

Exploring Name Pronunciation: Impact on Labour Market Perceptions among Dutch Natives

Master Thesis

S. Leenders

Radboud University Nijmegen

Faculty of Arts – MA Global Communication & Diversity

Supervisor: Dr. W.F.J. van Meurs

Assessor: Dr. P.M. Schmid

Word count: 11612

June 13th, 2024

Radboud University



Statement of own work

Statement of Own Work – MA thesis

By signing this declaration, the undersigned
[first name, surname and student number],

Sanne Leenders
S1087173

Master's student at the Radboud University Faculty of Arts,

declares that the submitted MA thesis is entirely original and was written exclusively by himself/herself, and without the use of AI tools, such as ChatGPT. The undersigned has indicated explicitly and in detail where all the information and ideas derived from other sources can be found by referencing all sources used, both in the text and in the bibliography.

By signing this declaration, the undersigned also declares that the research data presented in this MA thesis were collected by the undersigned himself/herself using the methods described in this thesis.

Place and date:

Groesbeek, June 12, 2024

Signature:



Abstract

Names play a significant role in identity and serve as fundamental elements in interactions, providing a starting point for conversations. Despite their deep significance, people sometimes choose to change their names or their pronunciation for various reasons, often to make them easier to pronounce. Adapting names, particularly English names, is common among ethnic minorities and foreigners to facilitate better interactions with English speakers. However, this practice can raise concerns about authenticity. Studies show biases towards easily pronounceable names, which can impact labour market outcomes. Therefore, the current study aims to discover how Dutch natives evaluate Spanish names (easy-to-pronounce vs. difficult-to-pronounce) when pronounced in English or Spanish, exploring the influence of name pronunciation on labour market perceptions. An experimental study was conducted to compare the impact of name difficulty (easy vs. difficult) and type of pronunciation (English vs. Spanish). This involved using three different simulated job interview introductions to assess the effects. The current study used a 2 (difficulty) x 2 (pronunciation) x 3 (fragments) mixed design. The findings revealed a significant interaction effect between name difficulty and type of pronunciation for both comprehensibility and job suitability. Fragments featuring English pronunciations of names were evaluated more positively than those with the Spanish pronunciation. Within the English pronunciation group, easy-to-pronounce names received more positive evaluations than difficult-to-pronounce names. Additionally, there was a significant main effect of name difficulty on perceived competence, with all fragments of easy-to-pronounce names being rated more positively than those of difficult-to-pronounce names. These findings highlight that name pronunciation and name difficulty significantly affect comprehensibility, job suitability and competence evaluations in professional settings. Addressing these biases is essential for fair and equitable labour market evaluations. Increasing awareness of how linguistic factors influence perceptions can help organizations create a more inclusive and supportive environment for individuals with diverse names and backgrounds.

Keywords: name pronunciation, name difficulty, easy-to-pronounce, difficult-to-pronounce, Communication Accommodation Theory, labour market, job interviews, English, Spanish

Introduction

Names serve as significant markers of identity, communication initiators, and conveyors of information, reflecting aspirations and shaping self-concepts (Lehiste, 1975; Quaglia et al., 2015). As a fundamental aspect of communication, names initiate conversations, providing a starting point for interactions (Zhao & Biernat, 2018). Although names hold deep significance, individuals occasionally decide to change their names or their pronunciation. This is often motivated by differences in ease of pronunciation, such as modifying names that are difficult-to-pronounce to make them easier to pronounce (Giles et al., 1991). In some cases, individuals may even render their own names virtually unrecognizable to those familiar with them, in an attempt to make them pronounceable to the masses (Lipski, 1976). Adapting English names, for example, serves various purposes, especially evident among ethnic minorities and foreign individuals seeking to enhance interactions with English speaking individuals (Zhao & Biernat, 2018). However, the use of English names may raise authenticity concerns (Bucholtz, 2016; Cotterill, 2020; Edwards, 2006; Lehiste, 1975; Zhao & Biernat, 2018). Evaluations of name pronunciation reveal biases, favouring easily pronounceable names (Laham et al., 2012; Newman et al., 2014) and potentially impacting labour market outcomes (Gen & Wu, 2022). However, literature on the impact of name pronounceability on labour market judgments is limited, highlighting a gap in the literature, namely the effects of pronouncing non-English names in an English way versus in the native way. Therefore, the current study aims to address gaps in the literature by examining easy-to-pronounce and difficult-to-pronounce names and how Dutch natives evaluate Spanish names pronounced in English or Spanish, shedding light on the role of name pronunciation in labour market perceptions.

Theoretical framework

Names hold significant importance and carry significant affective weight, serving as reflections of our identities and representing both individual and group affiliations (Lehiste, 1975; Quaglia et al., 2015). Beyond mere labels, names often embody the aspirations of parents, and individuals can internalize the meanings attached to their names, shaping their self-concepts (Zittoun, 2004). As a fundamental aspect of communication, names initiate conversations, providing a starting point for interactions (Zhao & Biernat, 2018). Additionally, names serve as rich sources of information, signalling aspects such as gender, ethnicity, or social class (Kasof, 1993), and even conveying personality traits from warmth to morality (Mehrabian, 2001; Mehrabian & Piercy, 1993).

Despite the profound significance attached to names, individuals sometimes choose to alter their names or pronunciation, driven by the inherent differences in ease of pronunciation, for example, altering difficult-to-pronounce names make them easier to pronounce. A nearly universal phenomenon is the rendering of a foreign name into the phonetic system of the dominant language, usually by the individual themselves in anticipation of the pronunciation their name will receive in inexpert mouths (Lipski, 1976). Lipski (1976) explains that a phonetic system is essentially the set of sounds and pronunciation rules used in a particular language. In relatively simple names, the only change may be in the sound of a few vowels, for example, in such Spanish names as Santos [sentos] or José [howzej]. In other cases, individuals may render their names virtually unrecognizable to those familiar with them, in an attempt to make them pronounceable to the masses (Lipski, 1976). Giles et al. (1991) propose that the Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) suggests that individuals adjust their communication styles to accommodate others, leading to positive evaluations when such efforts are perceived (Giles et al., 2023). This theory can be applied to the phenomenon of people changing their names for ease of pronunciation. When individuals alter their names to make them easier to pronounce, they may be accommodating to others. This accommodation can lead to more favourable impressions because it demonstrates an effort to facilitate communication and improve mutual understanding (Giles et al., 1991; 2023). Conversely, difficult-to-pronounce names may create communication barriers and affect perceptions negatively. The name-pronunciation effect posits that names that are easy to pronounce, and their bearers, tend to be judged more positively compared to those with more challenging names (Laham et al., 2012).

Strategic adoption of English names

Adapting Anglicised names serves various purposes, especially evident among ethnic minorities and foreign individuals seeking to enhance interactions with English speaking individuals (Zhao & Biernat, 2018). This practice, aimed at fostering intercultural communication, host connectedness, and integration, is supported by studies such as Zhang and Noels (2022). They found that using an English name helps the listeners with pronunciation, spelling, and memorization, reducing communication barriers that may occur during social interactions. Moreover, Zhang and Noels (2022) suggest that English names can help foreign individuals develop friendships and social networks with English speaking individuals.

According to Cotterill (2020), the use of English names by Chinese speakers while studying in English-speaking environments is a well-established norm. Many institutions incorporate these names into documents such as class registers. In Cotterill's (2020) study, the vast majority of Chinese students in the United Kingdom opted for Anglicized versions of their names. Reasons cited included the ease of remembrance and pronunciation by teachers, along with a perceived expectation from educators (Barešová & Pikhart, 2020; Cotterill, 2020). Additionally, some students felt compelled by cultural expectations and used English names as a means of compliance, while simultaneously engaging in strategies to preserve their identities (Edwards, 2006).

The selection of English or foreign names by Chinese individuals is often strategic, reflecting desired personality traits or qualities individuals wish to project (Cheang, 2008). Beyond educational settings, English names find common usage in corporate environments, particularly those with international affiliations (Barešová & Pikhart, 2020; Gilks, 2014). Respondents typically employ their English names when communicating with colleagues, while reserving their Chinese given names, nicknames, or full names for interactions with close friends, depending on situational factors and mood (Barešová & Pikhart, 2020). Furthermore, the increasing preference for names that are easy for foreigners to remember and pronounce highlights a global trend towards facilitating communication and fostering a sense of belonging to the global community (Barešová & Pikhart, 2020; Gilks, 2014).

However, listeners might perceive an English pronunciation of a foreign name as less authentic, questioning whether it truly expresses the speaker's genuine identity. This parallels the evaluation by bilingual individuals of anglicized versus native versions of their names (Bucholtz, 2016; Cotterill, 2020; Edwards, 2006; Lehiste, 1975; Zhao & Biernat, 2018), as names inherently represent one's identity (Lehiste, 1975), potentially leading individuals to internalize the significance of their names within their self-concepts (Zittoun, 2004).

Evaluations of name pronunciation

Newman et al. (2014) showed that individuals with easily pronounceable names receive more favourable evaluations in both positive and negative contexts, for example based on positive or negative traits. In these contexts, easy names were perceived as more familiar, less risky, and less dangerous. The advantages of having an easy-to-pronounce name extend beyond mere evaluations. Newman et al. (2014) found that individuals with easy-to-pronounce names tend to lend a sense of truthiness to claims compared to those with difficult names. Furthermore, individuals with easily pronounceable names are seen as conferring a

sense of truthiness to their claims, contrasting with those with more difficult names. This highlights the impact of name pronounceability on judgments beyond the names themselves, suggesting its potential relevance to the pronunciation of foreign names using an English pronunciation.

Additionally, Laham et al. (2012) found that individuals with easy-to-pronounce names tend to receive more favourable evaluations compared to those with difficult-to-pronounce names. This effect remains consistent regardless of factors such as name length, orthographic regularity, unusualness, typicality, or foreignness. Laham et al. (2012) indicate that aspects such as conventional spelling and unusualness play a role in shaping positivity ratings. Given that unconventionally spelled and uncommon names often coincide with difficulty in pronunciation, it is plausible that the influence of these factors on evaluation may be partly attributed to the ease of pronunciation. This phenomenon persisted across diverse samples, spanning from basic name assessments to nuanced political evaluations and workplace dynamics. The study done by Laham et al. (2012) showed that lawyers with more easily pronounceable names tended to hold higher positions within their company hierarchies, irrespective of whether the analysis focused solely on Anglo-American names.

Ge and Wu (2022) propose that individuals with difficult-to-pronounce names might encounter setbacks in the labour market. This could stem from employers harbouring subconscious biases against names that are more challenging to pronounce, leading to a tendency to assess such candidates more negatively. Additionally, recruiters might find it simpler to process and recall easy-to-pronounce names. Ge and Wu's (2022) study indicates a negative correlation between name complexity and the likelihood of securing academic or tenure track positions, as well as the research productivity associated with initial institutional placements. Moreover, they identify evidence of discrimination based on name fluency.

In line with Ge and Wu's (2022) findings, a study done by Hosoda et al. (2012) highlighted that compared to an applicant with a Standard American-English accent, one with a Mexican-Spanish accent was at a disadvantage when applying for a high-status job, such as a software engineer. The Mexican-Spanish-accented applicant was rated as less suitable for the job and viewed as less likely to be promoted to a managerial position. Additionally, participants were less likely to hire the applicant with the Mexican-Spanish accent. These findings suggest that Mexican-Spanish-accented applicants might experience both access-related discrimination (i.e., not being hired for a high-status job) and treatment-related discrimination (i.e., being less likely to be promoted to a higher-level position) even if they were hired. Consistent with literature on language attitudes (Lee & Fiske, 2006), the Mexican

Spanish-accented applicant was perceived as less competent than the Standard American English-accented applicant.

Finally, a study done by Purkiss et al. (2006) suggest that a Hispanic-named applicant with a Spanish accent received the most negative evaluation, but a Hispanic-named applicant with a Standard American English accent received the most positive evaluation. The evaluation of an applicant with an English name was the same regardless of whether he had a Spanish accent or a Standard American English accent. These findings highlight the multifaceted nature of linguistic biases, encompassing both name pronounceability and accentedness, and their combined impact on evaluations in professional contexts.

Current study

Names play a crucial role in shaping individuals' experiences, interactions, and opportunities, influencing perceptions of identity, communication dynamics, cultural adaptation, and even career outcomes (Ge & Wu, 2022; Lehiste, 1975; Quaglia et al., 2015). However, literature on the impact of name pronounceability on labour market judgments is limited, highlighting a gap in the literature; the effects of pronouncing non-English names in an English way versus in the native way. Expanding this literature could reveal potential barriers faced by individuals with non-traditional or difficult-to-pronounce names, offering insights to address name-based discrimination and promote fair access to career opportunities. Additionally, while much attention has been given to the adaptation of names among Chinese individuals in English-speaking environments, where Anglicized versions of names are commonly adopted (Cotterill, 2020), the phenomenon can extend to various cultural contexts, also highlighting a gap in the literature. While other literature has focused on examining the impact of Spanish-accented English on employment-related decisions (Hosoda et al., 2012; Purkiss, 2006), literature focusing specifically on the impact of name pronunciation on employment-related decisions within Spanish contexts has been scarce.

Moreover, existing studies predominantly examine evaluations of foreign names by English-speaking individuals despite the notion that the majority of English interactions occur without English native speakers being present (Graddol, 2006). Exploring perceptions of foreign names among non-native English speakers could provide valuable insights into how different types of names are perceived. Therefore, this study aims to investigate the influence of name pronounceability on labour market evaluations, specifically focusing on how Dutch natives evaluate Spanish names when pronounced in their native or English version. By

examining this aspect, this study aims to contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the role of names in shaping labour market outcomes.

The following research question was formulated: ‘How does the type of pronounceability (easy-to-pronounce vs. difficult-to-pronounce) of Spanish names when pronounced in an English or Spanish way influence labour market evaluations by Dutch natives?’

Method

Materials

The independent variables for this study were the type of pronunciation of the names (English vs. Spanish), the degree of difficulty of the names (easy-to-pronounce vs. difficult-to-pronounce), and the fragments. All speakers who recorded the fragments for the experiment were native Spanish speakers. Only male speakers were used to record all fragments, as previous studies have demonstrated that the gender of speakers can be a factor determining how listeners evaluate non-standard accented speakers (Grondelaers et al., 2019; Nelson et al., 2016). Fragments were digitally recorded to simulate a job interview. The fragments contained three different descriptions of the applicant based on Carlson and McHenry (2006), Hancock (n.d.), and Hosoda et al. (2012), which can be found in Appendix 1. Regarding the third description, the following sentence has been added in order to remain consistent: 'I have a Bachelor's degree in Political Science'. For each description, the applicant's target position was specified beforehand. For the first description, the applicant was applying for a job as an entry-level software engineer. For the second description, the applicant was applying for a job as an entry-level HR specialist. For the third description, the applicant was applying for a job as an entry-level political analyst. Prior to the description of the applicant, the speakers introduced themselves using fictional first and last names, which the researcher has devised. These names were either difficult-to-pronounce or easy-to-pronounce in an English-speaking context and were pronounced in their native language and in English. Using an online Google search to gather different names, the easy-to-pronounce names which were used are: 'Carlos García', 'Pablo Rivera', and 'Diego Moreno'. The difficult-to-pronounce names which were used are: 'Guillermo Aguilar', 'Joaquín Velázquez', and 'Agustín Guerrero'. The specific Google search term was 'common male Spanish names', followed by scanning the first search results. A pre-test was done by presenting several Spanish names to several Dutch natives in order to confirm if these names were in fact easy- or difficult-to-pronounce. The number of participants, materials, and results for the pre-test can be found in Appendix 2.

Subjects

The subjects of the current study were chosen based on their nationality, specifically Dutch. Network sampling was mainly used to recruit participants for this study and all the participants needed to be eighteen years or older. A total of 160 individuals participated in the experiment. However, 90% completely finished the questionnaire, allowing their responses to

be selected as a part of the analysis. A total of 144 individuals finished the questionnaire (age: $M = 39.52$, $SD = 16.10$; range: 18-76; 62.5% female). The subjects' various levels of education were defined into seven levels: high school, MBO, HBO Bachelor, HBO Master, WO Bachelor, WO Master, and a PhD degree. Slightly less than half of the subjects obtained a HBO Bachelor's degree (41%), followed by MBO (36%), WO Bachelor's degree (33%), WO Master's degree (15%), high school degree (14%), PhD (3%), and HBO Master's degree (2%). Subjects rated their self-assessed Spanish proficiency as follows; $M = 2.18$, $SD = 1.20$. Moreover, all of the subjects had work experience, and more than half of the subjects (72.9%) have had previous experience with hiring people for a job position. Age ($F(3, 140) < 1$), gender ($\chi^2(6) = 5.38$, $p = .496$), education ($\chi^2(18) = 20.84$, $p = .288$), self-assessed Spanish proficiency ($F(3, 140) < 1$), and experience with hiring people for a job position ($\chi^2(3) = 1.64$, $p = .651$) were evenly distributed across all four conditions.

Design

The current study used a 2 (pronunciation of the names) x 2 (difficulty of the names) x 3 (fragments) mixed design. The independent variables were the type of pronunciation of the names (two levels: English and Spanish), the degree of difficulty of the names (two levels: easy and difficult), and the fragments (three levels: fragment one, fragment two, and fragment three). The type of pronunciation and the degree of difficulty were between-subjects variables, and the type of fragment was a within-subjects variable.

Instruments

The subjects filled in an online questionnaire in which they evaluated three separate fragments on comprehensibility, job suitability, likelihood of promotion, hiring decision, status, competence, communication accommodation, pronounceability, unusualness, and likeability.

Comprehensibility was measured with the statements; 'The speaker speaks clearly'; 'The speaker is well intelligible'; and 'I do understand what the speaker means', followed by seven-point Likert scales anchored by 'completely disagree – completely agree' (based on Hendriks et al., 2016). The reliability of 'comprehensibility' was good ($\alpha = .94$).

Job suitability was measured with a three-item summated scale using seven-point Likert scales including the statements: "I believe that this person is qualified for the job" and 'I feel that this person has the necessary skills and abilities to perform the job' anchored by

‘completely disagree – completely agree’ (based on Hosoda et al., 2012). The reliability of ‘job suitability’ was good ($\alpha = .93$).

Likelihood of promotion was measured by using seven-point Likert scales including the statements: ‘The potential for this person to be promoted to a supervisor within five years is’ and ‘The likelihood of this person to move up to the upper-level managerial position is’ anchored by ‘very low – very high’ (based on Hosoda et al., 2012). The reliability of ‘likelihood of promotion’ was good ($\alpha = .92$).

Hiring decision was measured by using a seven-point Likert scale asking participants whether they think they would hire the applicant for the job anchored by ‘completely disagree – completely agree’ (based on Hosoda et al., 2012). The reliability of ‘hiring decision’ was good ($\alpha = .83$).

Status was measured with five seven-point Likert scales following the statement ‘In my opinion, this speaker sounds’ with the items ‘authoritative’, ‘trustworthy’, ‘self-confident’, and ‘influential’ anchored by ‘completely disagree – completely agree’. The reliability of ‘status’ was good ($\alpha = .92$).

Competence was measured with five seven-point Likert scales following the statement ‘In my opinion, this speaker sounds’ with the items ‘reliable’, ‘intelligent’, ‘competent’, ‘hardworking’ and ‘highly educated’ anchored by ‘completely disagree – completely agree’ (based on Hendriks et al., 2021). The reliability of ‘competence’ was good ($\alpha = .95$).

Communication accommodation was measured utilizing the Communication Accommodation Scale (CAS) with five seven-point Likert scales following the statement ‘In my opinion, this speaker sounds’ with the items ‘pleasant’, ‘accommodative’, ‘respectful’, ‘polite’, and ‘explanatory’ anchored by ‘completely disagree – completely agree’ (based on Giles et al., 2006). Moreover, communication accommodation was also measured using a seven-point Likert scale following the statement ‘In my opinion, the speaker adjusts his communication to accommodate to the listener’ anchored by ‘completely disagree – completely agree’. The reliability of ‘communication accommodation’ was good ($\alpha = .97$).

Pronounceability was measured by using a seven-point Likert scale asking the participants ‘Please rate the ease with which these names of people can be pronounced’ anchored by ‘very difficult– very easy’ (based on Laham et al., 2012; Newman et al., 2014). The reliability of ‘pronounceability’ was good ($\alpha = .94$).

Unusualness was measured by using a seven-point Likert scale asking the participants ‘How unusual are the following names’ anchored by ‘not at all – very unusual’ (based on Laham et al., 2012). The reliability of ‘unusualness’ was good ($\alpha = .96$).

Likeability was measured by using a seven-point Likert scale asking the participants 'How much do you like the following names' anchored by 'not at all – very much' (based on Laham et al., 2012). The reliability of 'likeability' was good ($\alpha = .92$).

Strength of foreign accent was measured with seven-point Likert scales anchored by 'completely disagree – completely agree' following the statement 'This speaker has a strong foreign accent in English' (based on Jesney, 2004). The reliability of 'strength of foreign accent' was good ($\alpha = .88$).

Self-assessed proficiency level of Spanish was measured with four seven-point Likert scales anchored by 'very bad – very good' (based on Krishna & Ahluwalia, 2008) following the statement 'Please indicate how fluent your Spanish is in the following areas: (1) speaking, (2) writing, (3) reading and (4) listening'. The reliability of 'self-assessed proficiency' was good ($\alpha = .96$).

At the end of the questionnaire, the origin of speakers was measured by asking respondents to write down the country/nationality of the speakers (based on Hendriks et al., 2016).

Procedure

The dependent variables were addressed through the usage of online questionnaires in Qualtrics, taking into account the Ethics Review. Participants were completely free to participate in the experiment and could stop at any given point. Participants also had to consent to participating in the experiment. Additionally, participants were given partial information about the aim and nature of the study to prevent any influence on the experiment. In the current study, each participant was presented with an online questionnaire in their native language to avoid the potential of the anchor contradicting effect (de Langhe et al., 2011) of a bilingual design. The participants were exposed to the stimuli in a randomized manner. Moreover, to exclude any translation issues the online questionnaires were translated using the back translation method. Demographic questions, such as gender, age, education, job and hiring experience were presented at the end of the questionnaire. It took the subjects approximately 17.23 minutes to complete the questionnaire. The gathering of all the data took place from April 17th until May 5th, 2024.

Statistical treatment

Multiple mixed ANOVA tests with two between-subjects factors and one within-subject factor were used to see if there are any significant interactions between the type of

pronunciation of the names (English vs. Spanish) and difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) as between-subjects factors and the fragments as within-subjects factor. If the mixed ANOVA tests showed a significant effect, a post-hoc analysis was performed to see if there was any interaction between the type of pronunciation, the degree of difficulty and fragments. Moreover, if Mauchly's Test of Sphericity was violated, the alternative F-ratios were used, specifically the F-ratios by Huynh-Feldt.

Results

Comprehensibility

Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity for comprehensibility had been violated, $\chi^2(2) = 17.13, p < .001$. A repeated measures analysis for comprehensibility with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation of the names (English vs. Spanish) and difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) as between-subjects factors showed a significant main effect of the type of fragment ($F(1.85, 259.41) = 7.27, p = .001, \eta^2 = .049$). The second fragment was evaluated more negatively ($M = 4.69, SD = 0.98$) than the first ($p = 0.15$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.92, SD = 1.06$) and third ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.92, SD = 0.98$) fragments. There was no difference between the first and third fragment ($p = 1.00$, Bonferroni correction).

A repeated measures analysis for comprehensibility with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant main effect of the type of pronunciation ($F(1.85, 259.41) < 1$). Moreover, a repeated measures analysis for comprehensibility with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant main effect of difficulty ($F(1.85, 259.41) < 1$).

However, a repeated measures analysis for comprehensibility with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a significant interaction effect of the type of pronunciation and difficulty ($F(1.85, 259.41) = 4.60, p = .013, \eta^2 = .032$).

Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity for the English and Spanish pronunciation was violated $\chi^2(2) = 10.58, p = .005$; $\chi^2(2) = 18.25, p < .001$, respectively. The interaction is due to the fact that a difference between the fragments was found for the English pronunciation ($F(1.82, 127.26) = 3.75, p = .030, \eta^2 = .051$) and the Spanish pronunciation ($F(1.68, 117.57) = 4.06, p = .026, \eta^2 = .055$). Regarding the fragments with the English pronunciation, the third fragment was evaluated more positively ($M = 5.29, SD = 0.87$) than the second fragment ($p = .004$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 5.01, SD = 0.87$). There were no differences between the first and second fragment ($p = .224$, Bonferroni correction) and the first and third fragment ($p = 1.00$, Bonferroni correction). Regarding the Spanish fragments, there were no differences between the first and second fragment ($p = .086$, Bonferroni correction), the first and third fragment ($p = 1.00$, Bonferroni correction), and the second and third fragment ($p = 0.62$, Bonferroni correction). All three fragments with the English pronunciation were evaluated more positively ($M = 5.25, SD = 0.95$; $M = 5.01, SD = 0.87$; M

= 5.29, $SD = 0.87$) than the three fragments with the Spanish pronunciation ($M = 4.60$, $SD = 1.07$; $M = 4.38$, $SD = 0.99$; $M = 4.56$, $SD = 0.96$).

Moreover, the interaction is due to the fact that the difference between the two types of difficulty was only found for the English pronunciation ($F(1.82, 127.26) = 3.42$, $p = 0.40$, $\eta^2 = .047$). All three fragments with the easy-to-pronounce names were evaluated more positively ($M = 5.83$, $SD = 0.57$; $M = 5.41$, $SD = 0.86$; $M = 5.63$, $SD = 0.75$) than the difficult-to-pronounce names ($M = 4.52$, $SD = 0.83$; $M = 4.52$, $SD = 0.59$; $M = 4.86$, $SD = 0.83$). There was no difference between the two types of difficulty for the Spanish pronunciation ($F(1.68, 117.57) = 1.34$, $p = .264$).

Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity for the easy- and difficult-to-pronounce names was violated $\chi^2(2) = 10.66$, $p = .005$; $\chi^2(2) = 9.95$, $p = .007$, respectively. The interaction is due to the fact that the difference between the fragments was only found for the easy-to-pronounce names ($F(1.83, 138.98) = 5.24$, $p = .008$, $\eta^2 = .064$). The second fragment was evaluated more negatively ($M = 4.69$, $SD = 0.98$) than the first ($p = .028$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.92$, $SD = 1.06$) and third ($p = .030$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.92$, $SD = 0.98$) fragment. There was no difference between the first and third fragment ($p = 1.00$, Bonferroni correction). Additionally, there was no difference between the fragments for the difficult-to-pronounce names ($F(1.82, 116.35) = 3.01$, $p = .058$).

Lastly, there were no differences between the type of pronunciation among the easy- and difficult-to-pronounce names ($F(1.83, 138.98) = 1.94$, $p = .151$; $F(1.82, 116.35) = 2.75$, $p = .073$, respectively). The means and standard deviations for comprehensibility can be found in Table 1.

Table 1. Means and standard deviations (between brackets) and n for comprehensibility in function of the type of pronunciation (English vs. Spanish), difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) and fragments (1 = low, 7 = high)

Pronunciation	Difficulty	Fragment 1	Fragment 2	Fragment 3	Total
		<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>
English	Easy	5.83(0.57) 40	5.41(0.86) 40	5.63(0.75) 40	5.62(0.63) 40
	Difficult	4.52(0.83) 32	4.52(0.59) 32	4.86(0.83) 32	4.64(0.38) 32
	Total	5.25(0.95) 72	5.01(0.87) 72	5.29(0.87) 72	5.18(0.72) 72
Spanish	Easy	4.88(1.16) 38	4.77(0.86) 38	4.94(0.93) 38	4.86(0.87) 38
	Difficult	4.29(0.88) 34	3.93(0.95) 34	4.13(0.80) 34	4.12(0.80) 34
	Total	4.60(1.07) 72	4.38(0.99) 72	4.56(0.96) 72	4.51(0.91) 72

Total	Easy	5.36(1.02) 78	5.10(0.91) 78	5.29(0.91) 78	5.25(0.84) 78
	Difficult	4.40(0.86) 66	4.22(0.84) 66	4.48(0.89) 66	4.37(0.68) 66
	Total	4.92(1.06)	4.69(0.98)	4.92(0.98)	4.85(0.89)
		144	144	144	144

Job suitability

A repeated measures analysis for job suitability with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation of the names (English vs. Spanish) and difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) as between-subjects factors showed a significant main effect of the type of fragment ($F(2, 280) = 18.12, p < .001, \eta^2 = .115$). The second fragment was evaluated more negatively ($M = 4.36, SD = 0.93$) than the first ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.65, SD = 0.97$) and third ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.68, SD = 0.96$) fragments. There was no difference between the first and third fragment ($p = 1.00$, Bonferroni correction).

A repeated measures analysis for job suitability with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant main effect of the type of pronunciation ($F(2, 280) = 1.78, p = .171$) and a non-significant main effect of difficulty ($F(2, 280) = 1.18, p = .309$).

However, a repeated measures analysis for job suitability with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a significant interaction effect of the type of pronunciation and difficulty ($F(2, 280) = 5.32, p = .005, \eta^2 = .037$).

Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity for the English pronunciation was violated $\chi^2(2) = 14.00, p < .001$. The interaction is due to the fact that a difference between the fragments was found for the English pronunciation ($F(1.75, 122.61) = 10.61, p < .001, \eta^2 = .132$) and the Spanish pronunciation ($F(2, 140) = 9.40, p < .001, \eta^2 = .118$). Regarding the fragments with the English pronunciation, the second fragment was evaluated more negatively ($M = 4.74, SD = 0.86$) than the first ($p = .016$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.95, SD = 0.77$) and third ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 5.08, SD = 0.73$) fragment. There was no difference between the first and third fragment ($p = .087$, Bonferroni correction). Regarding the Spanish fragments, the second fragment was evaluated more negatively ($M = 3.99, SD = 0.85$) than the first ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.35, SD = 1.07$) and third ($p = .002$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.28, SD = 1.02$) fragment. There was no difference between the first and third fragment ($p = .087$, Bonferroni correction). All three fragments with the English pronunciation were evaluated more

positively ($M = 4.95, SD = 0.77$; $M = 4.74, SD = 0.86$; $M = 5.08, SD = 0.87$) than the three fragments with the Spanish pronunciation ($M = 4.35, SD = 1.07$; $M = 3.99, SD = 0.85$; $M = 4.28, SD = 1.02$).

Moreover, the interaction is due to the fact that the difference between the two types of difficulty was only found for the English pronunciation ($F(1.75, 122.61) = 4.19, p = 0.22, \eta^2 = .056$). All three fragments with the easy-to-pronounce names were evaluated more positively ($M = 5.38, SD = 0.65$; $M = 5.16, SD = 0.74$; $M = 5.33, SD = 0.57$) than the difficult-to-pronounce names ($M = 4.42, SD = 0.54$; $M = 4.20, SD = 0.69$; $M = 4.77, SD = 0.93$). There was no difference between the two types of difficulty among the Spanish pronunciation ($F(2, 140) = 2.46, p = .090$).

Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity for the difficult-to-pronounce names was violated $\chi^2(2) = 16.30, p < .001$. The interaction is due to the fact that a difference between the fragments was found for the easy- and difficult-to-pronounce names ($F(2, 152) = 11.16, p < .001, \eta^2 = .128$; $F(1.69, 108.26) = 8.41, p < .001, \eta^2 = .116$, respectively). Regarding the easy-to-pronounce names, the second fragment was evaluated more negatively ($M = 4.74, SD = 0.83$) than the first ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 5.10, SD = 0.89$) and third ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 5.05, SD = 0.81$) fragment. There was no difference between the first and third fragment ($p = 1.00$, Bonferroni correction). Regarding the difficult-to-pronounce names, the second fragment was evaluated more negatively ($M = 3.91, SD = 0.84$) than the first ($p = .026$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.12, SD = 0.78$) and third ($p = .004$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.23, SD = 0.95$) fragment. There was no difference between the first and third fragment ($p = .212$, Bonferroni correction). All three fragments with the easy-to-pronounce names were evaluated more positively ($M = 5.10, SD = 0.89$; $M = 4.74, SD = 0.83$; $M = 5.05, SD = 0.81$) than the three fragments with the difficult-to-pronounce names ($M = 4.12, SD = 0.78$; $M = 3.91, SD = 0.84$; $M = 4.23, SD = 0.95$).

Lastly, the interaction is due to the fact that a difference between the type of pronunciation was found among the difficult-to-pronounce names ($F(1.69, 108.26) = 5.08, p = .011, \eta^2 = .073$). All three fragments in the English pronunciation were evaluated more positively ($M = 4.42, SD = 0.54$; $M = 4.20, SD = 0.69$; $M = 4.77, SD = .0.78$) than the fragments in the Spanish pronunciation ($M = 3.84, SD = 0.88$; $M = 3.63, SD = 0.88$; $M = 3.74, SD = 0.83$). There was no difference between the type of pronunciation among the easy-to-pronounce names ($F(2, 152) = 2.12, p = .124$). The means and standard deviations for job suitability can be found in Table 2.

Table 2. Means and standard deviations (between brackets) and n for job suitability in function of the type of pronunciation (English vs. Spanish), difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) and fragments (1 = low, 7 = high)

Pronunciation	Difficulty	Fragment 1	Fragment 2	Fragment 3	Total
		<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>
English	Easy	5.38(0.65) 40	5.16(0.74) 40	5.33(0.57) 40	5.29(0.58) 40
	Difficult	4.42(0.54) 32	4.20(0.69) 32	4.77(0.93) 32	4.46(0.50) 32
	Total	4.95(0.77) 72	4.74(0.86) 72	5.08(0.73) 72	4.92(0.68) 72
Spanish	Easy	4.80(1.02) 38	4.30(0.69) 38	4.76(0.93) 38	4.62(0.73) 38
	Difficult	3.84(0.88) 34	3.63(0.88) 34	3.74(0.83) 34	3.74(0.81) 34
	Total	4.35(1.07) 72	3.99(0.85) 72	4.28(1.02) 72	4.20(0.89) 72
Total	Easy	5.10(0.89) 78	4.74(0.83) 78	5.05(0.81) 78	4.96(0.73) 78
	Difficult	4.12(0.78) 66	3.91(0.84) 66	4.23(0.95) 66	4.09(0.77) 66
	Total	4.65(0.97) 144	4.36(0.93) 144	4.68(0.97) 144	4.56(0.87) 140

Likelihood of promotion

A repeated measures analysis for likelihood of promotion with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation of the names (English vs. Spanish) and difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) as between-subjects factors showed a significant main effect of the type of fragment ($F(2, 280) = 11.98, p < .001, \eta^2 = .079$). The third fragment was evaluated more positively ($M = 4.50, SD = 0.99$) than the first ($p = .012$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.31, SD = 1.00$) and second ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.16, SD = 0.97$) fragments. There was no difference between the first and second fragment ($p = .112$, Bonferroni correction).

However, a repeated measures analysis for likelihood of promotion with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant main effect of the type of pronunciation ($F(2, 280) < 1$) and difficulty ($F(2, 280) = 1.93, p = .146$). Additionally, a repeated measures analysis for likelihood of promotion with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant interaction effect of the type of pronunciation and difficulty ($F(2, 280) = 2.01, p = .136$). The means and standard deviations for likelihood of promotion can be found in Table 3.

Table 3. Means and standard deviations (between brackets) and n for likelihood of promotion in function of the type of pronunciation (English vs. Spanish), difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) and fragments (1 = low, 7 = high)

Pronunciation	Difficulty	Fragment 1	Fragment 2	Fragment 3	Total
		<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>
English	Easy	5.09(0.65) 40	4.86(0.88) 40	5.15(0.64) 40	5.03(0.58) 40
	Difficult	4.03(0.79) 32	4.11(0.63) 32	4.56(0.68) 32	4.23(0.44) 32
	Total	4.62(0.89) 72	4.53(0.86) 72	4.89(0.72) 72	4.68(0.65) 72
Spanish	Easy	4.51(0.82) 38	4.20(0.78) 38	4.66(0.86) 38	4.46(0.57) 38
	Difficult	3.41(0.88) 34	3.32(0.91) 34	3.50(0.98) 34	3.41(0.87) 34
	Total	3.99(1.01) 72	3.78(0.95) 72	4.11(1.08) 72	3.96(0.89) 72
Total	Easy	4.81(0.79) 78	4.54(0.89) 78	4.91(0.79) 78	4.75(0.64) 78
	Difficult	3.71(0.89) 66	3.70(0.88) 66	4.02(1.00) 66	3.81(0.80) 66
	Total	4.31(1.00) 144	4.16(0.97) 144	4.50(0.99) 144	4.32(0.86) 144

Hiring decision

A repeated measures analysis for hiring decision with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation of the names (English vs. Spanish) and difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) as between-subjects factors showed a significant main effect of the type of fragment ($F(2, 280) = 8.27, p < .001, \eta^2 = .056$). The third fragment was evaluated more positively ($M = 5.13, SD = 0.96$) than the second ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.83, SD = 1.15$) fragment. There was no difference between the first and third fragment ($p = .319$, Bonferroni correction) and the first and second fragment ($p = .061$, Bonferroni correction).

However, a repeated measures analysis for hiring decision with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant main effect of the type of pronunciation ($F(2, 280) = 1.73, p = .178$) and difficulty ($F(2, 280) < 1$). Additionally, a repeated measures analysis for hiring decision with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant interaction effect of the type of pronunciation and difficulty ($F(2, 280) = 2.42, p = .091$). The means and standard deviations for hiring decision can be found in Table 4.

Table 4. Means and standard deviations (between brackets) and n for hiring decision in function of the type of pronunciation (English vs. Spanish), difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) and fragments (1 = low, 7 = high)

Pronunciation	Difficulty	Fragment 1	Fragment 2	Fragment 3	Total
		<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>
English	Easy	5.88(0.82) 40	5.85(1.05) 40	5.93(0.80) 40	5.88(0.80) 40
	Difficult	4.75(0.92) 32	4.63(0.91) 32	5.19(0.64) 32	4.85(0.53) 32
	Total	5.38(1.03) 72	5.31(1.16) 72	5.60(0.82) 72	5.43(0.86) 72
Spanish	Easy	5.13(0.84) 38	4.71(0.90) 38	5.11(0.65) 38	4.98(0.53) 38
	Difficult	4.18(0.90) 34	3.97(0.83) 34	4.18(0.83) 34	4.11(0.73) 34
	Total	4.68(0.99) 72	4.36(0.94) 72	4.67(0.87) 72	4.57(0.77) 72
Total	Easy	5.51(0.91) 78	5.29(1.13) 78	5.53(0.83) 78	5.44(0.82) 78
	Difficult	4.45(0.95) 66	4.29(0.92) 66	4.67(0.90) 66	4.47(0.74) 66
	Total	5.03(1.06) 144	4.83(1.15) 144	5.13(0.96) 144	5.00(0.92) 144

Status

Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity for status had been violated, $\chi^2(2) = 18.29, p < .001$. A repeated measures analysis for status with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation of the names (English vs. Spanish) and difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) as between-subjects factors showed a significant main effect of the type of fragment ($F(1.84, 257.67) = 19.38, p < .001, \eta^2 = .122$). The third fragment was evaluated more positively ($M = 4.82, SD = 0.84$) than the first ($p = .012$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.67, SD = 0.79$) and second ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.44, SD = 0.81$) fragments. The first fragment ($M = 4.67, SD = 0.79$) was also evaluated more positively than the second fragment ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.44, SD = 0.81$).

However, a repeated measures analysis for status with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant main effect of the type of pronunciation ($F(1.84, 257.67) < 1$) and difficulty ($F(1.84, 257.67) = 1.09, p = .335$). Additionally, a repeated measures analysis for status with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant interaction effect of the type of pronunciation and difficulty ($F(1.84, 257.67) = 2.37, p = .100$). The means and standard deviations for status can be found in Table 5.

Table 5. Means and standard deviations (between brackets) and n for status in function of the type of pronunciation (English vs. Spanish), difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) and fragments (1 = low, 7 = high)

Pronunciation	Difficulty	Fragment 1	Fragment 2	Fragment 3	Total
		<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>
English	Easy	5.36(0.63) 40	5.07(0.86) 40	5.38(0.68) 40	5.27(0.62) 40
	Difficult	4.50(0.47) 32	4.34(0.57) 32	4.80(0.68) 32	4.55(0.30) 32
	Total	4.98(0.70) 72	4.74(0.82) 72	5.12(0.73) 72	4.95(0.61) 72
Spanish	Easy	4.73(0.66) 38	4.38(0.56) 38	4.93(0.63) 38	4.68(0.46) 38
	Difficult	3.96(0.64) 34	3.85(0.70) 34	4.05(0.78) 34	3.96(0.59) 34
	Total	4.37(0.75) 72	4.13(0.68) 72	4.51(0.83) 72	4.34(0.64) 72
Total	Easy	5.05(0.72) 78	4.73(0.80) 78	5.16(0.69) 78	4.98(0.62) 78
	Difficult	4.22(0.62) 66	4.09(0.68) 66	4.42(0.82) 66	4.24(0.56) 66
	Total	4.67(0.79) 144	4.44(0.81) 144	4.82(0.84) 144	4.64(0.69) 144

Competence

Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity for competence had been violated, $\chi^2(2) = 25.14, p < .001$. A repeated measures analysis for competence with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation of the names (English vs. Spanish) and difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) as between-subjects factors showed a significant main effect of the type of fragment ($F(1.77, 248.16) = 10.53, p < .001, \eta^2 = .070$). The second fragment was evaluated more negatively ($M = 4.57, SD = 0.87$) than the first ($p = .004$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.79, SD = 0.87$) and third ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.83, SD = 0.85$) fragments. There was no difference between the first and third fragment ($p = .675$, Bonferroni correction).

A repeated measures analysis for competence with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant main effect of the type of pronunciation ($F(1.77, 248.16) = 1.31, p = .269$). Moreover, a repeated measures analysis for competence with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant interaction effect of the type of pronunciation and difficulty ($F(1.77, 248.16) = 1.19, p = .302$). On the other hand, a repeated measures analysis for competence with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a significant main effect of difficulty ($F(1.77, 248.16) = 4.29, p = .018, \eta^2 = .030$).

The main effect of difficulty is due to the fact that a difference in difficulty regarding the three fragments among the easy- and difficult-to-pronounce names ($F(1.60, 121.90) = 10.00, p < .001, \eta^2 = .116$; $F(2, 128) = 4.40, p = .014, \eta^2 = .064$, respectively); Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity for the easy-to-pronounce names was violated $\chi^2(2) = 25.16, p < .001$. Regarding the easy-to-pronounce names the second fragment was evaluated more negatively ($M = 4.88, SD = 0.91$) than the first ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 5.25, SD = 0.76$) and third ($p = .010$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 5.20, SD = 0.72$) fragments. Regarding the difficult-to-pronounce names, there were no differences between the first and second fragment ($p = .067$, Bonferroni correction), the first and third fragment ($p = .055$, Bonferroni correction), and the second and third fragment ($p = 1.00$, Bonferroni correction). All three fragments among the easy-to-pronounce names were evaluated more positively ($M = 5.25, SD = 0.76$; $M = 4.88, SD = 0.91$; $M = 5.20, SD = 0.72$) than the difficult-to-pronounce names ($M = 4.24, SD = 0.65$; $M = 4.21, SD = 0.65$; $M = 4.41, SD = 0.80$). There was no difference in difficulty regarding the type of pronunciation for both the easy-to-pronounce and difficult-to-pronounce names ($F(1.77, 248.16) = 1.33, p = .265$; $F(2, 128) = 1.29, p = .279$, respectively). The means and standard deviations for competence can be found in Table 6.

Table 6. Means and standard deviations (between brackets) and n for competence in function of the type of pronunciation (English vs. Spanish), difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) and fragments (1 = low, 7 = high)

Pronunciation	Difficulty	Fragment 1	Fragment 2	Fragment 3	Total
		<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>
English	Easy	5.51(0.58) 40	5.26(0.79) 40	5.45(0.61) 40	5.41(0.59) 40
	Difficult	4.49(0.44) 32	4.53(0.46) 32	4.78(0.67) 32	4.60(0.32) 32
	Total	5.06(0.73) 72	4.93(0.75) 72	5.15(0.72) 72	5.05(0.63) 72
Spanish	Easy	4.99(0.84) 38	4.49(0.88) 38	4.93(0.73) 38	4.80(0.58) 38
	Difficult	4.00(0.73) 34	3.91(0.67) 34	4.05(0.76) 34	3.99(0.68) 34
	Total	4.52(0.93) 72	4.21(0.83) 72	4.52(0.86) 72	4.42(0.75) 72
Total	Easy	5.25(0.76) 78	4.88(0.91) 78	5.20(0.72) 78	5.11(0.66) 78
	Difficult	4.24(0.65) 66	4.21(0.65) 66	4.41(0.80) 66	4.28(0.62) 66
	Total	4.79(0.87) 144	4.57(0.87) 144	4.83(0.85) 144	4.73(0.76) 144

Communication accommodation

A repeated measures analysis for communication accommodation with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation of the names (English vs. Spanish) and difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) as between-subjects factors showed a significant main effect of the type of fragment ($F(2, 280) = 3.85, p = .023, \eta^2 = .027$). The third fragment was evaluated more positively ($M = 4.76, SD = 0.91$) than the second ($p = .038$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.62, SD = 0.94$) fragment. There were no differences between the first and third fragment ($p = .767$, Bonferroni correction) and the first and second fragment ($p = .241$, Bonferroni correction).

However, a repeated measures analysis for communication accommodation with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant main effect of the type of pronunciation ($F(2, 280) < 1$) and difficulty ($F(2, 280) = 2.82, p = .061$). Additionally, a repeated measures analysis for communication accommodation with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant interaction effect of the type of pronunciation and difficulty ($F(2, 280) = 1.23, p = .293$). The means and standard deviations for communication accommodation can be found in Table 7.

Table 7. Means and standard deviations (between brackets) and n for communication accommodation in function of the type of pronunciation (English vs. Spanish), difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) and fragments (1 = low, 7 = high)

Pronunciation	Difficulty	Fragment 1	Fragment 2	Fragment 3	Total
		<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>
English	Easy	5.65(0.63) 40	5.50(.073) 40	5.60(0.55) 40	5.58(0.61) 40
	Difficult	4.70(0.69) 32	4.77(0.49) 32	4.91(0.48) 32	4.79(0.37) 32
	Total	5.22(0.81) 72	5.17(0.73) 72	5.29(0.62) 72	5.23(0.65) 72
Spanish	Easy	4.59(0.80) 38	4.33(0.82) 38	4.61(0.76) 38	4.51(0.63) 38
	Difficult	3.77(0.56) 34	3.77(0.65) 34	3.80(0.74) 34	3.78(0.63) 34
	Total	4.20(0.80) 72	4.06(0.79) 72	4.23(0.85) 72	4.17(0.72) 72
Total	Easy	5.13(0.89) 78	4.93(0.97) 78	5.12(0.83) 78	5.06(0.82) 78
	Difficult	4.22(0.78) 66	4.26(0.76) 66	4.34(0.84) 66	4.27(0.72) 66
	Total	4.71(0.95) 144	4.62(0.94) 144	4.76(0.91) 144	4.70(0.87) 144

Pronounceability

Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity for pronounceability had been violated, $\chi^2(2) = 6.77, p = .034$. A repeated measures analysis for pronounceability with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation of the names (English vs. Spanish) and difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) as between-subjects factors showed a significant main effect of the type of fragment ($F(198, 276.71) = 13.41, p < .001, \eta^2 = .087$). The third fragment was evaluated more positively ($M = 4.39, SD = 1.88$) than the first ($p = .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.09, SD = 1.98$) and second ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 3.91, SD = 1.99$) fragments. There was no difference between the first and the second fragment ($p = .207$, Bonferroni correction).

However, a repeated measures analysis for pronounceability with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant main effect of the type of pronunciation ($F(198, 276.71) = 2.94, p = .055$) and difficulty ($F(198, 276.71) < 1$). Additionally, a repeated measures analysis for pronounceability with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant interaction effect of the type of pronunciation and difficulty ($F(198, 276.71) < 1$). The means and standard deviations for pronounceability can be found in Table 8.

Table 8. Means and standard deviations (between brackets) and n for pronounceability in function of the type of pronunciation (English vs. Spanish), difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) and fragments (1 = low, 7 = high)

Pronunciation	Difficulty	Fragment 1	Fragment 2	Fragment 3	Total
		<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>
English	Easy	6.05(0.68) 40	5.80(1.32) 40	6.18(0.59) 40	6.01(0.75) 40
	Difficult	3.16(1.02) 32	3.12(1.10) 32	3.28(1.22) 32	3.19(0.88) 32
	Total	4.76(1.67) 72	4.61(1.81) 72	4.89(1.72) 72	4.75(1.62) 72
Spanish	Easy	4.92(1.19) 38	4.66(1.44) 38	5.29(1.11) 38	4.96(1.01) 38
	Difficult	1.74(0.57) 34	1.59(0.70) 34	2.32(1.30) 34	1.88(0.71) 34
	Total	3.42(1.86) 72	3.21(1.92) 72	3.89(1.91) 72	3.50(1.78) 72
Total	Easy	5.50(1.11) 78	5.24(1.49) 78	5.74(0.99) 78	5.50(1.03) 78
	Difficult	2.42(1.08) 66	2.33(1.19) 66	2.79(1.34) 66	2.52(1.03) 66
	Total	4.09(1.89) 144	3.91(1.99) 144	4.39(1.88) 144	4.13(1.81) 144

Unusualness

A repeated measures analysis for unusualness with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation of the names (English vs. Spanish) and difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) as between-subjects factors showed a significant main effect of the type of fragment ($F(2, 280) = 10.03, p < .001, \eta^2 = .067$). The third fragment was evaluated more positively ($M = 3.67, SD = 1.76$) than the first ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 3.38, SD = 1.84$) and second ($p = .002$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 3.42, SD = 1.93$) fragments. There was no difference between the first and second fragment ($p = 1.00$, Bonferroni correction).

However, a repeated measures analysis for unusualness with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant main effect of the type of pronunciation ($F(2, 280) = 2.15, p = .119$) and difficulty ($F(2, 280) = 1.40, p = .248$). Additionally, a repeated measures analysis for unusualness with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant interaction effect of the type of pronunciation and difficulty ($F(2, 280) = 1.13, p = .326$). The means and standard deviations for unusualness can be found in Table 9.

Table 9. Means and standard deviations (between brackets) and n for unusualness in function of the type of pronunciation (English vs. Spanish), difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) and fragments (1 = low, 7 = high)

Pronunciation	Difficulty	Fragment 1	Fragment 2	Fragment 3	Total
		<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>
English	Easy	5.40(1.01) 40	5.40(1.24) 40	5.43(1.17) 40	5.41(1.02) 40
	Difficult	2.25(0.92) 32	2.44(1.05) 32	2.63(0.98) 32	2.44(0.89) 32
	Total	4.00(1.85) 72	4.08(1.88) 72	4.18(1.77) 72	4.09(1.77) 72
Spanish	Easy	3.89(1.31) 38	4.00(1.49) 38	4.26(1.27) 38	4.05(1.25) 38
	Difficult	1.50(0.79) 34	1.38(0.70) 34	1.91(0.87) 34	1.60(0.61) 34
	Total	2.76(1.62) 72	2.76(1.76) 72	3.15(1.61) 72	2.89(1.59) 72
Total	Easy	4.67(1.38) 78	4.72(1.53) 78	4.86(1.35) 78	4.75(1.32) 78
	Difficult	1.86(0.93) 66	1.89(1.03) 66	2.26(0.98) 66	2.01(0.86) 66
	Total	3.38(1.84) 144	3.42(1.93) 144	3.67(1.76) 144	3.49(1.78) 144

Likeability

Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity for likeability had been violated, $\chi^2(2) = 16.65, p < .001$. A repeated measures analysis for likeability with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation of the names (English vs. Spanish) and difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) as between-subjects factors showed a significant main effect of the type of fragment ($F(1.86, 260.12) = 14.99, p < .001, \eta^2 = .097$). The second fragment was evaluated more negatively ($M = 4.35, SD = 1.46$) than the first ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.64, SD = 1.29$) and third ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.72, SD = 1.23$) fragments. There was no difference between the first and third fragment ($p = .548$, Bonferroni correction).

However, a repeated measures analysis for likeability with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant main effect of the type of pronunciation ($F(1.86, 260.12) < 1$) and difficulty ($F(1.86, 260.12) = 1.38, p = .254$). Additionally, a repeated measures analysis for likeability with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant interaction effect of the type of pronunciation and difficulty ($F(1.86, 260.12) < 1$). The means and standard deviations for likeability can be found in Table 10.

Table 10. Means and standard deviations (between brackets) and n for likeability in function of the type of pronunciation (English vs. Spanish), difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) and fragments (1 = low, 7 = high)

Pronunciation	Difficulty	Fragment 1	Fragment 2	Fragment 3	Total
		<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>	<i>M(SD) n</i>
English	Easy	5.85(0.80) 40	5.65(1.08) 40	5.85(0.77) 40	5.78(0.78) 40
	Difficult	4.47(0.76) 32	4.03(1.23) 32	4.50(0.76) 32	4.33(0.77) 32
	Total	5.24(1.04) 72	4.93(1.40) 72	5.25(1.02) 72	5.14(1.06) 72
Spanish	Easy	4.58(1.29) 38	4.32(1.17) 38	4.63(1.08) 38	4.51(1.05) 38
	Difficult	3.44(0.89) 34	3.15(1.11) 34	3.68(1.15) 34	3.42(0.93) 34
	Total	4.04(1.25) 72	3.76(1.27) 72	4.18(1.20) 72	4.00(1.13) 72
Total	Easy	5.23(1.24) 78	5.00(1.30) 78	5.26(1.11) 78	5.16(1.12) 78
	Difficult	3.94(0.98) 66	3.58(1.24) 66	4.08(1.06) 66	3.86(0.96) 66
	Total	4.64(1.29) 144	4.35(1.46) 144	4.72(1.23) 144	4.57(1.23) 144

Strength of foreign accent

Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity for strength of foreign accent had been violated, $\chi^2(2) = 16.65, p < .001$. A repeated measures analysis for strength of foreign with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation of the names (English vs. Spanish) and difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) as between-subjects factors showed a significant main effect of the type of fragment ($F(1.86, 261.01) = 38.09, p < .001, \eta^2 = .214$). The second fragment was evaluated as having a stronger foreign accent ($M = 3.36, SD = 1.57$) than the first ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 2.86, SD = 1.41$) and third ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 2.58, SD = 1.11$) fragments. The first fragment was also evaluated as having a stronger foreign accent ($M = 2.86, SD = 1.41$) than the third fragment ($p = .002$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 2.58, SD = 1.11$).

However, a repeated measures analysis for strength of foreign accent with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant main effect of the type of pronunciation ($F(1.86, 261.01) < 1$) and difficulty ($F(1.86, 261.01) < 1$). Additionally, a repeated measures analysis for strength of foreign accent with the fragments as within-subjects factor and pronunciation and difficulty as between-subjects factors showed a non-significant interaction effect of the type of pronunciation and difficulty ($F(1.86, 261.01) < 1$). The means and standard deviations for strength of foreign accent can be found in Table 11.

Table 11. Means and standard deviations (between brackets) and n for strength of foreign accent in function of the type of pronunciation (English vs. Spanish), difficulty of the names (easy vs. difficult) and fragments (1 = low, 7 = high)

Pronunciation	Difficulty	Fragment 1		Fragment 2		Fragment 3		Total	
		<i>M(SD)</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M(SD)</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M(SD)</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M(SD)</i>	<i>n</i>
English	Easy	2.35(1.08)	40	3.03(1.54)	40	2.17(0.98)	40	2.52(1.05)	40
	Difficult	2.59(1.39)	32	3.00(1.54)	32	2.31(1.06)	32	2.64(1.18)	32
	Total	2.46(1.22)	72	3.01(1.52)	72	2.24(1.01)	72	2.57(1.11)	72
Spanish	Easy	3.55(1.62)	38	3.95(1.64)	38	3.05(1.16)	38	3.52(1.33)	38
	Difficult	2.94(1.25)	34	3.44(1.40)	34	2.79(1.04)	34	3.06(1.13)	34
	Total	3.26(1.48)	72	3.71(1.54)	72	2.93(1.11)	72	3.30(1.25)	72
Total	Easy	2.94(1.49)	78	3.47(1.65)	78	2.60(1.16)	78	3.00(1.29)	78
	Difficult	2.77(1.32)	66	3.23(1.47)	66	2.56(1.07)	66	2.85(1.17)	66
	Total	2.86(1.41)	144	3.36(1.57)	144	2.58(1.11)	144	2.94(1.23)	144

Conclusion & Discussion

The aim of this study was to discover how the type of pronounceability (easy-to-pronounce vs. difficult-to-pronounce) of Spanish names when pronounced in an English or Spanish way influence labour market evaluations by Dutch natives based on comprehensibility, job suitability, likelihood of promotion, hiring decision, status, competence, communication accommodation, pronounceability, unusualness, and likeability.

Perceived comprehensibility: the impact of pronunciation and name difficulty

Comprehensibility showed a significant interaction effect between the type of pronunciation (English vs. Spanish) and the difficulty of the name (easy-to-pronounce vs. difficult-to-pronounce). Fragments with English pronunciations were evaluated more positively than those with Spanish pronunciations across all conditions. This interaction effect was primarily due to differences in name difficulty that were observed only within the English pronunciation condition: fragments with easy-to-pronounce names were rated more positively than those with difficult-to-pronounce names. In contrast, no significant differences were found between easy-to-pronounce and difficult-to-pronounce names within the Spanish pronunciation condition. Overall, English pronunciations consistently received higher comprehensibility ratings compared to Spanish pronunciations.

These findings are consistent with Newman et al. (2014) and Laham et al. (2012). Newman et al. (2014) demonstrated that individuals with easily pronounceable names are perceived more favourably because these names are seen as more familiar and less risky. This familiarity likely enhances comprehensibility, as individuals find it easier to process and understand names that are simple to pronounce. Additionally, the concept of "truthiness," which refers to the perception of statements as true based on how they sound, further supports why easy-to-pronounce names might be deemed more comprehensible. When a name is easy to pronounce, it has been found to lend an aura of credibility and trustworthiness (Newman et al., 2014), which may enhance overall comprehensibility.

Additionally, Laham et al. (2012) extended these findings by showing that easy-to-pronounce names are positively evaluated across various settings. They noted that conventional spelling and name familiarity play significant roles in how names are perceived. In professional environments, where communication clarity is paramount, the ease of pronunciation can directly impact how well a person is understood. Laham et al. (2012) suggest that names with conventional spellings and less unusual sounds are associated with better comprehension. This aligns with the findings that English pronunciations, which are

generally more familiar and easier for the participants to process, received higher comprehensibility ratings than Spanish pronunciations.

Evaluating job fit: impact of name pronunciation and complexity on job suitability ratings

Job suitability showed a significant interaction effect between the type of pronunciation (English vs. Spanish) and the difficulty of the name (easy-to-pronounce vs. difficult-to-pronounce). Specifically, fragments with English pronunciations were evaluated more positively than those with Spanish pronunciations across all conditions. The interaction effect was driven by the fact that differences in job suitability were only observed for the English pronunciations: fragments with easy-to-pronounce names were rated more positively than those with difficult-to-pronounce names. In contrast, no significant differences were found between easy-to-pronounce and difficult-to-pronounce names within the Spanish pronunciation condition. Additionally, the effect of name difficulty was significant; fragments with easy-to-pronounce names received higher evaluations than those with difficult-to-pronounce names overall. Lastly, among the difficult-to-pronounce names, English pronunciations were rated more positively than Spanish pronunciations, while no difference was observed between pronunciation types for the easy-to-pronounce names.

These findings also align with Newman et al. (2014), who found that individuals with easily pronounceable names receive more favourable evaluations. Easy-to-pronounce names were perceived as more familiar and less risky, lending a sense of truthiness to the claims made by individuals with such names. This suggests that the ease of pronunciation plays a significant role in shaping positive judgments, extending beyond mere name recognition to influence perceptions of credibility and trustworthiness. Similarly, Laham et al. (2012) demonstrated that easy-to-pronounce names were evaluated more positively across diverse settings, including political evaluations and workplace dynamics. Their study indicated that aspects such as conventional spelling and unusualness contributed to positivity ratings, with easy-to-pronounce names often associated with higher status and better job prospects.

Furthermore, Ge and Wu (2022) propose that individuals with difficult-to-pronounce names might encounter setbacks in the labour market due to subconscious biases. Their study found a negative correlation between name complexity and the likelihood of securing high-status positions, such as academic or tenure-track roles. This suggests that employers might harbour implicit biases against candidates with challenging names, leading to more negative evaluations. In the context of job suitability, this could mean that candidates with difficult-to-pronounce names are viewed as less suitable for high-status positions, supporting the findings

from our study that job suitability ratings were lower for fragments with difficult-to-pronounce names, particularly when pronounced in Spanish.

Perceived competence: name complexity and its effect on competence evaluations

Moreover, the findings of this study also showed that there was a significant main effect of name difficulty regarding competence. Easy-to-pronounce names were consistently evaluated more positively than difficult-to-pronounce names, regardless of the pronunciation type. This indicates a general bias favouring easily pronounceable names when assessing competence. Ge and Wu (2022) proposed that individuals with difficult-to-pronounce names might encounter setbacks in the labour market due to subconscious biases. Their study found a negative correlation between name complexity and the likelihood of securing high-status positions, indicating that employers might harbour implicit biases against candidates with challenging names. In the context of competence evaluations, this bias could manifest as a tendency to perceive candidates with difficult-to-pronounce names as less competent, potentially hindering their career progression.

Differences in evaluations among fragments: the role of accent strength

The findings showed that the second fragment, which featured a stronger foreign accent, was evaluated more negatively across all dimensions compared to the first and third fragments. These dimensions included comprehensibility, job suitability, likelihood of promotion, hiring decision, status, competence, communication accommodation, pronounceability, unusualness, and likeability. Van Meurs and Hendriks (2017) highlight that speakers with stronger degrees of accentedness are typically evaluated less positively than those with weaker accents or native speakers, in terms of both understanding and attitudinal evaluations. This finding resonates with the findings of this study, where the second fragment's strong accent was uniformly rated lower across all dimensions. Similarly, Hendriks et al. (2018) found that lecturers with moderate non-native English accents were evaluated less positively compared to those with slight accents, who received similar evaluations to native speakers. Hendriks et al. (2021) further support these observations by demonstrating that moderately non-native accented lecturers are evaluated more negatively by both Dutch and international non-native listeners, but not by native English listeners. This suggests that non-native listeners apply native speaker pronunciation norms in their evaluations, a dynamic that could explain the uniformly negative assessments of the strongly accented fragment in the current study. Dragojevic et al. (2017) provide additional insight, showing that heavy-

accented speakers are perceived with less status and elicit more negative affective reactions due to reduced processing fluency.

Moreover, earlier research conducted by Hosoda et al. (2012), which highlighted the disadvantages faced by applicants with a Mexican-Spanish accent in the labour market, showed that applicants with a Mexican-Spanish accent were rated as less suitable for high-status jobs, less likely to be promoted to managerial positions, and less likely to be hired compared to applicants with a Standard American-English accent. This discrimination was attributed to perceived lower competence and unfavourable evaluations based on the accent (Hosoda et al., 2012).

Discrepancy in findings on evaluations of names

The findings of this study revealed that dimensions such as likelihood of promotion, hiring decision, status, communication accommodation, pronounceability, unusualness, and likeability were not significant. This outcome is surprising given the earlier research highlighting the importance of these factors in various evaluative contexts (Newman et al., 2014; Laham et al., 2012; Ge & Wu, 2022; Hosoda et al., 2012; Purkiss et al., 2006). Potential explanations can be considered for this discrepancy. For example, contextual differences in the evaluation scenarios might explain the difference in the findings. Previous studies often focused on high-status job roles or environments where name pronunciation and accent biases are more likely to manifest prominently (Hosoda et al., 2012; Purkiss et al., 2006). The context of this study did not emphasize such high-stakes scenarios, the impact of name pronunciation and related factors might have been minimized. Additionally, cultural and temporal shifts in societal attitudes towards names and accents could play a role. Increasing awareness and efforts towards diversity and inclusion might have mitigated some of the biases observed in earlier studies. Consequently, the impact of name pronunciation on evaluations could be less pronounced today compared to a decade ago when studies by Newman et al. (2014) and Laham et al. (2012) were conducted. The unexpected non-significant findings regarding the impact of name pronunciation and related dimensions suggest the need for further investigation.

Contribution to theory

This study significantly contributes to the existing theory by providing insights into the influence of name pronounceability and pronunciation type on labour market evaluations by Dutch natives. It fills a research gap by examining the nuanced effects of pronunciation

type (English vs. Spanish) and name difficulty (easy-to-pronounce vs. difficult-to-pronounce) on various dimensions of evaluation, including comprehensibility, job suitability, and competence. The findings reveal a significant interaction effect between pronunciation type and name difficulty on comprehensibility and job suitability, with English pronunciations consistently receiving higher ratings than Spanish pronunciations, particularly for fragments with easy-to-pronounce names. This aligns with previous research by Newman et al. (2014) and Laham et al. (2012), indicating that easy-to-pronounce names are perceived more positively and enhance comprehensibility due to their familiarity and credibility. Additionally, the study extends the understanding of how name complexity influences competence evaluations, showing a general bias favouring easy-to-pronounce names. These findings corroborate Ge and Wu's (2022) proposition that individuals with difficult-to-pronounce names may face setbacks in the labour market due to subconscious biases. Furthermore, the study sheds light on the role of accent strength in evaluations, with strongly accented fragments consistently receiving lower ratings across all dimensions. This resonates with previous research by Van Meurs and Hendriks (2017) and Hendriks et al. (2018), highlighting the impact of accent on perceptions of understanding and attitudinal evaluations. However, the non-significant findings regarding the dimensions likelihood of promotion, hiring decision, status, communication accommodation, pronounceability, unusualness, and likeability suggest potential contextual and cultural shifts in societal attitudes towards names and accents, warranting further investigation. Overall, this study advances the understanding of how name pronunciation and related factors shape labour market evaluations, offering valuable insights for future research and practical implications for promoting diversity and inclusion in hiring processes.

Limitations and further research

Several limitations are evident in this study. Firstly, the qualifications of the applicants (see Appendix 1) may have fallen somewhat below the expected standard for the assigned job title (Hosoda et al., 2012), potentially impacting the validity of the findings. Secondly, the length of the fragments, each lasting no more than twenty-five seconds, might not have afforded sufficient information for the demands of the assigned job title. However, previous literature has shown that listeners can identify an accented speaker's ethnic or cultural group membership by just listening to thirty milliseconds of speech (Flege, 1984) or as soon as the speaker says, "hello" (Baugh, 2000). Even when listeners do not recognize a speaker's specific accent, they still tend to make quick judgments about the speaker (Lindemann, 2003).

Additionally, the absence of an evaluation of Spanish speakers based on their proficiency in foreign accents prior to the experiment could have contributed to biased assessments, particularly evident in the more negative evaluations of the second speaker who exhibited a stronger foreign accent compared to others. Furthermore, the presence of background noise exclusively in the second fragment introduces another variable that could have influenced the results, as the first and third fragments remained unaffected by such noise. Finally, the constrained timeline for conducting the experiment, driven by set deadlines, limited the recruitment of additional subjects, potentially constraining the generalizability of the findings.

Future research could tackle the limitations presented in this study by addressing several key areas. Firstly, ensuring that the qualifications of applicants meet or exceed the expected standards for the assigned job title could enhance the validity of the findings. Additionally, increasing the length of speech fragments beyond twenty-five seconds may provide more comprehensive information, aligning better with the demands of the assigned job title. This extension could be instrumental despite literature suggesting that listeners can make quick judgments based on very brief speech samples (Baugh, 2000; Flege, 1984; Lindemann, 2003). To mitigate potential bias in assessments, future studies could evaluate Spanish speakers' proficiency in foreign accents prior to the experiment. Furthermore, controlling for background noise across all fragments could ensure uniformity and could potentially reduce the likelihood of external variables influencing the results. Lastly, studies examining the effectiveness of interventions, such as training programs or organizational policies aimed at promoting awareness of linguistic diversity and reducing biases, could contribute to more inclusive practices. For example, Hansen et al. (2014) introduced an intervention where participants' own experiences unobtrusively influenced their evaluations of others. Their findings demonstrated that bias against nonstandard-accented speakers can be mitigated through interventions that encourage evaluators to empathize with those being evaluated.

In conclusion, the findings of this study highlight the significant impact of name pronunciation and ease of pronunciation on evaluations of competence in professional settings. These results highlight the need to address biases related to name pronunciation to ensure fair and equitable evaluations within the labour market. By promoting awareness of the influence of linguistic factors on competence perceptions, organizations can foster a more inclusive and supportive environment for individuals with diverse names and backgrounds.

References

- Barešová, I., & Pikhart, M. (2020). Going by an English name: The adoption and use of English names by young Taiwanese adults. *Social Sciences*, 9(4), 60. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci9040060>
- Baugh, J. (2000). Racial identification by speech. *American Speech*, 75(4), 362–364. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00031283-75-4-362>
- Bucholtz, M. (2016). On being called out of one's name. In J. R. Rickford (Ed.), *Raciolinguistics: How language shapes our ideas about race* (pp. 273-289). Oxford University Press.
- Carlson, H. K., & McHenry, M. A. (2006). Effect of accent and dialect on employability. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 43(2), 70–83. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1920.2006.tb00008.x>
- Cheang, J. (2008). Choice of foreign names as a strategy for identity management. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 17(2), 192-202. <http://repository.um.edu.mo/handle/10692/21431>
- Cotterill, S. (2020). Call me Fei: Chinese-speaking students' decision whether or not to use English names in classroom interaction. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 33(3), 228-241.
- De Langhe, B., Puntoni, S., Fernandes, D., & Van Osselaer, S. M. J. (2011). The Anchor Contraction Effect in international marketing research. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 48(2), 366–380. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.48.2.366>
- Dragojevic, M., Giles, H., Beck, A., & Tatum, N. T. (2017). The fluency principle: Why foreign accent strength negatively biases language attitudes. *Communication Monographs*, 84(3), 385–405. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2017.1322213>
- Edwards, R. (2006). What's in a name? Chinese learners and the practice of adopting 'English' names. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 19(1), 90-103.
- Flege, J. E. (1984). The detection of French accent by American listeners. *The Journal Of The Acoustical Society Of America/The Journal Of The Acoustical Society Of America*, 76(3), 692–707. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.391256>
- Ge, Q., & Wu, S. (2022). How do you say your name? Difficult-to-pronounce names and labor market outcomes. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4031991>
- Giles, H., Coupland, N. & Justine Coupland, J. (1991). Accommodation theory: Communication, context, and consequence. In H. Giles, N. Coupland & J. Coupland

- (Eds.), *Contexts of accommodation: Developments in applied sociolinguistics*. (pp. 1–68). Cambridge University Press.
- Giles, H., Edwards, A. L., & Walther, J. B. (2023). Communication accommodation theory: Past accomplishments, current trends, and future prospects. *Language Sciences*, 99, 101571.
- Giles, H., Fortman, J., Dailey, R. M., Barker, V., Hajek, C., Anderson, M. C., & Rule, N. O. (2006). Communication accommodation: Law enforcement and the public. In Beth A. Le Poire, René M. Dailey (Eds.) *Applied Interpersonal Communication Matters: Family, Health, & Community Relations* (pp. 242–269). Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., New York. <https://escholarship.org/content/qt52d406tv/qt52d406tv.pdf>
- Gilks, P. (2014). “Just call me ‘Ocean’ . . .”: How the Chinese practice of adopting English names facilitates, but sometimes violates, cross-cultural discourse. *International Journal of Arts and Commerce*, 3(6), 94–104. https://www.ijac.org.uk/images/frontImages/gallery/Vol._3_No._6/9.pdf
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English Next: Why global English may mean the end of “English as a Foreign Language.”* London: The British Council.
- Grondelaers, S., Van Hout, R., & Van Gent, P. (2018). Re-evaluating the prestige of regional accents in Netherlandic Standard Dutch: The role of accent strength and speaker gender. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 38(2), 215–236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927x18810730>
- Hancock, J. (n.d.). *Linguistic bias in hiring: The effects of Asian accents in job interviews*. Orange Coast College.
- Hansen, K., Rakić, T., & Steffens, M. C. (2013). When actions speak louder than words. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 33(1), 68–77. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927x13499761>
- Hendriks, B., Van Meurs, W., & Hogervorst, N. (2016). Effects of degree of accentedness in lecturers’ Dutch-English pronunciation on Dutch students’ attitudes and perceptions of comprehensibility. *Dutch Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dujal.5.1.01hen>
- Hendriks, B., Van Meurs, F., & Reimer, A. (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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.03.001>

- Hendriks, B., van Meurs, F., & Usmany, N. (2021). The effects of lecturers' non-native accent strength in English on intelligibility and attitudinal evaluations by native and non-native English students. *Language Teaching Research*, 136216882098314. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820983145>
- Hosoda, M., Nguyen, L., & Stone-Romero, E. F. (2012). The effect of Hispanic accents on employment decisions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(4), 347–364. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941211220162>
- Jesney, K. (2004). The use of global foreign accent rating in studies of L2 acquisition. *Calgary, AB: University of Calgary Language Research Centre Reports*, 1-44.
- Kasof, J. (1993). Sex bias in the naming of stimulus persons. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113(1), 140–163. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.113.1.140>
- Krishna, A., & Ahluwalia, R. (2008). Language choice in advertising to bilinguals: Asymmetric effects for multinationals versus local firms. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 35(4), 692–705. <https://doi.org/10.1086/592130>
- Laham, S. M., Koval, P., & Alter, A. L. (2012). The name-pronunciation effect: Why people like Mr. Smith more than Mr. Colquhoun. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48(3), 752-756.
- Lee, T. L., & Fiske, S. T. (2006). Not an outgroup, not yet an ingroup: Immigrants in the Stereotype Content Model. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30(6), 751–768. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2006.06.005>
- Lehiste, I. (1975). The attitudes of bilinguals toward their personal names. *American Speech*, 50(1/2), 30-35.
- Li, D.C.S. (2009). Researching non-native speakers' view towards intelligibility and identity: Bridging the gap between moral high grounds and down-to-earth concerns. In F. Sharifian (Ed.) *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues*. (pp. 81-118). Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Lindemann, S. (2003). Koreans, Chinese or Indians? Attitudes and ideologies about non-native English speakers in the United States. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(3), 348–364. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00228>
- Lipski, J. M. (1976). Prejudice and pronunciation. *American Speech*, 51(1/2), 109. <https://doi.org/10.2307/455361>
- Mehrabian, A. (2001). Characteristics attributed to individuals on the basis of their first names. *PubMed*, 127(1), 59–88. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11352229>

- Mehrabian, A., & Piercy, M. (1993). Positive or negative connotations of unconventionally and conventionally spelled names. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 133*(4), 445–451. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1993.9712168>
- Nelson, L. S., Signorella, M. L., & Botti, K. G. (2016). Accent, gender, and perceived competence. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 38*(2), 166–185. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739986316632319>
- Newman, E. J., Sanson, M., Miller, E. K., Quigley-McBride, A., Foster, J. L., Bernstein, D. M., & Garry, M. (2014). People with easier to pronounce names promote truthiness of claims. *PloS One, 9*(2), e88671.
- Purkiss, S. L. S., Perrewé, P. L., Gillespie, T. L., Mayes, B. T., & Ferris, G. R. (2006). Implicit sources of bias in employment interview judgments and decisions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 101*(2), 152–167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.06.005>
- Van Meurs, W., & Hendriks, B. (2017). Native and non-native listeners' evaluation of degrees of foreign accentedness in English: a literature review. *Leiden University Repository, 102–111*. <https://repository.uibn.ru.nl/handle/2066/181777>
- Zhang, Y. S. D., & Noels, K. A. (2022). ‘Call me “Katy” instead of “Yueyun”’: English names among Chinese international students in Canada. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 1–15*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2098304>
- Zhao, X., & Biernat, M. (2018). “I have two names, Xian and Alex”: Psychological correlates of adopting Anglo names. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 49*(4), 587-601.
- Zittoun, T. (2004). Symbolic competencies for developmental transitions: The case of the choice of first names. *Culture & Psychology, 10*(2), 131–161. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067x04040926>

Appendix

Appendix 1: Descriptions of applicant

Description 1 (Hosoda et al., 2012):

My name is Carlos García *or* Guillermo Aguilar and I have a Bachelor's degree in Computer Engineering. I consider myself to be an ambitious and motivated person. I like taking risks and will never back away from challenges. I will do anything in my power to get what I want. Although I work well with a team, I prefer to work independently. I can also manage multiple tasks at the same time. I am competitive and strongly believe that competition is essential to one's success.

Description 2 (Hancock, n.d.):

My name is Pablo Rivera *or* Joaquín Velázquez and I have a Bachelor's degree in Industrial Psychology. During my school years, I worked as an administrative assistant at the department of psychology. I have excellent time management skills and I can complete multiple tasks efficiently and on schedule. I can work well in groups or independently.

Description 3 (Carlson and McHenry, 2006):

My name is Diego Moreno *or* Agustín Guerrero and I have a Bachelor's degree in Political Science. My skills are really well suited for this position. I enjoy working with people and can get along with anyone. I don't panic when there's a problem. When I don't know how to do something, I take the initiative to find the information I need to get the job done.

Appendix 2: Pre-test: participants, materials, and results

A total of nine Dutch natives participated in the pre-test to evaluate whether the selected names were easy- or difficult-to-pronounce. The table displays the pre-test results, indicating the number of subjects who found each name either easy- or difficult-to-pronounce. Based on these findings, the names for the experiment were chosen.

Table 12: Pre-test results showing pronunciation difficulty ratings by nine Dutch native subjects

Names	Easy-to-pronounce	Difficult-to-pronounce	Total
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>
Carlos García	9	0	9
Emiliano Benavides	2	7	9
Pablo Rivera	9	0	9
Joaquín Velázquez	0	9	9
Manuel Cruz	8	1	9
Agustín Guerrero	0	9	9
Benjamín López	9	0	9
Guillermo Aguilar	0	9	9
Antonio Martínez	8	1	9
Maximiliano Altamirano	3	6	9
Diego Moreno	9	0	9
Gael Aguilera	2	7	9

Start of Block: Introduction

Q1 INFORMATIE EN TOESTEMMING

Beste deelnemer,

U wordt uitgenodigd om deel te nemen aan een onderzoeksproject over het beoordelen van sollicitanten. Uw deelname is anoniem en de resultaten worden alleen gebruikt voor dit onderzoek dat bijdraagt aan een masterscriptie bij de afdeling Communicatie- en Informatiewetenschappen van de Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. Om aan dit onderzoek deel te nemen, moet u minimaal 18 jaar oud zijn.

Wat gaat er met u gebeuren?

De procedure omvat het invullen van een online enquête. U krijgt vragen over het beoordelen van sollicitanten en enkele vragen over uzelf, zoals uw geslacht, leeftijd, (bij)baan en opleiding. Tijdens de enquête krijgt u verschillende fragmenten te horen waarin sollicitanten zichzelf kort beschrijven. De tijd die nodig is om deze enquête in te vullen bedraagt ongeveer 10 minuten.

Vrijwillige deelname

Deelname aan dit onderzoek is vrijwillig. Dit betekent dat u op elk gewenst moment uw deelname en toestemming kunt intrekken. Vanwege de anonimisering van de gegevens is het niet mogelijk om uw onderzoeksgegevens na afloop van het experiment te laten verwijderen.

Wat gebeurt er met mijn gegevens?

De onderzoeksgegevens die tijdens dit onderzoek worden verzameld, zullen door wetenschappers worden gebruikt als onderdeel van datasets, artikelen en presentaties. De geanonimiseerde onderzoeksgegevens die in dit onderzoek worden verzameld, worden gedurende een periode van 10 jaar bewaard en mogen hergebruikt worden voor ander onderzoek en blijven vertrouwelijk. Dit betekent dat wanneer de gegevens met andere onderzoekers worden gedeeld, deze gegevens niet naar u te herleiden zijn. Alle onderzoeks- en persoonsgegevens worden veilig bewaard volgens de richtlijnen van de Radboud Universiteit.

Meer informatie?

Wilt u meer informatie over dit onderzoek, neem dan contact op met de begeleider Frank van Meurs (frank.vanmeurs@ru.nl) of onderzoeker Sanne Leenders (sanne.leenders@ru.nl).

Zorgen of klachten

Indien u vragen of klachten heeft over dit onderzoek, kunt u contact opnemen met de onderzoeker.

Bedankt voor uw medewerking en vriendelijke groet,

End of Block: Introduction

Start of Block: Consent

Consent **Toestemming**: Selecteer hieronder uw keuze.

Door op “Ik ga akkoord” te klikken, verklaart u dat u de gepresenteerde informatie begrijpt en leest en dat u akkoord gaat met deelname aan dit onderzoek.

Als u niet wilt deelnemen aan het onderzoek, kunt u deelname weigeren door op de knop 'Ik wil niet deelnemen' te klikken.

- Ik ga akkoord (1)
- Ik wil niet deelnemen (2)

End of Block: Consent

Start of Block: English Easy: Fragment 1

Q3 Klik op afspelen om het fragment te beluisteren. De spreker solliciteert voor een baan als software-ingenieur op instapniveau.

Q3

Q221 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

Page Break

Com_ENG_EASY Geef aan of u het eens of oneens bent met de volgende uitspraken:

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De spreker spreekt duidelijk (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De spreker is goed verstaanbaar (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik begrijp wat de spreker bedoelt (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Page Break

JobS_EN_EASY Geef aan of u het eens of oneens bent met de volgende uitspraken:

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Ik ben van mening dat deze persoon geschikt is voor de functie (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik ben van mening dat deze persoon over de nodige vaardigheden en capaciteiten beschikt om de taak uit te voeren (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Page Break

Prom_EN_EASY_1 De kans dat deze persoon binnen vijf jaar wordt gepromoveerd tot supervisor is:

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Heel laag	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Heel groot

Prom_EN_EASY_2 De kans dat deze persoon doorgroeit naar een leidinggevende functie op het hoogste niveau is:

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Heel laag	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Heel groot

Page Break

HiringD_EN_EASY Ik zou de sollicitant aannemen

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Helemaal mee oneens	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Helemaal mee eens

Page Break

Status_EN_EASY Naar mijn mening klinkt deze spreker:

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Gezaghebbend (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Te vertrouwen (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Zelfverzekerd (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Invloedrijk (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Page Break

Competence_EN_EASY Naar mijn mening klinkt deze spreker:

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Betrouwbaar (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Intelligent (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Competent (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hardwerkend (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hoog opgeleid (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Page Break

CAT_EN_EASY_1 Naar mijn mening klinkt deze spreker:

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Aangenaam (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meegaand (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Respectvol (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beleefd (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Verduidelijkend (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

CAT_EN_EASY_2 Naar mijn mening stemt de spreker zijn communicatie af op de luisteraar

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Helemaal mee oneens	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Helemaal mee eens

End of Block: English Easy: Fragment 1

Start of Block: English Easy: Fragment 2

Q15 Klik op afspelen om het fragment te beluisteren. De spreker solliciteert voor een baan als HR-specialist op instapniveau.

Q15

Q222 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

Page Break

Com_ENG_EASY Geef aan of u het eens of oneens bent met de volgende uitspraken:

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De spreker spreekt duidelijk (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De spreker is goed verstaanbaar (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik begrijp wat de spreker bedoelt (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Page Break

JobS_EN_EASY Geef aan of u het eens of oneens bent met de volgende uitspraken:

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Ik ben van mening dat deze persoon geschikt is voor de functie (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik ben van mening dat deze persoon over de nodige vaardigheden en capaciteiten beschikt om de taak uit te voeren (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Page Break

Prom_EN_EASY_1 De kans dat deze persoon binnen vijf jaar wordt gepromoveerd tot supervisor is:

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Heel laag	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Heel groot

Prom_EN_EASY_2 De kans dat deze persoon doorgroeit naar een leidinggevende functie op het hoogste niveau is:

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Heel laag	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Heel groot

Page Break

HiringD_EN_EASY Ik zou de sollicitant aannemen

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Helemaal mee oneens	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Helemaal mee eens

Page Break

Status_EN_EASY Naar mijn mening klinkt deze spreker:

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Gezaghebbend (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Te vertrouwen (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Zelfverzekerd (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Invloedrijk (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Page Break

Competence_EN_EASY Naar mijn mening klinkt deze spreker:

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Betrouwbaar (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Intelligent (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Competent (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hardwerkend (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hoog opgeleid (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Page Break

CAT_EN_EASY_1 Naar mijn mening klinkt deze spreker:

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Aangenaam (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meegaand (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Respectvol (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beleefd (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Verduidelijkend (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

CAT_EN_EASY_2 Naar mijn mening stemt de spreker zijn communicatie af op de luisteraar

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Helemaal mee oneens	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Helemaal mee eens

End of Block: English Easy: Fragment 2

Start of Block: English Easy: Fragment 3

Q25 Klik op afspelen om het fragment te beluisteren. De spreker solliciteert voor een baan als politiek analist op instapniveau.

Q25

Q223 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

Page Break

Com_ENG_EASY Geef aan of u het eens of oneens bent met de volgende uitspraken:

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De spreker spreekt duidelijk (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De spreker is goed verstaanbaar (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik begrijp wat de spreker bedoelt (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Page Break

JobS_EN_EASY Geef aan of u het eens of oneens bent met de volgende uitspraken:

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Ik ben van mening dat deze persoon geschikt is voor de functie (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik ben van mening dat deze persoon over de nodige vaardigheden en capaciteiten beschikt om de taak uit te voeren (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Page Break

Prom_EN_EASY_1 De kans dat deze persoon binnen vijf jaar wordt gepromoveerd tot supervisor is:

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Heel laag	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Heel groot

Prom_EN_EASY_2 De kans dat deze persoon doorgroeit naar een leidinggevende functie op het hoogste niveau is:

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Heel laag	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Heel groot

Page Break

HiringD_EN_EASY Ik zou de sollicitant aannemen

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Helemaal mee oneens	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Helemaal mee eens

Page Break

Status_EN_EASY Naar mijn mening klinkt deze spreker:

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Gezaghebbend (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Te vertrouwen (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Zelfverzekerd (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Invloedrijk (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Page Break

Competence_EN_EASY Naar mijn mening klinkt deze spreker:

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Betrouwbaar (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Intelligent (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Competent (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hardwerkend (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hoog opgeleid (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Page Break

CAT_EN_EASY_1 Naar mijn mening klinkt deze spreker:

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Aangenaam (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meegaand (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Respectvol (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beleefd (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Verduidelijkend (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

CAT_EN_EASY_2 Naar mijn mening stemt de spreker zijn communicatie af op de luisteraar

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Helemaal mee oneens	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Helemaal mee eens

End of Block: English Easy: Fragment 3

Start of Block: Pron/Unu/Like (English Easy)

Q218 U krijgt nu de eerste zin van elk fragment opnieuw te horen. Kunt u daarover een paar korte vragen beantwoorden?

Q156

Pron_EN_EASY_1 Beoordeel alstublieft het gemak waarmee de naam van de sollicitant kan worden uitgesproken

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Heel moeilijk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Heel makkelijk

Un_EN_EASY_1 Hoe ongebruikelijk was de naam van de sollicitant?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Heel ongebruikelijk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Heel gebruikelijk

Lik_EN_EASY_1 Hoe aangenaam vindt u de naam van de sollicitant?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Helemaal niet aangenaam	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Heel aangenaam

Acc_EN_EASY_1 De sollicitant heeft een sterk buitenlands accent in zijn Engels

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Helemaal mee oneens	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Helemaal mee eens

Page Break

Q167

Pron_EN_EASY_2 Beoordeel alstublieft het gemak waarmee de naam van de sollicitant kan worden uitgesproken

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Heel moeilijk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Heel makkelijk

Un_EN_EASY_2 Hoe ongebruikelijk was de naam van de sollicitant?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Heel ongebruikelijk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Heel gebruikelijk

Lik_EN_EASY_2 Hoe aangenaam vindt u de naam van de sollicitant?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Helemaal niet aangenaam	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Heel aangenaam

Acc_EN_EASY_2 De sollicitant heeft een sterk buitenlands accent in zijn Engels

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Helemaal mee oneens	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Helemaal mee eens

Page Break

Q168

Pron_EN_EASY_3 Beoordeel alstublieft het gemak waarmee de naam van de sollicitant kan worden uitgesproken

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Heel moeilijk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Heel makkelijk

Un_EN_EASY_2 Hoe ongebruikelijk was de naam van de sollicitant?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Heel ongebruikelijk	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Heel gebruikelijk

Lik_EN_EASY_3 Hoe aangenaam vindt u de naam van de sollicitant?

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Helemaal niet aangenaam	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Heel aangenaam

Acc_EN_EASY_3 De sollicitant heeft een sterk buitenlands accent in zijn Engels

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)	
Helemaal mee oneens	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Helemaal mee eens

End of Block: Pron/Unu/Like (English Easy)

Nationality_of_Speak Kunt u aangeven welke nationaliteit u vermoedt dat de sollicitanten hebben?

End of Block: Nationality of Speaker

Start of Block: Demographic Questions

Gender Ik identificeer me als:

- Man (1)
- Vrouw (2)
- Anders, namelijk (3) _____

Age Mijn leeftijd is:

Education Mijn hoogst behaalde opleiding is:

- Middelbare school (1)
- MBO (2)
- HBO Bachelor (3)
- HBO Master (4)
- WO Bachelor (5)
- WO Master (6)
- Gepromoveerd (7)

Work_Experience Heeft u werkervaring?

- Ja (1)
- Nee (2)
-

Hiring_Experience Heeft u ervaring met het aannemen van werknemers?

- Ja (1)
- Nee (2)
-

Native_Language Wat is uw moedertaal?

- Nederlands (1)
- Anders, namelijk (2) _____
-

Spanish_Proficiency Beoordeel alstublieft uw vaardigheid in het Spaans aan de hand van de volgende criteria:

	Heel slecht (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Heel goed (7)
Spreken (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Luisteren (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lezen (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Schrijven (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: Demographic Questions
