**Recent debate on pronunciation models and targets**

***Vasiliki Kanellou & Paul Tench***

*The question of whether students should conform to native-speaker norms of English, in an era when English is increasingly used in international contexts, is one which has been keenly debated in recent years… however, it is not a debate in which the voice of students and classroom teachers have been heard.* Timmis, 2002: 240

While bearing in mind the two main different viewpoints on the debate on pronunciation models and targets – either they should be based on native-speaker (NS) norms (Gimson/Cruttenden 2001; Cruttenden 2014), or on *English as an International Language* (EIL) (Jenkins 2000), one of the aims of our research (Kanellou 2011) was to discover which pronunciation models and targets are actually followed in TEFL in Greece and whether or not they are appropriate in relation to the contexts in which the learners intend to use English. Thus, the learners were asked for context(s) they anticipate using English for, so that we could decipher who the interlocutors would be and make appropriate recommendations as to models to be adopted and targets to be aimed at.

Furthermore, the aim was also to compare teachers’ and learners’ views with respect to pronunciation models and targets to see if there is a gap between what the teachers do and what the learners want (see Australian studies: Willing 1988; Nunan 1988; Peacock 1999; Fraser 2000; European studies: Wanieck-Klimczak 1997; Sobkowiak 2002; Wanieck-Klimczak & Klimczak 2005; Henderson et al 2012, 2015). For example, the teachers in Kanellou (2011) were asked to choose between ‘native-speaker competence’ and ‘accented international intelligibility’ as targets for the learners’ pronunciation and, also, to justify their choice. The results that the particular question yielded might serve to highlight any differences in the opinions of teachers and learners and might also shed light on why such differences might exist. The next step would be to try to understand which views are more appropriate in the light of current thinking and developments in terms of the use of English as well as the teaching and learning of English worldwide and suggest how those that hold other views may be convinced to see things differently.

**The studies**

We begin our review of the debate with studies conducted in the late 1990s and will then move on to studies conducted in the first decade of the 21st century. As we move to more recent studies, attention is directed towards the issue of EIL and its perceived influence on English language pedagogy. We note also the results of the relevant parts of the *English Pronunciation Teaching in Europe Survey* (Henderson et al 2012, 2015), even though it was published after our own project had been conducted.

*Cenoz & Lecumberri (1999)*

Cenoz and Lecumberri investigated the views of 86 first year ‘English studies’ university students of the Basque country, Spain, on the acquisition of the phonetic component of English. The questionnaire data revealed that the participants believed that “the best way to acquire phonetic competence is to establish contact with native speakers of English” (Cenoz & Lecumberri, 1999: 11). If contact with NSs is viewed as an important factor in the acquisition of English pronunciation, we can assume that those learners were in favour of NS models and targets. As far as the learners’ attitudes towards different English accents are concerned, the following emerged:

Learners are… aware of the different degree of difficulty of English accents, and they seem to rate this according to their own experience and their contact with the accent. Accents in the British Isles are considered easier than American accents, and this pattern corresponds to the popularity that English courses in the south of England and Ireland enjoy in the Basque Country and also with learning materials in which RP is used as a model. Learners hold more favourable attitudes towards those accents closer to their experience; British and Irish are rated more favourably than American accents.

Cenoz & Lecumberri, 1999: 12

*Dalton-Puffer et al (1997)*

132 ‘English Department’ students of Vienna University in Austria were asked to evaluate three native accents of English (RP, near RP and GA) and two Austrian non-native accents of English (an ‘Austrian-British’ accent and an ‘Austrian-American’ accent in response to the modified matched-guise test[[1]](#footnote-1). NS accents were preferred to non-NS ones and more specifically, the RP speaker was rated best, the speaker of ‘Austrian-British’ English last (Dalton-Puffer et al, 1997: 125). It emerged that the subjects of the study displayed a preference for the British NS variety, i.e. RP, with which they had become familiar in school or through travel:

The responses showed that British English, traditionally preferred in Austria, is still the most popular model: more than two-thirds of the respondents attempt to learn British English and its standard accent – RP. This orientation towards British English is, of course, supported by the British Isles’ geographical closeness to Austria. While about 30 percent of the respondents have already spent more than one month in the UK, only 17 percent have been to the USA, and a mere 4 percent to Canada, Australia or other English-speaking countries further afield.

Dalton-Puffer et al, 1997: 115

Dalton-Puffer et al (1997) concluded that “due to traditional preferences and present models offered at schools, the preferred accent is mostly RP. For pronunciation teaching this means that the norms put up by English teachers in Austria are also widely accepted by their students” (ibid: 126). Nevertheless, it must be noted that the researchers did not seek directly the teachers’ views on this matter; no teachers participated in the study they conducted.

*Waniek-Klimczak (1997)*

The next three studies relate to Poland. The first used a questionnaire survey of 120 first year ‘English Philology’ university students in Poland; only 43% said that the goal of pronunciation teaching should be the achievement of native-like pronunciation. RP was chosen as the accent that was nicer and easier to understand by the majority of respondents; 81% would like to speak with an RP accent and the remainder would like to speak with a GA accent[[2]](#footnote-2). The discrepancy between the students’ answers to the question of ‘which accent they would like to speak’ and ‘what are the most important goals in pronunciation teaching’ was interpreted as a sign of the students’ judgement as to the possibility of reaching the goal of a native-like accent.

*Waniek-Klimczak & Klimczak (2005)*

Nearly a decade later (2005), Waniek-Klimczak and Klimczak investigated Polish ‘English studies’ (ES) as well as ‘Economics and Sociology’ (E&S) university students’ preferences and aims in relation to English pronunciation. Both groups (ES and E & S) “showed a strong preference for British English as a model for speech development” (Waniek-Klimczak & Klimczak, 2005: 229). Waniek-Klimczak and Klimczak attributed the students’ greater preference for British English over American English as a model for their speaking to their English language learning experience so far (which was similar in both groups). However, when the students were asked whether they believed that speaking like NSs of the selected variety was possible in their case, the majority of ES students said ‘yes’ (81%) whereas only 43% of E & S students said ‘yes’[[3]](#footnote-3) (ibid: 241-242). They concluded that E & S students are less concerned with native-like speech patterns because they “expect to use English for international communication more often than for communication with native speakers” (2005: 229).

*Janicka et al (2005)*

As part of yet another questionnaire survey on pronunciation models and targets conducted in Poland, 240 ‘English Philology’ university students were asked: ‘which accent are you taught, British or American?’ and ‘would you as a teacher teach a specific pronunciation? What would it be? Why?’ (Janicka et al, 2005: 253). It emerged that:

1. IFA[[4]](#footnote-4) students are strongly in favour of a native-like model of pronunciation
2. Achieving a native-like accent is extremely high on the respondents’ priority list (nearly all the subjects claimed to aspire to a near-native accent)
3. The respondents would impose an American or British standard on their prospective students

Janicka et al, 2005: 258

The key finding of the questionnaire was that “almost all subjects declared voluntarily that the model must be native-like… the learners do see the need and insist on adopting a native-like model” (ibid: 257). The students’ motivations behind their choice of a native-like model are diverse, from purely emotional, attitudinal and aesthetic to entirely practical. For example, “a vast majority of students believe that native-like pronunciation is an integral part of foreign language competence” (Janicka et al, 2005: 287).

*Timmis (2002)*

Timmis explored EFL learners’ and teachers’ attitudes to the question of conforming to NS norms in the areas of pronunciation and grammar in the context of EIL. 400 learners from 14 different countries and 180 teachers from 45 different countries participated in the questionnaire survey of Timmis’s study[[5]](#footnote-5) and were asked to indicate their preference between two pronunciation targets: ‘native-speaker competence’ (NSC) and ‘accented international intelligibility’ (AII). Timmis composed two quotations in order to represent these two pronunciation targets and make them clear and understandable to all respondents.

**Student A:** ‘I can pronounce English just like a native speaker now. Sometimes people think I am a native speaker.’

**Student B:** ‘I can pronounce English clearly now. Native speakers and non-native speakers understand me wherever I go, but I still have the accent of my country.

Please underline one answer. Would you prefer your students to be like Student A or Student B?

**Student A** **Student B** No preference

67% of all students expressed the desire to achieve NSC in pronunciation whereas only 27% of all teachers expressed the desire for their students to achieve this target. Timmis noted that “it appears that there is a greater tendency among teachers than among students to regard ‘accented international intelligibility’ as the most *desirable* outcome” and, concluded that “teachers seem to be moving away from native-speaker norms faster than students are” (ibid: 248). Timmis interpreted the findings of the student data as follows:

There is still some desire among students to conform to native-speaker norms, and this desire is not necessarily restricted to those students who use, or anticipate using, English primarily with native speakers. More tentatively, we can suggest that while the main motivation of the majority of students is the ability to communicate, the rather traditional idea of ‘mastering a language’ survives, at least among a minority. Timmis, 2002: 248

When looking at the teachers’ answers more closely, Timmis found that “many teachers were choosing what they regarded as the more *realistic* rather than the more *desirable* outcome” (ibid: 243). For example, one teacher who had actually opted for AII wrote that NSC is preferable but since it is impossible to achieve in reality, AII can be a good standard. (We wonder if, in some way, it was made clear to teachers that they should make a choice based on what they *desire* and not on what they *expect*, that the study would have yielded different results.)

*Matsuda (2003)*

Matsuda carried out a case study[[6]](#footnote-6) of Japanese secondary school students’ attitudes to English pronunciation models and targets and also examined their beliefs in relation to EIL matters (i.e. the ownership of English). It emerged that students perceived British English and American English as the standard varieties and, also, the varieties they wanted to acquire (and preferred those varieties to i.e. an outer circle variety such as Singapore English): “58% strongly agree and 26% agreed with the statement “I want to pronounce English as American or British people do”; 10% disagree and only 3% strongly disagreed” (Matsuda, 2003: 489). As for students’ attitudes to a Japanese accent of English, she wrote:

It seems that the idea of the Japanese variety of English was acceptable at the abstract level, but not at the personal level; they believed it should be accepted, especially since it is unavoidable, but they personally would rather not have it, and people should not be encouraged to speak it.

Matsuda, 2003: 493

A very interesting finding of the study was that even though the students perceived English as an international language in the sense that it is being used internationally, they did not believe it ‘belongs’ to the international community (see Matsuda, 2003: 483). She pointed out that students primarily saw *English* as American and British entities and *English* speakers as the speakers of those two varieties (ibid: 490). As Matsuda put it:

The students believed that…English is the property of native English speakers (Americans and British, more specifically), and the closer they follow the native speakers’ usage, the better… The Japanese variety of English was perceived as either Japanese or incorrect English that deviated from the “real” English of native speakers.

Matsuda, 2003: 493

*Kanellou (2001)*

The next five studies all relate to research in the context of ELT in Greece. Kanellou carried out a small-scale study into 26 EFL teachers’ and 23 learners’ attitudes towards the acquisition of English pronunciation. As part of the questionnaire data it emerged that teachers and learners agreed on the selection of RP as a model of pronunciation; 88.5% of teachers used RP as a pronunciation model and 82.6% of learners wished to be taught RP. Only 11.5% of the teachers opted for GA along with only 17.4% of the learners. Kanellou attributed the teachers’ and learners’ preference for RP over GA to the geographical closeness of Greece to Britain[[7]](#footnote-7). It was also revealed that many participants viewed RP as more prestigious than GA (Kanellou, 2001: 52).

However, there was disagreement between teachers and learners in terms of pronunciation targets; 78.3% of learners wished to acquire native-like pronunciation, whereas only 38.5% of teachers regarded this as a desirable target. It was argued that the learners’ preference stemmed from their desire to identify with the target culture since every year, hundreds (if not thousands) of Greek college or university graduates arrive in Britain in order to pursue undergraduate or postgraduate degrees at British Universities or to seek employment there. Thus, it made sense for learners to be pronunciation-conscious and express the desire to speak with a native-like accent. On the other hand, it was found that teachers’ unwillingness to opt for native-like pronunciation, was associated with a lack of confidence and skill in this area. For example, as one of the teachers interviewed put it: “my pronunciation is not perfect and thus I do not feel comfortable asking my students to aim for native-like pronunciation in English” (see Kanellou, 2001: 53).

*Sifakis & Sougari (2003)*

Hannam (2005) also reported an earlier study which confirmed her review (see below): “Sifakis and Sougari (2003) found that 54% of Greek English teachers questioned felt their students should acquire a Standard British accent and 7% a Standard American accent, whilst only 6% felt that an EL2 (Greek) accent was appropriate” (Hannam, 2005: 3).

*Sifakis & Sougari (2005)*

Sifakis and Sougari then engaged in a much bigger study, exploring the pronunciation beliefs and practices of 421 Greek EFL teachers; they examined teachers’ beliefs about the importance of NS accents and their role in pronunciation norms and tried to establish the extent to which Greek EFL teachers take an EIL perspective with respect to the ownership of English and whether or not they hold stereotypical attitudes towards inner-circle varieties.

By means of a questionnaire survey, teachers were asked to choose one among four possible answers placed on a continuum ranging from ‘extremely’ (= 1) to ‘not at all’ (= 2) in response to the question ‘Do you think it is important for your learners to acquire a native-like accent?’ They commented on the results, as follows:

First, those teachers who indicated that they believe in promoting a native-like accent do so because they believe that learners need to communicate with NSs and because they believe that a native-like accent will help NNSs develop confidence (ASR = 6.0). Both of these reasons support a NS norm-bound perspective. Second, those teachers who considered native-like accents as only “fairly” important identified intelligibility as a more important goal (ASR = 5.9). This result leads to a paradox. A significant number of teachers who had a norm-bound perspective also believed that promoting intelligibility in communication is of great value. Nonetheless, although all teachers felt that native accents were important as accent models, only a very small number of respondents saw an intelligible accent as an appropriate model.

Sifakis & Sougari, 2005: 477-478

Teaching context appeared to be a significant predictor of teachers’ attitudes; primary level teachers believed that attaining a native-like accent is very important (ASR = 2.4), whereas upper secondary level teachers considered improving their learners’ pronunciation (ASR = 2.6) less important. “This result appears to reflect a norm-bound teaching orientation in the earlier stages of education but a diminishing focus on accent as learners get older” (Sifakis & Sougari, 2005: 476-477).

As for the teachers’ views with respect to the ownership of English in the context of EIL, the results[[8]](#footnote-8) were as follows:

More than 70% of the respondents said that English belongs either to NSs or to people with NS competence: 50% selected “the native speakers (independently of nationality”); and 23% said that “anyone fluent enough to speak the language without major problems” was a rightful owner. Very few took an EIL perspective: Only 8% chose as owners “speakers of the language (independently of problems)” and 2% chose bilingual speakers (“those whose mother tongue is another language, but have grown up using English as well”).

Sifakis & Sougari, 2005: 480

Sifakis & Sougari conclude that “when asked about their current pronunciation practices, teachers seem to hold a strongly norm-bound perspective and to focus on teaching standard NS pronunciation norms” (ibid: 481) and claim that “teachers’ NS norm-bound perspective can be understood against the backdrop of modern Greece as a traditional monolingual society” (ibid: 482).

*Hannam (2005)*

Hannam used a focus-group format and in-depth interviewing in order to investigate Greek EFL teachers’ attitudes towards NS and NNS pronunciation varieties. Her study was a small-scale one which took place in Thessaloniki, Greece. All EFL teachers considered “RP to be more suitable and easier to use in the language classroom, partly due to the availability of pre-produced samples” (Hannam, 2005: 5). Overall, the teachers were very critical of the ‘Greek English’ accent, “with only 50% saying they would be happy using this accent as a model – some felt the accent was “too Greek” and that it required moderation” (Hannam, 2005: 5).

*Batziakas (2008)*

Batziakas conducted a cross-sectional qualitative research study based on semi-structured interviews with Greek EFL school teachers and students of all educational levels in order to discover if teachers are aware of what the construct of ELF calls for (and if are they willing to take it on board) and whether or not it serves the students’ school and social needs. Batziakas (2008) includes only a couple of interview excerpts and very little information on the emerging themes that seemed to answer the research questions of his study. As far as the teachers are concerned, Batziakas (2008) found that they “follow wholesale the norms which exist in the textbooks, with the result of the marks to be awarded according to an imaginatively homogenous native model”. As for the students, he wrote:

…students were very sceptical towards the externally imposed and unrealistic native norms, and were rather embracing the English which they themselves experienced without thinking that it is problematic, in so far as they saw that it can actually cause or potentially cause no problem at all.

Batziakas, 2008

He provides the following interview excerpt in order to illustrate this finding:

English? What is English? Or rather what’s perfect English? … But do I have to make myself understood and to put forward my meaning, notwithstanding the infelicities of my accent, grammar and vocabulary? Yes!”

[Student B, 3rd grade upper high school] in Batziakas, 2008

*English Pronunciation Teaching in Europe Survey, 2012 & 2015*

It is interesting to note that whereas European teachers report that their learners are generally well motivated to learn English, they have less motivation to “aspire to have native or near native pronunciation of English” (Henderson et al 2012:18-19). The lowest aspiration was reported for Poland, which puts the earlier studies which focussed on students and prospective English teachers into perspective.

On the question of which model is taught by teachers and preferred by learners, there is an interesting divergence. (p 20-23). The teachers were offered 13 options of models but were free to choose more than one, including British ‘RP’, General American English, “a type of international English”. These were, in fact, the three that received most attention. The teachers’ responses were:

Receptive work (ie listening and reading) RP: 91.63% GA: 70.73% IE: 36.26%

Productive work (ie speaking and writing) RP: 84.2% GA: 53.84% IE: 22.04%

The teachers reported that their learners’ preferences would be:

Receptive work (ie listening and reading) RP: 64.53% GA: 66.69% IE: 23.83%

Productive work (ie speaking and writing) RP: 55.24% GA: 63.35% IE: 21.15%

In conclusion, they note that RP is preferred by most teachers, although they recognize that GA might be more popular among their learners. Quite probably, the teachers’ preference for RP reflects their training and the textbooks and other material that they use for classroom work. On the other hand, their learners’ preference for GA might well reflect their exposure to American media and their aspirations to engage with that media. This divergence was most noticeable with the responses from Poland: all (100%) teachers used RP, but they recognize that their learners were evenly divided between RP and GA.

It is also interesting to note that the third highest rated model was a “type of international English”, a tacit recognition that local accented models are tolerated.

**Evaluation of studies**

These studies have produced important evidence of English language learners’ and teachers’ views and practices in terms of pronunciation models and targets. The use of NS models (RP and GA) is common practice among EFL teachers (Dalton-Puffer et al 1997; Kanellou, 2001; Sifakis & Sougari, 2003; 2005; Hannam, 2005 and Batziakas 2008) and EFL learners express a clear preference for NS models in a variety of contexts worldwide (Dalton-Puffer et al, 1997; Waniek-Klimczak, 1997; Cenoz & Lecumberri, 1999; Kanellou, 2001; Matsuda, 2003; Waniek-Klimczak & Klimczak, 2005). Of the two models, namely RP and GA, RP appears to be the favourite one in a European setting (Dalton-Puffer et al, 1997; Waniek-Klimczak, 1997; Cenoz & Lecumberri, 1999; Kanellou, 2001; Sifakis & Sougari, 2003; Hannam, 2005; Waniek-Klimczak & Klimczak, 2005).

Learners tend to view a foreign accent of English negatively, despite the fact that the particular foreign accent is the result of the influence of their own L1 (Dalton-Puffer et al 1997; Matsuda, 2003). Interestingly, there was a greater tendency among EFL learners to consider native-like competence in pronunciation as an appropriate goal than among EFL teachers (Kanellou, 2001; Timmis, 2002). Finally, it is striking that despite the emergence of EIL (which has raised questions as to the ownership of English and the teachers’ and learners’ adherence to NS norms), NSs are still viewed as the owners and custodians of the English language and native-like pronunciation is still the goal in a variety of contexts and teaching situations worldwide (see Timmis, 2002; Matsuda, 2003; Sifakis & Sougari, 2005).

Let us now draw attention to limitations and weaknesses of the studies reviewed.

1) Some of the studies referred to in this section were carried out a long time ago. For example, in Dalton-Puffer et al (1997), Austrian learners displayed a negative attitude towards their own accent of English and we wonder if the study might produce a different result if carried out a decade later. If it was conducted now in the light of what Jenkins and her supporters have expressed, perhaps learners might be more willing to express their identity through the preservation of their L1 accent.

2) Methodological inadequacies and limitations: many studies utilised only one method of data collection (Dalton-Puffer et al, 1997; Waniek-Klimczak, 1997; Cenoz and Lecumberrri, 1999; Janicka et al, 2005; Waniek-Klimczak and Klimczak, 2005). A number of studies were small scale studies (case studies with a limited number of participants) and, thus, their findings need to be approached with caution; that they may not be representative of the wider population the sample was drawn from (Matsuda, 2003; Hannam, 2005; Kanellou, 2001). Finally, while Timmis’s (2002) study and Sifakis and Sougaris’s (2005) study are highly commendable in many respects, questions might be raised as to the representativeness of their samples.

3) A major shortcoming of previous research in this area is that most studies did not address teachers’ as well as learners’ views; out of the 12 studies reviewed, 5 studies only dealt with learners’ views (Cenoz & Lecumberri, 1999; Dalton-Puffer et al, 1997; Waniek-Klimczak 1997; Waniek-Klimczak & Klimczak, 2005 and Janicka et al, 2005) and 4 studies only with teachers’ views (Sifakis & Sougari, 2003, 2005; Hannam, 2005; Henderson et al 2012). Of course, it goes without saying that greater effort is required on the part of the researcher to acquire teachers’ as well as learners’ views but, nevertheless, it is worth doing so because it provides a clearer picture and understanding of a particular teaching situation; teachers and learners are the protagonists in any classroom and you cannot have one without the other. Furthermore, it is important to discover whether or not there is a gap between teachers beliefs’ and learners’ beliefs because such a gap may result in negative learning outcomes (for example, see Peacock, 1999).

4) In half of the studies that presented learners’ views, the learners were university students studying English philology (Cenoz & Lecumberri 1999; Dalton-Puffer et al, 1997; Waniek-Klimczak, 1997; Waniek-Klimczak & Klimczak, 2005[[9]](#footnote-9); Janicka et al, 2005). The data on EFL primary and high school learners is probably scarce due to time and access issues; for example, it is certainly easier for a researcher, who is often an academic at a university, to investigate their university students’ attitudes rather than to leave the university setting, liaise with EFL school teachers and administer questionnaires in their classrooms. This is disappointing as the majority of the EFL student population in ‘expanding circle’ countries do not comprise university students with a special interest in the English language and the views of such students cannot necessarily be seen as representative of the views of students studying English for general purposes. The vast majority of learners of English around the world are in schools; Batziakis (2008) was the only study that focussed fully on this population at the time this paper was prepared[[10]](#footnote-10).

Furthermore, the majority of the students in the studies described above are prospective teachers of English, which raises the question of whether or not their views would be closer to those of EFL teachers rather than EFL learners. Perhaps, it would be best to view such participants as neither belonging to the learners’ nor the teachers’ camp; they could easily form a category of their own, that of prospective EFL teachers.

Great care has been taken to try and overcome the disadvantages and limitations of previous studies in the design of our survey (Kanellou 2011). Thus, our study obtained learners’ as well as teachers’ views on pronunciation models and targets, the learners were high school students, two research methods were employed, qualitative as well as quantitative data were collected, and, finally, a large sample of participants was obtained through the method of random sampling. None of the studies reviewed in this section fulfilled all these criteria.

*Cardiff, 2017*

1. The present study used a modified matched guise methodology, the ‘verbal guise’ method (Cooper, 1975: 5; Teufel, 1995: 75). Instead of one speaker assuming different guises, several speakers were used on the stimulus tape. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The information regarding the results of this study was obtained from Sobkowiak (2005: 139) and Waniek-Klimczak and Klimczak (2005: 131) as we did not have direct access to the particular study. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. A further 44% of the E & S students’ gave ‘I don’t know’ answers. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The students were referred to as IFA from Polish ‘Instytut Filologii Angielskiej’. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The student questionnaire was also supported by 15 interviews. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The study took place at a private senior high school in Tokyo, and one class consisting of 34 students was selected for the study. 31 students completed a questionnaire, 10 students participated in in-depth interviews and the researcher observed English classes for 36 hours. Also, 4 English teachers were interviewed. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Many Greek teachers of English had travelled to Britain for leisure, work or training purposes and many Greek learners of English intended to study at a British university. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. The teachers’ responses showed no significant differences among the teachers at the three levels (primary, lower secondary and upper secondary). [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. We ought to remind the reader that in Waniek-Klimczak & Klimczak (2005), one group of students comprised ‘English Studies’ students; however, the other group comprised ‘Economics and Sociology’ students. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. 2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)