

How Motivation as Quality Influence ESL Learners' Attitudes toward English Pronunciation Learning

Yang Zhou^{1,*}

¹School of Teacher Education, Florida State University, USA

*Correspondence: School of Teacher Education, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, 32306, USA. Tel: 1-412-889-0602. E-mail: yz17c@my.fsu.edu

Received: May 20, 2019

Accepted: July 10, 2019

Online Published: July 22, 2019

doi:10.5430/ijelt.v6n2p33

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijelt.v6n2p33>

Abstract

The current study attempted to examine ESL learners' attitudes toward L2 pronunciation learning and meanwhile, to investigate how these learners' qualitative motivation explain their attitudes toward pronunciation learning. A total of 124 ESL learners participated in the survey in which several questionnaires were included regarding L2 self representations (Papi et al., 2018), chronic regulatory focus (Higgins et al., 2001) and L2 learners attitudes toward pronunciation learning (Elliot, 1995a; Gardner, 1985). An exploratory factor analysis was performed on all pronunciation items and the results revealed a threefold-factor solution: importance of pronunciation, learning pronunciation for communicative purpose and preference for native accent. The data analysis suggested that promotion-focused orientation, ideal L2 self own, ought-to L2 self own and ought-to L2 self other were respectively correlated with ESL learners' attitudes toward all three factors of pronunciation learning. Particularly, ideal L2 self own was found to predict more positive attitude toward the importance of pronunciation learning and toward the preference for native accent than ought-to L2 self own, while the former one also predicted more negative attitude toward learning pronunciation for communicative purpose. The study has yielded significant implications for researchers regarding the understanding of motivation from its qualitative perspective which delineates individual's inclination to different goals and to specific strategies for attaining these goals (Papi, 2018), as well as for ESL instructors concerning the improvement of L2 pronunciation pedagogy and the selection of motivational approaches for L2 pronunciation instruction.

Keywords: L2 self, regulatory focus, L2 motivation, attitudes, L2 pronunciation learning

1. Introduction

Pronunciation is the way a speaker uses when he or she utters, and it is one of the most important traits manifested in individual's speech. For second language (L2) learners, developing an intelligible language pronunciation skill not only can contribute to the development of L2 speaking proficiency, but also to the overall L2 achievement (Elliot, 1995a). In addition to playing a pivotal role in L2 acquisition, pronunciation learning is predominantly associated with L2 learners' communicative competence as well. Although there is no clear evidence showing that good pronunciation is the guarantee of successful communication, it does facilitate the overall intelligibility of conversation between speakers (Derwing, Munro, & Wiebe, 1997). On the contrary, obscure pronunciation may somewhat lead to less-productive communication, misunderstanding, and even negative impression. For instance, Kelly (2000) claimed that Spanish students who used Spanish intonation in speaking English might be considered bored and disinterested, while German students who adopted their native prosody patterns in English were regarded to be rude and abrupt. Gilakjani (2016) also supported the point that the articulated pronunciation was beneficial to oral communication, whereas unclear pronunciation somewhat impeded the progress of speech. Additionally, interlocutors' articulation in a conversation should be understandable to both sides and it is one of the thresholds when evaluating their communicative competence (Aliaga-García, 2007; Gilakjani, 2016; Martínez-Flor, Usó-Juan, & Alcón Soler, 2006). It can be seen from the above facts that pronunciation is a crucial constituent of L2 skill that can facilitate the overall development of language acquisition and it to a great extent determines whether a successful oral communication can take place.

The reason why this study closely focuses on exploring pronunciation learning rather than discuss other language skills is that pronunciation has not been received as much attention as other skills in L2 instruction, as well as in second language acquisition (SLA) research field in the past decades. A previous study (Foote, Holtby, & Derwing, 2011) has indicated that the research on L2 pronunciation was full of challenges because pronunciation instruction excessively emphasizes overdependence on decontextualized practices including reiterative and tedious drill on training audiolingual competence. Furthermore, the time that L2 instructors set aside for teaching L2 pronunciation is very limited, and within such limited exposure of L2 pronunciation instruction, it is of great difficulty for researchers to exclusively investigate learners' pronunciation learning performance. Because L2 instruction is more than a socio-culturally detached educational area, so except for being impeded by the above factors, the study on L2 pronunciation learning also needs to take into account various irresistible factors such as learners' age, aptitude, personality, motivation, and the interrelationship between L1 and L2 (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015).

There are numerous studies that have investigated the above socio-psychological factors of individual difference as predictors of pronunciation learning performance (i.e., Bongaerts et al., 1997; Burgess & Spencer, 2000; Derwing, Munro & Wiebe, 1998; Elliot, 1997; Jerkins, 2004; Foote, Holtby, & Derwing, 2011; Kissling, 2014; Levis, 2015; Purcell & Suter, 1980; Suter, 1976). However, only a small number of studies have delved into the role that motivation played in pronunciation learning. (i.e., Cahya, 2017; Krashen & Terrell, 1983; Meléndez, 2006; Moyer, 1999; Smit, 2002; Smit & Dalton, 2000; Sardegna, Lee, & Kusey, 2014). Nevertheless, these studies all focused on the dimension of how different extent of motivation such as extrinsic, intrinsic (Noels, 2001) and integrative, instrumental (Gardner, 1985) motivation exerting influence on learning pronunciation, which was viewed from the perspective of quantitative effect that motivation has highlighted (Papi, 2018). How individual learner being motivated qualitatively by the most basic needs as human being (Higgins, 2012), has been barely attached attention by the previous researchers, so the current study tried to fill the gap by looking at the qualitative distinction of motivational effect on learners' attitudes toward pronunciation learning.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Individual Differences and L2 Pronunciation

The acquisition of L2 pronunciation has always been viewed as a dynamic and complex process which is influenced by a series of individual difference (ID) factors and the context in which the pronunciation is being picked up. In terms of the learners' ID, it is acknowledged that first language (L1) learners speak, learners' age, personality, aptitude, and motivation are the common factors that exert influence on the effectiveness of L2 learners' pronunciation learning (Avery & Ehrlich, 1992; Bongaerts et al., 1997; Carroll, 1981; Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Graham, 1994; Lenneberg, 1967; Rogerson-Revell, 2011; Sparks et al., 1997).

It was shown that the distinction between sound systems of first and second language that learners speak may either facilitate or hinder L2 pronunciation acquisition (Avery & Ehrlich, 1992; Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Graham, 1994; Rogerson-Revell, 2011). For instance, a number of L2 learners were found to have difficulty in pronouncing a chain of words especially when the phonetic symbols of these words were non-existent, or hard to be distinguished from the existing sound pattern in their L1 (Avery & Ehrlich, 1992). Speaking of age, Lenneberg (1967) hypothesized that after the onset of puberty it would be extremely difficult for late learners to achieve complete mastery of L2 phonetic skills due to the stagnation of neurological and biological development at this critical period. Nevertheless, other researchers (Bongaerts, Planken, & Schils, 1997) argued that late learners were still able to attain native-like pronunciation skills but varied greatly from one another. Furthermore, the amount of time that learners being exposed to the context of using L2 can also affect their acquisition of L2 pronunciation. Also, learners' personalities play a very important role in this regard. According to Avery and Ehrlich (1992), extroverted learners were more desired to engage themselves in interactions with native speakers while introverted learners tended to feel uncomfortable to communicate with native speakers. In this case, the latter group may lose the opportunity of improving their pronunciation skills since the nurturance of L2 communicative competence is greatly related to learners' engagement in interacting with speakers of the target L2 (Gass & Mackey, 2007). In addition, there were some other studies that demonstrated the relationship between aptitude and L2 pronunciation acquisition. For example, learners' phonetic coding ability, which plays a pivotal role in differentiating the sound patterns between L1 and L2, and it further help learners produce appropriate associations between different symbols. In a word, the phonetic coding capability was found to be one of the strongest aptitude outgrowths that predicted the success of L2 pronunciation acquisition (Carroll, 1981; Sparks et al., 1997).

2.2 *The Effect of Motivation and Attitudes on L2 Pronunciation Learning*

In addition to the aforementioned ID variables that affect L2 pronunciation acquisition, a number of studies have illustrated the significant role another ID factor, motivation plays in L2 learners' pronunciation development (Cahya, 2017; Krashen & Terrell, 1983; Meléndez, 2006; Moyer, 1999; Smit, 2000, 2002; Sardegna, Lee, & Kusey, 2014). For instance, L2 learners who possess good self-images and specific type of motivation such as integrative motivation tend to achieve better performance in L2 pronunciation learning (Krashen & Terrell, 1983; Moyer, 1999). Similarly, Smit and Dalton (2000) revealed the fact that L2 learners who were highly-motivated were strongly eager to practice their speaking skills with ultimate goal of near-nativeness. However, in another study, Smit (2002) concluded that the result he previously discovered was not convincing to demonstrate the plausibility of the hypothesis that learners' achievement in learning pronunciation was positively affected by motivation which had been examined as the most relevant factor determining L2 achievement, but it was essentially not part of the motivational construct at all (p. 15). In another study (Sardegna, Lee, & Kusey, 2014), the desire of practicing and improving pronunciation among English as a foreign language (EFL) Korean learners were demonstrated to be highly related to their motivational factors such as extrinsic, intrinsic and integrative ones. Furthermore, Cahya (2017) suggested that EFL students could make more progress in English pronunciation learning if they were more motivated, but what specific aspects of motivation correlated to what pronunciation skills, remained unanswered in her study.

With respect to attitudes, much of previous research dealing with attitudes toward L2 pronunciation merely put focus on how attitudes as a singular variable influencing the improvement or performance of L2 pronunciation learning (i.e., Bayard, 1990; Burgess & Spencer, 2000; Dalton-Puffer, Kaltenboeck & Smit, 1997; Kang, 2010; Kang & Rubin, 2009; MacDonald, 2002). The number of studies focused on exploring the relationship between L2 motivation and learners' attitudes toward pronunciation learning was fairly limited (Suter, 1976; Elliot, 1995a; Meléndez, 2006; Guinn-Collins, 2011; Huensch & Thompson, 2017).

When it comes to measuring the degree of learners' attitudes toward L2 pronunciation acquisition, one of the most widely-used instruments is Pronunciation Attitude Inventory (PAI), which was developed by Elliot (1995a) in the study that examined the relationship between attitude and adult learners' performance in different types of L2 pronunciation tasks. In this study, data was collected from 66 English as a second language learners (ESL) intermediate students (34 female and 32 male students) who studied at Indiana University at Bloomington. Scores for the subject of attitude were found significantly related to the years of formal language instruction that learners had received, years of living abroad and students' overall performance in learning English. The results indicated that the attitudes, to a great extent were related to the accuracy of pronunciation, which also supported Suter's finding (1976) that learners who had acquired better L2 pronunciation were more concerned about their pronunciation learning. However, the potential factors such as motivation which might have originally given rise to this concern was not measured.

Drawing on Gardner's Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB, Gardner, & Lambert, 1972), Meléndez (2006) investigated the relationship between motivation and the improvement of L2 pronunciation learning, as well as learners' attitudes toward pronunciation learning. In the study, AMTB as the main research instrument was adopted for data collection and 18 Spanish speakers who were learning English as a second language were recruited in the study. During the data collection the participants were asked to complete the AMTB questionnaire and meanwhile, their pronunciation proficiency was assessed through both a pretest and protest, before and after a fifteen days' training on their accuracy of L2 articulation (20min/day). However, the results showed that there was a weak correlation between motivation and improvement of pronunciation learning, and a moderate correlation between attitudes toward pronunciation learning and learners' motivation. The inconspicuous results might have been due to the limited number of participants and low-reliability of the motivation questionnaire.

Similarly, Guinn-Collins (2011) in his study investigated how individual attitude and motivation respectively influence learners' success and failure of acquiring good pronunciation. The targeted population in the study he focused on were English as the first language speakers who learned Japanese as target language after the age of sixteen-year-old in the Japanese department at one of the universities of the Pacific Northwest. Seven female and three male students, from the senior and graduate level voluntarily participated in the study. The researcher adopted Academic Motivation Scale (AMS) (Vallerand et al., 1989) as one of the instruments to assess learners' motivation for learning Japanese pronunciation. The other two instruments he used were AMTB (Gardner & Lambert, 1972) and PAI (Elliot, 1995a) for evaluating the degree of learners' attitudes toward pronunciation learning, as well as toward the importance of native-like sound of Japanese pronunciation. Also, five native Japanese speakers as raters were

recruited to assess the accuracy of participants' pronunciation. Concerning the way of measuring participants' pronunciation performance, the students were asked to read five paragraphs extracted from the textbook which was used in the senior and graduate Japanese classes, and three aspects relating to pronunciation were examined. Those were phonological features, correctness, and appropriateness of expression. The result showed that positive attitude and intrinsic motivation were highly correlated with native-like pronunciation, respectively. Nevertheless, the limited number of samples greatly impaired the generalizability of the study.

Likewise, a recent study which was conducted by Huensch and Thompson (2017) investigated the relationship between FL learners' attitudes toward pronunciation performance and L2 motivation among 195 FL learners. In this study researchers adopted two questionnaires as data-collecting instruments. The motivation questionnaire, drawn from Dörnyei (2005, 2009), was used to measure learners' ideal, ought-to selves. The results of the study showed moderate correlation between learners' perceived importance of improving pronunciation and their ideal selves. Besides, they discovered that the learners with strong ideal selves were more willing to interact in the context where the target language was used. However, the correlation between learners' perceived importance of improving pronunciation and ought to selves was inconspicuous.

In fact, studies that have attempted to investigate learners' beliefs and attitudes regarding L2 pronunciation were abundant (i.e., Bernat & Gvozdenko, 2005; Burgess & Spencer, 2000; Cenoz & Lecumberri, 1999; Jenkins, 2009; MacDonald, 2002; Simon & Taveniers, 2011). Nevertheless, the majority of studies were either focused on exploring how attitudes were related to English pronunciation instruction (e.g., Sardegna, Lee, & Kusey, 2014; Smit, 2002; Smit & Dalton, 2000), or on learners' attitudes toward the effect of accent varieties on pronunciation learning (e.g., Kang, 2010; Meléndez, 2006). There was scant research that has dealt with learners' attitudes toward pronunciation learning, and meanwhile, has taken the effect of learners' motivation on learners' attitudes into consideration (Borges, 2014; Guinn-Collins, 2011; Tanner, 2012; Huensch & Thompson, 2017). Conclusively, none of these four studies provided strong evidence to illuminate the relationship between learners' attitudes and L2 motivation. In particular, the positive or negative attitude learners holding toward pronunciation was merely depicted superficially, without indicating which aspect of L2 pronunciation learners attach importance to was related to their motivation in detail.

In addition, it is necessary to point out that the past studies that have explored the relationship between motivation and learners' perceptions toward L2 pronunciation learning (Borges, 2014; Guinn-Collins, 2011; Meléndez, 2006; Tanner, 2012) all shared a common view that they all looked at the relationship between pronunciation learning and motivation from the angle of quantity and overlooked L2 pronunciation performance on which motivation as quality exerted influence. Generally, the former form of motivation is created for developing, continuing and completing the learning pursuit, which was usually elicited by specific L2 motives such as instrumental and integrative orientations (Gardner, 1985). The concept of quantity of motivation has been embedded in the field of SLA research for a long time. The way motivation is commonly viewed has narrowed our understanding of the maximal role motivation plays in language learning processes and outcomes (Papi, 2016). According to Papi (2018), "this motivation-as-energy view has been of great value and has formed applied linguists' current understanding of L2 motivation. Nevertheless, at the same time it has obscured the true nature of motivation as a phenomenon which is driven by fundamentally different human needs and can result in qualitative differences in individuals' choices and behavior" (p. 2). In fact, studying L2 motivation from the qualitative perspective (i.e., how learners learn) not only can fill the gap that quantity perspective has overlooked, but also contribute to our understanding of different traits of motivation.

2.3 Theoretical Background of Qualitative Motivation

In accordance with Higgins (1997), when people pursue their goals or make decisions for achieving utilitarian value, they are often driven by two different self-regulatory manners: promotion focus (to gain pleasure) and prevention focus (to avoid pain).

A promotion focus is concerned with advancement, growth, accomplishment. Goals are hopes and aspirations. The strategic inclination is to make progress by approaching matches to the desired end-state. In contrast, a prevention focus is concerned with security, safety, responsibility. Goals are duties and obligations or even necessities. The strategic inclination is to be prudent and precautionary and avoid mismatches to the desired end-state (Crowe & Higgins, 1997, p. 120).

Given that different self-regulatory orientations learners have can engender different beliefs and mindsets that reflect unique emotional, motivational and behavioral characteristics solely belonged to individual learner (Carver, Lawrence, & Scheier, 1999), the use of promotion and prevention focus as theoretical framework in the current study may be an advisable move for exploring learners' chronic motivation.

In addition to drawing on Higgins's regulatory focus (1997), the L2 Self model which was developed for measuring language-specific regulatory focus was adopted as another theoretical framework in the study. The commonly used L2 Self model in the past studies was L2 Motivational Self System developed by Zoltán Dörnyei (2005, 2009). According to Huensch and Thompson (2017), the development of L2 Motivational Self System was groundbreaking and facilitated a number of innovative and instructive studies on investigating the self-role of L2 motivation and personality psychology. The concept of L2 Self is composed of three components: ideal L2 self, ought-to self and L2 learning experience, which at present are the frequently-used, theoretical framework used for studying learners' L2 motivation. The differences between ideal self and ought to self can be explained as follows:

The ideal self refers to the representation of the attributes that one would ideally like to possess (i.e. representation of hopes, aspirations, or wishes), while the ought-to self refers to the representation of attributes that one believes one ought to possess (i.e. representation of someone else's sense of duties, obligations or moral responsibilities) and which therefore may bear little resemblance to one's own desires or wishes (Dörnyei, 2009, p.13).

In regard to L2 learning experience, it represents a series of situated, directive motives applied to the immediate language learning context and experience. In a word, the most evident effect that L2MSS exerts on L2 learning is to mediate and control learners' ongoing behavior: "possible selves act as 'future self-guides', which further reflects a dynamic, forward-pointing conception explaining how someone moves from the present toward the future" (Dörnyei, 2009, p.13). Although the discovery of the previous studies that have utilized Dörnyei's L2 Self model as the main theoretical framework have provided robust evidence to its feasibility and validity of predicting L2 motivational behaviors (e.g., Csizér & Kormos, 2009; Kormos & Csizér, 2014; Papi & Teimouri, 2012, 2014; Taguchi, Magid, & Papi, 2009; Huensch & Thompson, 2017), there was an inconsistent relationship between ought-to L2 Self and learners' motivational behavior based on the past research findings (Teimouri, 2016). The above studies implied that the inconsistency was due to the neglect of the effect of socio-educational factors on learners' ought-to L2 Self in different context.

For filling the gap, Teimouri (2017) developed a trichotomous L2 Self model which examined L2 self from a bifurcated standpoint (i.e., Own vs. Others) by drawing on the theoretical tenets from the self-discrepancy theory (Higgins, 1987, 2011) and the regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997). According to what has mentioned above that ideal self (own) standing for the features that one hopes to have, while ideal self (other) means the features one thinks others wanting him or her to have. In comparison, ought self (own) stands for the traits one ought to have, whereas ought self (other) describing the traits one should have as others would like him or her to do so. In his study, the L2 Self/Others questionnaire was adopted as the main instrument for data collection and a sample of 524 adolescent EFL learners with intermediate low level of language proficiency has been included in. Also, fifty-six items were created in the questionnaire for measuring learners' motivational and emotional variables. Results from the study indicated a satisfying reliability for all scales of L2 Self constructs (e.g., ideal L2 self/own, $\alpha = .79$; ideal L2 self/others, $\alpha = .81$; ought-to L2 self/own, $\alpha = .67$; ought-to L2 self/other, $\alpha = .76$). However, comparing with previous studies, this model did not yield apparent evidence for the relevance and validity of ought-to L2 selves, nor the qualitative differences in learners motivated behaviors.

For finding out more powerful evidence to prove the availability of the bifurcation of both ideal L2 self and ought-to L2 Self items, Papi et al. (2018) analyzed Teimouri's model (2017) and proposed a new L2 self model: the 2x2 Model of L2 self-guides. Two-hundred-fifty-seven international students from one of the universities in the U.S. were recruited to participate in the study (Papi et al., 2018) and asked to complete the L2 self survey. The study was aimed at examining the model of L2 self (Dörnyei's, 2005, 2009) which was asymmetric in viewpoints but did not show unambiguous regulatory distinctions. The validity of the model was demonstrated through Confirmatory Factor Analysis and its superiority over alternate frameworks was also confirmed. In other words, the results in the study (Papi et al., 2018) confirmed the superior fit of 2 x 2 model in comparison with the original model developed by Dörnyei (2005, 2009) which only contained two L2 selves (ideal and ought-to L2 self), as well as comparing to Teimouri's (2016) tripartite model with ideal, ought-to L2 self and ought-to L2 self/other. In addition, it supported the fitness of the original L2 self model and further corroborated the dominant tenets of Regulatory Focus Theory that both promotion and prevention orientations could engender motivation. Most significantly, the study (Papi et al., 2018) has not only revealed the importance of qualitative effect of motivation, but also illustrated the equivalent value of researching both promotion and prevention-related motives. Under the circumstances, motivation is not merely considered as quantity of energy produced by specific motives; rather, learners with different motivational orientations also show qualitative differences in their learning pursuits (Papi, 2018). Therefore, the newly developed 2x2 model of L2 self-guides (Papi et al., 2018) was adopted as the theoretical framework in the present study owing

to its superior fit in comparison with Teimouri's (2016) tripartite model and the original model (Dörnyei, 2005, 2009).

Although the 'ideal' and 'ought-to' constructs in L2 self-guides are greatly related to Higgins's two motivational orientations (1997), how learners' motivation being measured through the two frameworks is essentially different. The framework of 2×2 L2 self-guides is used for measuring language-specific regulatory focus, whereas promotion and prevention focus are used for measuring chronic motivational regulatory orientations. In a word, by reviewing the aforementioned studies, the majority either focused on studying the relationship between L2 motivation and pronunciation performance or aimed at researching how attitudes affect pronunciation learning, in a separate direction. Very few probed how motivational orientations can predict qualitative differences in learners' attitudes toward pronunciation learning (Huensch & Tompson, 2017).

3. Research Objective and Questions

Consequently, the purpose of the study was to examine L2 learners' attitudes toward L2 pronunciation learning and at the same time, to investigate how Regulatory Focus and 2×2 self guides explain ESL learners' attitudes toward pronunciation learning through a self-report survey. Based on the above discussion, following research questions were addressed:

- 1) How do promotion and prevention orientations explain ESL learners' attitudes toward English pronunciation learning?
- 2) How do ideal L2 self (own/others) and ought-to L2 self (own/others) explain ESL learners' attitudes toward English pronunciation learning?
- 3) What are the differences between the impact of chronic motivation and the one of L2-based motivation on learners' attitudes toward English pronunciation learning? If there are, what reason may cause such difference?
- 4) By considering the tenets of the dichotomous, psychological orientations and future selves, the hypotheses of the study are that:
 1. Concerning the overall perceived importance learners attach to pronunciation learning, promotion (Ideal L2 Self Own) would predict more positive attitudes than prevention (Ought-to L2 Self Own)
 2. Concerning the perceived importance learners attach to native accent, promotion (Ideal L2 Self Own) would predict more positive attitudes than promotion (Ought-to L2 Self Own).
 3. Concerning the perceived importance learners attach to learning pronunciation for communicative purpose, promotion (Ideal L2 Self Own) would predict more negative attitude than prevention (Ought-to L2 Self Own).

4. Method

4.1 Participants

Table 1. Demographic Information (N = 124)

Gender	Undergraduate	Graduate	Total
Female	39	28	67 (54%)
Male	31	26	57 (46%)
Total	70 (56%)	54 (44%)	124 (100%)

The participants' demographics was shown in Table 1. 133 ESL students studying at a public university in the southeastern U.S. participated in the study, while 9 surveys were excluded due to the students' incomplete responses. Finally, a sample of 124 students (Female = 67) ranging from 18 to 26 years old (Mean Age = 22.5; SD = 2.4) was included in the study. 70 of the total number of participants are from undergraduate level.

Table 2. Background Information (N = 124)

First Language	Mandarin	Spanish	Korean	Arabic	Turkish	Vietnamese
	55	44	9	7	4	3
Time in English-speaking country	Less than 6 months	6 months - 12 months	1 year - 3 years	56	12	
Took English pronunciation class	Never	Less than 3 months	3 months - 6 months	31	18	

As shown in Table 2, among the 124 participants, nearly half of them (n = 55) reported speaking Mandarin as first language, and one-third of respondents' (n = 44) first language is Spanish. Nearly half of them have stayed in the U.S. or in other English-speaking countries for more than one, but less than three years (n = 56). Besides, 97 students of the total took English pronunciation classes before, while only 27 have not taken any English pronunciation courses yet. The detailed background information of participants can be seen from Table 2.

4.2 Instruments and Procedure

In this study, Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (Higgins et al., 2001) was used for examining the learners' chronic history of both promotion success and prevention success (See Appendix A). The RFQ(note 1) contains 11 items based on a five-point Likert Scales varying from 1 (Never or Seldom; or Certainly False) to 5 (Very Often; or Certainly True). The second questionnaire which included 16 items was extracted from the 2×2 model of L2 self-guides (Papi et al., 2018), which had been confirmed with high reliability. The model was used for measuring learners' future L2 selves own/others (See Appendix B). The third questionnaire, Attitudes toward English Pronunciation Learning Scale (AEPLS) which consisted of 15 items was used for measuring learners' attitudes toward the pronunciation learning. Six items (1, 2, 3, 4, 11,12) were adapted from the AMTB (Gardner & Lambert, 1972) and nine items (5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13,14,15) were adapted from PAI (Elliot, 1995a) (See Appendix C). The responses of 31 items in the questionnaires of L2 self-guides and AEPLS were both elicited by adopting a six-point Likert scale for every item ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 6 (Strongly Agree). The background questionnaire was used for collecting personal information such as gender, age and learners' first language, etc. (See Appendix D). The survey was administered online via Qualtrics, and the link of the survey was forwarded by the researcher to each participant after being informed of the objective and the procedures of the study. After completing the survey, their responses of each questionnaire item were automatically stored in the researcher's Qualtrics account. It should be noted that each participant was labelled with a sequential number and all participants' numbers were entered into a drawing to win one of five \$20 Amazon gift cards offered by the researcher.

4.3 Data Analysis

In order to examine the effect of Regulatory Focus and L2 future selves/others on participants' attitudes toward English pronunciation learning, the study followed a descriptive design and all data were analyzed via SPSS Statistics 22. First of all, an exploratory factor analysis was performed (maximum likelihood analysis; direct oblimin rotation; eigenvalues > 1; item loading values > 0.3) to determine the potential dimensions that should be formulated among the 15 attitude items. The KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) measure of sampling adequacy was 0.864, above the generally recommended value of 0.6 (Kaiser, 1974). After running the EFA analysis there were four factors generated, but only two items (9, 12) were included in the fourth factor. However, one of the two (item 9) was more related to F3, so the item 12 was excluded and the operation of EFA was performed for the second time (Loewen & Gonulal, 2015).

The result of the AEPLS was displayed in Table 3, which comprised a three-factor solution: F1: Preference for Native accent; F2: Importance of Pronunciation learning and F3: Learning pronunciation for communicative purpose. Items 1, 9, 10 and 14 were the four instances of cross-loading. The item 14 loaded more strongly onto F1 and the item 1 loaded onto F2, while both item 9 and 10 fell into F3. The three factors accounted for 72.57% of the overall variance (F1= 47.65%; F2 = 16.76%; F3 = 8.16 %).

Table 3. Factor Loading for the Preference for Native Accent (F1), Importance of Pronunciation Learning (F2) and Learning Pronunciation for Communicative Purpose (F3)

	Factor		
	1	2	3
13. I think sounding as native as possible is important to me when learning English pronunciation.	.931		
14. Acquiring native pronunciation in learning English is important to me.	.682		-.336
15. I try to imitate native English speakers as much as possible.	.547		
7. I think more emphasis should be given to proper pronunciation in class.		.889	
3. I think learning English pronunciation is not a waste of time.		.862	
6. I think English pronunciation learning is as important as learning vocabulary and grammar.		.848	
4. English pronunciation is an important part of the English language learning program.		.813	
1. I enjoyed learning English pronunciation.	.416	.768	
5. I'm concerned with my progress in learning English pronunciation.		.725	
2. I think learning to pronounce well is important for learning a language.		.689	
11. I think I will be satisfied with my English pronunciation as long as people who speak English can understand me.			.797
10. I would rather spend class time working on communicating in my second language, instead of spending time on practicing English pronunciation.		-3.87	.530
9. Communicating is much more important than sound like a native speaker of English.		-3.20	.456

Note: It is common for an item to load onto more than one theme positively or negatively. Take item 14 as an example, it loaded most strongly onto Importance of Native Accent (F1) and consequently was considered be mostly related to that theme, so did item 1 which loaded onto F2 more, so it was put into that theme.

Cronbach reliability analysis was run on the results of attitude items based on the three main categories, as well as on the results yielded from each construct of L2 self-guides (See Table 4). For increasing the overall reliability of each attitude dimension and L2 self construct, the item 8 “*I want to improve my accent when I learn English pronunciation*” was deleted from the theme of *pronunciation learning of AEPLS*. In terms of L2 self-guides, the 1st item of ought-to L2 self other: *If I don't learn English, I will disappoint my parents/teachers* was deleted as well. In the end, a Pearson correlation analysis was performed on the entire sample with scores of motivational orientations (i.e., promotion and prevention; ideal self own and ought-to self own; ideal self other and ought-to self other) as the predictor variables, and scores of the three attitude themes as outcome variables.

Table 4. Reliability Statistics of AEPLS and Motivational Constructs (N = 124)

Themes (Items)	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items	Mean	SD
F2: Importance of Pronunciation learning (1-7)	.974	7	4.37	1.16
F3: Learning pronunciation for communicative purpose (9-11)	.842	3	4.09	1.01
F1: Preference for native accent (13-15)	.913	3	3.14	1.28
Ideal L2 self own	.927	4	4.51	0.67
Ideal L2 self other	.713	4	4.18	0.58
Ought-to L2 self own	.751	4	4.99	0.69
Ought-to L2 self other	.640	3	3.24	0.98
Promotion	-	-	3.75	0.67
Prevention	-	-	3.32	0.73

5. Results

As displayed in table 4, the Cronbach’s alphas demonstrated good reliability for all factors of attitude as well as for all motivational constructs. The mean scores of F2 and F3 were 4.37 and 4.09 respectively, which demonstrated that the participants somewhat attached importance to L2 pronunciation learning and to communication. However, the average score of F1 was 3.14, indicating that the participants did not think the native accent was necessary to master while learning English pronunciation. On the other hand, among the four L2 self guides, ought-to L2 self own was found to be the strongest self-guide that participants possessed (*mean* = 4.99). Following that was ideal L2 self own (*mean* = 4.51) as the second strong self-guide and ideal L2 self other (*mean* = 4.18) appeared as the least strong self guide that participants had. However, they neither feel highly motivated under the self-guide of ought-to self other (*mean* = 3.24), nor under the chronic regulatory focus (promotion, *mean* = 3.75; prevention, *mean* = 3.32).

Table 5. Correlation between RFQ, L2 self-guides and Attitudes toward Pronunciation Learning

	Promotion	Prevention	Ideal L2 self own	Ideal L2 self other	Ought-to L2 self own	Ought-to L2 self other
F2	<i>r</i> = .702** <i>p</i> = .000	<i>r</i> = .358 <i>p</i> = .108	<i>r</i> = .863** <i>p</i> = .000	<i>r</i> = .123 <i>p</i> = .173	<i>r</i> = .759** <i>p</i> = .000	<i>r</i> = -.405** <i>p</i> = .000
F3	<i>r</i> = -.649** <i>p</i> = .000	<i>r</i> = -.088 <i>p</i> = .330	<i>r</i> = -.779** <i>p</i> = .000	<i>r</i> = -.159 <i>p</i> = .096	<i>r</i> = -.651** <i>p</i> = .000	<i>r</i> = .304** <i>p</i> = .001
F1	<i>r</i> = .629** <i>p</i> = .000	<i>r</i> = .157 <i>p</i> = .083	<i>r</i> = .786** <i>p</i> = .000	<i>r</i> = .135 <i>p</i> = .134	<i>r</i> = .645** <i>p</i> = .000	<i>r</i> = -.358** <i>p</i> = .000

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**.

The correlation between learners’ regulatory focus orientation, L2 self-guides and their attitudes toward pronunciation learning were presented in Table 5. It could be discovered that both learners’ attitudes toward F2 and F1 significantly correlated with promotion, respectively (*r* = .702, *p* < .001; *r* = .629, *p* < .001). Besides, there was a negative correlation between promotion and F3 (*r* = -.649, *p* < .001). The results indicated that ESL learners who were more chronically promotion-focused attached more importance to pronunciation learning and more preference for learning native accent, but more negative attitude toward learning pronunciation for communicative purpose. However, none of the above attitude factors were demonstrated to be significantly predicted by prevention. In terms of the correlation between each construct of L2 self-guides and the three factors of attitudes, the results showed that both the ESL learners’ ideal L2 self own and ought-to L2 self own were strong predictors of their attitudes toward all three factors. It suggested that the stronger ideal L2 self own or ought-to L2 self own learners had, the more positive attitude they would hold toward the importance of pronunciation learning and toward the preference for native accent, but they would attach less importance to learning pronunciation for communicative purpose.

Importantly, it was discovered that the ideal L2 self own predicted more positive attitude toward the importance of pronunciation learning (F2: *r* = .863, *p* < 0.01) and toward the preference for native accent (F3: *r* = .786, *p* < 0.01) than ought-to L2 self own (F2: *r* = .759, *p* < 0.01; F3: *r* = .645, *p* < 0.01), but the former also predicted more negative attitude toward learning pronunciation for communicative purpose (*r* = -.779, *p* < 0.01) than that predicted by ought-to L2 self own (*r* = -.651, *p* < 0.01). However, differing from the above two motivational self-guides, the ought-to L2 self other was demonstrated to be positively correlated with F3 (*r* = .304, *p* < 0.01) but was negatively correlated with F1 (*r* = -.358, *p* < 0.01) and F2 (*r* = -.405, *p* < 0.01), which indicated that ESL learners who possess stronger ought-to L2 self other are more inclined to attach importance to learning pronunciation for communicative purpose, and reject the importance of pronunciation learning as well as the preference for native accent. In terms of the ideal L2 self other, there was no evidence proving that it was correlated with any of the attitude factor above.

Table 6. Correlation between L2 Self-Guides and Regulatory Focus

	Ideal L2 self own	Ideal L2 self other	Ought-to L2 self own	Ought-to L2 self other
Promotion	<i>r</i> = .751** <i>p</i> = .000	<i>r</i> = -.077 <i>p</i> = .396	<i>r</i> = .657** <i>p</i> = .000	<i>r</i> = -.324** <i>p</i> = .000
Prevention	<i>r</i> = .362 <i>p</i> = .087	<i>r</i> = .060 <i>p</i> = .504	<i>r</i> = .420 <i>p</i> = .066	<i>r</i> = -.277** <i>p</i> = .002

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**.

Another correlation analysis between chronic regulatory focus (promotion and prevention) and L2 self-guides was administered and results were showed in Table 6. As it can be seen that except for ideal L2 self other, the other three motivational constructs of L2 self were demonstrated to be significantly correlated with promotion orientation. Specifically, both ideal L2 self own ($r = .751, p < 0.01$) and ought-to L2 self own ($r = .657, p < 0.01$) were positively correlated with promotion. whereas ought-to L2 self other was shown to have negative correlation ($r = -.324, p < 0.01$; $r = -.277, p < 0.01$) with both promotion and prevention. This set of data suggested that the participants who were more promotion focused were also with higher ideal L2 self own and higher ought-to L2 self own, but conversely with lower ought-to L2 self other. Similarly, the participants who were more prevention focused were demonstrated to be less motivated under the motivational construct of ought-to L2 self other.

6. Discussion

The study attempted to explore the relationship between ESL learners' attitudes toward English pronunciation and individual motivation from its qualitative perspective (Papi, 2018). The results presented above have highlighted some salient values regarding the role each motivational construct playing in shaping learners' attitude toward pronunciation learning, which was worthy of an in-depth discussion. Firstly, the mean scores of general attitudes toward F2 and F3 are 4.37 and 4.09 respectively (See table 4), which reveals the fact that the participants generally feel positive toward the importance of pronunciation learning and toward pronunciation learning for communicative purpose. It has supported Huensch and Thompson's findings (2017) that L2 learners tending to show positive feeling toward the importance of improving pronunciation (mean = 4.90) and toward the importance of communication (mean = 4.31), although both two values in the current study are less prominent. The result is not surprising though L2 learners who have picked up intelligible speech are thought to be at a more competitive advantage in learning advanced communicative skills (Sardegna, 2014), because most of ESL learners especially those who are in college-level tend to show more concern for other English skills such as writing and grammar which can explicitly contribute to their academic progress (Martinez-Flor et al., 2006).

Concerning the significant correlation between ideal L2 self own, ought-to L2 self own and each factor of pronunciation learning attitudes (See table 5), the results suggest that ESL learners who are more self-motivated are apt to attach more importance to learning pronunciation and meanwhile show more preference for native accent in pronunciation learning, while deny that they would only learn pronunciation for communicative purpose. We can interpret this result by drawing on the fundamental concept of ideal L2 self (Dörnyei, 2009) that those learners who preserve strong ideal self would like to imagine themselves as good English pronunciation learners. The image they conceive in mind is exactly the drive that motivates them to learn all necessary skills about L2 pronunciation and the understanding of native accent is part of the entirety of pronunciation learning (Derwing, Munro, & Wiebe, 1998), so probably this is the reason why they refuse to compromise for merely learn L2 pronunciation for communicative purpose. Besides, it should be noted that the participants in the study were all ESL learners. They are not only surrounded by native English speakers in a daily basis but also they have to speak English frequently even though it is only for academic purpose, so the sense of responsibility they uphold for English pronunciation learning may not merely be restricted to learning it for maintaining their daily communication, but to become better English speakers, which to a great extent accounts the result that why learners with stronger ought-to L2 self own also have shown optimistic perception toward pronunciation learning as well as toward the preference for native accent.

On the other hand, all three aforementioned motivational constructs (Promotion, ideal L2 self own and ought-to L2 self own) were negatively correlated with F3 (Learning pronunciation for communicative purpose), which also partly corroborated the last hypothesis that in terms of the perceived importance that learners attach to communication, ideal L2 self own predicted more negative attitudes than ought-to self own. Although the mean value of attitude toward learning pronunciation for communicative purpose (Mean = 4.09) and of the preference for native accent (Mean = 3.14) might show a hint that the ESL learners have somewhat compromised with pursuing native English pronunciation, it seems that highly motivated ESL learners, on the contrary, have higher aspiration toward learning pronunciation which is not only restricted to facilitating daily communication as it was mentioned above, but also would like to learn native-like pronunciation. Furthermore, comparing with ought-to L2 self own motivated learners who are more influenced by the sense of obligation and external pressure for language learning (Dörnyei, 2009), ideal L2 self own learners always follow their own desire. Hence, it was totally anticipatory that they were more unwilling to yield to learning pronunciation only for the purpose of communication. However, neither prevention nor ideal L2 self other significantly correlated with any categories of pronunciation learning attitudes based on the findings, which on the other hand rejected the first two hypotheses. Not as apparent as L2 self-guides that both L2

self own (i.e., ideal & ought-to) and ought-to L2 self other were found to be significantly correlated with all attitude themes respectively, the prevention orientation of regulatory focus was not demonstrated to have any predictive effect on any of the three attitude themes.

Interestingly, ought-to L2 self other, as another construct of L2 self guides, was discovered to have a negative correlation with the attitude toward the importance of pronunciation learning and the preference for native accent, whereas it predicted positive attitudes toward learning pronunciation for communicative purpose. In accordance with the theory of psychological resistance (Negriy, 2013), it suggests that more external pressure that family or parents bring to their children, more severe the degree of children's resistance to learning will be and being "forced" to reach expectation coming from the parents by definition will undermine children's enthusiasm toward learning, which may be one of the reasonable explanations for the result. In addition, learners who are less affected by the pressure brought from others may be more willing to enjoy the process of learning a language rather than merely approach it for specific purpose.

In terms of the relationship between the regulatory focus and L2 self guides, the above results suggest that L2 learners who are more promotion focused can either have strong sense of ideal L2 self own or ought-to L2 self own. For this result, it is speculated that individuals' chronic motivation in everyday life does not necessarily reflect their L2 learning motivation. However, the L2 learner who has either strong image of ideal L2 self own or ought-to L2 self own is likely to be a highly promotion-oriented person in everyday life in turn (See Table 6). On the other hand, as L2 self-guides was reconceptualized on the basis of Higgins's regulatory focus theory (1997), it could be easily taken for granted that prevention focus should have also predicted learners' attitudes toward the same factor of pronunciation learning as ought-to L2 self did, since both ought-to L2 self and prevention emphasized the concern for fulfillment of responsibilities and safety, and the absence of negative outcomes (Dörnyei, 2015). However, the ought-to L2 self in the study is specifically aligned with L2 learning context, which suggests that the motivation prevention-oriented learners often show habitually does not exactly align with that in L2 learning scenarios. The result also indicates that L2 self-guides has a stronger predictive effect on L2 learners' attitudes toward English pronunciation learning than chronic regulatory focus which is not strictly linked to L2 context.

In a word, the correlation between L2 self own and learners' attitudes toward certain themes of English pronunciation learning was demonstrated significant, which rejected the findings from the study conducted by Huensch and Thompson (2017) that only ideal L2 self was correlated with attitude toward the importance of improving pronunciation. The reasons that give rise to the different results between the two studies may be interpreted from the following aspects. Firstly, the items of attitude created in the questionnaire of the two studies was not identical and each item did not rigorously fall into a specific theme due to the vague demarcation between the importance of native pronunciation and improvement of pronunciation. On the other hand, the participants in the study (Huensch & Thompson, 2017) were the learners who were learning different L2 instead of learning the same language as the ESL participants did in the current study. Generally, individuals learning different L2 respectively have unique language learning experience that shape their ways of thinking toward specific linguistic features of L2 (Hiver et al, 2019). Besides, neither the participants in their study were required to use their L2 as a daily communication tool, nor the L2 is set as an official language for their academic use, hence the different extent of attitude learners held toward L2 learning in the two studies should not be at all felt unexpected. Despite the fact that previous hypotheses were not supported by the results of the study, the utilization of L2 self-guides and regulatory focus has greatly extended our understanding of the effect of qualitative motivation variables on individual's belief toward L2 pronunciation learning, without being restricted to quantitative motivation which was regarded as the dominant, theoretical framework in the previous studies.

7. Conclusion

As illustrated above, the present study mainly delved into how ESL learners' pronunciation learning perceptions were shaped by their motivation from a distinct perspective that through labeling learners' motivation as a qualitative trait which was presumed to yield different levels of energy (Gardner, 1985), rather than from the perspective of considering motivation as a "quantity of energy" (Papi, 2018, p.1) that were reflected on themselves. The main findings indicate a strong relationship between certain motivational constructs (i.e., Promotion, ideal L2 self own, ought-to self own and ought-to self other) and learners' attitudes toward pronunciation learning. Importantly, by looking into the interface between the two different images respectively reflected in learners' two types of L2 self representation: one image was what learners are eager to have, and the other image was what learners thought they are obliged to possess, it has depicted a broad picture for us to understand the ESL learners' L2 motivation in a

comprehensive way. Besides, we have fathomed not only the image of how they envision what they should accomplish from their own side, but have also grasped the idea of how they treated the expectation from their family or teachers, based on the bifurcated L2 self-guides (Papi, 2018). In addition, Exploratory analysis performed on the 15 AEPLS items uncovered that the three attitude factors (i.e., pronunciation learning, importance of native accent and learning pronunciation for communicative purpose) were with satisfying internal consistency, which provided an explicit way to understand learners' beliefs and desires on the basis of specific factors of English pronunciation that has been frequently discussed in the past decade (Sardegna, 2014).

8. Limitation

There are several limitations exposed in the study that need to be addressed. First of all, the questionnaire items for measuring learners' attitudes toward specific aspects of English pronunciation learning created in the study were extracted from two different studies. The perception toward pronunciation learning in relation to specific pronunciation learning issue defined in one study might vary significantly from how the other study have defined, and the integration of these different items might not work effectively as a whole for measuring an exclusive aspect of pronunciation learning. Besides, the number of items developed under each pronunciation factor were of great unbalance. Consequently, more questionnaire items that have the potential to measure different aspects of pronunciation learning attitudes needed to incorporate in the future study and a more rigorous factor analysis should be rerun with larger sample size. Also, more factors of pronunciation learning needed to be further investigated, such as the role that ESL instructors play in teaching English pronunciation, as it has been argued for decades that there is less training in phonology instruction among English practitioners, which unavoidably results in a less promising pronunciation learning environment (Breitkreutz, Derwing, & Rossiter, 2001). Another factor should be included in is the desire of learning and practicing pronunciation for improvement of accuracy, which is another frequently discussed issue regarding pronunciation learning (Sardegna, 2014). It was noteworthy that the use of questionnaires as the only instrument for investigating the ESL learners' attitudes somewhat failed to provide an in-depth, concrete views toward different components of pronunciation learning. In addition, other variables of individual difference such as first language use or aptitude that are likely to affect learners' attitudes should be also considered, since they all have a great impact on learners' motivation and beliefs toward language learning (Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015). Last but not least, the investigation of pronunciation learning should be extended to experimental stage such as how learners' pronunciation acquisition influenced by their motivation along with the variation of practice time or improvement of proficiency, rather than restrict to a certain affective profile (Huensch & Thompson, 2017).

9. Implication

The study has yielded some significant implications for L2 pronunciation research and ESL instruction. On one hand, studying motivation from its qualitative perspective which delineates individual's preference of different goals and strategies for attaining these goals, can contribute to our understanding of L2 Pronunciation learning processes and outcomes (Papi, 2018). On the other hand, by knowing the results yielded from the study that have shed light on the effect of L2 motivation on ESL learners' attitudes, ESL instructors can be more sensitive to students' beliefs toward specific aspect of pronunciation learning, so they are more likely to develop appropriate pronunciation learning activities in which learners can be more excitedly engaged in. For instance, the L2 pronunciation materials should be designed by considering whether they would meet learners' need that maybe some of them are more interested in learning advanced phonetics while others may attempt to pick up basic pronunciation skills simply for daily communication.

References

- Aliaga-García, C. (2007). *The role of phonetic training in L2 speech learning*. In Phonetics Teaching & Learning Conference (PTLC).
- Avery, P., & Ehrlich, S. (1992). *Teaching American English pronunciation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bayard, D. (1990). God help us if we all sound like this: Attitudes to New Zealand and other English accents. In A. Bell and J. Holmes (Eds.), *New Zealand Ways of Speaking English*. (pp. 67-96). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bernat, E., & Gvozdenko, I. (2005). Beliefs about Language Learning: Current Knowledge, Pedagogical

- Implications, and New Research Directions. *TESL-EJ*, 9, 1-21.
- Bongaerts, T., Summersen, C., Planken, B., & Schils, E. (1997). Age and ultimate attainment in the pronunciation of a foreign language. *Studies on second Language Acquisition*, 19, 447-465. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197004026>
- Borges, L. (2014). *Pronunciation beliefs and other predictors of phonological performance: A study with Brazilian ESL learners* (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/library/theses>
- Breitkreutz, J., Derwing, T. M., & Rossiter, M. J. (2001). Pronunciation teaching practices in Canada. *TESL Canada Journal*, 19(1), 51-61. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v19i1.919>
- Burgess, J., & Spencer, S. (2000). Phonology and pronunciation in integrated language teaching and teacher education. *System*, 28, 191-215. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(00\)00007-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(00)00007-5)
- Cahya, P. (2017). The Correlation between students' L2 motivation and their EFL proficiency. *Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, 4(2), 176-183. <https://doi.org/10.30605/ethicallingua.v4i2.633>
- Carroll, J. B. (1981). Twenty-five years of research on foreign language aptitude. In Karl C. Diller (Ed.), *Individual differences and universals in language learning aptitude* (pp. 119-154). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Carver, C. S., Lawrence, J. W., & Scheier, M. F. (1999). Self-discrepancies and affect: Incorporating the role of feared self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 783-792. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167299025007002>
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M., Goodwin, J. M., & Griner, B. (2010). *Teaching Pronunciation. A Course Book and Reference Guide*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cenoz, J., & Garcia Lecumberri, L. (1999). The acquisition of English pronunciation: learners' views. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 3-17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.1999.tb00157.x>
- Crowe, E., & Higgins, E. T. (1997). Regulatory focus and strategic inclinations: Promotion and prevention in decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 69(2), 117-132. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1996.2675>
- Csizer, K., & Kormos, J. (2009). Learning experiences, selves and motivated learning behaviour: A comparative analysis of structural models for Hungarian secondary and university learners of English. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 98-119). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691293-006>
- Dalton-Puffer, C., Kaltenboeck, G., & Smit, U. (1997). Learner attitudes and L2 pronunciation in Austria. *World Englishes*, 16, 115-128. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-971X.00052>
- Derwing, T. M., Munro, M. J., & Wiebe, G. (1997). Pronunciation instruction for fossilized learners. Can it help? *Applied Language Learning*, 8, 217-235.
- Derwing, T. M., Munro, M. J., & Wiebe, G. (1998). Evidence in Favor of a Broad Framework for Pronunciation Instruction. *Language Learning*, 48(3), 393-410. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00047>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. Routledge: New York. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315779553>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9-42). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691293-003>
- Elliot, A. R. (1995a). Field independence/dependence, hemispheric specialization, and attitude in relation to pronunciation accuracy in Spanish as a foreign language. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79, 356-371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1995.tb01112.x>
- Elliot, A. S. (1997). On the teaching and acquisition of pronunciation within a communicative approach. *Hispania*, 80, 95-109. <https://doi.org/10.2307/345983>
- Footo, J. A., Holtby, A. K., & Derwing, T. M. (2011). Survey of pronunciation teaching in adult ESL programs in Canada, 2010. *TESL Canada Journal*, 29, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v29i1.1086>

- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2007). Input, interaction, and output in second language acquisition. In B. Vanpatten, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 175-200). London: LEA.
- Gilakjani, A. P. (2016). What factors influence the English pronunciation of EFL learners? *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 7(5), 967-972. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0705.18>
- Graham, J. (1994). Four Strategies to Improve the Speech of Adult Learners. *TESOL Journal*, 3(3), 26-28.
- Guinn-Collins, S. (2011). *Motivation in Late Learners of Japanese: Self-Determination Theory, Attitudes and Pronunciation* (Master Dissertation). Retrieved from Portland State University Library. (191)
- Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1280-1300. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.12.1280>
- Higgins, E. T. (2012). *Beyond pleasure and pain: how motivation works*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199765829.001.0001>
- Higgins, E. T., Friedman, R. S., Harlow, R. E., Idson, L. C., Ayduk, O. N., & Taylor, A. (2001). Achievement orientations from subjective histories of success: Promotion pride versus prevention pride. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 3-23. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.27>
- Hiver, P., Obando, G., Sang, Y., Tahmouresi, S., Zhou, A., & Zhou, Y. (2019). Reframing the L2 learning experience as narrative reconstructions of classroom learning. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 9(1), 85-118. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2019.9.1.5>
- Huensch, A., & Thompson, A. S. (2017). Contextualizing attitudes toward pronunciation: foreign language learners in the United States. *Foreign Language Annals*, 50(2), 410-432. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12259>
- Jenkins, J. (2004). Research in teaching pronunciation and intonation. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 109-125. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000054>
- Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, 28, 200-207. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01582.x>
- Kaiser, H. (1974). An index of factor simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39, 31-36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291575>
- Kang, O. (2010). ESL learners' attitudes toward pronunciation instruction and varieties of English. In J. Levis & K. LeVelle (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 1st Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference*, Iowa State University, Sept. 2009. (pp. 105-118), Ames, IA: Iowa State University.
- Kang, O., & Rubin, D. (2009). Reverse linguistic stereotyping: Measuring the effect of listener expectations on speech evaluation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 28, 441-456. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X09341950>
- Kelly, G. (2000). *How to teach pronunciation*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Kissling, E. M. (2014). What predicts the effectiveness of foreign language pronunciation instruction? Investigating the role of perception and other individual differences. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 70, 532-558. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.2161>
- Kormos, J., & Csizer, K. (2014). The interaction of motivation, self-regulatory strategies, and autonomous learning behavior in different learner groups. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48, 275-299. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.129>
- Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1983). *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. San Francisco, CA: The Alemany Press.
- Lenneberg, E. H. (1967). *The geological foundations of language*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Levis, J. (2015). Learners' views of social issues in pronunciation learning. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 9, A42-A55.
- Loewen, S., & Gonulal, T. (2015). Exploratory factor analysis and principal components analysis. In L. Plonsky (Ed.), *Advancing quantitative methods in second language research* (pp. 182-212). New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315870908-9>
- MacDonald, S. (2002). Pronunciation—views and practices of reluctant teachers. *Prospect*, 17, 3-18.

- Martínez-Flor, A., Usó-Juan, E., & Alcón Soler, E. (2006). Towards acquiring communicative competence through speaking. In Usó-Juan, E., & Martínez-Flor, A. (Eds.), *Current Trends in the Development and Teaching of the Four Language Skills* (pp. 139-157). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197778.3.139>
- Meléndez, C. E. (2006). *Motivation and acquisition of pronunciation in EFL students in El Salvador* (Master Dissertation). Retrieved from Iowa State University. (16120)
- Moyer, A. (1999). Ultimate attainment in L2 phonology. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21(1), 81-108. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263199001035>
- Negriy, V. A. (2013). Psychological problems of learning resistance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 86(10), 116-121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.08.535>
- Noels, K. A. (2001). New orientations in language learning motivation: Towards a model of intrinsic, extrinsic and integrative orientations, In Z. Dornyei, & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- Papi, M. (2018). Motivation as quality: regulatory fit effects on incidental vocabulary learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 40, 707-730. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263118000153>
- Papi, M., & Teimouri, Y. (2012). Dynamics of selves and motivation: A cross-sectional study in the EFL context of Iran. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 287-309. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2012.00312.x>
- Papi, M., & Teimouri, Y. (2014). Language learner motivational types: A cluster analysis study. *Language Learning*, 64(3), 493-525. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12065>
- Papi, M., Bondarenko, A. V., Mansouri, S., Feng, L., & Jiang, C. (2019). Rethinking L2 motivation research: The 2 × 2 model of L2 selfguides. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 41(2), 337-361. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263118000153>
- Purcell, E. T., & Suter, R. W. (1980). Predictors of pronunciation accuracy: A reexamination. *Language Learning*, 30, 271-287. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1980.tb00319.x>
- Rogerson-Revell, P. (2011). *English Phonology and Pronunciation Teaching*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Sardegna, V. G., Lee, J., & Kusey, C. (2014). Development and validation of the learner attitudes and motivations for pronunciation (LAMP) inventory. *System*, 47, 162-175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.10.009>
- Simon, E., & Taverniers, M. (2011). Advanced EFL Learners' Beliefs about Language Learning and Teaching: A Comparison between Grammar, Pronunciation, and Vocabulary. *English Studies*, 92, 896-922. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0013838X.2011.604578>
- Smit, U. (2002). The interaction of motivation and achievement in advanced ESL pronunciation learners. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 40, 89-116. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2002.009>
- Smit, U., & Dalton, C. (2000). Motivation in advanced EFL pronunciation learners. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 38, 229-246. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2000.38.3-4.229>
- Sparks, R., Ganschow, L., Artzer, M., Siebenhar, D., & Plageman, M. (1997). Anxiety and proficiency in a foreign language. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 85, 559-562. <https://doi.org/10.2466/PMS.85.6.559-562>
- Suter, R. W. (1976). Predictors of pronunciation accuracy in second language learning. *Language Learning*, 26, 233-253. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1976.tb00275.x>
- Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 motivational self system among Japanese, Chinese, and Iranian learners of English: a comparative study. In: Dörnyei, Z. and Ushioda, E. (Eds.), *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self, Multilingual Matters*, Bristol, 66-97. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691293-005>
- Tanner, J. D. (2012). *Factors affecting the acquisition of pronunciation: culture, motivation, and level of instruction* (Master Dissertation). Retrieved from Scholar Archive (3242).
- Teimouri, Y. (2017). L2 selves, emotions, and motivated behaviors. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 39, 691-709. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263116000243>

Note

Note 1. The final value of RFQ is calculated based on the formula: Promotion = $[(6-Q1) + Q3 + Q7 + (6-Q9) + Q10 + (6-Q11)] / 6$; Prevention = $[(6-Q2) + (6-Q4) + Q5 + (6-Q6) + (6-Q8)] / 5$

Appendix A

Regulatory Focus Questionnaire

Instructions: The following statements inquire about your thoughts and feelings toward the personal experience that has occurred in your life. For each item, please indicate your answer to each question by circling the appropriate number below it.

1) Are you typically unable to get what you want in your life?	Never or seldom		sometimes		Very often
	1	2	3	4	5
2) When you were growing up, would you ever “cross the line” by doing things that your parents would not tolerate?	Never or seldom		sometimes		Very often
	1	2	3	4	5
3) How often have you accomplished things that got you energized to work even harder?	Never or seldom		sometimes		Very often
	1	2	3	4	5
4) Did you get on your parents’ nerves often when you were growing up?	Never or seldom		sometimes		Very often
	1	2	3	4	5
5) How often did you obey rules and regulations that were established by your parents?	Never or seldom		sometimes		Very often
	1	2	3	4	5
6) When you were growing up, did you ever act in ways that your parents thought were unacceptable?	Never or seldom		sometimes		Very often
	1	2	3	4	5
7) Do you often do well at different things that you try?	Never or seldom		sometimes		Very often
	1	2	3	4	5
8) Not being careful enough has gotten me into trouble at times.	Never or seldom		sometimes		Very often
	1	2	3	4	5
9) When it comes to achieving things that are important to me, I find that I don’t perform as well as I ideally would like to do.	Never or Seldom		sometimes		Very Often
	1	2	3	4	5
10) I feel like I have made progress toward being successful in my life.	Certainly False				Certainly True
	1	2	3	4	5
11) I have not found many hobbies or activities in my life that capture my interest or motivate me to put effort into them.	Certainly False				Certainly True
	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix B

2×2 Model of L2 Self Questionnaire

Instructions: The following statements inquire about your thoughts and feelings toward the second language learning experience that has occurred in your life. For each item, please indicate your answer to each question by circling the appropriate number below it.

1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Somewhat Disagree;
4 = Somewhat Agree; 5 = Agree; 6 = Strongly Agree

<i>Ideal L2 Self Own</i>						
I can imagine a day when I speak English like a native speaker of English.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I can imagine a day when I speak English fluently with international friends/colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I can imagine a day when I write effectively and read fluently in English.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I can imagine a day when I use English effectively to communicate with people from all around the world.	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Ideal L2 Self Other</i>						
My family hopes that one day I will speak English fluently.	1	2	3	4	5	6
My family will be proud of me if one day I master the English language.	1	2	3	4	5	6
It is my parents' hope that one day I will speak English fluently.	1	2	3	4	5	6
The people who are important to me hope that one day I will master the English language.	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Ought-to L2 Self Own</i>						
If I don't improve my English, it will have a negative impact on my future.	1	2	3	4	5	6
If I don't work on my English, I will fail in my future career.	1	2	3	4	5	6
If I don't work on my English, I will fail in my social life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
If I don't work on my English, I will fail in school/university.	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Ought-to L2 Self Other</i>						
If I don't learn English, I will disappoint my parents/teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
My family puts a lot of pressure on me to learn English.	1	2	3	4	5	6
If I fail to learn English, my family/teachers will blame me	1	2	3	4	5	6
It will upset my family/teachers if I fail to learn English	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix C**Attitude toward English Pronunciation Learning Scale**

Instructions: The following statements inquire about your attitudes toward the importance of pronunciation. For each item, please indicate your answer to each question by circling the appropriate number below it.

1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Somewhat Disagree;
4 = Somewhat Agree; 5 = Agree; 6 = Strongly Agree

<i>Importance of Pronunciation Learning</i>						
1. I enjoyed learning English pronunciation (AMTB)	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I think learning to pronounce well is important for learning a language (AMTB)	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I think learning English pronunciation is not a waste of time (AMTB)	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. English pronunciation is an important part of the English language learning program (AMTB).	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I'm concerned with my progress in learning English pronunciation. (PAI)	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I think English pronunciation learning is as important as learning vocabulary and grammar. (PAI)	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. I think more emphasis should be given to proper pronunciation in class. (PAI)	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Pronunciation Learning for Communicative Purpose</i>						
8. Communicating is much more important than sound like a native speaker of English. (PAI)	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I would rather spend class time working on communicating in my second language, instead of spending time on practicing English pronunciation (PAI).	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. I think I will be satisfied with my English pronunciation as long as people who speak English can understand me (AMTB)	1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Importance of Native Accent</i>						
11. Sounding like a native speaker is important to me when learning English pronunciation. (PAI)	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Acquiring native pronunciation in learning English is important to me. (PAI)	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. I try to imitate native English speakers as much as possible. (PAI)	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix D

Demographic Information

1. Gender:

- ① Male ② Female

2. What is your age?

3. Which country are you from?

4. What is your current status at FSU?

- ① Undergraduate student ② Graduate student ③ Others: _____

5. Have you spent any time in an English-speaking country, and if so, for how long? (including the time you have stayed in the U.S).

- ① No, never
② Yes, for less than 6 months
③ Yes, for more than 6 months but less than 1 year
④ Yes, for more than 1 year but less than 3 years
⑤ Yes, for more than 5 years

6. Have you ever taken an English pronunciation class to improve your pronunciation skills?

- ① No, never
② Yes, for less than 3 months
③ Yes, for more than 3 months but less than 6 months
④ Yes, for more than 6 months but less than 1 year
⑤ Yes, for more than 1 year

7. Are you currently taking any English pronunciation courses? ① Yes ② No