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ABSTRACT

L2 Spanish Speakers’ Attitudes Toward Selected Features of Peninsular and Mexican Spanish

G. Perry Stotts
Department of Spanish and Portuguese, BYU
Master of Arts

Many studies have been done on language attitudes, including attitudes toward languages in contact, various dialects of a language, nonnative speech, and attitudes of second-language (L2) learners toward the language that they are learning. Typically the studies of second-language learning deal with the attitudes toward the language in general rather than toward specific varieties within the language.

The present study measures the attitudes of L2 learners of Spanish who lived in Spain, Mexico and Argentina toward native speakers from Spain and Mexico. The nonnative speakers listened to recordings of four native speakers, a male and a female from Spain, and a male and a female from Mexico, and rated each on a series of characteristics such as intelligence, education, attractiveness, work ethic, and honesty.

T-tests were run to determine whether or not the time spent in one of the countries affected the attitudes toward each variety of Spanish. The results show that the judges had a tendency to give higher ratings to the speakers that they could understand the easiest. In addition, there was an overall tendency to rate both of the speakers from Spain higher, as was found in studies by Álvarez, Martínez and Urdaneta (2001), as well as Montes-Alcalá (2011), and to rate the females higher, supporting what both González Martínez (2008) and Labov (1972) found.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

While sitting in an undergraduate-level Spanish linguistics class learning about dialectology, the professor asked for a raise of hands of those who disliked the use of /θ/, the voiceless interdental fricative, in Spain. Nearly everybody raised his or her hand except those who had learned Spanish in Spain. Various reasons were given, but the general consensus was that it sounded feminine or could be compared to speaking English with a lisp, despite the distinction in such dialects between /s/ and /θ/, such as with the words casa and caza. Some even explained that when a woman used the /θ/, it was fine, or even attractive, but that they didn’t like it when a man used it. Even after the professor explained the distinction and how we also have a distinction between the same sounds in our native language of English (such as with the words sink and think), most still expressed a dislike for the use of /θ/ in Spanish. In English, the grapheme used for /θ/ is {th}, and in Spanish the graphemes used are {z}, {ce}, and {ci}, in some parts of Spain. {th} in English also represents the voiced interdental fricative, /ð/, such as with the word thy, as opposed to the voiceless interdental fricative in thigh. Despite the different spelling contexts in which the sound is found in English and Spanish, it fascinated me that native English speakers could have such feelings toward a sound that also exists in their own language. It is interesting that L2 (second language) speakers can have a strong preference for one dialect over another in the language that they are learning.

While the majority of the students in that class expressed an explicit attitude toward Peninsular Spanish, at least the varieties that use /θ/, this study aims to determine if there is a general negative attitude toward Peninsular Spanish among those who learn Spanish as a second language in the Americas. Also, those in that class who had learned Spanish in Madrid and its
surrounding areas seemed to have a sense of loyalty toward that dialect and used /θ/ as the native speakers used it.

Montes-Alcalá (2011) explains that there is no such thing as a language or dialect that is “ideal” or “perfect” from a grammatical or historical point of view. Instead, there are a variety of national and geographical norms, and attitudes are often motivated by a sense of loyalty to one’s group or community. Young (2003) found in her study that judges often rate the speaker that they identify with the highest, a finding confirmed by other researchers. For example, her judges were primarily native English speakers, and they rated the native English speaker in her study highest in most of the categories, while speaking both English and Spanish.

There are several reasons to study language attitudes. Agheyisi and Fishman (1970) list topics in the field of sociolinguistics such as “language choice in multilingual societies, differential allocation of codes, dialect differences and mutual intelligibility – to name a few.” In addition, language is emblematic. A speaker’s grammar, vocabulary, accent, etc. affect how others think of him or her. Therefore, a study of language attitudes reveals not only attitudes toward a particular language or variety of a language, but also attitudes toward speakers of said language or variety. According to Garrett (2010), “language variation carries social meanings, and so can bring very different attitudinal reactions, or even social disadvantage or advantage.” He reports a Colombian who was taking a course to try to improve his accent as saying:

This class is my last hope. If it doesn’t work out, I’m going back to my country. I was practically raised in this country... But I have this accent. Does this mean that I am not an American? I don’t know. (p. 13)

There have been many studies centering on attitudes toward languages in contact, which can have important political implications. For example, in a multilingual society, which
language should be the official language? Should the other languages have co-official status? How many and which languages should be included on road signs or official documents?

For pedagogical reasons, many other studies have investigated the implications of attitudes of nonnative speakers toward the language being learned, including how a teacher can help students to develop a positive attitude toward the language being learned in order to make it easier and more fun. This study is a little different in that I am not asking learners of Spanish about their attitudes toward the target language in general, but rather their reactions to two different varieties of the language. There are twenty-seven learners of Spanish, or judges, involved in this study—sixteen who lived in Mexico, six who lived in Spain, and five who lived in Argentina.

According to de la Zerda Flores and Hopper (1975), “listeners’ judgments are usually influenced by the extent to which a speaker seems to have adopted ingroup or outgroup stereotypes about the language group presented.” If this carries over to nonnative speakers who have been immersed in the target language and culture, it is possible that the judges used in the present study have adopted attitudes toward both dialects from those with whom they associated during their in-country experience.

Hypotheses

There are several questions guiding this study. First, it is predicted that the L2 speakers will have a preference for the dialect that they learned due to having been immersed in and having attempted to integrate themselves into the language and culture of the region. It is also predicted that they will favor the speech of a female over a male who employs /θ/, especially those participants who lived in Mexico and Argentina.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Language Attitudes

Garrett (2010) explains that “language attitudes permeate our daily lives” and even though “we are not always conscious of them... many nevertheless are overt.” Allport (1959) defines attitude as “a learned disposition to think, feel and behave toward a person (or object) in a particular way.” Agheyisi and Fishman (1970) add that a typical mentalist definition, such as the one given by Allport, implies that attitudes “are not directly observable but have to be inferred from the subject’s introspection.” They then offer definitions that came after Allport that attempted to put attitudes in “more measurable terms.” Because these definitions put attitudes “in terms of observable data,” it is possible to quantify and measure attitudes.

Not only are language attitudes a part of everything that we do in our daily lives, but beliefs about language have more intrinsic relevance than facts about language use, and they motivate our behaviors (Malmkjær, 2002). According to Álvarez, Martínez and Urdaneta (2001), identity and language are so connected that it can be easy to confuse how we feel toward another with our feelings toward how they speak. Our attitude and reaction to their speech reflect our attitude toward the speaker. This includes how we feel about their ethnicity, education level, religion, etc. So, when people listen to others speaking and then rate them on such personal characteristics as friendliness, intelligence, and so on, the results will likely reflect both how they feel about the way that person is speaking and about people in general who speak that way, because they are connected.

In the 1960s and 1970s, Labov’s work “provided additional evidence that dialectal differences among native speakers of the same language... produced unconscious social and
economic prejudices” (Donaher, 2010). While conducting the traditional, tape-recorded, one-on-one interview can elicit formal speech, observing someone’s speech in their own “natural social context” can give more authentic results (Labov, 1972b). Labov attempted to gather data from a speech community by observing people speaking in their natural social context. He referred to the difficulty of doing so as the “observer’s paradox,” which is defined as the attempt to “find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed; yet,” he added, “we can only obtain this data by systematic observation” (Labov, 1970).

In the early seventies, a collection of essays entitled “Language attitudes: current trends and prospects” was published (Shuy and Fasold, 1973). According to Donaher (2010), this was a “ground-breaking collection of essays that brought together scholars from a number of fields to present their research on how people felt about their own language and the language of others.” Topics included in this collection are subjective reactions toward a particular language or variety, attitudes toward learning a second language, attitudes toward nonnative speech, bilingualism and languages in contact, and language assimilation among second-generation language speakers. In this chapter, I will give an overview of some of the important research that has been written on language attitudes that relate to the present study. I will first discuss the matched guise technique, then attitudes toward learning a second language, followed by language attitudes and gender, and finally, folk linguistics.

The Matched Guise Technique

The matched guise technique was developed in the 1960s by Lambert and others as a way to “measure language attitudes as a reflection of prejudice for racial and social groups” (Donaher, 2010). Garrett (2010) summarizes the technique as evoking “private emotional and conceptual reactions” to speech. He also points out that every technique used to measure
attitudes has its advantages and disadvantages. With a direct approach, judges give overt responses to direct questions, and these responses can be different than the private attitudes that the judges have toward a particular language or dialect. Using an indirect approach such as the matched guise technique, where judges rate speakers on personality ratings, for example, instead of answering direct questions, can help to elicit the private attitudes. According to the summary provided by Blas Arroyo (1999), Lambert had listeners (or judges) document their reactions to one person reading the same passage in two different languages, but the judges were unaware that both recordings were done by the same speaker. This method takes away distracting factors such as the sound of the speaker’s voice, because two of the speakers are actually the same person, and thus have the same voice quality. The only difference between the two recordings by the same speaker was the language. In addition, Brown and Lambert (1976) explain that simply having each speaker read the same passage provides for much greater inter-rater reliability than having the speakers tell a story or describe something in their own words. Young (2003) states that the matched guise technique “has been employed not only as an instrument in comparing attitudes toward languages, but also toward variations in dialects and accents.”

According to Solís Obiols (2002), studies using an indirect approach are “based on the multicomponential theory.” Garrett (2010) explains that the three components of this theory, cognition, affect, and behavior, should be “seen more in terms of causes and triggers of attitudes” rather than equating them with attitudes. The cognitive component deals with what we believe about a language (learning Spanish will give one an advantage in the work force in the United States, for example), the affective relates to how we feel about the language (being excited about learning another language); and behavior relates to the actions that we take (enrolling in a course to learn another language).
Giles also performed similar studies using an indirect approach (Garrett, 2010), and co-authored research with Lambert (Lambert, Giles and Picard, 1975). According to Garrett (2010), Giles’ technique differed from Lambert’s, in that he directed a speaker to read the same passage in several different accents, but told the judges that they would hear recordings of several different speakers. 

Solís Obiols (2002) lists some of the criticisms of the matched guise technique, including the possibility that those listening to and rating speakers may be expressing “what they think they should express in public about their opinions” rather than their actual opinions. In addition, the matched guise technique can potentially “reveal stereotypes that do not actually exist, since interviewees can judge according to data in the questionnaire and not using their own opinions.” It is also experimental and artificial, whereas Labov’s major objective was to gather data about people’s speech and attitudes in their natural setting, rather than in a lab or classroom. She concludes, however, that “what makes indirect methodology preferable (over direct methods), is that the use of questionnaires... involves choosing or deciding rationally.” She points out that language attitudes are not rational, and thus using an indirect method, where the participants rate the speakers on personal characteristics rather than answering direct questions about which dialect they like the most, for example, keeps in mind “the affective component of language attitudes.”

Attitudes Toward Learning a Second Language

Gardner (1985) explains that when he and Lambert wrote “Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning” (1972), the study of the relationship between attitudes and affective variables and the role that they play in the learning of a second language was relatively new. Since that time, many others (Macnamara, 1973; Gardner, 1985; Lynch and Klee, 2005) have
written works that have dealt with the relationship between success in learning a second language and attitudes toward that language. Macnamara (1973) concluded that the artificiality of learning in a school setting (compared to learning to speak a first language at home) produces a wide variety of abilities among students of a second language (compared to the lack of variety of abilities among native speakers).

The majority of studies on attitudes toward learning a second language look at the attitudes that the L2 speakers have toward the language being learned. Many experts in the field of second-language acquisition believe that having a positive attitude toward the target language has an impact on the ability of the student to learn the language well. Gardner (1985) explains, “if the students’ attitudes are favourable... the experience with the language will be pleasant, and the students will be encouraged to continue.” On the other hand, Macnamara (1973) concludes, “favorable attitudes are of only minor importance” in learning a second language. Gardner also discusses the probability of many students entering a foreign language classroom for the first time with potential attitudes toward the language and that their attitude toward it can likely be shaped and molded to produce this result of having a positive experience with the language.

An important aspect of attitudes and learning a second language is that attitude can be considered both as input and output. When attitude as input is favorable toward the subject (toward learning a language, for example), it contributes to success in learning the language. An example of attitude as output is when a student has success learning the language, which in turn improves the student’s attitude toward the language (Baker, 1992). In addition, students have different degrees of motivation when learning a second language. Gardner (1972) explains integrative motivation as the motivation that a student experiences while learning a language in order to be integrated into a community. If someone is learning a language because they live in
or are planning on moving to a community where it is spoken, or because many of their relatives speak the language, or simply because they are interested in the language and culture, they will be motivated to practice consistently. Gardner says, “The notion of an integrative motive implies that success in mastering a second language depends on a particular orientation on the part of the learner.” He also describes “a desire to be like representative members of the ‘other’ language community.” On the other hand, instrumental motivation reflects a “desire to gain social recognition or economic advantages through knowledge of a foreign language.”

While reviewing previous research on attitudes toward the learning of a second language, I was unable to find any studies on the attitudes that second-language learners have toward different dialects of a language. However, there have been many studies on native speakers’ attitudes toward different dialects of their language, as well as studies on attitudes that second-language learners have toward the language in general that they are learning, which can be affected by the attitude that they have toward the country or the culture where the language is spoken. Garrett (2010) explains, “We learn attitudes... through a variety of means,” including our social environment and personal experiences. This can obviously be applied to attitudes toward learning a second language, because a student learning Spanish in school, for example, can have positive or negative experiences with the language that may affect his or her attitude toward Spanish and the desire to continue to learn it. It can also be applied toward the attitude that a student has toward different varieties of Spanish. For example, if the Spanish teacher tells the class that people from Spain have a more “pure” variety of Spanish, then the students may adopt that attitude from their teacher. Or, for example, I remember meeting someone who was going to be a missionary in a Spanish-speaking country and was told that people there spoke “dirty” Spanish, and he had that attitude before even arriving there.
Other studies have dealt with attitudes toward nonnative speech. Gynan (1985) performed a study where Spanish speakers were asked to listen to and rate nonnative Spanish speakers whose first language was English. He found that the judges who also spoke English were harsher raters. He points out that studying the attitudes of native speakers toward nonnatives had become a recent interest at that time, and that it carried important pedagogical implications. For example, Gynan says “knowledge of such attitudes may aid language teachers in the development of realistic and practical proficiency goals for the English-speaking language barrier.”

Language Attitudes and Gender

Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003) explain that when Robin Lakoff published her article “Language and Woman’s Place” in 1972, it “created a huge fuss.” She argued that men and women speak differently, and that the way that women speak “both reflects and produces a subordinate position in society,” and is “imposed on women by societal norms.” Eckert and McConnell-Ginet go into depth about the various language and gender studies that followed throughout the subsequent decades. Johnson and Meinhof (1996) point out that despite Lakoff’s claim in her study that “men’s language” needs to be studied just like women’s language has been studied, there has been a “relative neglect of masculinity within the field of language and gender.”

Tannen (1990) argues that the speech of girls and boys is different because they live in distinct subcultures, much like the subcultures associated with social class or ethnic background. After Lakoff’s article, many others were published on either the claim that men and women speak differently simply because they are different and have a different relationship with language, while others argued that the difference was reflected in the dominance of men in society. The
topics that are covered in “Language and Gender” range from gender markers in speech, variation in the speech (including grammar and vocabulary) of men and women, the differences in purpose of speaking for men and women and the pragmatics of men’s and women’s speech (Eckert and MecConnell-Ginet, 2003).

While language and gender studies have focused strongly on female speech and how it relates to male dominance in many societies, some studies have also been carried out on the speech of men. Cameron (1996) discusses the role of gender in masculine or feminine speech. She asserts that the “‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’ styles of talking identified by researchers might be thought of as the ‘congealed’ result of repeated acts by social actors who are striving to constitute themselves as ‘proper’ men and women.” In addition, she describes a conversation among men where they referred to other men as gay even though they were hitting on women. She concludes, “The term ‘gay’ is not so much sexual deviance as gender deviance.” There are societal norms for how men and women are expected to act (and speak), and attitudes can exist toward others who act or speak in a way other than what society would expect. For example, there is a common belief that men who speak with a lisp are feminine or gay. This belief probably exists because in many cases it is true, or because the media portrays it to be that way, or a combination of the two. However, there is not necessarily a correlation between a lisp, especially as a speech impediment, and masculinity or sexual preference.

Folk Linguistics

Folk linguistics refers to “the views and perceptions of those who are not formally trained experts” in the area of linguistics (Garrett, 2010). Garrett describes this direct approach to gathering data on language attitudes developed during the 1990s, identified particularly with Preston. Some of Preston’s works include: “Perceptual Dialectology: Nonlinguists’ Views of
Areal Linguistics” (1989); “The Uses of Folklinguistics” (1993); and “Whaddayaknow?: The Modes of Folklinguistic Awareness” (1996). Garrett goes on to explain that even though most language attitude studies deal with ordinary people, the study of folk linguistics attempts to give a more “contextualized view” and a broader understanding of attitudes that ordinary people have toward specific language varieties. Instead of using structured interviews, questionnaires, or the matched guise technique, experts in this field give more attention to:

Beliefs about the geographical distribution of speech, beliefs about standard and affectively preferred language varieties, the degree of difference perceived in relation to surrounding varieties, imitations of other varieties, and anecdotal accounts of how such beliefs and strategies develop and persist. (p. 180)

Folk linguistics aims to give a wider scope than traditional methodologies, and to focus not only on what is said and how it is said, but also how people react to it, and what people say to describe other varieties of a language. One of the procedures used in folk linguistics is a map task, where the participants are asked to outline their beliefs about regional dialects on a blank map. Another task given to participants is to rate different regions for language correctness. They are given a ten-point scale and a list of regions, and asked to rate each region from 1 (least correct, pleasant, etc.) to 10 (most correct, pleasant, etc.).

The present study draws on each of these categories of attitudinal research. It is not a true example of the matched guise technique because I did not use one speaker for two different dialects, but it still used many aspects of the indirect approach of the matched guise technique, as I had the judges rate each speaker on personality characteristics. I also included more direct questions at the end of the questionnaire to gather information about what the judges would say to describe the two varieties of Spanish that they heard. While the present study is not an
example of a traditional study of attitudes and second-language learning, the judges used were L2 Spanish speakers. Finally, the relationship between language attitudes and gender also plays an important role in this study, as one of my hypotheses is that the judges who had lived in Mexico will favor the speech of the female from Spain over the male from Spain.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

There are many different factors that affect how an individual speaks, and there are many factors that affect how others judge that speaker. Some of them include: region, age, contact with other languages, social class, ethnicity, gender, religion, and the situation in which the conversation takes place (Van Herk and Rees-Miller, 2010, pp. 486-7). When studying attitudes toward language, it is important to attempt to control as many factors as possible. For the present study, I recorded four speakers all reading the same passage, and had three groups of judges listen to and rate each speaker on several different characteristics. I attempted to control as many variables as possible during this process, which will be outlined in the following sections.

Speakers

Three of the four speakers recorded were graduate students pursuing their master’s degree at BYU and the fourth was a BYU professor with a doctoral degree, who is relatively young for a professor, so the speakers were close in age. Though the professor has more education than the other three speakers, they all have studied at a graduate level. I wanted to have either four students in the master’s program or four professors as the speakers for this study. However, in attempting to control for other extra-linguistic variables besides origin, such as age, education level, etc., I found that the four speakers chosen were the best set of speakers to use, because they all sounded intelligent and educated, and none of them had a noticeably poor voice quality.

Some possible disadvantages to this technique are that the speech of the readers will be more artificial and less spontaneous than if they were explaining the passage in their own words.
However, this disadvantage is minimized in a study of attitudes toward pronunciation. If each speaker is reading the exact same passage, then the judges will not be able to focus on lexical, semantic or morpho-syntactic variation, only phonetic and phonological differences, though it is still something that needs to be considered as a disadvantage. Also, having each speaker read the same passage can be repetitious for the listeners. It is likely that as the judges listen to several speakers all saying the same thing, they will understand each speaker better than the previous speaker because of the repetition, and may rate the speakers that they understand well the highest.

Of the four speakers recorded, there was one male and one female from each country. The Mexican female is from Atlixco, Puebla, about two hours southeast of Mexico City, and the Mexican male is from Tampico, on the coast of the Gulf of Mexico. While they do not come from the same region of Mexico, they have very similar accents when reading a passage out loud. Both of the speakers from Spain are from Alcalá de Henares, just outside of Madrid. I knew all three of the graduate students well from having classes with them in the Spanish graduate program and knew the professor from the program also. I asked each speaker, either in person or through email, if they would be willing to be recorded reading a passage for the study, and each was happy to help.

The reason that I chose speakers from Spain was because it was the country that I wanted to focus on. I was curious to see if the judges who had learned Spanish in a Spanish-speaking country other than Spain would react negatively or positively to a dialect that uses /θ/. I chose speakers from Mexico because I knew that it would be easy to find students at BYU who had spent time in Mexico as missionaries to be judges.
Judges

Each judge was a nonnative Spanish speaker. Each had learned Spanish as a second language and recently (within a year or two by the time they participated in the study) spent almost two years in Spain, Mexico, or Argentina as a missionary for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Missionaries learning a foreign language first spend about two months in a training center learning the language as well as how to be a missionary. In addition to the two months in the training center, they spend about sixteen to twenty-two months in the country or area where they were called to serve a mission.

All of the participants were in the same age range, between twenty years old and twenty-five years old. They were all males and enrolled in Spanish 321, “Third-Year Spanish Reading, Grammar and Culture,” at BYU. I found volunteers in these categories by visiting about twenty sections of Spanish 321 and asking for participants who had spent almost two years in one of these countries (Spain, Mexico and Argentina) as missionaries to take a ten to fifteen minute survey. Over one hundred students gave me their email addresses so that I could email them with some available times to come take the survey outside of their class time. I reserved a classroom on campus for several different time slots and emailed each potential judge with times to choose from. In the end, there were six males who spent time as missionaries in Spain, five who spent time in Argentina, and sixteen in Mexico. The original plan was to find at least five males and five females who had lived in these countries as missionaries, but I was unable to find enough females who met these qualifications, as there is a high ratio of males to females in this course due to a higher volume of males serving missions. In addition, there were many more judges who had lived in Mexico than those who had lived in Spain and Argentina. This was not
expected, but not surprising either, as there is a larger population of Spanish speakers in Mexico than in Spain and Argentina, and many more missionaries are sent there.

**Passage**

The passage read was as follows:

Todo empezó cuando la señora que vivía en frente de mi casa salió con su perro en brazos, cruzó la autopista, y abandonó a su perro. Seguidamente, el señor que se encontraba a mi lado, esperando que llegara el autobús, vio como la señora abandonó a su perro, y la denunció. Fue a juicio, y al final, el perro se quedó con el señor, y la mujer tuvo que pagar una multa. Después, todo volvió a la normalidad. (Crespo Zapico, 2011)

When choosing a passage for the speakers to record, there are several factors that need to be considered, including “phonetic, morphological, syntactic and lexical aspects,” as well as a formal versus an informal register (Solís Obiols, 2002). I searched for possible passages to use on Google and found four or five that had a few instances of both /s/ and /θ/. This particular passage was used because it contains five words where the speakers from Spain use /θ/ and the speakers from Mexico use /s/ (empezó, brazos, cruzó, denunció and juicio), and it had a more informal register, making the recording feel like the speakers were telling a story to the judges, whereas the other passages were more technical or academic.

In addition to the contrast between /θ/ and /s/ in the passage, there are other sounds in the passage that can help to distinguish between the speakers from Spain and Mexico. For example, not only do certain dialects of Spain have two phonemes, /s/ represented by the grapheme {s}, and /θ/ represented by the graphemes {z}, {ci}, and {ce}, versus just /s/, which is represented by all of those graphemes in Mexico, but the phoneme /s/ is also realized differently in both places. In some areas of Spain, the tip of the tongue approaches the alveolar region, represented by [ś],
whereas in Mexico, it is the pre-dorsal part of the tongue, represented by [s]. The result is that, impressionistically, the /s/ can sound somewhat like a whistle in Spain (Hualde et al, 2010). In addition, there is a tendency in areas of Mexico to use a glottal variant of /x/, represented by the allophone [h], compared to the velar [x] or even uvular [χ] variant found in Spain (Moreno de Alba, 1992). While this is a difference between the dialects, there were only two examples in the passage (juicio and mujer), and it is not likely to affect the data. The differences in focus, /θ/ versus /s/ and [s] versus [ʂ], are very noticeable and are the main distinguishable contrasts of sounds in question.

Brown and Lambert (1976) explain that judges are able to “accurately discriminate social status level,” and that they use cues that are both verbal (the words that are said) and vocal (how they are said, such as intonation and pronunciation). They affirm that “most of the information about social status is contained in the vocal aspects of speech.” Because all of the speakers used in my study read the same passage, the participants were only able to judge based on vocal cues.

Recording

All four speakers were recorded in the same studio room and with the same equipment, on BYU campus in the Humanities Learning Resource Center, to control for the recording quality. I reserved the room for four separate time slots and had each speaker meet with me individually to record the passage. I had emailed them a copy of the passage previously to give them some time to look over and familiarize themselves with the passage. While recording, I attempted to have each speaker read at the same speed and at the same distance from the microphone. I had each speaker read the passage three or four times so that I would have several options to choose from to get the best take possible.
After recording each speaker, I took the recordings home and listened to each take from each speaker and chose the take where they sounded the most natural and confident. I then sent the best take to each speaker and asked if they noticed anything that did not sound natural in the recording, and after approval from each one, I put the best take from each speaker onto the same take and adjusted the volumes a little because they were not all at quite the same volume. I put them in the order of male from Mexico, female from Spain, male from Spain, and finally female from Mexico. The order was chosen randomly.

Questionnaire

I created the questionnaire for the present study based on the questionnaire from a study done by Brown and Lambert (1976). Their study used the matched guise technique and had judges listen to several speakers in English and French, and rate them from one to six on their judged social status — intelligence, confidence, attractiveness, ambitiousness, sincerity, height, dependability, politeness, sense of humor, kindness, etc. The characteristics in the current study are similar sets of opposites: uneducated/educated, unintelligent/intelligent, lazy/hard working, ugly/good looking, short/tall, unpleasant voice/pleasant voice, dishonest/honest, mean/nice, boring/interesting, proud/humble, unorganized/organized, unfriendly/friendly. The judges listened to each speaker and rated them on each set of qualities from 1 (being very negative) to 6 (being very positive). A scale of 1 to 6 was chosen so that the judges would be unable to give a neutral rating.

Blas Arroyo (1999) explains that these types of judged characteristics can be separated into three groups: A) Personal competence and socioeconomic status, including intelligence, ambition, etc.; B) Personal integrity, including humility, honesty, loyalty, etc.; C) Social attractiveness, or friendliness, happiness, etc. Instead of including attractiveness, height, and
voice quality in the category of social attractiveness, I decided to add a fourth category, physical attractiveness. Table 1 shows how I separated the questions into the four categories. The characteristic of an unpleasant versus a pleasant voice was also used to try to determine if the participants were judging the speakers solely based on the sound of their voice rather than on their pronunciation.

I determined which characteristics to use by looking at Blas Arroyo’s explanation of the three groups of characteristics, as well as the characteristics chosen by Brown and Lambert (1976) and Young (2003). Unfortunately, I did not fully consider which characteristics would go into each group until after I had administered the surveys. In retrospect, I should have chosen three characteristics from each group, but instead I chose four from the group Competence/Social Status and only two from Integrity. I used Blas Arroyo’s model to assign each characteristic to a group as well, but also decided to create a fourth group, Physical Attractiveness, in an effort to make the number of characteristics in each group more similar. Ugly/good looking, short/tall and unpleasant voice/pleasant voice were assigned to the group physical attractiveness because they are each physical characteristics that people have, whereas mean/nice, boring/interesting and unfriendly/friendly do not have to do with physical appearance, but contribute to the social attractiveness of an individual.

Table 1 Characteristics Grouped Into Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence/Social Status</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Physical Attractiveness</th>
<th>Social Attractiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uneducated/educated</td>
<td>Dishonest/honest</td>
<td>Ugly/good looking</td>
<td>Mean/nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligent/intelligent</td>
<td>Proud/humble</td>
<td>Short/tall</td>
<td>Boring/interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy/hardworking</td>
<td>Unpleasant voice/pleasant voice</td>
<td>Unfriendly/friendly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unorganized/organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process

After developing the recordings and the questionnaire (see Appendix A), I performed a pilot study with students from the Spanish 102 class that I was teaching to make sure that the instruments (recording and questionnaire) were ready for the study. The judges from the pilot study had no trouble understanding what to do and it went as I had intended, so I moved forward with the actual study.

I met the judges at a scheduled time in a room on BYU’s campus that I had previously reserved. I met with groups of two to seven participants each session. First they filled out the top portion of the questionnaire, which gave me information about their age, gender, where they had lived as missionaries (either Argentina, Mexico or Spain), how long they had been home, and additional experience with Spanish (if they had taken an advanced Spanish class in high school such as AP Spanish or equivalent, if they had done a study abroad or internship with Spanish, etc.).

Once all of the participants had finished the first section, I played the recording and asked them to listen and rate each speaker on all twelve characteristics. I paused in between each speaker so that they had adequate time to rate him or her on each quality before the next speaker started. After they had rated all of the speakers, they had two open-ended questions to answer: “Why did you provide the ratings that you gave for each speaker?” And “Which speaker did you think had the best Spanish and why?”
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Once the questionnaires were collected, I entered the data into an Excel spreadsheet. I grouped the questions into their subgroups (Personal Competence/Judged Socioeconomic Status, Personal Integrity, Physical Attractiveness and Social Attractiveness, see Table 1) and after consulting with the statistics center on BYU campus as well as with Dr. Rob Martinsen in the department, determined that performing a t-test to calculate for significance would be the best route with the data collected. While some consider anything more than .01 to not be statistically significant, I decided to use standard procedure, as in the Brown and Lambert study (1976), and considered a value of p equal to or below .05 to be statistically significant.

In addition to testing for the value of p with a t-test, I calculated the average ratings from each category that the judges who had lived in Spain, Mexico and Argentina gave to each speaker. I also used Excel to test for standard deviations to make sure that the average ratings were reliable. Because the rating system used goes from 1, being a low rating, to 6, being a high rating, we will consider a mean rating between 1 and 2.9 low, between 3 and 3.9 neutral (neither a positive nor a negative attitude), and between 4 and 6 high.

A high standard deviation shows that the ratings are more dispersed and spread apart, while a low standard deviation shows that the ratings are closer to the mean (Niles, n.d.). A similar study on language attitudes by Casesnoves Ferrer and Sankoff (2003) used a rating system with only two possible values, 0 and 1. They considered any standard deviation below 0.20 (20% of the highest possible rating) to reflect solidarity in the results, meaning that the majority of the ratings were close to the mean. After consulting with Dr. Rob Martinsen, and based on the study by Casesnoves Ferrer and Sankoff, I determined that for this study, a standard
deviation below 1.20 (which is 20% of the highest possible rating, 6) reflects solidarity in the ratings. The standard deviation for each individual question on the survey can be found in Appendix C. Each table in this chapter includes the standard deviation for the categories found in Table 1, and all of the standard deviations were below 1.20 (except for the ratings given to the female from Mexico by the judges from Argentina for Social Attractiveness), which shows that the ratings given were close together rather than dispersed.

First, I will show the results that pertain to the first hypothesis, which is that the judges will give the highest ratings to the speakers from the country where they lived. This section will be divided into three subsections: how the judges who had lived in Mexico rated each speaker from Mexico compared to each speaker from Spain; how the judges from Spain rated each speaker from Spain compared to each speaker from Mexico; how the judges who had lived in Argentina rated each speaker from Spain compared to each speaker from Mexico; and the ratings that each speaker received from the judges who had lived in Mexico compared to the ratings that they received from the judges who had lived in Spain. Then I will show the results that pertain to the second hypothesis, which is that the judges will rate the female from Spain higher than they will rate the male from Spain. Finally, I will show some of the comments that the judges left in the comments section about why they gave the ratings that they gave to each speaker and about which speaker they thought had the best Spanish.

For each figure, I left out the category of Personal Integrity because the t-tests for that category did not reach statistical significance. It is likely that the reason for this was because there were only two characteristics in this category, so there were less data than there were in the other categories. However, there are other possible factors as well. The judges may have had a clear idea in mind as to which of the speakers they felt were more attractive or competent, and
they may have felt that all of the speakers had the same level of integrity, causing the ratings to be closer in value than they were for the other categories. To see the results for Personal Integrity, see Appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker Abbreviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mex, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mex, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp, F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The abbreviations for each speaker can be found in Table 2

Results Pertaining to Hypothesis 1

The following tables and figures show the data pertaining to the first hypothesis, that L2 Spanish speakers will rate the speakers from the country where they lived the highest. They include the results from the t-test showing statistical significance of the data.

Judges Who Lived in Mexico

In the first two sections of Hypothesis 1, the data will show each speaker compared to the speakers from the other country, showing the ratings that the judges who had lived in Mexico gave to the male from Mexico compared to the ratings that the same judges gave to the male from Spain, for example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Competence/ Social Status</th>
<th>Physical Attractiveness</th>
<th>Social Attractiveness</th>
<th>All Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mex, M</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mex, F</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp, M</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp, F</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 1 through 3 show the compared mean ratings for each speaker. As can be seen in Table 3, the females were given high ratings (above 4) in each category, and the males
were given neutral ratings (between 3 and 3.9) in each category, with the exception of the male from Spain receiving a high rating for Personal Competence/Judged Social Status.

Figure 1 Mexican Judges’ Ratings for the Mexican and Spanish Males

![Bar chart showing ratings for Mexican and Spanish males](image)

* = Significant

The judges who had lived in Mexico gave the male from Mexico a lower rating for Personal Competence/Judged Social Status than the rating that they gave to the male from Spain (3.72 compared to 4.03). However, they gave the male from Mexico a 3.92 for Physical Attractiveness compared to 3.27 for the male from Spain. Both speakers received almost the same rating for Social Attractiveness (3.77 for the male from Mexico compared to 3.83 for the male from Spain) and for all of the questions combined (3.80 compared to 3.78). The ratings for the two males were statistically significant only for the category of Physical Attractiveness. As outlined under my hypotheses, I had expected the judges who had lived in Mexico to rate the
speakers from Mexico higher than the speakers from Spain, which was only the case for the
category of Physical Attractiveness.

Figure 2 Mexican Judges’ Ratings for the Mexican Male Versus the Female from Spain

* = Significant

The t-tests for the male from Mexico compared to the female from Spain were all
significant, with the female from Spain being rated higher than the male from Mexico in each
category by the judges who had lived in Mexico. They gave the male from Mexico a rating of
3.72 for the category of Personal Competence/Judged Social Status compared to 4.56 for the
female from Spain, 3.92 for Physical Attractiveness compared to 4.42, and 3.77 for Social
Attractiveness compared to 4.58. For all of the questions combined, they gave the male from
Mexico a rating of 3.80 compared to 4.49 for the female from Spain. These findings do not
support my hypothesis that the judges who had lived in Mexico would rate both speakers from
Mexico higher than both speakers from Spain. The fact that they rated the female from Spain so much higher than the male from Mexico may be due to the fact that all of the judges were males.

Figure 3 Mexican Judges’ Ratings for the Mexican Female Versus the Male from Spain

![Bar chart showing ratings](chart.png)

* = Significant

The four t-tests for the female from Mexico compared to the male from Spain when rated by those who had lived in Mexico were significant. They gave the female from Mexico higher ratings in each category. She received a 4.48 for Personal Competence/Judged Social Status compared to 4.03 for the male from Spain and 4.40 for Physical Attractiveness compared to 3.27. They gave her 4.29 for Social Attractiveness compared to 3.83 for the male from Spain, and 4.37 for all of the questions combined compared to 3.78 for the male from Spain.

All four of the t-tests for the female from Mexico compared to the female from Spain when rated by the judges who had lived in Mexico did not reach significance. They received almost the same ratings for each category (see Table 3). This set of data was unexpected and
does not support my hypothesis that the judges who had lived in Mexico would rate the speakers from Mexico higher than the speakers from Spain.

*Judges Who Lived in Spain*

Table 4 Speaker Mean and Standard Deviation, Judges Who Lived in Spain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Competence/ Social Status Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Physical Attractiveness Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Social Attractiveness Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>All Questions Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mex, M</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mex, F</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp, M</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp, F</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 4 through 7 provide the compared mean ratings for each speaker. As can be seen in Table 4, the judges who had lived in Spain gave both speakers from Spain high ratings (above 4) in each category. They gave the male from Mexico neutral ratings for each category, and they gave the female from Mexico high ratings for Personal Competence/Judged Social Status and for Social Attractiveness, and a neutral rating for Physical Attractiveness, with the average ratings for all of the questions combined being neutral.
Figure 4 Spanish Judges’ Ratings for the Spanish and Mexican Males

Figure 4 shows that all of the ratings for the male from Spain compared to the male from Mexico, given by the judges who had lived in Spain, are significant. They rated the male from Spain at 4.79 for Personal Competence/Judged Social Status compared to 3.67 for the male from Mexico and 4.28 for Physical Attractiveness compared to 3.06. They gave the male from Spain a rating of 4.56 for Social Attractiveness compared to 3.28 for the male from Mexico, and for all of the questions combined, they gave the male from Spain a rating of 4.47 compared to 3.43 for the male from Mexico. These results were what I expected, according to my hypothesis that the judges would give higher ratings to the varieties that they were more familiar with. However, because the results from the judges who had lived in Mexico do not support the hypothesis, it is possible that the judges in this study simply preferred the Spanish from Spain over the Spanish from Mexico, on average.
Figure 5 shows that all of the ratings for the male from Spain compared to the female from Mexico, given by the judges who had lived in Spain, are significant, except in the category Social Attractiveness. They rated the male from Spain at 4.79 for Personal Competence/Judged Social Status compared to 4.08 for the female from Mexico, 4.28 for Physical Attractiveness compared to 3.22, and 4.56 for Social Attractiveness compared to 4.22. For all of the questions combined, they gave the male from Spain a rating of 4.47 compared to 3.96 for the female from Mexico. While I had expected a bigger difference for the category Social Attractiveness, I did expect the male from Spain to be rated higher than the female from Mexico in each category.
Figure 7 shows that all of the ratings for the female from Spain compared to the male from Mexico, given by the judges who had lived in Spain, are significant. She received significantly higher ratings than he did from these judges, who rated her at 4.88 for Personal Competence/Judged Social Status compared to 3.67 for the male from Mexico and 5.06 for Physical Attractiveness compared to 3.06. They also gave the female from Spain a rating of 4.94 for Social Attractiveness compared to 3.28 for the male from Mexico, and for all of the questions combined, they gave her a rating of 4.86 compared to 3.43 for the male from Mexico. Again, I had expected the judges who had lived in Spain to rate the female from Spain higher than the male from Mexico. However, this may also be due to the fact that all of the judges were males.
Figure 7 shows that all of the ratings for the female from Spain compared to the female from Mexico, given by the judges who had lived in Spain, are significant. They rated the female from Spain at 4.88 for Personal Competence/Judged Social Status compared to 4.08 for the female from Mexico, 5.06 for Physical Attractiveness compared to 3.22, and 4.94 for Social Attractiveness compared to 4.22. For all of the questions combined, they gave the female from Spain a rating of 4.86 compared to 3.96 for the female from Mexico.

Judges Who Lived in Argentina

Table 5 Speaker Mean and Standard Deviation, Judges Who Lived in Argentina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Competence/Social Status</th>
<th>Physical Attractiveness</th>
<th>Social Attractiveness</th>
<th>All Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mex, M</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mex, F</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp, M</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp, F</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figures 8 through 11 provide the compared mean ratings for each speaker as judged by those who had lived in Argentina. As can be seen in Table 5, they gave both speakers from Spain high ratings (above 4) in each category. They gave the male from Mexico neutral ratings for each category, and they gave the female from Mexico high ratings for Personal Competence/Judged Social Status and for Social Attractiveness, and a neutral rating for Physical Attractiveness, with the average ratings for all of the questions combined being high.

Figure 8 Argentine Judges’ Ratings for the Spanish and Mexican Males

![Bar chart showing ratings for different categories](image)

* = Significant

Figure 8 shows that the ratings for the category Physical Attractiveness were not significant, while the ratings for all of the other categories were significant. They rated the male from Spain at 4.90 for Personal Competence/Judged Social Status compared to 3.90 for the male from Mexico and 4.27 for Physical Attractiveness compared to 3.73. They gave the male from
Spain a rating of 4.27 for Social Attractiveness compared to 3.13 for the male from Mexico, and for all of the questions combined, they gave the male from Spain a rating of 4.47 compared to 3.68 for the male from Mexico.

Figure 9 Argentine Judges’ Ratings for the Male from Spain Versus the Mexican Female

![Figure 9](attachment:image.jpg)

* = Significant

Figure 9 shows that all of the ratings for the male from Spain compared to the female from Mexico, given by the judges who had lived in Argentina, are significant, except in the category Personal Competence/Judged Social Status, and for all of the questions combined. They rated the male from Spain at 4.90 for Personal Competence/Judged Social Status compared to 4.15 for the female from Mexico, 4.27 for Physical Attractiveness compared to 3.80, and 4.27 for Social Attractiveness compared to 4.07. For all of the questions combined, they gave the male from Spain a rating of 4.47 compared to 4.02 for the female from Mexico.
Figure 10 shows that all of the ratings for the female from Spain compared to the male from Mexico, given by the judges who had lived in Argentina, are significant. As with the judges who had lived in Spain, the female from Spain received significantly higher ratings than the male from Mexico did from these judges, who rated her at 5.00 for Personal Competence/Judged Social Status compared to 3.90 for the male from Mexico and 4.60 for Physical Attractiveness compared to 3.73. They also gave the female from Spain a rating of 4.60 for Social Attractiveness compared to 3.13 for the male from Mexico, and for all of the questions combined, they gave her a rating of 4.63 compared to 3.68 for the male from Mexico.
Figure 11 shows that all of the ratings for the female from Spain compared to the female from Mexico, given by the judges who had lived in Spain, are significant, except for the category Social Attractiveness. They rated the female from Spain at 5.00 for Personal Competence/Judged Social Status compared to 4.15 for the female from Mexico, 4.60 for Physical Attractiveness compared to 3.80, and 4.60 for Social Attractiveness compared to 4.07. For all of the questions combined, they gave the female from Spain a rating of 4.63 compared to 4.02 for the female from Mexico.

*Mexican Judges Versus Spanish Judges (All Speakers Compared)*

It is also beneficial to compare the ratings that each group of judges gave to the speakers. This section will show the results side by side that each speaker received from each group of judges, and will include the statistical significance of the data, which was determined by
performing a t-test. Table 5 through 8 show the mean and standard deviation again, but with the groups of judges side by side.

### Table 6 Judges Compared, Personal Competence/Judged Social Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Mex, M</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mex, F</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sp, M</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sp, F</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 12 Personal Competence/Judged Social Status**

Because the male from Mexico and the female from Spain were both given nearly the same rating from each group of judges for Personal Competence/Judged Social Status, the data did not reach significance. The male from Mexico received a rating of 3.72 in this category from the judges who had lived in Mexico, compared to 3.67 from the judges who had lived in Spain. The female from Spain received a rating of 4.56 from the judges who had lived in Mexico.
compared to 4.88 from the judges who had lived in Spain. The male from Spain was given a higher rating from the judges who had lived in Spain, and the female from Mexico was given a higher rating from the judges who had lived in Mexico.

Figure 8 also shows that the judges who had lived in Spain rated both of the speakers from Spain higher than the speakers from Mexico. However, the judges who had lived in Mexico rated the two females the highest, rather than giving higher ratings specifically to the speakers from the country where they lived as missionaries.

Table 7 Judges Compared, Physical Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13 Physical Attractiveness

* = Significant
For the category of Physical Attractiveness, all of the data were significant. Unlike with Personal Competence/Judged Social Status, each speaker received higher ratings from the judges who had lived in the country where they are from than from the judges who had lived in the other country. However, similar to the results from Personal Competence/Judged Social Status, the judges who had lived in Spain gave higher ratings to the speakers from Spain than they did to the speakers from Mexico, but the judges who had lived in Mexico rated both of the females higher than they did both of the males. The judges who had lived in Mexico did, however, rate the male from Mexico significantly higher than they did the male from Spain (3.92 compared to 3.27). See Figure 1, which shows that this result was statistically significant.

Table 8 Judges Compared, Social Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Mex, M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mex, F</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sp, M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sp, F</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The only significant results for Social Attractiveness were for the ratings that the speakers from Spain received from both groups of judges, who were given higher ratings from the judges who had lived in Spain than from the ones who had lived in Mexico. Again, each speaker was rated higher by the group of judges that lived where the speaker is from than by the other group of judges. Also, the judges who had lived in Spain rated the speakers from Spain higher than the speakers from Mexico, and the judges who had lived in Mexico rated the females higher than the males.

Table 9 Judges Compared, All Questions Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Mex, M</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mex, F</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sp, M</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sp, F*</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data for combining all of the questions together were significant for each speaker. Overall, each speaker was rated significantly higher by the group of judges who had lived where they are from than by the other group of judges. The judges who had lived in Spain rated both speakers from Spain higher than both of the speakers from Mexico, and the judges who had lived in Mexico rated both of the females higher than both of the males.

Results Pertaining to Hypothesis 2

My second hypothesis was that the female from Spain would be rated higher than the male from Spain, specifically by the judges who had lived in Mexico. To review the exact ratings that each speaker from Spain received by category, see Table 3, and to see the results by question, see the tables in Appendix C.
The judges who had lived in Mexico rated the female from Spain significantly higher than the male from Spain in all categories. The rating that she received for all of the questions combined was 4.49 compared to 3.78 for the male from Spain.
In the category of Physical Attractiveness, and with all of the questions combined, the judges who had lived in Spain rated the female from Spain significantly higher than the male from Spain. In the category of Personal Competence/Judged Social Status, the judges who had lived in Spain gave them both almost the same rating (4.88 for the female from Spain compared to 4.79 for the Male).

Comments

Table 10 Mexican Judges’ Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear Speech (Mexico)</th>
<th>Clear Speech (Spain)</th>
<th>Male from Mexico slurred speech</th>
<th>Used Imagination</th>
<th>Recognized from Mexico</th>
<th>Speed/Confidence</th>
<th>Tone</th>
<th>No Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eleven of the judges who had lived in Mexico wrote in the comments section that they thought one or both of the speakers from Mexico had the best Spanish out of the group because of how clearly they spoke or how easy they were to understand. Most of them mentioned the female from Mexico rather than the male from Mexico. Two of them mentioned that they rated one of the speakers from Spain highest because of how clearly they spoke, and one mentioned that the male from Mexico slurred his speech. Eleven of them mentioned that they either tried to imagine the person speaking or that one or more of the speakers reminded them of people that they knew when they lived in Mexico and two of them explicitly stated that they rated one or more of the speakers from Mexico higher because they could tell that they were from Mexico and it was easier to understand them for that reason. Five of them mentioned either the speed at which the speakers spoke, or how confident they sounded. Four of them mentioned the tone that the speakers had. One of the judges did not comment.

One of the judges wrote about the female from Mexico, “I am sure I chose this one because it is an accent from where I served my mission, thus is the Spanish I learned and speak.” Another said, “I like the first and fourth the best because they are the most understandable, they pronounce everything well, and don’t say their ‘c’ and ‘z’ funny (even though that’s proper in some places.... I’m just not used to it).” One of the judges that said he liked the female from Spain the best wrote, “Sometimes a particular accent influences how I feel. The more clean the accent, the more positive attributes become associated with the voice.”

Table 11 Spanish Judges’ Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear Speech (Spain)</th>
<th>Male from Mexico slurred speech</th>
<th>Social Preconceptions</th>
<th>Women's Speech from Spain</th>
<th>Tone</th>
<th>Reminded of Someone (Spain)</th>
<th>Reminded of Someone (Mexico)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Four out of the six judges who had lived in Spain commented that they rated the female from Spain higher than the others because of how clearly she spoke, how much she articulated or her confidence as she spoke, and two of those four said that they rated both speakers from Spain higher than the speakers from Mexico because of the clarity of their speech. One of them pointed out that he rated the male from Mexico, lower because of his “slurred language.” One justified his ratings by saying “social preconceptions from living in Spain make me think differently of people with Spanish accents vs. Latin American accents.” He also said that he is a “sucker for Spanish women speaking Spanish.”

One pointed out that he gave higher ratings to those who spoke more clearly, specifically the female from Spain, because he could understand her better than the other speakers even though she spoke faster. Another stated that he was reminded of people that he knew with similar voices. One also commented that the female from Spain sounded more confident, her tone was more upbeat, and her words flowed better when compared to the other speakers.

Table 12 Argentine Judges’ Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clear Speech (Spain)</th>
<th>Used Imagination</th>
<th>Male from Mexico Boring</th>
<th>Tone</th>
<th>Male from Spain Educated</th>
<th>Male from Spain Stuck Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The judges from Argentina also gave some interesting comments. Three of them commented on the clarity of speech from the speakers from Spain, one specifically pointing out the female’s clarity of speech, one commenting on the male’s, and one pointing out that both had clear speech. Also, one of them wrote that the male from Mexico sounded boring. One of them mentioned tone as being an important factor, though he did not clarify what he meant by tone, and another said that the male from Spain spoke clearly and sounded educated, but also sounded “stuck up.”
While I attempted to find speakers whose only difference was their dialect, there are other factors that are not completely controllable when having different people record their speech. The speakers that I selected all had a similar level of education, were close to each other in age, and I made an effort to have their recordings done in the same manner. I also attempted to have them all read the passage at the same pace, and in the same way, besides their pronunciation. However, Speaker 1, the male from Mexico, had a more monotonous tone while he read, and although he did not stutter or have difficulty reading, he did not have much enthusiasm or confidence in his voice. While we recorded the passage, I did not notice this, but after listening to the recordings a few times while administering the questionnaire, I started to notice that issue. A couple of the judges even wrote about his slurred speech in the comments section, and one mentioned that they thought that he sounded boring.

Speaker 4, the female from Mexico, also had a couple of pauses that she likely would not have had if she had spoken the passage spontaneously rather than reading it, but they were not very noticeable, and given her ratings and the fact that none of the judges pointed that out specifically in their comments, I think that it was not quite obvious enough to affect the results.

I was expecting both groups of judges to give higher ratings to the speakers from the country where they had lived, but, possibly due to the lack of clarity and confidence in the speech of the male from Mexico, the judges who had lived in Mexico rated him even lower than they did both of the speakers from Spain. However, the judges who had lived in Spain rated the speakers from Spain significantly higher than they did the speakers from Mexico, as well as significantly higher than the judges who had lived in Mexico rated the speakers from Spain, in
almost every category. In addition, several of the judges pointed out in the comments section
that they rated the speakers higher whose dialect they were more familiar with, or whichever
speaker they understood the best. As mentioned before, there are several factors that could have
affected which speakers the judges understood the best. In general, the judges seemed to
understand best the speakers from the country where they had lived, but it also appears that the
first speaker was difficult to understand, which could have been because he was the first speaker
that they heard reading the passage, and also possibly because of his slurred speech.

The fact that the judges who had lived in Spain rated the speakers from Spain
significantly higher in every category besides Integrity shows that despite the overall feeling of
the dialect from Spain being a prestigious variety, there may also have been a sense of the
speakers from Spain being proud or “stuck up,” as one of the judges worded it. Another possible
factor is that the judges may have had different opinions on whether it is better to be humble or
proud. Pride can be associated with having confidence, or with being arrogant, and humility can
be associated with being poor, or unpretentious.

My second hypothesis was that the speech of the female from Spain would be favored
above the speech of the male from Spain, especially by the judges who had lived in Mexico. The
male from Mexico was rated significantly lower than both females in every category, but this
may have been due to his lack of confidence while reading the passage. However, despite the
fact that the male from Spain spoke with confidence, and did not hesitate or mumble, the female
from Spain was rated significantly higher than he was in all of the categories (besides Integrity)
by the judges who had lived in Mexico. He was rated significantly lower than the female from
Spain in the category of Physical Attractiveness. In the category of Social Attractiveness and in
Competence, the difference did not reach significance. A couple of the judges commented on
either one of the females having “the most beautiful voice” out of the four, or that her voice was “appealing” to him, or that he was a “sucker” for the way females from Spain spoke. González Martínez (2008), Labov (1972) and Martínez Ibarra (2011) all affirm that women typically speak a more prestigious variety than do men. Martínez Ibarra also explains that men and women may reveal different attitudes toward various dialects or forms of speech. If I had been able to find enough female judges for this study, it is possible that they would not have had more positive attitudes toward the women’s speech than toward the men’s speech, as the male judges did.

It is likely that the judges who had lived in Mexico rated the speakers from Mexico higher than the judges who had lived in Spain rated them because they were more familiar with their variety of Spanish due to living in Mexico for two years. Many commented that they gave higher ratings to the speakers that they understood the easiest. What appears more probable, however, at least in this group of participants, are the facts that the dialect from Spain is very prestigious in the Spanish-speaking world, as well as non-linguistic factors, such as the clarity of speech, how much confidence they had in the recording, their intonation, enthusiasm, etc. We can conclude that the majority of the judges rated the speakers that they could understand well the highest, because most of the judges specifically stated that in their comments.

My hypotheses before administering the questionnaires were that the judges would identify with the speakers from the country where they lived and rate those speakers higher, and that the female from Spain would be rated higher than the male from Spain. I predicted that the judges who had lived in Mexico would have a negative attitude toward the use of /θ/ and /ʃ/ and would thus rate the speakers from Spain lower than they would the speakers from Mexico. Overall, the results do not completely support these hypotheses. While the judges who had lived in Spain did rate the speakers from Spain more favorably than the speakers from Mexico, the
judges who had lived in Mexico rated the females from each country about the same as each other, as well as the males from each country about the same as each other, but they did not rate the speakers from Mexico higher than they rated the speakers from Spain. The judges who had lived in Mexico rated the female from Spain significantly higher than they did the male from Spain, but the judges from Spain only rated her significantly higher in the category of Physical Attractiveness, which could have been because all of the judges were males.

There are a few things that I would change if I were to replicate this project. During the recording process, I would have kept tone in consideration for each of the speakers. I was careful to have each of them read the passage at approximately the same speed, but did not think about the tone of their voice. If I had thought about it, I would have had the male from Mexico record again, with a more confident and upbeat tone. Also, when I designed the questionnaire, I would have replaced one of the characteristics in the category of Competence/Judged Social Status with a characteristic from Personal Integrity, that way each category would have had the same amount of characteristics. Lastly, it would have been helpful to have similar sized groups of judges, instead of having so many Mexican judges compared to those who had lived in Spain and Argentina. A possible solution to this issue would have been to only ask for judges who had lived in Spain and Argentina after reaching the quota for those who had lived in Mexico.

In addition, there are other questions that can be answered through further research. For example, how would the results compare if the judges were native speakers from Spain, Mexico and Argentina? Or if the speakers compared to those from Spain were from other countries besides Mexico? Another possibility that I considered including in this study, but was unable to due to time and financial constraints, would be to have judges from other areas of the world who have learned Spanish as a second language, such as from countries closer to Spain, in Europe. It
also would have been helpful to be able to compare ratings from female judges to the ratings
given by the male judges. Because I was unable to find any other studies that have measured
language attitudes of L2 speakers toward dialectal variations of a language, there are many
possibilities of research that can be done to learn and understand the role of language attitudes in
learning a second language.
Appendix A – Questionnaire

Please circle what best represents you out of the following:

Age:   18-25  26-35  35+
Gender:                     Male                Female
Where you served a mission:     Argentina     Mexico     Spain     other (specify)

How long have you been home? _________________

In high school, did you take AP Spanish or equivalent (if so, what)? ___________________________________

Before your mission, what university level Spanish classes did you take (if any)? _________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
Do you have any additional experience with Spanish (study abroad, internship, etc.)? If so, what and how long?
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

Now, listen to the following recordings and rate each speaker from 1 to 6 on the following qualities, based on your initial reaction, 1 being very low and 6 being very high:

Speaker 1
1. Uneducated/educated 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Unintelligent/intelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. Lazy/hard working 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Ugly/good looking 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. Short/tall 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Unpleasant voice/pleasant voice 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Dishonest/honest 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. Mean/nice 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. Boring/interesting 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. Proud/humble 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. Unorganized/organized 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. Unfriendly/friendly 1 2 3 4 5 6

Speaker 2
1. Uneducated/educated 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Unintelligent/intelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. Lazy/hard working 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Ugly/good looking 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. Short/tall 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Unpleasant voice/pleasant voice 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Dishonest/honest 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. Mean/nice 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. Boring/interesting 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. Proud/humble 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. Unorganized/organized 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. Unfriendly/friendly 1 2 3 4 5 6
### Speaker 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uneducated/educated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligent/intelligent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy/hard working</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugly/good looking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short/tall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant voice/pleasant voice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishonest/honest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean/nice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring/interesting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud/humble</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unorganized/organized</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly/friendly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why did you provide the ratings that you gave for each speaker?

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

### Speaker 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uneducated/educated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintelligent/intelligent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy/hard working</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugly/good looking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short/tall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant voice/pleasant voice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishonest/honest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean/nice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring/interesting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud/humble</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unorganized/organized</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly/friendly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why did you provide the ratings that you gave for each speaker?

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

Which speaker did you think had the best Spanish and why?

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
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Appendix B – Recorded Passage

“Todo empezó cuando la señora que vivía en frente de mi casa salió con su perro en brazos, cruzó la autopista, y abandonó a su perro. Seguidamente, el señor que se encontraba a mi lado, esperando que llegara el autobús, vio como la señora abandonó a su perro, y la denunció. Fue a juicio, y al final, el perro se quedó con el señor, y la mujer tuvo que pagar una multa. Después, todo volvió a la normalidad.”
### Appendix C – Means and Standard Deviations for Individual Questions

#### Table 9 Judges Who Lived in Mexico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean (Mex, M)</th>
<th>SD (Mex, M)</th>
<th>Mean (Sp, F)</th>
<th>SD (Sp, F)</th>
<th>Mean (Sp, M)</th>
<th>SD (Sp, M)</th>
<th>Mean (Mex, F)</th>
<th>SD (Mex, F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Uneducated/educated</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unintelligent/intelligent</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lazy/hard working</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ugly/good looking</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Short/tall</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unpleasant voice/pleasant voice</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dishonest/honest</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mean/nice</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Boring/interesting</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Proud/humble</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Unorganized/organized</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Unfriendly/friendly</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall (all questions combined)</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 10 Judges Who Lived in Spain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean (Mex, M)</th>
<th>SD (Mex, M)</th>
<th>Mean (Sp, F)</th>
<th>SD (Sp, F)</th>
<th>Mean (Sp, M)</th>
<th>SD (Sp, M)</th>
<th>Mean (Mex, F)</th>
<th>SD (Mex, F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Uneducated/educated</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unintelligent/intelligent</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lazy/hard working</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ugly/good looking</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Short/tall</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unpleasant voice/pleasant voice</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dishonest/honest</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mean/nice</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Boring/interesting</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Proud/humble</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Unorganized/organized</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Unfriendly/friendly</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall (all questions combined)</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Mex, M Mean</td>
<td>Mex, F Mean</td>
<td>Sp, M Mean</td>
<td>Sp, F Mean</td>
<td>Mex, M SD</td>
<td>Mex, F SD</td>
<td>Sp, M SD</td>
<td>Sp, F SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Uneducated/educated</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unintelligent/intelligent</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lazy/hard working</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ugly/good looking</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Short/tall</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Unpleasant voice/pleasant voice</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dishonest/honest</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mean/nice</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Boring/interesting</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Proud/humble</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Unorganized/organized</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Unfriendly/friendly</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall (all questions combined)</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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