

Radboud Universiteit



Bachelor's Thesis

The Effects of Non-Native Accents on Hiring Success

7th of June 2019

Bielefeld, Vera

S4741552

v.bielefeld@student.ru.nl

International Business Communication

Radboud University

Supervision: dr. B.C. Hendriks

Second assessor: drs. Evelyne Fruit

Abstract

The process of globalization and an increase in migration have led to a multicultural workforce. Multinational companies often opt for English as their corporate language, which in turn leads to an increasing number of interactions between non-native English speakers and thus the prevalence of non-standard accents in business contexts. The current study investigated the effects of non-native accents on hiring success. In an experiment, 116 Dutch participants evaluated either a standard American job candidate, a Spanish accented candidate or a German-accented candidate in terms of perceived status, solidarity, dynamism and hiring success. Findings showed, that overall, the non-standard accents were downgraded in comparison to the American accent. For Dutch multinationals with English as their corporate language, this could mean that non-native job applicants face discrimination issues. Countermeasures could include creating awareness of such tendencies and therefore increasing social acceptance of non-standard accents in English.

The effects of non-native accents on hiring success

A single “Hello” is sufficient to recognise a speaker’s ethical or cultural background (Wang, Arndt, Singh, Biernat & Liu, 2013). Accents give listeners a range of information about the identity of speakers and how to categorise them by only hearing fractions of their voice and their pronunciation patterns in languages in which a speaker might not feel as comfortable in as in their native language.

Migration and immigration increase the prevalence of non-native accents in a globalised world (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010), especially in employment settings. International connections and cooperation in business contexts but also global consumption patterns and ideologies are examples of today’s globalised society. The redefinition of place and space through connectivity and international relations as well as through the process of digitalisation has shaped the business landscape around the world and has increased the contact between native and non-native speakers (Amin, 2002).

Within this process of globalisation, English has become the lingua franca, a global language for international communication. It is the official corporate language of numerous multinational companies, where it serves as a medium of communication between people from different language backgrounds. A major percentage of cases where English is used to communicate thus involves non-native English speakers (Seidlhofer, 2005). Considering this scale

of global communication and the prevalence of accented English, it becomes crucial to investigate the influence of accents on the perception and categorisation of speakers. Accents serve as cues for ethnic, cultural or linguistic membership and may thus lead to stereotypes and discrimination (Levi, Winters & Pisoni, 2007).

This salience of accentedness can have important implications for businesses and has been researched in different settings, such as in service (van Varenbergh & Holmqvist, 2013) and call-service encounters (Wang, Arndt, Singh & Biernat, 2009) as well as in the domain of lectures (Hendriks, van Meurs & Reimer, 2018) and for marketing purposes where researchers measured purchase intentions (DeShields, Kara & Kaynak, 1996). All these studies have revealed a consistent pattern of results. They found more negative ratings for higher degrees of accent strength and for non-native accents compared to native accents. The influence of accented English on hiring success, however, has received little attention in current research. In order to prevent discrimination in the hiring process and to raise awareness for the salience and impact of accents on evaluations, it is crucial to investigate which role accents play in the perception of job candidates.

Several studies have already found significant effects of accent on speaker evaluations in employment settings (e.g. Carlson & McHenry, 2006; Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010; Hosoda, Nguyen & Stone-Romero, 2012; Hosoda & Stone-Romero, 2010). Non-standard accents are generally downgraded in comparison to standard accents (Fuentes, Gottdiener, Martin, Gilbert, & Giles, 2012). The current study focuses on the non-standard accents German and Spanish in English in comparison to the standard American accent and how job candidates of these three accents are perceived by listeners. The evaluation of Spanish-accented English has already received significant attention in scientific research (e.g. Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010; Hosoda, Nguyen & Stone-Romero, 2012). German-accented English, however, has received only little attention in existing research. The standard Midwestern American accent is included in the current study because of its prevalence in media and its increased popularity in comparison to other standard English accents such as the RP (Giles & Billings, 2004).

Furthermore, a variety of factors could influence how listeners perceive accented speakers. Possible impacts on the evaluation of speakers could be the listener's familiarity with an accent or the perceived comprehensibility of the speaker.

A majority of studies has focused on accent evaluations by native English speakers (e.g. Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010). However, investigating how non-native English speakers perceive accented English could yield different insights and perspectives, especially because English plays an important role in the corporate context in the Netherlands. Dutch business people are regularly required to communicate in English as the use of Dutch is challenged by the emergence as English as the lingua franca (Nickerson, 1998). This study thus investigates how non-native English accents are perceived by Dutch listeners. The results of this study could be of special interest by Dutch multinational firms that employ people from diverse language backgrounds.

Theoretical Framework

Accentedness

An accent is one's "manner of pronunciation" (Giles, 1970), which deviates from the standard pronunciation (Rosini, Lippi-Green, Donati, Donati, & Lippi, 1997). Different levels and characteristics of the speaker's native language are taken over when speaking a second language and thus may result in accentedness. An accent reveals information about the speaker's identity, for instance, his or her geographical origin, first language, prestige or ethnicity as well as group-memberships (Rosini et al., 1997).

Another important concept in the domain of accentedness is accent strength, which refers to the degree of phonetic differences between accented and non-accented utterances perceived by the listener (Munro & Derwing, 2001). An important point is a delineation and distinction between accent strength and the knowledge of a language. The inability to identify words and parts of accented speech by the listener could lead to perceived incompetence of speakers, even though they know the language perfectly well (Munro & Derwing, 1995).

A standard accent is spoken by the majority group within a specific region (Giles & Billings, 2004). Standard varieties of the English language are for example British English or Mid-Western American English. A non-standard accent, on the other hand, can be described as a variety of language spoken by non-native speakers, or as regional varieties that differ from the standard language in terms of pronunciation and grammar.

This study focuses on three different accents, among them the standard Mid-Western American accent. Studies have found that standard accents are evaluated higher regarding perceived status, attraction, intelligence and professional success (Giles, 1970) and that in general,

standard accents are more valued and perceived as more advantageous, charming and as more favourable to listen to than non-standard accents (Rosini et al, 1997). According to Gluszek and Dovidio (2010), people with standard accents reach higher positions and better professional possibilities in political, economic and in educational domains than people having a non-standard accent. Furthermore, Ryan, Hewstone and Giles (1984) stress that even listeners who are themselves non-native English speakers, as in the current study, evaluate non-standard accents more negatively than standard accents.

Evaluation of accents

Just 30 milliseconds of speech or the simple utterance “hello” contain enough information for a listener to unconsciously categorize speakers according to their accent (Wang et al., 2013). An utterance provides listeners with information on a linguistic level in terms of the content of the speech but also triggers them to draw conclusions on the speaker’s social category (Levi, Winters & Pisoni, 2007).

Giles and Billings (2004) have established three main dimensions among which accents influence the evaluation of speakers. Perceived status, solidarity and dynamism are said to have an effect on how listeners perceive accents. A meta-analysis of all relevant studies concerning accented English was carried out by Fuertes, Gottdiener, Martin, Gilbert and Giles (2012). This analysis confirmed that speakers with a non-standard accent receive lower evaluations on the dimensions perceived status, solidarity and dynamism than speakers with non-standard accents. Non-standard accented speakers are thus considerably disadvantaged when it comes to impression making.

The perception of status involves how the listeners evaluate the speaker’s competencies, education, social class and intelligence as well as ambitions. Studies emphasize that speakers with standard accents are, for instance, perceived as more competent and confident, as there are linked to prestige, a better social reputation and prevalent in the media and in educational institutions (Giles & Billings, 2004). Fuertes et al. (2012) confirm, that non-standard accents are evaluated significantly lower in terms of perceived status. Non-standard accents usually have a lower social reputation and are used by a minority of the population (Giles & Billings, 2004). A pronunciation that differs from the standard or majority language spoken in a specific area may lead to negative

and stereotypical associations, particularly when the accent displays a minority that is associated with lower social status (Hosoda & Stone-Romero, 2010).

The concept of solidarity incorporates the perceived trustworthiness, attractiveness and benevolence of the speaker. In other words, solidarity describes the closeness between speaker and listener and therefore their similarity. Studies have found that a higher similarity between persons leads to more positive attitudes and higher attraction than divergent backgrounds and dissimilarity (Turban & Jones, 1988). Pulakos and Wexley (1983) have found a correlation between high-performance evaluations and higher perceived similarity between managers and workers. However, this effect might not be as strongly applicable in a hiring setting. On the other hand, Dalessio and Imada (1984) accentuate the importance of an image of a perfect candidate for a specific job position as being more important than the similarity between recruiter and candidate.

The liveliness and degree of activity of speakers are summarised in the concept of dynamism. Fuertes et al. (2012) have found inferiority of non-standard accents rated in terms of dynamism. However, there are also studies underlining relatively high scores of Hispanic accents in comparison to standard American accents in terms of perceived warmth, attractiveness and character traits such as kindness (e.g. Cargile & Bradac, 2001; Sebastian, Ryan, Keogh & Schmidt, 1980)

Factors determining the evaluation of accentedness

The concept of comprehensibility is the difficulty for a listener to comprehend speakers (Derwing & Munro, 1997). Studies have shown that lower evaluations of comprehensibility by listeners judging accented speech can possibly be caused by a missing distinction between an accent and language proficiency and competences (Carlson & McHenry, 2006). Studies have also found consistent results with regard to this concept. Accented non-native speakers are generally perceived as more difficult to understand than native speakers with standard accents. Furthermore, Hosoda and Stone-Romero (2010) found that even though the speech was completely understandable, the listeners still made negative inferences about the speakers on the basis of their non-native accents.

Furthermore, familiarity with certain pronunciation patterns was found to impact the processing of language varieties. Listeners that already have experiences with certain accents are more flexible in terms of adapting to new variations that deviate from the standard (Sumner &

Samuel, 2009). The participants of the current study are native Dutch speakers. Germany is the most important trade partner of the Netherlands and Germans account for a big part of the total number of tourists in the Netherlands (German-Dutch Chamber of Commerce, 2018). High familiarity with the German language could thus influence the perception of German-accented English. Additionally, Gass and Varonis (1984) have found a significant relation between familiarity with a specific accent and better-perceived comprehensibility of accented speech. Nejjari, Gerritsen, Van der Haagen and Korzilius (2012) in contrast, have found that participants familiar with the Dutch accent, evaluated accented speakers lower in terms of status. This could be due to perceived incompetence and low proficiency connected to having an accent. The participants familiar with the accent could have expected better fluency and a more standard-like pronunciation. Familiarity thus does not consistently appear as a positive factor in existing literature.

The English proficiency and accent strength of the listener could play an important role when it comes to evaluating accents. Another term belonging to this aspect is the concept of intelligibility, which describes the capability of the listener to correctly understand a message (Beinhoff, 2014). In contrast to comprehensibility, intelligibility is often measured by transcription tasks and not by scale ratings and thus does not display perception but rather actual recognition and understanding (Derwing & Munro, 1997). According to Beinhoff (2014), the listeners' individual proficiency has a significant effect on how they rated intelligibility and accents of speakers.

A further determinant could be the listener's opinion about the importance of keeping an accent or reducing a non-native accent. The popularity of accent reduction programs indicates a tendency of negative attitudes towards the presence of accents in general. Such programs aim at the reduction or elimination of accents and suggest the necessity of treatment when having a non-standard accent (Munro & Derwing, 1995).

The evaluation of accentedness in employment settings

Several studies have already found a significant effect of accents on hiring intentions. A majority found superiority of standard accents compared to non-standard accents. Nevertheless, there are contrasting and unambiguous results among the studies in the field of employability, which enhances the relevance of the current study and the importance to investigate different accents.

The evaluation of Spanish accents repeatedly appears in scientific research, whereas the German accent has not been examined very often. This could be due to the prevalence of Hispanic accents in the United States, where many studies were carried out. It is crucial to investigate whether the findings are also applicable to the perception of Spanish accents in a European context.

Deprez-Sims and Morris (2010) measured the influence of the Standard Midwestern American accent and French- and Colombian-accented English on application evaluations by US students. In the between-subjects design, each participant listened to an audio file and made a hiring decision for an accented job applicant for a human resource position. They had to rate the speaker based on his similarity to the listener, the understandability of the accent, the degree of accentedness and whether to hire him or not. Results show negative evaluations of the French accent, whereas the Mid-Western American accent and the Colombian accent received similar, more positive ratings. Deprez-Sims and Morris (2010) justify these results with the similarity-attraction model, stressing the finding of a high degree of similarity between listeners and speakers from the US and Colombia.

Several studies investigated Spanish-accented English in employment settings because of the high percentage of the Hispanic people among the population of the United States and their influence on the labour market (Ramirez, 2004). Hosoda, Nguyen and Stone-Romero (2012), for instance, have found significant effects of Spanish accented speech on hiring decisions. Participants had to rate a Mexican Spanish-accented and a Standard American-accented applicant for a software engineering job based on their personality but also whether they match the job and will be promoted. The Spanish accented candidate received lower ratings regarding his suitability for the job. Consistently, the Spanish-accented candidate was evaluated as less competent than the applicant with the standard American accent.

Carlson and McHenry (2006) measured the effect of ethnicity, the degree of accent, and comprehensibility of the speaker on hiring success. Participants listened to Spanish- and Asian-accented as well as to African American-accented speakers with varying accent strengths. 60 HRM experts from different ethnic backgrounds rated the speakers in terms of hiring success and comprehensibility. The African American accent and the Spanish accent were perceived as more comprehensible than the Asian accent in the slight accent condition. When speaking with a strong accent, in contrast, the Spanish-accented candidate received higher ratings in terms of comprehensibility than the African and the Asian accented candidate. The researchers justify this

outcome with a possible effect of familiarity, which is also included in the current study. The study by Carlson and McHenry (2006) was conducted in Texas, where people have a high degree of contact with Spanish-influenced English.

Another study by Hosoda and Stone-Romero (2010) has also found contrasting effects. 286 college students had to evaluate job applicants with a Standard American Accent, a French and a Japanese accent in terms of hiring success. In a verbal guise experiment, the participants had to rate the speaker's suitability for four jobs with different degrees of status and different communication demands. Surprisingly, French-accented speakers were rated more positively than the standard accented and the Japanese-accented applicants. This outcome could have been influenced by the names of the speakers or other skill-related materials, given to the listener. This is why the current research excludes the names of the applicant.

In order to extend research in the field of accentedness and employability and to investigate the issues mentioned in the above sections, the following research question is formulated.

RQ: Are non-standard-accented English speakers downgraded by Dutch listeners in comparison to standard American speakers when applying for a job?

Several sub-questions are established in order to adequately answer the main research question.

RQa: How are German- and Spanish-accented speakers in English evaluated by Dutch listeners in terms of status, solidarity, dynamism and hiring success in comparison to American speakers?

RQb: Are German- and Spanish-accented speakers evaluated differently by Dutch listeners?

RQc: Could familiarity with an accent and the perceived comprehensibility of the accent have an influence on the perception of the speakers?

Method

The method used for this experiment follows the overall structure of Deprez-Sims and Morris (2010) and Deprez-Sims and Morris (2013). The current study uses a verbal guise technique. The different audios are recorded by different speakers from different native language backgrounds reading the same texts as opposed to the matched-guise technique where the same bilingual speaker is used for all accent conditions (Biliotti & Calamai, 2012). The items and statements were derived

from Giles and Billings (2004), Mulac, Hanley and Prigge (1974), Zahn and Hopper (1985) and Śliwa and Johansson (2014).

Materials

The stimulus materials consisted of six different audio files displaying speakers of the three accent conditions Spanish-accented English, German-accented English and standard American English. The stimulus accent was thus manipulated. In total, six speakers were selected for the final audio files. Every accent condition was thus recorded twice, but every participant of the study only listened to one speaker. After listening to the manipulated stimulus, every participant filled out a questionnaire containing 35 questions. The questionnaire was translated to Dutch and is included in the appendix.

Pre-test

In order to select suitable recordings of the three accent conditions, four German native speakers, four Spanish native speakers and three American native speakers were recorded. In the sound studio of the Erasmus Study Centre at Radboud University in Nijmegen, 12 female speakers were asked to read the interview script and to include additional sounds and words in order to sound more realistic and natural. These are for instance hesitations or pauses. The speakers all read the same script of the interview, which is included in the appendix. The program Adobe Audition was used to record the speakers and to edit the fragments and adjust the volume. For all recordings, the microphone was at the same distance from the mouth of the speaker, the standard frequency of 44100hz was used as well as a monophonic sound reproduction. The audio files were then saved as WAV files and later converted to MP3 in order to include them in the online questionnaire created on Qualtrics.

After recording the 12 speakers, six students from the Bachelor's programme Communication and Information Science from Radboud University selected three speakers of each accent condition in terms of similarity. In a pilot study, the recorded interviews of the six different accented speakers were then examined by six experts of language studies from Radboud University. An online questionnaire containing all six accents and six following questions for each condition were sent to the experts via e-mail. The questionnaire of the pre-test is included in the appendix. The experts were asked to indicate the country of origin of the speaker, to evaluate the accent

strength and to state whether the speakers sounded like a native speaker and in the case of the American accent, whether they perceive it as more British or American. Furthermore, they were asked to rate the speakers in terms of pitch, pace of voice and comprehensibility.

On the basis of the experts' responses to the questionnaire, one speaker of each accent condition was excluded from the audio samples. After conducting several one-way analyses of variance, the first Spanish speaker was excluded, as she was the least comprehensible one ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.75$). The recordings of the second and the third Spanish speaker were thus selected for the final material.

Statistical analysis revealed that the second German speaker had the slowest pace of all speakers ($M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.26$) and was thus also excluded from the sample. The recordings of the first and the third German speaker were therefore selected for the final material.

As there were no quantitative grounds to exclude one particular American speaker, qualitative feedback from one of the experts was used. According to him, the second American speaker did too many pauses and hesitations which makes the audio divergent from the other two American recordings. The recordings of the first and the third American speaker were therefore selected for the final material. Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations of the selected speakers.

Table 1. Mean scores and standard deviations of comprehension, accent strength, pitch and pace in function of selected speakers of accent conditions (1 = completely disagree, 7 = completely agree)

	American		Spanish		German	
	1	3	2	3	1	3
Comprehension	6.67 (0.52)	6.83 (0.41)	6.50 (0.55)	5.67 (1.03)	6.67 (0.52)	5.83 (0.98)
Accent strength	6.83 (0.41)	6.33 (0.82)	4.17 (1.83)	6.00 (0.63)	4.33 (1.97)	4.83 (1.17)
Pitch	5.00 (1.10)	4.17 (0.41)	4.33 (1.03)	4.00 (1.10)	3.83 (0.98)	3.50 (0.84)
Pace	5.17 (0.98)	4.67 (0.82)	4.50 (1.05)	4.17 (0.98)	4.67 (1.21)	6.00 (0.63)

Subjects

A total of 116 Dutch participants took part in the experiment. The researchers did not limit age, gender and professional characteristics in order to portray the general Dutch population. This is different from other studies in the same field that mainly focused on students (e.g. Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010).

The mean age was $M = 35.03$, $SD = 14.79$ and ranged from 18 to 71 years. Age was not equally distributed across the conditions ($F(2, 113) = 4.03, p = .020$). The participants assigned to the German accent condition ($M = 29.67, SD = 12.36$) were significantly younger than the participants assigned to the Spanish accent condition ($M = 39.03, SD = 15.12$).

Out of all participants, 31% were men and 69% were women. Amongst them, 31.9% indicated to be students and 64.66% were employed or self-employed, the rest indicated no profession or was retired. Moreover, the participants were asked to indicate their highest level of education completed ranging from high school, vocational education (MBO), higher professional education (HBO) to scientific education (WO). Out of all participants, 34.5% completed a higher professional education, followed by 25% who completed a scientific education, with either a Bachelor's or Master's degree.

Gender ($\chi^2(2) = .13, p = .938$), profession ($\chi^2(144) = 136.05, p = .669$), highest level of education completed ($\chi^2(10) = 10.17, p = .424$), experiences as interviewer ($F(2, 113) = 3.78, p = .686$), experiences as an interviewee ($F(2, 113) = .068, p = .918$), LexTale score ($F(2, 113) = 2.14, p = .122$), self-assessed accentedness ($F(2, 113) = .655, p = .521$), perceived importance to sound like a native speaker of English ($F(2, 113) = .841, p = .434$) and liking of accents ($F(2, 113) = 1.12, p = .334$) were equally distributed across all three participant groups assigned to the accent conditions and therefore did not influence possible differences.

Design

The present study has a one factorial design with accent as a main factor (German-accented English, Spanish-accented English, American English). A between-subjects design was used. 43 participants were randomly assigned to the American accent condition, 37 were assigned to the Spanish accent condition and 36 were assigned to the German accent condition.

Instruments

The questionnaire measured the participants' attitude towards the accented job applicant and includes background variables of the listeners as well as possible variables that could affect speaker evaluation. The questionnaire contains the constructs to be measured in the order below. If inter-item reliability was adequate or good, composite means were calculated.

The evaluation of the speaker was divided into perceived status, solidarity and dynamism that were rated using 7-point Likert scales ranging from (1) completely disagree to (7) completely agree. All Likert scales were introduced by the statement "The speaker is" and followed by the respective items. Status was measured using the items "intelligent, ambitious, confident and competent" ($\alpha = .85$). Solidarity was measured using the items "trustworthy, benevolent and attractive" as well as the statement "The speaker is similar to me" ($\alpha = .73$). Dynamism was measured using the items "active, lively, talkative and enthusiastic" ($\alpha = .94$).

Hiring success was measured using the statements "I think is speaker is suitable for the position", "I would hire the speaker" and "I would recommend to hire the speaker" anchored by 7-point Likert scales ranging from (1) completely disagree to (7) completely agree ($\alpha = .94$).

Perceived compressibility was measured using the statement "I found this person easy to understand" followed by a 7-point Likert scale ranging from (1) completely disagree to (7) completely agree.

Familiarity was measured using the statements "I am very familiar with the speaker's accent" and "I am known with the speaker's accent" anchored by 7-point Likert scales ranging from (1) completely disagree to (7) completely agree ($\alpha = .86$).

The pleasantness of voice was measured by the statements "The person's speed of speaking was pleasant", "The speaker had a pleasant intonation" and "The speaker had a pleasant voice" followed by 7-point Likert scales ranging from (1) completely disagree to (7) completely agree ($\alpha = .79$).

Accent strength was measured by the statements "The speaker had a strong accent" and "The speaker sounds like a native speaker" followed by 7-point Likert scales ranging from (1) completely disagree to (7) completely agree ($\alpha = .84$). The second item was reverse coded.

The participants were asked to indicate the country of origin of the speaker by choosing from 192 options. Furthermore, several background variables were included in the current study.

Participants had to indicate their age, gender, profession and their highest level of education completed, which was presented by six possible options, as stated in the subjects section.

The listeners' experience with job interviews was measured using the statements "I am experienced as a job interviewer" and "I am experienced as a job interviewee" followed by 7-point Likert scales ranging from (1) completely disagree to (7) completely agree ($\alpha = .30$). The items were analysed independently.

The English proficiency of the participants was measured using the statements "I sound like a native speaker when I speak English" and "When I speak English, I sound more American than British" evaluated on 7-point Likert scales ranging from (1) completely disagree to (7) completely agree. A following LexTALE test was included, measuring the actual English proficiency of the participants, the score was displayed at the end of the questionnaire. According to Lemhöfer and Broersma (2012), the test approximately takes five minutes and is a valid and adequate predictor of English word knowledge and correlates highly with English proficiency self-evaluations. Furthermore, including the test should motivate people to take part in the study while at the same time testing their English proficiency for free.

The attitude towards accents was measured using the statements "I think it is important for non-native speakers to sound native when speaking English", "I like non-native accent in general" and "I prefer American English over British English" followed by 7-point Likert scales ranging from (1) completely disagree to (7) completely agree. The second item was reverse coded.

Procedure

Before listening to the pitch, the Dutch participants read an instruction. They were informed about the following audio file and the questionnaire as well as the duration and the purpose of the study and the possibility to win a "bol.com" voucher worth 30€. The information provided and the questionnaire were translated into Dutch because of the anchor contraction effect. Studies have indicated that people tend to display a higher emotional intensity when rating their opinion on scales that follow a question in a non-native language (De Langhe, Puntoni, Fernandes & Van Osselaer, 2012). After listening to the randomly assigned audio file corresponding to one accent condition, respondents were asked to evaluate a female candidate for the position as a Junior Marketing Assistant in a company with English as a corporate language. This information was

provided in the description of the questionnaire. Respondents needed seven to ten minutes to complete the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was created using the program Qualtrics and was distributed via e-mail, LinkedIn, Facebook and WhatsApp. The participants were randomly assigned to one of the three conditions by the program Qualtrics. After responding to all questions and doing the LexTale test, the participants could indicate their e-mail address in order to win a 30€ voucher.

Statistical treatment

In order to find differences in the evaluation of the three accent conditions, several statistical tests using the program SPSS were carried out. First, Chi-square tests confirmed equal groups, that do not differ in terms of education, gender, age, experiences and English proficiency. Several t-tests indicated whether the individual speakers of each condition differ. One-way analyses of covariance with Bonferroni follow-up tests then revealed whether the speakers of the three accent conditions were evaluated differently along the different dimensions.

Results

The main purpose of this study was to investigate how native Dutch listeners evaluate native American-, Spanish- and German-accented English speakers in a hiring setting and whether a number of variables could have an influence on the perception of the job candidates.

Manipulation check

The audio recordings featuring the accented speakers of each condition were intended to be very similar in terms of accent strength and voice pleasantness. Table 2 shows the respective means and standard deviations of accent strength and voice pleasantness.

Accent strength

A one-way analysis of variance showed a significant effect of accent on perceived accent strength ($F(2, 113) = 69.73, p < .001$). The American accent ($M = 2.87, SD = 1.41$) was evaluated as less strong than the Spanish accent ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 5.73, SD = 1.18$) and than the German accent ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 5.77, SD = 1.17$). There was no significant difference between Spanish and German accents in terms of accent strength ($p = 1.000$,

Bonferroni-correction). This result is in line with the intended manipulation of the researchers, as the study includes two non-standard accents and the American accents as a control condition.

Voice pleasantness

A one-way analysis of variance showed a significant effect of accent on perceived pleasantness of voice of the speaker ($F(2, 113) = 5.37, p = .006$). The American speakers' voices ($M = 5.21, SD = 1.34$) were evaluated more pleasant than the German accented speakers' voices ($p = .004$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 4.27, SD = 1.28$). There was no significant difference between Spanish and German accented speakers in terms of voice characteristics ($p = .397$, Bonferroni-correction) and between American and Spanish accented speakers ($p = .270$, Bonferroni-correction).

Table 2. Mean scores and standard deviations of accent strength and voice pleasantness in function of accent conditions (1 = completely disagree, 7 = completely agree)

	American	Spanish	German
Accent Strength	2.87 (1.41)	5.73 (1.18)	5.77 (1.17)
Voice pleasantness	5.21 (1.34)	4.72 (1.20)	4.27 (1.28)

Recognition of the country of origin of the speakers

According to the lenient scale, including countries where the language is spoken as correct answers, 55.2% of the participants indicated the correct country of origin of the speaker. This scale includes all Spanish and German speaking countries as correct answers. A one-way analysis of variance showed no significant effect of accent on the recognition of the country of origin according to the lenient scale measure ($F(2, 113) = 1.99, p = .142$). The participants recognised the German, Spanish and American accent equally well.

Evaluation of the speakers

Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations of the evaluations of the main variables: perceived status, solidarity, dynamism and hiring success. Separate one-way analyses of variance were carried out for each variable.

Perceived Status

A one-way analysis of variance showed a significant effect of accent on perceived status of the speaker ($F(2, 113) = 6.18, p = .003$). The Spanish-accented speakers ($M = 5.12, SD = 1.34$) were evaluated with a lower status than the American speakers ($p = .033$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 5.71, SD = .78$). The German-accented speakers ($p = .004$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 4.95, SD = .91$) were perceived as having a lower status than the American speakers. There was no significant difference between Spanish and German accented speakers in terms of perceived status ($p = 1.000$, Bonferroni-correction).

Solidarity

A one-way analysis of variance showed no significant effect of accent on perceived solidarity with the speaker ($F(2, 113) = .82, p = .444$). There was no difference between the three accent conditions in terms of solidarity with the speaker. An analysis of the evaluations of the individual speakers of each accent condition also reveals no significant effect of accent ($F(5, 110) = 1.08, p = .375$).

Dynamism

A one-way analysis of variance showed a significant effect of accent on perceived dynamism of the speaker ($F(2, 113) = 16.14, p < .001$). The German-accented speakers ($M = 4.01, SD = 1.43$) were evaluated as less dynamic than the American speakers ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 5.64, SD = 1.06$). The Spanish accented speakers ($M = 4.95, SD = 1.34$) were perceived as more dynamic than the German-accented speakers ($p = .006$, Bonferroni-correction). There was no significant difference between American and Spanish-accented speakers ($p = .053$, Bonferroni-correction).

Hiring success

A one-way analysis of variance showed a significant effect of accent on hiring success of the speaker ($F(2, 113) = 3.47, p = .034$). A Bonferroni post-hoc test revealed no significant differences between the accent conditions in terms of hiring success even though the one-way analysis of variance showed a marginal significant effect. When analysing possible differences between the individual speakers of each accent, a one-way analysis of variance showed a

significant effect of accent on hiring success of the speaker ($F(5,110) = 2.51, p = .034$). The first German speaker ($M = 4.00, SD = .93$) was evaluated as less hireable than the first American speaker ($p = .044$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 5.15, SD = 1.32$).

Table 3. Mean scores and standard deviations of perceived status, solidarity, dynamism and hiring success in function of accent conditions (1 = completely disagree, 7 = completely agree)

	American	Spanish	German
Perceived Status	5.71 (0.78)	5.12 (1.34)	4.95 (0.91)
Solidarity	4.87 (1.00)	4.71 (1.01)	4.59 (0.94)
Dynamism	5.64 (1.06)	4.95 (1.34)	4.01 (1.43)
Hiring Success	4.97 (1.19)	4.38 (1.35)	4.32 (1.12)

Confounding variables

Table 4 shows the means and standard deviations of the variables that may have influenced the dependent variables. These are perceived comprehensibility and the listeners' familiarity with the accent. Separate one-way analyses of variance were carried out for each variable.

Perceived comprehensibility

A one-way analysis of variance showed a significant effect of accent on perceived comprehensibility of the speaker ($F(2, 113) = 7.65, p = .001$). The Spanish-accented speakers ($M = 5.05, SD = 1.37$) were evaluated as less comprehensible than the American speakers ($p = .004$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 6.12, SD = 1.18$) and the German-accented speakers ($p = .003$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 5.03, SD = 1.73$) were also evaluated as less comprehensible than the American speakers. There was no significant difference between Spanish and German accented speakers in terms of perceived comprehensibility ($p = 1.00$, Bonferroni-correction).

Familiarity

A one-way analysis of variance showed a significant effect of Type of accent on perceived familiarity with the accent ($F(2, 113) = 16.05, p < .001$). Participants were more familiar with the American accent ($M = 5.74, SD = 1.24$) than with the Spanish accent ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 4.03, SD = 1.55$) and than with the German accent ($p = .021$, Bonferroni-correction;

$M = 4.90$, $SD = 1.26$). Furthermore, participants were more familiar with the German accent than with the Spanish accent ($p = .020$, Bonferroni-correction).

Table 4. Mean scores and standard deviations of perceived comprehensibility and familiarity in function of accent conditions (1 = completely disagree, 7 = completely agree)

	American	Spanish	German
Perceived Comprehensibility	6.12 (1.18)	5.05 (1.37)	5.03 (1.73)
Familiarity	5.74 (1.24)	4.03 (1.55)	4.90 (1.26)

Differences between speakers

Even though a pre-test was conducted to find two speakers of each condition that best match the purpose of this study, there were differences in the evaluation of the speakers within the accent conditions. An independent samples t-test showed a significant difference between the first American speaker and the second American speaker with regard to pleasantness of voice ($t(31.76) = 2.78$, $p = .009$). The voice of the first American speaker ($M = 5.73$, $SD = .88$) was perceived as more pleasant than the voice of the second American speaker ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 1.52$).

Furthermore, an independent samples t-test showed a significant difference between the first Spanish speaker and the second Spanish speaker with regard to accent familiarity ($t(35) = 2.13$, $p = .040$). The Dutch participants were more familiar with the accent of the first Spanish speaker ($M = 4.59$, $SD = 1.36$) than with the accent of the second Spanish speaker ($M = 3.55$, $SD = 1.57$).

An independent samples t-test showed a significant difference between the first German speaker and the second German speaker with regard to status ($t(34) = 2.53$, $p = .016$), dynamism ($t(34) = 2.78$, $p = .009$), and pleasantness of voice ($t(31.87) = 5.55$, $p < .001$). The second German speaker was evaluated with a higher status ($M = 5.32$, $SD = .77$) than the first German speaker ($M = 4.61$, $SD = .91$) and as more dynamic ($M = 4.65$, $SD = 1.46$) than the first German speaker ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.16$). Moreover, the participants evaluated the voice of the second German speaker ($M = 5.18$, $SD = .76$) as more pleasant than the voice of the first German speaker ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 1.10$). The first German speaker thus generally received lower evaluations than the second German speaker.

Conclusion and Discussion

Due to globalisation and an increase in migration, communication between non-native English speakers becomes prevalent (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010). This could have crucial implications for the hiring processes in Dutch multinational companies with English as a corporate language. The main purpose of this study was to investigate whether German- and Spanish accented speakers are downgraded by Dutch listeners in comparison to standard-accented American speakers in a hiring context.

The results of the current study show that Spanish- and German-accented speakers are perceived as having a lower status than standard American speakers. This is in line with a range of existing literature emphasizing that non-standard accented speakers are perceived as less competent and less confident than standard accents, as these are usually used by minorities and not prevalent in the media or in an educational context (Giles & Billings, 2004). A meta-analysis by Fuertes et al. (2012) examined 20 studies in the context of accentedness and underlines the finding of the current study. They have found that non-standard accents are evaluated lower in terms of perceived status. Moreover, a range of studies has found that Hispanic accents were downgraded when it comes to status evaluations by American listeners (e.g. De la Zerda & Hopper, 1979).

Furthermore, there were no significant effects found for the concept of solidarity. Fuertes et al. (2012) have found contrasting outcomes. In general, non-standard accents were downgraded. The opposite, thus higher evaluations of non-standard accents in terms of solidarity were also found in empirical studies, included in the meta-analysis. There are thus contrasting results and it is, therefore, the role of future research to shed more light on this specific dimension in order to create a clearer picture.

With regard to dynamism, German-accented speakers were perceived as less dynamic than American speakers and Spanish-accented speakers rated as more dynamic than German-accented speakers. Fuertes et al. (2012) have found inferiority of non-standard accents with regard to dynamism, which confirms the first result. However, studies have also found higher scores for Spanish-accented speech in terms of warmth and kindness in comparison to American accents (e.g. Cargile & Bradac, 2001), which creates ambiguity concerning the results of the current study. There were no significant differences found with regard to the hiring success of the speakers of each accent condition. However, at an individual level of analysis, the first German-accented

speaker was perceived as less hireable than the first American speaker. This finding complements the existing results of inferior evaluations of non-standard-accented candidates in comparison to standard-accented speakers (Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010). Hosoda, Nguyen and Stone-Romero (2012) have found effects of Spanish-accented English on hiring decision that are not found in the current study. Spanish-accented speakers in their study were less likely to be promoted and even to be hired in comparison to standard-accented American speakers.

The answers to how German-and Spanish-accented speakers were evaluated in terms of the main variables perceived status, solidarity, dynamism and hiring success (RQa) of the current study show their clear inferiority in evaluations compared to the standard American accent.

The second sub-question concerned possible differences between the two non-standard accents (RQb). The Spanish accent has mostly been researched in an American context (e.g. Hosoda, Nguyen & Stone-Romero, 2012). This study adds to the existing findings in that it included a European perspective, which could crucially differ from an American perspective because Hispanics display one of the biggest majorities in the US (Ramirez, 2004). The differences that were found between the German- and Spanish-accented speakers concern the previously discussed concept of dynamism and the concept of familiarity and do not lead to a clearer answer to the question.

This leads to the third sub-question determining possible factors influencing the evaluation of the job candidates (RQc). The participants of the current study indicated to be more familiar with American accented English than with German- and Spanish-accented English and to be more familiar with the German than with the Spanish accent. The high familiarity with the American accent could be due to its prevalence in media and its increase in popularity surpassing other standard accents such as the RP (Giles & Billings, 2004). Higher familiarity with the German-accented English than with the Spanish-accented English could be due to a high number of business relations between the Netherlands and Germany, due to a high number of German tourists in the Netherlands (German-Dutch Chamber of Commerce, 2018) or for instance the exposure to German-accented lecturers (Hendriks, van Meurs & Reimer, 2018). As discussed in the previous paragraph, the German-accented speakers were generally downgraded in comparison to the American speakers with regard to the main variables. Relatively high familiarity with the German accent might therefore not have triggered positive evaluations, but instead possibly evoked negative feelings among the participants. They could have expected a better pronunciation and

connected the strong accent to a poor English proficiency (Nejjari, Gerritsen, Van der Haagen & Korzilius, 2012).

With regard to perceived comprehensibility, participants rated the Spanish-accented speakers as less comprehensible than the American speakers. The same holds for the German-accented speakers, receiving significantly lower evaluations than the American speakers. This result is in line with existing research showing that non-standard accented speakers are generally perceived as more difficult to understand (Hosoda & Stone-Romero, 2010). The inability to identify words of accented speech by the listener could lead to perceived incompetence of speakers, even though they know the language perfectly well (Munro & Derwing, 1995). This could have led to inferior evaluations of the non-standard accents in comparison to the American accent with regard to the main variables such as lower rating in terms of status.

Taking the previously discussed results of the study into account, a substantial answer to the main research question can be formulated. German- and Spanish-accented speakers are downgraded by Dutch listeners with regard to various aspects in comparison to the evaluation of standard-accented American speakers applying for the same job. This general finding is also in line with Ryan, Hewstone and Giles (1984), emphasising a higher evaluation of standard accents, even by listeners who are themselves non-native English speakers as in the current study. This adds to already existing literature, which is mostly focusing on accent evaluations by native English speakers (e.g. Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010), but also contradicts a range of studies showing reverse findings (e.g. Hosoda & Stone-Romero, 2010).

Limitations and suggestions for future research

Despite the fact, that a pre-test was carried out in order to select the best materials, there were significant differences between the two German speakers. Overall, the first German speaker was evaluated more negatively than the second German speaker in terms of perceived status, dynamism and pleasantness of voice. This finding could be the reason for the overall more negative position of the German-accented English speakers in comparison to the other two accent conditions. This has to be seen as a clear limitation of the current study. Future research could improve pre-testing and include more speakers in order to select the best materials.

Moreover, this study only included female speakers for the recordings of the audio files. The effects may thus be gender specific. Future research could include speakers of both genders

in order to get a clearer view of possible differences. In addition, age was not equally distributed across all conditions and could have influenced the outcomes as well as voice pleasantness of the speakers which differed between the groups. The American speakers' voices were perceived as more pleasant and could have led to more positive evaluations. Future research should improve manipulation and similarity between the recordings.

Even though a financial incentive was used and participants were informed about the content and duration of the questionnaire, some participants did not progress after the first questions. This aspect thus needs further refinement.

Implications

As the findings of the current study suggest, discrimination issue due to different evaluations of accents could arise in the hiring process. Multinational companies in the Netherlands with English as their corporate language could benefit from the insights of the current study. HR experts would have to raise awareness of the empirically proven point that people tend to evaluate non-standard accented candidates more negatively than standard accented candidates. According to Roessel, Schoel, Zimmermann and Stahlberg (2019) making people aware of these tendencies could counteract the discrimination of non-standard accented speakers. Active anticipation by creating awareness of this issue could thus be a first mean to prevent discrimination problems based on accentedness. Further possibilities to counteract these problems are beyond the scope of the current study and should be further investigated by future research. It becomes crucial to initiate social debates about redefining the norm and the standard perspective on accentedness and to take initiative against accent-based discrimination.

References

- Amin, A. (2002). Spatialities of globalisation. *Environment and planning A: Economy and Space*, 34(3), 385-399.
- Beinhoff, B. (2014). Perceiving intelligibility and accentedness in non-native speech: A look at proficiency levels. *Concordia Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 5, 58-72.
- Biliotti, F., & Calamai, S. (2012). Linguistic opinions and attitudes in Tuscany: verbal guise experiments on the varieties of Arezzo and Florence. In CALAMAI, S., CELATA, C., CIUCCI, L. (2012, eds), *Proceedings of the Workshop «Sociophonetics, at the crossroads of speech variation, processing and communication»*, Edizioni della Normale, Pisa (pp. 1-4).
- Byrne, D. E. (1971). *The attraction paradigm* (Vol. 11). Academic Press.
- Cargile, A. C., & Bradac, J. J. (2001). Attitudes toward language: A review of speaker-evaluation research and a general process model. *Communication Yearbook 25* (pp. 361-396). Routledge.
- Carlson, H. K., & McHenry, M. A. (2006). Effect of accent and dialect on employability. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 43(2), 70-83.
- Dalessio, A., & Imada, A. S. (1984). Relationships between interview selection decisions and perceptions of applicant similarity to an ideal employee and self: A field study. *Human Relations*, 37(1), 67-80.
- De Langhe, B., Puntoni, S., Fernandes, D., & Van Osselaer, S. M. (2011). The anchor contraction effect in international marketing research. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 48(2), 366-380.
- De La Zerda, N., & Hopper, R. (1979). Employment interviewers' reactions to Mexican American speech. *Communications Monographs*, 46(2), 126-134.
- Deprez-Sims, A. S., & Morris, S. B. (2010). Accents in the workplace: Their effects during a job interview. *International Journal of Psychology*, 45(6), 417-426.
- Deprez-Sims, A. S., & Morris, S. B. (2013). The effect of non-native accents on the evaluation of applicants during an employment interview: The development of a path model. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 21(4), 355-367.
- Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (1997). Accent, intelligibility, and comprehensibility: Evidence from four L1s. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 1-16

- DeShields Jr, O. W., Kara, A., & Kaynak, E. (1996). Source effects in purchase decisions: The impact of physical attractiveness and accent of salesperson. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 13(1), 89-101.
- Fuertes, J. N., Gottdiener, W. H., Martin, H., Gilbert, T. C., & Giles, H. (2012). A meta-analysis of the effects of speakers' accents on interpersonal evaluations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(1), 120-133.
- Gass, S., & Varonis, E. M. (1984). The effect of familiarity on the comprehensibility of nonnative speech. *Language Learning*, 34(1), 65-87.
- German Dutch Chamber of Commerce. (2018). *Marktinformationen*. Retrieved from <https://www.dnhk.org/beratung/marktinformationen/>
- Giles, H. (1970). Evaluative reactions to accents. *Educational Review*, 22(3), 211-227.
- Giles, H., & Billings, A. C. (2004). Assessing language attitudes: Speaker evaluation studies. *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, 187.
- Gluszek, A., & Dovidio, J. F. (2010). The way they speak: A social psychological perspective on the stigma of nonnative accents in communication. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 14(2), 214-237.
- Hendriks, B., van Meurs, F., & Reimer, A. K. (2018). The evaluation of lecturers' nonnative-accented English: Dutch and German students' evaluations of different degrees of Dutch-accented and German-accented English of lecturers in higher education. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 34, 28-45.
- Hosoda, M., Nguyen, L. T., & Stone-Romero, E. F. (2012). The effect of Hispanic accents on employment decisions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(4), 347-364.
- Hosoda, M., & Stone-Romero, E. (2010). The effects of foreign accents on employment-related decisions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(2), 113-132.
- Lemhöfer, K., & Broersma, M. (2012). Introducing LexTALE: A quick and valid lexical test for advanced learners of English. *Behavior Research Methods*, 44(2), 325-343.
- Levi, S. V., Winters, S. J., & Pisoni, D. B. (2007). Speaker-independent factors affecting the perception of foreign accent in a second language. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 121(4), 2327-2338.

- Mulac, A., Hanley, T. D., & Prigge, D. Y. (1974). Effects of phonological speech foreignness upon three dimensions of attitude of selected American listeners. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 60(4), 411-420.
- Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (1995). Processing time, accent, and comprehensibility in the perception of native and foreign-accented speech. *Language and Speech*, 38(3), 289-306.
- Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (1995). Foreign accent, comprehensibility, and intelligibility in the speech of second language learners. *Language Learning*, 45(1), 73-97.
- Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (1999). Foreign accent, comprehensibility, and intelligibility in the speech of second language learners. *Language Learning*, 49, 285-310.
- Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (2001). Modeling perceptions of the accentedness and comprehensibility of L2 speech the role of speaking rate. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 23(4), 451-468.
- Nejjari, W., Gerritsen, M., Van der Haagen, M., & Korzilius, H. (2012). Responses to Dutch-accented English. *World Englishes*, 31(2), 248-267.
- Nickerson, C. (1998). Corporate culture and the use of written English within British subsidiaries in the Netherlands. *English for Specific Purposes*, 17(3), 281-294.
- Piller, I. (1999). Iconicity in brand names. *Form Miming Meaning: Iconicity in Language and Literature*, 325-341.
- Pulakos, E. D., & Wexley, K. N. (1983). The relationship among perceptual similarity, sex, and performance ratings in manager-subordinate dyads. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(1), 129-139.
- Ramirez, R. R. (2004). *We the people: Hispanics in the United States*. Washington, DC: US Department of Commerce, Economic and Statistics Administration, US Census Bureau.
- Roessel, J., Schoel, C., Zimmermann, R., & Stahlberg, D. (2019). Shedding new light on the evaluation of accented speakers: Basic mechanisms behind nonnative listeners' evaluations of nonnative accented job candidates. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 38(1), 3-32.
- Rosini, L. G., Lippi-Green, R., Donati, S., Donati, R., & Lippi, R. (1997). English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States. *Psychology Press*.
- Ryan, E. B., Hewstone, M., & Giles, H. (1984). Language and intergroup attitudes. *Attitudinal Judgment* (pp. 135-158). Springer, New York, NY.

- Sebastian, R. J., Ryan, E. B., Keogh, T. F., & Schmidt, A. C. (1980). The effects of negative affect arousal on reactions to speakers. *Language* (pp. 203-208). Pergamon.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*, 59(4), 339-341.
- Śliwa, M., & Johansson, M. (2014). How non-native English-speaking staff are evaluated in linguistically diverse organizations: A sociolinguistic perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 45(9), 1133-1151.
- Sumner, M., & Samuel, A. G. (2009). The effect of experience on the perception and representation of dialect variants. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 60(4), 487-501.
- Turban, D. B., & Jones, A. P. (1988). Supervisor-subordinate similarity: types, effects, and mechanisms. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(2), 228.
- Van Vaerenbergh, Y., & Holmqvist, J. (2013). Speak my language if you want my money: Service language's influence on consumer tipping behavior. *European Journal of Marketing*, 47(8), 1276-1292.
- Wang, Z., Arndt, A., Singh, S., & Biernat, M. (2009). The impact of accent stereotypes on service outcomes and its boundary conditions. *ACR North American Advances*.
- Wang, Z., Arndt, A. D., Singh, S. N., Biernat, M., & Liu, F. (2013). "You Lost Me at Hello": How and when accent-based biases are expressed and suppressed. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 30(2), 185-196.
- Zahn, C. J., & Hopper, R. (1985). Measuring language attitudes: The speech evaluation instrument. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 4(2), 113-123.

Appendix

Script of the recordings

Well, as you probably can see, I finished school five years ago and immediately started university. I followed a programme in Communication science in which I graduated with a bachelor's degree and afterwards I did an internship in that area with a larger organisation. And, well, now I'm on the lookout for a job to get more experience and to further develop myself. I already learned a lot during my study, especially about marketing, corporate communication, and intercultural communication, all those sorts of things.

A little about myself ... I enjoy working with other people a lot. You might say I'm a teamplayer but I can do perfectly fine on my own as well, that's not a problem. My internship has taught me about responsibility and I was actually surprised how ambitious I can be. That doesn't mean I don't care about my colleagues, though. I tend to get along quite well with everyone I come across.

If I had to describe myself in three words, I'd probably say enthusiastic, trustworthy and open-minded. I think I know pretty well where my limits are so I can use that .and also push myself a little further. And whenever I meet a dead end, I try other ways to come up with a solution. That's my creative side. I think that's important ... to think outside the box.

So I think I would be a perfect fit for the position of junior marketing assistant in your organisation. I did a little research and so far I like what I read about you, your values, goals, what you do in general ... I like it a lot and I think I would be a good match.

Pre-test questionnaire for the experts

We are currently examining the effects of a foreign accent in English on hiring success. For this purpose, we will present our participants three different accent conditions they will listen to. In order to find reliable samples, we are asking you to listen to three of each of those conditions of which we will rule out one. You will be listening to all three samples and choose the one you would rule out by answering the questionnaire. The foreign accents should be moderate, which means that they are comprehensible, but it is evident from which country they are.

Questionnaire for German and Spanish speakers

1. Where do you think the speaker is from? (open question)

2. Accent Strength:

The speaker had a strong foreign accent.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Completely disagree

Completely agree

The speaker sounds like a native speaker

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Completely disagree

Completely agree

3. Voice Pitch:

The speaker's pitch was

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Low

High

4. Voice Speed:

The speaker was speaking

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Slowly

Fast

Questionnaire for American speakers

1. Where do you think the speaker is from? (open question)

2. Accent Strength:

The speaker is a native speaker.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Completely disagree

Completely agree

3. Voice Pitch:

The speaker's pitch was

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Low

High

4. Voice Speed:

The speaker was speaking

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Slowly

Fast

5. Accent

The accent was more

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

British

American

English Questionnaire**1. Status****Intelligence***The speaker is intelligent.*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

Ambition*The speaker is ambitious.*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

Confidence*The speaker is confident.*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

Competence*The speaker is competent.*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

2. Solidarity**Trustworthiness***The speaker is trustworthy.*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

Benevolence*The speaker is benevolent.*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

Similarity*The speaker is similar to me.*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

Attractiveness*The speaker is attractive.*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

3. Dynamism

Level of activity

The speaker is active.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

Liveliness

The speaker is lively.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

Talkativeness

The speaker is talkative.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

Enthusiasm

The speaker is enthusiastic.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

4. Hiring success

I think the speaker is suitable for the position.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

I would hire the speaker.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

I would recommend to hire the speaker,

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

5. Perceived Comprehension

I found the speaker easy to understand.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

6. Familiarity

I am very familiar with the English accent of the speaker.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

2. Manipulation check

2.1 Voice characteristics:

3.3 English proficiency

English proficiency as displayed on LexTALE:

.....

I sound like a native speaker when I speak English.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

When I speak English, I sound more American English than British English.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

3.4 Attitude towards accents

I think it is important for non-native speakers to sound native when speaking English.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

I like non-native English accents in general.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

I prefer American English over British English.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Completely disagree				Completely agree		

Dutch Questionnaire

1. Status

Intelligentie

De spreker is intelligent.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volledig mee oneens				Volledig mee eens		

Ambitie

De spreker is ambitieus.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volledig mee oneens				Volledig mee eens		

Zelfverzekerd

De spreker is zelfverzekerd

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volledig mee oneens				Volledig mee eens		

Competentie

De spreker is competent.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volledig mee oneens				Volledig mee eens		

2. Solidariteit

Betrouwbaarheid

De spreker is betrouwbaar.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volledig mee oneens				Volledig mee eens		

Welwillendheid

De spreker is welwillend.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volledig mee oneens				Volledig mee eens		

Gelijkheid

De spreker lijkt op mij.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volledig mee oneens				Volledig mee eens		

Aantrekkelijkheid

De spreker is aantrekkelijk.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volledig mee oneens				Volledig mee eens		

3. Dynamisme

Niveau van activiteit

De spreker is actief.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volledig mee oneens				Volledig mee eens		

Levendig

De spreker is levendig.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volledig mee oneens				Volledig mee eens		

Spraakzaamheid

De spreker is spraakzaam.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volledig mee oneens				Volledig mee eens		

Enthousiasme

De spreker is enthousiast.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volledig mee oneens				Volledig mee eens		

4. Werving succes

De spreker is geschikt voor de positie.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volledig mee oneens				Volledig mee eens		

Ik zou de spreker aannemen.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volledig mee oneens				Volledig mee eens		

Ik zou de spreker aanraden.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volledig mee oneens				Volledig mee eens		

5. Waargenomen begrip

Ik vond de spreker makkelijk te verstaan.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volledig mee oneens				Volledig mee eens		

6. Bekendheid

Ik ben bekend met het Engelse accent van de spreker.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volledig mee oneens				Volledig mee eens		

Ik ben vertrouwd met het Engelse accent van de spreker.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Volledig mee oneens Volledig mee eens

2. Manipulatie check

2.1 Stem eigenschappen:

De spreeknelheid van de spreker was aangenaam.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Volledig mee oneens Volledig mee eens

De intonatie van de spreker was aangenaam.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Volledig mee oneens Volledig mee eens

De stem van de spreker was aangenaam.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Volledig mee oneens Volledig mee eens

2.2 Accent sterkte:

De spreker had een sterk buitenlands accent in het Engels.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Volledig mee oneens Volledig mee eens

De spreker klinkt als een moedertaal spreker van Engels.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Volledig mee oneens Volledig mee eens

2.3 Herkenning van het accent:

Waar komt de spreker vandaan? Kies uit de lijst:

3. Achtergrond variabelen:

3.1 Demografische

Leeftijd:

Geslacht:

Beroep:

Hoogst afgeronde opleidingsniveau:

- Middelbare school
- MBO
- HBO
- WO bachelor
- WO master

Studierichting:

3.2 Ervaring met sollicitaties

Ik heb ervaring met het afnemen van sollicitaties.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Volledig mee oneens Volledig mee eens

Ik heb ervaring als sollicitant.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Volledig mee oneens Volledig mee eens

3.3 Engels kennis

Engels vaardigheid zoals weergegeven op LexTALE:

.....

Ik klink als een moedertaalspreker als ik Engels spreek.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Volledig mee oneens Volledig mee eens

Als ik Engels spreek, heb ik meer een Amerikaans Engels dan Brits Engels accent.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Volledig mee oneens Volledig mee eens

3.4 Mening over accenten

Het is belangrijk om te klinken als een moedertaalspreker in het Engels.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Volledig mee oneens Volledig mee eens

Ik vind buitenlands-klinkende Engelse accenten in het algemeen leuk.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Volledig mee oneens Volledig mee eens

Ik geef de voorkeur aan Amerikaans Engels boven Brits Engels.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Volledig mee oneens Volledig mee eens

Statement of own work

Print and sign this *Statement of own work* form and add it as the last appendix in the final version of the Bachelor's thesis that is submitted as a hard copy to the first supervisor.

Student name: Vera Bielefeld
Student number: s4741552

PLAGIARISM is the presentation by a student of an assignment or piece of work which has in fact been copied in whole or in part from another student's work, or from any other source (e.g. published books or periodicals or material from Internet sites), without due acknowledgement in the text.

DECLARATION:

- a. I hereby declare that I am familiar with the faculty manual (<http://www.ru.nl/stip/english/rules-regulations/fraud-plagiarism/>) and with Article 16 "Fraud and plagiarism" in the Education and Examination Regulations for the Bachelor's programme of Communication and Information Studies.
- b. I also declare that I have only submitted text written in my own words
- c. I certify that this thesis is my own work and that I have acknowledged all material and sources used in its preparation, whether they be books, articles, reports, lecture notes, and any other kind of document, electronic or personal communication.

Signature: 

Place and date: Nijmegen, 7th june 2019