2024

Judgmental Perspectives/Perceptions of Foreign Languages/ Foreign Language Speakers

Katherine Miles
Syracuse University

Judgmental Perspectives/Perceptions of Foreign Languages/Foreign Language Speakers

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements of the Renee Crown University Honors Program at

Syracuse University

Katherine Miles

Candidate for Bachelor of Arts

And Renee Crown University Honors

May 2024

Abstract

This project intended to gain insight into the language attitudes of Americans toward foreign languages and speakers of foreign languages. Data were collected through a survey, which asked participants for demographic information and questions about their linguistic background. The survey contains three audio recordings of Aesop's fable "The North Wind and the Sun" in English, Japanese, and Southwestern Norwegian. After each audio recording, participants answered questions about their familiarity with the language in the sample without explicitly being told what language was featured in the sample. Then, participants were asked to rate their agreement with a set of statements regarding the language and the speaker, on a scale of 1 to 7, 1 being strongly disagree and 7 being strongly agree. Each recording was followed by seven statements that include "this language is beautiful," "the speaker is kind," "the speaker is aggressive," etc. The results from the survey were then analyzed regarding the hypotheses. The first hypothesis suggests that participants who speak more than one language are more likely to strongly agree with complimentary statements (kindness, friendliness, education) and strongly disagree with pejorative statements (destituteness, aggressiveness, dishonesty). The second hypothesis is that participants who speak more than one language are more likely to strongly agree with the statement that any language is beautiful. As for the third hypothesis, participants are more likely to give more favorable ratings to languages with which they are familiar. The data showed partial support for all three hypotheses, but due to inconsistency in the data, full support was not exhibited by the survey results. In conclusion, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of how language attitudes are shaped by factors such as multilingualism, familiarity, and cultural context within the U.S., and is a foundation for future language attitude research.

Executive Summary

This thesis project aims to better understand American language attitudes, specifically foreign languages, and speakers of languages other than English. A survey was conducted that consisted of questions about the demographic and linguistic background of the participants, as well as three recordings featuring English, Japanese, and Southwestern Norwegian. The recordings are of the same fable, “The North Wind and the Sun” by Aesop. Each recording is followed by questions to gauge the participants’ familiarity with the language in the sample. After each set of questions is a set of seven statements, the first being “this language is beautiful,” followed by statements regarding the destituteness, aggressiveness, dishonesty, kindness, friendliness, and education of the speaker. Participants are asked to rate their agreement with the statements on a scale of 1 to 7, 1 being ‘strongly disagree', 4 being ‘neutral’, and 7 being ‘strongly disagree’. The first hypothesis is that participants who speak more than one language are more likely to strongly agree with the complimentary statements (kindness, friendliness, education) and strongly disagree with the pejorative statements (destituteness, aggressiveness, dishonesty). The second hypothesis is that participants who speak more than one language are more likely to strongly agree with the statement that any language is beautiful. As for a third hypothesis, participants are more likely to give more favorable ratings to languages they are familiar with. The survey data were collected over a period of three weeks and analyzed in accordance with the outlined hypotheses.

The results show that the first hypothesis, regarding monolingual and multilingual participants, has only partial support. While a question inquiring about participant nationality was not explicitly asked, responses from participants who indicated they permanently reside outside of the United States and those who indicated they did not speak English as their first language were removed from consideration. Average ratings across languages for the

complimentary and pejorative statements show that only some exhibited agreement with the first hypothesis whereas others did not. The second hypothesis also had mixed results, as the monolingual participants gave the English sample a higher rating than the multilingual participants, the monolingual participants gave the Japanese sample a lower rating than the multilingual participants, and the monolingual and multilingual participants gave the Southwestern Norwegian sample equal ratings. The third hypothesis faced similar uncertainty, as the English sample, although unanimously familiar, was not most favorably rated across any of the statements. Concerning Japanese and Norwegian, participants who indicated they had experience with the language in the sample gave more favorable ratings than inexperienced participants. Coupled with the results from the complimentary statements about the same two languages which indicate that experienced participants gave more favorable ratings than inexperienced participants, there is moderate support for the third hypothesis. The third hypothesis doesn't have full support because the results from the pejorative statements show that experienced participants disagree less than inexperienced participants regarding certain statements.

This study led to unclear conclusions and may benefit from structural revisions to ensure clearer findings. The matched-guise technique, using the same speaker for each language sample, would have been ideal, as well as an explicit question in the background questionnaire at the beginning of the survey concerning nationality. However, this study occupies a unique place in language attitude research. It considers the American perspective on many languages, while other studies may focus solely on attitudes toward accented English or examine a European perspective. Ultimately, this study provides a foundation for future research on how language

attitudes are shaped by factors such as multilingualism, familiarity, and cultural context within the U.S.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my Thesis Advisor, Professor Rania Habib, for stepping in last minute to fill this role. Your support has been extremely helpful to me throughout this process, and I'm grateful for the opportunity to have worked with you. I would like to thank my Reader, Dr. Sylvia Sierra, for being so detail-oriented in her comments and for holding me to a high standard during the editing process. I would like to thank the most impactful professor I had during my time at Syracuse, and the professor who began the Thesis process with me back when I was a junior, Dr. Corrine Occhino. I would like to thank my Honors Advisor, Robin Berkowitz-Smith, for offering guidance throughout our several meetings in this last semester of mine.

As for my family, friends, and all the special people in my life, thank you for your endless encouragement and for listening to my every grievance while I slowly worked through the biggest project I have ever undertaken. I would like to thank my brothers, Pat and Sean, for their technical support as I struggled to create tables and navigate countless Excel spreadsheets. Thank you to my parents for encouraging me to pursue my passions. Otherwise, I would not have had the courage to switch majors during my freshman year and I never would have ended up creating this project.

Thank you to all the professors I've had throughout my education here, specifically those in the Linguistics, French, and Spanish departments for being so inspiring.

Introduction

Language ideology research is essential to the understanding of tensions and biases in an increasingly multilingual society. It is an uncommon reality to live an entire day only hearing one's native language, and it is essential that we understand what happens when we are exposed to different languages and the thoughts that form surrounding the speakers of other languages. In many U.S. communities, there are strong populations of refugees, international students, and expatriates who regularly experience prejudice based on their native language. In an increasingly diverse world, it is imperative that we unpack and explore such prejudices. Language biases, though common and historically rooted, often go unnoticed. Understanding the perceptions and perspectives of others is extremely valuable information in the development of language ideologies.

This research aims to better understand trends in how people across America view those who speak languages other than English. In a country that doesn't have an official language, it is perplexing to hear arguments from Americans who believe that everyone "should just learn English." Past research on U.S. language policy suggested a tolerance for multilingualism (Kloss, 1998). However, as Wiley (2014) critiqued, the research that led to these conclusions of tolerance focuses mainly on European immigration to the U.S. occurring during the 20th century and disregards covert, documented social behaviors that constitute intolerance of languages other than English. However, this approach overlooks the intersectionality of language ideologies with those about race and ethnicity (Wiley, 2014). It is this Eurocentric approach to language ideology that I oppose and seek to avoid in this thesis by gathering data from languages of many different language families.

More recent research on language ideologies focuses on studying specific populations and enlisting surveys to assess public opinion. For example, one study enlisted student

participants who were British, Central European, and from German-speaking and Dutch-speaking areas, and investigated the effect of variables such as nationality, field of study, mobility, and urbanicity on students' beliefs about multilingualism as it relates to factors of qualification, functionality, enjoyment, dedication, rootedness, and risk (Vogl, 2017). The study reveals a significant correlation between nationality, mobility, urbanicity, and the importance participants attribute to the measured factors. While this study elicited valuable data and findings, it leaves room for similar research in a U.S.-based context that focuses on nationalities outside of Europe.

The study intends to focus on an American perspective and better understand average perceptions of foreign languages. The study consists of an online survey disseminated by email, social media, and word of mouth. The survey, which garnered 145 responses, asks participants for demographic information, as well as about their language background. Then, they are asked to listen to a series of three language recordings, without knowing what the language is ahead of listening, followed by a set of questions. The questions are meant to gauge the familiarity of the participants with the language in the recording. After each set of questions is a set of seven statements, also concerning the language sample, with which participants rate their agreement on a scale of 1 to 7, 1 being strongly disagree, and 7 being strongly agree. The first of these statements is "this language is beautiful," followed by statements about the destituteness, aggressiveness, dishonesty, kindness, friendliness, and education of the speaker. Regarding the data from the survey, participants who speak more than one language are expected to more strongly agree with complimentary statements (kindness, friendliness, education) and more strongly disagree with pejorative statements (destituteness, aggressiveness, dishonesty). Additionally, participants who speak more than one language are predicted to agree more

strongly with the statement that any language is beautiful. This rests on the expectation that those exposed to foreign languages are more likely to appreciate any language compared to monolinguals. As for the third hypothesis, participants are more likely to give more favorable ratings to languages they are familiar with. In other words, it is expected that the English sample, as it is most familiar to participants, will receive the most favorable ratings, followed by the Japanese sample, which is likely to be second in familiarity to participants, then the Southwestern Norwegian sample as least familiar. This assumption is founded in language statistics about the rough number of Japanese speakers in the United States. According to Dietrich & Hernandez (2022), in 2019, there were approximately 455,000 Japanese speakers in the U.S. Concerning Norwegian, due to the small number of people living in the U.S. who speak languages such as Norwegian, in data from a census, Norwegian was grouped with Germanic languages, Slavic languages, other Scandinavian languages and more, and labeled as "Other Indo-European Languages." This group, in 2019, consisted of roughly 576,000 speakers. It is unclear what portion of that total is solely Norwegian speakers, but more than likely is less than the number of Japanese speakers in the U.S. (Dietrich & Hernandez, 2022).

Literature Review

Language ideology and language attitudes are relatively new areas of study in linguistics research that became of interest and importance in the 1970s (Irvine, 2022). Since then, there have been many studies ranging in subject from attitude differences toward Punjabi accented-English and Standard American-accented English, to the correlation between speaking pace and intelligence (Dragojevic & Giles, 2016). Woolard & Schieffelin (1994) examined language ideology's role in anthropology and linguistics, influenced by historical events, literacy ideologies, and linguistic purism. Their review of over 300 sources finds a clear lack of boundaries denoting what language ideology encompasses, as well as a lack of organization of

literature concerning language ideology. They argue that a better understanding of language ideologies is imperative in resolving many issues facing American society, specifically referring to the notion of free speech, journalists' responsibilities, multiculturalism in schools, and the interpretations of non-English juror testimony.

Following Woolard and Schieffelin's 1994 review is a 2014 review by Terrence G. Wiley about monolingualism in the United States and attitudes toward multilingualism throughout American history. This review mainly focuses on language policy in the U.S. and invokes an argument by German linguist Heinz Kloss, suggesting that the U.S. government created language policy primarily from a standpoint of tolerance. Wiley concludes that while there may be some truth to Kloss' assertion of tolerance in American language policy, events of coercive assimilation against indigenous peoples taken together with the treatment of involuntarily relocated African and indigenous peoples point to a history of intolerance in parts of society unconcerned with language policy. In addition, Kloss' disconcerting background as having begun work as a scholar under the Third Reich in pre-World War II Germany, and his narrow focus on European immigrants and formal language policy leaves undiscussed crucial avenues through which discrimination and intolerance were experienced. With such a questionable foundation to his argument, the status of Kloss's work as a key text through which language policy in the U.S. is interpreted becomes concerning and highlights the need for advancement in this field.

In contrast, Dragojevic and Giles (2016) explored language discrimination by comparing perceptions of Standard American English (SAE) and Punjabi-accented English (PE). These researchers attempt to confront biases and cite that "foreign-accented speakers tend to be judged less favorable on a host of traits, including intelligence and friendliness, compared to their

native-speaking counterparts" (Dragojevic & Giles, 2016). The researchers formed five hypotheses, firstly that the SAE speaker will incur more favorable ratings regarding status and solidarity than the PE speaker. Secondly, more white noise present in the recording will result in a lower processing fluency than little to no white noise present in the recording. The third hypothesis is that more white noise present in the recording will result in a more negative rating than less white noise present in the recording. The fourth hypothesis is that as noise increases, status and solidarity ratings will decrease. Lastly, researchers predict that "the effects of noise on language attitudes will be mediated by processing fluency and sequentially by processing fluency and affect" (Dragojevic & Giles, 2016, pg. 402).

The first of two experiments conducted involved audio recordings of a female Californian native of Indian descent in her mid-20s normalized at 70dB and then combined with varying levels of white noise (+0dB, +10dB, +20dB, +30dB), producing 10 recordings total. Participants were told they would listen to a speaker reading a short story, and that the study was concerned with how people rate others' personalities based on limited information. Each participant was randomly assigned one of the possible 10 recordings to listen to. Participants were then asked how much certain personality traits characterized the speaker on a scale of 1 to 7. These traits were divided into two categories of status-related adjectives, like intelligent, educated, and successful, and solidarity-related traits, like friendly, honest, and nice. Lastly, participants rated the ease with which they understood the speaker on a scale from 1 to 7. The results of this study showed that participants' responses became more negative as noise increased, but only for the PE guise and not for the SAE guise. As for status, the SAE and PE guises were given equal ratings in the low and moderate noise conditions, but in the high noise condition, the PE guise was given lower ratings than the SAE guise in terms of status. Regarding solidarity, only the PE

guise was attributed less solidarity as noise increased. These results are consistent with the part of the first hypothesis relating to solidarity, yet conflict with the second part of the first hypothesis as both guises were rated nearly equally concerning status. Processing fluency decreased in noisier listening conditions, affirming the second hypothesis. Participants exhibited a more negative emotional reaction in noisier listening conditions, aligning with the fourth hypothesis. The fifth and final hypothesis was supported by the results as noisier listening conditions made the speaker more difficult to understand, eliciting a more negative affective reaction. The processing difficulty and negative reaction had a negative effect on participants' language attitudes.

Regarding the second experiment, participants were told, based on which recording they were assigned, where the speaker was from (California or India) allowing for the correct categorization. Additionally, participants were asked to complete a memory task before rating the recording. This is intended to draw the participants' attention to their processing difficulties. The second experiment, which maintained the same hypotheses as the first, elicited similar results. The SAE recording received higher solidarity ratings than the PE recording, yet the two were relatively equal concerning status. Noisier conditions decreased processing fluency, generated a more negative affective reaction, and garnered lower status, not solidarity, for both the SAE and PE guises. In accordance with the fifth hypothesis "the significant effects of noise on status attributions were mediated by processing fluency and sequentially by processing fluency and affect" (Dragojevic, 2016, pg. 413). These experiments contributed greatly to language attitudes research as they show that more negative attitudes toward foreign-accented speech may arise from difficulty understanding foreign-accented speech.

While it has been shown across studies that foreign-accented speech tends to be rated more negatively, this suggests room for discussing language attitudes on other levels such as vocal attractiveness. Pisanski & Feinberg (2018) contend that "we rely on voice attractiveness to find friends, fend off foes, network, and to climb social ladders," stating the everyday implications of their research (pg. 607). Interestingly, Pisanski & Feinberg (2018) found that voice and face attractiveness are related as exposure to attractive voices and faces activates similar brain regions. Additionally, they explore the idea of sex-typicality in voices and what factors denote a sex-typical voice, referring to vocal masculinity and alternatively, vocal femininity. Vocal masculinity is measured by features of fundamental frequency and formant frequency, both of which are relatively lower in male voices than in female voices. Fundamental frequency describes a voice's pitch whereas formant frequency is a measure of timbre. Vocal femininity uses the same features but exhibits higher fundamental/formant frequencies than male voices. Vocal masculinity preferences of women are described as tied to their reproductive status. For example, women most prefer low fundamental/formant frequencies during the most fertile phase of their menstrual cycle. In addition, preferences change when women consider short-term rather than long-term partners, with lower fundamental/formant frequencies being preferable to women considering short-term partners. As for vocal femininity, men reported higher assessments of the voices of women in the 19-30 age range compared to the voices of women closer to menopause. Regarding social stereotypes, women's voices on the higher end of fundamental/format frequencies are more often associated with femininity, fertility, immaturity, weakness, and lower levels of competence, which Pisanski & Feinberg (2018) describe as the dilemma of sounding attractive or powerful (pg. 611). Another interesting finding contends that voices rated highly attractive were rated less and less attractive as they were listened to more.

This is in accordance with the mere-exposure effect considered by Anikin et al. (2022), that there is a correlation between liking or disliking a voice and familiarity with a voice.

Pisanski & Feinberg (2018) present findings in the context of preferences of men and women, more specifically preferences of men who are attracted to women and women who are attracted to men. It would be an interesting extension to research on vocal attractiveness to include those who do not align with the gender binary and to explore the vocal preferences of those who are not attracted to the opposite sex. Overall, this investigation resulted in findings that support the interconnectedness of linguistics and other scientific fields such as biology and anthropology. However, it only scratched the surface of research into vocal attractiveness especially considering the continuing development of voice manipulation technology.

Technology has advanced since the beginning of studying language attitudes, leading to a more recent study by Irvine (2022), who enlisted a Reddit thread and Wikipedia entry in analyzing the formation of and discussion surrounding language ideologies. The Reddit thread presented diverse opinions; for instance, some equated the ‘southern-sounding’ Maryland accent with perceived unintelligence among Marylanders. Mentions of foods such as grits, common in the American South and in Maryland as argued by some commenters, serve as an example of how a place may be indexed by certain vocabulary relating to food, clothing, and other cultural indicators. Irvine terms this phenomenon axes of differentiation, where different speech forms index different regions and residents, and constantly evolve to encapsulate the latest cultural developments.

Moreover, Irvine (2022) stresses the importance of considering what sources fail to address in their argument in addition to what they succeed in mentioning. This is apparent in the Wikipedia entry and Reddit thread as the Wikipedia entry lends itself to an academic lens,

whereas the latter is more from a “folk” lens. Additionally, the Wikipedia entry focuses squarely on urban class and racial divisions, lacking discussion of the American South. Comparatively, the Reddit thread discusses ‘southerness,’ geography, and history, but does not effectively mention race as a factor in the Maryland accent discourse. It is important to note that Irvine also emphasizes representation and analysis of language ideology on a micro scale, as it occurs in everyday life, rather than a macro scale of how language exists in policies and texts from political movements, and is used in larger systems of capitalism, socialism, etc. (pg. 233). This provides context for Irvine’s choices of noninstitutional, accessible, and ordinary sources such as the Wikipedia entry concerning Baltimore, and the Reddit thread about the Maryland accent. Ultimately, it represents that ideologies are pondered in settings beyond academia.

In better understanding the linguistic situation in Maryland, Irvine (2022) also attempts to better define terms such as “ideology” as it relates to languages. Irvine references definitions by other scholars and addresses their differences in what spaces their definitions invoke, whether that be in the background as a cognitive map or at the forefront in terms of policy, as well as whether their definitions are rooted in conscious or unconscious dimensions. Irvine then continues to explore the impact of politics and power on the connotations of ideology, referencing the development of implicit contrast of the word during the Cold War. That with a set of ideas deemed an “ideology” must exist a set of opposing ideas. Irvine’s exploration of the history and evolution of words imperative to the language ideology and language attitudes fields is unique and in its conversational form contrasts and refines the foundation of many scientific studies in linguistics.

There is ample research relating to attitudes toward accented English, vocal attractiveness across English varieties, and monolingualism in the U.S., however, research on universal

language attitudes is noticeably lacking. One of the few studies on the topic, conducted by Vogl (2017), analyzes the opinions of 1,880 multilingual university students across Europe. Vogl conducted an online survey consisting of sociobiographical questions regarding four variables: nationality, field of study, mobility, and urbanicity. Urbanicity and mobility refer to a participant's desire to live in a big city, and willingness to move to a different country, respectively. It is worth noting that participants were chosen in a snowball sampling fashion as each participant was asked to identify other potential participants. The next portion of the survey features statements with which participants rate their agreement on a scale from 1, meaning completely disagree, to 6 for completely agree. Vogl reports that the statements are common assumptions about multilingualism and becoming multilingual (language learning).

Vogl (2017) records several hypotheses regarding the results of his study, which garnered 1,880 responses and represented 63 different nationalities. Vogl believes for historical reasons that students from Central Europe would view the identity function of language and the value of the mother tongue as more significant than would students from other areas of Europe. Additionally, participants in arts and humanities fields would give higher scores, indicative of stronger agreement, to statements about the importance of language and culture rather than statements about language as a skill. The mobility factor tested for in the sociobiographical portion of the questionnaire allows for the third hypothesis that those who indicated they intend to move to another country would exhibit less agreement with statements about the importance of identity through language than students who do not intend to move to another country. Lastly, students who intend to live in a more urban environment would be less likely to attach significance to the identity function of language (feeling of belonging through language).

Results from the survey were examined using Exploratory Factor Analysis, a technique that allows similar results to be grouped into factors. Six factors regarding how students think about language learning resulted from this method of analysis, including qualification, functionality, rootedness, dedication, enjoyment, and risk. Table 2 in Vogl's article shows that enjoyment, functionality, and qualification were the first, second, and third-ranked factors by score. Participants seemed to agree with one another along nationality lines, with the main groups being British, Central European, and participants from German-speaking and Dutch-speaking areas. A finding that agrees with the second hypothesis proposed by Vogl was that students in arts and humanities fields rated functionality lower in comparison with ratings from students in natural sciences fields. There was an observable relationship between students with high Mobility who scored the importance of Rootedness (proficiency in the national language of the country you live in) more highly than students who preferred to stay in their home country. Regardless of nationality, students tended to attach more importance to function and instrumental factors than to identity factors. Overall, students showed an understanding of the importance of the preservation of a mother tongue, while simultaneously recognizing the value of multilingualism in the context of a globalized Europe.

Similarly to the research of Vogl (2017), Anikin et al. (2022) examine whether there are certain universally attractive phonetic features. A major focus of their research is phonesthetics, which they define as "the perception of beauty in spoken language that is independent of meaning." Their experimental design includes analyzing the spectrotemporal complexity of recordings of the King James Bible translated into hundreds of world languages. Additionally, recordings of 228 languages from 43 language families were rated on pleasantness by speakers of English, Chinese, and Semitic languages.

Anikin et al. (2022) suggest an optimal level of spectrotemporal complexity for activating brain areas without overwhelming processing. Therefore, the most aesthetically appealing languages may be of average phonetic complexity. Aside from the phonemes contained within a language, aesthetic appeal will likely have to do with voice quality, as the authors cite that healthy-sounding and sex-typical voices are generally preferred. The exposure effect, which contends that there is a positive correlation between a respondent's preference for a particular language and their familiarity with it, is also considered by the researchers. Ultimately, these researchers formed a hypothesis that respondents would judge a language to be more beautiful if it exhibited phonological overlap with the respondents' first language.

The results of this study supported the researchers' presumption, as there was a 12.2% higher pleasantness score when respondents indicated they recognized the language in question. Languages were slightly more often misidentified than correctly identified, with misidentification occurring 50.3% of the time. Yet familiarity with a language, whether perceived or actual, overall resulted in a higher pleasantness score. Cultural biases were evident in some results, as Chinese speakers preferred languages they presumed were spoken in North Asia and North America, yet poorly rated languages they presumed were spoken in Africa. Speakers of Semitic languages tended to rate North American and South American languages highly, suggesting culture-specific preferences.

An important finding from Anikin et al. (2022) shows that there is greater cross-cultural agreement about unattractiveness in languages, as well as a negative skew in scores of unfamiliar languages. None of the features analyzed for impact on pleasantness score, namely phonetic complexity, phonetic typicality, and overlap with the listener's mother tongue, were found to be significant. Most surprising from these results was the lack of correlation between the

pleasantness score and similarity to the listener's mother tongue. Anikin et al. conclude that given the minute differences in results across different demographics if there are true phonesthetic differences between languages, they are negligible at the population level. Additionally, future phonesthetic research may want to center on the unattractiveness of languages, as that garnered clearer results in this study.

This study is unique as it compares starkly different languages and relies on speaker-focused judgments, diverging from listener-participant perceptions. Participants are directly asked to rate their agreement with the statement "this language is beautiful," with the intent to unearth opinions about a language rather than a people. Likely, participants will still consider speaker-related features in their assessment such as voice quality and pitch. Ultimately, the study aims to understand opinions toward foreign languages, and the effect that familiarity with a language has on one's perception of it and the people who speak it. The languages featured in the study are each from a different language family, and the results are intended to show an American perspective from a subset of the U.S. population. The findings presented by this study will allow for a better understanding of the judgments made against those who speak foreign languages, especially as those judgments may be influenced by the recognition of a language.

Methods

The study utilizes a survey comprising a background questionnaire, language samples, and related attitudinal examination. The background questionnaire asks participants their age, race, gender identity, where they reside in the U.S., the highest level of education they completed, as well as how many languages they speak, and their proficiency level in each language. These typical sociolinguistic questions facilitate the comparison of language sample results across demographic variables. The survey includes three language samples taken from an online resource, Aesop's Language Bank, featuring three different male speakers between the

ages of twenty-one and twenty-six. Each recording features one speaker retelling Aesop's fable "The North Wind and the Sun" and runs approximately 30-45 seconds.

The American English sample serves as the control, due to its unanimous familiarity among participants. The second language sample is Japanese and is likely to be of medium familiarity to survey participants. The third language sample is Southwestern Norwegian which was chosen due to its relative obscurity to average Americans in comparison with languages like Spanish or French. To limit possible gender-based biases in speaker judgment, three recordings of male voices were chosen. The recordings available on Aesop's Language Bank vary greatly in voice quality, level of background noise, and gender of speaker. Upon listening to all the recordings available on their website, a shortlist was made of recordings with the best voice quality and the least background noise. Selecting a moderately familiar second language sample and a less familiar third language sample was crucial. Additionally, languages from different language families were desirable, leading to the selection of Japanese and Southwestern Norwegian to represent the moderately familiar and least familiar languages, respectively. The three language samples were uploaded to Qualtrics; the platform used to construct the survey.

Following similar survey designs (Anikin et al., 2022; Dragojevic & Giles, 2016; Vogl, 2017), questions were selected to accompany each language sample. Many use a set of statements and ask participants to rate their agreement, on a scale of 1 to 5 or 1 to 7. This experimental design was adapted to fit the goals of this study, resulting in a series of 10 questions following each language sample. The first three questions ask participants if they've heard the language before, from which continent the language originates, and if they have experience with the language. These questions are designed to assess the degree of familiarity the participant has with each language. The succeeding portion of the survey contains seven

statements, and participants were instructed to rate their agreement with each statement on a scale of 1, meaning strongly disagree, to 7, meaning strongly agree. The first of the seven statements is “this language is beautiful” allowing participants to primarily consider the language sample, while also considering the speaker in the recording. The remaining six statements follow the same formula “The speaker is ___,” with 3 of the statements featuring positive adjectives (kind, friendly, educated), and 3 featuring negative adjectives (destitute, aggressive, dishonest). Polarizing adjectives like these were chosen to make participants consider the speaker's character, in addition to the language in the sample. This would allow for language-based biases or instantaneous impressions to be recorded and analyzed for patterns across demographics. The same format and questions/statements were used for each of the three language samples. Participant answers indicating they did not speak English as their first language and did not live in the U.S. at the time of taking the survey were removed from consideration in this study. This is because the study is meant to represent the opinions of Americans and native-English speakers.

Results

The survey received 145 responses and represented a wide variety of backgrounds. Regarding the age of participants, 52% of survey respondents were between 18 and 20 years old, 40% were between 21 and 29 years of age, and the remaining 8% of respondents were 30 or older. As for gender, 72% of survey respondents were female, 23% male, 3% other and 1% preferred not to say. Concerning race, 67% of participants are white, 6% are Black or African American, 12% are Asian, 7% are Hispanic, and the remaining 8% selected “other.” Geographical data from participants shows that 47% of survey respondents are currently residing in New York state, followed by 8% from New Jersey, and 6% from California. The remaining participants reside in other states in the U.S. and Puerto Rico. Educational backgrounds of

participants include 59% having participated in some college but did not or have not received a degree, followed by 18% with a high school degree equivalent, then 17% with a bachelor's degree, 4% with a graduate degree, and 3% with an associate degree.

Table 1: Average Participant Ratings of English Sample

		Question 7: How many languages do you speak?		
Answer the following questions using a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 correlating to strong disagreement with the statement, and 7 correlating to strong agreement with the statement.		Overall	1	≥2
	# of Responses	141	67	74
	This language is beautiful	4.1	4.3	3.9
	The speaker is destitute	2.5	2.3	2.7
	The speaker is kind	4.4	4.6	4.2
	The speaker is aggressive	1.9	1.9	2.0
	The speaker is friendly	4.1	4.1	4.0
	The speaker is dishonest	1.8	1.9	1.8
	The speaker is educated	4.7	4.7	4.7

Table 2: Average Participant Ratings of Japanese Sample

		Question 7: How many languages do you speak?		
Answer the following questions using a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 correlating to strong disagreement with the statement, and 7 correlating to strong agreement with the statement.		Overall	1	≥2
	# of Responses	138.0	66.0	72.0
	This language is beautiful	4.9	4.7	5.1
	The speaker is destitute	2.3	2.3	2.4
	The speaker is kind	4.5	4.5	4.5
	The speaker is aggressive	1.9	2.1	1.8
	The speaker is friendly	4.6	4.4	4.8
	The speaker is dishonest	1.8	1.7	1.8
	The speaker is educated	4.7	4.6	4.8

Table 3: Average Participant Ratings of Norwegian Sample

		Question 7: How many languages do you speak?		
Answer the following questions using a scale		Overall	1	≥2
	# of Responses	131.0	62.0	69.0

of 1 to 7, with 1 correlating to strong disagreement with the statement, and 7 correlating to strong agreement with the statement.	This language is beautiful	4.0	4.0	4.0
	The speaker is destitute	2.4	2.3	2.4
	The speaker is kind	3.9	3.9	3.9
	The speaker is aggressive	2.3	2.1	2.6
	The speaker is friendly	3.8	3.9	3.7
	The speaker is dishonest	1.9	1.8	2.1
	The speaker is educated	4.4	4.5	4.4

Considering the overall average ratings from Tables 1-3, it seems that monolinguals and multilinguals tend toward neutrality regarding the complimentary statements, and disagreement regarding the pejorative statements. The overall average ratings for each language show that complimentary statements received ratings close to neutral (4.0), and the pejorative statements received ratings that indicate disagreement (2.0). Across all languages, it seems that of the complimentary statements, "the speaker is educated" received slightly higher ratings, between .1-.7 higher than the other statements. Additionally, across the three languages, participants tended to rate the statement "the speaker is kind" second-most favorably of the complimentary statements, followed by "the speaker is friendly." Of the pejorative statements, the statement "the speaker is destitute" received average ratings closest to 4.0 compared to average ratings of the other pejorative statements, indicating that participants disagree least with this pejorative statement. Overall ratings show that participants gave the Japanese sample more favorable ratings for the beauty of the language, the kindness of the speaker, and the friendliness of the speaker, and an equal rating for the education of the speaker as in the English sample, but higher than that of the Norwegian sample.

The results in Table 1 are taken from 141 total responses, consisting of 67 responses from monolingual participants, and 74 responses from people who speak 2 or more languages. The results show that on average, monolingual participants were more likely to agree with the statement that the English language is beautiful as the average monolingual rating was a 4.3 and

the average multilingual rating was a 3.9. A neutral rating is a 4, meaning that both monolinguals and multilinguals tended toward neutrality regarding the beauty of the sample. Multilinguals gave a more favorable average rating for the English sample for statements about the kindness and friendliness of the speaker, although the difference in the friendliness ratings is small. Multilinguals indicated stronger disagreement with the statement about dishonesty, but the difference in the multilingual and monolingual ratings is small. Monolinguals gave an average rating indicating stronger disagreement about the English sample for statements on the aggressiveness and destituteness of the speaker, although the difference in the aggressiveness ratings is extremely small. Multilinguals and monolinguals gave equal average ratings to the English sample about the statement "the speaker is educated."

Given that participants were allowed to use their discretion and exit the survey at any point, it is expected that not all participants who gave ratings for the English sample continued to give ratings for the Japanese sample. For that reason, Table 2 concerns the Japanese sample which received 138 total responses, broken down as 66 responses from monolingual participants, and 72 responses from participants who speak two or more languages. For the first statement about the beauty of the sample, multilingual participants gave a higher average rating (5.1) compared to monolingual participants (4.7). Multilingual participants also gave more favorable average ratings for statements about the friendliness and education of the speaker. Multilinguals indicated stronger disagreement with the statements about the destituteness and dishonesty of the speaker. Monolingual participants indicated stronger disagreement for the statement regarding the aggressiveness of the speaker, and monolinguals and multilinguals gave equal average ratings about the kindness of the speaker. It is important to clarify that the differences between

the monolingual and multilingual ratings differ by as little as .1 and as much as .4 and should therefore be interpreted with caution.

Table 3 depicts the results concerning the Norwegian sample. There were 131 total responses consisting of 62 responses from monolingual participants, and 69 responses from multilingual participants. Multilingual and monolingual participants gave equal average ratings for the beauty of the Norwegian sample as well as the kindness of the speaker. Multilinguals gave more favorable average ratings, indicating stronger disagreement, for the destituteness, aggressiveness, and dishonesty of the speaker. The ratings for destituteness differed by .1, an insignificant difference compared to the differences of .5 and .3 exhibited across multilingual and monolingual ratings of the aggressiveness and dishonesty of the speaker. Monolinguals gave higher average ratings regarding the friendliness and education of the speaker. However, these differences were extremely small.

Tables 1-3 also allow for comparison of ratings across the three languages concerning the second hypothesis that those that speak multiple languages are more likely to agree with the statement “this language is beautiful.” The average rating for the English sample by multilingual participants was a 3.9, .4 less than the average rating for the English sample by monolingual participants (4.3). The average rating for the Japanese sample by multilingual participants was a 5.1, .4 more than the average rating for the Japanese sample by monolingual participants (4.7). Regarding the Norwegian sample, multilingual participants gave an average rating of 4.0, equal to the 4.0 average rating of monolingual participants.

Overall, Japanese received the highest rating from both monolingual and multilingual participants concerning its beauty. Then, for monolinguals, English received a more favorable

rating than Norwegian, and Norwegian received a more favorable rating than English from multilinguals, although the differences between each of these ratings is small.

Table 4: Overall Participant Ratings across English/Japanese/Norwegian

	English	Japanese	Norwegian
This language is beautiful.	4.1	4.9	4.0
The speaker is destitute.	2.5	2.3	2.4
The speaker is kind.	4.4	4.5	3.9
The speaker is aggressive	1.9	1.9	2.3
The speaker is friendly	4.1	4.6	3.8
The speaker is dishonest.	1.8	1.8	1.9
The speaker is educated.	4.7	4.7	4.4

The data represented in Table 4 show a broad comparison of participant ratings across each language. It is clear from the results that generally the Japanese sample was most preferred among the three samples. Participants tended toward slight agreement with the statement “this language is beautiful,” and fell between neutrality and slight agreement for the complimentary statements with average ratings ranging from 4.5-4.7. Participants seemed to disagree with the pejorative statements about the Japanese sample pretty strongly as their average ratings were around 2.0. The English sample received a neutral rating (4.1) regarding the statement “this language is beautiful.” Participants exhibited very slight agreement with the complimentary statements, averaging between 4.1-4.7, and pretty strong disagreement with the pejorative statements as average ratings fell around 2.0. The Norwegian sample exhibited lower ratings in the complimentary statements compared to the other two languages. Ratings for the complimentary statements and the statement “this language is beautiful” averaged at 4.0 or below, signaling overwhelming neutrality toward the Norwegian sample. Yet, the pejorative

statement ratings were comparable to those of the other languages, with the exception of the average rating for the statement “the speaker is aggressive” which is .4 higher than the English and Japanese ratings. Comparing the English and Norwegian samples, for each complimentary statement, as well as “this language is beautiful,” the English sample received more favorable ratings. Comparatively, the English statement received ratings indicating stronger disagreement with the statement “the speaker is destitute.”

Table 5: Average Participant Ratings according to Experience with English/Japanese/Norwegian

		Do you have experience with this language?								
		English			Japanese			Norwegian		
		Total	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No
Answer the following questions using a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 correlating to strong disagreement with the statement, and 7 correlating to strong agreement with the statement.	# of Responses	141	141	0	138	31	107	131	4	127
	This language is beautiful	4.1	4.1		4.9	5.4	4.7	4.0	4.5	4.0
	The speaker is destitute	2.5	2.5		2.3	2.8	2.2	2.4	1.3	2.4
	The speaker is kind	4.4	4.4		4.5	4.7	4.4	3.9	4.5	3.9
	The speaker is aggressive	1.9	1.9		1.9	2.0	1.9	2.3	2.3	2.3
	The speaker is friendly	4.1	4.1		4.6	4.8	4.5	3.8	5.0	3.8
	The speaker is dishonest	1.8	1.8		1.8	2.0	1.7	1.9	1.3	1.9
	The speaker is educated	4.7	4.7		4.7	5.0	4.6	4.4	5.3	4.4

Table 6: Average Participant Ratings according to Experience with English/Japanese/Norwegian and # of Languages Spoken

			Do you have experience with this language?					
			English		Japanese		Norwegian	
		# of Languages Spoken	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Answer the following questions using	This language is beautiful.	1	4.3		4.7	4.7	4.4	3.9
		≥2	3.9		6.0	5.0	4.2	3.9

a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 correlating to strong disagreement with the statement, and 7 correlating to strong agreement with the statement.	The speaker is destitute.	1	2.3		1.7	2.3	2.6	2.2
		≥2	2.7		1.0	2.4	2.5	2.3
	The speaker is kind.	1	4.6		5.0	4.5	3.6	4.0
		≥2	4.2		7.0	4.4	3.6	3.7
	The speaker is aggressive.	1	1.9		1.3	2.1	2.7	2.0
		≥2	1.9		1.0	1.7	2.9	2.4
	The speaker is friendly.	1	4.1		5.0	4.4	3.9	4.0
		≥2	4.0		6.0	4.7	3.3	3.6
	The speaker is dishonest.	1	1.9		1.0	1.8	1.9	1.7
		≥2	1.7		1.0	1.7	2.5	1.7
	The speaker is educated.	1	4.7		5.3	4.6	4.4	4.5
		≥2	4.8		6.0	4.7	4.5	4.2

Tables 5 and 6 represent results regarding the third hypothesis that participants who are familiar with a language will be more likely to favorably rate that language. Table 5 allows for comparison of average participant ratings across the three languages considering their experience with each language. Table 6 allows for similar comparison, but with the added dimension of monolingual vs. multilingual participant ratings. For the English sample, 140 respondents out of 141 indicated they were familiar with the language, and it is highly plausible that the individual response that indicated unfamiliarity with English was an error on the part of the participant. This is the reason for counting 141 participants as having answered “Yes” to the question “Do you have experience with this language?”.

Concerning the ratings in Table 5, participants who indicated they had experience with the language in the sample are considered ‘experienced participants’, and those who indicated they did not have experience with the language in the sample are considered ‘inexperienced participants’. For Japanese, the average rating of an experienced participant for the statement “this language is beautiful” was a 5.4, whereas the average rating for an inexperienced

participant was a 4.7. Regarding the remaining three complimentary statements (the speaker is kind, the speaker is friendly, the speaker is educated), the average experienced participant ratings (4.7, 4.8, 5.0) were each more favorable than their inexperienced participant counterpart ratings (4.4, 4.5, 4.6). Given that each response was greater than 4.0, these responses indicate agreement with the statement whereas a rating below 4.0 would indicate disagreement. Therefore, the intensity with which the experienced participants agreed with the complimentary statements was greater than that of the inexperienced participants.

As for the average participant ratings of the pejorative statements about the Japanese sample (the speaker is destitute, the speaker is aggressive, the speaker is dishonest), both experienced and inexperienced participants gave average ratings below 4.0, indicating disagreement with the statements. Average experienced participant ratings for the pejorative statements (2.8, 2.0, 2.0) are each higher than their average inexperienced participant counterpart ratings (2.2, 1.9, 1.7). This indicates inexperienced participants are more in disagreement with the pejorative statements than the experienced participants. However, this should be interpreted with caution given that the difference in ratings is small.

Regarding the results depicted in Table 5 about Norwegian, 131 participants gave ratings for the Norwegian sample, with 4 indicating they have experience with the language in the sample and the remaining 127 indicating they do not have experience with the language in the sample. The first statement concerning the beauty of the language in the sample received an average 4.5 rating from experienced participants, whereas inexperienced participants gave an average rating of 4.0. The complimentary statements regarding the kindness, friendliness, and education of the speaker received average experienced participant ratings of 4.5, 5.0, and 5.3, whereas inexperienced participants gave average ratings of 3.9, 3.8, and 4.4 for each

complimentary statement. These ratings show a tendency of experienced participants to agree with the complimentary statements more strongly, when compared to inexperienced participants.

The pejorative statements concerning the Norwegian sample allude to the destituteness, aggressiveness, and dishonesty of the speaker. These statements received average experienced participant ratings of 1.3, 2.3, and 1.3. Comparatively, inexperienced participants gave average ratings of 2.4, 2.3, and 1.9 about the same statements. This shows that in the case of two of the pejorative statements (the speaker is destitute, the speaker is dishonest) experienced participants were more likely to strongly disagree than inexperienced participants.

The results in Table 6 allow for a more detailed depiction of participant opinion, as it considers both experience with the sample languages, and the monolingualism/multilingualism of participants. Regarding the first statement, “this language is beautiful,” for the Japanese sample, monolinguals both with and without experience gave a 4.7 rating, whereas multilingual, experienced participants gave a 6.0 rating, and multilingual, inexperienced participants gave a 5.0 rating. Results from the English sample show that monolingual participants gave a more favorable average rating than multilingual participants. For the same statement but about Norwegian, regardless of how many languages a participant spoke, those without experience with Norwegian gave a 3.9 rating. Concerning English and Norwegian, multilingual participants, regardless of experience, tended to give less favorable ratings for the statement “this language is beautiful.” Considering the statement “the speaker is kind” and the Japanese sample, there is a strong divide amongst those with experience with Japanese. Monolingual experienced participants gave an average rating of 5.0 whereas multilingual experienced participants gave an average rating of 7.0. As for the same statement but other languages, for Norwegian experienced participants and multilingual inexperienced participants gave very similar ratings around 3.6,

whereas monolingual inexperienced participants gave an average rating of 4.0. The English sample exhibited slight divergence, with monolingual participants giving an average response .4 higher than the multilingual average rating, both of which show neutrality to slight agreement with the statement.

The statement regarding the friendliness of the speaker showed more polarizing results for Japanese and Norwegian than the kindness statement. The English sample received results indicating neutrality from both monolingual and multilingual participants, with the monolingual participant rating being .1 higher than the multilingual participant rating. The Japanese sample received results indicating moderate agreement from both experienced monolinguals and inexperienced multilinguals. Comparing experienced participants to inexperienced participants, experienced participants gave more favorable ratings than inexperienced participants whose average ratings fell around 4.5. The results from the Norwegian sample show that monolinguals regardless of experience gave neutral average ratings. Additionally, monolinguals gave more neutral ratings than multilinguals, as multilinguals exhibited slight disagreement with the statement. Those without experience with Norwegian gave more neutral ratings than those with experience.

The statement about the education of the speaker received similar results from monolinguals and multilinguals concerning English. These average ratings show slight agreement with the statement. Ratings from the Japanese sample show that inexperienced monolingual and multilingual participants gave similar ratings, 4.6 and 4.7, and were in slight agreement with the statement. Experienced participants show stronger agreement overall regarding Japanese, but experienced multilinguals gave the most favorable rating (6.0). The Norwegian sample exhibited an interesting pattern as experienced participants as well as

inexperienced monolinguals gave similar ratings, 4.4-4.5, but inexperienced multilinguals showed less agreement, with an average rating of 4.2. Ultimately, Japanese was rated most favorably across complimentary statements, often regardless of experience level and number of languages spoken by participants.

As for pejorative statements, concerning the destituteness of the speaker, monolinguals and multilinguals seem to diverge in their opinion of the English sample. Monolinguals gave an average rating of 2.3, showing more disagreement and less neutrality than multilingual participants who gave an average rating of 2.7. Considering Japanese, experienced participants seem to show stronger disagreement than inexperienced participants, and the greatest difference in ratings occurred between experienced multilinguals (1.0) and inexperienced multilinguals (2.4). Norwegian results show a general consensus amongst participants that they are in slight disagreement with the statement. Monolingual participants show the greatest difference in ratings, as the experienced participant average rating is 2.6 and the inexperienced participant average rating is 2.2.

The statement about the aggressiveness of the speaker garnered the same rating from monolingual and multilingual participants for the English sample (1.9), which shows moderate disagreement. As for the Japanese sample, experienced participants show the most disagreement for this statement and language, with average ratings of 1.0 and 1.3. Inexperienced multilinguals show more disagreement with the statement than their experienced counterparts, as is the case with inexperienced monolinguals. The Norwegian sample received results that contrast with the results about the Japanese sample. Inexperienced participants gave a more favorable rating than experienced participants as they showed stronger disagreement with the statement. Inexperienced monolinguals (2.0) and experienced multilinguals (2.9) contrasted most in their ratings.

The statement about the perceived dishonesty of the speaker also received results that indicate moderate to strong disagreement. Monolingual and multilingual participants differed in their average ratings of the English sample by .2, but both indicate moderate disagreement. The Japanese sample shows strong disagreement on the part of experienced participants, who exhibited average ratings of 1.0. The inexperienced participant ratings were closer to 2.0, indicating weaker disagreement. Inexperienced participants show strong disagreement regarding Norwegian, as monolinguals and multilinguals gave an average rating of 1.7. Experienced multilinguals surprisingly show the weakest disagreement for this language and statement, as their average rating is 2.5. Experienced monolinguals on the other hand fall closer to the inexperienced participant ratings, with an average rating of 1.9, indicating stronger disagreement.

Discussion

The data from the survey provide some findings about the language attitudes of the sampled population subset. The data somewhat supports the first hypothesis, which suggests that multilingual participants are more likely to give favorable ratings to each language sample. For the data to support this hypothesis, it was expected that multilingual participants would give average ratings closer to 7.0 (correlating to strongly agree) regarding the complimentary statements (kindness, friendliness, and education of the speaker) about each language compared to the average ratings of monolingual participants. Alternatively, for the pejorative statements (destituteness, aggressiveness, and dishonesty of the speaker) it was expected that multilingual participants give average ratings closer to 1.0 (correlating to strongly disagree) compared to monolingual participants.

The English sample exhibited results inconsistent with the hypothesis, as average multilingual ratings for two of the three complimentary statements (kindness, 4.2, and friendliness of the speaker, 4.0) were farther from 7.0 than the average monolingual ratings for

the same statements (4.6, 4.1). The third complimentary statement about the education of the speaker received equal average ratings (4.7) from monolingual and multilingual participants. Regarding the Japanese sample, for statements about the friendliness and education of the speaker, average multilingual participant ratings were closer to 7.0 than average monolingual ratings (4.8 and 4.8, compared to 4.4 and 4.6). For the statement about the kindness of the speaker, the average monolingual and multilingual participant ratings were equal (4.5). As for the Norwegian sample, in two of the three complimentary statements (friendliness and education of the speaker) average multilingual participant ratings were farther from 7.0 than average monolingual participant ratings (3.7 and 4.4, compared to 3.9 and 4.5). For the statement concerning the kindness of the speaker, monolingual and multilingual participants exhibited the same average rating of 3.9.

The results for the pejorative statements about each language are even less clear. The English sample received average ratings indicating stronger disagreement from monolingual participants on the statements about the destituteness and aggressiveness of the speaker compared to average multilingual participant ratings. The opposite is true for the statement concerning the dishonesty of the speaker, as the average multilingual rating indicated stronger disagreement than the average monolingual rating. The Japanese sample exhibited a similar pattern, where average monolingual participant ratings for statements about the destituteness and aggressiveness of the speaker indicate stronger disagreement than average monolingual participant ratings. The average multilingual participant rating for the statement about the aggressiveness of the speaker showed the anticipated pattern, as it indicates stronger disagreement than the average monolingual participant rating. The Norwegian sample showed results entirely inconsistent with the first hypothesis, as for each pejorative statement the average

monolingual participant rating shows stronger disagreement than the average multilingual participant rating. However, the difference regarding the average ratings for destituteness was extremely small (.1) in comparison with the .5 and .3 differences exhibited by the other two pejorative statements. It appears from this study that there is an overall lack of support for the first hypothesis that multilingual participants would be more likely to favorably rate the samples as opposed to monolingual participants.

The second hypothesis expects that multilingual participants would give a more favorable rating to the statement “this language is beautiful.” In support of this hypothesis, it was anticipated that the average multilingual participant rating for each language sample would be closer to 7.0 than the average monolingual participant rating for each language. As for the English sample, the monolingual participants gave an average rating closer to 7.0 than the average multilingual participant rating. The Japanese sample exhibited the opposite trend, as the average multilingual participant rating was closer to 7.0 than the average monolingual participant rating. The Norwegian sample received equal average participant ratings between monolingual participants and multilingual participants. These results show some support for the hypothesis but are overall inconclusive and do not exhibit a clear trend. Interestingly, comparing the averages across languages, Japanese was given the most favorable ratings by both monolingual and multilingual participants. English had the overall lowest average multilingual participant rating, at 3.9. This suggests that participants may not think to appreciate their L1, English, as it is a part of their everyday life. English is habitual for all participants included in the study, and like an argument about vocal attractiveness by Pisanski, as one becomes accustomed to a language, its effectiveness or noticeability decreases.

The third hypothesis is that participants are more likely to favorably rate a language sample if they are familiar with the language in the sample compared to participants without familiarity with the language in the sample. The expected support for this hypothesis would be average experienced participant ratings of complimentary statements closer to 7.0 than average inexperienced participant ratings exhibiting stronger agreement, and average experienced participant ratings of pejorative statements closer to 1.0 than average inexperienced participant ratings, exhibiting stronger disagreement. Additionally, since English is unanimously familiar to participants, it should be the most favorably rated language overall, followed by Japanese, then Norwegian. This was not the case across all statements, as the average participant rating for English either tied with Norwegian or fell between the Japanese and Norwegian average participant ratings. As for the first statement, "this language is beautiful," across Japanese and Norwegian, experienced participants gave average ratings indicating stronger agreement than inexperienced participants. Of the three complimentary statements, three of three about the Japanese sample had average experienced participant ratings showing stronger agreement than inexperienced participant ratings. Regarding the Norwegian sample, the same is true as each complimentary statement had stronger agreement from experienced participants than from inexperienced participants. Concerning only the complimentary statements, these results are in support of the third hypothesis.

However, considering the pejorative statements which refer to the destituteness, aggressiveness, and dishonesty of the speaker, there is less of an evident trend. The Japanese sample garnered results on the pejorative statements from experienced participants that, on average, indicate less disagreement than the inexperienced participant ratings, diverging from what would be expected from the hypothesis. The Norwegian sample seemed to show support

for the hypothesis, as for two of the three pejorative statements, experienced participants showed more disagreement than the inexperienced participants. The remaining pejorative statement, about aggression, exhibited equal average ratings from the experienced and inexperienced participants, meaning neither indicated more or less disagreement than the other.

Table 4 is most helpful in determining broad conclusions about the data. Generally, the most preferred sample was Japanese, which exhibited more favorable ratings across almost all statements. For any statement where Japanese was not most favorably rated, it tied for most favorable with English. Interestingly, English outperformed Norwegian across every complimentary statement and two of three pejorative statements, by a small margin. This was unexpected, as according to the third hypothesis English should have been the most preferred. The data shows a slight preference for Japanese and a relative distaste for Norwegian. The English sample seemed to fall between Japanese and Norwegian in many ratings, potentially signaling an apathetic approach on behalf of native English speakers toward English. It would be of interest to analyze the samples in accordance with principles about vocal attractiveness put forth by Pisanski & Feinberg (2018). This would allow for consideration of pitch, timbre, and other vocal characteristics that may influence participant judgment.

The findings represented in Table 6 provide a detailed view of how experience with a language, or lack thereof, coupled with monolingualism or multilingualism can affect participant judgments. Across various statements assessing attributes such as friendliness, kindness, and education, and pejorative traits such as destituteness, aggressiveness, and perceived dishonesty, there are evident trends in the data. Japanese received consistently more favorable ratings across the complimentary statements, regardless of the linguistic background of participants or their experience with the language. However, English and Norwegian made varying impressions on

participants, with monolinguals tending to give more favorable ratings than their multilingual counterparts. Furthermore, results regarding the pejorative statements, which generally exhibited moderate disagreement, varied based on the experience and linguistic backgrounds of participants. This suggests an interaction between these factors and American language attitudes.

These results provide interesting insight into how complimentary statements and pejorative statements garner different reactions from participants. The complimentary statements exhibited a clear pattern of experienced participant ratings being more favorable than inexperienced participant ratings, but the same cannot be said for pejorative statements. So, while familiarity may positively impact likeability, low familiarity does not necessarily indicate decreased likeability. Rather, confronting participants with the opportunity to be complimentary toward another person versus derogatory seems to elicit different behaviors.

While this study garnered important data with respect to language attitudes, several possible improvements may result in more statistically significant data. The matched-guise technique, using the same speaker for each of the language samples, would have been ideal for this study to eliminate unique voice features as a factor for participants to base their judgments on. Additionally, it may be of interest to reduce the options for the character ratings from 7 to 6 to eliminate a neutral option. This would oblige participants to give favorable or unfavorable ratings, resulting in more opinionated data. Lastly, regarding the construction of the survey, it would have been more efficient to ask participants to list their nationality. The study is intended to focus on an American perspective, therefore asking participants for their nationality would make it easier to discern which participant data is usable.

Conclusion

This study was intended to gain insight into American language attitudes across different languages of varying degrees of familiarity. The survey conducted allowed for the collection and

analysis of American opinions about English, Japanese, and Southwestern Norwegian. These languages were chosen to represent a variety of continents, cultures, and levels of familiarity.

The findings of this study showcase the complexities of American language attitudes. While the first hypothesis expecting that multilingual participants would be more likely to give more favorable ratings than monolingual participants was not entirely supported, the differences in monolingual and multilingual responses highlight an interaction between multilingualism and perception of other languages. The second hypothesis also received varied results, with no clear trend exhibited across the three language samples. Japanese seemed to elicit the most favorable ratings, suggesting that cultural and historical factors may influence language appreciation. The third hypothesis, suggesting that familiarity with a language would garner more favorable ratings, was partially supported by the data concerning the complimentary statements. However, this pattern did not remain true when considering the pejorative statements. This suggests an interaction between the opportunity to be complimentary toward another person versus derogatory. Additionally, it highlights the importance of considering both positive and negative attributes in language attitude research. While the study provides valuable insights, future research could benefit from methodological refinements, such as employing the matched-guise technique and streamlining survey questions to enhance data reliability and relevance. Overall, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of how language attitudes are shaped by factors such as multilingualism, familiarity, and cultural context within the U.S.

References

Aesop Language Bank Team. (2010). Aesop Language Bank. Aesop Language Bank. https://aesoplanguagebank.com/

Anikin, A., Aseyev, N., Erben Johansson, N. (2022). *Do some languages sound more beautiful than others?* Berkeley, CA: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS). Retrieved from https://www.pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.2218367120.

Dietrich, S., & Hernandez, E. (2022). *Language Use in the United States: 2019.* U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2022/acs/acs-50.pdf.

Dragojevic, M., & Giles, H. (2016). *I Don't Like You Because You're Hard to Understand: The Role of Processing Fluency in the Language Attitudes Process.* Washington, DC: International Communication Association. Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/hcre.12079.

Irvine, J. (2022). *Revisiting Theory and Method in Language Ideology Research.* Hopewell, VA: American Anthropological Association. Retrieved from https://anthrosource.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jola.12335.

Kloss, H. (1998). *The American bilingual tradition.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. (Reprinted from *The American bilingual tradition* by H. Kloss, 1977, Rowley, MA: Newbury House).

Pisanski, K., & Feinberg, D.R. (2018). Vocal Attractiveness. In S. Frühholz & P. Belin (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Voice Perception* (pp. 607-625). Oxford University Press. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334151544_Vocal_attractiveness.

Vogl, U. (2017). *Standard language ideology and multilingualism: Results from a survey among European students.* DeGruyter Mouton. Retrieved from https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/eujal-2016-0016/html.

Wiley, T. (2014). *Diversity, Super-Diversity, and Monolingual Language Ideology in the United States: Tolerance or Intolerance?* American Educational Research Association. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/43284060.

Woolard, K., Schieffelin, B. (1994). *Language Ideology.* Annual Review of Anthropology. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/2156006.

Appendices

Background Questionnaire:

1. How old are you?
    a. 18-20
    b. 21-29
    c. 30-39
    d. 40-49
    e. 50-59
    f. 60 or older
2. What best describes your gender?
    a. Male
    b. Female
    c. Other
    d. Prefer not to say.
3. Which category below represents your race?
    a. White
    b. Black or African American
    c. Asian
    d. Hispanic
    e. Other
4. If you are from the United States, in what state do you permanently reside?
    a. Select state, D.C. or Puerto Rico
5. If you are not from the United States, where are you from?
    a. Select country
6. What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
    a. Less than a high school degree
    b. High school degree equivalent (e.g., GED)
    c. Some college but no degree
    d. Associate degree
    e. Bachelor's degree
    f. Graduate degree
7. How many languages do you speak?
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4 or more
8. What are your languages?
    a. 1st language: _____
    b. 2nd language: _____
    c. 3rd language: _____
    d. Other languages: _____
9. Please indicate your proficiency level in the English language
    a. Native
    b. Near native
    c. Advanced

    d. Intermediate
    e. Basic
10. (Only displayed if 2nd language was selected in Q8) What best describes your experience with your second language?
    a. Formal experience in an academic setting (classes throughout educational experience, middle school, high school, college)
    b. Informal experience (heritage speaker, spoken by family member(s), caretaker, guardian)
    c. Independent study (Duolingo, other language-learning apps, internet resources, club)
11. (Only displayed if 2nd language was selected in Q8) Please indicate your level of proficiency in that language.
    a. Native
    b. Near native
    c. Advanced
    d. Intermediate
    e. Basic
12. (Only displayed if 3rd language was selected in Q8) What best describes your experience with your third language?
    a. Formal experience in an academic setting (classes throughout educational experience, middle school, high school, college)
    b. Informal experience (heritage speaker, spoken by family member(s), caretaker, guardian)
    c. Independent study (Duolingo, other language-learning apps, internet resources, club)
13. (Only displayed if 3rd language was selected in Q8) Please indicate your level of proficiency in that language.
    a. Native
    b. Near native
    c. Advanced
    d. Intermediate
    e. Basic
14. (Only displayed if ‘other language(s)’ was selected in Q8) What best describes your experience with your other language(s)?
    a. Formal experience in an academic setting (classes throughout educational experience, middle school, high school, college)
    b. Informal experience (heritage speaker, spoken by family member(s), caretaker, guardian)
    c. Independent study (Duolingo, other language-learning apps, internet resources, club)
15. Please indicate your level of proficiency in that language.
    a. Native
    b. Near native
    c. Advanced
    d. Intermediate
    e. Basic

Survey:

Audio Clip #1

1. Have you heard this language before?
    a. Yes
    b. No
2. From what continent does this language originate?
    a. Africa
    b. Asia
    c. Australia
    d. Europe
    e. North America
    f. South America
3. Do you have experience with this language?
    a. Yes
    b. No

Answer the following questions using a scale of 1 to 7, 1 correlating to strong disagreement with the statement, and 7 correlating with strong agreement with the statement.

1. This language is beautiful.
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4
    e. 5
    f. 6
    g. 7
2. The speaker is destitute.
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4
    e. 5
    f. 6
    g. 7
3. The speaker is kind.
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4
    e. 5
    f. 6
    g. 7
4. The speaker is aggressive.
    a. 1

   b. 2
   c. 3
   d. 4
   e. 5
   f. 6
   g. 7
5. The speaker is friendly.
   a. 1
   b. 2
   c. 3
   d. 4
   e. 5
   f. 6
   g. 7
6. The speaker is dishonest.
   a. 1
   b. 2
   c. 3
   d. 4
   e. 5
   f. 6
   g. 7
7. The speaker is educated.
   a. 1
   b. 2
   c. 3
   d. 4
   e. 5
   f. 6
   g. 7

Audio Clip #2

4. Have you heard this language before?
   a. Yes
   b. No
5. From what continent does this language originate?
   a. Africa
   b. Asia
   c. Australia
   d. Europe
   e. North America
   f. South America
6. Do you have experience with this language?
   a. Yes
   b. No

Answer the following questions using a scale of 1 to 7, 1 correlating to strong disagreement with the statement, and 7 correlating with strong agreement with the statement.

8. This language is beautiful.
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4
    e. 5
    f. 6
    g. 7
9. The speaker is destitute.
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4
    e. 5
    f. 6
    g. 7
10. The speaker is kind.
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4
    e. 5
    f. 6
    g. 7
11. The speaker is aggressive.
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4
    e. 5
    f. 6
    g. 7
12. The speaker is friendly.
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4
    e. 5
    f. 6
    g. 7
13. The speaker is dishonest.
    a. 1
    b. 2

c. 3
d. 4
e. 5
f. 6
g. 7

14. The speaker is educated.
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4
    e. 5
    f. 6
    g. 7

Audio Clip #3

7. Have you heard this language before?
    a. Yes
    b. No
8. From what continent does this language originate?
    a. Africa
    b. Asia
    c. Australia
    d. Europe
    e. North America
    f. South America
9. Do you have experience with this language?
    a. Yes
    b. No

Answer the following questions using a scale of 1 to 7, 1 correlating to strong disagreement with the statement, and 7 correlating with strong agreement with the statement.

15. This language is beautiful.
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4
    e. 5
    f. 6
    g. 7
16. The speaker is destitute.
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4
    e. 5

f. 6
g. 7

17. The speaker is kind.
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4
    e. 5
    f. 6
    g. 7
18. The speaker is aggressive.
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4
    e. 5
    f. 6
    g. 7
19. The speaker is friendly.
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4
    e. 5
    f. 6
    g. 7
20. The speaker is dishonest.
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4
    e. 5
    f. 6
    g. 7
21. The speaker is educated.
    a. 1
    b. 2
    c. 3
    d. 4
    e. 5
    f. 6
    g. 7