Radboud Universiteit

The influence of Language Proficiency on the Evaluations of Non-standard Accented English and Standard Accented English

Radboud University Nijmegen, Netherlands

BA CIW International Business Communication

5th of July 2021

Words: 7199

Abstract

The current study investigated the influence of language proficiency on the evaluation of standard and non-standard accents. The Social Identity Theory (SIT) is an underlying mental process that is often considered in the evaluation of accents. It suggests that a non-standard accent evokes a perception that the speaker belongs to a certain social group, creating a bias towards the non-standard accent. Several studies have investigated this accent bias in multiple contexts, where contradictory effects of the SIT were found. Therefore, the present study aimed to gain new insights in the existing bias through considering language proficiency, because it is related to non-native accented speech and speaker evaluations. An experiment was conducted to measure the influence of language proficiency on speech understandability (*perceived comprehensibility*) and speaker evaluations (*status*, *dynamism*, *solidarity*, *hirability*). Dutch listeners (N = 125) were asked to evaluate two accents (moderate Dutch-accented English and standard British English) in a job interview. The language proficiency was measured with a LexTALE test and the perceived language proficiency of the listener. The results suggest that the SIT is not present when considering language proficiency and accent evaluations. This has given the implication that other attributions of accent evaluations are considered in the perception of the listener. These implications are further explored and explained in the current study, where it proposes to extend the measurements of the SIT.

Keywords: accentedness, language proficiency, business context, speaker evaluations.

Introduction

Due to globalization, there has been an increase in international trade and exchange of ideas and culture (Liu, Volcic, & Gallois, 2015). In particular, globalization has a significant impact in the business world. For example, businesses are now operating in multiple countries, creating multinational organisations (Liu, Volcic, & Gallois, 2015). Within these multinational businesses, various languages are spoken, which has created language barriers and miscommunication between employees. To overcome these problems, multinationals often implement a common corporate language (CCL) (Piekkari, Welch, & Welch, 2015). Frequently, these organisations decide to implement English as a CCL, since it is the lingua franca. This implicates that English serves as a 'contact language' between people who do not share a common native language (L1) nor a common (national) culture (Jenkins, 2009).

Research shows that implementing a foreign language as a CCL creates a bias towards non-native speakers (Roessel, Schoel, Zimmermann, & Stahlberg, 2019). This bias impacts opportunities on the job market for non-native applicants. Several studies examined the underlying mechanisms that create the bias in order to find techniques to reduce it. One of these mechanisms is the Social Identity Theory (SIT), where listeners favour their own social in-group over the out-group (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Nevertheless, contrasting results are found when investigating different language listener groups. Therefore, the current study attempts to obtain new insights into language biases by exploring accents and language proficiency since research has shown that these aspects of non-native speech generate a speaker bias (Beinhoff, 2014; Roessel et al., 2019).

An aspect of non-native speech are accents. Accents refer to a particular way of language pronunciation (Crystal, 2010; Giles, 1970). When speakers communicate in a foreign language, research has shown that speakers adopt a non-standard accent in that foreign language (Collins & Clément, 2012). When this adoption occurs, an accent can influence how the speaker is perceived by allowing the receiver in a conversation to make inferences about the group membership of the speaker, creating in and out-groups (Fuertes, Gottdiener, Martin, Gilbert & Giles, 2012).

The creation of in and out-groups can be explained through the SIT, consisting of three mental processes when evaluating others (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). The first process is social categorization, where people categorize others in order to understand the social environment (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). In the second process, called social identification, the individual adopts the identity of the group in which they categorize themselves as belonging to (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). In this stage, emotional significance is added to the identification and self-esteem of the individual is linked to group membership. Lastly, the process of social comparison occurs. When the categorization has developed, the individual compares its own social group to the groups with other characteristics (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

The process of comparison can create biases towards members of the out-group. Because the non-standard accent is a signal of group membership, it also stimulates a bias in speaker evaluations. The SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) suggests that the non-standard accent accentuates the negative in evaluating out-group members and that listeners prefer members of their own in-group (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Several researchers have investigated the evaluation of listeners on standard and non-standard accents to obtain insights into the SIT.

One of the characteristics that is considered when examining the evaluation of accents is the nativeness of the listener, where the perspective of the native listener and non-native listener is considered. For example, Nejjari, Gerritsen, Van der Haagen and Korzilius (2012) investigated the evaluation of non-native listeners of English on standard and non-standard accents in the context of sale calls. The standard accent received higher evaluations than the non-standard accent. In addition, the standard British English was perceived as more comprehensible, having a higher social attractiveness and prestige than the slight and moderate Dutch accent. Another study that investigated the evaluation of the native listener is the study of Huang, Frideger, and Pearce (2013). The results showed that the standard British English accent was perceived as having a higher political skill, which is an attribution to someone's job skill set. Political skill is the ability to understand others at work and to apply such knowledge to influence others to act in ways to enhance personal and organizational objectives (Ferris et al., 2005). Huang et al. (2013) also suggested that native speakers would be preferred to employ over non-native speakers in job interviews. Both of these studies indicate that the English native listener prefer their own in-group, the standard accent, over the out-group, the non-standard accent.

In intercultural communication, evaluation of accents can also occur from the perspective of a non-native listener. To measure this evaluation, research was conducted on the evaluation of non-native listeners on non-standard accents. Gallois and Forbes (1983) and Mckenzie (2010) found that non-native listeners downgrade non-standard accented speech, including the accented speech of their linguistic background. Hendriks, Van Meurs and Reimer (2018) confirmed these findings by conducting an experiment in an educational setting where Dutch and German students were asked to evaluate the Dutch-accented and German-accented English of lecturers. The results showed that moderate non-native English lectures were evaluated less positively than slight non-native English accents.

The findings of Gallois and Forbes (1983), Mackenzie (2010) and Hendriks et al. (2018) show that non-native listeners do not favour non-standard accents and therefore do not favour their in-group. This contradicts the findings of Nejjari et al. (2012) and Huang et al. (2013) where native English listeners evaluated the standard English accent over the non-standard accent and therefore favouring their in-group. This results in contradictory findings to the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). A possible explanation could be that English (the standard accent) is evaluated more positively because listeners already perceive English as more potent, intelligent, perceptive, knowledgeable, capable, educated, and successful than the non-standard accent without even considering the SIT (Weyant, 2007).

To investigate whether the standard accent is indeed favoured over the non-standard accent, Roessel et al. (2019) conducted an experiment where non-native listeners evaluated the standard accent and the non-standard accent. In the experiment, German listeners evaluated the standard British English accent and non-standard German accents. The results showed that non-native listeners assigned lower hirability ratings to candidates who speak English with a strong non-standard accent than to candidates who speak English natively. Thus, non-native listeners also favour the standard accent (their out-group) over their in-group. Because of this result, there are multiple studies that demonstrate that the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) is not present in the evaluation of standard and non-standard accents and that other characteristics influence the perception of the listener.

However, these studies still demonstrate that there is a bias in the evaluation of non-standard accents. To further explore the underlying principles of this bias, other aspects of language can be investigated in relation to the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Beinhoff (2014) has investigated an aspect of language that is called language proficiency in an attempt to gather information on which features of non-standard English speech are perceived to influence accent evaluations and comprehensibility. Language proficiency is defined as the ability of an individual to use language with a level of accuracy that transfers meaning in production and comprehension (Kraut & Wulff, 2013). Beinhoff (2014) investigated which level of accentedness (high, moderate, and low) was evaluated higher on perceived comprehensibility by listeners with different levels of language proficiency. The results showed that the intermediate proficiency Spanish listeners and the intermediate proficiency German listeners perceived the speaker with a high level of accentedness as easier to comprehend compared with the ratings of the advanced proficiency Spanish listeners, the advanced proficiency German listeners, and English NS listeners. Thus, the non-native listeners with an intermediate proficiency preferred their in-group regarding perceived comprehensibility in comparison with non-native listeners with an advanced proficiency level, who did not prefer their in-group. This implies that the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) is not present when listeners with an advanced proficiency evaluate non-standard accents, while intermediate proficiency listeners do show signs of the SIT when evaluating the non-standard accents.

Therefore, the results of Beinhoff (2014) show that there are contradictory results regarding the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). The in and out-group comparison seems to change when the proficiency of the listener is intermediate or advanced. However, this research did not compare between a non-standard and a standard accent, where previous

research did find other results (Roessel et al., 2019). More insights should be obtained in order to conclude that the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) is present when considering language proficiency. The current study could broaden the research on intercultural communication and the SIT to obtain intricate understanding into the mechanisms that operate in communication. Therefore, to gather new observations, the current study examined the influence of language proficiency on the evaluation of standard and non-standard accents. Based on the present literature, the following research question was reviewed:

RQ: What is the influence of language proficiency of non-native listeners on their evaluations of a standard accent and a non-standard accent?

The current study focused on a business context to answer the research question. Roessel et al. (2019) show that the biases in speaker evaluations caused by a non-standard accent have consequences for the hirability of an applicant. This suggests that the bias has an impact on the professional life of the non-native speaker, meaning that the business context is a high-stake setting and speaker evaluation is crucial. Gaining more insights into the nature of a bias based on accent and language proficiency can reduce this bias. The possible findings do not only give more opportunities for non-native applicants, but also for multinational organisations, because inclusion and diversity has become a key to success in business activities (De Wit, 2020).

To investigate the influence of language proficiency on the evaluation of standard and non-standard accents in a business context, several dimensions of speaker evaluations area considered. In order to discover whether the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) is present when examining the influence of language proficiency on the evaluation of standard and non-standard accents, the current study examines solidarity. This evaluation involves judgements about traits such as social attractiveness of the speaker, their benevolence and trustworthiness and the similarity of the speaker to the listener (Śliwa and Johansson, 2014). Solidarity is an important aspect investigating integration in a 'shared language' situation (Śliwa and Johansson, 2014).

Since multinationals are considered an environment where language is constantly shared, solidarity is essential when researching a job interview context. Fuertes et al. (2012) found that speakers with a standard accent are rated more positively on solidarity than speakers with a non-standard accent. Therefore, it is expected that non-native listeners with an advanced language proficiency evaluate the standard accent higher on solidarity, contradicting the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and rejecting their in-group. It is assumed that this

rejection occurs because advanced proficiency listeners perceive English as the norm language. As a consequence, non-native speakers with an advanced proficiency perceive themselves more as a native speaker because there is more overlap in speech characteristics (Papageorgiou, 2005). On the contrary, based on the findings of Beinhoff (2014), non-native listeners with an intermediate language proficiency are expected to evaluate the non-standard accent higher on solidarity and acknowledging their in-group.

Another dimension that is fundamental in evaluating speakers in a business setting is perceived comprehensibility, which is defined as the respondents' estimation to illustrate to which extent they understood the message (Nejjari et al., 2012). Successful communication between non-native and native speakers of English depends on the mutual understandability of each other's speech (Nejjari et al., 2012). As intercultural communication is present in multinational organisations, it is crucial to be understood when applying for a job. Therefore, in the current study, the evaluation of perceived comprehensibility is investigated.

Hendriks et al. (2018) showed more negative understanding evaluations from Dutch students towards lectures taught in a strong-Dutch English accent than lectures taught in a slight Dutch accent. This finding contradicts the matched inter-language speech intelligibility benefit (ISIB) that suggests that non-native listeners may perceive non-native speakers with the same L1 background as more understandable than native speakers (Bent & Bradlow, 2003). Based on these findings, it is hypothesized that the advanced non-native listener evaluates the standard accent higher on perceived comprehensibility than the non-standard accent. However, Beinhoff (2014) showed that the perceived comprehensibility of non-native listeners with an intermediate proficiency was higher for the standard accent. It is expected that intermediate listeners evaluate the non-standard accent higher, they associate with their in-group and reject their out-group. In the case of advanced listeners, the opposite is expected to occur.

When examining perceived comprehensibility, it is also relevant to consider the evaluation of status, since Nejjari et al. (2012) found that the higher the perceived comprehensibility of the speaker, the higher the perceived status of the speaker. Moreover, Śliwa and Johansson (2014) found that status is present in evaluating an applicant in a job interview, because status plays a role in the construction of power difference between native and non-native speakers. The evaluation of status also includes how intelligent, competent, ambitious, and educated the listener thinks the speaker is (Fuertes et al., 2012). Based on the findings of Nejjari et al. (2012) and Beinhoff (2014), the advanced listeners are expected to attribute a higher status to the standard accent than the non-standard accent, rejecting their in-group and preferring their out-group. In contrast, the findings of Beinhoff (2014) also create

the assumption that the intermediate non-native listeners attribute a higher status to the non-standard accent, because it is assumed that they evaluate the non-standard accent higher on perceived comprehensibility.

Śliwa and Johansson (2014) also state that status intertwines with solidarity and dynamism. Therefore, the present study also considers dynamism as a speaker evaluation dimension. Dynamism is associated with activity and liveliness (Fuertes et al., 2012). The meta-analysis of Fuertes et al. (2012) demonstrates that a standard accent was evaluated higher on dynamism than a non-standard accent, suggesting that the in-group was not preferred over the out-group. Based on these findings and the findings of Beinhoff (2014) it is hypothesized that the advanced non-native listener evaluates the standard accent higher on dynamism. On the contrary, the intermediate non-native listener evaluates the non-standard accent higher on dynamism than the standard accent.

Lastly, because the goal of this study is to investigate the bias that exists in hiring employees, the evaluation of hirability is measured. Hirability is the measure of how hireable somebody is and how fit they are to be hired (Roessel et al., 2019). In a job interview, the goal is to hire the applicant that is perceived to be the best fit for the company. Therefore, hirability is a central dimension in the evaluation of speakers. With the intention of measuring the underlying principles of the bias that occurs when non-native listeners evaluate the standard and non-standard accent, the results of Roessel et al. (2019) are significant.

The research of Roessel et al. (2019) presents that non-native German listeners assign lower hirability ratings to German candidates who speak English with a strong non-standard accent than to candidates who speak English natively. These results are contradictory to the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979), where the in-group of non-native listeners is not favoured in hirability over the out-group. Based on the expectations for solidarity, it is assumed that the advanced proficiency listeners evaluate the standard accent higher on hirability. Moreover, it is expected that intermediate listeners will evaluate the non-standard accent higher on hirability based on their in-group acceptance.

The current study adopted the experimental conditions of Roessel et al. (2019) to measure the effects of language proficiency on the evaluation of a standard accent and non-standard accent. However, the current study investigated Dutch accented English because there is consistent and increasing use of English lingua franca (ELF) in Dutch businesses (Gerritsen & Nickerson, 2009, p. 187). More precisely, moderate Dutch accented English was selected as the non-standard accent because moderately non-standard accents were evaluated less positively by non-native listeners than slight non-native English (Hendriks et al., 2018).

Furthermore, British accented English was selected as the standard accent because an increasing number of secondary school pupils in the Netherlands receive up to 50 per cent of their education in standard British English (Nejjari et al., 2012). Due to the increasing ELF in Dutch business, the current study also focused on the language proficiency of Dutch listeners. To measure whether there was a difference between various language proficiencies, the study differentiated between an intermediate proficiency and an advanced proficiency in order to measure the effects of SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) based on the study of Beinhoff (2014).

Method

Materials

To examine the effect of language proficiency on the evaluation of accentedness in a business setting, Dutch students with either an intermediate proficiency or an advanced proficiency in English were asked to evaluate a moderate Dutch accented English or a standard British accented English job application fragment. The manipulated variable in this condition was accentedness. This is the extent to which a listener judges L2 speech to differ from native-speaker norms (Munro & Derwing, 1995). Dutch students were asked to evaluate speakers who shared their mother tongue (Dutch) or speakers who had a different mother tongue (English).

A division was made between subjects with an intermediate proficiency and subjects with an advanced proficiency to investigate the effect of English language proficiency on the evaluation of speakers with a standard or non-standard accent. These levels were chosen because Beinhoff (2014) found significant differences between these two levels. The language proficiency of the subjects was measured through LexTALE test (Lemhöfer & Broersma, 2012). Subjects were presented with a list of 60 words in British English and the subjects had to decide whether the word was an existing word or not. The subjects who scored between 80% and 100% were assigned to the advanced proficiency condition (N = 67, M = 89.09, SD = 5.50) and the subjects who scored below 80% were assigned to the intermediate proficiency condition (N = 58, M = 71.01, SD = 6.07).

The Dutch listeners evaluated fragments of a job application recorded by a female speaker with a moderate Dutch accent and by a female speaker with a British English accent. Both speakers were asked to read the same text about their suitability for the job vacancy. The job position was an executive position because the study of Huang et al. (2013) showed that an executive position influences employability concerning accentedness. More precisely, the

position is an International Communication Officer, where the context of a multinational company is signalled through "International".

To assure that the voices utilized in the experiment were comparable based on different accent characteristics, a pre-test was conducted with two Dutch female speakers and two British English speakers. A total of 20 subjects evaluated all the four speech fragments based on speech recognition, country of origin, perceived comprehensibility, voice characteristics, speaker pace dynamism, and age. One speaker from each group was selected based on the least number of significant results from a repeated measures within-subject ANOVAs for the dependent variables. Results of the pre-test can be found in appendix.

Subjects

A total of 125 native Dutch university students (age: $M = 21.40$, $SD = 1.79$; range 18-25; 70.4% female, 28% male, 1.6% other) took part in the experiment. 76.8% of the subjects never followed a Human Resource course and 10.4% has hired personnel before with a range 0-15 job interviews where the listener was an interviewer. 92.8% has been an applicant, where the largest group had been applicant in three interviews (20.8%; $M = 3.94$, $SD = 2.65$).

A chi-square analysis showed that there was no significant relation for language proficiency[1] with regard to gender ($\chi^2(1) = 1.97$, $p = .161$). A chi-square analysis showed that there was no significant relation for accentedness with regard to gender ($\chi^2(1) = .001$, $p = .974$). This suggests that the language proficiency and accentedness conditions are equally distributed regarding gender. A chi-square analysis showed that there was no significant relation between language proficiency and HR course experience ($\chi^2(1) = .053$, $p = .817$). A chi-square analysis showed that there was no significant relation for accentedness and applicant experience ($\chi^2(1) = 1.17$, $p = .280$). In the accentedness and language proficiency conditions, the groups are similar concerning HR course experience. Lastly, a chi-square analysis for language proficiency showed no significant relation between language proficiency and hiring experience ($\chi^2(1) = 0$, $p = .985$). A chi-square analysis showed no significant relation between accentedness and hiring experience[2] ($\chi^2(1) = .914$, $p = .339$). The conditions for language proficiency and accentedness are equally in their hiring experience.

[1] A chi-square analysis for all four conditions showed that not enough cases were present for the chi-square distribution analysis for all the demographic variables.

[2] A chi-square analysis for accentedness and language proficiency for applicant experience was not possible due to the shortage of cases.

Three one-way analyses of variance showed no significant effect of total condition on age, number of times applicant and number of times interviewer (F (3,121) < 1). These results suggest that in the four conditions with accentedness and language proficiency presented in this study are similar regarding age, number of times applicant and number of times interviewer.

Design

The present study had a between-subject design in which subjects listened to either the standard accent or to the non-standard accent. The subjects were only exposed to one level of the actual language proficiency condition and one level of the accentedness condition. Furthermore, these subjects were also divided based on their actual language proficiency This resulted in a 2x2 between subject design which is presented in table 1.

Table 1. The distribution of subjects (N =125) based on the actual English language proficiency level of the subjects with M = 80.70, SD = 10.72, range 53.75-100).

Condition	**Language Proficiency**	
	Intermediate	Advanced
Moderate Dutch accent	38	33
Native British accent	20	34

Instruments

Five dependent variables were measured as the evaluations of the Dutch listeners on the standard or the non-standard accent in a job application context. These evaluations were perceived comprehensibility, status, dynamism, solidarity and hirability.

Perceived comprehensibility was measured with 7-point Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree; 4 = neutral) with the statements 'I think the speaker is easy to understand' and 'I think the speaker is clear to understand' (based on Munro, Derwing, & Morton, 2006; Hendriks et al., 2018). To account for construct validity, the statement 'I think the speaker is easy to understand' was changed to the negative statement 'I think the speaker is difficult to understand'. The reliability of *perceived comprehensibility* comprising two items was excellent: $\alpha = .93$. Consequently, the mean of the two items was used to calculate the compound variable *perceived comprehensibility,* which was used in the further analysis.

Status was measured with 7-point Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree; 4 = neutral) with the statements 'The speaker sounds…' with the characteristics of *status* (competent, educated, having authority, intelligent and cultured) as suggested by Nejjari et al. (2020). To account for construct validity, the characteristic *competent* was changed to antonym

incompetent. The reliability of *status*, which was comprised by five items, was good: α = .85. In turn, the compound variable *status* was calculated using the mean of all five items. This variable was used for further analysis in this study.

To measure *dynamism*, listeners indicated on a 7-point Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree; 4 = neutral) to which extent the listener believed the speaker possessed the three personality traits energetic, enthusiastic, and confident (based on Nejjari et al., 2020). *Confident* was changed to *insecure* to account for the construct validity of the items. The decision has been made to use a 7-point Likert scales instead of a 5-point Likert scales (Nejjari et al., 2020) because it facilitates more insights into the speaker evaluations. The reliability of *dynamism* comprising three items was good: α = .86. Consequently, the mean of all three items was used to calculate the compound variable *dynamism*, which was used in the further analysis.

Solidarity was measured with a 7-point Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree; 4 = neutral) with the statements 'The speaker sounds…' with the characteristics of *solidarity* (attractive, benevolent, similar to me, trustworthy) as suggested by Śliwa and Johansson (2014). The characteristic *trustworthy* was changed to *untrustworthy* to account for construct validity. *Solidarity* was measured using four items. The reliability of *solidarity* was acceptable: α = .73. The compound variable for *solidarity* was calculated with the mean of all four items. This variable was used in further analysis.

To measure *hirability*, a 7-point Likert scales (1= very poor; 7 = excellent; 4 = neutral) with the characteristics suitable for the position, recommend employing the candidate for the position and the general impression of the candidate was used. The first characteristic is measured with the statement 'If I were hiring for the position of ..., I would consider this person the following type of candidate for the job'. These scales are based on the research of Huang et al. (2013). The second characteristic is measured with the statement 'I would recommend employing the candidate for this position' with 7-point Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree; 4 = neutral). Lastly, the statement 'my general impression of the candidate was…' was included where listeners indicated on a 7-point Likert scales (1 = very negative; 7 = very positive; 4 = neutral) what their impression was. *Hirability* consisted of three items. The reliability was excellent: α = .94. Consequently, the compound variable *hirability* was calculated using the mean of all three items. In further analysis, this variable was used.

Procedure

The questionnaire was written in Dutch and administered using the online survey tool Qualtrics in 2021. Subjects first read an introduction in which they were informed about the terms of conditions when participating in the questionnaire. In addition, the incentive for a gift card of 20 euros was presented. A short description was provided about the job; however, subjects were not informed about the actual purpose of the study nor about the origin of the speakers in the samples. The listeners were only told that they were going to listen to an audio fragment and were advised to listen with headphones to exclude any noise. Consecutively, the subjects were asked to answer questions regarding their perceived English proficiency based on the research of Hendriks et al., (2018). After that, the participants were divided randomly into two groups. Subsequently, the subjects were presented with the sample, containing either the non-standard accented English condition or the standard accented English condition. After this, demographical questions were presented concerning the listeners (age, gender, education, Human Resource background). In this section the subject was asked to fill in the questions that were explained in the instruments section. The final section of the questionnaire was a LexTALE test (Lemhöfer & Broersma, 2012).

The results were calculated manually with the method of Lemhöfer and Broersma (2012) to divide the subjects according to their proficiency level, which is defined in the materials. Lastly, the questionnaire ended with the aim of the study and whether the subjects wanted to participate to earn the incentive. The participants were approached by social media (WhatsApp, LinkedIn, Instagram). Filling in the questionnaire took about 10 minutes. Approximately 30% (N = 51) of the data was excluded based on the restrictions that were included in the questionnaire, this to ensure that the subjects had the requested characteristics to participate (age between 18-25, university student and mother tongue Dutch). In total there was one round of data collection, where all the data was excluded at once, giving the remaining 125 subjects.

Statistical treatment

To measure whether the perceived language proficiency correlates with the actual proficiency measured with the LexTALE, a Spearman test was conducted. Multiple two-way analyses of variance were used to analyse the interaction between language proficiency and accentedness and the dependent variables. The analyses in the current study were significant if p <.05.

Results

Correlation

To measure the relationship between perceived proficiency and LexTALE scores, a Spearman test was executed. A significant positive correlation was found between actual proficiency and perceived proficiency (r_s (125) = .46, p < .001). The correlation between actual proficiency and perceived proficiency was moderate. Based on this finding, the current study also examined the effect of perceived proficiency of the subjects by conducting several two-way ANOVAs for perceived comprehensibility, status, dynamism, solidarity and hirability. These results can be found in the section 'perceived proficiency measurement'. In the following statistical treatments, language proficiency is defined by the actual proficiency of the subjects, measured with the LexTALE.

Speaker evaluations

In table 2 the ratings of the speaker evaluations are presented between intermediate and advanced proficiency for the standard and non-standard accent.

Table 2. Means and standard deviations (between brackets) for perceived comprehensibility, status, solidarity, dynamism and hirability in function of accent (standard and non-standard) and language proficiency (intermediate and advanced) (1 = low, 7 = high).

	Conditions					
	Intermediate	Advanced	Intermediate	Advanced	Total	
	Non-Standard accent n = 38	Non-standard accent n = 33	Standard accent n = 20	Standard accent n = 34	Non-standard accent n = 71	Standard accent n = 54
	M (SD)	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*
Perceived comprehensibility	5.26(*1.20*)	5.45(*1.13*)	5.55(*1.38*)	6.19(*1.02*)	5.35(*1.16*)	5.95(*1.19*)
Status	4.78(*.86*)	4.55(*1.12*)	5.49(*.83*)	5.75(*.82*)	4.68(*.99*)	5.65(*.82*)
Dynamism	3.32(*1.10*)	3.12(*1.33*)	4.55(*1.31*)	4.96(*1.33*)	3.23(*1.21*)	4.81(*1.32*)
Solidarity	4.49(*.85*)	4.20(*1.11*)	4.56(*.81*)	4.82(*1.12*)	4.35(*.99*)	4.72(*1.01*)
Hirability	4.20(*1.14*)	4.23(*1.37*)	4.97(*1.31*)	5.37(*1.34*)	4.22(*1.24*)	5.22(*1.33*)

Perceived comprehensibility

In order to measure whether language proficiency and accentedness had an influence on perceived comprehensibility, the study performed a two-way analysis of variance. The two-way ANOVA with accentedness (standard or non-standard) and language proficiency (intermediate or advanced) as factors showed a significant main effect of accentedness on perceived comprehensibility (F (1, 121) = 5.65, p = .019). This implies the standard accent evoked a higher perceived comprehensibility evaluation (M = 5.95, SD = 1.19) than the non-standard accent (M = 5.35, SD = 1.16). For language proficiency no significant main effect was revealed on the evaluation of perceived comprehensibility (F (1, 121) = 3.77, p = .054). The interaction effect between accentedness and language proficiency was not statistically significant (F (1, 121) < 1).

Status

To verify whether language proficiency and accentedness influence the evaluation of status of Dutch listeners, a two-way analysis of variance was conducted. The two-way ANOVA with accentedness (British English or moderate Dutch) and language proficiency (intermediate or advanced) as factors revealed a significant main effect of accentedness on status (F (1, 121) = 30.84, p <.001). This suggests that the standard accent evoked a significantly higher status evaluation (M = 5.65, SD = .82) than the non-standard accent (M = 4.68, SD = .99). Language proficiency was not found to have a significant main effect on status (F (1, 121) < 1). The interaction effect between accentedness and language proficiency was not statistically significant (F (1, 121) = 1.94, p = .176).

Dynamism

A two-way analysis of variance was utilized to measure the effect of language proficiency and accentedness on the evaluation of dynamism. A two-way ANOVA with accentedness and language proficiency as factors revealed a significant main effect of accentedness on dynamism (F (1, 121) = 43.15, p < .001). This indicates that subjects who listened to the standard accent evaluated the speaker higher on dynamism (M = 4.81, SD = 1.32) than subjects who listened to the non-standard accent (M = 3.23, SD = 1.21). For language proficiency, no significant main effect on dynamism was discovered (F (1, 121) <1). The interaction effect between accentedness and language proficiency was statistically not significant (F (1, 121) = 1.24, p = .268).

Solidarity

A two-way analysis of variance with accentedness and language proficiency as factors showed no significant main effect of accentedness on solidarity (F (1, 121) = 3.59, p = .060). For language proficiency, no significant main effect on solidarity was identified (F (1, 121) <1). The interaction effect between accentedness and language proficiency was not statistically significant (F (1, 121) = 1.76, p = .187).

Hirability

A two-way analysis of variance with accentedness and language proficiency as factors demonstrated a significant main effect of accentedness on hirability (F (1, 121) = 15.69, p < .001). This implies that the standard accent evoked a significantly higher hirability evaluation (M = 5.22, SD = 1.33) than the non-standard accent (M = 4.22, SD = 1.25). Language proficiency was not found to have a significant main effect on hirability (F (1, 121) <1). The interaction effect between accentedness and language proficiency was not statistically significant (F (1, 121) <1).

Perceived proficiency measurement

To measure the effect of perceived proficiency, the subjects of the perceived proficiency condition were divided in the intermediate and advanced listener conditions based on the median (Mdn = 6.00). The subjects who scored below the median were perceived intermediate listeners and subjects who scored the median or higher were perceived advanced listeners. This calculation provided the distribution as displayed in table 3, where M = 5.98 and SD = .78.

Table 3. The distribution of subjects (N =125) based on the perceived English language proficiency level of the subjects.

Condition	**Language Proficiency**	
	Intermediate	Advanced
Moderate Dutch accent	26	45
Standard British accent	16	38

The results of the perceived proficiency analyses were the same as for the actual proficiency analyses, as shown in table 4.

Table 4. *Results of two-way ANOVAs with Effect, F-value, and p-value for the effects of accentedness, perceived proficiency and the interaction between perceived proficiency x accentedness for the five speaker evaluations (N = 125).*

Speaker evaluation	Effect	df	*F*	*p*-value
Perceived comprehensibility	Accentedness	1, 121	6.82	.010
	Perceived proficiency	1, 121	2.70	.103
	Perceived proficiency x accentedness	1, 121	<1	-
Status	Accentedness	1, 121	30.43	<.001
	Perceived proficiency	1, 121	3.98	.094
	Perceived proficiency x accentedness	1, 121	<1	-
Dynamism	Accentedness	1, 121	40.92	<.001
	Perceived proficiency	1, 121	<1	-
	Perceived proficiency x accentedness	1, 121	<1	-
Solidarity	Accentedness	1, 121	3.56	.061
	Perceived proficiency	1, 121	<1	-
	Perceived proficiency x accentednes	1, 121	<1	-
Hirability	Accentedness	1, 121	17.51	<.001
	Perceived proficiency	1, 121	<1	-
	Perceived proficiency x accentedness	1, 121	<1	-

df = Degrees of freedom. Numbers represent df for the effect of interest (numerator) and the residuals (denominator)

Conclusion and discussion

The current study aimed to measure the influence of language proficiency of non-native listeners on their evaluations of a standard and a non-standard accent. The results show that language proficiency does not influence the evaluation of standard and non-standard accents. Furthermore, the results indicate that the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) is not present in the evaluation of solidarity of standard and non-standard accents by Dutch listeners. The advanced proficiency listeners do not evaluate the standard accent higher on solidarity, which was expected based on the assumption that Dutch listeners perceive themselves as more similar to the native speaker. In addition, the results of Fuertes et al. (2012) for solidarity are also not confirmed in this study.

A possible explanation for the overall results for solidarity could be that the Dutch listeners still favour their in-group due to the similarity they experience because of the recognisability of the Dutch accented English. However, due to the high exposure of British English in business and in Dutch education (Nejjari et al., 2012), the Dutch listeners might be familiarized with the standard accent. In this case, the Dutch listeners cannot differentiate

between their in-group and their out-group, because they feel associated with their mother tongue but also with the English language.

Aside from the results of solidarity, the current study did show differences in evaluation of the standard accent and the non-standard accent for the dimensions perceived comprehensibility, status, dynamism and hirability. The standard accent is favoured over the non-standard accent in these four dimensions. These findings support the previous investigations on speaker evaluations, where the standard accent is also favoured over the non-standard accent (Fuertes et al., 2012; Hendriks et al., 2018; Roessel et al., 2019). The current study therefore confirms that the mental process of comparison in the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) is not strong enough to resist the perceived attributions of the standard accent. The findings suggest that the out-group in these evaluations have more favourable attributions than their in-group. The bias that is caused in the evaluations in a job interview are caused by other aspects of perception.

Because no difference was found in the evaluation of solidarity, the results for the effect of language proficiency on the dimensions perceived comprehensibility, status, dynamism and hirability cannot be explained based on the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). For these dimensions, no difference was found between language proficiency and the evaluation of standard accents and non-standard accents. In the case of perceived comprehensibility, the results contradict the findings of Beinhoff (2014), because non-native listeners with an intermediate proficiency did not evaluate the non-standard accent higher on perceived comprehensibility. A reason for these results can be that the advanced proficiency of the listener ensures that they can comprehend a standard accent as well as a non-standard accent and therefore not favour their out-group over their in-group.

As explained before, the Dutch listeners with an intermediate and advanced proficiency might already be too familiar with the British language, therefore not recognizing British speakers as a prominent out-group and therefore they do not favour one group over the other based on perceived comprehensibility, status, dynamism and hirability. This indicates that the identification process and the comparison process in the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) is not strong enough for the Dutch listeners to prefer their own in-group (non-standard accent) over the out-group (standard accent).

Future research could expand the findings based on SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) by measuring more perceived speaker characteristics based on solidarity. The Cronbach's alpha of this item was the lowest in comparison to the other dimensions. Proposing more items in future research could create more insights into the overall perception of solidarity of the

speaker. In this study, the item that measured the similarity was ‘The speaker sounds like me’. This single item could be extended by including open-ended questions focused solely on solidarity characteristics. The listener can state why the speaker sounds similar or dissimilar to them, which can create new items to measure. This method is based on the research of Fishbein and Ajzen (2010). Open questions can create more clarity in the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) to discover which characteristics the listeners attribute to the standard and non-standard accent without restrictions of close-ended items.

In addition, to further extend the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and insights into the characteristics of the listener, the perception of the overall language of the listener can be measured. This could serve as a pre-condition test, where the participant is first asked to state their perception towards the two languages that are going to be presented in the experimental condition. Even though the present study confirms earlier findings, it is still unclear which underlying characteristics of the standard accent caused the non-native listeners to prefer the standard accent over their own in-group. To obtain these insights, further research could ask participants more open-ended questions, because these give a more detailed description of the attributions that are given to the native speakers.

The present study did not show any effects of language proficiency on accent evaluations. A reason for these findings could be that a moderate correlation was found between the perceived proficiency and the LexTALE scores of the Dutch listeners, suggesting that the measurements for language proficiency are not accurate enough in order to find significant results. This can be caused by the LexTALE test (Lemhöfer & Broersma, 2012), where it might not measure all the aspects that are related to the language proficiency of the listener. LexTALE (Lemhöfer & Broersma, 2012) only measures the English vocabulary of the subjects, whereas writing skills, listener skills and speaker fluency are also part of the language proficiency of the listener. Further research could implement these tests in the experimental condition in order to obtain more precise measurements.

Based on the finding that there is a low correlation between the perceived proficiency of the listener and the LexTALE scores, the current study also investigated whether there would be a difference in results when perceived proficiency was measured. This could be the case, because the Dunning-krugereffect (Dunning & Kruger, 1999) argues that people have a cognitive bias on their perceived competence. The listeners who perceive themselves as having an advanced proficiency could overestimate their own capabilities, whereas the listeners who perceive themselves as having an intermediate proficiency could underestimate themselves.

The results did not differ from the actual proficiency results. Therefore, even if the Dutch listeners perceive themselves as having an advanced or intermediate proficiency, the evaluation does not change. Thus, even if Dutch listeners perceive themselves as having an advanced proficiency, they still do not differentiate between the SIT. The Dutch listeners do not prefer their out-group over their in-group based on the discussed speaker evaluations. However, it would be assumed that due to the over-estimation of their own language proficiency, the listeners would associate themselves as a member of the group with the highest level of English (the standard accent). In this case, the listeners would shift from their social group. This finding also indicates that future research could investigate the underlying mechanisms in speaker evaluations, where this current study has shown that the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) is absent in the effect language proficiency on accent evaluations.

Another limitation that was encountered is based on the number of participants in each condition. Due to the exclusion of participants after gathering all the data, not all conditions consisted of $n = 30$ participants. This distribution has caused the fact that not every condition is comparable, creating the possibility that language proficiency did not have an effect because of this. However, even though there were insufficient participants in all conditions, accentedness did influence the speaker evaluations. This study suggests obtaining a larger sample in further investigations.

This study has given implications for the influence of language proficiency on the evaluations of standard and non-standard accents of English. This extends the research on the evaluation of accents in a business context. The findings of the current study imply that non-standard accents create a bias in the perception of the listener, however the nature of the bias cannot be fully related to the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). In addition, language proficiency did not show a result of the SIT, where no in or out-group was favoured in the evaluation of accents. This gave implications that other mental processes might be related to the biases towards non-standard accents. The results indicate that the Dutch listeners do not favour the standard accent nor the non-standard accent when differentiated in language proficiency. This suggests that in the accent evaluations other speaker characteristics are more prominent than only the SIT (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Future research could expand the findings by investigating the underlying perception of the listener when they evaluate accents in order to reduce the bias in job interviews.

References

Beinhoff, B. (2014). Perceiving intelligibility and accentedness in non-native speech: A look at proficiency levels. *Concordia Working Papers in Applied Linguistics* (Vol. 5, pp.58-72)

Bent, T., & Bradlow, A.R. (2003). The interlanguage speech intelligibility benefit. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 114, 1600-1610. doi:10.1121/1.1603234

Collins, K. A., & Clément, R. (2012). Language and prejudice. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 31*(4), 376-396. doi:10.1177/0261927x12446611

Crystal, D. (2010). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language* (3rd ed.) Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Kruger, J., & Dunning, D. (1999). Unskilled and unaware of it: How difficulties in recognizing one's own incompetence lead to inflated self-assessments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(6), 1121–1134. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.6.1121

Ferris, G. R., Treadway, D. C., Kolodinsky, R. W., Hochwarter, W. A., Kacmar, C. J., Douglas, C., & Frink, D. D. (2005). Development and Validation of the Political Skill Inventory. *Journal of Management, 31*(1), 126–152. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206304271386

Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. (2010). *Predicting and changing behavior*: The reasoned action approach. New York: Psychology Press.

Fuertes, J., Gottdiener, W., Martin, H., Gilbert, T., & Giles, H. (2012). A meta-analysis of the effects of speakers' accents on interpersonal evaluations. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 42*(1), 120-133. doi:10.1002/esjp.862

Gerritsen, M., & Nickerson, C. (2009). BELF: Business English as a lingua franca. *The handbook of business discourse,* 187. doi:10.11648.j.tecs.20170205.11

Giles, H. (1970). Evaluative reactions to accents. *Educational Review, 22,* 211-227

Giles, H., & Billings, A.C. (2004). Assessing language attitudes: Speaker evaluation studies. *The handbook of applied linguistics*. doi: 10.1002/9780470757000.ch7

Hendriks, B., Van Meurs, F., & Reimer, A. (2018). The evaluation of lectures' nonnative-accented English: Dutch and German students' evaluations of different degrees of Dutch-accented and German-accented English of lectures in higher education. *Journal of English for Academic purposes*, 34, 28-45. doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2018.03.001

Huang, L., Frideger, M., & Pearce, J. L. (2013). Political skill: Explaining the effects of nonnative accent on managerial hiring and entrepreneurial investment decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*(6), 1005-1017. doi:10.1037/a0034125

Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua Franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes, 28*(2), 200-207. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971x.2009.01582.x

Kraut, R., & Wulff, S. (2013). Foreign-accented speech perception ratings: A multifactorial case study. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 34*(3), 249-263. doi:10.1080/01434632.2013.767340

Lemhöfer, K., & Broersma, M. (2012). Introducing LexTALE: A quick and valid Lexical Test for Advanced Learners of English. *Behavior Research Methods, 44*, 325-343.

Liu, S., Volcic, Z., & Gallois, C. (2015). *Introducing Intercultural Communication, Global Cultures and Contexts* (Second edition). Thousaand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Ltd.

Munro, M.J., Derwing, T.M., & Morton, S.L. (2006). The mutual intelligibility of L2 speech. Studies in Second Language Acquistion, 28(1), 11-31. doi:10.107/S02722631060690049

Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (1995). Foreign accent, comprehensibility, and Intelligibility in the speech of second language learners. *Language Learning, 45*(1), 73-97. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1995.tb00963.x

Nejjari W., Gerritsen, M., van Hout, R., and Planken, B. (2020) Where does a 'foreign' accent matter? German, Spanish and Singaporean listeners' reactions to Dutch-accented English, and standard British and American English accents. PLoS ONE 15(4), e0231089.https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0231089

Nejjari, W., Gerritsen, M., Van der Haagen, M., & Korzilius, H. (2012). Responses to Dutch-accented English. *World Englishes,* 31(2), 248-267. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-971X.2012.01754.x

Papageorgiou, S. (2005). Book review: Common european framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment: Case studies, insights from the common european framework. *Language Testing*, *22*(3), 406-411. doi:10.1177/026553220502200310

Piekkari, R., Welch, D.E., & Welch, L.S. (2015). *Language in International Business: the Multilingual Reality of Global Business Expansion.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Roessel, J., Schoel, C., Zimmermann, R., & Stahlberg, D. (2019). Shedding new light on the evaluation of accented speakers: Basic mechanisms behind nonnative listeners' evaluations of nonnative accented job candidates. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 38(1), 3-32.

Śliwa, M., & Johansson, M. (2014). How non-native English-speaking staff are evaluated in linguistically diverse organizations: A sociolinguistic perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies, 45*(9), 1133-1151. doi:10.1057/jibs.2014.21

Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation Between Social Groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations.* New York City, NY: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. (1979). An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict. In M.J. Hatch & M. Schultz (Eds.), *Organizational Identity: A Reader* (pp. 56-65). New York City, NY: Oxford University Press.

Weyant, J. M. (2007). Perspective taking as a means of reducing negative stereotyping of individuals who speak English as a second language. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37*(4), 703-716. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00181.x

Wit, B. de (2020). *Strategy: An international perspective*. 7e editie. Cengage Learning EMEA.

Appendix

A. Statement of own work

Sign this Statement of own work form and add it as the last appendix in the final version of the bachelor's thesis that is submitted as to the first supervisor.

Student name:

Student number:

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

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

Signature:

Place and date:

B. Checklist EACH (version 1.6, november 2020)

You fill in the questions by clicking on the square next to the chosen answer ☐
After clicking, a cross will appear in this square ☒

1. Is a health care institution involved in the research?
Explanation: A health care institution is involved if one of the following (A/B/C) is the case:

A. One or more employees of a health care institution is/are involved in the research as principle or in the carrying out or execution of the research.
B. The research takes place within the walls of the health care institution and should, following the nature of the research, generally not be carried out outside the institution.
C. Patients / clients of the health care institution participate in the research (in the form of treatment).

☒ No → continue with questionnaire

☐ Yes → Did a Dutch Medical Institutional Review Board (MIRB) decide that the Wet Medisch Onderzoek (Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act) is not applicable?
☐ Yes → continue with questionnaire
☒ No → This application should be reviewed by a Medical Institutional Review Board, for example, the Dutch CMO Regio Arnhem Nijmegen → end of checklist

2. Do grant providers wish the protocol to be assessed by a recognised MIRB?

☒ No → continue with questionnaire

☐ Yes → This application should be reviewed by a Medical Institutional Review Board, for example, the Dutch CMO Regio Arnhem Nijmegen → end of checklist

3. Does the research include medical-scientific research that might carry risks for the participant?

☒ No → continue with questionnaire

☐ Yes → This application should be reviewed by a Medical Institutional Review Board, for example, the Dutch CMO Regio Arnhem Nijmegen → end of checklist

Standard research method

4. Does this research fall under one of the stated standard research methods of the Faculty of Arts or the Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies?

☒ Yes → 2. Standard research into audio and audio-visual recordings of persons and 12. Standard questionnaire research → continue with questionnaire

☐ No → assessment necessary, end of checklist

Participants

5. Is the participant population a healthy one?

☒ Yes → continue with questionnaire

☐ No → assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

6. Will the research be conducted amongst minors (<16 years of age) or amongst (legally) incapable persons?

☐ Yes → assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

☒ No → continue with questionnaire

Method

7. Is a method used that makes it possible to produce a coincidental finding that the participant should be informed of?

☐ Yes → assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

☒ No → continue with questionnaire

8. Will participants undergo treatment or are they asked to perform certain behaviours that can lead to discomfort?

☐ Yes → assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

☒ No → continue with questionnaire

9. Are the estimated risks connected to the research minimal?

☐ No → assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

☒ Yes → continue with questionnaire

10. Are the participants offered a different compensation than the usual one?

☐ Yes → assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

☒ No → continue with questionnaire

11. Should deception take place, does the procedure meet the standard requirements?

☐ No → assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

☒ Yes → continue with questionnaire

12. Are the standard regulations regarding anonymity and privacy met?

☐ No → assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

☒ Yes → continue with questionnaire

Conducting the research

13. Will the research be carried out at an external location (such as a school, hospital)?

☒ No → continue with questionnaire

☐ Yes→ Do you have/will you receive written permission from this institution?

☐ No → assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

☐ Yes → continue with questionnaire

14. Is there a contact person to whom participants can turn to with questions regarding the research and are they informed of this?

☐ No → assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

☒ Yes → continue with questionnaire

15. Is it clear for participants where they can file complaints with regard to participating in the research and how these complaints will be dealt with?

☐ No→ assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

☒ Yes → continue with questionnaire

16. Are the participants free to participate in the research, and to stop at any given point, whenever and for whatever reason they should wish to do so?

☐ No→ assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

☒ Yes → continue with questionnaire

17. Before participating, are participants informed by means of an information document about the aim, nature and risks and objections of the study? (zie explanation on informed consent and sample documents).

☐ No→ assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

☐ Yes → continue with questionnaire

18. Do participants and/or their representatives sign a consent form? (zie explanation on informed consent and sample documents.

☐ No→ assessment necessary, end of checklist → go to assessment procedure

☒ Yes → checklist finished

If you want to record the results of this checklist, please save the completed file.

If you need approval from the EACH due to the requirement of a publisher or research grant provider, you will have to follow the formal assessment procedure of the EACH

C. Job applicant recording text

"It is my ambition to work as an international communication officer for an internationally operating insurance agency, which provides various forms of insurance to businesses and other organisations. I am highly motivated to make sure that all communication between the company, the subsidiaries and the clients, domestically as well as globally, runs smoothly. It

appeals to me that I often get to travel to other countries, attend meetings, and give presentations. What I like most about this job is its diversity. I believe that every workday is different from the other and that I will regularly get to meet new, interesting people, especially when traveling to other countries. Generally speaking, I really enjoy jobs in which you get to deal with many different types of people, particularly because I'm a very adaptable person, although sometimes, it can be quite demanding. There are always many deadlines that need to be met, which can be really challenging. However, I really like to be challenged since it gives me lots of satisfaction, which is in my opinion, the most essential aspect of a job. I am convinced that I am suitable for the position of international communication officer because of my experience in communication, my knowledge about insurance policies, my high degree of adaptability and my hands-on mentality. I would be honoured if you considered me for the job".

D. Instruction manual pre-test

Beste deelnemer,

Bedankt dat je mee wil doen aan ons onderzoek. Het is een onderzoek naar accenten in het Engels in een werkomgeving. Hierbij wordt gekeken of een accent invloed heeft op het aannemen van kandidaten. Dit specifieke stuk van het onderzoek is een pretest, waarbij meerdere participanten worden gevraagd om een geluidsopname op te nemen waarbij zij een stuk tekst voorlezen dat past in de context van een sollicitatiegesprek. Wij sturen deze opnames naar 20 deelnemers waaruit vervolgens 1 opname wordt gebruikt voor onze scriptie. Daarbij is het belangrijk om te weten dat je anoniem blijft!

Het opnemen:

Het opnemen moet gebeuren via een dictafoon op je mobiel. Hierbij is het belangrijk dat er een stille omgeving is waarbij er zo min mogelijk achtergrondgeluiden aanwezig zijn. De lengte van de opname zal ongeveer tussen 1 en 2 minuten moeten zitten. Het is de bedoeling dat je niet te snel praat zodat het duidelijk is wat je zegt. Mochten er woorden tussen zitten die je niet kan uitspreken, is het eventueel mogelijk deze op te zoeken via google translate. Het gaat er niet om dat je een bepaald accent opzet of dat je de woorden volledig correct uitspreekt! Het doel is vooral het accent dat je hebt in het Engels analyseren.

De opname mag je sturen naar mijn mail: tamarbilo@live.nl.

De tekst:

"It is my ambition to work as an international communication officer for an internationally operating insurance agency, which provides various forms of insurance to businesses and other organisations. I am highly motivated to make sure that all communication between the company, the subsidiaries and the clients, domestically as well as globally, runs smoothly. It appeals to me that I often get to travel to other countries, attend meetings, and give

presentations. What I like most about this job is its diversity. I believe that every workday is different from the other and that I will regularly get to meet new, interesting people, especially when traveling to other countries. Generally speaking, I really enjoy jobs in which you get to deal with many different types of people, particularly because I'm a very adaptable person, although sometimes, it can be quite demanding. There are always many deadlines that need to be met, which can be really challenging. However, I really like to be challenged since it gives me lots of satisfaction, which is in my opinion, the most essential aspect of a job. I am convinced that I am suitable for the position of international communication officer because of my experience in communication, my knowledge about insurance policies, my high degree of adaptability and my hands-on mentality. I would be honoured if you considered me for the job".

E. Questionnaire pre-test

Q1 Beste deelnemer,
Hierbij ben je uitgenodigd om deel te nemen aan een pretest voor een onderzoek naar de beoordeling van verschillende accenten. Dit onderzoek wordt gedaan door studenten aan de Radboud Universiteit die momenteel werken aan hun scriptie over het zojuist genoemde onderwerp.
Deelname aan de pretest betekent het invullen van een online enquête. De vragen in de enquête zullen gaan over vier korte opnames van verschillende sprekers. Je hoort telkens eerst een opname en vervolgens zullen aan jou enkele vragen over deze opname worden gesteld. Daarom is het belangrijk dat het geluid van het apparaat waarop je meedoet aan dit onderzoek AAN staat. Bovendien is het beste als je je in een stille omgeving bevindt. Het invullen van de enquête duurt ongeveer 10 minuten.
De resultaten van de pretest worden gebruikt voor onze scripties. Vanzelfsprekend blijven jouw antwoorden compleet anoniem en wordt er discreet met de resultaten omgegaan volgens de richtlijnen van de Radboud Universiteit.Jouw deelname aan dit onderzoek is volkomen vrijwillig. Dat betekent dat je jouw deelname op elk moment kan stopzetten tijdens het experiment. Alle data die tot dat punt verzameld is, zal dan later worden vernietigd. Voor verdere vragen over het onderzoek kun je contact opnemen met Yuri Segers (yuri.segers@student.ru.nl).
Als je de hierop volgende enquête invult, betekent dat je bevestigt dat je:
18 jaar of ouder bent
Vrijwillig deelneemt aan het onderzoek·
Akkoord gaat met de voorwaarden
Alle informatie hierboven gelezen hebt

Met vriendelijke groet,Emilija, Femke, Liina, Tamar, en Yuri

Q3 Luister alsjeblieft zorgvuldig naar de opname hieronder. Na het beluisteren zullen er vragen gesteld worden over deze spraakopname.

Q4 Hoe klinkt de spreker?

	Helemaal mee eens (1)	Eens (2)	Beetje mee eens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee oneens (5)	Oneens (6)	Helemaal mee oneens (7)
De spreker klinkt als een moedertaalspreker van het Engels (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q5 Uit welk land denk je dat de spreker komt?

_____

Q6 Hoe zou je de begrijpelijkheid van de spreker beoordelen?

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De spreker is makkelijk te begrijpen (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q7 Hoe zou je de stem van de spreker beoordelen?

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De spreker heeft een aangename stem (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
De spreker heeft een natuurlijke stem (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
De spreker heeft een luide stem (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q8 Hoe zou je de spreker beoordelen?

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De spreker klinkt energiek (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q9 Hoe zou je het tempo van de spreker beoordelen?

	Langzaam			Gemiddeld					Snel		
	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
De spreker spreekt ()											

Q10 Hoe oud denk je dat de spreker is?

- ○ 15-20 (1)
- ○ 21-25 (2)
- ○ 26-30 (3)
- ○ 31-35 (4)
- ○ 35 of ouder (5)

Q12 Hoe klinkt de spreker?

	Helemaal mee eens (1)	Eens (2)	Beetje mee eens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee oneens (5)	Oneens (6)	Helemaal mee oneens (7)
De spreker klinkt als een moedertaalspreker van het Engels (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q13 Uit welk land denk je dat de spreker komt?

_____

Q14 Hoe zou je de begrijpelijkheid van de spreker beoordelen?

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De spreker is makkelijk te begrijpen (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q15 Hoe zou je de stem van de spreker beoordelen?

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De spreker heeft een aangename stem (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
De spreker heeft een natuurlijke stem (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
De spreker heeft een luide stem (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q16 Hoe zou je de spreker beoordelen?

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De spreker klinkt energiek (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q17 Hoe zou je het tempo van de spreker beoordelen?

	Langzaam			Gemiddeld					Snel		
	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
De spreker spreekt ()											

Q18 Hoe oud denk je dat de spreker is?

- 15-20 (1)
- 21-25 (2)
- 26-30 (3)
- 31-35 (4)
- 35 of ouder (5)

Q27 Luister alsjeblieft zorgvuldig naar de opname hieronder. Na het beluisteren zullen er vragen gesteld worden over deze spraakopname.

Q28 Hoe klinkt de spreker?

	Helemaal mee eens (1)	Eens (2)	Beetje mee eens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee oneens (5)	Oneens (6)	Helemaal mee oneens (7)
De spreker heeft een sterk buitenlands accent in het Engels (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q29 Uit welk land denk je dat de spreker komt?

_____

Q30 Hoe zou je de begrijpelijkheid van de spreker beoordelen?

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De spreker is makkelijk te begrijpen (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q31 Hoe zou je de stem van de spreker beoordelen?

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De spreker heeft een aangename stem (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
De spreker heeft een natuurlijke stem (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
De spreker heeft een luide stem (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q32 Hoe zou je de spreker beoordelen?

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De spreker klinkt energiek (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q33 Hoe zou je het tempo van de spreker beoordelen?

	Langzaam / Gemiddeld / Snel 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
De spreker spreekt ()	

Q34 Hoe oud denk je dat de spreker is?

- ○ 15-20 (1)
- ○ 21-25 (2)
- ○ 26-30 (3)
- ○ 31-35 (4)
- ○ 35 of ouder (5)

Q38 Luister alsjeblieft zorgvuldig naar de opname hieronder. Na het beluisteren zullen er vragen gesteld worden over deze spraakopname.

Q39 Hoe klinkt de spreker?

	Helemaal mee eens (1)	Eens (2)	Beetje mee eens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee oneens (5)	Oneens (6)	Helemaal mee oneens (7)
De spreker heeft een sterk buitenlands accent in het Engels (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q40 Uit welk land denk je dat de spreker komt?

_____

Q41 Hoe zou je de begrijpelijkheid van de spreker beoordelen?

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De spreker is makkelijk te begrijpen (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q42 Hoe zou je de stem van de spreker beoordelen?

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De spreker heeft een aangename stem (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
De spreker heeft een natuurlijke stem (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
De spreker heeft een luide stem (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q43 Hoe zou je de spreker beoordelen?

	Helemaal mee oneens (1)	Oneens (2)	Beetje mee oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee eens (5)	Eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De spreker klinkt energiek (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q44 Hoe zou je het tempo van de spreker beoordelen?

	Langzaam / Gemiddeld / Snel 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100
De spreker spreekt ()	

Q45 Hoe oud denk je dat de spreker is?

- ○ 15-20 (1)
- ○ 21-25 (2)
- ○ 26-30 (3)
- ○ 31-35 (4)
- ○ 35 of ouder (5)

F. Results pre-test

A repeated measures analysis with British accent as the within subject factor showed no significant main effect on speaker sounds native (F (1, 22) = 1.61, p = .218). A repeated measures analysis with Dutch accent as the within subject factor showed a significant main effect on strong foreign accent (F (1, 22) = 30.953, p <.001). Speaker 2 had a stronger foreign accent (M = 6.39, SD = .94) than speaker 1 (M = 5.43, SD = .79).

A repeated measures analysis with British accent and Dutch accent as the within subject factors showed a significant main effect on perceived comprehensibility (F (3.66) = 9.68, p <.001). English speaker 1 and Dutch speaker 2 are significantly different regarding perceived comprehensibility (p = .007), where the English speaker 1 is evaluated higher on perceived comprehensibility (M = 6.22, SD = 1.04) than the Dutch speaker 2 (M = 4.78, SD = 1.51). English speaker 2 and Dutch speaker 2 are significantly different regarding perceived comprehensibility (p = .001), where the English speaker 2 is evaluated higher on perceived comprehensibility (M = 6.35, SD = .83) than the Dutch speaker 2 (M = 4.78, SD = 1.51). English speaker 2 and Dutch speaker 1 are significantly different regarding perceived comprehensibility (p = .004), where the English speaker 2 is evaluated higher on perceived comprehensibility (M = 6.35, SD = .83) than the Dutch speaker 1 (M = 5.48, SD = 1.28). No significant difference was found between both Dutch speakers (p = .621) and no significant difference was found between both English speakers (p = 1.000). Lastly, no significant difference was found between English speaker 1 and Dutch speaker 1 (p = .207).

A repeated measures analysis with British accent and Dutch accent as the within subject factors showed a significant main effect on voice pleasantness (F (3.66) = 10.96, p <.001). Dutch speaker 1 and Dutch speaker 2 were significantly different (p <.001), where Dutch speaker 1 was evaluated higher on voice pleasantness (M = 5.48, SD = .99) than Dutch speaker 2 (M = 3.87, SD = 1.42). For English speaker 1 and Dutch speaker 2 a significant difference was found (p =.008). English speaker 1 was evaluated higher on voice pleasantness (M = 5.30, SD = 1.19) than Dutch speaker 2 (M = 3.87, SD = 1.42). English speaker 2 and Dutch speaker 2 were significantly different regarding voice pleasantness (p = .003). English speaker 2 was evaluated higher on voice pleasantness (M = 5.74, SD = 1.21) than Dutch speaker 2 (M = 3.87, SD = 1.42). No significant difference was found between both English speakers (p = .808) and no significant difference was found between English speaker 1 and Dutch speaker 1 (p = 1.000). Lastly, no significant difference was found between English speaker 2 and Dutch speaker 1 (p = 1.000).

A repeated measures analysis with British accent and Dutch accent as the within subject factors showed a significant main effect on natural voice (F (3.66) = 7.54, p <.001). For English speaker 1 and Dutch speaker 2 a significant difference was found (p =.002). English speaker 1 was evaluated higher on natural voice (M = 5.61, SD = 1.34) than Dutch speaker 2 (M = 4.04, SD = 1.22). English speaker 2 and Dutch speaker 2 were significantly different regarding natural voice (p = .024). English speaker 2 was evaluated higher on natural voice (M = 5.57, SD = 1.47) than Dutch speaker 2 (M = 4.04, SD = 1.22). No significant difference was found between both

English speakers (p = 1.000) and both Dutch speakers (p = .054). Lastly, no significant difference was found between English speaker 1 and Dutch speaker 1 (p = .781). and no significant difference was found between English speaker 2 and Dutch speaker 1 (p = 1.000).

A repeated measures analysis with British accent and Dutch accent as the within subject factors showed a significant main effect on voice loudness (F (3.66) = 6.77, p <.001). English speaker 1 and Dutch speaker 1 were significantly different regarding voice loudness (p = .011). English speaker 1 was evaluated higher on voice loudness (M = 5.70, SD = .88) than Dutch speaker 1 (M = 4.83, SD = 1.07). For English speaker 1 and Dutch speaker 2 a significant difference was found (p = .004). English speaker 1 was evaluated higher on voice loudness (M = 5.70, SD = .88) than Dutch speaker 2 (M = 4.65, SD = 1.07). English speaker 2 and Dutch speaker 2 were significantly different regarding voice loudness (p = .030). English speaker 2 was evaluated higher on voice loudness (M = 5.43, SD = 1.08) than Dutch speaker 2 (M = 4.65, SD = 1.07). No significant difference was found between both English speakers (p = 1.000) and both Dutch speakers (p = 1.000). Lastly, no significant difference was found between English speaker 2 and Dutch speaker 1 (p = .270).

A repeated measures analysis with British accent and Dutch accent as the within subject factors showed a significant main effect on dynamism (F (3.66) = 12.87, p <.001). Dutch speaker 1 and Dutch speaker 2 were significantly different (p = .040), where Dutch speaker 1 was evaluated higher on dynamism (M = 4.13, SD = 1.74) than Dutch speaker 2 (M = 3.26, SD = 1.39). English speaker 1 and Dutch speaker 1 were significantly different regarding dynamism (p = .010). English speaker 1 was evaluated higher on dynamism (M = 5.48, SD = 1.08) than Dutch speaker 1 (M = 4.13, SD = 1.74). For English speaker 1 and Dutch speaker 2 a significant difference was found (p <.001). English speaker 1 was evaluated higher on dynamism (M = 5.48, SD = 1.08) than Dutch speaker 2 (M = 3.26, SD = 1.39). English speaker 2 and Dutch speaker 2 were significantly different regarding dynamism (p = .006). English speaker 2 was evaluated higher on dynamism (M = 4.91, SD = 1.62) than Dutch speaker 2 (M = 3.26, SD = 1.39). No significant difference was found between both English speakers (p = .808) and no significant difference was found between English speaker 2 and Dutch speaker 1 (p = .516).

A repeated measures analysis with British accent and Dutch accent as the within subject factors showed no significant main effect on pace (F (3.66) = 1.87, p = .143).

A repeated measures analysis with British accent and Dutch accent as the within subject factors showed a significant main effect on age (F (3.66) = 59.67, p <.001). English speaker 1 and English speaker 2 were significantly different (p = .001), where English speaker 2 was evaluated higher on age (M = 3.70, SD = 1.06) than English speaker 1 (M = 2.74, SD = .75).

English speaker 1 and Dutch speaker 1 were significantly different regarding age (p <.001). English speaker 1 was evaluated higher on age (M = 2.74, SD = .75) than Dutch speaker 1 (M = 1.74, SD = .45). For English speaker 1 and Dutch speaker 2 a significant difference was found (p <.001). English speaker 1 was evaluated higher on age (M = 2.74, SD = .75) than Dutch speaker 2 (M = 1.57, SD = .51). English speaker 2 and Dutch speaker 1 were significantly different regarding age (p <.001). English speaker 2 was evaluated higher on age M = 3.70, SD = 1.06) than Dutch speaker 1 (M = 1.74, SD = .45). English speaker 2 and Dutch speaker 2 were significantly different regarding age (p <.001). English speaker 2 was evaluated higher on age M = 3.70, SD = 1.06) than Dutch speaker 2 (M = 1.57, SD = .51). No significant difference was found between both Dutch speakers (p = .971).
These results showed that English speaker 2 and Dutch speaker 1 are most similar with only perceived comprehensibility and age differences.

4. Questionnaire experiment

Beste deelnemer,

Hierbij ben je uitgenodigd om deel te nemen aan het onderzoek naar ***de beoordeling van verschillende sollicitanten*****.** Dit onderzoek wordt gedaan door studenten aan de Radboud Universiteit van de Faculteit der Letteren die momenteel werken aan hun scriptie over het zojuist genoemde onderwerp.

Deelname aan dit onderzoek betekent dat je een online enquête zal invullen. De vragen in de enquête gaan over een korte opname van een sollicitant, die je gaat beoordelen. Daarom is het belangrijk dat je de audio kan afluisteren op het apparaat waarop je de survey invult. Het is daarbij het beste als je dit op een laptop doet met een koptelefoon of oortjes. Na de stellingen over de sollicitant wordt er gevraagd om een kort vocabulaire test te maken. Het invullen van de enquête zal ongeveer 10 minuten duren.

Daarnaast is het belangrijk om te weten dat je specifiek sollicitanten zult horen voor de positie van een International Communication Officer. Taken die bij deze functie horen zijn onder andere het coördineren van interne en externe communicatie en het behouden van internationale relaties.
De resultaten van het onderzoek worden gebruikt voor onze scriptie. Vanzelfsprekend blijven de antwoorden anoniem en er zal discreet met de resultaten worden omgegaan volgens de privacyrichtlijnen van de Radboud Universiteit.

Deelname aan dit onderzoek is volkomen vrijwillig. Dat betekent dat de deelname op elk moment kan worden stopgezet tijdens het experiment. Mocht je na het invullen van de enquête jouw deelname willen stopzetten, dan kan dit door contact met ons op te nemen. Alle data die tot dat punt verzameld zijn, zullen dan later worden vernietigd. *Als dank voor je*

deelname, maak je kans op een bol.com cadeaukaart t.w.v. € 20. Voor verdere vragen over het onderzoek kun je contact opnemen via yuri.segers@student.ru.nl
Als je de enquête invult, bevestig je dat je:
- *18 jaar of ouder bent*
- *Vrijwillig deelneemt aan het onderzoek*
- *Akkoord gaat met de voorwaarden*
- *Alle informatie hierboven gelezen hebt*

Succes met het invullen van de enquête!

Met vriendelijke groet,
Emilija, Femke, Liina, Tamar, en Yuri

Q40 Allereerst worden er enkele algemene vragen gesteld.

Q1 Wat is je leeftijd?

_____

Q2 Wat is je geslacht?

- ○ Man (1)
- ○ Vrouw (2)
- ○ Zeg ik liever niet (3)
- ○ Anders: (4) _____

Q23 Is Nederlands je enige moedertaal?

- ○ Ja (1)
- ○ Nee (2)

Q33 Doe je een universitaire opleiding?

- ○ Ja (1)
- ○ Nee (2)

Q3 Heb je ooit een een vak gevolgd over Human Resource Management?

- ○ Ja (1)
- ○ Nee (2)

Q4 Heb je ervaring met het aannemen van personeel?

- ○ Ja (1)
- ○ Nee (2)

Q20 In hoeveel solliciatiegesprekken ben je de interviewer geweest?

_____

Q5 Heb je een sollicitatiegesprek bijgewoond als sollicitant?

- ○ Ja (1)
- ○ Nee (2)

Q21 Hoeveel solliciatiegesprekken heb je gevoerd als sollicitant?

_____

Q6 Mijn Engelse taalvaardigheid

	Zeer slecht (1)	Slecht (2)	Onvoldoende (3)	Neutraal (4)	Voldoende (5)	Goed (6)	Zeer goed (7)
Ik vind mijn Engelse schrijfvaardigheid: (1)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ik vind mijn Engelse spreekvaardigheid: (2)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ik vind mijn Engelse leesvaardigheid: (3)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ik vind mijn Engelse luistervaardigheid: (4)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q37 Je krijgt een opname te horen van een sollicitant. De rol die je nu aanneemt als respondent is die van ***interviewer in een sollicitatiegesprek***. Dit is belangrijk om te onthouden bij het invullen van de vragen. Luister alsjeblieft één keer zorgvuldig naar de opname hieronder.

Q38 Je krijgt een opname te horen van een sollicitant. De rol die je nu aanneemt als respondent is die van ***interviewer in een sollicitatiegesprek.*** Dit is belangrijk om te onthouden bij het invullen van de vragen. Luister alsjeblieft één keer zorgvuldig naar de opname hieronder.

Q7 Hoe beoordeel je de begrijpelijkheid van de kandidaat?

	Helemaal niet mee eens (1)	Niet mee eens (2)	Beetje oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee eens (5)	Mee eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Ik vind de kandidaat moeilijk te begrijpen (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ik vind de kandidaat duidelijk te begrijpen (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q8 Hoe zou je de kandidaat beoordelen?

	Helemaal niet mee eens (1)	Niet mee eens (2)	Beetje oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee eens (5)	Mee eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De kandidaat klinkt incompetent (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
De kandidaat klinkt geschoold (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
De kandidaat klinkt gezaghebbend (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
De kandidaat klinkt intelligent (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
De kandidaat klinkt ontwikkeld (5)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q9 Hoe zou je de kandidaat beoordelen?

	Helemaal niet mee eens (1)	Niet mee eens (2)	Beetje oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee eens (5)	Mee eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De kandidaat klinkt energiek (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
De kandidaat klinkt enthousiast (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
De kandidaat klinkt onzeker (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q10 Hoe zou je de kandidaat beoordelen?

	Helemaal niet mee eens (1)	Niet mee eens (2)	Beetje oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee eens (5)	Mee eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
De kandidaat klinkt aantrekkelijk (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
De kandidaat klinkt welwillend (2)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
De kandidaat klinkt zoals ik (3)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
De kandidaat klinkt onbetrouwbaar (4)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q11 Hoe zou je de kandidaat beoordelen?

	Zeer slecht (1)	Slecht (2)	Gematigd (3)	Neutraal (4)	Gemiddeld (5)	Goed (6)	Zeer goed (7)
Als ik iemand zou moeten aannemen voor de functie "International Communication Officer" dan beschouw ik deze kandidaat als: (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q12 Hoe zou je de kandidaat beoordelen?

	Helemaal niet mee eens (1)	Niet mee eens (2)	Beetje oneens (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje mee eens (5)	Mee eens (6)	Helemaal mee eens (7)
Ik zou deze kandidaat aanbevelen als "International Communication Officier" (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q13 Wat was je indruk van de kandidaat?

	Heel negatief (1)	Negatief (2)	Beetje negatief (3)	Neutraal (4)	Beetje positief (5)	Positief (6)	Heel positief (7)
Mijn algemene indruk van de kandidaat was (1)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Q17 Het volgende onderdeel van het experiment kost ongeveer 5 minuten. Bij elke vraag zul je een combinatie van letters zien. De taak is om te beslissen of deze combinatie van letters een bestaand Engels woord is of niet. Als je denkt dat het een bestaand woord is, dan mag je "ja" aanvinken in de kolom “Woord?”, en als je denkt dat het een NIET bestaand woord is, dan mag je "nee" aanvinken in de kolom. Als je zeker weet dat het woord bestaat, al ken je de precieze betekenis van het woord niet, dan mag je nog steeds met "ja" antwoorden. Maar,

als je niet zeker weet of het woord bestaat, dan is het de bedoeling om "nee" aan te vinken. In dit experiment, gebruiken we de Brits Engelse spelling in plaats van de Amerikaans Engelse spelling. Bijvoorbeeld, “realise” in plaats van “realize”; “colour” in plaats van “color”, enzovoorts. Laat dit je niet verwarren. Het doel van het experiment is niet om zulke subtiele verschillen in spelling op te merken. Er is geen tijdslimiet voor de items.

	Woord?	
	Ja (1)	Nee (2)

platery (1)	○	○
denial (2)	○	○
generic (3)	○	○
mensible (4)	○	○
scornful (5)	○	○
stoutly (6)	○	○
ablaze (7)	○	○
kermshaw (8)	○	○
moonlit (9)	○	○
lofty (10)	○	○
hurricane (11)	○	○
flaw (12)	○	○
alberation (13)	○	○
unkempt (14)	○	○
breeding (15)	○	○
festivity (16)	○	○
screech (17)	○	○
savoury (18)	○	○

plaudate (19)	○	○
shin (20)	○	○
fluid (21)	○	○

Q18 Vervolg

	Woord?	
	Ja (1)	Nee (2)

spaunch (1)	○	○
allied (2)	○	○
slain (3)	○	○
recipient (4)	○	○
exprate (5)	○	○
eloquence (6)	○	○
cleanliness (7)	○	○
dispatch (8)	○	○
rebondicate (9)	○	○
ingenious (10)	○	○
bewitch (11)	○	○
skave (12)	○	○
plaintively (13)	○	○
kilp (14)	○	○
interfate (15)	○	○
hasty (16)	○	○
lengthly (17)	○	○
fray (18)	○	○

crumper (19)	○	○
upkeep (20)	○	○
majestic (21)	○	○

Q19 Vervolg

	Woord?	
	Ja (1)	Nee (2)

magrity (1)	○	○
nourishment (2)	○	○
abergy (3)	○	○
proom (4)	○	○
turmoil (5)	○	○
carbohydrate (6)	○	○
scholar (7)	○	○
turtle (8)	○	○
fellick (9)	○	○
destription (10)	○	○
cylinder (11)	○	○
censorship (12)	○	○
celestial (13)	○	○
rascal (14)	○	○
purrage (15)	○	○
pulsh (16)	○	○
muddy (17)	○	○
quirty (18)	○	○

pudour (19)	○	○
listless (20)	○	○
wrought (21)	○	○

Q14 Dankjewel voor het meedoen aan dit onderzoek. Het doel van het onderzoek was om in kaart te brengen of het niveau van de Engelse taal van de luisteraar een invloed heeft op het beoordelen van sollicitanten die met een bepaald accent spreken. Als je kans wil maken op een bol.com bon ter waarde van 20 euro dan kun je hieronder je e-mailadres achterlaten. Als je geen interesse hebt dan kun je verder klikken en is de vragenlijst voltooid!