In P. De Costa, Crowther & Maloney (Eds.). Investigating World Englishes: Research Methodology and Practical Applications. London and NY: Routledge

4 The use of surveys and questionnaires in World Englishes research

Ying-Ying Tan

Introduction

This chapter discusses the use of surveys and questionnaires in World Englishes (WE) research. It highlights the use of surveys and questionnaires as methodological tools for participant elicitation in the specific research areas of WE within which they have been employed. This chapter will also provide the background to this methodology, its strengths, weaknesses, and application. More importantly, as one of the major aims of this chapter is to provide a historical overview of how WE research has employed this methodological tool, this chapter will also provide a glimpse of how the field has developed over the last 35 years. This overview is based on the archive of 1,064 published articles in the journal *World Englishes*, from the first issue in September 1981 to the most current issue (during the time this chapter is being written) in June 2017. While there are other journals dealing with Englishes, most notable being *English World-Wide*, *English Today*, *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, amongst others, *World Englishes* is without a doubt the first and also the definitive journal dedicated to research in WE, and thus forms the basis from which this chapter draws its references.

Background and methodological principles

The use of questionnaires and surveys as a methodological tool is common in sociolinguistic research. Schleef (2013, p. 44) distinguishes between five types of sociolinguistic surveys. They are, as he labels them: (1) language surveys, (2) regional variation surveys, (3) surveys of language use, (4) language attitude and perception studies, and (5) acceptability judgements. This typology is particularly useful, and it merits a brief summary of each item just so we can understand the use of surveys in the field of sociolinguistics as a whole. The first two survey types are focused on languages and varieties spoken in specific communities and domains. *Language surveys* are broad, and they investigate what languages are spoken in a specific area, the sociolinguistic profile of ethnic minorities, and in what domain certain varieties are spoken. *Regional variation surveys*, however, investigate dialect variation and, in such surveys, elicitation of grammatical features is also usually done. The third type of survey, *surveys of language*

use, for Schleef (2013), aim to explore "the use of particular words and phrases in research that is not of a dialectological nature; for example, the use of loan words, swear words, certain colour terms, or sexist/non-sexist language use" (p. 44), and they can range from comparing semantics of words, to looking at the differences between written and spoken language. The final two categories of surveys, *language attitude and perception studies* and *acceptability judgements*, deal more with speakers' attitudes and beliefs. They usually also involve other techniques such as matched and verbal guise tests (e.g., Clark & Schleef, 2010; Garrett, 2010; Ladegaard, 1998; Lambert, 1967) to elicit attitudes towards languages, dialects, accents, vocabulary, pronunciation, grammatical items, and so on.

While there has been much research in the field of WE, the use of questionnaires and surveys in WE can be said to be somewhat limited. Of the 1,064 published articles in *World Englishes* in the 35 years between 1981 and 2017, only 25 papers made use of this mode of data collection (these articles are annotated in the timeline section). And of these 25 articles, 19 of them made use of questionnaires and surveys to study language attitudes. The other areas that were studied were accent perception, language use, intelligibility, acceptability judgements, and one slightly unusual piece that is a phonetic perception study. The use of questionnaires and surveys as a methodological tool in WE research was also not prevalent until the early 1990s, and the bulk of these studies appeared between 2008 and 2014.

It is not at all surprising to find questionnaires and surveys to be relatively uncommon in the field of WE. The field was pioneered by Braj Kachru, founding editor of *World Englishes*, and its initial focus had a pedagogical slant, and even the use of questionnaires was restricted to a classroom context, as evidenced by only one paper (Wade & Cartwright, 1983) published in *World Englishes*, which looked at the perception of teachers' accents by students. Except for a couple of papers looking at intelligibility and attitudes over the next decade, there were few who employed questionnaires and surveys as a methodological tool in the research of WE. As the field developed over the next ten years, there was emphasis on the description of different English varieties, and the explication of grammatical, phonological, and lexical features was the primary occupation of WE researchers. Underlying the description of the different Englishes was the desire to establish legitimacy and gain recognition for WE against the norms of the "traditional" Englishes such as those from the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia. Of course, much of this description work is still being done, but it is no coincidence that the use of sociolinguistic methodology such as that of surveys and questionnaires comes only around the mid-2000s, when the bulk of linguistic description and theoretical musings have reached a point of maturity. The questions raised, 20 years into the field, have started to change. Researchers have begun to look away from the English varieties, but have started to ask questions about how English speakers view and use the different varieties of English. This also explains why there is a concentration of work on language attitudes, and of which the questionnaires and surveys are the best methodological tools for such studies.

As mentioned earlier, the bulk of the WE research employing questionnaires and surveys looks at language attitudes. Besides that, the other areas that have been studied are accent perception, language use, intelligibility, acceptability judgements, and phonetic perception. Unique to WE research, however, many of these questionnaires and surveys are conducted with additional stimuli, usually in the form of recordings. This particular technique has also been referred to as "speaker evaluation studies" (Giles & Billings, 2004). In speaker evaluation studies, stimuli are created, usually in the form of voice recordings. These recordings are then played to listeners who are subsequently asked to fill out a questionnaire, answering questions about the speakers who voices they just heard. In research on WE, these recordings usually take one of two forms. In one, the recordings can be of speakers who are speaking in different English varieties or accents. Participants are then asked questions about how they feel about the speakers' accents, making it a study on language attitudes towards accents; or they can be asked to write down what they think they heard, and this is the basis of studies on intelligibility and comprehensibility. These stimuli usually consist of different speakers, and they are called verbal guise studies (Cooper, 1975; Cooper & Fishman, 1974). This technique is particularly useful for comparing across many different varieties or accents, or across varieties that are not found in the same region or spoken by the same community. However, when using different speakers, the variables not pertaining to the study also increase. For example, participants may feel positively towards Accent A, but it may not necessarily be due to the accent, it may be that the speaker of Accent A happened to sound more articulate, friendly, or cheerful. These characteristics, which are not necessarily relevant to the research in question, get introduced as the stimuli are created with different speakers.

To counteract the influence of these other factors due to speaker differences, Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner, and Fillenbaum (1960) developed the matched guise technique in which a single speaker produces both (or all) guises. This is the second form of stimuli that often accompany questionnaires in WE research. Matched guise stimuli are used typically to compare across varieties of the same language, for example, between colloquial and standard varieties of Singapore English (Cavallaro & Ng, 2009; Cavallaro, Ng, & Seilhamer, 2014; Tan & Tan, 2008), and not for comparison across multiple varieties. This is because the matched guise technique requires a single multilingual/multidialectal speaker to be recorded saying the same content in either two or more languages/varieties. These versions have to be matched for speaker and content, with the only difference being the language or variety. This method takes out the variability introduced with different speakers' voice or personality characteristics, which, as mentioned earlier, are problems with the verbal guise technique. Using matched guise stimuli, WE researchers then get the participants to answer questions on their questionnaire and survey on the kinds of traits that are associated with speakers of a certain language or dialect, while the fact that the recordings are done by the same speaker is unbeknownst to the participants. The researcher can then draw conclusions, with a fair amount of confidence that the participants'

responses towards the guises are representative of their attitudes towards speakers of the variety of English or accent they heard.

Given that the use of recorded stimuli to accompany questionnaires and surveys is a tried and tested method that is employed in the field of WE, one has also started to see this method extended beyond language attitude studies. This particular methodology has also been employed, albeit only once, in 2015, on an experimental phonetic study looking at the perception of stress in Singapore English by speakers of British, American, Australian, and Singapore English. Tan's (2015) study involved playing snippets of words spliced from a Singapore English spontaneous speech corpus to more than 180 participants, and participants were asked to listen to the stimuli and then indicate where they felt the stress was. This technique has also sometimes been called the *identification task* (Drager, 2013), and it is commonly employed in phonetics and psycholinguistic experiments.

I have gone on at length talking about questionnaires and surveys with accompanied speech stimuli as most of the research on WE have used this method in the study of language attitudes. However, that is not to say that this is the only form to be employed, and certainly, language attitude is not the only area that employs this methodology. There are also questionnaires and surveys that do not make use of additional stimuli. These studies typically involve questions pertaining to *language practices* and *language ideology*. According to Spolsky (2004), *language practices* refer to the habitual selection patterns of language varieties within the linguistic repertoire of a speech community, and *language ideology* is a general set of beliefs held by members of a speech community about language and its usage. Researchers on WE (e.g., Chong and Seilhamer, 2014; Tan, 2014) have also made use of questionnaires to get participants' responses on their use of Englishes in their everyday lives, and specific domains, and what they believe the use of English represents to them. Suffice to say, questionnaires and surveys, when designed well, are versatile tools that can answer an array of questions in WE.

Strengths and weaknesses

One of the best things about questionnaires and surveys is that they allow researchers to collect a large amount of data quickly, efficiently, and economically, and in the age of technology, they also allow the researcher to be far removed from the site where the research is being done. This section will outline in detail some of the key strengths and pitfalls of this mode of data collection.

The key advantage of surveys and questionnaires is quantity. For data that can bear the weight of statistical analysis, the sample size needs to be quantitatively large enough. Only a large sample size allows the researcher to subject the data to statistical analyses that can then be generalised to the population with some level of confidence. Other modes of data collection that involve smaller groups of participation, especially small-group interviews or ethnographic studies, while important as methodological tools (see Chapters 3 and 6 by Maloney & Kessler, this volume), often suffer from their inability to be generalised to the larger group

within which these participants may be in. This limits the conclusions that can be drawn from these studies. Researchers can collect a large amount of data in a short span of time using questionnaires and surveys. Even if one were to go back to the days of pen and paper, thousands of copies of a written survey can be distributed fairly easily. For instance, Scargill and Warkentyne, in 1972, collected more than 14,000 responses to the *Survey of Canadian English* from Canadian schoolchildren and their parents. This large dataset also allowed for variables such as region, age, and gender to be analysed with enough statistical strength. Today, with the use of online survey and questionnaire sites, e.g., *Qualtrics* and *Surveymonkey*, amongst others, setting up an online questionnaire is easier than ever. These sites are usually free, and once the online survey is set up, they can be distributed to a large network of friends and contacts at the click of a button. The data collected also need not be manually tagged or processed, but are collated by the online survey programme, making it easy for the researcher to carry out statistical analyses.

The reason why these questionnaires are capable of creating large amounts of data is also because one can have hundreds or thousands of respondents filling out these questionnaires at the same time. They can also do it in their own time, which cuts out the logistical constraints of having to meet or talk with the researcher or the research assistants. The amount of time and effort to meet with each of the participants is immense: there is time needed to locate willing participants, scheduling time to meet, travelling time, time needed to talk to the participants, and the time to process the resulting responses. If all these were to be translated to costs, it is an unimaginable amount of cost involved to collect even hundreds of responses, let alone thousands. Using questionnaires and surveys, and especially if they are done online, the data collection can be completed in a matter of days, with almost no financial cost involved. The researcher can be in another part of the world, far removed from the participants, therefore not only cutting down on travel time and costs but also removing boundaries of geographical and time differences for data to be collected.

Another advantage of surveys and questionnaires is the ease of analysis. As the same questionnaire is administered to each participant in the same way, one can assume that inter-participant differences that may be influenced by various techniques of data collection are greatly diminished. This allows the researcher to analyse the data with a fair amount of confidence that it is unlikely that there are extenuating circumstances that may throw the data askew. Once the data is collected, the responses are generally easy to analyse. As mentioned earlier, online survey sites now have automated programmes that categorise the collected data in an accessible way. These survey applications can also tabulate the results that allow the researcher to carry out statistical analyses in any fashion. Even if the surveys involve open-ended questions that may not be quantitatively analysed, they are also easily accessible as they will be collated usually in a spreadsheet for further scrutiny.

Unfortunately, despite the advantages described previously, the data collected may often be seen to be lacking in depth and quality. This method of data

collection is not suitable to any kind of micro-level linguistic analysis. While they are useful for revealing whether a particular language or accent or linguistic feature is negatively or positively evaluated in a community, these attitudes are based on the participants' linguistic intuitions. Linguistic intuitions, however, are poor substitutes to how people use the language. It is perfectly possible that participants may respond in a way that they believe is the desirable answer so as to present themselves in a favourable light, regardless of whether they truly believe in their answer. And this is especially chronic when it comes to variables that involve, for example, "nonstandard" use of the language or stigmatised varieties of Englishes. Participants may feel sensitive about these questions, and the answers often may simply reflect the degree to which they wish to be associated or disassociated from the community of speakers. Depending on the social image they wish to project, they may underreport the usage of stigmatised forms or exaggerate their use of prestige varieties.

There are also some rather practical constraints to the use of surveys and questionnaires. As the researcher need not be present at the same space and time as the participant, one cannot be sure if the participant is truly the person he/she reports to be. One can only trust that when the participant reports himself to be a 45-year-old graduate who speaks American English, he is not his 16-year-old daughter pretending to be her father. There is also some degree of unreliability in the use of this mode of data collection. Given that the participant is left to complete the survey in his/her own time, there is no chance for clarification with the researcher in cases in which they may not understand what is being asked. There is, therefore, a chance that a question may be misread or misinterpreted. And in cases in which the survey is being done online, some participants who may not be as technologically competent may end up giving responses that are not reflective of their use or attitudes towards the language, but instead are responses of technological trials and errors. Participants may also get tired of filling in a questionnaire. They may give answers in haste or leave questions blank.

Pointers for application

Questionnaires and surveys, when designed well, are excellent tools for data collection. Designing a questionnaire, however, requires a thoughtful process, and this is especially so if one requires additional stimuli, as in the case of verbal or matched guise studies. This section outlines some of the points to consider when employing this mode of data collection.

It is imperative to remember that all the conclusions one draws from the questionnaire will be based on the responses of the participants. What this means is that every single question in the questionnaire is meant to answer a particular area or aspect of the research agenda. It is, therefore, good practice to ask yourself what each item in the questionnaire represents, and how the responses will be interpreted.

The next step is to decide on whether the types of questions to be asked require closed questions or open-ended questions. Closed questions are those

that provide a closed range of possible answers (Schleef, 2013). What this means is that the possible answers would have to be first selected by the researcher, and they could be presented in the form of a checklist, true-false options, multiple choice questions, or a Likert scale (see De Vaus, 2002, for examples of other question types used in sociolinguistic surveys). For open-ended questions, respondents are given the freedom to provide a response in any way, and they are not restricted by the preselected answers. This does present some difficulties when analysing data, as compared to the closed questions. The choice, therefore, boils down to what the research aims are.

If additional stimuli are required, the choices one makes in selecting or creating the stimuli will be the most important choices in the questionnaire design. Depending again on what the aims are and how many varieties or dialects one is comparing, the researcher will need to make a decision on whether to use verbal guise or matched guise recordings, and if the recordings are to be from read speech or spontaneous speech. Whatever the choice may be, as long as speech samples are going to be used, it is important to ensure that the recordings are of extremely good quality, taken in a soundproof setting. In the ideal world, each participant should be equipped with a set of noise-reduction or noise-cancelling headphones when listening to the stimuli and answering the questions. However, in reality, it is likely that the stimuli will be played in a lecture theatre, in a café, or in one's kitchen or bedroom, and there will be ambient noises present. A high-quality stimulus, at the very least, can mitigate these extraneous factors that the researcher cannot control.

It is likely that most questionnaires now are being administered online. It is, therefore, important to ensure that the questionnaire is sufficiently short as participants are more likely to give up completing the questionnaire if they get bored or tired. If there is going to be additional speech stimuli, it is also important to ensure that the stimuli are embedded as sound files in the questionnaire for ease of access. It might also be worth the while to devote an entire section of the questionnaire to capture, in as much detail as possible, the profile of the participant, especially because identities can be faked easily online. Therefore, as much as possible, when soliciting responses, even if the questionnaire is going to be administered online, it is important that one tries to get contacts through trusted sources instead of randomly going for all and sundry.

Future directions

As mentioned earlier, the bulk of the WE research employing questionnaires and surveys looks at language attitudes. However, as also discussed, there are other areas in WE that can also make good use of questionnaires and surveys as a methodological tool. These areas include accent perception, language use, intelligibility, and acceptability judgements. More work certainly should be done in these areas, especially because questionnaires and surveys can be adopted and applied to these research areas fairly easily.

What can perhaps break new ground is to apply surveys and questionnaires, a traditionally "sociolinguistic" method, to phonetic research and other areas such as psycholinguistics. One such example is Tan's (2015) work, in which she employed the methodology on an experimental phonetic study looking at the perception of stress in Singapore English by speakers of British, American, Australian, and Singapore English. Even though this is but one study, there are grounds to believe that such a methodology, when coupled with modern techniques, can be applied to fields beyond sociolinguistics. In fact, as WE develops and matures, one can expect to see researchers looking at it from different disciplinary angles. Sharing methods across fields certainly will be the direction moving forward.

Timeline

	Reference	*Annotation*	*Topic*
1983	Wade, B., & Cartwright, J. (1983). Accent in schools. *World Englishes*, *2*(3), 150–155.	Voices of six teachers with different accents were recorded. Recordings were played to a class of 13- and 14-year-old students from North London. These participants were required to answer a two-part questionnaire on the basis of understandability of the speakers' accents and perception of the speakers' social class. Results showed that accent is seen to correspond to social class and prestige, with Received Pronunciation being perceived as the most prestigious British accent compared to the other regional accents and foreign accents.	Accent perception and language attitude
1984	Williams, D. (1984). Attitudes towards varieties of Nigerian spoken English. *World Englishes*, *3*(1), 6–10.	Eleven informants took part in the study to represent three types of Nigerian accents: near-native, accented Nigerian, and heavily accented. Eighty-one listeners listened to the informants' recorded voice and then answered a questionnaire designed to represent three dimensions of attitudes: cognitive, affective, and conative. Results revealed a pattern of acceptability amongst listeners in favour of the native and near-native accents, and intelligibility was a crucial factor in influencing listeners' ratings.	Accent perception and language attitude

	Reference	*Annotation*	*Topic*
1993	Flaitz, J. (1994). French attitudes towards the ideology of English as an international language. *World Englishes, 12*(2), 179–191.	A four-part questionnaire (supported by five ethnographic interviews) administered to French native speakers from France investigated the perception of American and British English, along with its associated users and culture. Results indicated positive perception of both the language and users, at least for those not among the French power elite.	Language attitude
1994	Pennington, M. C., & Yue, F. (1994). English and Chinese in Hong Kong: Pre-1997 language attitudes. *World Englishes*, *13*(1), 1–20.	A questionnaire, with 23 direct attitude questions on a four-point Likert scale was administered to 285 participants from lower and upper secondary schools in Hong Kong. Results showed that participants had a strong motivation to learn English and tolerance towards the use of English in Hong Kong.	Language attitude
1995	Chiba, R., Matsuura, H., & Yamamoto, A. (1995). Japanese attitudes toward English accents. *World Englishes*, *14*(1), 77–86.	A two-part questionnaire on the attitudes of Japanese university students towards varieties of spoken English was administered to 169 Japanese university students. The stimulus consisted of recordings of nine male speakers, three of whom were Japanese university students, three native speakers of English, and three nonnative speakers of English. The first part of the questionnaire asked participants to indicate their impression of speaker based on adjectives in a bipolar rating scale. The second part had participants rate their general ideas on foreign languages and language learning using a seven-point rating scale. Results showed that participants with more instrumental motivation were more positive towards nonnative English accents, and participants' respect for indigenous languages also affects their attitudes towards nonnative English accents.	Language attitude

	Reference	*Annotation*	*Topic*
1995	Baumgardner, R. J. (1995). Pakistani English: Acceptability and the norm. *World Englishes*, *14*(2), 261–271.	Three questionnaires were administered over six years to Pakistani English speakers. The first questionnaire, with 320 respondents, dealt with their choice of English model. The second questionnaire, with 150 respondents, dealt with Pakistani English lexical and grammatical items. The third questionnaire, with 165 respondents, looked at complementation items. Results showed that while British English had considerable influence in Pakistan, a Pakistani norm was emerging, with respondents finding Urdu borrowings, local morphological and syntactical innovation acceptable.	Language attitude and acceptability
1995	Kaur, K. (1995). Why they need English in Malaysia: A survey. *World Englishes*, *14*(2), 223–230.	A two-part questionnaire looked at nine separate functions related to three broad themes of choice of language in Malaysia. The questionnaire was administered to 182 students in Malaysia. Results showed that participants prioritised English when it came to academic functions, and English use in social functions received the lowest priority.	Language attitude
1999	Matsuura, H., Chiba, R., & Fujieda, M. (1999). Intelligibility and comprehensibility of American and Irish Englishes in Japan. *World Englishes*, *18*(1), 49–62.	This study investigates Japanese university students' intelligibility and comprehensibility judgements of familiar (American) and unfamiliar (Irish) English. Recordings of American and Irish English speakers were played to 106 Japanese university students, and participants were asked to indicate their judgements in a questionnaire by using seven-point scales. Results showed that listeners were able to understand the utterances, though they might not be able to transcribe them, and that familiarity with these varieties was a factor that contributed to higher perceived comprehensibility.	Intelligibility

	Reference	*Annotation*	*Topic*
2005	Hiraga, Y. (2005). British attitudes towards six varieties of English in the USA and Britain. *World Englishes, 24*(3), 289–308.	This paper examines British attitudes to six varieties of English in Britain and the United States. Speech samples were played to 32 participants, and they were asked to rate the speakers based on 17 adjectives. Results showed that the Network American accent was significantly more favoured than British regional varieties and that there was the existence of a hierarchical framework of accent prestige divisible into "standard," "rural," and "urban" as suggested by Wilkinson (1965).	Language attitude
2005	Yoshikawa, H. (2005). Recognition of world Englishes: Changes in Chukyo University students' attitudes. *World Englishes*, *24*(3), 351–360.	The questionnaire consisted of seven items, written in Japanese, and responses were based on a five-point Likert scale. A total of 314 participants were divided into three groups: World Englishes students, English major students, and non-English major students. Results indicated that students who understood the concept of World Englishes showed positive responses to the acceptability of Japanese English, though there was still a stronger preference for traditional English varieties and lower tolerance for New Englishes.	Language attitude
2008	Kirkpatrick, A., Deterding, D., & Wong, J. (2008). The international intelligibility of Hong Kong English. *World Englishes*, *27*(3–4), 359–377.	Using matched guise technique, recordings of three female and three male English major students from Hong Kong were played to 72 participants were from Singapore and Australia. Listeners were required to complete a questionnaire based on the intelligibility of the recordings and evaluate which they thought were intelligent and likeable. Results showed that the Hong Kong English was highly intelligible to international audiences.	Intelligibility and language attitude

	Reference	*Annotation*	*Topic*
2008	Tan, P. K., & Tan, D. K. (2008). Attitudes towards non-standard English in Singapore. *World Englishes*, *27*(3–4), 465–479.	A three-part questionnaire, using a modified matched guise technique, was administered to 260 secondary school students on their attitude towards "non-standard" English in Singapore. Results showed a clear appreciation of the value of Standard English, though students also understood the value of "non-standard" English when used in the community or in social functions.	Language attitude
2009	van Rooy, S. C. (2009). Intelligibility and perceptions of English proficiency. *World Englishes*, *28*(1), 15–34.	Speech data from Korean speakers of English who live in South Africa was used to determine the levels of intelligibility, comprehension, and interpretability of Korean English to South African users of English. A questionnaire was administered to 18 university students in South Africa. Participants were required to dictate the speech they heard and answer a few questions. Results showed that the South Korean speakers' speech was not entirely intelligible to South African speakers and that a positive attitude towards other speakers of English is necessary for intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability.	Intelligibility
2009	He, D., & Li, D. (2009). Language attitudes and linguistic features in the "China English" debate. *World Englishes*, *28*(1), 70–89.	A questionnaire with matched guise speech samples was administered to 1,030 participants to investigate college teachers' and students' perceptions of the ideal pedagogic model of college English in Mainland China. Findings showed that the preferred teaching model of college English in Mainland Chinese classrooms was a standard variety of English supplemented with salient, well-codified, and properly implemented features of "China English."	Language attitude

	Reference	*Annotation*	*Topic*
2009	Cavallaro, F., & Ng, B. C. (2009). Between status and solidarity in Singapore. *World Englishes*, *28*(2), 143–159.	This matched guise study examined subjective reactions to Singapore Standard English (SSE) and Singapore Colloquial English (SCE). Seventy-five Singaporeans and 19 non-Singaporeans listened to recorded speech sample in SCE and SSE and were required to rate the speakers on a set of semantic traits. Results showed that SCE was rated lower in solidarity traits compared to SSE.	Language attitude
2011	Tokumoto, M., & Shibata, M. (2011). Asian varieties of English: Attitudes towards pronunciation. *World Englishes*, *30*(3), 392–408.	A total of 128 university students from Japan, South Korea, and Malaysia were asked to rate their own varieties of English by using a questionnaire with 12 items based on intelligibility, endorsement, competence, and social attractiveness. Results revealed that Malaysian students valued their own "accented" English highly, while Japanese and Koreans disapproved of their own varieties and preferred "native" English pronunciation.	Language attitude
2012	Bernaisch, T. (2012). Attitudes towards Englishes in Sri Lanka. *World Englishes*, *31*(3), 279–291.	This study examined 169 informants' attitudes towards Sri Lankan English, Indian English, British English, and American English in Sri Lanka with the help of an attitudinal survey based on bipolar semantic differential scales. While the findings of the survey indicated that British English continues to be a variety of English which is highly valued in Sri Lanka, the informants also displayed a positive attitude towards Sri Lankan English.	Language attitude

	Reference	*Annotation*	*Topic*
2014	Ahn, H. (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards Korean English in South Korea. *World Englishes*, *33*(2), 195–222.	This study investigated the attitudes of Korean and non-Korean English teachers on Korean English in South Korea. Method consisted of 204 respondents to questionnaires, and 25 post-survey interviews. Results showed that participants displayed a positive attitude towards Korean English, though they also indicated conflicting and confused attitudes towards behavioural elements of Korean English.	Language attitude
2014	Tan, Y. Y. (2014). English as a "mother tongue" in contemporary Singapore. *World Englishes, 33*(3), 319–339.	Using a questionnaire administered to 436 Singaporeans of different ages and ethnic groups, this paper investigated the role of English and what it represented to speakers of the three major ethnic groups across three different age groups in Singapore. The results in this study showed a pervasive use of English across different domains and suggested that English in Singapore has to be reconceptualised as a new mother tongue.	Language use
2014	Cavallaro, F., Ng, B. C., & Seilhamer, M. F. (2014). Singapore Colloquial English: Issues of prestige and identity. *World Englishes*, *33*(3), 378–397.	This matched guise study investigated Singaporean attitudes towards Singapore Colloquial English (SCE) and Singapore Standard English (SSE). A total of 259 participants' attitudes were elicited using a questionnaire, and 113 of the participants were also interviewed subsequently. Results showed that Singaporeans assigned lower solidarity ratings for SCE than for SSE, a stark contrast to anecdotal and public opinion that SCE is a language of solidarity and identity for Singaporeans.	Language attitude

	Reference	*Annotation*	*Topic*
2014	Chong, E. L. J., & Seilhamer, M. F. (2014). Young people, Malay and English in multilingual Singapore. *World Englishes*, *33*(3), 363–377.	An online questionnaire was conducted with subsequent qualitative data from a subsample of survey participants investigating the relationship Singaporean Malay university students have with the Malay language. Fifty participants took part in the survey. The questionnaire was designed to elicit the participants' proficiency in Malay and English, their patterns of language use, their perceptions towards Malay and English, and to gauge the sense of inheritance and affiliation. Results showed that participants' relationship with Malay is strongly characterised by expertise, inheritance, and affiliation despite their prevalent use of English.	Language use
2015	Tan, Y. Y. (2015). "Native" and "non-native" perception of stress in Singapore English. *World Englishes*, *34*(3), 355–369.	A perception questionnaire with speech samples of Singapore English speakers was administered to 182 participants in Singapore, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Australia, the aim of which was to compare the perception of word stress between Singapore English speakers and the "Inner Circle" English speakers from the United Kingdom, the United States, and Australia. Results indicated different perceptions of stress between speakers of different Englishes.	Phonetic perception
2015	Hundt, M., Zipp, L., & Huber, A. (2015). Attitudes in Fiji towards varieties of English. *World Englishes*, *34*(4), 688–707.	This paper explored attitudes towards varieties of English among a group of young Fiji citizens in tertiary education. The study was conducted using a two-page questionnaire with open-ended questions about language attitude, use, and further comments with a section on personal and linguistic background. The results indicated that British English was still a strong reference variety, while American English was clearly favoured over more local Pacific varieties, like Australian and New Zealand English.	Language attitude

	Reference	*Annotation*	*Topic*
2016	Bernaisch, T., & Koch, C. (2016). Attitudes towards Englishes in India. *World Englishes*, *35*(1), 118–132.	This paper studied Indian English speakers' attitudes towards Indian English by simultaneously examining their attitudes towards American English, British English, and Sri Lankan English. The method involved using an attitudinal survey based on bipolar semantic differential scales and later correlating results with relevant meta-information. A total of 169 informants participated in the study. Results indicated that British English continues to be the most highly valued variety, and informants also displayed the least positive attitudes towards Sri Lankan English.	Language attitude
2016	Orikasa, M. (2016). The intelligibility of varieties of English in Japan. *World Englishes*, *35*(3), 355–371.	This study investigated the extent to which 37 Japanese speakers of English found four different varieties of English (U.S., China, South Korea, and Vietnam) to be intelligible, using a mixed-methods approach that included an intelligibility test and a short questionnaire that measured intelligibility and comprehensibility and the factors affecting them. Results showed that participants found different varieties to be intelligible, with the highest being the speaker from China and the lowest from America. The speaker's speech speed was the most cited factor for comprehensibility.	Intelligibility

References

Boberg, C. (2013). Surveys: The use of written questionnaires in sociolinguistics. In C. Mallinson, B. Childs, & G. Van Herk (Eds.), *Data collection in sociolinguistics: Methods and applications* (pp. 132–141). New York, NY: Routledge.

Campbell-Kibler, K. (2013). Language attitude surveys: Speaker evaluation studies. In C. Mallinson, B. Childs, & G. Van Herk (Eds.), *Data collection in sociolinguistics: Methods and applications* (pp. 142–146). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cavallaro, F., & Ng, B. C. (2009). Between status and solidarity in Singapore. *World Englishes*, *28*(2), 143–159.

Cavallaro, F., Ng, B. C., & Seilhamer, M. F. (2014). Singapore colloquial English: Issues of prestige and identity. *World Englishes*, *33*(3), 378–397.

Clark, L., & Schleef, E. (2010). The acquisition of sociolinguistic evaluations among Polish-born adolescents learning English: Evidence from perception. *Language Awareness*, *19*(4), 299–322.

Chong, E. L. J., & Seilhamer, M. F. (2014). Young people, Malay and English in multilingual Singapore. *World Englishes*, *33*(3), 363–377.

Cooper, R. L. (1975). Introduction to language attitudes. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 6*, 5–9.

Cooper, R. L., & Fishman, J. A. (1974). The study of language attitudes. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 3*, 5–20.

De Vaus, D. (2002). *Surveys in social research* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Drager, K. (2013). Experimental methods in sociolinguistics. In J. Holmes & K. Hazen (Eds.), *Research methods in sociolinguistics: A practical guide* (pp. 59–74). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Giles, H., & Billings, A. C. (2004). Assessing language attitudes: Speaker evaluation studies. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 187–209). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Holmes, J., & K. Hazen (Eds.). (2013). *Research methods in sociolinguistics: A practical guide*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ladegaard, H. (1998). National stereotypes and language attitudes: The perception of British, American and Australian language and culture in Denmark. *Language and Communication, 18*(4), 251–274.

Lambert, W. E. (1967). The social psychology of bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues, 23*(2), 91–109.

Lambert, W. E., Hodgson, R. C., Gardner, R. C., & Fillenbaum, S. (1960). Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 60*(1), 44–51.

Scargill, M. H., & Warkentyne, H. J. (1972). The survey of Canadian English: A report. *English Quarterly, 5*(3), 47–104.

Schleef, E. (2013). Written surveys and questionnaires in sociolinguistics. In J. Holmes & K. Hazen (Eds.), *Research methods in sociolinguistics: A practical guide* (pp. 43–58). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tan, P. K., & Tan, D. K. (2008). Attitudes towards non-standard English in Singapore. *World Englishes*, *27*(3–4), 465–479.

Tan, Y. Y. (2014). English as a "mother tongue" in contemporary Singapore. *World Englishes*, *33*(3), 319–339.

Tan, Y. Y (2015). "Native" and "non-native" perception of stress in Singapore English. *World Englishes*, *34*(3), 355–369.

Wade, B., & Cartwright, J. (1983). Accent in schools. *World Englishes*, *2*(3), 150–155.