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Abstract
As a result of the globalizing world, the number of non-native English-speaking people has increased. Previous research conducted on non-native accented English has not yet examined the effects of a Dutch-English accent in an employment context. The purpose of the present study was to examine how Dutch non-native listeners evaluate job applicants with moderate and slight Dutch-English accents in terms of perceived comprehensibility, attitudes, and suitability for a job. In an online questionnaire, 189 Dutch participants evaluated speech fragments recorded by moderately and slightly accented Dutch speakers and native English speakers. Findings indicate that all speakers were evaluated similarly on perceived comprehensibility. Although all speaker groups were evaluated the same on warmth and dynamism, moderately accented and slightly accented speakers were evaluated more negatively on superiority than native speakers. Additionally, moderately accented speakers were considered as less suitable for a job with high communicative demands compared to native speakers. Evaluations were always similar for moderately accented and slightly accented speakers, and often similar for slightly accented speakers and native speakers. The findings show that non-native accented job applicants are generally not evaluated more negatively than native accented job applicants. Future research could replicate this study using longer speech fragments in order to confirm or disprove the present findings.
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**Introduction**

The globalization of the world has ensured that a growing number of people are using English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010). English is often the main language in a business environment in particular (Neeley, 2012). For numerous people this means that they have to speak English at work, which for many of them is not their native language. Speaking in a language other than the native language often implies that a non-native accent can be heard.

Research conducted on foreign-accented English has shown that speakers with a non-native accent are often evaluated more negatively than native speakers, both by native and non-native listeners. The impact of non-native accents has been studied in various contexts, for example in a teaching context or during job interviews in an employment context. The Dutch-English accent in particular has already been tested in several studies. However, this specific accent has not yet been researched in an employment context. Furthermore, with the increasing number of non-native speakers of ELF, research into the evaluations of non-native listeners has become more important. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine how speakers with a Dutch-English accent are evaluated by Dutch (non-native) listeners in the context of a job interview.

The results of this study might contribute to the research field and they might be helpful in determining whether action should be taken, either on the part of the speakers by modifying their accent, or on the part of the listeners by adjusting their perspectives towards accented speakers. Actions undertaken by either or both groups may consequently increase recruitment opportunities for non-native accented speakers.
Theoretical framework

Since the arrival of the Internet, the world has become more globalized, meaning that economics, politics, and culture have become more integrated and more global. Due to this globalization, English has become a dominant language in the business world (Neeley, 2012), involving that many people have to speak English at work and with foreign colleagues. English can be considered as a *lingua franca*, as it is used among many people and companies in order to communicate with people having different first language backgrounds. English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) implies that English is a second language for many speakers (Hendriks, Van Meurs, & De Groot, 2017). It is possible to become highly competent and fluent in a second language. However, in most cases, people retain the phonology of their native language, causing them to speak with an accent (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010; Scovel, 2000).

Evaluations of non-native accents

Much research on foreign-accented English has already been conducted, focusing on different accent strengths (Carlson & McHenry, 2006; Hendriks et al., 2017; Hendriks, Van Meurs, & Reimer, 2018; Neijari, Gerritsen, van der Haagen, & Korzilius, 2012; Roessel, Schoel, Zimmerman, & Stahlberg, 2019), on specific foreign accents (Cargile, 2000; Carlson & McHenry, 2006; Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010; Hosoda & Stone-Romero, 2010; Timming, 2017), and on the perceptions of the listeners, either native or non-native, in both teaching contexts (Hendriks et al., 2018) and employment contexts (Cargile, 2000; Carlson & McHenry, 2006; Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010; Hosoda & Stone-Romero, 2010; Roessel et al., 2019; Timming, 2017). In general, a considerable amount of research has shown that people who speak with a non-native accent are perceived more negatively than people who speak with a native accent (Fuertes, Gottdiener, Martin, Gilbert, & Giles, 2012; Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010). Generally, people who speak with a non-native accent are perceived as less pleasant to listen to than people who speak with a native accent (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010). Moreover, people who have a non-native accent are considered as less intelligent (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010) and less competent (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010; Hendriks, Van Meurs, & Hogervorst, 2016; Hendriks et al., 2018). Other research has shown that communication in a non-native accent is considered harder to process than communication in a native accent (Russo, Islam, & Koyuncu, 2017).
Often, when a foreign accent is perceived, negative impressions with regard to the speaker are developed by the listener (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010). Experimental studies have shown that it is often the perception of an accent, independent of the origin and the strength of the accent, that influences negative evaluations by the listeners with regard to the speakers (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010; Nejjari et al., 2012). Furthermore, the stronger the accent, the more negative the evaluations are with regard to the accented individuals (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010).

One of the factors that might determine the evaluation of an accent is familiarity with the accent. The similarity attraction theory argues that positive evaluations are evoked by a sense of interpersonal attraction through perceived similarity (Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010). In addition, Hendriks et al. (2018) showed that more positive attitudinal evaluations are caused by the listeners’ familiarity with the accent of a non-native speaker of English. Nevertheless, familiarity can also have a negative influence. To wit, non-native listeners sometimes downgrade non-native accented speakers with the same linguistic background (Roessel et al., 2019). The observation of an accent might imply a poorer fluency in the target language, which for the listeners may correlate with a lower educational level and a lower social status (Nejjari et al., 2012). Furthermore, listeners might feel an amount of vicarious shame when a speaker of the same nationality speaks with a clearly noticeable accent (Hendriks et al., 2018).

**Accent strength**

Individuals can vary in the degree of their accent strength (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010; Levi, Winters, & Pisoni, 2007). Multiple experimental studies have been conducted on the effects of different accent strengths in different contexts. The general finding in these studies is that stronger accents have more negative effects than weaker accents (Van Meurs & Hendriks, 2017). Nejjari et al. (2012) investigated the reactions of native British English speakers to Dutch-accented English. They incorporated three accents in their study: a slight Dutch-English accent, a moderate Dutch-English accent, and a standard British English accent. Findings indicated that British English was more comprehensible than both Dutch-English accents. Moreover, more status was assigned to the British English accent than to both Dutch-English accents, and speakers with a British English and a slight Dutch-English accent were attributed more affect than speakers with a moderate Dutch-English accent (Nejjari et al., 2012).
Hendriks et al. (2017) examined the effect of a non-native English accent on the evaluation of comprehensibility and attitude towards the speaker by French, German, and Spanish listeners. The accents that were incorporated in the study were a strong Dutch-English accent, a slight Dutch-English accent, and a native English accent. Their findings demonstrated that a strong accent had a negative effect on understanding and evaluations regarding attitude, while a slight accent did not evoke negative effects. Furthermore, a speaker with a strong accent was considered as less competent than speakers who had a slight or a native accent (Hendriks et al., 2017).

Hendriks et al. (2018) also investigated the evaluations of Dutch- and German-accented English in a teaching context. Their aim was to examine how Dutch and German lecturers with moderate and slight non-native English accents are evaluated by Dutch and German students with regard to competence and likeability. Their findings demonstrated that in general, lecturers with a moderate non-native accent in English were evaluated less positively. However, lecturers with a slight non-native accent in English were evaluated in the same way as lecturers with a native English accent (Hendriks et al., 2018).

Another study that examined the evaluations of non-native accented speakers by non-native listeners is the study by Roessel et al. (2019). However, this study focused on the evaluation of job candidates by students instead of the evaluation of speakers in a general context or lecturers in a teaching context. Their findings showed that candidates with a strong German accent were evaluated worse than candidates with a native-like English or a native English accent by German students. The researchers also tested for hirability. Their results showed that a strong accent generated lower hirability ratings than a weak accent or native speech (Roessel et al., 2019).

The findings of these experimental studies incorporating different strengths of accents show that in general a strong accent is perceived more negatively, while a slight accent is often perceived the same as a native accent. Furthermore, native English speakers are never evaluated worse than non-native accented English speakers (Hendriks et al., 2018).

**Accents in an employment context**

Most of the research discussed had a general focus regarding the evaluations of the different accent strengths. However, Hendriks et al. (2018) focused on the evaluations in a teaching context, and Roessel et al. (2019) paid attention to an employment context, in which job candidates with different accent strengths were evaluated. Much other research on accents in an employment context has already been conducted. For example, Deprez-Sims & Morris
investigated the influence of accents on the evaluation of job applicants during a job interview for a human resource manager position. The listeners and evaluators of the job candidates were American, i.e. native listeners. The findings showed that applicants with a Midwestern US-English accent were evaluated more positively than applicants with a French-English accent regarding attitude, understandability, and hirability (Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010).

Timming (2017) examined the effect of foreign accents on the employability ratings of job applicants in the USA. The results of this study revealed that Chinese, Indian, and Mexican accents scored significantly lower than an American or a British English accent. Furthermore, employability ratings of these accents with regard to customer-facing jobs compared to non-customer facing jobs were tested. The conclusion of this experiment was that Chinese-, Indian-, and Mexican-accented job candidates are perceived by hiring managers as more suitable for non-customer facing jobs than for customer-facing jobs (Timming, 2017).

Another study that investigated the effects of foreign accents on employment-related decisions in the USA is the study by Hosoda & Stone-Romero (2010). The authors incorporated jobs that differed on job status and communication demands into their study to test whether these variables influenced the effects. Their findings showed that Japanese-accented applicants were considered as less suitable than Standard American-accented applicants for a low or a high-status job with high communication demands. However, the Japanese-accented applicants were more likely to be hired when the job status was low and when the job required little communication (Hosoda & Stone-Romero, 2010).

Carlson & McHenry (2006) also examined the effect of accent on employability, but they also incorporated different strengths of the accent (minimal – maximal). Their findings demonstrated that maximally perceived accents always received more negative ratings than minimally perceived accents. Furthermore, when an accent was minimally perceived, employability was not affected. However, the employability ratings were lower when the accent was maximally perceived, regardless of the accent (Carlson & McHenry, 2006).

All this research focusing on the effects of accents on employability yielded similar results, i.e. that non-native accented job applicants score lower on employability than native-accented job applicants. However, contradictory results have also been found in this area. For example, Cargile (2000) investigated whether a Mandarin-Chinese accent in English would have an influence on employment suitability in the USA. His findings showed that speakers with a Chinese accent obtained similar scores regarding efficiency and suitability for a high-
or low status job as Standard American-accented speakers. These results thus contradict the generalization that non-native accented speakers are considered as less suitable for high status jobs and more suitable for low status jobs (Cargile, 2000).

**Research gaps and hypotheses**

This review of literature has shown that a standard accent is almost always evaluated more positively than a non-native accent and that listeners, both native and non-native, often downgrade speakers with a non-native accent. The poor evaluations often depend on the strength of the accent, in that strong accents are evaluated more negatively than weak accents, which are often evaluated similarly as native accents. Furthermore, accents have also been researched in an employment context to some extent. This research has indicated that accents also have an impact on the employability of job candidates, in that strong accents are also evaluated more negatively than weak or native accents.

The job status (high/low) and the communication demands of the job (high/low) have been examined in some studies focusing on the evaluation of accented job candidates (Cargile, 2000; Hosoda & Stone-Romero, 2010). However, the impact of accents on employability regarding the type of job, like an HR-function or an IT-function, has never been investigated before. In addition, although Dutch-accented English has been incorporated into several studies focusing on different contexts and using different strengths of the accent (Hendriks et al., 2017; Hendriks et al., 2018; Nejjari et al., 2012), this specific accent has never been researched in an employment context. Finally, as the number of non-native speakers of ELF is increasing, it has become more important to examine the evaluations of non-native listeners. Focusing especially on non-native listeners with the same L1 background as non-native speakers might be interesting, as these non-native listeners have been found to be particularly negative in their judgment of fellow non-native speakers (Roessel et al., 2019).

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of a Dutch-English accent on the evaluations of Dutch (non-native) listeners with regard to perceived comprehensibility, attitudes, and suitability for the job. The hypotheses that form the foundation of our study are the following:
Perceived comprehensibility
H1: Speakers with a moderate Dutch-English accent are perceived as less comprehensible than speakers with a slight Dutch-English accent and native English speakers by Dutch listeners

Attitudes
H2: Speakers with a moderate Dutch-English accent are evaluated more negatively on attitudes than speakers with a slight Dutch-English accent and native English speakers by Dutch listeners

Suitability for the job
H3: Speakers with a moderate Dutch-English accent are perceived as less suitable for jobs with high communicative demands compared to speakers with a slight Dutch-English accent and native English speakers by Dutch listeners

Slight Dutch-English accent versus native English accent
H4: Speakers with a slight Dutch-English accent are not evaluated differently compared to native English speakers on perceived comprehensibility, attitudes, and suitability for the job by Dutch listeners
Method

Materials

Participants evaluated short fragments of a job interview by female speakers with a moderate Dutch-English accent, a slight Dutch-English accent, and a native British English accent. The speech fragments consisted of a general script applicable to a job interview for an international profit organisation. The script was taken from the study by Timming (2017), who used the following script to simulate a telephone job interview in order to examine how a foreign accent can affect employability: ‘Good morning. Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. I’m really excited about this job.’ The length of the speech fragments was approximately seven seconds, which was long enough for the respondents to evaluate the accents (Timming, 2017). Two speakers were selected for each level of accent strength. The speech fragments and the speakers were randomized among the respondents to prevent an order effect.

Participants also read a job description for either a human resource function (HR) or an information technology function (IT) (see Appendix 1). These two functions were selected as they differ in communicative demands in such a way that an HR function requires much communication, whereas an IT function requires little communication. The job descriptions were also randomized among the respondents to prevent an order effect.

Selection of materials

A total of 21 female speakers (seven speakers of moderate Dutch-accented English, seven speakers of slight Dutch-accented English, and seven speakers of native British English) recorded a speech fragment. The speakers were all students aged between 18 and 25. The native British English accented speech fragments were recorded by students originating from the UK. The slight Dutch-accented speech fragments were recorded by students of the English stream of the International Business Communication programme at Radboud University. Since students enrolled in this programme are exposed to English daily and receive extra training in English (pronunciation), they have a level of English that represents one of the highest levels of English that Dutch people can acquire in the Netherlands (Nejjari et al., 2012). The moderate Dutch-accented speech fragments were recorded by students of Dutch Bachelor programmes at Radboud University. Students enrolled in Dutch Bachelor programmes are not often exposed to English and therefore have a level of English that
represents the highest level of English that Dutch people can achieve in Dutch secondary schools (Nejjari et al., 2012).

Undergraduate students of the degree programme English Language and Culture at Radboud University were invited to evaluate the different accents in the fragments. Nejjari et al. (2012) have proved that these non-expert judges are capable of confirming whether the speech fragments do or do not represent the different accents. In order to obtain sufficient responses, students enrolled in the English track of the degree programme International Business Communication at Radboud University were also invited to assess the accents. As these students receive English-taught education and pronunciation training, they can also be considered competent for evaluating the accents.

All fragments were evaluated by 17 people on accent strength (moderate, slight, native), comprehensibility, speech rate (slow – fast), voice characteristics (volume, pitch, naturalness, speaks with emotions), and impressions of the speaker (friendliness). Based on the evaluations, the 21 speakers were divided into three accent strength categories (moderate, slight, native) (see Table 1, 2, 3). Afterwards, two speakers were selected from each category. For the moderate accent, speaker 1 (foreign accent: $M = 4.25, SD = 1.50$) and speaker 7 (foreign accent: $M = 4.50, SD = 1.73$; see Table 1) were selected. For the slight accent, speaker 2 (foreign accent: $M = 3.75, SD = 1.50$) and speaker 3 (foreign accent: $M = 3.75, SD = 2.22$; see Table 2) were selected. For the native accent, speaker 6 (foreign accent: $M = 2.66, SD = 2.89$) and speaker 7 (foreign accent: $M = 1.00, SD = 0.00$; see Table 3) were selected. The choice of speakers was based on the representativeness of the scores for the concerning accent strength and on similar scores for accent strength, speech rate, and voice characteristics. No statistical tests were conducted for the selection of speakers as the fragments were evaluated by few people.
Table 1. Means and standard deviations (between brackets) for accent strength in function of the moderately accented speakers (1 = low; 7 = high)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(moderate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strong foreign accent</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.50)</td>
<td>(2.08)</td>
<td>(2.71)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(1.73)</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>(1.73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sounds native</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.29)</td>
<td>(2.31)</td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
<td>(1.83)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Means and standard deviations (between brackets) for accent strength in function of the slightly accented speakers (1 = low; 7 = high)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(slight)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strong foreign accent</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.73)</td>
<td>(1.50)</td>
<td>(2.22)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
<td>(1.26)</td>
<td>(1.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sounds native</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
<td>(1.41)</td>
<td>(2.50)</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Means and standard deviations (between brackets) for accent strength in function of the native accented speakers (1 = low; 7 = high)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(native)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strong foreign accent</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.29)</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(1.89)</td>
<td>(2.38)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(2.89)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sounds native</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.41)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Subjects**

A total of 189 Dutch participants (age: $M = 29.76$, $SD = 12.93$; range 19-77; 67.2% female) took part in the experiment. Of the participants, 66.1% were students, and 83.6% indicated that their current or highest level of education is higher education (HBO or WO). Regarding the English proficiency of the participants, LexTALE scores ranged from 47.50-100.00 ($M = 76.24$, $SD = 12.41$). The participants’ self-assessed English proficiency ranged from 2-7 ($M = 5.51$, $SD = 0.90$) on a 7-point scale. This self-assessed proficiency consisted of writing skills ($M = 5.14$, $SD = 1.17$), reading skills ($M = 5.88$, $SD = 1.02$), speaking skills ($M = 5.16$, $SD = 1.09$), and listening skills ($M = 5.85$, $SD = 0.96$). Participants also indicated their experience with being interviewed as an applicant ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 1.60$) and their experience with interviewing applicants ($M = 2.49$, $SD = 1.68$) on 7-point scales.

**Design**

The study had a 3 (accent: moderate, slight, native) x 2 (type of job: HR, IT) between-subjects verbal guise design. Each respondent was randomly assigned to one of the six conditions.

**Instruments**

Participants filled in an online questionnaire in which they evaluated a speech fragment on identification of the speaker’s country of origin, strength of the speaker’s accent, perceived comprehensibility of the speaker, attitudes towards the speaker, and the speaker’s suitability for the job. The complete questionnaire can be found in Appendix 2.
Identification of the speaker’s country of origin was measured with the open question ‘What do you think is the speaker’s country of origin?’ for which the respondents could fill in their answer. For the slight and moderate accented speakers, the answers ‘Nederland(s)’, ‘NL’, and ‘Dutch’ were considered correct identifications. For the native speakers, the answers ‘England’, ‘London’, ‘Great Britain’, and ‘UK’ were regarded as correct identifications.

Strength of the speaker’s accent was measured with two items on a 7-point Likert scale anchored by ‘totally disagree – totally agree’ developed by Hendriks et al. (2018). The items were ‘This speaker has a strong foreign accent in English’ and ‘This speaker sounds like a native speaker of English’ (r) (α = .61).

Perceived comprehensibility of the speaker was measured with seven items on a 7-point Likert scale anchored by ‘totally disagree – totally agree’ developed by Hendriks et al. (2016), who in turn based it on Dalle & Inglis (1989). The items can be found in Appendix 3.

Attitudes towards the speaker were measured by means of three dimensions: superiority, warmth, and dynamism (α = .78). Each dimension contained three items that were measured on 7-point Likert scales anchored by ‘totally disagree – totally agree’ developed by Grondelaers, Van Hout and Van Gent (2019). All scales contained the statement ‘This person sounds x’, in which x was replaced by the items. For superiority, the items were chic, educated, serious (α = .65). For warmth, the items were nice, warm, helpful (α = .82). For dynamism, the items were modern, hip, trendy (α = .85).

The speaker’s suitability for the job was measured with eight items on a 7-point Likert scale anchored by ‘totally disagree – totally agree’ developed by Deprez-Sims and Morris (2010). The items can be found in Appendix 3.

In the final part of the questionnaire, participants filled in information about their age, gender, level of education, and experience with interviewing or being interviewed. In addition, both actual and self-assessed English proficiency was measured. Actual proficiency was measured by the LexTALE test (Lemhöfer & Broersma, 2012). Self-assessed proficiency was measured by having the respondents rate their writing, reading, speaking, and listening skills on four 7-point semantic differential scales anchored by ‘poor – excellent’ (Hendriks et al., 2018).
Procedure

The Dutch questionnaire was administered using the online survey tool Qualtrics. Participants first read a short introduction with information about the questionnaire, without the purpose of the study and the origin of the speakers in the speech fragments being revealed. They also read a consent form stating that they participated voluntarily, that they could leave the questionnaire at any time, and that their answers would be processed anonymously. Before the respondents could start the questionnaire, consent had to be given regarding that information. Subsequently, the respondents read one of the two job descriptions, followed by the speech fragment they were asked to evaluate. Filling in the questionnaire took 9.62 minutes on average ($SD = 3.47$). Participants were approached by e-mail and via social media. In order to increase the response rate, a gift card was raffled among the respondents.

Statistical treatment

Independent samples t-tests were conducted in order to test for similarities between the speakers per accent strength condition. Furthermore, a one-way analysis of variance and a chi-square test were performed to check the manipulation of the accent strengths.

Two-way ANOVAs were conducted to test for interaction effects between the factors accent strength and type of job on the dependent variables perceived comprehensibility, attitudes (superiority, warmth, dynamism), and suitability for the job.
Results

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of a Dutch-English accent on the evaluations of Dutch (non-native) listeners with regard to perceived comprehensibility, attitudes, and suitability for the job.

Manipulation checks

Independent samples t-tests for perceived comprehensibility, superiority, warmth, dynamism, suitability for the job, and accent strength between two speakers per accentedness condition showed that there were no significant differences between the speakers (all p’s higher than .099).

A one-way analysis of variance showed that listeners recognised different levels of accentedness in the speech fragments ($F (2, 186) = 100.43, p < .001$; see Table 4). The moderately accented speakers ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 5.19, SD = 0.97$) and the slightly accented speakers ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 5.27, SD = 0.83$) were evaluated as having a stronger foreign accent than the native speakers ($M = 2.88, SD = 1.37$). No significant differences were found in accentedness between the moderately and slightly accented speakers ($p = 1.000$, Bonferroni-correction).

Table 4. Means, standard deviations (between brackets), and n for perceived accent strength in function of accent strength (1 = no foreign accent; 7 = strong foreign accent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accent strength</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.19 (0.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.27 (0.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.88 (1.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>4.45 (1.54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A chi-square test was conducted to assess whether the listeners correctly identified the origin of the speakers for the different accentedness conditions. This test showed a significant relation between country of origin and accent ($\chi^2 (2) = 15.82, p < .001$). The majority of the listeners correctly identified the moderately accented speakers (79.7%) and the slightly accented speakers (97.0%) as Dutch, and the native speakers as English (71.4%). Table 5
shows absolute numbers and percentages of correct and incorrect identifications of the origins of the speakers.

Table 5. Counts and percentages for the correct and incorrect identifications of the speaker’s country of origin in function of accent strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accent strength</th>
<th>Correct Count (%)</th>
<th>Incorrect Count (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>47a (80%)</td>
<td>12a (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>65a (97%)</td>
<td>2b (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>45a (71%)</td>
<td>18b (29%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each subscript letter denotes a subset of Origin_correct categories whose column proportions do not differ significantly from each other at the .05 level.

**Perceived comprehensibility**

A two-way analysis of variance with accentedness (moderate, slight, native) and type of job (HR, IT) as factors showed a significant main effect of type of job on perceived comprehensibility ($F(1, 183) = 4.79, p = .030$; see Table 6) but no main effect for accentedness ($F(2, 183) = 1.29, p = .277$). The interaction effect between accentedness and type of job was not statistically significant ($F(2, 183) < 1$).

Perceived comprehensibility with regard to the speaker was higher when participants had read an HR job description ($M = 6.46, SD = 0.62$) than when participants had read an IT job description ($M = 6.26, SD = 0.67$).

**Attitudes (superiority, warmth, dynamism) towards the speaker**

**Superiority**

A two-way analysis of variance with accentedness and type of job as factors showed a significant main effect of accentedness on superiority ($F(2, 183) = 25.30, p < .001$; see Table 6). Type of job was not found to have a significant main effect on superiority ($F(1, 183) < 1$). The interaction effect between accentedness and type of job was not statistically significant ($F(2, 183) = 2.75, p = .066$).

Participants evaluated the moderately accented speakers ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 4.32, SD = 0.92$) and the slightly accented speakers ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-
correction; $M = 4.06, SD = 0.98$) to be less superior than the native speakers ($M = 5.15, SD = 0.81$). No significant differences were found in superiority between the moderately and slightly accented speakers ($p = .333, \text{Bonferroni-correction}$).

**Warmth**

A two-way analysis of variance with accentedness and type of job as factors showed no significant main effects of accentedness ($F(2, 183) = 1.92, p = .150$) and type of job ($F(1, 183) < 1$; see Table 6) on warmth. The interaction effect between accentedness and type of job was not statistically significant ($F(2, 183) < 1$).

**Dynamism**

A two-way analysis of variance with accentedness and type of job as factors showed no significant main effects of accentedness ($F(2, 183) = 1.87, p = .157$) and type of job ($F(1, 183) = 1.10, p = .295$; see Table 6) on dynamism. The interaction effect between accentedness and type of job was not statistically significant ($F(2, 183) = 2.00, p = .138$).

**Suitability for the job**

A two-way analysis of variance with accentedness and type of job as factors showed no significant main effects of accentedness ($F(2, 183) = 2.11, p = .124$) and type of job ($F(1, 183) < 1$; see Table 6) on the suitability for the job. However, there was a significant interaction between accentedness and type of job on the suitability for the job ($F(2, 183) = 3.29, p = .039$).

Separate one-way ANOVAs for the type of jobs showed that the effect of accentedness was significant for the HR job description ($F(2, 94) = 3.11, p = .049$), but not for the IT job description ($F(2, 89) = 2.52, p = .086$).

Participants who had read the HR job description evaluated the moderately accented speakers ($M = 4.31, SD = 0.71$) as significantly less suitable for the job than the native speakers ($p = .046, \text{Bonferroni-correction}$; $M = 4.81, SD = 0.88$). No significant differences were found in the evaluation of suitability for the job between the moderately accented and the slightly accented speakers ($p = .343, \text{Bonferroni-correction}$; $M = 4.64, SD = 0.83$) and between the slightly accented speakers and the native speakers ($p = 1.000, \text{Bonferroni-correction}$).
Table 6. Means, standard deviations, and n for perceived comprehensibility, attitudes (superiority, warmth, dynamism), and suitability for the job in function of accent strength and type of job (1 = low; 7 = high)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Native</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiority</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamism</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion and discussion

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to investigate how Dutch non-native listeners evaluate job applicants with varying degrees of Dutch-accented English in terms of perceived comprehensibility, attitudes, and suitability for the job.

Findings indicate that Dutch non-native listeners did not evaluate job applicants with varying degrees of accentedness differently regarding perceived comprehensibility. The moderately accented speakers were not perceived as less comprehensible than the slightly accented speakers and the native speakers. These findings do not provide support for our first hypothesis, as we expected moderately accented speakers to be less comprehensible than both slightly accented speakers and native speakers.

Findings concerning attitudes towards the job applicant were mixed. The moderately accented and the slightly accented speakers were evaluated more negatively on superiority than the native speakers. Evaluations were similar for the moderately accented and the slightly accented speakers for superiority. However, with regard to warmth and dynamism, all speaker groups were evaluated similarly. These findings provide partial support for our second hypothesis, in which we expected moderately accented speakers to be evaluated more negatively on attitudes than both slightly accented speakers and native speakers. Although the moderately accented speakers were indeed evaluated more negatively than the native speakers on superiority, they were not evaluated more negatively on superiority than the slightly accented speakers. Furthermore, the moderately accented speakers were also not evaluated more negatively than the slightly accented speakers and the native speakers on warmth and dynamism.

Findings with regard to suitability for the job indicate that Dutch non-native listeners evaluated the moderately accented speakers as less suitable for the HR job than the native speakers. Moderately accented speakers were thus considered to be less suitable for a job with high communicative demands compared to native speakers. Nevertheless, Dutch listeners did not evaluate the slightly accented speakers as less suitable for the HR job than the native speakers. In addition, the moderately accented and the slightly accented speakers were evaluated similarly with regard to suitability for the HR job. These findings provide partial support for our third hypothesis, in which we expected moderately accented speakers to be less suitable for a job with high communicative demands compared to slightly accented speakers and native speakers. Moderately accented speakers were indeed perceived as less
suitable for a job with high communicative demands compared to native English speakers. However, this speaker group was not perceived as less suitable for such a job compared to slightly accented speakers.

Findings regarding the evaluations of the slightly accented speakers and the native speakers indicate that these speaker groups were evaluated similarly on perceived comprehensibility, warmth, dynamism, and suitability for the job. However, the slightly accented speakers were evaluated more negatively than the native speakers with regard to superiority. These findings provide partial support for our fourth hypothesis, in which we expected slightly accented speakers to be evaluated similarly as native speakers on perceived comprehensibility, attitudes, and suitability for the job. Although the slightly accented speakers were indeed often evaluated similarly as the native speakers, they were evaluated less positively on superiority compared to the native speakers.

Discussion

A general finding of our study showed that moderately accented speakers were sometimes evaluated more negatively than native speakers, whereas they were always evaluated similarly as slightly accented speakers. This finding is contradictory to the findings from previous experimental studies that showed that moderate accents were evaluated less positively, but that slight and native accents were often evaluated in the same way (Hendriks et al., 2017; Hendriks et al., 2018; Nejjari et al., 2012; Roessel et al., 2019).

An explanation for this finding might lie in the manipulation of the accent strengths that was performed in order to conduct the study. The manipulation checks showed that the moderately accented and the slightly accented speakers were recognized as having a stronger foreign accent than the native speakers. However, the moderately accented and the slightly accented speakers did not differ significantly from each other. In fact, both speaker groups were evaluated as having a moderate accent. This means that the manipulation of the accent strengths was not strong enough, as all three accent strengths should have been significantly different from each other with regard to the perceived accent strength.

The unsuccessful distinction between the moderate and the slight accent may have been due to the pretest, to the respondents in the experiment, or to the length of the speech fragments. The fact that the selection of the speech fragments in the pretest was based on so few evaluations might explain why the manipulation in the experiment was unsuccessful. Future studies on accents are recommended to conduct a solid pretest, including a statistical test as a basis for the choice of speech fragments in order to avoid an unsuccessful
manipulation. Moreover, the respondents in the experiment might not have given enough attention to the reversed formulation of one of the scales for accent strength and might thus have given a similar answer on both scales. Furthermore, as the speech fragments only lasted around seven seconds, Dutch listeners might not have recognised a difference between the slight and the moderate Dutch-English accent. Future studies should focus on similar research designs while incorporating longer speech fragments. These studies might yield other results that can be accounted for.

The finding that moderately accented speakers were not evaluated differently from slightly accented speakers and native speakers on perceived comprehensibility is both contradictory and in line with findings from previous studies. It contradicts findings from the studies by Hendriks et al. (2017) and Nejjari et al. (2012). Hendriks et al. (2017) showed that a strong accent had a negative effect on understanding and Nejjari et al. (2012) showed that a native accent was found to be more comprehensible than a moderate or a slight Dutch-English accent. However, the present finding is in line with the study by Hendriks et al. (2018), that showed that moderately Dutch-accented speakers, slightly Dutch-accented speakers, and native English speakers were all evaluated as equally intelligible by Dutch listeners.

An explanation for the moderate accent being evaluated similarly as the slight and the native accent on perceived comprehensibility could be assigned to the manipulation of the accent strengths and the short duration of the fragments. As Dutch listeners did not distinguish between slight and moderate accents, they may have judged the perceived comprehensibility of these accents in the same way. Furthermore, listeners might not have had any comprehension problems with regard to the different accents, as all speech fragments only consisted of a simple standard introductory sentence.

The finding that moderately accented and slightly accented speakers were evaluated more negatively on superiority than native speakers concurs with the study by Hendriks et al. (2018), who suggested that native English speakers are never evaluated worse than non-native accented English speakers.

On the contrary, the finding that moderately accented speakers were not evaluated differently than slightly accented speakers and native speakers regarding attitudes (warmth and dynamism) is opposed to several studies that showed that stronger accents were evaluated more negatively on attitudes than weaker or native accents (Hendriks et al., 2017; Hendriks et al., 2018; Nejjari et al., 2012; Roessel et al., 2019).

Possible explanations for the findings regarding attitudes could also be assigned to the manipulation of the accent strengths and the short duration of the fragments. As Dutch
listeners distinguished the moderate and the slight Dutch-English accent from the native accent, they may have judged these accents more negatively than the native accent, as shown in the finding with regard to superiority. Regarding the findings for warmth and dynamism, a possible explanation could be that the Dutch listeners appreciated the non-native speakers for speaking in a language other than their native language, in spite of the accent they might have noticed. Evaluations for non-native accented speakers and native speakers might therefore have been similar.

The finding that moderately accented speakers were perceived as less suitable for a job with high communicative demands compared to native speakers is in line with previous studies conducted on employability with regard to accents (Carlson & McHenry, 2006; Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010; Hosoda & Stone-Romero, 2010; Roessel et al., 2019). These studies showed that non-native accented job applicants (with a strong accent) were evaluated more negatively than native-accented job applicants with regard to employability.

An explanation for moderately accented speakers being perceived as less suitable for a job with high communicative demands than native speakers could be that the already more negative evaluations of the moderately accented speakers with regard to superiority affected the perceptions of their suitability for a job. As superiority is considered an important quality for a management function, the Dutch listeners might have taken this quality into account when evaluating the moderately accented speakers on suitability for an HR job with high communicative demands.

The finding that the slightly accented speakers were evaluated similarly as the moderately accented speakers and the native speakers on suitability for a job with high communicative demands could be explained in several ways. Firstly, as the respondents have not distinguished the two Dutch-English accents due to the unsuccessful manipulation of the accent strengths and the short duration of the fragments, they might have evaluated the Dutch-accented speakers similarly on suitability. However, another explanation could be that the listeners noticed the slight accent but still could understand the speaker well enough to be suitable for an HR function. This might explain why the slight accented speakers were evaluated similarly as the native speakers. A final explanation could be that the respondents in the experiment have not paid enough attention to the job description and the questions and therefore gave their answers rather randomly.

The finding that slightly accented speakers were evaluated in the same way as native speakers on perceived comprehensibility, warmth, dynamism, and suitability for the job concurs with previous experimental studies that showed that slight and native accents were
often evaluated similarly (Hendriks et al., 2017; Hendriks et al., 2018; Nejjari et al., 2012; Roessel et al., 2019). An explanation for this finding could be that even though the Dutch non-native listeners noticed the accent, they still admired the speaker for taking the effort to speak in another language than their native language.

The current study is one of the few studies that have examined the effect of different accent strengths on the evaluations of non-native speakers by non-native listeners in an employment context, and particularly in the context of a job interview. It has shown that non-native accented job applicants are generally not evaluated more negatively than native accented job applicants. The evaluations only appear to be more negative for moderately accented and slightly accented speakers in the case of superiority, and for moderately accented speakers in the case of suitability for a job with high communicative demands.

Furthermore, the present study is one of the first studies to investigate the effect of various accent strengths on the suitability for a job with high communicative demands. It has demonstrated that moderately accented speakers can be evaluated more negatively with regard to suitability for a job with high communicative demands compared to native speakers. Slightly accented speakers seem to be evaluated similarly as native speakers in this regard.

The present study has several limitations. Firstly, the short duration of the speech fragments and the lack of content in the fragments might have caused difficulties for the Dutch listeners in evaluating the speakers. Although the short fragments may have caused problems in the present study, the fragments seemed to be effective in the study by Timming (2017), the study on which the fragments of the present study were based. This difference in effectiveness could be due to the focus applied in these studies. Whereas Timming (2017) focused on distinctive accents, the present study focused on various accent strengths of the same accent. As it is easier to distinguish between different accents than between different accent strengths, the study by Timming (2017) might have obtained more significant results. Furthermore, the differences between the moderate and the slight accent in the present study may have been too subtle in order for the Dutch listeners to be able to distinguish them. Future research should replicate this study with longer speech fragments in which qualifications and character traits of the speakers are included, since a short fragment consisting of one sentence did not seem to be sufficient for listeners to base their evaluations on in the current study.

Secondly, the present study was based on evaluations between British English and Dutch-English accents. Future studies could focus on other variations of native English, such as American English or Australian English. Furthermore, comparisons between evaluations
could also be researched for various other foreign accents in English, such as French-English and Spanish-English. Evaluations from various listener groups (native, non-native) in the context of a job interview could then be investigated for these accents.

Thirdly, the present study only compared perceived comprehensibility with regard to different accent strengths. Future studies are suggested to investigate the objective comprehensibility (actual understanding) of these or other accents as well, since perceived comprehensibility and objective comprehensibility may differ. Perceived comprehensibility often appears to be lower than objective comprehensibility, due to listeners’ prejudices that often affect their beliefs about their capacity to understand the accent (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010). Both perceived and objective comprehensibility are thus important to investigate with regard to various accents and different accent strengths.

Lastly, slightly more than half of the participants in our study were students. Since students do not have the set of skills needed for evaluating job applicants on suitability for a job, the representativeness of the findings might be poor. Future research should conduct similar studies within organisations, in which the participants are all HR managers with experience in assessing job applicants. Findings from those studies will probably be more representative and will give more insight into how people with a non-native accent are truly perceived in organisations.

The present study has shown that non-native accented speakers applying for a job are generally not evaluated more negatively than native speakers. Only if the accent appears to be strong, non-native accented speakers might be evaluated more negatively compared to native speakers in some cases, but they are never evaluated more negatively than slightly accented speakers. In view of the limitations, future research is needed to confirm or disprove the findings of this study.
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Appendix 1

Job description for Human Resource manager (adapted from Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010)

• Plans and carries out policies relating to all phases of personnel activity such as training and development
• Recruits, interviews, and selects employees to fill vacant positions
• Plans and conducts employee orientation to foster positive attitude toward company goals
• Investigates on-the-job accidents and prepares reports for insurance carriers
• Conducts internet survey within labour market to determine competitive salaries

English translation

• Plans and carries out policies relating to all phases of personnel activity such as training and development
• Recruits, interviews, and selects employees to fill vacant positions
• Plans and conducts employee orientation to foster positive attitude toward company goals
• Investigates on-the-job accidents and prepares reports for insurance carriers
• Conducts internet survey within labour market to determine competitive salaries

Job description for IT technician (adapted from IT Technician Job Description, 2020, resources.workable.com)

• Werkstations opzetten met computers en noodzakelijke randapparatuur (routers, printers enz.)
• Computer hardware (HDD, muizen, toetsenborden enz.) controleren om functionaliteit te garanderen
• Geschikte software en functies installeren en configureren volgens specificaties
• Lokale netwerken ontwikkelen en onderhouden op manieren die de prestaties optimaliseren
• Zorgen voor beveiliging en privacy van netwerken en computersystemen
English translation

- Sets up workstations with computers and necessary peripheral devices (routers, printers etc.)
- Checks computer hardware (HDD, mouses, keyboards etc.) to ensure functionality
- Installs and configures appropriate software and functions according to specifications
- Develops and maintains local networks in ways that optimize performance
- Ensures security and privacy of networks and computer systems
Appendix 2
Experiment Bachelor thesis

Start of Block: Informatie en toestemming

Consent

Wat wordt er van u verwacht?
Meedoen aan het onderzoek houdt in dat u een online vragenlijst gaat invullen. Allereerst zult u een Engelstalig geluidsfragment horen waarna enkele vragen volgen die betrekking hebben op dit fragment. Vervolgens zullen we u vragen om een korte taaltest uit te voeren. Ten slotte vragen we u om enkele demografische gegevens in te vullen. Het invullen van de vragenlijst duurt ongeveer 10 minuten.

Vrijwilligheid
U doet vrijwillig mee aan dit onderzoek. Daarom kunt u op elk moment tijdens het onderzoek uw deelname stopzetten en uw toestemming intrekken. U hoeft niet aan te geven waarom u stopt. U kunt tot twee weken na deelname ook uw onderzoeksgegevens laten verwijderen. Dit kunt u doen door een mail te sturen.

Wat gebeurt er met mijn gegevens?
De onderzoeksgegevens die we in dit onderzoek verzamelen, zullen door wetenschappers gebruikt worden voor datasets, artikelen en presentaties. De anoniem gemaakte onderzoeksgegevens zijn tenminste 10 jaar beschikbaar voor andere wetenschappers. Als we gegevens met andere onderzoekers delen, kunnen deze dus niet tot u herleid worden.

We bewaren alle onderzoeksgegevens op beveiligde wijze volgens de richtlijnen van de Radboud Universiteit.
Heeft u vragen over het onderzoek?
Als u meer informatie over het onderzoek wilt hebben, of als u klachten heeft over het onderzoek kunt u contact opnemen.

Toestemming
Door te klikken op de knop 'Ik ga akkoord om deel te nemen aan dit onderzoek' geeft u aan dat u:

- Bovenstaande informatie heeft gelezen
- Vrijwillig meedoet aan het onderzoek
- 18 jaar of ouder bent

Als u niet mee wilt doen aan het onderzoek, kunt u op de knop 'Ik wil niet deelnemen aan dit onderzoek' klikken. De enquête zal dan worden afgesloten.

- [ ] Ik ga akkoord om deel te nemen aan dit onderzoek (1)
- [ ] Ik wil niet deelnemen aan dit onderzoek (2)

End of Block: Informatie en toestemming

Start of Block: Vacature IT
**Job description IT**

U hoort zo een fragment van iemand die solliciteert naar de baan van een IT Technicus bij een internationaal bedrijf. Dit fragment is in het Engels, omdat het bedrijf veel Engels gebruikt onder werknemers en klanten. Na het fragment volgen er enkele vragen. Hieronder ziet u een aantal vereisten voor de positie van een IT Technicus:

- Werkstations opzetten met computers en noodzakelijke randapparatuur (routers, printers enz.)
- Computer hardware (HDD, muizen, toetsenborden enz.) controleren om functionaliteit te garanderen
- Geschikte software en functies installeren en configureren volgens specificaties
- Lokale netwerken ontwikkelen en onderhouden op manieren die de prestaties optimaliseren
- Zorgen voor beveiliging en privacy van netwerken en computersystemen

End of Block: Vacature IT

Start of Block: Vacature HR

**Job description HR**

U hoort zo een fragment van iemand die solliciteert naar de baan van een HR Manager bij een internationaal bedrijf. Dit fragment is in het Engels, omdat het bedrijf veel Engels gebruikt onder werknemers en klanten. Na het fragment volgen er enkele vragen. Hieronder ziet u een aantal vereisten voor de positie van een HR Manager:

- Plannen en uitvoeren van beleid met betrekking tot alle fasen van personeelsactiviteiten zoals training en ontwikkeling
- Werknemers werven, interviewen en selecteren om vacatures te vervullen
- Werknemersoriëntatie plannen en geleiden om een positieve houding ten opzichte van de bedrijfsdoelstellingen te bevorderen
- Arbeidsongevallen onderzoeken en rapporten voor verzekeringsschakelpijnen opstellen
- Uitvoeren van internetonderzoek op de arbeidsmarkt om competitieve salarissen te bepalen
M1
U kunt nu luisteren naar een spraakfragment van iemand die solliciteert naar de baan. Hierna volgen de vragen. **Luister aandachtig, u kunt hierna niet meer terugkeren naar het fragment.**

M2
U kunt nu luisteren naar een spraakfragment van iemand die solliciteert naar de baan. Hierna volgen de vragen. **Luister aandachtig, u kunt hierna niet meer terugkeren naar het fragment.**

S1
U kunt nu luisteren naar een spraakfragment van iemand die solliciteert naar de baan. Hierna volgen de vragen. **Luister aandachtig, u kunt hierna niet meer terugkeren naar het fragment.**
S2
U kunt nu luisteren naar een spraakfragment van iemand die solliciteert naar de baan. Hierna volgen de vragen. **Luister aandachtig, u kunt hierna niet meer terugkeren naar het fragment.**

**Start of Block: Voice recording slight 2**

N1
U kunt nu luisteren naar een spraakfragment van iemand die solliciteert naar de baan. Hierna volgen de vragen. **Luister aandachtig, u kunt hierna niet meer terugkeren naar het fragment.**

**End of Block: Voice recording native 1**

**Start of Block: Voice recording native 2**

N2
U kunt nu luisteren naar een spraakfragment van iemand die solliciteert naar de baan. Hierna volgen de vragen. **Luister aandachtig, u kunt hierna niet meer terugkeren naar het fragment.**

**End of Block: Voice recording native 2**

**Start of Block: Speaker's country of origin and accent strength**

**Origin speaker**
Wat denkt u dat het land van herkomst is van de spreker?

__________________________________________________________________________
Accent strength
Deze spreker heeft een sterk buitenlands accent in het Engels

- Zeer mee oneens (1)
- Mee oneens (2)
- Beetje mee oneens (3)
- Neutraal (4)
- Beetje mee eens (5)
- Mee eens (6)
- Zeer mee eens (7)

Native speaker?
Deze spreker klinkt als een moedertaalspreker van het Engels

- Zeer mee oneens (1)
- Mee oneens (2)
- Beetje mee oneens (3)
- Neutraal (4)
- Beetje mee eens (5)
- Mee eens (6)
- Zeer mee eens (7)

End of Block: Speaker's country of origin and accent strength

Start of Block: Perceived comprehensibility/waargenomen begrijpelijkheid
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensibility</th>
<th>Zeer mee eens (1)</th>
<th>Mee eens (2)</th>
<th>Een beetje mee eens (3)</th>
<th>Neutraal (4)</th>
<th>Een beetje eens (5)</th>
<th>Mee eens (6)</th>
<th>Zeer mee eens (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ik moet heel goed luisteren om de spreker te kunnen begrijpen</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De spreker spreekt duidelijk</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De spreker is nauwelijks verstaanbaar</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De spreker was moeilijk te begrijpen</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik heb moeite om te begrijpen waar de spreker het over heeft</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik heb geen moeite om de spreker te begrijpen</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik begrijp niet wat de spreker bedoelt</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Superiority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zeer mee oneens (1)</th>
<th>Mee oneens (2)</th>
<th>Een beetje mee oneens (3)</th>
<th>Neutraal (4)</th>
<th>Een beetje mee eens (5)</th>
<th>Mee eens (6)</th>
<th>Zeer mee eens (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deze spreker klinkt chique (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deze spreker klinkt hoogopgeleid (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deze spreker klinkt serieus (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Warmth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zeer mee oneens (1)</th>
<th>Mee oneens (2)</th>
<th>Een beetje mee oneens (3)</th>
<th>Neutraal (4)</th>
<th>Een beetje mee eens (5)</th>
<th>Mee eens (6)</th>
<th>Zeer mee eens (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deze spreker klinkt aardig (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deze persoon klinkt warm (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deze spreker klinkt behulpzaam (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dynamism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zeer mee oneens (1)</th>
<th>Mee oneens (2)</th>
<th>Een beetje mee oneens (3)</th>
<th>Neutraal (4)</th>
<th>Een beetje mee eens (5)</th>
<th>Mee eens (6)</th>
<th>Zeer mee eens (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deze spreker klinkt modern (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deze spreker klinkt hip (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deze spreker klinkt trendy (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**End of Block: Attitude/houding**

**Start of Block: Hiring recommendation/aanwervingsaanbeveling**
Hiring
Deze persoon is geschikt voor de beschreven functie in de vacature aan het begin van de vragenlijst

- Zeer mee oneens (1)
- Mee oneens (2)
- Een beetje mee oneens (3)
- Neutraal (4)
- Een beetje mee eens (5)
- Mee eens (6)
- Zeer mee eens (7)
## Hiring 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zeer meeoneens (1)</th>
<th>Meeoneens (2)</th>
<th>Een beetje meeoneens (3)</th>
<th>Neutraal (4)</th>
<th>Een beetje mee eens (5)</th>
<th>Mee eens (6)</th>
<th>Zeer mee eens (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ik zou tevreden zijn als deze persoon wordt aangenomen (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik voel me positief over deze sollicitant (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik wil met deze sollicitant werken (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deze sollicitant zou een aanwinst zijn voor het bedrijf (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deze sollicitant zou ik aannemen (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Hiring 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zeer meeoneens (1)</th>
<th>Meeoneens (2)</th>
<th>Een beetje meeoneens (3)</th>
<th>Neutraal (4)</th>
<th>Een beetje meeeens (5)</th>
<th>Meeeen (6)</th>
<th>Zeer meeeens (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deze sollicitant zou een goede relatie hebben met haar ondergeschikten (1)</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deze sollicitant heeft bestuursvaardigheid (2)</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of Block: Hiring recommendation/aanwervingsaanbeveling

Start of Block: English proficiency tests/Engels bekwaamheidstesten

### Self-proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Slecht</th>
<th>Uitmuntend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mijn schrijfvaardigheid in het Engels is ()</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Slecht" /> <img src="image" alt="Uitmuntend" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mijn leesvaardigheid in het Engels is ()</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Slecht" /> <img src="image" alt="Uitmuntend" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mijn spreekvaardigheid in het Engels is ()</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Slecht" /> <img src="image" alt="Uitmuntend" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mijn luistervaardigheid in het Engels is ()</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Slecht" /> <img src="image" alt="Uitmuntend" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LexTALE**

Deze taaltest bestaat uit ongeveer 60 trials, waarin je telkens een reeks letters ziet. Het is uw taak om te beslissen of dit een bestaand Engels woord is of niet. Als u denkt dat het een bestaand Engels woord is, klikt u op "ja", en als u denkt dat het geen bestaand Engels woord is, klikt u op "nee".

Als u zeker weet dat het woord bestaat, ook al weet u de exacte betekenis niet, kunt u nog steeds 'ja' antwoorden. Maar als u niet zeker weet of het een bestaand woord is, moet u "nee" antwoorden.

In dit experiment gebruiken we Brits-Engelse in plaats van Amerikaans-Engelse spelling. Bijvoorbeeld: "realise" in plaats van "realize"; "colour" in plaats van "color", enzovoort. Laat dit u niet verwarren. Dit experiment gaat hoe dan ook niet over het detecteren van zulke subtiele spellingsverschillen.

U heeft voor elke beslissing zoveel tijd als u wilt. Dit deel van het experiment duurt ongeveer 5 minuten.

Als alles duidelijk is, kunt u nu beginnen met het experiment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ja (1)</th>
<th>Nee (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>platery (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denial (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generic (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mensible (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scornful (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stoutly (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ablaze (7)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kermshaw (8)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moonlit (9)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lofty (10)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hurricane (11)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flaw (12)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alberation (13)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unkempt (14)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breeding (15)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>festivity (16)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>screech (17)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Column1</td>
<td>Column2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>savoury (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plaudate (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shin (20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fluid (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spaunch (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allied (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slain (24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recipient (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exprate (26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eloquence (27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cleanliness (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dispatch (29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rebondicate (30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingenious (31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bewitch (32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skave (33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plaintively (34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kilp (35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interfate (36)
hasty (37)
lengthy (38)
fray (39)
crumper (40)
upkeep (41)
majestic (42)
magrit (43)
nourishment (44)
abergy (45)
proom (46)
turmoil (47)
carbohydrate (48)
scholar (49)
turtle (50)
fellick (51)
destription (52)
cylinder (53)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>censorship</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>celestial</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rascal</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purrage</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pulsh</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muddy</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quirky</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pudour</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listless</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrought</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of Block: English proficiency tests/Engels bekwaamheidstesten

Start of Block: Personal information/Persoonlijke informatie
**Exp. interviewee**

Ik heb veel ervaring met geïnterviewd worden als sollicitant

- Zeer mee oneens (1)
- Mee oneens (2)
- Beetje mee oneens (3)
- Neutraal (4)
- Beetje mee eens (5)
- Mee eens (6)
- Zeer mee eens (7)

**Exp. interviewer**

Ik heb veel ervaring met het interviewen van sollicitanten

- Zeer mee oneens (1)
- Mee oneens (2)
- Beetje mee oneens (3)
- Neutraal (4)
- Beetje mee eens (5)
- Mee eens (6)
- Zeer mee eens (7)
Origin
Wat is uw land van herkomst?

☐ Nederland (1)
☐ Anders (2) ________________________________________________

Mother tongue
Wat is uw moedertaal?

☐ Nederlands (1)
☐ Anders (2) ________________________________________________

Education
Wat is uw hoogst afgeronde of huidige opleiding?

☐ Middelbare school (1)
☐ MBO (2)
☐ HBO (3)
☐ WO (4)
☐ Postdoctoraal (5)

Student?
Bent u een student?

☐ Ja (1)
☐ Nee (2)
Display This Question:
If Bent u een student? = Ja

Degree programme
Welk studieprogramma volgt u?
_______________________________________________________________

Sex
Wat is uw geslacht?
- Man (1)
- Vrouw (2)
- X (3)

Age
Wat is uw leeftijd?
________________________________________________________________

Giftcard
Wilt u kans maken op een cadeaukaart van €10,- van bol.com? Laat dan uw e-mailadres achter in het onderstaande vak. Dit e-mailadres zal alleen worden gebruikt voor de verloting van de cadeaukaart. De antwoorden in de vragenlijst blijven anoniem.
________________________________________________________________

End of Block: Personal information/Persoonlijke informatie
Appendix 3

Items for perceived comprehensibility of the speaker ($\alpha = .76$)

1. I have to listen very carefully to be able to understand the job applicant (r)
2. The job applicant speaks clearly
3. The job applicant is barely intelligible (r)
4. The job applicant was difficult to comprehend (r)
5. I have problems understanding what the job applicant is talking about (r)
6. I have no problems comprehending the job applicant
7. I don’t understand what the job applicant means (r)

Items for the speaker’s suitability for the job ($\alpha = .90$)

1. This applicant is suitable for the position described in the job description at the beginning of the questionnaire
2. I would be satisfied if this applicant is hired
3. I feel favourable towards the applicant
4. I have a desire to work with this applicant
5. This applicant would be an asset to the company
6. I would hire this applicant
7. This applicant would have a good relationship with his/her subordinates
8. This applicant has the ability to manage