EVALUATIONAL REACTIONS TO FOREIGN ACCENT AMONG IMMIGRANTS IN TORONTO

William J. Samarin
Ivan Kalmar

The following paper contributes in a small measure to the great need for studies of language use in Canada. The need is acute, not merely because Canada is a polylingual nation with a constant flow of immigrants who have to learn or at least cope with one or both of Canada's national languages, a situation that poses many practical problems for the immigrants, their co-citizens, and their governments, but also because we still know so little about how language is actually used in Canada. Census figures, no matter how valuable they are for any study, cannot reflect the dynamics of contemporary language use.

We are reporting here on a study¹ whose topic was "foreign accent" (henceforth FA), or the set of those features in speech which make the hearer realize that the speaker is using a language of which he is not a native speaker.² FA is obviously an important factor in the dynamics of language use in Toronto, where our study was conducted. In this, one of the largest and most polylingual cities of Canada, the number of people who speak English with a FA must surely be at least in the tens of thousands. FA is also of potential interest to the general theory of sociolinguistics. In North America, where social stratification proceeds along ethnic as well as socioeconomic lines (for a general discussion of this, see e.g. Gordon 1964), it is reasonable to expect that among the social variants of English (in Anglophone North America) there will be some that correlate with the ethnic background of the speaker. At least some of these are obviously marked by FA ("Italian accent," "German accent," etc.). We wanted to make a step towards discovering the role of FA as a sociolinguistic "boundary marker" in society, and the topic we chose was the attitudes of immigrants (themselves speakers of English with a FA) to different degrees of FA in the speech of others.

Experimental Design

We showed a five-minute episode from a Charlie Chaplin comedy film to seventeen Italian immigrants. Then we immediately recorded their descriptions, in English, of what they saw. One of the recordings thus obtained was selected for the experiment. Two stretches of speech were clipped from this one recording, to be used as experimental recording 1 (ER 1, 13 seconds), and experimental recording 2 (ER 2, 7 seconds). The reason for selecting these particular stretches of speech was that ER 1 appeared to us more deviant from "native" English than ER 2. (Fifteen of sixteen native speakers of English who listened to the experimental recordings, believing them to be the voices of two different men, agreed that this was so, while only one thought that ER 1 and ER 2 sounded as equally "good" English).³

These recordings were presented to subjects as if they represented two different speakers. Consequently, we shall in this paper call ER 1 "the worse speaker" and ER 2 "the better speaker."

The subjects, 50 Czechoslovak and 49 Armenian immigrants resident in Toronto, were asked the questions given in Table 1.

TABLE 1

The Interviewing Protocol

1. *What do you think is the best way for a child to learn English?*
2. *What do you think is the best way for an adult to learn English?*
3. *Do you have a foreign accent in English?*
4. *Compared to other people similar to you, is your accent weak, strong, or in between?*
5. *Do you think you will ever lose your accent?*
6. *[If so] in how many years?*
7. *Imagine that you suddenly lost your accent. How would people you know react?*

[The tape is played]

8. *Which of these two men speak English better?*
9. *Which of these men is older?*
10. *Which of these men is taller?*
11. *If these people were your neighbours and you needed to borrow something, which of them would you turn to?*
12. *Which of these men would you prefer to work for?*

13. *What type of occupation does each of these men have? (Warner's scale was applied to the answers to this question to see which speaker was imagined to have an occupation with higher social status).*
14. *Which of these men would find a new job more easily?*
15. *What is the native language of each of these men?*
16. *Which of these men speaks his own language more often?*
17. *Would the first man speak his own language with his family? With his friends? And at work? And what about the second man?*

The first seven questions were asked primarily with view to another objective of our study, one beyond the scope of this paper. The answers to them will be mentioned only if relevant in our context. Questions 8-17 were designed among other things to ascertain whether subjects associated "better English" with culturally valued personal attributes (questions 9 and 10), positive affect (questions 11 and 12) and economic opportunity (13 and 14).

The Armenian and Czechoslovak subject populations consisted of 17 female and 32 male Armenians and of 17 female and 33 male Czechoslovaks. Other than his sex, we also recorded each subject's age and occupation, how long he has been living in Canada, what languages he spoke, and what ethnic group within the Armenian or Czechoslovak community he belonged to.⁴ The degree of FA of the subject was coded by the interviewer subjectively on an eight-point scale. The social class of each subject was determined from his occupation according to Warner's (1960: 140) revised scale for rating occupation. These personal background factors were then related to the subject's answers.

Results and Discussion

Due to limitations of space, we will in the following communicate only those results that reached statistical significance, except where the results, although only approaching significance, seem to be of particular interest.

Only nine subjects said they had as much as a suspicion that the recordings were of the same speaker. Of the nine, eight were immediately (and deliberately) persuaded that they were wrong and proceeded to respond as though ER 1 and ER 2 represented two different men. No difference could be detected between their responses and those of the other subjects.

It seemed, moreover, that in the majority of the few cases where the subjects suspected something strange about the recording, some noise interfered with the playing of the recordings. This observation is worth checking in future research. It seems that because of the noise the "suspicious" subjects could not understand the recordings and thus their attention was brought more sharply upon some of the nonlinguistic features of the voices, which were the same in ER 1 and ER 2, as the voices had been

produced by the same speaker. If this is true then noise should properly be controlled for in all future "marched-guise" experiments where discrimination between guises is of central importance.

Only seven subjects thought that the English of the "two" speakers was equally "good." Thus it appears that the degree of FA can vary appreciably within the speech of a single "ethnic" speaker. At this stage the formalization and incorporation into sociolinguistic theory of intra-speaker variation in the degree of FA is difficult. However, one is tempted to advance a hypothesis.

Tentatively, variation in the extent of FA may be regarded as a continuum of variants such that the limits of each variant on the continuum from "strong accent" to "no accent" are defined in terms of listener attitudes. Thus if it were found that listeners have only three basic clusters of evaluational reactions to different degrees of FA, then it would be necessary to describe only three variants, such as "strong," "medium," and "slight" accent. Any number of these variants may co-exist in the repertory variants of a single speaker. (In our experiment the subjects showed, as we shall see, differential attitudes to speech by the same person, depending on the degree of FA in his speech). If the listener is exposed to only one variant (e.g. "strong accent") in the speaker's speech, he will, however, assume that the speaker speaks only that variant, at all times. Our subjects did not imagine that ER 1 and ER 2 could have been the same speaker, because they failed to realize that the worse speaker may at another time be able to speak as well as the better speaker.

However, it should be noted that there may be a similar relationship between register and sociolect in native speech as there is between degree of FA spoken by the speaker at a given moment and the degree of FA which characterizes the speaker in general. Labov (1966) noted that "r-less speech" in New York was most common among the lower classes in general *and* among *all* classes in less formal situations; that is, in both sociolect and register. Thus any speaker would sometimes produce an r-less form. But if the listener hears a non-lower-class speaker produce r-less speech only (as in a short recording or a telephone conversation), it may be assumed that he will classify the latter as lower class. Likewise, an "ethnic" speaker will on some occasions produce, let us say, "no accent," but a listener who hears him only on that occasion will have the same attitudes to him as though he had "no accent" at any time.

Many subjects thought that the better speaker was native and the worse speaker was foreign. The responses, to all questions, of these subjects were compared to those who thought both speakers were foreign, but no difference between the two groups was found (using the chi-square test).⁵

As for the subjects' responses to questions about the experimental recordings, strong statistical significance attached to the correlation between

height and FA. Seventy-five per cent of our subjects who answered the appropriate question associated the better speaker with taller size (see Table 2).⁶ In other words, when asked Which of these men speaks English better? and Which of these men do you think is taller? they chose the same person in response to both questions. This supports the finding of Anisfeld, Bogo, and Lambert (1962) that in Montreal speakers of English with a Jewish accent are imagined to be shorter than speakers who do not have an accent. Anisfeld et al. think that their finding may either be due to the fact that the perceived magnitude of objects is closely associated with value (Bruner and Goodman 1947, Carter and Schooler 1949, Lambert, Solomon and Watson 1949), or to a possibly objective opinion that the average immigrant is shorter than the average native Canadian.

The better speaker was also generally considered to be younger than the worse speaker. Several of the subjects expressed the opinion, after the test was given to them, that older people cannot learn English as well as younger ones.

The responses to question 13 also proved statistically significant: most subjects answered "don't know," i.e. they could not at all associate occupation and proficiency in English (see Table 2). This fact should be considered together with the responses to question 14. The latter indicate overwhelmingly that "better English means easier access to jobs" in the opinion of the subjects. From questions 13 and 14 we might conclude that our subjects thought that a person who speaks English well will find a job more easily than one who does not; yet if the latter tries hard, the job he gets will not necessarily be worse than one he would get if he spoke English better.

TABLE 2

Association between Perceived Degree of FA and other Attributes

Attribute	Better speaker	Worse speaker	p<
(9) Older	22	63	.01*
(10) Taller	51(75%)	17	.02*
(11) Preferred lender	52(68%)	24	.10
(12) Preferred employer	56	29	.10
(13) Better job*	32	7	.02*
(14) Finds job quicker	77(87%)	11	.001*

*53 subjects answered "don't know" to question 13

Question 15, about the native language of each speaker on the tape, was

intended to discover whether the subjects considered certain ethnic groups in Toronto to have heavier accents than others. It was not possible to who that they did, as the answers were too disparate.

Due to the fact that many subjects considered at least the "better" of the two voices as that of a native speaker of English, the question, "Which of these men do you think speaks his own language more often?" could be put to only a relatively small sample. Nevertheless, the response was unequivocal. While seven eligible respondents either thought that both the better and the worse speaker used their native languages to the same extent, or answered "I don't know," all of the remaining 38 said that the better speaker spoke his own language less often. This result indicates the subjects' faith in the apparently common-sense proposition that practice increases success in foreign language learning. One may note here that this contradicts the scepticism about the role of practice in language learning recently expressed by some specialists (see Jakobovits 1970).

The responses to question 17 varied widely; again definitive conclusions cannot be made. Many (19 out of 99) of the subjects thought that persons with good as well as bad English would speak their own language in the same situations, be it with their family or with their friends. These subjects would seem to hypothesize that immigrants speak their own language among themselves not because they could not speak English equally well but as a matter of solidarity and language maintenance. Other subjects, however, thought that the better speaker would speak English more often not only in absolute terms but also as far as number of situations is concerned (see Table 3).

TABLE 3

	Opinions		N of responses
	Worse speaker uses his own language with	Better speaker uses his own language with	
same environ- ment for both	family, friends	family, friends	14
	family	family	5
	family, friends, work	family, friends	9
	family, friends	family	2
	family	(native speaker)	1
	family, friends	(native speaker)	17
	family, friends, work	(native speaker)	5

family, work	(native speaker)	1
family, friends	friends	2
family, friends, work	work	1
family, friends	work	1
family, friends, work	(does not use own language)	2
family, friends, work	family	4

The answers to the rest of the questions showed nowhere the same uniformity of the responses discussed above (see Table 2), but in many cases social background and some personal differences as revealed through questions 3-7 (Table 1) had a demonstrable bearing on the subjects' responses.

For example, whether the immigrant believes he will ever lose his FA (question 5) is likely to correlate with his evaluational reactions to accent. Only 16 out of the 99 subjects expected to lose their accent, while 74 thought they never would, and the rest did not answer one way or another. The 16 positive answers to question 5 were scattered among different age groups, social classes, ethnic groups, and among persons who have been living in Canada for very different periods of time; thus relationships between expecting to lose one's FA and these factors could hardly be put to a test with such a small sample. That the subjects did not expect to lose their accents must be said to be a rather realistic attitude, for only one of the 99 subjects was seen by the interviewer as having no FA.

As the group of people who expected to lose their FA was too small, our results comparing the answers of these subjects with the rest did not reach significance. But the probability that the results were due to chance alone was less than 10% where it was shown that 100% of those who expected to lose their FA considered the "better speaker" to be taller (question 10) as opposed to only 69% of those who did not expect this to happen. Even closer to significance were data showing that more of the "expecters" would prefer to work for the speaker with "better English" (81% of the unequivocal answers) than the rest of the subjects (56%), as shown in Table 4. Significant data would, perhaps, be obtained with a larger subject population.

With respect to other answers, no significant distinction was detected between the two groups. But it should be noted that the very large proportion of answers that give advantage to the better speaker with respect to every single question (except perhaps 11) among "expecters" as opposed to "non-expecters" makes it not unlikely that the reason why these data do not reach significance is the small size of the "expecter" group. It seems

TABLE 4

Expecting to Lose one's FA and Association between
Perceived Degree of FA and other Attributes

Attribute	Expect		Non-exp		p<
	BS	WS	BS	WS	
(9) Older	3	10	17	50	.10
(10) Taller	11	0	37	16	
	100%		69%		
(11) Preferred lender	11	4	38	24	.10
(12) Preferred employer	13	3	33	25	
	81%		56%		
(13) Better job	5	1	25	6	
(14) Finds job quicker	16	0	58	9	

BS = better speaker; WS = worse speaker

reasonable to suppose that those second-language learners who hope to learn to speak like native speakers are more critical in their evaluation of others who have not learned to do so than are learners who do not hope to lose their FA.

Here it should be noted that those who expected to lose their FA expected this to happen within widely varying lengths of time: the scattered nature of the data in this very small sample of subjects precluded any serious attempt to match it with other factors.

By means of question 7, subjects were asked to describe how any persons in their surroundings would react if they lost their FA overnight. The proportion of different answers cannot be understood to represent the actual proportion of opinions in the sample, because subjects were not pressed to answer specific questions. For example, if a subject said, "My friends would envy me," he was not then asked, "And do you think that Canadians would accept you better?" Thus his opinion as to the last question was not established. But it is assumed that the answers the subjects gave voluntarily expressed their most strongly felt opinions. In this sense some subjects were classed into two groups for comparison of their answers to questions 9-14. One group consisted of subjects with an "integrative" language learning motivation (Lambert et al. 1968), that is, those who said that losing their FA would result in better acceptance by Canadians. The other group consisted of subjects who might be said to have "negative" language learning motivation, that is, ones who said that members of their own ethnic group would envy them if they lost their FA, and also one

woman who believed that Canadians thought "accents are charming." Each of these groups was compared to the rest of the subjects, (which included those whose answers did not classify them as having either integrative or negative motivation).

Despite the minute size of the sample with integrative motivation, it appeared (see Table 5) that this group saw the better speaker as younger more often than the other subjects (100% as opposed to only 62%) and also that this group with "integrative" motivation thought more decidedly that the better speaker was also taller than the rest of the subjects (100% vs. 72%). Interpretation of data with this low a level of significance is risky, but it appears that immigrants with integrative motivation are very sensitive to socially shared stereotypes of desirable personal attributes among natives of their host country (such as youth or tall size), as would indeed be expected of persons wishing to integrate into a foreign culture, and they associate these attributes readily with proficiency in English. But where their evaluations involved affect (questions 11 and 12) or economic opportunity (13 and 14), they did not associate these with better English to any greater extent than did the rest of the subjects.

TABLE 5

**Language Learning Motivation and Association between
Perceived Degree of FA and other Attributes**

Attribute	Integ		Rest		p<	Neg		Rest		p<
	BS	WS	BS	WS		BS	WS	BS	WS	
(9) Older	0	7	32	53	.20	3	8	29	52	
	100%		62%							
(10) Taller	10	0	40	15	.20	6	4	44	11	
	100%		72%							
(11) Preferred lender	7	3	43	19		6	5	44	17	
(12) Preferred employer	8	3	47	24		7	5	48	22	
(13) Better job	3	1	27	5		7	5	23	1	.02*
						58%		95%		
(14) Finds job quicker	8	2	66	9		7	4	67	7	.05*
						63%		90%		

BS = better speaker; WS = worse speaker

A significant relationship was found between membership in the group of learners with "negative" motivation and answers to questions 13 and 14 (Table 5). While, as all other subjects, most members of this group could not associate kind of occupation and proficiency in English, those that did were

significantly less pessimistic about the chances of the worse speaker to get a good job than were other subjects: only 58% of the negatively motivated subjects thought the better speaker would have a better job, while as many as 95% of the rest of the subjects who answered question 13 unequivocally shared this opinion.

It was also found that subjects in this group believed less often that the better speaker would have a better chance of finding a job quickly. Only 63% did so, compared to 90% of the rest of the subjects.

It follows that a "negative" motivation for language learning stemming from the belief that losing FA can be disadvantageous is consistently accompanied by a belief that the economical advantages of losing one's FA are few.

Other significant differences were found between the responses of Czechoslovaks and Armenians. Armenians (88%) associate proficiency in English with height more often than do Czechoslovaks (61%). But more Czechoslovaks (77%) than Armenians (58%) would prefer to borrow from the better speaker. It is also fairly likely ($p < .20$) that more Czechoslovaks would prefer to work for the better speaker than Armenians. On other questions there seemed to be no difference between the two ethnic groups (see Table 6).

TABLE 6

Some Background Differences among Subjects and Association between Perceived Degree of FA and other Attributes

Attribute	Armen		Cz		p<	Know Fr		Not Fr		p<
	BS	WS	BS	WS		BS	WS	BS	WS	
(9) Older	11	31	11	32		1 4%	21	16 33%	32	.01*
(10) Taller	30 88%	4	21 61%	13	.02*	17 94%	1 66%	25	13	.05*
(11) Preferred lender	21 58%	15	31 77%	9	.10	16	6	32	12	
(12) Preferred employer	26 59%	18	30 73%	11	.20	21	7	29	15	
(13) Better job	13	5	19	2		9	1	17	6	
(14) Finds job quicker	39	5	38	6		22	2	38	11	

BS = better speaker; WS = worse speaker

The interpretation of these results is somewhat difficult. If the answers to question 10 are seen as expressing an association of socially desirable

personal attributes with proficiency in English, then it could be argued that Armenians produce this association more readily than do Czechoslovaks. However, if this is so, then it is hard to see why the responses of the two ethnic groups to the question testing for another socially desirable attribute, namely youth (i.e. question 9) show no difference. These data seem to strengthen the suspicion that question 10 elicited opinions about the relative height of native Canadians and of immigrants rather than evaluational attitudes. Subjective observation indicates that Czechoslovaks are on the average taller than Armenians. It is perhaps not surprising that they gave less support to the hypothesis that the better speaker was taller.

The rest of the data can only be interpreted to mean that more Czechoslovaks seemed to attach positive affect to the better speaker than Armenians.

For what it is worth we will note that one Armenian said that Armenian accents were better than other accents, one Czech said Czech accents were better than Slovak accents, and one Slovak said Slovak accents were better than Czech accents!

When those Armenians and Czechoslovaks who knew French were compared to those who did not, the French speakers were seen as giving a much better evaluation of the better speaker in terms of youth (only 4%, as opposed to 33% of the rest of the subjects, seeing this speaker as older) and height (94 and 65%, respectively, seeing him as taller).

It appears that the French-speaking subjects were more conscious of what has prestige in society. More likely than not, speaking French in Czechoslovakia and among Armenians is in itself a socially desirable quality, and subjects who had made the effort to learn French are also unusually sensitive in their evaluation of other socially desirable qualities (such as height, youth, and — apparently — fluency in English). But this would require that question 10 be interpreted as testing for evaluation in terms of socially desirable attributes, which has been questioned above.

The sex of the subjects also correlated interestingly with the results of the experiment. Shuy, Baratz and Wolfram (1969) were interested in finding out whether women's subjective reactions to sociolects were different from those of men. They played tapes of Detroit residents' voices, which lasted from 20 to 30 seconds, to children and adults also living in Detroit. Of the tapes some represented black members of different social classes, and some represented whites of similarly varying background. The women respondents were not appreciably better at identifying the background of the speaker than the men, and measures of affective reactions to the speakers failed to show a difference between the responses of men and women. But Shuy (1969) also reviews work by Shuy, Wolfram and Riley (1967) and by Wolfram (1969), which shows that black Detroit women use less stigmatized features of low-class Black English than do black Detroit men. Thus the

question is: why do black women in Detroit use fewer stigmatized features and yet seem to be no more sensitive to such features in the speech of others than are black men?

In our study, women *were* more sensitive in their affective reactions to "stigmatized" speech than men. While no significant difference appeared between men and women in their reactions to the "socially desirable attributes" of height and youth or to the "economic" questions 13 and 14, the difference in their affective evaluation of ER 1 and ER 2 approached significance in their answers to question 12 (the chi-square associated with this finding was within .42 of the value corresponding to $p < .05$), and was unquestionably significant in the answers to question 11 (Table 7). Eighty-four per cent of the women subjects and only 60% of the male ones would prefer to borrow from the better speaker; and 78% of the women and only 58% of the men would prefer to work for the better speaker. Thus women were indeed more critical of FA.

The reason for this is probably differential socialization of women and men. Hannerz (1968) speculated that the reason why Black American women use fewer stigmatized features than men is that they are more familiar with "mainstream culture," as the nature of the Black family makes the women (who work in public contact jobs and who are dominant in the family more often than Black men) the family's "external affairs experts" (this unpublished report is described in Shuy, 1969). Our data support Shuy's rejection of this hypothesis. There is no reason to believe that Czechoslovak or Armenian families in Canada are female-headed to the extent that Black families are (or are said to be) in the United States, yet we found Czechoslovak and Armenian women more critical of "bad English" than men, a result which was not obtained in the studies of Black women reported by Shuy.

There does not seem to be any reason to think that only Black women are more critical of speech than men. Indeed if they are not, then there is little point in attributing what appears to be a case of differential socialization to the nature of the American Black family.

As for their answers to questions 9-14, more members of classes 1-3 (of Warner's 1960 scale, where the lower the number the higher the social class) favoured the better speaker than did members of classes 4-7 (see Table 7); but these results were not significant even though where the question was about working for one of the speakers rather than the other (question 12) the difference approached significance quite closely, 72% of the higher classes preferring the better speaker as opposed to a mere 50% of the lower classes. Also, 80% of the higher classes and only 58% of the lower classes thought the better speaker was also taller, but this result approached significance only rather remotely.

TABLE 7

Sex, Social Class, and Association between Perceived Degree
of FA and other Attributes

Attribute	Sex					Classes				
	Women		Men		p<	1-3		4-7		p<
	BS	WS	BS	WS		BS	WS	BS	WS	
(9) Older	6	26	16	37		34	8	16	7	
(10) Taller	20	6	31	11		29	7	7	5	.20
						80%		58%		
(11) Preferred lender	23	5	29	19	.02*	28	11	12	8	
	84%		60%							
(12) Preferred employer	25	7	31	22	.10	31	12	11	11	.10
	78%		58%			72%		50%		
(13) Better job	14	1	17	7		16	6	5	2	
(14) Finds job quicker	49	7	28	4		39	11	20	2	

BS = better speaker; WS = worse speaker

It seems that a larger sample would show a relationship between social class and attitudes to degrees of proficiency in English. But there were other factors in the background of our subjects which were more important in this respect than social class. Moreover, it could not be shown that degree of FA is a function of social class, taking our coding of the subjects' FA as a measure. All degrees of FA seemed to be randomly scattered among different social classes.

We conclude that social class is not necessarily the most important type of population to be considered in studying attitudes to socially significant linguistic variation. In this study the most important factors were ethnic identification, sex, and expected reinforcement to the language learner from native-born Canadians and from his own ethnic group.

The subjects' evaluation of their own FA, the degree of FA in the subjects' speech as subjectively coded by the interviewer, the number of languages spoken by the subjects, the subjects' age, and their allegiance to ethnic subgroups did not correlate with their evaluational reactions to FA as measured in our experiment.

Summary

Fifty Czechoslovakian and 49 Armenian immigrants living in Toronto were interviewed with the objective of testing the evaluational reactions of these subjects to different degrees of proficiency in English. The study included the presentation of two very short stretches of speech clipped from

a recording of one Italian immigrant describing a Chaplin film. One stretch of speech had more non-native linguistic features than the other. The recordings were presented to subjects as if they represented two different speakers. Subjects were then asked various questions about the recordings. The questions were designed to discover whether subjects associated "better English" with culturally valued personal attributes (tallness, youth), positive affect, and economic opportunities. Some subjects thought members of their own ethnic group would envy them if they lost their FA; these subjects did not associate economic advantages with "better English" to the extent that the rest did. Czechoslovak Canadians showed more positive affect to "better English" than Armenian Canadians, as did women compared to men. In the responses of all the subjects a significant overall relationship was found between "better English" and ability to get a job, and statistical significance attached to data showing that subjects could not associate "better English" and the *kind* of job a person is able to get. A number of other findings relating subjects' background and evaluational reactions to degrees of proficiency in English were discussed.

NOTES

¹The study was made possible by Canada Council grant S 70-1043 to W.J. Samarin. Earlier versions of this paper were presented to meetings of the Ontario Linguistic Circle on 7 October, 1972, and of the Michigan Linguistic Society on 13 October, 1972. We are indebted to Dr. Carol Reich for advice on the statistical evaluation of our data.

²This definition of FA is justified in our full report to Canada Council, *Language Attitudes among New Canadians* (1972), on which this paper is based.

³The text of the recordings was as follows:

ER 1: He start walking around and /hesitates/ in a funny way because the boat /hesitates/ was pushed /pusid/ around by the waves.

ER 2: Well, as the film started there was this funny-looking man leaning over the boat, and he was trying to catch a fish.

⁴Armenians were divided into ethnic groups based on what country they grew up in: most came from the Middle East and Turkey, but from different countries. Czechoslovaks were divided into three groups corresponding to the fact that Czechoslovaks identify themselves as either Czechs, Moravians, or Slovaks: these national groups maintain a separate identity within Czechoslovakia.

⁵The general trend was to have evaluational reactions to (presumed) native speech qualitatively the same as those to the better speaker when seen as having a FA. But quantitatively these reactions tended to be stronger where the better speaker was seen as native, suggesting that "less accent" was seen as corresponding to a person who is also more like a native Canadian in non-linguistic ways. There was surprisingly no significant difference between the responses of those who saw both speakers as native and those who saw both as foreign. Thus another variable involved here are general attitudes to "proper speech."

⁶The number of subjects in Table 2 and other Tables does not add up to the same total because the "don't know" answers are not given except in the case of question 13, where there was a large number of them. The numbers in this and other Tables are absolute numbers of subjects who answered in a certain way. Percentages and *p* values are given only in the case of significant or near-significant results, and significant *p* values are followed by an asterisk. In the case of question 13, one or the other speaker was scored as having a better job after the subjects' answers as to what job each speaker had were evaluated in terms of Warner's (1960) scale.

Bibliography

- Anisfeld, M., N. Bogo, and W.E. Lambert. 1962. "Evaluational Reactions to Accented English Speech." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 65: 223-231.
- Bruner, J.S., and C.C. Goodman. 1947. "Value and Need as Organizing Factors in Perception." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 42: 33-34.
- Carter, L.F., and K. Schooler. 1949. "Value, Need, and other Factors in Perception." *Psychological Review* 56: 200-207.
- Gordon, M.M. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hannerz, U. 1968. *Soulside: Essays on Ghetto Culture and Community*. Mimeo.
- Jakobovits, L.A. 1970. *Foreign Language Learning: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of the Issues*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Labov, W. 1966. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Lambert, W.E., R.C. Gardner, R. Olton, and K. Tunstall. 1968. "A Study of the Roles of Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning." In J.A. Fishman (ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, The Hague: Mouton, p. 473-491.
- Lambert, W.W., R.L. Solomon, and P.D. Watson. 1949. "Reinforcement and Extinction as Factors in Size Estimation." *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 39: 637-641.
- Shuy, R.W. 1969. "Sex as a Factor in Sociolinguistic Research." Paper presented to the Anthropological Society of Washington.
- Shuy, R.W., J.C. Baratz, and W.A. Wolfram. 1969. *Sociolinguistic Factors in Speech Identification*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics. Research Project No. MH 15048-01.
- Shuy, R.W., W.A. Wolfram, and W.K. Riley. 1967. *Linguistic Correlates of Social Stratification in Detroit Speech*. Cooperative Research Project No. 6-1347, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.
- Warner, W.L. 1960. *Social Class in America*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Wolfram, W.A. 1969. *A Sociolinguistic Description of Detroit Negro Speech*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.