Language attitudes and ESL: an investigation of nonnative speakers' reactions to accented English

Amelia Dyan Akers
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd

Part of the Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons, English Language and Literature Commons, and the First and Second Language Acquisition Commons

Recommended Citation
https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/16132

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.
Language attitudes and ESL:
An investigation of nonnative speakers’ reactions to accented English

by

Amelia Dyan Akers

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

Department: English
Major: English (Teaching English as a Second Language/Linguistics)
Major Professor: Janet Anderson-Hsieh

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa
1996

Copyright © Amelia Dyan Akers, 1996. All rights reserved.
This is to certify that the Master’s thesis of

Amelia Dyan Akers

has met the thesis requirements of Iowa State University

Signatures have been redacted for privacy
TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW 4
   Definition of Attitude 4
   Attitude and Language Connection 5
   Language Attitude Measurement 6
   Evaluations of International Students’ Language 11
   Interpretation of Data 13

CHAPTER 3. METHODS AND MATERIALS 23
   Subjects 23
   Testing Instruments and Procedures 28
   Data Analysis 33

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 35
   Analysis of Questions 35
   Listener Effects 48
   Identification of Speakers 50
   Discussion 52

CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSIONS 61

APPENDIX A. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SPEAKERS 70

APPENDIX B. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LISTENERS 71

REFERENCES CITED 76

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 81
INTRODUCTION

When a person speaks, listeners make subjective judgments, either consciously or unconsciously, about his or her personality. Members of a speech community depend on language not only for communication, but also to predict a speaker’s background and to make social judgments about that speaker. The actual words that are spoken may not be used to make these judgments. Social relations can be highly influenced by a listener’s first impressions of a speaker. Nemetz-Robinson (1985) points out that “once first impressions are made, they are difficult to change, due to a variety of cognitive biases...these first impressions affect not only how people perceive others, but also how they behave toward them (54). Research in the area of language attitudes focuses on investigating the subjective judgments elicited by language and how a listener formulates them.

Many studies (Lambert et al., 1960; Gallois and Callan, 1981; Mulac, 1974; and Giles et al., 1995) have shown that listeners, after hearing only a brief, audio-taped voice, feel capable of rating the speaker on various physical characteristics and personality traits. Language attitudes studies have traditionally focused on native English speakers’ judgments of accented English. The accents manipulated have been dialects (such as Yorkshire English vs. London English); or the English of nonnative speakers (such as a French speaker who learns English and therefore, speaks with an accent).

Interestingly, no research has yet been reported which focuses on the attitudes that nonnative speakers hold toward the English of other nonnative speakers. One would predict
that non-native speakers also have differing attitudes towards specific accents. In an educational setting such as an American university, a number of different languages come into contact. People from many different cultural groups find themselves interacting with each other and with Americans in a variety of situations. In multicultural classrooms, such as those found in intensive English programs or university English as a second language classes, it is possible that language attitudes are an important variable in student perceptions of each other. English as a second language teachers often must cope with cross-cultural issues that result in tensions and misunderstandings between students. Language attitudes may exert an influence on ESL students' relations and interactions both inside and outside of the classroom. This theory is supported by Giles, Hewstone, and Ball (1983) who state that “wherever multicultural settings exist, language attitudes can be found to play an integral social role not only in reflecting intergroup relations, but also in mediating and determining them” (95).

The specific questions being addressed in this research are (1) Do nonnative English speakers have attitudes towards different varieties of English, and if so, what are those attitudes? (2) Are different attitudes elicited by male and female voices? (3) Do certain accents elicit more negative or positive moods in listeners? (4) Can attitudes about accent influence a listener's desire to work with a classmate in a group? (5) Can nonnative English speakers determine the native country/language of other nonnative speakers they hear? The data were collected by means of a speaker evaluation study using a modification of the matched guise technique. The subjects of this study are twenty-four native Spanish speakers
who are in the process of learning English as a second language. Eight native speakers from
four language backgrounds, Russian, Chinese, Spanish, and U.S. English, were audio-taped
reading a prose passage from a retired form of the Iowa State University SPEAK test. The
twenty-four Spanish speakers listened to the voices and judged the speakers on a variety of
characteristics, set positively and negatively on a Likert 7-point scale.

The results of the study found that the twenty-four listeners rated the native English
speakers more positively on all characteristics. Surprisingly, no significant differences were
found to exist in their evaluations of the nonnative speakers. The listeners wanted to work as
a partner with the native English speakers more than the nonnatives, and again, little
differentiation was seen among the evaluations of partnership for the nonnative speakers.

It was also found that listener mood did not correlate significantly with the answers
for the other questions. Finally, significant differences were found to be due to gender, with
the females rated more positively than the males on most occasions.

Interestingly, listeners were not very successful in correctly guessing the native
country/language group the speakers came from, not even for the native Spanish or English
speakers. This indicates that the high marks given to the native speakers may have resulted
from attitudes toward English language ability instead of ethnic stereotypes. The particular
voice qualities of the speakers may have also played a role in the listeners' evaluations.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

For more than thirty years linguists and social psychologists have been engaged in the study of language attitudes. Numerous studies have been conducted which focus on the attitudinal judgments one speech community makes about another on the sole basis of spoken language. The aim of this chapter is to first briefly explain how the term “attitude” has been defined in previous studies and the connection between attitude and language. This will be followed by an explanation of the most popular language attitude measurement technique, the “speaker evaluation paradigm” (Ryan and Giles, 1982). Next, previous research will be outlined, with a specific focus on the “matched guise” technique developed by Lambert et al. (1960) and variations on the matched guise used in studies of international students (Alford et al., 1990). The chapter will conclude with a discussion of the way in which language attitude data are interpreted, including issues in ethnic identity/solidarity and the validity of inferring a person’s future behavior from his or her attitudinal judgments.

Definition of Attitude

Various definitions of the term “attitude” have been proposed, most of them from the discipline of social psychology. In 1975, Fishbein and Ajzen defined “attitude” as “a learned predisposition to respond in a consistently favourable or unfavourable manner with respect to a given object” and state that this object could be a person, group, event, situation, fact, language variety, or linguistic variant (p. 6). This is the definition which most exemplifies the way in which the term is understood in language attitude studies. Deprez and Persoons
(1988) present a thorough explanation of attitude. They state that attitude is often thought to consist of three components: belief, emotion, and behavior. The authors describe the reasoning behind these three components as follows. First, a person must have some knowledge about the object (belief) before he or she can react consistently to it. Next, the person uses the belief to react (emotion) either positively or negatively to the object. Finally, the beliefs and feelings are followed by behavioral intentions (behavior) (p.125). The term “attitude,” therefore, is differentiated from the terms “stereotype” and “prejudice.” As Deprez and Persoons explain, the belief component of attitude is often equated with “stereotypes” when the person’s knowledge about the object is incomplete and deficient. “Prejudice” is related to the emotional component of attitude when especially rigid feelings (either positive or negative) are felt toward a specific group of people (p.126). Attitudes develop during our socialization processes as children and continue to develop throughout our lives (p. 128). It is important to note that beliefs, values, and attitudes may differ between cultures. Therefore, language attitudes are tied to ethnic and social identity and are often culture specific. Ethnic and social identity will be discussed further at the end of this chapter.

**Attitude and Language Connection**

It has been proposed that “language behaviours are among the most salient and often used cues in social interaction” (Cargile *et al.*, 1994). Attitude is directly related to language, and ethnic, social, and regional language varieties serve to identify a person as a member of a specific group. How a listener evaluates those language varieties, and subsequently the
groups they represent, depends almost entirely on attitudes. Ryan and Giles (1982) define language attitudes as "any affective, cognitive or behavioural index of evaluative reactions toward different language varieties or their speakers" (p. 7). Because language is a central component in social relations, the language variety a person uses can be an important determiner of other's reactions toward that person in a number of social situations.

**Language Attitude Measurement**

Cargile *et al.* (1994) present a thorough overview of the three primary investigative techniques that have been used in language attitudes studies. The first type, content analyses of language varieties, are concerned with the public treatment of language varieties and how that treatment reflects the relative status and worth of those varieties in a community. Content analyses have used ethnographic studies and observation as their main information gathering methods. An example of this technique is a study done by Fishman *et al.* (1971) which compared the treatment of Puerto Ricans (their language, cultural concerns, and ethnicity) in English language and Spanish language newspapers of New York. In that study, Fishman *et al.* looked at the frequency of references to Puerto Ricans as well as the major focus of such references. They also investigated the frequency that the Spanish language was referred to in connection with Puerto Ricans and if the needs or problems of the Puerto Rican community were discussed. Finally, the researchers looked at whether Puerto Ricans were viewed as Americans or if their dual status was ignored (p. 43). The second technique utilized in language attitudes studies are direct measures. These have included interviews or questionnaires in which people are directly asked their opinions about certain language
varieties or the people who speak those varieties. A study by Taylor in 1973 used this method to ask opinions about standard American English and Black English. Taylor asked teachers to give their opinions about Black English and whether or not they felt that this dialect should be used in the classroom. Critics of direct attitude measurement feel that the technique does not convey the complexity of the issue and that socially desirable responses will be elicited instead of the respondents’ true, private feelings (Giles, Hewstone, and Ball, 1983, p. 83).

The third attitude measurement technique, indirect measures, has been the most popular way to investigate language attitudes, and the speaker evaluation paradigm has been the most common indirect measure used (Cargile et al., 1994, p. 212).

In the speaker evaluation paradigm, listeners evaluate a series of (usually anonymous) speakers on audiotape who represent various language varieties. No labels are attached to the voices and the listeners are left to make their own judgments about the speakers’ language background. Language varieties manipulated in these types of studies have included dialects, accents and languages. The listeners evaluate the speech by using a rating scale, usually a list of contrasting personality characteristics set positively and negatively on a Likert (1932) point scale. The classic prototype of this paradigm is the study by Lambert, Hodgson, Gardener, and Fillenbaum (1960). Their purpose was to examine listeners’ evaluative reactions to English and French in Montreal, Canada. English Canadian and French Canadian listeners rated the language of English and French speakers on the following fourteen traits: height, good looks, leadership, sense of humor, intelligence, religiousness, self-confidence, entertainingness, kindness, ambition, sociability, character, and
likability. The results of the study showed that both groups rated the English Canadian speakers more favorably than the French Canadian speakers. Lambert and colleagues interpreted the results to mean that the French-Canadians may have adopted the inferior position that has been assigned to them by the socio-political forces around them.

Lambert and colleagues have proposed that this technique effectively elicits stereotyped impressions that one ethnolinguistic group holds toward another. A 1967 study by Lambert offered a theory that two processes are involved in what is now know as the speaker evaluation paradigm. These processes are as follows: 1) the listener linguistically identifies the speaker as a member of a certain group and 2) stereotypes regarding that group are evoked in the listener (Ryan et al., 1988). This pattern has been outlined by Ryan, Hewstone, and Giles (1984) as shown below:

\[
\text{accent/language} \Rightarrow \text{social categorization} \Rightarrow \text{personality judgments}
\]

Ryan et al. (1988) feel that the major strength of the speaker evaluation technique is “the elicitation of spontaneous attitudes less sensitive to reflection and social desirability biases than are directly assessed attitudes” (p. 1072). In other words, they feel that the technique is likely to elicit a listener’s true feelings more than responses that the listener feels are publicly desirable, or “politically correct.”

Lambert and his colleagues were the first to develop the now well-known Matched Guise Technique (MGT), which they utilized in the study explained above. In this technique, bilingual speakers are tape recorded reading a standard passage of the same prose in each of their two language varieties. The passages are said to be ‘neutral’ in that they do not indicate
the speakers’ native language, nationality, or any other information that may influence the judges. However, it must be mentioned that Giles and Copeland (1991) believe that texts themselves can never be neutral. They feel that listener-judges are cognitively active while listening and interpret both the text and context of a message according to already existing social ideals (p. 55).

In a matched guise study, listeners are not told that the same person is reading the two passages and care is taken to make sure that the ‘guises’ are perceived as authentic. In other words, in the above study, listeners had to believe that the French passage was spoken by a French Canadian and the English passage was spoken by an English Canadian. The MGT was invented in order to control for speaker idiosyncrasies. Factors such as pitch, voice quality, speech rate, reading style, and expressiveness are said to be kept constant. The creators of the MGT argue that these controls allow speaker evaluations “to reflect the listeners’ underlying attitudes toward the target language variety or behavior” (Cargile et al., 1994). Since the Canadian study done by Lambert and his colleagues, numerous studies have employed the MGT to determine attitudes towards distinct languages. For example, Lambert et al. (1965) measured reactions to Hebrew and Arabic. The MGT has also been used to evaluate varieties of the same language. Some examples include Strongman and Woosley (1967) using London and Yorkshire accents; Tucker and Lambert (1969) using White and Black American English accents; and Giles et al. (1995) employing Hispanic- and Anglo-accented English.
The MGT has not escaped criticism and its opponents feel that, among other things, speakers may vary their voice qualities and exaggerate style in an attempt to distinguish among the two guises. This may create an accent which sounds counterfeit and which may represent the actual stereotypes elicited from the listeners (Alford and Strother 1990). These drawbacks have caused a number of language attitudes researchers to use a modification of the matched guise. In this modification, several speakers from each accent group are audiotaped using their own native accents. Voice quality, pitch, and speech rate are monitored and speakers who deviate significantly from the rest (such as people who have high, squeaky voices, a noticeably nasalized voice, etc) are not used. A modification of the MGT has been used by Anisfeld, Bogo, and Lambert (1962); Markel, Eisler, and Reese (1967); Tucker and Lambert (1969); Ryan and Carranza (1975); Brennan and Brennan (1981); and Alford and Strother (1990).

The general results of language attitudes studies show that language varieties which differ from Standard English are likely to be viewed less positively than the Standard, even by people who speak those other varieties (see Arthur, Farrar and Bradford, 1974). In evaluation studies which have asked listeners to evaluate both nonnative and native speakers, the native speakers are usually more favorably rated than the nonnatives (Ryan and Carranza, 1975). All language attitudes approaches are driven by the fact that “some forms of accented speech are rated lower on linguistic ability by ‘the system’” (Ryan, Hewstone, and Giles, 1984, p. 136). Ethnic group stereotypes are usually cited as the reason for these attitudinal differences. Some of the most salient patterns gleaned from the language attitudes research
are that standard speakers, or speakers of the language variety which is seen as socially superior in the community, are often given higher marks than nonstandard speakers for competence traits such as intelligence. However, nonstandard speakers are often given higher marks on solidarity traits such as friendliness and social attractiveness (Giles, Hewstone and Ball (1983, p. 85). Nonstandard or powerless speech styles may be supported by their speakers due to ethnic pride, which will be discussed later in this chapter. It is important to note that language attitudes may not remain constant over time. They are products of particular social situations. As the social and political make up of a community changes, the language attitudes associated with ethnolinguistic groups in that community may change also.

**Evaluations of International Students’ Language**

Studies evaluating the speech of international students at English speaking universities have necessarily been modifications of the MGT, simply because most international students learn English later in life and do not acquire the native pronunciation required for the technique. Most studies involving international students have focused on native speakers’ reactions to the international students’ accented English. Examples include Palmer (1973); Mulac et al. (1974); Arthur, Farrar and Bradford (1974); Sebastion, Ryan, and Corso (1978); Gallois and Callan (1981); and Anderson-Hsieh, Johnson, and Koehler (1992). Ryan (1983) points out that “the general finding in the literature is that non-native accents are downgraded, albeit more for some ethnic groups than others. More generally, the
non-native speaker appears uneducated, unintelligent, and relatively poor, especially if the speech style elicits an association with a lower class minority group” (p. 155).

Studies which have focused on the evaluation of speakers of Spanish accented English have found that those speakers have been negatively viewed by White (Anglo) and Black listeners, as well as Mexican American listeners (Eisenstein 1983, p. 172). Arthur, Farrar, and Bradford (1974) found that Anglo university students negatively evaluated Spanish accented English on scales relating to success, ability, and social awareness. Likewise, in a study by Sebastian, Ryan, and Corso (1978), it was found that for native English speaking listeners, a report of a speaker’s social class had a greater influence on the evaluations of nonnative speakers than it did for native speakers. The study found that “Spanish accented speakers were thought to be lower in social class, less similar in beliefs, and less desirable in a range of [social] relationships” (Eisenstein 1983, p. 173).

A study by Mulac et al. (1974) asked native English speakers to evaluate the speech of speakers from Norway, Italy, Eastern Europe, and the United States. The native speakers were rated highest in the area of socio-intellectual level, followed by Eastern Europeans and Norwegians. In the area of aesthetic quality, the native speakers were again rated higher, but there was no significant difference seen among the foreign voices (Eisenstein 1983, p. 171).

Nonnative speakers have only rarely played the role of listener/judges in speaker evaluation studies. One example is a study by Alford and Strother (1990) which asked nonnative English speakers to react to various US English regional dialects. They found that
the nonnative speakers could perceive differences in the dialects, but that they rated the
voices differently than the control native speaker judges.

Interestingly, no research has yet been reported which focuses on the attitudes that
nonnative speakers hold towards the English of other nonnative speakers. The present study
attempts to tap into the language attitudes one group of nonnative speakers feels toward other
nonnative speakers who come from different language backgrounds.

**Interpretation of Data**

In order to interpret the data gleaned from indirect language attitudes research, a
number of variables must be considered. One such variable is that language is closely tied to
ethnic identity, and so the issues of ingroup solidarity and intergroup conflict need to be
taken into account. The idea that future behavior can be inferred from measures of attitude
must also be examined. Finally, since most indirect measures of language attitudes depend
on only a few representative speakers for their stimulus group, the generalizability of these
studies also merits comment.

Giles (1977) points out that ethnic identity and language are closely tied. He states:

> Anything can become symbolic of ethnicity... but since language
> is the prime symbol system to begin with and since it is relied on so
> heavily (even if not exclusively) to enact, celebrate, and “call forth”
> all ethnic activity, the likelihood that it will be recognized and singled
> out as symbolic of ethnicity is great indeed. (p. 25)

Since language is seen as a symbol of ethnicity, language attitude studies become
investigations of the attitudes that one ethnolinguistic group feels toward another. Speakers
of the same native language/dialect are often members of the same ethnic group; this is
almost always the case when describing ESL students in United States universities. It has been proposed that when members of different groups come into contact, they compare themselves physically, economically, socially, and linguistically. (Giles 1979, p. 267). Giles points out that these types of comparisons may cause group members to find or even create differences which make them "positively distinct from the outgroup," their final goal being the creation of a separate social identity (p. 267-268). We can assume that this process takes place among ESL students. Their university classes are full of people from other ethnic groups, and new students must somehow find a way to fit into the social structures already present. Ethnic identity may become especially salient at this point, and students may attach themselves to others who speak their language and/or belong to their same ethnic group.

Giles (1979) notes that the more ethnicity is important to a person, the more ethnic speech characteristics are called upon. He states that "given that language and ethnic speech markers are for many ethnic groups salient and valued dimensions of their social identity, it may well be that the accentuation of ingroup speech markers is an important strategy for making oneself psychologically and favourably distinct from outgroup members" (p. 268). In other words, ingroup members use language to identify themselves as part of their ethnic group. This has also been found to be true when non-native speakers use the language of an outgroup (for example, Spanish speakers who speak English with a recognizably Spanish accent). This was found in an earlier study by Giles (1973). He discovered that the use of an outgroup language, but with a distinctive ethnic accent, still had the effect of categorizing the
speakers as members of their particular ethnic groups. Therefore, accented English can also serve to identify a person as part of his or her ethnic group.

The above behavior relates to language attitude studies in a number of ways. One would hypothesize that an ethnic group member who listens to an anonymous voice would listen for ethnic speech markers and would recognize a member of his or her own ethnic group. If the listener felt very proud of his or her own ethnicity, one would predict that the ingroup member's voice would be evaluated positively—perhaps even more positively than voices which were recognizably outgroup. This such behavior was found by Flores and Hopper (1975) in a study of Mexican-American attitudes toward Mexican-American dialect and standard English. Those raters who classified themselves as “Chicano,” signifying that they very positively evaluated their ethnic group, rated the Mexican-American dialect more positively than standard English. Giles, Hewstone, and Ball (1983) propose that a person's perceived ethnic identity is directly related to the social evaluations that person attributes to another individual who speaks a different language variety. They state that “it may be emphasized that attitudes held towards language varieties will depend on the extent to which group members have a positive or negative image of their own group (i.e. their social identity) . . . ” (p. 89).

Language attitudes studies, therefore, elicit between-group feelings. In these studies, stereotypes about certain language varieties and their speakers tend to emerge. In fact, Ryan, Giles, and Hewstone (1988) believe that in intergroup situations “one would expect more
stereotypical and less individuating judgments of the outgroup language variety, as well as more ingroup consensus about the positive attributes of one’s own language variety” (p. 1074).

In language attitudes research, individual attitudes serve as a window into group attitudes and opinions. It is widely accepted that prejudice is independent of personal experience (Heller, 1988). Giles, Hewstone, and Ball (1983) point out that the attitude concept “refers to knowledge about various aspects of social reality that is shared by many members of a society but is apprehended at the individual level” (p. 88). Evidence has shown that members of the same ethnic group tend to behave uniformly towards outgroup members. A 1984 study by Hewstone and Giles asserts that “all members of the same group tend in intergroup contexts. . . to behave in the same way towards outgroup members and to ignore differences between individual members of the outgroup” (qtd. in Ryan, Giles, and Hewstone, 1988). Therefore, previous research has shown that by eliciting attitudes from individual members of an ethnic group, it is possible to make generalizations about the attitudes held by the entire ethnic group.

A second factor in data interpretation deals with correct ethnic identification of the speakers. In many language attitudes studies, especially those using the matched guise technique, the speakers are pilot tested with a set of listeners in order to make sure that the listeners can positively identify the ethnic group the speaker comes from. If the majority of listeners guess the correct identity, the speaker’s guise is said to be successful (see Giles et al., 1995). However, all listeners may not predict the correct ethnicity. A study by Palmer
(1973) found that native English speaking judges were not successful in guessing the language backgrounds of Arabic, Lingala and Vietnamese native speakers when they were tape recorded speaking in English. The listeners still rated the speakers on various personality traits even though they did not guess the correct identities.

The difficulty in interpreting the results, then, lies in finding out how listeners reached their judgments. If the listeners are guessing a different ethnic group, are they simply calling upon stereotypes of that other group? What if the listeners cannot guess ethnicity because they cannot pinpoint the accent they hear? A possible answer to this question may be found in a study of native English speakers’ reactions to regionally accented British English by Milroy and McClenaghan (1977). In their study, listeners were asked to identify the ethnicity of each speaker they heard. The researchers found that their results were consistent, even across judges who misidentified the accents. They explain their findings as follows:

It has been widely assumed that an accent acts as a cue identifying a speaker’s group membership. Perhaps this identification takes place below the level of conscious awareness... In other words, accents with which people are familiar may directly evoke stereotyped responses without the listener first consciously assigning the speaker to a particular reference group. (qtd in Edwards, 1994, p. 25)

This hypothesis may serve to explain the reactions to a language variety a listener is familiar with. However, on many occasions, a listener may not be familiar with an accent because he or she has simply not had contact with its speakers. When nonnative English speakers are involved in both the speaking and listening positions, the situation becomes even more complicated. Guessing ethnicity is easier when it is done in one’s own language
because subtle pronunciation cues are easier to perceive and help listeners identify speaker origins. When all participants are using a language other than their own, however, this other language (English) may serve as an intermediary force which disguises identity. For example, a Spanish speaker will surely identify a native French speaker who is tape recorded speaking in Spanish. But, if the same French speaker is recorded speaking in English, the Spanish speaker may have a more difficult time pinpointing the French person’s identity.

In cases where listeners simply cannot identify a speaker’s accent, is it the particular sounds of the accent that the listeners react to instead of stereotypes of an ethnic group? This question is particularly pertinent to the study of international students’ language attitudes because many students are unfamiliar with nonnative English accents. However, despite this unfamiliarity, they make judgments about the speakers they hear. An obvious question then arises: are some languages simply more “aesthetic” sounding than others? Edwards (1982) points out that the aesthetic possibility has been disproved by a series of studies in which listeners heard unfamiliar (foreign) language varieties, and did not discriminate between them on aesthetic grounds (qtd. in Cargile et al., 1994). Another possible explanation has been postulated by Giles et al. (1995). Although not discounting the existence of stereotypes, Giles proposed that another variable may also be at work in language attitude studies. In a pioneering investigation, he studied the effect that a listener’s mood had on the results of an attitude study. His research dealt with Mexican-American English. Giles suggests that a negative mood may be triggered by a speaker’s voice, and that this mood may, along with stereotypes, influence the way a listener reacts to the voice (p. 116).
A third factor in data interpretation is the ability to infer and predict future behavior from the attitudes that are elicited. It is particularly difficult to validate the results of attitude studies simply because they deal with invisible mental processes; however, language attitudes research has generally assumed that a correlation exists. Smith (1970) states that “it is . . . assumed that there exists a direct concomitant, if not causal, relationship between attitudes and behavior in that how one evaluates the speech of another person will have an effect upon how he acts toward that person” (p. 97). Other scholars have also made the connection between attitude and behavior. Agheyisi and Fishman (1970) point out that “. . . there is . . . a consensus that attitudes are learned, enduring, and positively related to overt behavior” (p. 151). Williams (1970) also sees a correlation. He states that:

In a situation, (1) speech types serve as social identifiers. (2) these elicit stereotypes held by ourselves and others (including ones of ourselves). (3) We tend to behave in accord with these stereotypes, and thus (4) translate our attitudes into a social reality. (qtd. in Ryan, 1973, p. 61)

However, other researchers are more skeptical about an attitude-behavior connection. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) propose that general attitude measures, such as language attitudes studies, can only predict broad behavioral acts (such as the amount of French spoken in a week) but not specific behavioral acts (such as whether a person will speak French or English to a neighbor) (qtd. in Giles and Copeland, 1991, p. 57). Eisenstein (1983) points out that a startling outcome was found in a study by Buttino and Sebastian which was eventually published in 1985. Their study dealt with native English speaker reaction to Spanish accented speakers. Eisenstein (1983) feels that their study “illustrates the potential
strength of behavior mediated by accented speech” (p. 174). The subjects of the study believed that they were administering electric shocks of different intensity and duration to native English and Spanish accented English speakers. The researchers reported that the “findings suggested that more agresssion was directed toward individuals of Spanish ethnic background by angered subjects” (Eisenstein 1983, p. 175).

More direct methods have been employed to attempt to better assess the connection between language attitudes and behavior. Fishman (1968) introduced the concept of a “commitment measure” in language attitudes studies. This type of measure is usually assessed by questions which are designed to measure a listener’s willingness or commitment to perform an activity (such as invite a French speaker to dinner). These studies often follow up by actually observing the listener-respondents to see if their behaviors correlate with the answers they gave on the attitude test. Commitment measures are seen as more reliable predictors of behavior. (Agheyisi and Fishman, 1970, p. 144). Ryan, Hewstonec, and Giles (1984) mention two studies which also employ more direct measures to investigate the language attitude-behavior relationship. They include Giles, Baker, and Fielding (1975), who measured listeners’ willingness to cooperate with instructions given by an English speaker utilizing Received Pronunciation (the prestige British English) and a regional (Birmingham) speaker. These researchers found that listeners’ cooperated more when addressed by the RP English speaker. Similarly, Bourhis and Giles (1976) investigated the impact of accent upon listeners’ compliance with a request to fill out a survey that was read over an intercom system
at a movie theater. They also found that the RP speaker’s instructions were followed more than speakers of other English dialects (p. 141).

In traditional speaker evaluation studies, such as the speaker evaluation paradigm, the connection between language attitudes and behavior has been widely accepted. However, criticisms of this assumption do exist, and so the attitudes elicited by these studies cannot be used as proof for behavioral intentions. In 1994, Cargile et al., after reviewing the past 30 years of language attitudes research, state their belief that generalizations can be made about the behavioral component of language attitudes. They affirm that “language attitudes can shape behavioural outcomes (e.g. co-operation, accommodations) and decision-making in many important contexts including educational, legal, medical, and language public policies” (p. 228). Therefore, researchers of language attitudes, while not able to broadly overgeneralize their results, can make some important predictions about a person’s attitude and possible future behavior.

A fourth and final consideration in data interpretation deals with generalizability of the results. Language attitudes studies are often criticized because, in most cases, the stimuli for the listener-judges consist of only a few representative speakers from the ethnic groups under investigation. In matched guise studies, often only one speaker is used (Giles et al., 1995). In variations on the matched guise, one female and one male speaker may be chosen to represent each language variety/ethnic group in question (Alford and Strother, 1990). Despite the fact that only a few speakers are used as stimuli, these studies are valuable because they serve as a probe into the perceptions that people have of the language
varieties/ethnic groups those speakers represent. The object of these studies is to investigate the feelings that groups have about each other in order to better understand their social relationships. It is not possible to label a representative speaker the "norm" for all members of his or her group. Individual differences in voice prevent us from overgeneralizing results beyond the particular constraints of each study. This type of research simply serves as a way to gather important information about the ways people perceive each other through language. Each study undertaken adds to our growing knowledge of how attitudes towards language varieties may affect social relationships and interactions between members of different ethnic groups.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS AND MATERIALS

This chapter presents the method used to conduct this speaker evaluation study. Included is a discussion of the subjects, testing instruments, and data analysis procedure used.

Subjects

As in all speaker evaluation research, two sets of subjects were used for this study, speakers and listener-judges. Permission to use subjects was granted by the Human Subjects Committee of Iowa State University. Preliminary demographic information was gathered from all subjects by means of a questionnaire before the study was carried out. Both sets of subjects and their backgrounds will be described in detail below.

Speakers

This research used a modification of the matched guise technique, in which speakers from the groups under study used their own native accents. Eight subjects were chosen as speakers and all were graduate students at Iowa State University. A male and a female representative from the following language groups were used: Russian, Chinese, Spanish, and English (U.S.). These language groups were selected because they represent important areas from which the majority of ESL students are now coming: Eastern Europe, Latin America, and Asia. The native English speakers were included as a control group and were teaching assistants in the English department at Iowa State University.
In order to control for the nonnative speakers’ pronunciation and general comprehensibility in English, only individuals who had taken the Iowa State University SPEAK test were selected as subjects. The native English speakers were the only speakers who did not take the test. The SPEAK test is based on the Test of Spoken English (TSE), a test given by the Educational Testing Service. When the TSE was revised, the old version of the TSE was adopted for use as the Iowa State University SPEAK test. The SPEAK test is administered by the Graduate College and is used to ascertain the English language ability of nonnative English speaking graduate students. The score on the test determines eligibility for graduate teaching assistantships. Scores on the test range from 1-3 with one signifying lower ability and three higher ability in English. The speakers selected for this study all received relatively similar pronunciation scores and similar overall comprehensibility scores. Their pronunciation scores ranged from 2.1-2.4. A score of 2.2 is passing for pronunciation in SPEAK. However, SPEAK’s overall comprehensibility score is the best indicator of a speaker’s ability in English and is the score used to determine teaching assistantships. All speakers had passed the minimum comprehensibility score (2.2) and were practicing teaching assistants. Their scores in this area were also highly similar, ranging from 2.2-2.4.

As a final control, the speakers’ voices were screened by the researcher in order to avoid using people with strange voice qualities (such as a nasalized voice or a man who sounds like a woman). Demographic information was gathered from the speakers by means of a questionnaire, and their answers are shown along with information from SPEAK in Table 3.1.
As shown in Table 3.1, the ages of the speakers ranged from 21-32 years. The length of time spent in the United States ranged between two months and six years. Every speaker indicated that he/she had never lived in an English speaking country other than the United States. The SPEAK test was taken by most of the subjects in December of 1995; two subjects took the test in January of 1996.

**Listener-Judges**

The group chosen to judge the voices was made up of twenty-four native Spanish speakers, twelve male and twelve female. Spanish speakers were chosen because they represent a large nonnative English speaking population on the Iowa State University campus and were easily accessible to the researcher. In order to control for the listeners' English language ability, only university students taking regular classes taught in English were used. Students must have a TOEFL score of at least 500 to enter the university. Two subjects had taken upper level (junior year) English courses (English 314 and 371). Ten subjects had completed the upper level Freshman English course required of all undergraduate students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Language</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Time in U.S.</th>
<th>SPEAK pron. score</th>
<th>SPEAK comp. score</th>
<th>Year SPEAK taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>August 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8 months</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>August 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>January 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>August 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>January 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>August 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>lifetime</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>lifetime</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(English 105) and three had taken the lower level Freshman English course (English 104). The remaining subjects had taken university-level ESL. Six had taken ESL for graduate students (English 101D), and one had taken undergraduate ESL (English 101C). The remaining two subjects did not reply to the question.

The researcher spoke briefly to each listener to make sure that no serious hearing or comprehension problems existed which could affect their responses in the speaker evaluations. The subjects also completed a brief demographic questionnaire which asked them their sex, age, field of study, enrollment status, and length of time in the mainland U.S. They were also asked to indicate the extent to which they interact with nonnative speakers of English (people who speak neither English nor Spanish as a native language) while at the university, and to indicate from which countries/language backgrounds the people they interact with come from. The last set of questions on the demographic questionnaire was developed as a measure of Latino /Hispanic ethnic identity and will be explained later in this section.

The listener-judges ranged in age from 19-39 years; the mean age was 27 years and the median age was 24 years. Their enrollment status was as follows: two sophomores, two juniors, ten seniors, and ten graduate students. The length of time they had spent in the United States ranged from four months to seven years, with the average length of time spent being 2.5 years. The listeners came from eleven Spanish speaking countries, summarized in Table 3.2. The native English speakers were from Rhode Island and Maryland.
Table 3.2. Listener Origins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked the extent to which they interact with nonnative speakers at the university, the listeners were given the choices of often, seldom, and never. The majority of listeners (eighteen) stated that they interact often with nonnative English speakers. Five reported that they seldom interact with nonnative speakers and one reported never interacting with them. The listeners were also asked which countries or languages represented the nonnative speakers they had the most contact with. A range of answers were given. However, one geographic area was mentioned by almost every respondent: Asia, specifically the countries of China, Japan and Korea. Other groups were mentioned much less often, and included people from the Middle East, India, Africa, and Europe (Greece, France, Finland, Sweden, and Germany).

The final set of preliminary information gathered about the listeners was an ethnic identity measure. Giles, Hewstone, and Ball (1983) have proposed that a person’s perceived ethnic identity is directly related to the social evaluations that person attributes to language
varieties and the individuals who speak them. The identity measure was included in this study in order to explore possible connections between the listener’s speaker evaluations and their feelings of Latino/Hispanic ethnicity. The listener/judges were asked to indicate their feelings about their Latino/Hispanic identity in a set of three questions. They are in Figure 3.1 as follows:

1. My Latino/Hispanic identity is important to me. True False
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

2. I feel secure being Latino/Hispanic. True False
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

3. I am proud to speak English with a Spanish accent. True False
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Figure 3.1: Ethnic Identity Measure

These questions were adapted from a study done by Giles et al. (1995), in which Americans were asked to indicate their perceived national identity after listening to a matched guise speaker using Mexican American and Standard English. The researchers found that the subjects’ identity measures changed when they listened to the different accents.

**Testing Instruments and Procedures**

The testing instruments, which include the demographic information and speaker evaluation questionnaires, were pilot tested with six ESL students prior to their implementation in order to discover and rectify any possible problems in their interpretation.
The demographic questionnaire from both sets of subjects was explained above. The remaining testing instruments and implementation procedures are described below for both the speakers and the listeners.

**Procedures for Speakers**

After completing the brief demographic questionnaire, all speakers were tape recorded reading the same prose passage from the retired Form A of the SPEAK test. Therefore, syntax and word choice were controlled for. The paragraph was designed to measure pronunciation and to take approximately one minute to read. The subjects in this study took between 47 and 58 seconds to read it. The content of the reading passage was "neutral" in that it did not indicate the speakers’ native language, nationality, or any other specific information to influence the listeners’ decisions. The passage explained what a person should do to stay warm during cold winters. Most speaker evaluation studies use a neutral reading passage such as this one. Despite this fact, it must be mentioned that Giles and Copeland (1991) believe that texts themselves can never be neutral. A copy of the paragraph used in this study is included in Appendix A.

Each speaker was tape recorded separately in a quiet room. Once all voices were gathered, a Latin square design was used to compile the voices on audio-tape. The sequence of the voices was manipulated so that all listeners did not hear the same speaker first. Eight separate tapes were made so that every speaker was heard in each possible position on the tape (first, second, last, etc.). Since twenty-four listeners heard the voices, each tape was heard by three different listeners. The researcher’s voice was also included on the tape to
introduce each voice to the listeners. For example, the researcher’s voice was heard saying “Speaker 1” a few seconds before Speaker 1’s voice was played. This was done in order to keep the listeners from getting the speakers confused. Only a few seconds time was needed to space the voices apart on the tapes because the listeners were able to stop and play their tapes at will. The listener’s procedures will be explained in the next section.

Procedures for Listeners

The listeners were contacted by the researcher either by phone or in person, at which time a meeting time was set up in the university library. In the library, the listeners filled out the testing instruments either alone or in groups of two or three. They first filled out the demographic questionnaire. Then, the researcher explained the procedure and testing instrument to them, using the same explanations utilized by Gallois and Callan (1981). In that study, the researchers told the listeners that they would hear a series of speakers read a passage and be asked to give their first impression of each speaker as a person, using their own personal feelings and opinions. It was pointed out that people often make judgments this way, such as when they hear a stranger’s voice on the radio or telephone. The listeners were asked to first react to the voice they heard, and then to rate eight audio-taped voices on a set of features. These features were adjectives set positively and negatively on a seven-point scale. Each listener was equipped with a personal stereo and headphones in order to be able to complete the evaluations at his or her own pace and to avoid distractions. The listeners heard a voice, stopped the tape player, and then answered questions about that voice. Then
they started the tape again to hear the next voice. This procedure was repeated until the
listeners had heard all eight voices.

A seven-point Likert scale was used for all questions. Listeners were able to choose
(by circling) any number on the scale. Examples are shown in Figures 3.2 and 3.3.

The first question asked the raters to indicate how the voice made them feel given a
seven point range between Irritated and Comfortable (Figure 3.2).

1) This voice makes me feel:
   Irritated  Comfortable
      7  6  5  4  3  2  1

Figure 3.2. Mood Question

The next ten questions asked the listeners to rate the voices on the following
adjectives, which were set positively and negatively on the same seven point Likert scale:
Friendly/Unfriendly; Gentle/Harsh; Attractive/Unattractive; Honest/Dishonest; Self-
Confident/Not Self-Confident; Trustworthy/Untrustworthy; Very Intelligent/Not Very
Intelligent; Patient/Impatient; Ambitious/Lazy; and Good Manners-Polite/Poor Manners-
Impolite. These adjectives were adopted from Alford and Strother’s (1991) study of
international students’ reactions to U.S. regional dialects. Alford and Strother feel that their
adjectives can be clearly understood by second language learners (p. 485). Only three of the
adjective sets used in this study were not used by Alford and Strother. One set, Good
Manners-Polite/Bad Manners-Impolite was created as an adaptation of two of Alford and
Strothers’ sets: Good Family Training/Poor Family Training and Well Educated/Poorly
Educated. This was done in order to prevent possible misinterpretation; it was felt that “family training” may be interpreted in different ways by different people. Also, “well educated” can be erroneously translated into Spanish as “well mannered.” The other two adjective sets used in this study are Honest/Dishonest and Attractive/Unattractive. These were adopted from other well-known speaker evaluation studies. Attractive/Unattractive was used by Mulac et al. (1974); and Honest/Dishonest was used by Zahn and Hopper in their Speech Evaluation Instrument (SEI), (1985). The point scale for these ten questions was set up so that a 7 would correspond to the more “positive” characteristic and 1 the more “negative.” An example question is shown in Figure 3.3.

This person is:
2) Friendly
    Unfriendly
    7  6  5  4  3  2  1

Figure 3.3. Sample evaluation question

The next question asked the listeners to indicate the extent to which they would like to be a partner with the speaker on a required class project that would receive a grade. This is a commitment measure question which aims to investigate the relationship between the listener’s evaluations of the speaker with future behavior. The question is shown in Figure 3.4.
12) If you had to work on a graded class project with a partner, would you like this person to be your partner?

| Yes | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | No |

Figure 3.4. Group work question

The last question on the testing instrument asked the listeners to guess where the listener was from (country or native language). Listeners were told that if they did not have a guess, to leave the question blank. This was done in order to acquire authentic guesses; it prevented subjects who did not have a guess from writing anything down just to fill in the blank. The complete testing instruments for the listeners are included in Appendix B.

**Data Analysis**

Before any data were calculated, all information was organized and recorded on a spreadsheet. Both the listeners' demographic information and their evaluations of the speakers were recorded in this manner. Once the data were put into the file, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) and a comparison among means was carried out in order to determine if any of the differences found in the listeners' responses were statistically significant. An analysis of variance partitioned the sources of variation into the effects of listener, order, gender, and language group of the speakers. The interaction between gender and language group was investigated as well.

Seven specific questions were asked of the data in order to determine the effect that a speaker's gender and language group had on listener responses. They are as follows: 1) Did...
listeners give the same average response to both genders of speakers averaged over all language groups? 2) Did listeners give the same average response to US English speakers as they did to the average of the other three language groups averaged over both genders? 3) Did listeners give the same average response to Spanish speakers as they did to the average of Chinese and Russian speakers averaged over both genders? 4) Did listeners give the same average response to Chinese speakers as they did to Russian speakers averaged over both genders? The three remaining questions asked of the interaction between language group and gender for questions 2, 3, and 4.

Two specific questions were asked about the listeners: 1) Did the gender of the listener affect the average responses? and 2) Did the strength of the listeners’ ethnic identity affect the average responses? In addition, the listeners’ accuracy at identifying the speakers’ language groups/national origins is summarized.

Mean differences, judged by statistical tests (t-statistic, 154 degrees of freedom) as unlikely (P<.05) to have arisen by chance alone, were also noted for each data grouping. The results for all of the above questions are discussed in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter begins with an analysis of the findings for the first twelve questions on the testing instrument. The first area analyzed is that of the listeners’ moods after hearing the speakers (question 1). This is followed by a presentation of the listeners’ assessment of the speakers’ physical characteristics and personalities (questions 2-11). The group work question is then analyzed, with a focus on which speakers were seen as more desirable/less desirable class partners. The second part of this chapter deals with the listener effects of gender and ethnicity. Next, a discussion of the listeners’ ability to correctly identify speaker origins/native language is presented. Finally, the chapter concludes with a discussion of the results and their implication to teachers of English as a second language.

Analysis of Questions

The listeners’ evaluations were analyzed, and for each question, means were calculated for each speaker. In this chapter, tables are presented which show the mean scores that the speakers received for each question.

The Effect of the Speakers on the Listeners’ Moods

In question 1, the listeners indicated how each voice made them feel on a 7-point range from comfortable to irritated. A low mean indicates that the listeners were more comfortable, and a high mean indicates irritation. The average score for this question equalled 3.41, slightly less than the middle of the scale in the direction of comfortable.
Table 4.1. Mean Response Values for Question 1: Listener Mood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>US English</th>
<th>Gender means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language means</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>Question mean = 3.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(root mean square error 1.40)

Table 4.1 shows that the listeners felt more comfortable with a US English voice than with the average of the other voices of the other language groups combined (2.85 vs. 3.60). This difference is significant at the $P < .01$ confidence level. All other differences among the nonnative speakers’ voices and due to gender were not significant and could easily have arisen by chance.

The order in which the listeners heard the voices on the tapes was also significant for this question ($P < .05$). In other words, the listeners’ moods were affected by which speakers they heard first, second, etc. 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.

Giles (1995) proposed that a speaker’s voice may elicit certain positive or negative moods in listeners which, along with stereotypes, may influence the way a listener reacts to the voice (p. 116). However, the results of this study show that the nonnative speakers elicited very similar moods in the listeners. The fact that the listeners did not differentiate significantly between the nonnative speakers on the mood question does not give support to Giles’ claim. The results for this question show that the nonnative voices put the listeners
into relatively similar moods, and that these moods were not overwhelmingly negative. Therefore, it seems that these listeners were not turned off by any of the nonnative speakers’ accents. This finding casts a positive light on the role that language attitudes play in intergroup contexts such as ESL classrooms. A student’s Spanish, Russian, or Chinese accent may not be perceived as irritating to his or her nonnative speaking classmates, and so may not cause negative feelings in the classroom. More investigations of listener mood should be carried out in order to confirm these findings. It is also possible that the unique voice qualities of these particular speakers were such that they made the listeners feel more comfortable than irritated.

Listeners’ Assessment of Speakers’ Personalities and Physical Characteristics

This section presents an analysis of the listeners’ responses for the ten personality/physical characteristics. For these questions, a larger mean indicates a more positive rating and a smaller number indicates a more negative score. The characteristics under scrutiny included Friendliness, Gentleness, Attractiveness, Honesty, Self-Confidence, Trustworthiness, Intelligence, Patience, Ambition, and Manners/Politeness.

In the category of Friendliness, there was a significant difference found according to native language, shown in Table 4.2. The listeners found US English voices to be more friendly than the average of the other language groups combined, (5.08 vs. 4.64). This difference is significant at the P < .05 confidence level.
Table 4.2. Mean Response Values for Question 2: Friendliness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>US English</th>
<th>Gender means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language means</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>Question Mean = 4.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(root mean square error 1.58)

In addition, the gender difference in the Chinese, 1.05, exceeded that in the Russians (P < .05). The female Chinese voice seemed substantially more friendly than her male counterpart while very little gender difference appeared in the Russian speakers. No significant difference was found between the Hispanic voices and the other nonnative voices.

Table 4.3 presents the results for gentleness, and shows that again there were significant differences between the US voices and the other voices. On the whole, the US speakers were rated as more gentle than the other speakers at a P < .05 level of significance. Another significant difference was found to exist between the genders (P < .05). Female voices were rated as more gentle than male, and the US female was rated most gentle. The US female was rated significantly more gentle than the US male.

Table 4.3. Mean Response Values for Question 3: Gentleness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>US English</th>
<th>Gender means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language means</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>Question mean = 4.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(root mean square error 1.22)
When the native Spanish speakers were compared to the other speakers for the variables of gender and language background, a significant difference was also found ($P < .01$). The gender effect was not the same between the native Spanish speakers and the average of the Chinese and Russian speakers. The Hispanic male was rated more gentle than the Hispanic female ($P < .01$); however, the Chinese and Russian females were, on the average, rated more gentle than the Chinese and Russian males ($P < .01$).

Table 4.4. Mean Response Values for Question 4: Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Gender means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language means</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(root mean square error 1.12)

The results for attractiveness, shown in Table 4.4, indicate that the US English speakers were rated significantly more attractive than the others ($P < .01$). Gender also was significant in this question, with the females receiving higher scores for attractiveness than the males ($P < .01$). Overall, the US female was rated the most attractive of all speakers.

No significant differences were found to exist between the native Spanish speakers and the other speakers. However, a difference was found between the Chinese and Russians. The Chinese female was seen as a great deal more attractive than the Chinese male. She was also seen as more attractive than both Russians. The Russian male and female were seen as equally attractive, receiving the exact same score.
Table 4.5 presents the results for the category of honesty. No significant difference was found to exist between native languages in general. However, a significant difference was found for gender of the speakers. The women were seen as significantly more honest than the men at the $P < .05$ confidence level. A significant difference was also found in gender between the Chinese and Russians. The Chinese female was seen as more honest than the Chinese male. Conversely, the Russian male was seen as more honest than the Russian female. No significant differences were found to exist between the Spanish speakers and the others.

Table 4.5. Mean Response Values for Question 5: Honesty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Gender means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Chinese 5.50</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.92 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish 5.00</td>
<td>4.96 5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian 4.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US English 5.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(root mean square error .96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The order in which the listeners heard the voices on the tapes was also significant for this question ($P < .05$). In other words, the listeners were influenced by which speakers they heard first, second, etc. A speaker who was perceived as dishonest may have caused the following speaker to also be perceived negatively.

An important and significant difference was found to exist between native languages in the category of self-confidence, shown in Table 4.6. The US speakers were perceived to be much more self-confident than the others at the $P < .01$ level of significance. The native
Spanish speakers were actually seen as less self-confident than the others, but the difference was not found to be significant. No differences were found in the area of gender.

In the area of trustworthiness, shown in Table 4.7, a significant difference was found to exist between language backgrounds.

Table 4.6. Mean Response Values for Question 6: Self-Confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>US English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language means</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(root mean square error 1.23)

Table 4.7. Mean Response Values for Question 7: Trustworthiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>US English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language means</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(root mean square error 1.12)

The mean for trustworthiness was relatively high (5.00), indicating that the listeners felt that the speakers were more trustworthy than untrustworthy in general. The US speakers were considered to be most trustworthy (P < .01).

A significant difference was also found to exist between genders. The women were rated more trustworthy than men (P < .01) and the US female was seen as most trustworthy.
overall, followed by the Chinese female. The male and female Spanish speakers both received the same score, and so were seen as equally trustworthy.

In the area of intelligence, shown in Table 4.8, again, a significant difference was found to exist according to language background, with the US English speakers seen as more intelligent than the others (P < .01). No important differences were found between the nonnative voices, indicating that they were grouped together as equally trustworthy. No significant differences were found to be due to gender.

A number of significant differences were found in the area of patience. Native language was found to be significant at the P < .01 level of confidence, with the US speakers seen as more patient than the others. This information is presented in Table 4.9. Gender was also found to be an important area of difference in the category of patience. The women were rated as more patient than the men at the P < .01 level of confidence. The US and Chinese females rated most patient overall, and the Chinese and Russian males were seen as the least patient.
Table 4.9. Mean Response Values for Question 9: Patience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Gender means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language means</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(root mean square error 1.30)

Gender and language background were found to interact at a significant level in this question. When the native Spanish speakers were compared to the average of the Chinese and Russian speakers, it was found that the gender effect was not the same between them. The Hispanic male was seen as more patient than the Hispanic female. Conversely, the Chinese and Russian females were seen as more patient than the Chinese and Russian males.

The order in which the listeners heard the voices on the tape was significant for this question (P<.01). A possible reason for this is that some speakers spoke a bit faster than others on the tape. The range of speaker reading time was between 47 and 58 seconds. A speaker who read more slowly may have been perceived as more patient. If this speaker was followed by someone who spoke more quickly, that next speaker may have been seen as less patient in comparison.

In the area of ambition, shown in Table 4.10, a significant difference was again found to exist for language background. In general, the US speakers were seen as more ambitious than the others (P<.05).
No important differences were found among the nonnative speakers, which implies that the accented voices were seen as equally ambitious, but still less ambitious than the native English speakers. No significant differences were found to be due to gender of the speakers. Some interesting differences were found in the area of manners/politeness. The question mean was relatively high (5.17) indicating that the listeners generally rated the speakers as being more polite than impolite. Again, significant differences were found to exist between language backgrounds, with the US speakers receiving higher scores than the others (P < .01) This information is shown in Table 4.11.

Significant differences were also found in the area of gender (P < .01). The women were seen as having better manners than the men, and the US female was rated highest overall, followed by the Chinese female. Gender and language background interacted in significant ways also. Again, the Chinese male was rated lower than the Chinese female, and the Russian male was also rated lower than the Russian female. Conversely, the Hispanic male was rated higher for manners/politeness than the Hispanic female.
The order that the listeners heard the voices on the tape was also significant for this question (P<.05). Again, it is possible that a speaker’s rate of speech affected the results. Listeners may have associated slower readers with better manners/politeness. If a slower reader was followed by a faster reader, that next reader may have been seen as less polite in comparison.

**Average Effect for Personality and Physical Characteristics**

The ten personality/physical characteristics (Questions 2 through 11) were analyzed as a group in order to calculate an overall average score for each speaker. Results are shown in Table 4.13. The US English speakers had a higher combined score than the other language groups combined (5.28 vs. 4.73, P < .01). Interestingly, the native Spanish speakers as a group received the lowest overall score, but it was not significant. The women were evaluated more positively overall than the men for these ten characteristics; female voices had a distinctly higher combined score than male voices (P<.01). Gender and native language interacted significantly overall as well.
Table 4.13. Mean Response Values for Questions 2 through 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Female means</th>
<th>Male means</th>
<th>Language means</th>
<th>Gender means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US English</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>Question mean = 4.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(root mean square error 0.79)

The Chinese female was evaluated more positively than the Chinese male, the Russian female was evaluated more positively than the Russian male, and the US female was rated more positively than the US male. However, little overall difference was found to exist between the native Spanish speaking male and female. The gender difference in Chinese seems much more pronounced than for any other language group (P=.01).

Listeners' Desire to Work with Speakers on a Class Project

In question 12, the listeners indicated their willingness to work with each speaker as a partner on a graded class project. The results are shown in Table 4.14. Language background was the only significant difference found in the group work question. The listeners wanted to work as a partner with the US speakers more than the others (P<.01).

Table 4.14. Mean Response Values for Question 12: Willingness to Work with Speaker in a Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Female means</th>
<th>Male means</th>
<th>Language means</th>
<th>Gender means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US English</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>Question mean = 4.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(root mean square error 1.33)
Interestingly, no important differences were found to exist between the nonnative speakers or due to gender. Gender and native language did play an important role in the evaluations of the Chinese and Russians, however. The Chinese female was seen as a much more desirable partner than the Chinese male, but the Russian male was seen as a more desirable partner than the Russian female.

Another set of statistical tests done on the data looked for correlations between the listeners' answers to question 12 and their answers to the other questions on the testing instrument. The correlation coefficients indicated that the listeners' answers for the group work question correlated positively with their answers for seven other questions: questions 3 (gentleness, 0.61), 4 (attractiveness, 0.63), 5 (honesty, 0.58), 6 (self-confidence, 0.59), 7 (trustworthiness, 0.64), 8 (intelligence, 0.58), 10 (ambition, 0.53), and 11 (manners/politeness, 0.72). This means that if a listener gave a speaker a high score for gentleness, it was highly likely that he/she also wanted to work as a partner with the speaker. Likewise, if the listener gave a speaker a low score for gentleness, he/she was likely to not want to work with the speaker. Therefore, for this population of native Spanish speakers, the above characteristics are important in choosing a partner for a class project. Interestingly, question 9 (patience) did not correlate with the group work question. Patience is not a factor that the listeners feel is important for a class partner to possess. Another finding seen in the group work correlations is that question 1 (listener mood) did not correlate significantly with question 12. Future research on the effects of listener mood and behavior committement in speaker evaluation studies may shed more light on this issue.
Listener Effects

Gender and ethnicity are two areas which were investigated for the listeners with the aim of answering two main questions: 1) Did the gender of the listeners affect the average responses given? and 2) Did the strength of the listeners’ ethnic identities affect the average responses?

Gender Effect

The mean score for males and females listening to the tapes were calculated for the ten personality/physical characteristics. The mean female score was 4.85 and the mean male score was 4.89. The similarity of these scores indicate that the gender of the listener did not influence the way they evaluated the speakers. The same finding was reported by Gallois and Callan (1981) in a similar study. They found that the ratings of the male and female listeners did not differ according to nationality of the speaker. They point out that “males and females may thus act similarly when confronted with foreign accents...” (p. 357).

Ethnic Identity

The listeners were asked to complete an ethnic identity measure prior to listening to the speakers. They indicated, on a seven point scale (7=true and 1=false), their feelings about three statements: 1) My Latino/Hispanic identity is important to me; 2) I feel secure being Latino/Hispanic; and 3) I am proud to speak English with a Spanish accent.

Responses for the three questions were added together in order to obtain an overall identity score for each listener. A score of 7 indicated that a person feels very positively about his/her ethnic group and a score of 1 indicated less positive feelings. A wide range of scores was reported, ranging from 7 to 2.5. Out of the twenty four listeners, three gave
themselves a perfect score of 7 and nine subjects gave themselves scores of 6. Six subjects reported scores of 5, while three indicated identity scores of 4. On the lower end, a score of 3 was given by three subjects. Generally, there was a positive correlation between identity questions 1 and 2 (0.63). Listeners who indicated that they were proud to be Latino/Hispanic usually also indicated that they felt secure being Latino/Hispanic. The third identity question, which asked the listeners' pride about speaking with a Spanish accent, did not correlate significantly with the other two identity questions. Although some listeners indicated that they were very proud to speak English with a Spanish accent, the majority of listeners gave themselves lower scores for this question than for the other two identity questions. Future research would benefit from a more in-depth study of the connection between the pride of speaking with accented English and the pride in being Latino/Hispanic.

An analysis of these scores with the responses on the speaker evaluation shows that there was no significant correlation between a listener's perceived ethnic identity and his or her general evaluations of the speakers. Likewise, no significant correlations could be found to exist between the listeners' responses for each individual ethnic identity question and their assessments of the speakers for the ten personality/physical characteristics. Another analysis was done to find out if the listeners' perceived ethnic identities influenced their evaluations of particular speakers. It was previously hypothesized that listeners with high ethnic identities would rate the native Spanish speakers more positively because they represent the Latino ethnic group. In order to do this, the listeners were divided into two groups, one with an average identity score of five or less and one with an average score greater than five. These scores were compared to the average ratings these listeners gave to the eight specific
speakers. The results showed that the listeners with high ethnic identities did not give the Spanish speakers any significantly higher scores. The listeners’ ethnic identities, whether low or high, did not seem to influence the ratings for any of the eight speakers.

The above findings are interesting given that experts in the field such as Giles, Hewstone, and Ball (1983) state that “it may be emphasized that attitudes held towards language varieties will depend on the extent to which group members have a positive or negative image of their own group (i.e. their social identity). . .” (p. 89). Despite this claim, the results of this study show that no connection existed between identity and evaluations. However, most of the previous research has been based on native speakers’ evaluations of accented language. The fact that this study investigated the interplay of language and attitudes between two sets of nonnative speakers, the speakers and the evaluators, may be the reason for the distinct findings.

Identification of Speakers

The final question on the listener’s evaluation sheets asked them to indicate their guesses of each speakers native country/language. Table 4.15 shows the percentage of the time that the listeners were able to correctly or incorrectly identify the speakers’ native background. The table shows that the listeners seem to have had difficulty correctly identifying the speakers. The native Spanish, Chinese, and English speakers were correctly identified approximately the same percentage of the time.
The native Spanish speakers were correctly identified slightly more often than the other speakers at forty-four percent of the time. Descriptors accepted as a correct identification included Latin American, Central American, Hispanic, Mexican, and Spanish (language). The native English speakers came in second at forty percent, with American, USA, and English (language) being accepted as correct identifications. In third place were the Chinese, with thirty seven percent of listeners identifying them as Asian. Importance was given to their identification as Asian and so acceptable answers included China, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and Korea. Six percent of listeners were able to correctly identify the Russian speakers, with the descriptors Russian and Eastern European accepted as correct.

The Russian voices were identified incorrectly the most at forty-six percent of the time. Some common misidentifications included Africa, Middle East, India, and Asia. Eastern Europeans are a relatively new population entering into US universities in large numbers, which could be the reason that the majority of listeners could not identify the Russians correctly. If this same study is done in future years, more nonnative English speakers will have gained experience with this population and may be able to identify them more easily.

Table 4.15. Percentage of Listeners Identifying Speakers’ Native Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>US English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No guess</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vague answers</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The native Spanish speakers were correctly identified slightly more often than the other speakers at forty-four percent of the time. Descriptors accepted as a correct identification included Latin American, Central American, Hispanic, Mexican, and Spanish (language). The native English speakers came in second at forty percent, with American, USA, and English (language) being accepted as correct identifications. In third place were the Chinese, with thirty seven percent of listeners identifying them as Asian. Importance was given to their identification as Asian and so acceptable answers included China, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and Korea. Six percent of listeners were able to correctly identify the Russian speakers, with the descriptors Russian and Eastern European accepted as correct.

The Russian voices were identified incorrectly the most at forty-six percent of the time. Some common misidentifications included Africa, Middle East, India, and Asia. Eastern Europeans are a relatively new population entering into US universities in large numbers, which could be the reason that the majority of listeners could not identify the Russians correctly. If this same study is done in future years, more nonnative English speakers will have gained experience with this population and may be able to identify them more easily.
The Chinese and Spanish speakers were both incorrectly identified twenty-three percent of the time. Interestingly, the native Spanish speakers were often misidentified as native English speakers (twenty-seven percent of the time). The English speakers were misidentified only twenty-five percent of the time; however it is very interesting that fifty-eight percent of those wrong answers identified the native English speakers as Latin American/Spanish speakers.

A large number of listeners did not guess an identity for the speakers, implying that they did not know where the person was from or his/her native language background. However, it is also possible that the listeners simply did not choose to write down their guesses. The listeners did not guess the origin of the Chinese speakers the most, leaving the question blank forty percent of the time. No guess was given for the Spanish speakers thirty-three percent of the time. The vague answer “European” was given for the Russians and English speakers and listed in the table under “Vague answers.” Ten percent of the listeners identified the Russians as European, and six percent indicated that the US English speaker was European. Since the Russians are from Europe and English is a European language, it is not known if the particular respondents correctly identified the speakers or not.

Discussion

The results from this research point to a number of important findings. The first is that the US English voices (native speakers) were evaluated significantly more positively than all of the nonnative voices. This finding confirms previous research done in the field. In evaluation studies which have asked listeners to evaluate both nonnative and native speakers, the native speakers are usually more favorably rated than the nonnatives (Ryan and Carranza,
1975). Results from other studies (see Ryan, Hewstone, and Giles, 1984) have shown that nonnative speakers often downgrade their own language varieties/accents when they are compared with the socially accepted “standard” variety. However, “nonstandard” speech varieties are often supported by their speakers due to ethnic pride. Because of this, the nonstandard varieties are often given higher marks on solidarity traits such as friendliness and social attractiveness. Interestingly, in the present study, the native speakers were still given the highest marks on these solidarity traits.

The second important finding is that the listeners did not significantly differentiate between the nonnative voices in their evaluations of the speakers. Ludwig (1982) points out that second language learners are aware of their linguistic handicaps when faced with a native speaker of the target language, and she reports that “a lowered self-esteem results from that situation” (p. 279). It is possible that the inclusion of native speakers on the stimulus tape may have caused the listeners to feel a low esteem for their accented English, which as a result, may have caused them to downgrade the nonnative speakers (as a group) in comparison. This could be a possible reason that no significant differences were found to exist between the nonnative speakers’ voices.

Another important finding seen in the results is that female voices were rated significantly more positively than male voices. When the results of this item analysis are compared to traditional assumptions about sex roles in Latino culture, some interesting observations can be made. The vast majority of listeners in this study (92%) were from Latin America. A study of Latin American sex roles by Quiñones (1979), points out that traditionally, Latin Americans view females more positively than males (p. 50). Quiñones
states that males are seen as emotional, earthy, and polite, whereas women are seen as controlled, spiritual, and assertive. However, Stevens (1973) states that the traditional concepts at work in sex role socialization of Latin American men and women are those of machismo and marianismo. Stevens identifies the chief characteristics of machismo as “exaggerated aggressiveness... in male-to-male interpersonal relationships and arrogance and sexual aggression in male-to-female relationships” (p. 90). The author defines marianismo as “the cult of female spiritual superiority, which teaches that women are semi-divine, morally superior to and spiritually stronger than men” (p. 91).

Stevens’ assessment of Latin American sex role stereotypes tends to agree with that of Quiñones, except for the “assertive” designation for women and the “polite” designation for men. If women are indeed viewed as semi-divine and morally superior to men, it seems plausible that native Spanish speakers from Latin America would perceive women’s voices more positively than men’s on characteristics that reflect those ideals (i.e. gentleness, honesty, trustworthiness, patience, and manners/politeness). The women in this study, on the average, received significantly higher scores in those areas than the men. However, if sex role stereotypes influenced these results, they did not have the same effect for the Hispanics as they did for the Chinese and Russians. Interestingly, the listeners usually evaluated the US, Chinese, and Russian females more positively than their male counterparts, but often indicated no difference between the Hispanic male and female. Actually, the Hispanic male was rated significantly higher than the female in the areas of gentleness and patience. The Hispanic female did not receive significantly higher scores than the male on any characteristic. Therefore, Latin American sex role stereotypes, if a predictor of listener
responses, did not function as a predictor for the responses to the native Spanish speakers, who were themselves Latin American.

The fourth important finding of this study is that the listeners did not differentiate between the nonnative speakers when asked if they would be willing to work with them on a class project. For these listeners, a classmate's accent did not influence their decision to work with that classmate. This is a significant finding for the ESL classroom, and it implies that ESL students may not use language/accent as a barrier to positive relationships between classmates.

Another interesting result of this study was that the Latino/Hispanic ethnic identity measure proved to have no impact on the listeners' evaluations of the speakers. Previous research has asserted that a persons perceived ethnic identity is directly related to the social evaluations that person attributes to individuals who speak different language varieties (Giles, Hewstone, and Ball 1983). However, previous studies have focused on ethnic group relations in areas where power relationships exist. For example, studies done in the United States such as Brennan and Brennan (1981) have focused on Mexican Americans' evaluations of both Mexican American and Standard English. In that setting, there is an obvious power differential between the users of Mexican American English and the Standard. Mexican Americans are a minority group in the United States and are often downgraded and discriminated against by the powerful Anglo population. Therefore, it is plausible that Mexican Americans focus on ethnic identity and its relationship to language and social evaluations. The present study investigated the ethnic identities of nonnative English speakers who are temporarily living in the United States as university students. None of
them grew up in the United States as members of a minority group, and so may not have the same feelings about ethnic identity and language that a member of a minority group may have. It is possible that some listeners have experienced minority status in their own countries, but they did not use the English language as a variable in those relationships. Therefore, the ethnic identity measure may be less effective in situations where minority status/power relationships are not as evident.

A final important finding of this study is that the listeners did not seem to have the ability to correctly identify the native language/country of the speakers. This was a surprising discovery because three of the language groups chosen, Chinese, English, Spanish, are very well represented on the university campus. Although Russians do not make up a large group on campus, it was predicted that the particular features of the Russian accent would cue the listeners to the correct language background. It is interesting that the listeners had difficulty identifying Asians because the majority of listeners reported on the demographic questionnaire that they had frequent contact with Asians. The listeners obviously have frequent contact with native English speakers at the university, and they themselves are native Spanish speakers.

A possible reason why the listeners in the present study were not able to identify a Spanish accented speaker is that Spanish speakers, when socializing together, tend to speak in Spanish, not English. Therefore, it is possible that these listeners rarely hear someone speaking in English with a Spanish accent. Another possible explanation deals with the fact that the listeners in this study came from many different Spanish speaking countries. The Spanish language often differs in characteristics such as pronunciation across national and
geographic boundaries. It is possible that the native Spanish speakers (who were from Peru and Argentina) were not identified correctly because their pronunciation of some consonants and vowels differed from that of the listeners.

The fact that the listener-judges deal with native English speaking professors, staff, and students every day at Iowa State University, makes it difficult to speculate as to why they were not able to correctly identify a native English speaker. It is possible that since the instructions on the testing instrument stated that “different speakers of English” would be studied, some listeners may have assumed that only nonnative speakers would be studied. The researcher did not give the listeners any other information about the speakers and did not tell them that both nonnative and native speakers would be included on the tape. The native English speakers used in this study were from the Eastern United States and the listeners were used to Midwestern English. However, the speakers did not have pronounced Eastern accents and they sounded very much like people from the Midwest. Despite this fact, it is possible that the listeners did detect something different in these speakers’ voices which was caused by an Eastern accent. For this reason, the listeners may have decided that the subjects could not be native English speakers.

Few studies have been reported which investigate accent recognition by either native or nonnative speakers. However, there was a speaker evaluation study done by Gallois and Callan (1981) which found that native English speakers had difficulty identifying the origins of nonnative speakers. The researchers carried out a study at an Australian university which asked native English speaking Australians to evaluate the accented English speech of Asians, Italians, French, British, and native English speaking Australians. They asked the listeners to
guess the origin of each speaker after listening to his/her voice. The researchers found that the listeners were able to identify Australian and British English speakers (the native speakers) a high percentage of the time, but were usually not able to accurately identify the nonnative speakers who were from French, Italian, Greek, and Vietnamese language backgrounds. Overall, their study produced similar results to the present one: they found that nationality and sex of a person speaking in English interacted in influencing judgments made of that person by the listeners. Also, like the present study, their listeners rated speakers positively/negatively even when they did not correctly guess their language/ethnic background. It is also interesting to note that one of the Australian findings parallels a finding of this study: the female speakers were given higher scores than the male speakers for all characteristics.

This study by Gallois and Callan (1981) demonstrates that the correct identification of the speakers' backgrounds is not necessary for the results of a study to be meaningful. The study by Gallois and Callan (1981), like the present study, indicates that "people differentiate between the voices of male and female speakers from various national groups, even when they are unable to correctly identify the speaker's nationality" (p. 358). This finding in itself is significant. Gallois and Callan (1981) point out that "this reaction to a voice may be more immediate than that elicited by national labels, and more closely related to behavior in situations in which Australians hear accented English speech" (p. 358). They imply that the accent itself may act as the trigger for a listener's behavior and that a listener's perception of a speaker's ethnic identity or nationality may not be the only important factor eliciting a listener's attitudes about a speaker. The model for language attitudes outlined by Ryan,
Hewstone, and Giles (1984) *accent/language* ≪ *social categorization* ≫ *personality*

judgments, therefore, may not explain every speaker evaluation case. In some cases, perhaps the "social categorization" area is eliminated and the accent may directly evoke judgments or even behavior in a listener. This theory may help to explain the method by which the listeners reached their judgments in the present study.

The fact that the native speakers in this study were evaluated significantly more positively than the nonnatives suggests that the listeners grouped the taped voices into two categories, "native" and "nonnative/accented" and formed their opinions on that basis. However, since the listeners did not seem to be very accurate at guessing the language backgrounds/origins of the speakers, the results imply that the listeners did not make a conscious decision to evaluate the native speakers more positively than the nonnatives. This research found that the listeners rated the native speakers more positively on all characteristics. Therefore, it is possible that listeners were not identifying their attitudes towards the speakers' accents, but instead were indicating their attitudes about English language ability. The native speakers were obviously more competent in English than the nonnatives. The SPEAK scores of the nonnative speakers indicated that they had similar abilities in English, and so this may be a reason why the listeners rated them similarly the majority of the time.

The implications of the listeners' misidentifications are pertinent for language attitudes research using nonnative speakers as the language evaluators. If the listeners are not able to successfully identify the ethnic group of the voices they hear, then it is not plausible to use the data collected to make claims about intergroup relations. Due to the listeners'
misidentifications of the speakers in this study and the fact that the nonnative speakers were evaluated very similarly, the results of this research seem to prove inconclusive in the area of intergroup relations in an ESL classroom. Future investigations of nonnative speakers’ language attitudes may shed more light on the complexities of interethnic relations in multicultural settings such as university ESL classes.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

This study investigates the language attitudes that nonnative English speakers hold toward the English of other nonnative speakers, focusing particularly on the implications of these attitudes for the ESL classroom. Five main research questions were explored in this study: 1) Do nonnative English speakers have attitudes towards different varieties of English? 2) Are different attitudes elicited by male and female voices? 3) Do certain accents elicit more negative or positive moods in listeners? 4) Can attitudes about accent influence a listener’s desire to work with a classmate in a group? and 5) Can nonnative English speakers determine the native country/language of other nonnative speakers they hear? Each of these questions will be discussed in turn in light of the results generated by this study.

The results show that nonnative English speakers do have attitudes towards different varieties of English; the nonnative English speakers who evaluated the voices (native Spanish speakers) felt more positive attitudes towards the voices of the native English speakers than they did towards the voices of the nonnative speakers. This observation supports previous research in language attitudes which has found that native speakers are usually viewed more positively than nonnatives in speaker evaluation studies.

However, it is significant that the listeners felt relatively the same attitudes towards the nonnative speakers as a whole. No significant differences in listener attitude were found to exist for the nonnative speakers. Since no previous research in the area of nonnative speakers’ evaluations of other nonnative speakers has been reported, the present study gives
new insight into this area. Previous research in language attitudes has reported that language attitudes play an integral social role in intergroup relations (Giles, Hewstone, and Ball, 1983, p. 95). However, most of that research has used native speakers as the language evaluators, and so the results of the present study may indicate an inherent difference in attitudes between native and nonnative listener-judges. Future studies which use both native and nonnative speakers as judges will be able to test that hypothesis. Also, due to the fact that the native speakers were evaluated more positively on all characteristics, it is possible that the listeners were indicating their attitudes towards English language ability instead of the speakers’ particular accents.

This study also shows that different attitudes are elicited by male and female voices. The women were evaluated significantly more positively than the men for all the characteristics. Sex role stereotypes of Hispanic/Latino culture offer possible explanations for this behavior. However, Gallois and Callan (1981) reported the same finding in an Australian study which did not include Hispanics. Clearly, more research needs to be done in order to investigate the effect that male and female voices, as well as sex role stereotypes, have on language attitude studies.

This research also found that the speakers’ voices did not elicit extremely negative or positive moods in the listeners. In fact, the average score for the mood question was 3.41, basically a neutral score. Also, it was found that the mood elicited in a listener by a speaker’s voice had no influence on the listener’s desire to be a partner with that speaker for a class project. This is significant for multicultural settings such as ESL. It means that even if a
listener perceived a speaker’s voice to be rather irritating, it did not influence that listener’s
decision to either choose or not choose that speaker as a partner. If the student’s accent is the
cause of that irritation, it may not be held against him/her when it comes to class activities
and group socialization. However, it must be pointed out that an irritating voice may not
necessarily be due only to a speaker’s particular accent. The voice qualities of the particular
representative speakers can also influence speaker evaluations. Gallois and Callan (1981)
point out in their Australian study that the individual characteristics of the speakers may have
influenced their results to some extent. They feel that their “subjects’ impressions of the
voices may have been determined by speakers’ accents, by variations in voice qualities across
the national groups, or by a combination of the two” (p. 357). This theory may also explain,
in part, the listeners’ method of evaluation in the present study. However, when discussing
voice quality, Gallois and Callan (1981) are unclear as to whether they are describing
idiosyncratic voice qualities or voice qualities shared by all members of a specific language
group.

Interestingly, the Latino/Hispanic ethnic identity measure proved to have no impact
on the listeners’ evaluations of the speakers. Previous research has asserted that a person’s
perceived ethnic identity is directly related to the social evaluations that person attributes to
individuals who speak different language varieties (Giles, Hewstone, and Ball 1983).
The findings of the present study refute this claim. However, previous studies have generally
focused on the language of minority groups contrasted with the dominant “standard”
language variety in areas such as the United States. In those situations, a definite power
structure exists which places the minority language variety very low on the social and political scales. In that type of setting, it is plausible that a minority group would focus on ethnic identity/pride and its relationship to language and social evaluations. The listeners in this study (native Spanish speakers) are most likely aware of the prejudice which exists about nonstandard language varieties. However, because these listeners did not grow up in the United States as members of a minority group, it is possible that they do not share the same feelings that minority groups do about ethnic identity and language.

Another possible reason why the ethnic identity measure did not impact the speaker evaluations is that it may not have successfully ascertained a subject’s ethnic identity. Perhaps a future study could add more questions to the measure, which may give a better indication of a listener’s perceived ethnic identity.

Finally, this research discovered that the nonnative listener-judges were not able to determine the native country/language of the other speakers they heard. This was a surprising discovery due to the fact that three of the language groups chosen were familiar to the listeners (Chinese/Asian, Spanish, English). The fact that the listeners were not able to identify the speakers’ native languages/countries is a significant finding in itself. It indicates that listeners differentiate between the voices of male and female speakers from different language groups even when they cannot successfully identify the speakers’ native language or country. Gallois and Callan (1981) discovered a similar result in their Australian study and demonstrated that the correct identification of the speakers’ backgrounds is not necessary for the results of a speaker evaluation study to be meaningful. They believe that this type of
reaction to a voice (without knowledge of the speaker’s nationality) may be more immediate than reactions elicited by national labels and may be more closely related to a listener’s behavior when he/she comes into contact with a speaker (p. 358). Therefore, it is possible that a speaker’s ethnicity or nationality may not be the only important factor eliciting a listener’s attitudes about that speaker. The misidentification of the speakers in this study indicates that the listeners were reacting to something other than ethnicity. However, if the listeners in this study were not reacting to ethnicity or nationality, then what were they reacting to? It is possible that the individual voice qualities of the speakers influenced the listeners’ evaluations. Also, the speakers’ language proficiencies may have played a role in evaluations. More research in this field needs to be pursued in order to gain more information about how a listener’s misidentification of a speaker’s nationality affects the speaker evaluation paradigm.

The implications of speaker misidentification in language evaluations are pertinent for language attitudes research which uses nonnative speakers as the language evaluators. The listeners in this study were not able to successfully identify the speakers’ native languages/countries, and so no claims can be made concerning intergroup relations. This study, therefore, proves inconclusive in the area of interethnic relations in a multicultural setting such as ESL. It is possible that these inconclusive findings indicate that language attitudes play no role in the stereotypes that nonnative English speakers have toward each other. International students may use other means to socially evaluate classmates, such as visual and nonverbal cues or a classmate’s particular religion or race.
However, it is highly probable that nonnative English speakers do hold important attitudes about nonnative speech that this particular study did not uncover. Many scholars assert that language attitudes exist in multicultural settings (Bradac and Giles, 1991; Giles, Hewstone, and Ball 1988). Future research may be more successful if a speaker’s language proficiency is investigated along with gender and language background. It seems that the listeners in this study may have been indicating their attitudes toward English proficiency. Perhaps speakers of differing English proficiencies elicit important attitudes in listeners which may interact with their attitudes about gender and language background. ESL students often complain that the majority of interlocutors in their ESL programs are other nonnative speakers. With those complaints may come antagonistic feelings about other ethnic groups, their language variety, and their English proficiency. If an instructor does feel that language attitudes play a role in interethnic relations in his or her class, activities can be instituted which address the issue.

Bradac and Giles (1991) present a number of suggestions in dealing with language attitudes in the second language classroom. They feel that the solution may be for “both teachers and students to become aware of their attitudes toward different accents, dialects, and languages” (p. 10). They believe that more tolerance for linguistic diversity can be achieved by getting students to talk about language and stereotypes in the classroom. The idea is that showing students the value of language diversity and the potential inaccuracy of linguistic stereotyping may cause them to be more accepting of language varieties unlike their own (p. 8). Small scale speaker evaluation projects could be done in the classroom to
expose students to both nonnative and native varieties of English. These projects may help to legitimize other varieties in the minds of students. Along with the speaker evaluations, class discussions could address the issue of linguistic stereotypes. Bradac and Giles present some excellent areas that could be discussed including “the speakers’ perceived personal and group attributes, the appropriateness of their voices in different contexts, how they thought other people might react to the voices, how the voices would have a bearing on scholastic achievement, and how much listeners would wish to sound similar to the speakers” (p. 10). Attitudes about students who represent different English proficiency levels could also be discussed.

Bradac and Giles also note that presenting the concept of “New Englishes,” or the various varieties of English which exist around the world, also promotes understanding. Showing students that in different areas of the world, English differs phonologically, lexically, and grammatically is important. If students are shown that English is a “constantly evolving and complex social system taking many different and legitimate forms” (p. 9) they may learn to be more tolerant of their classmates’ language varieties, thereby creating more harmony in the ESL classroom.

This study’s limitations may be due to a number of factors. There was a relatively small sample size of both speakers and listeners which makes its findings difficult to generalize. Also, it was difficult to control various elements of the speakers’ voices: voice quality, speech rate, and pausing/repetition. Voice quality is notorious for causing problems in speaker evaluation studies. Some voices simply sound more polite or friendly than others,
which is extremely difficult to control. It is possible that the listeners in this study were reacting to the particular voice qualities of the speakers they heard. The speakers ranged in their reading speed from 47 to 58 seconds, which could have influenced the listener’s ratings on such characteristics as patience and manners/politeness. Also, although the speakers were tape recorded a number of times and the best version was selected for inclusion on the tape, some speakers still included a bit of pausing and repetition in their readings. This could have also affected the listeners’ responses, especially in areas such as self-confidence.

Should a study similar to this one be conducted in the future, the following suggestions could make the results more significant. First, more speakers should be used. Ideally, eight tapes with eight different speakers (eight Russian males, eight Chinese females, etc.) would be a better representation of the ethnic groups in question. A study with that number of representative speakers may give more accurate information about how listeners feel towards those ethnic groups. Also, if listeners are exposed to a number of speakers from each ethnic group, speaker identification may improve. Replacing the native English speakers with nonnative speakers of another ethnic group may also provide more information. In the present study, the inclusion of the native speakers may have caused the listeners to downgrade the nonnative speakers as a group in comparison. Eliminating the native speakers from the study may cause the listeners to differentiate between the nonnative voices. Another suggestion would be to select listener-judges based on their ability to correctly identify the native language/nationality of the speakers. Prospective listeners could be given
a practice speaker evaluation, and those that correctly guess the speakers' native languages/nationalities could then be used for the principal study.

In addition to using more speakers, speakers of various English proficiency levels could be included. Also, better controls for the variables of speech rate, and stammering should be utilized. Speakers could be timed so that they read at the same rate. Also, extensive rehearsals of the passage could be done so that the speakers never stammer or repeat words.

A final suggestion for future studies of this type would be to expand the number of listeners and/or manipulate the listeners' ethnic groups. A study which utilized twenty-four or more listeners from each ethnic group represented by the speakers would be able to investigate interethnic relations in more depth. A Chinese listener's responses to a Spanish speaker or a Chinese speaker could be contrasted with a Hispanic listener's responses to those same speakers. This would make cross-cultural evaluations of the speakers a possible new area to investigate. Changes such as these may enhance future research of this kind.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SPEAKERS

This research is being conducted for the purpose of gaining insight into the attitudes people hold toward the speech of non-native English speakers. You will be asked to read a short passage in English and to provide your SPEAK test identification number. Your personal responses to the survey will be kept confidential; to ensure confidentiality your SPEAK test number will be permanently removed from this questionnaire once it is established that all the information it contains is complete and accurate. Your participation is completely voluntary and is greatly appreciated. This procedure should take approximately 10 minutes. You are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation in this study at any time without prejudice. Thank you!

1. Speaker # from SPEAK ____________________________

2. Age ____________________________

3. Sex  M  F

4. Native Language and Country ____________________________

5. How long have you studied English? ____________________________

6. How long have you lived in an English speaking country? ____________________________

7. What English speaking countries have you lived in besides the US? ____________________________

8. What score did you receive on the last TOEFL exam you took? ____________________________

READING PASSAGE

Please read the printed paragraph below using proper pronunciation and clear speech. After you have a minute to read the paragraph silently to yourself, you will have another minute to read the paragraph aloud with expression.

*** During cold winters, people must be extra careful to prevent excessive exposure to cold and serious loss of body heat. Layers of relatively light, loose clothing give better protection than one thick, heavy item. Between each layer, there’s a film of trapped air, which, when heated by the body, acts as excellent insulation. Tight clothing should be avoided because it does not leave room for the trapped air. When people exercise or work hard, layered clothing becomes particularly important. As they move about, they may get overheated. If a person becomes too warm, layers of clothing can be removed during the active time and put back on when the exercise is stopped. By wearing layers of clothing during activity, a person can avoid an unnecessary chill.
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LISTENERS

This survey is being conducted for the purpose of gaining insight into the attitudes people hold about different speakers of English. Your personal responses to this survey will be kept confidential; to assure confidentiality, you will not be asked to give your name. You will be given an audiotape and will be asked to listen to eight speakers reading a one-minute long reading passage. After each speaker finishes, you will fill out a brief attitude survey regarding that person's voice. Please be as truthful as possible; your first impression is usually the best guide. This project will in no way affect the people on the tape or you personally. This survey should last approximately 20 minutes. Your participation is voluntary and is greatly appreciated. You are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation in this study at any time without prejudice. Thank you!

What is your sex? M F

What is your age? _____

What is your major? _____

What is your current enrollment status?
   Please circle one: freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, graduate student

How long have you been in the mainland United States? ______

What is the highest level English course you have taken at ISU?
   Please circle one: IEOP, Eng101B, Eng 101C, Eng 101D, Eng 104, Eng 105,
   Other ______

What is your home country? _______

At ISU, how often do you interact with (talk to) non-native speakers of English? (People from countries where neither English nor Spanish is spoken)
   Please circle one: often seldom never

List the countries/languages which represent the non-native English speakers you have had the most contact with ________________________________.

Please indicate whether the following statements are true or false. Circle the number which best represents your feelings on a scale of 7 (true) to 1 (false).

12. My Latino/Hispanic identity is important to me. True False
    7 6 5 4 3 2 1

13. I feel secure being Latino/Hispanic. True False
    7 6 5 4 3 2 1

14. I am proud to speak English with a Spanish accent. True False
    7 6 5 4 3 2 1
You will now listen to 8 speakers. Using only your personal feelings and opinions, rate each voice on the following features. Choose one of the numbers on the 7-point scale listed below the adjective which corresponds to your opinion.

**SPEAKER 1**

1) This voice makes **me** feel:
   - Irritated
   - Comfortable

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

2) I think this person is:
   - Friendly
   - Unfriendly

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

3) Gentle
   - Harsh

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

4) Attractive
   - Unattractive

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

5) Honest
   - Dishonest

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

6) Self-confident
   - Not self-confident

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

7) Trustworthy
   - Untrustworthy

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

8) Very intelligent
   - Not very intelligent

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

9) Patient
   - Impatient

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

10) Ambitious
    - Lazy

    7 6 5 4 3 2 1

11) Good manners/polite
    - Poor manners/impolite

    7 6 5 4 3 2 1

12) If you had to work on a graded class project with a partner, would you like this person to be your partner?
    - Yes
    - No

    7 6 5 4 3 2 1

13) I think this person is from______________.
    (If you do not have a guess, leave blank)

**SPEAKER 2**

1) This voice makes **me** feel:
   - Irritated
   - Comfortable

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

2) I think this person is:
   - Friendly
   - Unfriendly

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

3) Gentle
   - Harsh

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

4) Attractive
   - Unattractive

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

5) Honest
   - Dishonest

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

6) Self-confident
   - Not self-confident

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

7) Trustworthy
   - Untrustworthy

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

8) Very intelligent
   - Not very intelligent

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

9) Patient
   - Impatient

   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

10) Ambitious
    - Lazy

    7 6 5 4 3 2 1

11) Good manners/polite
    - Poor manners/impolite

    7 6 5 4 3 2 1

12) If you had to work on a graded class project with a partner, would you like this person to be your partner?
    - Yes
    - No

    7 6 5 4 3 2 1

13) I think this person is from______________.
    (If you do not have a guess, leave blank)
Using only your personal feelings and opinions, please rate each voice on the following features. Choose one of the numbers on the 7-point scale listed below the adjective which corresponds to your opinion.

### Speaker 3

1) This voice makes me feel:  
   **IRRITATED** COMFORTABLE  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

I think this person is:  
2) FRIENDLY UNFRIENDLY  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

3) GENTLE HARSH  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

4) ATTRACTIVE UNATTRACTIVE  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

5) HONEST DISHONEST  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

6) SELF-CONFIDENT NOT SELF-CONFIDENT  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

7) TRUSTWORTHY UNTRUSTWORTHY  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

8) VERY INTELLIGENT NOT VERY INTELLIGENT  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

9) PATIENT IMPATIENT  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

10) AMBITIOUS LAZY  
    7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

11) GOOD MANNERS/ POLITE POOR MANNERS/ IMPOLITE  
    7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

12) If you had to work on a graded class project with a partner, would you like this person to be your partner?  
    **YES** NO  
    7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

13) I think this person is from.  
    **(If you do not have a guess, leave blank)**

### Speaker 4

1) This voice makes me feel:  
   **IRRITATED** COMFORTABLE  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

I think this person is:  
2) FRIENDLY UNFRIENDLY  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

3) GENTLE HARSH  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

4) ATTRACTIVE UNATTRACTIVE  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

5) HONEST DISHONEST  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

6) SELF-CONFIDENT NOT SELF-CONFIDENT  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

7) TRUSTWORTHY UNTRUSTWORTHY  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

8) VERY INTELLIGENT NOT VERY INTELLIGENT  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

9) PATIENT IMPATIENT  
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

10) AMBITIOUS LAZY  
    7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

11) GOOD MANNERS/ POLITE POOR MANNERS/ IMPOLITE  
    7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

12) If you had to work on a graded class project with a partner, would you like this person to be your partner?  
    **YES** NO  
    7 6 5 4 3 2 1  

13) I think this person is from.  
    **(If you do not have a guess, leave blank)**
Using only your personal feelings and opinions, please rate each voice on the following features. Choose one of the numbers on the 7-point scale listed below the adjective which corresponds to your opinion.

**SPEAKER 5**

1) This voice makes me feel:
   - IRRITATED
   - COMFORTABLE
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   I think this person is:
   - FRIENDLY
   - UNFRIENDLY
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   3) GENTLE
   - HARSH
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   4) ATTRACTIVE
   - UNATTRACTIVE
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   5) HONEST
   - DISHONEST
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   6) SELF-CONFIDENT
   - NOT SELF-CONFIDENT
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   7) TRUSTWORTHY
   - UNTRUSTWORTHY
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   8) VERY
   - NOT VERY
   - INTELLIGENT
   - INTELLIGENT
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   9) PATIENT
   - IMPATIENT
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   10) AMBITIOUS
   - LAZY
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   11) GOOD
   - MANNERS/
   - POLITE
   - POOR
   - MANNERS/
   - IMPOLITE
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   12) If you had to work on a graded class project with a partner, would you like this person to be your partner?
   - YES
   - NO
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   13) I think this person is from__________________.
   (If you do not have a guess, leave blank)

**SPEAKER 6**

1) This voice makes me feel:
   - IRRITATED
   - COMFORTABLE
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   I think this person is:
   - FRIENDLY
   - UNFRIENDLY
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   3) GENTLE
   - HARSH
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   4) ATTRACTIVE
   - UNATTRACTIVE
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   5) HONEST
   - DISHONEST
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   6) SELF-CONFIDENT
   - NOT SELF-CONFIDENT
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   7) TRUSTWORTHY
   - UNTRUSTWORTHY
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   8) VERY
   - NOT VERY
   - INTELLIGENT
   - INTELLIGENT
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   9) PATIENT
   - IMPATIENT
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   10) AMBITIOUS
   - LAZY
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   11) GOOD
   - MANNERS/
   - POLITE
   - POOR
   - MANNERS/
   - IMPOLITE
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   12) If you had to work on a graded class project with a partner, would you like this person to be your partner?
   - YES
   - NO
   - Scale: 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

   13) I think this person is from__________________.
   (If you do not have a guess, leave blank)
Using only your personal feelings and opinions, please rate each voice on the following features. Choose one of the numbers on the 7-point scale listed below the adjective which corresponds to your opinion.

**SPEAKER 7**

1) This voice makes me feel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRRITATED</th>
<th>COMFORTABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think this person is:

2) FRIENDLY | UNFRIENDLY

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

3) GENTLE | HARSH

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

4) ATTRACTIVE | UNATTRACTIVE

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

5) HONEST | DISHONEST

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

6) SELF-CONFIDENT | NOT SELF-CONFIDENT

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

7) TRUSTWORTHY | UNTRUSTWORTHY

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

8) VERY INTELLIGENT | NOT VERY INTELLIGENT

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

9) PATIENT | IMPATIENT

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

10) AMBITIOUS | LAZY

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

11) GOOD MANNERS/ POLITE | POOR MANNERS/ IMPOLITE

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

12) If you had to work on a graded class project with a partner, would you like this person to be your partner?

| YES | NO |
| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

13) I think this person is from_________________.

(If you do not have a guess, leave blank)

**SPEAKER 8**

1) This voice makes me feel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRRITATED</th>
<th>COMFORTABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think this person is:

2) FRIENDLY | UNFRIENDLY

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

3) GENTLE | HARSH

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

4) ATTRACTIVE | UNATTRACTIVE

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

5) HONEST | DISHONEST

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

6) SELF-CONFIDENT | NOT SELF-CONFIDENT

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

7) TRUSTWORTHY | UNTRUSTWORTHY

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

8) VERY INTELLIGENT | NOT VERY INTELLIGENT

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

9) PATIENT | IMPATIENT

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

10) AMBITIOUS | LAZY

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

11) GOOD MANNERS/ POLITE | POOR MANNERS/ IMPOLITE

| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

12) If you had to work on a graded class project with a partner, would you like this person to be your partner?

| YES | NO |
| 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

13) I think this person is from_________________.

(If you do not have a guess, leave blank)
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