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Motivations
On voice alone, listeners make “moral, intellectual, and aesthetic” judgments of others (Lindemann, 2000, p. 2).
Previous work on evaluative reactions to accented speech consider:
- judgments of regional varieties of the same language (e.g., Wilson & Baynard, 1992; Boushis, Giles & Lambert, 1975; Arthur, Farrar & Bradfield, 1974)
- native speaker judgments of second-language learners with a common L1 (e.g., Young, 2003; Lindemann 2002; Cangile 1997)

Methods: Materials
Audio-recordings: 8 learners of Spanish, each with different L1s
In the following order:
1. Polish (mid)
2. Brazilian Portuguese (close)
3. Chinese (far)
4. Surinamese (mid)
5. French (close)
6. Korean (far)
Rating form: 7-point Likert-scale
15 antonym pairs of adjectives
Three open-ended questions:
Would you be friends with this person? Why or why not?
Where do you think this person is from? How can you tell?
Is there anything else you would like to add?

Results
1964 of 4500 reported scores were neutral (43.6%), obscuring findings.
Neutral scores (4) were removed and ratings were collapsed into two scores (1.3 & 5.7)

Table 1. Percentage of non-neutral ratings in evaluative categories by Talker language distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Personality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>n = 500</td>
<td>p = 0.01</td>
<td>p = 0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>n = 450</td>
<td>p = 0.04</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far</td>
<td>n = 500</td>
<td>p = 0.004</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far L1</td>
<td>n = 500</td>
<td>p = 0.01</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Percent of neutral versus non-neutral ratings in each evaluative category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Easy/Difficult to understand</th>
<th>Very accented/unaccented</th>
<th>Very fluent/not at all fluent</th>
<th>Very educated/Uneducated</th>
<th>Sophisticated/Unsophisticated</th>
<th>Intelligent/Unintelligent</th>
<th>Trustworthy/Untrustworthy</th>
<th>Open minded/Narrow minded</th>
<th>Wealthy/Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future Considerations
Raters may be less likely to judge near the beginning of the task and more likely to judge at the end:
1. Would you be friends with this person? Why or why not?
2. T2: I’m not sure because I cannot accurately guess their personality based on this listening.
3. T3: I’m not sure.
4. T4: I can’t guess their personality & the Spanish is not very good.
5. T5: His accent makes the Spanish hard to understand, so I guess not.
6. T6: I don’t think I would. (R31)

talkers are of the same proficiency level
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