

## **NOTE TO USERS**

**Page(s) not included in the original manuscript are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received**

**36**

**This reproduction is the best copy available.**

**UMI<sup>®</sup>**



A STUDY OF EMPATHETIC RESPONSE TO TWO FOREIGN LANGUAGE  
SPEECH STYLES

By Louise Morley

Thesis presented to the School of Graduate Studies  
of the University of Ottawa in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Ottawa, August, 1976.

UMI Number: EC55271

### INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

**UMI<sup>®</sup>**

---

UMI Microform EC55271  
Copyright 2011 by ProQuest LLC  
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against  
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

---

ProQuest LLC  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

## ABSTRACT

The experiment described in this thesis was carried out to determine which type of second language learner was likely to elicit more empathetic responses from native speakers in everyday situations: the one who resembles the native speaker in prosody and articulation but makes syntactic errors or the one whose speech is characterized by pronounced phonic interference from his first language even though his syntax and lexicon are closer to normative usage. Contrary to the experimental hypothesis, more subjects chose the second type of speaker on the basis of an empathetic response than the first type. A significantly large number of subjects also chose speakers for other reasons; i.e., preference for a particular voice, or because the speech type was heard first. Considering the fact that significant numbers of subjects reacted to the two types of speech, it is suggested that a follow-up study might support the original hypothesis.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Gerald Neufeld for his advice and guidance during the writing of this thesis. I would also like to thank Jean Yamashita and Darien Neufeld for their encouragement and suggestions, and Herbert Taylor for his assistance in locating subjects.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Chapter 1	Introduction..... 1
Chapter 2	Experimental Design..... 5
2.1	Selection of Subjects..... 5
2.2	Materials..... 7
2.3	Procedures..... 14
Chapter 3	Analysis and Interpretation of Data..... 17
3.1	Group 1 - Syntactic-lexical (SLSLSL)..... 21
3.2	Group 2 - Prosodic-articulatory (PAPAPA). 23
3.3	Group 3 - Voice preference (VP)..... 24
3.4	Group 4 - First position (F)..... 28
3.5	Group 5 - No trends (NT)..... 28
3.6	Summary of Results..... 29
Chapter 4	Theoretical Problems..... 32
Glossary	..... 37
Appendix A	Outline for Telephone Calls Recruiting Subjects..... i
Appendix B	SES Questionnaire..... ii
Appendix C	Monologues 1, 2, and 3 in both versions..iii
Appendix D	Answer Sheet..... x
Appendix E	Instructions (written)..... xi
Appendix F	Instructions (recorded).....xiii
Appendix G	Orderings of Monologues, Versions and Voices.....xvi
Bibliography	..... xx

TABLES

	PAGE
Table 1. Mean age, mean GPA, mean SES, and proportions of subjects per faculty for each of the five groups.....	20
Table 2. Number of subjects hearing voices in first position and number of choices made of all readers.....	25

## CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This paper is concerned with the reactions of native speakers to two different types of speech commonly produced by second language speakers. The first type of speech is characterized by the production of prosodic and articulatory features of the language close to that of the native speaker, while the second type may be characterized by more standard use of syntax and lexicon and by strong phonic interference from the first language. These two types of speech production probably result from different experiences in the learning situation. For example, a speaker producing the first type might have acquired his second language (L2) through contact with native speakers in informal situations. A speaker producing the second type might have studied the target language in a more structured classroom situation.

In the present study, it is postulated that the average native speaker will empathize more with the second language student who produces speech type one, that is, who more closely resembles the native speaker in the production of prosodic and articulatory features, than he will with the second language student who produces speech type two.

In order to investigate this hypothesis, an experiment was conducted where subjects (Ss), native francophone speakers from Quebec, listened to both types of speech uttered, one after the other, by speakers of three different language

origins: Italian, Spanish and English. Ss were asked to indicate which speaker they preferred by indicating with whom they would rather associate, or in whom they had greater confidence.

Accounts of experimental work involving individuals' affective reactions to mastery of prosodic and articulatory features of a second language versus mastery of more normative syntactic and lexical elements are difficult to find in the socio- and psycholinguistic literature. To get a somewhat clearer idea of what was being investigated in the present experiment, it might be helpful to consider some of the studies conducted in the past which do not parallel this experiment, but which are similar to it in some ways.

Sociolinguistic studies have concentrated on such questions as whether phonological variants could be identified with certain social classes (Labov, 1965), whether judges could consistently assign correct social status on the basis of syntax alone (Callary, 1974), and how stereotyped sets of attitudes about dialects of speakers play a role in how one person perceives another person's speech characteristics (Williams, 1973).

In addition, and closer to the present study, several articles have been published based on research seeking to establish attitudes of subjects towards speakers using different languages, dialects or speech styles. The significance that spoken language has for listeners has been studied by analyzing their evaluational reactions to the two languages, English and

French (Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner and Fillenbaum, 1960).

Research into whether Ss exhibit different reactions to people speaking "pure" (sic) English versus English with a Jewish accent has been carried out, in part, to see whether differences in attitudes would be evident between Gentile and Jewish Ss (Anisfeld, Bogo and Lambert, 1962). D'Anglejan and Tucker (1973) carried the work further by investigating, as part of their study on the sociolinguistic correlates of speech style, the attitudes of people towards their own style of speech as well as towards speakers from other social classes and regions. A more recent American study on attitudes related to speech sought to determine what attitudes Anglo-American college students in Los Angeles had towards Mexican-Americans (Chicanos) who speak standard English as compared to those who speak a Chicano dialect of English (Arthur, Farrar and Bradford, 1974).

In this study, an effort was made to avoid associations by the Ss with specific cultures, that is, to avoid possible cultural biases based, for example, on references to the country of the Ss forbears. Since there was to be only one vehicle language in the experiment (French), we attempted to get speakers from three language groups other than French who could produce both speech types. This will be described in more detail in Chapter two. We wanted to avoid the possibility of the Quebec Ss responding negatively to an interlocutor who might, prosodically, be speaking a type of French produced in France, for instance, as opposed to a Quebec dialect.

Generally speaking, most language courses, in North

America, at least, whether they are aimed at immigrants, university students or public servants, emphasize those aspects of language which will enable the student to speak at a basic level. The student completes the course having gained an ability to use a number of grammatical rules and to express himself with a basic vocabulary. The majority of teachers do not emphasize the features which primarily influence affect.

If, in the present study, Ss were to respond more favourably to those who produced prosodic and articulatory patterns closer to their own language despite unusual or faulty syntax or unorthodox vocabulary, such findings would have a profound effect upon what might be taught in the language classroom. More attention might be paid to the prosodic features of language in second language teaching, for example. If it can be assumed that the goals of language teaching today are becoming more oriented towards communicative competence (Savignon, 1974) then greater attention to aspects of suprasegmental production might enhance communication.

## CHAPTER 2

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

The present study was undertaken to test the following hypothesis:

foreign language learners who, consciously or not, stress the acquisition of prosodic and articulatory features while learning are likely to elicit more empathetic responses when communicating with native speakers in everyday situations than will those students whose speech is heavily "accented" but grammatically and lexically "correct".

In order to test this hypothesis, francophone subjects listened to recorded samples of both types of speech. Readers, whose mother tongues represented three languages other than French, recorded the short texts which served as vehicles for these two types of speech. Ss were then asked to indicate which speaker they regarded more favourably.

Selection of Subjects

The population from which the sample was drawn for this study consisted of francophone students from Western Quebec, registered in their first year in 1974-75 at the University of Ottawa. Ss were restricted to students between the ages of seventeen and twenty-four who were enrolled in the four largest and predominantly francophone faculties - Arts, Science and Engineering, Social Sciences and Management Sciences. All of the Ss were from the same area of Quebec, that is, from the four counties bordering the Ottawa River on the Quebec side - Gatineau, Hull, Papineau and Pontiac. If Ss had come

from such divergent points in Quebec as La Tuque, Montreal and Natashquan, their exposure to English might well have varied more than was desirable. In addition, by drawing a sample from the faculties where French-speaking students predominated, and by using students enrolled in the first year only, we hoped to get Ss with as close to the same degree of exposure to the English language and culture as possible. We surmised that native speakers of French who have rarely heard another language, for example, English, might be more distracted by moderately heavy English interference in a speaker using their language than would a francophone who spoke English or, although he didn't know English himself, was used to hearing people speak his language with an English accent.

We attempted to be as representative as possible in our sample of francophone students, in light of the constraints listed above.

With the help of the university data-processing centre, we were able to obtain a list of students' names based on the constraints: faculty, year, age, mother tongue and county of origin. This enabled us to reduce immeasurably the time required to locate prospective Ss.

The possible number of Ss given the constraints proved to be 242. We were able to reach 205 by telephone, 79 of whom actually took part in the experiment. Representation of those in their first year by faculty stands at:

24%	of the population of the Arts faculty.....	27 Ss;
40%	" " " " Science and Engineering.....	18 Ss;
52%	" " " " Social Sciences.....	11 Ss;

36% of the population of Management Sciences.....23 Ss.

The project assistant who made the telephone calls, a Quebecois francophone, was given a written outline of points to cover (See Appendix A). This outline allowed the assistant to be as uniform as possible in her telephone approach when contacting each prospective S while, at the same time, giving an impression of spontaneity.

During the telephoning, Ss were questioned about their own assessment of their competence in English with respect to speaking and comprehension, in the event that this data might bear some relation to their responses to the experimental tasks.

During the experimental sessions, the Ss also responded to a questionnaire on socio-economic status which rated the educational and occupational levels of both parents on a seven-point scale similar to that devised by Warner (1960). As in the case of personal assessments of competence in English, this questionnaire was administered in the event that the data might correlate in some way with Ss' responses (See Appendix B).

### Materials

When work was begun on the drafting of the monologues which were to be eventually recorded, we encountered a number of problems. First, we had to avoid contrasts that were too marked between formal and informal registers in order to preclude the possibility that Ss might see such variations as one of the parameters of the experiment. Another problem was how to avoid Ss reacting to speakers on the basis of a cultural bias reflecting a Canadian French-English opposition rather

than on the basis of differences in the speech they heard. A third difficulty was to try to avoid eliciting choices based on preference for the quality of one reader's voice over the other reader's voice, that is, for instance, a voice which triggers a more positive affective reaction or has a more aesthetically pleasing timbre. Further attention will be paid to these problems later in this section.

Two francophone university students, one from Montreal and one from Hull, collaborated on the writing of the three short texts conceived in the form of monologues, which represented spontaneous, real-life situations (See Appendix C). Each monologue was to be read in both a prosodic-articulatory and syntactic-lexical version. These two versions will henceforth be referred to as "PA" and "SL". The taped versions of PA and SL can be described as follows:

- 1) PA emphasizes near native mastery of the supra-segmental features of language, such as rhythm, pitch variation, stress and duration. Articulation in this version is also quite close to the phonetic patterns of the target language. This version also embodies a more colloquial use of vocabulary and exhibits some interference in syntax from the mother tongue (L1), and from English if that is not the mother tongue being used. (Despite the different cultural backgrounds, all of the foreign language speakers used had lived in the Canadian setting for some time and could hardly have avoided interlingual interference from English in their French.)

- 2) SL emphasizes a normative use of syntax and a somewhat more elaborated vocabulary approaching an international French, and contains, as well, a marked non-native "accent" carried over from L1.

In other words, these two versions were developed to reflect the different types of speech that might be acquired by two different types of learners, one who picks up L2 in informal situations and the other who learns it in the more formal classroom context.

None of the readers could have been mistaken for native speakers, as they all manifested traces of L1 interference.

Two readers from each of the three linguistic groups selected were chosen to read a specific monologue; each reader recorded both PA and SL. These recordings were dubbed onto tape cassettes in twenty different orders.

Before continuing the discussion, it is important to note that the written scripts for the SL versions of the three monologues were drafted first; then the modifications were introduced to create the PA versions. When the scripts of the monologues were read onto the tapes, the reverse order, that is, PA first and then SL, was observed by the readers. This will be explained further on in the chapter.

We tried to incorporate into the written drafts of the SL versions a normative grammatical usage which would approach the kind of speech employed by people using an "elaborated" code in Quebec, as opposed to a "restricted" code (Bernstein, 1972). That is, we tried to incorporate into SL a grammatical usage which was not, strictly speaking, of the standard international variety of French often found in text books, but a grammatical

usage which would be used by an average educated Quebecois. Since there was to be a non-native "accent" in SL, it was felt that by adding to this variable an international grammatical usage, we would create such a marked contrast between SL and PA that we might prejudice the experiment by cueing Ss on the fact that we were investigating their reactions to different ways of speaking.

Once the scripts for the SL versions were drafted, the monologues were modified, as mentioned above, in order to incorporate interferences from Italian, Spanish and English. Interlingual interferences from English that could normally have been picked up in Western Quebec by any ethnic group were also introduced into the Spanish and Italian versions. At this point, we had to decide whether it was enough, in writing the scripts, to vary only the syntax and prosodic-articulatory features between the two versions, or whether vocabulary should also be made to vary. It was recognized at the outset that a difference between the two versions of a more colloquial vocabulary vs a more standard international vocabulary, e.g., "char" vs "voiture", could represent an independent variable which might have a significant influence on Ss responses, and thus cause problems of interpretation. For example, Ss who are beginning their university studies, and who may be seeking identity linguistically, academically and culturally, when asked to listen to the two types of speech, might well, in an experimental situation, prefer to choose a speaker who was using formal speech, even though they themselves use colloquial speech outside the classroom. Such a possibility would bias

the Ss in favour of the SL version. This problem could have been avoided by simply using the same vocabulary and varying only the syntactic elements of the scripts. On the other hand, we were convinced that an individual who has not studied a language formally - who has learned the language in the street, so to speak - is going to try to "sound more French" and not pay so much attention to grammatical rules. Moreover, this person will attempt to pick up the vocabulary used by his or her associates. Conversely, the individual studying French formally is not likely to encounter texts that use such words as "piastre" as opposed to "dollar". He probably wouldn't be aware of such a usage. In other words, the language learning contexts precluded using identical vocabulary in the two versions of the monologues.

As noted above, three languages were represented by the readers. Of the six readers, two had learned Italian as a first language, two, Spanish, and two, English. The use of the three language groups was an attempt to lessen the possible impact on francophones' reactions to English as a cultural variable. Had the prepared texts been read by anglophones only, the francophone Ss might have consistently chosen PA because, possibly motivated by political factors, they wanted to avoid choosing a more English-sounding speech, i.e., SL.

When the people who were to read the texts aloud arrived for the recording sessions, they were asked to read the PA version of the monologue first, using their normal manner of speaking. Had we begun by asking readers to practice a somewhat artificial speech, as was necessary in producing SL, this

inevitably would have had adverse effects on their PA versions, contaminating their natural way of speaking. Once PA had been recorded, each reader then had to be coached to try to re-create in SL the prosodic and articulatory production that might have characterized his or her speech in an earlier "interlanguage" stage in the acquisition of this second language (Selinker, 1972; Corder, 1974). It was difficult for the individuals reading the monologues to take the prosodic and articulatory features of their mother tongue and transpose them onto the French that they had come to master to a rather high degree. Despite the difficulties involved, we managed to obtain a reasonable degree of matching between the two SL recordings in each language group so that one reader's recording didn't sound more "foreign" than the other's.

In addition to the problem of matching the production of speakers in terms of SL, which had to be rehearsed many times, it was also necessary to deal with the problem of whether readers' SL production, because of its contrived nature, was likely to be less convincing than their normal speech. Since Ss were going to be asked such questions as, "In which person would you have more confidence?", readers were encouraged to match the speech that they were trying to recapture as closely as possible in terms of animation and pitch, and, therefore, in terms of potential affective responses, with their more normal type of speech, i.e., PA. After a considerable number of practice runs, a set of two monologues per reader was obtained which, although they were read, gave the impression of spontaneity.

A further difficulty was the rate of speed for each reading, which had to be carefully considered. We tried to ensure that the SL versions were as close to each other as the readers could make them so that differences in rate of speed would not, in themselves, account for the reactions of Ss.

These difficulties were reduced as much as possible by monitoring tapes and re-recording where necessary.

The problem of whether a subject would choose PA over SL purely because of the quality of the reader' voice was dealt with by the ordering of presentations and the counterbalancing of materials across Ss so that neither reader would appear predominantly in any one version. This is to say that where one S might hear Italian reader x in SL and Italian y in PA, the S in the next experimental session might hear Italian y in SL and Italian x in PA.

Two sets of instructions were prepared for use during the experimental sessions. They were drafted in a written form (See Appendix E) and in the form of scripts to be read onto the tapes (See Appendix F). No reference was made to the aim of the project in the instructions, or in any other contacts with Ss.

The person who recorded the instructions preceding each monologue was a Quebecois who read in a dispassionate manner, thus producing the desired effect of presenting a contrast between himself and the more animated readers of the monologues.

In order to avoid presenting any one language first at the expense of the others, presenting PA a greater number of times than SL in first position, presenting a reader in one

version more often than in the other version, or, finally, presenting one reader always before the other reader, the twelve recordings representing each language group, each version and each reader were organized into a series of four blocks. Each block contained a different ordering. The constraints observed were that each block first, would contain all language groups, Italian, English and Spanish; second, would expose all readers: if one in PA, then the other in SL, or vice versa; and third, would contain no more than two consecutive presentations of one version, PA or SL, in first position. These blocks were recorded on cassettes in sets of five per cassette. (See Appendix G for ordering of presentations).

### Procedures

Scheduling of the testing sessions was organized through the use of a weekly timetable with a matrix of cells set up for the names of the Ss and their appointment times. As the telephoning of Ss proceeded, the names were entered into the appropriate spaces.

We felt that the advantage offered by the university's language laboratories, that is, the opportunity to apply the experimental treatment in an identical manner to each S, with a high degree of precision in sound reproduction, would contribute positively to the experiment if the same number of Ss could be scheduled per session. The university's Raytheon and Tandberg language laboratories were used for the experiment.

Altogether, eighteen of the twenty sets of recordings were used. One set was found to be faulty, for technical reasons, and one set was never heard as the scheduled cell was

not filled by Ss.

After each S had arrived in the laboratory and had been seated in a sound booth, he or she was handed a set of instructions to read, as well as an answer sheet which contained two columns of underlined blanks, labelled one and two, provided for the check marks of the Ss (See Appendix D). After they had read the instructions, Ss were given an opportunity to ask for further clarification. They then proceeded to listen to a set of recorded instructions, through close-fitting earphones, to reinforce what they had read. These instructions preceded each pair of monologues and differed one from the other only insofar as the subject matter they introduced differed.

The two readers of Spanish origin (S1 and S2) played the role of a real estate agent describing the virtues of a house that she is trying to sell. The two readers of Italian background (I1 and I2) played the part of a garage mechanic explaining to a customer why the repairs to his car had cost as much as they had. The two anglophone readers (E1 and E2) played the role of someone day-dreaming about having a cottage in the country to go to in the hot summer months. Once the two versions of the monologue had been played, Ss were asked one of such questions as: "If you were the buyer in this case, from which of the two young women would you most likely buy the house?", "If you were the customer in this situation, who would you have the most confidence in, the first mechanic or the second?", or "If one of these women were to buy a cottage close to yours, which one of the two would you prefer as a neighbour?". As mentioned above, the order of presentation of

these three monologues, as well as the two versions of each, varied from session to session. Ss were then asked to listen to short excerpts from each version in order to refresh their memories about the particular characteristics of the two versions they had heard. Then, after placing a check in the appropriate space to designate their choice, Ss proceeded to the second and then to the third set of instructions and monologues. At the end of each session, Ss answered the SES questionnaire. Once the response sheets had been filled in and returned, the results were tabulated according to versions and readers and were entered on data sheets at the end of each day.

Where relevant, distributional variables such as socio-economic status or age differences between faculties, were evaluated through the use of analysis of variance. Because of the dichotomous and non-normally distributed nature of responses to the experimental tasks, the distribution-free  $\chi^2$  statistic was employed as the principle means of data analysis, as will be seen in the following chapter.

## CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATAIntroduction

The experiment on which this paper is based would, for optimum results, have taken place under conditions similar to those described in Chapter 2. If the scheduling of subjects could have begun in January as originally planned, there would have been a long enough time span to enlist Ss in the experimental sessions one by one. Refinements that had to be made in the recorded materials took the schedule well into March. It was this lateness in the scheduling that made it impossible to proceed subject by subject. Therefore, the testing had to be administered to groups of Ss. If the number of Ss per group were to have remained constant, then conditions would have remained close to the optimum situation. Since there were almost 80 Ss participating in the study and since there were 19 different orderings of the recordings of the three pairs of monologues, it stands to reason that approximately four Ss would have heard each set of monologues in any case, whether they heard the recordings separately or in a group. Had precisely four Ss per set of monologues been achievable, the results of the testing should not, in principle, have differed from individual testing. But Ss sometimes appeared for a session in greater numbers than anticipated and couldn't come at any other time. Conversely, some Ss failed to appear for scheduled sessions and only one or two arrived. Since we

didn't want to lose these Ss altogether, we accepted them for the experimental session. The result was that the number of people hearing the recordings from one session to the next varied. One set of recordings was heard per session. Although the nineteen sets were run through one after the other, the whole sequence being repeated up to the seventh set, five people might have heard one reader doing a particular version while only two people might have heard the other reader doing it in the next session.

It will be recalled, as mentioned in Chapter 2, that each of the four blocks (five sets of monologues per block, see Appendix G) had different orderings for each set of monologues to ensure that an anticipated twenty people per block would hear different orderings. The intent was to avoid the possibility that the ordering would become a factor. As it turned out, it is probable that the ordering was a factor influencing the data, since counter-balancing was impossible. One set of monologues was, in fact, heard more often than another. For example, set #16 (See Appendix G) was heard by eight Ss while set #4 was heard by only three Ss. In the final tabulations, this situation resulted in such figures as 60 Ss who heard reader E1 (See figure 1 below) in the first position as opposed to only 19 Ss who heard reader E2 in first position.

Figure 1

E1 - native English reader #1	E2 - native English reader #2
I1 - native Italian reader #1	I2 - native Italian reader #2
S1 - native Spanish reader #1	S2 - native Spanish reader #2

In principle, exposure of each of the voices in first position should have been divided equally between the two voices, rather

than the 60/19 split that actually occurred. As we hope to show, however, the inability to follow the scheduling as originally planned has not precluded the raising of a number of interesting questions.

Rather than tabulating a series of unrelated choices of the prosodic and articulatory (PA) version as opposed to the syntactic-lexical (SL) version, (for definitions of PA and SL, see page 8), we felt that establishing patterns would be more meaningful. A subject was accepted as representing PA or SL preference only if he or she chose PA or SL three times out of three.

As the results were compiled and analysed, five groups of different types of respondents emerged. These five groups can be described as follows:

- Group 1: SL-SL-SL - Ss having responded consistently to versions which were characterized by a standard use of syntax and lexicon but which were overlaid with a strong "foreign accent" from L1 (first language);
- Group 2: PA-PA-PA - Ss having responded consistently to versions which were characterized by a more native prosodic and articulatory mastery than characterized Group 1, despite more colloquial lexical usage and the occasional non-native syntactic error;
- Group 3: VP - - - - Ss having responded consistently to the versions containing the voices whose preference by Ss was established statisti-

cally, that is, to E1 (English reader one) and to I1 (Italian reader one);

Group 4: F - - - - Ss having responded consistently to the first voice they heard in each of the three pairs of monologues' slots, without any other apparent reason than the fact that that particular voice came first;

Group 5: NT - - - - Ss having responded in a manner which revealed no trends that we were able to detect.

Each of the groups described above, and the manner in which they were isolated, will be discussed in detail in the ensuing sections. Care was necessary in the statistical analysis because of the impossibility of applying the original counter-balancing design.

As noted earlier, Ss were divided among four university faculties. When a one-way analysis of variance was conducted, no significant differences were found between any of the faculties in terms of age, SES (socio-economic status) or GPA (grade point average for the academic year immediately preceding entrance into university). That is, no faculty accounted for a given type of answer more than another. Therefore, because of the homogeneity of the groups, the data was pooled.

The breakdown of the five groups is set forth in Table 1 below.

Table 1

	Group 1 SLSLSL n = 16	Group 2 PAPAPA n = 10	Group 3 VP n = 21	Group 4 F n = 12	Group 5 NT n = 20
Mean age	18.4	18.6	19.9	18.8	19.2
Mean SES	4.5625	4.275	4.38	4.27	4.51
Mean GPA	77	75.4	75.4	69.8	73.7

Proportion of S s per faculty  
per each group:

Faculty of Arts:.....	31%	30%	33%	42%	30%
Social Sciences:....	13%	20%	10%	8%	25%
Management Sciences:	25%	40%	38%	50%	20%
Science & Engineer- ing:	31%	10%	19%	50%	25%

#### Group 1 - Syntactic-lexical (SL-SL-SL)

Out of the 79 Ss participating in the experiment, 16 chose SL consistently,  $p = 12$ . ( 7 out of the 16 Ss who chose SL consistently heard the SL version in the first position in only one monologue slot out of the three. They had to go out of their way to choose the second recording in two slots out of three.) It was quite possible that there were other factors which might have been motivating the choices that appeared to be consistent SL preference. In some cases, Ss might have been choosing on the basis of voice preference rather than on the basis of preference for native-like accent, or standard use of syntax and vocabulary. On the other hand, Ss might have chosen one version because it was the first version heard, although, as noted in the preceding chapter, no block contained an order where either PA or SL were presented in first position three times consecutively. Since the focus of this paper is on the question of whether Ss would prefer speech production emphasizing native-like prosody and articulation rather than

standard use of syntax and lexicon, it was decided, after the experimental run had been completed, to call back a number of Ss who had chosen SL or PA consistently. We wanted to see, first, if Ss would persist in their original choices and second, what explanation they would offer for choosing as they did. We explained to the Ss that an interesting factor had emerged during the actual running of the experimental sessions and that we were randomly calling back a number of Ss to investigate this new development. This time, if we were to find that Ss, when presented with entirely new orders, again responded consistently by choosing the SL versions, we felt that Ss preference for SL over PA would be clearly established.

7 of the Ss who chose the SL versions consistently were called back. After they had made their choices for a second time, they were asked to listen to short excerpts from each pair of voices and to write down the reasons why they had chosen one speaker over the other. Of this group, three Ss returned consistent SL versions again. Two Ss chose two SL's and one PA out of the three monologues. One S admitted being motivated by voice quality. The other remarked that the voice with the foreign (sic) accent was almost incomprehensible. Two Ss chose two PA's and only one SL. They explained their choices on the basis of voice quality and degree of conviction carried by the reader.

Following are quotations from SL responses:

- i) "elle a une meilleur vocabulaire";
- ii) "grammaire correcte";
- iii) "Je crois que je ne fais pas trop confiance (ou

que je suis moins influencée) à un agent d'immeuble qui n'est pas capable de décrire une maison avec des bons termes. Je pense que #2 choquait un peu l'oreille.";

- iv) "No. 2 est plus compréhensible. Tant qu'a avoir une des deux comme voisine, je préfère celle avec qui je suis capable d'avoir une conversation agréable. Ses erreurs sont moins nombreuses."

#### Group 2 - Prosodic-articulatory (PA-PA-PA)

10 Ss out of the total group chose consistently on the basis of PA preference, that is, a significantly greater number of Ss chose SL over PA. More will be said about this later on in the chapter. Of these 10 Ss, 6 were called back and the procedure was repeated as with group 1. One S returned a consistent PA score a second time. Three Ss chose two PA's out of three. They admitted that they didn't know quite why they had chosen the voice which happened to be reading SL except that it seemed more pleasant. Of the two Ss who chose two SL's to one PA, one S explained the choice on basis of voice quality, and the other S on the observation of incorrect use of articles - an apparent shift from the factors he had been paying attention to earlier.

Following are some quotations taken from the responses of Ss choosing the PA versions:

- i) "La prononciation est meilleur... la voix, l'accent est plus convaincant et moins hésitant";
- ii) "voix convaincante avec intonations nécessaires";
- iii) "L'accent est plus facile à comprendre".

Up to this point, approximately one third of the sample has been shown to choose according to the parameters built into the experiment.

### Group 3 - Voice preference (VP)

In the original design of the experiment, it was anticipated that if one reader represented PA only and another reader, SL only, Ss might choose PA consistently not on the basis of PA preference, but on the basis of preference for the voice of that particular reader. It was in order to avoid this that each reader recorded the monologue for their particular language group in a PA version and an SL version as mentioned in Chapter 2. Despite this precaution, readers E1 (English) and I1 (Italian) emerged as having voices that 21 Ss preferred no matter what version they were reading. That is, voice preference took precedence over discrimination between PA and SL.

As will be explained in the next section, some of the Ss who were thought to be choosing on the basis of the voice they preferred were choosing for other reasons.

It has been noted that two types of respondents have already been established, making up almost a third of the total number of Ss. That is, the answers of these 26 Ss might be explained in terms of the original hypothesis. Therefore, the responses of 53 Ss remained to be analysed.

Table 2 (page 25) illustrates both the number of Ss hearing voices in the first position and the numbers of actual choices made of all readers. Column 1 represents the number of Ss who heard one reader or the other in first position.

Table 2

NUMBER OF SS HEARING VOICES IN FIRST POSITION AND NUMBER OF  
CHOICES MADE OF ALL READERS

<u>SLOT</u>	<u>READER</u>	<u>SS HEARING READERS</u>	<u>SS WHO CHOSE ONE</u>	
		<u>IN FIRST POSITION</u>	<u>READER OR THE OTHER</u>	
ENGLISH	1	E1	26 (96%)	21 (78%)
		E2	1 (4%)	6 (22%)
	2	E1	5 (83%)	6 (100%)
		E2	1 (17%)	0 (0%)
	3	E1	8 (40%)	14 (70%)
		E2	12 (60%)	6 (30%)
ITALIAN	1	I1	5 (42%)	6 (50%)
		I2	7 (58%)	6 (50%)
	2	I1	19 (61%)	22 (71%)
		I2	12 (39%)	9 (29%)
	3	I1	3 (30%)	8 (80%)
		I2	7 (70%)	2 (20%)
SPANISH	1	S1	14 (100%)	6 (43%)
		S2	0 (0%)	8 (57%)
	2	S1	2 (13%)	10 (63%)
		S2	14 (87%)	6 (37%)
	3	S1	12 (52%)	11 (48%)
		S2	11 (48%)	12 (52%)

Column 2 represents the number of Ss who chose one reader or the other.

The voice of E1 (English reader one) was preferred in the first slot 78% of the time. (Statistical analysis of the voice preference will be given at the end of the discussion for each language group.) Further analysis of the data showed that she had actually been presented in the first position 96% of the time. Ideally, she should have been heard by Ss 50% of the time in first position with equal attention paid to PA and SL. In fact, although she was heard 96% of the time in first position, she was actually chosen by a somewhat smaller percentage of the Ss. The second slot repeats the situation of more frequent exposure of E1 in first position rather E2. But in this instance, although E1 is heard only 83% of the time in the first position, she is chosen by 100% of the Ss. Finally, it is the third slot which appears to strengthen considerably the hypothesis that a number of Ss would make choices based on voice preference alone. Although E1 was heard in the first position by only 40% of the Ss, she was chosen by 71% of them, which means that even though she was often heard in the second position, she was still preferred. In considering all three slots together, where E1 was chosen 41 times and E2 was chosen 12 times, a significant indication of Ss preference for the voice of E1 was computed.  $\chi^2$  (with 1 df) yielded 15.87 (p. less than .01).

The trend observed with the English language group also occurred with the Italian language group. I1 was heard by only 42% of Ss in slot one, but was chosen by 50% of them, despite the position. Such figures might have been expected

purely in terms of probability. The second slot is a little more revealing.  $I_1$  is heard more often in the first position - 61% of the time - yet he is chosen more often - 71% of the time - including times when he is not heard in position one. Once again, it is in slot three that evidence leads to rejecting the hypothesis that people are choosing  $E_1$  and  $I_1$  because they were the first speakers heard. Even though  $I_1$  is heard fewer than half the number of times in initial position as compared to  $I_2$ , that is, 30% of the time, he is chosen by 80% of Ss in spite of this. For all three slots,  $I_1$  was chosen 36 times,  $I_2$  17 times - a statistically significant preference for  $I_1$ .  $\chi^2$  (1 df) yielded 6.81 (p. less than .01). At this point, we felt reasonably confident that voice preference had been established as a third parameter.

With respect to the Spanish readers,  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , no significant differences in voice preference were observed. In slot one,  $S_1$  happened to be presented 100% of the time in the first position. If people were choosing the first thing they heard, we could expect  $S_1$  to be chosen 100% of the time. In fact, she was chosen only 43% of the time in first position - by fewer than half of the Ss. The situation is reversed in the second slot.  $S_2$  is presented 87% of the time in first position but is chosen by only 37.5% of the Ss. In the third slot, approximately 50% of Ss heard each reader in position one. The choices were also almost equally divided, demonstrating little preference on the part of Ss for one reader over the other. A  $\chi^2$  analysis of the significance of differences between Ss' preference for  $S_1$  over  $S_2$  or vice versa yielded results which fell

well below the level of chance. Hence, neither reader could be viewed as being preferred over the other.

#### Group 4 - First position (F)

Of the 32 Ss remaining to be analysed, 12 Ss chose consistently the first voice in every pair of monologues they heard. Was this choice based on an inclination to choose the first as opposed to the second presentation irrespective of other factors? Or was it motivated by some other cause? Five individuals out of the twelve chose E<sub>1</sub> and I<sub>1</sub> as well as S<sub>1</sub>. That is, in two out of the three sets of monologues presented, 5 Ss out of the 12 chose the preferred voice which also happened to be in first position. It is the consistent choice of S<sub>1</sub> (who is, of course, in first position) on the part of all five Ss that seems to establish the hypothesis that these Ss were really choosing on the basis of what they heard first as opposed to voice preference. Note that, in the discussion on the two Spanish readers, no voice preference could be established between them. Especially in the final monologue, the Ss chose almost 50% equally between the two readers. One would expect this trend to carry through to the sub-group of 5 Ss. For example, two Ss might choose S<sub>1</sub> and three might choose S<sub>2</sub>. But all these Ss chose S<sub>1</sub>, who was the reader in first position, even though the larger sample had not established S<sub>1</sub> as a preferred voice.

#### Group 5 - No trends (NT)

The remaining group of Ss represents responses which appeared to follow no particular pattern.

### Summary of results

From the above analysis, we can make the following observations:

a) Approximately 20% of the total sample of 79 Ss chose SL consistently. Therefore, SL does appear to be a salient feature of auditory input chosen by Ss, as was implied in the original hypothesis. The fact that more Ss chose SL over PA may be explained by the composition of the sample of Ss itself. It is conceivable that, once introduced into a formal academic environment like that of a university, where the code is usually "elaborated", and where one is expected to subscribe to normative forms, Ss would respond in greater numbers to SL than PA. In any case, contrary to the original hypothesis, a significantly greater number of Ss chose the SL versions over the PA versions.

b) About 13% of Ss chose PA consistently. As in the case of SL, PA also appears to be a distinguishable and important feature chosen by Ss. Respondents answered consistently despite such other factors as order, voice preference, etc. It is possible that the laboratory setting of the experiment prompted the Ss to pay greater attention to the more formal aspects of speech production than to the supra-segmental features. And yet, given this experimental atmosphere, where the S might try to guess at what the experimenter was investigating and respond to the more normative type of speech, Ss still responded to the PA version. It would be interesting to find out what ratio of SL to PA would be in a context favouring neither PA nor SL.

c) As was surmised in Chapter 2, the particularly attractive qualities of some peoples' voices, regardless of the circumstances, proved to be a significant factor in the purely auditory, one-way type of communication on which this experiment was based. Almost 27% of Ss chose on the basis of the voice they preferred. Unless highly artificial means were used to induce very similar voice qualities, it would be very difficult to eliminate the influence of this factor.

We would like to point out here that Ss who chose the voice they preferred were indeed listening for something. That is, they were not only choosing the first thing they heard, nor were they choosing randomly. What would have been their second choice? One wonders if preference for a given voice could in some way be connected to attention paid to the prosodic features. It might not only have been the timbre of the voice that attracted Ss but it might also have been the expressiveness manifested by that voice that struck a responsive chord in the Ss. These expressive qualities resemble the emotive qualities that underly the prosodic features of language.

d) We wish to emphasize that the seemingly random responses elicited from the final group of Ss analyzed are not necessarily meaningless. It may be that in a more tightly controlled or in a less artificial setting, the random-like responses obtained might have become more meaningful in terms of the original hypothesis. An improvement in experimental technique, should it prove feasible, would be to watch Ss perform in spontaneous situations as opposed to the more formal experimental paradigms. In such spontaneous situations, Ss

might perhaps be a little less sensitive about what the experimenter is looking for and might, therefore, react in a more natural way. Responses then might have been directed more consistently to SL or PA.

Finally, it is clear that the hypothesis, as discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, was not substantiated in this study. The fact that significant numbers of Ss reacted to the different parameters discussed in the experiment justifies a larger scale study with a more spontaneous type of elicitation technique.

## CHAPTER 4

THEORETICAL PROBLEMS

A study like the present one offers abundant opportunity to gain insights into some of the problems that confront experimental researchers, problems which do not arise in most work in linguistics.

As a linguist, one is not looking for psychological reality, as such. One is seeking to develop an adequate theory which will permit an explanation of how language functions, as an arbitrary formal system. This theory can be relevant to and yet evolved independently of the manner in which the human brain functions.

The psycholinguist, on the other hand, must resort to an empirical framework if he is to make any generalizations, or give any explanations about behaviour. Unlike the linguist, he is essentially doing a psychological type of research which aims at identifying processes and explaining how they function. What distinguishes him from the average experimental psychologist is that he must be familiar with linguistic theory and the basic tools of linguistic description in order to quantify the kind of data he is eliciting. However, his research is still process-oriented. The psycholinguist, who has had the benefit of being exposed to pure theoretical research and who realizes what innovations can be achieved without the encumbrances of sample statistics and the laboratory, is still very aware that any psychological study must not only be empirically

based, but also that critical attention must be given to the relevance that a particular experimental paradigm bears to reality. These constraints create a number of problems which we would like to discuss.

First, in empirical research, the fact that one must be sure that all Ss either hear or see the same stimuli requires that these treatments must be systematized to some extent. For example, it may be necessary to use samples of speech that are read from prepared texts as opposed to spontaneous speech, because all Ss must be exposed to identical stimuli. Or Ss may have no opportunity to dialogue with their interlocutor because the latter's voice has been recorded. Or Ss' attention may be channelled into a purely auditory mode, thus forestalling any reference to normal visual cues. It is the necessity to systematize one's materials in a study of this nature that imposes a certain degree of artificiality on the elicitation technique. A superior method of experimentation would be, perhaps, to observe individuals in a natural setting reacting to one another in a spontaneous way. The problem with this type of approach is that of controlling the immense day-to-day variation in human behaviour. In other words, one must seek a balance whereby one can combine the maximum control over variables with the most accurate representation of the total reality of communication.

Another difficulty is to be certain that experimental measures and the resulting data reflect the working hypothesis. Taking the present study as an illustration, the hypothesis (see page 5) is, in a sense, more inclusive than the tests used to verify it. Only part of the hypothesis was really studied.

It might have been more appropriate, in the present case, to postulate that university students brought into a laboratory to listen to two different types of recorded speech are more likely to choose the type representing greater emphasis on prosodic elements and articulation than the type representing emphasis on grammar and extensive lexicon. This type of particularized hypothesis would cover the condensed version of real life that was actually tested. On the other hand, a hypothesis which may refer to a broader spectrum of real life circumstances can suggest many areas of investigation which do not have to be approached all at the same time, and this brings us to another of the complexities involved in experimental research, that of the relationship between a micro and a macro study.

A large scale study is never really justified until certain fundamental questions have been asked and answered. It would have been unwise to have begun by attempting to explain empathy, and constructing experiments to investigate sets of variables until one has established that those sets exist. We have shown, in the present study, that several types of behaviour do exist. The following two questions now arise: "would these sets of different kinds of behaviour be sustained in a larger study?" and "how could the Ss' different types of reactions be explained?"

To have examined such questions in a pilot study would have required a large number of different types of tests to investigate communication in all of its aspects. But it hadn't yet been established whether the various reactions in a commun-

ication situation, as set forth here, even existed. So, at this point, creation of a battery of experimental tests was not worthwhile. The most important goal was to condense what was being investigated into a small area which could still be considered as a part of reality.

Although, as mentioned above, only part of the hypothesis was investigated, i.e., the communicative acts that Ss were asked to respond to were strictly one-way and solely auditory, the part that was studied does constitute an important aspect of communication. People are involved everyday in non-visual exchanges, for instance, on the telephone. They do accept a non-participatory role in communication (that is, not originating a message) when listening to radio, or watching television. During these activities, they undoubtedly experience emotive responses to what they are hearing. It is unlikely that these responses are less natural than the ones they feel in a two-way discussion situation.

In summary, we felt that it was preferable to begin with a more modest project where only one communicational mode was involved, and where we were, as a consequence, obliged to manipulate only a fraction of the variables implicit in a normal two-way communicative act. By progressively developing techniques that can be used to account for behaviour in more spontaneous linguistic situations, psycholinguists will be able to minimize the artificiality which inevitably results from laboratory studies.

GLOSSARY

block - a set of 5 sets of recordings, each block being ordered differently.

communicative competence - "the ability to function in a truly communicative setting - that is, in a dynamic exchange in which linguistic competence must adapt itself to the total informational input, both linguistic and paralinguistic, of one or more interlocutors." (Savignon, 1972)

elaborated code - a code in which the probability of predicting the pattern of organizing elements is considerably reduced because the speaker will select from a relatively extensive range of alternatives.

interlanguage - a separate linguistic system based on the observable output which results from a learner's attempted production of a TL (target language) norm.

L1, L2 - first language, second language.

monologue - a short text serving as a vehicle for the two types of speech, PA and SL.

N.T. - no trends.

PA - version of the speech style which emphasizes near native mastery of the supra-segmental features of language. Articulation is also quite close to the phonetic patterns of the target language. A more colloquial vocabulary is used and some interference in syntax from the mother tongue is exhibited.

position - of the two versions of a given monologue, either one or the other had to be presented first; i.e., in first

"position".

restricted code - a code in which the probability of predicting the pattern of organizing elements is greatly increased because the number of alternatives to be selected by the speaker is often severely limited.

S - subject.

SL - the version of the speech type which emphasizes a normative use of syntax and a somewhat more elaborated vocabulary approaching an international French, and which contains, as well, a marked non-native "accent" carried over from L<sub>1</sub>.

set of recordings - recordings of all three monologues, in both versions.

slot - the fact that there were three monologues (in two versions each) to be presented to subjects meant that one monologue (in its two versions) would be presented first, one, second, and one, third. If the two versions of the Italian monologue were to be heard first, it would appear in the first "slot".

V.P. - voice preference.

## APPENDIX A

OUTLINE FOR TELEPHONE CALLS RECRUITING SUBJECTS

Il y a une étudiante au niveau de la maîtrise qui est en train d'étudier un problème d'une certaine importance. Le but précis de ce projet sera expliqué à tous les sujets qui participent dans l'expérience une fois que les analyses sont faites.

On vous a choisi puisque vous êtes de langue française et habitant de Québec, ce qui est une variable importante dans notre projet.

Il faudrait seulement un quart à vingt minutes de votre temps. On appréciera beaucoup votre participation si cela vous est de la moindre façon possible.

Il s'agit uniquement de trouver une heure qui vous convient et de se rencontrer.

Encore, on fournira un rapport des résultats du projet à tous qui ont la gentillesse de participer.

J'ai plusieurs questions préliminaires à vous poser pour vérifier plusieurs choses statistiques:

1) Est-ce que vous avez habité à Ottawa avant que vous êtes venu à l'université? Plus que deux ans? A peu près combien

2) Comprenez-vous l'anglais?

bien? \_\_\_\_\_

moyennement? \_\_\_\_\_

mal? \_\_\_\_\_

Le parlez-vous?

bien? \_\_\_\_\_

mal? \_\_\_\_\_

Merci beaucoup de votre coopération.

## APPENDIX B

SES QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Quel est le métier de votre père? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Quel est le métier de votre mère? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Votre père a comme formation académique:
  - i. assisté à l'école primaire. \_\_\_\_\_
  - ii. complété sa formation primaire. \_\_\_\_\_
  - iii. assisté à l'école secondaire. \_\_\_\_\_
  - iv. complété sa formation secondaire. \_\_\_\_\_
  - v. assisté au niveau universitaire. \_\_\_\_\_
  - vi. achevé un baccalaureat. \_\_\_\_\_
  - vii. complété un niveau supérieur. \_\_\_\_\_
4. Votre mère a comme formation académique:
  - i. assisté à l'école primaire. \_\_\_\_\_
  - ii. complété sa formation primaire. \_\_\_\_\_
  - iii. assisté à l'école secondaire. \_\_\_\_\_
  - iv. complété sa formation secondaire. \_\_\_\_\_
  - v. assisté au niveau universitaire. \_\_\_\_\_
  - vi. achevé un baccalaureat. \_\_\_\_\_
  - vii. complété un niveau supérieur. \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX C

MONOLOGUES 1, 2, AND 3 IN BOTH VERSIONSItalian Monologue 1 - Syntactic-lexical

Bonjour! Mon g erant m'a dit que vous avez fait des plaintes au sujet du prix des r eparations de votre auto. J'ai la facture ici. Je vais vous donner les d etails.

D'abord, regardez ici. Vous avez pour commencer une mise au point mineure du moteur. Evidemment, on aurait pu inspecter seulement les pi eces d efectueuses, mais je pense, moi, qu'en sortant d'ici, vous auriez eu des probl emes avant longtemps. Etant donn e que vous voulez, puis pas seulement vous, hein, tous les clients qui viennent ici veulent de bon service. Ca fait qu'on est bien mieux d'en faire un petit peu plus, puis comme  a, vous  etes satisfaits.

A part de  a, bien, on a remplac e la porte. On aurait pu simplement la r eparer. Ca vous aurait fait 75 dollars de moins, d'accord. Mais on en a d ej a eu comme  a, qui ont eu le m eme genre d'accident. On leur a r epar e leur porte, parce qu'ils l'ont demand e. Mais 3 mois apr es, ils nous arrivaient avec la poign ee qui march pas, ou bien c'est la vitre qui monte puis qui descend pas comme il faut, ou bien c'est la peinture qui est rong ee par la rouille. Ca fait que... on a pens e vous  eviter ces troubles- la,  a vous.

En plus, bien, la gr eve a pas arrang e les choses. Depuis que  a a commenc e, les hommes ont 3 dollars et 7 de plus de l'heure. Alors, 3 hommes, 8 heures de travail chacun,  a augmente pas mal le prix de votre facture,  a. Est-ce qu'il y a autre chose que vous voulez savoir?

Je comprends! Ca vous paraît cher, mais d'un autre côté, il faut que je paye mes hommes, puis mon loyer à la fin de chaque mois. Ca fait que, vous comprenez, on peut rien faire pour baisser votre facture.

Italian Monologue 2 - Prosodic-articulatory

Bonjour! Mon gérant m'a dit que vous avez fait un plainte concernant le total de votre bill pour les réparations de votre char. J'ai la facture, ici, avec moi. La chose est comme ça:

Premier, regardez ici. Vous avez pour commencer un mise au point mineur de moteur. Naturellement, on pourrait inspecter les parties défectueuses seulement, mais quand vous sortez d'ici, vous aurez peut-être des problèmes avant longtemps, je pense. Etant donné que vous voulez, puis pas seulement vous, hein, tous les clients qui viennent ici veulent du bon service. Ca fait qu'il est mieux de faire plus, puis comme ça, vous êtes satisfaits.

A part de ça, on a remplacé la porte. On pouvait la réparer certainement, et ça vous coûterait 75 piastres de moins, O.K. Mais on a eu déjà des cas comme ça, qui ont eu la même sorte d'accident. On a réparé leur porte, parce que c'est ce qu'ils ont demandé. Mais 3 mois après, ils viennent ici avec la poignée qui marche pas, ou bien c'est la vitre qui monte puis qui descend pas bien, ou bien c'est la penture qui est toute rouillée. Donc, vous voyez, on voulait pas que ça se passe dans votre cas.

En plus, bien, la grève a pas aidé les choses. Puisque ça a commencé, les hommes ont 3 piastres et 7 de plus par heure. Alors, 3 hommes, 8 heures de travail pour chacun, ça augmente pas mal le total de votre bill. Est-ce qu'il y a quelque chose encore que vous voulez savoir?

Je comprends! Ca vous paraît cher. Mais d'un autre côté, il faut que je paye mes hommes, puis mon loyer à la fin de chaque mois. Ca fait que, vous comprenez, on peut pas faire quelque chose avec votre bill.

English Monologue 1 - Syntactic-lexical

J'aime bien l'été. C'est vraiment très amusant. Il y a plusieurs choses à faire. Presqu'à chaque fin de semaine, nous emmenons la famille à la plage. Nous nous baignons, nous jouons avec les enfants, et quand nous revenons, nous sommes tous détendus, prêts à recommencer une autre semaine de travail. Il est très fatiguant de demeurer en ville toute la semaine: il fait tellement chaud et c'est très humide. D'ailleurs, en campagne comme j'ai dit, nous pouvons nous baigner, moi, je peux m'étendre au soleil, les enfants peuvent jouer dans le sable et tous sont heureux. La chose que je regrette le plus est de ne pas avoir un chalet. Nous pourrions y demeurer l'été entier, et peut-être y aller pour les fins de semaine pendant l'automne. Etre propriétaire d'un joli petit chalet assez proche de la ville, c'est mon grand rêve. En attendant d'en trouver un à notre goût, nous profitons de la campagne en allant aux plages publiques des environs.

English Monologue 2 - Prosodic-articulatory

J'aime bien l'été. Il est vraiment très amusant. Y a plusieurs choses à faire. Presque chaque fin de semaine, nous apportons notre famille au plage. Nous baignons, nous jouons avec les enfants, et quand nous revenons, nous sommes tous détendus, prêts à commencer un autre semaine de travail. C'est très fatigant de rester dans ville toute la semaine. Il est tellement chaud et c'est très humide. D'ailleurs, en campagne, comme j'ai dit, nous pouvons baigner, moi, je peux m'étendre dans le soleil, les enfants peuvent jouer dans la sable et tous sont heureux. La chose que je regrette le plus est de n'avoir pas un chalet. Nous pourrions rester là l'été entière et peut-être aller là pour les fins de semaine dans l'automne. Etre propriétaire d'un joli petit chalet proche assez de la ville, c'est mon grand rêve. Pendant le temps que nous cherchons pour un, nous profitons du campagne en allant à les plages publiques.

Spanish Monologue 1 - Syntactic-lexical

Bonjour. Je suis madame Leblanc. On m'a dit que vous vouliez des renseignements au sujet de la maison en vente dans le Mont-Bleu. Je crois que la meilleure façon de procéder serait de vous expliquer de quoi elle a l'air. La cuisine est spacieuse, la laveuse à vaisselle est incorporée dans le mur et vous avez 18 pieds d'armoires, très grands armoires. Il y a un comptoir entre la cuisine et la salle à dîner pour faciliter le temps de repas. Le salon est confortable et nous voyons la montagne de la fenêtre; c'est vraiment une belle vue. Il y a trois chambres à coucher de même grandeur; les garde-robes mesurent six pieds chacun, les fenêtres sont grandes et elles s'ouvrent facilement, très facilement. La salle de bain comprend un bain creusé avec douche, et deux armoires sous le lavabo. La maison sera peinturée à l'intérieur avant le déménagement; comme ça vous n'auriez rien à faire. Vous pourriez même choisir les couleurs. Le propriétaire s'occupera de tous avant la vente. Vous savez, la maison n'a eu qu'un seul propriétaire et ces gens en ont pris extrêmement soin. Elle est dans un état considérablement meilleur que plusieurs autres maisons que j'ai vu jusqu'à date. En dehors, le terrain est grand: un acre et demi. Le passage est pavé. La cour est clôturée et la pelouse a toujours été très, très, très bien entretenue. Il faudrait vraiment que vous voyiez la maison pour pouvoir l'apprécier.

Spanish Monologue 2 - Prosodic-articulatory

Bonjour. Je suis madame Leblanc. On a dit à moi que vous voulez des informations sur la maison pour vente dans le Mont-Bleu. Et je crois que la meilleure façon de procéder est donner des explications sur ce qu'elle a l'air. La cuisine est grosse, la laveuse à vaisselle est incorporée dans le mur et vous avez 18 pieds d'armoires. Il a un comptoire entre la cuisine et la salle à dîner pour faciliter le temps des repas. Et vous voyez, le salon est confortable et nous voyons le montagne par la fenêtre; c'est vraiment une belle vue. Il a trois chambres pour coucher de même grandeur; les gardes-robres mesurent six pieds chaque; les fenêtres sont grandes et elles sont facilement ouvertes. La salle de bain a un bain creusé avec douche et deux armoires en dessous de lavabo. La maison va être peinturée partout avant que vous déménagez. Vous pouvez choisir les couleurs même. Le propriétaire va s'occuper de les détails. Vous savez, la maison a eu seulement un propriétaire et ces gens on pris extrêmement bon soin de la maison. Elle est dans une condition considérablement meilleure que plusieurs maisons que j'ai vu. Et puis, dehors, vous avez un gros terrain; un acre et demi. Le stationnement est pavé. La cour est clôturée et la pelouse a toujours été bien maintenue. Il est nécessaire voir la maison pour pouvoir l'apprécier.

## APPENDIX D

ANSWER SHEET

On vous pris de ne rien écrire sur cette feuille avant d'entendre des instructions enregistrées qui se trouvent à la fin de chaque série de monologues que vous entendrez.

Premier Monologue:

1 \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_

Deuxième Monologue:

1 \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_

Troisième Monologue:

1 \_\_\_\_\_

2 \_\_\_\_\_

Il y a d'autres élèves dans votre faculté qui ont eu la gentillesse d'accepter de participer à cette expérience. On vous pris, donc, de bien vouloir ne leur rien dire à ce sujet puisque vos explications pourraient influencer leurs réponses.

## APPENDIX E

INSTRUCTIONS (WRITTEN)

Vous allez entendre sur une bande magnétique plusieurs séries de monologues qui traitent chacune des situations quotidiennes.

Dans un monologue, par exemple, vous entendrez un mécanicien qui tâche de justifier le montant très élevé d'une facture d'un de ces clients.

Le deuxième monologue dans la série sera une duplication du premier, sauf qu'il s'agira, cette fois-ci, d'un autre mécanicien qui parle, et qui a toujours les mêmes buts.

Après avoir écouté les deux versions, l'on vous demandera de choisir le mécanicien à qui vous faites le plus de confiance.

Dans une autre série de monologues, deux femmes, l'une après l'autre, essaient de vendre une maison à un de leurs clients. Encore une fois, vous aurez à choisir la personne qui, selon vous, a l'air la plus convaincante.

Dans toujours une autre situation, vous entendrez deux versions différentes d'un monologue où deux femmes, encore l'une après l'autre, parlent de leur désir d'avoir, éventuellement, un chalet à la campagne. Cette fois-ci, l'on vous demandera d'exprimer votre choix de l'une des deux personnes si vous alliez l'avoir comme voisine.

Nous tenons à vous faire remarquer que l'ordre des séries de monologues sera très probablement différente de celles décrites ici.

Comme vous entendrez dans les instructions enregistrées,

vous entendrez un bref extrait de chaque monologue après avoir entendu toute la série avant de prendre votre choix et de cocher le numéro qui y correspond.

On tient, également, à vous dire que tous les parleurs que vous entendrez dans ces monologues ont été choisis à cause de leur status immigrant: il va sans dire que le français n'est pas leur langue maternelle.

S'il y a des questions, n'hésitez pas de les poser à l'adjointe.

Merci de votre collaboration.

APPENDIX F

INSTRUCTIONS (RECORDED)

English Monologue

Veillez écouter attentivement le texte suivant qui a été enregistré deux fois, par deux individus différent.

.....  
.....

Dans les deux versions du monologue qui suit, deux femmes expriment, chaque à son tour, leur désir d'acheter un chalet à la campagne.

.....  
.....

Si une de ces femmes achetait un chalet près du vôtre, laquelle des deux choisiriez-vous comme voisine? Afin de vous aider dans votre choix, voici quelques énoncés de chaque version:

Numéro 1: .....

Numéro 2: .....

Choisiriez-vous numéro 1 ou numéro 2?

Spanish Monologue

Dans les deux versions suivantes du texte, vous entendrez deux femmes qui sont des agents d'immeubles et qui tache de convaincre un client de la valeur d'une maison qu'elles essaient de lui vendre.

.....  
.....

Si vous étiez l'acheteur dans cette situation, laquelle des deux femmes aurait le plus de chance de vous vendre la maison? Afin de vous aider dans votre choix, voici quelques énoncés de chaque version:

Numéro 1: .....

Numéro 2. ....

Préfériez-vous numéro 1 ou numéro 2?

Italian Monologue

Ce que vous entendrez maintenant est la réponse d'un mécanicien en chef à une plainte d'un de ses clients.

.....  
.....

Si vous étiez le client en question, en qui auriez-vous le plus de confiance: le premier ou le deuxième mécanicien? Afin de vous aider dans votre choix, voici quelques énoncés de chaque version:

Numéro 1: .....

Numéro 2: .....

Préfériez-vous numéro 1 ou numéro 2?

## APPENDIX G

ORDERINGS OF MONOLOGUES, VERSIONS AND VOICESBLOCK 1

	<u>SLOT 1</u>	<u>SLOT 2</u>	<u>SLOT 3</u>	<u>NUMBER OF Ss</u>	
				Round 1	Round 2
Set 1:	English (E) Monologue	Italian (I) Monologue	Spanish (S) Monologue	2	3
Position:	1 PA - 2 SL	1 PA - 2 SL	1 SL - 2 PA		
Reader:	E <sub>1</sub> E <sub>2</sub>	I <sub>2</sub> I <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub>		
Set 2:	S	I	E	7	1
Position:	1 SL - 2 PA	1 PA - 2 SL	1 PA - 2 SL		
Reader:	S <sub>2</sub> S <sub>1</sub>	I <sub>1</sub> I <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>2</sub> E <sub>1</sub>		
Set 3:	E	S	I	5	4
Position:	1 PA - 2 SL	1 SL - 2 PA	1 PA - 2 SL		
Reader:	E <sub>1</sub> E <sub>2</sub>	S <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub>	I <sub>2</sub> I <sub>1</sub>		
Set 4:	I	E	S	3	6
Position:	1 SL - 2 PA	1 PA - 2 SL	1 PA - 2 SL		
Reader:	I <sub>2</sub> I <sub>1</sub>	E <sub>1</sub> E <sub>2</sub>	S <sub>2</sub> S <sub>1</sub>		
Set 5:	I	S	E	1	2
Position:	1 PA - 2 SL	1 SL - 2 PA	1 PA - 2 SL		
Reader:	I <sub>1</sub> I <sub>2</sub>	S <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>1</sub> E <sub>2</sub>		

BLOCK 2

	<u>SLOT 1</u>	<u>SLOT 2</u>	<u>SLOT 3</u>	<u>NUMBER OF Ss</u>	
				Round 1	Round 2
Set 6:	E	I	S	5	7
Position:	1 SL - 2 PA	1 SL - 2 PA	1 PA - 2 SL		
Reader:	E <sub>1</sub> E <sub>2</sub>	I <sub>1</sub> I <sub>2</sub>	S <sub>2</sub> S <sub>1</sub>		
Set 7:	S	I	E	6	
Position:	1 SL - 2 PA	1 SL - 2 PA	1 PA - 2 SL		
Reader:	S <sub>2</sub> S <sub>1</sub>	I <sub>1</sub> I <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>2</sub> E <sub>1</sub>		
Set 8:	E	S	I	2	
Position:	1 PA - 2 SL	1 SL - 2 PA	1 SL - 2 PA		
Reader:	E <sub>1</sub> E <sub>2</sub>	S <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub>	I <sub>1</sub> I <sub>2</sub>		
Set 9:	I	E	S	2	
Position:	1 PA - 2 SL	1 SL - 2 PA	1 SL - 2 PA		
Reader:	I <sub>1</sub> I <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>2</sub> E <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub>		
Set 10:	I	S	E	-	
Position:	1 PA - 2 SL	1 SL - 2 PA	1 PA - 2 SL		
Reader:	I <sub>1</sub> I <sub>2</sub>	S <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>2</sub> E <sub>1</sub>		

BLOCK 3

	<u>SLOT 1</u>	<u>SLOT 2</u>	<u>SLOT 3</u>	<u>NUMBER OF Ss</u>
Set 11:	E	I	S	3
Position:	1 SL - 2 PA	1 SL - 2 PA	1 PA - 2 SL	
Reader:	E <sub>1</sub> E <sub>2</sub>	I <sub>2</sub> I <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub>	
Set 12:	S	I	E	1
Position:	1 SL - 2 PA	1 PA - 2 SL	1 SL - 2 PA	
Reader:	S <sub>2</sub> S <sub>1</sub>	I <sub>2</sub> I <sub>1</sub>	E <sub>1</sub> E <sub>2</sub>	
Set 13:	E	S	I	2
Position:	1 SL - 2 PA	1 PA - 2 SL	1 SL - 2 PA	
Reader:	E <sub>2</sub> E <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub> S <sub>1</sub>	I <sub>1</sub> I <sub>2</sub>	
Set 14:	I	E	S	1
Position:	1 PA - 2 SL	1 SL - 2 PA	1 SL - 2 PA	
Reader:	I <sub>2</sub> I <sub>1</sub>	E <sub>1</sub> E <sub>2</sub>	S <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub>	
Set 15:	I	S	E	3
Position:	1 SL - 2 PA	1 PA - 2 SL	1 SL - 2 PA	
Reader:	I <sub>2</sub> I <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>1</sub> E <sub>2</sub>	

BLOCK 4

	<u>SLOT 1</u>	<u>SLOT 2</u>	<u>SLOT 3</u>	<u>NUMBER OF Ss</u>
Set 16:	E	I	S	8
Position:	1 SL - 2 PA	1 PA - 2 SL	1 PA - 2 SL	
Reader:	E <sub>1</sub> E <sub>2</sub>	I <sub>2</sub> I <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub>	
Set 17:	S	I	E	2
Position:	1 PA - 2 SL	1 PA - 2 SL	1 SL - 2 PA	
Reader:	S <sub>2</sub> S <sub>1</sub>	I <sub>1</sub> I <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>2</sub> E <sub>1</sub>	
Set 18:	E	S	I	1
Position:	1 PA - 2 SL	1 SL - 2 PA	1 SL - 2 PA	
Reader:	E <sub>1</sub> E <sub>2</sub>	S <sub>2</sub> S <sub>1</sub>	I <sub>2</sub> I <sub>1</sub>	
Set 19:	I	E	S	-
Position:	1 SL - 2 PA	1 SL - 2 PA	1 PA - 2 SL	
Reader:	I <sub>1</sub> I <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>1</sub> E <sub>2</sub>	S <sub>2</sub> S <sub>1</sub>	
Set 20:	I	S	E	2
Position:	1 PA - 2 SL	1 SL - 2 PA	1 PA - 2 SL	
Reader:	I <sub>1</sub> I <sub>2</sub>	S <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>1</sub> E <sub>2</sub>	

BIBLIOGRAPHYReferences Cited

- d'Anglejan, Alison and G. Richard Tucker, 1973. "Sociolinguistic Correlates of Speech Style in Quebec". In Shuy, R.W. and R.W. Fasold, eds., Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects. Washington, D.C. Georgetown University Press.
- Anisfeld, Moshe, Norman Bogo and Wallace E. Lambert, 1962. "Evaluational Reactions to Accented English Speech". Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 65, No. 4, pp 223-231.
- Arthur, Bradford, Dorothee Farrar and George Bradford, 1974. "Evaluation Reactions of College Students to Dialect Differences in the English of Mexican Americans". Language and Speech, Vol. 17, Pt. 3, pp. 255-270.
- Bernstein, Basil, 1971. Class, Codes and Control. London. Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Callary, R.E., 1974. "Status Perception through Syntax". Language and Speech, Vol. 17, Pt. 2, April-June, pp. 187-192.
- Corder, S. Pitt, 1974. Personal Notes.
- Labov, William, 1966. The Social Stratification of English in New York City. Washington, D.C. Centre For Applied Linguistics.
- Lambert, Wallace E., R. Hodgson, R.C. Gardner, and S. Fillenbaum, 1960. "Evaluational Reactions to Spoken Languages". Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 60,

No. 1, pp. 44-51.

Savignon, Sandra J., 1972. Communicative Competence: An Experiment in Foreign-Language Teaching. Philadelphia, The Centre for Curriculum Development, Inc.

Selinker, Larry, 1972. "Interlanguage". International Review of Applied Linguistics, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 209-231.

Warner, W., 1960. Social Class in America. New York. Harper and Row.

Williams, Frederick, 1973. "Some Research Notes on Dialect Attitudes and Stereotypes". In Shuy, R.W. and R.W. Fasold, eds., Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects. Washington, D.C. Georgetown University Press.

#### Supplementary References

Corder, S. Pitt, 1971. "Idiosyncratic Dialects and Error Analysis", International Review of Applied Linguistics, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 147-159.

Crystal, David and Randolph Quirk, 1964. Systems of Prosodic and Paralinguistic Features in English. London-The Hague-Paris. Mouton & Co.

Greene, Judith, 1972. Psycholinguistics: Chomsky and Psychology. Harmsworth, Middlesex, England. Penguin Education.

Hymes, Dell, 1967. "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Setting". Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 8-28.

Laberge, Suzanne and Michèle Chiasson-Lavoie, 1971. "Attitudes face au français parlé à Montréal et dégrès de

- conscience de variables linguistiques". In Linguistic Diversity in Canadian Society, Regna Darnell, ed., Edmonton, Linguistic Research, Inc.
- Lambert, Wallace E., Moshe Anisfeld and Grace Keni-Yomshian, 1965. "Evaluational Reactions of Jewish and Arab Adolescents to Dialect and Language Variations". Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 84-90.
- Lambert, Wallace E., Hannah Frankl and G. Richard Tucker, 1966. "Judging Personality through Speech: A French Canadian Example". Journal of Communication, Vol. 16, pp. 305-321.
- Lieberman, Philip, 1967. Intonation, Perception and Language. Research Monograph No. 38. Cambridge, Mass. The M.I.T. Press.
- Miller, Gerald R. and Murray A. Hewgill, 1964. "The Effect of Variations in Nonfluency on Audience Ratings of Source Credibility". Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. 50, pp. 36-44.
- Ryan, Ellen Bouchard, 1973. "Subjective Reactions Toward Accented Speech". In Shuy, R.W. and R.W. Fasold, eds. Language Attitudes: Current Trends and Prospects. Washington. D.C., Georgetown University Press.
- Ryan, Michael, 1974. The Factor Structure of Credibility Reactions to Standard and Dialect English Speech. Presented to the International Communication Association, New Orleans.
- Segalowitz, Norman, 1976. "Communicative Incompetence and the

Non-fluent bilingual". Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science - Revue canadienne des Sciences du comportement, Vol. 8, No. 2, April/avril.

Slobin, Dan I., 1971. Psycholinguistics. Glenview, Illinois. Scott, Foresman and Company.

Stevens, P.D., 1965. "Varieties of English". In Papers in Language and Language Teaching, P.D. Stevens, ed. Oxford. Oxford University Press. pp. 74f.

Williams, Frederick, 1970. "Language, Attitude and Social Change". In F. Williams, ed., Language and Poverty. Chicago. Markham Publishing Co.