

Dutch listeners' evaluations of different degrees of Dutch-accented English
in the context of a job interview

Ilse Duijff

s1003559

International Business Communication

Radboud University

Theme 7: You're hired! Effects of non-native accentedness in the workplace

Supervisor: dr. Hendriks

Second assessor: dr. van der Slik

03-07-2020

7469 words

Abstract

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

Keywords: Accent strength, non-native English, employment context, job interview, perceived comprehensibility, attitudes, suitability for a job

Introduction

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

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

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

Theoretical framework

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

Evaluations of non-native accents

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

Often, when a foreign accent is perceived, negative impressions with regard to the speaker are developed by the listener (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010). Experimental studies have shown that it is often the perception of an accent, independent of the origin and the strength of the accent, that influences negative evaluations by the listeners with regard to the speakers (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010; Nejjari et al., 2012). Furthermore, the stronger the accent, the more negative the evaluations are with regard to the accented individuals (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010).

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

Accent strength

Individuals can vary in the degree of their accent strength (Gluszek & Dovidio, 2010; Levi, Winters, & Pisoni, 2007). Multiple experimental studies have been conducted on the effects of different accent strengths in different contexts. The general finding in these studies is that stronger accents have more negative effects than weaker accents (Van Meurs & Hendriks, 2017). Nejjari et al. (2012) investigated the reactions of native British English speakers to Dutch-accented English. They incorporated three accents in their study: a slight Dutch-English accent, a moderate Dutch-English accent, and a standard British English accent. Findings indicated that British English was more comprehensible than both Dutch-English accents. Moreover, more status was assigned to the British English accent than to both Dutch-English accents, and speakers with a British English and a slight Dutch-English accent were attributed more affect than speakers with a moderate Dutch-English accent (Nejjari et al., 2012).

Hendriks et al. (2017) examined the effect of a non-native English accent on the evaluation of comprehensibility and attitude towards the speaker by French, German, and Spanish listeners. The accents that were incorporated in the study were a strong Dutch-English accent, a slight Dutch-English accent, and a native English accent. Their findings demonstrated that a strong accent had a negative effect on understanding and evaluations regarding attitude, while a slight accent did not evoke negative effects. Furthermore, a speaker with a strong accent was considered as less competent than speakers who had a slight or a native accent (Hendriks et al., 2017).

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

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

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

Accents in an employment context

Most of the research discussed had a general focus regarding the evaluations of the different accent strengths. However, Hendriks et al. (2018) focused on the evaluations in a teaching context, and Roessel et al. (2019) paid attention to an employment context, in which job candidates with different accent strengths were evaluated. Much other research on accents in an employment context has already been conducted. For example, Deprez-Sims & Morris

(2010) investigated the influence of accents on the evaluation of job applicants during a job interview for a human resource manager position. The listeners and evaluators of the job candidates were American, i.e. native listeners. The findings showed that applicants with a Midwestern US-English accent were evaluated more positively than applicants with a French-English accent regarding attitude, understandability, and hirability (Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010).

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

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

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

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

or low status job as Standard American-accented speakers. These results thus contradict the generalization that non-native accented speakers are considered as less suitable for high status jobs and more suitable for low status jobs (Cargile, 2000).

Research gaps and hypotheses

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

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

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of a Dutch-English accent on the evaluations of Dutch (non-native) listeners with regard to perceived comprehensibility, attitudes, and suitability for the job. The hypotheses that form the foundation of our study are the following:

Perceived comprehensibility

H1: *Speakers with a moderate Dutch-English accent are perceived as less comprehensible than speakers with a slight Dutch-English accent and native English speakers by Dutch listeners*

Attitudes

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

Suitability for the job

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

Slight Dutch-English accent versus native English accent

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

Method

Materials

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

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

Selection of materials

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

represents the highest level of English that Dutch people can achieve in Dutch secondary schools (Nejjari et al., 2012).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Speaker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(native)	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Very strong foreign accent	2.50 (1.29)	1.50 (1.00)	2.25 (1.89)	2.50 (2.38)	1.00 (0.00)	2.66 (2.89)	1.00 (0.00)
Sounds native	5.00 (1.41)	7.00 (0.00)	6.00 (0.82)	7.00 (0.00)	7.00 (0.00)	7.00 (0.00)	6.75 (0.50)

Subjects

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

Age ($F(2, 186) < 1$), gender ($\chi^2(2) = 3.68$, $p = .159$), student ($\chi^2(2) = 0.50$, $p = .779$), educational level ($\chi^2(6) = 4.56$, $p = .602$), LexTALE score ($F(2, 186) < 1$), self-assessed proficiency ($F(2, 186) = 2.40$, $p = .094$), experience with being interviewed ($F(2, 186) < 1$), and experience with interviewing ($F(2, 186) = 1.10$, $p = .336$) were all distributed evenly across the accentedness conditions.

Age ($t(186.99) = 0.49$, $p = .628$), gender ($\chi^2(1) = 0.46$, $p = .499$), student ($\chi^2(1) = 0.13$, $p = .723$), educational level ($\chi^2(3) = 1.56$, $p = .668$), LexTALE score ($t(186.99) = 0.37$, $p = .715$), self-assessed proficiency ($t(185.86) = 1.40$, $p = .164$), experience with being interviewed ($t(186.61) = 1.04$, $p = .300$), and experience with interviewing ($t(186.19) = 0.28$, $p = .778$) were also all distributed evenly across the type of job conditions.

Design

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

Instruments

Participants filled in an online questionnaire in which they evaluated a speech fragment on identification of the speaker's country of origin, strength of the speaker's accent, perceived comprehensibility of the speaker, attitudes towards the speaker, and the speaker's suitability for the job. The complete questionnaire can be found in Appendix 2.

Identification of the speaker's country of origin was measured with the open question 'What do you think is the speaker's country of origin?' for which the respondents could fill in their answer. For the slight and moderate accented speakers, the answers 'Nederland(s)', 'NL', and 'Dutch' were considered correct identifications. For the native speakers, the answers 'England', 'London', 'Great Britain', and 'UK' were regarded as correct identifications.

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

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

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

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

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

Procedure

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

Statistical treatment

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

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

Results

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

Manipulation checks

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

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

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

Accent strength	n	$M (SD)$
Moderate	59	5.19 (0.97)
Slight	67	5.27 (0.83)
Native	63	2.88 (1.37)
Total	189	4.45 (1.54)

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

shows absolute numbers and percentages of correct and incorrect identifications of the origins of the speakers.

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

		Correct	Incorrect
		Count (%)	Count (%)
Accent strength	Moderate	47 _a (80%)	12 _a (20%)
	Slight	65 _a (97%)	2 _b (3%)
	Native	45 _a (71%)	18 _b (29%)

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

Perceived comprehensibility

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

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

Attitudes (superiority, warmth, dynamism) towards the speaker

Superiority

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

Participants evaluated the moderately accented speakers ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 4.32, SD = 0.92$) and the slightly accented speakers ($p < .001$, Bonferroni-

correction; $M = 4.06$, $SD = 0.98$) to be less superior than the native speakers ($M = 5.15$, $SD = 0.81$). No significant differences were found in superiority between the moderately and slightly accented speakers ($p = .333$, Bonferroni-correction).

Warmth

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

Dynamism

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

Suitability for the job

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

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

Participants who had read the HR job description evaluated the moderately accented speakers ($M = 4.31$, $SD = 0.71$) as significantly less suitable for the job than the native speakers ($p = .046$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 4.81$, $SD = 0.88$). No significant differences were found in the evaluation of suitability for the job between the moderately accented and the slightly accented speakers ($p = .343$, Bonferroni-correction; $M = 4.64$, $SD = 0.83$) and between the slightly accented speakers and the native speakers ($p = 1.000$, Bonferroni-correction).

Table 6. Means, standard deviations, and *n* for perceived comprehensibility, attitudes (superiority, warmth, dynamism), and suitability for the job in function of accent strength and type of job (1 = low; 7 = high)

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

Conclusion and discussion

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

suitable for a job with high communicative demands compared to native English speakers. However, this speaker group was not perceived as less suitable for such a job compared to slightly accented speakers.

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

Discussion

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

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

The unsuccessful distinction between the moderate and the slight accent may have been due to the pretest, to the respondents in the experiment, or to the length of the speech fragments. The fact that the selection of the speech fragments in the pretest was based on so few evaluations might explain why the manipulation in the experiment was unsuccessful. Future studies on accents are recommended to conduct a solid pretest, including a statistical test as a basis for the choice of speech fragments in order to avoid an unsuccessful

manipulation. Moreover, the respondents in the experiment might not have given enough attention to the reversed formulation of one of the scales for accent strength and might thus have given a similar answer on both scales. Furthermore, as the speech fragments only lasted around seven seconds, Dutch listeners might not have recognised a difference between the slight and the moderate Dutch-English accent. Future studies should focus on similar research designs while incorporating longer speech fragments. These studies might yield other results that can be accounted for.

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

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

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

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

Possible explanations for the findings regarding attitudes could also be assigned to the manipulation of the accent strengths and the short duration of the fragments. As Dutch

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

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

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

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

The finding that slightly accented speakers were evaluated in the same way as native speakers on perceived comprehensibility, warmth, dynamism, and suitability for the job concurs with previous experimental studies that showed that slight and native accents were

often evaluated similarly (Hendriks et al., 2017; Hendriks et al., 2018; Nejari et al., 2012; Roessel et al., 2019). An explanation for this finding could be that even though the Dutch non-native listeners noticed the accent, they still admired the speaker for taking the effort to speak in another language than their native language.

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

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

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

Secondly, the present study was based on evaluations between British English and Dutch-English accents. Future studies could focus on other variations of native English, such as American English or Australian English. Furthermore, comparisons between evaluations

could also be researched for various other foreign accents in English, such as French-English and Spanish-English. Evaluations from various listener groups (native, non-native) in the context of a job interview could then be investigated for these accents.

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

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

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

References

- Cargile, A. C. (2000). Evaluations of employment suitability: Does accent always matter? *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 37, 165-177.
- Carlson, H. K., & McHenry, M. A. (2006). Effect of accent and dialect on employability. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 43, 70-83.
- Dalle, T. S., & Inglis, M. J. (1989). *What really affects undergraduates' evaluations of nonnative teaching assistant's teaching?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, San Antonio, TX.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED310641.pdf>
- Deprez-Sims, A.-S., & Morris, S. B. (2010). Accents in the workplace: Their effects during a job interview. *International Journal of Psychology*, 45(6), 417-426.
- Fuertes, J. N., Gottdiener, W., Martin, H., Gilbert, T. C., & Giles, H. (2012). A meta-analysis of the effects of speakers' accents on interpersonal evaluations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(1), 120-133.
- Gluszek, A., & Dovidio, J. F. (2010). The way *they* speak: A social psychological perspective on the stigma of nonnative accents in communication. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 14(2), 214-237.
- Grondelaers, S., Van Hout, R., & Van Gent, P. (2019). 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.
doi:10.1177/0261927X18810730
- Hendriks, B., Van Meurs, F., & De Groot, E. (2017). The effects of degrees of Dutch accentedness in ELF and in French, German and Spanish. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 27(1), 44-66. doi:10.1111/ijal.12101
- Hendriks, B., Van Meurs, F., & 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.
- Hendriks, B., Van Meurs, F., & Reimer, A.-K. (2018). The evaluation of lecturers' nonnative-accented English: Dutch and German students' evaluations of different degrees of Dutch-accented and German-accented English of lecturers in higher education. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 34, 28-45.
- Hosoda, M., & Stone-Romero, E. (2010). The effects of foreign accents on employment-related decisions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(2), 113-132.

- Lemhöfer, K., & Broersma, M. (2012). Introducing LexTALE: A quick and valid lexical test for advanced learners of English. *Behaviour Research Methods*, 44, 325-343.
doi:10.3758/s13428-011-0146-0
- Levi, S. V., Winters, S. J., & Pisoni, D. B. (2007). Speaker-independent factors affecting the perception of foreign accent in a second language. *Journal of Acoustical Society of America*, 121, 2327-2338.
- Neeley, T. (2012). Global business speaks English. *Harvard Business Review*.
- Nejjari, W., Gerritsen, M., van der Haagen, M., & Korzilius, H. (2012). Responses to Dutch-accented English. *World Englishes*, 31(2), 248-267.
- Roessel, J., Schoel, C., Zimmerman, R., & Stahlberg, D. (2019). Shedding new light on the evaluation of accented speakers: Basic mechanisms behind nonnative listeners' evaluations of nonnative accented job candidates. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 38(1), 3-32.
- Russo, M., Islam, G., & Koyuncu, B. (2017). Non-native accents and stigma: How self-fulfilling prophecies can affect career outcomes. *Human Resource Management Review*, 27, 507-520.
- Scovel, T. (2000). A critical review of the critical period research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 213-223.
- Timming, A. R. (2017). The effect of foreign accent on employability: a study of the aural dimensions of aesthetic labour in customer-facing and non-customer-facing jobs. *Work, employment and society*, 31(3), 409-428.
- Van Meurs, F., & Hendriks, B. (2017). *Native and non-native listeners' evaluation of degrees of foreign accentedness in English: A literature review*. Leiden: Leiden University Repository.

Appendix 1

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

- Plannen en uitvoeren van beleid met betrekking tot alle fasen van personeelsactiviteiten zoals training en ontwikkeling
- Werknemers werven, interviewen en selecteren om vacatures te vervullen
- Werknemersoriëntatie plannen en geleiden om een positieve houding ten opzichte van de bedrijfsdoelstellingen te bevorderen
- Arbeidsongevallen onderzoeken en rapporten voor verzekeringsmaatschappijen opstellen
- Uitvoeren van internetonderzoek op de arbeidsmarkt om competitieve salarissen te bepalen

English translation

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

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

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

English translation

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

Appendix 2

Experiment Bachelor thesis

Start of Block: Informatie en toestemming

Consent

Hallo, wij zijn Mathis Barten, Ilse Duijff, Maud Korsten, Nils Lechtenbrink en Bregtje Noordhoek. Wij zijn derdejaarsstudenten van de studie International Business Communication aan de Radboud Universiteit. Voor onze bachelor scriptie doen wij onderzoek naar sollicitatiegesprekken en vacatures. Graag willen wij u uitnodigen om mee te doen aan dit onderzoek.

Wat wordt er van u verwacht?

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

Vrijwilligheid

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

Wat gebeurt er met mijn gegevens?

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

We bewaren alle onderzoeksgegevens op beveiligde wijze volgens de richtlijnen van de Radboud Universiteit.

Heeft u vragen over het onderzoek?

Als u meer informatie over het onderzoek wilt hebben, of als u klachten heeft over het onderzoek kunt u contact opnemen.

Toestemming

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

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

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

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

End of Block: Informatie en toestemming

Start of Block: Vacature IT

Job description IT

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

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

End of Block: Vacature IT

Start of Block: Vacature HR

Job description HR

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

- Plannen en uitvoeren van beleid met betrekking tot alle fasen van personeelsactiviteiten zoals training en ontwikkeling
- Werknemers werven, interviewen en selecteren om vacatures te vervullen
- Werknemersoriëntatie plannen en geleiden om een positieve houding ten opzichte van de bedrijfsdoelstellingen te bevorderen
- Arbeidsongevallen onderzoeken en rapporten voor verzekeringsmaatschappijen opstellen
- Uitvoeren van internetonderzoek op de arbeidsmarkt om competitieve salarissen te bepalen

End of Block: Vacature HR

Start of Block: Voice recording moderate 1

M1

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

End of Block: Voice recording moderate 1

Start of Block: Voice recording moderate 2

M2

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

End of Block: Voice recording moderate 2

Start of Block: Voice recording slight 1

S1

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

End of Block: Voice recording slight 1

Start of Block: Voice recording slight 2

S2

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

End of Block: Voice recording slight 2

Start of Block: Voice recording native 1

N1

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

End of Block: Voice recording native 1

Start of Block: Voice recording native 2

N2

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

End of Block: Voice recording native 2

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

Origin speaker

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

Accent strength

Deze spreker heeft een sterk buitenlands accent in het Engels

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

Native speaker?

Deze spreker klinkt als een moedertaalspreker van het Engels

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

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

Start of Block: Perceived comprehensibility/waargenomen begrijpelijkheid

Comprehensibility

	Zeer mee oneens (1)	Mee oneens (2)	Een beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Een beetje mee eens (5)	Mee eens (6)	Zeer mee eens (7)
Ik moet heel goed luisteren om de spreker te kunnen begrijpen (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De spreker spreekt duidelijk (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De spreker is nauwelijks verstaanbaar (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
De spreker was moeilijk te begrijpen (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik heb moeite om te begrijpen waar de spreker het over heeft (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik heb geen moeite om de spreker te begrijpen (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik begrijp niet wat de spreker bedoelt (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: Perceived comprehensibility/waargenomen begrijpelijkheid

Start of Block: Attitude/houding

Superiority

	Ze er mee oneens (1)	Mee oneens (2)	Een beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Een beetje mee eens (5)	Mee eens (6)	Ze er mee eens (7)
Deze spreker klinkt chique (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Deze spreker klinkt hoogopgeleid (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Deze spreker klinkt serieus (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Warmth

	Ze er mee oneens (1)	Mee oneens (2)	Een beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Een beetje mee eens (5)	Mee eens (6)	Ze er mee eens (7)
Deze spreker klinkt aardig (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Deze persoon klinkt warm (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Deze spreker klinkt behulpzaam (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Dynamism

	Zeer mee oneens (1)	Mee oneens (2)	Een beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Een beetje mee eens (5)	Mee eens (6)	Zeer mee eens (7)
Deze spreker klinkt modern (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Deze spreker klinkt hip (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Deze spreker klinkt trendy (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: Attitude/houding

Start of Block: Hiring recommendation/aanwervingsaanbeveling

Hiring

Deze persoon is geschikt voor de beschreven functie in de vacature aan het begin van de vragenlijst

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

Hiring 2

	Zeer mee oneens (1)	Mee oneens (2)	Een beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Een beetje mee eens (5)	Mee eens (6)	Zeer mee eens (7)
Ik zou tevreden zijn als deze persoon wordt aangenomen (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik voel me positief over deze sollicitant (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ik wil met deze sollicitant werken (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Deze sollicitant zou een aanwinst zijn voor het bedrijf (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Deze sollicitant zou ik aannemen (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Hiring 3

	Zeer mee oneens (1)	Mee oneens (2)	Een beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Een beetje mee eens (5)	Mee eens (6)	Zeer mee eens (7)
Deze sollicitant zou een goede relatie hebben met haar ondergeschikten (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Deze sollicitant heeft bestuursvaardigheid (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: Hiring recommendation/aanwervingsaanbeveling

Start of Block: English proficiency tests/Engels bekwaamheidstesten

Self-proficiency

	Slecht	Uitmundend					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mijn schrijfvaardigheid in het Engels is ()							
Mijn leesvaardigheid in het Engels is ()							
Mijn spreekvaardigheid in het Engels is ()							
Mijn luistervaardigheid in het Engels is ()							

Page Break

LexTALE

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

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

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

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

Als alles duidelijk is, kunt u nu beginnen met het experiment.

	Ja (1)	Nee (2)
platory (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
denial (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
generic (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
mensible (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
scornful (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
stoutly (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ablaze (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
kermshaw (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
moonlit (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
lofty (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
hurricane (11)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
flaw (12)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
alberation (13)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
unkempt (14)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
breeding (15)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
festivity (16)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
screech (17)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

savoury (18)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
plaudate (19)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
shin (20)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
fluid (21)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
spaunch (22)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
allied (23)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
slain (24)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
recipient (25)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
exprate (26)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
eloquence (27)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
cleanliness (28)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
dispatch (29)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
rebondicate (30)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ingenious (31)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
bewitch (32)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
skave (33)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
plaintively (34)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
kilp (35)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

interfate (36)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
hasty (37)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
lengthy (38)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
fray (39)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
crumper (40)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
upkeep (41)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
majestic (42)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
magrity (43)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
nourishment (44)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
abergy (45)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
proom (46)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
turmoil (47)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
carbohydrate (48)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
scholar (49)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
turtle (50)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
fellick (51)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
destription (52)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
cylinder (53)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

censorship (54)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
celestial (55)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
rascal (56)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
purrrage (57)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
pulsh (58)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
muddy (59)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
quirty (60)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
pudour (61)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
listless (62)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
wrought (63)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: English proficiency tests/Engels bekwaamheidstesten

Start of Block: Personal information/Persoonlijke informatie

Exp. interviewee

Ik heb veel ervaring met geïnterviewd worden als sollicitant

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

Exp. interviewer

Ik heb veel ervaring met het interviewen van sollicitanten

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

Origin

Wat is uw land van herkomst?

☐ Nederland (1)

☐ Anders (2) _____

Mother tongue

Wat is uw moedertaal?

☐ Nederlands (1)

☐ Anders (2) _____

Education

Wat is uw hoogst afgeronde of huidige opleiding?

☐ Middelbare school (1)

☐ MBO (2)

☐ HBO (3)

☐ WO (4)

☐ Postdoctoraal (5)

Student?

Bent u een student?

☐ Ja (1)

☐ Nee (2)

Display This Question:

If Bent u een student? = Ja

Degree programme

Welk studieprogramma volgt u?

Sex

Wat is uw geslacht?

☐ Man (1)

☐ Vrouw (2)

☐ X (3)

Age

Wat is uw leeftijd?

Giftcard

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

End of Block: Personal information/Persoonlijke informatie

Appendix 3

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

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

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

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