



Radboud Universiteit

COMMUNICATIE- EN INFORMATIEWETENSCHAPPEN

INVESTIGATING THE JUDGEMENTS OF SPANISH ACCENTS: HOW CRITICAL ARE THE DUTCH?

MS MARTE PARRA

S4249011

Globalization and multiculturalism is something the world cannot longer deny. Economies and cultures are coming closer together and that implies a fluid communication, mostly in a different language than the mother tongue. A growing number of people is therefore learning a second language (L2). Along with this learning process exist many difficulties, such as the development of a good pronunciation in order to avoid an accent. This research proposal deals with the effects of accented speech of Spanish learners of Dutch L2 on their intelligibility, accentedness and status as perceived by Dutch native speakers. An experiment is conducted to investigate these evaluations on the Spanish-accented Dutch L2 speakers with proficiency levels A1, A2, B1 and B2. Results show tendencies for correlations between intelligibility, accentedness and status judgements.

Bachelor Thesis

Mentor: K. W. M. van Krieken

Second reader: B. Hilberink

Date: 6th June 2016

Theoretical review

Born in Amsterdam, raised by Dominican parents and lived in both the Dominican Republic and The Netherlands, I can say that multiculturalism and new language acquirement is something I am familiar with. Being able to communicate in three different languages has provided me with a lot of advantages in life. It is also a gift in some way that I have been able to learn new languages with almost no accent in my foreign language speech. My mother on the other hand is an example of a Latin American woman who learned Dutch as a second language (L2) and shows a notable Spanish accent in her Dutch speech. An accent is according to Giles (1970, p. 213) “[...] a manner of pronunciation with grammatical, syntactical, morphological and lexical levels being regarded as more or less commensurate with the standard”. Additionally, Moyer (2013, p. 8) defines accent as “[...] the means by which we make ourselves understood and the yardstick by which others judge us [...]”. The judgement towards an accent in one’s speech that Moyer (2013) mentions is of great importance for the current study. As an illustration, my mother’s accented speech has made her feel insecure several times during her social and working life in The Netherlands. She has felt like there always have been people that do not take her seriously in work-related context or even doubt about her competences because of her accent and grammatical mistakes in her Dutch speech, which has led to missed opportunities. Although it is outrageous that such discrimination still takes place, it is in agreement with findings of several studies (e.g. Ryan, Carranza and Moffie, 1977; Brennan and Brennan, 1981; Bradac and Wisegarver, 1984; Hosoda, Nguyen and Stone-Romero, 2012; Mai and Hoffman, 2014). However, to be understood as a second language speaker is not the issue that causes negative judgements. Munro and Derwing (1995) support this thought in their study in which they investigated the correlation between accentedness, perceived comprehensibility and intelligibility of the L2 learners’ speech. They concluded that there was relatively little significant correlation between the non-native stimuli and intelligibility. They examined this by letting the native speakers transcript the recordings they heard. More than half of those transcriptions scored 100% on resemblance with what was said in the recordings. In other words, there is indeed a correlation between accentedness and perceived intelligibility, but accentedness does not necessarily reduce the intelligibility of L2 learners’ speech. Intelligibility is thus “[...] the extent to which the native speaker understands the intended message” (Derwing and Munro, 1997, p. 2).

Piske, MacKay and Flege (2001) state in their study, that there is a phase in the development of a second language learner’s speech in which it cannot make further progress

and its accent remains forever. Additionally, in the specific case of the speech of Spanish learners of Dutch L2, the Dutch vowels are of great importance for difficulties in the pronunciation process, because of the extension from five Spanish vowels to fifteen full vowels, and the reduced vowel schwa, in Dutch (Burgos, Jani, Cucchiarini, Van Hout and Strik, 2014b). Burgos, Cucchiarini, Van Hout and Strik (2014a) concluded that the most mistakes in the Spanish-accented Dutch speech were made with the vowel pronunciation, which also were the most persistent mistakes, as compared to consonant errors. Consequently, there are several reasons to argue the critics on accented speech as encountered by researchers (e.g. Ryan et al., 1977; Brennan & Brennan, 1981; Bradac & Wisegarver, 1984; Hosoda et al., 2012; Mai & Hoffman, 2014). First, the accentedness of a second language speaker's speech does not critically interfere with the intelligibility of the second language speaker's message (Derwing & Munro, 1997). Second, there exists a limit in the development of second language learner's speech (Piske et al., 2001). Third, there is a persistent difficulty for Spanish learners of Dutch L2 (Burgos et al., 2014a; Burgos et al., 2014b).

Several studies have investigated the complexity of an accent in L2 learners' speech and the listeners' judgements about the L2 speakers and their accent. Firstly, Brennan and Brennan (1981) studied the relationship among accentedness in English of Mexican American speakers as judged by non-linguistically trained, or naïve, listeners, both Anglo and Mexican Americans, and the evaluative judgements of these listeners towards accented speakers. They stated that the accented speakers are sufficiently intelligible, as is also concluded by Munro and Derwing (1995). Moreover, Brennan and Brennan add that even the slightest amount of accent is negatively correlated with the evaluative judgements of naïve listeners towards accented speakers. Naïve judges gave significantly lower ratings for status as the level of accentedness increased. There was no difference found in the judgements given by the listeners of the different ethnic groups, being the Anglo and Mexican Americans. This means that there is not only a strict evaluation from native listeners but also from non-native listeners.

Secondly, Hosoda et al. (2012) found in their study on the effect of Hispanic accents on employment decisions, that a Mexican-Spanish-accented job applicant was at disadvantage in comparison to an American-English-accented job applicant for a software engineering job. The Mexican-American was rated less competent and would have less chances to be promoted to a managerial position. Moreover, there were more participants that would hire a standard Anglo-American applicant than a Mexican-American applicant.

Thirdly, Ryan & Carranza (1975) and Ryan et al. (1977) found that Spanish accent features in the speaking of English are negatively stereotyped and it indicates that the greater the presence of those features, the stronger the stereotyping will be.

Problem definition and objectives

In conclusion, Spanish-accented English speech and particularly Mexican-Spanish-accented English has been frequently investigated through the years (e.g. Ryan et al., 1977; Brennan & Brennan, 1981; Derwing & Munro, 1997; Hosoda et al. 2012). Spanish-accented Dutch speech on the other hand, has been studied less (e.g. Burgos et al., 2014; Burgos, Sanders, Cucchiarini, Van Hout, Strik, 2015). Therefore, there is a lot of room for research on this topic. In the current study, the main concepts will be (1) Spanish accented speech in Dutch L2, (2) intelligibility of Spanish accented speech in Dutch L2 and (3) the by Dutch native listeners' perceived status of the Spanish learner of Dutch L2 in terms of occupation and intelligence. Consequently, the following research questions are formulated:

RQ₁: To what extent is the intelligibility of a message influenced by Spanish accented speech in Dutch L2?

RQ₂: To what extent does the proficiency level of Spanish learners of Dutch L2 have an effect on the by Dutch native listeners' perceived accentedness?

RQ₃: RQ3: To what extent does the proficiency level of Spanish-accented Dutch L2 influence the by Dutch native listeners' perceived status of the Spanish learner of Dutch L2 in terms of occupation and intelligence?

To be able to answer these questions, several facts have to be taken into account. Firstly, Ryan and Sebastian (1980) stated that when native listeners are slightly biased about the second language learners' class range, their judgement changes significantly. When accented speakers are said to belong to the middle class, the listeners produce significantly higher status ratings than when the same speakers are said to belong to the lower class. Class range has thus to be omitted to prevent biased ratings, by the non-disclosure of information about the speakers. Secondly, several studies have showed that non-linguistically trained listeners are able to give reliable judgements of the degree of accentedness (e.g. Brennan & Brennan, 1981; Derwing & Munro, 1997). To reduce bias, it can be helpful to recruit informants who are not linguistically trained, since this does not interfere with the reliability of judgements.

Thirdly, Derwing and Munro (1997) found that there was a significant correlation between familiarity with, among others, a Spanish accent and the intelligibility scores. To reduce this bias, it is favourable to gather participants that do not have knowledge of the Spanish language or by any means are familiar with the Spanish language.

Method

Material

The independent variable in this experiment was the language proficiency of Spanish learners of Dutch L2. Eight recordings from the Spanish L1 Dutch L2 corpus analysed in Burgos et al. (2014) and transcribed in Burgos et al. (2015) were used. The speakers in Burgos et al. (2014, 2015) consist of twenty-eight adult Spanish learners of Dutch from Spain and various Latin American countries of which nine males and nineteen females. They had been living in The Netherlands for an average of 4.82 years in the range of one month to twenty years during the Burgos et al. investigation. All Spanish participants had taken Dutch courses at some point during their stay in The Netherlands. Some of them were participating in Dutch courses at Radboud in'to Languages, the language learning centre of the Radboud University (<http://www.ru.nl/radboudintolanguages>) during the recordings. Others were not participating in Dutch courses at the time of the recordings, however they reported being exposed to Dutch and using it daily. The language proficiency level of the Spanish speakers of Dutch L2 varied from A1 to B2 rated according to the CEFR Self-Assessment Grid (Burgos et al., 2014). For each proficiency level a male's and a female's recordings were used.

Two new recordings were also used. These were recorded for this particular experiment. They belong to two Dutch native speakers of which one male and one female. These recordings were used as the control group during the experiment. The Dutch native speakers are teachers of Dutch second language and work at the Radboud in'to Languages, the language centre of the Radboud University. These Dutch teachers speak General Civilized Dutch (ABN), which is "[...] the Dutch standard language that is widely used in the public domain, i.e. in all major public sectors, including management, administration, justice, education and the media." (Taalunie, n.d.).

All the speakers read the script in the following Figure 1.

Speech stimuli(text): prompt id="357" text=" (62 woorden)
Het wordt druk op de arbeidsmarkt.
Een op de tien jongeren zit nu al werkloos thuis, blijkt uit de laatste cijfers van het Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek.
Ook onder mensen van dertig jaar en ouder en onder vijftigplussers wordt de werkloosheid een steeds groter

probleem.
Tegelijkertijd moeten mensen die nu rustig thuis zitten en helemaal geen werk zoeken, de arbeidsmarkt op.

Participants

A total of 316 participants took part in this experiment of which 49,4% male and 50,6% female in a range from 17 to 76 years. The nationality varied between the Dutch (77,4%) and the Belgian (0,6%). The most frequent completed education was the secondary school (49,1%), following vocational school (17,7%) and University (17,4%). Moreover, from the survey appeared that 54,1% had no knowledge of the Spanish language and 45,9% had some knowledge of the Spanish language in a range from bad (17,4%) to excellent (1,3%). Also, 41,8% said to know someone who speaks Spanish-accented Dutch.

The χ^2 -test between the Proficiency Level and Gender showed a non-significant association ($\chi^2(9) = 10.23, p = .332$), which means the distribution of gender was homogeneous.

Research Design

This experiment conducted a 5x3 design and a between subject design. The 5x3 design refers to the four levels of proficiency of the Spanish speakers of Dutch L2 (A1, A2, B1, B2) and one control group, being the Dutch native speakers. Every condition was then exposed to the three dependent variables, accentedness, intelligibility and status. Furthermore, a between subject design was conducted, because every participant was assigned to one condition only. Each participant heard one out of the ten recordings (eight Spanish learners of Dutch L2 and two Dutch natives) and rated the dependent variables explained in the Instruments' section.

Instruments

The dependent variables in this experiment were accentedness, intelligibility and status. The tool to undertake the experiment was Qualtrics Research Suite survey software, an online survey tool (<https://www.qualtrics.com/>). To investigate the dependent variables, 7-point Likert scales were used based on several researches (Ryan & Carranza, 1975; Brennan & Brennan, 1981; Munro & Derwing, 1995). To measure Accentedness, a four itemed 7-point Likert scale was used. The reliability of the Proficiency level regarding the Accentedness consisting of four items was good: $\alpha = .93$. To measure Intelligibility, a three itemed 7-point Likert scale was used. The reliability of the Proficiency level regarding the Intelligibility

consisting of three items was good: $\alpha = .86$. To measure Status, a four itemed 7-point Likert scale was used. The reliability of the Proficiency level regarding the Status consisting of four items was good: $\alpha = .89$.

To gather general information about the participants, questions were asked concerning gender, age, nationality, mother tongue, last completed education, foreign languages spoken including self-assessment of proficiency level and whether the participant knows a Spanish-accented Dutch speaker. The conducted survey is enclosed in Annex 1.

Procedure

To maintain control of the recruitment of the participants, they were approached personally, instead of crowd sourcing on for example social media, as was done in Burgos et al. (2015). Nevertheless, the surveys were completed anonymously. The survey began with an introduction for the participant. This introduction stated the university and education the researchers were studying, the procedure of the survey, the time it would take to complete the survey and a thank you note for the participation. The participants were advised to complete the survey on a computer or laptop due to the enclosed recording, which could not be opened on for example a Smartphone. The survey was then completed individually. Few participants had issues concerning the recording. Most of them did not fully understand the fact that it had to be done on a computer or laptop. The average time it took to complete the survey was five minutes.

Statistical tests

To answer the research questions, several one-way-ANOVA's were applied to compare the dependent variables with the independent variable. Furthermore, several bivariate correlation tests were applied to investigate the correlation between the dependent variables.

Results

This section states the results that were found based on the quantitative investigation. On the basis of these results, the research questions will be answered.

A Pearson's r correlation test for the Accentedness relative to the Intelligibility showed a significant, positive correlation ($r(316) = .65, p < .001$). This means that a strong accent reduces the intelligibility.

A Pearson's r correlation test for the Intelligibility relative to the Status showed a significant, positive correlation ($r(316) = .52, p < .001$). This means that a better intelligibility increases the positive status' judgements.

A Pearson's r correlation test for the Accentedness relative to the Status showed a significant, positive correlation ($r(316) = .57, p < .001$). This means that a strong accent reduces the positive status' judgements.

In Table 1 the means and standard deviations of the dependent variable Intelligibility are demonstrated. With these results the first research question can be answered.

RQ1: To what extent is the intelligibility of a message influenced by Spanish accented speech in Dutch L2?

Table 1. The proficiency level of Spanish learners of Dutch L2 and its effect on their intelligibility (1 = negative; 7 = positive)

Proficiency level	Intelligibility	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
A1		
Woman	2.31	0.83
Man	3.06	1.49
A2		
Woman	3.59	1.26
Man	2.87	1.28
B1		
Woman	4.12	1.52
Man	5.42	1.30
B2		
Woman	3.05	1.10
Man	4.63	1.40
Native		
Woman	6.08	0.80
Man	5.91	0.99

From a one-way analysis of variance between the proficiency level of Spanish learners of Dutch L2 and the Intelligibility there has been found a significant difference ($F(9, 306) = 39.34, p < .001$).

Bonferroni post-hoc comparisons ($p < .050$) showed various significant differences concerning the intelligibility between the proficiency levels.

The A1-Woman's intelligibility ($M = 2.31, SD = 0.83$) was significantly lower than the intelligibility of the A2-Woman ($M = 3.59, SD = 1.26$) with $p = .002$, B1-Woman ($M = 4.12, SD = 1.52$) with $p < .001$, B1-Man ($M = 5.42, SD = 1.30$) with $p < .001$ and B2-Man ($M = 4.63, SD = 1.40$) with $p < .001$.

The A1-Man's intelligibility ($M = 3.06, SD = 1.49$) was significantly lower than the intelligibility of the B1-Woman ($M = 4.12, SD = 1.52$) with $p = .024$, B1-Man ($M = 5.42, SD = 1.30$) with $p < .001$ and B2-Man ($M = 4.63, SD = 1.40$) with $p < .001$.

The A2-Woman's intelligibility ($M = 3.59, SD = 1.26$) was significantly higher than the intelligibility of the A1-Woman ($M = 2.31, SD = 0.83$) with $p = .002$, but significantly lower than the intelligibility of the B1-Man ($M = 5.42, SD = 1.30$) with $p < .001$ and B2-Man ($M = 4.63, SD = 1.40$) with $p = .043$.

The A2-Man's intelligibility ($M = 2.87, SD = 1.28$) was significantly lower than the intelligibility of the B1-Woman ($M = 4.12, SD = 1.52$) with $p = .003$, B1-Man ($M = 5.42, SD = 1.30$) with $p < .001$ and B2-Man ($M = 4.63, SD = 1.40$) with $p < .001$.

The B1-Woman's intelligibility ($M = 4.12, SD = 1.52$) was significantly higher than the intelligibility of the A1-Woman ($M = 2.31, SD = 0.83$) with $p < .001$, A1-Man ($M = 3.06, SD = 1.49$) with $p = .024$, A2-Man ($M = 2.87, SD = 1.28$) with $p = .003$ and B2-Woman ($M = 3.05, SD = 1.10$) with $p = .022$, but significantly lower than the intelligibility of the B1-Man ($M = 5.42, SD = 1.30$) with $p = .002$.

The B1-Man's intelligibility ($M = 5.42, SD = 1.30$) was significantly higher than the intelligibility of the A1-Woman ($M = 2.31, SD = 0.83$) with $p < .001$, A1-Man ($M = 3.06, SD = 1.49$) with $p < .001$, A2-Woman ($M = 3.59, SD = 1.26$) with $p < .001$, A2-Man ($M = 2.87, SD = 1.28$) with $p < .001$, B1-Woman ($M = 4.12, SD = 1.52$) with $p = .002$ and B2-Woman ($M = 3.05, SD = 1.10$) with $p < .001$.

The B2-Woman's intelligibility ($M = 3.05, SD = 1.10$) was significantly lower than the B1-Woman ($M = 4.12, SD = 1.52$) with $p = .022$, B1-Man ($M = 5.42, SD = 1.30$) with $p < .001$ and B2-Man ($M = 4.63, SD = 1.40$) with $p < .001$.

The B2-Man's intelligibility ($M = 4.63$, $SD = 1.40$) was significantly higher than the intelligibility of the A1-Woman ($M = 2.31$, $SD = 0.83$) with $p < .001$, A1-Man ($M = 3.06$, $SD = 1.49$) with $p < .001$, A2-Woman ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 1.26$) with $p = .043$, A2-Man ($M = 2.87$, $SD = 1.28$) with $p < .001$ and B2-Woman ($M = 3.05$, $SD = 1.10$) with $p < .001$.

The Native speakers, both the woman ($M = 6.08$, $SD = 0.80$) and the man ($M = 5.91$, $SD = 0.99$) have a significantly higher rating in intelligibility than all the other proficiency levels ($p < .05$), but do not have a significant difference in intelligibility in comparison to the B1-Man's intelligibility ($M = 5.42$, $SD = 1.30$) with $p > .05$.

In Table 2 the means and standard deviations of the dependent variable Accentedness are demonstrated. The second research question can be answered in accordance with these results.

RQ2: To what extent does the proficiency level of Spanish learners of Dutch L2 have an effect on the by Dutch native listeners' perceived accentedness?

Table 2. The proficiency level of Spanish learners of Dutch L2 and its effect on the by Dutch native listeners perceived accentedness (1 = negative, thus higher accentedness; 7 = positive, thus lower accentedness).

Accentedness		
Proficiency level	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
A1		
Woman	1.62	0.55
Man	1.95	1.06
A2		
Woman	1.93	0.76
Man	2.16	1.25
B1		
Woman	2.21	0.69
Man	2.78	0.97
B2		
Woman	2.05	0.90
Man	2.59	1.09
Native		
Woman	6.13	1.23
Man	5.98	1.22

From a one-way analysis of variance between the proficiency level of Spanish learners of Dutch L2 and the perceived Accentedness there has been found a significant difference of $F(9, 306) = 92.23, p < .001$.

Bonferroni post-hoc comparisons ($p < .050$) showed significant differences concerning the perceived Accentedness.

The A1-Woman's accent ($M = 1.62, SD = 0.55$) was rated significantly higher than the accent from the B1-Man ($M = 2.78, SD = 0.97$) with $p < .001$ and B2-Man ($M = 2.59, SD = 1.09$) with $p = .008$. Also, the native Dutch speakers, both the woman ($M = 6.13, SD = 1.23$) and the man ($M = 5.98, SD = 1.22$), were rated significantly lower on accent than all the other proficiency levels ($p < .05$). The non-significant values were higher than $p > .051$.

In Table 3 the means and standard deviations of the dependent variable Status are demonstrated. The third research question can be answered in accordance with these results.

RQ3: To what extent does the proficiency level of Spanish-accented Dutch L2 influence the by Dutch native listeners' perceived status of the Spanish learner of Dutch L2 in terms of occupation and intelligence?

Table 3. The proficiency level of Spanish learners of Dutch L2 and its effect on the by Dutch native listeners perceived status (1 = negative; 7 = positive).

Proficiency level	Status	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
A1		
Woman	3.81	0.91
Man	3.72	1.03
A2		
Woman	3.98	0.74
Man	3.49	0.95
B1		
Woman	4.05	0.80
Man	4.01	0.72
B2		
Woman	3.77	0.70

Man	3.94	0.82
Native		
Woman	5.19	0.56
Man	5.05	0.96

From a one-way analysis of variance between the proficiency level of Spanish learners of Dutch L2 and the perceived Status there has been found a significant difference of $F(9, 306) = 15.10, p < .001$.

Bonferroni post-hoc comparisons ($p < .050$) showed significant differences. Only the native Dutch speakers, both the woman ($M = 5.19, SD = 0.56$) and the man ($M = 5.05, SD = 0.96$) showed a significant higher status in comparison with the other proficiency levels ($p < .05$). For the non-significant values, it can be stated that the p 's > 0.36 .

Conclusion

The first research question was about the extent to which Dutch native listeners would be influenced in their judgement by a Spanish accent in the Dutch speech in terms of intelligibility. In general, the results show a tendency for the increment of intelligibility as the proficiency level increases. This is in agreement with Munro and Derwing's study (1995) where they state that regardless the accentedness, the L2 speaker's intelligibility is not critically interfered with. Although low scores were given to the speakers of A1 and A2 proficiency levels, not one result shows extreme unintelligibility. Nevertheless, one exception

is of importance in these results. The male with a B1 proficiency level has a higher score than expected, such that there is no significant difference between him and the native speakers. A reason for this result could be that the speakers rated themselves according to the CEFR Self-Assessment Grid (Burgos et al., 2014). This could mean that this man estimated himself to have a much lower proficiency level than he actually has. In future research, an official rating of proficiency level, such as the TOEFL for English (ETS.org, n.d.) or the D.E.L.E for Spanish (DELE.org, n.d.), should be conducted to acquire more reliable ratings.

The second research question was about the extent to which Dutch native listeners perceive the accentedness of a Dutch L2 speaker. A tendency for the decrease of accentedness as the proficiency level increases can be concluded. Nonetheless, the male and female with a B1 proficiency level got higher ratings than the male and female with the B2 proficiency level. This result can also be caused by the conduction of self-assessment of the proficiency level. A limitation for these results is the fact that it can not be assumed whether Piske et al. (2001) and Burgos et al. (2014) were right about the development and thus the decrease of the accent, because a comparison with the C1 and C2 proficiency levels, the ones that come closest to the native speech, could not be made. Future research should include these proficiency levels to be able to draw more general conclusions.

The third research question was about the extent to which Dutch native listeners were influenced in their judgement about the status of the Spanish-accented Dutch L2 speakers in terms of intelligence and occupation. The only significant difference in the results of this variable was that both native speakers were thought to be higher educated and have a higher job perspective than the Dutch L2 speakers. It can thus be concluded that whether you have a high or low proficiency level in a second language, the judgements about one's status will only be significantly higher if one speaks with no accent and thus has a native-like speech. This is in line with Brennan and Brennan (1981) where is stated that even the smallest traces of an accent can negatively affect one's judgement. Also Hosoda et al. (2012) and Ryan et al. (1977) emphasize this negative effect regarding job application and stereotyping. However, no general statement can be made about the accentedness because of the absence of the C1 and C2 proficiency levels.

An important limitation for this study was the length of the experiment, due to time constraints. In future research, there should be more time available to be able to conduct

transcriptions of for example recordings of L2 speakers, to have a better view of the perceived intelligibility by the native speakers, as was done in Munro and Derwing's study (1995).

Subsequently, an interesting investigation should be taken into account in future research, if more time is available. Mai and Hoffman (2014) studied the effects of an accent in second language speech in business related context. They suggested a model, the Accents-in-Business-Communication (ABC) model, to explain the negative, but also the positive outcomes of listeners' judgements with the receiver as most important person. They state that they (2014, pg. 139) "[...] adopt this angle because it is primarily the receiver's expectations and perceptions of accent that are responsible for its impact on business-related outcomes and not the accent itself." This study can be of interest for a more thorough investigation of the effects of accented speech in business contexts such as the study of Hosoda et al. (2012).

In general, a great amount of similarities with earlier research has been found in this study. It can carefully be stated that discrimination of the unknown is still present in these modern times and as this study proves, it is particularly present among the Dutch. In this investigation, the only control group was that of two native speakers who also were Dutch teachers. Future research could have more control groups to compare with. In the Netherlands for example, there are a lot of different accents in different counties. It would be interesting to see how the native Dutch speakers react to those accents in comparison to a Spanish accent and to a completely accent-less speaker.

References

- Bradac, J. J., & Wisegarver, R. (1984). Ascribed status, lexical diversity, and accent: Determinants of perceived status, solidarity, and control of speech style. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 3(4), 239 – 255.
- Brennan, E. & Brennan, J. (1981). Accent scaling and language attitudes: Reactions to Mexican American English speech. *Language and Speech*, 24 (3), 207 – 221.
- Burgos, P., M., Cucchiarini, C. Van Hout, R. & Strik, H. (2013) Phonology acquisition in Spanish learners of Dutch: error patterns in pronunciation. *Elsevier Language Sciences*, 129 – 142.
- Burgos, P., Jani, M., Cucchiarini, C. Van Hout, R. & Strik, H. (2014). Dutch vowel production by Spanish learners: duration and spectral features. *Proceedings of Interspeech, Singapore*, 529 – 533.
- Burgos, P., Sanders, E., Cucchiarini, C., Van Hout & R., Strik, H. (2015). Auris populi: crowdsourced native transcriptions of Dutch vowels spoken by adult Spanish learners. *Proceedings of Interspeech, Dresden*, 2819 – 2823.
- DELE Diplomas of Spanish as a Foreign Language. (n.d.). Internet Education Services S.L. Retrieved on 25-05-2016 from <http://www.dele.org/>.
- Derwing, T.M. & Munro, M.J. (1997). Accent, Intelligibility and Comprehensibility. Evidence from four L1s. *SSLA, Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 1 – 16.
- Giles, H. (1970). Evaluative reactions to accents. *Educational review*, 22, 211 – 227.
- Hosoda, M., Nguyen, L.T. & Stone-Romero, E.F. (2012). "The effect of Hispanic accents on employment decisions", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(4), 347 – 364
- Mai, R., & Hoffmann, S. (2014). Accents in Business Communication: An integrative model and propositions for future research. *Journal of consumer psychology*, 24(1), 137 – 158.
- Moyer, A. (2013). *Foreign accent. The phenomenon of non-native speech*. Cambridge University Press.
- Munro, M.J. & Derwing, T.M. (1995). Foreign accent, comprehensibility and intelligibility in the speech of second language learners. *Language Learning*, 45, 73 – 97.
- Piske, T., McKay, I. R. A. & Flege, J. E. (2001). Factors affecting degree of foreign accent in an L2: A review. *Journal of Phonetics*, 29, 191 – 215.
- Ryan, E.B. & Carranza, M.A. (1975). Evaluative reactions of adolescents toward speakers of standard English and Mexican American accented English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31, 855 – 863.

Ryan, E.B., Carranza, M.A. & Moffie, R.W. (1977). Reactions toward varying degrees of accentedness in the speech of Spanish-English bilinguals. *Language and Speech*, 20 (3), 267 – 273.

Ryan, E.B. & Sebastian, R.J. (1980). The effects of speech style and social class on social judgements of speakers. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 19, 229 – 233.

Standaardtaal. (n.d.). Nederlandse Taalunie. Retrieved on 5-05-2016, from <http://taaladvies.net/taal/advies/term/113>

The TOEFL Test. (n.d.). Educational Testing Service. Retrieved on 25-05-2016 from <https://www.ets.org/toefl>.

Annex 1:

Q1 Beste deelnemer, Voor onze bachelorscriptie voor de studie Communicatie- en Informatiewetenschappen aan de Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen voeren wij een onderzoek uit. Wij willen u vragen deel te nemen aan dit onderzoek door deze vragenlijst in te vullen. Het invullen van de vragenlijst zal 5 tot 10 minuten in beslag nemen. Tijdens het eerste deel beluistert u een fragment waarover een aantal vragen gesteld zullen worden. In het tweede deel zullen er vragen gesteld worden over uw achtergrond. Ga bij het beantwoorden van de vragen af op uw eerste ingeving; er zijn geen foute antwoorden mogelijk. Uw antwoorden zullen zorgvuldig worden geanalyseerd en niet worden gebruikt voor andere doeleinden dan dit onderzoek. Bij voorbaat dank voor het invullen!

Q2 U bent een...

- ☐ man (1)
- ☐ vrouw (2)

Q3 Wat is uw leeftijd?

Q4 Wat is uw nationaliteit?

Q5 Wat is uw moedertaal?

Q6 Wat is uw hoogst afgeronde opleiding?

- ☐ Basisonderwijs (1)
- ☐ Middelbaar onderwijs (2)
- ☐ MBO (3)
- ☐ HBO (4)
- ☐ WO (5)

Q7 In het volgende deel van de vragenlijst krijgt u een fragment te horen. Wij vragen u om zorgvuldig te luisteren naar het fragment.

Q23 Luister naar het volgende fragment:

Q8 Nu volgt een aantal stellingen over de spreker die u net hebt gehoord. U kunt telkens aangeven in hoeverre u het oneens of eens bent met de stelling door op het bolletje van uw keuze te klikken.

Q9 Ik vind de spreker verstaanbaar.

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

Q10 Ik heb moeite de spreker te verstaan.

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

Q11 Ik zou precies op kunnen schrijven wat de spreker heeft gezegd.

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

Q12 De spreker heeft...

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)
een slechte uitspraak:een goede uitspraak (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
een sterk buitenlands accent:geen buitenlands accent (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Nederlands niet als moedertaal:Nederlands wel als moedertaal (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
geen vloeiend Nederlandse uitspraak:een vloeiend Nederlandse uitspraak (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q13 De spreker komt op mij over als...

	1 (1)	2 (2)	3 (3)	4 (4)	5 (5)	6 (6)	7 (7)
laagopgeleid:hoogopgeleid (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
niet intelligent:intelligent (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
onsuccesvol:succesvol (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
arm:rijk (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
onvriendelijk:vriendelijk (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
onaardig:aardig (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
slecht van aard:goed van aard (7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
onbetrouwbaar:betrouwbaar (8)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
onbehulpzaam:behulpzaam (9)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
gierig:gul (10)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q14 De spreker lijkt me lui.

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

Q15 De spreker lijkt me gezellig.

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

Q16 De spreker lijkt me gedreven.

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

Q17 De spreker lijkt me saai.

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

Q18 Ten slotte willen wij u vragen enkele vragen te beantwoorden over uw talenkennis.

Q19 Ik beheers de volgende talen:

	Niet (1)	Slecht (2)	Enigzins (3)	Voldoende (4)	Redelijk goed (5)	Goed (6)	Uitstekend (7)
Engels (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Spaans (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Duits (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Frans (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Italiaans (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Portugees (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q21 Kent u mensen die Nederlands spreken met een Spaans accent?

- ☐ Ja (1)
- ☐ Nee (2)