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ABSTRACT

Increasing numbers of Latino immigrants continue to enter the United States. Many people have strong feelings about Spanish and Spanish-accented speech, and they believe that these immigrants should learn to speak English as soon as possible. This has given rise to official English bills at both the state and federal levels. This study investigates the attitudes that Iowans have toward Spanish-accented English and how these attitudes relate to language and political issues in Iowa.

The study examines three questions: (1) Do native English speaking Iowa university students react more negatively to accented English as opposed to non-accented English? (2) Are native Spanish speakers more likely to be assigned certain negative characteristics (according to native English speaking Iowans) than native English speakers or other non-native English speakers? (3) Do native English speaking Iowans react more negatively to accented English when they hold negative opinions toward immigration and cultural diversity in Iowa?

Twenty-six native English-speaking Iowa State University students who were long-time Iowa residents were surveyed about their opinions on language and political issues in Iowa, and their reactions to speech samples by native English speakers, native Spanish speakers, and other non-native English speakers and evaluated them on several characteristic scales. The data were analyzed using the Wilcoxon rank sums test on the SAS system.

The results showed that the evaluators reacted more negatively to accented speech, especially the Spanish-accented speech. The native Spanish speakers were assigned negative characteristics, such as unintelligent and unreliable, more often than the other non-native
English speakers and the native English speakers. The results for the third research question were mixed. They seemed to show some correlations between attitudes toward language and political issues and attitudes toward accent for the other non-native English speakers. However, the results also appeared to reveal a clear distinction between the attitudes of the higher-bias group and the lower-bias group.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Historically, many Americans have been suspicious of foreigners who want to enter the United States. Early settlers from Great Britain often disdained newer immigrants both for their ability to speak English and for their suspect morality. The cycle repeated when new groups of immigrants from different countries arrived, with the slightly more established residents mistreating the newcomers as they had been mistreated. This cycle has continued into the present day, with some Americans still holding a variety of opinions about new immigrants, stereotyping all immigrants of certain nationalities the same way. For example, some think that all Mexicans are illegal aliens who cross the border to work in factories or packing plants without paying any taxes. Some people assume that they only come to this country to make a little money and have no desire to learn the English language or become part of American society. In addition, race, color, and religion can trigger strong emotions, especially when someone of that race, color, or religion has committed a violent act.

Stereotypes about immigrants have existed for many years. Many believed that immigrants from different native language backgrounds would negatively impact the English language and create other problems. Some were worried about the large influx of Germans in the eighteenth century, although most believed that English would be preserved as the most used language (Baron 1982, p. 26). Others clearly had concerns about Mexicans: in 1777, William Robertson described Mexicans as “fierce” and “detestable,” as well as inferior to all other North Americans. McLaren and Muñoz (2000) said that, “The assessment that Robertson offered of Mexicans was fundamentally informed by his repugnant low estimation of the character of Spaniards as well as of Mexican aboriginals, whose racial
fusion gave rise to the modern biological Mexican archetype” (p. 30). In 1911, the U.S. Immigration Commission, or Dillingham Commission, released a report that determined “the new immigrants were inferior intellectually, racially, and educationally; were not learning English, assimilating, or naturalizing quickly enough; and were criminally inclined” (p. 106). It seems clear that the nation was still trying to adapt to its growing diversity.

It is interesting to note that when the United States was founded, the founding fathers did not “designate English as the national language” (Crawford 1992, p. 36). The topic was discussed, but deemed unnecessary at that time. In fact, many leaders, including Thomas Jefferson, believed in learning additional languages besides English for the “practical advantages and opportunities for the expansion of knowledge” (p. 22). French, German, and Spanish were important, widely-used languages at various points in the history of the United States. For example, since the French originally settled Louisiana, the influence remains there, in descendents of original French settlers, Acadians from Canada who speak Cajun, and West Africans who speak French Creole (Molesky 1988, p. 40). German immigrants taught their own language in schools around the country until anti-German sentiment during World War I brought that to a halt. Some Amish and Mennonite groups still speak the language, but their population is quite small (p. 41). Spanish is the most common foreign language spoken in the United States, although the Spanish-speaking immigrants today are different from those of the past. Molesky attributes its survival to its status as the “oldest European culture,” as well as the proximity of the United States to both Mexican and some Caribbean islands (p. 44). Other immigrants have also brought their native languages at various points in history, but despite all this, English has been the most-used language in the country since the American Revolution.
According to Leibowicz (1992), Americans showed both positive and negative reactions to immigrants in the early twentieth century, but the overriding theme was the importance of “making Americans out of foreigners as quickly as possible” (p. 105). Out of that emerged the thought that the English language was the most important unifying factor. Therefore, simply learning English was not sufficient; the immigrants also needed to erase their native languages. Clearly, these beliefs placed many obstacles in the way of immigrants that made reaching their goals more difficult.

Official English

Official English laws throughout history have been seen as a way of (sympathetically) creating unity out of diversity while also (not so sympathetically) putting up fences and creating barriers. According to Crawford (1992), Americans must know about “the historic role of English in American identity and our past responses to minority tongues,” among other things, in order to make a responsible, intelligent decision about any future language policies (p. 6). Supporters of official English policies believe “reaffirming the preeminence of English means reaffirming a unifying force in American life” (p. 2). In other words, immigrants would be encouraged to become a part of the American society through learning English. Those who oppose such a proposal feel that making English the official language is not unifying at all; instead, by taking away services for immigrants in their native languages, this policy would alienate and separate them from native English speakers even more. It seems clear that the whole debate involving immigrants and languages is much more complicated than many are willing to believe.
Many states have passed measures within the last twenty years that make English the official language. However, U.S. English, the organization that has encouraged such laws, has been more interested in passing laws than in helping immigrants assimilate. Norman Cousins, who had been on its advisory board, resigned in 1986 after he found out 40,000 Los Angeles residents were on waiting lists for ESL classes. Proposition 63, which established English as “the common language” in California, had been passed earlier that same year. Cousins’ concern was “discrimination against language minorities” (p. 92). Two years later, after Official English amendments were passed in Arizona, Colorado, and Florida, there were reports of “a rise in incidents of discrimination against minority language speakers” (p. 93). Although none of the ESL learners could instantly learn English the second the law was passed, they were penalized instantly. After all, English is a second language for them, and learning it would take instruction and time.

One focus of the present research is the attitudes that native English-speaking Americans have toward accented English. Preconceptions about what a person sounds like can have a strong effect on responses to a group. According to Cargile et al. (1994), “it is what a speaker is perceived to be and how they are perceived to sound and communicate that is often more important in determining hearers’ language attitudes and subsequent behaviours” (p. 216). In other words, if the hearer’s perception of the speaker is negative, the accent certainly plays a role in that bias. Additionally, that bias often extends to characteristics about the speakers, such as their intelligence, their dependability, and their ambition. Many studies have shown that people judge others simply by hearing qualities of their voices.
Many immigrants have come to the United States in recent years in search of jobs and a better income for themselves and their families. Often they look for unskilled factory positions, which pay better than similar positions in their native countries. A contributing factor is that Americans have become more educated and therefore look for white-collar jobs rather than the blue-collar jobs of the past. This opens up more factory positions that still need to be filled by both legal and illegal residents. These factories are spread out all over the United States, some in areas of the country with predominantly white, non-Hispanic populations. Because of the influx of immigrants, the residents of these cities have had to rethink their attitudes.

**Immigration in Iowa**

Iowa, which has been largely a white, non-Hispanic state, has found itself experiencing such an influx. Between 1990 and 2000, Iowa’s overall population increased by 5.4 percent; the Asian population grew by 47.8 percent, while the Hispanic population increased by 152.6 percent (http://www.fairus.org). Perry and Marshalltown, Iowa are two communities that are home to meat packing plants, and both have shown mixed reactions that reflect both welcoming and resentful attitudes toward Hispanic immigrants. Perry has hosted Hispanic festivals to enable Hispanics to celebrate and share their own traditions. Both communities offer a number of English as a Second Language (ESL) classes, but many people are still on waiting lists for these classes. However, Marshalltown also passed a resolution that all governmental documents should only be printed in English, which means the new residents who have not learned English yet are denied access.
Other examples of smaller Iowa towns with increased immigrant populations are Storm Lake and Postville. Like Perry, Storm Lake is home to a meat packing plant. The town hired interpreters and put up signs in several different languages to help the newcomers. Postville has a turkey-processing plant, which drew immigrants like Zenida and Adolfo Calderon in 1995, as reported in a Sunday, November 19, 2000 article in the *Waterloo-Cedar Falls Courier*. In 1990, Postville had 1,467 white residents – and five non-white residents. Now it includes an estimated 400 Hispanics, 200 Hasidic Jews, and 200 Eastern Europeans. The school district has hired several ESL teachers and interpreters, and others organized “diversity teams” to help unite immigrants and other residents, including the Hasidic Jews who are not immigrants in the traditional sense. However, many still have reservations about the newest arrivals and think their town would be better off without them.

In June 2000, the Iowa 2010 Strategic Council proposed that Iowa should welcome more immigrants if the state is to prosper in the coming years. The council believed that the immigrants could help fill a surplus of jobs, but the proposal was met with much debate. In the winter of 2000, Iowa Governor Tom Vilsack named Mason City, Fort Dodge, and Marshalltown as “model communities to attract and welcome immigrants to Iowa” (*Waterloo-Cedar Falls Courier*, July 26, 2001). This was part of his New Iowans Pilot Project, in which the three communities would each receive $50,000 in state money to plan how to welcome immigrants. Not all residents, however, welcomed the initiative. That next summer, petition drives were started in Mason City and Fort Dodge by residents who did not want immigrants to come in and take their jobs away while driving down wages.

Based on their race, color, and accent, Hispanics, legal and illegal, are often grouped together as one entity. They are categorized as illegal immigrants who do not want to pay
taxes or learn English. Many think they are all from Mexico and work in meatpacking plants and as agricultural laborers. Some Americans feel like this group is trying to take over the country with a different language and different traditions. For this reason, among others, there have been several English-only bills in the Iowa legislature; proponents believe that making English the official state language will unify the state under one language. On March 1, 2002, Iowa governor Tom Vilsack signed into law an official English bill that had already been approved by the state Senate and House of Representatives. Iowa is the 27th state to enact some form of official English legislation, according to a front-page article of the Saturday, March 2, 2002, edition of The Des Moines Register. This decision and the arguments both for and against it will be explained further in Chapter 2.

Purpose

This study aims to examine the attitudes that native Iowans possess toward Spanish-accented English in order to determine if there is a correlation between attitudes about political issues, such as English-only laws and immigration, and attitudes toward accented speech. The specific questions being addressed in this research are as follows: (1) Do native English speaking Iowa university students react more negatively to accented English as opposed to non-accented English? (2) Are native Spanish speakers more likely to be assigned certain negative characteristics (according to native English speaking Iowans) than native English speakers or other non-native English speakers? (3) Do native English speaking Iowans react more negatively to accented English when they hold negative opinions toward immigration and cultural diversity in Iowa?
I hypothesized that Iowa State students would in fact respond more negatively to the accents of the native Spanish speakers by giving them lower rankings than the native English speakers and other non-native speakers. I also believed there would be a correlation between the attitudes toward accented speech and the attitudes shown regarding immigration and official English policies. In other words, I predicted that the results would show that those evaluators who show a greater bias toward immigrants would also judge the speakers more negatively.

The importance of this study has been revealed in the emotional arguments both for and against the official English bill. New immigrants are coming to Iowa each day, and they will continue to come, unless they are told that they are no longer welcome or the plants where many of them work are shut down. It is essential to find a balance between teaching the immigrants about the American culture while helping them preserve their own culture. This study should shed some light on the stereotypes and biases that people have toward immigrants. Its purpose is to show that these opinions, especially about accents, need to be changed if any other attitudes about language issues are going to change.

From a political standpoint, it appears that the majority of Iowans do agree with making English the official language of Iowa. However, many of them also believe that immigrants should be allowed to maintain some aspects of their own cultures. It is also apparent that many people judge others by the sound of their voice without knowing anything else about them. Pedagogically, it is important to teach children and adults about different cultures, so they know that looking and sounding different is not bad. All of these items reveal a need for studies like this one.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The United States is a land of immigrants. Although many people can claim that their families have lived in this country for generations, there are many others who have just arrived here. What has not changed is the discrimination these new immigrants face when they arrive. They are instantly judged for the color of their skin and the sound of their voice. This chapter examines the attitudes toward Latino immigrants in the United States and Iowa, both past and present. Additionally, it will address proponents’ and opponents’ views about the official English policy that was recently passed in Iowa. Finally, it will evaluate the literature regarding attitudes about accented speech.

Latino Immigrants

Early settlers from Great Britain often disdained Irish and Italian immigrants because even if they knew how to speak English, they did not speak it correctly. The cycle repeated when a new group of immigrants from a different country arrived, with the slightly more established residents mistreating the newcomers as they had been mistreated. Some researchers have suggested that widespread prejudice against all Latinos began with the Mexican War and Spanish-American War (Joshi 1999). In 1845, Lansford W. Hastings offered his particularly disturbing view of Mexicans:

"... ignorance and its concomitant, superstition, together with suspicion and superciliousness, constitute the chief ingredients, of the Mexican character. More indomitable ignorance does not prevail, among any people who make the least pretensions to civilization; in truth, they are scarcely a visible grade, in the scale of intelligence ...” (p. 464).
It appears that Hastings did not even need to hear their foreign accents; he simply dismissed the Mexican people on the basis of their surmised "ignorance."

There was a large increase in Mexican immigrants in the early 1900s, yet Hastings' views continued to prevail, as evidenced by the following statements by John Box, a Methodist minister and United States representative from 1919-1931:

"Every reason which calls for the exclusion of the most wretched, ignorant, dirty, diseased, and degraded people of Europe or Asia demands that the illiterate, unclean, peonized masses moving this way from Mexico be stopped at the border" (p. 480).

Box also called for "the protection of American racial stock from further degradation or change through mongrelization," and he said, "The Mexican peons are illiterate and ignorant" (pp. 481-482). All of these beliefs came to be associated with a distrust of anyone of Latino descent. These negative attitudes surrounding the general population clearly affected American views of Latinos (and more specifically Mexicans) for years to come.

The 1910 Mexican Revolution, combined with increased economic development in the U.S., encouraged many to go north. According to Romo (1975), more than one million Mexican immigrants came to the U.S. between 1910 and 1930 (p. 25). Interestingly, Mexican immigration was not halted during that time, like Oriental and European immigration, because various industries, especially in the Southwest, needed the Mexican workers. Many came first because of the development of the railroad, which soon extended to Los Angeles; later, large numbers of general laborers came for the job opportunities. Often the husband and father of a family came first to find work, and later brought his wife and children to live with him when he had earned a sufficient amount of money.

Mexicans were needed during World War I, when they helped keep some industries running while American men were at war. Some found their way to Midwestern cities in the
1920s and changed the complexion of those communities. When the laws restricting immigrants did not include Mexicans, some opponents tried to change them since they "considered Mexicans nonassimilable or undesirable as an ethnic group" (Lopez 1995, p. 41). This attitude is similar to some current beliefs, in that many today still think Mexicans are undesirable. The Great Depression slowed down the arrival of Mexicans, because fewer jobs were available, but Mexicans had already become a part of many communities in the Midwest and Southwest.

After the Great Depression, the demand for unskilled labor increased again, creating a new wave of immigrants (Valdés 1988). Some consider Mexicans to be a part of two large periods of immigration. The first lasted until the 1960s, when the Bracero Program was terminated. This 22-year program was a "contract labor program intended to relieve the shortage in agriculture" (Morales and Bonilla 1993, p. 18). That was replaced by the Border Industrialization Program in Mexico to help displaced laborers find positions in maquiladoras, which are "export platform industries" (p. 18). However, the net result of the second period of immigration has been many undocumented workers, who continue to make their way into the U.S. in search of higher-paying jobs. Despite their hopes, many Latinos still struggle to find consistent employment with often-limited skills, and they do not make nearly as much money as white males in similar positions (p. 25).

The 1980s gave way to a different type of immigration. Residents of Latin American countries, in both Central and South America, made their way to the United States in search of better jobs. Cubans, who had begun to come to the United States after Castro took control in 1959, continued to populate the city of Miami and all of Dade County, Florida (Ferree 1995). The Latino population increased by 16 percent between 1980 and 1985 (Valdés
Some were professionals in their native countries who could not find work or make sufficient money to support their families, so they came to the U.S. to work in less skilled jobs and make more money (Salas 1991). A number of young students have come to study here because the schools simply are not providing them with an adequate education. They have also changed the complexion of the United States. This has led to many problems among citizens who are unhappy about the changes in the complexion of the United States.

Valdés (1988) also points out an interesting difference between “Mexican-origin immigrants” and other groups. The former group has three types: permanent immigrants, who come here and plan to make this their home; short-term immigrants, who come for 10-12 weeks and then go back to Mexico; and cyclical immigrants, who come for certain seasons, usually without their families, and eventually return to Mexico (p. 112). The first group usually learns English, and their children’s children will likely be monolingual English speakers. The second group rarely learns any English, and the third group learns enough to survive while they are here in the U.S.

Morales and Bonilla (1993) reached three conclusions about Latinos. First, their labor is essential to maintain the low-end jobs that are needed in many industries. They have proven that they are willing to accept less pay, so they are stuck in those positions. Next, Latinos are far behind all other ethnic groups in terms of education received. They are much less likely to go to college, and many even struggle to finish high school. Last, it seems that this is more of a “class” issue than a “race” issue, based mainly on the lack of education and the failure to attain higher prestige positions (pp. 48-49). These problems seem to be closely tied to the immigrant status of many Latinos. If they have moved around many times and had their schooling interrupted as children, they will probably not go to college. They will
also have the example of their parents, who may be hard workers but continue to work in low prestige jobs for minimal pay. The cycle then continues through another generation.

Latinos may also face discrimination when they apply for jobs. The Urban Institute Press, led by Cross et al. (1990), looked at low-skilled, entry-level positions, which are sometimes filled by Latino young adults. The researchers used newspaper ads for San Diego and Chicago, two cities in very different area of the country, and chose 16 college students, half Anglo and half Latino, as testers (p. 20). The testers went through a maximum of three stages – application, interview, and job offer. The overall results showed that Anglos received 33 percent more interviews and 52 percent more job offers than Latinos (p. 42). Latinos were also at least three times more likely to receive “unfavorable treatment” at both the interview and job offer stages. The results also revealed more negative reactions toward Latinos in Chicago than San Diego, and the researcher theorized that this could be attributed to San Diego’s proximity to Mexico and larger Latino population (p. 55). It seems that San Diego residents may be more comfortable with the Spanish-speaking population. Although Chicago is also home to Latino immigrants, they have not lived there for as many years, which could also lead to negative feelings toward that group because they are relative newcomers. Therefore, both groups of Latino immigrants face discrimination, but that may stem from different reasons.

Latina women who are immigrants may also face difficulties in their adjustment to American culture. Many Spanish-speaking countries, especially Mexico, are patriarchal, and women are expected to submit to their husbands. Often they do not work, but instead stay home with the children and take care of household chores. They depend heavily on their extended families for assistance. However, when they come to the United States, that
extended family may be left back in Mexico. To help support their families, the women may have to work for low wages in undesirable jobs. It has been shown that Latina women nationwide make less than non-Latinas (López 129). Additionally, they have to struggle to learn English, often because they do not have enough time to study, due to family and job obligations.

**Early Iowa Immigrants**

Iowa began as a state of immigrants, like every other state. One example of an area of mixed immigrants was Hibernia, which was a neighborhood in Burlington during the 1800s. Hibernia was an Irish, mostly Catholic neighborhood from the 1850s to the 1890s (Rogers 2000). Previously, the Germans had been the largest ethnic group, followed by the Irish and the Swedes, but new job opportunities and the topography of the city, which reminded the Irish immigrants of Ireland, brought increased numbers to Burlington. Two industries, Murray Iron Works and the Embalming Burial Case Company, opened operations in Hibernia during those years. St. Patrick’s Catholic Church was built in the neighborhood in 1870.

Most of the new immigrants were general laborers; although it had previously been thought that the railroad brought them to Iowa, very few actually worked for the railroads. In 1850, there were 63 Irish households; by 1870, that number had leapt to 230 households (Rogers 2000). The opening of McCosh Iron and Steel Company and Burlington Vinegar and Pickle Works in the 1880s and 1890s created even more jobs. The immigrants also formed the West End Improvement Club in an attempt to obtain public improvements for the
area. The different ethnic groups did not seem to interact very much, but there was minimal ethnic unrest.

Other Iowa towns experienced much more racial tension. One such example occurred during World War I in Lowden, Iowa, in Cedar County. Lowden was home to a group of German-Americans who had lived there for years, some since the 19th century. According to Derr (1989), Lowden’s 1915 population included many first- or second-generation German Protestant immigrants (74 percent). However, the other residents of Cedar County were mostly long-time American citizens. The anti-German sentiments began to control the area, due in large part to World War I, and two Lutheran ministers were no longer allowed to preach in German, especially after Governor William Harding issued his “Babel Proclamation” in 1918. This meant that “Iowa became the one state to forbid conversations in foreign languages” (p. 12). That is, if any residents were caught speaking another language, they could be jailed or fined.

After that, one German man was seriously injured by an anti-German mob, and although he brought charges against them, they were found not guilty. The tension between the German and non-German communities continued until 1921. Henry Mowry, the town’s former mayor, filed suit against several men who he said had maligned his character and tried to plan a German celebration in the town. The defense tried to show the patriotism of the defendants, but in the end, the jury ruled in Mowry’s favor and awarded him $40,000. Several years later, the case was retried, and he only received $3,000. Even though the fierce struggle between the immigrants and the natives no longer exists, the German influence remains in Lowden.
New Diversity in Iowa

Today, Iowa still has a relatively small minority population, especially in comparison with most states. In 1990, Latinos comprised only 1.2 percent of the state, while Latinos accounted for 9 percent of the entire United States population. However, the overall minority population in Iowa increased between 1980 and 1990, while the white population decreased. Four counties contained 49.1 percent of Latinos in Iowa in 1990: Muscatine, Polk, Scott, and Woodbury. Overall, every county had at least 10 Latino residents. Of the 30,642 residents of Latino origin in 1990, only 5,789 were foreign born. The remainder had been born in the United States (Goudy et al. 1995). This trend of babies being born in the United States continued into the late 1990s, when Latino births more than doubled. Goudy attributed this fact to the Latino immigrant population being younger than other Iowa residents.

The 2000 data, however, showed an even greater jump in the number of Latinos in Iowa. According to Charvat Burke (2001), the 2000 census showed 82,473 Latino residents, an increase of 152.6 percent from 1990. Instead of 1.2 percent, there are now 2.8 percent Latinos in Iowa. Only Ringgold County had fewer Latinos in 2000 than in 1990, and 13 counties saw an increase of 1,000 or more residents. Eight counties experienced increases of more than 5 percent in their Latino population (p. 1).

In June 2000, the Iowa 2010 Strategic Council made recommendations to Governor Tom Vilsack. They encouraged an increase in the number of immigrants to Iowa to help fill many jobs and add to Iowa’s population. Additionally, their goal was to make Iowa an “Immigration Enterprise Zone,” which would not be affected by nationwide quotas on immigrants (Waterloo-Cedar Falls Courier, June 8, 2000). Communities would also be encouraged to welcome newcomers and help them in their adjustments to the new country.
This was met with much debate, as some legislators did not believe that bringing in more immigrants, perhaps the 100,000 that Vilsack would like to recruit, would be the answer.

The debate expanded later that year when the governor created the New Iowans Pilot Project and chose Mason City, Fort Dodge, and Marshalltown to participate. These three cities were expected to form task forces that would create a plan to welcome immigrants into their communities, thereby serving as model communities for the rest of the state. Each community received $50,000 to do so. However, after the governor created the project by executive order, without approval from the legislature, petition drives began in Mason City and Fort Dodge to protest the arrival of new immigrants, including those from Spanish-speaking countries. Their argument was that too many immigrants would take away jobs from current residents and decrease wages at the same time (Waterloo-Cedar Falls Courier, July 5, 2001). Mason City even held a town hall meeting to discuss the controversy.

The town of Postville is an interesting example of growing diversity in Iowa. According to a November 19, 2000, article in the Waterloo-Cedar Falls Courier, Postville had only five non-whites out of nearly 1,500 residents in 1990 (Garmoe 2000, p. 1). By 2000, its population had grown to include residents who could speak 20 different languages. There are approximately 400 Latinos, 200 Hasidic Jews from New York, and about 200 people from Russia and other Eastern European countries, according to the Rev. Paul Ouderkirk, a local priest. The immigrants have established their own businesses, including a Mexican grocery store and a kosher meat packing plant. They have sent their children to Postville schools and attended religious services in the town. There is a weekly Spanish mass, as well as occasional masses in Ukrainian. Postville community members also formed a diversity team, which organized workshops to unite all residents. The immigrants have
also shared their native cultures with other residents. Although many established residents are still wary of the newer residents, the community is at least trying to function with its increased diversity.

Other towns, like Marshalltown and Perry, have experienced large influxes of Latinos primarily due to meat packing plants. Marshalltown has tried to accommodate the Spanish speakers in a number of ways. For instance, St. Mary’s Catholic Church has a Spanish mass each week. The church also hosts various information fairs to give families access to services in the area. Since Latinos who come to Iowa are generally younger than the average Iowan, Latinos have more babies, and several health care organizations have collaborated to offer prenatal and postpartum care to this population. These health care organizations have interpreters on hand to help, and most forms are printed in both English and Spanish. The ESL classrooms at Marshalltown High School are full of students who are trying to learn the language. In many ways, it appears that the community has rallied around its immigrants and made them feel welcome. However, many long-time residents are still suspicious of the immigrants, and tensions are high due to the changes in the city.

Perry is a similar case. According to Hardy (2000), only 10 percent of the students in the Perry school district were minorities in 1994. By 2000, that number had jumped to 30 percent, and it continues to grow. Students begin with an intensive ELL (English Language Learners) program and then move into regular classrooms after a few weeks. They are still taken out of those classes to participate in “pullout classes” each day. By placing them in a regular classroom for a portion of the day, it is hoped that they can learn from their classmates. However, they still receive individualized attention for at least a few hours to help them master the English language. Perry also has a Diversity Committee, whose goal is
to improve relations between the different cultures. However, some public figures, including a councilman, said that they would not choose to be involved in any activities to promote diversity. Therefore, while some feel a sense of progress, others feel like there are still two very separate groups that rarely interact.

**Perceptions of Immigrants**

Viramontez (1994) conducted a study in which he examined the family experience of one Mexican-American family who had settled in north central Iowa in relation to the community. This family was in the minority in a rural farming community; there were only a few other Mexican families. The family experienced some difficult situations; for example, the father was arrested and thrown in jail for using a knife to defend himself after he had been beaten up. The children faced prejudice at school, too; they felt they were labeled as bad children, even though they had not done anything. In spite of that, the family liked the community and wanted to stay there. Viramontez concluded that some residents did not understand the Latino culture and language, although they tolerated the presence of Latinos (p. 70). He also noted that communities must be sensitive to the existing diversity, because it is not going away.

Another study, by Dettman (2000), investigated the perceptions of Latino deviance by community members and how Latinos are affected by those perceptions (p. 5). Like Viramontez, she examined a small, rural community in Iowa, which was identified by the pseudonym “New Austin” but was in fact, Postville, which was mentioned earlier. She looked at the impact that a kosher slaughterhouse and a turkey processing plant had on the town. Those industries led to an influx of Latino workers, who could earn more money by
working in factories than as seasonal migrant workers in the fields. Often, the men came first, followed by their families, and later followed by friends and other relatives who would then use the network of people to find jobs (p. 9). They basically built their own communities within the community. However, as stated before, many residents of the towns were not pleased about the changes.

In this particular situation, a large number of Hasidic Jews had immigrated to the town first. Knowing that most Iowans did not understand their religion, the group planned seminars to give information and open up communication lines. That seemed to work for a while, even though according to Dettman’s research, many residents were at first concerned about that population (p. 33). Then, it seemed as if there were suddenly large numbers of Spanish speakers who had virtually come out of nowhere. The residents were forced to deal with yet another new ethnic group, and this time, they did not adjust very well. Dettman observed conversations and interactions that reflected feelings of hostility and blatant stereotypes. Often the Latino immigrants are all put into one group, which is what happened here, despite the fact that the immigrants came from several different countries. It seemed to be easier for the longtime residents to group them all together. These problems suggest that historical attitudes toward Mexicans remain unchanged, even though they have lived in Iowa for at least a century.

In a Waterloo-Cedar Falls Courier article on March 12, 2000, Latinos discussed their desire that people do three things: “Don’t label them as illegal immigrants, don’t assume they all earn their pay in meatpacking plants, and don’t take it for granted they are all from Mexico” (Fernandez 2000, p. 1). In fact, a growing number of Latinos are going to college to become doctors, teachers, and engineers, among other things. Don Marburger, the
principal of Perry High School, said that some students who did not know English as freshmen have now received scholarships to colleges and universities (Bouma 2002). Still, when Molina (1992) looked at the position of Latina women in education, she found that they often lacked role models to show them how to succeed, and they struggled to find their place on the university level. They all faced barriers, including isolation, differential treatment, and lack of financial resources, but most of the women had managed to overcome those issues to some extent (pp. 60-62).

The concern remains that negative perceptions toward Latinos could result in “self-fulfilling prophecies whereby negative perceptions become internalized in the self-concepts of many Hispanics [Latinos]” (Jackson 1996). This was the focus of Jackson’s research in which she determined which characteristics could be termed stereotypic; that is, if at least 10 percent of the participants believed the characteristic existed, it would be called a stereotype. Among other things, Latinos were perceived by whites as “less … ambitious…, dependable…, intelligent…, (and) good-looking…” (p. 4). This unfavorable result is interesting, because the study showed that this group of whites had little contact with Latinos. Their attitudes could be attributed to the mass media, as well as other sources like families, communities, or schools. This connects to other research related to negative community feelings toward minority groups (Dettman 2000, Viramontez 1994). Flores Niemann (1998) also found that minority groups are strongly affected by “negative racial stereotypes” that are often perpetuated by the majority group (p. 1). She gave the example that some Mexican Americans even think their group members are “uneducated or uninterested in education.” Often this leads to fewer Latino students and teachers, and therefore, fewer role models, as mentioned in Molina (1992).
History of the English Language in the United States

In the past, selecting English as the official language was not considered important. Some chose, instead, to try to make “American” the official language because of the anti-British sentiments in the United States. In fact, Rep. Washington McCormick (Montana) attempted this very thing in 1923, but the bill died quickly. However, one state, Illinois, did make “American” the official language of the state. Even though everything continued to be carried out in English, not American, it remained the official language of the state until 1969, when English took over once again.

Nebraska was the first state to designate English as its official language in 1920. Hawaii has two official languages, English and Native Hawaiian. As of March 2002, 27 states have passed official English measures of some type, including Iowa, which passed it into law in March 2002. Leibowicz (1992) discusses some problems with such laws. He said the laws suggest that language is the last unifying bond that Americans possess (p. 102). However, the nation was built on liberty and tolerance as well, and both of those factors have often been tied to language. However, Leibowicz said it is not clear that “speaking English assures loyalty to American values” (p. 104). Obviously, many Americans who can speak English have done horrible things to degrade the values of this country, so that cannot be the only measure of being American.

States have frequently tried to restrict language use among immigrants. Pennsylvania forced miners to learn English in 1897. In 1918, New York required that all immigrant employees maintain enrollment in English education classes. Later, the New York Constitution was changed to include a requirement for English literacy (Leibowicz 1992, p. 106). All immigrants to the United States were required to take a literacy test beginning in
1917 at the urging of immigration restrictionists, who wanted to reduce immigration from eastern and southern Europe substantially. They believed the literacy requirement would serve to weed out undesirable immigrants who would likely not make positive contributions to American society. This so-called Americanization movement could also be termed "Anglo-conformity," and it led to a different way of thinking, "cultural pluralism" (p. 108). This new movement embraced the cultural and linguistic diversity of the United States, although most supporters believed English was the common language and should be treated as such. This philosophy has been common for many decades now, but there are signs that Anglo-conformity is once again rising to the surface. Leibowicz believes that "supporters of the E.L.A. (English Language Amendment) are afraid of Spanish and the people who speak it" (p. 109). These new immigrants are viewed as a threat to American ideals. It appears that language is not the only fear of the English-only groups; they are also concerned about Latino politicians who may take some control away from them (Fishman 1992, p. 170).

A Campaign for Official English

A national campaign to make English the official language in the United States took hold in the early 1980s. Many people were surprised, as they thought English was already the official language (Crawford 1992, p. 1). Some called it unnecessary, since most people did actually speak English. The late Senator S.I. Hayakawa even proposed an English Language Amendment in 1981, but Congress paid little attention to it. Two years later, Hayakawa founded U.S. English, an organization that has now been responsible for much of the official English legislation in the United States. Supporters believe that since English is the common language, making it the official language will serve to unify the country even
more and give immigrants more opportunities to succeed. They also emphasize that they are not against other languages, especially in the home. However, all government business would be conducted in English when official English policies are in place. That means “all official documents, records, legislation and regulations, as well as hearings, ceremonies and public meetings are conducted solely in English” (http://www.us-english.org). U.S. English supporters claim that multilingualism in government hurts immigrants’ chances of learning English quickly, so this type of law will enable them to assimilate more rapidly.

Two claims made by U.S. English especially stand out. The members believe that the separation of ethnic and language groups can in fact be harmful and create increased segregation and other problems, and that “designating English as the official language will help reverse this harmful process.” Additionally, a second claim states that “immigrants will understand that they must know English to fully participate in the process of government” (http://www.us-english.org). However, the problem remains that many immigrants do not yet know English when they arrive in the United States. How they are supposed to understand that they must know English if they do not yet know English is a question that U.S. English fails to answer.

In a January 4, 2002 press release, U.S. English Chairman and CEO Mauro E. Mújica made reference to a poll by the Des Moines Register that revealed that 81 percent of Iowans agreed with official English policies. He later praised the state of Iowa for passing an official English law, calling it “a victory for all Hawkeyes,” in a March 4, 2002 press release (http://www.us-english.org). Clearly, U.S. English had been focusing a lot of its efforts on Iowa, playing on public sentiment toward a growing immigrant population.
U.S. English also has a foundation whose goal is to assist in the English education of immigrants, as well as investigate language policy elsewhere and provide information to the public through the media. Its supporters believe in short-term, transitional language teaching that would give immigrants a base of English knowledge. They also note that there are not enough English classes to go around. Although they do have a database of ESL classes around the country, they do not offer many suggestions about where to go to learn English. It appears that passing official English bills is the first priority of U.S. English, with actual English instruction lagging behind. If immigrants need to understand that they must learn English, it would seem that English classes should be a higher priority. Again, this seems like a contradiction.

Opponents’ Views

Opponents believe the official English bills are anti-immigrant and do not welcome or unite other cultures that enter the United States. English was never declared the official language when the founding fathers were writing the Constitution; English was simply a mode of communication to them. In spite of this, or perhaps because of this, the debate will likely continue for years to come. Crawford (1992) believes Americans need to formulate a well-informed position about all aspects of the issue. To do that, they must know six things. First, it is important to know how English has historically impacted American identity. Second, there is a need to understand the arguments both for and against official English. Third, people must know about the sociological impact that various language conflicts have had on society. Fourth, various precedents have been set regarding language and civil liberties, and those must be evaluated. Fifth, it is clear that schools are affected by “linguistic
diversity,” yet this needs to be examined in greater detail. Last, the United States must be aware of how other countries have dealt with similar issues (p. 6). In short, many who are against Official English believe that the law is a quick, insufficient fix for a situation that needs a lasting solution.

It is apparent that many people are in fact trying to learn English. Rep. Stephen Solarz (D-NY) spoke in 1988 about how the official English legislation seems to punish people who are actually trying to correct their “disability,” that is, their lack of English knowledge (Crawford 1992, p. 125). In other words, many immigrants may be attempting to learn English – taking classes, practicing at home, etc. – but learning a language is a process that does not happen overnight. These students need some assistance along the way, possibly in the form of documents or signs printed in their native language so they can compare them with the English version and gain even more knowledge. Some of the English-only bills would not allow for that transition period. They could in fact “hinder the assimilation of non-English-speaking Americans into the mainstream of our society” (p. 125). Without adequate time to learn the language, frustration is likely. Many Latinos also must work several jobs in order to make enough money to support their families. They may try to find the time for English classes, but it is often difficult.

The main point is that immigrants do learn English, and it does not need to be forced. The 1988 Veltman Report revealed that 75 percent of Latino immigrants speak English daily after 15 years in the United States (Nicolau and Valdivieso 1992, p. 318). Additionally, most third generation Americans of Latino descent are completely monolingual in English. Many more immigrants will become primarily English speakers in future years; how many depends on the immigration trends. However, it is necessary to have programs in place to help them
learn the English language; it seems that creating such programs, not official English policies, should be the objective of legislators.

**Attitudes Toward Accented Speech**

No one’s speech can be considered non-accented, but certain accents are unmarked relative to the listeners. For example, people from Iowa may not recognize the speech of other Iowans as accented because they are accustomed to hearing it every day. Immigrants generally have stronger accents, especially if they did not learn English until their teenage years or later. Historically, Americans have expressed stereotypical, even racist attitudes toward foreign accents. Therefore, these attitudes can affect new immigrants in adverse ways. However, as Milroy and Milroy (1985) point out, people may express certain attitudes about language use publicly, but in fact, hold completely contrary feelings privately (p. 11). They may just feel like they need to appear a certain way to avoid being different from others. Baron (1982) refers to the “linguistic insecurity” of the American culture, which continues to regard certain accents as superior and inferior (p. 228). This, too, is an attitude that has seemed to perpetuate itself throughout history. This section will discuss the research that looks at why positive and negative attitudes toward accent exist; how those attitudes are shaped; and finally, what can be done to move past the voice and look at the actual person.

Several elements are important in examining the attitudes toward language that people possess (Cargile 1994, Cantor 1985, Fazio 1982). The first element is the goal of the listener, that is, what the listener’s purpose for the interaction really is (p. 218). If the listener has already formed ideas about what he or she wants to gain from the conversation, the participants in the conversation will probably not communicate very well. More specifically,
if the listener already dislikes Spanish accents, possibly from a negative experience with a native Spanish speaker, he or she will probably tune out the other person or discount what he or she says. This ties into Clark’s principle of mutual responsibility (Lippi-Green 1997). Both parties are supposed to share the communicative burden, but sometimes that does not happen. The first thing a person must do upon entering a new conversation with an accented person is to decide if he or she wants to accept the responsibility of the communicative burden (p. 70). According to Lippi-Green, a breakdown in communication may be “due not so much to accent as it is to negative social evaluation of the accent in question, and a rejection of the communicative burden” (p. 71). The listener may have already formed the attitude that the person is not someone to whom he or she wants to listen, so the communicative bond will be broken. Edwards (1982) echoes that belief by attributing a person’s reaction to accented speech to his or her perception of accented speakers in general (p. 20).

The second element that has an effect on the accessibility of language attitudes relates to the listener’s mood, and how his or her attitudes can be shaped by it. Giles et al. (1995), in a study on Mexican-American English, suggested that some voices may bring on a negative mood, which might have some effect on the listener when combined with other outside influences (p. 116). Ryan (1983) and Cargile (1994) also brought up the argument that “negative attitudes toward non-fluent and accented speakers of second languages can arise directly from the affect engendered by intelligibility problems” (p. 219). More recent research has revealed similar results. Akers (1996) found that the order of speakers on a tape affected the listeners’ attitudes. She concluded, “If a listener felt irritated by the first speaker, it is possible that the following speakers were downgraded because the first voice had put
him/her into a bad mood” (36). Although the connection is not completely clear, it seems evident that mood can have some effect on attitudes toward accented speech.

People with accents often face discrimination because of the way they speak. Lippi-Green (1997) presents a model of what she terms the “language subordination process” (p. 68). It includes several points, including the fact that “language is mystified,” meaning that a non-native speaker can never learn to speak correctly without a lot of help from someone who does speak well. The model also emphasizes native speakers as authority figures who are always correct, and trivializes language that is not mainstream by saying “how cute” or “how funny” it is. Those who conform to speaking the language in the “proper” manner are shown as good examples of what the others should become. Some people may face threats if they do not conform to proper speech. The non-native speakers face all these difficulties, and yet, when they make the attempt to learn, they still continue to face ridicule because their speech is never perfect enough (Lippi-Green 1997, Gallois and Callan 1981).

Immigrants do seem to recognize the importance of adjusting their accents, yet attitudes of potential employers toward accented speech have a strong impact on employment decisions. Many of these choices about who to hire are affected by accent, as evidenced by a study by de la Zerda and Hopper (1979). They learned that applicants without an accent would be more likely to obtain supervisory positions, whereas those with a stronger accent would be relegated to semi-skilled jobs (Hurtado and Gurin 1995, p. 91). When this happens, many native Spanish speakers feel like they have no choice but to give up their native language and virtually assimilate with the English-speaking community. Thompson (1975) also conducted a study of Mexican-American men to investigate whether or not accent would make a difference in applying for a job. He found the following: “Those who
had a non-ethnic regional pronunciation believed that accent was of primary importance in obtaining employment, and most reported having consciously developed their accents” (Carranza 1982, p. 77). Others also believe that non-standard speech, which includes differences in grammar, pronunciation, and accent, can abruptly stop conversations, end job interviews, and take away other opportunities (Honey 1989, p. 71). However, other Latino men have reported that accent was not an issue in the workforce, so most of them have not adjusted their pronunciation. In other words, unlike what many Americans think, Latinos are making a conscious choice about their accents.

Even back in the 1940s, Mexican Americans appeared to have similar thoughts and attitudes toward the American culture, according to Friday (1999):

“Instead, large proportions of Mexican Americans and Mexican immigrants, especially those of the working class, considered themselves resident aliens and took pride in maintaining and recreating a distinctive culture. Much more than some nostalgic grasping at the past, this transborder culture, though it did have its divisions and conflicts, provided some measure of power and effectiveness” (p. 122).

In other words, it was not that these Mexican Americans did not want to become a part of mainstream American culture; they simply wanted to integrate parts of it into their native culture to create a new reality. They “held a desire to define self-worth in their own culturally specific ways” (p. 123). However, the longtime residents were continually grouped with new immigrants and quickly became frustrated with the situation. In reality, each new group that arrived in America wanted to form its own identity without being stereotyped as one component of the Latino masses. Unfortunately, the media continues to perpetuate common stereotypes in movies and television that only reflect small aspects of each ethnic group.
Brennan et al. (1980) evaluated the language background, as well as cultural and language attitudes, of Mexican American high school students in both Chicago and Kansas City. They found that the students mostly preferred English over Spanish and “viewed accentedness as a handicap,” although they had positive attitudes about bilingualism (p. 152). Interestingly, more students in Kansas City felt that a strong accent would cause problems like increased discrimination for them, possibly because Kansas City is less diverse than Chicago. In addition, the students with lesser accents felt more control over their situation, and they experienced more freedom to accomplish what they wanted without as much fear of stereotyping or other discrimination (p. 153). The more English-dominant they were, the less pressure they felt about their accents. Ryan et al. (1982) agree with the finding that all speakers make decisions about their own speech style, and those choices are impacted by a variety of factors, including personal characteristics, social group memberships, and psychological states. The speaker has to determine what is more important: fitting in with the rest of society or holding strongly to the beliefs of a native, foreign culture.

Status and Solidarity

Some researchers have also studied the effects of accent on status and solidarity ratings. Brennan and Brennan (1981) examined judgments of both naive raters and linguists when they evaluated Anglo and Mexican American speech (p. 210). They believed that a stronger accent would result in a great difference between the status and solidarity scores. They used two scaling methods in their research, magnitude estimation and sensory-modality matching, to investigate their hypothesis (p. 489). They also believed that Mexican-Americans would approve of accented speech much more than Anglos would. In addition,
they proposed an Accentedness Index, to predict status and solidarity reaction scores (p. 211). After completing their study, they concluded that accent, and by extension, the Accentedness Index, were both closely tied to status (p. 217). However, differing levels of accent did not result in varied solidarity ratings. Interestingly, the Anglo and Mexican-American raters did not differ overall in their evaluations. Brennan and Brennan proposed that a future study could look at “the degree of accentedness in the raters' own speech” and relate it both to “their accentedness ratings of other speakers and their perception of their own nonstandardness” (p. 500).

Giles et al. (1995) theorized that native English speakers would receive more positive responses regarding superiority characteristics than Spanish-accented speakers, which they found to be true (p. 107). Additionally, their study included an examination of the English-only movement; they wanted to see if the position held by the speakers had any impact on the listeners’ ratings. First, subjects completed a brief questionnaire on social issues, including attitudes toward the English-only movement. One week later, the subjects listened to a tape about the movement; the subjects who had seemed to be for the English-only movement listened to an anti-English-only movement passage, and those who had responded against it listened to a pro-English-only movement passage (p. 112). Then they responded to an additional questionnaire to elicit attitudes about the speakers and the passage. As in other studies, Spanish-accented speakers were downgraded more than the native English speakers. They expressed different, more negative viewpoints on the questionnaire if the speaker was Spanish-accented, and also in response to the message that they heard on the tape (p. 116). These results reflect the need for further study in this area.
When people hear an unfamiliar accent, Honey (1989) believes there are three factors that influence their reactions: intelligibility, distraction, and prejudice (p. 97). The spoken words might be difficult to understand, which distracts the listeners, and those factors may lead to feelings of dislike for the speaker. As Lippi-Green (1997) relates, "... the wrong English, accented English ... literally stinks of unwashed humanity" (p. 234). This is perhaps a harsh, over-exaggerated statement, but shows that it is particularly important to look at the stereotypes about native Spanish speakers, because research shows that "speakers with Spanish accents are consistently downgraded - more so than speakers with other nonnative accents" (Zuengler 1988, p. 35). Other studies have given light to similar results. According to Carranza (1982), "Attitudinal research among college students also revealed negative reactions to speakers of accented English" (p. 77). This is in relation to studies by Arthur et al. (1974) and Flores and Hopper (1975), both of which showed higher ratings for standard English speakers over Mexican-American English speakers. Interestingly, Sebastian and Ryan (1985) held the view that speech styles could make listeners uncomfortable, and that their negative feelings, instead of merely stereotypes about the speakers, could cause them to rate the speakers more negatively (p. 113). However, it would probably be difficult to demonstrate this; it is likely that listeners' evaluations result from a combination of experiences and feelings.

**Formation of Attitudes**

Some studies have examined how language attitudes are formed. Sebastian and Ryan (1985) investigated attitudes toward Spanish-accented English, mainly whether negative attitudes are formed due to the ethnic groups of the speakers, the social class they belong to,
or a combination of the two. Evaluators listened to speech samples by two speakers of Spanish-accented English and two speakers of standard American English; they were asked to rate them on a variety of personality characteristics. The research revealed that “being either a standard speaker or a middle class person resulted in favourable evaluations while being both a Spanish-accented speaker and a lower class person led to especially negative evaluations” (p. 118). This confirms other studies, which showed that accents and class judgments have a strong effect on listeners’ reactions to speech.

A second study, by Sebastian, Ryan, and Corso (1985), again used native English and native Spanish speakers, but this study included native Spanish speakers from three different proficiency levels, low, medium, and high. Subjects were asked to evaluate each speaker’s social class and personality, as well as potential agreement on several social and relationship issues. The findings revealed correlations “between perceived accentedness and each of the social reaction indices” (p. 120). Therefore, attitudes toward accent and feelings about social issues may be connected, although further research should be conducted to verify this link.

Other studies found that Americans still tend to stereotype on the basis of accent, depending on their attitudes about it. “It seems reasonable, then, to assume that evaluations by native speakers of non-native speech are influenced by listener attitude” (Delamere 1996, p. 282). The speakers in Delamere’s study were from five different language backgrounds: Farsi, Malay, French, Arabic, and Spanish. She used a semantic differential questionnaire with a matched-guise technique, which involves hearing a non-native speaker read the same passage twice, once correctly and later with errors that ESL students would tend to make. When speakers made errors, the listeners made few distinctions between the different nationalities. According to Delamere, this suggests a strong stereotype about the similarities
among foreigners. In contrast, “the speakers were viewed as quite separate and distinct individuals” when they did not make any errors (p. 284). In the end, the Arabic and Farsi speakers received better ratings when they spoke without errors, while the Arabic and Malay speakers were more highly regarded when they spoke with errors. Interestingly, the Spanish speakers were rated the same with or without errors (p. 291). Delamere concluded that “it simply did not matter to the listeners if (the Spanish speaker) made errors or not suggesting that the profile of characteristics associated with a Latino accent constituted a strong salient feature which remained unchanged whether this voice made errors or not” (p. 292). From that, it could also be deduced that people are more accustomed to the Latino accent, and they just interpret the errors as part of Latino speech as a whole. Delamere also believes in a point “when accent ceases to merely signal ‘foreignness’ and becomes recognizable as being from a specific cultural group” (p. 293).

Edwards (1982) makes perhaps the most important point to remember when he discusses how language attitudes only reflect “social judgements, ones of taste, preference, and convention” (p. 30). The danger is when people consider accents to be the only quality by which people should be evaluated. Just because a person speaks with an accent does not mean he or she lacks other valuable skills. Baugh (1981) suggests that social differences are reinforced when some people speak with a foreign accent (p. 10). Stereotypes also continue when different ethnic groups do not intermingle very often. The group members then find it necessary to either blend in by conforming to American cultural norms or continue to adhere to their native cultural standards, which results in many conflicts, both internal and external.
CHAPTER 3: METHODS AND MATERIALS

This chapter presents the methods used in this study, including a description of the subjects, procedures, and data analysis. Many studies have used a modification of the matched guise technique to elicit attitudes about accented language. While the current study uses this technique as well, it also uses a survey to elicit other attitudes that do not rely on spoken language. Only one other study, by Cunningham-Andersson (1997), in Sweden, attempts a similar combination of tasks. It is hoped that the combination of these two tasks, giving opinions on language and political issues related to immigrant groups, and listening to and evaluating accented speech, will lead to greater insights into the attitudes that Caucasian, non-Latino English speakers have toward immigrant groups.

Development of Survey

The researcher developed the statements on the survey through reading about current language and political issues, such as official English laws, immigration policies, and cultural diversity issues, in several newspapers, including The Des Moines Register and The Tribune in Ames. Other statements concerning non-language issues, including the death penalty, gun control, human cloning research, and identification of sexual offenders, were created to act as distracters so the students would not be fully aware of the purpose of the questionnaire. Those issues were also chosen from recent newspaper articles because most of them have been widely disputed both in Iowa and the United States over the past several months and years.
A total of 25 statements were created, one of which was used as an example on the survey. Of the remaining 24 statements, 15 concerned political and language issues in four general categories: official English, preservation of culture, cultural sensitivity, and new immigrants. The remaining nine statements concerned other non-language issues. No other surveys were used as a basis for this instrument, because the researcher was unable to find any other studies that looked at these types of opinions (what was being evaluated in this particular study). The responses were measured on a five-point scale, ranging from disagree (1) to neither agree nor disagree (3) to agree (5).

Recording of the Stimuli

The spoken samples were recorded by a total of 16 speakers. Approval to use the subjects was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of Iowa State University. The first ten speakers were Mexican university students (undergraduates). They were asked to participate in this study because they were native Spanish speakers who were also studying English. Nine students were taking English classes as part of a special summer curriculum. The tenth student was studying English at a different university. The students ranged in age from 18 to 24. Three students were male, and seven were female. One male student had spent several months studying in Canada, but the remainder of the students had never studied in an English-speaking country. Their formal study of English ranged from three to fourteen years; however, their overall level of spoken proficiency did not vary greatly, according to informal evaluations in the classroom during their summer courses and conversations outside the classroom by both the researcher and several other teachers. That their spoken proficiency is similar despite the variance of formal study reveals the emphasis of most
English classes in Mexico, which is a focus on written grammatical exercises, not oral activities.

The next four speakers came from several different language backgrounds. They were all undergraduate students at an American university at the time this study was completed. They were either currently enrolled in an English composition class or had previously taken such a class. Their native languages were Mandarin, Tamil, Arabic, and Malay. Several also spoke additional languages. All of them had studied English for at least 10 years before coming to study in the United States. Three were male and one was female. The remaining two speakers, one male and one female, were native English speakers. Both were born and raised in the United States, one in North Dakota and one in Iowa, and they were also studying at an American university. These six speakers ranged in age from 19 to 28. They were chosen to include different accents that may or may not have been familiar to the evaluators. It was hypothesized that the evaluators would rate the native Spanish speakers lower than the other speakers, so these speakers were included to see if that hypothesis would be supported.

All 16 speakers were asked to complete a preliminary questionnaire, in which I asked them to write their full name, field of study, number of years studying English, courses taken, native country and language, foreign study, and any other relevant information about their ability to speak English (i.e. watching movies or television programs in English, listening to music in English, chatting with native English speakers on the Internet, etc.). They also signed a consent form to give the researcher permission to use their data in the study. Finally, all of the speakers completed a brief feedback survey, in which they rated the difficulty of the activities and their feelings about completing the tasks.
The speakers were given two brief passages, one about elephants and the other about the outlook for certain jobs. The content of both passages was fairly neutral, in that it did not indicate any specific information about the speaker, such as nationality or native language. Most studies that involve speaker evaluation use similar, relatively neutral passages. The speakers were given several minutes to read each passage silently and ask the researcher questions if they did not know how to pronounce certain words or understand the meaning of a sentence. Then, the speakers read the two passages into the tape recorder. They were given the option to record each passage twice if they were not pleased with their initial attempt, but they were not obligated to do so. Five of the sixteen speakers chose to record the first passage twice, while four speakers recorded the second passage twice.

Next, the speakers were presented with two questions and asked to prepare a brief response to each question. The two questions are as follows: 1) Describe your favorite holiday in as much detail as you can. Tell about how your family celebrates it and what makes it special, and 2) What do you think are the characteristics that make a person successful, and why? Again, they were given several minutes to write down notes to help them remember what they wanted to say, and they were also offered the chance to record a second time if necessary. In several cases, noise outside the classroom (in Mexico) forced the speakers to record their responses twice.

When all the voices had been recorded, the second portion of the recordings (free speech) was eliminated from further research. It was determined that the sentences in the two passages could be controlled much more precisely than the free speech from the answered questions. This control was necessary because the evaluators would be listening to the speakers and making judgments solely about their accents. If the spoken sentences were
ungrammatical or difficult to understand, the evaluators' opinions would already be somewhat biased toward the speaker, and it was important to avoid that type of bias. Since the researcher already had the words for each passage, it would be much easier to keep that aspect constant.

It was then decided to use four sentences from each passage. These sentences were carefully chosen for their length, which was between 11 and 23 words, as well as because the majority of the speakers pronounced the words in the sentences correctly without any abnormal pauses between words. Additionally, each sentence except one could be understood when it stood alone, meaning there were no pronouns without the noun to which they referred. For example, the evaluators would not be confused about who "they" are because the sentence had already mentioned "elephants". In the one case where a pronoun was used ("they" for "elephants"), the evaluators did not hear that sentence before any other sentences that referred to elephants, so the meaning was clear enough and did not distract the evaluators. These eight sentences were also spoken correctly (without errors or awkward pronunciation) by the majority of the speakers, which allowed for more flexibility in making the tapes.

Next, the researcher listened to the speakers' tapes and determined which of the eight sentences (for each speaker) were grammatically correct enough and could be used for the evaluation. Two sentences, one from the elephants passage and one from the job outlook passage, were then chosen from each speaker's sample readings. Those sentences were then organized in a way that placed two native Spanish speakers together, followed by either a native speaker of English or a native speaker of a language other than English or Spanish, followed by two more native Spanish speakers, etc. In a few cases, a single Spanish speaker...
was followed by a native speaker or other non-native speaker, but those instances were limited. Two native speakers or other non-native speakers of English were never placed together on the tapes.

**Development of Tape for Accent Study**

The master tapes that were used for the accent study were developed using the previously recorded spoken samples. They consisted of several different items. First, the researcher recorded instructions for the evaluators that were also printed on the answer sheets. Two sample sentences were also recorded to help the evaluators understand what they needed to do. Both samples were recorded twice, and then there was a pause of 20 seconds after each sample to give the evaluators time to respond. Neither sample sentence was used again during the remainder of the accent study.

Then, the evaluators were told they would begin the actual accent study, which consisted of 32 sentences, each repeated twice, with 20 seconds after the second recording of each sentence to give the evaluators adequate time to respond. This portion was the same on both tapes that were made. However, the order of the real sentences in the accent study was different on each tape. The first tape began with the 16 sentences related to elephants, while the second tape began with the 16 sentences about job outlook. The order of each set of sentences was also reversed on both tapes (tape 1 had elephant sentences 1-16, while tape 2 had elephant sentences 9-16 and 1-8). This was done to verify that the topic of the sentence would not have an effect on the way the evaluators responded. Additionally, since the evaluators had to listen and respond for 30 minutes, the order was changed in case fatigue or boredom had a role in their later responses. Some evaluators also may have determined the
purpose of the listening task when they were halfway done, so switching the order again balances out the responses. Fourteen evaluators heard the first tape that began with the sentences about elephants, while twelve heard the second tape that started with job outlook sentences.

Evaluators

The evaluators were selected from ten English composition classes at Iowa State University. Most ISU students are required to take English composition classes, so choosing students from these classes would likely result in a diverse group with a variety of hometowns and majors. The researcher obtained permission from each instructor before visiting each class to solicit volunteers for the research. The researcher read from a script during each class. The main requirement for participation was that the students be Iowans, natives of the state if possible. However, it was specified that even if the students had not been born in Iowa, but had lived in Iowa for at least half of their lives and considered Iowa their home state, they would be able to participate. This parameter was established because the political and language issues have been so heavily debated in Iowa in recent years. Additionally, many Iowans still live in communities that are quite homogeneous, so they may have strong opinions on such issues.

A total of 42 volunteer evaluators signed up during these visits. They were asked to write their name, phone number, and email address, as well as their first and second choices of times when they would be able to participate. During the evaluations, which took place over two weeks, only 26 were actually able to participate. Of the 26 students, 16 were male and 10 were female. Twenty-five students were currently undergraduates at the university;
the remaining female student was a high school senior who was taking English composition as part of a special accelerated program. The oldest student was 22, while the youngest was 17.

Procedures

The evaluators were notified by email of the date, time, and place of their evaluations. The 26 students participated during one of 10 sessions; each session took approximately 45 minutes. The largest group was four students; the smallest was one student. When the evaluators arrived for the evaluation, they were first asked to sign a consent form, giving the researcher permission to use any data that was collected. They were also issued a number by which they would be identified so their confidentiality would be kept intact. They completed the entire evaluation in various university classrooms that had been assigned to the researcher.

Their first task was a questionnaire in which the evaluators were asked to give their opinions on language and political issues in Iowa, as well as other issues that have been newsworthy in the state and around the nation. As previously stated, those statements were designed to make sure the evaluators could not clearly determine the real purpose of the questionnaire. First, the evaluators filled in their name, age, hometown, major, and year in school. They were also asked to write their assigned identification number in the top right corner. The students were reminded that they would only be identified by their number, not their name, in the future. Next, I read the instructions and a sample question; I also emphasized that the evaluators should verify that they had completed every question. Then
the evaluators completed the questionnaire, which took between five and ten minutes. I later decided to exclude one of the statements on the questionnaire because it was poorly worded.

Then the evaluators began the accent study component of the research. They were given a packet, which asked for their name and identification number. I used a Sanyo tape recorder to administer this portion of the evaluation. When I started the tape, they listened to the instructions and two sample sentences. After hearing each sample, the evaluators were asked to circle their responses on five different scales that compared the following pairs of adjectives: intelligent – unintelligent, attractive – unattractive, ambitious – unmotivated, pleasant – unpleasant, and dependable – unreliable. These pairs of adjectives were set both positively and negatively on a five-point Likert scale. The evaluators could choose to circle any of the five numbers on the scale. They were told to respond with their initial reaction to the accent, using their personal opinions about the speaker. After asking for any questions, I again started the tape and allowed the evaluators to begin listening to the 32 sentences, which were each repeated twice. This segment took approximately 30 minutes. At the conclusion of the tape, they were thanked for their participation and allowed to leave.

The complete testing instruments for the evaluation are included in Appendix C. See Figure 3.1 for a graphic representation of the methods used in this study.

Data Analysis

The mean figures of each evaluator’s answers to the survey were divided into two groups, a lower-bias group in which the mean range varied from 1.07 to 2.07 (1 was equal to strongly agree, 5 to strongly disagree), and a higher-bias group where the range extended from 2.36 to 3.36. Fourteen evaluators were placed in the lower-bias group, with the
remaining twelve in the higher-bias group. Even though this distribution is the same as for the number of evaluators who listened to each tape, a mixture of evaluators listened to tapes in both orders.

After means for both the responses to each speaker, as well as each pair of characteristics, were calculated, those groupings were later divided into separate spreadsheets for tape 1 and tape 2. They were further subdivided into tables that recorded the lower-bias group and higher-bias group responses to native Spanish speakers (SP), other non-native speakers (ONNS), and native speakers (NS), in order to see the variance between those means. This was done in order to see if any of the differences between the responses were statistically significant.

The Wilcoxon rank sums test was used to calculate the statistics on the SAS system. The tests were one-tailed, because the assumption had been made that the higher-bias group was greater than the lower-bias group. Additionally, I also assumed that the evaluators would rate the Spanish speakers more negatively than both the other non-native speakers and native English speakers, and that the other non-native speakers would be rated more negatively than the native English speakers for each pair of characteristics.

Several specific questions were asked to determine the difference in the reactions to native speakers of Spanish, English, and other languages. They are as follows: 1) What are the differences between higher-bias and lower-bias groups relative to NS, other NNS, and SP speakers? 2) What are the differences between reactions to NS and other NNS? 3) What are the differences between reactions to NS and SP? 4) What are the differences between reactions to other NNS and SP? 5) What are the correlations between the responses to the questionnaire and the answers on the evaluation, if any? A significance level of p<.05 was
used to determine differences between groups. The results for all of the questions are discussed in Chapter 4.
Figure 3.1. Methods of Study.

**SPEAKERS**

- **10 SP** (Mexico)
- **4 ONNS** (Malaysia, India, and Jordan)
- **2 NS** (United States)

**INSTRUMENT: TAPE**

- Two sentences per speaker
- Two tapes with different orders

**HIGH GROUP**

- 12 participants

**LOW GROUP**

- 14 participants

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

- 15 statements about language/political issues

**EVALUATORS**

- 26 ISU students in English 105 classes
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter is divided into four sections. First, it begins with an analysis of the questionnaire results on language and political issues in Iowa. It examines the differences between the higher-bias and lower-bias groups, as well as which questions distinguished between groups most and which did not. Second, the results of the accent study are analyzed in several different ways. The differences between the higher-bias and lower-bias groups for each pair of characteristics are compared and contrasted, as are the overall differences between native English speakers (NS), native Spanish speakers (SP), and native speakers of other languages (ONNS). Third, the following six comparisons are made for each pair of characteristics: SP vs. NS (lower-bias), SP vs. NS (higher-bias), SP vs. ONNS (lower-bias), SP vs. ONNS (higher-bias), ONNS vs. NS (lower-bias), and ONNS vs. NS (higher-bias). Finally, the chapter concludes with an examination of what the results mean.

Analysis of Questionnaire Results

Each of the 24 statements on the survey was set up on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from disagree (1) to agree (5). For most of the 15 target questions, the response ‘agree,’ or (5), indicated a higher-bias response. For example, evaluators who marked (5) showed greater agreement with official English policies or thought too many Spanish-speaking people were coming to Iowa. The response ‘disagree,’ or (1), indicated a lower-bias response. Since not all questions were phrased to reflect a higher bias for higher numbers, the polarity of several questions needed to be changed to tabulate results. Therefore, the responses for several statements were changed (from (5) to (1), (4) to (2), etc.)
in order to make the responses correspond to each other. That way, if an evaluator agreed with one statement that reflected a higher bias and disagreed with another statement that also showed a higher bias, the numbers were made to be equal to show that the evaluator’s responses were in fact quite similar instead of contradictory.

The respondents were then divided into two groups, higher-bias and lower-bias, based on their mean responses. The means of the respondents ranged from 1.07 to 3.36, with 1.00 being the lowest possible mean and 5.00 being the highest possible. The lower-bias group consisted of 14 respondents, with an overall mean of 1.74 (range: 1.07-2.07). The higher-bias group consisted of 12 respondents, with a mean of 2.82 (range: 2.36-3.36). They answered a total of 15 questions that were intended for study; however, one question was removed because it was poorly worded. That sentence read, “Immigrants to Iowa should learn English.” It was determined that the sentence could have been answered equally by subjects in either the higher-bias or lower-bias-bias groups. Table 4.1 gives the mean response for each evaluator, along with the average mean for the lower-bias and higher-bias groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Responses</th>
<th>Average Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower-bias</td>
<td>1.07, 1.35, 1.43, 1.64, 1.64, 1.64, 1.79, 1.85, 1.93, 1.93, 2.00, 2.00, 2.00, 2.07</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-bias</td>
<td>2.36, 2.50, 2.50, 2.57, 2.64, 2.71, 2.79, 2.79, 3.14, 3.21, 3.29, 3.36</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, a mean response was determined for each question. For the lower-bias group, those means ranged from 1.07 to 3.5. For the higher-bias group, they ranged from 1.67 to 4.75. The highest mean for both groups came from the same statement (#1), which
reads, “English should be the official language of Iowa.” This questionnaire was conducted before an official English law was passed; however, it seems clear that most of the participants in this study agree with the law. It also bears noting that the next lowest means after 3.5 and 4.75 were 2.36 and 4.00, respectively, for the same question. That statement reads, “All governmental information should be in English only.” The responses are really not surprising, since the two statements are closely linked. The separation among the higher-bias and lower-bias group means, shown in Table 4.2, justifies the division of the two groups. The lower-bias group consistently shows less bias for all of the statements, just as the higher-bias group shows much greater bias. The goal of the questionnaire was to investigate differences in attitudes, and the results in Table 4.2 show the distinctions quite clearly.

The lower means vary between the higher-bias and lower-bias groups, though. Most of the higher-bias group agreed with the statement, “I would invite a classmate who speaks English as a second language out to lunch,” for which the mean was 1.67. The lower-bias group had a similar response to that question (1.29). However, the strongest responses for the lower-bias group were to two other questions: “It is important for immigrants to the United States to preserve their own culture,” and “I feel angry or resentful when I hear people speaking another language in public,” with means of 1.07. In other words, they agreed that it is important for immigrants to keep their culture, and they do not feel angry or resentful when people speak another language. Both of these statements suggest a fairly high tolerance for speakers of other languages, while the higher-bias group seems to have a slightly lower tolerance. However, there is still a clear distinction between the two groups.
Table 4.2. Mean Responses for Individual Questions on Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Lower-bias Group Mean</th>
<th>Higher-bias Group Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. English should be the official language of Iowa.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2. It is important for immigrants to the U.S. to keep speaking their own language at home.</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel uncomfortable in public places where there are people of different ethnic backgrounds.</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Immigrants who don’t learn English aren’t trying very hard.</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*5. Iowa should open its doors to immigrants.</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*6. I would invite a classmate who speaks English as a second language out to lunch.</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. There are too many Spanish-speaking people coming to Iowa.</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Immigrants usually take jobs away from citizens.</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. All governmental information should be in English only.</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**11. I would feel comfortable doing business on the phone with a person who spoke with an accent.</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Immigrants should try to completely fit in with the American culture.</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Everyone who lives in Iowa should speak English in public.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I feel angry or resentful when I hear people speaking another language in public.</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*15. It is important for immigrants to the United States to preserve their own culture.</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The polarity of these questions was changed to reflect agreement or disagreement with the other statements when the results were tabulated.
** Question 10 was omitted because it was unclear. The numbers of the rest of the questions remained the same for research purposes.

The statements on the survey can be divided into several groups. Several statements focus specifically on official English issues. Others relate more to the preservation of native culture or cultural sensitivity/tolerance issues. Finally, one last group asks for feelings about new immigrants. This division reveals some interesting results. For example, the four
official English statements include the highest and second highest mean responses for both the higher-bias and lower-bias groups. However, one statement, "I feel angry or resentful when I hear people speaking another language in public," had the lowest mean for the lower-bias group and the second lowest mean for the higher-bias group. Table 4.3 shows how the questions were divided into different groups. It appears that two categories, Official English and New Immigrants, differentiated more between the higher-bias and lower-bias groups. The respondents showed clear variation on the Preservation of Culture and Cultural Sensitivity categories as well. From this, it seems that the respondents have stronger, more varied opinions about the statements that have been most controversial and most widely discussed in the media. However, the difference in the reactions to the statements also reveals that people feel strongly on both sides of these issues, and this further illustrates the distinction between the lower-bias and higher-bias groups. For additional information, see Table 4.3.

**Rating of Speech Samples**

This section examines how the data answer the research questions. The first research question asks whether native English speaking Iowa university students react more negatively to accented English as opposed to non-accented English. The data reveal that native English speaking Iowa university students do in fact respond more negatively to Spanish-accented English, and they tend to rate native English speakers most positively (see Tables 4.4 and 4.5 for details). The second research question asked if native Spanish speakers are more likely to be rated as having negative characteristics, such as unintelligent or unattractive rather than intelligent or attractive, than native English speakers or other non-
Table 4.3. Division of Questions from Questionnaire into Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category and Statements</th>
<th>Lower-Bias</th>
<th>Higher-Bias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Official English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English should be the official language of Iowa.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All governmental information should be in English only.</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone who lives in Iowa should speak English in public.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel angry or resentful when I hear people speaking another language in public.</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preservation of Culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for immigrants to the U.S. to keep speaking their own language at home.</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants should try to completely fit in with the American culture.</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for immigrants to the United States to preserve their own culture.</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Sensitivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel uncomfortable in public places where there are people of different ethnic backgrounds.</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would invite a classmate who speaks English as a second language out to lunch.</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel comfortable doing business on the phone with a person who spoke with an accent.</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Immigrants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Immigrants who don’t learn English aren’t trying very hard.</em></td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa should open its doors to immigrants.</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are too many Spanish-speaking people coming to Iowa.</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants usually take jobs away from citizens.</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

native English speakers. The evaluators thought the native Spanish speakers reflected more negative characteristics. These first two items are quite similar to the results found in other studies (Giles et al. 1995; Carranza 1982; Arthur et al. 1974; Flores and Hopper 1975), which revealed that native Spanish speakers were often rated more negatively on personal characteristics. Finally, the third question examined the possibility of a correlation between the reactions of native English speaking Iowans toward accented speech and negative opinions toward immigration and cultural diversity in Iowa. The results were mixed for this
question. They seemed to show a correlation for the other non-native English speakers, but not for the native Spanish speakers or native English speakers.

The first distinction concerns the higher-bias and lower-bias groups. It was expected that the higher-bias subjects would respond more negatively to accented English (than non-accented English), which relates back to the first research question, which asked if native English speakers would react more negatively to accented English than non-accented English. This was indeed found to be the case. Their ratings of native speakers were consistently more positive than their ratings of native Spanish speakers and other non-native speakers. Another observation reveals that the native Spanish speakers are consistently rated more negatively than any other group. This occurs in the higher-bias and lower-bias groups. The scale was set up so that (1) would be the most positive response (i.e. intelligent) and (5) would be the most negative response (i.e. unintelligent). The greatest difference for the higher-bias group (1.31) lies between native English speakers and native Spanish speakers for the characteristic pair of intelligent – unintelligent. On the pair of dependable – unreliable, the same groups of speakers are separated by 1.12, also for the higher-bias group. The largest separation for the lower-bias group is 1.02 for intelligent – unintelligent. Both groups show the smallest spread for pleasant – unpleasant. One would expect the members of the higher-bias group to reflect greater variation among their responses, since their degree of bias will likely vary more. The lower-bias group reveals more uniformity in its responses. Overall, only two of the mean responses for the lower-bias group are higher than the responses for the higher-bias group, which suggests that the division of the groups is appropriate. See Tables 4.4 and 4.5 for a complete listing of mean responses.
Table 4.4. Lower-Bias Group Mean Responses for Characteristic Pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native English Speakers</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-Native Speakers</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Spanish Speakers</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5. Higher-Bias Group Mean Responses for Characteristic Pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native English Speakers</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-Native Speakers</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Spanish Speakers</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every pair of characteristics, except pleasant – unpleasant, showed significance in a comparison of the higher-bias and lower-bias groups through a t-test for the other non-native speakers of English. The variable pair of dependable – unreliable showed significance, at 0.0028. However, none of the pairs showed significance for the native Spanish speakers, whereas only one characteristic, dependable – unreliable, was significant for the native English speakers. In other words, the differences shown in Table 4.5 were not significant, even though there appeared to be a substantial spread between the responses for different characteristics.
From these results, it can perhaps be concluded that the higher-bias and lower-bias groups had similar feelings about both the native Spanish speakers and the native English speakers, possibly because they shared beliefs about speakers with those accents. This could explain the lack of significance between the two groups. Still, the evaluators may have also preferred the native speaker accents because they were more familiar, while they felt some bias toward the accents of the native Spanish speakers and judged them more harshly.

However, the marked significance between the higher-bias and lower-bias groups for the other non-native speakers of English could reflect the evaluators’ lack of familiarity and thus lack of stereotypes for those particular accents. The four non-native speakers came from three different countries – Malaysia, India, and Jordan – and had four different native languages – Malay, Mandarin Chinese, Tamil, and Arabic. Several of them also speak additional languages that probably influence their accents. Because of this lack of knowledge, the evaluators in the higher-bias group, who already have shown a greater bias toward immigrants, may have judged these non-native speakers more negatively as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-sided t-test</th>
<th>Intelligent – Unintelligent</th>
<th>Attractive – Unattractive</th>
<th>Ambitious – Unmotivated</th>
<th>Pleasant – Unpleasant</th>
<th>Dependable – Unreliable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native English Speakers</td>
<td>.3513</td>
<td>.3056</td>
<td>.1036</td>
<td>.0559</td>
<td>*.0277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-Native Speakers</td>
<td>*.0258</td>
<td>*.0388</td>
<td>*.0182</td>
<td>.0584</td>
<td>**.0028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Spanish Speakers</td>
<td>.2613</td>
<td>.2051</td>
<td>.2377</td>
<td>.1429</td>
<td>.3185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
**p<.01
When looking at native English speakers versus native Spanish speakers, the lower-bias group showed significant differences between the responses for three pairs of characteristics: intelligent – unintelligent, attractive – unattractive, and dependable – unreliable. Similarly, the higher-bias group revealed significance for those pairs, as well as ambitious – unmotivated. The only pair that was not significant was pleasant – unpleasant. This shows that both groups heard differences in the accents and therefore rated the speakers very differently based on accent, which may have been due to prior feelings about the accent and associations with speakers having that accent.

The next comparison involves other non-native speakers versus native Spanish speakers. Again, for the lower-bias group, the characteristic pair of intelligent – unintelligent shows significance, as does ambitious – unmotivated. The higher-bias group responds similarly to those characteristics, as well as dependable – unreliable. It appears that the evaluators also chose to differentiate between the two groups and rate the native Spanish speakers more negatively on several categories. Finally, it is necessary to look at the differences between native English speakers and other non-native speakers. The lower-bias group revealed a significant difference for the characteristic pair of attractive – unattractive, whereas the higher-bias group included intelligent – unintelligent and dependable – unreliable, as well as attractive – unattractive. All of these comparisons support the division of the evaluators into higher-bias and lower-bias groups, because the higher-bias group is consistently more biased in the number of characteristics showing significance.

In nearly every comparison, the evaluators significantly rated the other non-native English speakers or the native Spanish speakers more negatively, especially in the category of intelligent – unintelligent. This may reflect a belief that people who speak with a foreign
accent are not as intelligent as those who speak without one. In any case, it seems that the non-native speakers are judged negatively for their accents. They were also rated as more unreliable than dependable. This returns to the stereotypical belief that immigrants, especially Mexicans (native Spanish speakers), are lazy, which may have influenced the evaluators’ reactions to the speakers. The higher-bias group also showed a significant bias in the ambitious – unmotivated characteristic group toward native Spanish speakers, which ties in to another stereotype about Mexicans. Many believe that Mexicans do not want to get jobs, and they just come to the United States to live off the system. The ratings by this group of evaluators suggest that some may hold similar viewpoints.

### Table 4.7. Lower-Bias Group Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower-bias group t-test (one-sided)</th>
<th>Intelligent – Unintelligent</th>
<th>Attractive – Unattractive</th>
<th>Ambitious – Unmotivated</th>
<th>Pleasant – Unpleasant</th>
<th>Dependable – Unreliable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS vs. SP</td>
<td>**.0013</td>
<td>**.0041</td>
<td>.1704</td>
<td>.1709</td>
<td>*.0332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONNS vs. SP</td>
<td>**.0039</td>
<td>.3003</td>
<td>*.0228</td>
<td>.4818</td>
<td>.0792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS vs. ONNS</td>
<td>.0848</td>
<td>**.0054</td>
<td>.4544</td>
<td>.1149</td>
<td>.1015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p<.05
** *p<.01
The third research question addressed the possibility of a correlation between positive (or negative) responses to the survey questions and positive (or negative) reactions to accented speech. There were very few correlations between these two parts of the study. When looking at the responses of the higher-bias and lower-bias groups together toward native Spanish speakers, none of the comparisons showed any correlation between the responses on the questionnaire and the reactions to Spanish-accented speech. The same was true of native English speakers. However, there were some correlations associated with other non-native English speakers. The scores with respect to intelligent – unintelligent, ambitious – unmotivated, and dependable – unreliable were all correlated with the responses on the questionnaire. All of the correlations can be viewed in Table 4.10.

### Table 4.8. Higher-Bias Group Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS vs. SP</td>
<td>**.0002</td>
<td>**.0076</td>
<td>.0407</td>
<td>.1823</td>
<td>**.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONNS vs. SP</td>
<td>.0257</td>
<td>.3038</td>
<td>.0404</td>
<td>.4658</td>
<td>.0242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS vs. ONNS</td>
<td>**.0003</td>
<td>**.0052</td>
<td>.2460</td>
<td>.1890</td>
<td>**.0008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01

### Table 4.9. Scales with Significant Differences for Higher- and Lower-Bias Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-Bias</th>
<th>Higher-Bias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS vs. SP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONNS vs. SP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS vs. ONNS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.10. Correlations for Characteristic Pairs and Questionnaire Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Intelligent – Unintelligent</th>
<th>Attractive – Unattractive</th>
<th>Ambitious – Unmotivated</th>
<th>Pleasant – Unpleasant</th>
<th>Dependable – Unreliable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native English Speakers</td>
<td>.2334</td>
<td>.3939</td>
<td>.5334</td>
<td>.0559</td>
<td>.2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-Native Speakers</td>
<td>*.0282</td>
<td>.1292</td>
<td>*.0102</td>
<td>.5163</td>
<td>*.0141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Spanish Speakers</td>
<td>.5790</td>
<td>.8224</td>
<td>.0812</td>
<td>.1766</td>
<td>.1315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Discussion

Several hypotheses were proposed for this research. The first was that the native English speaking evaluators would rate the native Spanish speakers more negatively than the other non-native speakers and the native English speakers. This turned out to be the case, based on the responses for both the higher-bias and lower-bias groups of evaluators. The native English speakers consistently received the highest ratings for every positive characteristic, followed by the other non-native English speakers, with the Spanish speakers coming in last. This result is the same as what other researchers, specifically Delamere (1996), Gallois and Callan (1981), and Zuengler (1988), found in similar studies that involved the evaluation of native and non-native speech. This seems to show that evaluators, in these cases native English speakers, generally give more positive ratings to the accents that sound most like them. The less familiar accents appear to be rated more negatively because they are different.
The second research question hypothesized that native Spanish speakers would reflect more negative personal characteristics. Certain groups of characteristics did in fact reveal more striking differences among the speech samples. For example, when asked to rate the speech using the characteristic pair intelligent – unintelligent, the difference between the means for native Spanish speakers and native English speakers was very large. The same was true for dependable – unreliable. However, for the pair pleasant – unpleasant, evaluators did not seem to see much of a difference between all three groups of speakers. In other words, the evaluators thought the native Spanish speakers were less intelligent and less reliable than the other non-native speakers and native English speakers, yet they thought all of the speakers were almost equally pleasant. This may reflect some uncertainty about the term, since “pleasant” is not often used to describe people. Additionally, although the evaluators may have thought the speakers were unintelligent or unmotivated, based on their accented speech, they may also have thought the speakers’ voices sounded nice enough. Although previous studies have included these characteristics in their evaluations, few seemed to have this particular outcome (Ryan et al. 1977). This is an interesting result, one that merits future study to see why accented speakers are seen as pleasant but not intelligent or reliable or attractive.

The third hypothesis was that a correlation would exist between the attitudes toward immigrants and official English policies and the attitudes toward accented speech. The results of this study were rather mixed. In other words, if an evaluator were placed in the higher-bias group initially, based on his or her responses to the questionnaire, he or she would not necessarily have more negative attitudes toward the Spanish-accented speech than those in the lower-bias group. However, the higher-bias group did seem to distinguish
between the three different groups of speakers most of the time, whereas the lower-bias group only seemed to have two groups, accented speech and non-accented speech (see Table 4.9). This suggests that the lower-bias group does in fact have a less biased attitude toward the Spanish-accented speakers than the higher-bias group. Additionally, the results seem to reveal that attitudes toward accent may be closely tied to the emergence of language as a sociopolitical issue; this seems to merit further study.

However, there were several correlations, with the characteristics pairs of intelligent – unintelligent, ambitious – unmotivated, and dependable – unreliable, for the other non-native English speakers. The higher-bias and lower-bias bias groups were combined for this portion, because it was unnecessary to look at each group separately. By combining the groups, it was possible to see if there were any correlations overall between the attitudes survey and the accent study. One possible explanation for these correlations relates to the unfamiliarity of the accents. The Spanish accent may have been more familiar than a Malay or Arabic accent, so some evaluators may have given it a slightly more positive rating. Another potential issue concerns the native speaker of Arabic. That particular accent is generally unfamiliar, so evaluators may just have disliked the voices and thought them unintelligent, unmotivated, or unreliable.

As in all studies, there are several limitations on this research. The first limitation is the number of evaluators (26). A larger pool of evaluators would perhaps give a better opportunity to see trends clearly. It is possible that a larger group would also reveal some correlations among the reactions to native Spanish speakers. Additionally, a different group of evaluators, such as a group of people of all ages from one of the towns that has gained a larger immigrant population, would likely result in different opinions than those of Iowa
State undergraduates, who are more accustomed to seeing people of different races and ethnicities.

The speakers and their speech samples also present another limitation. Even though there were 16 speakers, only two native English speakers and four other non-native speakers were included. Therefore, although the evaluators heard a number of speakers of Spanish-accented English, their ability to compare those speakers with the other accented and non-accented speakers was somewhat limited. Future studies could include a more evenly divided group of speakers (i.e. five Spanish speakers, five other non-native English speakers, and five native English speakers) to ensure that the results were not just a reflection of the particular speakers in the study.

A final limitation is the lack of past studies that used both a questionnaire about language attitudes and an evaluation of accented speech. Many studies have looked at attitudes toward accent, but very few have investigated current attitudes toward immigration, official English policies, and cultural diversity. This made it difficult to determine which statements would be the most useful for finding out pertinent information. It did seem, though, that the statements that were used resulted in some strong differences in the opinions of the respondents. In any case, it is possible that this may lead to further research in this area.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS

This study investigated three research questions: (1) Do native English speaking Iowa university students react more negatively to accented English as opposed to non-accented English? (2) Are native Spanish speakers more likely to be assigned certain negative characteristics (according to native English speaking Iowans) than native English speakers or other non-native English speakers? (3) Do native English speaking Iowans react more negatively toward accented English when they hold negative opinions toward immigration and cultural diversity in Iowa? The research revealed that the native Spanish speakers do in fact evoke more negative reactions from the English-speaking evaluators and are assigned more negative characteristics than the other ethnic groups that were included in the study. However, the study showed mixed results between attitudes toward immigration and cultural diversity, and attitudes toward accent.

Applications

This study has a number of applications. The results of the questionnaire illustrate that while many believe that English should be the official language and governmental information should be printed in English, they also think that immigrants should be allowed to preserve their native culture and language. This information might be useful for politicians who are trying to obtain knowledge about their constituents’ feelings about immigrants and official English policies. A larger scale survey of this kind, covering a specific district or city, may help them serve their state or country more efficiently. It may also be helpful for politicians to know that people often respond differently to accented
voices, especially Spanish accented voices, sometimes with no real basis for doing so. Since Iowa continues to gain more Latino immigrants, the state government needs to be aware of people’s feelings toward them.

It seems, too, that schools and their teachers could learn from these results. Even though there were few significant correlations between the questionnaire and the listening evaluation, they could be useful when taken separately. For example, this study would at least give them an awareness of the prejudice that exists, and the teachers could teach their students about how differences should not be negative things. It is possible that early education about immigrants and languages could help prevent many children from having negatively biased viewpoints toward immigrants in the future. Perry’s diversity festival encourages interaction and communication among different cultures, but such actions are only the beginning. Other cities and school districts would be wise to adopt similar customs, both to welcome the immigrants and help them become a part of the community, and to encourage longtime residents to add some diversity to their lives.

Recommendations

Some recommendations for future study include an expansion of both the questionnaire and the listening evaluation. The questions on the questionnaire in this study could be examined for their validity. One question was already removed because it was unclear; other questions may need to be clarified more precisely in order to evoke clear responses. Future studies could even utilize additional questions that specifically pertain to the city, state, or area that is being researched. Additionally, it might be useful to include several questions where the students would be asked to write out their own answers.
Although those responses would be more difficult to tabulate, it is likely that they would also provide more insight into the evaluators' opinions on the subject matter. It may also be useful to ask the evaluators about what types of contact they have had with non-native English speakers, as this could reveal additional biases.

The speech samples could also be chosen differently. One possibility would be for evaluators to listen to multiple sentences in a row from each speaker to gain more insight into the speakers' personal characteristics. At the conclusion of the evaluation for this study, several subjects noted that it was difficult to have to evaluate the speakers on various characteristics after hearing them speak a short sentence, so a modification of this technique might be helpful in future research. Additionally, it might be helpful to include fewer than 32 sample sentences in the evaluation. Many of the evaluators appeared to become restless and even bored about ten sentences before the end, which raises the concern that they may not have paid full attention to rating those last ten sentences. It might be better to include a smaller number of slightly longer sentence groups in order to keep the evaluators' attention on the task at hand. Another option, which I would recommend, would be to leave less time between each sentence on the tape. Twenty seconds seemed to be too long, so perhaps ten seconds would be enough.

Another recommendation is the inclusion of speakers of different native languages. This study focused on (and utilized the voices of) native Spanish speakers, and therefore only included a few other non-native speakers (Mandarin, Malay, Tamil, and Arabic), along with two native English speakers. It might be interesting to have half of the participants be from one language background and the other half from a different language background to observe the differences in how the groups are judged. An alternative would be to include an equal
number of speakers from a variety of language backgrounds. All of these choices would vary depending on the purpose of the study. Changes like these could enhance future study in this area.
APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SPEAKERS

1. What is your full name?_____________________________________________________________________

2. What is your field of study?___________________________________________________________________

3. How many years have you been studying English? ________________

4. What classes have you taken (for example, grammar, conversation, etc.)? ____________

5. Have you ever studied in a country other than Mexico? If so, where, and for how long? ____________

6. Please add any other relevant information about your ability to speak English. ____________________________

Feedback

1. Please rate the difficulty of the paragraphs and the topics for the short talk on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being very easy and 5 being very difficult.

   Paragraph 1 (elephants): 1 2 3 4 5
   Paragraph 2 (handbook): 1 2 3 4 5
   Holiday topic: 1 2 3 4 5
   Success topic: 1 2 3 4 5

2. In general, which task was easier, reading the paragraphs or speaking about a topic? ____________________________

3. How did you feel before, during, and after completing the task? ____________________________

4. Please give any suggestions to improve this study. ____________________________

Thank you for your assistance!
APPENDIX B: READING PASSAGES FOR SPEAKERS

Reading 1

Elephants are some of the most admired animals in the world, but their future has long been uncertain. Elephants have been under attack for a long time. Ivory hunters killed all the elephants in north Africa 1,200 years ago. By the end of the 19th century, all of the elephants were also gone from south Africa. Today, the price of ivory is at an all-time high. Illegal hunters are a greater threat to the elephants of Africa than they have ever been. But there is an even greater threat: the growing human population of Africa. Elephants have been crowded into parks that are much smaller than the areas they used to occupy. In the old days, elephants could eat as much grass as they pleased and destroy as many trees as they wanted. They could move on to a new area and give the grass and trees time to recover. Now, with only limited land, there is not enough time for the grass and trees to recover. There is a very real possibility that many elephants could starve to death in the African parks. If elephants are to survive in the wild, people must find ways either to provide more food or to decrease the elephant population.

From Elephants Zoobooks published by Wildlife Education, Ltd.
Reading 2

Each year, the United States government publishes the Occupational Outlook Handbook. This large book lists over 250 kinds of jobs. It describes job duties, working conditions, education needed, and salary. Most importantly, the Handbook gives the job outlook and tells how many openings there will be for different jobs in the coming years. The job outlook may be excellent, good, or poor.

The job outlook for auto mechanics is good. The number of cars will continue to grow. Because cars are so expensive, people are keeping their cars longer. In the future, their cars will need more repairs. Computer programmers will be in demand, and their job outlook is excellent. There are more than 50 million computers in offices and homes in the United States. Both companies and individuals depend on computers for information, record keeping, and services. The men and women who deliver mail every day face a poor job future. Companies will use computers and fax machines to send information. People will buy their stamps at supermarkets and department stores.

The Occupational Outlook Handbook is in the reference section of the library. It can tell you if the work you are interested in has a future or not.

From Now Hear This! by Barbara H. Foley, published by Heinle & Heinle Publishers
Short Talks

Prepare a short talk of about 2 minutes for each of the topics below. You will have several minutes to prepare what you want to say about each topic.

1. Describe your favorite holiday in as much detail as you can. Tell about how your family celebrates it and what makes it special.

2. What do you think are the characteristics that make a person successful, and why?
APPENDIX C: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EVALUATORS

Name and Age
Hometown
Major and current year in school

Each of the following statements reflects a political or social issue that has been of importance in Iowa and other nearby states. Tell whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Use the five-point scale below to give your opinion of each issue. Circle the number that best reflects your opinion.

1 = disagree (D)
2 = somewhat disagree (SW D)
3 = neither agree nor disagree (NAND)
4 = somewhat agree (SW A)
5 = agree (A)

Example:
The state of Iowa should make a college education more affordable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SW D</th>
<th>NAND</th>
<th>SW A</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. English should be the official language of Iowa.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is important for immigrants to the U.S. to keep speaking their own language at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The death penalty should be legal in the state of Iowa.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Families with small children should not own guns.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel uncomfortable in public places where there are people of different ethnic backgrounds.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Immigrants who don’t learn English aren’t trying very hard.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Iowa should open its doors to immigrants.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would support a law that prevented telemarketers from calling me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I would invite a classmate who speaks English as a second language out to lunch.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Parents have the authority to tell their children’s sports coaches what to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SW D</td>
<td>NAND</td>
<td>SW A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. There are too many Spanish-speaking people coming to Iowa.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Immigrants usually take jobs away from citizens.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. All governmental information should be in English only.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. It is important for students to learn about civil rights leaders like Martin Luther King, Jr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Human cloning research is needed and should continue.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Immigrants to Iowa should learn English.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I would feel comfortable doing business on the phone with a person who spoke with an accent.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Students should be required to study a foreign language in high school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Immigrants should try to completely fit in with the American culture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Everyone who lives in Iowa should speak English in public.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Smoking in restaurants should be banned completely.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I feel angry or resentful when I hear people speaking another language in public.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. All sex offenders should be identified when they move into a neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. It is important for immigrants to the United States to preserve their own culture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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