University of Northern Iowa

UNI ScholarWorks

2012

Perceptions of "Americanism": U.S. high school students' attitudes towards non-standard English accents

Christina Michelle Goering
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

PERCEPTIONS OF "AMERICANISM": U.S. HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS'

ATTITUDES TOWARDS NON-STANDARD ENGLISH ACCENTS

A Thesis Submitted

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Designation

University Honors

Christina Michelle Goering

University of Northern Iowa

December 2012

This study by: Christina Michelle Goering

Entitled: Perceptions of "Americanism": U.S. High School Students' Perceptions of Non-

Standard English Accents

Has been approved as meeting the thesis or project requirements for the Designation

University Honors.

_____   _____
Date   Dr. Ardith J. Meier, Honors Thesis Advisor, Department of Languages
                and Literatures

_____   _____
Date   Jessica Moon, Director, University Honors Program

Acknowledgements

This research project was a very large endeavor for me, and I would not have been able to complete it without the help of others. First of all, if it were not for the Honors Program at the University of Northern Iowa, I would not have even dreamed of doing a research project of this caliber. Thank you, Dr. Moon and the Honors Department, for encouraging me to take healthy risks and to challenge myself. As I embarked on this project and sought inspiration from my professors, all of them were very encouraging and supportive. In particular, my advisor, Dr. Meier, was extremely helpful and guided me through the steps that needed to be taken in order to make this thesis idea a reality. Thank you.

Of course, a special thanks needs to be given to those who allowed me to record their voices as well as my participants and those who helped me to find participants for this study. I would not have been able to carry out this project without you. Thank you. Additionally, I would like to thank my family and friends who were eager to help and discover the results of the study.

Last but definitely not least, I would like to formally thank God for all of His inspiration, constant guidance and assistance. He helped me every step of the way from coming up with a research topic to editing the final draft. He especially helped me to have hope in this project even when the possibilities of securing a research site seemed grim. Thank you very much for helping me to carry out this project and to carry it out to the best of my ability.

Introduction

If you were asked what people from your hometown are like, you would be able to tell someone even if you have not met every single person from your town. If you have not met them, then how can you describe what they are like? This phenomenon of "knowing" someone without meeting them could be termed "imagined community" (de Jong, 2009, p. 39). An imagined community in the above described scenario would be a mental construct we use to determine who is part of a group and who is not. As de Jong described it, an imagined community can extend to the national level, representing a nation's identity, as it highlights which characteristics determine who is part of the nation.

Our current perception of the United States' imagined community is founded upon its immigrant history. The first settlers began to construct America's national identity. Through written law, education and daily social interactions, they created the precedent of the "true American" (de Jong, 2009, p. 125-127).

As a consequence of these imagined community constructions, the United States has gone through several phases of assimilating the newest immigrants to become like the older ones (de Jong, 2009, p. 126). The period between 1900 and 1920 was the peak of immigration of the "old immigrants" (Salomone, 2010, p. 50) topping out with about 15 million foreign-born citizens (Congressional Budget Office, 2011). As Salomone (p. 19) explained, this influx sparked the Americanization Movement, which sought to help new arrivals adjust to life in the United States so that they, too, could become U.S. Americans. It was not enough to have citizenship; to be Americanized, one needed to be accepted into the imagined community. Not surprisingly, people had differing opinions about what being American meant, and this caused conflict.

However, there was one characteristic that was present in every veteran immigrant's mental rubric of what constituted being U.S. American. President Theodore Roosevelt summed up his nation's thoughts saying, "We have room…for but one language…the English language, for we intend to see that the crucible turns our people out as Americans, and…not as dwellers in a polyglot boarding house" (as cited in Salomone, 2010, p. 21). Once an immigrant could speak English "reasonably," as deemed by the so-called native-speaker, then the newly arrived immigrant crossed the mental boundary from being one of "them" to being one of "us, the Americans" (Salomone, p. 31). Speaking English well was part of the nation's construct of the imagined community of America.

Since that time, additional waves of immigrants have become citizens of the United States. By 2009, the foreign-born population grew to more than 36 million, which shattered the previous record of the early 1900s by more than 20 million (Congressional Budget Office, 2011).

The growing presence of immigrants has impacted education. Students who are learning English as an additional language to their native tongue are called English Language Learners (ELLs). According to Ballantyne, Sanderman and Levy (2008, p. 7), there are more than 5 million ELLs in U.S. schools. This number rose by 57% from 1998-2008. In 2010, Kids Count Data Center reported that 22% of 5-17 year-olds in the U.S. spoke a language other than English at home.

It can reasonably be expected that most students whose first language is not English will speak English differently than their native peers; in other words, they will likely have a perceivable difference in accent. An accent is a difference in pronunciation

between language groups (Northern Arizona University, 2009). Years of research has

"…demonstrated that an accent different from one's own is an important indicator

signaling that someone is different" (Bresnahan et al., 2002, p. 172).

Thus, research indicates that speaking English is a defining characteristic of the

imagined community of America and that accent is an identity marker. Research has also

shown that there is a large and growing presence of ELLs in U.S. schools. To what

extent are these students perceived as having an American accent or not? How does this

perception affect whether or not these students are accepted into the imagined

community? What effects might these perceptions and attitudes have on the socialization

of ELLs in public schools? These unanswered questions are of paramount importance if

one is to more fully address the needs of the growing ELL population within U.S. public

schools.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to identify the extent to which U.S. high school

students perceive various English accents as being part of their American community or

not and to further investigate how likely these high school students are to socialize with

speakers of the varying English accents.

As the literature review illustrates, this study is innovative. There is a plethora of

other studies investigating relationships between accent and attitude. However, these

studies typically investigated perceptions of the personal characteristics of the speaker,

such as intelligence, generosity, or social class. Based on the data from present studies, it

can be inferred that an individual may interact with another based upon accent

judgments; however, no other study to date has specifically addressed this. Additionally,

previous studies tended to look at adult speakers. If educators want to help the rising

generation, then youths' attitudes should be more fully investigated. Furthermore, many

previous studies have addressed contexts other than education, such as economics or

marketing. Those that did address educational contexts have largely focused upon either

(1) students' perceptions of non-native teachers' accents or (2) the language perceptions

of ELL versus the perceptions of native speakers about the ELL. Thus, this study

represents a focus and context that has remained unexplored, one that will provide greater

insight into how the ELL is perceived and accepted into the imagined community based

upon accent.

Literature Review

Numerous studies investigating the relationship between a speaker's accent and the listeners' perceptions towards the speaker have been conducted. This literature review summarizes findings from matched and verbal guise studies as well as accent studies within an educational context. Specifically, this review will cite studies which have examined students' perceptions of teachers with differing accents, ELLs' perceptions of language use, native English speakers' perceptions of ELLs' accents, and youth's attitudes towards accented speech. Finally, this review discusses how Social Identity Theory helps illustrate the extent to which accent can influence a listener's perception.

Matched and Verbal Guise Studies

Studies of languages and their effect upon attitude began in the 1930s (Cargile, 2000). Accent and attitude research made huge bounds in progress in the 1960s when the renowned linguist, Wallace Lambert, introduced the matched guise technique to more fully analyze the effect that accent has on a listener's attitude (Mesthrie, Swan, Deumert, and Leap, 2000, p. 149). In matched guise studies, one person's voice is recorded while s/he reads a passage. The person reads the passage multiple times, each time speaking a different accent. People then listen to the various recordings and judge the speaker based upon perceptions of the speech (Mesthrie et al., 2000, p. 149).

Matched guise studies have helped us to understand general attitudes and perceptions of others based upon language. Citing various studies, Lindemann (2003) summarized that generally speakers of a standard variety are preferred and viewed more

positively than speakers of a non-standard variety. Additionally, the author noted that

non-standard varieties were perceived negatively; namely, the speakers were perceived to

be less friendly, competent, likeable, or intelligent.

Attitudes are never fixed, however. Lindemann (2003) observed that more recent

studies have suggested that there is a shift in attitudes. For example, in 2000, Cargile

conducted a study using the matched guise technique which looked at American job-

seeking Mandarin-accented English speakers and attitudes of employers regarding hiring

them compared to hiring someone who speaks a standard variety of English. Cargile's

study found that generally job-seekers with Mandarin-accented English were just as

likely to get a job as the standard American-accented English speakers. Accent did not

play a role in how qualified employers perceived their future employees to be. In

summary, matched guise studies study the perceptions of personality based upon accent,

and a few recent studies have suggested that attitudes toward accented speech are

changing.

However, the matched guise technique, which takes multiple speech samples of

varying accents spoken by the same person, is not the only method used in order to test

perceptions based upon accent. The verbal guise technique takes samples of recorded

speech from different individuals. Respondents listen to the recordings and rate the

speakers based upon their first impressions (see e.g., Cargile, 1997; Lindemann, 2003).

Although far fewer studies have employed this technique, linguists have corroborated

findings from matched guise research. Just as was found with the matched guise

investigations, researchers discovered that native U.S. English-speaking Americans

generally perceive foreign accented English (i.e., Spanish, German, Malaysian, Chinese,

Japanese, Korean, Italian, Norwegian, and Eastern European varieties) negatively when compared to the standard variety (as cited in Lindemann, 2005: Cargile, 1997; Cargile and Giles, 1998; Gill, 1994; Lindemann, 2003; Mulac, Hanley & Prigge, 1974; Ryan & Bulik, 1982; Ryan, Carranza & Moffie, 1977).

The above examples illustrate that studies using matched and verbal guise methods have helped us understand how others perceive characteristics of the speaker based on accent. However, few to none have specifically used these methods to investigate the likelihood of social interactions between the listener and speaker.

Accent Studies in Education

Language is used in many contexts and domains, one of these being education. There is a large body of accent research dealing with students' perceptions of non-native teachers' accents and language perceptions from an ELL's perspective. A limited number of studies exist which address native English students' perceptions of non-native speakers' accents, and these studies are of particular interest to this study. Each of these major areas of research will be discussed in this review.

Students' perceptions of teacher. Various studies looked at the attitudes of native-English speaking U.S. American students towards non-native English speaking instructors. When compared to non-native English speaking professors, research has indicated that students perceive native English speaking instructors more favorably than non-native speakers (e.g., Gill, 1994; Rubin & Smith, 1990). Interestingly, Hertel and Sunderman (2009) found this to be true, but only in regard to some skills and course content within English classes. While the participants in their study rated proficient, yet

foreign-accented speakers of English just as capable as native instructors in teaching

vocabulary and grammar, they were perceived as less capable in teaching culture and

pronunciation.

In 2002, Bresnahan, Ohashi, Nebashi, Liu, and Shearman furthered research in

this context by investigating if the speakers' role (i.e., friend vs. instructor) influenced

attitudes towards the accented speech. They found that listeners showed a preference for

standard American English; however, if the students participated in a comprehensible

dialogue with a friend and with a teacher, all students preferred the friend regardless of

degree of accent. Thus, role was found to influence perceptions based upon accent.

ELLs' perceptions of language use. A growing body of research exists which

investigates attitudes of ELLs and bilingual students. For example, Moyer (2007) studied

how bilinguals' attitudes towards the newly acquired language influenced the degree to

which they maintained or lost their foreign-accented speech. Other studies investigated

how context (e.g., home, on the radio, school) and the students' attitudes toward a

particular language influence when students speak in their first or second language (e.g.,

Duisberg, 2001; Galindo, 1995).

Native speakers' perceptions of ELLs' accent. The research most pertinent to

the present study is that which investigates the attitudes of native English speaking

students towards foreign-accented speech. Brennan and Brennan (1981), for example,

examined high school students' judgments about speakers with varying degrees of

Spanish-accented English. The students rated the Mexican-American speakers on

characteristics such as social class, trustworthiness, and friendliness. They found that the

more accented the speech was, the more negatively the speaker was rated by the listeners.

These findings lead to further questions: If native English speaking students view others negatively, how will this affect how they accept accented speakers into their community? How will accents other than Spanish affect this inclusion?

Said (2006) added additional insight by examining the differences of perceptions based upon accent between college students who were either native English speakers or non-native English speakers. The author found that non-native English speakers showed more positive attitudes towards foreign accented English speakers compared to the native speakers, who showed more positive attitudes towards standard U.S. American English speakers. Applying these findings to the high school setting could mean that ELLs are more tolerant and accepting of one another than native-speakers are of ELLs.

Other studies suggested that not all students with accented speech are perceived negatively by native speakers. For example, Scales, Wennerstrom, Richard and Hui (2006) examined how accurately native and non-native English speakers could identity the nationality of speakers with either a Chinese, British, Mexican or U.S. American accent. The college participants then stated their preferences for and opinions about each accent. As a whole, the ELLs in their study could not correctly identify the nationality of the accents but the native speakers could. The ELLs preferred the U.S. American accent. The authors suggested that this might be because the students rated this as the slowest speech and most easily understood. Because they could understand the speech, they liked it. The least preferred accent rated by the ELLs was Mexican-accented English. On the other hand, the native speakers did not prefer their own U.S. American accent; they preferred the British and the Mexican accents overall. This is surprising because other

studies, such as Brennan and Brennan (1981) indicated that the Mexican accent was less desirable.

      Studies of young learners. Like many of the above cited references, other recent studies have used adult students as their participants (see e.g., Lindemann, 2005; Young, 2003). In comparison, there are few studies that use elementary or high school students as their participants; however, Butler (2007) studied the perceptions of Korean elementary children on different varieties of English. The children preferred U.S. English over Korean accented English. This suggested that accents can affect attitudes and perceptions of young learners as well as those of adults. Children's and youths' perceptions are influenced by accent, and this has not been adequately studied.

Social Identity Theory

      One can see through the course of matched and verbal guise studies, as well as the research on accent within the domain of education, that the perception of accent plays an important role in how a speaker is perceived. As a final note, this review will illustrate the extent to which accent can impact the perception of the listener. The gravity of these studies does not end by simply filling in answers on a Likert scale; rather, these perceptions can greatly influence the course of a life.

      Social Identity Theory, which was developed by Henri Taijfel in 1979, provides insight into why accents different from one's own might be perceived negatively. As explained by McLeod, "Social Identity Theory is a person's sense of who they are based on their group membership" (2008, para. 2). Group membership gives one a sense of pride and belonging. If one is part of a group, others are outside of the group. The in-

group tries to portray a better social image of themselves than the out-group, and in order

to maintain this perception, the "in-group will discriminate against the out-group"

(McLeod, 2008, para. 6). Drawing upon previous research by Lambert, Giles, and others,

Bresnahan (2002) summarized that their research on "social identity theory suggests that

people will exhibit a preference for a variety of language that is associated with their

most salient in-group. Speaking with a foreign accent identifies the other as a member of

an out-group and is likely to evoke negative stereotypes" (p. 172). Thus, foreign accent

is a marker of who is "in" and who is "out."

Such negative stereotypes go beyond initial reactions. Creese and Kambere

(2003), for example, interviewed African-Canadian immigrants about how others'

perceptions of them based upon their accents had affected them. All of the participants

were highly educated and proficient English speakers. Caroline, one of the participants,

said the following: "When you don't have their own accent (native Canadian), they don't

want to accept you in areas where you have to speak like receptionist, teacher of English,

customer service. It is a big barrier" (p. 569). Other participants expressed that, although

they are legal citizens and speak well, they are not accepted as Canadian citizens by their

native associates. They are "outsiders within" who suffer prejudices and discrimination

resulting in difficult educational and economic situations. Although this study took place

in Canada, one can still note the gravity of an immigrant's dilemma with speaking with a

"foreign accent" and becoming part of an in-group, or in other words, part of the

imagined community.

Conclusion

Decades of research have provided a foundation upon which this study is founded. Linguists, through matched and verbal guise studies, have investigated how accents affect the perception of a speaker's personal characteristics. However, none of these studies to date specifically addresses how likely the listener is to interact with the speaker of the accented speech. The present study will investigate this. Linguistic research within the domain of education has studied native English-speaking high school students' perceptions of accented speech to a certain extent. However, recent research suggests that these attitudes might be changing. Thus, current research is needed. This study investigates various non-standard varieties and how they compare to each other and to the standard. The perceptions and attitudes discovered through this study have the potential to greatly help educators to gain a deeper understanding of how native English speakers allow others to enter into their imagined communities. In turn, these attitudes could affect classroom environment, discrimination, school unity and other social factors that are pertinent to the success of any student within U.S. public schools.

Methodology

Research Questions to be Answered

1.   Based on a selected group of U.S. American high school students, to what degree

are varieties of English considered "American?"

2.   How likely are U.S. American high school students to socialize with speakers of

varying accents under given circumstances?

Question 1 will provide insight into ascertaining which accents are part of the

students' "in-group" and "out-group." Question 2 will help distinguish how likely these

students are to socialize with people in their in-group and out-group.

Anticipated Results

It is anticipated that the students will rate the U.S. American Midland, Southern,

and AAVE as "somewhat more American than foreign" or "completely American." If

this is not the case, it may be that they have not been exposed to many varieties of accent.

It is unclear how the students will rate the other accents. It is quite possible that they will

rate them as "somewhat foreign" or below due to the fact that these accents will probably

be more unfamiliar to them.

It is hoped that all students will be willing to socialize with the various accented-

speakers, but due to some negative perceptions towards Arabic-speaking people,

Mexicans and other immigrants, it is estimated that students will be less likely to

socialize with these speakers.

Participants

Two Sociology classes from a large Midwestern high school were invited to participate in the study. Thirty students, with parental consent, voluntarily participated in the study. The participants consisted of both males and females (gender is not a variable to be analyzed in this study). All students were native English speakers between the ages of 15 and 18, and all students were taking or had taken a foreign language.

Voice Samples

This study used the verbal guise method. Eight anonymous voice samples were recorded from speakers with the following English accents: U.S. American Midland, U.S. Southern, African American Vernacular English, Mexican, Thai, Russian, Chinese and Arabic. In order to only test perception based on accent, the speakers uttered the same phrase, were female, and were between the ages of 18 and 40 years. Informal observation would indicate that not all speakers had an equal amount of accentedness. In linguistics, differences between a speaker's language and a given norm are referred to as *marked features*. The more an accent is different from the norm, the more marked it is (Horwitz, 2008, p. 245). The speakers in this study had varying degrees of markedness, as it is extremely difficult to compare absolute markedness of accent across different languages. However, all accents were intelligible.

The first three accents are generally accepted as U.S. American varieties (American Varieties, 2005). These were used to ascertain if the students perceived these accents as foreign or not, although speakers of these accents are generally accepted as American. Furthermore, because the students in this study live in a region where the predominant accent is U.S. American Midland, this accent served as a control upon

which comparisons were made between the different accents. The remaining accents

used in this study helped gain insight into how willing the participating students would be

to interact with such speakers and include them, to some extent, into their social circle.

Materials

The voice recordings were recorded onto a computer and burned onto a CD. The

CD was played using a computer and speakers located at the research site. Participating

students received two handouts: a demographic questionnaire and survey containing

questions which asked the students about their attitudes toward the recorded accented

speaker. See Appendix A for the questionnaire and survey.

Procedures

Following IRB guidelines, written and voluntary consent was gathered from each

of the participating students. The participants were enrolled in one of two high school

Sociology classes; the study was administered to each class individually in their regular

classroom during part of their normal class period.

On the day of the study, participants were given the demographic questionnaire.

The questionnaires were filled out and collected. Surveys were then passed out to all

participants. Participants listened to eight speech samples, one at a time, and each sample

was played three times. After listening to the first recording, students answered question

A of the survey for Speaker 1, which asked the participants to rate the accent based upon

how American they thought it sounded. The voice sample was then played two more

times with approximately a 10 second pause between replays. The replays occurred to

insure that all participants heard the voice recording. Students were instructed to fill out
section B any time after the first voice recording was played. Section B contained fifteen
questions illustrating various social encounters that a high school student might
experience in a typical day. Students were to rate on a scale from 1-5 how likely they
were to participate in the given social situations as indicated by each question. Students
had up to two minutes and forty-five seconds to complete each survey for each speaker.
This procedure was repeated for each voice sample until all eight samples had been
played. Furthermore, students were explicitly instructed to answer the questions based
upon their first impressions and not to reflect extensively on what they were feeling.
Students remained silent throughout the procedure.

Before listening to Speaker 1, a sample voice with a U.S. Midland accent was
played, and the students practiced going through the procedures of the study in order to
familiarize them with it.   Participants were also given the opportunity to ask questions
about the procedure before beginning the study.   After practicing the procedures and
answering questions, the participants began to take the survey. The surveys were
collected after all of the students finished noting their responses.

Analysis

A quantitative analysis was carried out on the resulting data. Responses for each
speaker were organized according to the established choices of the survey and frequency
counts were made (see Appendix B). Question "A" asked the participants to rate the
speaker on how American she sounds.   The responses that the participants could choose
were 1-Completely Foreign, 2- Somewhat Foreign, 3- Somewhat More American than
Foreign, and 4-Completely American. Percentages of the responses for each of the above

four choices per accented speaker were calculated. An "American Score" and a "Foreign Score" were then derived from these percentages. The American Score is the sum of the percentage of the two "American" choices: 3-Somewhat American and 4-Completely American. A Foreign Score is similarly the sum of the percentages of the two "foreign" choices: 1-Completely Foreign and 2-Somewhat Foreign. Speakers were then ranked from most American to least American (in terms of perceived accentedness) based, first of all, on their highest percentage for a given choice and second, on their American Score. For example, Mexico's largest percentage is somewhat foreign (70%), and so is China's (73%). However, Mexico has a higher American Score than China, so Mexico is ranked more American than China.

Additionally within this ranking, speakers were labeled as American if they had their highest percentage of responses found within the 4-Completely American choice. For example, although Iowa's highest percentage is 100%, 4-Completely American, and North Carolina's highest percentage is 77%, 4-Completely American, both of them are considered American because their highest percentages are in the 4- Completely American choice. If speakers did not have their highest percentage for this choice but had an American Score of over 50%, they were labeled as More American than Foreign. If the Foreign Score were higher than the American Score, then they were marked as foreign (see Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1

Percentages of Participants' Responses to "Question A" per Choice

Speaker	1- Completely Foreign	2- Somewhat More Foreign	3- Somewhat More American	4- Completely American
Saudi Arabia (1)	7%	36%	57%	0
Thailand (2)	83%	17%	0	0
North Carolina (3)	0	0	23%	77%
Mexico (4)	7%	70%	23%	0
Iowa (5)	0	0	0	100%
St. Petersburg, Russia (6)	0	0	93%	7%
AAVE- Georgia, USA (7)	0	3%	27%	70%
Tianjin, China (8)	27%	73%	0	0

Table 2

American and Foreign Scores per Speaker

Speaker	American Score	Foreign Score	In-Group/Out-Group
Saudi Arabia (1)	57%	43%	More American than Foreign
Thailand (2)	0%	100%	Foreign
North Carolina (3)	100%	0%	American
Mexico (4)	23%	77%	Foreign
Iowa (5)	100%	0%	American
St. Petersburg, Russia (6)	100%	0%	More American than Foreign
AAVE- Georgia, USA (7)	97%	3%	American
Tianjin, China (8)	0%	100%	Foreign

Question "B" asked the students to rate how likely they were to participate in fifteen given social activities with the speaker. The participants' response choices were 1-Not at All, 2-Somewhat, 3-About 50% of the time, 4-Most Likely, and 5- Definitely. Students' responses to all 15 questions were tallied for each individual speaker. The total number of responses for each choice per speaker was calculated, and percentages were derived from this in order to conceptualize to what degree students are likely to socialize with the speaker (see Appendix C). For example, Saudi Arabia received 42 responses for

the 1-Not at all choice and 92 responses for the 2-Somewhat choice. Out of all 450

students' responses for all five given choices, 42 is equal to 9%, and 92 is equal to 21%.

These percentages were then used to calculate a Positive Perception Score (PPS)

and a Negative Perception Score (NPS). The PPS is the sum of the percentages from the

4-Most Likely and 5-Definitely choices, indicating a likelihood that the respondent would

engage in a particular social activity with the speaker. The NPS is the sum of the

percentages from the 1-Not at All and 2-Somewhat choices, indicating that a social

engagement would be unlikely. For example, Saudi Arabia's NPS is 21% plus 9%,

which equals a NPS of 30%. Speakers were then ranked from most likely to least likely

to be engaged in a social activity based upon their PPS, with the highest scores being the

most likely and the lowest being the least likely. Speakers were also ranked from most

likely to be involved in social interactions to least likely based upon their NPS. Speakers

with a low NPS are more likely to be socialized than speakers with a high NPS.

<div align="center">**Results**</div>

For ease of description, the speakers with each accent will be referred to as Iowa, NC (North Carolina), AAVE (African American Vernacular English), Russia, SA (Saudi Arabia), Mexico, China and Thailand.

Question 1 Results

The first research question was "Based on a selected group of U.S. American high school students, to what degree are varieties of English considered "American?"" By analyzing the American Score and the percentages of participants' response, the accents were ranked from those most perceived as American to those least perceived as American.

Table 3

Rankings from Most American to least American

Speaker	In-Group/Out-Group	Highest Percentage
1. Iowa	American	100% Completely Amr.
2. NC	American	77% Completely Amr.
3. AAVE	American	70% Completely Amr.
4. Russia	More US than Foreign	93% Somewhat Amr.
5. SA	More US than Foreign	57% Somewhat Amr.
6. Mexico	Foreign	70% Somewhat For., Amr. Score 23%
7. China	Foreign	73% Somewhat For., Amr. Score 0%
8. Thailand	Foreign	83% Completely Foreign

Although Iowa, NC and AAVE were the only speakers rated as American, Iowa was the only speaker unanimously perceived as 100% American. NC was ranked second with 77% Completely American and 23% Somewhat American. AAVE came in third with 70% Completely American, 27% Somewhat American, and 3% Somewhat Foreign (Table 1).

Russia was overwhelmingly rated as Somewhat American (93%). This speaker was even perceived by some to be Completely American (7%). SA was also perceived as Somewhat American (57%), but participants seemed to be more uncertain of this speaker's degree of Americanism. She was also perceived as Somewhat Foreign (37%) and to a much lesser degree as Completely Foreign (7%).

China and Mexico were decidedly Somewhat Foreign (73% and 70% respectively). However, Mexico was perceived as 23% Somewhat American, and China was 27% Completely Foreign; China did not have any Somewhat American ratings, and Mexico did. As consequence, Mexico was rated more American than China. The only speaker rated as Completely Foreign was Thailand, with a strong 83%.

Other striking data include comparisons between Completely Foreign and Completely American. The two top percentages for any given choice were Iowa (100%, Completely American) and Thailand (83%, Completely Foreign). The only speakers rated with an American Score of 100% were Iowa, NC, and Russia. Interestingly, AAVE did not make the cut, although it is considered to be an American accent (American Varieties, 2005). The only speakers with a Foreign Score of 100% were China and Thailand.

The data clearly indicate that the participants perceived the speakers differently. The differences between the degrees of perceived Americanism to the degree of perceived foreignism are quite marked.

Question 2 Results

The second proposed research question was "How likely are U.S. American high school students to socialize with speakers of varying accents under given

circumstances?" Based upon the Positive Perception Score (PPS) and the Negative Perception Score (NPS), the speakers were ranked from most likely to be involved in social activities with native English speakers to least likely. The rankings are as follows with their respective scores.

Table 4

Rankings from Most Likely to Least Likely to be Socially Engaged Based on PPS and NPS

Ranking of Social Interactions	
PPS- Inclusion	**NPS- Exclusion**
1. Iowa, 59%	Iowa, 13%
2. SA, 45%	Russia, 26%
3. AAVE, 44%	AAVE, 27%
4. Mexico, 42%	Mexico, 28%(PPS, 42%)
5. NC, 40%	SA, 30% (PPS, 46%)
6. Russia, 40% (NPS, 26%)	China, 33%
7. China, 39% (NPS, 33%)	NC, 34%
8. Thailand, 32%	Thailand, 46%

The PPS shows the likelihood of native speakers actively participating in social activities with the speaker. For example, 59% of respondents said that they would actively participate in an activity with Iowa. The NPS shows the likelihood of the native speaker actively not participating in a given activity. For example, only 13% of respondents said they are not likely to participate with Iowa. The remaining percentages that are not stated exist because some participants were indifferent, which is to say, they were not inclined to actively engage nor actively choose not to participate with the speaker.

        The only speaker rated more negatively than positively was Thailand; Thailand's

NPS was higher than its PPS. The only speaker who was overwhelmingly rated

positively (PPS higher than 50%) was Iowa (59%). This means that no matter what the

social activity was, the participants were over 50% likely to socialize with the speaker.

SA was only four percentage points shy of being rated over the 50% mark. No speakers

were strongly rated negatively (NPS greater than 50%); however, Thailand was only 4%

shy of this negative rating.

         It is interesting that the rankings of the PPS and the NPS are not always the same.

Only Iowa, AAVE, Mexico and Thailand maintained consistent rankings for PPS and

NPS. Iowa was the most likely to be engaged in social activities and least likely to be left

out of social activities, indicating that Iowa in definitely part of the "in-group." AAVE

was ranked third in both the PPS and NPS, suggesting a high "in-group" probability as

well. Thailand, on the other hand, was rated least likely to be engaged in social activities

and most likely to be left out of social activities. This suggests that Thailand is part of

the "out-group."

        All other speakers exhibited inconsistencies in their PPS and their NPS rankings.

The greatest differences in these rankings are found for the SA, NC and Russia speakers.

SA moved from second to fifth, indicating that this speaker is second in terms of being

most likely to be involved socially, but is only 5th likely to not be left out socially. NC

fell from fifth to seventh place. Participants indicated that they were 34% likely to

exclude this speaker from activities and only 40% likely to include her. Only Thailand

was marked more likely to be excluded. The most positive change was with Russia,

which was ranked sixth for most likely to be involved in social activities and was ranked

second for least likely to be excluded. This suggests that the participants had few

negative perceptions of the Russian speaker while at the same time not having many

positive perceptions of her either.

Discussion

One might argue that one's degree of "Americanisms" should not be judged on the basis of accent. Furthermore, accent technically does not determine a person's citizenship. However, because the participants did not rate all speakers equally, it can be inferred that accent does influence the listener's perception of how American the speaker is. The results of the study clearly support others who have argued that there are differences in perception of "closeness" to one's own nationality based on accent. In the case of this study, it appears that this perception in turn affects the likelihood of the respondents interacting with an individual.

It is safe to assume that the participants of this study spoke the U.S. American Midland accent, which is the same accent as the Iowa speaker. It was anticipated that all students would not rate Iowa, NC and AAVE as 100% American. It was thought that some students might not be familiar with the NC and AAVE accents or that they would simply think that their own accent was the most American. Hence, any speaker with a differing accent would be perceived as being less American. This seems to be exactly what the participants thought. It was not anticipated that all participants would speak with the same accent as the Iowa speaker, but upon informal observation, it appears that this was the case.

This likely explains why the Iowa speaker was the only speaker who received a 100% Completely American rating. It seems that the participants thought of themselves as 100% American, and anyone else who spoke like them would also be considered Completely American; actual "nativeness" did not carry as much weight as did perceived differences from the listener's accent. Although AAVE and NC are generally considered

to be U.S. American accents, the students did not think that these accents were 100% American, probably because they spoke differently from the participants. Building upon this notion, any speaker who speaks differently from the native listener could be perceived as being less American. This also explains why no non-native speaker was considered 100% American either.

Another interesting result is that the SA speaker did not have a very pronounced non-U.S. accent. In the opinion of the researcher, she could have easily been a speaker from the East Coast or some other part of the U.S. However, the participants perceived her as speaking a bit different from them. Thus, they concluded that she probably was foreign-born and not completely American, despite her nearly native accent.

On the other hand, in the opinion of the researcher, the Russian speaker had a more pronounced non-U.S. accent than the Saudi Arabian speaker had, but the participants seemed to think otherwise. In fact, the Russian speaker was the only non-native speaker who was not rated as Completely Foreign.

This perception of Americanism continues as one compares the speakers' American and Foreign Scores (Table 2). It was anticipated that Iowa, NC and AAVE would be rated as the most American. However, not all participants rated these speakers as 3-Somewhat More American than Foreign or 4-Completely American. In fact, AAVE was even rated as 2-Somewhat More Foreign than American. For this reason, AAVE did not receive an American Score of 100%. Perhaps the student who rated the AAVE speaker as Completely Foreign simply did not have any previous experiences with this accent and therefore assumed it was foreign.

Surprisingly, Russia, which is not a U.S. accent, did receive an American Score of 100%. It was the only non-native American accent to receive such a rating. Perhaps the participants noted that there was only a slight accent, distinguishing it from the Iowa norm. However, because they possibly perceived the accent as being less pronounced, they rated it as being more American than foreign (but still less than 100% American considering the raw percentages versus the American Score).

Discovering how American a speaker is perceived is not a means to an end in itself. What is interesting is how that perception affects the likelihood of peer social interactions to occur between the accented speaker and the native English-speaking listener. Table 5 summarizes the results of this study.

Table 5

Rankings Based on Perceived Accent from American to Least American and Rankings of Degree of Social Interactions Based on PPS and NPS

Ranking of Perceived Americanism		Ranking of Degree of Social Interactions	
Speaker	In-Group/Out-Group	PPS- Inclusion	NPS- Exclusion
1. Iowa	American	1. Iowa, 59%	Iowa, 13%
2. NC	American	2. SA, 45%	Russia, 26%
3. AAVE	American	3. AAVE, 44%	AAVE, 27%
4. Russia	More US than Foreign	4. Mexico, 42%	Mexico, 28%(PPS, 42%)
5. SA	More US than Foreign	5. NC, 40%	SA, 30% (PPS, 46%)
6. Mexico	Foreign	6. Russia, 40% (NPS, 26%)	China, 33%
7. China	Foreign	7. China, 39% (NPS, 33%)	NC, 34%
8. Thailand	Foreign	8. Thailand, 32%	Thailand, 46%

"American" Speakers

The speakers perceived as the American in-group are Iowa, NC and AAVE. Iowa is the most likely to be included in social interactions and the least likely to be excluded. Indeed, Iowa is 14% more likely to be included than the second most likely speaker (SA) and 27% more likely to be included than the speaker least likely to be included

(Thailand). Iowa is also 13% less likely to be excluded than the second least excluded speaker (Russia) and 33% less likely to be excluded than the most likely speaker (Thailand). Iowa was also the only speaker to be perceived by the raw percentage score to be 100% American. It seems that being perceived as such does indeed positively influence the likelihood of native speakers to engage in social interactions with the speaker.

But what about the other speakers who are perceived as being American? The AAVE speaker was rated slightly less likely to be included in social interactions compared to SA, which was part of the More American than Foreign group. She was also 1% more likely to be excluded than Russia, which was perceived to belong to the More American than Foreign group as well.

Additionally, NC was rated as more American than every speaker except for the speaker from Iowa, but NC was less likely to be included than AAVE, Mexico and SA. NC was ranked seventh according to the Negative Perception Score, indicating that respondents held stronger negative feelings towards NC than all other speakers except Thailand. Through examining these relationships, it appears that speakers who are perceived as American (Table 3) are not automatically more likely to be engaged in social activities. Although perceptions of being American versus Somewhat American and Somewhat Foreign exist, it appears that this perception is not the most important factor listeners consider when deciding with whom to socialize.

"Foreign" Speakers

However, as illustrated by the Iowa speaker, being perceived as Completely American did correlate with a greater possibility of social interactions, conversely being perceived as completely foreign correlates to a greater probability of not being involved in social interactions and even a greater probability of being excluded. Just as Iowa was substantially perceived as the most American and the most likely to be involved in social activities, Thailand, which was largely perceived as the most foreign (83% raw score), was also the least likely to be included in activities with native English speakers. Additionally, she was also 12% more likely to be excluded than the next most likely speaker to be excluded (NC) and 33% more likely to be excluded than Iowa. As suggested by this data, being perceived as completely foreign does negatively influence the likelihood of being included in social activities with native English speakers.

This conclusion is also supported by examining China's scores. The only speakers to receive a Foreign Score of 100% were Thailand and China. They were perceived as being the most foreign out of all of the speakers. They were also the least likely to be included. In truth, China had the second lowest PPS (39%).   With the exception of NC, they were also the most likely to be excluded. Thus, it seems that being perceived as completely foreign does negatively influence, to a degree at least, the probability of native speakers socializing with the foreign speakers.

However, not examining the percentage of the Foreign Score but analyzing the overall in-group/out-group categorization, Mexico was also perceived as being 77% foreign (Table 2). She was not perceived as only Completely Foreign, but she was still thought of as foreign. Possibly due to this partial American perception, she fell within a

cluster of Positive Perception Scores, which included SA, AAVE, Mexico, NC, Russia and China. All of these scores were within five percentages of one another. Mexico was rated in the top four most likely to be included, based upon the PPS and NPS. This indicates that compared to other speakers, participants were not more or less inclined to socialize with this speaker solely based upon the perception of being foreign.

In summary, being perceived as 100% foreign negatively influences the likelihood of being socially included. According to the results of this study, those who are perceived as 100% foreign are the least likely to be involved in social interactions with native high school English speakers. Conversely, an American Score of 100% does not guarantee acceptance, as NC clearly illustrates. (As explained above, an American Score is the sum of the responses to the 3-Somewhat more American than Foreign and 4-Completely American choices, whereas a raw American score is simply the percentage of responses for the 4-Completely American choice.) As the Iowa speaker highlights, being perceived as 100% American, in other words, speaking with the same accent as the native listener, does positively influence social interactions. Outside of the extremes of the perceptions of completely foreign or American, there is little correlation between perceived Americanism and the likelihood of social interactions to occur. One might ask whether degree of accentedness places a role.

Weaknesses of the Study

In considering the generalizability of this study, it must be noted that the degree of the markedness of the speakers' accents was not controlled, as it would have been extremely difficult to do so. Some of the speakers, such as the Chinese and Thai speakers,

had more marked accents than some of the other speakers, such as the Saudi Arabian and

Russian speakers. This difference could have contributed to the fact that the Thai,

Chinese and Mexican speakers were rated as more foreign than other speakers. In order

to claim that one accent is generally perceived as more American than another,

markedness of the accent should be taken into consideration. However, the purpose of

this study was not to generalize that all speakers of one accent are perceived to be more

American than another by the general adolescent populace; rather, one purpose of this

study was to ascertain if there is a relation between the perception of any speaker's accent

and how American she or he is.

Implications in Education

It seems that purely based upon accent and not considering other social factors,

only the most foreign perceived students are at risk for not being included in social

activities with native-speaking peers. But what does this mean within the classroom?

Citing previous studies, Wentzel and Caldwell (1997) stated, "Elementary-aged children

who are not well accepted by their classmates tend to do less well than more popular

children and appear to be at risk for dropping out during the high school years" (p. 1198).

At the high school level, Walters and Bowen (1997) summarized numerous studies

reporting that "students who feel accepted by their peers are better able to meet academic

challenges…rejection or negative experiences in the peer group over time are likely to

erode an adolescent's level of self-confidence and promote disruptive behaviors at school,

which in turn, are associated with a decline in academic performance" (p. 414). Hence,

social inclusion at the peer level can influence student achievement.

Numerous factors influence student achievement, but perhaps perceptions based upon "foreign" English do have some effect upon English Language Learners and their completion of high school within the U.S. Basing its data on U.S. Census records, Child Trends Databank reported in 2011 that 18% of foreign born students aged 16-24 drop out before graduating high school, and 10% of students from foreign-born parents drop out as well. This is compared to only 4% of native born children (2012). Furthermore, the dropout rates for foreign born students and students of foreign-born parents accounts for nearly 90% of all U.S. dropouts (Child Trends Databank, 2012). One can see that these students, who are typically ELLs, are at-risk for dropping out of school. Although it is unlikely that not all of these dropouts are perceived by their peers as having a "foreign" accent, helping all students to feel accepted into the learning community could possibly lead to more positive classroom environments, additional positive relationships, feelings of support and self-worth, and increased motivation, all of which contribute to improved academic performance and emotional stability and well-being

So what can be done to help ELLs, especially those who are perceived as "foreign", therefore being less likely to be socially included by their peers? One of the most effective classroom strategies that could be implemented more regularly is structuring classroom activities around small group work and cooperative learning. Studies show that this has contributed to the development of positive relationships between students with differing language backgrounds, a diminishment of stereotypes and an increase in positive attitudes among the students (De Jong, 2011, p. 179). One might also speculate that small group work would increase familiarity with other accents, which would likewise lead to less stigmatism in regard to that accent. In actuality, any

activity that encourages respect for differences and acknowledgement of similarities could potentially help all students to be accepted by one another. With this acceptance, student achievement is likely to be increased.

Suggestions for Future Research

This pilot study could be expanded and conducted in many ways in order to more completely understand the factors that influence perceptions based upon accent and the resulting likelihood of social interactions. All students who participated in this study had studied a foreign language at school. It would be interesting to examine to what extent studying a foreign language influences the likelihood for students to socialize with the accented speakers. Discovering relationships between experience with learning a foreign language and more positive social interactions could provide research-based support to either fund or not to fund world language education programs.

Another variable inherent to the respondents that could be investigated further is ethnicity. One might pose the question of whether there are general trends of how accepting respondents are of accented speakers based upon the respondents' ethnicities. In addition to ethnicity, many other respondent variables could be investigated, such as gender, former contact with ELLs, and former experiences with speakers of other languages. Finally, this study only used a small sample of participants from a particular town in Iowa. Students from other states and regions could be surveyed in order to obtain a more accurate picture of the current attitudes expressed by youth throughout the nation. Gathering this additional data could help educators understand their students

more completely, and consequentially, be able to discern how to help meet more of their

students' needs.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study investigated to what degree eight varieties of English are perceived as being American by a group of high school students and how likely these students are to engage in social activities with the accented speakers under given circumstances. Results of the study suggest that any speaker who speaks differently from the native listener could be perceived as being less American, despite the fact that a speaker could be native to the United States. More importantly than this, the study points to the importance of perceived accent for peer acceptance in terms of social interaction. Perceptions of how American a speaker is does influence the likelihood of native English speaking peers participating in social interactions with the speaker. However, this perception only seems to affect speakers who are either perceived as completely American or completely foreign. Listeners who perceive speakers to be 100% American by their raw score (compared to the derived American Score) are more likely to participate in social activities with the accented speaker. Listeners who perceive speakers as 100% foreign as expressed by their Foreign Score, are significantly less likely to participate in social activities with the foreign accented speaker. Outside of the extremes of the perceptions of completely foreign or American, there is little correlation between perceived Americanism and the likelihood of social interactions to occur.

As consequence, educators should be aware that students who are perceived as speaking with a completely foreign accent may be at risk for being excluded from or not included in social activities with their native English speaking peers. This in turn could affect academic achievement. Through small group work, cooperative learning and other

intervention strategies, educators have the potential to help all students be part of a

healthy, thriving and united imagined community.

References

American Varieties. (2005). Retrieved from
        http://www.pbs.org/speak/seatosea/americanvarieties/

Ballantyne, K.G., Sanderman, A.R., Levy, J. (2008). *Educating English language
        learners Building teacher capacity*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for
        English Language Acquisition. Retrieved from
        http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/3/EducatingELLsBuildingTeacherCapaci
        tyV   ol1.pdf

Brennan, E. M., & Brennan, J. (1981). Accent scaling and language attitudes: Reactions
        to Mexican American English speech. Language & Speech, 24(3), 207-221.

Bresnahan, M. J., Ohashi, R., Nebashi, R., Liu, W. Y., & Shearman, S. M. (2002).
        Attitudinal and affective response toward accented English. *Language and
        Communication, 22*, 171-185.

Butler, Y.G. (2007). How are nonnative-English speaking teachers perceived by young
        learners? *TESOL, 4*(14), 1-40.

Cargile, A.C. (1997) Attitudes toward Chinese-accented speech: an investigation in
        two contexts. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology,* 16, 434–44.

Cargile, A.C. (2000). Evaluations of employment suitability: Does accent always matter?
        Journal of Employment Counseling, 37, 165-177.

Child Trend Databank. (2012). *High School Drop Out Rates-Indicators on Children and
        Youth.* Retrieved from:
        http://www.childtrendsdatabank.org/sites/default/files/01_Dropout_Rates.pdf

Congressional Budget Office. (2011). A description of the immigrant population: An
        update. Retrieved from
        http://www.cbo.gov/publication/41453

Creese G. and Kambere E. N. (2003). What colour is your English? *The Canadian
        Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 40(5), 565-573.

De Jong, E. J. (2009). *Foundations for multilingualism in education: From principles to
        practice.* Philadelphia, PA: Caslon, Inc.

Duisberg, S. (2001). High school heritage learners of Spanish: An investigation of
        language attitudes. *Dissertation Abstracts International, Section A: The
        Humanities and Social Sciences*, *62*(4), 1390.

Galindo, D. (1995). Language attitudes toward Spanish and English varieties: A Chicano perspective. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *17*, 77-99.

Gill, M.M. (1994). Accent and stereotypes: their effect on perceptions of teachers and Lecture comprehension. *Journal of Applied Communication Research,* 22, 349–61.

Hertel, T., & Sunderman, G. (2009). Student attitudes toward native and non-native language instructors. *Foreign Language Annals*, *42*(3), 468-482.

Horwitz, E. (2008). *Becoming a language teacher: a practical guide to second language learning and teaching.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Kids Count Data Center. (2010). Children that speak a language other than English at home. Retrieved from http://datacenter.kidscount.org/data/acrossstates/Rankings.aspx?order=a&ind=81&dtm=397&tf=133

Lindemann, S. (2003) Koreans, Chinese, or Indians? Attitudes and ideologies about non-native English speakers in the United States. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7: 348–64.

Lindemann, S. (2005). Who speaks "broken English"? US undergraduates' perceptions of non-native English, 15(2), 187-212

McLeod, S. A. (2008). Social Identity Theory. *Simply Psychology.* Retrieved from http://www.simplypsychology.org/social-identity-theory.html

Mesthrie, R., Swan, J., Deumert, A., Leap, W. L. (2000). *Introducing Sociolinguistics.* Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Moyer, A. (2007). Do language attitudes determine accent? A study of bilinguals in the U.S.A. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6, 502-518.

Northern Arizona University (2009). *Online lesson: Language versus dialect.* Retrieved from http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~carrasco/bme637/class/languages/dialects/lesson3-2.html

Rubin, D.L. & Smith, K.A. (1990). Effects of accent, ethnicity, and lecture topic on underrgraduates' preceptions of non-native English-speaking teaching assistants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relation,*. 14, 337-353.

Said (2006). *Attitudes towards accented speech: A comparative study of native and non-native speakers of American English* (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from http://www.personal.psu.edu/sbb170/MA%20Thesis.pdf

Salomone, R. C. (2010). *True American.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Scales, J., Wennerstrom, A., Richard, D., & Hui Wu, S. (2006). Language learners' perceptions of accent. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*, 715-738.

Walters, K., & Bowen, G.L. (1997). Peer Group Acceptance and Academic Performance Among Adolescents Participating in a Dropout Prevention Program. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 14(*6), 413-426.

Wentzel, K. & Caldwell, K. (1997). Friendships, peer acceptance, and group membership: relations to academic achievement in middle school. *Child Development, 68*(6), 1198-1209.

Young. C.E. (2003). College students' reactions to accents of L2 learners of Spanish and English. In L. Sayahi (Ed.), *Selected proceedings of the first workshop on Spanish sociolinguistics* (pp. 107-111). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Appendix A: Student Demographics Questionnaire and Survey

1. What is your age?
    A.) 15   B.) 16   C.) 17   D.) 18

2. Is English your native language?
    A.) Yes   B.) No

3. Have you studied a foreign language?
    A.) Yes   B.) No

    If "yes" for how many years have you studied it?_____

PLEASE ASSUME THAT THE SPEAKER IS YOUR AGE.   **SPEAKER 1**

A.) Rate the accent based upon how American you think it is by circling your response.

1- Completely foreign   **2**- Somewhat foreign   **3**-Somehwat more American   **4**- Completely
                                                                                    than foreign   American

B.) For each speaker, place an "X" in the box which indicates how likely you would be to do the following:

1- Not at all!   2-Somewhat   3-About 50% of the time   4- Mostly likely   5-Definitely!

1	Pursue a friendship	1	2	3	4	5
2	Share a secret	1	2	3	4	5
3	Sit with her at lunch	1	2	3	4	5
4	Choose to be her partner for a school homework activity	1	2	3	4	5
5	Work with her cooperatively on a group project	1	2	3	4	5
6	Invite her to your house or one of your parties	1	2	3	4	5
7	Go to her house if she invites you over	1	2	3	4	5
8	Invite her to be your friend on Facebook	1	2	3	4	5
9	Accept a friend invitation on Facebook	1	2	3	4	5
10	Send her a text	1	2	3	4	5
11	Help her with homework if you are able to do so	1	2	3	4	5
12	Help her with a skill that you are good at (playing basketball, playing a musical instrument, drawing, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
13	Attend a school event (athletic competition, music concert, school play, etc) with her	1	2	3	4	5
14	Stand up for her if someone teased her	1	2	3	4	5
15	Try to learn more about her home culture	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix B: Frequency Tables

Table 1: Participants' Responses Towards Speaker 1: Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

A.	1- completely foreign	2- somewhat foreign	3- somewhat American+	4- completely American	Total	
	2	11	17	0	30	
B.	1- Not at all	2- Somewhat	3- About 50%	4- Most likely	5-Definitely	Total
1	1	11	12	5	1	30
2	15	10	4	1	0	30
3	2	6	8	9	5	30
4	2	7	9	8	4	30
5	0	7	5	11	7	30
6	3	14	7	4	2	30
7	1	4	12	10	3	30
8	2	2	4	12	10	30
9	2	0	3	13	12	30
10	3	6	10	7	4	30
11	1	4	7	9	9	30
12	3	3	10	8	6	30
13	4	8	8	6	4	30
14	1	5	5	8	11	30
15	2	5	7	11	5	30
Total:	42	92	111	122	83	450

Table 2: Participants' Responses Towards Speaker 2: Thailand

A.	1- completely foreign	2- somewhat foreign	3- somewhat American+	4- completely American	Total	
	25	5	0	0	30	
B.	1- Not at all	2- Somewhat	3- About 50%	4- Most likely	5-Definitely	Total
1	6	12	9	2	1	30
2	21	5	3	0	1	30
3	5	10	7	4	4	30
4	9	7	4	7	3	30
5	6	5	7	7	5	30
6	9	16	2	2	1	30
7	6	11	8	5	0	30
8	5	5	5	8	7	30
9	2	2	6	12	8	30
10	7	10	9	2	2	30
11	4	3	12	5	6	30
12	5	7	6	6	6	30
13	7	11	7	4	1	30
14	2	5	5	8	10	30
15	2	4	9	7	8	30
Total:	96	113	99	79	63	

Table 3: Participants' Responses Towards Speaker 3: North Carolina, U.S.A.

A.	1- completely foreign	2- somewhat foreign	3- somewhat American+	4- completely American	Total	
	0	0	7	23	30	
B.	1- Not at all	2- Somewhat	3- About 50%	4- Most likely	5-Definitely	Total
1	4	8	9	5	4	30
2	14	10	3	1	2	30
3	3	9	7	7	4	30
4	3	9	6	10	2	30
5	1	9	5	11	4	30
6	5	7	9	5	4	30
7	4	5	9	10	2	30
8	3	4	7	8	8	30
9	0	2	12	6	10	30
10	3	7	10	8	2	30
11	1	3	7	14	5	30
12	1	6	9	8	6	30
13	4	6	11	4	5	30
14	2	3	6	9	10	30
15	6	10	7	6	1	30
Total:	54	98	117	112	69	

Table 4: Participants' Responses Towards Speaker 4: Mexico

A.	1- completely foreign	2- somewhat foreign	3- somewhat American+	4- completely American	Total	
	2	21	7	0	30	
B.	1- Not at all	2- Somewhat	3- About 50%	4- Most likely	5-Definitely	Total
1	3	6	10	8	3	30
2	12	11	3	4	0	30
3	3	5	12	6	4	30
4	3	9	9	6	3	30
5	1	7	7	9	6	30
6	2	10	10	4	4	30
7	4	4	13	6	3	30
8	3	3	6	11	7	30
9	1	2	8	9	10	30
10	3	7	13	6	1	30
11	2	1	10	11	6	30
12	3	4	8	10	5	30
13	4	4	13	6	3	30
14	2	3	3	11	11	30
15	2	4	10	9	5	30
Total:	48	80	135	116	71	

Table 5: Participants' Responses Towards Speaker 5:Iowa, U.S.A.

A.	1- completely foreign	2- somewhat foreign	3- somewhat American+	4- completely American	Total		
	0	0	0	30	30		
B.	1- Not at all	2- Somewhat	3- About 50%	4- Most likely	5-Definitely	Total	
1	0	1	7	14	8	30	
2	6	10	10	3	1	30	
3	0	2	12	9	7	30	
4	0	3	9	13	5	30	
5	0	0	4	15	11	30	
6	0	6	6	14	4	30	
7	0	2	11	11	6	30	
8	0	3	8	5	14	30	
9	0	1	5	9	15	30	
10	0	5	10	10	5	30	
11	0	1	6	15	8	30	
12	0	1	13	11	5	30	
13	0	2	11	14	3	30	
14	0	1	6	9	14	30	
15	4	9	8	7	2	30	
Total:	10	47	126	159	108		

Table 6: Participants' Responses Towards Speaker 6: St. Petersburg, Russia

A.	1- completely foreign	2- somewhat foreign	3- somewhat American+	4- completely American	Total		
	0	0	28	2	30		
B.	1- Not at all	2- Somewhat	3- About 50%	4- Most likely	5-Definitely	Total	
1	0	9	11	8	2	30	
2	12	11	3	3	1	30	
3	2	7	11	5	5	30	
4	1	5	14	5	5	30	
5	0	2	11	9	8	30	
6	2	12	9	5	2	30	
7	1	6	13	8	2	30	
8	1	5	8	8	8	30	
9	0	0	9	13	8	30	
10	2	12	9	5	2	30	
11	0	2	13	9	6	30	
12	0	4	12	9	5	30	
13	3	6	14	5	2	30	
14	1	3	5	11	10	30	
15	3	6	12	6	3	30	
Total:	28	90	154	109	69		

Table 7: Participants' Responses Towards Speaker 7: Georgia, U.S.A. (African American Vernacular English)

A.	1- completely foreign	2- somewhat foreign	3- somewhat American+	4- completely American	Total		
	0	1	8	21	30		
B.	1- Not at all	2- Somewhat	3- About 50%	4- Most likely	5-Definitely	Total	
1	1	9	10	6	4		30
2	12	9	5	2	2		30
3	1	6	12	6	5		30
4	1	6	12	9	2		30
5	0	3	11	11	5		30
6	1	11	6	8	4		30
7	1	5	10	11	3		30
8	2	5	6	6	11		30
9	0	0	11	9	10		30
10	2	10	7	9	2		30
11	0	3	10	12	5		30
12	1	5	9	11	4		30
13	2	7	9	8	4		30
14	1	4	4	13	8		30
15	7	5	10	7	1		30
Total:	32	88	132	128	70		

Table 8: Participants' Responses Towards Speaker 8: Tianjin, China

A.	1- completely foreign	2- somewhat foreign	3- somewhat American+	4- completely American	Total		
	8	22	0	0	30		
B.	1- Not at all	2- Somewhat	3- About 50%	4- Most likely	5-Definitely	Total	
1	2	9	10	5	4		30
2	9	12	4	5	0		30
3	2	7	12	1	8		30
4	2	10	8	6	4		30
5	2	4	7	11	6		30
6	3	9	12	3	3		30
7	3	8	8	10	1		30
8	4	3	7	5	11		30
9	1	3	6	8	12		30
10	3	10	8	8	1		30
11	2	4	9	10	5		30
12	3	5	9	9	4		30
13	4	7	12	5	2		30
14	1	6	5	8	10		30
15	2	7	8	10	3		30
Total:	43	104	125	104	74		

Appendix C: Question "B" Pie Charts for Each Speaker

Percentage of Responses for Thailand

- 1- Not at all: 21%
- 2- Somewhat: 25%
- 3- About 50%: 22%
- 4- Most likely: 18%
- 5-Definitely: 14%

Percentage of Responses for Iowa

- 1- Not at all: 2%
- 2- Somewhat: 11%
- 3- About 50%: 28%
- 4- Most likely: 35%
- 5-Definitely: 24%

Percentage of Responses for Saudi Arabia

- 1- Not at all: 9%
- 2- Somewhat: 21%
- 3- About 50%: 25%
- 4- Most likely: 27%
- 5-Definitely: 18%

Percentage of Responses for North Carolina

- 1- Not at all: 12%
- 2- Somewhat: 22%
- 3- About 50%: 26%
- 4- Most likely: 25%
- 5-Definitely: 15%

Percentage of Responses for China

- 1- Not at all: 10%
- 2- Somewhat: 23%
- 3- About 50%: 28%
- 4- Most likely: 23%
- 5-Definitely: 16%

Percentage of Responses for AAVE

- 1- Not at all: 7%
- 2- Somewhat: 20%
- 3- About 50%: 29%
- 4- Most likely: 28%
- 5-Definitely: 16%

Percentage of Responses for Mexico

- 1- Not at all: 10%
- 2- Somewhat: 18%
- 3- About 50%: 30%
- 4- Most likely: 26%
- 5-Definitely: 16%

Percentage of Responses for Russia

- 1- Not at all: 6%
- 2- Somewhat: 20%
- 3- About 50%: 34%
- 4- Most likely: 24%
- 5-Definitely: 16%