




**The effects of non-native accents on hireability: A comparison of German-
accented English, Spanish-accented English and American English in job
interviews**

Author:

Nieke de Nijs



Supervisor:

Dr. Berna Hendriks
Radboud University
Nijmegen

Abstract

The relevance of high English proficiency has grown with the increase of English as a lingua franca. Accents are often seen as cues of lack of language proficiency, which then influences other judgments, such as status, solidarity, and dynamism. The big question is whether these negative evaluations influence the hireability of a non-native accented candidate. The purpose of this present study is to examine the effects of German-accented English and Spanish-accented English on hireability of job candidates in contrast to American English amongst Dutch listeners. A verbal-guise experiment with six speakers and 116 respondents showed that the German-accented speakers were evaluated significantly lower than the American-accented speakers on status, dynamism, and hireability and lower than the Spanish-accented speaker on dynamism. The fact that significant differences were found between the German and American speakers, or even German and Spanish speakers, but none were found between the Spanish and American speakers, indicate that accent-biases are more complex than just native vs non-native. It is important to become aware of such differences. When such subconscious preferences are known, it might be possible to consciously take the accent variable out of the decision for the best candidate.

Introduction

English is not the language with the most native speakers. In fact, it is not even second. English is the third most spoken language by native speakers (Lane, 2018). Yet it seems as if English is the go-to language to communicate with individuals of a different linguistic background everywhere. However, most spoken English is not at native level. The native speakers of English are outnumbered by non-native speakers at a ratio of one to three (Crystal, 2003). English is the go-to language because it is globally accepted as the lingua franca (ELF) of business, travel and international relations. Jenkins (2009, p. 143) defined ELF as “English as it is used as a contact language among speakers from different first

languages". It can be expected that this ratio will only continue to grow due to the active presence of English-speaking cultures in the global environment (Svartvik & Leech, 2013). Crystal (2003, p. 140) even went as far as to say: 'that English, in some shape or form, will find itself in the service of the world community for ever'. Since there are so many non-native speakers of English, it is important to discover the effect of non-native accents in the professional environment.

The rise of globalisation has caused businesses to partake in the international market. This usually affects the internal and external environments. Companies often enforce corporate language policies to maintain control and efficiency within multilingual workplaces (Angouri, 2013). English is usually chosen as the corporate language by default (Piekkari, Vaara, Tienari, & Säntti, 2005). Growth of English as a lingua franca in the business context has been proven in many countries, for example in Russia (Gritsenko & Laletina, 2016), Finland (Charles & Marschan-Piekkari, 2002), Germany (Ehrenreich, 2010), Malaysia (Nair-Venugopal, 2000), Spain (Jurado-Bravo, 2018), and the Netherlands (Gerritsen & Nickerson, 2009, p. 187).

Because of the global acceptance of English as a lingua franca, employees with English language knowledge are in high demand (Fabo, Beblavý, & Lenaerts, 2017). However as mentioned before, only a small number of the English-speaking population has a native accent. Even though there are now more non-native speakers than there are native speakers, accents are often seen as cues of lack of language proficiency regardless of the actual competence of a speaker (Lindemann, 2002). This perceived language incompetence has several side effects. For example, it influences the personality judgments, compliance-gaining, social decision-making, and behavioural reactions towards accented speakers (Giles & Billings, 2004).

The elements that affect the evaluations of non-native speakers have been divided into three judgment-clusters: status (e.g. confidence & ambition), solidarity (e.g. friendly & ambitious), and dynamism (e.g. active & lively) (Giles & Billings, 2004). Fuertes, Gottdiener, Martin, Gilbert, & Giles (2012) performed a meta-analysis of 20 independent studies to research the differences in evaluations of standard and non-standard accents, which included non-native accents, but was also extended to national dialects (E.g. Welsh English). The evaluations were based on the previously mentioned judgment-clusters. They found large effect sizes indicating that speakers with standard accents are rated more positively than speakers with non-standard accents. This result was found for status ($d = 0.99$), solidarity ($d = 0.52$), and dynamism ($d = 0.86$). Additionally, Fuertes et al. (2012) found that American English was rated higher than British English when compared to non-standard accents. This is because American English has become the new measure of nativeness, as it is more present in popular media (Piekkari, Welch, & Welch, 2014).

Śliwa & Johansson (2014) found that the negative self-evaluations of the non-native speakers influenced the status and dynamism, as the speakers would not place themselves in positions that could strengthen their perceived status and dynamism. The perceived dynamism was shown to have a direct negative correlation with the listener's evaluation of the speaker's professional competence. The evaluation by the listener of status of the speaker appeared contradictory. The evaluation of a Greek English speaker was influenced negatively because of the accent, whereas for a German-accented English speaker the accent was considered an indication of seriousness and intellectual gravity. This indicates there is not only a difference between native and non-native accents, but also between different non-native languages.

The effect of accents on evaluations has previously been researched in numerous contexts and languages. Contexts include the evaluation of lecturers (Hendriks, Van Meurs, & Reimer, 2018); service employees (Rao Hill & Tombs, 2011; Rao Hill & Tombs, 2014);

foreign-accented commercials (Hendriks, van Meurs, & van der Meij, 2015); student comprehension (Hassan & Manap, 2014); compliance-gaining (Kristiansen & Giles, 1992); multilingual EMI programmes (Baker & Huttner, 2018); and telephone sales (Nejjari, Gerritsen, Van der Haagen, & Korzilius, 2012).

The question is whether negative evaluations also influence the hireability of a non-native accented candidate. The effect of accents on hireability has been studied for several languages. Many found significant results, favouring native accents. For example, French English, Colombian English (Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010), Mexican-Spanish English (Hosoda, Nguyen, & Stone-Romero, 2012), Spanish English, Asian English, African American English (Carlson & McHenry, 2011), and Chinese English (Hosoda & Stone-Romero, 2010) were all rated less positively than American English. However, there were also studies that did not find significant results. Including Dutch-accented English and Chinese-accented English in comparison to Australian English (Singer & Eder, 1989), Chinese-accented English in comparison to Standard American (Cargile, 2000), and French-accented English in comparison to American English (Hosoda & Stone-Romero, 2010)

A meta-analysis with 460 experiments found a significant large effect between attraction and both actual similarity and perceived similarity (Montoya, Horton, & Kirchner, 2008). This effect was specifically found in short-interactions, as would be the situation in job interviews. Similarity on demographic, personality, and race between rater-applicant were found to have an important influence on the evaluation of competence, job suitability, overall interview assessments, and final hiring decision (Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010; Goldberg, 2005; Sears & Rowe, 2010). Individuals are able to infer race from speech pattern alone (Massey & Lundy, 2001). This means that accents indicating similar race to the one of the decision maker are likely to be evaluated better than individuals with dissimilar accents. This is in line with the similarity-attraction theory. Accents could also cause social categorization.

The accent might trigger stereotypical thoughts and biases linked to the detected race amongst the interviewers as detected in the Śliwa & Johansson (2014) study for the Greek and German speaker.

There are contradictory findings on the effects of non-native accents compared to native accents. There are also multiple languages that remain unstudied. The present study intends to research the gap of the effects of German accented English and Spanish accented English on hireability in contrast to American English amongst Dutch listeners. Dutch listeners were chosen since the Netherlands has shown a consistent and increasing use of ELF in business (Gerritsen & Nickerson, 2009, p. 187). German-accented English can be expected to be rated more positively according to similarity-attraction theory as German and Dutch are both Germanic languages. As mentioned before, similarity between rater-applicant were found to have a positive effect on evaluations (Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010; Goldberg, 2005; Sears & Rowe, 2010). Due to the close geographical proximity from Germany and the Netherlands, the Dutch listeners are also ought to be more familiar with the German accent than the Spanish accent. By experimenting with both Spanish-accented and German-accented English, it is possible to test the effect of similarity and familiarity on evaluations. Familiarity has been found to positively influence the evaluation of the speaker (Nejjari, et al., 2012). However, another study found no significant results on the evaluation (Huang, 2013). Previous research has also indicated that amongst non-native English accents, Germanic accents tend to be valued more highly than accents from economically less developed regions (Coupland & Bishop, 2007; Śliwa & Johansson, 2014). However, all previous mentioned studies have focused on native listeners. The difference in evaluations of non-native accents varying in familiarity and similarity by non-native listeners remain unknown. The research question of this present study was formulated as follows: *To what extent is there a difference between the evaluation of German accented English speakers and Spanish accented English*

speakers when compared to a native American English speaker in job interviews as evaluated by Dutch listeners?

The negative correlations found by Śliwa & Johansson (2014) between evaluations and accents were not based on perceived comprehension. Meaning that even though the spoken English was understandable, he or she was still evaluated as inferior. However, other studies did in fact find perceived comprehension to influence the evaluations of a speaker (Carlson & McHenry, 2006; Derwing & Munro, 1997).

It is important to become aware of evaluation differences towards non-native accentedness, as a more qualified candidate might be rejected because of them. Awareness has been discovered as a tool to reduce discrimination (Sahraie, Weiskrantz, & Barbur, 1997). Awareness is especially important for individuals in hiring positions. When, for example, HR personnel know about their subconscious preference, they might be able to consciously take the accent variable out of their decision for the best candidate. This will lead to the improvement of business operations.

Methodology

Material

The independent variable of this study was the accentedness of the speaker. The variable was divided in three conditions: German-accented English, Spanish-accented English, and American-accented English. The verbal-guise structure was used during recording, meaning different speakers read the same text. To exclude any gender biases, all interviewees were female. In total nine different audio fragments were recorded. Three for every condition. The objective was to decide upon two equally accented speakers for each condition to minimize the risk of noise regarding a speaker. All speakers were recorded in the same studio with an equal audio level using the Adobe audio program. They all read out the same text in which a job applicant introduces herself (Appendix A).

A pre-test was conducted to find the most compatible speakers for each independent variable. Language experts from the Radboud University language department were asked to identify the origin of the speaker and to evaluate the accents strength, voice pitch, speed of speaking, and perceived comprehension on a 7-point scale. Based on the evaluation of six experts, the final speakers were selected. For the speakers selected, the mean scores were as follows: accent strength of the non-native speakers ($M = 5.15$, $SD = 0.72$); accent strength of the native speakers ($M = 1.83$, $SD = 0.47$); voice pitch ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.55$); speed of speaking ($M = 4.86$, $SD = 0.49$); perceived comprehension ($M = 6.36$, $SD = 0.41$). The country of origin was selected correctly by 72% on average.

Several one-way ANOVAs were conducted with accent condition as the factor. There was no significant difference between the accent conditions on pitch ($F(2, 3) = 2.76$, $p = .209$), speed of speaking ($F(2, 3) = 1.42$, $p = .369$), perceived comprehension ($F(2, 3) = 1.02$, $p = .459$), and correct origin ($F(2, 3) = 3.50$, $p = .164$). An independent t-test was conducted with accent strength as the dependent variable between the Spanish and German conditions. No significant differences were found ($t(1.344) = .34$, $p = .780$).

Subjects

There were 116 Dutch respondents to the questionnaire in total. The age ranged between 18 and 71 ($M = 35$, $SD = 14.79$). Gender was divided as following: 69% female and 31% male. The highest completed education ranged from high school to WO master. HBO was the most reported education (34.5%). The decision to include all demographics was made to form generalizable results. However, results did show that mostly students participated. The respondents were not very experienced in conducting job interviews ($M = 3.23$, $SD = 2.15$), but were experienced in being interviewed for a job ($M = 5.17$, $SD = 1.64$).

The respondents rated their own native accent in English on average as 3.42 ($SD = 1.72$) and indicated to sound more American English than British English when speaking

English ($M = 4.68$, $SD = 1.85$). The participants scored on average 79% on the included LexTale test ($M = 79.08$, $SD = 12.92$). This is just above B2 CEFR (Lemhöfer & Broersma, 2012). The participants had a moderate attitude regarding the importance of speaking with a native English accent when speaking English ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.55$), liking of non-native accents ($M = 3.55$, $SD = 1.27$), and the preference of American English above British English ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.87$).

Separate Chi-Square tests to validate equal distribution of the participants in accent conditions showed no significant differences for gender ($X^2(2) = .051$, $p = .975$) and education ($X^2(10) = 11.46$, $p = .323$). Additionally, no significant results were found in several one-way ANOVAs with accent condition as factor and job interview experience (conducting interviews, $F(2, 113) < 1$; being interviewed, $F(2, 112) < 1$), Lextale score ($F(2, 113) = 1.08$, $p = .130$), self-assessed accent severity ($F(2, 113) = 1.08$, $p = .344$), and attitude towards accents (importance of native accent, $F(2, 113) < 1$; liking of foreign accents, $F(2, 113) = 1.13$, $p = .328$; preference of American or British English, $F(2, 113) < 1$).

The only significant difference that was found was in a one-way ANOVA with accent condition as factor and age as dependent variable ($F(2, 113) = 4.77$, $p = .010$). Respondents in the Spanish accent condition ($M = 39.56$, $SD = 14.99$) were significantly older than the ones in the German condition ($p = .009$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 29.41$, $SD = 12.29$). There were no significant differences in age between the American ($M = 36.09$, $SD = 15.34$) speakers and the Spanish ($p = .861$) and German ($p = .119$) speakers.

Design

The study had a one-factorial between-subjects design, meaning that one respondent was only exposed to one condition of the independent variable (German-accented English, Spanish-accented English, or American English). The participants that listened to the

American English recording functioned as a control group to evaluate the effect of the non-native accents. According to Fuertes et al. (2012), American English has been found to be rated higher against non-standard accents than Received Pronunciation English.

Instruments

The questionnaire was based on three judgment clusters: status, solidarity, and dynamism (based on Fuertes et al, 2012; Giles & Billings, 2004; Śliwa & Johansson, 2014). These functioned as the main dependent variables of the research, including one additional variable to indicate the hiring success of the speaker. All questions were 7-point Likert scales. All were anchored by completely disagree (1) to completely agree (7). The anchor contraction effect states that participants tend to respond more extremely on a Likert scale, when being questioned in their second language (de Langhe, Puntoni, Fernandes, & van Osselaer, 2011). To exclude this effect, the questionnaire was formulated in the native language of the respondents (Dutch). The entire questionnaire is in Appendix B.

The questionnaire started with the measurement of the dependent variables. All measurements started with the statement “The speaker sounds” and continued with four characteristics per judgement cluster to measure the dependent variables. Status was measured with four items, “intelligent”, “ambitious”, “confident”, and “competent” ($\alpha = .85$). Solidarity was also measured with 4 items, “trustworthy”, “benevolent”, “similar to me”, & “attractivene” ($\alpha = .73$). Dynamism was measured through “active”, “lively”, “talkative”, & “enthousiastic” ($\alpha = .94$) (Śliwa & Johansson, 2014).

Hireability of the speaker was measured with three items, beginning with “suitable for the position”, followed by “I would hire the speaker for the position” and “I would recommend the speaker for the position” ($\alpha = .94$). The perceived comprehensibility was tested with one item, namely “I found the speaker easy to understand”.

After the main variables were measured, the background variables were tested. Familiarity was measured with two items: “I am familiar with the English accent of the speaker” and “I am known with the English accent of the speaker” ($\alpha = .86$). Voice pleasantness was measured with three items: “The speaking pace of the speaker was pleasant”, “The intonation of the speaker was pleasant”, and “The voice of the speaker was pleasant” ($\alpha = .79$). The manipulation check was conducted. The recognisability of operation was measured. The accent strength was measured with two items, “The speaker has a strong foreign accent when she speaks English” and “The speaker sounds like a native speaker of English”. The second statement was reverse coded and in doing so an acceptable alpha was achieved ($\alpha = .84$). Another check to identify the recognisability of operation was a question with a drop-down menu to select the perceived origin of the speaker.

The questionnaire continued with the demographics of the participants. The age, gender, profession, and highest completed education level were measured with one item each. Followed by two questions evaluating the participants experience in job interviews, “I am experienced in conducting job interviews” and “I am experienced in being interviewed for a job”. The self-assessed accent is measured in two ways, “I sound like a native speaker of English when I speak English” and “When I speak English, my accent sounds more American than British”. The questionnaire continued with a Lextale test consisting of 63 words from which the respondents had to indicate if it was an actual English word or not. The scores of the participants were transformed into another variable displaying the percentage of correct answers. The Lextale test has been found to be a substantial measure of English proficiency and showed superior to self-ratings (Lemhöfer & Broersma, 2012). The questionnaire measured two items testing the respondents’ attitude towards accents, “I find it important that a speaker of English sounds like a native speaker of English” and “I like English with a foreign accent in general”. The second statement was reversed coded. The Cronbach alpha for

these two items ($\alpha = .592$) was not acceptable and thus they will be evaluated separately. The questionnaire concluded with “I prefer American English over British English”.

Procedure

The experiment was conducted as an online questionnaire in Qualtrics. The respondents were mostly invited to participate per social media (Appendix C). Participation was voluntary and processed anonymously. Participants were only explained that the study was about the evaluation of a job interview participant and were provided with a consent form previous to the questionnaire.

Statistical treatment

Multiple statistical tests were used for the analysis of the results. The one-way ANOVA was most used as most variables were measured with scales. Additionally, several Chi-square analyses were conducted to verify equal distribution of the respondents and for the analysis of the identifiability of accents. During the manipulation check, several independent t-tests were used to evaluate the differences between the two speakers for all accent conditions. The Pearson’s correlation coefficient was also used to find correlation between variables. This was done to get insights into the potential relevance of the background variables.

Results

Manipulation check

Accent strength. A one-way ANOVA was conducted with accent strength as the dependent variable and accent condition as the factor showed significant results ($F(2, 113) = 69.92, p < .001$). The American speakers ($M = 4.69, SD = 1.88$) were evaluated to have a significantly lower accent strength than German ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 5.69, SD = 1.27$) and Spanish speakers ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 5.82, SD = 1.06$). The Spanish and German speakers were evaluated to have an equal accent strength ($p = 1$;

Bonferroni correction). This means that the desired effect will be measured, namely the comparison of a native speaker to a moderately accented non-native speaker.

Identifiability of accents. The identifiability of the accents was evaluated in two manners. The first one was the strict way, accepting only the exact correct country of origin and a more lenient manner accepting other countries with the same native language. With the strict manner, 48.3% of the respondents selected the correct origin. A Chi-square test showed a significant relation between accent condition and the strict manner ($X^2(2) = 6.85, p = .033$). The Bonferroni test was conducted to locate the significant difference. Participants who had listened to the German speakers gave relatively more correct answers (59.5%) compared to participants who had listened to fragments by Spanish speakers (30.6%). The differences between the American speakers (53.5%) and the non-native speakers were not significant.

The more lenient manner evaluated 55.2% of the answers correct. Another Chi-square test did not show significant relation between accent condition and the lenient manner ($X^2(2) = 3.94, p = .140$). Meaning, there was no significant difference in the amount of identifications of the American speakers (62.8%), German speakers (59.5%), and Spanish speakers (41.7%).

In total 13.8% of the respondents thought the speaker they were listening to was Dutch. This was 18.6% of the respondents in the American-accented condition, 16.2% of the respondents in the German-accented English condition, and 5.6% of the respondents in the Spanish-accented English condition.

Table 1. Means, standard deviations (in brackets) and n for the accent strength of the three accent conditions (1 = low evaluation, 7 = high evaluation). The percentage of participants who correctly answered the origin of the speaker in the strict and more lenient manner.

	German	Spanish	American
	$n = 37$	$n = 36$	$n = 43$

Accent strength	5.68 (1.27)	5.82 (1.06)	2.87 (1.41)
Identifiability strict	59.5%	53.5%	30.6%
Identifiability lenient	62.8%	59.5%	41.7%

Speakers. Several separate independent samples t-tests were performed to detect potential differences in evaluations between the two speakers for each accent. At an overall level, no significant differences were found between speaker one and speaker two on perceived comprehension ($t(112.96) = .43, p = .669$), status ($t(107.28) = .45, p = .651$), solidarity ($t(113.51) = .61, p = .542$), dynamism ($t(107.34) = .167, p = .098$), hiring success ($t(114) = .40, p = .693$), accent strength ($t(113.77) = 1.57, p = .120$), familiarity ($t(111.93) = 1.26, p = .212$), voice pleasantness ($t(112.19) = .35, p = .727$), and perceived accentedness ($t(113.77) = 1.57, p = .120$).

However, at an individual level, some significant differences were found. The two German speakers were rated significantly different on status ($t(32.85) = 2.75, p = .010$), solidarity ($t(34.96) = 2.09, p = .044$), dynamism ($t(30.61) = 2.92, p = .007$), perceived comprehension ($t(34.93) = 2.25, p < .001$) and voice pleasantness ($t(33.86) = 5.77, p < .001$). Speaker two (status, $M = 5.32, SD = 0.77$; solidarity, $M = 4.88, SD = 0.88$; dynamism, $M = 4.65, SD = 1.46$; perceived comprehension, $M = 6.00, SD = 1.32$; voice pleasantness, $M = 5.18, SD = 0.75$) was rated higher in all mentioned cases than speaker one (status, $M = 4.43, SD = 1.20$; solidarity, $M = 4.24, SD = 1.00$; dynamism, $M = 3.36, SD = 1.17$; perceived comprehension, $M = 4.05, SD = 1.64$; voice pleasantness, $M = 3.45, SD = 1.07$).

The Spanish speakers were rated significantly different on familiarity ($t(33.69) = 2.25, p = .031$). Speaker one ($M = 4.66, SD = 1.38$) was evaluated greater than speaker two ($M = 3.55, SD = 1.57$). The American speakers were rated significantly different on voice pleasantness ($t(31.76) = 2.78, p = .009$). Speaker one ($M = 5.73, SD = 0.88$) was evaluated significantly better than speaker two ($M = 4.67, SD = 1.52$). Table 2 shows the mean, standard deviation and count of the two speakers per accent conditions.

The lower evaluation of the German speaker one and the small differences for the speaker one and two of American English and Spanish-accented English may influence the results. Alternative testing to account for the individual differences is beyond the scope of this present study, as there were no significant differences found at general level.

Table 2. Means, standard deviations (in brackets) and *n* for the two different speakers of the three accent conditions (1 = low evaluation, 7 = high evaluation).

	German		Spanish		American	
	One <i>n</i> = 20 <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Two <i>n</i> = 17 <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	One <i>n</i> = 16 <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Two <i>n</i> = 20 <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	One <i>n</i> = 22 <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Two <i>n</i> = 21 <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
Perceived comprehension	4.05 (1.64)	6.00 (1.32)	5.56 (1.09)	4.80 (1.36)	6.45 (0.80)	5.76 (1.41)
Status	4.43 (1.20)	5.32 (0.77)	5.45 (1.03)	5.05 (1.25)	5.82 (0.92)	5.60 (0.59)
Solidarity	4.24 (1.00)	4.88 (0.88)	5.02 (0.84)	4.58 (1.01)	4.83 (1.05)	4.92 (0.96)
Dynamism	3.36 (1.17)	4.65 (1.46)	5.16 (1.27)	4.94 (1.27)	5.57 (1.33)	5.71 (0.69)
Hireability	3.95 (0.93)	4.69 (1.22)	4.75 (1.16)	4.15 (1.45)	5.15 (1.32)	4.78 (1.04)
Accent strength	5.50 (1.40)	5.91 (1.09)	5.72 (0.89)	5.90 (1.20)	2.48 (1.10)	3.29 (1.61)
Familiarity	4.65 (1.35)	5.12 (1.14)	4.66 (1.38)	3.55 (1.57)	5.86 (1.20)	5.62 (1.30)
Voice pleasantness	3.45 (1.07)	5.18 (0.75)	4.92 (1.15)	4.63 (1.23)	5.73 (0.88)	4.67 (1.52)
Perceived accentedness	5.50 (1.40)	5.91 (1.09)	5.72 (0.89)	5.90 (1.20)	2.48 (1.10)	3.29 (1.61)

Dependent variables

The dependent variables of this study: perceived comprehension, status, solidarity, dynamism, and hireability, were tested with separate one-way ANOVAs with accent condition as the factor. Table 3 provides the means and standard deviations of the evaluations for the different conditions. Solidarity was the only dependent variable that did not show significant results in a one-way ANOVA with accent condition as factor ($F(2, 113) = 1.22, p = .298$).

Perceived comprehension. A one-way ANOVA was carried out with perceived comprehension as the dependent variable and language condition as the factor. Significant differences were found ($F(2, 113) = 7.83, p = .001$). The Spanish speakers ($M = 5.14, SD =$

1.29) were rated significantly lower than the American English speakers ($p = .009$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 6.12$, $SD = 1.18$). The German-accented English speakers ($M = 4.95$, $SD = 1.78$) were also rated significantly lower than the American English speakers ($p = .001$, Bonferroni correction). The Spanish and German speakers were not significantly different ($p = 1$, Bonferroni correction).

Status. The one-way ANOVA with status as the dependent variable and accent condition as the factor showed significant results ($F(2, 113) = 7.40$, $p = .001$). The German speakers ($M = 4.84$, $SD = 1.16$) were evaluated significantly more negative than the American speakers ($p = .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 5.71$, $SD = 0.78$). The effect size was large ($d = 0.88$). There were no significant differences between the Spanish speakers ($M = 5.03$, $SD = 1.26$) and the American speakers ($p = .116$, Bonferroni correction) and between the Spanish speaker and the German speakers ($p = .307$, Bonferroni correction).

Dynamism. Another one-way ANOVA was executed with dynamism as the dependent variable and condition as the factor. Significant differences were found ($F(2, 113) = 18.20$, $p < .001$). The German speakers ($M = 3.95$, $SD = 1.45$) were evaluated significantly more negatively than the Spanish speakers ($p = .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 5.03$, $SD = 1.06$) and the American speakers ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 5.64$, $SD = 1.06$). The difference between the German speakers and the Spanish speakers ($d = 0.85$) was large, as was the difference between the German and American speakers ($d = 1.33$). The difference in means between the American and Spanish speakers was not significant ($p = 1$, Bonferroni correction).

Hireability. The one-way ANOVA with hireability as the dependent variable and accent condition as the factor was significant as well ($F(2, 113) = 3.56$, $p = .032$). Again, the German speakers ($M = 4.29$, $SD = 1.12$) were evaluated significantly worse than the American speakers ($p = .043$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.97$, $SD = 1.19$). The effect size

was moderate ($d = 0.59$). There was no significant difference between the American speakers and the Spanish speakers ($p = .143$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.42$, $SD = 1.34$), nor between the Spanish and German speaker ($p = 1$, Bonferroni correction).

Table 3 Means, standard deviations (in brackets) and n for the main variables in the three accent conditions (1 = low evaluation, 7 = high evaluation).

	German	Spanish	American
	$n = 37$	$n = 36$	$n = 43$
	$M (SD)$	$M (SD)$	$M (SD)$
Perceived comprehension	4.95 (1.78)	5.14 (1.29)	6.12 (1.18)
Solidarity	4.53 (0.99)	4.77 (0.95)	4.87 (1.00)
Status	4.84 (1.16)	5.03 (1.26)	5.71 (0.78)
Dynamism	3.95 (1.45)	5.03 (1.26)	5.64 (1.06)
Hireability	4.29 (1.12)	4.42 (1.34)	4.97 (1.19)

Background variables

Familiarity with the accent and voice pleasantness were measured as background variables. Table 4 shows the mean and standard deviations of these background variables amongst the accent conditions.

A one-way ANOVA with accent condition as the factor and familiarity as the dependent variable showed significant differences ($F(2, 113) = 15.49$, $p < .001$). The familiarity with the accents was highest for American English ($M = 5.74$, $SD = 1.24$), compared to German-accented English ($p = .014$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.86$, $SD = 1.26$) and Spanish-accented English ($p < .001$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.04$, $SD = 1.57$). Respondents were also significantly more familiar with German-accented English than Spanish-accented English ($p = .033$, Bonferroni correction).

Another one-way ANOVA with condition as factor and voice pleasantness as dependent variable showed significant results ($F(2, 113) = 5.75$, $p = .004$). The American speakers ($M = 4.24$, $SD = 1.27$) were rated significantly more pleasant to listen to than the

German speakers ($p = .003$, Bonferroni correction; $M = 4.24$, $SD = 1.27$). There were no significant differences between the Spanish speakers ($M = 4.76$, $SD = 1.19$) and the American ($p = .359$, Bonferroni correction) and German speakers ($p = .256$, Bonferroni correction).

Table 4 Means, standard deviations (in brackets) and n for the background variables in the three accent conditions (1 = low evaluation, 7 = high evaluation).

	German	Spanish	American
	$n = 37$	$n = 36$	$n = 43$
	$M (SD)$	$M (SD)$	$M (SD)$
Familiarity	4.86 (1.26)	4.04 (1.57)	5.74 (1.24)
Voice pleasantness	4.24 (1.27)	4.76 (1.19)	5.21 (1.34)

Correlations

Significant positive correlations were found for perceived comprehension, familiarity, voice pleasantness, and liking of accents. Significant positive correlations were found between perceived comprehension and status ($r = .487$, $p < .001$), solidarity ($r = .348$, $p < .001$), dynamism ($r = .328$, $p < .001$), and hireability ($r = .391$, $p < .001$). Another significant positive correlation was found between familiarity and status ($r = .381$, $p < .001$), solidarity ($r = .312$, $p = .001$), dynamism ($r = .239$, $p = .010$), and hireability ($r = .338$, $p < .001$). A significant positive correlation was found between voice pleasantness and status ($r = .449$, $p < .001$), solidarity ($r = .454$, $p < .001$), dynamism ($r = .468$, $p < .001$), and hireability ($r = .475$, $p < .001$). There was also a negative correlation found. This is the one between the liking of accents and dynamism ($r = -.24$, $p = .009$). To conclude, this means that respondents with a high-perceived comprehension, familiarity, or voice pleasantness rating also rated status, solidarity, dynamism, and hireability highly. But respondents, who like accents in general, evaluated the dynamism of the speakers lower.

Conclusion & Discussion

The purpose of this present study was to research the gap of the effects of German-accented English and Spanish-accented English on hireability in contrast to American English amongst Dutch listeners. To provide in-depth insights into the reason for potential differences in hireability, three judgment-clusters affecting the evaluation of non-native speakers, status, solidarity, and dynamism, were measured. In compliance with previous research, our findings indicate differences in evaluations of the speakers on status, dynamism, and hireability in favour of the native speakers compared to the non-native speakers (Giles & Billings, 2004; Fuertes et al., 2012; Śliwa & Johansson, 2014). This might be due to that the native speakers were rated significantly more comprehensible than the non-native speakers. Some studies have previously found perceived comprehension as an important factor in the evaluation of speakers (Carlson & McHenry, 2006; Derwing & Munro, 1997).

The German speakers were evaluated significantly worse than the American speakers on status. This effect had a large size. This could be due to the lower evaluation of the German speakers on perceived comprehension and voice pleasantness. The German accent was rated significantly lower on voice pleasantness than the American accent. Previous research has found that qualities of the voice can affect perceptions of leadership (Klofstad, Anderson, & Peters, 2012). Leadership is an important element of the status cluster and thus this could have negatively influenced the evaluation of the German speakers.

The German speakers were also evaluated significantly lower than the American speakers during the measurement of dynamism. The German speakers were evaluated significantly lower than both the American and Spanish speakers. The effect size was large. Śliwa & Johansson (2014) previously found that accents in the workplace decreased the rating of dynamism. This was due to that the speech was less fluid. This could be the same reason that the current study found significant differences between native and non-native speakers. The less fluid speech of the German speakers could have caused the impression of a less

active and lively personality. However, the Spanish speakers did not suffer from this effect. A potential reason for this could be that Hispanic culture have a very passionate, loud, and energetic image (Croom, 2014). This could have counterbalanced the potential non-native effect.

No significant differences were found for the solidarity judgment cluster. Previous research has also indicated a lesser or even non-existing effect of decrease in evaluation on solidarity (Fuertes et al., 2012; Śliwa & Johansson, 2014). Solidarity has been found to increase by in-group cohesion (Marlow & Giles, 2008). The respondents assessed their own English as moderately accented, which is similar to the accent of the speakers. This could explain why the solidarity was evaluated the same for the native and non-native speakers. Another explanation could be that in social context accents are often found more appealing when talking about casual topics in informal settings (Ryan, 1979). The setting of the present study was of course not casual. However, most participants were still students and not experienced in conducting job interviews. This could have caused the lack of differences found in this judgment cluster.

The lower status and dynamism evaluation could explain the significantly lower score of the German speakers on hireability compared to the American speaker. However, this effect was less defined as it was at a moderate level. Previous research already indicated that accents are seen as lacking the competence or effort to speak standard language and therefore are discriminated against on competence and hirability ratings (Rakić, Steffens & Mummendey, 2011). The results of this present study concur with these findings. Links between non-nativeness and poor status, dynamism were found. The results also showed that non-native candidates were evaluated as less fit for a position than native speakers, while they had the same qualifications.

The fact that significant differences were found between the German and American speakers, or even German and Spanish speakers, but none are found between the Spanish and American speakers, indicate that accent-biases are more complex than just native vs. non-native. The findings of this present study are contradicting to the previous research. The German accent was expected to be rated more positively according to the similarity-attraction theory (Turban & Jones as cited in Deprez-Sims & Morris, 2010). The German accent was evaluated significantly more familiar than the Spanish accent. Nejari et al. (2012) has previously found familiarity with an accent as a cause of decrease in evaluations by native listeners. They suggest that this might be due to familiarity indicating more contact with one another and may evoke some negative feelings towards the other group. This could also explain why, even though American speakers were rated higher on familiarity, they were still evaluated better. American language is more known through pop culture than through personal contact (Piekkari, Welch, & Welch, 2014).

However, the overall lower evaluation of the German speakers could also have occurred due to the multiple significant differences found between the two German speakers. One of the German speakers was evaluated significantly lower on status, solidarity, dynamism, perceived comprehension, and voice pleasantness. Despite that a pre-test was carried out these differences still occurred and future research should be carried out to find if the results of this present study are influenced by this limitation.

The difference between the two German speakers was an unexpected limitation that occurred. As were the single differences found in the American condition regarding voice pleasantness and in the Spanish conditions regarding familiarity. Although the latter two do not appear to have influenced the main results of the experiment. Another potential limitation could be that the recognition of the origin of the speakers was just 55.2%. The accents were mistaken for Dutch by 13.8% of the respondents. This could make the study about Dutch

listeners evaluating Dutch-accented English speakers, rather than about Dutch listeners evaluating native or foreign-accented English. Both the similarity of the speakers and the recognition of the origin of the speakers were tested in the pre-test. No significant difference or concerns regarding the recognition were detected during this phase.

The respondents were not very familiar with conducting job interviews. This could be a limitation as they might not have been able to identify themselves in the role and thus were not able to make a professional evaluation. Further research amongst actual recruiting professionals could clarify if this difference in experience was substantial enough to influence the results of this present study. For now, recruiting professionals could use the findings of this present study in the evaluation of interviews with non-native candidates for a position. English has been proven as an important lingua franca in the business environment. Because of this it is important to be aware of the biases that exist towards speakers with a non-native accent.

This present study contributes to the research area of the evaluations of non-native speakers in that it shows differences even between two separate non-native accents. Furthermore, this could be a starting point to further study whether they also occur in different contexts than job interviews and amongst other language combinations. Other nationalities for speakers and listeners should be experimented with to determine the reason for the differences found between two separate non-native accents. Future research is also recommended to focus on improving the present study with speaker recordings that do not appear significantly different from one another within one condition. As previously mentioned, it is also recommended for research to focus on actual recruitment professionals to find if the effect still appears in expertise evaluations.

References

- Baker, W., & Huttner, J. (2018). "We are not the language police": Comparing multilingual EMI programmes in Europe and Asia. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics (united Kingdom)*, (2018). doi:10.1111/ijal.12246
- Cargile, A. (2000). Evaluations of employment suitability: Does accent always matter? *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 37(3), 165-177. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1920.2000.tb00483.x
- Carlson, H., & McHenry, M. (2006). Effect of accent and dialect on employability. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 43(2), 70-83. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1920.2006.tb00008.x
- Charles, M., & Marschan-Piekkari, R. (2002). Language training for enhanced horizontal communication: A challenge for MNCs. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 65(2), 9-29. doi:10.1177/108056990206500202
- Coupland, N., & Bishop, H. (2007). Ideologised values for British accents. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(1), 74-93. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9841.2007.00311.x
- Croom, A. (2014). Spanish slurs and stereotypes for mexican-americans in the usa: A context-sensitive account of derogation and appropriation. *Pragmática Sociocultural / Sociocultural Pragmatics*, 8(2). doi:10.1515/soprag-2014-0007
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Derwing, T., & Munro, M. (1997). Accent, intelligibility, and comprehensibility: Evidence from four l1s. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 1-16. doi:10.1017/S0272263197001010
- de Langhe, B., Puntoni, S., Fernandes, D., & van Osselaer, S. (2011). The anchor contraction effect in international marketing research. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 48(2), 366-380. doi:10.1017/S0272263197001010

- Deprez-Sims, A., & Morris, S. (2010). Accents in the workplace: Their effects during a job interview. *International Journal of Psychology : Journal International De Psychologie*, 45(6), 417-26. doi:10.1080/00207594.2010.499950
- Ehrenreich, S. (2010). English as a business lingua franca in a German multinational corporation. *Journal of Business Communication*, 47(4), 408-431. doi:10.1177/0021943610377303
- 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/ejsp.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
- Goldberg, C. B. (2005). Relational demography and similarity-attraction in interview assessments and subsequent offer decisions: are we missing something?. *Group & Organization Management*, 30(6), 597-624. doi:10.1177/1059601104267661
- Giles, H., & Billings, A. C. (2004). Assessing language attitudes: Speaker evaluation studies. *The handbook of applied linguistics*. doi:10.1002/9780470757000.ch7
- Giles, H., & Marlow, M. L. (2011). Theorizing language attitudes existing frameworks, an integrative model, and new directions1. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 35(1), 161-197. doi:10.1080/23808985.2011.11679116
- Giles, H., Wilson, P., & Conway, A. (1981). Accent and lexical diversity as determinants of impression formation and perceived employment suitability. *Language Sciences*, 3(1), 91-103. doi:10.1016/S0388-0001(81)80015-0
- Gritsenko, E., & Laletina, A. (2016). English in the international workplace in Russia. *World Englishes*, 35(3), 440-456. doi:10.1111/weng.12211

- Hassan, H., & Manap, F. (2014). Listening to German native and non-native speakers: An evaluation of students' comprehension. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, 159-165. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.021
- Hendriks, B., Van Meurs, F., & Reimer, A. (2018). The evaluation of lecturers' nonnative-accented English: Dutch and German students' evaluations of different degrees of Dutch-accented and German-accented English of lecturers in higher education. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 34, 28-45. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2018.03.001
- Hendriks, van Meurs, & van der Meij. (2015). Does a foreign accent sell? the effect of foreign accents in radio commercials for congruent and non-congruent products. *Multilingua*, 34(1), 119-130. doi:10.1515/multi-2013-0048
- Hosoda, M., Nguyen, L., & Stone-Romero, E. (2012). The effect of Hispanic accents on employment decisions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(4), 347-364. doi:10.1108/02683941211220162
- Hosoda, M., & Stone-Romero, E. (2010). The effects of foreign accents on employment-related decisions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(2), 113-132. doi:10.1108/02683941011019339
- Huang, B. H. (2013). The effects of accent familiarity and language teaching experience on raters' judgments of non-native speech. *System*, 41(3), 770-785. doi:10.21832/j.ctt1xp3wcc.11
- Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *Englishes in Practice*, 2(3), 49-85. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9841.2003.00242.x
- Jurado-Bravo, M. (2018). Vowel quality and vowel length in English as a lingua franca in Spain. *Miscelanea*, 57, 13-34. doi:10.1080/13488678.2018.1536817

- Klofstad, C., Anderson, R., & Peters, S. (2012). Sounds like a winner: Voice pitch influences perception of leadership capacity in both men and women. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 279(1738), 2698-2704. doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.0311
- Kristiansen, T., & Giles, H. (1992). Compliance-gaining as a function of accent: Public requests in varieties of Danish. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(1), 17-35. doi:10.1111/j.1473-4192.1992.tb00021.x
- Lane, J. (2018, November 14). What are the 10 most spoken languages in the world? | Babbel Magazine. Retrieved February 24, 2019, from <https://www.babbel.com/en/magazine/the-10-most-spoken-languages-in-the-world>
- Lemhöfer, K., & Broersma, M. (2012). Introducing LexTALE: A quick and valid lexical test for advanced learners of English. *Behavior Research Methods*, 44(2), 325-343. doi:10.3758/s13428-011-0146-0
- Lindemann, S. (2002). Listening with an attitude: A model of native-speaker comprehension of non-native speakers in the united states. *Language in Society*, 31(03). doi:10.1017/S0047404502020286
- Massey, D. S., & Lundy, G. (2001). Use of Black English and racial discrimination in urban housing markets: New methods and findings. *Urban affairs review*, 36(4), 452-469.
- Nair-Venugopal, S. (2000). English, identity, and the Malaysian workplace. *World Englishes*, 19(2), 205-13. doi:10.1111/1467-971X.00169
- 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
- Piekkari, R., Welch, D., & Welch, L. S. (2014). *Language in international business: The multilingual reality of global business expansion*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Rakić, T., Steffens, M., & Mummendey, A. (2011). When it matters how you pronounce it: The influence of regional accents on job interview outcome. *British Journal of Psychology*, *102*(4), 868-883. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8295.2011.02051.x
- Rao Hill, S., & Tombs, A. (2011). The effect of accent of service employee on customer service evaluation. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, *21*(6), 649-666. doi:10.1108/09604521111185637
- Ryan, E. B. (1979). Why no low-prestige language varieties persist? In H. Giles, & R. N. St. Clair (Eds.), *Language and social psychology*, 145–157
- Sahraie, A., Weiskrantz, L., & Barbur, J. L. (1997). Awareness and confidence ratings in motion discrimination. *Perception*, *26*(1_suppl), 337-337.
- Sears, G. J., & Rowe, P. M. (2003). A personality-based similar-to-me effect in the employment interview: Conscientiousness, affect-versus competence-mediated interpretations, and the role of job relevance. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, *35*(1), 13. doi:10.1023/B:PEEV.0000032425.42878.f3
- Singer, M., & Eder, S. (1989). Effects of ethnicity, accent, and job status on selection decisions. *International Journal of Psychology: Journal International De Psychologie*, *24*(1-5), 13-34. doi:10.1080/00207594.1989.10600029
- 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
- Tombs, A., & Rao Hill, S. (2014). The effect of service employees' accent on customer reactions. *European Journal of Marketing*, *48*(11-12), 2051-2070. doi:10.1108/EJM-03-2013-0115

Appendix

Appendix A: Audio script

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

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

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

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

I guess that’s it ... that’s me.”

Appendix B: Questionnaire

Beste deelnemer,

U wordt uitgenodigd om mee te doen aan een onderzoek naar de evaluatie van verschillende sollicitanten. Dit onderzoek wordt uitgevoerd door Vera Bielefeld, Céline Thomas, Iris Faassen, Nieke de Nijs, Camila Quezada Obando en Carolijn Visscher, International Business Communication van de Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen.

Meedoen aan het onderzoek houdt in dat u een online vragenlijst gaat invullen. De vragen hebben betrekking op een korte geluidsfragment dat u evalueert aan de hand van een aantal stellingen. Daarom is het belangrijk dat het volume van uw computer of telefoon werkt. U zult ook aan een korte taalvaardigheidstoets Engels deelnemen. De uitslag hiervan vindt u aan het einde van de vragenlijst. Het invullen van de vragenlijst kost ongeveer 12 minuten.

Vertrouwelijkheid van de onderzoeksgegevens

De gegevens die we in dit onderzoek verzamelen, zullen door wetenschappers gebruikt worden voor artikelen en presentaties. Natuurlijk maken we deze gegevens volledig anoniem en bewaren we ze op beveiligde wijze volgens de richtlijnen van de Radboud Universiteit. Uitgangspunt is dat de anoniem gemaakte data tenminste 10 jaar ten behoeve van de wetenschappelijke gemeenschap opvraagbaar zijn.

Vrijwilligheid

U doet vrijwillig mee aan dit onderzoek. Daarom kunt u op elk moment tijdens het invullen van de vragenlijst uw deelname stopzetten. Alle gegevens die we bij u verzameld hebben, worden dan definitief verwijderd.

Vergoeding

Als dank voor uw medewerking, maakt u kans op een bol.com cadeaukaart t.w.v. 30 euro.

Nadere inlichtingen

Als u graag verdere informatie over het onderzoek wilt hebben, nu of in de toekomst, kunt u contact opnemen met Carolijn Visscher (e-mail: c.visscher@student.ru.nl)

TOESTEMMING:

Door te klikken op de knop met het pijltje geeft u aan dat u:

- Bovenstaande informatie heeft gelezen
- Vrijwillig meedoet aan het onderzoek
- 18 jaar of ouder bent
- Akkoord gaat met de voorwaarden

Met vriendelijke groet, Céline, Vera, Camila, Nieke, Iris en Carolijn

Block 15

Tijdens het invullen van de vragenlijst kunt u niet terug naar het geluidsfragment. Probeer daarom aandachtig te luisteren. Klik op play om het fragment te starten.

audio recording

Status

ST1 De spreker klinkt intelligent

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

ST2 De spreker klinkt ambitieus

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

ST3 De spreker klinkt zelfverzekerd

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

ST4 De spreker klinkt competent

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

Solidariteit

SO1 De spreker klinkt betrouwbaar

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

SO2 De spreker klinkt welwillend

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

SO3 De spreker lijkt op mij

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

Hireability

WS1 De spreker klinkt geschikt voor de positie

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

WS2 Ik zou de spreker aannemen voor deze positie

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

WS3 Ik zou de spreker aanbevelen voor deze positie

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

Perceived comprehension

WB1 Ik vond de spreker makkelijk te verstaan

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

Familiarity

B1 Ik ben bekend met het Engelse accent van de spreker

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

B2 Ik ben vertrouwd met het Engelse accent van de spreker

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

Voice pleasantness

SE1 De spreesnelheid van de spreker was aangenaam

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

SE2 De intonatie van de spreker was aangenaam

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

SE3 De stem van de spreker was aangenaam

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

Accent strength

AS1 De spreker had een sterk buitenlands accent in haar Engels

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

AS2 De spreker klinkt als een moedertaalspreker van het Engels

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

Recognition of origin

H1 Waar denkt u dat de spreker vandaan komt? Kies uit de lijst:

▼ Afghanistan (1) ... Zwitserland (192)

Demographics

Q1 Leeftijd

Q2 Geslacht

- Man (4)
- Vrouw (5)
- Anders (6)
-

Q3 Beroep

Q4 Hoogst afgeronde opleidingsniveau

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

Experience with job interviews

ES1 Ik heb ervaring met het afnemen van sollicitatiegesprekken

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

ES2 Ik heb ervaring met solliciteren

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

English proficiency

EK2 Ik klink als een moedertaalspreker van het Engels als ik Engels spreek

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

EK3 Als ik Engels spreek, heb ik eerder een Amerikaans Engels accent dan een Brits Engels accent

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

LEXTALE test

Deze test bestaat uit ongeveer 60 trials. U krijgt steeds een letterreeks te zien. Uw taak is het om te beslissen of dit een bestaand Engels woord is of niet. Als u denkt dat het een bestaand Engels woord is klik dan op 'ja', als u denkt dat het geen bestaand Engels woord is, klik dan op 'nee'.

Als u er zeker van bent dat het woord bestaat, ook als u niet precies weet wat het betekent, mag u toch met "ja" antwoorden. Maar als u twijfelt of het wel een bestaand woord is, kies dan "nee". In dit experiment gebruiken we de Brits Engelse spelling in plaats van de Amerikaans Engelse spelling. Bijvoorbeeld: "realise" i.p.v. "realize"; "colour" i.p.v. "color", enzovoort. Laat dit u niet in verwarring brengen. In dit experiment gaat het niet om het detecteren van dergelijke subtiele spellingsverschillen.

U heeft zoveel tijd als u wilt voor elke beslissing. Dit deel van het onderzoek duurt ongeveer 5 minuten. Aan het einde van het onderzoek krijgt u te zien wat uw score is.

	Nee (1)	Ja (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"/>

destruction (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"/>
purrage (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"/>

Attitude towards accents

MA1 Ik vind het belangrijk dat iemand die Engels spreekt klinkt als een moedertaalspreker van het Engels

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



MA2 Ik vind Engels met een buitenlands accent in het algemeen leuk

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

MA3 Ik geef de voorkeur aan Amerikaans Engels boven Brits Engels

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

Q50 Dankuwel voor het meedoen aan dit onderzoek. Wilt u kans maken op de bol.com cadeaukaart t.w.v. 30 euro? Vul dan hieronder uw emailadres in. Geen interesse? Dan kunt u gewoon verder klikken voor de resultaten van de taalvaardigheidstoets.

Appendix C: Questionnaire invite

Beste Deelnemer,

U wordt uitgenodigd om mee te doen aan een onderzoek naar de evaluatie van sollicitatiegesprekken. Dit onderzoek wordt uitgevoerd door Vera Bielefeld, Céline Thomas, Iris Faassen, Nieke de Nijs, Camila Quezada Obando en Carolijn Visscher, International Business Communication van de Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen.

Meedoen aan het onderzoek houdt in dat u een online vragenlijst gaat invullen. De vragen hebben betrekking op een korte geluidsfragment dat u evalueert aan de hand van een aantal stellingen. Daarom is het belangrijk dat het volume van uw computer of telefoon werkt. U zult ook aan een korte taalvaardigheidstoets Engels deelnemen. De uitslag hiervan vindt u aan het einde van de vragenlijst.

Het invullen van de vragenlijst kost ongeveer 12 minuten. Daarnaast maakt u door deel te nemen ook kans op een cadeaukaart van bol.com t.w.v 30 euro! Klik op de onderstaande link om te starten:

https://radboudletteren.eu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_56LtyEUshem9jVj

Appendix D: Statement of own work

Appendix A. Statement of own work

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

Student name:

Nieke de Nijs

Student number:

1025641

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

DECLARATION:

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

Signature:



Place and date:

Nijmegen 05-06-19