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ABSTRACT

Kate Rustad: Taking Linguistics: Does an Introductory Linguistics Class Result in Increased Social Emotional Competency? (Under the direction of David Mora-Marín)

The present study was conducted to investigate changes in dialectal tolerance and/or social emotional competencies of Linguistics 101 students through the duration of a semester. Students from Linguistics 101 were surveyed twice during Spring 2018, along with students from a control class outside of Linguistics. A third class based in variationist theory was also surveyed. Six speaker clips of various dialects (Valley Girl, AAE, NNS, and SAE) were played for participants in a verbal-guise task, to be rated on politeness, level of education, sociability, kindness, and professionalism. Participants were asked to rate themselves according to the five core competencies of social emotional learning: Self-Awareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, Relationship Skills, and Responsible Decision Making. Minor differences appeared in relation to social emotional competencies when comparing linguistics students to a control group. Dialect tolerance ratings showed minor differences, but not enough to suggest that an introductory linguistics course can change inherent biases.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAE</td>
<td>African American English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>Mainstream American English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>Non-native Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEL</td>
<td>Social Emotional Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>Worldview Explorations Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Previous work in language attitude studies holds the idea that attitudes towards languages, or dialects, can be tied to attitudes toward the people who speak them (Preston 2002). However, this idea is not limited to just the large-scale view of language, but also specific linguistic components of language, such as speakers’ phonological spaces (Niedzielski 1999). It is not an unreasonable hypothesis to venture that exposure to linguistics curricula might alter one’s attitudes towards language, and towards oneself. In 2014, Suzanne Loosen implemented a linguistics curriculum for high schoolers at the Milwaukee School of Languages. After completing the semester-long course, she published the general outcome and feedback from her students, saying that they were “willing to ask questions, to share examples about their use of language, and to become more apt observers of language over the course of the class” (Loosen 2014:268). She also noted that her students were able to reflect on their own speech in a unique manner, which can lead to a higher capacity for conflict resolution. In turn, they are able to be “less judgmental, more sensitive, [and] more inquisitive” (Loosen 2014:271). Comparably, in 2010, Colleen Fitzgerald saw changes in her students at the end of a semester through implementing a service-learning approach to her linguistics class at Texas Tech University. Her students served as tutors for those learning English as a Second Language while taking the course, and were also required to complete periodic reflections about their tutoring experience. Notably, at the end of the semester, her students were more partial to the idea of racial diversity,
and less accepting of the idea that children in the United States should only speak English (Fitzgerald 2010).

Similarly, Joyce Milambiling’s 2001 article about introductory linguistics sheds light on the socially developmental possibilities that come with teaching the class. As a teacher herself, Milambiling speaks both from personal experience and from past literature on the topic of introductory linguistic concepts. Key concepts like the notion of “language” vs “dialect”\(^1\) and the grammaticality of African American English (AAE), she says, are some of the ideas that expose students to alternative viewpoints more so than those presented to them previously (Milambiling 2001). Crucially important to all of these articles is that while they discuss linguistics, they all mention key goals and competencies as reflected in the field of Social Emotional Learning, or SEL. Understanding alternative viewpoints, accepting other languages and communities of thought, the ability to self-reflect – each of these outcomes and observations from the aforementioned articles are directly related to SEL’s five core competencies. Despite this strong correspondence, introductory linguistics classes and SEL core competencies have not been studied in conjunction. This study aims to discover if there exists a connection between these two fields, and if so, to further understand the strength of the connection.

\(^1\) This is, arguably, one of the harder conceptual dichotomies to fully understand. A common misconception outside of the field of linguistics is that a dialect is merely an incorrect, “ungrammatical” version of language. What is important for the present study is that both dialects and languages have systematic grammar and variation, and that those outside of the field of linguistics may not be aware of this notion. See Reaser (2009) for a more in-depth discussion.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

At the time of the present study, one is hard-pressed to find literature which directly investigates a connection between a student’s Social Emotional competence, and their previous or current enrollment in a linguistics course. To establish a proper base for examination, in this chapter, I look at three different areas of literature that touch on both of these concepts in an effort to make clear their relation. The first sect I examine is the concept of Social Emotional intelligence, and consequently, Social Emotional Learning. Then, I explore various language attitude studies. Finally, I look at linguistics curricula, and what exactly it entails according to those who have been instructors of an introductory linguistics course.

2.1 Social Emotional Learning/Social and Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence, a term first used in 1990 by Salovey and Mayer (c.f. Schutte et al. 1998), gained popularity in the following years as the first time that the expression of experiencing emotions was seen as a domain of intelligence. Several competing viewpoints became prevalent at the time, one of which being that of Cooper and Sawaf (1997), wherein four different sections of emotional intelligence were defined: literacy, fitness, depth, and intensity. Most often in recent years, emotional intelligence is scored on the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory, also referred to as the EQ-i. This model states that “[social emotional] intelligence is a cross-section of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills and facilitators that determine how effectively we understand and express ourselves, understand others and relate with them, and cope with daily demands” (Bar-On 2006:14). The EQ-i consists of over 100
questions for participants to rate on a 5-point scale. Questions result in scores on five scales and fifteen subscales, as illustrated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intrapersonal</th>
<th>Self-awareness and self-expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-regard</td>
<td>To accurately perceive, understand and accept oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional self-awareness</td>
<td>To be aware of and understand one’s emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>To effectively and constructively express one’s emotions and oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>To be self-reliant and free of emotional dependency on others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-actualization</td>
<td>To strive to achieve personal goals and actualize one’s potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Social awareness and interpersonal relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>To be aware of and understand how others feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
<td>To identify with one’s social group and cooperate with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal relationship</td>
<td>To establish mutually satisfying relationships and relate well with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress management</td>
<td>Emotional management and regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress tolerance</td>
<td>To effectively and constructively manage emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulse control</td>
<td>To effectively and constructively control emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>Change management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality-testing</td>
<td>To objectively validate one’s feelings and thinking with external reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>To adapt and adjust one’s feelings and thinking to new situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving</td>
<td>To effectively solve problems of a personal and interpersonal nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General mood</td>
<td>Self-motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>To be positive and look at the brighter side of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>To feel content with oneself, others and life in general</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The EQ-i scales and what they assess, where bolded text represents a scale, and other text represents a subscale (Bar-On 2006:23)

In discussing various correlations of high EQ-i scores and concepts such as social interaction and performance in school, Bar-On also conjectures that one can teach his model. He
cites studies in various settings, like school classrooms, workplaces, as well as clinical settings - all of which prove social and emotional intelligence to be “teachable and learnable” skills (Bar-On 2006:22).

Social Emotional Learning, then, while not an inherently well-known topic in academia/higher education, has been in the works since 1994. The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning defines Social and Emotional Learning, or SEL, as:

the process [of acquiring and applying] the knowledge, attitudes and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions (CASEL 2018).

In concordance with this statement, SEL is defined as having five main components, or “Core Competencies” -- Self-Awareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, Relationship Skills, and Responsible Decision Making, each of which will be briefly discussed. Self-Awareness relates to accurately recognizing one’s own emotions, and how emotions influence on one’s behavior. This includes assessing one’s personal strengths and limitations, as well as acquiring a sense of self-confidence and optimism. Self-Management refers to the ability to regulate emotions, thoughts, and behaviors in a multitude of situations. Stress management, impulse control, motivation, and goal-setting behaviors are all examples of success in this area. Social Awareness includes the capacity to understand the perspective of a person with a different background and culture than one’s own, as well as a basic grasp of social and ethical norms. Also included is the ability to recognize support systems within one’s community, and how and when to utilize them. Relationship Skills refers to the ability to establish and maintain healthy relationships with a diverse group of individuals. Finally, Responsible Decision Making addresses how to make constructive and respectful choices concerning behavior in social
interactions, especially with regard to ethical standards, safety concerns, social norms, the
evaluation of consequences, and the wellbeing of oneself and others (CASEL 2018).

There are various SEL programs implemented in P-12 (preschool through 12th grade)
schools nationwide, including PATHS (Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies), RULER
(Recognizing, Understanding, Labeling, Expressing, Regulating), and the Worldview
Explorations Project, which focuses on understanding oneself and others, and making
meaningful contributions to the world. Fundamentally important to the proposed study is that
SEL can be incorporated in a curriculum without implementing any one specific program. At the
discretion of the teacher, simply including bits and pieces of the five core competencies into a
lesson plan can make a fundamental difference in a student’s life. Common types of SEL lessons
that are easily implementable range from activities like mindfulness periods, focusing on
emotional “trigger” words when reading a story, lessons on how to be a flexible learner, and
more.

A particularly salient example of implementation is the experience of the students and
faculty at Visitacion Valley Middle School (VVMS) in San Francisco, CA. VVMS is in a
neighborhood with high rates of drug usage, violence, homicide, and unemployment. Referred to
as the “fight school” from an excessive amount of fights breaking out, students were reported to
show symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder due to the violent environment in which they
were learning (Lindsay 2013). The Center for Wellness and Achievement in Education began to
train the teaching and administrative staff in mindfulness practices. After this training, the
teachers were instructed to implement 15 minutes of mindfulness into their classrooms two times
a day. In the years since this small piece of SEL – called “Quiet Time” at VVMS – has been
implemented, GPAs went up half a point, students reported fewer symptoms associated with
PTSD, such as getting more sleep, feeling less nauseated, and experiencing fewer headaches. Suspension rates were also cut in half. VVMS students were reported to have some of the highest satisfaction levels among all San Francisco middle schools, with one of the highest teacher retention rates in the district (Lindsay 2013).

In some students with learning disabilities, the inability to vocalize emotions can lead to added stress. To single out these students is to further isolate these students from their classmates, and continue to promote the stigma that comes with learning disabilities, leading to a higher chance of emotional issues in these children (Elias 2004). There are multiple connections between the goals of special education and SEL: help-seeking and help-giving, resisting negative peer pressure, respecting others and appreciating differences, and approaching others and building positive relationships. SEL can also assist in building caring relationships with and among students so that they can build healthy relationships with others, a principle of special education teachers (Elias 2004). The concern of “sad” and “mad” often comes into play in regards to children with non-vocal learning disabilities; when children with these disabilities are upset, and a teacher asks them what is wrong, they will most likely say that they are “sad” or “mad.” However, these words can connote any number of emotions that the child simply does not know how to articulate. There are two actions that can take place to combat this issue as well as increase the emotional vocabulary, and in turn, competency, of the student. The first is as simple as reading a story, tracing back to a concept called reader-response theory. Reader-response theory is founded on the integration of emotional awareness into class activities. This theory is based on a two-way relationship between text and reader, allowing for the reader’s background, experiences, and emotion to come into play when interpreting a text’s meaning (Farahian & Farshid 2014). The integration of such a theory into instruction can promote
increased critical thinking abilities when compared to those without, as students might struggle to transfer this knowledge to other contexts (Farahian & Farshid 2014). This is a theoretical approach that can be used in a number of contexts ranging from an early P-12 classroom to a second-language classroom in a university environment.

As the teacher reads a story aloud, the classroom focus might turn to the words that hold emotion for the characters. For instance, if a word like “frustrated” arises in a story, the teacher can take a brief pause and go over what the word means to each of the students. Rosenblatt (1994) notes that there are numerous possibilities of expression in regards to reader response – the most overt response, such as “laughter or tears;” a description of the characters assumed personality or appearance; a connection to other types of literary concepts like satire, or drama, and so on (136). The teacher could, if appropriate, point to a time that day where a student might have shown this emotion and ask this student what that was like on a personal level. Drawing these connections allows more words to enter the vocabulary of the classroom, as well as increasing the capacity of each student to express emotion in a more concise way. Inter-student connections will also warrant a higher level of empathy in the students. Another course of action involves the sense of touch as well, as it is a physical object, involving more of the student’s senses, allotting for better sensory memory of the experience. This option is a mood thermometer, often seen in the RULER program. “Mood Meter” methods are fairly straightforward: The student places a marker of sorts anywhere on the scale side of the paper, and fills in the blanks with how he or she might feel at this mood level. As students go through their day, they move their marker accordingly, allowing the teacher to

---

2 In regards to a second-language classroom at the university level, it can be argued that this approach can increase comprehension of texts written in the target language. See Farahian & Farshid (2014) for a full discussion and study detailing these claims, as well as Rosenblatt (1994) for an insightful look into reader-response theory as a whole.
observe changes in mood and ask each student what that might mean on an individual, or classroom, basis. The “Mood Meter” allows for social awareness, identifying one’s own emotions, and setting goals for how the student wants to feel in school. Increasing a child’s ability to vocalize emotion early on will more than likely have a positive, long-term effect on this child and their ability to develop a more sophisticated vocabulary (Brackett & Rivers 2014).³

As with any non-traditional curriculum, SEL integration comes with a few conflicts. In one particular case, the principal of a Southern California high school only allowed the SEL Worldviews Explorations Project (WE) to be implemented under a number of conditions. He disallowed WE to be taught in place of, or included within, any existing curriculum. All students must have had parent permission on file to participate. WE could only be taught during lunchtime or as an after-school activity. The principal offered no comment as to why these limitations were put into place (Lindsay 2013). As such, WE was implemented during lunchtime once a week, for approximately 20 minutes. Each session focused on a specific section of WE’s three main components as decided by the facilitating instructor. Thirty students attended the orientation meeting, twenty-two attended the first session, and thirteen attended the final session. Among these thirteen, four themes emerged: a new understanding of their world, a new understanding of factors that affect their world, an increased understanding of others and why they believe they do the things they do, and an increased sense of wanting to share their new knowledge with others. One can argue that attendance lessened, and that there was not a high attendance rate to begin with, and perhaps that the limitations placed on the program by the

³ While these tactics are often referred to in the literature as useful for students with learning disabilities, it should be pointed out that such methods would have merit in any classroom environment.
school’s principal all add up to something that might not have been worth the effort in the first place. However, a reflection from one of the participants speaks to the impact of the program:

I can use the knowledge I have acquired through the Worldview Explorations Project by not holding hate in my heart towards unruly people, but I can choose to understand and try to better myself and influence others in a positive way. I feel that if all students took at least one year of this project, they will understand others and end hate in this world. People could finally understand and finally get along (31)

In just over 3 hours of total time with the WE program, a student felt deeply affected by the material enough to make a remark that if other students partook in the program, there might be less hate in the world. Another student offered this sentiment:

I plan on educating my peers as well as many adults on the benefits of a rounded worldview. Although, I cannot do it on my own, this idea [should be shoved] into the public school systems’ brain. This is a huge step forward if it can be taken to the next step. We need at least an hour [per] week. Being allowed only 25 minutes is ridiculous. We learned things, yes, but I feel that I have barely dipped my toe in the vast pool that has been lavishly laid in front of me (32)

Noting the lack of time allotted for the program, this student holds the belief that more public schools should hold programs such as this one.

SEL is not solely a curriculum additive, or something that necessitates curriculum integration. Having the ethos suggested by SEL can allow a teacher to infiltrate these positive ideals outside of the classroom entirely, advocating for these standards both in and out of an academic setting. For example, a middle school-aged girl who displayed behavioral issues was also recognized as having strong fine-motor skills. Her teachers noticed that, specifically, she was skillful at braiding hair; in turn, they gave her a table in the lunchroom. Students were given the chance to have their hair braided by the girl, with emphasis given to those with whom she did not get along. After some persuasion, these students sat with her, and other students began to come to her table as well. The caveat given by her teachers was that should she fail to change her
negative behavior, she would lose her table. This opportunity allowed for her to learn a lesson of her own accord. The girl asked counselors to help control her temper, and started working with teachers in a way that allowed her to absorb the material instead of giving in quickly to frustration (Elias 2004). The student’s identity in the school changed entirely, and she grew academically because of it. This is an example of how having a SEL mindset and applying it to a scenario outside of the classroom can fundamentally change a student’s mindset.

The fundamental idea that SEL does not need to be its own curricula but can merely be added into an existing one can have a large effect on students enrolled in such a course. This was true in the case of SEL integration into the freshman seminar curriculum in Pennsylvania’s Widener College – a course which was already set in place to ease the transition to college. The existing curriculum aimed to ease students into the transition from high school to a higher education environment (Wang 2012). The SEL integrations included:

- Time management; class participation and note-taking; knowledge of one’s own emotions and awareness of the emotions of others’;
- active learning; self management – physical, emotional, and behavioral; critical thinking; relationship skills; appreciating difference and tolerance for disagreement; test-taking - both written and oral; perspective-taking; and behavioral flexibility (2)

The students exposed to the experimental curricula showed higher GPAs than those in a control course – the same course, in fact – without SEL integration during four consecutive semesters (Wang 2012). At the end of the course, of 104 students, 99 reported their capacity to understand emotions in self and in others, 82 noted higher tolerance for differences in others, and 99 found success in gaining self-management skills. This was after only four sessions with an added SEL component. Another student found “the importance of not rushing a relationship and instead waiting for the right time,” not part of the curriculum, but an interesting result to observe in regards to the potential for overall growth in emotional development (Wang 2012).
Thomas et al. (2017) looked into this idea in conjunction with cognitive test anxiety and coping mechanisms of undergraduate students. They initially note that traditional approaches to measuring student success are usually using a deficit mindset, looking at what might be taking away from their performance. As such, they encourage investigating both “adaptive and maladaptive influences” in regards to the affective domain of the student (Thomas et al. 2017:41). Emotional intelligence (EI) is a factor that, on a surface level, can be attributed to higher stress levels due to a heightened emotional awareness and attunement to one’s emotions – however, more often, EI indirectly assists with students’ academic success in that it fuels their need to be their best selves, helps in negotiating coping strategies, and fostering positive relationships and interactions with other students (Thomas et al. 2017). For example, a common coping strategy in a challenging academic situation is to disengage.

If a child was exposed to lessons in Self-Awareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, Relationship Skills, and Responsible Decision Making at a young age, or even at a high school or college level, the effect would be considerable. These are all aspects of being human that sometimes fail to be recognized in an academic setting. Should teachers feel inspired to improve the lives of their students, why not do so in way that will allow them to thrive academically, socially, and emotionally, all three of which will be beneficial to the students and the world around them, feasibly preventing tragedy along the way. Research shows that as little as 30 minutes a day of SEL integration has a significant effect on students and faculty. While, undoubtedly, there are instructors who naturally integrate SEL into their lesson

---

4 With limited exposure to P-12 classroom settings outside of my own experiences, I do not claim to be an expert in these environments. This statement is based on literature, and anecdotal evidence from those I have spoken to who are currently, or have been, P-12 instructors.
plans, to leave the acquisition of such vital skills up to chance is a dangerous choice (Lindsay 2013).

2.2 Language attitudes

Various studies involving participants’ attitudes towards language have shown that certain dialects afford a higher level of prestige, while others do not. Many times, the observed attitudes towards the dialects coincide with the attitudes toward the group of people that use them (Preston 2004), pointing to a larger issue of perception and judgment. This is seen in various articles within the field of sociolinguistics, to be discussed below, ranging from large-scale judgements wherein entire languages are judged hierarchically (Gal 1978), or individual phonemes serve as the point of judgment (Niedzielski 1999).

Gal (1978) studied the residents of a town in eastern Austria, called Oberwart – only having belonged to Austria since 1921. The residents of this town are Hungarian-German bilinguals. Gal emphasizes the importance of bilingual communities as they display the “linguistic heterogeneity” which is true of all communities (1978:3). As such, data for the article was gathered via usage-based questionnaires which were filled out by various informants, ranging in age from 14 to 76. Situations described in these questionnaires were, for example, which language would be used when speaking to one’s grandparents, or when speaking to a government official. Gal notes two prominent factors in relation to the usage of Hungarian instead of German: age and social network. In this specific scenario, two social networks (defined, by Gal, as all of the people with whom a participant speaks in a seven-day span) are of particular interest: those who own either pigs or cows, or those who own neither. Those who live in Oberwart have identified, on their own accord, those who own pigs or cows as “peasants” (Gal 1978:8). As such, Gal found that higher usage of Hungarian has an inverse correlation with the
“peasantness” level of one’s social network, as well as age. This result held various implications for residents of Oberwart, the most relevant to this study being the negative attitude of young women towards peasant men; namely, that “they do not want to marry [them]” (Gal 1978:11). While not directly stating that they would prefer a husband who speaks Hungarian, the implications of not doing so are clear, resulting in the title of Gal’s paper, *Peasant Men Can’t Get Wives*. Peasant men, while previously showing high counts of endogamous (or within social caste) marriages, were finding less luck in recent years, having to find a wife in a nearby monolingual village – where the women only spoke German. While this example is forty years old, it is a solid foundation on which Gal makes the statement that these sorts of preferential language attitudes can be “translated into action,” having a real effect on the community (Gal 1978:14).

Rosina Lippi-Green (2012) offers an important discussion of how children are taught from a young age to discriminate against voices that we are not used to hearing. Looking at Disney movies like *The Lion King*, in which the villainous characters have a different voice than the rest, it is portrayed that different equates to bad or evil. These English villain varieties correlate with marginalized social groups. In conjunction with this, male characters who start off as villainous can become good, while female characters who are bad experience no character development. The typical male protagonists, then, sound more “mainstream;” that is to say, white and middle class (Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 2015, Lippi-Green 2012). In Disney movies, 43.1% of characters speak MAE, (Mainstream American English), 13.9% speak regionally, racially, ethnically, or economically associated dialects, and 21.8% speak less stigmatized varieties of British English. Ninety-one out of 371 characters have roles in which they would logically not use English, yet only 34 speak English with a foreign accent (Lippi-
Green 2012). Characters with non-stigmatized accents appear as humans 43.1% of the time, animals 54.4% of the time, and inanimate objects 2.5% of the time. However, characters who speak AAE, for example, tend to be animals more often than humans, with the exception of movies like *Atlantis, Lilo and Stitch*, and *The Princess and the Frog*. Also notably, *The Lion King* offers quite a conundrum. The movie is set to take place in Africa, yet the main role of Simba is voiced by a white actor. The only appearance of AAE in this film is found in Whoopi Goldberg’s voicing of the villainous hyena (Lippi-Green 2012).

From a young age, children see that these differentiations in characters’ appearance seem to be based entirely on their voices. Because they are observing the normalization of what is “the same” as being good and to take caution with what is “different,” children are primed to make this same divide in their daily lives as adults as well. Pullum (1999) notes that some people believe AAE is just Standard English that is not well-spoken, instead of seeing it as its own grammatical dialect. He says that upon hearing two languages of which one has higher prestige than the other, there is an inclination to categorize the language of lower prestige to be “incorrect,” even though this is factually untrue. While it is different than MAE (Mainstream American English), this does not signify that it is, in any sense, “worse” than what is considered to be the standard. This is similar to the notion that someone from a Northern dialect region might consider someone from a Southern dialect region to speak “worse” English – though both of these languages are still grammatically correct English. Through making these negative judgments, there is a “[confusion of] lexicon with syntax, accent with dialect, difference with deficiency, and grammar with morality” (Pullum 1999:55). This categorization of correctness and incorrectness based solely on speech can result in a higher level of judgment and social isolation of the speakers in question.
Niedzielski (1999) performed an experiment in which she presented listeners with an audio file and a sheet of paper – however, the sheet of paper differed in that some saw the word “Canada” at the top of the page while others saw the word “Michigan.” Before the study, she hypothesized that listeners would use social data to ascertain the phonological space of another person’s speech; and, that stereotypes about speakers can alter the way they hear certain varieties along with their own speech, in turn inaccurately determining their own phonological spaces (Niedzielski 1999). The “Canada” and “Michigan” labels affected how participants heard the audio file, which remained the same throughout. If the listener thought the speaker in the audio file was Canadian, they accurately reported hearing a raised token; however, if they were prompted with a Michigan label, they inaccurately reported hearing a lower token (Niedzielski 1999). This study is able to show that socially salient information about a speaker can have an effect on perception of speech, conscious or otherwise.

After completing the study and analyzing the results, Niedzielski conjectured that mass media industries set the standard; so, the fact that many movies and television shows in the U.S. are filmed in Southern California might have an effect on the dialect upon which perceived MAE is based. She also hypothesizes, citing Wolfram (1991), that any language variants that do not have an attached negative stigma are considered to be the “standard.” Like Lippi-Green (2012), Niedzielski theorizes that people may generalize their own speech because they like to see themselves as normal as possible, concurrently failing to see their dialects as different or stigmatized until being made aware. Because of this, it is common to create an “us” and “them”

---

5 “Token” here denotes the sound of the /a/ vowel that the participant reported hearing, in relation (correctly or incorrectly) to the actual sound produced in the audio file. See Niedzielski (1999) for a full description of the vowel resynthesis process/the /a/ vowel “tokens” used in the study.
dichotomy off of laymen cultural knowledge of dialects, resulting in an increased level of social judgment and criticism for those who do not fall into the MAE, or normalized, categories.

Similarly, the linguistic stereotyping hypothesis is one in which short samples of speech associated with groups of lower prestige can trigger a negative response when judging a single speaker. In 2009, Kang and Rubin performed a study in which one audio file – a college lecture about galaxies – was played multiple times, though listeners were prompted with different pictures on a projector screen while hearing the audio file. The two pictures were of a white male and an Asian male, prompting the listeners to believe the speaker was of the race shown in the picture. Participants listened to the initial audio file, then, a distractor audio file which contained a speaker of distinct East Asian descent, and finally listened to the initial audio file again, with a different picture prompt. At the end of the study, students were asked to answer various comprehension questions about the lecture given in the audio file. Before the study itself was completed, information was gathered from the participants about a variety of traits. The most notable information in relation to the present study is the amount of formal linguistic training that the participants had received.6

Formal course work in linguistics and the number of foreign language courses taken showed positive impact on comprehension of Asian guise’s speech. This finding indicates that the higher language sophistication was indexed the better [the] raters’ comprehension of NNS’s [non-native speaker’s] speech. (452)

This study, in combination with previous SEL literature and sociolinguistic work, led to the suggestion that through taking a linguistics class, students might display a higher level of SEL competency at the end of the semester than was demonstrated at the beginning.

6 Also important in the consequent quote is the number of foreign language courses taken, a concept to be discussed in Chapter 6.
2.3 Linguistics curricula

Linguistics as a field often faces a dilemma of categorization: is it considered an art or a science? By definition, linguistics is the study of human speech, but beyond that, it is categorized as a different field depending on the university in question; for example, UNC Chapel Hill offers a Master of Arts in linguistics, while Georgetown University offers a Master of Science. Often a point of contention, Tim Shopen argues that linguistics “deserves to be called a science because of the amount of good work that has gone beyond the bounds of mere taxonomy” (Shopen 1974:2). Whether the intent of the student is to go into the field as a linguistics major, to gain a better knowledge of language as a non-major, or simply to fill a course requirement for graduation, the introductory linguistics class is responsible for covering any and all aspects of this multidimensional field. It is one of the strongest countermeasures that linguists can give to misjudgments or stereotypes about language; and as it is common for non-major students to take this introductory class without pursuing further linguistic coursework, the role of the introductory linguistics course is integral (Spring et al. 2000).

Perhaps most common between the linguistics major and non-major student is a misconception of language, often stemming from “opinions fostered by [culture], society, and educational institutions” (Falk 1978:8). It is the obligation of the instructor to both present the basic structure of language as established by the field, as well as explore the more personal questions that come with the role of language in the world (Falk 1978). As such, the instruction of phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics all serve as integral building blocks to the greater understanding of language. Once the basic principles are learned, these individual aspects of language can be studied at length; or, can be combined to answer larger questions
about language, such as why it varies so greatly, how it is learned, and why it changes over time (Falk 1978).

Inherent to the curricula of introductory linguistics is a fundamental negation of what students have learned up to that point (Milambiling 2001). This sort of curriculum will affect each student in a different way, as a student’s “intellectual personality and socio-moral knowledge is ‘constructed’ by students internalizing concepts through self-discovery” (Jaramillo 1996:135, emphasis in original). Because each student in any given class experiences a different living environment, each student likely comes to the classroom with varying perspectives and preconceived notions. Along with this, the university environment is often more diverse than what students have experienced up to that point, already requiring the development of the capability to negotiate the differences in others, whether with regard to beliefs, values, styles, etc. (Wang 2012). Consequently, the students will each gain something different from the class itself based on these individualized experiences (Jaramillo 1996). It is the instructor’s responsibility to cater to this diversity. The instructor first has to accept that the students’ exposure to language is fundamentally different than the material being taught, as well as their autonomy in accepting or rejecting the position held by the instructor (Milambiling 2001). In the case of rejection, however, the instructor also has the choice to engage in discussion; for example, if students insist that they have bad grammar, the instructor might use this as a transition into the discussion of different dialects (Milambling 2001). It is also the responsibility of the instructor to serve as a model for students of the class, as a discussion of how dialect diversity can become invalid if the instructor does not make an effort to develop their own “receptive competence” (Milambiling 2001:252) in understanding a student’s dialect. Finally, because of the numerous publicized discussions surrounding language, such as the Oakland
Ebonics controversy, it is also in the power of the instructor to serve as an advocate, where the explanation of such complications can ultimately result in a more informed, receptive group of students (Milambiling 2001).

2.4 Why do this study?

Each of the three previous sections represents an aspect of the academic world that has clear social implications. Along with adding to the growing field of dialect studies, the present study will provide insight as to how the attitudes of students in higher education do or do not change over the course of the semester. The proposed comparison of linguistics versus non-linguistics classes, to be discussed next, allows for concrete observations of students who are, and are not, exposed to basic linguistic theory. As mentioned in Lindsay (2013), there are instructors that already integrate SEL into their daily lessons. To provide evidence that a linguistics course does so innately is integral to the promotion and survival of both fields, at a high school (as seen in Loosen 2014) or college level. If school boards are able to see an increase in positive attitudes not only towards stigmatized dialects but also towards the five core competencies of SEL, this may establish a base upon which the field of linguistics becomes something more integrated into a student’s academic career, as opposed to just a college elective course.
CHAPTER 3
STUDY DESIGN

As observed in the previous chapters, a fundamental goal of SEL advocates and linguists alike is the greater understanding and acceptance of difference in community and language. Consequently, this study seeks to find if a Linguistics 101 class will perform at or above chance at the end of the semester in relation to Social Emotional competencies, via language attitude judgments and other self-reflection-based questions.

**RQ1:** Does taking an introductory level linguistics class increase a student’s social and emotional competence when compared to a class whose curriculum is centered on linguistic variation, and more (or less) so than a control class whose curriculum does not relate to linguistics?

**RQ2:** Do students’ language attitudes towards stigmatized dialects change from beginning to end of semester while taking an introductory level linguistics class?

**RQ3:** Are RQ1 and RQ2 mutually exclusive?

3.1 Participants

The present study aimed to find the level of social and emotional competence in students at the beginning and end of the semester, while enrolled in an introductory linguistics class. Data was collected from students enrolled in three courses: a section of Linguistics 101, a section of a linguistics class that is based in variation (Linguistics 484), and a control class outside of the linguistics department (Mathematics 118). The selection of the control classes served to establish a baseline, with regard to Mathematics 118, as well as a type of “end goal,” with regard to
Linguistics 484. The study gathers demographic information from each student to account for social and academic background, as well as previous enrollment in a linguistics class. The two instances of data collection took place at the early-middle and the end of the semester (late February/early March and April of 2018, respectively). This was to get a baseline data set with less exposure to the class material, and comparison data gathered after the course neared completion.

3.2 Method

The data collection itself asked participants to fill out a questionnaire with items on a Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree, 3 = Neutral, 5 = Strongly agree) about their opinions on short audio clips of various speakers, as well as various items relating to social and emotional intelligence. To introduce the present study to its participants, a recruitment script was read, and consent forms detailing what participation in the study means were handed out. The most important item in regards to both of these processes was the notion that the student’s grade in the class will not be negatively nor positively affected by participation in the study (or lack thereof), and that the responses to the study will remain completely anonymous. The emphasis on anonymity was taken into great consideration when scripting and writing both the recruitment script and the consent form. This factor is of great importance, because if the participant felt their responses would be compromised, they might not answer as honestly. For this reason, it was made clear, and repeated, that the responses do not correspond to their grade in the class, nor will they be able to be connected to their names. The utmost caution was taken in that the names of the participants were not documented whatsoever.

For the audio clips used in the study, six speakers of American English were recorded, including those who do and do not speak with traditionally stigmatized dialects. The former
includes one male and one female non-native speaker of English – one with a native language of Chinese, the other, Spanish, respectively (see discussion of NNS dialect stigmatization in Munro & Derwing 2000) – a speaker of African American English (see Pullum 1999), and a speaker of “Valley Girl” English, that is to say, a female speaker of American English who presents multiple instances of raises in pitch at the end of an utterance, along with creaky voice, or “vocal fry” (see Hildebrand-Edgar 2016 for discussion of creaky voice). The remaining two clips are from speakers of Mainstream American English, or English without few traditionally identifiable or stigmatized features (see Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 2015). These audio files, compiled into one, five-minute-long clip, were then played two times each. Participants were told before the study to rank each speaker on a scale of one to five on the following traits, where one denotes a strong disagreement with the given statement, and five denotes a strong agreement:

- This person is polite
- This person is educated
- This person is sociable
- This person is kind
- This person is professional

Likert scale items concerning the speaker’s social and emotional intelligence were based on assessment data found from the Washoe County School District’s SEL assessment in 2017, as well as the 33-item emotional intelligence scale found in Schutte et al. (1998). The items used in the questionnaire can be found in the table below, with the accompanying area of social emotional intelligence to be tested.7

---

7 Some items are taken directly from Schutte et al. (1998) as well as the Washoe County School District’s assessment; others have been altered slightly.
I have a lot of strong friendships with people who have opinions different from my own.

| I can give a list of my weaknesses as easily as I can give a list of my strengths. | Self-awareness |
| If I’m taking a test and the first question I see is something I’m not familiar with, I’ll be in a bad mood and won’t do well on the rest of the test. | Self-management, self-awareness |
| If I’m having a conflict with someone, I am able to articulate how I feel on the spot. | Self-management, self-awareness, relationship skills |
| I tend to form a strong opinion of people when I first meet them. | Social awareness, self-awareness |
| I get frustrated when people use incorrect grammar. | Social awareness, self-awareness |
| If my friends are having an argument, I’m always the first one to jump in and try to help them see each other’s point of view. | Responsible decision making, self-awareness |

| Table 2: Social emotional Likert items and corresponding SEL competencies |

Questionnaires in full, as well as the recruitment script and consent forms used, can be found in the appendices of this paper. If Linguistics 101 data is comparable to the data found in a class with emphasis on linguistic variation, and differs from data found in a control group, this might suggest that an introductory linguistics class does in fact lead to a higher social emotional competency.

### 3.3 Dialect samples

The dialect samples consisted of audio recordings of 6 different speakers. Recordings were modified for consistency in white noise and volume using acoustic phonetics computer software Praat, Version 6.0.39. To summarize, the dialects included were:

- Standard American English
- Non-native English (speakers were male and female native speakers of Chinese and Spanish, respectively)
- African American English
• “Valley Girl” English - high instances of creaky voice (also referred to as vocal fry) and uptalk (a raise in pitch at the end of an utterance)

Speakers read the same three-sentence phrase to imitate a matched-guise test (as defined in Lambert 1960). However, as opposed to a traditional matched-guise task using a single speaker, the audio samples used in the present study were given by 6 separate speakers, making it better defined as a verbal-guise task (Carrie 2017). This is to avoid the possible discrepancies that come with a single speaker reading the same passage - most notably, that the participants might realize that only one speaker is being rated, thus skewing the data. In this sense, there is less control for voice quality issues, but higher control for authentic dialect productions, and no chance that participants will skew data through the belief that only one aspect of speech is being rated.

3.4 Demographics summary

The first round of data collected contained 169 participants. Of these participants, 76 were enrolled in Linguistics 101, 15 were enrolled in Linguistics 484, and 78 were enrolled in Mathematics 118. The second round of data contained 144 participants, 74 Linguistics 101 students, 14 Linguistics 484 students, and 56 Mathematics 118 students. During the first and second data collections, there were two and four participants that chose to begin the study, but not complete it, respectively. For this reason, their data was not included in the demographic or final data analysis. In all, 308 responses were received -- 165 in the first round of data collection, and 141 in the second. The following tables summarize basic information given from the participants. To maintain anonymity of participants, statistics relating to major, age, gender, and the like will be analyzed on a large-scale basis; that is to say, they will be analyzed as a whole instead of by course for the remainder of this study. Figures 1-3 illustrate the grade level, race, and gender dispersion of the participants for both data collections, consolidated into single charts to further maintain anonymity of participants.
Figure 1: Consolidated year-in-school demographics of participants

Figure 2: Consolidated racial diversity of participants

Figure 3: Consolidated gender of participants
CHAPTER 4
DATA RESULTS

This section will present and analyze the data collected. First, the data collected about
dialect ratings will be discussed; then, data relating to social emotional intelligence will be
discussed.

4.1 Dialect ratings

During the data collections themselves, the audio clips were played in a single clip
synthesized together using Praat, the order of which was Valley Girl, standard male, non-native
female, AAE, standard female, and non-native male. The sequence of dialects altered with regard
to gender, but was otherwise ordered randomly. The following tables are organized
alphabetically by dialect. Bolded text in columns Polite 2 through Professional 2 signifies an
increase in number over 0.1. Italicized text indicates a decrease in number over 0.1.

4.1.1 Mathematics 118

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Math 118</th>
<th>Polite 2</th>
<th>Educated 2</th>
<th>Sociable 2</th>
<th>Kind 2</th>
<th>Professional 2</th>
<th>Polite 2</th>
<th>Educated 2</th>
<th>Sociable 2</th>
<th>Kind 2</th>
<th>Professional 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNS, f</td>
<td>3.195</td>
<td>3.273</td>
<td>2.974</td>
<td>3.117</td>
<td>2.948</td>
<td>3.432</td>
<td>3.211</td>
<td>3.269</td>
<td>3.192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 In Tables 4 through 6, Mathematics and Linguistics are abbreviated to “Math” and “Ling”,
respectively, to ensure consistent formatting.
9 This is true for Tables 4 through 6.
Mathematics 118 students initially rate the standard and non-native speaker males as most polite. The standard male is rated as most educated. Valley Girl is rated most sociable, NNS male is least. Standard female is rated as least kind, while NNS male is most kind. Standard male is rated most professional. In regards to the final data collection, Mathematics 118 students rate the standard male as most polite, educated, and professional. The Valley Girl speaker is most sociable and NNS male is kindest. Out of the 25 ratings in the second data collection, Mathematics 118 students increased in 16 numbers by more than 0.1.

### 4.1.2 Linguistics 484

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ling 484</th>
<th>Polite</th>
<th>Educated</th>
<th>Sociable</th>
<th>Kind</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Polite</th>
<th>Educated</th>
<th>Sociable</th>
<th>Kind</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Table 4: Linguistics 484 mean dialect ratings*

During the first data collection, Linguistics 484 students rate the NNS male speaker as most polite, and most kind. The standard male speaker is rated as most educated and professional. The Valley Girl speaker is rated as most sociable. The second data collection shows
similar results. The NNS male speaker is most polite and most kind. The standard male speaker is most educated and professional. Finally, Valley Girl is rated as most sociable again, too. Out of 25 ratings during the second data collection, five values increased.

4.1.3 Linguistics 101

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistics 101</th>
<th>Polite</th>
<th>Educated</th>
<th>Sociable</th>
<th>Kind</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Polite 2</th>
<th>Educated 2</th>
<th>Sociable 2</th>
<th>Kind 2</th>
<th>Professional 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNS, m</td>
<td>3.921</td>
<td>3.237</td>
<td>2.553</td>
<td>3.684</td>
<td>3.053</td>
<td>3.808</td>
<td>3.301</td>
<td>2.918</td>
<td>3.726</td>
<td>3.192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Linguistics 101 mean dialect ratings

Linguistics 101 students initially rate the standard male as most polite, educated, and professional. The Valley Girl speaker is most sociable and the NNS male speaker is most kind. During the second data collection, Linguistics 101 students continue to rate the standard male speaker as most polite, educated, and professional. The Valley Girl speaker is most sociable and the NNS male is most kind. Linguistics 101 students showed an increase of more than 0.1 for 14 out of 25 ratings.

4.2 Social emotional competencies

The following tables represent the Likert items related to social emotional intelligence. Table 7 contains the median, mean, and mode statistics for all three courses. As before, in Table 8, a bolded number represents an increase of more than 0.1, and an italicized number represents a decrease of more than 0.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Friendships with differing opinions</th>
<th>Listing strengths and weaknesses</th>
<th>Test anxiety</th>
<th>Articulate emotions during conflict</th>
<th>Judgment at first sight</th>
<th>Annoyed at incorrect grammar</th>
<th>Mediate during arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics 118: Initial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>median</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>3.658</td>
<td>3.934</td>
<td>2.368</td>
<td>3.320</td>
<td>3.513</td>
<td>3.132</td>
<td>3.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mode</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Linguistics 484: Initial** |                                     |                                 |              |                                    |                         |                              |                          |
| median                    | 3                                   | 4                               | 2            | 4                                  | 3.5                     | 2                            | 4                        |
| mean                      | 2.786                               | 4.286                           | 1.786        | 3.500                              | 3.214                   | 2.286                        | 4.071                    |
| mode                      | 2                                   | 4                               | 2            | 5                                  | 4                       | 1                            | 4                        |

| **Linguistics 101: Initial** |                                     |                                 |              |                                    |                         |                              |                          |
| median                    | 3.5                                 | 4                               | 2            | 3                                  | 3                       | 3                            | 3                        |
| mode                      | 3                                   | 4                               | 3            | 4                                  | 4                       | 4                            | 4                        |

*Table 6: Social emotional competencies during data collection 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Friendships with differing opinions</th>
<th>Listing strengths and weaknesses</th>
<th>Test anxiety</th>
<th>Articulate emotions during conflict</th>
<th>Judgment at first sight</th>
<th>Annoyed at incorrect grammar</th>
<th>Mediate during arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics 118: Final</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>median</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mode</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Linguistics 484: Final** |                                     |                                 |              |                                    |                         |                              |                          |
| median                    | 3                                   | **4.5**                         | 2            | 3.5                                | **4**                   | 3                            | 3.5                      |

30
In correspondence with Table 2 (Chapter 3.2), the following statements are true of the data in Tables 7 and 8. A high number for the statement, “I have a lot of strong friendships with people who have opinions different from my own” would indicate good relationship skills. A larger number for “I can give a list of my weaknesses as easily as I can give a list of my strengths” indexes high self-awareness. A lower number for “If I’m taking a test and the first question I see is something I’m not familiar with, I’ll be in a bad mood and won’t do well on the rest of the test” indicates lower self-management, but might indicate higher self-awareness. A higher number for “If I’m having a conflict with someone, I am able to articulate how I feel on the spot” indicates high self-management/-awareness, and good relationship skills. A lower number for “I tend to form a strong opinion of people when I first meet them” might indicate higher self-awareness and social awareness, while a high number might indicate high self-awareness, but lower social awareness. The same sentiment applies to “I get frustrated when people use incorrect grammar.” A higher number for “If my friends are having an argument, I’m always the first one to jump in and try to help them see each other’s point of view” indicates high social awareness, and responsible decision making.

10 This statement is analyzed at face-value. Different participants may have answered based on a more in-depth reading, such as opinions of a person based on particular aspects, physical or otherwise.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

This chapter will first look deeper into the comments section of both data collections, and what patterns do and do not emerge. The results of the present study will be discussed as they relate to existing literature and discussion surrounding the topic of linguistics, dialect attitudes, and certain aspects of education.

5.1 Cross-course numerical data summary

5.1.1 Dialect tolerance

The following subsection will summarize and compare the apparent changes and general patterns seen across classes. The pattern of dialect ratings appears the same across courses. That is to say, the Valley Girl speaker is usually rated as most sociable, and the non-native male speaker is rated as the least sociable. The non-native male speaker is rated as the most polite, with some classes rating the standard male speaker more favorably in politeness. Similarly, the standard male is always rated as the most educated. NNS male is always most kind.

Unsurprisingly, the standard male speaker is rated most favorably in all courses, and throughout both data collections. This speaks to a number of issues related to language and gender, the most pertinent being the permeability of hegemonic masculinity in all discourses, in and out of academia (as seen in Connell 1987 and Lakoff 1973, for example). This will be discussed further in section 5.2.

Throughout both initial and final data collections, there was a clear tendency in the data to stay around the middle of the one-to-five Likert scale. Many participants chose 3 as their
rating for both stigmatized and non-stigmatized dialects. The notion of keeping a central, neutral option is discussed in Guy and Norvell (1977). In similar studies where a Likert scale is presented without a neutral option, the data tends to skew towards the middle. If participants are familiar with Likert-type scales, they may be sensitized to a five-point scale; thus, ridding of the central option can result in skewed data. It is for these reasons that all items given to participants in the present study were done on a five-point scale as opposed to a four-point scale.

The three courses seem to show a similar pattern in ranking, with numbers increasing when rating males, notably the standard male, and decreasing in relation to females, especially in relation to professionalism. Sociable ratings tend to be lower for most speakers but greatly increase in relation to the speaker of “Valley Girl” English. While politeness shows less of a distinct pattern, the non-native male speaker tended to rate more highly in this regard. Figures 4-6 illustrate initial mean rankings for all three courses, and Figures 7-9 illustrate final mean rankings for all three courses.\textsuperscript{11}

\textit{Figure 4: Linguistics 484 initial mean ratings}

\begin{figure}[h!]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure4.png}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{11} In Figures 4-9, “f” and “m” correspond to “female” and “male,” respectively.
Figure 5: Linguistics 101 initial mean ratings

Figure 6: Mathematics 118 initial mean ratings
Figure 7: Linguistics 484 final mean ratings

Figure 8: Linguistics 101 final mean ratings
5.1.2 SEL measurements

The pattern of SEL measurement varies slightly across courses. Using demographic information from participants, statistical analyses were performed in Excel in relation to SEL measurements. The number of previous linguistics courses taken correlates significantly with a higher number for “I have a lot of strong friendships with people who have opinions different from my own” only during the second data collection (p < .05). Other changes were analyzed as not being statistically significant. Other measurements when compared to linguistics courses taken did not show significance. Similarly, comparisons between the data sets of both collections also did not indicate significant changes. Figures 10-12 illustrate the spread of data during the first collection, and Figures 13-15 illustrate the spread of data during the second collection. In correspondence with Table 2, the order of Likert scale items in Figures 10-15 is the same as that in Tables 7 and 8: “I have a lot of strong friendships with people who have opinions different from my own,” “I can give a list of my weaknesses as easily as I can give a list of my strengths,”

---

12 Analytical consultation provided by UNC’s Research Hub.
“If I’m taking a test and the first question I see is something I’m not familiar with, I’ll be in a bad mood and won’t do well on the rest of the test,” “If I’m having a conflict with someone, I am able to articulate how I feel on the spot,” “I tend to form a strong opinion of people when I first meet them,” “I get frustrated when people use incorrect grammar,” and “If my friends are having an argument, I’m always the first one to jump in and try to help them see each other’s point of view.”

Figure 10: Linguistics 484 initial SEL measurements
**Figure 11: Linguistics 101 initial SEL measurements**

![Box plot for Linguistics 101 initial SEL measurements]

**Figure 12: Mathematics 118 initial SEL measurements**

![Box plot for Mathematics 118 initial SEL measurements]
Figure 13: Linguistics 484 final SEL measurements

Figure 14: Linguistics 101 final SEL measurements
5.2 Comment sections

While there were not enough comments to include in the previous section’s quantitative analysis, the comments received during the study will be discussed next. Relevant comments will be mentioned and analyzed; however, a full list of all comments received can be found in Appendix E. Presently, the comments from Mathematics 118, Linguistics 484, and Linguistics 101 will be discussed, respectively.

5.2.1 Math 118

The first data collection from Mathematics 118 presented eleven comments. Approximately one-half of these comments related to negative personal opinions about the speakers’ voices – such as “I don’t know why but she annoyed me,” “doesn’t enunciate,” and “sounds bored.” Other comments included justifications for rankings, such as “clearly English not first language so has learned it,” in relation to the education rankings for the non-native male speaker. There was one comment related to the format of the study: “education does not equal speaking abilities.”
The second data collection from Mathematics 118 offered a similar dispersion and variety of comments, with ten comments in all. One participant attempted to identify each speaker’s race and gender through comments like “white girl,” “Latina or black girl,” “Asian boy,” etc. Sentiments like “sounds annoyed” and “pace is weird” were offered, but one participant in particular took issue with the study. The comment reads, “these aren't things you can really tell from the person's tone of voice; these are things that are determined by word choice & all of the speakers are saying the same thing.” Other participants said, “clearly speaks with an accent, I assume they are educated b/c they may speak a diff lang [sic],” and “to me sounds like second language” in relation to the non-native male speaker.

5.2.2 Linguistics 484

The Linguistics 484 participants displayed similar patterns to those presented in Mathematics 118; but, tended more towards a justification-heavy comment section. The first data collection contained eleven comments, seven of which related to a reason why the participant gave their rating – including comments like “rated on content and not tone,” “very natural speech in conversation,” and “talks more slowly and with articulation.” Two comments related to the study structure: “I don't think these statements are enough to state personality or education,” and “it's difficult for me to reconcile what I’ve been socialized to believe about different dialects/varieties of English and what I know, as a linguistics student, is actually the case - that no dialect is superior or inferior.” While the first comment is harder to directly understand, the second comment speaks directly to the variationist component in Linguistics 484.

The second data collection in this course offered eight comments. This data collection presented more cynicism from the participants, with comments like, “sounds like he's a college kid helping someone with their thesis and reading from a script,” and “this test feels ridiculous it
feels like a blatant ‘are you racist or discriminatory based on voice’ test.” Two comments given about the non-native male speaker offer a similar reading to the last comment mentioned in the previous paragraph: “in America, persistent stereotypes would probably make it hard for this guy to have a "professional" job (or at least hard to climb the ladder)” and “once again, I felt my biases and prejudices that I’ve learned about nonstandard dialects, but this time I resisted the urge to let it affect my rankings.” It is important to note that the participants were not aware of the purpose of the study aside from a brief introduction given in the recruitment speech (see Appendix A), but offered metacognitive statements in acknowledging their implicit biases.

5.2.3 Linguistics 101

The Linguistics 101 initial data collection gave sixteen comments. Five of these comments were mildly related to linguistics, mentioning tones of the speakers, vocal fry in relation to the “Valley Girl” speaker, and the concept of dialects. Other comments relayed negative judgements toward the speakers, such as, “kinda [sic] dejected sounding,” and “not showing respect.” Finally, a handful of comments also directly acknowledge what they believed to be the study’s aim, with statements like, “pretty sure this has to do with racism.”

The second data collection for Linguistics 101 contained ten comments. One comment in particular directly acknowledges the perception of the participant: “she sounds young, and I don't equate that with professionalism (I know I should change that!).” The majority of the remaining comments were justifications or negative feedback about the speakers, such as “sounds like a text to speech program,” or “accent & perfect grammar makes me think English is a second language. fluency in 2 languages = educated 2 me [sic].”

5.2.4 Summary and discussion
The three courses’ comment sections present similar patterns. Many participants choose to discuss why they gave a specific rating, whether through semi-linguistic analysis of concepts like tone, negative judgements about who the speakers sound like in their own lives, or personal feelings about the speakers’ voice. Unique to Linguistics 484 and 101 are the acknowledgement of stereotypes or inherent biases that the participants believe they have, or believe to be true about American society. Students enrolled in Mathematics 118 offer justifications for their comments as well as critiques of the study, but do not acknowledge any biases they may or may not have.

Another pattern that reveals itself in the comment section is apparent in the numeric data, that pattern being a tendency to favor the standard (and occasionally NNS) male throughout the data collection process.13 Looking back at Chapter 4, the results present a divide between sociable and professional/educated in regard to the “Valley Girl” speaker, and standard/NNS males, respectively. Canonically in language attitude studies, these sorts of traits are found disparately, where regional dialects like Southern English often denote friendliness, but not professionalism (see Preston 2002, for example). This notion ties into what the basis was for numerous language and gender studies, dating back to Lakoff (1973). Women’s speech tends to be judged as friendlier or more sociable, with the caveat that it is also not as professional nor educated-sounding. The results of the present study fall in line with this dichotomy, as the “Valley Girl” speaker always holds the highest rating for sociability, but falls to the bottom in regards to professionalism. The variable ratings for educated may be related to the study’s participants being enrolled in a university, where canonical “young female speech” is common.14

---

13 Further gender-based analysis of participant ratings of speakers was not performed beyond the gender binary of male and female, as only two participants identified as genderqueer.

14 This is also seen as one of the participants commented “sounds like a white female college student” for the “Valley Girl” speaker.
As previously mentioned, the lower number of comments in comparison to data points does not allow for a quantitative analysis of comment distribution and content frequency. However, the appearance of metacognition in relation to language attitudes and societally-based stereotypes presents an interesting point of discussion, and speaks positively to the idea that a linguistics course – diversity-based, or introductory – can affect a student’s mindset to certain predisposed dialect judgements.

### 5.3 Application to existing literature and discussion

The results of this study demonstrate that there is a potential for positive change while enrolled in Linguistics 101 coursework. Stigmatized dialect increases were small – positive increases in professionalism and kindness are promising, and a sizable increase in the sociable rating for the male NNS also speaks to a more open-minded perspective. Current efforts being made include not only language awareness in curricula, but also the how and why. North Carolina State University, for example, has an initiative dedicated to dialect diversity awareness – the Language and Life Project – and has produced works like *Talking Black in America*, a film detailing the history of African American English. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is also starting similar efforts in regards to dialect diversity. These are important steps, and should be considered at the P-12 level along with the university level. It is important to note, however, that language awareness does not change implicit biases as they relate to power. The notion of power, as discussed by Fairclough (2001) is based around the idea that power is inherent to discourse – even the notion of code-switching, or alternating dialects, in the classroom denotes a higher and lower power associated with each dialect. Freire (1968) also touches on this concept in discussing the hand-in-hand relationship of politics and education. For the majority, instructors tend to have less-inhibited access to education, and more opportunity to
education than those they are teaching. Unless the language of the instructor has a referential base in the structure of the surrounding world, it runs the risk of low effectiveness, and notable bias. With this being said, the discussion alone of dialect awareness may not be enough to make significant changes in this power structure, nor in the education system as a whole, but it is certainly a start. Dialects and their history are an important part of language, and therefore, an important part of society.

Much of Penelope Eckert’s work relates to the effects of language in the P-12 setting, a notable example being Eckert (2000). The students of Belton High demonstrate social structure through their phonologies, leading to an important question of how much language – even at the level of individual sounds – and social meaning actually intertwine. This sort of notion is inherent in linguistics curricula, so it is reasonable that comments like “these aren't things you can really tell from the person's tone of voice; these are things that are determined by word choice & all of the speakers are saying the same thing” are made by a student who has not taken a linguistics course. While word choice does contribute to possible judgements about speakers, to disregard “tone” all together would also be to disregard an entire subsect of linguistics; and, notwithstanding, to disregard tonal languages like Mandarin, a concept that a student of introductory linguistics would be familiar with by the end of a semester of coursework.

Bissell (2018) surveyed participants’ judgements of Southern “accents” to find possible correlations of self-perception of accentedness, and dialect judgements. In this way, the attention

---

15 Paulo Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1968) in its entirety is an important read, with many notable arguments that exceed the breadth of the present study.

16 One of Eckert’s most cited works in the sociolinguistic community, this paper details an ethnography of a Michigan high school and how its social groupings made use of linguistic tools from both social and gendered perspectives. See Eckert (2000) for data, as well as an in-depth discussion of linguistic variables as they relate to socioeconomic class, gender, etc.
is not only on the judgement of the participants, but also on their demographic information. The results from this study show that self-identification of accentedness correlates significantly to more favorable ratings of stigmatized dialects. Thus, in the present study, a regression analysis was performed on the correlation of non-standard dialect speakers and social emotional competence. While values indicated as further from chance for those with non-standard dialects, they were not significant. This relates to Fairclough’s 2001 discussion of the inherent power structure in language, which can lead away from a solidarity-based ranking of stigmatized dialects to an acknowledgement. That is to say, those who speak non-standard varieties are aware of the present power structure, and rated as such. These sorts of structures are revealed in more publicly mentioned linguistics controversies, like the Ebonics controversy in Oakland, California. Publicity in regards to linguistic diversity, in this case, received negative backlash from the public, as media outlets used it to make a profit through amplifying the alleged incorrectness of the dialect (see Rickford 1999). Such controversies only serve to strengthen the need for linguistic education; be it through steps like the Linguistic Society of America’s committee to solidify an AP Linguistics class in high schools, or a mandated linguistic requirement in higher education.

---

17 Nine participants identified as having non-standard dialects in the initial data collection, and 11 participants did so in the final data collection.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSION

In this chapter, first, a summary of the results of the study will be given, as well as the weaknesses and consequent implications that might accompany the results. Then, the following subsection will give suggestions for further research.

6.1 Summary and implications/weaknesses

While the previous chapter illustrated that not all data comparisons from the two data collections revealed a significant effect, it is of note that the data shifted in regards to those enrolled in Linguistics 101. Small differences appeared in relation to social emotional competencies when comparing linguistics students to a control group. Comparing dialect tolerance ratings resulted in some differences, but not enough to resolutely suggest that an introductory linguistics course can change students’ inherent biases. However, the present study brings to light an important idea – the information presented by an instructor, the form in which this information is presented, and the manner in which this information is discussed among the students is all consequently relayed into the outside world. This is to say, the information trail from teacher to learner has real-world implications outside the classroom as well as inside. While Social Emotional Learning may not be a commonly discussed ideology in the classroom, P-12 or otherwise, this fundamental sequence of events is certainly foundational.

Many outside factors could have affected these results, such as psychology or sociology classes current or past. Similarly, the second data collection had to be performed at a time that is particularly stressful for students in regards to final projects and exams. Along with this, the
present study does include various weaknesses and consequent implications. General mood may or may not have been a factor in participant’s ratings, as most especially the SEL items were of a more personal nature. In a similar vein, a great deal of deliberation went into how exactly to frame the guised task in the present study. Ideally, each audio file would correspond exactly to the dialect in question, both phonologically and morphosyntactically. However, it was the decision of the author and advising committee that to introduce both would be to introduce too many variables into the rating of each speaker. Because the morphosyntactic variables are more easily identified, especially in terms of AAE and “Valley Girl” English, phonological variation was the final decision. Nonetheless, this creates its own implications in that the audio files presented to participants were not completely accurate in relation to the respective grammar of the speaker.

Another implication of the present study is the sheer amount of data collected from participants. Due to time, technology, and manpower constraints, it simply was not possible to analyze all of the possible correlations and connections within the data, nor was it possible to analyze each and every Linguistics 101 course, which would have allowed for more diverse faculty exposure among the participant pool. This accompanies the fact that it is incredibly hard to distinguish between a change in opinion of a dialect versus a change in the implicit biases towards a dialect. To gain insight to this issue, a longitudinal study would be appropriate, perhaps documenting all four (or more) years of undergraduate linguistics major students and control students. One might consider, even, a comparative longitudinal study that starts in the P-12 classroom and ends in the final year of undergraduate education.

Some comments, as previously discussed, introduce another variable of participants’ judgements of the study itself into consideration of results, and as something to consider for
further research. However, the present study does merit further investigation as it holds an important place in current linguistics-in-education research, and in the larger field of linguistic theory as applied to other fields.

6.2 Further research

This study serves as a basis for future research into the connection between social emotional intelligence and introductory linguistics courses. While much research has been done on both of these fields separately, previous disjunctive analysis has done a disservice to their theoretical connection. Further research should ensure data collections as early as possible in the semester, as opposed to almost mid-semester. This may have had an effect on the significance of changes in data, as there may not have been an adequate amount of time to allow for more significant changes. Another consideration for consequent studies is the inclusion of foreign language classes. Foreign language classes allow for the exploration of culture along with language, which may have an effect on SEL competencies like social awareness, as seen in the Worldview Explorations example in Chapter 2.1. The inclusion of foreign language classes would also allow for a deeper understanding of which factors are at play in relation to the previously quoted passage from Kang and Rubin (2009) – that is to say, is it the number of linguistics classes, the number of foreign language classes, or a combination of both that results in a higher comprehension and more favorable rankings of a non-native speaker guise? Equally, the foreign language classroom allows the students to learn not only the target language, but also the culture behind the target language. For example, texts that are less known in the home country’s classroom but well known in the target culture can be introduced and discussed as a way to integrate sounds, sentence structure, prose, and often times, the historical events that led up to the penning of the text itself (Omaggio-Hadley 2001). Drawing back to reader-response
theory, exercises similar to those in the present study can allow the students to create an emotional connection to texts in the target language – and in higher level classes, students might be given assignments in which they can articulate their thoughts in the target language, allowing the teacher to determine if students are able to do more than simply “parrot” sentences. It is because of concepts like this that foreign language classes should undoubtedly be included in further research, perhaps as a control class, or as its own pool of participants.

Further research should also include multiple sections of introductory linguistics classes. Classes should, ideally, be controlled for instructor and university; but, to have a wider breadth of exposure of what an introductory linguistics course means in multiple higher education settings would be conducive to a more diverse - and perhaps, more widely accurate - data set. Reaser (2009) notes that integrating linguistic perspectives into educational materials can be difficult for linguistics, as educational policies and practices are often not within their skillset. Future studies such as this, however, might lessen the need for training practices as introductory linguistics instructors would not have to alter their curricula, as the educational merit that brings with it tolerance and self-awareness is already in the material.
APPENDIX A: SCRIPT FOR CLASS RECRUITMENT

1. Introduction

   Hi, my name is Kate Rustad and I’m a graduate student at UNC Chapel Hill. I am working on a study looking at how we think and feel about how people talk, and how that relates back to us. I have a few clips of different people - I’d like you to listen and answer some questions for each person, telling me what you think about them. You don’t have to pay attention to the actual content, just how you generally think they sound.

   It will take about 20 minutes to listen to the speakers and fill out the response forms. All of the study information is confidential and your name will not be associated with the answers that you give. First, we’ll talk more about the study itself. I’d really like you to participate, and your instructor is not going to see any of your responses. However, you don’t have to if you don’t want to, and your grade will not be affected by whether you participate or not.

2. Hand out consent & background forms/Answer any questions

   This consent form says that you are okay with participating in the study, and are aware that you will remain anonymous. You don’t need to sign them; they are solely for your information. The second [demographic/questionnaire] form just asks for some information about you so that I can run some analyses, then we’ll continue with the audio portion of the study. None of the information you give me will be able to be traced back to you. Basically, what you will have to do is circle how strongly you agree or disagree with the statements given about the speakers you’ll hear.

   We’re going to run through the process, but first, are there any questions about your participation in the study? For those of you who do not wish to participate, feel free to leave the classroom at this time, [but stay close so that you can come back inside after the study has ended – applicable to classes where study will take place during first half of class]. Remember, your participation is voluntary, and your grade will not be affected at all by your responses nor your choice to not participate.

3. Speaker sample

   Okay, now we’re going to listen to the speakers. You will hear 6 different speakers in all. Go ahead and get familiar with these forms; this is what’s called a Likert scale. Just like we talked about before, what you’ll have to do is circle strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree in accordance with what you feel about the statement given in relation to the speaker. If you really cannot decide, you can put neutral.

   For example, say that I’m the speaker you’re analyzing, and the statement given is similar to those on your form, like, “This speaker is young.” If you think this is true, you might circle “strongly agree.” If you aren’t as sure, you might circle “agree,” or if you are leaning towards thinking this statement is false, you might circle “disagree.” If you think that I don’t sound young at all, you might choose to circle “strongly disagree.” And, finally, if you truly do not know if I sound young or old, you might circle neutral. Does this make sense?
What’s important here is that there are no wrong answers - all I’m looking for is your first gut reaction to the speakers. If you want to explain your reasoning for the answers to any of the questions, or give any extra information, there is a comments section – however, this is not necessary for you to do.

I will play each speaker two times. Again, don’t feel like you have to answer in a certain way, just go with what you feel about each speaker. If you feel like you don’t know, just make your best guess - and pay attention to how they sound, not to what they say, right?

Any questions before we begin?

*Play each speaker sample twice.

4. Thanks!
APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM FOR IRB EXEMPTION

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Research Information Sheet
IRB Study #: 17-3303
Principal Investigator: Kate Rustad

The purpose of this research study is to see what we think about how different people speak. You are being asked to take part in a research study because you are a student in Linguistics 101 [Linguistics 484, Mathematics 118].

Being in a research study is completely voluntary. You can choose not to be in this research study. You can also say yes now and change your mind later. Deciding not to be in the research study, now or later, will not affect your ability to receive medical care at UNC, nor your grade in the course.

If you agree to take part in this research, you will be asked to listen to various speech samples, and numerically describe any inclinations you have about the samples. Your participation in this study will take about 20 minutes today, as well as another 20 minutes during the follow-up survey to occur later on in the semester. We expect that 225 people will take part in this research study.

You can choose not to answer any question you do not wish to answer. You can also choose to stop taking the survey at any time. You must be at least 18 years old to participate. If you are younger than 18 years old, please stop now.

There are minimal risks associated with this study.

To protect your identity as a research subject, the researcher(s) will not share your information with anyone. In any publication about this research, your name or other private information will not be used.

If you have any questions about this research, please contact the Investigator named at the top of this form by calling 608-235-9572 or emailing katerust@live.unc.edu. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the UNC Institutional Review Board at 919-966-3113 or by email to IRB_subjects@unc.edu.
APPENDIX C: AUDIO CLIP SCRIPT

I was talking with my friend yesterday about what we wanted to do. We talked about getting dinner or watching a movie, or something else. Neither of us could make a choice, so we ended up staying in for the night.
APPENDIX D: DEMOGRAPHIC/SEL QUESTIONNAIRE (FORMATTING IS ALTERED)

1. Background information
   a. What is your year in school (first, second, etc.)?
   b. List your majors/minors:
   c. What is your race/ethnicity?
   d. What is your gender?
   e. In what year were you born?
   f. Have you taken any linguistics classes before? If yes, which classes?
   g. Do you speak a non-standard dialect of English?
   h. Do you speak any other language(s) at home? If yes, which language(s)?

2. On a scale from 1-5, mark how you feel about the following statements.
   a. I have a lot of strong friendships with people who have opinions different from my own.
      
      Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5  Strongly agree
   
      b. I can give a list of my weaknesses as easily as I can give a list of my strengths.
      
      Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5  Strongly agree
   
      c. If I’m taking a test and the first question I see is something I’m not familiar with, I’ll be in a bad mood and won’t do well on the rest of the test.
      
      Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5  Strongly agree
   
      d. If I’m having a conflict with someone, I am able to articulate how I feel on the spot.
      
      Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5  Strongly agree
   
      e. I tend to form a strong opinion of people when I first meet them.
Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

f. I get frustrated when people use incorrect grammar.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree

g. If my friends are having an argument, I’m always the first one to jump in and try to help them see each other’s point of view.

Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree
APPENDIX E: LIKERT SCALE SURVEY FOR AUDIO CLIPS (FORMATTING IS ALTERED)

For the audio clips that you will hear, circle the number where you feel inclined to for each speaker. Remember, there is no right or wrong answer.

**Speaker 1**

1. This person is polite.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree
   
   Comments:

2. This person is educated.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree
   
   Comments:

3. This person is sociable.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree
   
   Comments:

4. This person is kind.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree
   
   Comments:

5. This person is professional.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly agree
   
   Comments:
APPENDIX F: COMMENTS GIVEN BY PARTICIPANTS DURING DATA COLLECTIONS

(Note: any lack of capitalization, abbreviations, or misspellings are quoted directly from participants’ responses)

Mathematics 118: Data collection 1

- Standard male
  - pronunciation of "neither" strong voice (projection)
- African American English
  - educated: talks slower and more choppy
  - educated: choppy
- Standard female
  - educated: doesn't enunciate
  - sociable: sounds bored
  - sociable: quiet, monotone
  - I don't know why but she annoyed me
- NNS male
  - polite: quieter which is normally polite
  - educated: clearly English not first language so has learned it
  - sociable: quiet typically = shy
  - education does not equal speaking abilities

Mathematics 118: Data Collection 2

- Valley Girl
  - white girl
  - kind: sounds annoyed
  - these aren't things you can really tell from the person's tone of voice; these are things that are determined by word choice & all of the speakers are saying the same thing
- Standard male
  - White boy
  - Pace is weird
- NNS female
  - Latina or black girl
- African American English
  - black boy
- NNS male
  - educated: clearly speaks with an accent, I assume they are educated b/c they may speak a diff lang
  - professional: Asian boy
  - to me sounds like second language

Linguistics 484: Data Collection 1
• Valley Girl
  o polite: rated on content and not tone
  o sociable: she has friend
• Standard male
  o sounded like storytelling like an audiobook, not so much conversational
  o kind: she sounds nicer than the first girl
• African American English
  o it's difficult for me to reconcile what I’ve been socialized to believe about
different dialects/varieties of English and what I know, as a linguistics student, is
actually the case - that no dialect is superior or inferior
  o educated: "washin" a movie "sometin else"
• Standard female
  o sociable: seems a little timid/quieter?
  o sociable: very natural speech in conversation.
  o I don't think these statements are enough to state personality or education
• NNS male
  o educated: there is generally a perception that L2 speakers are less educated... or at
least less educated in the English language
  o talks more slowly and with articulation

Linguistics 484: Data collection 2

• Valley Girl
  o polite: long "so" sounded flippant
  o kind: she sounded annoyed
  o sounds like a white female college student
• Standard male
  o educated: sounds like he's a college kid helping someone with their thesis and
reading from a script
• African American English
  o this test feels ridiculous it feels like a blatant "are you racist or discriminatory
based on voice" test
• Standard female
  o kind: she sounds nicer than the first girl
• NNS male
  o in America, persistent stereotypes would probably make it hard for this guy to
have a "professional" job (or at least hard to climb the ladder)
  o once again, I felt my biases and prejudices that I’ve learned about nonstandard
dialects, but this time I resisted the urge to let it affect my rankings

Linguistics 101: Data collection 1

• Valley Girl
  o very neutral except for slightly excessive vocal fry
• Standard male
- slowish speech makes this sound less social to me. kinda dejected sounding
- middle-upper class white male
- NNS female
  - sounded very curt. like unhappy to be taking.
  - could tell they were reading more easily
- African American English
  - sounds friendly, maybe based on personal experiences
  - does not enunciate in lower tones
  - stereotypes have a lot to do with perception
- Standard female
  - sounds laidback, same reasons as [AAE]
  - sounds similar to [Valley Girl]
  - not showing respect. Impatient
  - slightly southern-reminds me most of the accents I’m around. same with less enunciation lower notes
- NNS male
  - foreign language sounding accent with fluent English sounds educated to me. bias because Asian sounding accent likely.
  - a feeling of dialect?
  - non-native speaker
  - pretty sure this has to do with racism

Linguistics 101: Data collection 2

- Valley Girl
  - kind: sounds like the bitchy girls I went to middle school with
  - she sounds young, and I don't equate that with professionalism (I know I should change that!)
- NNS female
  - kind: sounds like the bitchy girls I went to middle school with
  - sounds like African American
  - sounds really curt
  - she sounds disinterested so it's hard to gauge
- Standard female
  - sociable: sounds disinterested
- African American English
  - sounds like he's reading, not naturally speaking
- Standard male
  - sounds like a text to speech program
- NNS male
  - accent & perfect grammar makes me think English is a second language. fluency in 2 languages = educated to me
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