ASSESSING NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE ACCENTS IN THE UNITED STATES: ARE WE BIASED?

By

Aidan Sabert

Submitted to the Psychology Department
School of Natural and Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Bachelor of Arts

Purchase College
State University of New York

May 2020

Sponsor: Kaori Kubo Germano, Ph.D.

Second Reader: Krystal Perkins, Ph.D.

Abstract

Research that has investigated the perception of accented English in the United States has evidenced a stereotype being applied to people who speak English with a non-native accent. Such a stereotype is often attributed to individuals being from another country and being foreign. There is also evidence that individuals from the southern section of the United States face certain negative stereotypes because of where they are from. Such a bias against the South could include a bias against Southern accented English, which non-Southerners may perceive as being foreign, or belonging to an out-group rather than an in-group. The aim of the current study was to determine if there is a hierarchical preference to accented speech, in which more familiar native accents are preferred over unfamiliar non-native accents. Participants were presented with recordings of an individual speaking in one of three categories of accented English (non-native Hispanic, native Southern, and General American non-accented) and then asked to complete the Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1933). Results indicated that the groups with accented speech did not face greater social distance than the group without accented speech. Furthermore, non-native accents did not face greater social than native accents.

Assessing Native and Non-native Accents In The United States: Are We Biased?

Humans are very social creatures, and communication is a vital form of expression for interaction. The most primary form of communication is the use of language, which enables us to convey and exchange information, efficiently and expeditiously. Language itself can vary between particular groups or countries and can be used differently in various social and cultural contexts. The interaction within these groups of a singular language is seen as intergroup communication. Intergroup communication is the concept that interaction is shaped mainly by social membership rather than individual characteristics (Giles, 2012). Thus, distinctive characteristics of an individual can cue their identification to a certain social group. One of the most salient characteristics of an individual is their use of language. This further allows others to interpret their accent and categorize them into a particular social group.

Although accent is implicit for everyone who speaks a language, certain regions can be deemed as accentless. The Oxford English Dictionary (n.d.) defines "accent" as a way of pronouncing a language that is distinctive as it is particularly associated with one's country, area, or social class. In the United States, "accentless English" has been associated with a Midwestern dialect otherwise known as General American, or Standard American, English (Ash, Boberg & Labov, 2006) and having a high education (Kortmann & Schneider, 2004). Roughly 90 percent of all Americans do not fit this criterion; technically, the majority of Americans speak English with an accent (U.S. Census, 2011). While one's accent does not convey meaningful linguistic information, it does convey a significant amount of social information (Giles, 2012). Accent has traditionally been observed through the perspective and impressions of the listener. However, recent studies have turned the focus on the perspective of the speaker and the influence of their

accent in intergroup relations under various social settings (Alvarez, Deng, Kim, Li, & Wang, 2011). In the United States, there is a growing population of non-native English speakers, many of whom may face some social consequences of their accented English which has been previously understudied.

The Experience of Non-native English-speakers in the United States

The United States has traditionally been recognized as a haven for people from all over the world to assimilate into Western culture with the hopes of acceptance and creating new opportunities. However, although new residents may try to integrate as much as they can into their new home past culture, tradition, and identity can remain. The United States has predominantly had the term 'the melting pot' endowed upon it, deeming it a home where culture blends together. However, it has become more apparent in modern times that individuals face various forms of prejudice and stereotypes when trying to immigrate and assimilate into the United States. Public opinions of immigrants as a whole are generally seen in a negative way (Dovido & Gluszek, 2010). The largest ethnic minority in the United States today are Hispanic-Americans, who roughly consist of 17 percent of the country's population. Close to 70 percent of these individuals speak Spanish regularly at home (U.S. Census 2011), and it is not unreasonable to posit that many of these individuals likely speak English with some type of accent. In addition to this marker of immigrant status, Hispanic Americans are often attributed as being Mexican, as more than half of their population in the U.S. identify as being of Mexican heritage. Negative stigma has become increasingly salient surrounding Mexican identity in recent times. In particular, there is a commonplace belief that Mexican presence within the United States strains the country's resources for native-born Americans (Giles, 2012). Such beliefs create a general

stereotype for immigrants which is also seen as a foreigner stereotype. Immigrants as a whole are often composited into a singular category of foreigner which becomes most apparent in the evaluation of accent. Individuals are often unable to discern where a non-native accent stems from however are still able to detect the accent as foreign (Gomez, 2017). Stereotypes against an individual is problematic as a whole as it can create a very negative self-perception in addition to a negative perception of being identified with a particular group. Identification and placement of a stereotype is rooted in the evaluations of the characteristics of an individual within forms of intergroup communication.

Susceptibility to Stereotype of Accent Within the U.S.

Stereotype is inherent as accent is applied as a definitive characteristic to an individual, especially when that individual has a non-native accent (Dovido & Gluszek, 2010). Dovido and Gluszek describe a non-native accent as a noticeable characteristic that is intrinsic to a person from another country. This then further cements the concept of being a foreigner, which ultimately is distinguished as an outgroup and a minority. Individuals with non-native accents are viewed by others as less intelligent, less competent, and speaking the language poorly. This attributed on the grounds that individuals rarely are able to speak another language to perfection synonymously with their own due to accent developing naturally post-adolescence in secondary languages.

In regard to social status, non-native speakers are perceived to have lower social status, and this is especially true when their accent is more difficult to understand (Dovido & Gluszek, 2010). However, this perception has shown to only apply to those who do not have a British-English or West-European accent, as English speaking and West-European countries are

recognized as being more prestigious than other countries (Lindemann, 2005). Thus, British-English and West-European accents are perceived as being more pleasant to hear in comparison to other accents. While this contradicts previous research on the stereotype of individuals with non-native English accents, it could be implied that people who are not from the United States or Western-Europe are identified more substantially as being a foreigner. Interpretations of certain non-native accents allow the listener to categorize the speaker in accordance to a foreign outgroup. Despite this, normally the listener does not need to precisely determine the origin of an accent to make a perceived stereotype and the speaker is simply categorized as foreigner. People who have a non-native accent in general will face more problems in comparison to individuals who do not (Dovido & Gluszek, 2010). The idea of foreignness is sufficient enough to induce stereotype threat.

Stereotype threat is a negative stereotype that can be seen as a self-characteristic within one's own group. Aronson and Steele (1995) conducted a study looking at an academic stereotype of African-American. This self-confirming stereotype was believed that the African-American subjects might feel as if they are lower in intellectual ability and competence than others. In the experiment, a test was administered and was either labeled as determinant on one's intellectual ability or simply a laboratory test to evaluate if the self-fulfilling stereotype would be fulfilled. The results indicated that throughout the study when African-Americans were primed with the stereotype placed upon them implicitly or explicitly they tended to do worse than the control groups who were not primed. Implications of a specific stereotype can be evaluated with how deeply-rooted an individual identifies with their specific in-group. Individuals with heavier non-native accents may be perceived more as a foreigner than individuals with lighter accents.

Those with a heavier non-native native accent will generally face more conflicts than individuals with a lighter accent (Dovido & Gluszek, 2010). However, certain circumstances such as being from an English speaking or Western-European country can also influence an individual's perceived foreignness. Accent is seen as a characteristic that is implicit to one's identity. In addition, characterizations of individuals who are native speakers are generally more positive by both native and non-native speakers, in comparison to non-native speakers who are characterized more negatively by both groups (Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner, & Fillenbaum,1960). This suggests that non-native speech and the speakers are subjected to a self-confirming stereotype that is implicitly related to being a foreigner.

Discrimination for people with non-native accents has been most apparent in the workplace. Non-native speakers often feel that their accent serves as an obstacle to their personal and social success, thus have more negative attitudes towards speaking with an accent (Dovido & Gluszek, 2010). Those who have a non-native accent in the workplace are less likely to be hired in comparison to their native accented counterparts (Dovido & Hansen, 2016). Davila, Bohara, and Bohara (1993) found that Mexican Americans who spoke English with an accent were compensated significantly less in their wages in comparison to their non-accented counterparts. This may be due to accent discrimination being predominantly acceptable both socially and legally in the workplace. Participants in this study were also often thought to be illegal immigrants who were looking for work as this is. Furthermore, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of nationality but does not mention accent or linguistics. Essentially, this legally allows companies and enterprises to discriminate against accented individuals. Individuals with a non-native accent often face a glass ceiling effect in the

workplace as a result of this discrimination. Their accent is presumed to negatively influence intergroup communication within the workplace. Such communication in the workplace can be argued as being vital to the enterprise and success of a business. This notion stems from the idea that non-native accents are seen to speaking the language inadequately (Dovido & Gluszek, 2010). It is important to note once again, however, that accent itself is not related to language proficiency, but rather is linked simply with the way someone speaks. This means that an individual with a non-native accent can be just as proficient in the linguistics of a language as a native speaker.

The experience of discrimination among those with a non-native accent goes beyond the workplace. Previous research suggests and an American identity is more readily available to those who are of European descent rather than ethnic minorities (Devos, Huynh, & Smalarz, 2011). This illustrates that foreign individuals live in a state of a constant social outgroup. Social outgroups such as foreigners are often given negative connotations which ultimately can lead to a negative self-concept and low self-esteem (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Foreign individuals often face depressive symptoms along with how heavily their foreigner stereotype fits into their identity. Such factors are also assessed when evaluating the birthplace of the individual (Alvarez, et. al, 2011). In addition to this, non-native accent identification is attributed towards a foreigner stereotype (Dovido & Gluszek, 2010). The perpetual foreigner stereotype helps shape the idea of American identity by enabling comparison. It is not uncommon for ethnic minorities to be questioned, in a social context, about where they are ‘really from’ and their proficiency in English (Alvares et. al, 2011). Such social interactions are meant to casually and subtly marginalize minorities although the interaction itself that is thought to be benign. The issue with

such interactions is they are thought to amiably help strangers familiarize with each other. However, while in reality it inadvertently or covertly demeans a minority. Although it may be a socially normal to interact in this way, such occurrences detract minorities from the American identity and may promote a foreign stereotype. In addition to this, stereotyping can also happen in a reverse form when an individual is questioned about their proficiency of another language because of their heritage. Consequences of continuous prejudice in regard to a foreign stereotype can create an overall negative self-concept and lead to depression and other forms of mental illness (Alvares et. al, 2011).

Stereotypes Against Regional American Accents

While non-native accented speech and the implications of foreigner stereotype has been established in the research literature, to be uncovered there are minimal amounts of information on different forms of native stereotypes. More precisely, regional stereotypes within the United States that may already have a national or even international consensus. This concept is hard to define since there is such little research on differences characteristically between regional groups. However, one example of this is the idea of the American South (i.e., Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, etc.). Southern culture is very distinct as it has many cohesive aspects that have been associated with it throughout time. Its distinction from other regions of the United States can arguably be seen most apparently during the Civil War where it sought to secede from the United States to become its own nation. One defining feature that is most easily recognizable is the way that Southerners speak. Simply the use of the word “y’all” alone is a distinctive feature for an individual to make the interpretation that the person speaking is a Southerner or from the Southern part of the United States. Such ideas once again follow the principle that accent is

implicit to one's identity. This cohesive idea of a Southerner, no matter where from the southern part of the United States the individual is from, is comparable almost in the same way a foreign individual is categorized. Instead of having a distinctive background, the individual is composited into a singular category. Such dogmatism of interpreting or characterizing an individual can often lead to negative associations.

In the past. southern culture has been represented quite poorly, with individuals from "the South" categorized as dull and un- or under-educated. Clark, Eno, and Guadagno (2010), investigated the negative implications of southern identity by replicating the methodology of stereotype threat. They did this by mimicking the experiment conducted by Aronson and Steele (1995) which examined self-confirming stereotypes. However, in this study the stereotype of southerners was investigated rather than those of African Americans. Four studies in total were conducted in which participants had a Southern stereotype presented prior to taking an academic test. This Southern stereotype was presented either explicitly or implicitly with concepts such as Southerners being less intelligent and competent. Participants who had less salient identification with the southern stereotype effectively scored better on a test that was given to them. As a result, the more individuals identified as a southerner, the lower they performed. Ultimately, a southern accent can be deemed as an implicit characteristic to identity and could possibly be inferred that it has a negative influence as well.

Measuring Stereotype

The use of the Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1933) is a method that applies effectively when looking at social exclusion and stereotypes, in general. It allows investigators to examine bias directly through acceptance or rejection. What is meant by "social distance" is how

willing participants are to engage in pre-determined interactions with people of a certain characteristic. In this case, this study is looking specifically at the characteristic of accent. Examining this singular characteristic could give insight to the larger impression of the foreigner stereotype within the United States. In addition, measuring prejudice by using this scale allows for a direct reflection of participants sympathy or feelings towards others of a particular group in a numerical value. While other scales or forms of measurement may focus on implicit stereotype, this form of measurement is indirect and can be misguided. Alternatively, directly measuring stereotype straightforward and forthright using the Social Distance Scale avoids assessing from a subconscious perspective. Ultimately using a direct form of measurement allows for a less clouded interpretation of a participant's prejudice.

Current Research

The purpose of the current study was to examine the influence of accent and how it was interrelated with stereotype. In addition, the objective was to discern the extent of stereotype for both native and non-native English-speaking individuals; whether there is a disparity or possibly synonymity of discrimination between non-native and native accent groups and whether stereotype is associated with both groups. Previous research has entailed the concept that a non-native English accent is an implicit characteristic that hashes into the larger idea of a foreign stereotype. The aim of investigating a distinctive native English Southern accent is to find whether a similar stereotype is found for Southerners and to expand on the idea of a Southern stereotype. Such findings could give insight into people's perceptions of a Southern stereotype as a whole which has minimal research about it. On the opposite end of the spectrum, further investigating non-native English accent in comparison would allow to possibly expose a

hierarchy of accents as well. Furthermore, the current study would allow to speculate consequent implications of either a foreign or Southern stereotype on an individual. Thus, it is hypothesized that accented individuals as a whole will be stereotyped more than individuals who are deemed accentless. In addition to this, non-native accent will be stereotyped more so than a native accent in that immigrants and foreigners have a larger notion of intolerance by Americans.

Methods

Participants

A total of 90 participants were recruited for this study. Participants were recruited via Amazon MTurk, an increasingly popular online research platform utilized in psychological research. Of the total sample, 63.3% identified as male, and 98.9% of participants identified English as their native language. With regard to racial/ethnic identification, 81.1% of participants identified as White/Caucasian, 7.8% identified as African-American/Black, 6.7% identified as Asian, and 4.4% identified with an alternative ethnicity. Half of the sample (52.2%) had at least a Bachelors degree. Nearly a quarter of participants (24.4%) reported being from the South. Participants' parents or primary caregivers mainly identified to speak English as their native language, which was 88.9% for their maternal parent and 87.8% for their paternal parent. However, a large pool of participants noted that had parents, close friends, or family that spoke with a regional accent which was 46.7%.

Materials

Audio Stimulus. Three audio recordings were created as the independent variable for this study. Prior to beginning the survey each participant was given an exclusive audio clip with six different friendly greetings that they were required to play before beginning the survey. The

transcript of these recordings is provided in Appendix A. The audio clip was presented with an accent in accordance to the accent category that participants subsequently responded to. These accent categories were Hispanic, Southern, and General American. Voice actors were hired via the voice over service VoiceBunny. The three voice actors were recruited by all identifying as male and speaking with an accent in accordance the assigned accent category of the study. The goal of the study was never revealed to the voice actors as they were only asked to say each greeting in their accent to the best of their ability. Each audio clip was 30 seconds in length for each accent. The participant was required to initiate the audio clip by pressing a play button which also allowed participants to replay the recording.

Social Distance Scale. The Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1933) was utilized in this study to measure participants' willingness to engage in sixty different types of relationships with individuals whose accents were categorized as either General American, Hispanic, or Southern American. Such relationships varied very broadly in association and intimacy. As an example, one survey question asked was "Assuming you are single and not currently in a relationship, would you marry this person?" While another situation asked was "Would have as my regular friends?" Participants willingness to engage in these different relationships was measured on a Likert-type scale of 1 to 5 (1 = completely open to, 2 = somewhat open to, 3 = neutral to, 4 = somewhat closed to, 5 = completely closed to). The responses to these survey questions are aggregated into a mean social-distance score for each participant. Higher social-distance scores indicate a larger social distance the participants feel from the target, which in this study was accent. The full scale, as well as the unique instructions provided for each group, is provided in Appendix B.

Demographics Questionnaire. A short demographics questionnaire was created for this study to capture important demographic information about each participant such as age, ethnicity, education level, among other things. Most importantly, the demographics questionnaire required participants to provide some detail about their exposure, if any, to accented English speakers, either within their own families or through close relationships with friends or colleagues. The demographics questionnaire is provided in Appendix C.

Procedure

Participants were provided a link to the survey on Psytoolkit via Amazon Prime Turk. Prior to starting the survey each participant was required to complete the informed consent form (provided in Appendix D) with a signature. The form itself described the general concept and extent of the study. Before beginning the survey, participants were instructed to wear their headphones to adjust the volume to an adequate and comfortable level. Subsequently, each participant was given only one exclusive accent that they responded to. To operationalize each accent further, participants were instructed to play an audio clip of their correlative accent which they responded to in the Social Distance Scale survey. To properly listen to the audio clips of each recording the participants used their headphones during the survey. This survey and the demographics survey were recorded and programmed on the online program Psytoolkit. This survey was web-based and took roughly 30 minutes to complete in total. This would suggest that the participants were able to hear each audio recording adequately and were able to focus on the survey presented to them. Lastly, participants conducted the demographics survey in which they reported about their own background and additionally about close friends and family. In the last section of the demographics survey participants also answered about the noise level of which

they conducted the experiment in. All of the participants had noted at the end of the study that they successfully completed the survey in a quiet environment.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

There were three levels of the independent level, to which participants were randomly assigned (Hispanic, Southern, or General American). Regardless of group category, all participants had completed the Social Distance Scale; the mean of the SDS scores (M= 2.58, SD= 0.50) indicates that participants were overall open to engaging in different types of relationships with their target individual. Of the 90 participants included in our final analyses, 21.1% of participants were in the Hispanic Accent group (n = 19), 38.9% were in the Southern Accent group (n = 35), and 40.0% of participants were in the General American group (n = 36).

Inferential Statistics

To test the first hypothesis of the study, that accented individuals as a whole will be stereotyped more so than individuals who are deemed accentless, a one-way ANOVA was conducted with Social Distance Scores as the dependent variable and Accent categories as the independent variable with three levels Hispanic, Southern, and General American. Results from this analysis revealed that there was no statistically significant difference in SDS scores between participants in the Hispanic Accent group (M = 2.63, SD = 0.52), the Southern Accent group (M = 2.68, SD = 0.44), and the General American group (M = 2.46, SD = 0.54, $F(2,87) = 1.81$, $p = .166$, $\eta^2 = 0.04$.

To test the second hypothesis of this study, that a non-native accent will be less favorable than a native accent, an Independent Samples T-Test was conducted with mean Social Distance

Scores entered as the dependent variable and Accent categories entered as the independent variable with only two levels: Hispanic and Southern. Groups remained the same for this analysis Hispanic Accent group (M = 2.63, SD = 0.52) and the Southern Accent group (M = 2.68, SD = 0.44). Results revealed once again that there was no statistical significance between groups $t(52)$ = -0.339, p = .736, d = -0.096, 95% CI [0.463, -0.655].

Exploratory Analyses

As nearly half of participants reported knowing a close family member or friend with a regional accent the regional nativity of Southern participants reported on the demographic questionnaire was analyzed. Participants living east of New Mexico and south of Maryland were categorized as being a Southerner. In total 24.4% (n = 22) of participants were categorized as a Southerner. A 2 x 3 one-way ANOVA was conducted to analyze the interaction of Southern nativity and accent category on Social Distance Scores. Results indicated that there was no statistical significance for the interaction $F(2,84)$ = 0.393, p = .677, η^2 = 0.009. However, regional accents reported by participants was not exclusive to the South. Regional accents from other areas such as Boston, Brooklyn, and the Pacific Northwest were identified, ultimately giving an indication of other salient regional accents apart from the South.

Discussion

The objective of the current study was to evaluate different English accents and the possible stereotypes that hearing one may initiate in comparison to non-accented English. Furthermore, the subsequent goal was to assess a possible hierarchy of English accents by comparing native and non-native accents, which in this study were Southern and Hispanic. The first hypothesis was used to evaluate social distance between accented and non-accented groups.

There wasn't any statistically significant evidence for a difference in social distancing between these groups. While social distance scores did not show any statistical significance between all of the accent groups, there is an alluring trend when looking at the mean social distance scores of the groups. This is that both Hispanic and Southern categories had higher social distance scores than the General American category exposing a predisposition for accent groups to stereotype. Furthermore, when looking at the evaluation of Hispanic and Southern accent groups exclusively in comparison of social distance scores, there was no statistical significance as well. However, the trend from the native and non-native comparison is exceedingly less distinguishable than the comparison between non-accented and accented groups. Although these results can't be securely established due to lack of statistical significance, this stark contrast in trends could give insight to further implications of the methods used and differences between groups. Such findings could allude to the possibility that there is not a hierarchy in accents at all such as between native and non-native English accents but rather accented individuals are stereotyped as a whole.

Limitations

There are several differing limitations in this study that could have influenced the results. The primary limitation of this study was the research design of using a social distance scale survey as the methodical approach to measuring stereotype. Since the survey presented was completed on a self-report basis there can be complication with the internal validity. In general, self-report methods have a great risk of being susceptible to self-report bias. Self-report bias is when participants may under-report or over-exaggerate the symptoms measured in a study to minimize their predicament and maximize their social-desirability. For example, in this study participants were measured on how they might react to different social situations to later indicate

the amount of stereotype they display to researchers. If the participants were to under-report their true reactions to the situations presented, they would appear to stereotype less and thus seem more socially desirable. Furthermore, with self-report scales like the Likert scale there is a tendency for participants to respond towards the middle of the scale to seem less extreme which also is symptomatic of social desirability. When looking at the results from the current study, all of the accent categories have a mean social distance score that is considerably close to the middle of the scale.

A further limitation of the study is the sample used. Although the majority of participants were native to the United States and did not have immediate family from outside of the United States, 46.7% of participants indicated that a family member spoke with a regional accent. an influence could be indicative of mere exposure. This would imply that participants' exposure to accented English may make participants less prone to form prejudices and stereotypes to other accents they might not even be accustom to. Such an idea speaks upon mere exposure where repeated exposure to a stimulus may increase its attractiveness and how accustom the perceiver is to it (Zajonc, 1970). Possibly an accent that is distinguishable whether it is native or non-native could actually be perceived as comforting or attractive to some listeners.

Implications

Although the hypotheses could not be substantiated in the current study, there is still further grounds for investigating accent perception as it is still an apparent issue in the modern world. Accent discrimination in previous research has been argued to be a prominent issue especially when looking at non-native accents as it is strongly interrelated to foreigner stereotype (Dovido & Gluszek, 2010). In addition to this, native accent as a whole has gone unnoticed and

understudied. Native or regional stereotypes such as the South have minimal research to implore upon their population's exposure to stereotype as a whole. In addition, as a result of the exploratory analyses, participants indicated other regional accents besides that of the South. This means that there are other salient regional accents which could be studied as well. Measuring stereotype can be difficult to as there is large opposition to it in terms of social desirability and using another form of measurement in comparison to this study could speak upon possible subconscious bias as well. There is an immense number of different directions for future research to study accent as the implications of it are only scratching the surface. Continuing such research could help individuals who struggle with stereotype because of such a characteristic like accent. There have been legal cases in which individuals feel they have been rejected simply due to the way that they speak but do not have the legal grounds to state their case. Future research in this field can not only add to discovering new ideas of accent, but can also help solidify the case for those who feel maltreated because of somethings that inherently in their character.

References

Accent. (2019). *Oxford English Dictionary*. Retrieved from Oxford Reference Online database.

Alvarez, R., Deng, S., Kim, S., Li, J. & Wang, Y. (2011). Accent, perpetual foreigner stereotype, and perceived discrimination as indirect links between English proficiency and depressive symptoms in Chinese American adolescents. *Developmental Psychology. 47*. 289-301.

Aronson, J. & Steele, C. (1995). *Stereotype threat and the intellectual test-performance of African-Americans*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 69. 797-811.

Ash, S., Boberg, C., & Labov, W. (2006). *Atlas of North American English: phonetics, phonology and sound change; a multimedia reference tool*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bogardus, Emory. (1933). *A Social Distance Scale*. Sociology and Social Research. 265-271.

Clark, J., Eno, C. & Guadagno, R. (2011). Southern Discomfort: The Effects of Stereotype Threat on the Intellectual Performance of US Southerners. *Self and Identity*. 10. 248 - 262.

Davila, A. & Bohara, A. (1993). Accent Penalties and Earnings of Mexican Americans. *Social Science Quarterly*. 74.

Devos, T., Huynh, Q., & Smalarz, L. (2011). Perpetual Foreigner in One's Own Land: Potential Implications for Identity and Psychological Adjustment. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*. 30. 133-162.

Dovidio, J. & Gluszek, A. (2010). Speaking With a Nonnative Accent: Perceptions of Bias, Communication Difficulties, and Belonging in the United States. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. J LANG SOC PSYCHOL. 29. 224-234.

Dovidio, J. & Hansen, K. (2016). Social dominance orientation, nonnative accents, and hiring recommendations. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 22.*

Giles, H. (2012). *The dynamics of intergroup communication* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Lang.

Gomez, J. (2016). Stereotypes and Stigma: The Case Against Bilingual Individuals. SUNY Purchase, New York, United States.

Kortmann , B. & Schneider, E. W. (2004). *A Handbook of Varieties of English: A Multi-Media Reference Tool*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Lambert, W., Hodgson, R., Gardner, R. & Fillenbaum, S. (1960). Evaluational Reactions to Spoken Languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*.

Lindemann, Stephanie. (2005). Who Speaks 'Broken English'? US Undergraduates' Perception of Non-native English. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 15. 187 - 212.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. 33.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964. (1964). Pub. L. 88–352, 78 Stat. 241, (1964)

U.S. Census Bureau. (2011). *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2011 130th Edition*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

APPENDIX A.

Transcript of vocal recording

Hispanic Speaker:

- How are you doing?
- What's going on?
- It's so nice to see you
- How was your day?
- What's new with you?
- Hello! I am pleased to meet you!

Southern Speaker:

- How are you doing?
- What's going on?
- It's so nice to see you
- How was your day?
- What's new with you?
- Hello! I am pleased to meet you!

General American Speaker:

- How are you doing?
- What's going on?
- It's so nice to see you
- How was your day?
- What's new with you?
- Hello! I am pleased to meet you!

APPENDIX B.

Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1933)

Prompt version 1:

The following items are designed to assess how comfortable you would feel with various levels of association or relationship with an accented **Hispanic American**. Please listen to the entire audio clip above to hear this accented individual speak. For each item, please indicate how open or closed you are to the possibility described. In doing, check one blank for each item. The blanks you check should indicate your ***first reactions*** to the possibilities.

Prompt version 2:

The following items are designed to assess how comfortable you would feel with various levels of association or relationship with someone who has an accent from the American South. By American South we are referring to the picture above. In addition, please listen to the entire audio clip above to hear this accented individual speak. For each item, please indicate how open or closed you are to the possibility described. In doing, check one blank for each item. The blanks you check should indicate your ***first reactions*** to the possibilities.

Prompt version 3:

The following items are designed to assess how comfortable you would feel with various levels of association or relationship with a General American accent. Please listen to the entire audio clip above to hear this accented individual speak. For each item, please indicate how open or closed you are to the possibility described. In doing, check one blank for each item. The blanks you check should indicate your ***first reactions*** to the possibilities.

1. Assuming you are single and not currently in a relationship, would you marry?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

2. Assuming that they are not currently in a romantic relationship, would you be willing to have your brother or sister marrying?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

3. Assuming that they are not currently in a romantic relationship, would you be willing to have your son or daughter marrying?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

4. Would you have as chums (close friend)?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

5. Would have as a minority in my social club, fraternity, or lodge?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

6. Would have as a majority in my social club, fraternity, or lodge?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

7. Would debar from my social club, fraternity, or lodge?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

8. Would have as my regular friends?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

9. Would decline to have as friends?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

10. Would have merely as speaking acquaintances?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

11. Would decline to speak to?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

12. Would have as my guests at public dinners?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

13. Would decline to be seen with in public?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

14. Would have as my guests at private dinners?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

15. Would entertain overnight in my home?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

16. Would decline to invite to my home?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

17. Would allow one family only (of their group) to live in my city block?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

18. Would allow several families (of their group) to live in my city block?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

19. Would live surrounded by them in their neighborhood?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

20. Would rejoice when as my neighbors they gained increased social standing?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

21. Would feel disturbed when as my neighbors they gained increased social standing?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

22. Would debar from my neighborhood?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

23. Would take as my guests at church?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

24. Would have a few as members of my church?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

25. Would have a few as members of my church?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

26. Would have as my pastor, or religious guide?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

27. Would have as my teachers?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

28. Would allow a few of their children to attend school with my children?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

29. Would have none of their children attend school with my children?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

30. Would have two-thirds of the school attended by my children composed of their children?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

31. Would have their children attend segregated schools?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

32. Would have my small children play with them regularly?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

33. Would have their young people as social equals for my adolescent sons and daughters?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

34. Would forbid my children from playing with their children?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

35. Would dance with in public regularly?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

36. Would dance with in private regularly?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

37. Would play bridge or golf with regularly?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

38. Would play bridge or golf with occasionally?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

39. Would decline to play bridge or golf with?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

40. Would take as guests on automobile trips?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

41. Would ride with them as their automobile guests?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

42. Would decline to ride in an automobile with them?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

43. Would have them ride in segregated sections of street cars?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

44. Would ride in same seat with them in street cars?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

45. Would have as mayors of cities in my country?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

46. Would have several of them in our Congress?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

47. Would debar them from being Congressmen?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

48. Would have as president of my country?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

49. Would have as voting citizens of my country up to 1/5 of total population?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

50. Would have as voting citizens of my country up to 1/3 of total population?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

51. Would have as voting citizens of my country up to 2/3 of total population?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

52. Would allow as visitors in my country but without citizen-ship rights?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

53. Would keep out of my country entirely either as visitors or citizens?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

54. Would work beside in an office?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

55. Would decline to work with in same office?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

56. Would work- under as my supervisor?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

57. Would have them as my business partners?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

58. Would have them in a competitive business near my business location?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

59. Would have them in a noncompetitive business near my business location?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

60. Would debar them as competitors in my business?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
completely open to	somewhat open to	neutral to (neither open nor closed)	somewhat closed to	completely closed to

APPENDIX C.

Demographics Questionnaire

What is your date of birth?

With which gender do you identify? Male Female Other

Where do you currently live? City, State, Zip code

Where were you raised? Zip code

With which ethnic/racial group do you identify? (Please check all that apply)

African-American or Black	Caribbean or West Indian	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
American Indian or Alaska Native	Caucasian or White	Other
Asian	Hispanic or Latino	Prefer not to answer
	Middle Eastern	

Where you born in the United States?

If NO:

How old were you when you moved to the US?

In what country were you born?

Is English your native language? (the first language you learned to speak?

If NO:

What is your native language?

How old were you when you learned to speak your non-native language? (age in years)

Do you speak more than one language fluently?

If YES:

What language(s) besides English, do you speak fluently?

English, Spanish, Other (please specify)

What language do you usually speak at home?

English, Spanish, Other (please specify), Comfortable using both equally

What language do you feel more comfortable using?

English, Spanish, Other (please specify), Comfortable using both equally

Which language are you best able to speak?

English, Spanish, Other (please specify), Comfortable using both equally

What is the language you prefer to speak?

English, Spanish, Other (please specify)

What is the language you prefer to write?

English, Spanish, Other (please specify)

What is your highest level of education?

Did not complete High School

High School Diploma/GED

Trade School

Some College

Bachelor's Degree

Master's Degree

Advanced Graduate work or Ph.D.

N/A

The following questions ask you about your primary caregivers. Usually these are referred to as "parents" (mother, father). If one or more of your parents were not in your household while you were growing up, or you were cared for by an extended member of your family (for example your grandparent), please answer the following questions based on that person.

Did you grow up in an area of mostly people from your (or your parents) cultural background?

Do your currently live in an area of mostly people from your cultural background?

Was your father (or caregiver) born on the U.S.?

If NO: Where was your father (or caregiver) born?

Is your father's (or caregiver's)native language English?

If NO: What is your father's (or caregiver's) native language, and do they speak English with an accent??

Was your Mother (or caregiver) born on the U.S.?

If NO: Where was your Mother (or caregiver) born?

Is your Mother's (or caregiver's) native language English?

If NO: What is your Mother's (or caregiver's) native language and do they speak English with an accent?

Do any of your family members speak English with a regional accent?

If YES:

Specify what region this accent stems from (ex: Boston- Bostonian accent)

In terms of income, would you say your parents/caregivers are:

Upper class Upper middle class Middle class

Lower middle class Working class Prefer not to answer

Think of the 3 people you spend the most time with; is their native language English?

If NO:

What is the native language of the people you spend your time with? If any of these people have different native languages, please specify for each and if they speak with an accent, (ex: Boyfriend- French, Bestfriend- Spanish)

Would you consider yourself to be a religious individual?

If YES:

Use the scale below to indicate the extent to which religion has an influence on your daily life

Does not correspond at all		Corresponds a little		Corresponds moderately		Corresponds a lot		Corresponds exactly
1	2		3	4	5		6	7

Did you use headphones to listen to the recording?

Were you in a quiet area while participating in this study?

Appendix D

Informed Consent Form

Name of Study: Assessing Native and Non-native Accents in the United States: Are We Biased?

Researchers: Aidan Sabert and Dr. Kaori Kubo Germano

Contacts: aidan.sabert@purchase.edu (914)589-4427

Purpose: We would like permission to enroll you as a participant in a research study**.** This study investigates different accented individuals. Further information for the purpose of the study will be provided at the end of the study.

Procedure: In this experiment, you will be asked to first complete a demographic survey which will not be traced back in any way and will remain completely anonymous. You will then listen to three separate recordings which will require headphones and complete 2 different tasks. This study should take no longer than 30 minutes of your time.

Costs, risks, and discomforts: There is minimal risk associated with your participation in this experiment; you may become fatigued or tired when completing the tasks provided. However, this fatigue should be no greater than that which you encounter during your normal day while using a computer. Should you feel too tired or fatigued to continue, you have the ability to opt-out at any point of this study.

Benefits and compensation: The general benefit of participating in scientific research is the satisfaction that comes from contributing to science and the pursuit of knowledge. If you are a participant from the Purchase Participant Pool or an eligible course, you will receive 1 academic credit for every 30 minutes you participate in this study. You must email the experimenter with a completion code you will receive at the end of your participation. If you are a participant who is not from this select pool, you will be compensated monetarily at the federal minimum wage rate of $9.25 per hour (prorated).

Confidentiality: The results of this study may be published in a scholarly book or journal or used for teaching purposes. However, your name and other identifiers will not be used in any publication or teaching materials. Your data will never be associated with your name or any other information that would make it possible to identify you.

Refusal or withdrawal of participation: You do not have to participate in this study. If you decide to participate, you can change your mind and drop out of the study at any time without affecting your present or future interactions with the experimenters and with no loss of credit for participation.

Signature: I confirm that the purpose of the research, the study procedures, the possible risks and discomforts, as well as potential benefits that I may experience have been explained to me. All my questions have been answered. I have read this consent form. My signature below indicates my willingness to participate in this study. I understand that I may contact the chair of the Institutional Review Board if I experience any problems during this experiment or have concerns about the ethics of this research [irb.chair@purchase.edu].

☐ By checking this box you are indicating your consent to participate in this study.