners with a talent for pronunciation learning need to expend less effort when it comes to speech production and that their cortical efficiency is superior to that of poorer learners. The question as to which mechanisms are relevant for aptitude in pronunciation learning has been of interest among researchers. Memory has been found to play a significant role in language learning in general. Therefore, it is assumed that this might also be true for aptitude in phonological learning. However, which role it is exactly remains a matter of debate (Moyer 2013: 54). According to Kissling (2014: 535), Munro (2008) points out that sensory memory helps learners to acquire new sound categories, and that the learning of higher-order phonotactics, which are concerned with which sound combinations are permissible in a language, is aided by auditory sequence memory. While age is probably not a factor that separates PPOCS1 learners into a successful and a less successful group, it is reasonable to assume that successful PPOCS1 students may differ from less successful ones with regard to their talent in pronunciation learning.

Furthermore, gender has been hypothesised to be an influencing factor in phonological learning. The conventional wisdom is that females have a knack for languages, whereas males tend to be better in the realm of sciences. One of the possible explanations for the commonly anticipated female advantage in language learning given by researchers is the way females

and males process language differently. According to Lindell and Lum (2008: 202), "in females, phonological processing mechanisms are represented bilaterally [i.e. in both, the left and the right brain hemisphere], whereas in males, they are discretely left lateralised". Major (2001: 7) explains that, put simply, the left hemisphere is the brain region in which language is located, "whereas the right side has other functions such as […] perception of music". This is relevant in so far as it has been assumed that the more people rely on their right hemispheres the higher the chances are for suprasegmental features to be realised accurately "since tone and melody are thought to be processed there" (Moyer 2013: 54). The successful mastering of suprasegmental features seems to play a major role when listeners determine the perceived degree of accentedness. Spezzini, for example, observed that "[w]hen judging comprehensibility [based on accent], native-speaker raters were influenced primarily by prosodic dimensions" (2004: 423) and that "[u]nexpected prosodic features influenced raters to a greater degree than did phonetic errors" (Spezzini 2004: 424). Sakamoto (2010: 5) similarly points out that "[p]rosody has been found to significantly influence the auditory impression which native speakers of the target language make of an L2 speaker's accent". In addition to a difference in neurobiological processing between women and men, it has been pointed out that women tend to prefer standard varieties of a language and prestige phonological forms over casual ones, which are favoured by men, and that native speaker women do not differ from non-native speaker women in this regard (Major 2001: 76). It could be assumed that this female preference for standard forms positively affects phonological acquisition in a foreign language, as Spezzini (2004: 424) concluded that the female subjects in her study received higher comprehensibility ratings *because* they conformed to standard and ideal accent norms, whereas men scored lower *because* they accommodated their accents to those of their peers. It might come as a surprise to the reader, however, that these arguments and explanations rest on shaky ground. Wucherer and Reiterer (2018: 126) found that gender gaps differ with regard to language tasks, which disproves a general female language advantage. In fact, men outperformed women on phonetic speech imitation tasks. The researchers concluded that

> male performance in various language tasks [is] more interrelated, possibly drawing on various brain areas, which are believed to be rather left lateralised […] and intrahemispherically well connected […]. Conversely, females seem to use distinct areas for distinct abilities, spread widely across hemispheres, thus relying

> on a bilateral activation, which is a behaviour that is common to low-ability phonetic coders. (Wucherer & Reiterer 2018: 131)

The contradictory findings illustrate the complex nature of the gender issue and emphasise the need for further research. In the context of PPOCS1, gender, similar to age, will not determine whether a PPOCS1 learner will find him- or herself among the more successful or the less successful learners, as the majority of students at the English department is female but still characterised by great variability in achievement.

4.2.2. Experiential and socio-psychological factors

It seems reasonable to assume that language experience is vital for language acquisition. According to Moyer (2011: 193), the time a learner of a foreign language has spent in a country in which the target language is the native one is often used as a measure for a person's language experience. This equation, however, seems to be incongruous for two reasons, especially when one attempts to answer the question as to why some PPOCS1 learners are more successful than others. First of all, when attending PPOCS1 at the University of Vienna, students do not reside in a target language environment and – it is my assumption that – only few will have spent an extended period of time in an English speaking country (and should they have done so, the chance of having been immersed in an environment in which the ideal accents taught in PPOCS1, i.e. RP and General American English, are spoken by the natives is slim). If length of residence is taken to be the measure of language experience, it is most likely that experience is not the factor responsible for the higher attainment of successful PPOCS1 learners. Secondly, Moyer stresses that "simply measuring the number of years spent in the country provides little information on the availability of authentic, meaningful input" (2011: 193). This means that a person could spend years in a target language country but not engage in any "speech acts over a wide range of situations and topics", which, according to Munoz, is necessary for yielding an advantage in phonological learning (2008: 585). Moyer agrees and elaborates that "interactive L2 use in personal, informal contexts will be [even] more significant for accent than will perfunctory and/or formal interactions" (2011: 195). One can conclude that the amount a PPOCS1 learner meaningfully interacts with speakers of the target accent matters, as it may influence the eventual learning outcome at the end of the course. As students do not live in a target language environment while attending the course, one could

argue that the chances for meaningful interactions between learners and speakers of the target accent are limited. However, it was found that even if students engage in passive language activities, such as consuming radio shows or TV series which give learners access to the target accent, better accent ratings in the foreign language can be anticipated (Flege et al. 1999: 93).

Concerning socio-psychological factors influencing phonological acquisition in a foreign language, the role of a person's identity needs to be acknowledged. As reported by McCrocklin and Link, there is a connection between accent and identity, and this link exists with regard to any language a person speaks, regardless of whether a person's native language or an additional one is concerned (2016: 123). Setter and Jenkins recognise this as they point out that the accent a person speaks with is tied to his or her identity. According to them, "[o]ur accents are an expression of who we are or aspire to be, of how we want to be seen by others, of the social communities with which we identify or seek membership, and of who we admire or ostracise" (2005: 5). This suggests that ultimate attainment in phonological learning is not simply concerned with whether we are able to mimic a native accent in a foreign language, but also with whether we want to sound like a native speaker. The question of will, however, is a complicated one and often not easy to answer. Piller puts a finger on the problem when she observes that some learners

> just don't want to be perceived as members of a particular national group right away. Indeed […] they prefer not to be reduced to their original national identity. At the same time, they do not necessarily want to be perceived as native speakers either, because that would negate their achievement in learning [a foreign language] to a very high level and being interesting as a person from somewhere else. (2002: 194)

Even if there are learners who wish to sound native-like above anything else – and there should be no doubt that there are some – there will also be the ones who face the dilemma explained by Piller and those who do not want to sound native-like at all. Hinting at this, Thir puts forward that "some approaches to pronunciation teaching, such as those based on the nativeness principle [like PPOCS1], […] are […] only effective with certain types of learners (namely those who genuinely identify with the [native speaker] community), whereas others are highly disadvantaged and […] practically bound to fail" (2014: 49). This assumption suggests that the identity a learner has or wants to gain significantly influences the course his or her phonological development in a foreign language will take.

It is assumed that attitudes towards learning a certain language or a specific skill in that language, such as pronunciation, influence phonological learning as well. Attitudes are closely related to motivation, another potential, socio-psychological influence in accent acquisition, which – as has already been mentioned – is the focus of the present thesis. Therefore, the role of motivation and attitudes (because a close connection between these two factors is assumed) will be discussed separately in the following chapter.

5. The role of motivation in acquiring a native-like accent

As has been shown in the previous chapter, the attainment of a native like accent depends on and is influenced by a large number of factors, which can be clustered into intrinsic individual differences, factors relating to experience and input, and socio-psychological factors. Concerning the last group, the role of identity has already been discussed. However, there is another factor belonging to the socio-psychological group that has hitherto been omitted: motivation. The reason for this is that the study which is presented later in this thesis explores the manifestation of motivational factors, i.e. factors which determine the degree of a person's learning motivation, and the relationship between these factors and achievement in advanced EFL pronunciation learners. Paramount importance is thus attached to motivation and motivational factors and both will therefore be discussed in this separate chapter. In order to embed the following review of literature concerning motivation in language learning in a meaningful context, it is vital to first define and elaborate on the terms 'motivation' and 'motivational factors'.

5.1. Defining motivation

The term 'motivation' can be traced back to its Latin origin *movere*, which means 'to move'. According to Dörnyei and Ushioda, research and theories on motivation indeed revolve around the question as to "what moves a person to make certain choices, to engage in action, to expend effort and persist in action" (2011: 3). Trying to define motivation has led to the realisation that it is a concept far more complex than most people would intuitively think.

What researchers seem to agree on, however, is that it refers to "the *direction* and *magnitude* of human behaviour" [original emphasis] (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 4). Keller, for example, defines motivation as "the choices people make as to what experiences or goals they will approach or avoid and the degree of effort they will exert in that respect" (1983: 389).

It is not surprising that motivation has attracted keen interest from scholars researching what influences learning in general, and second or foreign language learning specifically. Studies dealing with motivation in language acquisition mostly focus on motivational factors, i.e. factors that influence motivation and contribute to determining its degree. One might want to refer to motivational factors as motives, which are defined as the reasons that lie behind an individual's behaviour (Gardner 2006: 243). However, I prefer using the former, in order to ensure they are not intuitively interpreted as mere goals.

The aims of the following sub-chapters are to review the history of motivation research in the field of foreign language acquisition and the different perspectives on motivation adopted by scholars, as well as to identify motivational factors the role of which will be explored in my study.

5.2. The social-psychological perspective

The relationship between motivation and learning a second or foreign language has been of interest since the late 1950s. Its study has passed through different phases, the first of which has been labelled "the social-psychological period" (Dörnyei 2005: 66). It lasted from 1959 to 1990 and is associated with the work of Robert Gardner and Wallace Lambert. The pioneering value of Gardner and Lambert's research in the field of second language acquisition is widely recognised among researchers, because they started to move away from the long-held belief that achievement in language learning is largely determined by a person's language aptitude – an assumption which they considered not invalid, but unsatisfying, because

> [e]veryone or almost everyone learns his native language painlessly, so why would not everyone have at least a minimally adequate aptitude profile? And history makes it clear that when societies want to keep two or more languages alive, and learning more than one is taken for granted, everyone seems to learn two or more as a matter of course (Gardner & Lambert 1972: 131)

For that reason, Gardner and Lambert started searching for a different answer to the question as to why some individuals acquire foreign languages easily and others, as they put it rather harshly, "are utter failures" (1972: 1), eventually suggesting that motivation acts "as a significant cause of variability in language learning success" (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 40). They "considered motivation to learn the language of the other community to be a primary force responsible for enhancing or hindering intercultural communication and affiliation" (2011: 40). Gardner and Lambert base their assumption on the theories outlined by Mowrer and Ervin, who hint that motivation even plays a role in first language acquisition. They write that

> Mowrer's theory […] suggests that [first] language acquisition is motivated by a desire to be like valued members of the family and, later, of the whole linguistic community. Ervin […] has extended this view, suggesting that emotional dependence or respect for another individual may account for some instances of marked success in second-language achievement (Gardner & Lambert 1959: 26)

Gardner and Lambert assume that the motivation necessary for success in second language learning does not differ from the kind of motivation fuelling a child's first language development.

In an early study on motivation in second language learning, Gardner and Lambert differentiate between two different orientations which function as triggers for motivation in language learning: instrumental and integrative orientation. According to them, the former reflects a "utilitarian value of linguistic achievement" (1959: 267), meaning that "[t]he perspective in this instance is […] self-oriented in the sense that a person prepares to learn a new code in order to derive benefits of a noninterpersonal sort" (1972: 14). This means that a possible reason for an instrumentally oriented subject to learn a second language could be, for example, to obtain a (better) job or to become better educated. The latter orientation type – integrative orientation –, on the other hand, refers to a kind "where the aim in language study is to learn more about the language group, or to meet more and *different* people" [original emphasis] (Gardner & Lambert 1959: 267). Later they point out that integrative orientation is "characterised by a willingness to be like valued members of the language community" (1959: 271) and may develop from holding a positive attitude toward the other ethnic group or a negative one toward one's own language community (Gardner & Lambert 1972: 16). Dörnyei and Ushioda summarise the researchers' arguments concerning integrative

orientation, writing that an integratively oriented individual not only wishes to become similar to but also to connect and communicate with members of the target language community (2011: 41).

In their study with English-Canadian high school students learning French in 1959, Gardner and Lambert showed that the students who were integratively oriented attained higher achievement scores than instrumentally oriented ones. This outcome was expected by the researchers, as

> sincere interest in the other group […] must underlie the long-term motivation needed to master a second language [while] [o]ther motivations [=orientations] such as a need for achievement or a fear of failure [=instrumental components] seem appropriate for short-term goals such as passing a language course […] [thus they] seem insufficient to account for the persistence needed in the laborious and time-consuming task of developing real competence in a new language (Gardner & Lambert 1972: 12)

One could object that an instrumentally oriented learner may be motivated over a similar timespan as an integratively oriented one, given that their goal is more ambitious than and exceeds that of passing a language course. Gardner and Lambert seem to be aware of this as they hypothesise that an "integratively oriented learner might be *better* motivated" [my emphasis] (1972: 16).

Weiner regards theories concerning motivation "deficient" (1986: 288) because they are not based on "reliable and replicable empirical relationships" (Dörnyei 1994a: 516). It is thus not surprising that Gardner and Lambert have been praised for their empirical approach to exploring motivation. However, a point of criticism concerning their empirical evidence has been brought forward by Coates (1986: 21). He argues that "[t]he use of direct self-rating questions in order to extract unconscious motives is […] an unacceptable procedure". According to him, Gardner and Lambert employed this very method by asking subjects to indicate their agreement on statements such as "It [learning the language] should enable me to begin to think and behave as the French do" (Gardner & Lambert 1972: 148). Notwithstanding, Coates acknowledges the attractiveness of Gardner and Lambert's theory, while at the same time expressing his doubts concerning the replicability of the results because of the uniqueness of the bilingual learning context found in Montreal (1986: 24).

Despite criticism and doubts of this sort, various other studies following that of Gardner and Lambert have found integrativeness, i.e. integrative orientations and attitudes a person holds towards the target language community, to play a major role when it comes to the effort a learner shows in the process of learning, independent of the learning context. For instance, it could be shown that integrativeness even seems to play a crucial role in learning contexts where the learners' contact with speakers of the target language is limited, as is the case in monolingual countries such as Hungary (cf. Dörnyei & Clément 2011) (as opposed to the bilingual learning context (Canada) in which Gardner and Lambert's study from 1959 was conducted). Dörnyei points out, however, that the observed superiority of integrativeness over instrumental reasons triggering motivation may be explained by the studies' subjects, i.e. mainly school children, for whom attaining a better job or getting a pay rise is obviously not relevant (1994a: 520). This being a justified objection, Dörnyei also reminds his readers that utilitarian benefits may not be completely uninteresting for school children, albeit different from those considered by (young) adults (1994a: 520). School-aged language learners may be motivated by a wish to pass a language class or by fear of failure, both of which can be considered instrumental reasons. It is noteworthy that Dörnyei's observation neither repudiates Gardner and Lambert's assumption that integrative orientation will result in a better kind of motivation, nor their hypothesis that integrative reasons for learning a language are longer-lasting than hopes for utilitarian gains. Nevertheless, it is also important to acknowledge the fact that attaining high proficiency in a foreign language may also be the result of instrumental orientation, namely "in settings where there is an urgency about mastering a second language – as there is in the Philippines and in North America for members of linguistic minority groups" (Gardner & Lambert 1972: 141). It was expected that in a setting similar to the ones just mentioned "instrumental orientation may acquire a special importance, and the individual's L2-related affectively based motivation would be determined by […] the values the L2 conveys rather than ethnocultural attitudes toward the L2 community" (Clément, Dörnyei & Noels 1994: 421). In order to explore this hypothesis, a study was conducted, and the results demonstrated the significant influence of instrumental ambitions "up to an intermediate level. However, learners whose interest in learning English included sociocultural and nonprofessional reasons [i.e. integrative ones] demonstrated the highest degree of desired proficiency" (ibid 1994: 421). These findings indicate that "even in

a context where foreign language learning is largely an academic matter, student motivation remains socially grounded" (ibid 1994: 421).

What is of interest in the present thesis is that Gardner and Lambert not only addressed the role of orientations in the general language learning process, but specifically mentioned the assumed superiority of integrative orientation regarding the acquisition of "the audio-lingual features of the [target] language", i.e. its "forms of pronunciation and accent" (1972: 134). Even in a context such as the Philippines, where instrumental orientation has been shown to be extremely effective in acquiring language competence, integrative orientation was found to strikingly influence the attainment of audio-lingual features (Gardner & Lambert 1972: 141).

While Gardner and Lambert have indubitably shaped the socio-psychological period in motivation research concerning foreign language attainment, other researchers have also contributed findings which should not be neglected. For example, Clément has stressed the importance of so-called linguistic self-confidence, which Noels, Pon and Clément have defined as "self-perceptions of communicative competence and […] low levels of anxiety in using the second language" (1996: 248). He originally proposed the importance of this motivational subprocess with regard to "positive attitudes toward the L2 community as well as to greater L2 achievement" (Hummel 2013: 69f.) in multi-ethnic settings, i.e. environments in which different language communities live together. Clément, Dörnyei & Noels argued that direct contact with the L2 community members would lead to the development of linguistic self-confidence, given that "this contact is relatively frequent and pleasant" (1994: 422). He and his associates later moved on to testing whether linguistic self-confidence can also develop in a unilingual context, i.e. one in which learners of a foreign language only have very limited direct contact with members of the target language community, hypothesising that "interethnic contact can also be made in a more remote manner, through the media or through travel outside the country" and that "anxiety and self-perceptions of L2 competence may be determinants of L2 achievement even in contexts where opportunity to use the L2 with members of the L2 community is lacking […]" (Clément, Dörnyei & Noels 1994: 423). One such context, they argue, may be the language classroom, in which "certain types of classroom activities may promote language anxiety, particularly those that expose the students to negative evaluations by the teacher or by peers" (1994: 423). According to Hummel, research

findings could indeed show that linguistic self-confidence may also develop in unilingual contexts (2013: 69). It could thus be expected that linguistic self-confidence forms a relevant motivational factor in the PPOCS1 learning context.

Giles and Byrne (1982) have yet proposed a different model, the so-called intergroup model, according to which "the extent to which members identify with their own ethnic in-group and perceive it to have strong ethnolinguistic vitality and hard in-group boundaries may determine the degree to which they acquire and exhibit target-like features of the [target] language" (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 44). The degree of ethnolinguistic vitality of a group results from the number of people belonging to the group, its social status, and its "institutional representation (e.g. in the media, government, education)" (ibid 2011: 44). Which kind of in-group boundaries a certain group has is determined by "the relative ease or difficulty of individual mobility across different groups" (ibid 2011: 44). This means that if a group, to which a certain learner belongs, is characterised by a strong ethnolinguistic vitality and hard boundaries, "members are likely to develop and adopt a second language code that diverges from the standard variety, characterised by, for example, [a] non-standard accent" (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 44). Here, it seems interesting to outline what Berkowitz (1989) has argued with regard to identity and the ability to shed one's foreign accent. According to Moyer, Berkowitz argues that learners of a language who "'already feel secure, socially accepted, and approved of' no longer feel the need to accommodate their interlocutors linguistically […], preferring to maintain their own vernacular style with the accent they are most comfortable with" (2013: 67). Moyer adds that "some individuals endeavour to hold on to their foreign accent as an essential link to their self-concept and linguistic heritage" (2013: 67). She assumes that while some of those learners consciously choose to keep their foreign accent, others are not able to attain a native accent because of unconscious processes (2013: 66).

5.3. The cognitive-situated perspective

The social-psychological tradition in second language motivation research has been succeeded by cognitively-situated views on motivation. This change was triggered by a dissatisfaction with the social-psychological theories which dominated motivation research in the field of second language acquisition from the 1960s to the late 1980s.

The researchers Crookes and Schmidt argued that research up until 1990 "focused primarily on social attitudes, a distal factor, rather than on motivation per se" (1991: 478). They also point out that "[w]hen teachers say that a student is motivated, they are not usually concerning themselves with the student's reason for studying [or his or her attitudes towards the target language community], but are observing that the student does study, or at least engage in teacher-desired behavior in the classroom and possibly outside it" (1991: 480). As Dörnyei and Ushioda put it, researchers were discontent with the inapplicability of social-psychological research findings to classroom settings, "to the concerns and needs of teachers" (2011: 46). Crookes and Schmidt note that attitude is only a minor influence when it comes to the development of motivation, and that

> it is probably fair to say that teachers would describe a student as motivated if he sustains […] engagement, without the need for continual encouragement or direction […] This teacher-validated use of the term motivation has not been adopted by [second language] investigators, but it is very close to the concept of motivation that has been substantially explored outside [second language acquisition research], particularly in social and educational psychology (1991: 480)

Aiming at finding a more practitioner-validated theory, Crookes and Schmidt adduce Keller's "education-oriented theory of motivation [which] identifies four major determinants of motivation: (1) interest, (2) relevance, (3) expectancy, and (4) outcomes" (1991: 481). *Interest* refers to how curious learners are, regarding themselves and their environment, and will influence or determine motivation. *Relevance* is related to instrumentality in so far as it results from the student's perception of how much a course contributes to approximating a certain goal. Such a goal could not only be gaining a better job but may also be related to human needs for achievement, affiliation and power. *Expectancy* touches on the importance of the student's individual expectation for success. If a student believes his or her chances for success in acquiring a language or a certain language feature are high, he or she will be motivated, whereas a learner who is positive about failing will be lacking motivation. Therefore, expectancy is closely related to the concept of linguistic self-confidence. The last component, *outcomes*, concerns extrinsic and intrinsic rewards. Intrinsic motivation has been defined as "the motivation to engage in an activity because that activity is enjoyable and satisfying to do" (Noels et al. 2000: 61). Thus, an intrinsic reward would be the satisfaction that is generated by and experienced in carrying out a certain activity. Extrinsic motivation "refers to doing

something because it leads to a separable outcome" (Ryan & Deci 2000: 55), meaning that an extrinsic reward would be, for example, achieving a good grade. According to Keller, these four components determine motivation. Crookes and Schmidt called for a reopening of the research agenda with regard to motivation. It should be noted, however, that their aim was not to discard social-psychological theories altogether, but rather to expand existing frameworks and to incorporate non-L2 motivational approaches, in order to make them applicable to classroom settings.

Tremblay and Gardner write that broadening theoretical frameworks "presents an interesting challenge when we consider that there is no single motivational theory suited to an understanding of all the factors involved in motivational behaviour" (1995: 505). Hinting at Crookes and Schmidt's criticism of Lambert's model, which concerns the postulate of a "connection between attitudes/affect and language learning outcomes without any discussion at all of intervening psychological processes of learning" (Crookes & Schmidt 1991: 483), Tremblay and Gardner suggest that "[o]ne way of improving a model is by clarifying the relationships among its variables" (1995: 506). According to them, this can be done by identifying mediators, which are variables that connect others and additionally explain the relationship between those (1995: 506). In their model, they therefore describe mediators which connect language attitudes with motivational behaviour, namely self-efficacy, valence and goal salience. *Self-efficacy* describes the "perceived probability of the attainability of the [learning] goal". The more confident a learner is about succeeding, the higher his or her self-efficacy is. High self-efficacy will have a positive effect on motivational behaviour as it will result in high attention, increased motivational intensity and persistence. The similarity between their understanding of self-efficacy and Keller's notion of expectancy is obvious. Concerning *valence*, Tremblay and Gardner write that "if language students do not perceive value in their performance, then their motivation will be lowered" (1995: 508). When it comes to *goal salience*, the researchers differentiate between goal specificity and goal frequency. Concerning the former, they write that it was found that "individuals with specific and challenging goals persist longer at a task than individuals with easy and vague goals" (1995: 508). A vague goal would be, for example, 'to do one's best', whereas a more specific goal could be 'to pass the upcoming oral exam with an A'. Goal frequency "is designed to assess

the extent to which students set goals for themselves such as by making plans" (1995: 509). All those mediators influence the motivational behaviour a learner shows. According to Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011: 48), Tremblay and Gardner's model of L2 motivation can be considered a paramount example for the educational shift found in L2 motivation research in the 1990s.

Dörnyei is one other researcher who attempted to "make L2 motivation research more 'education-friendly'" (1994b: 283) by developing a multilevel L2 motivation framework. Just like other scholars shaping the cognitive-situated period, he recognises Gardner and Lambert's contributions to L2 motivation research, which centred around the term 'attitude'. Interestingly, he mentions that attitude and motivation are usually not associated with each other in mainstream psychology because they belong to different fields, the former to social psychology and the latter to motivational psychology. He argues, however, that motivation in an L2 context constitutes a very unique phenomenon due to the "multifaceted nature" of L2 learning (Dörnyei 1994b: 274). The researcher explains that "L2 learning is more complex than simply mastering new information and knowledge; in addition to the environmental and cognitive factors normally associated with learning in current educational psychology, it involves various personality traits and social components" (Dörnyei 1994b: 274) and thus, a framework of L2 motivation must unite aspects taken from various areas of psychology. Dörnyei developed an L2 motivation construct capturing not only the role of the language in question and the individual learner but also, and most importantly, the relevance of the learning situation. According to Dörnyei, the different levels which can be found in his model, i.e. the *Language Level*, the *Learner Level* and the *Learning Situation Level* represent the different dimensions of language, which are the "the social dimension, the personal dimension, and the educational subject matter dimension" respectively (1994b: 279). Whereas the basis of the first two dimensions is the work of Gardner, "the third and most elaborate dimension [is] largely based on findings reported in educational psychology" (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 51). The *Language Level* follows the approach of Gardner as it encompasses two subsystems, namely an integrative motivational one which "is centred around the individual's L2-related affective predispositions […] as well as general interest in foreignness and foreign languages", and an instrumental motivational one which revolves around the learner's future career ambitions (Dörnyei 1994b: 279). The *Learner Level*

encompasses a learner's somewhat unchanging personal character traits, which are his or her need for achievement and self-confidence (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 52). The literature reviewed up until this point already suggests that self-confidence in language learning might be an important motivational factor, as it has been discussed by several scholars. The third level in Dörnyei's motivation construct, i.e. the *Learning Situation Level*, can be divided into three different sub-parts, i.e. course-specific motivational components, teacher-specific motivational components and group-specific motivational components (Dörnyei 1994b: 280). The first sub-component, i.e. the course-specific motivational one, reflects the previously outlined education-oriented theory of motivation by Keller (concerned with interest, relevance, expectancy and outcomes). The teacher-specific one encompasses three different aspects. The first one is the learner's desire to satisfy another liked person, be it the teacher or a parent (this is referred to as affiliative drive). The second one is the so-called authority type, which depends on which role is attributed to the learner by that 'authority' person, whether he or she is "autonomy supporting or controlling" (Dörnyei 1994b: 278). And the third one is the teacher's "role in direct and systematic socialization of student motivation […], that is, whether he or she actively develops and stimulates the learner's motivation" (Dörnyei 1994b: 278). The teacher acts as a model for the students, concerning which attitudes they hold towards learning, but he or she can also stimulate students' motivation by presenting tasks in an interesting way and providing useful feedback. The group-specific motivational component, i.e. the third component of the *Learning Situation Level*, is concerned with group dynamics, meaning that goal-orientedness, the norm and reward system and in how far this system has been internalised by the students, group cohesion and classroom goal structures play a role when it comes to what kind of motivational behaviour learners display. Goal orientedness refers to "the extent to which the group is attuned to pursuing its goal" (Dörnyei 1994b: 278). Whether norms and rewards have been internalised by students has a considerable effect on learners' motivation, as an internalisation will lead to counteraction by an individual or the whole group when a learner or the learning group as a whole deviate from an accepted norm (Dörnyei 1994b: 278f.). Group cohesion which refers to the "strength of the relationship linking the members to one another and the group itself" (Forsyth 1990: 10) also acts as an influencer, as well as classroom goal structures: it could be shown that cooperative structures promote the development of intrinsic motivation (meaning that an internal reward, such as joy, is expected, as opposed to an external one, such as a good grade) to a higher

degree than competitive or individualistic ones (Dörnyei 1994b: 279). Dörnyei and Ushioda stress that the different levels which were just described in more detail are independent of each other, as "by changing the parameters at one level and keeping the other two dimensions constant, the overall motivation might completely change" (2011: 53).

5.4. The process-oriented perspective

That motivation is temporally organised, meaning that it does not remain the same but changes over time, has not received much attention in research on L2 motivation up until the late 1990s. This seems staggering as it goes without saying that the learning of a second language is a difficult undertaking and does therefore not happen at one specific moment in time but rather over a long timespan. Therefore, the changing nature of motivation is especially relevant to L2 learning contexts.

Williams and Burden point out that it is important to differentiate between the initiation of motivation and the sustainment of motivation, when exploring the temporal organisation of motivation. They write that

> motivation is more than simply arousing interest. It also involves sustaining interest and investing time and energy into putting the necessary effort to achieve certain goals. We make this point because so often, from a teacher's point of view, motivation is seen as simply sparking an initial interest, for example, presenting an interesting language activity. However, motivating learners entails far more than this (Williams & Burden 1997: 121)

Ushioda developed a model of the changing nature of L2 motivation which she based on her assumption that "goal-orientation may be more appropriately conceived as a potential *evolving* aspect of language learning motivation, rather than as its basic defining attribute as conceptualised in the social-psychological research tradition" [original emphasis] (1996: 243). While Gardner and Lambert, for example, proposed that which kind of motivation an L2 learner will have depends on his or her goals in language study, Ushioda believes that motivation often stems from previous positive learning experiences since "personal goals may [only] crystallise, strengthen or change at different stages of the learning time span" (1996: 243) rather than before a person commences learning. Dörnyei and Ushioda explain that, in Ushioda's model,

> [l]earner A […] is motivated by positive experiences, with goal-directed patterns playing a minor role. In contrast, Learner B's motivational thought structure is primarily goal-directed. […] [T]he motivational pattern of Learner B may represent a potential later stage in the evolution of Learner A's motivational thinking, as future goals assume greater importance or clarity (2011: 63).

Dörnyei and Ottó (1998) have developed a different, more extensive process model of L2 motivation, consisting of two dimensions: The *Action Sequence* and the dimension of *Motivational Influences*. According to Dörnyei,

> [t]he first dimension represents the behavioural process whereby initial wishes, hopes, and desires are first transformed into goals, then into intentions, leading eventually to action and, hopefully, to the accomplishment of the goals, after which the process is submitted to final evaluation. The second dimension of the model, motivational influences, includes the energy sources and motivational forces that underlie and fuel the behavioural process (2000: 526)

The *Action Sequence* is trisected into three different phases. The first one is preactional and involves the transformation of wishes and hopes into goals and subsequently intentions. The difference between goals and intentions is that the latter "already involve commitment" (Dörnyei 2000: 526). According to Dörnyei, it is necessary to differentiate between those two concepts so that we can capture the distinctness of certain long-term goals a person has in mind and "the far fewer concrete intentions the individual will make actual resolutions to carry out" (2000: 526). He draws his readers' attention to the fact that the precursor for action is an intention but that, in order for action to commence, necessary resources must be available and the individual needs to contrive a plan concerning which individual steps he or she will need to undertake in order to realise his or her intention (ibid.). Motivational influences, i.e. sources of energy for carrying out the action, would be goal characteristics, such as relevance, the value one attributes to working towards and reaching a goal, and attitudes towards the L2 community, to name but a few (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 65).

The second phase, the actional one, begins with "the emphasis shift[ing] from deliberation […] to implementation" (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 65f.). The learner carries out the steps he or she specified in the preceding phase, compares his or her learning progress with the expected one or with one that would follow from taking different actions, and applies "mechanisms [which] may 'save' the action when ongoing monitoring reveals that progress is slowing, halting, or backsliding" (Dörnyei 2000: 527). Sources for motivation would be, among others,

the quality of the learning experience and influences of the social environment (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 66).

The postactional phase begins either after reaching one's goal or after putting the action to a halt. Individuals evaluate their degree of achievement with respect to their original expectations and causally attribute their achievement (Dörnyei 2000: 528). This evaluation will influence a learner's future learning strategies, goals and intentions. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011: 66) name "attributional factors, self-concept beliefs and external feedback and achievement grades" as the main motivational sources.

Dörnyei later reviewed his just-outlined model and identified a few shortcomings. The model represents learning as a process that can be clearly delineated from other activities. However, defining where a learning process begins and where it ends is not as easy as the model seems to suggest. Furthermore, the learner might be engaged in various activities at the same time (Dörnyei 2000: 531). "[T]he process model of L2 motivation cannot do justice to the dynamic and situated complexity of the learning process or the multiple goals and agendas shaping learner behaviour" (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 70).

5.5. Current socio-dynamic perspectives

The last half-century has witnessed considerable progress in the research concerning variables fuelling motivation and the relationship between motivation and outcomes in the learning of a foreign language. Rather simple theories, such as the one by Gardner and Lambert, have been superseded by more complex and elaborate models, for instance the process model of L2 motivation by Dörnyei and Ottó, which was outlined at the end of the previous section. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011: 75) observe that "the list of motivational variables has grown extensively beyond social psychological factors to include concepts such as intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy and attributions". Today, progress continues. Researchers have now moved away from process-oriented models, or rather refined them, and motivation in an L2 learning context has begun to be dominated by socio-dynamic perspectives. This trend results from the realisation that linear models, which are the product of "the search for *cause-effect relationships* [, which] has continued to dominate research perspectives, even when scholars

took a more dynamic, process-oriented approach" (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 75), do not capture the complex reality. The reasons will be explained in the following.

Firstly, the aim of such linear models, which is to identify the reasons for variability in learning behaviour and outcomes, requires researchers to focus on only a small proportion of the numerous variables influencing motivation. An examination of too many variables covering the "complex multiplicity of internal, situational and temporal factors" would infringe upon the models' empirical testability and their explanatory power (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 76). Thus, linear models cannot provide a full picture of the complexity of motivation. Secondly, the learner population represented by linear models needs to be scrutinised, as it consists of idealised learner types which sit at the end points of a motivation continuum and can hardly be found in real life: Motivated learners are contrasted with unmotivated ones, confident students with insecure ones, etc. Also, as Ushioda points out, "research on individual differences focuses not on differences between individuals, but on averages and aggregates that group together people who share certain characteristics", resulting in the depersonalisation of individuals (2009: 215). And thirdly, while researchers have already started to pay attention to context as a factor influencing motivation, they have treated it as an unalterable variable in the background. However, context should not be "conceived […] in static terms but as a developing process which individuals are involved in shaping through their actions and responses" (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 77). These reasons have contributed to the movement away from process-oriented theories towards models which take a socio-dynamic perspective on L2 motivation. Ushioda (2009) campaigns for a person-in-context relational view of motivation. Her aim is to "capture the mutually constitutive relationship between [individual] persons [as opposed to language learners in an abstract sense] and the contexts in which they act – a relationship that is dynamic, complex and non-linear" (Ushioda 2009: 218). According to Ushioda, a language learner is much more than just that; he or she is a "thinking, feeling human being, with an identity, a personality, a unique history and background, a person with goals, motives and intentions" (2009: 220) who is "necessarily located in particular cultural and historical contexts, and whose motivation and identit[y] shape and [are] shaped by these contexts" (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 78). Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011: 78f) point out, however, that a suitable test procedure for exploring the complex interplay which connects the individual person with various contexts has yet to be found.

A different socio-dynamic theory concerning L2 motivation has been put forward by Dörnyei and is called the L2 Motivational Self-System. Its development originated from a dissatisfaction with Gardner's notion of integrativeness, which is described by Noels et al. (2000: 60): "Although it was originally suggested that the desire for contact and identification with members of the L2 group would be critical for L2 acquisition, it would now appear that it is not fundamental to the motivational process, but has relevance only in specific sociocultural contexts". Since then, English has evolved as a world language. Dörnyei elaborates Noels' et al. argument by arguing that

> the ownership of Global English clearly does not rest with a specific geographically-defined community of speakers, especially as English is widely used as a *lingua franca* between speakers of other languages and not simply in interactions between so-called 'native' and 'non-native' speakers. Consequently, traditional concepts of L2 motivation such as integrativeness […] begin to lose meaning, as there is no clear target reference group and English is seen simply as a basic educational skill (much like literacy, numeracy, or computer skills) not tied to a particular culture or community (2011: 72).

It is for this reason that McClelland advocates a modification of what we mean when we use the term 'integrativeness'. According to him, integrativeness should focus on "integration with the global community rather than assimilation with native speakers" (2000: 109). In a general L2 learning context, a call for a revision of the traditional notion of integrativeness, like the one suggested by McClelland, is understandable. However, the study presented in this thesis is concerned with the relationship between motivation and achievement in the acquisition of a native-like accent, be it Received Pronunciation or General American English. Thus, McClelland's revision of integrativeness would not make much sense, as the course aim of PPOCS is the "assimilation with native speakers" and there is a clear target reference group. Furthermore, even in the age of global communities, there are individuals who show integrative motivation in its original sense – certainly among English majors. Nevertheless, the learning context is quite different to the one found in Gardner and Lambert's study, as English is taught to the students, albeit at university level, as a foreign language, since direct contact with the target language community is limited. Thus, in the context of PPOCS1, one might prefer Dörnyei's revision of the term 'integrativeness':

> [A] core aspect of the integrative disposition is some sort of a psychological and emotional *identification*. According to Gardner […], this identification concerns the L2 community (i.e., identifying with the speakers of the target language), but I

> argued […] that in the absence of a salient L2 group in the learners' environment (as is often the case in foreign language learning contexts in which the L2 is primarily learnt as a school subject) the identification can be generalized to the cultural and intellectual values associated with the language [or a specific accent] (2005: 96f.)

Returning to the link between Dörnyei's proposal of the so-called L2 Motivational Self System and the dissatisfaction with the term 'integrativeness', it was a survey carried out in Hungary which motivated Dörnyei to develop his new model. In his survey, a "variable that was originally identified as integrativeness played a principal role in determining the extent of a learner's overall motivational disposition […] [but] actually tapped into a broader dimension, the learner's 'ideal L2 self'" (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 85f.), one of the three components of his model. The other two are the 'ought-to L2 self' and the 'L2 learning experience'. Depending on their manifestations, all three of them may trigger motivation or inhibit it.

An ideal L2 self subsumes all the qualities a person would like to have with regard to language competence; thus, it might be "a powerful motivator to learn the L2 because of the desire to reduce the discrepancy between our actual and ideal selves" (Dörnyei 2005: 105). For motivation to arise, however, the existence of a discrepancy perceived by the individual is required – otherwise the individual will not feel a need to increase his or her effort. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2009: 14) note that "it is not always straightforward to decide at times of social pressure whether and ideal-like self state represents one's genuine dreams or whether it has been compromised by the desire for role conformity". An ought- to self, in comparison, refers to the beliefs a person has with regard to what is expected from him or her from the environment. It concerns "the attributes that one believes one *ought to* possess to meet expectations and to *avoid* possible negative outcomes" [original emphasis] (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 86). Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011: 87) mention an interesting point with regard to a further difference between ideal and ought-to selves: while an ideal self promotes and aims at reaching a wanted end-state, an ought-to self prevents and helps the individual to avoid reaching an unwanted end-state. They write that

> with this distinction in mind, we can see that traditionally conceived 'instrumentality/instrumental motivation' mixes up these aspects: when our idealised image is associated with being professionally successful, 'instrumental' motives with a promotion focus (e.g. to learn English for the sake of professional/career advancement) are related to the Ideal L2 Self. In contrast, instrumental motives with a prevention focus (e.g. to study in order not to fail an

> exam or not to disappoint one's parents) are part of the Ought-to L2 Self (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 87)

The third component, i.e. the L2 learning experience, points towards the fact that students may or may not show increased effort because of the influence of their learning environment, for example of their teacher, or their previous positive or negative learning experiences.

With his L2 Motivational Self System, Dörnyei manages to successfully overcome shortcomings of the traditional notions of integrativeness and instrumentality. He also views, similar to Ushioda with her person-in-context relational view of motivation, the learner as an individual person with unique hopes and dreams.

Several researchers, among them Dörnyei and Ushioda, have paid attention to the fact that individual differences play a significant role in the emergence and upholding of motivation. However, those differences have been understood as "stable and systematic deviations from a normative blueprint" (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 89), meaning that traits considered by scholars were usually those which are permanent and can be found in every person, albeit different in terms of intensity. Similar to context, individual differences were part of the background. Meanwhile, researchers have realised that individual differences vary not only from time to time, but are also dependent on the specific situation they are studied in. Furthermore, they emerge out of an interplay of multiple components, some of which "are of a different nature from the general character of the attribute in question" (Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 90), meaning that motivational components may cooperate with emotional and cognitive ones. One might argue that, following these realisations, there is no point in discussing motivational factors as such because they will always be knitted together with cognitive and/or emotional ones. However, it has been argued that motivation, cognition and emotion can indeed be trisected, because they differ with regard to their valence and how they feel (for a more detailed discussion consult Chapter 4.3.1 in Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011). Therefore, one may distinguish between these three concepts, but must acknowledge the fact that they continuously interact with each other in complex ways and that the existence of one depends on the remaining two principles, respectively. For example, future self-guides, including a person's ideal self and ought-to self, both of which have been addressed when elaborating on Dörnyei's L2 Motivational Self System, can be considered conglomerates of motivation, cognition and emotion. Dörnyei's model captures the motivational role of future

self-guides. Unsurprisingly, the concept also involves a cognitive component, as "[t]he relation between what students want to become and what students actually become may be mediated by what students feel they are able to become" (Pizzolato 2006:59). Lastly, future self-guides are ultimately affective because if they were not, they would remain "cold cognition, and therefore lack motivational potency" (MacIntyre et al. 2009: 47).

While motivation research in the field of foreign language acquisition has only emerged half a century ago, approaches today differ notably from those back then. Researchers have identified a multitude of motivational factors contributing to the emergence, upkeeping and disappearance of motivation. The ones which I consider most important, partly because they have surfaced again and again in the literature to date (cf. 6.1.), albeit under different notations, will be explored in my study.

6. Design of the empirical study

After having reviewed literature concerning motivation in language learning, more specifically factors which may influence the emergence of motivation in the context of learning a foreign language, the second part of the thesis will be devoted to my study. It aimed at exploring these contributing factors in a very specific context, namely the context of PPOCS1 (cf. chapter 3). Chapter 6 will be concerned with the description of the research questions guiding the study, the participants, and the methodology used. Furthermore, expectations concerning outcomes will be outlined briefly. The presentation and discussion of the obtained data will be the focus of Chapter 7.

6.1. Research questions, hypotheses and participants

Motivation and its contributing factors have mostly been explored with regard to their relationship with the general acquisition of a foreign language and overall language competence. Research on the relationship between motivation and phonological learning, however, is rather scarce. Therefore, this study aimed at investigating motivational factors in the context of PPOCS1, a language class the aim of which is the improvement of a learner's English accent (cf. chapter 3). The research questions with which the present study is concerned are the following:

1. How are the various motivational factors, which have been discussed in the literature to date, manifested in PPOCS1 students?
2. Do successful PPOCS1 students (SL) differ from less successful ones (LSL) with regard to the manifestation of those motivational factors?

Concerning achievement in PPOCS1, the study explores the following parameters:

- the role of the Ideal Self
- the role of the Ought-To Self
- instrumental reasons with a promotional focus
- instrumental motives with a prevention focus

- the quality of the learning experience
- the degree of linguistic self-confidence and expectancy
- the level of anxiety
- fear of assimilation
- a learner's attitude towards his or her native identity
- his or her attitude towards the target accent community
- the level of interest in native English accents
- integrativeness (as defined by Gardner and Lambert)
- the degree of intrinsic interest

Expected outcomes are manifold and will be outlined in the following. It is hypothesised that

- SL's Ideal Selves cohere with the PPOCS1 goal, while LSL's Ideal Selves do not or to a lesser degree. (→ the role of the Ideal Self)
- in comparison to LSL, SL worry more about disappointing others by not succeeding. SL consider a native-like English accent something that is expected from professional English speakers more strongly than LSL. (→ the role of the Ought-To Self)
- SL consider a native-like accent in English an asset for their careers and reputation, while LSL do not or to a lesser degree. (→ instrumental reasons with a promotional focus)
- SL show an increased wish to avoid a low final grade and think that low grades could potentially damage their reputation. LSL enjoy dealing with the topic of phonology less than SL. (→ instrumental motives with a prevention focus)
- SL experience their learning more positively than LSL. (→ the quality of the learning experience)
- in comparison to LSL, SL are more confident about succeeding at acquiring a native-like accent. (→ the degree of linguistic self-confidence)
- SL are less anxious when it comes to speaking in class than LSL. (→ the level of anxiety)
- in comparison to SL, LSL are more worried about losing their native identities by acquiring a native-like accent in English/adding a native-like accent to their linguistic repertoire. LSL do not want to become similar to SL as they perceive them as being conceited. (→ fear of assimilation)

- SL are less content with their native identities than LSL. (→a learner's attitude towards his or her native identity)
- SL show more interest in learning about and conversing with native English speakers. (→ a learner's attitude towards the target accent community)
- SL are more interested in native English accents than LSL. (→ the level of interest in native English accents)
- SL are more integratively oriented than LSL. (→integrativeness as defined by Gardner and Lambert)
- SL are more intrinsically interested than LSL. (→ the degree of intrinsic interest)

The questionnaire designed for the purpose of the study was filled in by 81 subjects. Participants were required to:

- have a native language other than English
- be enrolled in a programme or have gained a degree at the Vienna English Department
- have attempted PPOCS 1 at least once

Information concerning the characteristics of the participants, which will be outlined in the following, was solely collected to gain a better picture of the test population. The test population consisted of 72 women and 9 men, which is not surprising considering that male students only make up 20% of the department's student population and generally seem to be less responsive when they are asked to fill in questionnaires. 52 participants indicated they wanted to or had gained a teaching degree, 19 were enrolled or had completed the programme 'English and American Studies', and 10 subjects said they were currently enrolled in or had finished both programmes. The majority of participants, i.e. 51 students, had chosen Received Pronunciation as their target accent, the remaining 30 General American English. Since the structure and aim of PPOC1 have undergone only minor official changes since the implementation of the course in the 1960s (Thir 2014: 65), participants were not asked to specify the semester/year they were enrolled in a PPOCS1 class (for the first time).

6.2. Methodology

6.2.1. Choosing a research method and developing the questionnaire

As Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010: 1) note, questionnaires can be found among the most well-liked and widely used instruments for research in the social sciences. The reasons for this accord with the ones I had in mind when choosing a questionnaire as my research method. First of all, questionnaires are time-efficient tools, not only because they can be created but also because they allow the researcher to obtain much data in a relatively short amount of time (Gillham 2008: 5f.). Being enrolled in two full-time degree programmes in two different cities, this aspect proved to be extremely valuable to me. Secondly, information from a high number of people can be collected, which seemed necessary as the purpose of this study was not to compare one or two successful learners with a few less successful ones, but to explore a tendency in a larger population. And thirdly, the questionnaire elicited quantitative data. Dörnyei (2007: 34) argues that one of the perks of quantitative research is that it is "systematic, rigorous, focused, and tightly controlled", which enabled me to specifically target the research questions which were outlined earlier.

After choosing a research method, a good questionnaire had to be developed. In their book *Questionnaire in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration and Processing* (2010), Dörnyei and Taguchi provide novice researchers with valuable advice on what a researcher needs to consider when developing a questionnaire. Gillham (2008) has written a similar guide for the development of questionnaires. Both books were consulted before writing the questionnaire.

Since Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010: 12) assume that the topics covered in L2 research are usually not considered very important by participants, they stress that the researcher should try to keep the length of a questionnaire to a minimum. This lessens the chances of participants not completing the questionnaire or of them filling in the questionnaire without giving their answers much consideration, which would make the obtained data unreliable. There seems to be agreement among researchers that the filling in of questionnaires should not take up more than half an hour of a participant's time (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 12). The present study consists of 61 items, excluding questions about the participant's background, which might

seem a lot at first. However, by conducting a pilot study (which will be discussed in Chapter 6.2.2.), it was ensured that filling in the questionnaire does not take longer than 15 minutes.

Gillham (2008: 39f.) points towards the importance of a professional layout. Dörnyei and Taguchi seem to agree when they write that "the format and graphic layout carry a special significance and have an important impact on the responses" (2010: 13). Dörnyei and Taguchi advise researchers on what to consider when copies of the questionnaire are distributed as hard copies (2010: 13-15). The present study, however, was conducted via an online tool. I nevertheless aimed at designing the questionnaire well and making it look orderly, particularly by restricting the number of items 'on a page' to a maximum of 11, with clear gaps between them.

Since the questionnaire included items which by some might be considered rather sensitive (e.g. participants were asked to enter their final PPOCS1 grades) the participants were informed that their identities would remain unknown to the researcher and anyone interested in the study before being presented with the items, in order to prevent sensitive questions from falling "prey to the respondents' 'social desirability' bias" (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 16).

While these general features of a questionnaire are important, developing meaningful items is even more so. When constructing a questionnaire, Dörnyei & Taguchi (2010: 22) recommend that the researcher should start by "identifying what critical concepts need to be addressed by the questionnaire". This was done by reviewing literature on motivation research in an L2 learning context and subsequently, drawing up a list of motivational factors which are assumed to play a role in learning a foreign language. The questionnaire employed in this study was strongly inspired by the one developed by Taguchi, Magid and Papi (2009). Knowing which motivational factors should be explored enabled me to solely ask questions targeting the previously defined concepts as well as the research questions, and furthermore, to produce so-called multi-item scales, without which reliability cannot be achieved (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 23).

> "[W]hen it comes to assessing abstract, mental variables not readily observable by direct means (e.g. attitudes, beliefs, opinions, interests, values, aspirations, expectations, and other personal variables), the actual wording of the questions assumes an unexpected amount of importance: Minor differences in how a question is formulated and framed can produce radically different levels of agreement or disagreement (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 23)

This issue can be circumvented by introducing multi-item scales, i.e. coming up with at least three differently formulated questions targeting the same concept or construct. By using multi-item scales, "no individual item carries an excessive load, and an inconsistent response to one item [causes] limited damage" (Skehan 1989: 11). However, items sharing the same focus should not be presented one after another as this might result in the participant perceiving the questions as redundant (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 24-25). Therefore, items were randomised. In total, 13 different constructs were measured in the present study, each of which was targeted by three to four differently worded items. Simply using multi-item scales, however, does not make a questionnaire good. According to Oppenheim (1992: 128-130), items should not be ambiguous, so as to avoid any misunderstandings that could affect participants' responses. This aim can be reached by using simple and straightforward language and avoiding complex sentences (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 41). One might criticise that the questionnaire which was developed for the present study includes some negatively formulated items. Sometimes, this was not avoidable, as for example in the pool targeting instrumental motives with a prevention focus (cf. 6.3.4.); other times, main verbs were negated so that items targeting the same construct would not be too similar.

In the present study, an adaption of the Likert Scale was employed. Participants had to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement concerning the items on a scale of six response options ('Strongly disagree', 'Disagree', 'Slightly disagree', 'Partly agree', 'Agree', 'Strongly agree'). Not including a neutral response option aimed at preventing participants from 'being lazy' and 'forcing' them to decide for one side.

6.2.2. Pilot study and administration of the questionnaire

Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010: 53) stress the importance of piloting a study. They explain that an integral part of conducting a study should be to 'try out' the questionnaire with people who are similar to the eventual participants, in order to gain feedback concerning the research instrument. The feedback may concern the wording of certain items, the design of the questionnaire, the comprehensibility of instructions, or any shortcomings the researcher him- or herself failed to notice but which could be avoided. The questionnaire used in the present study was piloted with three students who had gained a degree at the English Department at

the University of Graz. They, too, had to complete a course focusing on pronunciation, albeit much earlier in the course of their studies. Considering their feedback, some adaptations were made to the original items.

The final questionnaire was distributed among the test population via the online tool *soscisurvey.de* between the 27th of May, 2018, and the 12th of July, 2018. The study was brought to the participants' attention by posting a link to the questionnaire in the Facebook group 'Anglistik Wien'. This post also specified the criteria which qualified students to participate. Furthermore, private messages were sent out to former PPOCS1 students who I knew fulfilled the criteria. Handing out hard copies and being present during the time participants fill in the questionnaire surely has its merits. However, this would only have been possible had a collection of PPOCS1 students' final grades not been required (only then could I have asked PPOCS1 professors to administrate the study in one of their classes). Distributing the questionnaire online over a longer timespan had the advantage of reducing the pressure for an immediate response, as former PPOCS1 students could choose themselves when they wanted to fill in the questionnaire.

The instructions students needed for participating were displayed when clicking on the link directing them to the questionnaire. Those instructions reminded the students that, when reacting to the statements, they should try and reminisce about the time they had attended PPOCS1 and the opinions they held towards the items *back then*.

6.2.3. Data analysis

For the analysis of the data, the statistics software IBM SPSS Statistics 25 (Statistical Software for the Social Sciences) was used.

The response format of the questionnaire took the form of an adapted Likert Scale. Participants were asked to indicate their opinions towards statements on a scale, consisting of six response options to choose from (ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree"). Likert Scales normally require the researcher to code the answers to make them eligible for statistical analysis. However, as the questionnaire was distributed among the test population via the online tool *soscisurvey*, this step was not necessary, since it automatically codes the

answers entered by the participants and allows the researcher to directly import the coded responses into SPSS.

Since multi-item scales were used, Cronbach alpha (α) had to be determined for certifying the internal consistency of items that were designed to measure one construct. According to Dörnyei and Taguchi (2010: 95), for short scales consisting of merely three to four items, α should exceed 0.70 so that one can be fairly sure about the homogeneity of items belonging to a certain group. Sardegna, Lee and Kusey (2014: 166) agree that a value over 0.70 indicates internal consistency. An α value over 0.70 could be achieved for 13 out of 19 constructs. The constructs with internal consistency could be averaged. The remaining items were analysed individually.

Descriptive as well as inferential statistics were used for the presentation and analysis of the obtained data. Descriptive statistics, as the name already suggests, aim at merely describing the obtained data, without making any inferences for the general population. In other words, they "do *not* allow drawing any general conclusions that would go beyond the sample" [original emphasis] (Dörnyei & Taguchi 2010: 97). Inferential statistics, on the other hand, do; they aim at making predictions for a general population (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2011: 606) on the basis of statistical significance, which indicates that a result did not occur by mere chance (2011: 613).

As responses of the participants were obtained through Likert Scales, the data analysed in this study is of ordinal nature. This means that the answers on the scale can be ranked but the distance between them may not be equal (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2011: 605). Therefore, one cannot apply parametric statistics, such as calculating and comparing the means (Allan & Seaman 2007: 64). Instead, the researcher has to fall back on non-parametric techniques. To describe the data, I therefore looked at relative frequencies and the median, i.e. the value that lies exactly in the middle of all obtained values for a variable, instead of the mean. For inferential statistical analysis and for capturing potential differences between more successful PPOCS1 students and less successful ones, I applied two non-parametric tests which may be used with ordinal data: the Mann Whitney U Test and Spearman's Route Order Correlation. Concerning the Man Whitney U Test, the difference is said to be statistically significant when the p value lies below 0.05. Spearman's Route Order Correlation offered me a way to investigate whether two variables, in this case the manifestation of one of the constructs and

the PPOCS1 grade, correlate, i.e. can be associated with each other. Spearman's Route Order Correlation calculates the correlation coefficient ρ between two variables. If the correlation coefficient is 0, this indicates that the tested variables are not correlated. The closer it gets to +1 or -1, the stronger the correlation between two variables is. A positive value indicates that if one variable increases, the other one does, too. A negative value, however, shows that if one variable increases, the other one decreases. What needs to be kept in mind when looking at the results of this study is that the grading scale in Austria ranges from 1 to 5, with 1 being the best possible grade and 5 being the worst. When investigating the correlation between a construct and the final grade, one therefore needs to remember that the better a grade is, the lower its value is. Thus, an increasing final grade value actually equals declining achievement. Furthermore, one has to be careful as it does not suffice to solely look at the strength of the relationship. It is also important to check whether this relationship takes on statistical significance. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011: 613) point out that "three levels of significance – the 0.05, 0.01 and 0.001 levels – are the levels at which statistical significance is frequently taken to have been demonstrated", meaning that the p value needs to lie below one of the above-mentioned levels (SPSS calculates which level this is). At this point, it is important to mention that statistically significant "correlation does not imply cause" (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 635), meaning that a correlation should not be interpreted as the motivational factor in question *causing* students' final grades without conducting further research.

7. Presentation and discussion of results

As mentioned in the introduction to Chapter 6, the present chapter aims at answering the research questions (cf. chapter 6.1.) by presenting and discussing the data obtained through the questionnaire. For the sake of clarity and reader-friendliness, motivational factors under investigation will be treated in separate sections. The reader should be aware that in some instances not all respondents reacted to every item in the questionnaire, for whichever reason, and that the number of given responses fluctuates between 79 and 81.

7.1. The role of the Ideal Self

The first motivational construct that was explored and will be described in this section coheres with Dörnyei's idea of the Ideal Self (cf. 5.5.). This factor seems to be of interest, not only because whether or not a student wishes to become as native-like as possible with regard to his or her pronunciation – in the context of PPOCS1 – will significantly affect that particular student's learning behaviour and, as a consequence, possibly his or her ultimate learning success, but also because the aim of acquiring a native accent, i.e. either Received Pronunciation or General American, in a world in which English has become a lingua franca, is considered questionable and unnecessary by some. Participants were asked to react to statements by choosing one of six options: Strongly agree (6), Agree (5), Partly agree (4), Slightly disagree (3), Disagree (2), Strongly disagree (1). The Ideal Self pool consisted of the following questions:

(1) My goal was to be mistaken for a native speaker.
(2) My goal was to shed my foreign accent in English.
(3) My goal was for people not to recognise my nationality because of my accent.
(4) My goal was to belong to the group of learners that has a near-native like accent.

The responses to each individual statement focusing on a student's ideal self are summarised in the table below.

Table 2: Response frequencies - The role of the Ideal Self

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(1)	6.2%	12.3%	8.6%	25.9%	19.8%	27.2%	4
(2)	1.2%	7.4%	8.6%	17.3%	40.7%	23.5%	5
(3)	6.2%	8.6%	13.6%	19.8%	24.7%	27.2%	5
(4)	1.2%	3.7%	7.4%	24.7%	30.9%	32.1%	5

From the table above, it can be seen that the majority of PPOCS1 students who participated in this study indicated that while attending PPOCS1 they wished to lose their foreign accents

in English. Regarding statements (1), (3) and (4), the majority of participants strongly agreed. Item (2) yielded a slightly less favourable, albeit still very positive response ('Agree'). When considering the small size of the student groups that indicated they strongly disagreed to the statements, the favourable attitude towards foreign accent reduction becomes even more evident, especially with regard to statements (2) and (4).

Since Cronbach alpha exceeded the 0.70 threshold ($\alpha = 0.867$), the answers given by the participants could be averaged, resulting in an overall median of 4.5, which indicates that the attitude towards assimilating one's accent to that of an English native speaker appears to be rather positive among the test population. For the sake of investigating potential differences between successful learners (SL) and less successful ones (LSL), students were separated into two broad groups during the data analysis procedure. The 'successful' group consists of those students who received a *Sehr gut* or *Gut* in their final exams, and the 'less successful' one of those who scored a *Befriedigend, Genügend or Nicht genügend.* Concerning the difference between the two groups with regard to the Ideal Self pool, a significant difference ($p=0.018$) could be found. The observed difference indicates that while an SL's ideal self tends to be one that is not characterised by a foreign English accent, the wish to lose one's foreign accent is not as widespread in LSL.

Since the students were grouped into 'successful' and 'less successful' on the basis of my personal interpretation of grades, it was decided to additionally calculate the Spearman's Route Order Correlation coefficient, which allows for the comparison of *more* than two groups and thus a more thorough exploration. If the coefficient takes on statistical significance, a certain construct manifestation can be associated with another one, in this case the students' final grades. In this study, it could be shown that a learner's ideal self characterised by a wish to shed his or her foreign accent in English negatively correlates with a student's final PPOCS1 grade ($\rho=-0.259$) and that this correlation takes on statistical significance ($p=0.020$). This means that the desire to acquire a native-like accent seems to increase in students with a better final grade. To avoid any confusion, the reader should be reminded that in this study a stronger desire to sound as native-like as possible does not automatically lead to a better evaluation of the student. It solely means that these two variables can be associated with each other.

To recapitulate, Dörnyei argues that a learner's desire to achieve a certain goal in learning a language functions as a motivator in the learning process, which may possibly have an influence on the learning success (cf. section 5.5.). I consider the correlation results not surprising, since the aim of PPOCS1 is to reduce students' foreign accents in English, and a student's ideal-self characterised by a strong desire to shed one's non-native accent ideally fits this goal. It could thus be hypothesised that a strong desire does help students to reach a better learning outcome in PPOCS1; however, further research would have to be conducted to explore whether or not a correlation-cause relationship exists.

7.2. Instrumental reasons with a promotional focus

I will now turn to a construct which is concerned with instrumental motivational factors, namely those which have a promotion focus. The reason for discussing them now is that Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011: 87) argue that "'instrumental' motives with a promotion focus […] are related to the Ideal L2 Self", as it is a wanted end-state which a student works towards. The construct consists of two sub-constructs, the first one of which included the following statements:

(5) I thought having a near-native like accent would be an advantage for my future.

(6) The things I want(ed) to do in the future require(d) me to speak with a near-native like accent.

(7) I considered a near-native like accent irrelevant in my future.

Table 3: Response frequencies - Instrumental reasons with a promotional focus 1

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(5)	0.0%	6.2%	6.2%	22.2%	32.1%	32.1%	5
(6)	6.2%	12.3%	21.0%	29.6%	17.3%	12.3%	4
(7)	21.0%	42.0%	16.0%	12.3%	4.9%	1.2%	2 (5 wr)

The data clearly shows that most participants (strongly) considered speaking with a near-native like accent an advantage for their future (Item (5)). It is interesting that participants tended to express a slightly less favourable attitude concerning statement (6). This, however, could stem from the use of the word 'require' which implies that speaking with a near-native like accent is not only an advantage but a necessity, which is a belief that might have been considered too extreme by some. Statement (7) was negatively formulated; it is thus not surprising that the response option 'Disagree' was chosen by the majority of subjects, which amounts to a notable 42%.

In order to certify the internal consistency of this sub-pool, the coding of statement (7) had to be reversed, as – it was mentioned before – it is negatively formulated. α amounts to 0.726, which indicates internal consistency. Thus, the responses could again be averaged, resulting in an overall median of 5, which indicates a rather strong tendency among participants to recognise the relevance of speaking with a near-native like accent. Neither the results of the Man Whitney U Test nor the Spearman Route Order Correlation coefficient indicates notable differences between SL and LSL, let alone statistically significant ones. This suggests that acknowledging the benefits of having a native-like accent does not set SL apart from LSL, and it could be interpreted that it does not seem to influence motivation in a way that could affect achievement in the context of PPOCS1.

The second sub-construct consisted of the following items:

(8) I believed that by shedding my foreign accent I would be considered a good student.

(9) To me, losing my foreign accent meant increasing my competence in English.

(10) I thought that by attaining a near-native like accent I would be considered a better student than others.

Table 4: Response frequencies - Instrumental reasons with a promotional focus 2

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(8)	2.5%	4.9%	9.9%	33.3%	38.3%	9.9%	4
(9)	1.2%	6.2%	4.9%	25.9%	32.1%	29.6%	5
(10)	1.2%	9.9%	14.8%	27.2%	32.1%	13.6%	4

Learners who expected that they would be perceived as good students by achieving the goal of PPOCS1 (Item (8)) hold the majority among the tested population. Similarly, most subjects agreed that a native-like accent equals increased competence (Item (9)) and that by losing their foreign accents they would stand out among the general student population at the English Department (Item (10)).

Since Cronbach alpha was not above 0.70, the three statements cannot be considered internally consistent. Thus, each individual statement in this sub-pool had to be analysed with regard to differences between SL and LSL. No differences could be found between SL and LSL. Keeping in mind that not even a statistically significant difference necessarily points towards a *causal* relationship, it can be assumed that the quality of the manifestation of the instrumental motivational factors with a promotion focus, which were investigated in this study, does not predict a PPOCS1 student's achievement, as SL do not differ from LSL with regard to those factors.

7.3. The role of the Ought-To Self

The next motivational factor which will be looked at more closely is the one that reflects Dörnyei's Ought-To Self (c.f. section 5.5.), which is the self that comes into being not by what the learner him- or herself wants but by the expectations that, he or she believes, come from other people. In the present study, this factor was also explored by two sub-constructs. The first one consists of three items and concerns the question as to whether the student's environment expects him or her to achieve the PPOCS1 goal in general. The three items were the following:

(11) People surrounding me expected me to attain a near-native like accent.

(12) By attaining a near-native like accent, I would gain the approval of others.

(13) I was worried that people in my environment would be disappointed if I did not attain a near-native like accent.

Table 5: Response frequencies - The role of the Ought-To Self 1

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(11)	8.6%	17.3%	19.8%	27.2%	17.3%	8.6%	4
(12)	4.9%	7.4%	9.9%	38.3%	27.2%	11.1%	4
(13)	24.7%	25.9%	19.8%	12.3%	13.6%	3.7%	2

From the data obtained, it can be seen that most of the participants partly agreed with statements (11) and (12), whereas the majority of students disagreed with statement (13). A comparison of the responses to the three statements is interesting, as one could argue that while the participating PPOCS1 students tended to believe they were expected to do well and by doing so could gain some kind of appreciation or recognition from others (cf. (11) and (12)), they seemed to be less worried about negative consequences a lower achievement could possibly entail (13). It could be interpreted that, among the test population, the final grade is considered powerful enough to improve the external perception of students with regard to competence, but not to impair other people's judgement of a learner's competence.

The difference between SL and LSL was only found to be statistically significant with regard to statement (13). SL were less concerned about disappointing others than LSL, which could be interpreted as a sign of LSL's increased insecurity. The Spearman's Route Order Correlation Test yielded similar results as the Man Whitney U Test, as a change in the responses was only found to be statistically significant for statement (13) (ρ=0.262, p=0.018). While the correlation between statement (13) and the final grade is a weak one, its positive value still suggests that those students who scored lower in their final PPOCS1 exam also worried more about disappointing their environment by not doing well.

The second sub-construct that taps into Dörnyei's Ought-To Self Construct was concerned with the question as to whether or not an accent which approaches the one of a native speaker is expected from professional English speakers. This question seems relevant since it is assumed that students at the English Department work towards professionalism. This item pool also consisted of three statements:

(14) Professional English speakers are expected to have a near-native like accent.

(15) People surrounding me believed that a successful student at the English Department had to have a near-native like accent.

(16) In my environment, a near-native like accent is considered something that sets successful learners apart from less successful ones.

Table 6: Response frequencies- The role of the Ought-To Self 2

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(14)	0%	8.6%	8.6%	23.5%	39.5%	19.8%	5
(15)	2.5%	13.6%	11.1%	28.4%	24.7%	18.5%	4
(16)	2.5%	13.6%	18.5%	30.9%	17.3%	16.0%	4

To all statements, (rather) favourable attitudes were expressed, with the majority of participating students agreeing to statement (14), and partly agreeing to statements (15) and (16).

In contrast to the first sub-pool of items, Cronbach alpha equals 0.711 for the second one and thus exceeds the threshold which is needed for internal consistency of a multi-item scale. The overall median amounts to 4, which mirrors the favourable responses given to the individual statements in this pool. It thus could be shown that there seems to be a consensus among participants concerning the belief that English professionalism is, among other things, expressed by a native-like accent. By applying the Man Whitney U Test and the Spearman's Route Correlation Test, it was found that the observed difference between SL and LSL does not amount to statistical significance with regard to the second sub-construct of the Ought-To Self pool. Thus, it cannot be argued that SL generally consider a native-like accent an indication for a professional English speaker's language competence more strongly than LSL.

Should the Ought-To Self motivational factor influence the chances of attaining a better final grade by increasing the degree of a learner's motivation, it seems that certain expectations coming from the students' environments matter (such as the fear of the learner that others would be disappointed if he or she did not do well), while other expectations do not (e.g. the belief that professional English speakers are expected to have a native-like English accent). However, one needs to treat this interpretation with caution, as the second sub-pool (which concerns professionalism) consists of items the agreement to which might not stem from the beliefs people in a student's environment have but from the belief a student him- or herself holds. Thus, the belief that professional language users should or should not have a native-like accent might have nothing to do with other people's expectations and consequently the Ought-To Self, but might tap into the field of the Ideal Self which was discussed earlier (cf. 5.5.).

7.4. Instrumental reasons with a prevention focus

In this sub-section, instrumental motivational factors with a prevention focus will be discussed, as Dörnyei & Ushioda (2011: 87) argue that such factors fall into the realm of the Ought-To Self, as they help a learner to avoid reaching a non-desired end-state.

The pool consists of three sub-constructs, the first one of which included the following statements:

(17) Getting a good mark in PPOCS1 was important to me.
(18) Getting a bad grade (but still a passing grade) in PPOCS1 course was NOT an option for me.
(19) I wanted to avoid getting a bad mark (but still a passing grade) in the PPOCS1 course by all means.

Table 7: Response frequencies - Instrumental reasons with a prevention focus 1

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(17)	2.5%	6.2%	18.5%	23.5%	18.5%	28.4%	4
(18)	14.8%	22.2%	16.0%	22.2%	14.8%	9.9%	3
(19)	2.5%	13.6%	9.9%	23.5%	28.4%	22.2%	5

Statement (17) received the most favourable response 'Strongly agree' by the majority of study participants. From the table above, it can be seen that most of the subjects hold favourable attitudes of varying degree towards statement (17), and that, taken together, only approximately 30% of subjects indicated that they did not attach importance to receiving a good grade. It is interesting and somewhat contradictive to compare the first statement in this sub-pool with statement (18), as, in sum, the slight majority of participating students seemed to consider a low grade, as long as it was a passing grade, acceptable. Concerning statement (19), on the other hand, the majority of students expressed favourable attitudes. One could interpret that the participating PPOCS1 students tended to hold a "like it or lump it" attitude towards receiving a low grade, should their invested efforts not have the desired effect, i.e. receiving a good grade.

With an α-value of 0.830, this sub-pool proved to be internally consistent. The overall median amounts to 4, which indicates that the instrumental motive to avoid receiving a low grade in the final exam was prevalent among the test population. The results of the Man Whitney U Test show a statistically significant difference ($p=0.001$) between SL and LSL, with SL attaching more importance to avoiding a bad performance in the final exam than LSL. The Spearman Route Order Correlation Coefficient mirrors these results, as it also reveals a statistically significant downhill relationship between the first sub-pool and students' final PPOCS1 grades. This relationship indicates that the better the final grade of a student was, the more importance had been given by the student to avoiding a low grade.

The second sub-pool aimed at exploring whether or not students would have minded to deal with the contents of PPOCS1 for a longer time than specified in the degree curriculum.

The following items were used:

(20) I DID NOT want to engage with the course's topic any longer than absolutely necessary.

(21) Dealing with the course's contents for more than one semester would have been a nightmare for me.

(22) I DID NOT want to deal with the PPOCS1 contents in the subsequent semester.

Table 8: Response frequencies - Instrumental reasons with a prevention focus 2

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(20)	32.1%	29.6%	8.6%	24.7%	2.5%	2.5%	2
(21)	33.3%	25.9%	12.3%	9.9%	11.1%	7.4%	2
(22)	30.9%	21.0%	12.3%	19.8%	8.6%	7.4%	2

To all three statements, the majority of subjects expressed a highly unfavourable attitude ('Strongly disagree'), which seems to suggest that most of the participants do not loathe dealing with the topic of accent reduction.

As all the items in this sub-pool were formulated rather similarly, it is not surprising that this sub-pool is characterised by high internal consistency (α=0.920). The overall median accounts for 2. The Man Whitney U Test yielded statistically significant results (p=0.011) concerning differences between SL and LSL. LSL expressed more favourable attitudes towards the statements and thus seem to enjoy the PPOCS1 contents less than SL. The Spearman Route Order Correlation Test yielded similar results, as the coefficient expresses a small positive correlation between the second sub-construct and the final grade. A positive correlation in this context means that the lower the final grade was, the more the student had wanted to avoid having to deal with the topic in the subsequent semester(s). This might be considered surprising as the sub-pool investigates motivational factors with a prevention focus. Thus, one could expect that the more students wanted to avoid dealing with the content for longer than scheduled in the curriculum, the harder they would work and the better they would achieve. However, the results suggest the opposite. It will be interesting to compare the present results with the 'Interest' construct, which will be discussed at a later stage, as it could be assumed

that not wanting to engage with the topic longer than necessary leads to less rather than more effort because it is concerned with lacking interest in the field of phonetics and phonology and consequently less expended effort.

The third sub-construct included the following items:

> (23) I believed that I would be regarded a failure if I didn't attain a near-native like accent.
> (24) I believed that if I did not do well in my PPOCS1 course, I would be considered a weaker student in my degree programme.
> (25) Not succeeding at attaining a near-native like accent makes a learner of English less competent.

One can clearly see the similarity between these items and the ones which can be found in the 'Ought-To Self' construct. However, what sets the former apart from the latter is that all of them focus on the negative consequences receiving a low grade could entail.

Table 9: Response frequencies - Instrumental reasons with a prevention focus 3

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(23)	11.1%	21.0%	19.8%	27.2%	12.3%	7.4%	3
(24)	9.9%	21.0%	8.6%	27.2%	25.9%	7.4%	4
(25)	16.0%	29.6%	21.0%	25.9%	7.4%	0.0%	3

When looking at the six response options, one can observe that most students indicated they partly agreed with statement (23). However, when adding up the percentage rates of the participants who picked a response option situated on the disagreeing half of the scale, and those who indicated they agreed in some form or another, the former quantitatively surpass the latter. Similarly, the majority of subjects disagreed with statement (25). Statement (24), on the other hand, yielded a more favourable response tendency among participants, with overall 60.5% agreeing at least to a certain extent.

When looking at the somewhat contradictory tendencies, the finding that the present sub-pool is not internally consistent is not surprising. By applying the Man Whitney U Test, a

statistically significant difference between SL and LSL could only be found for statement (23) (p=0.046). The belief that one would be regarded a failure if one did not manage to acquire a near-native like accent was more pronounced among LSL. Similar results could be obtained from the Spearman Route Order Correlation Test, which yielded a statistically significant positive correlation between statement (23) and the final grade (ρ=0.298, p=0.007), showing that the lower students scored in the final exam, the more strongly they believed a low grade was an indication of failure.

These results, similar to the ones found for the second sub-pool, could again be considered surprising as one could have expected students who more strongly believed they would be regarded failures if they did not lose their foreign accents to be *more* motivated and thus to invest more effort and eventually receive a better grade. However, common sense suggests that this belief might tap into the fields of self-confidence and expectancy, for which it is hypothesised that the less confident a student is about his or her ability to reach the course's goal, the worse he or she will do (cf. Crookes & Schmidt 1991). As a matter of fact, correlational analysis shows that the more a student is concerned about being considered a failure should he or she receive a low grade, the lower his or her linguistic self-confidence is (ρ=-0.318, p=0.004) (for the items testing linguistic self-confidence, refer to chapter 7.6.). Since a greater fear of being regarded a failure can be associated with lower self-confidence with regard to competence, the difference which was found between SL and LSL is not that surprising after all.

7.5. The quality of the learning experience

The third motivational factor which was put forward by Dörnyei (cf. 5.5.) concerns the quality of a student's learning experience. In order to explore this factor, this construct was again divided into two sub-constructs, the first one dealing with the learning atmosphere *in* the PPOCS1 classroom and the second one concerning how a student experienced the acquisition process *outside* of the classroom.

The first sub-construct was tested by the following three items:

(26) I liked the atmosphere in my PPOCS1 classes.

(27) I looked forward to the PPOCS1 classes that were to follow.

(28) I felt uncomfortable in my PPOCS1 classes.

Table 10: Response frequencies - The quality of the learning experience 1

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(26)	11.1%	9.9%	13.6%	21.0%	25.9%	17.3%	4
(27)	9.9%	13.6%	12.3%	25.9%	18.5%	19.8%	4
(28)	23.5%	24.7%	16.0%	9.9%	13.6%	11.1%	3 (4 wr)

It seems striking that while most participants experienced the atmosphere in their PPOCS1 classes as rather enjoyable, the exact same number of students, and again the majority, gave a slightly less favourable response when asked whether they had looked forward to the classes that were to follow ((27)). The responses given to (26) and (28) seem to be consistent with each other, because the total number of responses in the 'Disagree-half' for statement (26) accords with the one in the 'Agree-half' for the negatively formulated statement (28), and vice versa.

After reversing the coding of statement (28), the sub-pool concerning learning experience in the classroom could obtain a Cronbach alpha score of 0.824, which indicates high internal consistency. An overall median of 4 indicates that participants generally experienced the atmosphere in their PPOCS1 classes rather positively. By means of applying the Man Whitney U Test, it was found that the difference between SL and LSL with regard to how they experienced their PPOCS1 classes is highly significant, with a p-value of 0.000. SL evaluated their learning experience in the classroom more positively than LSL. Similar results could be obtained with the Spearman's Route Order Correlation Test, which found a significant and moderate downhill relationship between learning experience in the classroom and final grades (ρ=-0.439, p=0.000), meaning that the more comfortable students felt in their PPOCS1 classes, the better their final grades were. It should be mentioned, however, that perceiving one's learning experience in the classroom more positively probably goes hand in hand with

receiving positive feedback concerning one's accent (development) *while* attending PPOCS1, which SL probably did more often than LSL.

The second sub-construct concerned with the quality of the learning experience investigated whether or not participants experienced learning *outside* of the classroom as pleasant and if there was a difference between SL and LSL. It consisted of the following items:

(29) I enjoyed working on my pronunciation outside of class.

(30) Working on my accent by myself was fun.

(31) Working on improving my accent outside of class was a burden for me.

Table 11: Response frequencies - The quality of the learning experience 2

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(29)	2.5%	12.3%	14.8%	21.0%	24.7%	24.7%	4
(30)	7.4%	7.4%	8.6%	32.1%	17.3%	24.7%	4
(31)	23.5%	21.0%	17.3%	27.2%	7.4%	3.7%	3 (4 wr)

Concerning statement (29), the majority of subjects marked a response option situated at the positive end of the scale, with a tie between 'Agree' and 'Strongly Agree', indicating that working on one's pronunciation outside of class was generally considered enjoyable among participants. With regard to statement (30), the majority of responses was still positive, albeit less so. This seems to suggest that enjoyableness is not necessarily associated with fun, given that working outside of class equals working alone, which must not necessarily be true. The distribution of given responses was rather unexpected concerning statement (31), as the majority of participants partly agreed when asked if they had considered working on their accent outside of class a burden. This answer intuitively seems to contradict the positive tendency found for (29) and (30). However, one could argue that working outside of class was, albeit enjoyable, still considered an assignment by some, which is usually associated with obligation rather than voluntariness. Therefore, it might have been viewed as a burden by some.

Despite the surprising response tendency found for statement (30), this sub-pool proved to be internally consistent (α=0.927) (after answer codes were reversed for (30)). The Man

Whitney U Test yielded results showing a statistically significant difference (p=0.002) between SL and LSL. The former seem to have enjoyed working outside of the classroom more than the latter. The Spearman's Route Order Correlation Coefficient suggests a statistically significant and modest negative correlation (ρ=-0.318, p=0.004) between 'private' learning experience and final grades. It indicates that the more students enjoy working on their pronunciation by themselves, the better they score in their end-of-term PPOCS1 exams.

Since both sub-constructs found a statistically significant and negative correlation between the quality of a student's learning experience and the learner's final grade in PPOCS1, one can assume that a more positive evaluation of the general learning experience by a student goes hand in hand with higher achievement. The results are not surprising as it has been hypothesised that a positive learning experience aids motivation which itself increases effort and could, as a result, influence success (cf. Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011).

7.6. The level of linguistic self-confidence and expectancy

The role of linguistic self-confidence (or expectancy), i.e. the confidence a learner has concerning his achievement capabilities in language learning, with regard to motivation started to be discussed in the 1990s (cf. Crookes & Schmidt 1991; Clément, Dörnyei & Noels 1994). Back then, Clément, Dörnyei and Noels (1994: 423) argued that it may determine, among other factors, a learner's success in foreign language acquisition, regardless of whether or not he or she is in direct contact with speakers of the language in question. While in the last three decades much has been discovered and constructs with regard to what influences a learner's motivation in acquiring a language have been refined and enhanced, Dörnyei has not backed away from stressing the importance of linguistic self-confidence (cf. Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011). Thus, it was considered important to explore the degree of self-confidence and level of expectancy with regard to success in PPOCS1 learners. The questionnaire included four items focusing on this construct:

(32) I was confident I would attain a near-native like accent if I made an effort.

(33) I felt overwhelmed by the course's aim to attain a near-native like accent.

(34) I believed I could attain a near-native like accent if I kept working on it.

(35) I was sure I had a good ability to reach the course's goal.

Table 12: Response frequencies - The level of linguistic self-confidence and expectancy

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(32)	1.2%	6.2%	19.8%	23.5%	32.1%	17.3%	4
(33)	13.6%	18.5%	16.0%	22.2%	17.3%	12.3%	4 (3 wr)
(34)	0%	4.9%	6.2%	27.2%	37.0%	24.7%	5
(35)	1.2%	6.2%	17.3%	22.2%	35.8%	17.3%	5

Concerning statement (32), (34) and (35), most participants tended to agree that they could reach the course's aim if they invested enough time and effort. To statement (33), the only negatively formulated item in this pool, however, the majority of subjects, albeit a smaller one, considered 'Partly agree' the most appropriate response. This could indicate that they felt the aim of PPOCS1 is a very ambitious one which is difficult but not impossible to achieve. Because the responses to statement (33) appear to contradict the other ones, it would be interesting to investigate whether the perceived ambitiousness of what is demanded from the students in PPOCS1 negatively affects the self-confidence of students.

Although the majority expressed favourable attitudes towards statement (33), an α value of 0.768 suggests internal consistency (after reversing the coding of the just mentioned item). This value permitted me to calculate an overall median of 4.5, which indicates that the participants' linguistic self-confidence is already rather high but could be even higher. The results of the Man Whitney U Test point towards a statistically significant difference between SL and LSL ($p=0.000$), with SL being more confident concerning their chances of success. The Spearman Route Order Correlation Coefficient also seems to confirm the hypothesis that high linguistic self-confidence may lead to higher achievement, as it reveals a statistically significant and medium negative correlation between the 'Self-Confidence and Expectancy' construct and the final grade. It shows that the less optimistic a student was concerning high achievement, the lower they achieved in their final exams.

7.7. The level of anxiety

One could assume that strong linguistic self-confidence and high levels of anxiety are mutually exclusive. When exploring the correlation between self-confidence and anxiety, one can see that this assumption is true for the participants of this study, as the Spearman Route Order Correlation points towards a statistically significant and negative correlation between self-confidence and anxiety. Thus, it can already be assumed that the more anxious a student was in his or her PPOCS1 class, the lower his or her achieved grade was at the end of the semester. To ensure that this conclusion is not prematurely made, the construct measuring PPOCS1 students' levels of anxiety will be looked at more closely in this section.

The study participants had to indicate their level of agreement to the following three items:

(36) I got nervous when I had to read aloud or speak in front of others without having rehearsed before.
(37) I worried about making pronunciation mistakes in my PPOCS1 class.
(38) I was worried other students would make fun of my pronunciation behind my back when I spoke in my PPOCS1 class.

Participants' responses were as follows:

Table 13: Response frequencies- The level of anxiety

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(36)	8.6%	16.0%	7.4%	29.6%	17.3%	21.0%	4
(37)	2.5%	4.9%	6.2%	17.3%	33.3%	35.8%	5
(38)	29.6%	28.4%	12.3%	11.1%	7.4%	11.1%	2

To statement (36), most subjects partly agreed. The partial agreement could indicate that how anxious a learner was depended on various factors, e.g. what he or she had to say in class, or who and how many were listening, as Clément, Dörnyei and Noels (1994: 423) argued that while certain classroom activities trigger anxiety, others do so to a lesser extent or not at all. Strong agreement was found for statement (37). The reason for this, however, does not seem

to be the fear that other students would mock them, as the majority of participants indicated strong disagreement to item (38).

Cronbach alpha indicated the construct's internal consistency (α=0.732). Results were therefore averaged, resulting in an overall median of 4, and used for comparing SL with LSL. The Man Whitney U Test yielded a statistically significant difference between SL and LSL (p=0.002), showing that LSL felt more anxious than SL. The Spearman Route Order Correlation Coefficient mirrors these results, as it suggests a statistically significant (p=0.001) and positive (ρ=0.365) correlation between the construct under investigation and students' final grades, thereby indicating that the higher students rated their level of anxiety in PPOCS1, the lower their achievement was. Thus, the assumption which was made at the beginning of this sub-chapter proves to be correct.

7.8. Fear of assimilation

To investigate whether Moyer (2013: 67) has a point when arguing that a foreign accent is often a sign that a person is holding on to where he or she linguistically comes from, be it consciously or unconsciously, the items listed below were developed. The first sub-construct is concerned with what it means to lose one's foreign accent with regard to one's linguistic heritage.

(39) By working towards a near-native like accent, one risks losing one's (native) identity.

(40) Trying to lose one's foreign accent equals belittling one's origins.

(41) I think that those trying to attain a near-native like accent are NOT proud of where they come from.

(42) The aim of the PPOCS1 course poses a threat to the students' (native) identities.

Table 14: Response frequencies - Fear of assimilation 1

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(39)	55.6%	22.2%	9.9%	7.4%	1.2%	1.2%	1
(40)	56.8%	24.7%	12.3%	3.7%	2.5%	0.0%	1
(41)	56.8%	38.3%	1.2%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1
(42)	54.3%	24.7%	14.8%	4.9%	1.2%	0.0%	1

From the table above, it can clearly be seen that to each item in this sub-pool the overwhelming majority strongly disagreed. This indicates that the participating PPOCS1 students do not tend to feel that working towards shedding one's foreign accent in English is on par with losing or belittling one's linguistic origins. However, only a handful of subjects stated that they had received a failing grade the first time they attempted passing PPOCS1, which could explain why the percentage rate of students who agreed is very small. The strong disagreement may also stem from students' awareness that acquiring a native-like accent does not necessarily make a person incapable of speaking with a foreign accent.

As the present sub-pool proved to be internally consistent (α=0.797), the averaged responses could be submitted to comparative analysis. However, neither the Man Whitney U Test nor the Spearman Route Order Correlation Test found a statistically significant difference between SL and LSL. Contrary to expectation, this suggests that LSL, i.e. those learners whose accent could not be considered near-native like at the end of PPOCS1, did not feel that their linguistic heritage was threatened by the course's aim any more than SL did. It is thus assumed that fear of assimilation does not significantly influence PPOCS1 students' motivation.

The second item pool which is concerned with fear of assimilation aimed at finding out whether LSL think that students who managed to completely shed their foreign accents in English pride themselves with their achievement, which – and this is my assumption – is a personality trait which is not worth striving for. One may criticise my reasons for including such items in this study because such an observation has not been made in research on accent acquisition. They were included because, during my time as a PPOCS1 student, I have

encountered LSL and students who did not expect to do very well sneering at SL and expressing a wish to never become similar to the latter.

The pool consisted of the following three items:

(43) Learners speaking with a near-native like accent are snobs.

(44) In my opinion, students who did well in PPOCS1 are conceited about their pronunciation.

(45) Students who got a good mark in PPOCS1 think they are better than others.

Table 15: Response frequencies - Fear of assimilation 2

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(43)	46.9%	29.6%	9.9%	11.1%	1.2%	0.0%	2
(44)	16.0%	28.4%	11.1%	29.6%	6.2%	8.6%	3
(45)	17.3%	18.5%	13.6%	23.5%	17.3%	9.9%	4

When adding up the percentage rates of students who chose a response option situated on the 'Disagreeing'-half of the scale and doing the same for those learners who expressed (rather) favourable attitudes, the majority of students expressed disagreement of varying degrees concerning statements (43) and (44). This seems to indicate that the participating subjects did not tend to consider SL conceited. With regard to item (45), opinions seem to be divided, as – taken together – an extremely slight majority of students expressed rather favourable attitudes. Thus, it would be a step too far to argue that, among participants, the view of SL feeling superior over LSL is widespread.

Since the items in this sub-pool were not inspired by previous questionnaires, it is not surprising that no internal consistency could be found. As a consequence, the individual items were submitted to inferential statistics. Neither the Spearman Route Order Correlation Test nor the Man Whitney U Test yielded statistically significant differences between SL and LSL. Nevertheless, since on the latter test statistical significance is expressed by a p-value of 0.05 or lower, it seems worth mentioning that the difference between SL and LSL concerning statement (44) was extremely close to receiving statistical significance, with a p-value of 0.051.

The just-summarised results neither verify my hypothesis that there is a common belief that speaking with a native-like accent often comes with conceit and a feeling of superiority, nor my expectation that LSL are concerned about becoming similar to students who are perceived as priding themselves with their achievement. This leads me to guess that the students casting aspersions on learners who managed to shed their foreign accents are considerably outnumbered by those who do not, and that a fear of becoming similar to conceited SL is not prevalent among PPOCS1 students. Therefore, it is assumed that apprehension of this kind does not constitute a barrier in fuelling the kind of motivation that leads to higher final achievement.

7.9. A learner's attitude towards his or her native identity

As we have seen in the previous sub-chapter, the participating PPOCS1 students are not concerned about losing their native identities by working towards a native-like English accent. The reader should be reminded that there may be no such concern because acquiring a native-like accent does not necessarily mean replacing one's former accent with a new one, but rather expanding one's accent repertoire. The construct probing learners' attitudes towards their native identities was not inspired by the question as to whether or not learners feel they are putting their identities at risk by acquiring a native-like accent in English, but by the question as to whether or not LSL are more content with their linguistic heritage than SL. The reason for this lies in what has been mentioned in chapter 5.5., namely that feeling "secure, socially accepted, and approved of" in one's native linguistic community might be an obstacle in the accent modification process (Moyer 2013: 67). It is my assumption that a feeling of security, social acceptance and approval is linked with a feeling of contentment. Thus, the three items part of the present construct were designed to measure the students' level of contentment concerning their native languages and linguistic communities:

(46) I am proud of where I am from.

(47) I like English better than my native language.

(48) I wish my native language were a different one.

Table 16: Response frequencies - Learners' attitudes towards their native identities

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(46)	0.0%	2.5%	6.2%	22.2%	40.7%	27.2%	5
(47)	6.2%	29.6%	19.8%	23.5%	13.6%	6.2%	3
(48)	49.4%	21.0%	13.6%	8.6%	6.2%	0.0%	1.5

The data obtained shows that the majority of participants are proud of where they are from ((46)). The negatively formulated items (47) and (48) yielded less favourable responses, indicating that, while English is the participants' chosen field of study, they do not tend to prefer it to their native languages or wish they had grown up with it as their mother tongue. When exploring the items by means of inferential statistics, no statistically significant differences could be found between LSL and SL. Thus, it can be concluded that there is a general tendency among subjects to be content with their origins, and that SL do not seem to differ from LSL with regard to the level of contentment. It is assumed that the degree of contentment does not set SL apart from LSL and that it does not constitute a relevant motivational factor in the context of PPOCS1.

7.10. The learner's attitude towards the L2 community

After having looked at students' contentment with their native identities, it seems appropriate to now move on to presenting the results of the construct measuring students' attitudes towards native English communities. Although Dörnyei identified shortcomings of his theory in which a person's attitude towards the L2 community is regarded a motivational force influencing the behavioural, i.e. learning, process (Dörnyei 2000: 531; Dörnyei & Ushioda 2011: 70), it still seems interesting to explore the role of attitudes towards the L2 community further.

(49) I like spending time in English-speaking countries.

(50) I like meeting people from English-speaking countries.

(51) In general, I like learning about people from English-speaking countries.

Table 17: Response frequencies - Learners' attitudes towards L2 communities

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(49)	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	3.7%	24.7%	69.1%	6
(50)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	18.5%	77.8%	6
(51)	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	6.2%	38.3%	51.9%	6

As could be expected, the overwhelming majority of students strongly agreed to all three statements, with only very few or no students at all indicating they disagreed in some form or another. The results indicate that the participating students tend to hold an extremely positive attitude towards the L2 community.

The Cronbach alpha value (0.716) indicates internal consistency. Thus, responses could be averaged and used for inferential statistics, which did not yield any statistically significant differences between SL and LSL.

A shortcoming of this construct is that it revolves around people from English speaking countries *in general*, and not specifically on people speaking the target accent. It seems to be too broad for the context of this study, as, even without looking at the results, it can be assumed that students enrolled in a degree programme offered at the English department do not hold hostile attitudes towards English speaking communities. Luckily, this study included another construct which aimed at specifically exploring the level of interest a student has concerning the target accent, which seems to be more relevant in the context of the present study.

7.11. The learner's interest in native English accents

As only just announced, the construct which will be looked at more closely now is concerned with PPOCS1 students' interest in the target English accents of PPOCS1, i.e. Received Pronunciation and General American English. It included the following four statements:

(52) I like listening to a(n) British/American accent.

(53) I am interested in the way the British/Americans sound.

(54) I like the rhythm of the British/American accent.

(55) I find the difference between native and foreign accents in English interesting.

Table 18: Response frequencies - The learner's interest in native English accents

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(52)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	32.1%	63.0%	6
(53)	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	8.6%	39.5%	49.4%	5
(54)	0.0%	2.5%	1.2%	7.4%	37.0%	51.9%	6
(55)	0.0%	2.5%	6.2%	13.6%	43.2%	34.6%	5

Most of the participants strongly agreed to statements (52), (53) and (54), which shows that the subjects tend to be highly interested in the accent that was taught in their PPOCS1 classes. Item (55) yielded a slightly less favourable response, with the majority of participating students marking the option 'Agree'. While the first three statements in this pool merely focus on the target accent, agreement to the fourth item requires a student to be interested not only in studying the features of the target accent but also the ones of a foreign accent. This might explain the slight shift in agreement.

For achieving internal consistency, the deletion of item (55) was necessary. After deleting item (55), Cronbach alpha exceeded the threshold required for internal consistency with an α-value of 0.720. Only the responses to the first three items in this pool were averaged. The Man Whitney U Test yielded a difference between SL and LSL, with the former being more interested in the target accent than the latter. However, this difference was not statistically significant and could have thus occurred by mere chance. The Spearman Route Order Correlation Coefficient mirrors this result.

7.12. Integrativeness

The role of integrativeness received much attention at the beginning of motivation research in foreign language acquisition. Since then it has been dismissed, only for it to resurface again and again, albeit in revised forms. I felt that this study would be incomplete without a

construct measuring integrative orientation, as researchers have continued to come back to it and comment upon integrativeness, which, in its original sense, concerns the wish to become similar to L2 native speakers. The items by which this construct was measured were the following:

(56) I wanted to become similar to the British/American people.

(57) I wished I were a native speaker of English.

(58) I felt a foreign accent kept me from connecting with British/American people.

Table 19: Response frequencies - Integrativeness

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(56)	8.6%	22.2%	23.5%	18.5%	14.8%	11.1%	3
(57)	17.3%	14.8%	12.3%	23.5%	7.4%	23.5%	4
(58)	32.1%	25.9%	22.2%	9.9%	8.6%	0.0%	2

Concerning statement (56), the majority indicated that they slightly disagreed. With regard to item (58), most participants expressed strong disagreement. To statement (57), mostly favourable attitudes were held amongst participants, with a tie between partial and strong agreement. Comparing item (57) with statement (48) ("I wish my native language were a different one"), to which the majority strongly disagreed, is interesting, as the response tendencies concerning these two items seem to be contradictive. In this study, participants seem to be content with their first languages (cf. item (48)). At the same time, the majority responded that they would have liked to be native speakers of English (cf. item (57)) which implies that they would have preferred to grow up with a different native language. My assumption is that participants believed that being a native speaker of English would have come in handy during the time they attended PPOCS1 but that, generally, participants are not characterised by a wish to trade their mother tongue for becoming an English native. Looking at the data obtained for this construct, which shows that the majority holds an unfavourable attitude towards two of the three statements, it was interpreted that the test population does not tend to be integratively oriented (if we take Gardner and Lambert's original definition of integrativeness as a reference point).

As internal consistency could not be found for this construct, the individual items underwent comparative analysis, which did not yield any statistically significant differences between SL and LSL. SL and LSL do not differ with regard to their manifestation of integrative orientation. Therefore, it is assumed that integrativeness in its original sense does not influence PPOCS1 students' motivation and subsequently their learning behaviour in a way which could affect their eventual achievement.

7.13. The degree of intrinsic interest

A construct measuring students' intrinsic interest was included in the present study, as intrinsic motivation, i.e. motivation which results from expecting enjoyment and other positive feelings while carrying out a certain activity, has been considered valuable for fuelling the learning process by numerous researchers, among them Crookes and Schmidt (1991), Noels and colleagues (2000), Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011), and Nakamura and Dubin (2015). The construct aims at exploring how much participants enjoyed improving their English accents and whether there are differences between SL and LSL. It consisted of three items:

(59) Working on improving my accent was fun.

(60) I enjoyed imitating a(n) British/American accent.

(61) I enjoyed listening to myself as I tried out or imitated a(n) British/American accent.

Table 20: Response frequencies - The degree of intrinsic interest

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Median
(59)	2.5%	4.9%	9.9%	33.3%	18.5%	29.6%	4
(60)	2.5%	1.2%	3.7%	24.7%	28.4%	39.5%	5
(61)	12.3%	14.8%	19.8%	14.8%	24.7%	13.6%	4

The data obtained seems to suggest that the majority of participants were intrinsically interested, as most indicated strong agreement to statements (59) and (60), and agreement to item (61). Responsible for the slightly less, albeit still very positive response to statement

(61) could be the fact that (61) does not only comprise the enjoyment felt by working on one's accent per se but also one's own perception of success while doing so.

A Cronbach alpha value of 0.797 permitted using the averaged construct for comparing SL and LSL. On the Man Whitney U Test, a statistically significant difference (p=0.001) could be found between SL and LSL, showing that SL took more pleasure in trying to modify their accents than LSL. The Spearman Route Order Correlation Test yielded results which match the ones found by the Man Whitney U Test. The Coefficient suggests a medium negative correlation of statistical significance (ρ=-0.346, p=0.002) between intrinsic interest and final grade, showing that the less students enjoyed the activity of working on their accents, the lower they scored in their final exams.

8. Conclusion

Research on what fuels foreign language learning has come a long way and has led to a consensus among scholars that motivation plays a key role where the level of ultimate attainment is concerned. Scholars have mostly addressed the importance of motivation with regard to the four traditional language skills, i.e. reading, writing, listening and speaking. These skills, however, should be considered rather broad umbrella terms as they synthesise several sub-skills. Despite its significance for the speaking dimension and the reasonable suggestion that it should receive the status of a fifth language skill, pronunciation has not received much attention in motivation research. To contribute to expanding the rather scarce literature on pronunciation learning, the overall aim of the present thesis was to explore the relationship between motivational variables, i.e. factors which are assumed to influence the emergence and upholding of motivation, and learning outcomes in phonological learning in a foreign language.

For the sake of identifying relevant motivational constructs, literature on motivation in foreign language learning was reviewed. The result was the compilation of 13 motivational factors assumed to play a role in learning a foreign language. These factors were explored through the use of a questionnaire, which was administered to 81 students who had attended a pronunciation class at the English Department of the University of Vienna (commonly referred to as PPOCS1). By means of inferential statistics, it was found that successful pronunciation learners (i.e. those who received a 'Sehr gut' (=A) or 'Gut' (=B) in their final oral exam) differ from less successful ones (i.e. those whose final grades were lower than or equal to 'Befriedigend' (=C)) with regard to the manifestation of some, but not all, motivational factors explored in the study. In comparison to less successful pronunciation learners, successful students show an increased desire to shed their foreign accents in English and ascribe more importance to avoiding low (but still passing) grades. Their linguistic self-confidence is higher, and thus it comes as no surprise that they are less anxious about making mistakes and less concerned about disappointing others should they fail to do well. Furthermore, successful learners tend to be more intrinsically interested when it comes to practising, and they experience learning in as well as outside of the classroom more positively than less successful students. It was found that successful PPOCS1 learners do not differ from less successful ones

with regard to all motivational variables investigated. For example, successful students and less successful ones similarly interpret a native accent in English as a sign of professionalism. Furthermore, neither of the two groups considers the aim of the pronunciation class a threat to their linguistic heritage and is discontent with their native identity. Lastly, both groups do not differ with regard to the degree of interest they have for the target accents. It is thus assumed that not all of the explored factors influence the emergence and upholding of motivation in a way which raises the chances for higher achievement.

While the study presented in this thesis shed light on differences between successful pronunciation learners and less successful ones, which might have partly determined their ultimate success in PPOCS1, the reader is advised to treat the results with caution for three main reasons. Firstly, pronunciation is a skill which is difficult to measure, and the judgment of the examiners will always be somewhat subjective. Secondly, the final grade received by the participants mainly reflects their performance in the final exam which takes place in a setting that is highly artificial. Therefore, a learner's performance might differ from his or her general pronunciation ability. Lastly, when filling in the questionnaire, participants had already completed PPOCS1. This was necessary for investigating the role of motivational factors with regard to achievement. The subjects were asked to respond to the questionnaire items in a way that corresponds to how they felt while they attended PPOCS1, which, for some, was quite a while ago. Thus, some reactions might have fallen prey to 'memory gaps' or attributional processes. While the empirical study certainly provides the reader with interesting insights and identified a number of motivational factors which seem to influence motivation and achievement, I would like to stress the importance of further research on pronunciation learning and what it is exactly that determines its outcome.

9. References

Alipour, Sepideh. “Metalinguistic and linguistic knowledge in foreign language learners”. Theory and Practice in Language Studies 4(12), 2640-2645.

Berkowitz, Diana. 1989. “The effect of cultural empathy on second-language phonological production”. In Eisenstein, Miriam (ed.). *The dynamic interlanguage*. New York: Plenum Press, 101-114.

Bongaerts, Theo. 2005. “Introduction: Ultimate attainment and the critical period hypothesis for second language acquisition”. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 43(4), 259-267.

Bouchard Ryan, Ellen; Carranza, Miguel; Moffie, Robert. 1977. “Reactions toward varying degrees of accentedness in the speech of Spanish-English bilinguals”. *Language and Speech* 20(3), 267-273.

Bresnahan, Mary Jiang; Ohashi, Rie; Liu, Wen Ying; Nebashi, Reiko; Shearman, Sachiyo Morinaga. 2002. “Attitudinal and affective response toward accented English”. Language and Communication 22(2), 171-185.

Brown, Penelope; Levinson, Stephen. 1979. “Social structure, groups and interaction” In Scherer, Klaus (ed.). *Social markers in speech*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 291-342.

Callan, Victor; Gallois, Cynthia; Forbes, Paula. 1983. “Evaluative reactions to accented English: ethnicity, sex role, and content”. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 14(4), 407-426.

Clément, Richard; Dörnyei, Zoltán; Noels, Kimberly. 1994. “Motivation, self-confidence and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom”. *Language Learning* 44(3), 417-448.

Coates, John. 1986. *Pronunciation and personality: a study of personal factors in German students’ pronunciation of English*. Bochum: AKS-Verlag.

Crookes, Graham; Schmidt, Richard. 1991. “Motivation: Reopening the research agenda”. *Language Learning* 41(4), 469-512.

Cukor-Avila, Patricia. 1988. “The effect of accent on speech and personality judgements”. *PALM* 3, 1-20.

Dailey, René; Giles, Howard; Jansma, Laura. 2005. “Language attitudes in an Anglo-Hispanic context: the role of the linguistic landscape”. *Language and Communication* 25(1), 27-38.

Dalton-Puffer, Kaltenböck, Gunter; Smit, Ute. 1997. “Learner attitudes and L2 pronunciation in Austria”. *World Englishes* 16(1), 115-128.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 1994a. “Understanding L2 motivation: on with the challenge!”. *Modern Language Journal* 78(4), 515-523.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 1994b. “Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom”. *Modern Language Journal* 78(3), 273-284.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2000. “Motivation in action: towards a process-oriented conceptualisation of student motivation”. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 70(4), 519-538.

Dörnyei, Zoltán. 2005. *The psychology of the language learner: individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dörnyei, Zoltán; Ottó, István. 1998. “Motivation in action: a process model of L2 motivation”. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics* (Thames Valley University, London) 47, 173-210.

Dörnyei, Zoltán; Ushioda, Ema. 2009. *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Zoltán; Ushioda, Ema. 2011. *Teaching and researching motivation.* (2nd edition). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Escudero, Paola. 2007. "Second language phonology: the role of perception". In Pennington, Martha (ed.). *Phonology in context*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Flege, James; Yeni-Komshian, Grace; Liu, Serena. 1999. "Age Constraints on Second-Language Acquisition". *Journal of Memory and Language* 41(1), 78-104.

Forsyth, Donelson. 1990. *Group Dynamics*. Michigan: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Gardner, Robert. 2006. "The socio-educational model of second language acquisition: a research paradigm". *EUROSLA Yearbook* 6(1), 237-260.

Gardner, Robert; Lambert, Wallace. 1959. "Motivational variables in second-language acquisition". *Canadian Journal of Psychology* 13, 26-72.

Gardner, Robert; Lambert, Wallace. 1972. Attitudes and motivation in second language learning. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publications.

Garret, Peter. 2010. *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Giles, Howard; Byrne, Jane. 1982. "An intergroup approach to second language acquisition". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 3(1), 17-40.

Gluszek, Agata; Dovidio, John. 2010. "The way they speak: a social psychological perspective on the stigma of nonnative accents in communication". *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 14(2), 214-237.

Hummel, Kirsten. 2013. "Target-language community involvement: second-language linguistic self-confidence and other perceived benefits". *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 69(1), 65-90.

Hüttner, Julia; Kidd, Sophie. 2000. "Reconstructing or demolishing the 'Sprechpraktikum' – a reply to: Daniel Spichtinger / From Anglocentrism to TEIL: reflections on our English programme". *Vienna English Working Papers* 9(2), 75-78.

Jenkins, Jennifer. 2000. *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Keller, John. 1983. "Motivational design of instruction". In Reigelruth, Charles. *Instructional design theories and models: an overview of their current status*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 383-434.

Kissling, Elizabeth. 2014. "What predicts the effectiveness of foreign language pronunciation instruction?: Investigating the role of perception and other individual differences". *Canadian Modern Language Review* 70(4), 532-558.

Lev-Ari, Shiri; Keysar, Boaz. 2010. "Why don't we believe non-native speakers? The influence of accent on credibility". *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 46(6), 1093-1096.

Levis, John. 2005. "Changing contexts and shifting paradigms in pronunciation teaching". *TESOL Quarterly* 39(3), 369-377.

Lindell, Annukka; Lum, Jarrad. 2008. "Priming vs. Rhyming: Orthographic and phonological representations in the left and right hemispheres." *Brain and Cognition* 68 (2), 193-203.

Lindemann, Stephanie. 2002. "Listening with an attitude: a model of native-speaker comprehension of non-native speakers in the United States". *Language in Society* 31(3), 419-441.

MacIntyre, Peter; MacKinnon, Sean; Clément, Richard. 2009. "The baby, the bathwater, and the future of language learning motivation research". In Dörnyei, Zoltán; Ushioda, Ema (eds.). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters: 43-65.

Major, Roy. 2001. *Foreign accent: the ontogeny and phylogeny of second language phonology.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Major, Roy; Fitzmaurice, Susan; Ferenc, Bunta; Balasubramanian, Chandricka. 2002. "The effects of nonnative accents on listening comprehension: implications for ESL assessment". *TESOL Quarterly* 36(2), 173-190.

Marinova-Todd, Stefka; Marshall, Bradford; Snow, Catherine. 2000. "Three misconceptions about age and L2 learning". *TESOL Quarterly* 34(1), 9-34.

McClelland, Neil. 2000. "Goal orientations in Japanese college students learning EFL". In Cornwell, Steve; Robinson, Peter. *Individual differences in foreign language learning: effects of aptitude, intelligence and motivation*. Tokyo: Aoyama Gakuin University, 99-115.

McCrocklin, Shannon; Link, Stephanie. 2016. "Accent, identity, and a fear of loss?: ESL students' perspectives". *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 72(1), 122-148.

Moyer, Alene. 2004. *Age, accent, and experience in second language acquisition: an integrated approach to critical period inquiry*. Clevedon, Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

Moyer, Alene. 2011. "An investigation of experience in L2 phonology: does quality matter more than quantity?". *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 67(2), 191-216.

Moyer, Alene. 2013. *Foreign accent: the phenomenon of non-native speech*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Munoz, Carmen. 2008. "Symmetries and asymmetries of age effects in naturalistic and instructed L2 learning". *Applied Linguistics* 29(4), 578-96.

Munro, Murray. 2008. "Aptitude for novel speech sounds and sound sequences: implications for second-language pronunciation". Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California.

Munro, Murray; Derwing, Tracey. 1995. "Processing time, accent and comprehensibility in the perception of native and foreign-accented speech". *Language and Speech* 38(3), 289-306.

Munro, Murray; Derwing, Tracey. 2011. "The foundations of accent and intelligibility in pronunciation research". *Language Teaching* 44(3), 316-327.

Munro, Murray; Derwing, Tracey. 2015. *Pronunciation fundamentals: evidence-based perspectives for L2 teaching and research*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Müller, Albert. 2012. "English pronunciation training in the language laboratory of the University of Vienna – an analysis of students' needs and motivation". Diploma thesis, University of Vienna.

Nakamura, Jeanne; Dubin, Matthew. 2015. "Flow in motivational psychology". In Smelser, Neil; Baltes, Paul. *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioural sciences*. 260-265.

Neuliep, James; Speten-Hansen, Kendall. 2013. "The influence of ethnocentrism on social perceptions of nonnative accents". *Language and Communication* 33(3), 167-176.

Nikbakht, Hamid. 2010. "EFL pronunciation teaching: a theoretical overview". *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 4(8), 146-174.

Noels, Kimberly; Pelletier, Luc; Clément, Richard; Vallerand, Robert. 2000. "Why are you learning a second language? Motivational orientations and self-determination theory". *Language Learning* 50(1), 57-85.

Noels, Kimberly; Pon, Gordon; Clément, Richard. 1996. “Language, identity, and adjustment: the role of linguistic self-confidence in the acculturation process”. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 15(3), 246-264.

Piller, Ingrid. 2002. “Passing for a native speaker: identity and success in second language learning”. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 6(2), 179-206.

Pizzolato, Jane. 2006. “Achieving college student possible selves: navigating the space between commitment and achievement of long-term identity goals”. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 12(1), 57-69.

Reiterer, Susanne. 2009. “Brain and language talent: a synopsis” In Dogil, Grzegorz; Reiterer, Susanne. *Language Talent and Brain Activity.* Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 155-191.

Reiterer, Susanne; Hu, X.; Erb, Michael; Rota, Giusepina; Jilka, M.; et al. 2009. “Second language pronunciation ‚talent‘: Individual differences between good and poor ‘pronouncers’ of foreign language during speech production. An fMRI investigation.” *Neuroimage* 47, 118.

Rivera, N.F. 1998. Effecto de la edad de inicio de aprendizaje de la lengua extranjera (inglés) y cantidad de exposición a la LE en la percepción de las fonemas del ingls por hablantes de espanol y catalán [Effect of age at starting to learn English as a foreign language and amount of exposure on perception of English phonemes for speakers of Spanish and Catalan]. Paper presented at II Encuentro Interacional sobre Adquisición de las Lenguas del Estado, Barcelona, Spain.

Ryan, Richard; Deci, Edward. 2000. “Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: classic definitions and new directions”. *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 25(1), 54-67.

Sakamoto, Emi. 2010. “An investigation of factors behind foreign accent in the L2 acquisition of Japanese lexical pitch accent by adult English speakers”. PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh.

Scales, Julie; Wennerstrom, Ann; Richard, Dara; Wu, Su Hui. 2006. „Language learners’ perceptions of accent”. TESOL Quarterly 40(4), 715-738.

Setter, Jane; Jenkins, Jennifer. 2005. “State-of-the-art review article: pronunciation”. *Language Teaching* 38(1), 1-17.

Smit, Ute; Dalton, Christiane. 2000. “Motivational patterns in advanced EFL pronunciation learners”. *IRAL* 38(3-4), 229-246.

Smith, Larry. 1992. “Spread of English and issues of intelligibility”. In Kachru, Braj (ed.). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 75-90.

Spezzini, Susan. 2004. “English Immersion in Paraguay: Individual and sociocultural dimensions of language learning and use*.” International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 7 (5), 412-431.

Spichtinger, Daniel. 2000. “From Anglocentrism to TEIL: reflections on our English programme”. *Vienna English Working Papers* 9(1), 69-72.

Szpyra-Kozłowka, Jolanta. 2015. *Pronunciation in EFL instruction: a research-based approach.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Taguchi, Tatsuya; Magid, Michael; Papi; Mostafa. 2009. “The L2 motivational self system among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian learners of English: a comparative study”. In Dörnyei, Zoltán; Ushioda, Ema (eds.). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters: 66-97.

Thir, Veronika. 2014. “PPOCS1 revisited: exploring the implications of ELF for English pronunciation teaching”. Diploma thesis, University of Vienna.

Tremblay, Paul; Gardner, Robert. 1995. “Expanding the motivation construct in language learning”. *Modern Language Journal* 79(4), 505-520.

Ushioda, Ema. 1996. “Developing a dynamic concept of L2 motivation”. In Hickey, Tina; Williams, Jenny (eds.). *Language, education and society in a changing world.* Dublin/Clevedon: IRAAL/Multilingual Matters, 239-245.

Ushioda, Ema. 2009. “A person-in-context relational view of emergent motivation, self and identity”. In Dörnyei, Zoltán; Ushioda, Ema (eds.). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 215-228.

Üstünbaş, Ümran. 2018. “Does pronunciation instruction make any sense? EFL learners and teachers’ beliefs”. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction* 10(1), 71-84).

Weiner, Bernard. 1986. “Attribution, emotion and action” In Sorrentino, Richard (ed.). *Handbook of Motivation and Cognition: Foundations of Social Behavior*. New York: The Guilford Press, 281-312.

Weinziger, Susanne. 2015. “The four language skills in Austrian English as a foreign language (EFL) classrooms”. Diploma thesis, University of Vienna.

Williams, Marion; Burden, Robert. 1997. *Psychology for language teachers: a social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wucherer, Barbara; Reiterer, Susanne. 2018. “Language is a girlie thing, isn’t it? A psycholinguistic exploration of the L2 gender gap”. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 21(1), 118-134.

Yazan, Bedrettin. 2015. “Intelligibility”. *Elt Journal* 69(2), 202-204.

Online sources:

University of Graz:
https://www.ph-online.ac.at/ph-bgld/wbLv.wbShowLvDetail?pStpSpNr=146840 (12.11.2018)

University of Innsbruck:
https://lfuonline.uibk.ac.at/public/lfuonline_lv.home?sem_id_in=18W&suche_in=Listening%2FSpeaking+I#lv-details (12.11.2018)

University of Klagenfurt:
https://campus.aau.at/studium/course/96974 (12.11.2018)

University of Salzburg:
https://www.ph-online.ac.at/ph-linz/wbLv.wbShowLvDetail?pStpSpNr=169230 (12.11.2018)

Course catalogue of the University of Vienna. https://ufind.univie.ac.at/de/course.html?lv=121192&semester=2018S (15.07.2018)

PPOCS curriculum. Department of English, University of Vienna. 2013. *Oral language skills module / Practical phonetics and oral communication skills: curriculum*.

Schedule of ‘2015S 121192-3 PPOCS1’. https://moodle.univie.ac.at/pluginfile.php/1718696/mod_resource/content/5/Course%20info%20%20tentative%20schedule.pdf (15.07.2018)

Shemesh, Hadar. 2017. “Once a foreign student now an English coach/ my story/ confidence in English”. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=shTGQXrI4sQ (25.11.2017).

Online tools:

SoSciSurvey: https://www.soscisurvey.de/ (24.11.2018)

10. Appendix

10.1. Questionnaire

Dear study participant,

the following questionnaire concerning motivation in pronunciation learning is part of my diploma thesis, which I am writing for the purpose of completing my teaching degree (English and Psychology/Philosophy) at the University of Vienna. By answering the subsequent questions, you can make an important contribution to research – please answer them sincerely and honestly. There are no right and wrong answers and all of them will be treated anonymously.

Thank you very much for your participation.

INSTRUCTIONS

Following are a number of statements concerning PPOCS1 with which some people agree and others disagree. I would like you to indicate your opinion next to each statement by marking the box that best indicates the extent to which you agreed or disagreed with the statement when attending PPOCS1 (for the first time).

Please tick only one box for every question and don't leave out any of them. Thank you.

Items focusing on the role of the Ideal Self:

(1) My goal was to be mistaken for a native speaker.

(2) My goal was to shed my foreign accent in English.

(3) My goal was for people not to recognise my nationality because of my accent.

(4) My goal was to belong to the group of learners that has a near-native like accent.

Items focusing on instrumental reasons with a promotional focus 1:

(5) I thought having a near-native like accent would be an advantage for my future.

(6) The things I want(ed) to do in the future require(d) me to speak with a near-native like accent.

(7) I considered a near-native like accent irrelevant in my future.

Items focusing on instrumental reasons with a promotional focus 2:

(8) I believed that by shedding my foreign accent I would be considered a good student.

(9) To me, losing my foreign accent meant increasing my competence in English.

(10) I thought that by attaining a near-native like accent I would be considered a better student than others.

Items focusing on the role of the Ought-To Self 1:

(11) People surrounding me expected me to attain a near-native like accent.

(12) By attaining a near-native like accent, I would gain the approval of others.

(13) I was worried that people in my environment would be disappointed if I did not attain a near-native like accent.

Items focusing on the role of the Ought-To Self 2:

(14) Professional English speakers are expected to have a near-native like accent.

(15) People surrounding me believed that a successful student at the English Department had to have a near-native like accent.

(16) In my environment, a near-native like accent is considered something that sets successful learners apart from less successful ones.

Items focusing on instrumental reasons with a prevention focus 1:

(17) Getting a good mark in PPOCS1 was important to me.

(18) Getting a bad grade (but still a passing grade) in PPOCS1 course was NOT an option for me.

(19) I wanted to avoid getting a bad mark (but still a passing grade) in the PPOCS1 course by all means.

Items focusing on instrumental reasons with a prevention focus 2:

(20) I DID NOT want to engage with the course's topic any longer than absolutely necessary.

(21) Dealing with the course's contents for more than one semester would have been a nightmare for me.

(22) I DID NOT want to deal with the PPOCS1 contents in the subsequent semester.

Items focusing on instrumental reasons with a prevention focus 3:

(23) I believed that I would be regarded a failure if I didn't attain a near-native like accent.

(24) I believed that if I did not do well in my PPOCS1 course, I would be considered a weaker student in my degree programme.

(25) Not succeeding at attaining a near-native like accent makes a learner of English less competent.

Items focusing on a student's learning experience 1:

(26) I liked the atmosphere in my PPOCS1 classes.

(27) I looked forward to the PPOCS1 classes that were to follow.

(28) I felt uncomfortable in my PPOCS1 classes.

Items focusing on a student's learning experience 2:

(29) I enjoyed working on my pronunciation outside of class.

(30) Working on my accent by myself was fun.

(31) Working on improving my accent outside of class was a burden for me.

Items focusing on linguistic self-confidence and expectancy:

(32) I was confident I would attain a near-native like accent if I made an effort.

(33) I felt overwhelmed by the course's aim to attain a near-native like accent.

(34) I believed I could attain a near-native like accent if I kept working on it.

(35) I was sure a had a good ability to reach the course's goal.

Items focusing on the level of anxiety:

(36) I got nervous when I had to read aloud or speak in front of others without having rehearsed before.

(37) I worried about making pronunciation mistakes in my PPOCS1 class.

(38) I was worried other students would make fun of my pronunciation behind my back when I spoke in my PPOCS1 class.

Items focusing on fear of assimilation 1:

(39) By working towards a near-native like accent, one risks losing one's (native) identity.

(40) Trying to lose one's foreign accent equals belittling one's origins.

(41) I think that those trying to attain a near-native like accent are NOT proud of where they come from.

(42) The aim of the PPOCS1 course poses a threat to the students' (native) identities.

Items focusing on fear of assimilation 2:

(43) Learners speaking with a near-native like accent are snobs.

(44) In my opinion, students who did well in PPOCS1 are conceited about their pronunciation.

(45) Students who got a good mark in PPOCS1 think they are better than others.

Items focusing on students' attitudes towards their native identities:

(46) I am proud of where I am from.

(47) I like English better than my native language.

(48) I wish my native language were a different one.

Items focusing on students' attitudes towards L2 communities:

(49) I like spending time in English-speaking countries.

(50) I like meeting people from English-speaking countries.

(51) In general, I like learning about people from English-speaking countries.

Items focusing on a student's interest in the target accents:

(52) I like listening to a(n) British/American accent.

(53) I am interested in the way the British/Americans sound.

(54) I like the rhythm of the British/American accent.

(55) I find the difference between native and foreign accents in English interesting.

Items focusing on integrativeness:

(56) I wanted to become similar to the British/American people.

(57) I wished I were a native speaker of English.

(58) I felt a foreign accent kept me from connecting with British/American people.

Items focusing on intrinsic interest:

(59) Working on improving my accent was fun.

(60) I enjoyed imitating a(n) British/American accent.

(61) I enjoyed listening to myself as I tried out or imitated a(n) British/American accent.

Sociodemographic information:

Gender: □ Female

□ Male

□ Unspecified

Degree programme:

□ Teacher education

□ English and American Studies

□ Both

My PPOCS1 focus:

□ Received Pronunciation / British English

□ General American English

My (first) PPOCS1 grade:

□ 1

□ 2

□ 3

□ 4

□ 5

□ I do not want to share my grade

10.2. Relative frequencies of questionnaire items

Item No.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
(1)	6.2%	12.3%	8.6%	25.9%	19.8%	27.2%
(2)	1.2%	7.4%	8.6%	17.3%	40.7%	23.5%
(3)	6.2%	8.6%	13.6%	19.8%	24.7%	27.2%
(4)	1.2%	3.7%	7.4%	24.7%	30.9%	32.1%
(5)	0.0%	6.2%	6.2%	22.2%	32.1%	32.1%
(6)	6.2%	12.3%	21.0%	29.6%	17.3%	12.3%
(7)	21.0%	42.0%	16.0%	12.3%	4.9%	1.2%
(8)	2.5%	4.9%	9.9%	33.3%	38.3%	9.9%
(9)	1.2%	6.2%	4.9%	25.9%	32.1%	29.6%
(10)	1.2%	9.9%	14.8%	27.2%	32.1%	13.6%
(11)	8.6%	17.3%	19.8%	27.2%	17.3%	8.6%
(12)	4.9%	7.4%	9.9%	38.3%	27.2%	11.1%
(13)	24.7%	25.9%	19.8%	12.3%	13.6%	3.7%
(14)	0%	8.6%	8.6%	23.5%	39.5%	19.8%
(15)	2.5%	13.6%	11.1%	28.4%	24.7%	18.5%
(16)	2.5%	13.6%	18.5%	30.9%	17.3%	16.0%
(17)	2.5%	6.2%	18.5%	23.5%	18.5%	28.4%
(18)	14.8%	22.2%	16.0%	22.2%	14.8%	9.9%
(19)	2.5%	13.6%	9.9%	23.5%	28.4%	22.2%
(20)	32.1%	29.6%	8.6%	24.7%	2.5%	2.5%
(21)	33.3%	25.9%	12.3%	9.9%	11.1%	7.4%

(22)	30.9%	21.0%	12.3%	19.8%	8.6%	7.4%
(23)	11.1%	21.0%	19.8%	27.2%	12.3%	7.4%
(24)	9.9%	21.0%	8.6%	27.2%	25.9%	7.4%
(25)	16.0%	29.6%	21.0%	25.9%	7.4%	0.0%
(26)	11.1%	9.9%	13.6%	21.0%	25.9%	17.3%
(27)	9.9%	13.6%	12.3%	25.9%	18.5%	19.8%
(28)	23.5%	24.7%	16.0%	9.9%	13.6%	11.1%
(29)	2.5%	12.3%	14.8%	21.0%	24.7%	24.7%
(30)	7.4%	7.4%	8.6%	32.1%	17.3%	24.7%
(31)	23.5%	21.0%	17.3%	27.2%	7.4%	3.7%
(32)	1.2%	6.2%	19.8%	23.5%	32.1%	17.3%
(33)	13.6%	18.5%	16.0%	22.2%	17.3%	12.3%
(34)	0%	4.9%	6.2%	27.2%	37.0%	24.7%
(35)	1.2%	6.2%	17.3%	22.2%	35.8%	17.3%
(36)	8.6%	16.0%	7.4%	29.6%	17.3%	21.0%
(37)	2.5%	4.9%	6.2%	17.3%	33.3%	35.8%
(38)	29.6%	28.4%	12.3%	11.1%	7.4%	11.1%
(39)	55.6%	22.2%	9.9%	7.4%	1.2%	1.2%
(40)	56.8%	24.7%	12.3%	3.7%	2.5%	0.0%
(41)	56.8%	38.3%	1.2%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%
(42)	54.3%	24.7%	14.8%	4.9%	1.2%	0.0%
(43)	46.9%	29.6%	9.9%	11.1%	1.2%	0.0%
(44)	16.0%	28.4%	11.1%	29.6%	6.2%	8.6%
(45)	17.3%	18.5%	13.6%	23.5%	17.3%	9.9%

(46)	0.0%	2.5%	6.2%	22.2%	40.7%	27.2%
(47)	6.2%	29.6%	19.8%	23.5%	13.6%	6.2%
(48)	49.4%	21.0%	13.6%	8.6%	6.2%	0.0%
(49)	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	3.7%	24.7%	69.1%
(50)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	18.5%	77.8%
(51)	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	6.2%	38.3%	51.9%
(52)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.9%	32.1%	63.0%
(53)	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	8.6%	39.5%	49.4%
(54)	0.0%	2.5%	1.2%	7.4%	37.0%	51.9%
(55)	0.0%	2.5%	6.2%	13.6%	43.2%	34.6%
(56)	8.6%	22.2%	23.5%	18.5%	14.8%	11.1%
(57)	17.3%	14.8%	12.3%	23.5%	7.4%	23.5%
(58)	32.1%	25.9%	22.2%	9.9%	8.6%	0.0%
(59)	2.5%	4.9%	9.9%	33.3%	18.5%	29.6%
(60)	2.5%	1.2%	3.7%	24.7%	28.4%	39.5%
(61)	12.3%	14.8%	19.8%	14.8%	24.7%	13.6%

Abstract (English)

Researchers widely agree that motivation takes on a significant role in the process of acquiring a foreign language, particularly in the domain of phonological learning. Despite this assumption, literature on the relationship between motivation and pronunciation learning is rather scarce. Therefore, the present diploma thesis serves as a contribution to expanding the existing research in this field. The empirical study explores (1) how motivational factors (i.e. variables which are assumed to influence the emergence and upholding of motivation, such as a student's level of confidence or his wish to attain the target accent) manifest themselves in advanced pronunciation learners, and (2) whether successful learners differ from less successful ones in this regard.

The theory part of the thesis is concerned with a discussion of why phonological learning is important and opting for a 'native-speakerist' approach to pronunciation teaching is often preferred over one that merely aims at intelligibility. It also includes a review of factors which have been found to influence overcoming the challenges that come with the former approach. The literature review lays the foundation for the questionnaire, which was completed by 81 EFL students who had attended a pronunciation course at the English Department of the University of Vienna (PPOCS1), the goal of which is the acquisition of a native-like accent in English.

The obtained data reveals that, in the context of PPOCS1, successful pronunciation learners show an increased wish to acquire a native-like accent in comparison to less successful ones. Furthermore, they are more optimistic with regard to their chances of acquiring native-like pronunciation and less worried about making mistakes or disappointing others by failing to do so. Successful learners also enjoy pronunciation activities more than their less successful peers and experience learning in and out of the classroom more positively. Other motivational variables, such as a learner's contentment with his or her native identity or a student's general interest in the target accent, do not seem to contribute to a learner's achievement in PPOCS1.

Abstract (German)

WissenschaftlerInnen sind sich weitgehend einig, dass Motivation eine bedeutende Rolle für die Aneignung einer Fremdsprache einnimmt, insbesondere im Bereich des phonologischen Lernens. Es ist daher überraschend, dass wenig Literatur vorhanden ist, die sich mit dem Zusammenhang von Motivation und dem Erlernen der richtigen Aussprache einer Fremdsprache beschäftigt. Die Intention der vorliegenden Diplomarbeit ist es, einen Beitrag zur Erweiterung des Literaturumfanges in diesem Bereich zu leisten. Die empirische Studie erforscht (1) wie motivationale Einflussfaktoren (d.h. Faktoren, die wahrscheinlich die Entstehung und Aufrechterhaltung von Motivation mitbestimmen, wie z.B. das Selbstbewusstsein eines Lernenden oder dessen Wunsch, einen muttersprachlichen Akzent in einer Fremdsprache zu erlernen) in fortgeschrittenen Lernenden der englischen Aussprache ausgeprägt sind, und (2) ob erfolgreiche Lernende sich in dieser Hinsicht von weniger erfolgreichen unterscheiden.

Der Theorie-Teil der Arbeit beschäftigt sich mit der Frage, warum das Erlernen einer guten Aussprache in einer Fremdsprache wichtig ist und wieso die Lehrpraxis die Aneignung eines muttersprachlichen Akzentes in einer Fremdsprache einem Aussprache-Training, welches rein auf Verständlichkeit abzielt, oft vorzieht. Weiters werden Faktoren diskutiert, die einen Einfluss auf die Überwindung von Schwierigkeiten und Herausforderungen haben, die die Aneignung einer ausgezeichneten Aussprache in einer Fremdsprache begleiten. Die Theorie bildet die Basis für den Fragebogen, welcher von 81 Studierenden ausgefüllt wurde, die zuvor an der Anglistik und Amerikanistik in Wien einen Aussprache-Kurs besucht hatten, dessen Ziel die Aneignung eines muttersprachlichen Akzentes im Englischen ist (PPOCS1).

Die Datenanalyse hat ergeben, dass erfolgreiche PPOCS1 TeilnehmerInnen im Vergleich mit weniger erfolgreichen einen verstärkten Wunsch zeigen, einen muttersprachlichen Akzent zu beherrschen. Außerdem sind sie optimistischer in Bezug auf ihre Erfolgschancen und tragen weniger Sorge, Fehler zu machen oder andere zu enttäuschen, sollten sie das Ziel des Kurses nicht erreichen. Erfolgreiche Studierende haben mehr Freude an Ausspracheübungen und bewerten ihre Lernerfahrungen im und außerhalb des Klassenraumes positiver. Andere motivationale Einflussfaktoren, wie z.B. die Zufriedenheit eines/r Lernenden mit seiner/ihrer

linguistischen Identität oder dessen/deren allgemeines Interesse am Zielakzent, scheinen die Endnote nicht zu beeinflussen.